

Astroparticle experiment

- 1) Charged cosmic rays (CRs) and AMS-02 experiment
- 2) High-energy gamma rays: H.E.S.S. and Fermi-LAT

Goal of the lectures

- Selected topics and instruments in astroparticle physics
- Scientific debates (historical illustration with CRs)
- Complexity of data analysis (illustration with AMS-02)
- Variety of detection principles, ‘research activities’, etc.



David Maurin
(LPSC)

dmaurin@lpsc.in2p3.fr



GRASPA
Annecy-le-Vieux
27 August 2021

Astroparticle experiment 2

High-energy gamma rays, H.E.S.S and Fermi-LAT

- 1) Introduction: projections and coordinates
- 2) The gamma-ray sky tour
- 3) Air showers and detection techniques (CRs)
- 4) Fermi-LAT, H.E.S.S., and exp. activities
- 5) Constraints on dark matter from γ -rays

Main questions in the field

- Sources of cosmic rays
- Origin of non-thermal emissions
- Dark matter indirect detection



David Maurin
(LPSC)
dmaurin@lpsc.in2p3.fr





GRASPA
Annecy-le-Vieux
22 July 2019

Mapping the sphere to 2D view

Mercator



Hammer-Aïtoff




Question: what projection is best for astronomical use and why?

Mapping the sphere to 2D view



The Most Popular Map Projections in Astronomy as found on AstroExplorer.org



James Davenport :: ifweassume.com (2014)

(thumbnails from Wikipedia)

Representations of celestial coordinates in FITS
Calabretta & Greisen, A&A 395, 1077 (2002)

Galactic coordinates: the Milky Way

Unit conversion

Mass

$$1 M_{\odot} \sim 10^{57} \text{ GeV}$$

$$\sim 2 \cdot 10^{30} \text{ kg}$$


$$\sim 3 \cdot 10^5 M_{\oplus}$$

Distance

$$1 \text{ pc} \sim 3 \cdot 10^{16} \text{ m}$$

$$\sim 2 \cdot 10^5 \text{ AU}$$

$$\sim 3.26 \text{ ly}$$



Milky Way ID

$$\text{Stars} \sim 10^{11} \rightarrow 5 \cdot 10^{10} M_{\odot}$$

$$\text{Gas} \sim 10\% \rightarrow 5 \cdot 10^9 M_{\odot}$$


$$\text{Total mass} \rightarrow 2 \cdot 10^{12} M_{\odot}$$

$$D_{GC-\odot} \sim 8 \text{ kpc}$$


$$R_{MW} \sim 15 \text{ kpc}$$

$$R_{DM} \sim 300 \text{ kpc}$$

Galactic coordinates: ‘d’, l (longitude), b (latitude)



(from Wikipedia)



Remarks:

- still a challenge to define accurately MW properties
- coordinate system *changes* with time!


- IAU (International Astronomical Union) standards for coordinates systems
- FITS (Flexible Image Transport System) standards for archival storage

- 1) Introduction: projections and coordinates
- 2) The gamma-ray sky tour
- 3) Air showers and detection techniques (CRs)
- 4) Fermi-LAT, H.E.S.S., and exp. activities
- 5) Constraints on dark matter from γ -rays

Motivation

- Diffuse emission and origin
- Sources of non-thermal emissions
- GeV vs TeV sky

Diffuse emission: first detection >100 MeV



Diffuse emission in the disk = galactic origin

→ Distribution proportional to column density at 21cm (H_I)


→ Absolute intensity accounted for by π^0 production

(N.B.: there also exists an isotropic extragalactic diffuse emission)

Diffuse emission: a closer look


COS-B (70-150 MeV)

[4 years of data]



→ New correlations found: Perseus arm ($l=100^\circ\text{-}140^\circ$), spiral arm in Carina ($l=285^\circ$)


Diffuse emission: a closer look




- New correlations found: Perseus arm ($l=100^\circ-140^\circ$), spiral arm in Carina ($l=285^\circ$)
- Require additional leptonic emission (inverse Compton mostly, and synchrotron)

By the way: how to get the diffuse emission?

(1) Count the number of photons
(photons-instrument background)



(2) Subtract point sources



What remains
should be the
diffuse
emission

In real life

(i) Source intrinsic properties

- point-like sources (e.g., SN remnants, AGN...)
- extended emission (e.g. plerions, GMC in the vicinity of a source...)
- diffuse-like emission (DE from the galactic disk, ridge, extragalactic DE...)

(ii) Analysis method and/or assumptions

2008: new EGRET analysis, 188 sources instead of 271! [Casandjian & Grenier, A&A **489**, 849]

(iii) Angular resolution and/or sensitivity of the instrument

1999: OSSE find that 50% DE for soft γ -ray (<300 keV) [Kinzer *et al.*, ApJ **515**, 215]

2000: Hint at unresolved point sources HIREGS [Boggs *et al.*] + OSSE&RXTE [Valinia *et al.*]

2004: INTEGRAL find almost no diffuse emission [Lebrun, Terrier *et al.*, Nature **428**, 293]

→ Identifying the truly diffuse emission is always a very difficult task

Morphology and spectral information


Photon Intensity (E, l, b)

- Morphology (2D) → skymap for each energy
- Spectrum (1D) → spectrum in each direction

Modelling

- Gas, magnetic field: 3D
- CRs: 3D + spectrum + time (HE leptons)

Models from the Fermi-LAT collaboration



Ackermann *et al.*, ApJ 799, 86 (2015)

Work with the multi-wavelength sky!

<https://mwmw.gsfc.nasa.gov>

Radio
Microwave
Infrared
Visible
Ultraviolet
X-ray
Gamma-ray



AM radio



Amateur radio



Aircraft communication



Microwave oven



TV Remote Control



Night vision goggles




Visible light

UV light from the Sun





Airport security scanner



PET scan




Terrestrial gamma-ray flashes




2. The γ -ray sky

Fermi-LAT (> 1 GeV, 60 month results)




Indirect dark matter detection =
search for dark matter signature in this (astrophysical) mess

Fermi-LAT (> 1 GeV, 60 month results)




Pulsars
[rapidly rotating neutron stars]

Fermi-LAT (> 1 GeV, 60 month results)




Active galaxies and blazars
[powered by $10^6 M_{\odot}$ black holes]

Fermi-LAT (> 1 GeV, 60 month results)




Normal and
starburst galaxies

Fermi-LAT (> 1 GeV, 60 month results)



Supernova remnants
(and high mass binary systems,
globular clusters...)

Comparison with H.E.S.S. survey (> 1 TeV, 10 years)




TeV sky \neq GeV sky
→ less diffuse emission(?)


- 1) Introduction: projections and coordinates
- 2) The gamma-ray sky tour
- 3) Air showers and detection techniques (CRs)
- 4) Fermi-LAT, H.E.S.S., and exp. activities
- 5) Constraints on dark matter from γ -rays

Motivation

- Take advantage of atmosphere as a calorimeter
- Electromagnetic vs hadronic showers
- Detector types using atmospheric showers
- Rejection and calibration




High-energy photon interaction



High energy lepton interaction


Bremsstrahlung emission
(in Coulomb field of the nucleus)



→ About same interaction length as pair production

Electromagnetic air shower

Hütten, PhD thesis (2016)




Electromagnetic radiation length X_0
 $\sim 40 \text{ g/cm}^2$ in dry air

Calorimeter thicknesses
Particle physics @ LHC: $\sim 25 X_0$
 γ -ray satellites: $\sim 10 X_0$
Atmosphere: $\sim 27 X_0$

Depth of shower maximum z_{\max}
Homogeneous calorimeter $\propto \log(E_0)$
Atmosphere: $\sim 9 \text{ km} - 8.4 \text{ km} \times \log(\log(E_0/1 \text{ TeV}))$

Electromagnetic air shower

Hütten, PhD thesis (2016)



Electromagnetic radiation length X_0
 $\sim 40 \text{ g/cm}^2$ in dry air

Calorimeter thicknesses
Particle physics @ LHC: $\sim 25 X_0$
 γ -ray satellites: $\sim 10 X_0$
Atmosphere: $\sim 27 X_0$


Depth of shower maximum z_{\max}
Homogeneous calorimeter $\propto \log(E_0)$
Atmosphere: $\sim 9 \text{ km} - 8.4 \text{ km} \times \log(\log(E_0/1 \text{ TeV}))$

And additional processes, mainly at low energy

- multiple scattering off charged particles (shower broadening)
- E losses by ionisation and atomic excitation (shower extinction below 83 MeV in the air)
- Electron scattering and positron annihilation (10% electron excess → radio signal)
- Earth's magnetic field (shower broadening in the East-West direction)

Hadronic air shower

Hütten, PhD thesis (2016)



No simple description:

- nuclear interaction length
 - decay lengths for unstable particles
 - radiation length
- **no universal scaling**

Sub-showers:

- Hadronic (n , π and K mesons)
 - Electromagnetic (π^0 decay)
- and particles:
- High energy μ (π^\pm and K^\pm decay)
 - Atmospheric ν (π^\pm , K^\pm and μ^\pm decay)

Leptonic vs hadronic shower (1)




Figure 3.4.: Comparison between an electromagnetic air shower (triggered by a 300 GeV primary γ -ray) and a hadronic air shower (initiated by a 1 TeV proton). The figure shows the secondary particles projected onto a plane in (x, h) direction. Figure taken from Aharonian et al. (2008b).⁹

Leptonic vs hadronic shower (2)

De Naurois & Mazin, arXiv:1511.00463





Illustration of the intrinsic variability of shower development.


Simulation of 10 showers (300 GeV γ -rays)



Simulation of 10 showers (300 GeV protons)

→ larger transverse momentum transfers,
larger fluctuations


Detection techniques (using Earth's atmosphere)



Water pond

[MILAGRO, HAWC]

- timing information (direction)
- EM and hadronic showers (energy)




Goal

- Energy of the primary particle
- Direction of the primary particle
- Primary particle nature

Obviously, depends on


- Particle nature
- Particle energy
- Particle spectrum



Cerenkov detectors

[H.E.S.S, CTA]


- Cerenkov light (energy)
- stereoscopy (direction)



Hybrid detectors

[AUGER]

- 4 fluorescence telescopes
- 1660 surface detectors




- 1) Introduction: projections and coordinates
- 2) The gamma-ray sky tour
- 3) Air showers and detection techniques (CRs)
- 4) Fermi-LAT, H.E.S.S., and exp. activities
- 5) Constraints on dark matter from γ -rays

Motivation

- Ground and satellite γ -ray detectors
- Important experimental aspects to keep in mind
 - Research activities in a collaboration



Rejection factor is crucial for gamma-rays




Question: How can you reduce the background in space/ground detector?

Fermi satellite and Fermi-LAT

Fermi: ~ 12 countries, 90 institutes, 400 researchers



Segmented electromagnetic calorimeter
→ reconstruct e^- and e^+ direction in tracker
→ reconstruct total energy from calorimeter
→ charged particles vetoed by anticoincidence



Cerenkov telescopes

H.E.S.S.: ~ 13 countries, 45 institutes, 250 researchers





Figure 3.5.: Currently operating third generation IACT arrays: The MAGIC telescopes on La Palma, Canarian Islands (*upper left*, mirror diameters 17 m), the four H.E.S.S. telescopes (mirror diameters 12 m) and the large H.E.S.S. II telescope (average mirror diameter 28 m) on the Khomas Highland in Namibia (*upper right*), and the VERITAS array near Tucson, Arizona, USA (*bottom*, mirror diameters 12 m). Image credits by the MAGIC/H.E.S.S. & VERITAS collaborations.

Many crucial notions not covered...




Question: how would you explain the difference between Fermi-LAT and H.E.S.S. coverages (first light ~10 years ago for both)?

- Field of view
- Duty cycle
- γ -ray spectrum
- Sensitivity

- Effective area/acceptance/rejection capabilities
- Angular/energy resolution

... in any case, γ -ray astronomy has a bright future

De Naurois & Mazin, arXiv:1511.00463



- Field of view
- Duty cycle
- γ -ray spectrum
- Sensitivity

- Effective area/acceptance/rejection capabilities
- Angular/energy resolution

More on energy and position calibration

Question: what generic procedures can you think of to ensure

→ $E_{\text{measured}} = E_{\text{true}}$?

→ correct source reconstruction

- Pre-flight calibration
 - Test beams (e.g., @ CERN)
 - Monte Carlo simulation
- In-flight (on-line) calibration
 - Use specific data samples with known properties
 - Use reference source (Crab nebula)
 - Calibrate position from bright sources
- Inter-calibration
 - Internal calibration system (e.g., diodes)
 - Hybrid detectors (e.g., AUGER)

More on research activities

Question: what do you think we are doing (at the various stages of experiments)?

Before starting a new project

- Scientific goal and expected return (must involve large enough community)
- Proof of concept (+validation by Monte Carlo)
- Design (mechanics, electronics...), computing resources, cost evaluation
→ *Go to funding agencies*

During construction

- Build sub-detectors, sub-systems
- Design software analysis
- Supervise integration
- ...

Starting/during exploitation

- Monitor stability of instrument
- Calibration (more Monte Carlo)
- Design analysis methods/software for your physics problem/specific source
- Collaborate/compete with your colleagues/community
- Write papers, give talks (collaboration and/or international meetings)

→ *Exciting science and fun for everyone's taste!*


- 1) Introduction: projections and coordinates
- 2) The gamma-ray sky tour
- 3) Air showers and detection techniques (CRs)
- 4) Fermi-LAT, H.E.S.S., and exp. activities
- 5) Constraints on dark matter from γ -rays

Motivation

- Connect theoretical/experimental lectures
- Dark matter distributions and targets
- Current limits from DM indirect detection

Dark matter candidate: WIMP scenario

Schematic view of interactions




Limit on DM annihilation cross-section $\langle\sigma v\rangle$

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, \psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \underline{\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \times J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega)}$$

Particle physics

Weakly Interacting
Massive Particles
 $m_{\text{WIMP}} \sim 0.1 - 100 \text{ TeV}$

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\langle\sigma_{\text{ann}}v\rangle}{2m_\chi^2} \cdot \sum_f \left(\frac{dN_\gamma^f}{dE_\gamma} \right) B_f$$



Dark matter-induced signal strength

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, \psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \times J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega)$$

Particle physics


Astrophysics

Weakly Interacting
Massive Particles
 $m_{\text{WIMP}} \sim 0.1 - 100 \text{ TeV}$

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle}{2m_\chi^2} \cdot \sum_f \frac{dN_\gamma^f}{dE_\gamma} B_f$$

From numerical
simulations or data

$$J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \int_0^{\Delta\Omega} \int_{\text{l.o.s}} \rho^2(l(\psi, \theta)) \ dl \ d\Omega$$



Question: what target would you pick?

Dark matter-induced signal strength

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, \psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \times J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega)$$

Particle physics


Astrophysics

Weakly Interacting
Massive Particles
 $m_{\text{WIMP}} \sim 0.1 - 100 \text{ TeV}$

From numerical
simulations or data

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle}{2m_\chi^2} \cdot \sum_f \frac{dN_\gamma^f}{dE_\gamma} B_f$$

$$J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \int_0^{\Delta\Omega} \int_{\text{l.o.s}} \rho^2(l(\psi, \theta)) dl d\Omega$$



Question: what target would you pick?

→ Dense ($\sim \int \rho^2$), close ($1/d^2$),
and no astrophysical background

Dark matter-induced signal strength

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, \psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \times J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega)$$

Particle physics



Astrophysics

Weakly Interacting
Massive Particles
 $m_{\text{WIMP}} \sim 0.1 - 100 \text{ TeV}$

From numerical
simulations or data

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle}{2m_\chi^2} \cdot \sum_f \frac{dN_\gamma^f}{dE_\gamma} B_f$$

$$J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \int_0^{\Delta\Omega} \int_{\text{l.o.s}} \rho^2(l(\psi, \theta)) \ dl \ d\Omega$$



Question: how does the signal skymap look like?

Dark matter-induced signal strength

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, \psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \times J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega)$$

Particle physics


Astrophysics

Weakly Interacting
Massive Particles
 $m_{\text{WIMP}} \sim 0.1 - 100 \text{ TeV}$


$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma) \equiv \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle}{2m_\chi^2} \cdot \sum_f \frac{dN_\gamma^f}{dE_\gamma} B_f$$

From numerical
simulations or data

$$J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \int_0^{\Delta\Omega} \int_{\text{l.o.s}} \rho^2(l(\psi, \theta)) dl d\Omega$$





Synthetic skymap from
public tool CLUMPY:
<http://lpsc.in2p3.fr/clumpy>




Dark matter-induced signal strength

$$\frac{d\Phi_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma, \psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega) = \underbrace{\frac{d\Phi_\gamma^{PP}}{dE_\gamma}(E_\gamma)}_{\text{Particle physics}} \times \underbrace{J(\psi, \theta, \Delta\Omega)}_{\text{Astrophysics}}$$



Synthetic skymap from
public tool CLUMPY:
<http://lpsc.in2p3.fr/clumpy>

Dark matter-induced signal strength



H.E.S.S. + CTA

- Ground based
- $100 \text{ GeV} \rightarrow 100 \text{ TeV}$
- Resolution: $0.2^\circ - 0.02^\circ$
- Pointed instrument
- Background limited

Fermi-LAT (since 2008)


- Space-borne
- $30 \text{ MeV} - 300 \text{ GeV}$
- Resolution: $1^\circ - 0.1^\circ$
- Fullsky
- Signal limited

Exclusion plots: Fermi-LAT and CTA


$$\langle \sigma_{\text{ann}} v \rangle \propto m_\chi^2 \times J(\alpha_{\text{int}}) \times \text{Sensitivity} \times \frac{dN^{pp}}{dE}$$

→ After ~30 years of effort,
WIMP dark matter may be within reach


Ackermann et al. (2014, 2015)
[15 dSphs combined, 70 months]



Hütten et al. (2016)
[CTA prospects]



Comparison/complementarity of indirect detection targets



→ γ -rays from dSphs and antiprotons provide best targets for DM searches

Cerenkov light pool

N.B.: Cerenkov flash $\lesssim 10$ ns (beware of NSB)
→ ultrafast PMTs and electronic readout







Figure 3.6.: Comparison between the time-integrated Cherenkov light pool at ground level of an electromagnetic air shower (*left*; triggered by a 300 GeV primary γ -ray, like in Figure 3.4) and a hadronic air shower (*right*; initiated by a 1 TeV proton, like in Figure 3.4). Both showers approximately produce the same amount of Cherenkov light (see text). The figures are obtained by Monte-Carlo (MC) simulations of the showers and the showers' Cherenkov light emission. On the right figure, the intense dots originate from muons reaching the ground and most of the rings originate from the various electromagnetic subshowers. Figure taken from Aharonian et al. (2008b).

Shower image on the camera



Hütten, PhD thesis (2016)



Ellipse in the shower gives ellipse on the camera

- Image shape parameters to reconstruct energy
 - Image shape to veto hadrons
(require good granularity of camera)

Stereoscopic observation: principle




Figure 3.10.: Stereoscopic reconstruction of the air shower origin in the sky (*left*) and the impact point of the shower axis on the ground (*right*). The shower direction (green point on the left) is obtained as intersection of the major semiaxes of the shower ellipses of all images in the same camera coordinate system. On the right, the shower axis intersection point at ground is obtained as intersection of the lines connecting the center of gravity (yellow star) of each shower image, and the shower direction (green point) in the camera images located in the ground coordinate system of the telescopes. The figure illustrates a real, most likely electromagnetic event recorded by the VERITAS array. Figure courtesy of S. Vincent.

→ Better accuracy for source position, energy reconstruction
→ Better background rejection

Conclusions

High precision era

- Astroparticle physics lively field of research
- New instruments online soon
- Big questions might be solve tomorrow
- Plenty of research activities in which to have fun