Precision Measurement of Cosmic-Ray Antiproton Spectrum

S. Orito,[1] T. Maeno,[1] H. Matsunaga,[1] K. Abe,[1] K. Anraku,[1] Y. Asaoka,[1] M. Fujikawa,[1] M. Imori,[1] M. Ishino,[7] Y. Makida,[2] N. Matsui,[1] H. Matsumoto,[3] J. Mitchell,[4] T. Mitsui,[3] A. Moiseev,[4] M. Motoki,[1] J. Nishimura,[1] M. Nozaki,[3] J. Ormes,[4] T. Saeki,[1] T. Sanuki,[1] M. Sasaki,[3] E. S. Seo,[5] Y. Shikaze,[1] T. Sonoda,[1] R. Streitmatter,[4] J. Suzuki,[2] K. Tanaka,[2] I. Ueda,[1] N. Yajima,[6] T. Yamagami,[6] A. Yamamoto,[2] T. Yoshida,[2] and K. Yoshimura[1]

[1]University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan
[2]High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0801, Japan
[3]Kobe University, Kobe, Hyogo 657-8501, Japan
[4]National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland 20771
[5]University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742
[6]The Institute of Space and Astronautical Science (ISAS), Sagamihara, Kanagawa 229-8510, Japan
[7]Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

The energy spectrum of cosmic-ray antiprotons ($\bar{p}$'s) has been measured in the range 0.18–3.56 GeV, based on 458 $\bar{p}$'s collected by BESS in a recent solar-minimum period. We have detected for the first time a characteristic peak at 2 GeV of $\bar{p}$'s originating from cosmic-ray interactions with the interstellar gas. The peak spectrum is reproduced by theoretical calculations, implying that the propagation models are basically correct and that different cosmic-ray species undergo a universal propagation. Future BESS data with still higher statistics will allow us to study the solar modulation and the propagation in detail and to search for primary $\bar{p}$ components.

PACS numbers: 98.70.Sa, 96.40.De

The origin of cosmic-ray antiprotons ($\bar{p}$'s) has attracted much attention since their observation was first reported by Golden *et al.* [1]. Cosmic-ray $\bar{p}$'s should certainly be produced by the interaction of galactic high-energy cosmic rays with the interstellar medium. The energy spectrum of these "secondary" $\bar{p}$'s is expected to show a characteristic peak around 2 GeV, with sharp decreases of the flux below and above the peak, a generic feature which reflects the kinematics of $\bar{p}$ production. The secondary $\bar{p}$'s offer a unique probe [2] of cosmic-ray propagation and of solar modulation. As other possible sources of cosmic-ray $\bar{p}$'s, one can conceive novel processes, such as annihilation of neutralino dark matter or evaporation of primordial black holes [3]. The $\bar{p}$'s from these "primary" sources, if they exist, are expected to be prominent at low energies [4] and to exhibit large solar modulations [5]. Thus, they are distinguishable in principle from the secondary $\bar{p}$ component.

The detection of the secondary peak and the search for a possible low-energy primary $\bar{p}$ component have been difficult to achieve because of huge backgrounds and the extremely small flux especially at low energies. The first [1] and subsequent [6] evidences for cosmic-ray $\bar{p}$'s were reported at relatively high energies, where it was not possible to positively identify the $\bar{p}$'s with a mass measurement. The first "mass-identified" and thus unambiguous detection of cosmic-ray $\bar{p}$'s was performed by BESS 1993 [7] in the low-energy region (4 events at 0.3–0.5 GeV), which was followed by IMAX [8] and CAPRICE [9] detections. The BESS 1995 measured the spectrum [10] at solar minimum, based on 43 $\bar{p}$'s over the range 0.18–1.4 GeV. We report here a new high-statistics measurement of the $\bar{p}$ spectrum based on 458 events in the energy range from 0.18–3.56 GeV.

Figure 1 shows a schematic view of BESS. It was designed [11] and constructed as a high-resolution spectrometer to perform searches for rare cosmic rays as well as to make various precision measurements. A uniform field of 1 T is produced by a thin (4 g/cm^2) superconducting coil [12], through which particles can pass without too many interactions. The magnetic-field region is filled with the tracking volume. This geometry results in an acceptance of 0.3 m^2 sr, which is an order of magnitude larger than those of previous cosmic-ray spectrometers. The tracking is performed by fitting up to 28 hit points in the drift chambers, resulting in a magnetic-rigidity (R) resolution of 0.5% at 1 GV/c. The upper and lower scintillator hodoscopes provide two dE/dx measurements and the time-of-flight of particles. The dE/dx

FIG. 1. Cross-sectional view of the BESS spectrometer in its 1997 configuration. Overlayed is one of the $\bar{p}$ events.

    0031-9007/00/84(6)/1078(4)$15.00

in the drift chamber gas is obtained as a truncated mean of the integrated charges of the hit pulses. For the 1997 flight, the hodoscopes were placed at the outermost radii, and the timing resolution of each counter was improved to 50 psec rms, resulting in β^{-1} resolution of 0.008, where β is defined as particle velocity [13] divided by the speed of light. Furthermore, a Cherenkov counter with a silica-aerogel ($n = 1.032$) radiator was newly installed [14], in order to veto e^-/μ^- backgrounds which gave large Cherenkov light outputs corresponding to 14.7 mean photoelectrons when crossing the aerogel.

The 1997 BESS balloon flight was carried out on July 27, from Lynn Lake, Canada. The scientific data were taken for 57 032 sec of live time at altitudes ranging from 38–35 km (an average residual air of 5.3 g/cm^2) and cut-off rigidity ranging from 0.3–0.5 GV/c. The first-level trigger was provided by a coincidence between the top and the bottom scintillators, with the threshold set at $1/3$ of the pulse height from minimum ionizing particles. The second-level trigger, which utilized the hit patterns of the hodoscopes and the inner drift chambers, first rejected unambiguous null and multitrack events and made a rough rigidity determination to select negatively charged particles predominantly. In addition, one of every 60 first-level triggers was recorded, in order to build a sample of unbiased triggers.

The off-line analysis [10] selects events with a single track fully contained in the fiducial region of the tracking volume with acceptable track qualities [10]. The three dE/dx measurements are loosely required as a function of R to be compatible with proton or $\bar{p}$. The combined efficiency of these off-line selections is 83%–88% for R from 0.5–4 GV/c. These simple and highly efficient selections are sufficient for a very clean detection of $\bar{p}$'s in the low-velocity ($\beta < 0.9$) region. At higher velocities, the e^-/μ^- background starts to contaminate the $\bar{p}$ band, where we require the Cherenkov veto, i.e., (1) the particle trajectory to cross the fiducial volume of the aerogel, and (2) the Cherenkov output to be less than 0.09 of the mean output from e^-. This cut reduces the acceptance by 20%, but rejects e^-/μ^- backgrounds by a factor of 6000, while keeping 93% efficiency for protons and $\bar{p}$'s which cross the aerogel with rigidity below the threshold (3.8 GV/c). Figure 2 shows the β^{-1} versus R plot for the surviving events. We see a clean narrow band of 415 $\bar{p}$'s at the exact mirror position of the protons. The $\bar{p}$ sample is thus mass identified and essentially background-free, as the neatness of the band demonstrates and various background studies show. In particular, backgrounds of albedo and of mismeasured positive-rigidity particles are totally excluded by the excellent β^{-1} and R^{-1} resolutions. To check against the "reentrant albedo" background, we confirmed that the trajectories of all $\bar{p}$'s can be traced numerically through the Earth's geomagnetic field back to the outside of the geomagnetic sphere.

FIG. 2. The identification of $\bar{p}$ events. The solid lines define the $\bar{p}$ mass band used for the spectrum measurement.

We obtain the $\bar{p}$ fluxes at the top of the atmosphere (TOA) in the following way: The geometrical acceptance of the spectrometer is calculated both analytically and by the Monte Carlo method. The live data-taking time was directly measured in two independent ways by means of scaler systems gated by the "ready" gate which controls the first-level trigger. The efficiencies of the second-level trigger and of the off-line selections are determined by using the unbiased trigger samples. The TOA energy of each event is calculated by tracing the particle back through the detector material and the air. The interaction loss of the $\bar{p}$'s is evaluated by applying the same selections to the Monte Carlo events generated by GEANT/GHEISHA, which incorporates [15] detailed material distribution and correct $\bar{p}$-nuclei cross sections. We subtract the expected number [16] of atmospheric $\bar{p}$'s, produced by the collisions of cosmic rays in the air. The subtraction amounts to $(9 \pm 2)\%$, $(15 \pm 3)\%$, and $(19 \pm 5)\%$, at 0.25, 0.7, and 2 GeV, respectively, where the errors correspond to the maximum difference among three recent calculations [16–18] which agree with each other.

Table I contains the resultant BESS 1997 $\bar{p}$ fluxes at TOA. The first and the second errors represent the statistical [19] and systematic errors, respectively. We checked that the central values of the fluxes are stable against various trial changes of the selection criteria, including uniform application of the Cherenkov veto to the low β region. The dominant systematic errors at high and low energies, respectively, are uncertainties in the atmospheric

TABLE I.   Antiproton fluxes (in 10^{-2} m^{-2} s^{-1} sr^{-1} GeV^{-1}) and $\bar{p}/p$ ratios (in 10^{-5}) at TOA. T (in GeV) defines the kinetic energy bins. $N_{\bar{p}}$ and $\overline{T}_{\bar{p}}$ are the number of observed antiprotons and their mean kinetic energy in each bin, respectively. The eighth bin of BESS 1995 flux actually covers from 1.28–1.40 GeV.

	BESS 1997				BESS 1995			BESS 1997 + 1995		
T (GeV)	$N_{\bar{p}}$	$\overline{T}_{\bar{p}}$	$\bar{p}$ flux	$\bar{p}/p$ ratio	$N_{\bar{p}}$	$\overline{T}_{\bar{p}}$	$\bar{p}$ flux	$\overline{T}_{\bar{p}}$	$\bar{p}$ flux	$\bar{p}/p$ ratio
0.18–0.28	4	0.21	$0.74^{+0.58+0.12}_{-0.34-0.12}$	$0.44^{+0.34+0.08}_{-0.20-0.08}$	3	0.24	$1.75^{+1.41+0.37}_{-1.13-0.37}$	0.22	$1.00^{+0.51+0.18}_{-0.42-0.18}$	$0.51^{+0.31+0.08}_{-0.19-0.08}$
0.28–0.40	9	0.35	$1.05^{+0.51+0.12}_{-0.36-0.12}$	$0.52^{+0.25+0.08}_{-0.18-0.08}$	3	0.34	$1.00^{+0.86+0.14}_{-0.66-0.14}$	0.35	$1.04^{+0.43+0.12}_{-0.31-0.12}$	$0.52^{+0.22+0.06}_{-0.16-0.06}$
0.40–0.56	16	0.49	$1.23^{+0.45+0.13}_{-0.34-0.13}$	$0.67^{+0.24+0.10}_{-0.18-0.10}$	6	0.49	$1.40^{+0.87+0.17}_{-0.58-0.17}$	0.49	$1.27^{+0.37+0.14}_{-0.32-0.14}$	$0.70^{+0.22+0.08}_{-0.16-0.08}$
0.56–0.78	31	0.66	$1.63^{+0.41+0.16}_{-0.37-0.16}$	$1.01^{+0.26+0.14}_{-0.23-0.14}$	8	0.67	$1.29^{+0.66+0.14}_{-0.54-0.14}$	0.66	$1.54^{+0.33+0.16}_{-0.30-0.14}$	$0.97^{+0.22+0.10}_{-0.19-0.10}$
0.78–0.92	19	0.85	$1.41^{+0.48+0.14}_{-0.42-0.14}$	$1.11^{+0.38+0.16}_{-0.33-0.16}$	6	0.83	$1.57^{+1.07+0.17}_{-0.71-0.17}$	0.85	$1.44^{+0.44+0.15}_{-0.36-0.15}$	$1.15^{+0.35+0.12}_{-0.29-0.12}$
0.92–1.08	16	1.01	$0.83^{+0.42+0.10}_{-0.32-0.10}$	$0.78^{+0.39+0.12}_{-0.30-0.12}$	5	0.99	$1.05^{+0.84+0.12}_{-0.65-0.12}$	1.01	$0.87^{+0.36+0.10}_{-0.32-0.10}$	$0.82^{+0.35+0.09}_{-0.27-0.09}$
1.08–1.28	32	1.19	$1.68^{+0.46+0.15}_{-0.41-0.15}$	$1.86^{+0.50+0.25}_{-0.46-0.25}$	7	1.18	$1.60^{+0.99+0.16}_{-0.82-0.16}$	1.19	$1.65^{+0.40+0.15}_{-0.36-0.15}$	$1.85^{+0.46+0.18}_{-0.41-0.18}$
1.28–1.52	43	1.40	$2.18^{+0.49+0.19}_{-0.44-0.19}$	$2.89^{+0.65+0.38}_{-0.59-0.38}$	5	1.33	$1.87^{+1.35+0.18}_{-1.08-0.18}$	1.39	$2.13^{+0.43+0.19}_{-0.39-0.18}$	$2.82^{+0.61+0.25}_{-0.54-0.25}$
1.52–1.80	51	1.65	$2.45^{+0.48+0.24}_{-0.44-0.24}$	$4.22^{+0.83+0.59}_{-0.76-0.59}$	...	...	...	1.65	$2.45^{+0.48+0.24}_{-0.44-0.24}$	$4.22^{+0.83+0.59}_{-0.76-0.59}$
1.80–2.12	51	1.96	$2.27^{+0.45+0.24}_{-0.42-0.24}$	$4.90^{+0.98+0.71}_{-0.90-0.71}$	...	...	...	1.96	$2.27^{+0.45+0.24}_{-0.42-0.24}$	$4.90^{+0.98+0.71}_{-0.90-0.71}$
2.12–2.52	64	2.31	$2.40^{+0.42+0.21}_{-0.37-0.21}$	$6.74^{+1.19+0.89}_{-1.03-0.89}$	...	...	...	2.31	$2.40^{+0.42+0.21}_{-0.37-0.21}$	$6.74^{+1.19+0.89}_{-1.03-0.89}$
2.52–3.00	56	2.72	$2.02^{+0.40+0.18}_{-0.35-0.18}$	$6.89^{+1.36+0.92}_{-1.19-0.92}$	...	...	...	2.72	$2.02^{+0.40+0.18}_{-0.35-0.18}$	$6.89^{+1.36+0.92}_{-1.19-0.92}$
3.00–3.56	23	3.25	$1.65^{+0.56+0.20}_{-0.44-0.20}$	$7.63^{+2.59+1.19}_{-2.04-1.19}$	...	...	...	3.25	$1.65^{+0.56+0.20}_{-0.44-0.20}$	$7.63^{+2.59+1.19}_{-2.04-1.19}$

$\bar{p}$ calculations and in the $\bar{p}$ interaction losses to which we attribute $\pm 15\%$ relative error. As shown in Table I, the BESS 1997 fluxes are consistent with the 1995 fluxes in the overlapping low-energy range (0.2–1.4 GeV). The solar activities at the time of the two flights were both close to the minimum as shown by world neutron monitors. Variation in the $\bar{p}$ flux during the solar minimum period is expected to be very small [20].

FIG. 3. BESS 1995 + 1997 (solar minimum) antiproton fluxes at the top of the atmosphere together with previous data. The error bars represent the quadratic sums of the statistical and systematic errors. The curves are recent calculations of the secondary $\bar{p}$ spectra for the solar minimum period.

Shown in Fig. 3 is the combined BESS (1995 + 1997) spectrum, in which we detect for the first time a characteristic peak at 2 GeV of secondary $\bar{p}$, which clearly is the dominant component of the cosmic-ray $\bar{p}$'s.

The measured secondary $\bar{p}$ spectrum provides crucial tests of models of propagation and solar modulation since one has *a priori* knowledge of the input source spectrum for the secondary $\bar{p}$, which can be calculated by combining the measured proton and helium spectra with the accelerator data on the $\bar{p}$ production. The distinct peak structure of the $\bar{p}$ spectrum also has clear advantages in these tests over the monotonic (and unknown) source spectra of other cosmic rays.

Also shown in Fig. 3 are recent theoretical curves for the secondary $\bar{p}$ at the solar minimum (solar modulation parameter $\phi = 370{-}550$ MV, or current sheet tilt angle $= 10°$ and positive solar polarity) calculated in the diffusion model [21,22] and the leaky box model [23,24], in which the propagation parameters (diffusion coefficient or escape length) are deduced by fitting various data on cosmic-ray nuclei, such as the boron/carbon ratio, under the assumption that the different cosmic-ray species (nuclei, proton, and $\bar{p}$) undergo a universal propagation process. All these calculations use as essential inputs recently measured proton spectra [27–29], which are significantly (by a factor of 1.4–1.6) lower than previous data [30] in the energy range (10–50 GeV) relevant to the $\bar{p}$ production.

These calculations reproduce our spectrum at the peak region remarkably well within their $\pm 15\%$ estimated accuracy [24]. This implies that the propagation models are basically correct and that different cosmic-ray species undergo a universal propagation process.

At low energies, the calculations predict somewhat diverse spectra reflecting various uncertainties, which presently make it difficult to draw any conclusion on

FIG. 4.   BESS 1995 + 1997 $\bar{p}/p$ ratios with previous data [9].

possible admixture of primary $\bar{p}$ component. As noted in Ref. [5], the rapid increase of solar activity toward the year 2001 will drastically suppress the primary $\bar{p}$ component, such as from the primordial black holes [3], while changing the shape of the secondary $\bar{p}$ only modestly [23]. This will help us to separate out the primary and secondary components at low energies in the future.

Since most of the previous data were presented in the form of $\bar{p}/p$ flux ratios [9], our flux ratios are compared with those previous in Fig. 4. The lowest energy point of our data might suffer some uncertainties due to large subtraction of atmospheric secondary protons, which is significant in the low-energy region [29].

[1] R. L. Golden et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1196 (1979).
[2] T. K. Gaisser et al., Astrophys. J. 394, 174 (1992).
[3] S. W. Hawking, Commun. Math. Phys. 43, 199 (1975).
[4] K. Maki et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3474 (1996).
[5] T. Mitsui et al., Phys. Lett. B 389, 169 (1996).
[6] E. A. Bogomolov et al., in Proceedings of the 16th International Cosmic Ray Conference, Kyoto, 1979 (University of Tokyo, Tokyo, 1979), p. 330.
[7] K. Yoshimura et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3792 (1995); A. Moiseev et al., Astrophys. J. 474, 479 (1997).
[8] J. W. Mitchell et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3057 (1996).
[9] M. Boezio et al., Astrophys. J. 487, 415 (1997), and references therein.
[10] H. Matsunaga et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 4052 (1998).
[11] S. Orito, in Proceedings of the ASTROMAG Workshop, 1987, KEK (KEK Report No. 87-19, 1987), p. 111.
[12] A. Yamamoto et al., IEEE Trans. Magn. 24, 1421 (1988).
[13] β is defined to be positive for down-going particles.
[14] Y. Asaoka et al., Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A 416, 236 (1998).
[15] H. Matsunaga, Ph.D. thesis, University of Tokyo, 1997.
[16] T. Mitsui, Ph.D. thesis, University of Tokyo, 1996.
[17] Ch. Pfeifer et al., Phys. Rev. C 54, 882 (1996).
[18] S. A. Stephens, Astropart. Phys. 6, 229 (1997).
[19] G. J. Feldman et al., Phys. Rev. D 57, 3873 (1998).
[20] A. W. Labrador et al., Astrophys. J. 480, 371 (1997).
[21] A. Bottino et al., Phys. Rev. D 58, 123503 (1998).
[22] L. Bergström et al., astro-ph/9902012.
[23] J. W. Bieber et al., astro-ph/9903163.
[24] T. Mitsui et al. (to be published). The $\bar{p}$ spectra were calculated in the leaky box model. For the tertiary interaction of $\bar{p}$, a model which fit data was used instead of flat energy distribution of the emerging $\bar{p}$. Examples of the escape length (λ) were used, including a β dependent $\lambda(R, \beta)$ obtained in Ref. [25], and $\lambda(R)$ dependent on R. The spectra were solar modulated by following Fisk [26].
[25] S. A. Stephens et al., Astrophys. J. 505, 266 (1998).
[26] L. A. Fisk et al., J. Geophys. Res. 76, 221 (1971).
[27] W. Menn et al., in Proceedings of the 25th International Cosmic Ray Conference, Durban, 1997 (Potchefstroom University, South Africa, 1997), p. 409.
[28] M. Boezio et al., Astrophys. J. 518, 457 (1999).
[29] T. Sanuki et al., New Era in Neutrino Physics (Universal Academy Press, Tokyo, 1998) pp. 123–137.
[30] W. R. Webber et al., in Proceedings of the 20th International Cosmic Ray Conference, Moscow, 1987 (Nauka, Moscow, 1987), p. 325.