

# Selected Physics Results from the Pierre Auger Southern Observatory


John A.J. Matthews

[johnm@phys.unm.edu](mailto:johnm@phys.unm.edu)

University of New Mexico

Albuquerque, NM 87131

# Unraveling the physics of the UHECR sources





Cosmic rays to energies  $\sim 10^{20} \text{ eV}$  exist. Why they exist is not so clear. Are they protons or a cocktail of different nuclei? Do (at least some) point back to their sources?

And how do we learn what physics produces these very energetic particles? Probably we need many different observations *e.g. radio, visible, X-ray,  $\gamma$ -ray, ...*

Where we come in ... **Auger extends these measurements to include:**

- “protons” (special case of *light* nuclei)
- “iron” (special case of *heavy* nuclei)
- **gamma-rays**
- **neutrinos**

# Classes of possible sources for the UHECRs



- Extreme astrophysical sources: super-massive black holes/AGNs, GRBs, colliding galaxies, ...
- Particle physics motivated: massive relic particles or relics of early universe

# Unraveling the physics of the UHECR sources



When the UHECRs strike the atmosphere they produce an extensive air shower.


**Auger surface detectors (SD)** allow the properties of the initial cosmic ray to be reconstructed based on measuring the shower particles that reach the ground.

**Auger fluorescence detectors (FD)** allow the properties of the initial cosmic ray to be reconstructed based on measuring the air fluorescence light from the air shower in the atmosphere.

**Auger hybrid measurements** allow the properties of the initial cosmic ray to be reconstructed based on simultaneous measurement of a shower by both **FD** and **SD** components.




# In Auger the atmosphere IS the detector!




- Energy of *primary* cosmic rays from shower “brightness” as observed in FD and/or SD
- Composition of *primary* cosmic rays from depth of shower maximum,  $X_{max}$ , and/or from  $\mu/e$  ratio.

# 3 major physics topics: CR spectrum (details)




To enhance features in an  $E^{-n}$  spectrum, scale the spectrum by  $E^n$ :

(Right top ) AGASA spectrum





(Right bottom ) HiRes spectrum, with:

- **ankle** at  $4.5 \times 10^{18}$  eV  
( $\log_{10} E = 18.65$ )
- **GZK-cutoff** above  $10^{19.8}$  eV.




# 3 major physics topics: CR sources (search strategy)




- For several reasons, CRs with energies above *e.g. the ankle* are probably from extra-galactic sources ...
- If there is a GZK cutoff, then the very highest energy CRs must come from relatively nearby sources ...
- If the sources are **astrophysical**, the nearby ( $9 < R < 93$  Mpc) universe is observed to be non-isotropic ...
- **Thus**, excluding magnetic field and/or composition surprises, **the highest energy particles should not be isotropic!**
- **And what is the best way to search for signal(s):** *clusters of CRs, CR correlations with astrophysical catalogs, non-isotropy in CR arrival directions, ... ?*

# 3 major physics topics: CR composition (Fe $\rightarrow$ p ??)



- Except for neutrinos, we infer the CR particle (type) from the depth of shower maximum,  $X_{max}$ , in the atmosphere ...
- Plot of the average depth of shower maximum  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$  vs shower energy  $E$ .
- Model predictions are given for CR primary: photons, protons and iron nuclei.



# Auger Southern Observatory (*Summer 2008*)



- Auger is a collaboration of over 300 PhD scientists from Argentina, Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Croatia, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom, United States, and Vietnam.
- The dotted-area shows the final extent of the  $\sim 55\text{km} \times 55\text{km}$  SD array. The blue area shows running detectors.
- The FDs are at 4-locations: (*Los Leones, Morados, Loma Amarilla, Coihueco*) and over-look the SD ground array.




# Auger Surface Detectors (*aka SD*)



- **Left:** Photo of 1 of 1600 Auger ( $10\text{m}^2$ ) surface detectors.
- **Right:** Through-going muons provide a *natural* calibration: Vertical Equivalent Muon (VEM).
- The Auger SD cosmic ray energy scale is obtained either: from the FD using hybrid events OR by Monte Carlo simulations (which may not model the physics at our shower energies!) **For now we use the FD normalization.**



# Auger Fluorescence Detectors (*aka FD*)



One of four Fluorescence Detectors. Each FD includes 6 telescopes.




# Auger Fluorescence Detectors (*aka FD*)






- Telescopes: 2.2m diameter, Schmidt optics that view  $180^\circ$  in azimuth and from  $\sim 1^\circ$  to  $\sim 31^\circ$  from the horizontal
- Cameras: 440 PMTs (*i.e.*  $\sim 1.5^\circ$  pixels) with 10 Mhz sampling

# Air shower: FD, SD, and Hybrid reconstruction



- **Left plot:** FD view of a UHECR air shower. The colored *dots* show the photo-multiplier (telescope camera) pixels that recorded this event. *The event travels downward from the top (green dots) to the bottom (red dots).*
- **Right plot:** SD view of (the same) UHECR air shower. The red circles show the detectors that recorded this event. *The shower front proceeds from lower right to upper left.*
- Shower energies are measured with a statistical precision of  $\sim 10\%$ , and arrival directions with an angular precision of  $\sim 1^\circ$  (SD only) and  $\sim 0.5^\circ$  (Hybrid events).

# Why Hybrid?




Adding SD timing to the FD reconstruction converts angular error *bananas* into *circles*

Hybrid events provide a high-precision data sample that **significantly extend the energy reach of Auger**




## FD (hybrid) events




- FD events provide a calorimetric measurement of the shower energy and of the position of shower maximum,  $X_{\text{max}}$
- However the FD has no *natural* calibration source ...
- Furthermore FD data depend on time varying atmospheric parameters
- **Thus in practice there are many details:** *e.g. fluorescence yield, absolute calibration and atmospheric monitoring!*

# FD stereo-hybrid events




- Event reconstruction (above): First 4-fold stereo-hybrid event
- Hybrid, and stereo, events provide essential cross-checks with multiple measurements/event and **3-times the number of theses!**

# Auger data taking (*Fall 2008*)




- One advantage of a modular experiment is that you can start running long before the detector is totally complete ...
- Plot shows the preliminary SD exposure ( $\text{m}^2 \text{ s sr}$ ) since January 1, 2004
- Current exposure is  $\sim 8 \times$  **AGASA** and probably greater than HiRes-mono (and stereo)
- Combine FD and SD measurements will result in **reduced systematic errors** VS previous experiments
- Note: Auger is still a *young* experiment with **evolving** monitoring, data reduction software, and data analyses ...

# First question: Do UHECRs correlate with ... ?



Auger's photon fraction limit and initial ANITA results suggest **astrophysical sources** for the highest energy cosmic rays

Nearby ( $9 < R < 93$  Mpc) universe non-isotropic ... thus highest energy particles should not be isotropic ( $93 \text{ Mpc} \approx 0.022$  in redshift) **if there is a GZK cutoff**





Baring magnetic field and/or composition surprises, arrival directions should show structure ... **but on what angular scale(s)?**

And what is the best way to search for signal(s): **clusters of CRs, CR correlations with astrophysical catalogs, non-isotropy in CR arrival directions, ... ?**

blue print = more later

# Previous experiments' evidence for *point sources*



- IF sources are *bright* we expect to see multiple cosmic rays/source
- AGASA reported 5 doublets and 1 triplet few-degree sized event-clusters
- HiRes stereo, with  $> 3$ -times the exposure, has **not** verified the AGASA result.
- At somewhat larger angles ( $3 \sim 4^\circ$ ), the AGASA *triplet* plus a HiRes event may be the first *quartet event-cluster*!
- Are *any* point sources? and Do they correlate with anything (e.g. with known AGNs)?
- **BUT** if sources are *faint* we may only see correlations with *candidate* sources ...




# Which are *best* candidate sources?



- Popular astrophysical sources for UHECRs include active galactic nuclei (AGNs) and gamma ray bursts (GRBs) ... but no one knows: that is the Auger goal!
- AGNs are super-massive black holes emitting jets of relativistic particles along the accretion disk rotation axis.
- Catalogs of AGNs provide a starting point ...
- So far the most significant correlations are with the 12<sup>th</sup> Véron Cetty catalog
- Centarus-A ( $z = 0.0018$ ), shown above, is one of the nearby AGNs


# Distribution of the 15 events above 56EeV

( 1/ 1/2004 -> 27/ 5/2006)  $E/E_{\text{TeV}} \geq 56.0$ ,  $z \leq 0.018$ ,  $\psi \leq 3.1$



- Plot of nearby (Veron catalog) AGNs (\*), each within a  $3.1^\circ$  colored disk reflecting Auger acceptance, and CRs that correlate (filled circles) and that do not correlate (open circles).
- Miraculously, 12 of 15 CRs correlate ... especially so as the Véron catalog has a significant bias for galactic latitudes  $|b| \lesssim 15^\circ$

## So use a (1%) *Running Prescription* on new data



- Depending on how you define *pass*, the *Running Prescription* passed in May (6/8) or in July (8/11) of 2007; the plot in *Science* includes events through Aug 31, 2007.
- At a minimum, the Véron catalog: AGN maximum redshift and correlation angle, defines a limited area (effectively 21%) of the sky. *Thus the Véron catalog AGN:CR correlation signal is evidence for a non-isotropic flux of CRs that is enhanced near known extra-galactic objects.*
- At  $\sim 1$  event/month  $> 56$  EeV, there are now more data. What do the new data tell us? Unofficially: the combined data may favor a CR:AGN correlation at a larger angle (than  $3.1^\circ$ ) and with more nearby AGNs (than 75Mpc). And the Virgo cluster, near the edge of our acceptance, still lacks events  $> 56$  EeV.

# Alternate *Running* Prescription with Limited Error

- Brian Connolly (Segev BenZvi and Stefan Westerhoff) provided an alternative procedure ... that is of general interest! A generic version is now available as [arXiv:0711.3937](https://arxiv.org/abs/0711.3937)
- **Philosophy:** *All relevant information needed to infer parameters from an experiment is contained in the **observed** data.* This is not true of the Auger Running prescription.
- **Motivation:** Recall that the motivation for a running (vs fixed length) prescription is to be able to be as responsive as possible to data as they are collected!
- **History:** The technique comes from an “assembly line” defect analysis studied by Alexander Wald (1947). The relevant issue was how long to run a factory to ensure say  $< 40\%$  of the cars were defective ... before shutting it down to re-tool the assembly lines. This technique was important enough to be classified by the U.S. government during W.W.II!

# Connolly/Wald *Running* Prescription (I)

Definitions, and values, for the case of our AGN:CR correlations:

- Background (random AGN:CR coincidence) probability:  $p_0 = 0.21$
- Null hypothesis,  $H_0$ : corresponds to no signal, with correlation probability  $p_0$
- Model *Signal* probability:  $p_1$  (to be tested against  $p_0$ ); this may be one value or a range of values: e.g.  $p_1 > p_0$ . For the (previous) *Running* prescription values:  $p_1 = 0.57$  and  $p_1 = 0.80$  were chosen.
- Model hypothesis,  $H_1$ : corresponds to a (model) signal, with correlation probability  $p_1$
- The observed (*signal*) correlation probability in the new data:  $p$
- Errors:
  - $H_0$  is true, but rejected by the test (*Type-I error*)
  - $H_0$  is false, but accepted by the test (*Type-II error*)
  - Limit probability of *Type-I* error:  $\alpha = 0.01$
  - Limit probability of *Type-II* error:  $\beta = 0.05$



## Connolly/Wald *Running Prescription* (II)

Sequential test of hypothesis  $H_0$  vs  $H_1$ :

- Determine two positive constants:  $A$  and  $B$  (based on  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  ... see below)
- After each new event calculate the probability ratio:

$$R = \frac{P(Data|H_1)}{P(Data|H_0)}$$

- If  $R > A$  the running prescription is terminated with the rejection of  $H_0$ .
- If  $R < B$  the running prescription is terminated with the acceptance of  $H_0$ .
- If  $B < R < A$  the running prescription continues ... *i.e.* the result is inconclusive.
- Wald (1943) showed that:  $A \geq \frac{1-\beta}{\alpha}$  and  $B \leq \frac{\beta}{(1-\alpha)}$
- Furthermore Wald also showed that using “=” in the definitions for  $A$  and  $B$  provides protection against wrong decisions ... *i.e.*  $\alpha$  and/or  $\beta$  are not increased over the assigned values as long as they are  $\lesssim 0.05$  ... **consistent with our choices**

# Connolly/Wald *Running Prescription* (III)

## Sequential test of Auger AGN:CR correlations:

- After each new event calculate the probability ratio:

$$R = \frac{p_1^k \cdot (1 - p_1)^{n-k}}{p_0^k \cdot (1 - p_0)^{n-k}}$$


where  $k$  events correlate out of  $n$  total events and  $p_0 = 0.21$ . **But what value should we use for  $p_1$ ?**

- One approach is to choose a model  $p_1$  with  $p_1 > p_0$  but less than, but possibly near, the correlation signal in the data,  $p$ ; see arXiv:0711.3937.
- The new approach, proposed by Connolly, is to integrate over all possible values of  $p_1$ ; then the ratio test becomes (for example):

$$R' = \frac{\int_0^1 p^k \cdot (1 - p)^{n-k} dp}{p_0^k \cdot (1 - p_0)^{n-k}} = \frac{B(k+1, n-k+1)}{p_0^k \cdot (1 - p_0)^{n-k}}$$


where  $B( )$  is the beta function. This has now been validated in arXiv:0711.3937.

# Connolly/Wald *Running* Prescription (IV)



- With our choice of  $\alpha = 0.01$  and  $\beta = 0.05$  then  $A = 95$  and  $B = 0.0505$
- For a data sample ( $n$ ) of 11 events, how sensitive are  $R'$ , and/or  $R$ , to the observed number of correlations ( $k$ )?
- Plot: shows  $R'$  and  $R$  (for three values of  $p_1$ : 0.4, 0.57, 0.8) vs  $k$



# Connolly/Wald *Running Prescription* (V)



- With our choice of  $\alpha = 0.01$  and  $\beta = 0.05$  then  $A = 95$  and  $B = 0.0505$
- If  $R' < 0.0505$  the null hypothesis is accepted ... *i.e. this is evidence against a signal*
- If  $0.0505 < R' < 95$  ... keep going *i.e. we simply do not know!*
- If  $R' > 95$  the null hypothesis is rejected ... *i.e. this is evidence for a signal ...*

This occurred when  $k = 8$  correlations were observed in  $n = 11$  total events

## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* (I)





There are concerns with catalog dependent searches and the use of the 12<sup>th</sup> Véron Cetty AGN catalog in particular.

At UNM we are studying several *metrics* including:

- **2pt**, the standard two-point correlation function
- **ss**, or Shape-Strength, a three-point metric based on a moments about the *principle, major and minor axes*.

## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* (II)




In the three-point analysis we determine the eigenvalues with  $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \tau_3$ . As  $\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 = 1$  there are only two free parameters with *intuitive* choices:

- **Shape:**  $\gamma = \log\left(\frac{\log(\tau_1/\tau_2)}{\log(\tau_2/\tau_3)}\right)$   
as the **|shape|** increases the CR events are more *stringy*.
- **Strength:**  $\zeta = \log(\tau_1/\tau_3)$   
as the **strength** increases the CR events are more *concentrated*.



## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* (III)




To analyze a set (called a **sky**) of cosmic ray arrival directions (either data or Monte Carlo simulated *mock data*) we do the following:


- choose a *metric*: traditional **2pt** or the new **SS**;
- compute a pseudo-log-likelihood,  $\Sigma_P = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{bins}} \ln P_i(n_{obs}|n_{exp})$ , by comparing the test **sky's** *metric* distribution to the distribution from an ensemble of a large number of *equivalent* isotropic skies (typically 20,000). (The (above) plot is for the **SS** *metric* applied to Auger's 27 highest energy events from Auger's Science paper.);
- then the fraction of isotropic **skies** with a  $\Sigma_P$  less than that of the data gives the **p-value** (for isotropy). (The **p-value** for the 27 highest energy events is 0.2%.)

## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* (IV)


DIPOLE<sub>z</sub>




QUADRUPOLE<sub>x</sub>



VCV0020




VCVflat0020




A large number of *mock data* signals were used to study the sensitivity of our *metrics*.  
Four of these (in galactic coordinates) are shown.

## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* (V)



How do source detection *efficiencies* vary with source purity (*i.e.* signal/total) and **number of CR events?**  
**20 events**


## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* ( $V'$ )



How do source detection *efficiencies* vary with source purity (*i.e.* signal/total) and **number of CR events**?

**40 events**


## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* ( $V''$ )



How do source detection *efficiencies* vary with source purity (*i.e.* signal/total) and **number of CR events**?

60 events

## Next steps *catalog independent analyses* ( $V'''$ )



Based on simulated samples (*ie mock data*) from hypothetical sources, we find:

- some source (distributions) can be identified (at the 1% or 0.1% confidence level) **with 60 events** and some cannot!
- the sense is that **many more than 60 events** may be needed for a robust identification of an anisotropic signal in the highest energy cosmic rays.





## Second question: What evidence for a GZK-cutoff?

If the highest energy cosmic rays are non-isotropic, this is strong circumstantial evidence for a GZK cutoff!

(top) AGASA spectrum


(bottom) HiRes spectrum Phys. Lett. B619 271 (2005) and [astro-ph/0703099]:



- The ankle shows up clearly at  $4.5 \times 10^{18}$  eV ( $\log_{10} E = 18.65$ ).
- The spectrum steepens again at  $5.6 \times 10^{19}$  eV ( $\log_{10} E = 19.75$ ).
- The fall-off of the HiRes spectrum above  $10^{19.8}$  eV is evidence for the GZK cutoff.

What does Auger observe? And does Auger see a cutoff in the UHECR spectrum?

# Our Approach: Measuring Flux Suppression



(Left plot) The Auger Flux  $\times E^3$  (ICRC'07). The suppression is “obvious” but quantification should be done carefully.

Our eyes like the binned- $E^3$  flux plot but their *statistical estimators* have some drawbacks.


J. (Doug) Hague has provided two *statistical estimators* that are of general interest!

See: [arXiv:0710.3600](https://arxiv.org/abs/0710.3600) and [astro-ph/0610865](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0610865)

We choose the following:


- Un-binned estimators as they are less correlated, more precise and more accurate.
- The **Tail-Power (TP) statistic** (which is identically zero for a pure power-law) can reject **non-pure** power-laws. It is (nearly) independent of the measured spectral index  $\gamma$  and can discriminate tail suppression from tail enhancement.
- If a characteristic cutoff energy is desired, then a **Likelihood Ratio Test** has only a weak dependence on  $\gamma$ .

# Hague *Flux Suppression*: The Hill plot



- For each  $E_{\min}$ , we determine the un-binned estimate of the pure power-law spectral index  $\gamma$  (by maximizing the likelihood: **Top plot**).
- The **systematic** (energy) errors dominate for low  $E_{\min}$  but **statistical** errors dominate at large  $E_{\min}$ .
- The index **increases** as the energy **increases**.
- There is suppression (*i.e.* the slope increases)! But how do we determine the significance?

# Hague Flux Suppression: The TP-statistic



- The TP-statistic ( $\tau$ ) can discriminate between flux suppression (increasing slope with energy) and enhancement (decreasing slope with energy):

$$\hat{\tau}(E_{\min}) = \hat{\nu}_1^2(E_{\min}) - \frac{1}{2}\hat{\nu}_2(E_{\min})$$

where:

$$\hat{\nu}_n(E_{\min}) = \frac{1}{N_{>}} \sum_{E_i > E_{\min}} \ln^n \frac{E_i}{E_{\min}}$$

- It is (nearly) independent of  $\gamma$ .
- We can directly measure the *significance* in standard deviations of the flux suppression (**Bottom plot**)

## Hague *Flux Suppression*: Fitted Models (I)


- We study three models “ $f$ ” with parameters “ $\theta = \{\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots\}$ ”:
  - The **pure power-law**:  $\theta = \{E_{min}, \gamma\}$
  - and two models with tail *suppression*:
    1. the **double power-law**:  $\theta = \{E_{min}, \gamma, E_b, \delta\}$
    2. a **Fermi-like power-law**:  $\theta = \{E_{min}, \gamma, E_{1/2}, w_c\}$

- Parameters (  $\theta$  ) maximize the log-likelihood:

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^N \ln f(E_i|\theta)$$

- Systematic (CR event) energy uncertainties are incorporated by shifting all event energies and then re-maximize the likelihood.
- Statistical (CR event) energy errors and acceptance information can be taken into account by the appropriate convolution.

# Hague *Flux Suppression*: Fitted Models (II)



(Left plot) A log-log plot of the number of (Auger) events with energy greater than  $E_{min}$  VS event minimum energy ( $E_{min}$ ).

The vertical axis is “one minus the (cumulative distribution function) CDF.”

We plot:

- each event energy (with its systematic errors shown in gray)
- the three models; pure power-law, double power-law and Fermi-like power-law
- the reported HiRes double power-law (normalized to the Auger flux).

**Next:** we must now quantify the flux suppression.



## Hague *Flux Suppression*: **Likelihood Ratio**

- We can use the likelihoods to discriminate models. The **Likelihood Ratio** is:

$$\mathcal{R} = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\text{data} \mid \text{suppressed model hyp.})}{\mathcal{L}(\text{data} \mid \text{pure power law hyp.})}$$

- This test directly compares the best-fit suppressed model to the best fit pure power-law.
- Since  $\mathcal{R}^2 \sim \chi_1^2$  we can estimate the (asymptotic) *Probability of False Acceptance*:

$P_{\text{FA}} \equiv$  probability of accepting the *suppressed* model given that the data are drawn from a *pure* power-law.


If the data are drawn from a power-law then the chance that we would falsely accept either suppressed model is  $P_{\text{FA}}$ .

# Hague Flux Suppression: Summary

Model	Name	Value	Stat	$+S_{ys}$ $-S_{ys}$	p-value	Conclusion
Power-Law	$\gamma$	2.78	0.02	$-0.06$ $0.08$	$\geq 6\sigma$ (TP statistic)	Rejected
Double PL	$\gamma$	2.68	0.02	$-0.05$ $0.08$	$\lg P_{FA} = -4.12$	Favored
	$E_b$	35	2	$\frac{7}{7}$		
	$\delta$	4.22	0.22	$-0.10$ $0.17$		
Fermi PL	$\gamma$	2.63	0.02	$-0.05$ $0.08$	$\lg P_{FA} = -4.29$	Favored
	$E_{1/2}$	56	$\frac{5}{4}$	$\frac{13}{13}$		
	$w_c$	0.16	$-0.03$ $0.02$	$-0.005$ $0.008$		

- The *preliminary result* is that we can:
  - Reject the pure power-law model at a confidence level greater than six sigma.
  - Favor either suppressed model with confidence better than 1/10,000.
  - Verify that the data are consistent with  $E_{GZK} = 56 \pm 5(\text{stat}) \pm 15(\text{sys})$  EeV ... agrees with HiRes and with Berezhinsky protons!
- This analysis alone **cannot** verify the GZK-cutoff, for that we need additional information on: CR composition (e.g. all protons?) and CR astrophysics (e.g. sources uniformly distributed? constant source injection spectrum?).

## Third question: What about the CR *composition*?



- Plot of the average depth of shower maximum  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$  vs shower energy  $E$ .
- Model predictions are given for CR primary: photons, protons and iron nuclei.
- While photons are **most** distinctive, very high energy photons interact with the Earth's magnetic field (denoted by *pre-shower*) making them more *proton-like*.

# Auger's most direct *composition* measurements






Fig. 4. Photon showers and the selection requirement of observing  $X_{\max}$ . For near-vertical photon showers,  $X_{\max}$  is below the field of view of the telescopes; possibly the showers even reach ground before being fully developed as in the example shown. Such photon showers were rejected by the quality cuts. The situation changes when regarding more inclined photon events. The slant atmospheric depth that corresponds to the lower edge of the field of view increases with zenith.  $X_{\max}$  can then be reached within the field of view, and the photon showers pass the  $X_{\max}$  quality cut. Requiring a minimum zenith angle in the analysis, the reconstruction bias for photons is strongly reduced.



- The fluorescence detectors image the shower development and thus directly measure  $X_{\max}$ , with typical reconstruction uncertainties  $\sim 20 \text{ g cm}^{-2}$ .
- However, Auger hybrid events have potential biases:
  - At the lowest energies, shower  $X_{\max}$  may not enter the telescope field of view
  - At the highest energies, shower  $X_{\max}$  may extend past the telescope field of view; atmospheric depth for vertical showers is  $\sim 860 \text{ g cm}^{-2}$ .



# Upper-limit on CR $\gamma$ -Fraction (FD)



- Plot of 95% c.l. upper limits on the (integrated) CR  $\gamma$ -fraction above the energy plotted
- Plot also shows previous upper limits from: Haverah Park (HP), and AGASA (A)
- Representative theory predictions include: Z-burst (ZB), Topological Defects (TD) and Super Heavy Dark Matter particles (SHDM)
- **Auger FD-hybrid result, Astropart. Phys. 27 155 (2007), close to restricting models**





# Upper-limit on CR $\gamma$ -Fraction (SD)



- 95% c.l. upper limits on the (integrated) CR  $\gamma$ -flux (Left) and  $\gamma$ -fraction (Right) above the energy plotted
- Plot(s) include upper limits from AGASA (A), Haverah Park (HP) and Yakutsk (Y)
- Representative theory predictions include: Topological Defects (TD), Super Heavy Dark Matter particles (SHDM), and GZK-photons
- **Auger SD result, arXiv:0712.1147, are now restricting models ... and approaching observing GZK-photons!**
- One caveat is that the SD results rely on Monte Carlo shower simulations ...

# What about the CR *composition*?



- CR composition is measured using the correlation between depth of shower maximum ( $X_{max}$ ) and primary particle type (proton, iron)
- $X_{max}$  is directly measured by the Auger fluorescence detectors ... but as noted earlier: there are potential biases at lowest and highest energies
- Many in Auger argue that the AGN:CR correlations can only be consistent with proton primaries ... **but Auger composition measurements are inconsistent!**
- And what about (possible) systematic uncertainties in the shower simulations and/or the data reduction! **This is *either* an opportunity or a big problem!**

# Summary



- Auger is a *different* experience ... and the (physical) challenge of a  $55\text{km} \times 55\text{km}$  detector at a remote, largely undeveloped site **cannot** be overstated!
- The spectrum *cutoff* at  $\sim 10^{20}\text{eV}$  is now clear ... but is it the GZK cutoff ... **with the observation of GZK-photons a potential goal**
- The reported AGN:CR correlation is interesting ... will it need the high statistics from a Northern Auger?
- The Auger photon and ANITA neutrino flux limits are inconsistent with *particle physics* motivated sources ... **but are we any closer to identifying the sources?**

# Additional slides

# Auger results: $\tau$ -neutrino flux limits





Figure 8: Limits at 90 % CL for *each flavor* of diffuse UHE neutrino fluxes assuming a proportion of flavors of 1:1:1 due to neutrino oscillations. The Auger limits are given using the most pessimistic case of the systematics (solid lines). For the integrated format, the limit that would be obtained in the most optimistic scenario of systematics is also shown (dashed line). See text for the references to the other experimental limits. The shaded area corresponds to the allowed region of expected GZK neutrino fluxes computed under different assumptions [69, 70, 71, 72], although predictions almost 1 order of magnitude lower and higher exist.

# What is the CMB/GZK *wall* at $10^{20}$ eV?




- Cosmic rays interact with the cosmic micro-wave background (CMB) radiation; after a distance,  $d$ :

$$E = E_0 \cdot e^{-d/\Lambda_{atten}}$$

- Steep drop of  $\Lambda_{atten}$  near  $10^{20}$  eV from the onset of  $\pi$  photo-production:  
 $\gamma_{CMB} p \rightarrow \pi X.$




# The *GZK*-feature is complex ...





- Schematic showing how *cosmologically-distant* sources may build up the cosmic ray spectrum we measure today!
- Very distant sources,  $z \gtrsim 0.5$  dominate at CR energies  $< 10^{19}$  eV.

# The GZK cutoff *limits* the possible source distance



- Figure shows predicted fraction of cosmic ray events VS energy (in overlapping redshift regions) assuming proton primaries and GZK cutoff
- Note the higher  $E_{\min}$ : the greater the fraction of nearby (e.g.  $z_{\max} \leq 0.01$ ) sources and these may appear bright as source apparent brightness  $\propto z^{-2}$
- However we need events to study, thus the steep,  $E^{-3}$ , spectrum argues for as low a value of  $E_{\min}$  as possible

# Cosmic ray composition ... details (I)







- GZK physics is not only at  $10^{20} \text{ eV}$ !
- The extra-galactic spectrum *also* extends to energies below the GZK cutoff
- The division between *galactic* and *extra-galactic* contributions allows significant *wiggle room* for models!
- *Composition information would help ...*

# Cosmic ray composition ... details (II/a)

Test analysis: HiRes stereo  $> 10^{18}$  eV. Two *minima* ... one with **100%p : 0%Fe!**

Offset QGSjet p,Fe  $X_{max}$  distributions **less deep** into the atmosphere

*i.e.* move QGSjet-p  $< X_{max} >$  **toward** the data




# Cosmic ray composition ... details (II/b)

Test analysis: HiRes stereo  $> 10^{18}$  eV. Two *minima* ... one with **44%p : 56%Fe!**


Offset QGSjet p,Fe  $X_{max}$  distributions **deeper** into the atmosphere

*i.e.* move QGSjet-p  $< X_{max}$  **away from the data**


Graph




Graph





Graph



Graph



# Auger *HEAT* Enhancement



To extend Auger's high quality *hybrid*-events to lower energies three additional: **High Elevation Auger Telescope(s) (HEAT)** are currently under construction at the Coihueco FD site.

These telescopes **raise the FD viewing angle** because lower energy showers:

- can only be observed when they are close to the FDs ... **which then appear more overhead**
- reach shower maximum higher in the atmosphere ... **which is more overhead**