MC study for the effect of diffractive events on the air shower developments Ken Ohashi, Yoshitaka Itow, and Hiroaki Menjo (ISEE, Nagoya Univ., Japan)

abstract

To understand the origin of ultra-high energy cosmic-rays (UHECRs), mass composition of cosmic-rays is very important. The depth of shower maximum, X_{max} , is an indicator of the mass composition. The prediction of X_{max} by an air shower simulation is shifted significantly by the choice of hadronic interaction models. Diffractive events are one of the proposed sources of model differences in X_{max} predictions. In this work, we study the effect of parameters of diffractive events, such as the fraction, on X_{max} using the air shower simulation package COSMOS. 50000 air showers are simulated and categorized by the collision type of first interaction. We estimate the effect of diffractive events on air shower developments quantitatively by replacing the fraction and $\langle X_{max} \rangle$,.

Introduction

The origin of ultra-high energy cosmic-rays is unknown. Ultra-high energy cosmic rays (UHECRs) with $> 10^{18}$ eV are expected to be accelerated in energetic extra-galactic object such as AGNs and star burst galaxies, however, these accelerators of UHECRs are not identified experimentally yet. To understand the origin, the mass composition of shower event by 10¹⁵ eV proton cosmic-rays, protons, iron nuclei, or other nuclei, is cosmic-ray. one of the key observable. During the propagation Image credit: CORSIKA web page from the source to the Earth, UHECRs are bended by E[eV]the magnetic field of the inner/outer galaxy, and they ___ 850 ້ມ (<u>ໄ</u> (<u>ໄ</u> interact with cosmic microwave background. These effect strongly depends on the mass composition. shower $X_{max} > [$ As a result of interactions between a cosmic-ray and air nuclei, a large number of particles are produced in the · EPOS-LHC E 600 - SIBYLL 2.3 atmosphere, and this phenomenon is called "air shower" QGSJET II-04 (Fig. 1). UHECR experiments observe air-showers by 20.0 19.0 18.0 log(E/eV) Energy using particle detector arrays and/or fluorescence Figure 2 Experimental data and telescopes on the ground. The energy and the depth of maximum of the air shower developments, X_{max} , is one Exp. data are results by PAO [1]. of the indicators of the mass composition, and the mass composition is estimated by comparing the prediction simulations with several hadronic interaction models. and an experimental data of X_{max} (Fig. 2). However, a prediction of X_{max} depends on the choice of hadronic interaction models in simulation, and that makes difficult to interpret mass composition.



<u>the predictions of $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ </u>

By using the first interaction information, we divide the events into four or five categories, and calculate $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ for each category. Table 1 shows the $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ and fractions of each category. The effect of diffractive events is different among the diffractive types. $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ predictions of diffractive events are larger than that of ND, and that of tSD are largest in four or five categories.



predictions of mean X_{max} ($\langle X_{max} \rangle$). Predictions are results of air shower

Verification of hadronic interaction models is needed, and several components of the models are proposed as sources of the $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ discrepancy among the models. One proposed source is the different modeling of diffractive collisions among the models.

Diffractive collisions

Diffractive collisions is one of the event $P_1 \longrightarrow X M_x$ $P_1 \longrightarrow X M_x$ categories in inelastic collisions of hadrons and 16 to 22% of collisions between 10^{15} eV proton and an air nucleus are diffractive Central-Diff. Single-Diff. Double-Diff. events. There are three types of diffractive (CD) (SD) (DD) events as shown in Fig. 3. A single Figure 3 The feynman diagram of diffractive collisions.[1] diffractive event is a diffractive event with one proton dissociation, while a double Single-Diff. **SD** Non-Diff. diffractive event is with both proton ND dissociations. In this study, we focus on only single and double diffraction. Diffractive events are characterized by a tSD pSD smaller number and higher energy of target projectile produced particles than non-diffractive nucleus dis. proton dis. events. A few simulation studies about the effect non-diffractive (left, ND), projectile single diffractive of diffractive collisions on the air-shower tSD), and double diffractive (right, DD) at lab frame. development have been performed. The effect of the shift of diffractive cross section on X_{max} is estimated $\pm 5 \text{ g/cm}^2$ in Ref. 2. In Ref. 3, the maximum effect of diffractive events is estimated with an extreme assumption, and that is 15 g/cm^2 . However, the assumption in Ref. 3 is not realistic, and the effect of parameters of diffractive events on $X_{\rm max}$ is not well understood. These parameters are important to improve the models. In this work, we discuss the effect of parameters of diffractive events on the air shower



Table $1 < X_{max}$ and the fraction of each category of diffraction for three interaction models

			e .			
	ND	SD (proton dis.)	SD (air nucleus dis.)	DD	CD	total
SIBYLL 2.3c						
fraction [%]	84.2 ± 0.4	$10.5{\pm}0.1$	$4.20{\pm}0.09$	$1.10 {\pm} 0.05$		100.0
mean X_{max} [g/cm ²]	$577.0 {\pm} 0.4$	$609.9 {\pm} 1.3$	$648.1 {\pm} 2.5$	$605.7 {\pm} 3.8$		$583.8 {\pm} 0.4$
difference from ND	-	+32.9	+71.1	+28.7		
QGSJET II-04						
fraction [%]	84.7 ± 0.4	$7.2{\pm}0.1$	$4.20{\pm}0.09$	$4.00 {\pm} 0.09$		100.0
mean X_{max} [g/cm ²]	561.1 ± 0.4	$612.4{\pm}1.6$	$634.8 {\pm} 2.5$	$602.8 {\pm} 2.0$		$569.9 {\pm} 0.4$
difference from ND	-	+50.9	+73.3	+41.3		
EPOS-LHC						
fraction [%]	78.9 ± 0.4	$4.7 {\pm} 0.1$	$5.0{\pm}0.1$	$9.2{\pm}0.1$	$2.27{\pm}0.07$	100.0
mean X_{max} [g/cm ²]	565.5 ± 0.4	611.1 ± 1.9	$632.8 {\pm} 2.2$	$606.1 {\pm} 1.3$	$627.1 {\pm} 3.2$	$576.1 {\pm} 0.4$
difference from ND	_	+45.6	+67.3	+40.6	+61.6	

the effect of the fraction of each category of diffraction

To estimate the effect of the fraction, we replace fractions in QGSJET II to EPOS-LHC or SIBYLL 2.3c, and calculate total X_{max} using Eq. 1.

 $< X_{max}^{total} > = < X_{max}^{ND} > + f^{pSD} \alpha^{pSD} + f^{tSD} \alpha^{tSD} + f^{DD} \alpha^{DD}$ (Equation 1)

where $\langle X_{max}^{total} \rangle$ is $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ of all events, and $\langle X_{max}^{ND} \rangle$ is that of ND category. f^{i} (i = pSD, tSD, DD) is the fraction of each category and α^{i} is a difference of $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ of category i from ND. When we use $\langle X_{max}^{ND} \rangle$ and α^{i} in SIBYLL 2.3c and f^i in QGSJET II and calculate $\langle X_{max}^{total} \rangle$ (replacing the fraction in QGSJET II to SIBYLL 2.3c), the result is 570.4 g/cm², which is 0.5 g/cm² larger than the original one. From table 1, EPOS-LHC only has the

Figure 4 The schematic view of the diffractive event of (middle-left, pSD), target single diffractive (middle-right, category of CD. We ignore the fraction of CD and renormalize each fraction in order to make total fraction 100%, then replace the fraction in QGSJET II to EPOS-LHC. The result is 571.6 g/cm^2 , which is 1.7 g/cm^2 larger than the original one. From these results, the effect of model differences of the fraction between SIBYLL 2.3c (EPOS-LHC) and QGSJET II on $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ is 0.5 g/cm² (1.7 g/cm^2) , which is 3.5 % (27.1 %) of the current model discrepancy.

<u>the effect of $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ of each category of diffractive events</u>

To estimate the effect of diffractive events other than the fraction, which is a difference in particle production, we replace in α^i of each category in QGSJET II to EPOS-LHC or SIBYLL 2.3c. We estimate that effect by replacing α^i in Table 1 and calculate with Eq. 1. Replacing α^i in QGSJET II to SIBYLL 2.3c (EPOS-LHC), the result is 568.0 g/cm^2 (569.2 g/cm^2), which is 1.9 g/cm^2 (0.6 g/cm²) smaller than original one. This shift is 13.6 % (10.7 %) of the current model discrepancy between two models.

Conclusion

We studied the effect of diffractive events on air shower developments.

The effect of model differences in the fraction of each category between SIBYLL 2.3c (EPOS-LHC) and QGSJET II on X_{max} is 0.5 g/cm^2 (1.7 g/cm^2). The effect of model differences of each category of diffractive events between SIBYLL 2.3c (EPOS-LHC) and QGSJET II on X_{max} is 1.9 g/cm² (0.6 g/cm²).

development.

The effect of diffractive events on the air shower development

In this work, we simulate air showers by using the air shower simulation package COSMOS 8.035, and estimate the effect of parameters of diffractive events on mean X_{max} ($\langle X_{max} \rangle$). In parameters of diffractive events, we focus on the fraction of each category of diffractive events in inelastic collisions. The energy of each produced particle in diffractive events is different among the

simulation settings 50000 air showers categorize events using the first interaction information primary particle: 10¹⁵ eV proton Energy of the first interaction: $\sqrt{s_{NN}} \approx 1.3 \text{ TeV}$

types, and that of SD with target nucleus dissociation is highest. This feature affects shower developments of each type of diffractive events, therefore the fraction of each type in inelastic collisions is one of important parameters.

References

[1] The Pierre Auger Collaboration, ICRC 2017 (2017) [2] S. Ostapchenko, Phys. Rev. D 89, 074009 (2014) [3] L.B. Arbeletche et al., Int. J. Mod. Phys. A 33, 1850153 (2018)

Ken Ohashi, Yoshitaka Itow, and Hiroaki Menjo, KMI 2019, Feb. 18-20