Recent Results of Cosmic Ray Measurements from the IceCube Neutrino Observatory

> Dennis Soldin^{*} for the IceCube Collaboration ^{*}University of Delaware

ISCRA 2021 Virtual





Introduction

Spectrum & Composition

Density of GeV Muons

All-Sky Anisotropy

Summary & Outlook



The IceCube Neutrino Observatory

► IceCube

- ▶ Located at geographic South Pole
- $\sim 1 \, \mathrm{km}^3$ instrumented volume
- ► 86 strings with 5160 digital optical modules (DOMs)
- \blacktriangleright Depths between $1450\,\mathrm{m}$ and $2450\,\mathrm{m}$
- ► Trigger rate of ~ 2.15 kHz, mainly atmospheric muons ($E_{\mu} \gtrsim 400 \text{GeV}$)

► IceTop

- $\triangleright \sim 1 \, \mathrm{km}^2$ surface array
- Atmospheric depth $\sim 690 \,\mathrm{g/cm^2}$
- ▶ 162 ice Cherenkov tanks in 81 stations
- ▶ 2 DOMs per tank

\rightarrow CR air shower measurements!



The IceCube Neutrino Observatory

► IceCube

- ▶ Located at geographic South Pole
- $\sim 1 \, \mathrm{km}^3$ instrumented volume
- ► 86 strings with 5160 digital optical modules (DOMs)
- \blacktriangleright Depths between $1450\,\mathrm{m}$ and $2450\,\mathrm{m}$
- ► Trigger rate of ~ 2.15 kHz, mainly atmospheric muons ($E_{\mu} \gtrsim 400 \text{GeV}$)

► IceTop

- $\sim 1 \,\mathrm{km}^2$ surface array
- Atmospheric depth $\sim 690 \,\mathrm{g/cm^2}$
- ▶ 162 ice Cherenkov tanks in 81 stations
- ▶ 2 DOMs per tank

\rightarrow CR air shower measurements!



Cosmic Ray Physics with IceCube and IceTop

► IceTop

- ► Electromagnetic and muonic signal
 - $(E_{\mu} \simeq 1 \,\text{GeV}, \text{``GeV muons''})$
- Shower axis reconstruction
- ► Cosmic ray energy estimator

► IceCube

- Muon tracks/bundles in the ice $(E_{\mu} \gtrsim 400 \text{ GeV}, \text{``TeV muons''})$
- Track reconstruction
- Deposited energy along the track dE/dX

\rightarrow 3-dimensional cosmic ray detector!



- IceTop data with ≥ 5 stations hit
- ► Lateral Distribution Function (LDF) $S(r) = S_{125} \cdot \left(\frac{r}{125 \text{ m}}\right)^{-\beta - \kappa \cdot \log_{10}(r/125 \text{ m})}$
- ▶ Simultaneous fit of shower front curvature
- Energy proxy S_{125} : signal at r = 125 min Vertical Equivalent Muons (VEM)
- Snow depth taken into account
- ► Conversion function $S_{125} \rightarrow E(S_{125})$ based on CORSIKA MC (Sibyll 2.1,H4a)
- ▶ Quality cuts & efficiency correction



- IceTop data with ≥ 5 stations hit
- ► Lateral Distribution Function (LDF)

 $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{S}_{125} \cdot \left(\frac{r}{125 \,\mathrm{m}}\right)^{-\beta - \kappa \cdot \log_{10}(r/125 \,\mathrm{m})}$

- ▶ Simultaneous fit of shower front curvature
- Energy proxy S_{125} : signal at r = 125 min Vertical Equivalent Muons (VEM)
- Snow depth taken into account
- ► Conversion function $S_{125} \rightarrow E(S_{125})$ based on CORSIKA MC (Sibyll 2.1,H4a)
- ▶ Quality cuts & efficiency correction



- ▶ Data from June 2010 to May 2013
- $\triangleright \sim 5.1 \cdot 10^7$ selected events
- Detector systematics
 - Snow accumulation
 - ► Energy scale
- Agreement between years
- Agreement with previous results (e.g. IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 88 (2013))



IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019)

- Low energy extension
- ▶ Dedicated infill trigger: ≥ 2 stations hit
- ▶ LDF fit not feasible
 - \rightarrow Random Forest Regression
- ► 3 steps
 - ▶ Core position
 - Direction
 - ► Energy
- Training/testing uses CORSIKA MC (Sibyll 2.1,H4a)
- ▶ Quality cuts & efficiency correction
- ▶ Iterative Bayesian unfolding



IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020)

- ▶ Data from May 2016 to May 2017
- ▶ ~ $7.4 \cdot 10^6$ selected events
- Detector systematics
 - Mass composition
 - Unfolding
 - Efficiency correction
 - Pressure correction
- ▶ Agreement in overlap region



IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 102 (2020)

- ▶ IceTop & IceCube data
- Events with ≥ 5 hit stations, ≥ 8 in-ice hits
- ▶ Mean muon number

 $N_{\mu}(E,A) \propto A \cdot \left(E/A\right)^{\beta} , \ \beta \simeq 0.9$

- Energy E from IceTop
- ▶ Muon number proxy from IceCube
 - \rightarrow Mass number A
- Similar concepts apply for PeV gamma ray searches (IceCube, Astrophys. J. 891 (2020))



- ▶ IceTop & IceCube data
- Events with ≥ 5 hit stations, ≥ 8 in-ice hits
- Mean muon number

 ${\cal N}_{\mu}(E,A) \propto A \cdot \left(E/A\right)^{\beta} \ , \ \beta \simeq 0.9$

- Energy E from IceTop
- ▶ Muon number proxy from IceCube
 - \rightarrow Mass number A
- Similar concepts apply for PeV gamma ray searches (IceCube, Astrophys. J. 891 (2020))



Artificial Neural Network

- ► Template PDFs are obtained from CORSIKA MC for 4 mass groups (H, He, O, Fe)
- ▶ Template fits to data distributions for each energy bin





- ▶ Data from June 2010 to May 2013
- ▶ $\sim 7.3 \cdot 10^6$ selected events
- Detector systematics
 - Snow accumulation
 - ► Energy scale
 - ▶ In-ice light yield
- Agreement with IceTop-alone spectrum and with previous results
- Mass spectrum highly dominated by in-ice light yield uncertainties



IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019)

- ▶ Data from June 2010 to May 2013
- ▶ $\sim 7.3 \cdot 10^6$ selected events
- Detector systematics
 - Snow accumulation
 - ► Energy scale
 - ▶ In-ice light yield
- ► Agreement with IceTop-alone spectrum and with previous results
- Mass spectrum highly dominated by in-ice light yield uncertainties



IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019)

► Hadronic interaction models

- ► Sibyll 2.3
- ▶ QGSJet-II-04
- ► EPOS-LHC
- \blacktriangleright Limited statistics (10%) and H/Fe only
- Repetition of full analysis with these MC simulations not possible
- Instead, uncertainty estimates are derived based on the differences observed in S_{125} and dE/dX



\rightarrow Interpretation of results in the context of hadronic models not possible

IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019)

► Hadronic interaction models

- ► Sibyll 2.3
- \blacktriangleright QGSJet-II-04
- ► EPOS-LHC
- \blacktriangleright Limited statistics (10%) and H/Fe only
- Repetition of full analysis with these MC simulations not possible
- Instead, uncertainty estimates are derived based on the differences observed in S_{125} and dE/dX



\rightarrow Interpretation of results in the context of hadronic models not possible

IceCube, Phys. Rev. D 100 (2019)





- ▶ IceTop data only, including single hit tanks
- ▶ At large distances structure around 1 VEM
- ► Caused by single muons (*"muon thumb"*)
- ▶ Signal model
 - Electromagnetic component
 - Muon component
 - Uncorrelated background noise
- ▶ Fits for several energy bins and radial distances



- ▶ IceTop data only, including single hit tanks
- ▶ At large distances structure around 1 VEM
- ► Caused by single muons (*"muon thumb"*)
- ▶ Signal model
 - Electromagnetic component
 - Muon component
 - Uncorrelated background noise
- ▶ Fits for several energy bins and radial distances



- ▶ Data from May 2010 to May 2013
- $\triangleright \sim 1.8 \cdot 10^7$ selected events
- ► Muon density ρ_{μ} is given by the muon number per tank area
- Systematic uncertainties
 - Snow accumulation
 - ► Energy scale
 - ▶ Electromagnetic model
 - ▶ Correction factor

► z-parameter

$$\mathbf{z} = \frac{\log(\rho_{\mu}) - \log(\rho_{\mu,p})}{\log(\rho_{\mu,Fe}) - \log(\rho_{\mu,p})}$$

Studies of hadronic interaction models



Paper in preparation See also J. Gonzalez, EPJ Web Conf. 208 (2019)



 Cross-calibration of experimental data can change the interpretation in the context of hadronic models

► IceCube

- Dedicated cosmic ray event selection* of in-ice data
- Angular resolution: $\sim 3^{\circ}$
- Median energy: $\sim 10 \,\mathrm{TeV}$

► HAWC Observatory

- Located at Sierra Negra, Mexico
- $\blacktriangleright \sim 4100 \text{m a.s.l.}$
- ▶ 300 water Cherenkov tanks
- ▶ 4 PMTs per tank
- ▶ Dedicated cosmic ray event selection*
- Angular resolution: $\sim 0.4^{\circ}$
- Median energy: $\sim 10 \,\mathrm{TeV}$

*For details see

IceCube & HAWC, Astrophys. J. 871 (2019)



- IceCube data from May 2011 to May 2016 ($\sim 2.8 \cdot 10^{11}$ events)
- \blacktriangleright HAWC data from May 2015 to May 2017 ($\sim 2.8\cdot 10^{10}$ events)
- ▶ Relative intensity map at 10 TeV

IceCube & HAWC, Astrophys. J. 871 (2019)



- \blacktriangleright Decomposition in spherical harmonics ℓ
 - \rightarrow Angular power spectrum
- Individual measurements show differences due to partial sky coverage
- All-sky measurement removes these biases of the power spectrum
- Noise level dominated by limited statistics for HAWC



IceCube & HAWC, Astrophys. J. 871 (2019), 96.

- \blacktriangleright Subtraction of the fitted multipole components with $\ell \leq 3$
- ▶ Small-scale structures correspond to large gradients, aligned with features in the local interstellar magnetic field (LIMF) and heliosphere
- ▶ Inferred direction of LIMF (compatible with independent observations)
- ▶ Estimate of North-South dipole component

IceCube & HAWC, Astrophys. J. 871 (2019)



- ► Dipole amplitude
 - $\mathbf{A}{=}(1.17\ {\pm}0.01)\cdot 10^{-3}$
- ▶ Dipole phase
 - $\alpha = (38.4 \pm 0.3)^\circ$
- Systematic uncertainties

$$\begin{split} \Delta A \simeq 0.006 \cdot 10^{-3} \\ \Delta \alpha \simeq 2.6^\circ \end{split}$$

 Also previous measurements from IceCube and IceTop

> IceCube, Astrophys. J. 826 (2016) IceCube, Astrophys. J. 765 (2013)



IceCube & HAWC, Astrophys. J. 871 (2019)

Summary & Outlook

► IceCube and IceTop are perfect facilities for cosmic ray measurements

- ▶ Energy spectrum and mass composition
- Anisotropy studies
- Muons and air shower physics
- ► ...
- Dedicated calibration devices will reduce in-ice uncertainties
- Scintillator array
- Radio array
- Cherenkov telescopes
- Improved analysis methods

see also F. Schröder, PoS(ICRC2019)418 (2020)



University of Adelaide

BELGIUM

Université libre de Bruxelles Universiteit Gent Vrije Universiteit Brussel

CANADA SNOLAB University of Alberta-Edmonton

DENMARK University of Copenhagen

GERMANY

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron ECAP Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg Humboldt–Universität zu Berlin Ruhr-Universität Bochum **RWTH Aachen University** Technische Universität Dortmund Technische Universität München Universität Mainz Universität Wuppertal Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster

THE ICECUBE COLLABORATION

JAPAN Chiba University

MEN NEW ZEALAND University of Canterbury

REPUBLIC OF KOREA Sungkyunkwan University

SWEDEN Stockholms universitet Uppsala universitet

SWITZERLAND Université de Genève **NEW UNITED KINGDOM** University of Oxford

UNITED STATES Clark Atlanta University Drexel University Georgia Institute of Technology Lawrence Berkeley National Lab Marguette University Massachusetts Institute of Technology Michigan State University Ohio State University Pennsylvania State University South Dakota School of Mines and Technology

Southern University and A&M College Stony Brook University University of Alabama University of Alaska Anchorage University of California, Berkeley University of California, Irvine University of California, Los Angeles University of Delaware University of Kansas University of Maryland University of Rochester

University of Texas at Arlington University of Wisconsin–Madison University of Wisconsin–River Falls Yale University



VDING AGENCIES

onds de la Recherche Scientifique (ERS-ENRS) onds Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-Vlaanderen (FWO.Vlaanderen)

German Research Foundation (DEG) Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron (DESY)

Faderal Ministry of Education and Basearch (BMBE) Janan Society for the Promotion of Science (ISPS) Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation Swedish Polar Research Secretariat

The Swedish Research Council (VR) University of Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARE) US National Science Foundation (NSE)

icecube.wisc.edu

Thank you!

Backup

Snow depths





















MC self-consistency check (proton/iron)



Correction factor (proton/iron)



Correction factor (Sibyll 2.1/QGSJet-II-04/EPOS-LHC)







