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1: The aerosol phase function ... why Auger cares

![Diagram of light signal components](image)

Figure 6.3: A summary of the factors that affect the light signal measured by the detector. Light is generated by the EAS and is attenuated as it travels to the detector. The actual signal measured will further depend upon detector parameters such as the transmission filter and PMT quantum efficiency. Note that most cases the light signal will be dominated by the fluorescence component.

- Through scattering in the air, some air Cherenkov light appears as a background in the fluorescence data.
- The observed light from an extensive air shower will also include a contribution of multiple-scattered light.
- To estimate the multiple-scattered and air Cherenkov light scattered on aerosols we need the aerosol extinction length, $\Lambda^a(z, \lambda)$, and the aerosol phase function, $\frac{1}{\sigma^a} \left( \frac{d\sigma^a}{d\Omega} \right)$. 
2: Use Auger FD to view side-scattered light

Simulated $\frac{1}{\sigma^a}(\frac{d\sigma^a}{d\Omega})$ measurement using one of the nearby aerosol phase function light sources.

- As the Auger fluorescence detectors view $\sim 180^\circ$ in azimuth, even a fixed direction light beam crossing the fluorescence field of view allows $\frac{1}{\sigma^a}(\frac{d\sigma^a}{d\Omega})$ to be determined.

- Dedicated APF, aerosol phase function, light sources will be located near 2 fluorescence sites.
APF light source geometry

\[ \text{F.o.V of PMT: } \Delta \theta_i = \frac{\theta_i}{\theta} \]

\[ \text{APF light source} \]

\[ \frac{d}{d_1} \]

\[ \frac{\Delta z_i}{2} \]

\[ \frac{\Delta \Omega_i}{d^2} \]

\[ \text{Signal}_i = I_{APF} \times T \times \left( \frac{1}{\lambda^m \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)^m} + \frac{1}{\lambda^a \left( \frac{1}{\sigma} \frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)^a} \right) \Delta \Omega_i \Delta z_i \xi_i \]

where: \[ T \equiv \frac{\text{light path}}{\lambda_{\text{PET}}} \approx 1 \text{ for short paths} \]

\[ \Delta r_i \equiv \frac{d^2 \Delta \theta_i}{d_1} \]

\[ \Delta \Omega_i \equiv \frac{\text{Area (Telescope Aperture)}}{d^2} \]

Thus: \[ \Delta z_i \Delta \Omega_i = \frac{\text{Area} \times \Delta \theta_{\text{PMT}}}{d_1} \]

\[ \xi_i \text{ are the known (flat-fielded) efficiencies} \]
3: The first Auger APF light source

The APF light source includes three separate light sources at \( \sim 330\text{nm}, 360\text{nm} \) and \( 390\text{nm} \).

- The APF light sources provide a near-horizontal, pulsed light beam directed across the field of view of a near-by fluorescence detector.
- Three sources provide experimental cross checks as well as the potential to measure wavelength variations in the aerosol phase function.
APF light source at "Coihueco"

Control PC at "Coihueco"
Communications via serial radio link.

light source ~1.3 km from "Coihueco" F.D.

3 (selectible) light beams:
- 334 nm, 360 nm, 390 nm
- triggered on "GPS second"
- "No" moving parts
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4: A simple APF simulation

- Studies have been done with a simplified model

- Model does match measured quantities:
  1. source intensities (2.5\,\mu J/pulse at 334nm, 4\,\mu J/pulse at 360nm and 390nm)
  2. FD efficiencies (0.125 PEs/\gamma at 360nm, 0.080 PEs/\gamma at 334nm and 390nm) and 2.2m diameter Schmidt corrected telescope aperture
  3. night sky backgrounds (170 360nm-equivalent \gamma/m^2/\mu sec) ... and each datum was assumed to include 3 adjacent channels (transverse to the track) \times 4\,\mu sec (pulse duration)
  4. typical molecular and aerosol horizontal attenuation lengths
  5. actual locations of APF source and Coihueco FD with a 2° angle of APF beam to the horizontal

- But telescope details, PMT signal and readout details, multiple scattered light, ... were not included
5: Some fine print details

- Cylindrical geometry is almost correct ... in practice the simulated signals were corrected by actual "Δz · ΔΩ" versus approximate "Area · Δθ / d_⊥"

- No correction for light attenuation is almost correct ... in practice the simulated signals were corrected by $e^{\text{light-path(θ)/Λ_{tot}}}$ where: light-path(θ) is the total light travel distance (for a given scattering angle) and Λ_{tot} is the horizontal attenuation length at the height of the fluorescence detector

- The aerosol signal is almost correct ... but it is actually proportional to ALBEDO / Λ^a where ALBEDO < 1 means that some of the aerosol light is absorbed (versus all scattered). [The simulation used ALBEDO = 0.9]
6: 2-parameter and 3-parameter fits

- Two Mie scattering \( \text{phase function} \) parameterizations were compared (fitted) to the data:

  1. 2-parameter form:

  \[
  f^a(\mu) = \frac{1 - g^2}{4\pi} \left( \frac{1}{(1 + g^2 - 2g\mu)^{3/2}} + f \frac{3\mu^2 - 1}{2(1 + g^2)^{3/2}} \right)
  \]

  2. 3-parameter form:

  \[
  f^a(\theta) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \frac{e^{-B\theta} + E'e^{-D(\pi-\theta)}}{1 + e^{-B^2}} + \frac{E'(1+e^{-D^2})}{1+D^2} \right)
  \]

- Rayleigh scattering phase function from theory

- The relative fractions of Rayleigh (molecular) and MIE (aerosol) are set by \( 1/\Lambda^m \) and \( \text{ALBEDO}/\Lambda^a \) respectively.

- The horizontal attenuation lengths (\( \Lambda^m \) and \( \Lambda^a \)) are known from local T,P and horizontal backscattered LIDAR shots.

- For 2-parameter fits there is some sensitivity to ALBEDO ... else it must be an input (\( e.g. \text{ALBEDO} = 0.9 \))

- The overall intensity (normalization) is an additional parameter. For stable light sources and known/stable detector efficiencies this is essentially constant ... and thus can be averaged over many hours/night of APF light source operation!
7: Initial (simulation based) observations

- **Cross check**: When 2-parm (or 3-parm) Mie phase functions were used as input in the simulation, the fits to the simulated data resulted in essentially the same parameters

- For some (Elbert) input phase functions both 2-parm and 3-parm fits were stable and reproduced the simulated data. **In this instance a fit for the ALBEDO [2-parm phase function model] reproduced the input value ... with an uncertainty < 0.05**

- For some (Longtin) input phase functions only the 3-parm fit provides a description of the data ... but with little sensitivity to the ALBEDO

- Clearly the APF analysis is insensitive to radical (upward) variations (from smooth extrapolations) for \( \theta < 20^\circ \) and for \( \theta > 170^\circ \) ... e.g. from large aerosol particulates. **One indication (of radical upward variations) is a reduced value for the fitted ALBEDO!**
Elbert

APF Simulated Data

$g = 0.568 \pm 0.005$

$f = 0.282 \pm 0.030$

$f^2(180) = 0.024$

- data
- fit
- Rayleigh
- Mie

residuals [%]
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"Elbert"

APF Simulated Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.644 ± 0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>0.023 ± 0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.422 ± 0.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \theta \text{ [deg]} \]

Residuals [%]

\[ \theta \text{ [deg]} \]
Parameterized longtin

APF Simulated Data

PR Results

\( g = 0.604 \pm 0.005 \)
\( f = 0.408 \pm 0.035 \)
\( f(180) = 0.025 \)

- data
- fit
- Rayleigh
- Mie
Parameterized long: $B=2.50$, $EP=0.035$, $D=2.141$. 

APF Simulated Data

B = 2.504 ± 0.026
EP = 0.034 ± 0.005
D = 2.088 ± 0.252
$f^2(180) = 0.038$
8: Possible Atmospheric Community Involvement

- Auger will measure (every hour during Auger FD data taking):
  1. the aerosol phase function (in the near UV)
  2. the aerosol horizontal extinction length (at several wavelengths)
  3. the aerosol optical depth VS height (at 355nm)
  4. air temperature, pressure, humidity, wind speed and direction (+ radiosonde balloons ...)
  5. cloud cover

- Are these of interest to the atmospheric community?

- Can the atmospheric community provide us with guidance on how to extrapolate the aerosol phase function to heights of several kilometers above the ground level?