

Received by OSTI

SEP 08 1986

CONF-860741--14

Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by the University of California for the United States Department of Energy under contract W-7405-ENG-36

LA-UR--86-2766

DE86 015325

TITLE: A LIMIT ON THE $\bar{\nu}_e$ MASS IN FREE MOLECULAR TRITIUM BETA DECAY

AUTHOR(S): T. J. Bowles, J. F. Wilkerson, J. C. Browne, M. P. Maley, R. G. H. Robertson, D. A. Knapp, and J. A. Helffrich

SUBMITTED TO: The International Conference on Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions in Nuclei, Heidelberg, West Germany, July 1986

DISCLAIMER

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

By acceptance of this article, the publisher recognizes that the U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive, royalty-free license to publish or reproduce the published form of this contribution or to allow others to do so, for U.S. Government purposes.

The Los Alamos National Laboratory requests that the publisher identify this article as work performed under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy.

MASTER

Los Alamos Los Alamos National Laboratory Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

DISTRIBUTION OF THIS DOCUMENT IS UNLIMITED

Row

A Limit on the $\bar{\nu}_e$ Mass in Free Molecular Tritium Beta Decay

T.J. Bowles, J.F. Wilkerson, J.C. Browne, M.P. Maley, R.G.H. Robertson
Physics Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545

D.A. Knapp
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey 08544

J.A. Helffrich
University of California at San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093

The question of a nonzero neutrino mass has received considerable attention since the claims of Lyubimov et al [1] in 1980 were published which showed evidence for an electron antineutrino mass between 14 and 46 eV, with a best fit value of 35 eV. However, there are still considerable concerns about possible systematic problems in their experiment. Many of these concerns revolve around the use of a tritiated valine source, in which the energy given up in final state excitations of the molecule following the beta decay of one of the tritium atoms is comparable to the size of the neutrino mass observed. The effect of these final state effects is difficult to calculate in a molecule as complex as valine. In addition, ionization energy loss and backscattering of the betas in traversing the solid source are appreciable and must be very accurately accounted for. These concerns have led us to carry out an experiment using free molecular tritium as the source material. The final state effects have been accurately calculated for the tritium molecule [2-4] and the uncertainties in these calculations cannot generate a spurious neutrino mass greater than 1 eV. In addition, the energy loss in the source is small because the source consists of tritium only and there is no backscattering.

The apparatus has been discussed in detail elsewhere [5] and will only be briefly described here. Molecular tritium is passed through a palladium leak and enters a 3.8-m long, 3.8-cm inner diameter aluminum tube at the center and is pumped away and recirculated at the ends. The tube is held at approximately 130 K to increase the source strength and is uniformly biased to typically -8 kV. The source tube is inside a superconducting solenoid so that betas from the decay of tritium spiral along the field lines without scattering from the tube walls. At one end, the betas are reflected by a magnetic pinch and at the other end are accelerated to ground potential. Also located at the magnetic pinch is a hot filament that emits thermal electrons that neutralize the trapped positive atoms in the source. This keeps the change in source potential due to space charge buildup to less than a volt. The betas are guided through the pumping restriction where the tritium is differentially pumped away and the betas are then focused by nonadiabatic transport through a rapidly falling magnetic field to form an image on a 1 cm diameter collimator at the entrance to the spectrometer. The collimator projects an image down the center of the source tube so that decays originating on or close to the walls of the source tube are not viewed by the spectrometer. A small Si detector is located at a position in front of the collimator where it intercepts a small fraction of the betas from decays in the source tube. This beta monitor serves to normalize the source strength from point to point. The spectrometer is a 5-m long, 2-m diameter, 72-coil toroidal beta spectrometer similar in design to the Tretyakov instrument, but with a number of improvements. Betas from a 1.7 cm² area in the source tube are transmitted with 25% efficiency through the spectrometer entrance collimator and form a cone of 30° half angle into the spectrometer. Betas between 19.5° and 29.5° are transmitted through the spectrometer to a position sensitive gas proportional counter at the focal plane of the spectrometer. The focal plane detector is 2 cm in diameter with a 2 mm wide entrance slit. The energy resolution for 26 keV betas is 20% and the position resolution is 4 mm FWHM

(position information is used to reject backgrounds outside of the slit acceptance). The earth's magnetic field is cancelled to a level of ± 10 mG in the spectrometer volume by a set of cosine coils wound around the spectrometer and the zero field setting is determined by fluxgate magnetometers mounted in the spectrometer. The event rate in the last 100 eV was typically 0.10 counts/sec.

The beta spectrum is scanned by changing the voltage applied to the source tube so that betas of constant energy are analyzed by the spectrometer. By accelerating the betas by several keV, not only is the emittance of the source improved, but the betas of interest from the source are raised in energy well above backgrounds from betas originating from decay elsewhere in the pumping restriction or spectrometer. The beta monitor is biased at the same voltage as the source tube, which results in constant energy betas being detected by the beta monitor.

In order to determine the overall source and spectrometer resolution, we introduce ^{83m}Kr into the source tube in the same manner as tritium is injected. The krypton produces a 17.835(20)-keV conversion line and the shakeup and shakeoff effects are known [6-9] so that their contribution can be accurately removed from the resolution function. The contribution from scattering of the conversion electrons from nitrogen molecules in the source gas (which builds up due to the recirculation of the krypton) has been calculated using existing experimental data [10-11]. These measurements yield a spectrometer resolution function which has a skewed Gaussian shape with a FWHM of 52 eV for the first data set and 38 eV for the last two data sets. The change in resolution between the data sets was due mainly to improved cancellation of residual magnetic fields from the source magnets in region of the spectrometer. The total resolution function for the complete source and spectrometer consists of the skewed Gaussian optical resolution function determined from the krypton measurements which is folded in with the energy loss spectrum of betas scattering from tritium molecules in the source. This energy loss spectrum was determined using the measured tritium density in the source tube together with Monte Carlo calculations of electron scattering on molecular hydrogen [12-13] including tracking the betas along the magnetic field lines in the source region. Approximately 10% of the betas are trapped in local magnetic minima in the source region and must scatter several times to escape from the source region, while approximately 5% of the untrapped betas scatter before leaving the source region.

Measurements of backgrounds from the source and tritium contamination of the spectrometer have been made and we do not observe any backgrounds originating from the source walls, extraction region, or from tritium contamination of the spectrometer at a level less than 1 count/500 sec. The background rate in the focal plane detector has remained constant at 1 count/270 sec and is primarily due to cosmic ray muons traversing the detector.

Three data sets were taken, each of 3-4 days duration, with operating conditions (given in Table I) varied somewhat between runs to check systematic effects. The first two runs were taken with the spectrometer set to analyze 26.0-keV betas and the beta spectrum was scanned from 16.44 to 18.94 keV in 10 eV steps. Two randomly selected data points were taken for 600 seconds each, followed by a 200 second data run at 16.44 keV in order to check for time dependent systematic errors. The third data set was taken in a similar manner, except that the spectrometer was set to analyze 26.5 keV betas in order to check for any systematic effects in varying the extraction voltage (and therefore the extraction efficiency). Extra data points were taken in 5-eV steps near the endpoint in the last run. Several other data sets taken were not used because resolution measurements were not available, or the runs were incomplete.

To analyze the data, a predicted beta spectrum is generated which includes the molecular final states, Coulomb corrections, screening corrections, nuclear recoil effects, weak magnetism, and acceleration gap effects (the last three are negligible). The total system resolution and energy loss in the source are




Fig. 1. Resolution function for Run 4-B showing optical resolution, energy loss component and sum of both.




Fig. 2. Kurie Plot for Run 4-B.

folded in with the calculated spectrum. A five-parameter fit (varying the amplitude (determined by total number of events), endpoint energy, neutrino mass, background level, and a quadratic extraction efficiency term) in a maximum likelihood procedure with Poisson statistics is then performed. Extensive Monte Carlo calculations were carried out in order to study systematic effects and correlations between variables, and to verify the unbiased character of the fit estimator.

TABLE I. Summary of Parameters for each run and results from fitting procedure for each run. Uncertainties in Δm_ν^2 are 1σ .

	RUN 3	RUN 4-A	RUN 4-B	COMBINED
E_{SPECT} (keV)	26.0	26.0	26.5	
ΔE (FWHM, eV)	52.1 ± 1.7	32.0 ± 1.5	32.4 ± 1.3	
Skewness	.133	.153	.173	
Total Events	5,081,270	944,353	567,581	6,593,204
Counts in 100 eV	170	93	273	536
Background in 100 eV	36	28	53	117
Quadratic Term ($10^{-8}/\text{eV}^2$)	-1.28	-1.80	-0.64	
Number of Data Points	254	250	220	
E_0 (eV)	18584.8	18585.7	18584.4	18585.0
Δm_ν^2 (statistical, eV^2)	1126	1720	688	
Δm_ν^2 (resolution, eV^2)	70	364	52	638
Δm_ν^2 (e loss, eV^2)	50	28	25	
m_ν^2 (eV^2)	-1190	1880	-63	-186

In Table I we summarize run parameters and fit results for the four data sets. The consistency between the measured endpoint energies is good, notwithstanding the large change in spectrometer resolution between runs 3 and 4A, and the change to 26.5 keV operation in run 4B. The overall uncertainty in the endpoint energy is dominated by the 20-eV uncertainty in the energy of the ^{83}mKx calibration line, however. The quadratic correction term varies from run to run owing both to changes in focus coil excitation and (in run 4B) to normalization of the

source intensity by interpolation between calibration points rather than by the Si detector, which had become excessively contaminated. A linear term was tried in place of the quadratic one and gave similar results but with larger variations as the fitting interval was successively truncated. Such variations were within statistics with the (fixed) quadratic term when the fitting interval was varied over the range 2500 to 300 eV. There was no statistical evidence that both linear and quadratic terms were required.

Statistical errors in m_ν^2 were extracted from the χ^2 plots (which were closely parabolic in m_ν^2). A conservatively estimated systematic error arising from imperfect knowledge of the resolution function in each run was then added linearly to the statistical error. The resolution-function uncertainties have both systematic and statistical components, but are in any case believed to be largely uncorrelated from run to run. Finally, a systematic uncertainty from the measurement of the density of the source gas and the Monte Carlo simulation of multiple scattering was added linearly to the weighted average of all runs. These were the only systematic uncertainties considered to be non-negligible.




Fig. 3. Residual plot for Run 4-B with $m_\nu=0$.




Fig. 4. χ^2 plot for all three runs.

The uncertainty in the final result is predominantly statistical. An upper limit the mass of the electron antineutrino is found to be 29.3 eV at the 95% confidence level (C.L.) or 25.4 eV at the 90% C.L. It does not support the central value reported by Lyubimov (1) of 30(2) eV, but neither does it exclude the lower part of the range 17 to 40 eV. The present result is, for all practical purposes, model independent. Improvements to the apparatus transmission and resolution now in progress are expected to result in a sensitivity to neutrino mass in the vicinity of 10 eV.

1. S. Boris et al., Phys. Lett. 159B, 217 (1985)
2. R.C. Martin and J.S. Cohen, Phys. Lett. 110A, 95 (1985)
3. W. Kolos et al., Phys. Rev. A31, 551 (1985)
4. O. Fackler et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1388 (1985)
5. J.F. Wilkerson, Proc. XIX Recontre de Moriond (1985) to be published
6. T.A. Carlson and C.W. Nestor, Phys. Rev. A8, 2887 (1973)
7. D.P. Spears et al., Jour. Chem. Phys. 60, 103 (1974)
8. J.S. Levinger, Phys. Rev. 90, 11 (1953)
9. X. Bambynek et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. 44, 716 (1972)
10. E.N. Lassettre, Can. Jour. Chem. Phys. 47, 1733 (1969)
11. T.C. Wong et al., Phys. Rev. A12, 1846 (1975)
12. R.C. Ulsh et al., Jour. Chem. Phys. 60, 103 (1974)
13. J.W. Liu, Jour. Chem. Phys. 59, 1988 (1973)