#### Measurement of Atmospheric Neutrino Flux by Super-Kamiokande: energy spectra, geomagnetic effect, and solar modulation

Kimihiro Okumura okumura@icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Institute for Cosmic Ray Research (ICRR), University of Tokyo May 29th, 2018

Advanced Workshop on Physics of Atmospheric Neutrinos (PANE2018)

#### Introduction



- Atmospheric neutrino: end particle of cosmic ray interactions with atmosphere
- Neutrino flux affected by several factors:
  - primary CR flux, composition
  - hadron interaction
  - atmosphere model, seasonal variation, geomagnetic effect
- These effects are introduced in flux simulations precisely
- Can test flux prediction directly by flux measurement

#### Atmospheric Neutrino Flux in GeV-TeV





- Atmospheric neutrinos from π and K decays dominates below TeV energies ("conventional")
- Nominal spectrum:  $dN/dE \propto E^{-3.7}$ steeper for v<sub>e</sub>
- $v_{\mu}/v_e \sim 2$  at GeV determined from  $\pi$  decay
- Larger kaon fraction as higher energies
  - · Uncertainties due to  $\pi/K$  ratio

#### Motivations of This Study

- Accurate flux prediction is necessary as signal (oscillation analysis), and background (proton decay, DM, astro v)
  - previous measurement by Frejus in 1995
  - recent detection of astrophysical neutrino by IceCube
- Comparison with recent improved flux calculations from various perspectives:
  - energy spectrum
  - geomagnetic effect
  - solar modulation effect
- This talk is based on
   *Physical Review D 94, 052001 (2016)*



#### Super-K Detector



- Water Cherenkov imaging detector
- 1000 m underground in Kamioka mine
- 50 kton volume (fiducial 22.5 kton)
- 11129 20" PMTs in inner detector (ID) for Cherenkov ring imaging
- 1885 8" PMTs for outer detector (OD)

Phase	Period	# of PMTs	
SK-I	1996.4 ~ 2001.7	11146 (40%)	
SK-II	2002.10 ~ 2005.10	5182 (20%)	
SK-III	2006.7 ~ 2008.8	11129 (40%)	
SK-IV	2008.9 ~		

## **Energy Spectrum Analysis**

#### Flux Measurement in Super-K





- Neutrino oscillation affects flux and energy spectrum, especially for  $v_{\mu}$
- Atmospheric neutrino is utilized to measure neutrino oscillation
  - input: *Ν*, *Φ*, *σ*, ε
  - output: O
- Flux measurement
  - using estimated O from external measurement, we can measure flux (Φ)

#### Data Sample, Neutrino Energy



- Three event topologies: FC, PC, UPµ
- Covers from sub-GeV up to 100 GeV (10 TeV) for  $v_e~(v_\mu)$
- Provide high purity  $v_e$  and  $v_{\mu}$  sample thanks to excellent particle identification and NC background abilities
- Caveat: slightly different sample selection from that of Super-K oscillation analysis



### Flux Unfolding



- Adopt iterated Bayesian method for flux unfolding
- Response matrix constructed from MC events.
- Unfold number of events in neutrino energy bin, and then convert to flux value by applying normalization factor estimated with MC

(\*) G. D'Agostini, NIM A 362, 487 (1995)

#### Super-K Measured Energy Spectrum



- Provide significantly improved flux measurement below 100 GeV
- Extended to lower energies down to ~100 MeV
- Overlap in high energy with AMANDA and IceCube regions
- Caveat: larger flux expected at Frejus site due to lower rigidity cutoff

#### Comparison With Flux Models



		$\chi^2$	
Flux model	$ u_e  ext{ and }  u_\mu$	$\nu_e$ only	$ u_{\mu} \text{ only} $
HKKM11 [21]	21.8	4.9	10.3
HKKM07 [20]	22.2	6.2	10.0
Bartol [23]	30.7	7.1	14.7
FLUKA [22]	25.6	5.4	11.4
( DOF	23	11	12 )

$$\chi^{2} = \sum_{i}^{N} \sum_{j}^{N} \left( \Phi_{i} - \Phi_{MC,i} \right)^{T} C_{ij}^{-1} \left( \Phi_{j} - \Phi_{MC,j} \right)$$

- Compared with flux models and test agreement by  $\chi^2$
- Not strongly inconsistent
  - p-value: 0.53, 0.32, 0.13 for HKKM11, FLUKA, Bartol, respectively

# Fit with Variable Normalization and Spectral Index



 Fit data and models with variable normalization (Δα) and spectral index (Δγ) parameters

$$\Phi'_{MC,i} = (1 + \Delta \alpha) \left(\frac{\bar{E}_i}{1 \text{ GeV}}\right)^{\Delta \gamma} \Phi_{MC,i}$$

• Agrees within  $1\sigma$  except from FLUKA  $v_{\mu}$  spectrum (2.4 $\sigma$ )

### Systematic Uncertainty

-0.6

-0.8



8 10 12 14 16 18 20 22

6

4

 $\begin{array}{c}
2 \\
0 \\
0 \\
2 \\
4 \\
6
\end{array}$ 

- Utilize same systematic error estimation as used in oscillation analysis
- For calculation of error propagation, Toy MC method is adopted
  - Repeat Toy MC throw and flux unfolding by 2000 times. Variance of unfolded fluxes is taken as error
- Approximately 20% error estimated in total
- Neutrino interaction error is dominant

$$\tilde{M}_{j}(\mathbf{g}) = M_{MC,j} \times \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \sum_{k}^{N_{sys}} \checkmark \\ 1 + \sum_{k}^{k} f_{jk}g_{k} \\ \uparrow \end{pmatrix}$$
(3.10)  
nominal MC random Gauss.

**Azimuthal Spectrum Analysis** 

#### Geomagnetic Effect

- "East-West effect" in azimuthal direction is well-known on cosmic ray flux, such as dipole asymmetry
- Rigidity cutoff due to geomagnetic field depends on position and direction at Earth's surface
- Can test for such asymmetries by using Super-K neutrino data



#### **Azimuthal Distributions**

#### electron-like



**muon-like** 

- "East-west" effect becomes larger for lower energies and horizontal direction
- Modulation becomes small in lowest energy below E<0.4GeV because directional information is lost due to large lepton scattering angle

#### East-West Asymmetry



- Select events by  $|\cos\theta| < 0.6$  and  $0.4 < E_{rec} < 1.33$  GeV to optimize significance
- Clear asymmetries are seen and significance level
  - 6.0 $\sigma$  (8.0 $\sigma$ ) for  $\mu$ -like and e-like

 $A_{\mu} = 0.108 \pm 0.014(\text{stat}) \pm 0.004(\text{syst})$ 

 $A_e = 0.153 \pm 0.015(\text{stat}) \pm 0.004(\text{syst})$ 

 $A = \frac{n_{\text{east}} - n_{\text{west}}}{n_{\text{east}} + n_{\text{west}}}$ 

#### Energy and Zenith Dependence



- Test for in each energy and zenith angle with asymmetry parameter, A
- Agrees with expectation within statistical uncertainties

#### Azimuthal modulation phase



- Investigate phase shift of azimuthal modulation by fitting sine curve:  $k_2 \times sin(\varphi + B) + k_1$
- Zenith dependence is seen with 2.2σ significance, and consistent between data and MC
- HKKM11 calculation models reproduced geomagnetic effect

#### Solar Modulation Analysis

#### Modulation Effect of Solar Activity



- Atmospheric neutrino flux will be affected by solar activity below 1 GeV
  - Solar wind scatter off CR
- Larger effect for upward direction coming from polar regions, where solar effect is larger
- SuperK data covers more than one and half solar cycles
- Test correlation with solar modulation by event rate change

#### Correlation with Solar Modulation



- Correlations between sub-GeV event rate vs neutron monitor are investigated
- Effect is small and difficult to see:
  - directional information is lost by neutrino scattering
- Estimate correlation by one parameter fitting (a)
- Best fit : α = 0.62 ± 0.58 (1.06 σ)

#### Fitting to Sub-samples



- Also apply fitting for sub-sample ( elike / µ-like, upward / downward )
- No SK-III result since observation time is too short to cover solar cycle
- Prefer no correlation for e-like, but not statistically significant
- Not inconsistent with overall result

#### Summary

- A comprehensive study on the atmospheric neutrino flux in the energy region from sub-GeV to TeV using SuperK was performed
- $v_e$  and  $v_\mu$  energy spectra are measured with higher accuracy from 100 MeV up to 10 TeV, and consistent with flux models.
- Azimuthal spectrum of data and MC agrees well confirming implementation of geomagnetic field in flux calculation
  - Geomagnetic effect in azimuthal distribution is seen at  $6\sigma$  ( $8\sigma$ ) for  $v_{\mu}$  ( $v_{e}$ ).
  - An indication that the angle of the dipole asymmetry shifts depending on the zenith angle was found at the 2.2  $\sigma$  level
- Expected correlation between neutrino flux and solar activity was studied using sub-GeV sample
  - Predicted effect is found to be relatively small (62% of expected), and a weak preference is seen at  $1.1\sigma$  level