



Bayesian Analysis of Neutrino Mass in Katrin

Björn Lehnert



SciDAC Discussion online, Jan 26th 2022

Measuring the Neutrino Mass

- Neutrinos are most abundant matter particles in Universe
- Relevant for particle physics and cosmology
- Mass is very small but still unknown —

Observable:
$$m_{\beta}^2 = \sum_i m_i^2 |U_{ei}|^2$$





How we do the measurement?

Beamline with source, spectrometer, pixellated detector



Fit Model

Minimal fit: 4 parameter

 normalization (A), endpoint (E₀), constant background (R_{bg}), neutrino mass (m_{β^2})

Complete fit: ≈ 25 parameters

- Many systematic variations
- Correlations between datasets



Performance for response calculation (single thread):

- \approx 20 ms per MCMC step (minimal fit)
- \approx 10 s per MCMC step (complete fit)



detector pixelation (14 patches)

Beta spectrum: Multiple spectra from T₂, DT, HT Various final states units) $R_{\beta}(E, m^2(v_e))$ count rate (arb. 5 10 0 15 electron energy (keV) **Response function:** Transmission: B-fields Source density: Probability of scatter Electron energy loss: If scatter occurs 1.0 0.8 0.6 0.2 0.0 1.01 scatters transmission f(E-qU) 0.0 20 30 10 50 0 40 surplus energy E-qU (eV)

Model ingredients and systematics

Constant background

- Time varying component
- Potential slope

Datasets and Systematics



Datasets and Systematics



Latest Results

Traditionally Frequentist analyses in KATRIN-style experiments:





Bayesian analysis:

Advantages for Bayesian analysis:

- Straight forward limit setting only allowing physical parameter space (other analysis extend fit into unphysical region)
- Including prior information from other neutrino experiment
- Easier interface in global fits: use posterior distribution directly
- Other studies: Least informative priors etc.

Procedures and Challenges

https://bat.mpp.mpg.de currently used in development C++ Julia Metropolis [.il Metropolis-Hastings More clever convergence Metropolis-Hasting Challenges: Neutral network interpolation of • Large number of parameters response parameter space for fast evaluation Expensive response function calculation ٠ posterior probability Precision requirements pos=-0.038 0.6 • Numerical noise in posterior Quantifying impact of small systematics 0.5 0.4 Repeat analysis many times Code comparisons 0.3 Unblinding steps 0.2 • Different priors 0.1

· Acceptance of Bayesian statistics in community

1 1.5

m² [eV²]

-1.5

-1 -0.5 0 0.5

Backup

Datasets and Systematics



Measurement Concept



Integrated spectrum

 Run: complete scan of all HV points

Illustration only

- 4 fit parameters to describe spectrum
- Background is flat

Residuals

- Most sensitive region around endpoint
- With higher background the sensitive region moves lower in energy
- Statistical fluctuations can result in "negative m²"

Measuring time distribution

- Choose HV points and statistics in each point
- Optimize for sensitivity e.g. constrain background, normalization

Results Combined KNM1 + KNM2

Frequentist likelihoods (multiplication or combined fit)



Bayesian posteriors (KNM1 posterior as KNM2 prior):



Best fit: $m_{\beta}^2 = 0.1 \pm 0.3 \ {\rm eV}^2$ Limits LT and FC: $m_{\beta} < 0.8 \ {\rm eV}$ (90% CL)Limits Bayesian: $m_{\beta} < 0.73 \ {\rm eV}$ (90% Cl)

2 months KATRIN data better than Mainz, Troitsk

- Statistics x6, systematics x12
- · First sub-eV neutrino mass sensitivity in lab
- · Multiple independent blind analyses

