

## Erratum: Observational Constraints on the Ultra-high Energy Cosmic Neutrino Flux from the Second Flight of the ANITA Experiment

P. W. Gorham<sup>1</sup>, P. Allison<sup>1</sup>, B. M. Baughman<sup>2</sup>, J. J. Beatty<sup>2</sup>, K. Belov<sup>3</sup>, D. Z. Besson<sup>4</sup>, S. Bevan<sup>5</sup>, W. R. Binns<sup>6</sup>, C. Chen<sup>7</sup>, P. Chen<sup>7</sup>, J. M. Clem<sup>8</sup>, A. Connolly<sup>5</sup>, M. Detrixhe<sup>4</sup>, D. De Marco<sup>8</sup>, P. F. Dowkontt<sup>6</sup>, M. DuVernois<sup>1</sup>, E. W. Grashorn<sup>2</sup>, B. Hill<sup>1</sup>, S. Hoover<sup>3</sup>, M. Huang<sup>7</sup>, M. H. Israel<sup>6</sup>, A. Javaid<sup>8</sup>, K. M. Liewer<sup>9</sup>, S. Matsuno<sup>1</sup>, B. C. Mercurio<sup>2</sup>, C. Miki<sup>1</sup>, M. Mottram<sup>5</sup>, J. Nam<sup>7</sup>, R. J. Nichol<sup>5</sup>, K. Palladino<sup>2</sup>, A. Romero-Wolf<sup>1</sup>, L. Ruckman<sup>1</sup>, D. Saltzberg<sup>3</sup>, D. Seckel<sup>8</sup>, R.Y. Shang<sup>7</sup>, G. S. Varner<sup>1</sup>, A. G. Viereggs<sup>3</sup>, Y. Wang<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of Hawaii, Manoa, HI 96822.* <sup>2</sup> *Dept. of Physics, Ohio State Univ., Columbus, OH 43210.* <sup>3</sup> *Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of California Los Angeles, CA 90095.* <sup>4</sup> *Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045.* <sup>5</sup> *Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, Univ. College London, London, United Kingdom.* <sup>6</sup> *Dept. of Physics, Washington Univ. in St. Louis, MO 63130.* <sup>7</sup> *Dept. of Physics, National Taiwan Univ., Taipei, Taiwan.* <sup>8</sup> *Dept. of Physics, Univ. of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716.* <sup>9</sup> *Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, CA 91109.*

In a recent article [1] we reported a limit on the cosmic neutrino flux from the second flight of the ANITA experiment. The limit was based on observing two events passing all cuts on a background of  $0.97 \pm 0.42$ .

One of the first steps in the blind analysis procedure was inserting twelve pulser events at undisclosed random times to mimic a neutrino signal. These events would be removed upon unblinding the analysis. This was one of two ways that the analysis employed a blind analysis technique. After publication, we subsequently determined that due to a clerical error one of the two surviving events, Event 8381355, was actually one of the inserted pulser events. The fact that this event survived its subsequent scrutiny we consider as a demonstration that the blinding procedure was truly valid.

The net result is that ANITA-II observed one event on a background of  $0.97 \pm 0.42$ . The new limit, which is 33-34% stronger, is shown in in Figure 1. Now the actual limit is essentially the same as the expected limit so we no longer show both curves. The ANITA-II 90% CL integral flux limit on a pure  $E^{-2}$  spectrum for  $10^{18} \text{ eV} \leq E_\nu \leq 10^{23.5} \text{ eV}$  is  $E_\nu^2 F_\nu \leq 1.3 \times 10^{-7} \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1}$ . An updated evaluation of confidence limits for constraining representative models is given in Table I. The changes result in an improvement in the constraints on the given strong-source evolutionary models, the majority of which are now excluded at  $> 90\%$  confidence.




FIG. 1: ANITA-II limit for 28.5 days livetime. The blue curve is the new actual limit, based on the one surviving candidate. Other limits are from AMANDA, RICE, Auger, HiRes, and a revised limit from ANITA-I. The BZ (GZK) neutrino model range is determined by a variety of models. Full citations are given in the original article.

<b>Model &amp; references</b>	<b>predicted <math>N_\nu</math></b>	<b>CL,%</b>
<i>Baseline models:</i>		
Various	0.3-1.0	...
<i>Strong source evolution models:</i>		
Aramo <i>et al.</i> 2005	2.4	85
Berezinsky 2005	5.1	98
Kalashov <i>et al.</i> 2002	5.6	99
Barger, Huber, & Marfatia 2006	3.5	93
Yuksel & Kistler 2007	1.7	74
<i>Models that saturate all bounds:</i>		
Yoshida <i>et al.</i> 1997	30	> 99.999
Kalashov <i>et al.</i> 2002	19	> 99.999
Aramo <i>et al.</i> 2005	16	99.999
<i>Waxman-Bahcall fluxes:</i>		
Waxman, Bahcall 1999, evolved sources	1.4	...
Waxman, Bahcall 1999, standard	0.5	...

TABLE I: Expected numbers of events  $N_\nu$  from several cosmogenic neutrino models, and confidence levels for exclusion by ANITA-II observations when appropriate. Citations are given in the original article.