

A. Bonardi, S. Buitink, A. Corstanje, K. D. de Vries, H. Falcke, B. M. Hare, J. R. Hörandel, T. Huege, G. Krampah, P. Mitra, K. Mulrey\*, A. Nelles, H. Pandya, J. P. Rachen, E. Santiago, L. Rossetto, O. Scholten, R. Stanley, S. ter Veen, T. N. G. Trinh, T. Winchen



\*kmulrey@vub.be



- Energy scales between different experiments differ, must be scaled in order to achieve a global spectrum
- Difficult to directly compare energy reconstruction (different detection methods, systematics, etc.) between experiments

## K. Mulrey



- Energy scales between different experiments differ, must be scaled in order to achieve a global spectrum
- Difficult to directly compare energy reconstruction (different detection methods, systematics, etc.) between experiments
- A universal energy scale is critical for understanding cosmic ray sources and acceleration

## K. Mulrey

A common energy scale has been derived using a data driven using a Global Spline fit (H. Dembinski et al., PoS(ICRC2017)533



Can a global energy scale be determined experimentally?



A common energy scale has been derived using a data driven using a Global Spline fit (H. Dembinski et al., PoS(ICRC2017)533



Can a global energy scale be determined experimentally?

Cosmic-ray energy cross-calibration array

A common energy scale has been derived using a data driven using a Global Spline fit (H. Dembinski et al., PoS(ICRC2017)533



Can a global energy scale be determined experimentally?



A common energy scale has been derived using a data driven using a Global Spline fit (H. Dembinski et al., PoS(ICRC2017)533



Can a global energy scale be determined experimentally?



**ICRC 2021** 

A common energy scale has been derived using a data driven using a Global Spline fit (H. Dembinski et al., PoS(ICRC2017)533



Can a global energy scale be determined experimentally?





## Use radiation energy to compare energy scales

- energy emitted by the air shower in the form of radio waves
- integral of energy fluence on ground
- scales with energy in electromagnetic components of the air shower



# Concept

## Use radiation energy to compare energy scales



## Make it universal...



a = parametrization of the charge-excess fraction

B<sub>Earth</sub> = local magnet field

 $\alpha$  = angle between shower axis and B<sub>Earth</sub> axis

#### Method from: *C. Glaser, et al. JCAP, 1609(09):024, 2016*

# Concept

## Use radiation energy to compare energy scales



## Make it universal...



a = parametrization of the charge-excess fraction

B<sub>Earth</sub> = local magnet field

 $\alpha$  = angle between shower axis and B<sub>Earth</sub> axis

C. Glaser, et al. JCAP, 1609(09):024, 2016

**Corrected radiation energy is a universal** quantity that can be directly compared between experiments

## K. Mulrey

Method from:

# **Example: LOFAR**

LOFAR Radboud air shower Array (LORA)



### **Particle footprint**





Low Frequency Array (LOFAR)



Radio footprint



### K. Mulrey

# **Example: LOFAR**



K. Mulrey

South-North (m)



At a radiation energy of 1 MeV, the energy scales of Auger and LORA agree to within 6 ± 20 %





At a radiation energy of 1 MeV, the energy scales of Auger and LORA agree to within 6 ± 20 %

(How can we improve this?



At a radiation energy of 1 MeV, the energy scales of Auger and LORA agree to within 6 ± 20 %

- 14% uncertainty AERA antenna calibration
- 13.6% uncertainty LOFAR radiation energy (dominated by antenna calibration)

## K. Mulrey



At a radiation energy of 1 MeV, the energy scales of Auger and LORA agree to within 6  $\pm$  20 % Measure the

- 14% uncertainty AERA antenna calibration
- 13.6% uncertainty LOFAR radiation energy (dominated by antenna calibration)

## K. Mulrey

**ICRC 2021** 

radiation energy

with the same

array



# Measure the radiation energy with the same array!

Eliminate uncertainties on the comparison due to antenna calibration, system response, ...



# Measure the radiation energy with the same array!

Eliminate uncertainties on the comparison due to antenna calibration, system response, ...

- Autonomous: self triggering, independent energy measurement, no/minimal interference with main experiment
- Portable: can be deployed at different sites, spacing can be adjusted to probe different energy regimes





## **Triggering: radio + particle**



Particle: ensures a cosmic ray Radio: Strong radio signal / usable event



#### Antenna: SKA log-periodic (v2)

- High gain, smooth response up to 350 MHz
- Well modeled
- Used in SKA, IceTop radio



#### **Scintillators: KASCADE**

- ~1m<sup>2</sup>
- Well understood

## **CODALEMA** electronics



- 1 GS/s sampling
- 14 bit depth
- 2.56 µsec traces
- 15 ns relative accuracy
- 20-25 W power
- External / logic triggering

## K. Mulrey

## 1. Integrate fluence to get radiation energy (2D LDF)



$$F = \varepsilon_0 c \left( \Delta t \sum_{t_1}^{t_2} |\vec{E}(t_i)|^2 - \Delta t \frac{t_2 - t_1}{t_4 - t_3} \sum_{t_3}^{t_4} |\vec{E}(t_i)|^2 \right)$$
 A. Aab et al.  
PRL 116 (2016) no.24, 241101

- Only 5 stations- use direction/core info from host experiment
- Develop model for 50-350 MHz footprint
- Resolution ~20% (30-80 MHz)

## 2. Use broadband spectral information (ARIANNA style)





Welling et al. JCAP 10 (2019) 075

- Make use of spectral information to determine where you are w.r.t the Cherenkov cone
- Single antenna reconstruction?
- Resolution ~15%

Geomagnetic signal on vxvxB arm E~10<sup>17</sup>eV Xmax=640 g/cm<sup>2</sup> zenith=33°



30-80 MHz



position vxB (m)





### **Energy reconstruction: work in progress**

30-80 MHz



## K. Mulrey



# Timeline

- Prototype design and assembly 2020-2021
- *Deployment*: 2021-2022 @ LOFAR, 2022 @ Auger



Collect ~ 300 events at each location

• Longterm: deploy at other experiments

## K. Mulrey

# **RET-CR Surface array**



### K. Mulrey

# **VUB** prototype



# **VUB** prototype





## K. Mulrey

# **Extra**





Design should be compatible with LOFAR + Auger facilities

### K. Mulrey



### K. Mulrey



#### K. Mulrey