

Constraints on Cosmic Neutrino Fluxes from the Antarctic Impulsive Transient Antenna Experiment

S. W. Barwick,¹ J. J. Beatty,² D. Z. Besson,³ W. R. Binns,⁴ B. Cai,⁵ J. M. Clem,⁶ A. Connolly,⁷ D. F. Cowen,⁸ P. F. Dowkontt,⁴ M. A. DuVernois,⁵ P. A. Evenson,⁶ D. Goldstein,¹ P. W. Gorham,⁹ C. L. Hebert,⁹ M. H. Israel,⁴ J. G. Learned,⁹ K. M. Liewer,¹⁰ J. T. Link,⁹ S. Matsuno,⁹ P. Miočinić,⁹ J. Nam,¹ C. J. Naudet,¹⁰ R. Nichol,² K. Palladino,² M. Rosen,⁹ D. Saltzberg,⁷ D. Seckel,⁶ A. Silvestri,¹ B. T. Stokes,⁹ G. S. Varner,⁹ and F. Wu¹

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California at Irvine, Irvine, California, USA*

²*Department of Physics, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas, USA*

⁴*Department of Physics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, Missouri, USA*

⁵*School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA*

⁶*Bartol Research Institute, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware, USA*

⁷*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California, USA*

⁸*Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania, USA*

⁹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*

¹⁰*Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, USA*

(Received 9 December 2005; published 4 May 2006)

We report new limits on cosmic neutrino fluxes from the test flight of the Antarctic Impulsive Transient Antenna (ANITA) experiment, which completed an 18.4 day flight of a prototype long-duration balloon payload, called ANITA-lite, in early 2004. We search for impulsive events that could be associated with ultrahigh energy neutrino interactions in the ice and derive limits that constrain several models for ultrahigh energy neutrino fluxes and rule out the long-standing Z-burst model.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.171101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.96.171101)

PACS numbers: 98.70.Sa, 95.55.Vj

Cosmic rays of energy above 3×10^{19} eV are almost certain to be of extragalactic origin. At this energy, however, pion photoproduction losses on the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR) via the Greisen-Zatsepin-Kuzmin (GZK) [1] process limit their propagation distances to the local supercluster, of order 40 Mpc or less. Fortunately, the neutrinos that result from this process [2] are observable out to the edge of the visible Universe. Recent studies make compelling arguments that input from neutrino observations will be necessary to resolve the ultrahigh energy cosmic-ray (UHECR) problem [3]. Neutrinos are coupled to the highest energy cosmic rays both as a direct by-product and perhaps as a potential source of them. Straightforward reasoning indicates there is a required cosmogenic neutrino flux [2] with a broad peak in the energy range of 10^{17-19} eV. First, Lorentz invariance allows transformation of the cross section for photopion production at center-of-mass energies of order 1 GeV, the Δ^+ -resonance energy, up to GZK energies, a boost of order 10^{11} . Second, precision measurements of the CMBR establish its flux density for all cosmic epochs and, thus, determine the number density of boosted targets for the photopion production process. Third, we apply the standard cosmological postulate that the cosmic-ray sources are not uniquely overdense (and hidden) in our local supercluster compared to the cosmic distribution. Finally, evidence from composition studies indicates that the UHECRs are hadronic and, thus, unable to evade interaction with the CMBR, even if they are as heavy as iron [4]. We conclude that any localized source of UHECR at any epoch is surrounded by a “GZK horizon,” beyond

which the opacity of the CMBR to photopion interactions is sufficient to completely attenuate the charged progenitors, yielding pion secondaries which decay to neutrinos. The intensity of all of these GZK neutrino spheres thus sums to a quasi-isotropic cosmogenic neutrino flux.

Neutrinos may not only be cosmogenic by-products but could also be closely associated with sources of the UHECR. If there are large fluxes of neutrinos at energies of order 10^{22-23} eV, they can annihilate with big-bang relic cosmic background neutrinos ($T_\nu \sim 1.9$ K) in our own Galactic halo via the interaction $\nu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow Z^0$, the Z-burst process [5–8]. Decays of the neutral weak vector boson Z^0 then yield UHECRs, overcoming the GZK cutoff because of the nearby production. Moreover, topological defect (TD) models [9] postulate a flux of superheavy (10^{24} eV) relic particles that decay in our current epoch and within the Earth’s GZK sphere, yielding both neutrinos and UHECR hadrons in the process. Variant versions of such models, including hypothetical mirror matter [10], can evade standard bounds to TD models; such variants currently have the weakest experimental constraints. Limits on the fluxes of ultrahigh energy (UHE) neutrinos can constrain or eliminate such models as sources for the UHECR. Both of these classes of neutrino models predict fluxes well above the current predictions for cosmogenic GZK neutrinos. In all models, the neutrino fluxes in the 10^{18-20} eV energy range are well below what can be observed with a cubic kilometer target volume, so detection methods must use larger scales.

The Antarctic Impulsive Transient Antenna (ANITA) mission is now completing construction for a first launch

as a long-duration balloon payload in 2006. The mission has a primary design goal of detecting EeV neutrino interactions through coherent radio Cherenkov emission from neutrino-induced electromagnetic (EM) particle cascades within the ice sheet. The ANITA-lite prototype flew as a piggyback instrument aboard the Trans-Iron Galactic Element Recorder payload. The payload launched December 18, 2003, and was aloft for 18.4 days, spending a net 10 days over the ice in its 1.3 circuits of Antarctica. The payload landed on the ice sheet several hundred kilometers from Mawson Station (Australia) at an elevation of 2500 m. ANITA-lite investigated possible backgrounds to neutrino detection in Antarctica and verified many of the subsystems to be used by the full-scale ANITA. The payload operation was successful, and we have searched for neutrino-induced cascades among the impulsive events measured. The data quality was sufficient to distinguish events that were consistent with neutrino-induced cascades and exclude events which were not, thus enabling us to establish flux limits in the absence of candidate events.

ANITA exploits a property of EM cascades that has become known as the Askaryan effect [11]. During the development of the EM cascade, selective electron scattering processes lead to a negative charge asymmetry, inducing strong coherent radio Cherenkov radiation in the form of impulses with unique broadband spectral and polarization properties. When a high energy neutrino showers in the ice sheet, which has a radio attenuation length $L_\alpha \geq 1$ km [12], the resulting impulses can easily propagate up through the surface to the balloon payload. From balloon altitudes of 37 km, the horizon is at nearly 700 km distance, giving a synoptic view of ~ 1.5 M km² of ice or ~ 2 M km³ volume to a depth of $\approx L_\alpha$. ANITA will consist of a 2π array of dual-polarization antennas designed to monitor this entire ice target. ANITA-lite flew only two first-generation ANITA antennas, with a field of view covering about 12% of the 1.5 M km² ice sheet area within its horizon at any time, but the ≈ 170 000 km² area of ice in view still represents an enormous monitored volume for the uppermost kilometer of ice to which we were primarily sensitive. This leads to the strongest current limit on neutrino fluxes within its energy regime.

The ANITA-lite antennas are dual-linear-polarization vertical (V) and horizontal (H) quad-ridged horn antennas, sensitive over 230–1200 MHz, over which their angular response remains single-mode, with a nearly constant effective directivity gain of about 9–11 dBi. The antenna beam is somewhat ellipsoidal in shape, with average beamwidths of 59° and 37° in the E plane and the H plane, respectively. The antenna boresights were offset from one another by 1 m lateral separation, 22.5° in azimuth, and were canted 10° downward in elevation. The combined field of view of the two antennas taken in coincidence is of order 45° in azimuth for typical events but can be significantly larger for strong impulses.

A block diagram of the ANITA-lite antenna, trigger, and data acquisition system is shown in Fig. 1. The H - and

V -polarization antenna voltages are first filtered to limit the passband to 0.2–1.1 GHz. The signals are amplified by low-noise amplifiers (LNAs) with an approximately 100 K noise figure, for a net gain of ~ 62 dB. The resulting signals, with thermal-noise levels corresponding to ~ 35 mV rms, are split equally between the digitizers and the trigger coincidence section.

Coherent Cherenkov emission from showers in solid media is 100% linearly polarized [13], and Antarctic ice does not produce significant depolarization over the propagation distances (~ 1 km) required for detection of neutrino interactions [14]. ANITA-lite takes advantage of this characteristic by requiring that any trigger have roughly equal amplitude in left- and right-circular polarizations. This favors signals with a high degree of linear polarization and provides of order a factor of 2 improvement in rejecting circularly polarized backgrounds.

The trigger system is critical to the sensitivity of a radio impulse detection system. It initiates digitization of antenna waveforms based on correlated pulse amplitudes among the different antenna channels. For ANITA-lite, the trigger required a onefold to threefold coincidence among the four independent channels (two antennas and two polarizations), where each channel was required to exceed a power threshold during a 30 ns window. The pulse-height spectrum of received voltages due to ideal thermal noise is nearly Gaussian, and ANITA-lite was operated with an average threshold corresponding to $4.3\sigma_V$, where $\sigma_V = \sqrt{k\langle T_{\text{sys}} \rangle Z \Delta\nu}$ for bandpass-averaged system temperature values of $\langle T_{\text{sys}} \rangle \approx 700$ K during the flight. Here k is Boltzmann's constant, $Z = 50 \Omega$, and $\Delta\nu = 800$ MHz is the effective system bandwidth.

Calibration of the system gain, timing, and noise temperature was performed by several means. A calibrated noise diode was coupled to the system between the antenna and the first bandpass filter. Also, during the first day of the




FIG. 1. The ANITA-lite system block diagram.

flight, a pulse generator and transmitter antenna at the launch site (Williams Field, near McMurdo Station) illuminated the payload with pulses synchronized to global positioning system (GPS) signals. These pulses were recorded successfully by the system out to a several hundred kilometer distance. Timing analysis of these signals indicates that the pulse phase could be estimated to a precision of 150 ps for a $\geq 4\sigma$ signal-to-noise ratio. Finally, the response of the antennas to broadband noise from both the Sun and the Galactic center and plane was determined by differential measurements using data when the payload (which rotated slowly during the flight) was toward or away from a given source. The results of this analysis are shown in Fig. 2, showing the spectral response function with the various contributions from astronomical sources. The ambient rf noise levels at balloon float altitudes were found to be consistent with thermal noise due to the ice at $T_{\text{eff}} \sim 250$ K and our receiver noise temperature of 300–500 K, which included contributions from the cables, LNA, connectors, filters, and power limiters. Other than our own ground calibration signals, we also detected no sources of impulsive noise that could be established to be external to our own payload.

ANITA-lite recorded $\sim 113\,000$ events at an average lifetime of 40% [15]. Of these events, $\sim 87\,500$ are threefold-coincident triggers considered for data analysis. The remainder were recorded for system calibration and performance verification. Two independent analyses were performed within collaboration, both searching for narrow Askaryan-like impulses, in which almost all signal power is delivered within 10 ns about peak voltage, time coincident in at least two of four channels. Analysis A relied primarily on matched filtering the data with the expected signal shape and requiring the filtered data to show a better signal-to-noise ratio than the unfiltered data. Analysis B relied primarily on rejecting events which show a high level of cross correlation with known payload-induced noise events. This approach very efficiently removes the very common repetitive payload noise events. These constituted about 90% of triggers, with the remainder from unknown sources, probably also on the payload. None of these resembled the expected neutrino signals. Analysis A determined the signal passing efficiency by tightening the cuts until the last background noise event was removed and found 53% of the simulated signal still passing the cuts. Analysis B blinded 80% of the data, optimized the cuts with the other 20% using the model rejection factor technique [16], and found 65% signal efficiency. No data events pass either of the analyses. In both analyses, the systematic uncertainty in passing rates was estimated at $\sim 20\%$.

To estimate the effective neutrino aperture and exposure for ANITA-lite, two different and relatively mature simulation codes for the full ANITA instrument were modified to account for the ANITA-lite configuration. These simulations account for propagation of neutrinos through Earth crust models, for the various interaction types and neutrino




FIG. 2 (color online). Frequency dependence of the excess effective antenna temperature ΔT when pointing to the Sun and the Galactic center [28]. The top band is a model of the expected ΔT , with a width equal to the systematic uncertainties. The lower two bands give contributions due to galactic and solar emissions, respectively. The antenna frequency response is folded into the model.

flavors, for inelasticity, and for both hadronic and electromagnetic interactions (including Landau-Pomeranchuk-Migdal effects [17]). The shower radio emission is estimated via standard parametrizations which have been validated at accelerators [13,18]. Propagation through the ice uses a frequency- and temperature-dependent model for L_a , based on data measured at the South Pole [12]. Surface refraction is accounted for using a combination of ray and physical optics. Refracted emission is propagated geometrically to the payload, where a detailed instrument model, based on lab measurements of the spare flight system, is applied to determine whether a detection occurs.

Based on the treatment described in Refs. [19,20], the resulting model-independent 90% C.L. limit on neutrino fluxes with standard model cross sections [21] is shown in Fig. 3. ANITA-lite approaches the highest energy cosmogenic neutrino flux model [22] and now appears to have entirely excluded the Z-burst model [6,8,23] at a level required to account for the fluxes of the highest energy cosmic rays, as represented by the two crosses in the figure, with vertical and horizontal bars indicating the range of allowed model parameters for this case. Prior limits from the GLUE and FORTE experiments had constrained most but not all of this range. Our limits rule out all of the remaining range for two of the highest standard topological defect models, shown in Fig. 3, both of which were constrained already by other experiments. We also provide the first experimental limits on the highest mirror-matter TD model [10]. Table I shows the expected event totals and limits for several of these models. The ANITA-lite 90% C.L. integral flux limit on a pure E^{-2} spectrum for the energy range $10^{18.5} \text{ eV} \leq E_\nu \leq 10^{23.5} \text{ eV}$ is $E_\nu^2 F \leq 1.6 \times 10^{-6} \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1}$.

Although designed primarily as an engineering test, ANITA-lite has set the best current limits on neutrino fluxes above $10^{19.5} \text{ eV}$, improving constraints by more than an order of magnitude over the GLUE results [27]. This demonstrates the power of the radio Cherenkov technique applied to the balloon-based observations of the




FIG. 3 (color online). Limits on various models for neutrino fluxes at EeV to ZeV energies. The limits are AMANDA cascades [29], RICE [30], the current work, GLUE [27], the FORTE satellite [30], and projected sensitivity for the full ANITA. Models shown are topological defects for two values of the X -particle mass [9], a TD model involving mirror matter [10], a range of models for GZK cosmogenic neutrinos [22,24,25], and several models for Z bursts [6,26]. In the Z -burst models plotted as points, the flux is a narrow spectral feature in energy, and the error bars shown indicate the range possible for the central energy and peak flux values.

Antarctic ice. Simulations for ANITA shown in Fig. 3 indicate totals of the order of 5–50 events for the GZK model range shown for 50 days of flight time, sufficient to detect these model fluxes for the first time.

TABLE I. Expected numbers of events from several UHE neutrino models and the confidence level of exclusion by ANITA-lite observations.

Model and references	Events	C.L.%
GZK models:		
Baseline [22,24,25]	0.009	...
Strong source evolution [22,24,26]	0.025–0.048	...
Saturate all bounds [22,26]	0.48–0.60	38–45
Topological defects:		
Yoshida <i>et al.</i> $M_X = 10^{16}$ GeV [9]	7.8	99.959
Yoshida <i>et al.</i> $M_X = 10^{15}$ GeV [9]	22	100.000
Berezinsky, mirror necklaces [10]	6.4	99.834
Z -burst models:		
Fodor <i>et al.</i> halo background [6]	5.0	99.326
Fodor <i>et al.</i> extragalactic background [6]	14.2	99.999
Kalashov <i>et al.</i> [5]	45.9	100.000

We thank the NASA Particle Astrophysics Program the Columbia Scientific Balloon Facility, and the National Science Foundation for their excellent support of the Antarctic campaign.

- [1] K. Greisen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 748 (1966); G. T. Zatsepin and V. A. Kuz'min, JETP Lett. **4**, 78 (1966).
- [2] V. S. Berezinsky and G. T. Zatsepin, Phys. Lett. **28B**, 423 (1969); Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **11**, 111 (1970); F. W. Stecker, Astrophys. Space Sci. **20**, 47 (1973); Astrophys. J. **228**, 919 (1979).
- [3] D. Seckel and T. Stanev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 141101 (2005).
- [4] R. Abbasi *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **622**, 910 (2005).
- [5] O. E. Kalashev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 103003 (2002).
- [6] Z. Fodor, S. D. Katz, and A. Ringwald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 171101 (2002).
- [7] T. J. Weiler, Astropart. Phys. **11**, 303 (1999).
- [8] T. Weiler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 234 (1982).
- [9] S. Yoshida *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **479**, 547 (1997).
- [10] V. Berezinsky, in *Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Neutrino Telescopes, Venice, 2005*, edited by Milla Baldo Ceolin (Padua University, Padua, Italy, 2005), p. 339; astro-ph/0509675.
- [11] G. A. Askaryan, JETP **14**, 441 (1962); **21**, 658 (1965).
- [12] S. Barwick, D. Besson, P. Gorham, and D. Saltzberg, J. Glaciol. **51**, 231 (2005).
- [13] D. Saltzberg *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 2802 (2001); P. W. Gorham *et al.*, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 8590 (2000).
- [14] N. D. Hargreaves, J. Glaciol. **21**, 301 (1978); C. S. M. Doake, Geophys. J. R. Astron. Soc. **64**, 539 (1981).
- [15] This relatively low livetime was caused by a software bug leading to a slow readout of the GPS time for each event.
- [16] G. C. Hill and K. Rawlins, Astropart. Phys. **19**, 393 (2003).
- [17] J. Alvarez-Muñiz and E. Zas, Phys. Lett. B **411**, 218 (1997).
- [18] P. Gorham *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 023002 (2005).
- [19] L. A. Anchordoqui *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 103002 (2002).
- [20] N. Lehtinen, P. W. Gorham, A. R. Jacobsen, and R. A. Roussel-Dupré, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 013008 (2004) [fast on-orbit recorder of transient events (FORTE)].
- [21] R. Gandhi, Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl. **91**, 453 (2001).
- [22] C. Aramo *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **23**, 65 (2005).
- [23] B. Eberle *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 023007 (2004).
- [24] R. Engel, D. Seckel, and T. Stanev, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 093010 (2001).
- [25] R. J. Protheroe and P. A. Johnson, Astropart. Phys. **4**, 253 (1996).
- [26] O. E. Kalashev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 063004 (2002).
- [27] P. W. Gorham *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 041101 (2004) [the Goldstone lunar ultrahigh energy (GLUE) neutrino experiment].
- [28] The 230–350 MHz band had higher T_{sys} and is excluded here due to low measurement precision.
- [29] M. Ackermann *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **22**, 127 (2004) [the Antarctic muon and neutrino detector (AMANDA)].
- [30] I. Kravchenko *et al.*, Astropart. Phys. **20**, 195 (2003) [the radio ice Cherenkov experiment (RICE)].