MUTE: A Modern Calculation for Deep Underground and Underwater Muons

William Woodley

Supervisor: Prof. Marie-Cécile Piro 8 August 2022





Introduction

- Underground and underwater muons are crucial in data analyses in neutrino telescopes and in the design of Dark Matter detectors.
- Mei & Hime [1] and Crouch [2] use Depth-Intensity Relations (DIRs), which may contain bias induced by systematics.
- Theoretical calculations of Bugaev [3] lack rigorous treatment of uncertainties.
- MUTE (MUon inTensity codE) is a new computational tool written in Python that calculates muon fluxes underground.



Introduction

- Underground and underwater muons are crucial in data analyses in neutrino telescopes and in the design of Dark Matter detectors.
- Mei & Hime [1] and Crouch [2] use Depth-Intensity Relations (DIRs), which may contain bias induced by systematics.
- Theoretical calculations of Bugaev [3] lack rigorous treatment of uncertainties.
- MUTE (MUon inTensity codE) is a new computational tool written in Python that calculates muon fluxes underground.

$$I(h) = I_1 e^{(-h/\lambda_1)} + I_2 e^{(-h/\lambda_2)}$$



Method Overview



Method Overview



Calculations

• A convolution is performed to calculate underground fluxes:

$$\Phi^{u}(E_{j}^{u}, X_{k}, \theta_{k}) = \sum_{i} \Phi^{s}(E_{i}^{s}, \theta_{k}) P(E_{i}^{s}, E_{j}^{u}, X_{k}) \left(\frac{\Delta E_{i}^{s}}{\Delta E_{j}^{u}}\right)$$



Results – Vertical Underground Intensity



Comparison to Data

- DDM is better at shallow depths, and SIBYLL is better at deep depths.
- Uncertainties on data are smaller than those on theory.
- → Theoretical uncertainties on neutrino fluxes may be able to be constrained from 40% down to ~10%.



Labs under Mountains

- Underground intensities for mountains are first calculated on a grid of constant zenith angles and slant depths.
- Using a map of the mountain profile, these intensities are then interpolated to the slant depths $X(\theta, \phi)$ that define the mountain.



Results – Total Underground Flux

• Our calculation reproduces total underground flux measurements excellently.



Results – Seasonal Variations

- In the summer, the atmosphere is taller, meaning muons travel longer distances and decay more often ⇒ the muon flux is **lower** at the surface in summer.
- However, there are also more higher-energy muons in the summer, which reach deeper underground ⇒ the muon flux is higher underground in summer.



Results – Seasonal Variations

• MUTE can calculate seasonal variation amplitudes to very high precision.





• MUTE can be installed via pip (pip install mute). Computational scheme and detailed documentation are given in our recent paper [6] and on the GitHub page:

doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac5027

https://github.com/wjwoodley/mute

- Flexible:
 - Flat or mountain
 - Location on Earth
 - Month

- Medium (Standard Rock)
- Density of medium (2.65 gcm⁻³)
- Energy threshold

- Primary model (GSF)
- Interaction model (DDM)
- Level of statistics

- Fast:
 - MUTE comes with pre-calculated transfer tensors at installation.
 - Calculations take seconds to complete.

Applications

- MUTE can give full definitions of muon spectra:
 - Energy spectra
 - Angular spectra
 - Total muon rate
- Results from MUTE can be used as input into general particle transport codes like Geant4 and FLUKA to study muon-induced backgrounds in underground and underwater detectors.
- This can be used by Dark Matter and neutrino experiments to design effective shielding strategies for muon-induced neutrons.

Conclusion

- By combining MCEq and PROPOSAL, MUTE can calculate **forward predictions** for underground muon fluxes and intensities.
- The program is flexible, fast, and precise, and the results match experimental data very well.
- Uncertainties on data are smaller than those on theory. New constraints on cosmic ray fluxes and hadronic models can be obtained by leveraging measurements of the vertical and total fluxes from underground and underwater facilities.
- MUTE is public and available to be used by Dark Matter and neutrino experiments in labs under flat overburdens and mountains.



References

- 1. D. Mei and A. Hime, *Phys. Rev. D* 73 (2006) 053004 [astro-ph/0512125].
- 2. M. Crouch, in International Cosmic Ray Conference, vol. 6 of International Cosmic Ray Conference, p. 165, Jan., 1987.
- 3. E.V. Bugaev, A. Misaki, V.A. Naumov, T.S. Sinegovskaya, S.I. Sinegovsky and N. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev. D* 58 (1998) 054001.
- 4. A. Fedynitch, F. Riehn, R. Engel, T.K. Gaisser and T. Stanev, *Phys. Rev. D* 100 (2019) 103018.
- 5. J.-H. Koehne, K. Frantzen, M. Schmitz, T. Fuchs, W. Rhode, D. Chirkin et al., *Computer Physics Communications* 184 (2013) 2070.
- 6. A. Fedynitch, W. Woodley and M.-C. Piro, *The Astrophysical Journal* **928** (2022) 27.
- 7. PDG: Particle Data Group, <u>PTEP 2020 (2020) 083C01</u>.
- 8. ANTARES (2009): ANTARES, <u>0911.3055</u>.

10.

12.

13.

14. 15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

MUM (2001):

Super-K (2016):

Jinping (2020):

IceCube:

Borexino:

SNO:

- 9. AMANDA-II (2003): X. Bai *et al.*, in 28th International Cosmic Ray Conference, pp. 1373–1376, 5, 2003.
 - NEMO Phase-2 (2015): NEMO, <u>Astropart. Phys. 66 (2015) 1 [1412.0849]</u>.
- 11. Sinegovskaya (2001): T.S. Sinegovskaya and S.I. Sinegovsky, *Phys. Rev. D* 63 (2001) 096004 [hep-ph/0007234].
 - I.A. Sokalski, E.V. Bugaev and S.I. Klimushin, <u>Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 074015</u>.
 - Hyper-Kamiokande, <u>1805.04163</u>.
 - KamLAND (2010): KamLAND, *Phys. Rev. C* 81 (2010) 025807 [0907.0066].
 - Gran Sasso (2019): LVD, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 062002 [1909.04579].
 - Fréjus (2013): EDELWEISS, *Astropart. Phys.* 44 (2013) 28 [1302.7112].
 - JNE, <u>Chin. Phys. C 45 (2021) 025001 [2007.15925]</u>
 - IceCube, <u>PoS ICRC2019 (</u>2020) 894 [1909.01406].
 - MINOS: MINOS Collaboration. *Phys. Rev. D* 91 (2015) 112006.
 - M. Agostini, et al., Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics 2019 (2019) 046.
 - C. Kyba, Ph.D. thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 2006.