Cyclotron radiation emission spectroscopy for neutrino mass measurement and exotic interaction searches



- Prof. Dr. Martin Fertl
- 6th Workshop on the
- Physics of Fundamental Symmetries and Interactions PSI 2022
 - Paul Scherrer Institut
 - Oct 21st, 2022



JOHANNES GUTENBERG UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ





Short introduction to neutrino masses

- The current state of the art: KATRIN and its latest results
- Project 8: Narrow-range CRES for a neutrino mass measurement
- He-6: Broad-band CRES to search for chirality flipping interactions
- Summary

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Outline



Non-zero neutrino masses are firmly established ...

Standard Model of Elementary Particles



Figure adapted and updated from https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Standard_Model_of_Elementary_Particles_Anti.svg

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

... through neutrino flavor oscillation experiments ...

..., but neutrinos remain only particle without measured mass ...

... and the mass generation mechanism remains unclear.









- Source decay rate > 10^{11} Bq
- Tritium suppression > 10^{12}
- MAC-E filter width: 0.93 eV @ 18.6 keV
- Main spectrometer at < 10⁻¹⁰ mbar \bullet
- Exquisite MC model of experiment \bullet

Source: Direct neutrino-mass measurement with sub-electronvolt sensitivity, The KATRIN Collaboration, Nature Physics, volume 18, pages 160–166 (2022)

- Source decay rate > 10^{11} Bq
- Tritium suppression > 10^{12}
- MAC-E filter width: 0.93 eV @ 18.6 keV
- Main spectrometer at < 10⁻¹⁰ mbar \bullet
- Exquisite MC model of experiment

Source: Direct neutrino-mass measurement with sub-electronvolt sensitivity, The KATRIN Collaboration, Nature Physics, volume 18, pages 160–166 (2022) M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Neutrino mass signature: change of shape and shift of endpoint

- Source decay rate > 10^{11} Bq
- Tritium suppression > 10^{12}
- MAC-E filter width: 0.93 eV @ 18.6 keV
- Main spectrometer at < 10⁻¹⁰ mbar
- Exquisite MC model of experiment \bullet

Source: Direct neutrino-mass measurement with sub-electronvolt sensitivity, The KATRIN Collaboration, Nature Physics, volume 18, pages 160–166 (2022)

Can't build a larger vacuum tank!

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

• MAC-E filter resolution scales with inverse area of analysis plane ($\nabla \cdot B = 0!$)

- Can't build a larger vacuum tank!

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

• MAC-E filter resolution scales with inverse area of analysis plane ($\overrightarrow{\nabla} \cdot \overrightarrow{B} = 0!$)

• Already at max. T₂ column density and length: inelastic scattering!

- MAC-E filter resolution scales with inverse area of analysis plane ($\nabla \cdot B = 0!$) Can't build a larger vacuum tank!
- Already at max. T₂ column density and length: inelastic scattering!
- Integrating MAC-E filter spectrometer \rightarrow Stepping of retardation voltage, slow!
- Intrinsic final state distribution of ³HeT⁺ molecular ion causes smearing of decay endpoint \bullet

- MAC-E filter resolution scales with inverse area of analysis plane ($\overrightarrow{\nabla} \cdot \overrightarrow{B} = 0!$) Can't build a larger vacuum tank!
- Already at max. T₂ column density and length: inelastic scattering!
- Integrating MAC-E filter spectrometer \rightarrow Stepping of retardation voltage, slow!
- Intrinsic final state distribution of ³HeT⁺ molecular ion causes smearing of decay endpoint \bullet

Project 8 A frequency-based approach towards the measurement of the neutrino mass using ultra cold atomic tritium with 40 meV/c² sensitivity 1 2 5

Project 8: Cyclotron radiation emission spectroscopy of T₍₂₎

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Project 8: Cyclotron radiation emission spectroscopy of $T_{(2)}$

- Cyclotron radiation from single electrons
- Source transparent to microwave radiation
- No e- transport from source to detector
- Highly precise frequency measurement

$$f_{\rm c} = \frac{f_{\rm c,0}}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{eB}{m_{\rm e} + E_{\rm kin}/c^2}$$

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Novel approach: J. Formaggio and B. Monreal, Phys. Rev D 80:051301 (2009)

Project 8: Cyclotron radiation emission spectroscopy of $T_{(2)}$

Novel approach: J. Formaggio and B. Monreal, Phys. Rev D 80:051301 (2009) Cyclotron radiation from single electrons • Source transparent to microwave radiation • No e- transport from source to detector • Highly precise frequency measurement

$$f_{\rm c} = \frac{f_{{\rm c},0}}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{e}{m_{\rm e} + e}$$

$$\frac{B}{E_{
m kin}/c^2}$$

Project 8: Cyclotron radiation emission spectroscopy of $T_{(2)}$

Novel approach: J. Formaggio and B. Monreal, Phys. Rev D 80:051301 (2009) Cyclotron radiation from single electrons • Source transparent to microwave radiation • No e- transport from source to detector • Highly precise frequency measurement

$$f_{\rm c} = \frac{f_{\rm c,0}}{\gamma} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{eB}{m_{\rm e} + E_{\rm kin}/c^2}$$

$$P(E_{\rm kin}, m, \theta) = \frac{1}{4\pi\epsilon_0} \frac{2}{3} \frac{e^4}{m^4 c^5} B^2 \left(E_{\rm kin}^2 + 2E_{\rm kin} m c^2 \right) \sin^2 \theta$$

 $P(17.8 \text{ keV}, 90^{\circ}, 1 \text{ T}) = 1 \text{ fW}$ $P(30.2 \text{ keV}, 90^{\circ}, 1 \text{ T}) = 1.7 \text{ fW}$

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Small but readily detectable with state of the art detectors

Demonstrate the path to an electron neutrino mass experiment step by step!

2016 2015 2017 2018 2019 202

Phase I

Proof of principle to show the feasibility of CRES: Use mono-energetic conversion electrons from ^{83m}Kr gas in waveguide

20	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025

Demonstrate the path to an electron neutrino mass experiment step by step!

2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 202

Proof of principle to show the feasibility of CRES: Use mono-energetic conversion electrons from ^{83m}Kr gas in waveguide

Amplification, digitization, mixing, and Fourier transformation

Phase I

20	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025

Demonstrate the path to an electron neutrino mass experiment step by step!

2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 202

Proof of principle to show the feasibility of CRES: Use mono-energetic conversion electrons from ^{83m}Kr gas in waveguide

Amplification, digitization, mixing, and Fourier transformation

Phase I

Very first CRES spectrum of ^{83m}Kr

20	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025

Demonstrate the path to an electron neutrino mass experiment step by step!

2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025

Proof of principle to show the feasibility of CRES: Use mono-energetic conversion electrons from ^{83m}Kr gas in waveguide

and Fourier transformation

Phase I

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

(2017) 054004 Ċ Phys. <u>a</u>. et Ashtari

Project 8 phase II: CRES application to a continuous spectrum

Demonstrate the path to an electron neutrino mass experiment step by step!

20	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025

Project 8 phase II: CRES application to a continuous spectrum

Demonstrate the path to an electron neutrino mass experiment step by step!

201	5	2016	2017	2018	2019	202
Phase		Cons	struction		Data taking)

Goals:

- 1st application of CRES to continuous β spectrum
- 1st frequency-based neutrino mass limit
- Demonstration of:
 - high energy resolution
 - zero background
 - control of systematic effects

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration with:

- small pitch angle acceptance
- small magnetic field variation
- but high energy resolution

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration with:

- small pitch angle acceptance
- small magnetic field variation
- but high energy resolution

Development of line shape model:

- Kr decay physics: shake-up and shake-off
 - ^{83m}Kr used in many other experiment too New paper: H. Robertson and V. Venkatapath, Phys. Rev. C 102, 035502, 2020
- e⁻ scattering in (high-density) gas column, background gases, missed first track

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration with:

- small pitch angle acceptance
- small magnetic field variation
- but high energy resolution

Development of line shape model:

- Kr decay physics: shake-up and shake-off
 - ^{83m}Kr used in many other experiment too New paper: H. Robertson and V. Venkatapath, Phys. Rev. C 102, 035502, 2020
- e⁻ scattering in (high-density) gas column, background gases, missed first track

Measured line width: $(2.8 \pm 0.1) \text{ eV}$ Instrumental width: $(1.7 \pm 0.1) \text{ eV}$

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration:

• Extreme energy precision of CRES demonstrated

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration:

- Extreme energy precision of CRES demonstrated
- Cyclotron freq. vs. kin. energy fit: $\chi^2/ndf = 0.3$ Residuals < 50 meV (across 14 keV, < 3 \cdot 10⁻⁶)

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration:

- Extreme energy precision of CRES demonstrated
- Cyclotron freq. vs. kin. energy fit: $\chi^2/ndf = 0.3$ Residuals < 50 meV (across 14 keV, < 3 \cdot 10⁻⁶)
- Determine energy of 32-keV γ-line: (32153.6 ± 2.4) eV
 Excellent agreement with literature value: (32151.7± 0.5) eV
 Venos et al., NIM A 560, 2, 352-359, 2006

Trap depth determines the energy resolution and the line shape! \rightarrow Calibration with mono-energetic ^{83m}Kr conversion electrons

"Shallow trap" configuration:

- Extreme energy precision of CRES demonstrated
- Cyclotron freq. vs. kin. energy fit: $\chi^2/ndf = 0.3$ Residuals < 50 meV (across 14 keV, $< 3 \cdot 10^{-6}$)
- Determine energy of 32-keV γ -line: $(32153.6 \pm 2.4) \text{ eV}$ Excellent agreement with literature value: (32151.7±0.5) eV Venos et al., NIM A 560, 2, 352-359, 2006

Low T₂ decay rate!

"Deep trap" configuration with:

- large pitch angle acceptance
- larger magnetic field variation
- but lower energy resolution

Detector response model verified for deep trap configuration!

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Detector response is frequency dependent!

Sweep position of 17.8 keV ^{83m}Kr across frequency ROI by changing the background field!

$$f_{\rm c} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{eB}{m_{\rm e} + E_{\rm kin}/c^2}$$

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Detector response is frequency dependent!

Sweep position of 17.8 keV ^{83m}Kr across frequency ROI by changing the background field!

$$f_{\rm c} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{eB}{m_{\rm e} + E_{\rm kin}/c^2}$$

Direct characterization of frequency response variation of waveguide setup

Notch in detection efficiency:

- TM01 mode interaction in the waveguide "cavity" due to imperfections
- Characterized, quantitatively understood and accounted in the spectral analysis

Project 8 phase II: results from molecular tritium

T₂ endpoint consistent with literature value

First frequency-based neutrino mass measurement

Extremely low background rate, no events beyond the endpoint region

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Frequentist and Bayesian analyses:T2 endpoint: $E_0^{\text{Freq.}} = (18550^{+22}_{-18}) \text{ eV} (1\sigma)$
 $E_0^{\text{Bay.}} = (18553^{+17}_{-17}) \text{ eV} (1\sigma)$ Neutrino mass: $m_{\beta}^{\text{Freq.}} \le 178 \text{ eV/c}^2 (90 \% \text{ C. L.})$
 $m_{\beta}^{\text{Bay.}} \le 169 \text{ eV/c}^2 (90 \% \text{ C. I.})$ Background rate: $\le 3 \times 10^{-10} \text{ eV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} (90 \% \text{ C. I.})$

+ Best fit result + Literature 20000 20000 -20000 -4000 -40000 -400000 -40000 -40000 -40000 -40000

Improved control of systematic effects:

- Magnetic field characterization
- Control of scattering
- Gas column composition and stability

Improved control of systematic effects:

- Magnetic field characterization
- Control of scattering
- Gas column composition and stability

Larger volume \Rightarrow higher statistics, but signal dilution

Improved control of systematic effects:

- Magnetic field characterization
- Control of scattering
- Gas column composition and stability

Larger volume \Rightarrow higher statistics, but signal dilution

Higher density \Rightarrow higher statistics, but much shorter tracks

Improved control of systematic effects:

- Magnetic field characterization
- Control of scattering
- Gas column composition and stability

Larger volume \Rightarrow higher statistics, but signal dilution

Higher density \Rightarrow higher statistics, but much shorter tracks

Development of cold atomic hydrogen/tritium sources

... provide many research opportunities...

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Slide credit: Elise Novitski, Neutrino 2022 t 21st 2022

Slide credit: Elise Novitski, Neutrino 2022 M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

... and novel results.

Fierz term contribution to differential decay rate $w(\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle | E_e, \Omega_e, \Omega_\nu) dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu = \frac{F(\pm Z, E_e)}{(2\pi)^5} p_e E_e (E_0 - E_e)^2 dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu \times$ $\xi \left\{ 1 + a \frac{\mathbf{p}_e \cdot \mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} + b \frac{m_e}{E_e} + \frac{\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle}{J} \cdot \left[A \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_e} + B \frac{\mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_\nu} + D \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_\nu} \right] \right\}$

$$\left. \frac{e \times \mathbf{p}_{\nu}}{E_e E_{\nu}} \right] \right\} ,$$

Fierz term contribution to differential decay rate

 $w(\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle | E_e, \Omega_e, \Omega_\nu) dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu = \frac{F(\pm Z, E_e)}{(2\pi)^5} p_e E_e(E_0 - \xi \left\{ 1 + a \frac{\mathbf{p}_e \cdot \mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} + b \frac{m_e}{E_e} + \frac{\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle}{J} \cdot \left[A \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_e} + B \frac{\mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_\nu} + D \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_e} \right] \right\}$ First order sensitivity to new physics: $b \propto \text{Re} \left(\left| M_{\text{F}} \right|^2 \frac{C_{\text{S}}}{2} \right)^2$

$$(-E_e)^2 dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu \times$$

$$\left. \frac{e \times \mathbf{p}_{\nu}}{E_e E_{\nu}} \right] \right\}$$

$$\frac{C_{\rm S} + C_{\rm S}'}{C_{\rm V}} + \left| M_{\rm GT} \right|^2 \frac{C_{\rm T} + C_{\rm T}'}{C_{\rm A}} \right)$$

Fierz term contribution to differential decay rate

 $w(\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle | E_e, \Omega_e, \Omega_\nu) dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu = \frac{F(\pm Z, E_e)}{(2\pi)^5} p_e E_e(E_0 - \xi \left\{ 1 + a \frac{\mathbf{p}_e \cdot \mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} + b \frac{m_e}{E_e} + \frac{\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle}{J} \cdot \left[A \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_e} + B \frac{\mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_\nu} + D \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_\nu} \right] \right\}$ First order sensitivity to new physics: $b \propto \text{Re} \left(\left| M_{\text{F}} \right|^2 \frac{C_{\text{S}}}{2} \right)^2$

Volume 104, January 2019, Pages 165-223

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

$$(-E_e)^2 dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu \times$$

$$\left. \frac{e \times \mathbf{p}_{\nu}}{E_e E_{\nu}} \right] \right\}$$

$$\frac{C_{\rm S} + C_{\rm S}'}{C_{\rm V}} + \left| M_{\rm GT} \right|^2 \frac{C_{\rm T} + C_{\rm T}'}{C_{\rm A}} \right)$$

Fierz term contribution to differential decay rate

 $w(\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle | E_e, \Omega_e, \Omega_\nu) dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu = \frac{F(\pm Z, E_e)}{(2\pi)^5} p_e E_e (E_0 - E_e)^2 dE_e d\Omega_e d\Omega_\nu \times \\ \xi \left\{ 1 + a \frac{\mathbf{p}_e \cdot \mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} + \underbrace{b \frac{m_e}{E_e}}_{J} + \frac{\langle \mathbf{J} \rangle}{J} \cdot \left[A \frac{\mathbf{p}_e}{E_e} \right] + B \frac{\mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_\nu} + D \frac{\mathbf{p}_e \times \mathbf{p}_\nu}{E_e E_\nu} \right] \right\} ,$ First order sensitivity to new physics: $b \propto \operatorname{Re} \left(\left| M_{\mathrm{F}} \right|^2 \frac{C_{\mathrm{S}} + C_{\mathrm{S}}'}{C_{\mathrm{V}}} + \left| M_{\mathrm{GT}} \right|^2 \frac{C_{\mathrm{T}} + C_{\mathrm{T}}'}{C_{\mathrm{A}}} \right)$

Volume 104, January 2019, Pages 165-223

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

<u>6He:</u>

- 1. 100 % Gamow-Teller transition $\Rightarrow C_{\rm T}$ sensitivity
- 2. No γ emission with β^- decay
- 3. Short half-life time: 807 ms
- 4. Theoretically well understood

⁶He-CRES

Neutrons:

Most fundamental semi-leptonic weak decay ct 21st 2022

M. Gonzalez-Alonso and O Navilliat-Cuncic, PRC 94, 035503 (2016)

arXiv:2209.02870

arXiv:2209.02870

Very high-density of ⁶He tracks at 2T

arXiv:2209.02870

Very high-density of ⁶He tracks at 2T

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Two ¹⁹Ne tracks in detail

arXiv:2209.02870

Very high-density of ⁶He tracks at 2T

Two ¹⁹Ne tracks in detail

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

¹⁹Ne track affected by waveguide

- •CRES established as promising technique for next generation neutrino mass experiment
- •Phase II demonstrated background-free operation, control of systematics, first CRES m_{β} limit
- •Work ongoing toward key technology demonstrations on the path to the 40 meV experiment
- First cyclotron radiation emission signals from MeV-scale e[±] pave the way for wide-application frequency based precision spectroscopy.

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

Summary

Acknowledgments: Project 8 and ⁶He collaborations

B. Monreal, R. Mohiuddin, Y.-H. Sun,

Case Western Reserve University

C.-Y. Liu

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

W. Pettus

Indiana University

S. Böser, M. Fertl, A. Lindman, Ch. Matthé, B. Mucogllava, R. Reimann, F. Thomas, L. A. Thorne Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

T. Thümmler

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology

K. Kazkaz

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

N. Buzinsky, J. A. Formaggio, M. Li, J.I. Peña, J. Stachurska, W. Van De Pontseele

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

J. K. Gaison, N. S. Oblath, D. Rosa de Jesus, J. R. Tedeschi, B. A. VanDevender

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

M. C. Carmona-Benitez, L. de Viveiros, R. Mueller, A. Ziegler

Pennsylvania State University

C. Claessens, P. J. Doe, S. Enemoto, A. Marsteller, E. Novitski, R. G. H. Robertson, G. Rybka

University of Washington

K. M. Heeger, J. A. Nikkel, L. Saldaña, P. L. Slocum, P.T. Surukuchi, A. B. Telles, T. E. Weiss Yale University

M. Fertl - PSI, Oct 21st 2022

N. Buzinsky, W. Byron, W. DeGraw, B. Dodson, A. Garcia, G. Garvey, B. Graner, H. Harrington, K.S. Khaw, K, Knutsen, E. Novitski, R.G.H. Robertson, G. Rybka, E. Smith, M. Sternberg, D.W. Storm, H.E. Swanson, X. Zhu

University of Washington

M. Fertl

Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz

M. Guigue, X. Huyan, N. S. Oblath, J.R. Tedeschi, B.A. VanDevender

Pacific Northwest National Laboratory

L. Hayen, D.D. Stancil, A. Young

North Carolina State University

L. Hayen, A. Young

The Triangle Universities Nuclear Laboratory, Durham

D. McClain, D. Melconian

Texas A&M University

P. Müller, G. Savard, **Argonne National Laboratory**

F. Wietfeldt

Tulane University

This work is supported by the PRISMA+ Cluster of Excellence at the University of Mainz, the US DOE Office of Nuclear Physics, the US NSF, and internal investments at all institutions.

