

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

## Comment on “Precise Determination of the Unperturbed $^8\text{B}$ Neutrino Spectrum”

S. J. Freedman, K. E. Rehm, J. P. Schiffer, and D. Seweryniak

Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 189201 — Published 2 November 2012

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.189201](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.189201)

# Comment on “Precise Determination of the Unperturbed $^8\text{B}$ Neutrino Spectrum”

S. J. Freedman,<sup>1</sup> K. E. Rehm,<sup>2</sup> J. P. Schiffer,<sup>2</sup> and D. Seweryniak<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Physics Department, University of California, Berkeley and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Argonne, IL 60439, USA*

We point out a likely source of systematic error that was not discussed in the above Letter by T. Roger *et al.* [1]. From their experiment the authors deduce an apparently significant disagreement with previous measurements of the shape of the beta-delayed alpha spectrum of  $^8\text{B}$ . The previous, presently accepted, measurements in which some of us participated [2, 3], were later independently confirmed [4]. The difference in the new results of [1] is characterized by an  $\sim 18$  keV shift of the broad peak in the summed beta-delayed alpha-particle energy spectrum. The summed alpha-particle spectrum is important since it determines (after corrections for recoil and radiative effects) the primary  $^8\text{B}$  neutrino spectrum used to interpret many solar neutrino experiments.

A significant difference between the experiments is in the type of detector used and in the calibration procedure. While Refs. [2–4] used simple Si-wafer detectors, the measurements of [1] (and [5] by the same group) were carried out with a double-sided Si strip detector (DSSD). Here we focus on comparing the results from [1] and [2], which both use implanted  $^8\text{B}$  nuclei to measure the summed alpha spectrum. Many of our remarks also apply to the measurement with an external source [5].

In a DSSD detector with  $300\ \mu\text{m}$  wide strips, used in [1], there are inter-strip gaps of about  $35\ \mu\text{m}$  where the electric field in the Si is altered. Particles incident on the surface of this gap will still produce a pulse, but there is a charge loss, and the fraction of the charge collected will be reduced in a way that depends on the details of the field configuration and how the particles traverse the affected regions. These regions extend to depths comparable to the gap width [6, 7]. The details of these losses in charge-collection efficiency are complicated.

Such effects are not addressed in [1]. The DSSD was calibrated with alpha particles from an external source with energies between 3–6 MeV. The line shape was parameterized by a Gaussian with two exponential tails. However, the alpha particles from the implanted  $^8\text{B}$  have an energy of  $\sim 1.5$  MeV near the peak of the distribution with a range of  $\sim 5.5\ \mu\text{m}$  and originate  $\sim 26\ \mu\text{m}$  inside the detector. They necessarily sample the detector volume *differently* from the calibration alphas from external sources, whose ranges are  $\sim 24\ \mu\text{m}$ . This is a source of systematic error, not mentioned in the discussion, and is likely to be significantly larger than the 2-keV uncer-

tainty in the energy scale quoted in the paper. A precise correction for such effects is difficult, but would be in a direction to bring the new measurement into better agreement with the previous work.

The primary calibration in [2] was from the delayed alpha-decay lines from implanted  $^{20}\text{Na}$ , similar to the implanted  $^8\text{B}$ . The primary calibration in [1] came from external sources, and implanted  $^{20}\text{Na}$  was used only to help determine the dead layer on the detector. With the complicated response of a DSSD to low-energy alphas, the external calibration presents an additional problem.

Finally, Bahcall *et al.* [8] showed that older discrepancies in the inferred neutrino spectrum of  $^8\text{B}$  could be removed by a small shift in the alpha energy scale, using the measured shape of the  $^8\text{B}$  positron distribution [9] as a reference. Like the neutrinos, the positrons at high energies are also very sensitive to the low-energy alpha spectrum. The agreement between the positron spectrum and the neutrino spectrum of [2, 3] and [4]) is excellent. The difference in the high-energy neutrino spectrum deduced by Roger *et al.* is enough to spoil this agreement.

In view of the unaccounted-for systematic errors and the inconsistency with the positron data, the statement in the abstract of [1] that their spectrum “represents a benchmark for future measurements of the solar neutrino flux as a function of energy” seems unjustified.

This work was supported by the US Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Physics, under Contract Nos. DE-AC02-06CH11357 and DE-AC02-05CH11231.

- 
- [1] T. Roger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 162502 (2012).
  - [2] W. T. Winter *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 252501 (2003).
  - [3] W. T. Winter, S. J. Freedman, K. E. Rehm and J. P. Schiffer, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 025503 (2006).
  - [4] M. Bhattacharya, E. G. Adelberger, and H. E. Swanson, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 055802 (2006).
  - [5] O. S. Kirsebom *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **83**, 065802 (2011); Phys. Rev. C **84**, 049902(E) (2011).
  - [6] S. Takeda *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods of Phys. Res., Sect. A **579**, 859 (2007).
  - [7] J. P. Hayward and D. K. Wehe, IEEE Transact. Nucl. Sci. **55**, 2789 (2008) and references therein.
  - [8] J. N. Bahcall *et al.* Phys. Rev. C **54**, 411 (1996).
  - [9] J. Napolitano *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **36**, 298 (1987).