M orihiro H onda<sup>1</sup>, Takaaki K a jita<sup>1</sup>, K atsuaki K a sahara<sup>2</sup>, and Shoichi M idorikawa<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute for Cosm ic Ray Research, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 188 <sup>2</sup> Faculty of Engineering, Kanagawa University, Yokoham a 221 <sup>3</sup> Faculty of Engineering, Aom ori University, Aom ori 030

(Received January 12, 2022)

The atm ospheric neutrino-ux is calculated over the wide energy range from 1 GeV to 3,000 GeV for the study of neutrino-physics using the data from underground neutrino-detectors. The uncertainty of atm ospheric neutrino{ uxes is also discussed. A brief com m ent is m ade to interpret the anom aly in term s of neutrino oscillations.

#### x1. Introduction

Since the observation of atm ospheric neutrinos by the K am iokande group <sup>1)</sup>, some of the underground detectors<sup>2) 3)</sup> have con m ed that the ux ratio of neutrino species ( + )=(  $_{e}$  +  $_{e}$ ) is signi cantly di erent from the expected value, although the situation is still controversial <sup>4) 5)</sup>. The atm ospheric neutrino anom aly m ay have a crucial in portance in particle physics, sine it can be interpreted in term s of neutrino oscillations with a large m ixing angle and a typical mass squared di erence of 0 10<sup>2</sup> eV<sup>2</sup> <sup>6) 7) 8) 9)</sup>. The observation of the zenith angle variation of the double ratio ( =e)<sub>data</sub>=( =e)<sub>M C</sub> at multi-G eV energies is also suggestive<sup>10)</sup>. It is therefore in portant to calculate atm ospheric neutrino uxes precisely.

A tm ospheric neutrino uxes have been calculated from the incident beam of prim ary cosm ic rays by Volkova<sup>11)</sup>, M itsuiet al<sup>12)</sup>, Butkevich et al<sup>13)</sup>, and Lipari<sup>14)</sup> m ainly for high energies (from around 1 G eV to above 100,000 G eV). G aisser et al<sup>15)</sup>, B arr et al<sup>16)</sup>, Bugaev and N aum ov<sup>17)</sup>, Lee ans K oh<sup>18)</sup>, and H onda et al<sup>19)</sup> m ade a detailed calculation of the atm ospheric neutrino uxes for low energies from the prim ary cosm ic rays. On the other hand, Perkins<sup>20)</sup> calculated the low energy atm ospheric neutrinos using - ux observed at high altitude.

In this paper, we report the detailed calculation of the atm ospheric neutrino uxes in the energy range from 30 M eV up to 3,000 G eV, corresponding to the observation range of underground neutrino detectors<sup>21)</sup>. We also discuss the possiblity to interpret the anom aly in term s of neutrino oscillations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>)</sup> Talk presented by S.M idorikawa, to appaer in the Proceedings of Yukawa International Sem inar '95: From the Standard M odel to G rand U ni ed Theories.

# x2. Prim ary Cosm ic Ray Fluxes

Prim ary cosm ic ray uxes are relatively well known in the low energy region (< 100G eV), by which the low energy atmospheric – uxes (< 3 G eV) are mainly produced. Webber and Lezniak<sup>22)</sup> have compiled the energy spectrum of the cosm ic rays for the hydrogen, helium, and CNO nuclei in the range 10 M eV 1,000 G eV for three levels of solar activity. A sim ilar compilation has been made by others for hydrogen and helium nuclei, which agrees well with that of Webber and Lezniak.



Fig.1. Observed uxes of cosm ic ray protons, helium nuclei, and CNOs from the compilation of W ebber and Leziak<sup>1)</sup>. Solid lines are our param etrization for solar m id, dashed lines for solar m in., and dotted lines for solar m ax.

The geomagnetic eld determines the minimum eneqy with which a cosm ic ray can arrive at the earth. For the cosm ic ray nucleus, the minimum energy of cosmic rays arriving at the earth is determined by the minimum rigidity (rigidity cuto ) rather than the minimum m om entum. The value of the rigidity cuto for the actual geomagnetic eld can be obtained from a computer sim ulation of cosm ic ray trajectories. If a cosmic ray particle can reach the earth, the antiparticle with an opposite m om entum can escape from the earth. We launch antiprotons from the earth, varying the position and direction. W hen a test particle with a given momentum reaches a distance of 10 tim es of the earth's radius, it is assum ed that the test particle has escaped from the geo-

magnetic eld. The rigidity cuto at K am joka site is shown as the contour m ap in Fig. 2.

C osm ic rays with energy greater than 100 GeV, which are responsible for > 10 GeV atm ospheric neutrino uxes, are not a ected by solar activity and by geom agnetic eld. There are few measurements of the cosm ic ray chemical composition at these energies, especially above  $1 \text{ TeV} \cdot W = \text{com piled}$  the available data and and parametrized the observed uxes for 100 GeV with a single power function, and show the result in table I. We treated bound nucleons at these energies as independent particles, and estim ated the prim ary nucleon spectrum.



Fig.2. The contourm ap of cuto -rigidity for the arrival directions at K am ioka. A zim uthal angles of 0;90;180, and 270 show directions of south, easth, north, and west respectively.

Table I. Compiled cosm ic ray spectrum in the form : A (E =100 G eV ) .

Nucleus		A			
Н	(6 <b>:</b> 65	0:13)	10 <sup>2</sup>	2:75	0:020
Нe	(3:28	0:05)	10 <sup>3</sup>	2:64	0:014
CNO	(1 <b>:</b> 40	0:07)	10 4	2:50	0:06
Ne-S	(3:91	0:03)	10 5	2:49	0:04
Fe	(1:27	0:11)	10 5	2:56	0:04

x3.	P roduction	and D	ecay	ofhadrons
-----	-------------	-------	------	-----------

As cosm ic rays propagate in the atm osphere, they produce 's and K 's in interactions with air nuclei. These m esons create atm ospheric 's when they decay as follow s:

The calculations of the cosm ic ray protons with air nuclei consists of a number of M onte C arb codes corresponding to di erent prim ary energies. W e em ployed the NUCR IN <sup>23)</sup> M onte C arb code for the hadronic interaction of cosm ic rays for E <sub>lab</sub> 5 G eV, and LUND code { FRITIOF version  $1.6^{24}$  and JETSET version  $6.3^{25}$  { for 5 G eV  $E_{lab}$  500 G eV. Above 500 G eV, the original code developed by

K asahara et al  $(C \circ SM \circ S)^{26}$  was used. The K = ratio is taken 7 % at 10 GeV, 11 % at 100 GeV, and 14 % at 1,000 GeV in laboratory energy.

W e consider all the decay modes of and K m esons but for rare ones. W e have ignored channed meson production, since the contribution of channed particle to atm ospheric neutrinos becomes sizable only for E > 100 TeV.

In the two body decay of charged 's and K 's, the resulting is fully polarized against (toward) the direction of motion in the charged or K rest frame. We took into account the muon polarization e ect in the subsequent decay following Hayakawa<sup>27)</sup>. We applied the discussion in Ref. 28 for the polarization of 's from the K<sub>31</sub> decay. The sm all angle scattering of 's in the atm osphere reduces the polarization. This depolarization e ect was also evaluated in Ref. 27 as of the order of 21 M eV /vp, where v and p are velocity and momentum of 's respectively.

## x4. Atm ospheric N eutrinos

At low energies, the rigidity cuto has a signi cant directional variation. In the one-dimensinoal approximation which we adopted, we expect larger – uxes from the low rigidity cuto directions and a smaller – uxes from the high rigidity cuto direction. In the actual case, how ever, it may be dicult to observe these variations. There is a smearing e ect of direction in the –detector. W hen a low energy (< 3 G eV) creates a charged lepton by a quasi-elastic process, the lepton has a typical angle of 50 { 60 from the direction. Thus the directional dependence of atm ospheric neutrino ux is small for low er enregy neutrinos, especially when they are observed in the detector. W e present in Fig. 3 the atm ospheric neutrino uxes averaging over all directions together with other calculations.

In Fig. 4, we show the ux ratio by -species along with those of other authors. A lthough the calculation method and some of physical assumptions are dierent among these authors, the ratio (e + e) = (+) is very similar each other. The relatively large dierence in e = e among them may reject the dierence of calculation scheme and/or the physical assumptions.

#### x5. Uncertainties

The system atic error in the calculation of atm ospheric { uxes comes mainly from the incompleteness of the know ledge of the primary cosm ic ray uxes. Even at low energies, where the primary cosm ic ray uxes are rather well studied, it is di cult to determ ine the absolute value due to the uncertainties in the instrum ental e ciency ( 12%) and exposure factor(2 { 3% }. In our complation, the error in the t is 10 % for the nucleon ux at 100 GeV and 20 % at 100 TeV. Assuming

10% uncertainty below 100 G eV, the system atic error in the atm ospheric { uxes is estimated to be 10% at 3 GeV, increasing to 20% at 100 GeV, and remains alm ost constant up to 1,000 G eV.

The interaction m odel is another source of system atic errors. In our com parison, the agreem ent of the LUND m odel and the COSMOS code with the experim ental data is < 10 %. The authors of the NUCRIN code claim that the agreem ent is within



Fig. 3. The atm ospheric { uxes multiplied by E<sup>2</sup> for the K am ioka site at solar m id. (solid line). BGS are from Ref. [16], BN from Ref. [17], and LK from Ref. [18]. The dotted line is the result from the calculation for high energy without the rigidity cuto, and averaged over all directions.



Fig. 4. The ux ratio of {species calculated for K am ioka. BGS are from Ref. [16], BN from Ref. [17], and LK from Ref. [18] as before.

10 { 20 % <sup>23)</sup>. The hadronic interaction below 5 G eV contributes at most 5 % to the production of atm ospheric { uxes at 1 G eV. The system atic error caused by the hadronic interaction model is estimated to be 10 % above 1 G eV.

O ne-dimensional approximation which we have adopted is justimed only at high energies. It is expected to be accurate above 3 GeV. Since the calculation of rigidity cuto is very simplied in this scheme, this may result in a systematic error in the absolute value of the atm ospheric neutrino  $\,$  uxes of 10 { 20  $\%\,$  at 100 M eV and 5  $\%\,$  at 1 G eV .

The statistics of the M onte C arb calculation also causes an error in the atm ospheric neutrino uxes. The uncertainty due to the statistics is estimated to be < 5 % up to 100 { 300 G eV for and , and up to 30 { 100 G eV for  $_{\rm e}$  and  $_{\rm e}$ , depending on the zenith angle. The errors increase to 10 % at the highest energy for each kind of 's.

C on bining all the system atic and non{system atic errors, the total error is estimated as 15 % from 1 GeV to 100 GeV, and 20 { 25 % at the highest energy in our calculation. However, the error of the species ratio is smaller than that of the absolute value, since the {species ratio is not a ected much by the uncertainty of primary uxes and the calculation scheme. It is estimated to be < 10 % below 100 GeV for = and < 5 % below 30 GeV for ( + )=( $_{e}$ +  $_{e}$ ). These errors also increase to 10 { 15 % at the highest energies in our calculation.

## x6. Neutrino O scillations

We compare the K am iokande data  $^{10)}$  with the theotetical calculations. As in our previous paper<sup>8)</sup>, we de ne,

< " 
$$F > = {X Z \ }$$
 "(E) (E; E) F(E; ) (h) dE dE d dh; (6.1);

where "(E) is the detection e ciency for an -type charged lepton with energy E , the discussed lepton with energy E ,

the di erencial cross section of  $\ ,$  F (E ; ) the incident  $\$ ux with energy E and zenith angle  $\ .$ 

Insted of the num ber N  $_{\rm e}^{\rm obs}$  and N  $^{\rm obs}$  of the observed electron and m uon events, we use the ratios de ned as follow s:

$$f_{1} = \frac{\langle " F_{e} \rangle}{\langle " F_{e} \rangle}; \qquad f_{2} = \frac{\langle "_{e} F_{e} \rangle}{\langle "_{e} F_{e} \rangle}; \qquad (6.2)$$

and

$$U_{e} = \frac{N_{e}^{obs}}{\langle \mathbf{u}_{e} \mathbf{e} \mathbf{F} \rangle} = f_{2} \frac{N_{e}^{obs}}{N_{e}^{MC}}$$
(6.3)

$$U = \frac{N}{\langle \mathbf{W} | \mathbf{F} \rangle} = \frac{N^{\text{obs}}}{N^{\text{M} \text{C}}}; \qquad (6.4)$$

where ( = [num ber of nucleons] [tim e]),  $N_e^{MC}$  and  $N^{MC}$  are the expected num bers of electron and m uon events from the M onte C arlo calculations respectively.

If there is no 'atm ospheric neutrino anom aly', the data would point to  $(f_2, 1)$  in the  $(U_e; U)$  plain. Note that the elects of ux models, geomagnetic cuto s, and the detection elected are all inluded in the values of  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ . We ind  $f_1$  '  $f_2$ ' 0:473 = f from our neutrino uxes and the detection elected of the sub-GeV data at K am jokande.

If there are neutrino oscillations, the ratios U<sub>e</sub> and U become

$$U_e = f_2 < P(e! e) > + < P(! e) > (6.5)$$

$$U = \langle P( ! ) \rangle + f_1 \langle P( e! ) \rangle;$$
 (6.6)

where the brackest m eans the average over the distances and energies of neutrinos:

< P ( ! ) > = 
$$\frac{1}{< " F >}$$
x Z
" (E ) (E ; E )F (E ; )P ( ! ) (h)dE dE d dh: (6.7)
;

Table II. the values of  $U_e$ , U, and  $U_e=U$  calculated from both the sub- and multi-G eV data for the K am ioka site with an exposure of 7.7 ktn yr. The value f is taken to be f = 0.473.

Energy	Ue		U		U <sub>e</sub> =U	
Sub-G eV	0:518	0:084	0 <b>:</b> 656	0:103	0:790	0:072
M ulti-G eV	0 <b>:</b> 697	0:126	0:832	0:144	0 <b>:</b> 838	0:111

We summarize in Table II the values of  $U_e$ , U, and  $U_e=U$  which are obtained from both the sub-and multi-GeV data with 7.7 ktn yr. We used only single ring events for the analysis of sub-GeV data. For the multi-GeV data, we used both single and multi-ring events, and evaluated  $U_e$  using Eq. 6.4 with  $f_2 = f$  obtained from the sub-GeV data so that we can compare both data directly. We combine the statistical and system atic errors of 15% including the uncertaity in the neutrino cross section.

We show in Fig. 5 the regions allowed by the Table II together with the region  $(U_e; U)$  allowed by three neutrino oscillations assuming  $f_1 = f_2$  f.

From this gure, we nd that the sub-GeV and muti-GeV data are marginally consistent each other, and that it is possible to explain the anomaly in terms of three neutrino oscillations. A like up it may be premature to deduce what mode dominates oscillatios, the multi-GeV data seem to sugest e ! oscillations, while the sub-GeV data prefer ! oscillations. It seems that  $U_e$  and U grow with energy, keeping the  $U = U_e$  ratio alm ost constant. The same conclusion has also been drawn by Fogli and Lisi<sup>29)</sup>. This e ect may be explained by the improvement of of the data and/or calculations. However, if we take both the theory and the experiment seriouly, we are lead to a more fascinating conjecture. We can explain both data if matter enhanced oscillations would occur between sub- and multi-GeV regions.

In conclusion, we have show n a detailed calculation of atm ospheric neutrinos and a new analysis of the anom aly using the recent K am iokande data. The atm ospheric neutrino anom aly is eager for further con m ation by another types of neutrino exprim ents such as a long baseline experim ent.



Fig. 5. A nalysis of the K am iokande data. Bold line : A llowed region by three neutrino oscillations. Solid line: K am iokande Sub-G eV data. D ashed line: K am iokande M ulti-G eV data.

## A cknow ledgem ents

This work is supported in part by Grant-in-Aid for Scienti c Reseach, of the M inistry of Education, Science and Culture ]07640419.

#### References

- [1] K S. Hirata et al, Phys. Lett. B 205, 416 (1988).
- [2] D. Casper et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 2561 (1991); R. Becker-Szendy et al, Phys. Rev. D 66, 2561 (1991).
- [3] T.Kafka, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 35, 427 (1994).
- [4] Ch.Berger et al, Phys. Lett. B 227, 489 (1989); 245 305 (1990).
- [5] M.Aglietta, et al, Europhys. Lett. 8, 611 (1989).
- [6] J.G. Learned, S. Pakvasa, and T.J. W eiler, Phys. Lett. B 207, 79 (1988).
- [7] V.Berger and K.W hisnant, Phys.Lett.B 209, 365 (1988).
- [8] K.Hidaka, M.Honda, and S.Midorikawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 1537 (1988); S.Midorikawa, M.Honda, and K.Kasahara, Phys. Rev. D 44, 3379 (1991).
- [9] K S. Hirata et al, Phys. Lett. B 280, 146 (1992).
- [10] Y.Fukuda, et al, Phys. Lett. B 335, 237 (1994).
- [11] L.V. Volkova, Yad. Fiz. 31, 1510 (1980) [Soviet J. Nucl. Phys. 37, 784 (1980)].
- [12] K.M itsui, Y.M inorikawa, and H.Komori, Nuovo Cimento 9C, 995 (1986).
- [13] A.V. Butkevich, L.G. Dedenko, and IM. Zhelsnykh, Yad. Fiz. 50, 142 (1989) [Soviet J. Nucl. Phys. 50, 90 (1989)].
- [14] P. Lipari, A stroparticle Phys. 1, 195 (1993).
- [15] T.K.Gaisser, T.Stanev, and G.Barr, Phys. Rev. D 38, 85 (1988).
- [16] G.Barr, T.K.Gaisser, and T.Stanev, Phys.Rev.D 39, 3532 (1989).
- [17] E.V. Bugaev and V.A. Naum ov, Phys. Lett. B 232, 391 (1989).
- [18] H.Lee and Y.Koh, Nuovo Cim ento B 105, 884 (1990).
- [19] M. Honda, K. Kasahara, K. Hidaka, and S. Midorikawa, Phys. Lett. B 248, 193 (1990).
- [20] D.H. Perkins, A stroparticle Phys2, 249 (1990).
- [21] M. Honda, T. Kajita, K. Kasahara, and S. Midorikawa, ICRR-Report-336-95-2 (1995), to

be published in Phys.Rev.D.

- [22] W R.Webber and JA.Lezniak, Astrophys. Space Sci., 30, 361 (1974).
- [23] K. Hanseget and J. Ranft, Comput. Phys., 39, 37 (1986): Nucl. Sci. Eng., 88, 537 and 551 (1984).
- [24] B.Nilsson-Almqvist and E.Stenlund, Comput.Commun.43 387 (1987).
- [25] Sjostrand T. et al, Comput. Commun. 43, 367 (1987).
- [26] K.Kasahara, and S.Torii, Comput. Phys. Commun. 64, 109 (1991); K.Kasahara, S.Torii, and T.Yuda, in Proceedings of the 16th ICRC, Kyoto 1979 (University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan, 1979) Vol. 13, p. 70.
- [27] S.Hayakawa, Phys. Rev. 108, 1533 (1957).
- [28] N.Brene, L.Egrade, and B.Qvist, Nucl. Phys. 22, 553 (1961).
- [29] G L.Fogliand E.Lisi, Phys.Rev.D 52, 2775 (1955).