Reply to "Comment on 'Clustering of ultrahigh energy cosmic rays and their sources' "

N. W. Evans,[1] F. Ferrer,[2] and S. Sarkar[2]
[1]*Institute of Astronomy, University of Cambridge, Madingley Road, Cambridge CB3 OHA, United Kingdom*
[2]*Theoretical Physics, University of Oxford, 1 Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3NP, United Kingdom*
(Received 2 March 2004; published 30 June 2004)

We reiterate that there is no evidence that BL Lacs are sources of ultrahigh energy cosmic rays.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.69.128302 PACS number(s): 98.70.Sa

Tinyakov and Tkachev (TT) [1] have claimed that "BL Lacertae are sources of the observed ultrahigh energy cosmic rays" (UHECRs). They considered a set of 39 UHECRs with $E>4.8\times10^{19}$ eV observed by the Akeno Giant Air Shower Array (AGASA) and 26 UHECRs with $E>2.4\times10^{19}$ eV observed by Yakutsk, and compared their arrival directions with the positions of 22 BL Lacs selected by redshift ($z>0.1$ or unknown), apparent magnitude ($m<18$), and 6 cm radio flux ($F_6>0.17$ J y). Eight UHECRs were found to be within 2.5° of 5 BL Lacs, the chance probability of which was estimated to be 6×10^{-5} including all penalties for the arbitrary cuts made [1]. We have shown [2] that the significance of the coincidences has been greatly exaggerated. In the preceding Comment [3] TT assert that our criticism is incorrect. We argue below that this is not the case and provide further evidence in support of our position.

Our first criticism was that TT did not take into account the (energy dependent) angular resolution of the experiments. Although the positions of the BL Lacs are known to arcsecond accuracy, the arrival directions of UHECRs in air shower arrays cannot be reconstructed to better than a few degrees. In particular, for simulated events in AGASA, 68% have a reconstructed arrival direction within 1.8° of the true direction and 90% within 3°; the corresponding angles for all events above 10^{19} eV are 2.8° and 4.6° [4]. TT require, without providing specific justification, that the UHECR arrival direction be within 2.5° of a BL Lac in order to be considered a coincidence. This may appear to be a reasonable approximation for the AGASA data. When it comes to the Yakutsk data, however, the angular resolution is far worse for the lower energy events considered; in particular it exceeds 4° for $E<4\times10^{19}$ eV [5,6]. Nevertheless, the most significant correlation listed by TT is that of a "triplet" of UHECRs in the Yakutsk data having energies of $(3.4,2.8,2.5)\times10^{19}$ eV whose nominal arrival directions are within 2.5° of a BL Lac (1E 0806+524). In their Comment [3], TT assert: "By itself, worse angular resolution does not imply that correlations with sources must be absent in the Yakutsk set: even though the angular resolution is worse, the density of UHECR events around actual sources is larger as compared to a random set, and one has an excess in counts even at small angles." If this were indeed the case, then one would reasonably expect UHECRs observed by other experiments (with better angular resolution) to be (even better) aligned with the BL Lacs in question. In fact there are *no* such coincidences with any of the 39 AGASA events they considered. Therefore we reassert that there is no justification for ascribing any significance to coincidences between Yakutsk events and BL Lacs within 2.5°.

To demonstrate this quantitatively we have calculated the autocorrelation functions of the selected AGASA and Yakutsk events [8], as well as their cross correlation with the 22 selected BL Lacs [1], taking the angular resolution of the experiments into account. For each observed UHECR, a new arrival direction is generated from the distribution defined by the quoted experimental angular resolution at that energy, as has been done, e.g., for the BATSE data [7]. We generate 10^6 such data sets, for comparison with the data sets generated from an isotropic distribution. As seen in Fig. 1, this has a dramatic effect on the significance of the claimed clustering. We find the chance probability for an isotropic distribution to yield as many events (with $E>4.8\times10^{19}$ eV) as was observed by AGASA in the first (2.5°) angular bin to be 1.8×10^{-4}. Similarly, the chance probability for an isotropic distribution to yield as many events (with $E>2.4\times10^{19}$ eV) as was observed by Yakutsk in the first (4°) angular bin is 6.5×10^{-4}. Both these numbers agree with TT's estimates in Table 1 of Ref. [8], allowing for their "penalty factor" of ~3. However, when we take the angular smearing into account, these chance probabilities increase to 3.5% for AGASA and 18% for Yakutsk. Thus there is little basis for the claim that the "correlation function of ultrahigh energy cosmic rays favours point sources" [8]. The significance of the clustering in the AGASA data has also been questioned recently by other authors [9]; however, they did not take the limited angular resolution of AGASA into account.

Concerning the cross correlation with the 22 BL Lacs selected by TT, the probability for an isotropic distribution of UHECRs to yield as many coincidences between the AGASA events and these BL Lacs as is actually observed is only 1.5×10^{-3}, but this chance probability increases to 4% when the angular smearing is taken into account. For the Yakutsk data, the chance probability is 8×10^{-2} without the angular smearing, but as high as 38% when this is included. Thus, as shown in Fig. 2, there is *no* justification for TT's inclusion of the Yakutsk data; they do so simply because when the AGASA and Yakutsk data sets are combined, new clusters appear combining events from both data sets, thus artificially enhancing the significance of the coincidences.

Our second criticism was directed at TT's assumption that " . . . the energies of the events are not important for corre-



FIG. 1. Autocorrelation for AGASA and Yakutsk.

lations at small angles . . . " [1]. We demonstrated [2] that by lowering the energy cut on the AGASA data from 4.6×10^{19} eV to 4×10^{19} eV, the significance of the coincidences in fact *decreases* by a factor of 5.



FIG. 2. Cross correlation with selected BL Lacs for AGASA and Yakutsk.

In closing we would like to draw attention to other recent papers that have a bearing on this issue. Using an independent sample of 33 UHECRs observed by Volcano Ranch and Haverah Park, *no* coincidences are found between their arrival directions and the 22 BL Lacs selected by TT [1]; the probability that this null result arises as a fluctuation from the strongly correlated case is less than 5% [10]. Second, an independent analysis of the AGASA events finds *no* statistically significant correlations with BL Lacs [11].

[1] P.G. Tinyakov and I.I. Tkachev, Pisma Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz. **74**, 499 (2001) [JETP Lett. **74**, 445 (2001)].
[2] N.W. Evans, F. Ferrer, and S. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 103005 (2003).
[3] P.G. Tinyakov and I.I. Tkachev, preceding Comment, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 128301 (2004).
[4] M. Takeda *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **522**, 225 (1999).
[5] "Catalogue of Highest Energy Cosmic Rays," No. 3 Yakutsk, World Data Center C2 for Cosmic Rays, Institute for Physical and Chemical Research, Wako, Saitama, 1988.
[6] Y. Uchihori, M. Nagano, M. Takeda, M. Teshima, J. Lloyd-Evans, and A.A. Watson, Astropart. Phys. **13**, 151 (2000).
[7] M.S. Briggs *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **450**, 40 (1996).
[8] P.G. Tinyakov and I.I. Tkachev, Pisma Zh. Éksp. Teor. Fiz. **74**, 3 (2001) [JETP Lett. **74**, 1 (2001).
[9] C.B. Finley and S. Westerhoff, Astropart. Phys. **21**, 359 (2004).
[10] D.F. Torres, S. Reucroft, O. Reimer, and L.A. Anchordoqui, Astrophys. J. Lett. **595**, L13 (2003).
[11] W.S. Burgett and M.R. O'Malley, astro-ph/0312190.