

JUNO Sensitivity on Proton Decay $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ Searches

Angel Abusleme,¹ Thomas Adam,² Shakeel Ahmad,³ Rizwan Ahmed,³ Sebastiano Aiello,⁴ Muhammad Akram,³ Fengpeng An,⁵ Qi An,⁶ Giuseppe Andronico,⁴ Nikolay Anfimov,⁷ Vito Antonelli,⁸ Tatiana Antoshkina,⁷ Burin Asavapibhop,⁹ João Pedro Athayde Marcondes de André,² Didier Auguste,¹⁰ Nikita Balashov,⁷ Wander Baldini,¹¹ Andrea Barresi,¹² Davide Basilico,⁸ Eric Baussan,² Marco Bellato,¹³ Antonio Bergnoli,¹³ Thilo Birkenfeld,¹⁴ Sylvie Blin,¹⁰ David Blum,¹⁵ Simon Blyth,¹⁶ Anastasia Bolshakova,⁷ Mathieu Bongrand,¹⁷ Clément Bordereau,^{18,19} Dominique Breton,¹⁰ Augusto Brigatti,⁸ Riccardo Brugnera,²⁰ Riccardo Bruno,⁴ Antonio Budano,²¹ Mario Buscemi,⁴ Jose Busto,²² Ilya Butorov,⁷ Anatael Cabrera,¹⁰ Barbara Caccianiga,⁸ Hao Cai,²³ Xiao Cai,¹⁶ Yanke Cai,¹⁶ Zhiyan Cai,¹⁶ Riccardo Callegari,²⁰ Antonio Cammi,²⁴ Agustin Campeny,¹ Chuanya Cao,¹⁶ Guofu Cao,¹⁶ Jun Cao,¹⁶ Rossella Caruso,⁴ Cédric Cerna,¹⁸ Jinfan Chang,¹⁶ Yun Chang,²⁵ Pingping Chen,²⁶ Po-An Chen,¹⁹ Shaomin Chen,²⁷ Xurong Chen,²⁸ Yi-Wen Chen,²⁹ Yixue Chen,³⁰ Yu Chen,³¹ Zhang Chen,¹⁶ Jie Cheng,¹⁶ Yaping Cheng,³² Alexey Chetverikov,⁷ Davide Chiesa,¹² Pietro Chimenti,³³ Artem Chukanov,⁷ Gérard Claverie,¹⁸ Catia Clementi,³⁴ Barbara Clerbaux,³⁵ Selma Conforti Di Lorenzo,¹⁸ Daniele Corti,¹³ Flavio Dal Corso,¹³ Olivia Dalager,³⁶ Christophe De La Taille,¹⁸ Zhi Deng,²⁷ Ziyang Deng,¹⁶ Wilfried Depnering,³⁷ Marco Diaz,¹ Xuefeng Ding,⁸ Yayun Ding,¹⁶ Bayu Dirgantara,³⁸ Sergey Dmitrievsky,⁷ Tadeas Dohnal,³⁹ Dmitry Dolzhikov,⁷ Georgy Donchenko,⁴⁰ Jianmeng Dong,²⁷ Evgeny Doroshkevich,⁴¹ Marcos Dracos,² Frédéric Druillolle,¹⁸ Ran Du,¹⁶ Shuxian Du,⁴² Stefano Dusini,¹³ Martin Dvorak,³⁹ Timo Enqvist,⁴³ Heike Enzmann,³⁷ Andrea Fabbri,²¹ Ulrike Fahrenholz,⁴⁴ Donghua Fan,⁴⁵ Lei Fan,¹⁶ Jian Fang,¹⁶ Wenxing Fang,¹⁶ Marco Fargetta,⁴ Dmitry Fedoseev,⁷ Li-Cheng Feng,²⁹ Qichun Feng,⁴⁶ Richard Ford,⁸ Amélie Fournier,¹⁸ Haonan Gan,⁴⁷ Feng Gao,¹⁴ Alberto Garfagnini,²⁰ Arsenii Gavrikov,²⁰ Marco Giammarchi,⁸ Agnese Giaz,²⁰ Nunzio Giudice,⁴ Maxim Gonchar,⁷ Guanghua Gong,²⁷ Hui Gong,²⁷ Yuri Gornushkin,⁷ Alexandre Göttel,^{48,14} Marco Grassi,²⁰ Christian Grewing,⁴⁹ Vasily Gromov,⁷ Minghao Gu,¹⁶ Xiaofei Gu,⁴² Yu Gu,⁵⁰ Mengyun Guan,¹⁶ Nunzio Guardone,⁴ Maria Gul,³ Cong Guo,¹⁶ Jingyuan Guo,³¹ Wanlei Guo,¹⁶ Xinheng Guo,⁵¹ Yuhang Guo,⁵² Paul Hackspacher,³⁷ Caren Hagner,⁵³ Ran Han,³² Yang Han,³¹ Muhammad Sohaib Hassan,³ Miao He,¹⁶ Wei He,¹⁶ Tobias Heinz,¹⁵ Patrick Hellmuth,¹⁸ Yuekun Heng,¹⁶ Rafael Herrera,¹ YuenKeung Hor,³¹ Shaojing Hou,¹⁶ Yee Hsiung,¹⁹ Bei-Zhen Hu,¹⁹ Hang Hu,³¹ Jianrun Hu,¹⁶ Jun Hu,¹⁶ Shouyang Hu,⁵⁴ Tao Hu,¹⁶ Yuxiang Hu,¹⁶ Zhuojun Hu,³¹ Chunhao Huang,³¹ Guihong Huang,⁴⁵ Hanxiong Huang,⁵⁴ Wenhao Huang,⁵⁵ Xin Huang,¹⁶ Xingtao Huang,⁵⁵ Yongbo Huang,⁵⁶ Jiaqi Hui,⁵⁷ Lei Huo,⁴⁶ Wenju Huo,⁶ Cédric Huss,¹⁸ Safeer Hussain,³ Ara Ioannisian,⁵⁸ Roberto Isocrate,¹³ Beatrice Jelmini,²⁰ Kuo-Lun Jen,²⁹ Ignacio Jeria,¹ Xiaolu Ji,¹⁶ Xingzhao Ji,³¹ Huihui Jia,⁵⁹ Junji Jia,²³ Siyu Jian,⁵⁴ Di Jiang,⁶ Wei Jiang,¹⁶ Xiaoshan Jiang,¹⁶ Ruyi Jin,¹⁶ Xiaoping Jing,¹⁶ Cécile Jollet,¹⁸ Jari Joutsenvaara,⁴³ Sirichok Jungthawan,³⁸ Leonidas Kalousis,² Philipp Kampmann,⁴⁸ Li Kang,²⁶ Rebin Karaparambil,¹⁷ Narine Kazarian,⁵⁸ Amina Khatun,⁶⁰ Khanchai Khosonthongkee,³⁸ Denis Korablev,⁷ Konstantin Kouzakov,⁴⁰ Alexey Krasnoperov,⁷ Andre Kruth,⁴⁹ Nikolay Kutovskiy,⁷ Pasi Kuusiniemi,⁴³ Tobias Lachenmaier,¹⁵ Cecilia Landini,⁸ Sébastien Leblanc,¹⁸ Victor Lebrin,¹⁷ Frederic Lefevre,¹⁷ Ruiting Lei,²⁶ Rupert Leitner,³⁹ Jason Leung,²⁹ Demin Li,⁴² Fei Li,¹⁶ Fule Li,²⁷ Gaosong Li,¹⁶ Haitao Li,³¹ Huiling Li,¹⁶ Jiaqi Li,³¹ Mengzhao Li,¹⁶ Min Li,³⁰ Nan Li,¹⁶ Nan Li,⁶¹ Qingjiang Li,⁶¹ Ruhui Li,¹⁶ Shanfeng Li,²⁶ Tao Li,³¹ Weidong Li,^{16,62} Weiguo Li,¹⁶ Xiaomei Li,⁵⁴ Xiaonan Li,¹⁶ Xinglong Li,⁵⁴ Yi Li,²⁶ Yichen Li,¹⁶ Yufeng Li,¹⁶ Zhaohan Li,¹⁶ Zhibing Li,³¹ Ziyuan Li,³¹ Hao Liang,⁵⁴ Hao Liang,⁶ Jiajun Liao,³¹ Daniel Liebau,⁴⁹ Ayut Limphirat,³⁸ Sukit Limpijumngong,³⁸ Guey-Lin Lin,²⁹ Shengxin Lin,²⁶ Tao Lin,¹⁶ Jiajie Ling,³¹ Ivano Lippi,¹³ Fang Liu,³⁰ Haidong Liu,⁴² Hongbang Liu,⁵⁶ Hongjuan Liu,⁶³ Hongtao Liu,³¹ Hui Liu,⁵⁰ Jianglai Liu,^{57,64} Jinchang Liu,¹⁶ Min Liu,⁶³ Qian Liu,⁶² Qin Liu,⁶ Runxuan Liu,^{48,14} Shuangyu Liu,¹⁶ Shubin Liu,⁶ Shulin Liu,¹⁶ Xiaowei Liu,³¹ Xiwen Liu,⁵⁶ Yan Liu,¹⁶ Yunzhe Liu,¹⁶ Alexey Lokhov,^{40,41} Paolo Lombardi,⁸ Claudio Lombardo,⁴ Kai Loo,⁴³ Chuan Lu,⁴⁷ Haoqi Lu,¹⁶ Jingbin Lu,⁶⁵ Junguang Lu,¹⁶ Shuxiang Lu,⁴² Xiaoxu Lu,¹⁶ Bayarto Lubsandorzhev,⁴¹ Sultim Lubsandorzhev,⁴¹ Livia Ludhova,^{48,14} Arslan Lukanov,⁴¹ Fengjiao Luo,⁶³ Guang Luo,³¹ Pengwei Luo,³¹ Shu Luo,⁶⁶ Wuming Luo,¹⁶ Vladimir Lyashuk,⁴¹ Bangzheng Ma,⁵⁵ Qiumei Ma,¹⁶ Si Ma,¹⁶ Xiaoyan Ma,¹⁶ Xubo Ma,³⁰ Jihane Maalmi,¹⁰ Yury Malyshev,⁴⁸ Roberto Carlos Mandujano,³⁶ Fabio Mantovani,¹¹ Francesco Manzali,²⁰ Xin Mao,³² Yajun Mao,⁶⁷ Stefano M. Mari,²¹ Filippo Marini,²⁰ Sadia Marium,³ Cristina Martellini,²¹ Gisele Martin-Chassard,¹⁰ Agnese Martini,⁶⁸ Matthias Mayer,⁴⁴ Davit Mayilyan,⁵⁸ Ints Mednieks,⁶⁹ Yue Meng,⁵⁷ Anselmo Meregaglia,¹⁸ Emanuela Meroni,⁸ David Meyhöfer,⁵³ Mauro Mezzetto,¹³ Jonathan Miller,⁷⁰ Lino Miramonti,⁸ Paolo Montini,²¹ Michele Montuschi,¹¹ Axel Müller,¹⁵ Massimiliano Nastasi,¹² Dmitry V. Naumov,⁷ Elena Naumova,⁷ Diana Navas-Nicolas,¹⁰ Igor Nemchenok,⁷ Minh Thuan Nguyen Thi,²⁹ Feipeng Ning,¹⁶ Zhe Ning,¹⁶ Hiroshi Nunokawa,⁷¹ Lothar Oberauer,⁴⁴ Juan Pedro Ochoa-Ricoux,^{36,1} Alexander Olshevskiy,⁷ Domizia Orestano,²¹ Fausto Ortica,³⁴ Rainer Othegraven,³⁷ Alessandro Paoloni,⁶⁸ Sergio Parmeggiano,⁸ Yatian Pei,¹⁶ Nicomede Pelliccia,³⁴ Anguo Peng,⁶³ Haiping Peng,⁶ Frédéric Perrot,¹⁸ Pierre-Alexandre Petitjean,³⁵ Fabrizio Petrucci,²¹ Oliver Pilarczyk,³⁷ Luis Felipe Piñeres Rico,² Artyom Popov,⁴⁰ Pascal Poussot,² Wathan Pratumwan,³⁸ Ezio Previtali,¹² Fazhi Qi,¹⁶ Ming Qi,⁷² Sen Qian,¹⁶ Xiaohui Qian,¹⁶ Zhen Qian,³¹ Hao Qiao,⁶⁷ Zhonghua Qin,¹⁶ Shoukang Qiu,⁶³ Muhammad Usman Rajput,³ Gioacchino Ranucci,⁸ Neill Raper,³¹ Alessandra Re,⁸ Henning Rebber,⁵³ Abdel Rebi,¹⁸ Bin Ren,²⁶ Jie Ren,⁵⁴ Barbara Ricci,¹¹ Mariam Rifai,^{48,14} Markus Robens,⁴⁹ Mathieu Roche,¹⁸ Narongkiat Rodphai,⁹ Aldo Romani,³⁴ Bedřich Roskovec,³⁹ Christian Roth,⁴⁹ Xiangdong Ruan,⁵⁶ Xichao Ruan,⁵⁴

Saroj Rujirawat,³⁸ Arseniy Rybnikov,⁷ Andrey Sadovsky,⁷ Paolo Saggese,⁸ Simone Sanfilippo,²¹ Anut Sangka,⁷³ Nuanwan Sanguansak,³⁸ Utane Sawangwit,⁷³ Julia Sawatzki,⁴⁴ Fatma Sawy,²⁰ Michaela Schever,^{48,14} Cédric Schwab,² Konstantin Schweizer,⁴⁴ Alexandr Selyunin,⁷ Andrea Serafini,¹¹ Giulio Settanta,^{48,*} Mariangela Settimo,¹⁷ Zhuang Shao,⁵² Vladislav Sharov,⁷ Arina Shaydurova,⁷ Jingyan Shi,¹⁶ Yanan Shi,¹⁶ Vitaly Shutov,⁷ Andrey Sidorenkov,⁴¹ Fedor Šimkovic,⁶⁰ Chiara Sirignano,²⁰ Jaruchit Siripak,³⁸ Monica Sisti,¹² Maciej Słupecki,⁴³ Mikhail Smirnov,³¹ Oleg Smirnov,⁷ Thiago Sogo-Bezerra,¹⁷ Sergey Sokolov,⁷ Julanan Songwadhana,³⁸ Boonrucksar Soonthornthum,⁷³ Albert Sotnikov,⁷ Ondřej Šrámek,³⁹ Warintorn Sreethawong,³⁸ Achim Stahl,¹⁴ Luca Stanco,¹³ Konstantin Stankevich,⁴⁰ Dušan Štefánik,⁶⁰ Hans Steiger,^{37,44} Jochen Steinmann,¹⁴ Tobias Sterr,¹⁵ Matthias Raphael Stock,⁴⁴ Virginia Strati,¹¹ Alexander Studenikin,⁴⁰ Shifeng Sun,³⁰ Xilei Sun,¹⁶ Yongjie Sun,⁶ Yongzhao Sun,¹⁶ Narumon Suwonjandee,⁹ Michal Szelezniak,² Jian Tang,³¹ Qiang Tang,³¹ Quan Tang,⁶³ Xiao Tang,¹⁶ Alexander Tietzsch,¹⁵ Igor Tkachev,⁴¹ Tomas Tmej,³⁹ Marco Danilo Claudio Torri,⁸ Konstantin Treskov,⁷ Andrea Triossi,² Giancarlo Troni,¹ Wladyslaw Trzaska,⁴³ Cristina Tuve,⁴ Nikita Ushakov,⁴¹ Johannes van den Boom,⁴⁹ Stefan van Waasen,⁴⁹ Guillaume Vanroyen,¹⁷ Vadim Vedin,⁶⁹ Giuseppe Verde,⁴ Maxim Vialkov,⁴⁰ Benoit Viaud,¹⁷ Cornelius Moritz Vollbrecht,^{48,14} Cristina Volpe,¹⁰ Vit Vorobel,³⁹ Dmitriy Voronin,⁴¹ Lucia Votano,⁶⁸ Pablo Walker,¹ Caishen Wang,²⁶ Chung-Hsiang Wang,²⁵ En Wang,⁴² Guoli Wang,⁴⁶ Jian Wang,⁶ Jun Wang,³¹ Kunyu Wang,¹⁶ Lu Wang,¹⁶ Meifen Wang,¹⁶ Meng Wang,⁶³ Meng Wang,⁵⁵ Ruiguang Wang,¹⁶ Siguang Wang,⁶⁷ Wei Wang,⁷² Wei Wang,³¹ Wenshuai Wang,¹⁶ Xi Wang,⁶¹ Xiangyue Wang,³¹ Yangfu Wang,¹⁶ Yaoguang Wang,¹⁶ Yi Wang,²⁷ Yi Wang,⁴⁵ Yifang Wang,¹⁶ Yuanqing Wang,²⁷ Yuman Wang,⁷² Zhe Wang,²⁷ Zheng Wang,¹⁶ Zhimin Wang,¹⁶ Zongyi Wang,²⁷ Muhammad Waqas,³ Apimook Watcharangkool,⁷³ Lianghong Wei,¹⁶ Wei Wei,¹⁶ Wenlu Wei,¹⁶ Yadong Wei,²⁶ Kaile Wen,¹⁶ Liangjian Wen,¹⁶ Christopher Wiebusch,¹⁴ Steven Chan-Fai Wong,³¹ Bjoern Wonsak,⁵³ Diru Wu,¹⁶ Qun Wu,⁵⁵ Zhi Wu,¹⁶ Michael Wurm,³⁷ Jacques Wurtz,² Christian Wysotzki,¹⁴ Yufei Xi,⁴⁷ Dongmei Xia,⁷⁴ Xiang Xiao,³¹ Xiaochuan Xie,⁵⁶ Yuguang Xie,¹⁶ Zhangquan Xie,¹⁶ Zhizhong Xing,¹⁶ Benda Xu,²⁷ Cheng Xu,⁶³ Donglian Xu,^{64,57} Fanrong Xu,⁵⁰ Hangkun Xu,¹⁶ Jilei Xu,¹⁶ Jing Xu,⁵¹ Meihang Xu,¹⁶ Yin Xu,⁵⁹ Yu Xu,^{48,14} Baojun Yan,¹⁶ Taylor Yan,³⁸ Wenqi Yan,¹⁶ Xiongbo Yan,¹⁶ Yupeng Yan,³⁸ Anbo Yang,¹⁶ Changgen Yang,¹⁶ Chengfeng Yang,⁵⁶ Huan Yang,¹⁶ Jie Yang,⁴² Lei Yang,²⁶ Xiaoyu Yang,¹⁶ Yifan Yang,¹⁶ Yifan Yang,³⁵ Haifeng Yao,¹⁶ Zafar Yasin,³ Jiaxuan Ye,¹⁶ Mei Ye,¹⁶ Ziping Ye,⁶⁴ Ugur Yegin,⁴⁹ Frédéric Yermia,¹⁷ Peihuai Yi,¹⁶ Na Yin,⁵⁵ Xiangwei Yin,¹⁶ Zhengyun You,³¹ Boxiang Yu,¹⁶ Chiye Yu,²⁶ Chunxu Yu,⁵⁹ Hongzhao Yu,³¹ Miao Yu,²³ Xianghui Yu,⁵⁹ Zeyuan Yu,¹⁶ Zezhong Yu,¹⁶ Chengzhuo Yuan,¹⁶ Ying Yuan,⁶⁷ Zhenxiong Yuan,²⁷ Baobiao Yue,³¹ Noman Zafar,³ Andre Zambanini,⁴⁹ Vitalii Zavadskiy,⁷ Shan Zeng,¹⁶ Tingxuan Zeng,¹⁶ Yuda Zeng,³¹ Liang Zhan,¹⁶ Aiqiang Zhang,²⁷ Feiyang Zhang,⁵⁷ Guoqing Zhang,¹⁶ Haiqiong Zhang,¹⁶ Honghao Zhang,³¹ Jialiang Zhang,⁷² Jiawen Zhang,¹⁶ Jie Zhang,¹⁶ Jin Zhang,⁵⁶ Jingbo Zhang,⁴⁶ Jinnan Zhang,¹⁶ Peng Zhang,¹⁶ Qingmin Zhang,⁵² Shiqi Zhang,³¹ Shu Zhang,³¹ Tao Zhang,⁵⁷ Xiaomei Zhang,¹⁶ Xin Zhang,¹⁶ Xuantong Zhang,¹⁶ Xueyao Zhang,⁵⁵ Yan Zhang,¹⁶ Yinhong Zhang,¹⁶ Yiyu Zhang,¹⁶ Yongpeng Zhang,¹⁶ Yu Zhang,¹⁶ Yuanyuan Zhang,⁵⁷ Yumei Zhang,³¹ Zhenyu Zhang,²³ Zhijian Zhang,²⁶ Fengyi Zhao,²⁸ Jie Zhao,¹⁶ Rong Zhao,³¹ Shujun Zhao,⁴² Tianchi Zhao,¹⁶ Dongqin Zheng,⁵⁰ Hua Zheng,²⁶ Yangheng Zheng,⁶² Weirong Zhong,⁵⁰ Jing Zhou,⁵⁴ Li Zhou,¹⁶ Nan Zhou,⁶ Shun Zhou,¹⁶ Tong Zhou,¹⁶ Xiang Zhou,²³ Jiang Zhu,³¹ Kangfu Zhu,⁵² Kejun Zhu,¹⁶ Zhihang Zhu,¹⁶ Bo Zhuang,¹⁶ Honglin Zhuang,¹⁶ Liang Zong,²⁷ and Jiaheng Zou¹⁶

(JUNO Collaboration)

¹*Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile*

²*IPHC, Université de Strasbourg, CNRS/IN2P3, F-67037 Strasbourg, France*

³*Pakistan Institute of Nuclear Science and Technology, Islamabad, Pakistan*

⁴*INFN Catania and Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell'Università di Catania, Catania, Italy*

⁵*East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, China*

⁶*University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, China*

⁷*Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Russia*

⁸*INFN Sezione di Milano and Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Milano, Milano, Italy*

⁹*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand*

¹⁰*IJCLab, Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS/IN2P3, 91405 Orsay, France*

¹¹*Department of Physics and Earth Science, University of Ferrara and INFN Sezione di Ferrara, Ferrara, Italy*

¹²*INFN Milano Bicocca and University of Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy*

¹³*INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy*

¹⁴*III. Physikalisches Institut B, RWTH Aachen University, Aachen, Germany*

¹⁵*Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Physikalisches Institut, Tübingen, Germany*

¹⁶*Institute of High Energy Physics, Beijing, China*

¹⁷*SUBATECH, Université de Nantes, IMT Atlantique, CNRS-IN2P3, Nantes, France*

¹⁸*Univ. Bordeaux, CNRS, LP2I, UMR 5797, F-33170 Gradignan, France*

¹⁹*Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei*

²⁰*Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia dell'Università di Padova and INFN Sezione di Padova, Padova, Italy*

²¹*University of Roma Tre and INFN Sezione Roma Tre, Roma, Italy*

²²*Aix Marseille Univ, CNRS/IN2P3, CPPM, Marseille, France*

- ²³Wuhan University, Wuhan, China
- ²⁴INFN Milano Bicocca and Politecnico of Milano, Milano, Italy
- ²⁵National United University, Miao-Li
- ²⁶Dongguan University of Technology, Dongguan, China
- ²⁷Tsinghua University, Beijing, China
- ²⁸Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou, China
- ²⁹Institute of Physics, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Hsinchu
- ³⁰North China Electric Power University, Beijing, China
- ³¹Sun Yat-Sen University, Guangzhou, China
- ³²Beijing Institute of Spacecraft Environment Engineering, Beijing, China
- ³³Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina, Brazil
- ³⁴INFN Sezione di Perugia and Dipartimento di Chimica, Biologia e Biotecnologie dell'Università di Perugia, Perugia, Italy
- ³⁵Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium
- ³⁶Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California, Irvine, California, USA
- ³⁷Institute of Physics and EC PRISMA⁺, Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz, Mainz, Germany
- ³⁸Suranaree University of Technology, Nakhon Ratchasima, Thailand
- ³⁹Charles University, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics, Prague, Czech Republic
- ⁴⁰Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, Russia
- ⁴¹Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia
- ⁴²School of Physics and Microelectronics, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou, China
- ⁴³University of Jyväskylä, Department of Physics, Jyväskylä, Finland
- ⁴⁴Technische Universität München, München, Germany
- ⁴⁵Wuyi University, Jiangmen, China
- ⁴⁶Harbin Institute of Technology, Harbin, China
- ⁴⁷Institute of Hydrogeology and Environmental Geology, Chinese Academy of Geological Sciences, Shijiazhuang, China
- ⁴⁸Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Nuclear Physics Institute IKP-2, Jülich, Germany
- ⁴⁹Forschungszentrum Jülich GmbH, Central Institute of Engineering, Electronics and Analytics - Electronic Systems (ZEA-2), Jülich, Germany
- ⁵⁰Jinan University, Guangzhou, China
- ⁵¹Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China
- ⁵²Xi'an Jiaotong University, Xi'an, China
- ⁵³Institute of Experimental Physics, University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany
- ⁵⁴China Institute of Atomic Energy, Beijing, China
- ⁵⁵Shandong University, Jinan, China, and Key Laboratory of Particle Physics and Particle Irradiation of Ministry of Education, Shandong University, Qingdao, China
- ⁵⁶Guangxi University, Nanning, China
- ⁵⁷School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China
- ⁵⁸Yerevan Physics Institute, Yerevan, Armenia
- ⁵⁹Nankai University, Tianjin, China
- ⁶⁰Comenius University Bratislava, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, Bratislava, Slovakia
- ⁶¹College of Electronic Science and Engineering, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China
- ⁶²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
- ⁶³The Radiochemistry and Nuclear Chemistry Group in University of South China, Hengyang, China
- ⁶⁴Tsung-Dao Lee Institute, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, China
- ⁶⁵Jilin University, Changchun, China
- ⁶⁶Xiamen University, Xiamen, China
- ⁶⁷School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing, China
- ⁶⁸Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati dell'INFN, Roma, Italy
- ⁶⁹Institute of Electronics and Computer Science, Riga, Latvia
- ⁷⁰Universidad Tecnica Federico Santa Maria, Valparaiso, Chile
- ⁷¹Pontificia Universidade Catolica do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- ⁷²Nanjing University, Nanjing, China
- ⁷³National Astronomical Research Institute of Thailand, Chiang Mai, Thailand
- ⁷⁴Chongqing University, Chongqing, China
- (Dated: Friday 27th October, 2023)

The Jiangmen Underground Neutrino Observatory (JUNO) is a large liquid scintillator detector designed to explore many topics in fundamental physics. In this paper, the potential on searching for proton decay in $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ mode with JUNO is investigated. The kaon and its decay particles feature a clear three-fold coincidence signature that results in a high efficiency for identification. Moreover, the excellent energy resolution of JUNO permits to suppress the sizable background caused by other delayed signals. Based on these advantages, the detection efficiency for the proton decay via $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is $36.9\% \pm 4.9\%$ with a background level of $0.2 \pm$

0.05(syst) \pm 0.2(stat) events after 10 years of data taking. The estimated sensitivity based on 200 kton-years exposure is 9.6×10^{33} years, which is competitive with the current best limits on the proton lifetime in this channel and complementary using different detection technologies.

I. INTRODUCTION

To explain the observed cosmological matter-antimatter asymmetry, the baryon number B violation is one of three basic ingredients for an initially symmetrical Universe [1]. The baryon number is necessarily violated in the Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) [2, 3], which can unify the strong, weak and electromagnetic interactions into a single underlying force at a scale of $M_{\text{GUT}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV. A general prediction of the GUTs is proton decay. However, no experimental evidence of proton decay, B -violating neutron decay and neutron-antineutron oscillation has been found [4]. Fortunately, the new generation of underground experiments JUNO [5, 6], Hyper-Kamiokande [7] and DUNE [8] with huge target masses and different detection technologies will continue to search for proton decay and test the GUTs.

Among many possible proton decay modes [4], $p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0$ and $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ are the two dominant ones predicted by a majority of GUTs. The first one is expected to be the leading mode in many GUTs, particularly in those non-supersymmetric GUTs which typically predict the lifetime of proton to be about 10^{35} years [9]. In comparison, the decay mode $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ is favored by a number of supersymmetric GUTs. For these two decay modes, best measured upper limits of proton partial lifetime are $\tau/B(p \rightarrow e^+ \pi^0) > 2.4 \times 10^{34}$ years [10] and $\tau/B(p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+) > 5.9 \times 10^{33}$ years [11] at 90% C.L. from the Super-Kamiokande (Super-K) experiment, which is a water Cherenkov detector.

Compared to the water Cherenkov detectors, a liquid scintillator (LS) detector has a distinct advantage in detecting the proton decay mode $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ [5, 12–14]. The present paper plans to investigate the sensitivity of the future LS detector, JUNO. Here, the decay will give rise to a three-fold coincidence feature in time, which is usually composed of a prompt signal by the energy deposit of K^+ , a short-delayed signal ($\tau = 12.38$ ns) by the energy deposit of decay daughters of K^+ and a long-delayed signal ($\tau = 2.2$ μ s) by the energy deposit of the final Michel electron. Using the time-correlated triple coincidence, the JUNO detector can effectively identify the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ and reject the atmospheric neutrino backgrounds [14].

Preliminary studies have given a rough estimation of the sensitivity of JUNO to the proton decay mode $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ [5]. In this paper, the JUNO potential based on a detailed detector performance has been studied in Monte Carlo (MC) simulation. Sec. II briefly introduces the JUNO detector and its expected performance. In Sec. III, the MC simulation of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ and the atmospheric ν backgrounds will be described. In Sec. IV, the multi-pulse fitting method and other

selection criteria to discriminate $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ from the backgrounds are investigated. We will present the expected sensitivity of JUNO to the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ in Sec. V. Finally, a conclusion is given in Sec. VI.

II. JUNO DETECTOR

JUNO is a multi-purpose neutrino observatory under construction in South China. As a low background observatory, it has a vertical overburden of 700 m rock (1800 m.w.e) to shield the detector from cosmic muons. Its central detector (CD) is a 12 cm thick acrylic sphere with a diameter of 35.4 m, filled with 20 kton LS. The CD is immersed in a cylindrical water pool and supported by a stainless steel lattice structure. Besides, the CD is instrumented with 17612 20-inch PMT (LPMT) and 25600 3-inch PMT (SPMT) which are uniformly distributed outside the acrylic sphere. 5000 of the LPMT are dynode (DYN) PMT produced by Hamamatsu Photonics K.K., while the remaining LPMT are Micro Channel Plate (MCP) PMT manufactured by North Night Vision Technology Co. Ltd. (NNVT) [15]. Their transit time spread (TTS) are 1.1 ns and 5.0 ns in σ , respectively, according to the result of the PMT mass test [16]. The total photocathode coverage of the LPMT will be around 75%. The SPMT, which contribute another 2.5% photocathode coverage, are also deployed to serve as an additional independent calorimeter. The TTS (σ) of SPMT has been measured to be around 1.5 ns [17]. For each MeV energy deposition in LS when detecting the low energy events, around 1.3×10^3 photonelectrons (PE) are expected to be received by the LPMT.

A VETO system, including Top Tracker (TT) detector and water Cherenkov PMT system, is designed to prevent the influence of cosmic muons. The TT detector is a plastic scintillator detector complex which partly covers the water pool and the CD, which helps reject the cosmic muons passing it. The water Cherenkov PMT system is assembled on the outer surface of the stainless steel lattice structure and measures the Cherenkov light produced by the cosmic muons passing the water pool. The rejection ratio of cosmic muons is estimated to be more than 99%.

III. SIMULATION

To understand the behavior of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ and to discriminate them from the backgrounds in JUNO detector, a Monte Carlo simulation has been performed which is composed of two steps, the generator production and detector simulation. The generator of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ and its backgrounds is produced with GENIE (version 3.0.2) [18], in which the primary processes of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu} K^+$ and the atmospheric ν interactions in LS are simulated. The detector simulation, which is the simu-

* Now at Istituto Superiore per la Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale, 00144 Rome, Italy

lation of the final states of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and atmospheric ν interaction in the JUNO detector, is processed in SNiPER [19] which is a Geant4 [20] based simulation software developed by the JUNO collaboration. All the related optical processes, including the quenching effect, are considered. The profiles of the LS, including the fluorescence times can be found in Ref. [21]. In total, 10k $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (PD) events and 160k atmospheric ν events are simulated with vertex positions uniformly distributed over the whole LS volume.

This study does not yet use a full event reconstruction of energy, position and hit time information. Instead, they are smeared according to the expectation from the detector Monte Carlo and used as the input to our further analysis. The visible energy (E_{vis}) is the energy deposition reconstructed from the number of PE received by the LPMT. For a conservative consideration, it is smeared by $3\% / \sqrt{E_{\text{vis}}(\text{MeV})}$ when the energy deposition is smaller than 60 MeV, and a resolution of 1% when greater [22]. The position of the event is described with the center of energy deposition position, which is the averaged position weighted by the energy deposition each time. It is smeared by a Gaussian distribution with resolution of 30 cm. In this study, the detected times of the photons hit on the cathode of the SPMT are collected to form a hit time spectra for each event, after the correction of photon time-of-flight (TOF) relative to the reconstructed deposition center. TTS of SPMT are set randomly according to the measurement results introduced in Sec. II. The reason for not using the LPMT will be introduced in Sec. III A.

A. Proton Decay

Based on the JUNO LS components, the initial proton of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ may come from free protons (in Hydrogen) or bound protons (in Carbon). In free proton decay, the final states $\bar{\nu}$ and K^+ have fixed kinetic energies of 339 MeV and 105 MeV, respectively. According to a toy MC simulation with the corresponding monochromatic K^+ in the JUNO detector, it is found that 92.4% of K^+ will deposit all of their kinetic energy within 1.2 ns, which means a signal can be found in the hit time spectrum immediately. Then, these K^+ will stay at rest until decaying into their daughter particles after an average of 12.38 ns. The K^+ has six main decay channels. The most dominant channels are $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ with branching ratios of 63.56% and 20.67%, respectively [4]. In the first channel, the produced μ^+ has a kinetic energy of 152 MeV and decays to a Michel electron with a lifetime of about 2.2 μs . The produced π^0 and π^+ in the second channel will decay into two gammas, a μ^+ plus a ν_μ , respectively, and consequently produce a Michel electron. All daughter particles will deposit their kinetic energies immediately and give a second signal. After the TOF correction, the hit time spectrum of the K^+ and decay particles will form an overlapping double-pulse pattern. Given the relatively long lifetime of the muon, a later third pulse from the Michel electron, as a delayed feature of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$, will be found on the hit time spectrum. This triple coincidence as introduced in Sec. I is one of the most important features to distinguish a $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ event from the

backgrounds. This triple coincidence is illustrated in Fig. 1.






FIG. 1. Illustration of the hit time spectrum of a typical $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ event, containing the signals of K^+ , the decay daughter of K^+ (μ^+ in this event) and the Michel electron.

As introduced in Sec. II, both the LPMT and SPMT are used in JUNO. However, as shown in Fig. 2, they have different performances on the hit time spectrum collection. When a LPMT is triggered by a hit, the waveform will be digitized and recorded by the electronics. Then, the hit time reconstruction (from the waveform to the hit time of each PE) will be carried out to get the hit time spectrum. For low energy events such as the inverse β decay (IBD), the hit time reconstruction is possible since only a few photons could be received by most LPMT. However, a typical $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ event usually has an energy deposition of more than 200 MeV. In this case, many PEs would be received by the LPMT in a few tens of ns (as shown in Fig. 2(a)) and the hit time reconstruction would be difficult. As shown in Fig. 2(b), the overlapping of the first two pulses of the triple coincidence time feature would be smeared if the hit time reconstruction is not carried out. Thus, the LPMT are not used to collect the hit time spectrum in this study. In comparison, considering that the receiving area of SPMT is around 1/40 times that of LPMT, most SPMT will work in single hit mode in which the SPMT is usually hit by at most only one PE. Advantageously, the triple coincidence time feature of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ could be preserved well. Thus, only the SPMT in single hit mode are used in this study to collect the hit time spectrum.

The protons bound in Carbon nuclei will be influenced by nuclear effects [11], including the nuclear binding energy, Fermi motion and nucleon-nucleon correlation. The kinetic energies of the produced K^+ are smeared around 105 MeV which is relative to that in the free proton case. In addition, the K^+ kinetic energy will also be changed by the final state interactions (FSI). Before the K^+ escapes from the residual nucleus, it may interact with the spectator nucleons and knock one of them out of the remaining nucleus. It can also exchange its charge with a neutron and turn into K^0 via $K^+ + n \rightarrow K^0 + p$. Furthermore, the de-excitation of the residual nucleus will produce γ s, neutrons or protons etc. Obviously, the FSI and de-excitation processes will change the re-



(a) Waveform of a LPMT acquired from the SNIper electronics simulation.



(b) Comparison of the LPMT waveform and SPMT hit time output from a typical $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ event after TOF correction.

FIG. 2. Simulated PMT output of a typical $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ event. The total visible energy of this event is 275 MeV and the K^+ decays at 13.7 ns after it's born. Photon hit time reconstruction is not easy to achieve when using LPMT to detect a hundreds-of-MeV event. So the SPMT is used for hit time spectrum collection. More details can be found in the text.

action products, which are crucial to our later analysis.

The GENIE generator (version 3.0.2) [18] is used to model these nuclear effects. Some corrections have been made to the default GENIE. Firstly, the nuclear shell structure is taken into account which is not included in the default nuclear model of GENIE. A spectral function model, which provides a 2-dimensional distribution of momentum k and removal energy E_R for protons in ^{12}C , is applied to describe the initial proton states [23]. Then, the initial proton energy is determined by $E_p = m_p - E_R$ where m_p is the mass of a free proton. In this case, about 2.2% of the protons from ^{12}C cannot decay into $\bar{\nu}$ and K^+ since the corresponding proton invariant mass is smaller than the K^+ mass [24].

Secondly, we turn on the hadron-nucleon model in GENIE. The default GENIE uses the hadron-atom model to evaluate the FSI, which costs less time but does not include the $K^+ + n \rightarrow K^0 + p$ interaction. Meanwhile, we modify the target nucleon energy and the binding energy with $m_p - E_R$ (or $m_n - E_R$) and $E_B = E_R - k^2 / (2M_{11\text{B}})$ [25], respectively. In addition, the fraction of K^+ -nucleon charge exchange and elastic

scattering interactions is corrected in terms of the numbers of spectator protons and neutrons in the remaining nucleus. With all these modifications, we finally got a distribution of K^+ kinetic energies as shown in Fig. 3. The charge exchange probability is about 1.7% for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ in ^{12}C according to the result of the modified GENIE.




FIG. 3. The K^+ kinetic energy distributions for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ in ^{12}C with (solid line) and without (dashed line) the FSI from the default (blue) and modified (red) GENIE.

Thirdly, all the residual nuclei in the default GENIE are generated in the ground state, thus no de-excitation processes are taken into account. The TALYS (version 1.95) software [26] is then applied to estimate the de-excitation processes due to the excitation energy E_x . The E_x of the residual nucleus can be calculated through $E_x = M_{inv} - M_R$, where M_{inv} and M_R are the corresponding invariant mass and static mass, respectively. For $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ in ^{12}C , $^{11}\text{B}^*$, $^{10}\text{B}^*$ and $^{10}\text{Be}^*$ account for 90.9%, 5.1% and 3.1% of the residual nuclei, respectively. Among these residual nuclei, the $^{10}\text{B}^*$ and $^{10}\text{Be}^*$ come from the final state interactions between K^+ and one of the nucleons in $^{11}\text{B}^*$. The de-excitation modes and corresponding branching ratios of the residual nuclei $^{11}\text{B}^*$, $^{10}\text{B}^*$ and $^{10}\text{Be}^*$ have been reported in Ref. [24].

According to the result, many de-excitation processes could produce neutron. In the case of a $s_{1/2}$ proton decay, the dominant de-excitation modes of $^{11}\text{B}^*$ states, including $n + ^{10}\text{B}$, $n + p + ^9\text{Be}$, $n + d + ^8\text{Be}$, $n + \alpha + ^6\text{Li}$, $2n + p + ^8\text{Be}$, will contribute to a branching ratio of 45.8% [24]. About 56.5% of highly excited $^{11}\text{B}^*$ states can directly emit one or more neutrons from their exclusive de-excitation modes. In addition, the non-exclusive de-excitation processes, and the de-excitation modes of $d + ^9\text{Be}$ and $d + \alpha + ^5\text{He}$, can also produce neutrons [24]. Most of these neutrons will give a 2.2 MeV γ from the neutron capture in the JUNO LS, which will influence the setting of the criteria (introduced in Section. IV B).

B. Backgrounds

The dominant backgrounds of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ are caused by atmospheric ν and cosmic muon since the deposited energy of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ events are usually larger than 100 MeV. The cosmic muons come from the interaction of cosmic rays and the

atmosphere. The produced cosmic muons usually have a very high energy and produce obvious Cherenkov light when passing through the water pool outside JUNO CD. With the VETO system, JUNO is expected to discriminate more than 99% of the cosmic muons. The muons not detected by the VETO system usually clip the corner of the water pool with a very low energy deposited and few Cherenkov photons produced, and therefore escape from the watch of the VETO system. Thus, most VETO survived cosmic muons leave no signal in the CD and will not be background for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ observation. For those muons that are VETO survived, entering and leaving signals in the CD, the energy deposition processes are mainly caused by the energetic primary muon. Consequently, with the visible energy, VETO and volume selection, as well as the expected triple coincidence feature selection, this type of background is considered to be negligible. Therefore, the background mainly discussed in this paper is from atmospheric ν events.

The expected number of observed atmospheric ν events is calculated with the help of the atmospheric ν fluxes at the JUNO site [27], the neutrino cross sections from the GENIE [18] and the best-fit values of the oscillation parameters in the case of the normal hierarchy [4]. The JUNO LS detector will observe 36k events in ten years. We use GENIE in its default configuration to generate 160 k atmospheric ν events, which corresponds to 44.5 years of JUNO data taking or 890 kton-years exposure mass. Each atmospheric ν event has a weight value, which indicates the possibility of this event occurring for JUNO's 200 kton-years exposure considering the neutrino oscillation. Then, these atmospheric ν events are simulated in SNIPEr as our sample database.

The atmospheric ν events can be classified into the following four categories [28]: the charged current quasi-elastic scattering (CCQE), the neutral current elastic scattering (NCES), the pion production and the kaon production. The categories and their ratios are shown in Table I. The most dominant backgrounds in the energy range of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (Sub-GeV) are formed by elastic scattering, including the CCQE and the NCES events. The final states of the elastic scattering events usually deposit all their energy immediately and eventually followed by a delayed signal. Consequently, requiring a triple coincidence feature effectively suppresses these two categories of backgrounds.

Another significant background is CC and NC pion production, which is caused by single pion resonant interactions and coherent pion interactions, respectively. The produced pions will decay into muons with an average time of 26 ns. These muons, together with those produced in CC pion production, will consequently produce Michel electrons. It can be found that pion-production events would feature a triple coincidence in time similar to the search for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$. However, the muon contributed to the second pulse of the triple coincidence has kinetic energy of 4 MeV which is too small compared to the total energy deposition.

The atmospheric ν interactions with pion production have a larger possibility to produce the accompanying nucleons. Some of the created energetic neutrons have a small probability to propagate freely for more than 10 ns in the LS. In

this case, the neutron interaction can cause a sufficiently large second pulse. Therefore, pion production events with an energetic neutron, e.g. $\nu + p \rightarrow \nu + n + \pi^+$, can mimic the signature of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$. In fact, $\bar{\nu}_\mu$ CC quasi-elastic scattering $\bar{\nu}_\mu + p \rightarrow n + \mu^+$ can also contribute to this kind of background. It should be noted that this type of events was not observed by KamLAND [14]. However, because of its larger target mass and proton exposure compared to KamLAND, it is possible for JUNO to observe these backgrounds. Since the energetic neutron usually breaks up the nucleus and produces many neutrons, a large number of neutron capture can be used to suppress this kind of background.

Another possible source of background is resonant and non-resonant kaon production (with or without Λ). The visible energy distribution of the kaon is shown in Fig. 4. The Nuwro generator [29] is applied to help estimating the non-resonant kaon production, because this type of event is not included in GENIE due to the strangeness number conservation. Based on the result of simulation, this kind of background has a negligible contribution in the relevant energy range (smaller than 600 MeV), which is similar to the LENA [13] and KamLAND [14] conclusions.




FIG. 4. Visible energy distribution of the kaon production from atmospheric ν backgrounds. According to the plot, the resonant kaon production has a negligible contribution and the non-resonant background can be eliminated, with an upper E_{vis} cut at 600 MeV.

IV. ANALYSIS

To quantify the performance of background discrimination, we design a series of selection criteria to evaluate the detection efficiency of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and the corresponding background rate based on the simulation data sample. According to the physics mechanisms introduced in the last section, the key part of the selections is based on the triple coincidence signature in hit time spectrum. Many beneficial works to search for proton decay with a LS detector have been discussed by the LENA group and carried out by the KamLAND collaboration [13, 14]. However, the situation in JUNO is more challenging because of the much larger detector mass compared

TABLE I. The categories of atmospheric ν backgrounds. The data are summarized based on the result of GENIE and SNiPER.

Type	Ratio (%)	Ratio with E_{vis} in [100 MeV, 600 MeV](%)	Interaction	Signal characteristics
NCES	20.2	15.8	$\nu + n \rightarrow \nu + n$ $\nu + p \rightarrow \nu + p$	Single Pulse
CCQE	45.2	64.2	$\bar{\nu}_l + p \rightarrow n + l^+$ $\nu_l + n \rightarrow p + l^-$	Single Pulse
Pion Production	33.5	19.8	$\nu_l + p \rightarrow l^- + p + \pi^+$ $\nu + p \rightarrow \nu + n + \pi^+$	Approximate Single Pulse (Second pulse too low)
Kaon Production	1.1	0.2	$\nu_l + n \rightarrow l^- + \Lambda + K^+$ $\nu_l + p \rightarrow l^- + p + K^+$	Double Pulse

to KamLAND. Due to the relative masses, in ten years, the detected number of atmospheric ν would be about 20 times of that of the KamLAND experiment. Therefore, more stringent selection criteria have to be defined to suppress background to a level at least as low as that of KamLAND. Besides the common cuts on energy, position and temporal features, additional criteria have to be explored. For the JUNO detector, a possible way to additionally distinguish the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is by using the delayed signals, including the Michel electron and neutron capture gammas.

A. Basic Selections

The basic event selection uses only the most apparent features of the decay signature. The first variable regarded is the visible energy of the event. The visible energy of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ comes from the energy deposition of K^+ and its decay daughters. The average energy deposition of K^+ is 105 MeV, while that of the decay daughters is 152 MeV and 354 MeV in the two dominant K^+ decay channels respectively. Therefore, as illustrated in Fig. 5, the visible energy of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is mostly concentrated in the range of $200 \text{ MeV} \leq E_{\text{vis}} \leq 600 \text{ MeV}$, comparable to that of the atmospheric ν backgrounds. Nearly half of the atmospheric ν events in the simulated event sample can be rejected with the E_{vis} cut, while the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ survival rate is more than 94.6%. The left and right peaks mainly correspond to the $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+\nu_\mu$ and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^0$ decay channels, respectively.

In the second step, if the CD is triggered, the VETO detector is required to be quiet in two consecutive trigger windows of 1000 ns which is before and after the prompt signals respectively. In this way most muons can be removed, while the remaining muons usually get through the CD near its surface. The remaining muons usually have smaller visible energies and shorter track lengths. Thus, the track of the remaining muons should be closer to the boundary of the CD. Consequently, they can be further removed by a volume cut. The volume within $R_V \leq 17.5 \text{ m}$ is defined as the fiducial volume of JUNO detector in $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ searches, thus the fiducial volume cut efficiency is 96.6% and will be counted into the selection efficiency.

As shown in Table II, after the basic cuts:

(Cut-1): visible energy $200 \text{ MeV} \leq E_{\text{vis}} \leq 600 \text{ MeV}$,




FIG. 5. The visible energy distributions of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (PD) and atmospheric ν (AN) events.

(Cut-2-1): VETO system is not triggered in 1000 ns windows before and after the prompt signals,

(Cut-2-2): volume cut is set as $R_V \leq 17.5 \text{ m}$,

the survival rate of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ in the simulated signal sample is 93.7% while that of atmospheric ν events is 29.9% from the total atmospheric ν events. Further selection methods to reduce the atmospheric ν background are required.

B. Delayed Signals and Event Classification

Due to its good energy and time resolution, JUNO can measure the delayed signals of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and atmospheric ν events, including the Michel electron and neutron capture. About 95% of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is followed by a Michel electron, while only 50% of the background events exhibit a delayed signal after the basic selections. On the other hand, $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ on average has a smaller number of captured neutrons per event than the atmospheric ν events. Criteria can be set to further reduce the remaining background after the basic selection based on the differences between the characteristics of delayed signals.

The Michel electron is the product of the muon decay with kinetic energy up to 52.8 MeV and the muon lifetime is $2.2 \mu\text{s}$.

For the Michel electron signals, we can know the visible energy E_M , the correlated time difference ΔT_M to the prompt signal and the correlated distance ΔL_M to the deposition center of the prompt signal from the MC simulation. Based on the physical properties of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and background events, it is assumed that JUNO can fully identify the Michel electron with $10 \text{ MeV} < E_M < 54 \text{ MeV}$ and $150 \text{ ns} < \Delta T_M < 10000 \text{ ns}$. In this case, the efficiency to distinguish Michel electrons is 89.2%. The lower limit of E_M is set to avoid the influence of low energy background, like natural radioactivity. In Fig. 6, the number of events N_M and ΔL_M distributions of identified Michel electrons for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and atmospheric ν events are shown. About 5.58% of the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ events exhibit the number of Michel electrons $N_M = 2$ which corresponds to the K^+ decay channel $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$. For the $N_M = 2$ case, ΔL_M is taken to be the average value of two correlated distances. It is clear that proton decay has a smaller ΔL_M on average than the backgrounds. We can consequently use ΔL_M to reduce the atmospheric ν backgrounds by applying the criteria:

(Cut-3): tagged Michel electron number $1 \leq N_M \leq 2$,

(Cut-4): correlated distance $\Delta L_M \leq 80 \text{ cm}$,

in the remaining proton decay candidates after the basic selection. It can be found that 71.4% of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and 9.2% of atmospheric ν events survive in the simulated event samples.

Similar to the Michel electron, the neutron capture is another potential selection criterion. Here we assume that the delayed neutron capture signal can be fully identified by requiring the visible energy $1.9 \text{ MeV} \leq E_n \leq 2.5 \text{ MeV}$ and the correlated time difference $1 \mu\text{s} \leq \Delta T_n \leq 2.5 \text{ ms}$. In this way, 89.5% of the neutrons produced by atmospheric ν events can be distinguished. In Fig. 7, the identified neutron distributions of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ signals and backgrounds after the basic selections are shown. The proton decay events have a smaller N_n on average than the atmospheric ν events. So we use the selection cut $N_n \leq 3$ to suppress the background. As shown in Fig. 7, the distance ΔL_n , which is defined similarly to ΔL_M , can also be a powerful tool to reduce the backgrounds. Thus, a cut of $\Delta L_n \leq 70 \text{ cm}$ is required. Note that these criteria about N_n and ΔL_n can reduce an important class of background, namely events with a high energy neutron in the final state of the primary atmospheric ν interaction. Such a high energy neutron has a small probability not to lose its energy within 10 ns until it interacts with LS to give a second pulse. If the final states include μ^\pm or π^\pm , this background event will mimic the three fold coincidence of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$. Since the high energy neutron usually produces more neutrons and larger ΔL_n , we choose the following cuts:


(Cut-5): tagged neutron number $N_n \leq 3$ for $N_M = 1$,

(Cut-6): $\Delta L_n \leq 70 \text{ cm}$ if $N_M = 1$ and $1 \leq N_n \leq 3$,


to suppress this kind of background.

Based on the above discussions about the delayed signals, we naturally classify the MC events into the following three samples:

Sample 1: $N_M = 1, \Delta L_M \leq 80 \text{ cm}, N_n = 0$;



(a) Distribution of N_M



(b) Distribution of ΔL_M

FIG. 6. The N_M and ΔL_M distributions of identified Michel electrons for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and atmospheric ν events with the basic selection and the selection of the time and energy properties of Michel electrons. A unit area normalization is used.

Sample 2: $N_M = 1, \Delta L_M \leq 80 \text{ cm}, 1 \leq N_n \leq 3, \Delta L_n \leq 70 \text{ cm}$;

Sample 3: $N_M = 2, \Delta L_M \leq 80 \text{ cm}$.

The survival rate of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and the atmospheric ν events in the simulation can be found in Table II. About 6.8% of the total atmospheric ν events would survive, requiring further selection methods to reduce the background.

C. Multi-Pulse Fitting

As introduced in Sec. III A, a $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ event usually has a triple coincidence signature on its hit time spectrum. The first two pulses of the triple coincidence overlap with each other concerning the decay time of K^+ , which is a distinctive feature of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ comparing to the atmospheric ν backgrounds. It means that the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ can be distinguished from the backgrounds according to the characteristics of the overlapping double pulses. Therefore, the hit time spectrum is studied further by multi-pulse fitting method [14], in order to reconstruct the time difference and energy of the K^+ and its decay daughters.




FIG. 7. The N_n and ΔL_n distributions of identified neutron capture for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and atmospheric ν events with the basic selection. A unit area normalization is used.

For each event, its hit time spectrum can be fitted with double-pulse $\phi_D(t)$ and single-pulse $\phi_S(t)$ templates of hit time t ,

$$\phi_D(t; \epsilon_K, \epsilon_i, a, \Delta T) = \epsilon_K \phi_K(t) + \epsilon_i \phi_i[a(t - \Delta T)], \quad (1)$$

$$\phi_S(t; \epsilon_S) = \epsilon_S \phi_{AN}(at), \quad (2)$$

where $\phi_K(t)$ is the TOF-corrected template of K^+ , $\phi_i(t)$ is that of a decay daughter of K^+ . $i = \mu$ and π refer to the two dominant decay channels $K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ \nu_\mu$ for $E_{\text{vis}} \leq 400$ MeV and $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^0$ otherwise. These templates are produced by the MC simulations in which the particles are processed by SNIPEr with their corresponding kinetic energies. $\phi_{AN}(t)$ is the template of the backgrounds, generated as the average spectrum of all the atmospheric ν events with energy deposition from 200 MeV to 600 MeV. Due to the influence of reflection, the hit time spectrum is widened when the energy deposition center is close to the boundary. In order to deal with this effect, the templates are separately produced in inner volume (< 15 m) and outer volume (> 15 m), and applied to the fitting of events in the corresponding volumes respectively.

In Eqs. (1) and (2), ΔT is the correlated time difference of the delayed component, a is a scaling factor to account for

shape deformation of the second pulse caused by the electromagnetic showers, and $\epsilon_K, \epsilon_i, \epsilon_S$ are the corresponding energy factors. They are free parameters in the fitting. For illustration, we use Eq. (1) to fit two typical events as shown in Fig. 8.

After fitting the hit time spectra with the templates of Eqs. (1) and (2), we calculate the χ^2 of the double and single pulse fittings using

$$\chi_D^2 = \sum \frac{[\phi(t) - \phi_D(t)]^2}{\sigma^2[\phi(t)]}, \quad (3)$$

$$\chi_S^2 = \sum \frac{[\phi(t) - \phi_S(t)]^2}{\sigma^2[\phi(t)]}, \quad (4)$$

where $\sigma^2[\phi(t)]$ is the sample variance of the observed spectrum $\phi(t)$ at the t -th bin. The χ^2 ratio $R_\chi \equiv \chi_S^2/\chi_D^2$ is taken as the further selection criterion. From the double-pulse fitting by Eq. (1), the energies E_1 and E_2 of the overlapping double pulses from depositions of the postulated K^+ and its decay daughters are calculated from ϵ_K, ϵ_i and a introduced in Eq. (1),

$$E_1 = \frac{\epsilon_K T_K}{\epsilon_K T_K + \epsilon_i T_i/a} E_{\text{fit}} \quad (5)$$

$$E_2 = \frac{\epsilon_i T_i/a}{\epsilon_K T_K + \epsilon_i T_i/a} E_{\text{fit}}, \quad (6)$$

where $T_K = 105$ MeV is the initial kinetic energy of K^+ from the free proton decay. $T_\mu = 152$ MeV and $T_\pi = 354$ MeV are the initial kinetic energies of muon and pion from the K^+ decay at rest. The fitted total energy is defined as $E_{\text{fit}} = E_{\text{vis}} - \sum E_M - \sum E_n$ which is the visible energy subtracting the energies of Michel electrons and neutron captures.

The way to select $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ from the atmospheric ν backgrounds according to the parameters acquired above will be introduced as follows. In Fig. 9, we plot R_χ distributions for the proton decay and the atmospheric ν events after applying the selections from Cut-1 to Cut-6. It can be found that R_χ is a tool to reject the background. Actually, the R_χ can be regarded as an indicator that the fitted event tends to be a double pulse overlapping event or a single pulse event. The larger the R_χ is, the stronger it tends to be an event with two pulses overlapping in hit time spectrum. A cut of $R_\chi > 1$ can be applied to roughly do the selection. If $R_\chi > 1$, this fitted event could be preliminarily identified as a proton decay candidate. Otherwise, it would be rejected as a background candidate. However, a general cut of the R_χ is not justified to the three samples defined at the end of Sec. IV B. Compared to sample 1 which is composed of the common $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and atmospheric ν events, sample 2 is additionally composed of the background events with energetic neutrons introduced in Sec. III B. The second pulse caused by an energetic neutron makes these atmospheric ν events have a fake double pulse overlapping shape in the hit time spectrum. A stricter requirement to the R_χ is consequently necessary to reduce the background. The K^+ produced in the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ events in sample 3 actually decays via $K^+ \rightarrow \pi^+ \pi^+ \pi^-$ due to the cut on the number of Michel electrons $N_M = 2$. As a result, the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ should be easier to be distinguished from the backgrounds with $N_M = 2$. Therefore it is reasonable to set a less stringent cut on R_χ in order to keep




FIG. 8. Illustration of multi-pulse fitting to hit time spectra of a proton decay event (left) and an atmospheric ν event (right). The x axis is the hit time after TOF correction. The black dots are the observed spectrum from simulation. The blue line is the fitting result. The green and red filled histograms are the fitted result of the two components in the hit time spectrum which are contributed by the K^+ and the K^+ decay daughters.

a high detection efficiency. Consequently, the R_χ will be set for the three samples separately. In order to sufficiently reject atmospheric ν backgrounds, we require

(Cut-7-1): $R_\chi > 1.1$ for Sample 1,

(Cut-7-2): $R_\chi > 2.0$ for Sample 2,

(Cut-7-3): $R_\chi > 1.0$ for Sample 3.




FIG. 9. Distributions of the χ^2 ratio $R_\chi \equiv \chi_S^2 / \chi_D^2$ from the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (PD) and atmospheric ν (AN) events after the basic selection and the delayed signal selection.

The distributions of fitted ΔT are shown in Fig. 10(a), where a rough cut of $R_\chi > 1$ is applied to $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and the backgrounds. From the figure, it can be found that ΔT for the remaining backgrounds which are mis-identified as $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ candidates are mostly distributed at small ΔT , because the atmospheric ν events are usually a single pulse. Meanwhile, when the K^+ decays in few nanoseconds, the fitting has low

efficiency because both components are too close to be distinguished from each other (as Fig. 10(b) shown). Consequently, ΔT is required as:

(Cut-8): correlated time difference should be $\Delta T \geq 7$ ns,

Concerning the kinematics of the K^+ and its decay daughters, the sub-energy E_1 should be distributed from 0 to more than 200 MeV with an average of 105 MeV, while E_2 should be fixed around 152 MeV or 354 MeV depending on the decay mode. As shown in Fig. 11, we plot the correlated sub-energy deposition distributions of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and background events. Two obvious groups in the left panel can be observed, corresponding to the two dominant decay channels of K^+ . Only a small group of atmospheric ν events is left in the bottom right corner of the right panel of Fig. 11, which comes from the mis-identification of a tiny second peak. It is clear that a box selection on E_1 and E_2 can efficiently reject the atmospheric ν backgrounds. Therefore the selections,

(Cut-9-1): $30 \text{ MeV} \leq E_1 \leq 200 \text{ MeV}$

(Cut-9-2): $100 \text{ MeV} \leq E_2 \leq 410 \text{ MeV}$,

are required. The lower boundary of E_1 is set to avoid the influence of the coincidence with the low energy events like reactor antineutrinos or radioactive backgrounds.

The detection efficiencies under each selection criterion are listed in Table II, where the numbers of the remaining backgrounds are also shown, from which the elimination power of each criterion can be found. After applying these criteria, the total efficiency for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is estimated to be 36.9%, while only one event in sample 1 remains from the simulated 160 k atmospheric ν events (corresponding to an exposure of 890 kton-years or exposure time of 44.5 years on JUNO site). Since the volume cut in the basic selections provides a selection efficiency of 96.6% to the total efficiency, it will not be counted in the exposure mass calculation. The three samples contribute to 27.4%, 7.3% and 2.2% of the detection efficiencies, respectively. Considering the statistical error and the

TABLE II. Detection efficiencies of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ and the number of atmospheric ν background after each selection criterion. The total amount of atmospheric ν background simulated is 160 k, which corresponds to an exposure of 890 kton-years.

Criteria	Survival rate of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (%)			Survival count (fraction) of atmospheric ν			
	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	Sample 1	Sample 2	Sample 3	
basic selection	E_{vis}	94.6			51299 (32.1%)		
	R_V	93.7			47849 (29.9%)		
Delayed signal selection	N_M	74.4		4.4	20739 (13.0%)		1143 (0.7%)
	ΔL_M	67.0			13796 (8.6%)		994 (0.6%)
	N_n	48.4	17.9	–	5403 (3.4%)	6857 (4.3%)	–
	ΔL_n	–	16.6	–	–	4472 (2.8%)	–
Time character selection	R_X	45.9	9.0	3.8	4326 (2.7%)	581 (0.4%)	716 (0.4%)
	ΔT	28.3	7.7	2.4	121 (0.07%)	18 (0.01%)	30 (0.02%)
	E_1, E_2	27.4	7.3	2.2	1 (0.0006%)	0	0
Total	36.9			1			

TABLE III. The detection efficiency uncertainties for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$.

Source	Uncertainty
Statistic	1.6%
Position reconstruction	1.7%
Nuclear model	6.8%
Energy deposition model	11.1%
Total	13.2%

weighting value which accounts for the oscillation probability, the background level corresponds to 0.2 events which has been scaled to 10 years data taking of JUNO.

V. SENSITIVITIES AND UNCERTAINTIES

The detection efficiency uncertainties of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ are estimated in Table III. The statistical uncertainty is estimated to be 1.6% in the MC simulation. So far, we are using the ideal setting for the position reconstruction (30 cm of the energy deposition center position uncertainty without bias). Considering the performance of the vertex reconstruction algorithm, it is assumed that the residual bias of the position reconstruction of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is 10 cm. In this case, the efficiency uncertainty caused by the volume cut of 17.5 m will be 1.7%.

Another important systematic uncertainty of detection efficiency comes from the inaccuracy of the nuclear model which will influence the ratio of accompanying particles of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$. To estimate this uncertainty, another $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ sample base is simulated with the FSI and de-excitation processes of the residual nucleus disabled. After applying all the criteria, a difference in the detection efficiency is found to be 6.8%, which is the estimation of the uncertainty from the nuclear model.

The dominant uncertainty comes from the energy deposition model. Due to the lack of study on Sub-GeV particles' behavior, especially the quenching effect of hundreds of MeV K^+ in LAB based LS, the deposition simulation in the LS detector might be inaccurate. Therefore, the simulated waveform of the hit time spectrum might be different from the real one. According to the study of KamLAND [14], this kind of uncertainty is estimated as 11.1%. We conservatively use this value considering the similar detection method. Therefore,

the uncertainty of the proton lifetime is estimated as 13.2% considering all the sources introduced above.

The uncertainties of the background level in ten years is composed of two parts. One is the systematic uncertainty that is contributed by the uncertainty of the atmospheric neutrino flux (20%) and the atmospheric neutrino interaction cross-section (10%) [5]. Another uncertainty comes from the number N_n of neutron captures, which can be affected by the secondary interactions of hadronic daughter particles of atmospheric neutrino events in the LS. This is estimated as 10% assuming the same uncertainty as Super-K [30]. The statistic uncertainty is estimated following the $1/\sqrt{N}$ rule. Considering that only one event survives in the selection, it is calculated as ± 0.2 in ten years. With 160 k events in the current MC simulation, it is hard to improve since it will consume vast computing resources. We hope to update this value with a larger MC simulation data volume when it permits. Consequently, the background is estimated as $0.2 \pm 0.05(\text{syst}) \pm 0.2(\text{stat})$.

The sensitivity on $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is expressed as

$$\tau/B(p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+) = \frac{N_p T \epsilon}{n_{90}}, \quad (7)$$

where $N_p = 6.75 \times 10^{33}$ is the total number of protons (including 1.45×10^{33} free protons and 5.3×10^{33} bound protons) in the JUNO central detector, T is the running time which is assumed to be 10 years to achieve exposure mass of 200 kton-years, $\epsilon = 36.9\%$ is the total signal efficiency. n_{90} is the upper limit of 90% confidence level of the detected signals. It depends on the number of observed events and background level. According to the Feldman-Cousins method [31], n_{90} is estimated as 2.61 given an expected background of 0.2 in 10 years. Thus, the JUNO sensitivity on $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ at 90% C.L. with 200 kton-years would be

$$\tau/B(p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+) > 9.6 \times 10^{33} \text{ years}. \quad (8)$$

Comparing to the representative liquid scintillator detector, the detection efficiency on $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ of JUNO is relatively lower than LENA [13]. This should be reasonable considering that the study is based on an overall detector simulation of JUNO. Based on the background level 0.02 events per year, JUNO sensitivity as a function of running time is plotted as


VI. CONCLUSION

A Simulation study to estimate the performance of the JUNO detector on searching for proton decay via $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ has been presented. It is found that the expected detection efficiency of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is $36.9\% \pm 4.9\%$, while the background is estimated to be $0.2 \pm 0.05(\text{syst}) \pm 0.2(\text{stat})$ in ten years exposure. Assuming no proton decay events observed, the sensitivity of JUNO on $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ is estimated to be 9.6×10^{33} years at 90% C.L. based on the total exposure of 200 kton-years (or a live fiducial exposure of 193 kton-years). This is higher than the current best limit 5.9×10^{33} years from the excellent effort of Super-K experiment with a live fiducial exposure of 260 kton-years [11].


It shows that a liquid-scintillator detector like JUNO will be competitive when compared to the planned Hyper-Kamiokande [7] and DUNE [8] experiments. Using different target nuclei ^{12}C from the liquid scintillator and the newly developed analysis method considering the delayed signals (the Michel electrons and neutron captures), JUNO will provide a complementary search to test the GUTs from the view of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$. Besides the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ mode, JUNO will have some sensitivity to the other nucleon decay modes listed in Ref. [4], particularly to the decay modes that also have the three fold coincidence feature in time, such as $n \rightarrow \mu^- K^+$, $p \rightarrow e^+ K^*(892)^0$, $n \rightarrow \nu K^*(892)^0$ and $p \rightarrow \nu K^*(892)^+$. They will be analyzed in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We are grateful for the ongoing cooperation from the China General Nuclear Power Group. This work was supported by the Chinese Academy of Sciences, the National Key R&D Program of China, the CAS Center for Excellence in Particle Physics, Wuyi University, and the Tsung-Dao Lee Institute of Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China, the Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique de Particules (IN2P3) in France, the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN) in Italy, the Italian-Chinese collaborative research program MAECI-NSFC, the Fond de la Recherche Scientifique (F.R.S-FNRS) and FWO under the ‘‘Excellence of Science - EOS’’ in Belgium, the Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico in Brazil, the Agencia Nacional de Investigacion y Desarrollo in Chile, the Charles University Research Centre and the Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sports in Czech Republic, the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), the Helmholtz Association, and the Cluster of Excellence PRISMA+ in Germany, the Joint Institute of Nuclear Research (JINR) and Lomonosov Moscow State University in Russia, the joint Russian Science Foundation (RSF) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) research program, the MOST and MOE in Taiwan, the Chulalongkorn University and Suranaree University of Technology in Thailand, and the University of California at Irvine in USA.



(a) Distribution of fitted ΔT



(b) Fitting efficiencies of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$

FIG. 10. ΔT distribution and Fitting efficiencies. (a) Distribution of fitted ΔT (equation (1)) of $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (PD, in blue) and atmospheric ν (AN, red filled and pink) events with different R_χ cuts after the basic selection and delayed signal selection. (b) Fitting efficiencies for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ with different true ΔT (K^+ decay time). The efficiencies are low when K^+ decays within several ns because both pulse components are too close.

shown in Fig. 12. After 6 years running (120 kton-years), JUNO will overtake the current best limit from the Super-K experiment.

Moreover, the proton lifetime measured by JUNO will reach 10^{34} years for the first time after data taking of 10.5 years. In the case of no event observation after ten years, the 90% C.L. limit to the proton lifetime would reach 1.1×10^{34} years. In the case of one event observation (16.4% probability), the corresponding limit would be 6.0×10^{33} years.




FIG. 11. Correlated E_1 and E_2 distributions (in colored scale) for the $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ (a) and atmospheric ν (b) events with the basic selection, delayed signal selection, the R_χ cut and the ΔT cut. The events out of the red boxes would be rejected as the background. More details can be found in the text.




FIG. 12. JUNO sensitivity for $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ as a function of running time.

[1] A. D. Sakharov, Violation of CP Invariance, c Asymmetry, and Baryon Asymmetry of the Universe, Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **5**, 32 (1967) [JETP Lett. **5**, 24 (1967)] [Sov. Phys. Usp. **34**, 392 (1991)] [Usp. Fiz. Nauk **161**, 61 (1991)].

[2] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Unity of All Elementary Particle Forces, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32**, 438-441 (1974).

[3] For a review see P. Nath and P. Fileviez Perez, Proton stability in grand unified theories, in strings and in branes, Phys. Rept.

- 441**, 191 (2007).
- [4] P. A. Zyla *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Review of Particle Physics, *PTEP* **2020**, no.8, 083C01 (2020).
- [5] F. An *et al.* [JUNO Collaboration], Neutrino Physics with JUNO, *J. Phys. G* **43**, no. 3, 030401 (2016).
- [6] A. Abusleme *et al.* [JUNO], JUNO physics and detector, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **123**, 103927 (2022).
- [7] K. Abe *et al.* [Hyper-Kamiokande], Hyper-Kamiokande Design Report, [arXiv:1805.04163 [physics.ins-det]].
- [8] R. Acciarri *et al.* [DUNE], Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) and Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE), [arXiv:1512.06148 [physics.ins-det]].
- [9] K. S. Babu, E. Kearns *et al.*, Working Group Report: Baryon Number Violation, [arXiv:1311.5285 [hep-ph]].
- [10] A. Takenaka *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande], Search for proton decay via $p \rightarrow e^+\pi^0$ and $p \rightarrow \mu^+\pi^0$ with an enlarged fiducial volume in Super-Kamiokande I-IV, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, no.11, 112011 (2020).
- [11] K. Abe *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande], Search for proton decay via $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ using 260 kiloton-year data of Super-Kamiokande, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no. 7, 072005 (2014).
- [12] R. Svoboda, in Talk at the Eighth International Workshop on Topics in Astroparticle and Underground Physics (TAUP), Seattle, WA, 2003 (unpublished).
- [13] T. M. Undagoitia *et al.* [LENA], Search for the proton decay $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ in the large liquid scintillator low energy neutrino astronomy detector LENA, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 075014 (2005).
- [14] K. Asakura *et al.* [KamLAND], Search for the proton decay mode $p \rightarrow \bar{\nu}K^+$ with KamLAND, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no.5, 052006 (2015).
- [15] L. Ren, J. Sun, S. Si *et al.*, Study on the improvement of the 20-inch microchannel plate photomultiplier tubes for neutrino detector, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **977**, 164333 (2020).
- [16] L. J. Wen, M. He, Y. F. Wang, J. Cao, S. L. Liu, Y. K. Heng and Z. H. Qin, A quantitative approach to select PMT for large detectors, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **947**, 162766 (2019).
- [17] C. Cao, J. Xu, M. He, A. Abusleme, M. Bongrand, C. Bordenreau, D. Breton, A. Cabrera, A. Campeny, C. Cerna *et al.*, Mass production and characterization of 3-inch PMTs for the JUNO experiment, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **1005**, 165347 (2021).
- [18] C. Andreopoulos *et al.* [GENIE], The GENIE Neutrino Monte Carlo Generator: Physics and User Manual, e-Print: arXiv:1510.05494[hep-ph].
- [19] J. H. Zou *et al.*, *SNiPER: an offline software framework for non-collider physics experiments*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **664**, no.7, 072053 (2015).
- [20] S. Agostinelli *et al.* [GEANT4], GEANT4—a simulation toolkit, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **506**, 250-303 (2003).
- [21] A. Abusleme *et al.* [JUNO], The design and sensitivity of JUNO’s scintillator radiopurity pre-detector OSIRIS, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, no.11, 973 (2021).
- [22] A. Abusleme *et al.* [JUNO], Calibration Strategy of the JUNO Experiment, *JHEP* **03**, 004 (2021).
- [23] O. Benhar, N. Farina, H. Nakamura, M. Sakuda and R. Seki, Electron- and neutrino-nucleus scattering in the impulse approximation regime, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 053005 (2005).
- [24] H. Hu, W. L. Guo, J. Su, W. Wang and C. Yuan, Implementation of residual nucleus de-excitations associated with proton decays in 12C based on the GENIE generator and TALYS code, *Phys. Lett. B* **831**, 137183 (2022).
- [25] A. Bodek and T. Cai, Removal Energies and Final State Interaction in Lepton Nucleus Scattering, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, no.4, 293 (2019).
- [26] A. J. Koning and D. Rochman, Modern Nuclear Data Evaluation with the TALYS Code System, *Nucl. Data Sheets* **113**, 2841-2934 (2012).
- [27] M. Honda, M. Sajjad Athar, T. Kajita, K. Kasahara and S. Midorikawa, Atmospheric neutrino flux calculation using the NRLMSISE-00 atmospheric model, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no.2, 023004 (2015); <http://www.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/~mhonda/nflx2014/index.html>
- [28] J. A. Formaggio and G. P. Zeller, From eV to EeV: Neutrino Cross Sections Across Energy Scales, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 1307-1341 (2012).
- [29] C. Juszczak, J. A. Nowak and J. T. Sobczyk, Simulations from a new neutrino event generator, *Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl.* **159**, 211-216 (2006).
- [30] K. Abe *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande], Search for proton decay via $p \rightarrow e^+\pi^0$ and $p \rightarrow \mu^+\pi^0$ in 0.31 megaton-years exposure of the Super-Kamiokande water Cherenkov detector, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, no.1, 012004 (2017).
- [31] G. J. Feldman and R. D. Cousins, A Unified approach to the classical statistical analysis of small signals, *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 3873-3889 (1998).