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For the most excellent marriage of particle physics and astronomy:
- **Something old**
  - Recap of recent results
- **Something new**
  - New analyses of older data
  - New analyses of newer data
- **Something borrowed**
  - Extreme Cold Weather Clothing
- **Something blue**
  - Lips, fingertips, noses,…
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The Site:
5 cm of Powder, 2 km of Base, Never Rains, and Lots of Non-stop Sunshine
• Hot-water-drill 2km-deep holes & insert strings of PMTs in pressure vessels.
  – AMANDA-B10: 302 PMTs, completed in 1997
    • Old & new A-B10 results presented
  – AMANDA-II: 677 PMTs, completed in 2000
    • Prelimin. results presented

• AMANDA challenges:
  – Natural medium!
    • Blame Mother Nature
  – Remote location!
    • Blame Scott & Amundsen who made it look too hard to get there
  – Unfettered bkgd. source!
    • We’d all like to know exactly who to blame…
  – Prototype detector!
    • Can you blame us for trying to improve things?
AMANDA
Event Signatures: Muons

CC muon neutrino interactions → Muon tracks

\[ \nu_\mu + N \rightarrow \mu + X \]
CC electron and tau neutrino interactions:
\[ \nu_{(e,\tau)} + N \rightarrow (e,\tau) + X \]

NC neutrino interactions:
\[ \nu_x + N \rightarrow \nu_x + X \]
Important Definition for Northern Hemisphere Dwellers

“Up-going”

Earth

“Down-going”

Earth
AMANDA Is Working Well

• Sensitivity to up-going muons demonstrated with CC atm. $\nu_\mu$ interactions:

• Sensitivity to cascades demonstrated with *in-situ* sources (see figs.) & down-going muon brems.

- AMANDA also works well with *SPASE*:
  - Calibrate AMANDA angular response
  - Do cosmic ray composition studies.
# AMANDA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Analyses (published; under internal review); All analyses done <em>BLIND</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Atmospheric neutrinos; searches for WIMPs, supernovae, point sources, diffuse sources, EHE ν, UHE cascades, GRBs; cosmic-ray composition, relativistic monopoles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Difficult year for detector. Third reconstruction underway; analysis to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Smoother year. Fully reconstructed; data being analyzed. See 1997 for topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>~3x bigger → &gt;3x better. Preliminary results on atmospheric neutrinos, searches for point sources, diffuse sources, cascades, GRBs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Analyses in progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Collecting data. Online filtering in place at Pole.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Reconstruction Handles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Type</th>
<th>up/down</th>
<th>energy</th>
<th>source direction</th>
<th>arrival time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric $\nu_\mu$</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse $\nu$, EHE events</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Sources: AGN, WIMPs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRBs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Something Old”: 1997 Data
1. Atmospheric ν’s, Our Test Beam

The only known high energy ν source is also the hardest to work with: low E with no temporal or directional handle.

- 204 events
  - $\varepsilon_{\text{sig}} = 4\%$
  - $\varepsilon_{\text{data}} = 2 \times 10^{-5} \%$
- MC normalized to data
- Roughly 10% background (MC, visual scan)
- $E > 60$ GeV, $<E> \sim 300$ GeV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MC down $\mu$</th>
<th>MC atm $\nu$</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triggers</td>
<td>8.8e8</td>
<td>8,978</td>
<td>1.0e9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgoing</td>
<td>1,848</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>4,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q &gt; 7$</td>
<td>17 ± 5</td>
<td>279 ± 3</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

204 needles in a really big haystack

EASIER WITH AMANDA-II!

Astro-ph/0205109, submitted to PRD
UHE $\nu$ fluxes are equal at earth due to oscillations

At $E > 100$ TeV, only $\nu_\tau$ can penetrate earth*

Hard to use downgoing $\nu_\mu$ due to cosmic ray background, but can have $4\pi$ sensitivity to lower energy $\nu_e$, all energy $\nu_\tau$

*Halzen & Saltzberg

- Oscillations: $\nu_\mu \Rightarrow \nu_e, \tau$
- Better $E_\nu$ measurement
- Less cosmic-ray background
- Easier to calibrate
- Glashow resonance

Motivations for searching for cascades:

- Oscillations: $\nu_\mu \Rightarrow \nu_e, \tau$
- Better $E_\nu$ measurement
- Less cosmic-ray background
- Easier to calibrate
- Glashow resonance

2. EM & Hadronic Showers: “Cascades”

source $p+\gamma \rightarrow \pi \rightarrow \nu_{e,\mu}$

another source $p+\gamma \rightarrow \pi \rightarrow \nu_{e,\mu}$

Cosmic rays

det.

$\nu_{\mu}$

$\nu_e$

$\nu_{\tau}$
Response to Cascades: Simulated vs. Actual In-Ice Laser Data

Good agreement!

Disagreements: Understood in light of known systematic uncertainties.
Response to Cascades: Cosmic Ray Muon Brems, Simulated vs. Measured

Discrepancy due to uncertainties in:
- ice optical properties
- OM sensitivity
- cosmic-ray spectrum
- rate of $\mu$ energy losses

Agreement restored by shifting energy scale by 0.2 in $\log_{10}E$. Taken into account as systematic.
New Result, 1997 Data: Cascade Search

- Unique result:
  - Limit on all $\nu$ flavors and
  - Uses full reconstruction of cascade

- Analysis gets easier and more competitive with muons as detector grows in size, especially at higher energies
3. EHE ($E \geq 10^{15}$ eV) Event Search

- EHE events very bright; many PMTs detect multiple photons
- Main background: muon “bundles”
  - Comparable $N_{PMT}$ but smaller $N_\gamma$
- Calibrate with *in-situ* N$_2$ laser
- Still evaluating systematic uncertainties
- See poster I-1 by S. Hundertmark

Note: At EHE energies, expect only ~horizontal events*

*Klein & Mann, 1999

Preliminary Limit

- Flys Eye
- AGN P97
- AGN S91
- AGN S95
- TD Sig98

*Klein & Mann, 1999*
4. WIMP Search

WIMP annihilation at Earth’s center, use directional handle:

\[ \nu_\mu \rightarrow \mu^{+} + \mu^{-} \]

\[ \text{AMANDA} \]

Limit on \( \Phi_\mu \) from WIMP annihilation

\[ E_\mu^0 = 1 \text{ GeV (Super-K: 1.6 GeV)} \]

cf: Lars Bergstrom’s talk

\[ \text{MSSM/DarkSUSY} \]

astro-ph/0202370, submitted to PRD
5. Point Source Search

Point Sources: In each 12°x12° angular bin, look for more up-going $\mu$’s than expected from statistical fluctuations of a random distribution.

Results:

Neutrino flux limit (E⁻² spectrum assumed)

Muon flux limit (E⁻² spectrum assumed)
"Something New": Preliminary Results from AMANDA-II

- A-II is much larger than AMANDA-B10
  - Higher expected event rates
  - Improved angular acceptance near horizon
  - More efficient reconstruction of muons and cascades
    - As of 2002, initial reconstruction is done in real time

- Preliminary results:
  - Atmospheric neutrinos
    - the “test beam” for muons
    - anticipate ~5 clean \( \nu \)/day with very simple set of selection criteria
  - Diffuse cascade search
  - Diffuse \( \nu_\mu \) source search
  - Point source search
  - GRB search
2002 Data: Real Time Analysis

Weds. 15 May, 2002
“Something New”: 2000 Data
1. Atmospheric $\nu$’s, Still Our Test Beam

- **Selection Criteria:**
  - $N_{\text{hit}} < 50$
  - Zenith $> 110^\circ$
  - High fit quality
  - Uniform light deposition along track

- **Excellent shape agreement!**
  - Less work to obtain than with A-B10!

Gradual tightening of cuts extracts atm. $\nu$ signal
Notes: far from optimized; uses 60% of data; expect ~500-1000 atm. $\nu$ events eventually.
2. Cascade Search

- Larger detector size
  - Improves angular acceptance to $4\pi \rightarrow$
  - Easier to reject backgrounds
  - Increases reach in energy by 3x to $\sim 1\text{PeV}$
  - Will enable us to push limit down by about an order of magnitude—or to see something!

- Current analysis based on 20% subsample of the 2000 data in accordance with our blind analysis procedures
  - At current AMANDA limit of $\Phi \leq 10^{-6}$ GeV cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ (muon analysis), expect about one signal event in 20% subsample

- See poster I-2 by M. Kowalski
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Preliminary Cascade Limit (20% of 2000 Data)

Expected signal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected signal</th>
<th>Predicted events in 100% of 2000 data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Astrophysical $\nu$'s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi_{\nu_e^c+\nu_e} = 10^{-6} E^{-2}$ GeV cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi_{\nu_\tau^c+\nu_\tau} = 10^{-6} E^{-2}$ GeV cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmospheric $\nu$'s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\nu_e$ (CC), $\nu_e^c+\nu_\mu$ (NC)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prompt charm (RQPM)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Munich, Neutrino 2002  
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3. Diffuse $\nu_\mu$ Search

- **Analysis:**
  - Look for good muon tracks with channel density $\rho_{ch} > 3$
  - Normalize background to $N_{hit} < 50$ data

- **Preliminary results using 20% of 2000 data**
  - No systematics incorporated!
  - Sensitivity*: $\sim 8 \times 10^{-7}$
  - **Preliminary Limit:**
    - $\leq \sim 10^{-6}$ GeV cm$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$sr$^{-1}$
    - $\sim$ same as *full 1997

*Average limit from ensemble of experiments w/ no signal

![Graph showing data, MC nus E$^{-2}$, and MC nus atm with hit channels/10m tracklength](chart.png)

- 6 Data events
- 6.6 MC $E^{-2}$ $\nu^*$
- 5.0 MC Atm $\nu$

* @ $10^{-6}$ GeV cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$sr$^{-1}$
4. $\nu_\mu$ Point Source Search

- Improved coverage near horizon
- In $6^\circ \times 6^\circ$ bin, for $E^{-2}$ spectrum, $10^{-8}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ flux:
  - $\sim 2$ signal events
  - $\sim 1$ background event
- Sensitivities calculated using background levels predicted from off-source data

Sensitivities (Preliminary)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>muon ($\times 10^{-15}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$\nu$ ($\times 10^{-8}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Markarian 421</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markarian 501</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass. A</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS433</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyg. X-3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sky plot (Preliminary)

N.B.: Event times scrambled for blind analysis purposes. 60% of 2000 dataset shown.

Equatorial coordinates: declination vs. right ascension.
5. GRB $\nu_\mu$ Search

- Look for $\nu_\mu$'s in 10-100 TeV range, coincident with a GRB
  - Use off-source & off-time data—ideal for maintaining blindness
- 2000 data very stable
- Virtually background-free analysis
  - only need BG rejection factor of $10^{-3}$–$10^{-4}$ (orders of magnitude less demanding than other analyses)
- Anticipate having ~500 GRBs to look at with 1997—2000 datasets
- Waxman-Bahcall limit still out of reach, but we’re getting there!

Average event count/10s (some cuts applied)

Gradual cut tightening in a time window around a particular GRB ($10^{-3}$–$10^{-4}$ bkgd. rejection attainable).
Conclusions

• **AMANDA-B10**
  – Continues to produce results, many of which are competitive or better than existing measurements, & challenge existing models
  – Additional B10 data from 98 & 99 is being analyzed

• **AMANDA-II**
  – As expected, detector works much better than B10 alone
    • Larger instrumented volume
    • More mature experiment
  – Preliminary results based on 20% sub-samples of 2000 data are already comparable to B10 results from *full* 1997 dataset
  – 2001, 2002 data ready to be processed and analyzed
  – Detector upgrade: Adding full pulse digitization capability to extend physics reach
  – Will integrate A-II into…

• **IceCube: The Second Honeymoon** (see talk by A. Karle)
I lied, but only about the penguin.

AMANDA/IceCube postdoc positions available! Contact me afterwards or email me at cowen@phys.psu.edu