High Energy Experiments in Astronomy Multiple Galactic Sources

> Beatriz Pereira – 81813 TFPAC - MEFT

# Cosmic-Rays



- $\rightarrow$  MISTERIES OF COSMIC-RAYS
- ightarrow The 'knee' in the spectrum, around 1 PeV
  - ightarrow Sources of galactic origin
- ightarrow 'Ankle' situated at around 3 EeV
  - ightarrow Sources of extra-galactic origin
- $\rightarrow$  Detection via balloons and space experiments only possible up to 10<sup>14</sup> eV

#### HAWC Observatory



Water Cherenkov tank

Pico de Orizaba

150 m

(5,626 m)



#### Gamma rays vs cosmic rays

HAWC selects gamma rays from among a much more abundant background of cosmic rays.

gamma-ray shower



"hot" spots concentrate around the core cosmic-ray shower



"hot" spots are more dispersed

HAWC is located at 4,100 m above sea level, covering an area of 20,000 m<sup>2</sup>.

# Detectors

Field of View

Duty Cycle (uptime)

Small (<2°)

Low (5-10%)



Large (>45°)

High (>90%)

(b) Scaler DAQ

Fig. 2 - HAWC Sensitivity to Short GRBs.

# Experimental Procedure

Ground Parameter Method v Neural Network Method

#### HAWC's Estimators Performance

- GP has a higher bias below 1 TeV
- HAWC has a higher sensitivity to TeV than GeV; the low bias does not affect the fit.
- GP method is more suitable because it has better performance for temperatures above 32 TeV.





Mixing Matrices for the GP

#### LHAASO Estimators Performance

# The energy resolution is energy and zenith angle dependent.

Event-by-event comparison of the primary true energy and the reconstructed energy for simulated gamma-ray events over zenith angles  $0^{\circ}-50^{\circ}$ .

The color represents the log probability density within each reconstructed energy  $E_{rec}$  bin.

In this work, the events with reconstructed energy above 10 TeV are divided into five bins per decade.



#### ANALYSIS METHOD

- $\rightarrow$  Reconstruction
  - ightarrow Core Reconstruction
  - $\rightarrow$  Direction Determination
- ightarrow Likelihood fit
- $\rightarrow$  Event's selection



#### ANALYSIS METHOD

- $\rightarrow$  Reconstruction
  - ightarrow Core Reconstruction
  - $\rightarrow$  Direction Determination
- ightarrow Likelihood fit
- $\rightarrow$  Event's selection



#### ANALYSIS METHOD

- $\rightarrow$  Reconstruction
  - ightarrow Core Reconstruction
  - $\rightarrow$  Direction Determination
- ightarrow Likelihood fit
- $\rightarrow$  Event's selection

The fit for sources like Crab Nebula Log parabola:

$$\frac{dN}{dE} = \phi_0 \left(\frac{E}{E_0}\right)^{-\alpha - \beta \ln \left(\frac{E}{E_0}\right)}$$

Others were used the power-law with an exponential cutoff:

$$\frac{dN}{dE} = \phi_0 \left(\frac{E}{E_0}\right)^{-\alpha} exp\left(\frac{-E}{Ecut}\right)$$

The test statistc equation:

$$TS = 2 ln \left( \frac{L_{s+b}}{L_b} \right)$$



# Results and Discussion

Observations of the Crab Nebula

## Crab Nebula Spectrum Comparison

# LHAASO

- The statistical significance of the gamma ray signal from Crab Nebula is 14.7 σ past 100 TeV.
- The spectrum from 10 TeV to 250 TeV is well fitted with a power-law function with a spectral index of 3.09



# HAWC

- The statistical significance in the fit is above 2σ past 100 TeV
- To 100 TeV log-parabola fit is preferred over the cutoff
  - 0.2  $\sigma$  for the GP and 2.4  $\sigma$  for the NN
- Log-parabola fit is preferred over the log parabola convolved with a hard cutoff at 56 TeV
  - $5.12\sigma$  for the GP and  $6.99\sigma$  for the







## Maps in more detail:

**56 TeV** 





# Other sources' spectra past 100 TeV



In one of the sources (eHWC J1825-134) power-law with an exponential cutoff; the other two sources are fit to a log-parabola

Note that in the spectrum of eHWC J1907+063 has a relatively hard spectral index and less curvature than other sources!

Also, in IACTs... but HAWC tends to measure higher fluxes.



### Questions and discussion!



# Crab Nebula

What comes next?

# Mechanisms?