R econstructing the supernova bounce time with neutrinos in IceC ube

Francis Halzen¹ and Georg G.Ra elt^2

¹Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706, USA

²M ax-P lanck-Institut fur Physik (W emer-H eisenberg-Institut), F ohringer R ing 6, 80805 M unchen, G em any

(Dated: 17 August 2009, nalized 26 September 2009)

Generic model predictions for the early neutrino signal of a core-collapse supernova (SN) imply that IceC ube can reconstruct the bounce to within about 3.5 m s at 95% CL (assumed SN distance 10 kpc), relevant for coincidence with gravitational-wave detectors. The tim ing uncertainty scales approxim ately with distance-squared. The o set between true and reconstructed bounce tim e of up to several m s depends on the neutrino avor oscillation scenario. Our work extends the recent study of Pagliaroli et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 031102 (2009)] and dem onstrates IceC ube's superb tim ing capabilities for neutrinos from the next nearby SN.

PACS num bers: 95.85 Ry, 95.85 Sz, 97.60 Bw

I. IN TRODUCTION

The high-statistics neutrino observation from the next nearby supernova (SN) will provide a bonanza of inform ation about the astrophysics of core-collapse phenom – ena and neutrino properties. In a recent PhysicalR eview Letter a strong case was made for the in portance of coincidence m easurem ents between gravitational wave and neutrino signals from SN core bounce [1]. The largest existing SN neutrino detectors are Super-K am iokande and IceC ube, reaching to a distance of about 100 kpc. The expected distribution of galactic SN e drops o quickly beyond about 20 kpc [2]. At this \pessim istic" distance, Super-K am iokande can time the bounce to within a few tens of m illiseconds, an interval com parable to the expected duration of the gravitational wave burst [1].

W e here extend this study to IceC ube, a high-statistics SN neutrino detector that would have seen the SN 1987A neutrino signal with 5 signi cance. For galactic SN e, the large rate of uncorrelated Cherenkov photons provides excellent tim e-structure inform ation.

Following Ref. [1] we note that neutrino masses are small enough to neglect time-of-ight e ects. Recalling that the diameter of the Earth is 42 ms, millisecondcoincidence measurements between detectors at dierent geographic locations requires determining the SN direction either by astronomical observations or by the electron-scattering signal in Super-Kamiokande.

II. SUPERNOVA NEUTRINOS IN ICECUBE

W hen SN neutrinos stream through water or ice, C herenkov light is generated, prim arily by the secondary positrons from inverse beta decay $_{e} + p! n + e^{+}$. W hile ne-grained detectors reconstruct individual neutrinos on an event-by-event basis, IceC ube only picks up the average C herenkov glow of the ice. To estim ate the detection rate we follow R ef. [6], augmented with the latest Ice-C ube e ciencies [3]. The com plete detector will have 4800 optical m odules (OM s) and the data are read out in 1.6384 m s bins, in plying a total event rate of

$$R_{e} = 186 \text{ bin}^{1} L_{52} D_{10}^{2} \text{ h} E_{15}^{3} \text{ i=h} E_{15} \text{ i}; \qquad (1)$$

where L $_{52}$ = L $_{\rm e}$ =10 52 erg s 1 , D $_{10}$ = D =10 kpc and E $_{15}$ = E $_{\rm e}$ =15 M eV .

The peak lum inosity reaches $L_{52} = 2\{5 \text{ and at that time } hE_i 15 \text{ MeV}$. For a therm alor slightly pinched spectrum, hE_i^3 i=hE_i^3 2. A ltogether, we expect

$$R^{max} = 1.5 \quad 10^3 bin^{-1}$$
 (2)

as a typical peak event rate for a SN at 10 kpc.

This signal is to be compared with a background of 280 s¹ in each OM [3], corresponding for 4800 OM s to

$$R_0 = 220 \quad 10^3 \text{ bin}^{-1}$$
 (3)

with an rms uctuation of 47 bin 1 . Therefore, the SN – induced \correlated noise" in the entire detector is highly signi cant [4, 5, 6]. From any one neutrino interacting in the ice, at most one C herenkov photon is picked up: the signal counts are entirely uncorrelated.

The prompt $_{\rm e}$ burst immediately after bounce produces a peak rate of about 100 bin 1 , lasting for several ms. Its impact on the early count rate depends sensitively on the avor oscillation scenario (see below).

III. EARLY NEUTRINO EM ISSION

SN m odels suggest that neutrino em ission for the rst 20 m s after core bounce depends little on m odel assum ptions or input physics [7], although beyond this early phase the accretion rate and therefore neutrino em ission depends strongly, for exam ple, on the progenitor m ass pro le. The prom pt $_{\rm e}$ burst reaches its peak at 5{7 m s post bounce, which also m arks the onset of $_{\rm e}$ em ission that is initially suppressed by the large $_{\rm e}$ chem ical potential. Up to about 20 m s post bounce L $_{\rm e}$ rises roughly linearly. W e thus represent the early IceC ube signalas [1]

$$R_{e} = R_{e}^{\max} \begin{array}{c} n & 0 & \text{fort} < t_{r} \\ 1 & e^{(t t_{r})=r} & \text{fort} > t_{r} \end{array}$$
(4)

with $t_r = 6 \text{ m s}$, r = 50 m s and $\mathbb{R}^{\max}_{e} = 1.5 \quad 10^3 \text{ bin}^{-1}$. These parameters also provide an excellent t to the rst 100 m s of a num ericalm odel from the G arching group [8] that is available to us.

W e may compare these assumptions with the earlyphase models of Ref. [7]. L $_{\rm e}$ rises nearly linearly to L $_{52}$ = 1.5{2 within 10 m s. The evolution of hE $_{\rm e}$ $i_{\rm RMS}$ = (hE $_{\rm e}^{\rm a}$ i=hE $_{\rm e}$ i)^{1=2} is also shown, a common quantity in SN physics that characterizes, for example, the e ciency of energy deposition; the IoeC ube rate is proportional to hE $_{\rm e}$ $i_{\rm RMS}^2$. At 10 m s after onset, hE $_{\rm e}$ $i_{\rm RMS}$ reaches 15 M eV, im plying hE $_{15}^3$ i=hE $_{15}$ i = 1. W e thus estimate 10 m s after onset a rate of 280{370 bin} ^1, to be compared with 270 bin 1 from Eq. (4). Therefore, our assumed signal rise is on the conservative side.

Of course, the early models do not x_r and R_{e}^{max} separately; the crucial parameters are t_r and $R_{e}^{max} = r$. The maximum rate that is reached long after bounce is not relevant for determining the onset of the signal.

If avor oscillations swap the $_{\rm e}$ ux with $_{\rm x}$ (some combination of and), the rise begins earlier because the large $_{\rm e}$ chem ical potential during the prompt $_{\rm e}$ burst does not suppress the early emission of $_{\rm x}$ [7]. Moreover, the rise time is faster, hE i_{\rm RMS} larger, and the maximum luminosity smaller. We use Eq. (4) also for R $_{\rm x}$ with tr = 0, $_{\rm r}$ = 25 ms, and R $_{\rm max}^{\rm max}$ = 1.0 10^3 bin 1 .

F lavor oscillations are unavoidable and have been studied, for early neutrino emission, in Ref. [7]. A ssum ing the norm almass hierarchy, $\sin^2_{13} > 10^3$, no collective oscillations,¹ and a direct observation without Earth e ects, Table I of Ref. [7] reveals that the <u>e</u> burst would be completely swapped and thus nearly invisible because the <u>xe</u> elastic scattering cross section is much smaller than that of <u>e</u>. The survival probability of <u>e</u> would be $\cos^2_{12} = 2=3$ with <u>12</u> the \solar" mixing angle. Therefore, the elective detection rate would be $\frac{2}{3}$ R_e + $\frac{1}{3}$ R_x. We use this case as our main example.

IV. RECONSTRUCTING THE SIGNAL ONSET

A typicalM onte C arlo realization of the IceC ube signal for our example is shown in Fig. 1. One can determ ine the signal onset t_0 within a few m s by naked eye. For a SN closer than our standard distance of 10 kpc, one can follow details of the neutrino light curve without any t.

O ne can not separate the $_{\rm e}$ and $_{\rm x}$ components for the example of Fig. 1. Therefore, we reconstruct a t with a single component of the form Eq. (4), assuming the zero-signal background is well known and not tted



FIG.1: Typical M onte C arlo realization (red histogram) and reconstructed t (blue line) for the benchm ark case discussed in the text for a SN at 10 kpc.

here. U sing a time interval until 100 m s post bounce, we reconstruct $t_0 = 32$ 1.0 m s (1). If we use only data until 33 m s post bounce we nd $t_0 = 3.0$ 1.7 m s. Indeed, if one ts Eq. (4) on an interval that ends long before the plateau is reached, we e ectively t a second order polynom ial with a positive slope and negative second derivative at t_r , whereas the plateau itself is poorly tted and its assumed value plays little role. D epending on the distance of the SN one will the ore or fewer details of the overall neutrino light curve and there m ay be m ore e cient estim ators for t_r . O ur exam ple only provides a rough in pression of what LeeCube can do.

The reconstruction uncertainty of t_0 scales approximately with neutrino ux, i.e., with SN distance squared. The number of excess events above background marking the onset of the signal has to be compared with the background uctuations. Therefore, a signi cant number of excess events above background requires a longer integration period if the ux is smaller, explaining this scaling behavior.

The interpretation of t_0 relative to the true bounce time depends on the avor oscillation scenario realized in nature. This is in uenced by many factors: The value of

 $_{13}$, the m ass ordering, the role of collective oscillation e ects, and the distance traveled in the Earth. Com – bining the signal from di erent detectors, using future laboratory information on neutrino parameters, and perhaps the very coincidence with a gravitational-wave signal may allow one to disentangle some of these features. However, as a rst rough estimate it is su cient to say that the reconstructed t_0 tends to be systematically delayed relative to the bounce time by no more than a few ms. The statistical uncertainty of the t_0 reconstruction does not depend strongly on the oscillation scenario.

¹ In the norm al hierarchy, collective oscillation e ects are usually absent. It has not been studied, how ever, if the early neutrino signal can produce multiple splits that can arise also in the norm alhierarchy [9]. M oreover, for a low -m ass progenitor collective phenom ena can be important if the M SW resonances occur close to the neutrino sphere [10, 11].

V. DISCUSSION

The authors of R ef. [1] used a SN em ission m odelbased on a two-component tofthe sparse SN 1987A data and described the overall neutrino signal in terms of several parameters which they say, after Eq. (5), are at odds with theoretical expectations. However, their parameter $T_a = 2:4 \text{ M eV}$, describing the tem perature of the neutrino-em itting gas during the accretion phase, gives $hE_a i = 52T_a = 125 M eV$ (see paragraph after Eq. 15 in the published version of Ref. [12]) and thus is virtually identical to the corresponding hE $_{\rm c}$ i_{\rm RMS} from Ref. [7] at 20 m s post bounce. In other words, while the SN 1987A implied energies of Ref. [1] are lower than theoretical expectations for the overall accretion phase, in the absence of avor oscillations they agree nicely with the models of Ref. [7] for the crucial rst 20 m s. However, the chosen rise time r = 100 m s is very long com paredwith the early-time models of Ref. [7].

In Ref. [7] the early neutrino signal after bounce was system atically studied for di erent input assumptions (progenitor m ass, equation of state, neutrino opacities), leading to very similar results. On the other hand, one nds signi cantly di erent num erical exam ples in the literature. In Ref. [13] the $_{\rm e}$ lum inosity rises to 2 10^{52} erg s¹ after as much as 50 m s. In Ref. [14], a peak value of only $1 \quad 10^{52}$ erg s 1 is reached and the rise within 10{20 m s after bounce is small. In Ref. [15] the signal begins rising as late as 12 m s after the m aximum of the e burst. There are many di erences between these and other models in terms of num erical approach and input physics. It would be extrem ely useful if another group would investigate the early neutrino signal in the spirit of Ref. [7] for a range of physical assum ptions and with attention to num erical details that may in uence the early-tim e behavior.

In view of the large range of possible distances to the next nearby SN and concom itant ux di erences, these uncertainties do not change our overall conclusions. In our ducial example IceC ube can reconstruct the signal onset within $6{7 \text{ m s}}$ at 1 CL for a SN at 20 kpc, com - parable to what R ef. [1] found for Super-K am iokande. Ideally, of course, one would com bine the m easurem ents from several detectors.

A gravitational wave m easurem ent of the core bounce in coincidence with neutrino onset would be of obvious astrophysical in portance. In addition one could test the weak equivalence principle. Both neutrinos and gravitational waves should suler the same Shapiro time delay in the gravitational potential of the galaxy. For SN 1987A in the Large M agellanic C loud, this delay was a few m on ths. The coincidence of the neutrino burst with the rise of the light curve within a few hours proved an equal Shapiro delay for photons and neutrinos to within about 10⁻³ [16, 17]. A millisecond-scale coincidence between neutrinos and gravitational waves would extend and rene this test, in detail depending on the location of the SN.

If the SN can not be located by astronom icalm eans because of obscuration, the electron-recoil signal in Super-K am iokande or a future m egatonne water C herenkov detector is the m ethod of choice [18, 19], whereas arrivaltim e triangulation was dism issed. W ith IceC ube alm ost com plete, the situation has changed and triangulation can play a useful role after all, at least for a not-too-distant SN. M oreover, in Europe a big detector of the LAGUNA-class [20] m ay become available (representing one of three possible large-scale detector types) and a m egatonne water-C herenkov detector m ay be built in N orth Am erica. A rrival-tim e triangulation between large-scale neutrino detectors on di erent continents could becom e viable.

It would be a worthwhile exercise to study the possibilities of bounce timing, based on common astrophysical assumptions, for dierent detector types and what can be learnt from a combined analysis. To this end it would be worthwhile if groups other than the G arching one would system atically study the numerical early-time neutrino signal to judge if indeed the dependence on physical assumptions is as small as found in Ref. [7].

A cknow ledgm ents

W e thank B.D asgupta, H.-T.Janka and A.M irizzi for discussions. This research was supported in part by the U S.N ational Science Foundation under G rants N o. OPP-0236449 and PHY-0354776 and by the A lexander von Humboldt Foundation in Germany (F.H.) and by the D eutsche Forschungsgem einschaft under grant TR-27 \N eutrinos and B eyond" and the C luster of Excellence $\langle O rigin and Structure of the U niverse" (G R.).$

- [L] G. Pagliaroli, F. Vissani, E. Coccia and W. Fulgione, \Neutrinos from supernovae as a trigger for gravitationalwave search," Phys. Rev. Lett. 103, 031102 (2009) [arX iv:0903.1191].
- [2] A.M irizzi, G.G.Ra elt and P.D. Serpico, \Earth m atter e ects in supernova neutrinos: Optim al detector locations," JCAP 0605, 012 (2006) [astro-ph/0604300].
- [3] T. Kowarik, T. Griesel and A. Piegsa (for the IceCube Collaboration) \Supernova search with the

AMANDA/IceCube detectors," Proc. 31st ICRC, Lodz, Poland (2009) [arXiv:0908.0441].

- [4] C. Pryor, C. E. Roos and M. S. Webster, \Detecting therm al neutrinos from supernovae with Dum and," Astrophys. J. 329, 335 (1988).
- [5] F.Halzen, J.E.Jacobsen and E.Zas, \U lina-transparent antarctic ice as a supernova detector," Phys.Rev.D 53, 7359 (1996) [astro-ph/9512080].
- [6] A.S.D ighe, M.T.Keiland G.G.Ra elt, \Detecting the

- [7] M.Kachelriess, R.Tomas, R.Buras, H.-T.Janka, A.Marek and M.Rampp, \Exploiting the neutronization burst of a galactic supernova," Phys. Rev. D 71, 063003 (2005) [astro-ph/0412082].
- [8] A.Marek, H.T.Janka and E.Muller, \Equation-of-state dependent features in shock-oscillation modulated neutrino and gravitational-wave signals from supernovae," A stron. A strophys. 496, 475 (2009) [arXiv:0808.4136].
- [9] B.Dasgupta, A.Dighe, G.G.Raelt and A.Y.Smimov, \Multiple spectral splits of supernova neutrinos," Phys. Rev.Lett. 103, 051105 (2009) [arXiv:0904.3542].
- [10] H. Duan, G. M. Fuller, J.Carlson and Y.Z.Qian, \F lavor evolution of the neutronization neutrino Burst from an O-Ne-Mg core-collapse supernova," Phys.Rev.Lett.100, 021101 (2008) [arXiv:0710.1271].
- [11] B. Dasgupta, A. Dighe, A. Mirizzi and G. G. Ra elt, \Spectral split in prompt supernova neutrino burst: Analytic three- avor treatment," Phys. Rev. D 77, 113007 (2008) [arX iv:0801.1660].
- [12] G. Pagliaroli, F. Vissani, M. L. Costantini and A. Ianni, \Improved analysis of SN 1987A antineutrino events," Astropart. Phys. 31, 163 (2009) [arXiv:0810.0466].
- [13] A. Mezzacappa, M. Liebendorfer, O. E. B. Messer, W. R. Hix, F. K. Thielem ann and S. W. Bruenn, \Simulation of the spherically symmetric stellar core collapse, bounce, and postbounce evolution of a star of 13 solar

m asses with Boltzm ann neutrino transport, and its im plications for the supernova m echanism," Phys.Rev.Lett. 86,1935 (2001) [astro-ph/0005366].

- [14] C.L.Fryer and P.A.Young, \Latetim e convection in the collapse of a 23 solar m ass star," A strophys. J. 659, 1438 (2007) [astro-ph/0612154].
- [15] M. Herant, W. Benz, W. R. Hix, C. L. Fryer and S. A. Colgate, \Inside the supernova: A powerful convective engine," Astrophys. J. 435, 339 (1994) [astro-ph/9404024].
- [16] M.J.Longo, \N ew precision tests of the E instein equivalence principle from SN 1987A " Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 173 (1988).
- [17] L.M.K rauss and S.Trem aine, \Test of the weak equivalence principle for neutrinos and photons," Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 176 (1988).
- [18] J. F. Beacom and P. Vogel, \Can a supernova be bcated by its neutrinos?," Phys. Rev. D 60, 033007 (1999) [astro-ph/9811350].
- [19] R.Tom as, D.Sem ikoz, G.G.Ra elt, M.Kachelniess and A.S.Dighe, \Supernova pointing with low - and highenergy neutrino detectors," Phys. Rev. D 68, 093013 (2003) [hep-ph/0307050].
- [20] D. Autiero et al., \Large underground, liquid based detectors for astro-particle physics in Europe: scientic case and prospects," JCAP 0711, 011 (2007) [arXiv:0705.0116].