## Recent Results and New Puzzles from the Pierre Auger Observatory



## The first extremely high energy event

EVIDENCE FOR A PRIMARY COSMIC-RAY PARTICLE WITH ENERGY $10^{20} \mathrm{eV}^{\dagger}$
John Linsley
Laboratory for Nuclear Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts (Received 10 January 1963)
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FIG. 1. Plan of the Volcano Ranch array in February 1962. The circles represent $3.3-\mathrm{m}^{2}$ scintillation detectors. The numbers near the circles are the shower densities (particles $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) registered in this event, No $2-4834$. Point " $A$ " is the estimated location of the shower core. The circular contours about that point aid in verifying the core location by inspection.

## Ultra-high energy: $10^{20} \mathrm{eV}$

Need accelerator of size of Mecury's orbit to reach $10^{20} \mathrm{eV}$ with current technology

Large Hadron Collider (LHC), 27 km circumference, superconducting magnets

(M. Unger, 2006)

Acceleration time for LHC: 815 years

## Source: diffuse shock acceleration?

Hillas 1984:

$$
\underbrace{E_{\max } \simeq 10^{18} \mathrm{eV} Z \beta\left(\frac{R}{\mathrm{kpc}}\right)\left(\frac{B}{\mu \mathrm{G}}\right)}
$$



## Sources: exotic scenarios


$X$ particles from:

- topological defects
- monopoles
- cosmic strings
- cosmic necklaces
- ....


$$
\frac{d N_{h}}{d x} \sim x^{-3 / 2}(1-x)^{2}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { QCD: ~ } E^{-1.5} \text { energy spectrum } \\
& \text { QCD+SUSY: } \sim E^{-1.9} \text { spectrum }
\end{aligned}
$$

Injected particles: Gamma-ray/nucleon ~ I.5-3

## Fact sheet of some source scenarios

Process Distribution Injection flux

AGNs，GRBs，．．． （ $\bar{\alpha}$ ）

Young pulsars （ 动交）

X particles
（为动）
Z－bursts


Diffuse shock Cosmological acceleration

EM acceleration

Decay \＆particle cascade
$Z^{0}$ decay \＆
particle cascade

Galaxy \＆halo
（a）Halo（SHDM）
（b）Cosmological
Cosmological \＆ clusters
Distribution

$\nu, \gamma$－rays and $p$
P ．．．Fe
P ．．．Fe
Injection flux
mainly Fe
$V, \gamma$－rays and $p$

## Greisen-Zatsepin-Kuzmin (GZK) suppression

(Cronin, TAUP 2003)


Energy loss distance E ds/dE

(Allard et al., 2005)

Gamma-rays even more suppressed

## GZK suppression and magnetic field deflection

Extragalactic magnetic field deflection


| Redshift | Lum.Distance |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.004 | 16 Mpc |
| 0.01 | 40 Mpc |
| 0.05 | 200 Mpc |
| 0.1 | 415 Mpc |

GZK horizon: energy-source relation


## Expected anisotropy based on matter distribution


(Armengaud et al., 2006)

## Exotic propagation scenarios

Violation of Lorentz invariance (space time fluctuations)

$$
4 E_{C M B} E_{\mathrm{th}}=\left(m_{p}+m_{\pi}\right)^{2}-m_{p}^{2}+\epsilon \frac{E_{\mathrm{th}}^{2+a}}{M_{P}^{a}}\left[1-\frac{m_{p}^{1+a}+m_{\pi}^{1+a}}{\left(m_{p}+m_{\pi}\right)^{1+a}}\right]
$$

(Coleman \& Glashow PRD59 1999, Jankiewicz et al., 2004)

Light supersymmetric baryons
Threshold for GZK process increased But: extensive air showers different
(Farrar et al., 1998 )

## Observations?

## Situation before Auger Observatory: flux



Situation unclear

- Flux suppression, GZK effect?
- Energy of ankle
- Flux normalization

Energy reconstruction uncertainty:

AGASA ~18\%
HiRes $\sim 17 \%$

Events above $10^{20} \mathrm{eV}$ : II (AGASA), 4 (HiRes)

## Situation before Auger Observatory: composition

## QGSJET 98/0I

Haverah Park
AGASA
HiRes
SIBYLL I.6 Fly's Eye
AGASA AI 00
AGASAAI


HiRes: 80\% p and 20\% Fe
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## Caveats:

- low statistics
- interaction model dependence
- muon and Xmax information consistent?


## Situation before Auger Observatory: anisotropy

## AGASA


$E>4 \times 10^{19} \mathrm{eV}, 5$ doublets, $I$ triplet


HiRes


Monocular: 52 evts, stereo: 27 evts no small scale clustering found

Correlation with BI Lacs? Medium range $\sim 25^{\circ}$ correlation?
$\mathrm{E}>10^{18} \mathrm{eV}$, dipole anisotropy, excess from GC region (Excess in similar region also found in SUGAR)

## Different measurement techniques





## Southern Pierre Auger Observatory



## Auger South on a cloudy day ...









## One of 24 fluorescence telescopes

## PMT camera with 440 pixels,

I.5º FoV per pixel, IO MHz

UV transmitting filter, corrector lens, safety curtain
3.4 m segmented mirror (aluminum alloy, glass)

## Southern Pierre Auger Observatory




## Integrated aperture used for data analysis




AGASA: $1600 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ sryr HiRes I (mono) ~ $5000 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ sr yr @ $10^{20} \mathrm{eV}$
"Last Friday, June 13th, at 13:00 hs, the "last" surface detector (the one with signatures from the whole Collaboration) was filled with water. It was put to work immediately afterwards."


## Surface detector events

More than 650,000 events (T5 trigger, used in analysis)

$$
\text { Example: } \mathrm{E}>10^{20} \mathrm{eV}, \theta \approx 45^{\circ}
$$

Tank signal in units of the signal of a vertical muon



## Other types of Auger events



## Other types of Auger events



Event 200716104390 (11.6.2007)

## Other types of Auger events



Event 200716104

## Other types of Auger events



Event 3618809 (25 June 2007): 59 stations,

## Golden hybrid events: many cross checks possible



Event 200716104390 (11.6.2007)

Independent profile reconstuctions


Cosmic Ray Flux

## Energy calibration of surface detector




Fluorescence detector energy

$E_{\text {prim }}=f_{\text {corr }} \cdot \int \frac{\mathrm{d} E_{\text {ion }}}{\mathrm{dX}} \mathrm{d} X$
(Fluorescence yield uncertainty)

## Systematic uncertainties of energy assignment

## $\mathrm{f}=$ Etot/Eem


(T. Pierog et al., ICRC 2007)

| fluorescence yield | $14 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| telescope <br> calibration | $10 \%$ |
| reconstruction | $10 \%$ |
| aerosols | $5 \%$ |
| humidity | $5 \%$ |
| overall | $22 \%$ |

## Auger surface detector energy spectrum



Data: I Jan 2004-28 Feb 2007, $5165 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ sr yr

## Auger surface detector energy spectrum



Data: I Jan 2004-28 Feb 2007, $5165 \mathrm{~km}^{2}$ sr yr

## Update: spectrum published in PRL 2008



Phys. Rev. Lett. IOI (2008) 06IIOI

Equivalent c.m. energy $\sqrt{\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{pp}}} \quad(\mathrm{GeV})$


Elemental Composition, Photons, Neutrinos

## Composition: measurement of longitudinal profile





Field of view bias


## Composition: mean depth of shower maximum


(Note: not consistent with muon data and current interaction models)

## Composition: mean depth of shower maximum
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## Composition: mean depth of shower maximum


(Note: not consistent with muon data and current interaction models)

## Limit on fraction of photons in UHECR flux

Many exotic source scenarios excluded

Auger, 95\% c.l.
Integral photon flux limit


Data: I Jan 2004-3I Dec 2006

## Neutrino-induced shower sensitivity



## Neutrino-induced shower sensitivity



## Neutrino flux limit at ultra-high energy

## Auger 2007:

Horizontal showers with surface detector (PRL IO0 (2008) 21 I IOI)


Arrival direction distribution

## Galactic center point source search

Significance plots


Dark red: more events than expected Light red: fewer events than expected

## Auger, ICRC 2007

No confirmation of previous indications for excess from GC region

AGASA: would have $16 \sigma$ SUGAR: would have 306 in Auger

$$
10^{17}<\mathrm{E}<10^{18} \mathrm{eV}
$$

## Possible correlation with nearby objects ?

- $12^{\text {th }}$ Veron-Cetty \& Veron catalogue of AGN
- Data set: Jan $I^{\text {st }}, 2004$ to May $27^{\text {th }}, 2006$, well-contained events
- Scan over angular distance, maximum redshift, energy threshold


Minimum: I2 out of 15 correlated with nearby AGNs (3.2 expected)

$$
\Delta \alpha=3.1^{\circ}, E_{\min }=5.6 \times 10^{19} \mathrm{eV}, z_{\max }=0.018(75 \mathrm{Mpc})
$$

Uncorrected chance probability: $P \sim 2 \times 10^{-6}$
Correction for trials needed!

## Auger analysis: running prescription

Standard prescription: pre-define

- number of events or period of time
- data selection criteria and correlation parameters
- nominal chance probability threshold for publishing a claim
- perform test once if event number reached

Running prescription: test prescription for each new event (penalty factor for many tests has to be included)


|  |  | Threshold |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N$ | $k_{\min }$ | (percent) |
| 4 | 4 | 0.19 |
| 6 | 5 | 0.32 |
| 8 | 6 | 0.40 |
| 10 | 7 | 0.44 |
| 12 | 8 | 0.47 |
| 13 | 8 | 0.55 |
| 15 | 9 | 0.58 |
| 16 | 9 | 0.67 |
| 18 | 10 | 0.70 |
| 20 | 11 | 0.71 |
| 21 | 11 | 0.75 |
| 23 | 12 | 0.77 |
| 24 | 12 | 0.81 |
| 26 | 13 | 0.82 |
| 27 | 13 | 0.86 |
| 29 | 14 | 0.87 |
| 30 | 14 | 0.91 |
| 31 | 14 | 0.99 |
| 33 | 15 | 1.00 |
| 34 | 15 | 1.05 |

May 27, 2006

Scierce

## Anisotropy of utra-high energy cosmic rays



Auger: 27 events above $5.710^{19} \mathrm{eV}$, 20 correlated within $3.1^{\circ}$
Scan-corrected probability $\sim 10^{-5}$

## Exposure of southern Auger Observatory

Hammer-Aitoff projection, Equatorial coordinates

uncorrelated events (7)
supergalactic plane

## Exposure of southern Auger Observatory
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## Exposure of southern Auger Observatory

Hammer-Aitoff projection, Equatorial coordinates


## Astrophysical Interpretation

## Comparison with GZK suppression models



## Pure proton model

(Berezinsky et al.)

Mixed composition model (Allard et al., Hillas)


## Particle physics with air showers

(a) Correlation with sources allow identification of particles
(b) Propagation leads to either light or heavy composition



## Comparison of composition and flux features

Deviation from $E^{-2.6}$ flux

Mean mass number
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## Comparison of composition and flux features
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Mean mass number


## GZK suppression and anisotropy

GZK horizon: energy-source relation

(Bergmann et al., PLB 2006)

Extragalactic magnetic field deflection


Redshift Lum.Distance
$0.004 \quad 16 \mathrm{Mpc}$
$0.01 \quad 40 \mathrm{Mpc}$
$0.05 \quad 200 \mathrm{Mpc}$
$0.1 \quad 415 \mathrm{Mpc}$

New Puzzles

## Could it be that AGNs are indeed the sources?

Assumption: all AGNs of the VC catalogue have same injection power
Expectation: ~6 events from Virgo cluster, none observed (excluded at 99\% level for complete distribution)
(Gorbunov et al., arXiv:07I I. 4060 [astro-ph])

## Possible interpretations:

- AGNs have different injection power (predicted by Biermann, Falcke et al.)
- Sub-class of AGNs are sources
- AGNs are not sources, sources are distributed similar to AGNs
- Anisotropy of distribution independent of source catalogue
- AGNs correlated with UHECRs are standard Seyfert galaxies, not very powerful


## Why does HiRes not see a signal?



Blue: not correlated
Red: correlated
(HiRes Collab., astro-ph/0804.0382)



## Does the correlation imply protons as UHECRs?

Deflection of protons if only regular field of spiral is used


1000 events with isotropic arrival distribution


Directions of 27 Auger events

## Latest (preliminary) HiRes stereo data

HiRes: different method to determine Xmax from shower profiles,

Absolute numbers not comparable, relation to model predictions comparable



Auger: sys. uncertainty $\sim 15 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$

## Only three sources and mid-mass primaries?



Wibig \& Wolfendale, astro-ph/07/2.3403

| Source | Distance (Mpc) | Galaxy | IGM | Total | Median displacement observed | $Z$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CEN-A | 5 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 10 | 7.7 |
| Source B | 20 | 0.46 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 6 | 2.7 |
| Source C | 33 | 0.48 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 10 | 3.6 |

But: no detailed simulation yet available

## Comparison of longitudinal and lateral distributions

## Auger data:

Event ID 2222701
$\theta=48^{\circ}, \mathrm{E}=\mathrm{I} .1 \times 10^{19} \mathrm{eV}$

## Simulation:

CORSIKA, QGSJET II, proton primary


Systematic difference of lateral distributions found:
(a) Energy calibration problem?
(b) Muon deficit in simulation?

## Systematic study of differences: muon excess?

Fluorescence detector
energy scale uncertainty


## Change hadronic interaction models ?


(R. Ulrich et al., ISVHECRI 2008)

## Change hadronic interaction models?



## Conclusions and outlook

## Excellent performance Southern Pierre Auger Observatory

First physics results

- Primary cosmic ray flux: suppression, most likely GZK effect
- Composition:
- hadronic mixed (<A effi $>\sim 4$... I0), correlated with flux
- low limits on photon fraction (~2\% @ 95\% c.l.)
- Ultra-high energy cosmic rays are not isotropically distributed
- Not yet consistent picture


## Outlook:

- More statistics to come
- Enhancements of Southern Observatory to extend range to lower energy
- Design studies and R\&D for Northern Observatory


## Detector location and layout



## Surface detectors and trigger thresholds

- Water-Cherenkov tanks with one PMT only
- Use of existing I mi grid of roads
- Tank-to-tank commuication
full array
infill array (2000 km ${ }^{2}$ )




## Infill array of water Cherenkov detectors



Simulated acceptance

$433 \mathrm{~m} \quad 750 \mathrm{~m} \quad 1500 \mathrm{~m}$

Threshold for infill array $\sim 10^{17} \mathrm{eV}$

## AMIGA:Auger Muons and Infill for the Ground Array



## HEAT: High Elevation Auger Telescopes



- 3 "'standard" Auger telescopes tilted to cover 30-60 elevation
- Custom-made metal enclosures
- Also prototype study for northern Auger Observatory






