

AGILE detection of gamma-ray sources coincident with cosmic neutrino events

F. LUCARELLI,^{1,2} M. TAVANI,^{3,4} G. PIANO,³ A. BULGARELLI,⁵ I. DONNARUMMA,⁶ F. VERRECCHIA,^{1,2}
C. PITTORI,^{1,2} L. A. ANTONELLI,² A. ARGAN,³ G. BARBIELLINI,⁷ P. CARAVEO,⁸ M. CARDILLO,³
P. W. CATTANEO,⁹ A. CHEN,¹⁰ S. COLAFRANCESCO,^{10,2} E. COSTA,^{3,6} E. DEL MONTE,³
G. DI COCCO,¹¹ A. FERRARI,¹² V. FIORETTI,⁵ M. GALLI,⁵ P. GIOMMI,⁶ A. GIULIANI,⁸ P. LIPARI,¹³
F. LONGO,¹⁴ S. MEREGHETTI,⁸ A. MORSELLI,¹⁵ F. PAOLETTI,^{16,3} N. PARMIGGIANI,¹¹
A. PELLIZZONI,¹⁷ P. PICOZZA,¹⁸ M. PILIA,¹⁷ A. RAPPOLDI,⁹ A. TROIS,¹⁷ A. URSI,³
S. VERCELLONE,¹⁹ AND V. VITTORINI³
(THE *AGILE* TEAM)

¹*ASI Space Science Data Center (SSDC), Via del Politecnico snc, I-00133 Roma, Italy*

²*INAF-OAR, via Frascati 33, I-00078 Monte Porzio Catone (Roma), Italy*

³*INAF/IAPS-Roma, Via del Fosso del Cavaliere 100, I-00133 Roma, Italy*

⁴*Univ. "Tor Vergata", Via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy*

⁵*INAF/IASFBologna, Via Gobetti 101, I-40129 Bologna, Italy*

⁶*Agenzia Spaziale Italiana (ASI), Via del Politecnico snc, I-00133 Roma, Italy*

⁷*Dipartimento di Fisica, Universita di Trieste and INFN, via Valerio 2, I-34127 Trieste, Italy*

⁸*INAF/IASF-Milano, via E. Bassini 15, I-20133 Milano, Italy*

⁹*INFN-Pavia, Via Bassi 6, I-27100 Pavia, Italy*

¹⁰*University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa*

¹¹*INAF/IASF-Bologna, Via Gobetti 101, I-40129 Bologna, Italy*

¹²*CIFS, c/o Physics Department, University of Turin, via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

¹³*INFN-Roma Sapienza, Piazzale Aldo Moro 2, 00185 Roma, Italy*

¹⁴*Dip. di Fisica, Universita di Trieste and INFN, Via Valerio 2, I-34127 Trieste, Italy*

¹⁵*INFN-Roma Tor Vergata, via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, 00133 Roma, Italy*

¹⁶*East Windsor RSD, 25a Leshin Lane, Hightstown, NJ 08520, USA*

¹⁷*INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Cagliari, via della Scienza 5, I-09047 Selargius (CA), Italy*

¹⁸*INFN-Roma Tor Vergata, via della Ricerca Scientifica 1, I-00133 Roma, Italy*

¹⁹*INAF - Oss. Astron. di Brera, Via E. Bianchi 46, I-23807 Merate (LC), Italy*

ABSTRACT

The origin of cosmic neutrinos is still largely unknown. Using data obtained by the gamma-ray imager on board of the *AGILE* satellite, we systematically searched for transient gamma-ray sources above 100 MeV that are temporally and spatially coincident with ten recent high-energy neutrino IceCube events. We find three *AGILE* candidate sources that can be considered possible counterparts to neutrino events. Detecting 3 gamma-ray/neutrino associations out of 10 IceCube events is shown to be unlikely due to a chance coincidence. One of the sources is related to the BL Lac source TXS

0506+056. For the other two *AGILE* gamma-ray sources there are no obvious known counterparts, and both Galactic and extragalactic origin should be considered.

Keywords: neutrinos, BL Lacertae objects: general, gamma rays: galaxies, astronomical databases: miscellaneous

1. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of a diffuse flux of cosmic neutrinos by the IceCube experiment (Aartsen et al. 2013, 2015) opened a new field of investigation in the context of neutrino astronomy (after the detections of the Sun and SN1987a). Energetic neutrinos of energies above 10 TeV can be produced in astrophysical beam dumps, where cosmic rays are accelerated in regions near compact objects or in shock fronts, and interact via proton-proton ($p-p$) or proton-photon ($p-\gamma$) collisions with matter or radiation fields surrounding the central engine or within an ejected plasma flow (see Halzen (2017) for a review). High-energy gamma-ray emission above the GeV is expected to be associated with these hadronic processes, with intensities that vary depending on source characteristics and environment (Mészáros 2017).

No significant clustering of neutrinos above the expected background has been observed so far from any of the current experiments after several years of observations (Aartsen et al. 2017a; Albert et al. 2017). Active Galactic Nuclei (AGNs) of the blazar category are considered as the main cosmic neutrino source candidates (Mannheim 1995), although it has been suggested, based on the average properties, that they contribute only to a fraction of the observed diffuse flux (Aartsen et al. 2017b). A contribution from other types of active galaxies (starburst galaxies, radio-galaxies) (Loeb & Waxman 2006; Becker Tjus et al. 2014; Tavecchio et al. 2018), galaxy clusters/groups (Murase et al. 2008; Kotera et al. 2009), AGN winds (Wang & Loeb 2016; Lamastra et al. 2017), and Galactic sources (supernovae remnants expanding in dense molecular clouds, microquasars, hidden compact objects) should also be considered (Vissani 2006; Bednarek 2005; Sahakyan et al. 2014; Anchordoqui et al. 2014; Ahlers et al. 2016).

Observation of transient gamma-ray emission, spatially and temporally compatible with the IceCube neutrinos, is then crucial to identify their electro-magnetic (e.m.) counterparts. Since April 2016, the IceCube Collaboration is alerting the astronomical community almost in real time whenever a single-track high-energy starting event (HESE) or an extremely high-energy (EHE) through-going track event, with an energy higher than several hundred TeV, is detected (Aartsen et al. 2017c). The implementation of the IceCube alert system with the possibility of fast follow-up observations by several space- and ground-based instruments allows a global search for this association. On September 2017 a first significant association (at the level of 3σ) was announced: the gamma-ray flaring blazar of the BL Lac class, TXS 0506+056, was identified as a likely e.m. counterpart to the IceCube event IC-170922 (Aartsen et al. 2018a). Furthermore, from the analysis of archival data, an excess of VHE neutrinos from the direction of the same source has been also detected in 2014/2015 (Aartsen et al. 2018b). TXS 0506+056 has thus suggested as the first extragalactic neutrino point-like source ever detected.

We report here on a systematic search for *AGILE* transient gamma-ray counterparts to the IceCube HESE/EHE events announced through the GCN/AMON system. The paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we present the results of the systematic search for gamma-ray sources, in coincidence with

neutrino events, automatically detected by the *AGILE Quick Look* transient detection system. The level of *AGILE*/IceCube correlation for some significant gamma-ray detections found in the search, is then evaluated estimating the probability to be accidental using the *AGILE* False Alarm Rate (FAR) computed through the method discussed in Appendix A. In Section 3, we further investigated the common *AGILE*/IceCube detections, and we explore the possible e.m. counterpart candidates using the cross-catalog search tools available from the ASI Space Science Data Center¹. Finally, in Section 4, we discuss the astrophysical implications of the *AGILE* observations.

2. THE *AGILE* SATELLITE SEARCH FOR GAMMA-RAY COUNTERPARTS TO ICECUBE NEUTRINO EVENTS.

The *AGILE* (*Astrorivelatore Gamma a Immagini Leggero*) satellite monitors cosmic gamma-ray sources in the energy range from 30 MeV to 30 GeV (Tavani et al. 2009). Since November 2009, the satellite scans the whole sky in spinning mode, being an all-sky detector for transient gamma-ray sources capable to expose about 80% of the whole sky at any given time with good sensitivity and angular resolution to gamma-rays above 100 MeV.

In this observing mode, at the end of July 2016, the main instrument onboard of the satellite, the gamma-ray imager GRID, detected a gamma-ray transient (AGL J1418+0008) spatially and temporally consistent with the IceCube event IC-160731 (Lucarelli et al. 2017b). This detection was the result of the automatic and *Quick Look* (QL) search for gamma-ray transients above 100 MeV, daily performed over predefined 2-day integration time-bins of *AGILE*-GRID data (Bulgarelli et al. 2014).

Motivated by this first detection, we have explored the *AGILE* QL database searching for other transient gamma-ray detections with the following characteristics: 1) a centroid positionally compatible, within the *AGILE* angular resolution, with the reconstructed arrival directions of the IceCube HESE/EHE neutrino events; and 2) temporally occurring within a fixed search time window around the neutrino event time T_0 . Since Apr. 2016, a total of 13 neutrino events have been made public to date² (see Appendix B for the complete list); 10 events survive additional checks by the IceCube team. In this paper, we consider these 10 events as the basis for our study.

Typical IceCube HESE/EHE error circles are of order of 1° in radius, and the mean *AGILE* angular resolution measured from in-flight and calibration data is $\sim 1.5^\circ$ in the energy range 100 MeV-1 GeV (Sabatini et al. 2015). Based on this, we have tried three values for the database search radius around the 10 IceCube input sky positions (1.0° , 1.5° , and 2.0°), which are within the range of the *AGILE* point-spread function. Concerning the time window of interest, the astrophysics and timescales of the phenomena related to the emission of these extremely high-energy neutrinos and their likely correlated gamma-ray emission are still uncertain. Thus, based on the typical *AGILE* sensitivity to a transient gamma-ray source, we consider the *AGILE* QL detection *temporally* consistent with the neutrino event *if* occurs within a time interval of plus/minus 4 days around T_0 .

From the QL database mining, using the optimized 1.5° search cone radius, we found 3 significant *AGILE* detections which satisfy the temporal and spatial association criteria defined above in correspondence of the following three IceCube events: IC-160731, IC-170321, and IC-170922. From now

¹ <http://www.ssdsc.asi.it>

² https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/amon_hese_events.html and https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/amon_ehe_events.html

Table 1. The 3 *AGILE* QL detections close in time and space to IceCube HESE/EHE neutrinos. Columns 2 to 5 show the main parameters of the corresponding IceCube event (event ID, neutrino event time T_0 , best-fit reconstructed centroid position in Equatorial coordinates). Columns 6 to 9 show, respectively, the *AGILE* gamma-ray flux (above 100 MeV) estimated over the QL 2-day integration time bin, the distance in time Δt from the QL detection centroid, the false alarm rate (FAR) expected for each detection^a, and the corresponding *post-trial* false alarm probability P_i .

<i>AGILE</i> source	IceCube event	T_0 (MJD)	R.A. (J2000) (deg)	Decl. (J2000) (deg)	$F_\gamma(E > 100 \text{ MeV})$ $\times 10^{-6}$ (ph cm ⁻² s ⁻¹)	Δt (days)	FAR	P_i <i>post-trial</i>
A	IC-160731	57600.079	214.544	-0.3347	(1.8 ± 0.7)	-2.0	5.9×10^{-4}	2.0×10^{-3}
B	IC-170321	57833.314	98.3	-15.02	(1.5 ± 0.6)	-2.2	1.5×10^{-3}	5.7×10^{-3}
C	IC-170922	58018.871	77.43	5.72	(1.7 ± 0.7)	-2.8	1.0×10^{-3}	5.0×10^{-3}

^aSee Appendix A for the details about the *AGILE* FAR estimate.

on, we will indicate the corresponding three *AGILE* detections as *AGILE* Source A, Source B, and Source C, respectively. Table 1 shows the details about the 3 *AGILE* QL detections, along with the main parameters of the closest IceCube detection (event ID, neutrino event time T_0 , and best-fit reconstructed centroid position in Equatorial coordinates). In all cases, the gamma-ray position is within the *AGILE* angular resolution (1.5°) from the best-fit IceCube reconstructed arrival direction. The Table also shows the time difference Δt between T_0 and the center of the 2-day integration interval of the closest QL detection, and the corresponding gamma-ray flux above 100 MeV evaluated by means of the *AGILE* maximum likelihood (ML) algorithm (Bulgarelli et al. 2012).

The first *AGILE*/IceCube event in Table 1 is AGL J1418+0008, whose detection was already reported in Lucarelli et al. (2017b). The *AGILE* Source B is reported here for the first time: this detection, with a gamma-ray flux above 100 MeV of $F = (1.5 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-6}$ ph cm⁻² s⁻¹, is temporally close (2 days prior) to the IceCube event which occurred on 21 Mar. 2017 (Blaufuss 2017a). The last one, Source C, corresponds to the most recent IceCube-170922A event and is consistent with the gamma-ray activity from the blazar TXS 0506+056 as reported in Aartsen et al. (2018a). We notice that all the three events with an *AGILE* nearby source detection belong to the extremely high-energy (EHE) event class with track-like characteristics (Aartsen et al. 2017c) (see also Table 4 in App. B).

All the 3 QL detections are confirmed using the standard *AGILE* analysis (Bulgarelli et al. 2012), applying additionally a more stringent cut on the Earth albedo contamination³. Figure 1 shows: in the *left panel*, the *AGILE*-GRID gamma-ray lightcurves above 100 MeV around T_0 for each of the three sources; in the *right panel*, the gamma-ray intensity maps above 100 MeV corresponding to the detection found near T_0 .

The standard *AGILE* data analysis indicates that in all cases the peak gamma-ray emission is similarly observed within 1-2 days from T_0 . For sources B (IC-170321) and C (IC-170922), a weak gamma-ray emission is also observed over longer integration time-scales that include T_0 . In particular, for the new Source B an integration of 15 days starting from March 15th, 2017 (12:00 UT), shows a detection above 4σ with a flux $F(E > 100 \text{ MeV}) = (4.6 \pm 1.6) \times 10^{-7}$ ph cm⁻² s⁻¹. The *AGILE* centroid has Galactic coordinates $(l, b) = (224.59, -10.53) \pm 0.42$ (deg) (95% stat. c.l.) ± 0.1 (deg)

³ For comparison, the predefined QL maps are generated with a looser Earth albedo cut of 80° .




Figure 1. Results of the *AGILE*-GRID standard analysis for the three Sources A (*upper panel*), B (*middle panel*) and C (*lower panel*) of Table 1. *Left panels:* gamma-ray lightcurves above 100 MeV around the IceCube T_0 . *Right panels:* maps in Equatorial coordinates (J2000) of gamma-ray intensity above 100 MeV in ($\text{ph cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1}$) corresponding to the gamma-ray detection before T_0 shown on the left. The *AGILE* 95% confidence level (c.l.) location contours are shown in white color; the IceCube error boxes or circles are shown in yellow. A systematic error of 0.1° should be added to each *AGILE* source determination. The positions of the classified AGNs from the BZCAT Catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) and the *FERMI*-LAT 3FGL gamma-ray sources (Acero et al. 2015) are shown in cyan and red colors, respectively.




Figure 2. *Left panel:* *AGILE*-GRID intensity maps, in ($\text{ph cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{sr}^{-1}$) and Equatorial coordinates (J2000), centered at the position of the IceCube event IC-170321, over a long integration time of 15 days around T_0 ($(T_0 - 6; T_0 + 11)$ days). The *AGILE* 95% c.l. location contour obtained with the *AGILE* standard analysis is shown in white; the IceCube error box in yellow. *Right panel:* *AGILE*-GRID 7-day time bin gamma-ray light curve ($E > 100$ MeV) around T_0 , obtained from the *AGILE* standard analysis performed at the IC-170321 position.

(syst.) (R.A., Decl. (J2000))=(98.58, -15.08) (deg)), and it is fully compatible with the IceCube centroid (see Fig. 2).

2.1. Post-trial false alarm probability

To evaluate the probability that each of these three gamma-ray sources is associated to the neutrino events by chance, we have firstly evaluated the *false alarm rate (FAR)* for an *AGILE* QL detection per unit time δt and per unit solid angle $\delta\Omega$. As the unit time δt , we have assumed the standard integration time of the QL maps ($\delta t = 2$ days). For $\delta\Omega$, we have assumed the solid angle subtended by a cone with half-aperture matching the standard circular radius of 1.5° used in the database search ($\delta\Omega \simeq 2.15 \times 10^{-3} \text{sr}$)⁴. We then estimate the post-trial false alarm probability P_i of a random occurrence in *space* and *time* of a neutrino and a gamma-ray transient event separated by an interval Δt and by the solid angle $\Delta\Omega$ (corresponding to the angular distance $\Delta\theta$) as (Connaughton et al. 2016):

$$P_i = N_i * \text{FAR}(\geq \sqrt{TS}) * \Delta t * (1 + \ln(\Delta T / \delta t)) * \Delta\Omega \quad (1)$$

where N_i is the number of trials for a symmetric time window, $\text{FAR}(\geq \sqrt{TS})$ is the false alarm rate per 2-day map and per unit solid angle for *AGILE* detections above a given significance \sqrt{TS} ⁵, Δt is the absolute time difference between the QL detection centroid and T_0 , and ΔT is the one-sided time interval over which the search is done (set beforehand to $\Delta T = 4$ days). We have assumed a spatial coincidence whenever the centroids of the *AGILE* /IceCube detections are within an angular distance $\Delta\theta = 1.5^\circ$, so that in our case $\Delta\Omega \equiv \delta\Omega$.

⁴ See Appendix A for the details of the FAR computation.

⁵ See Bulgarelli et al. (2012) for the definition of an *AGILE* detection based on the value of the test statistic TS obtained after the application of the *AGILE* multi-source maximum likelihood (ML) algorithm.

Since the gamma-ray detection strategy we adopted is fully automated⁶, and there is no refined analysis around T_0 , the trials factor N_i takes into account only the choice of the symmetric window around T_0 and is thus equal to 2.

The last two columns of Table 1 show, respectively, the FAR (per 2-day map and per unit solid angle) and the corresponding *post-trial* false alarm probability P_i of a random coincidence with the IceCube neutrinos for each of the 3 QL detections. For each *AGILE* source, the *post-trial* chance correlation is of the order of 10^{-3} .

Given this basic information, we then proceed to calculate the *joint* post-trial probability to observe 3 gamma-ray sources out of 10 neutrino alerts over the period of the active IceCube alert system, as:

$$P_{joint}(\text{post-trial}) = 1 - (1 - P_A * P_B * P_C)^N$$

where the number of global trials N is given by the product of two contributions: the total number of IceCube HESE/EHE events considered (equal to 10), and the number (equal to 3) of optimizations of the search radius of the gamma-ray error boxes. We therefore determine the joint *post-trial chance probability* to be:

$$P_{joint}(\text{post-trial}) = 1.7 \times 10^{-6}$$

which corresponds to a number of Gaussian equivalent one-sided standard deviations of approximately 4.7σ .

Alternatively, assuming an average *post-trial* false alarm probability $p = 4.0 \times 10^{-3}$ for a typical gamma-ray source, we can use a binomial probability distribution to estimate the probability to observe 3 *AGILE* gamma-ray counterparts out of 10 IceCube events in the whole sky. That results in a probability of the order of 7.5×10^{-6} (one-sided 4.3σ).

3. POSSIBLE E.M. COUNTERPARTS TO THE ICECUBE EVENTS AND THE SOURCES A, B AND C DETECTED BY AGILE

3.0.1. *AGILE* Source A/IC-160731 event

The first IceCube HESE/EHE event, compatible and temporally close to an automatic *AGILE* QL detection, occurred on July 31, 2016 ($T_0 = \text{MJD } 57600.079$). The event and the possible *AGILE* gamma-ray counterpart (AGL J1418 +0008) were extensively studied in Lucarelli et al. (2017b). The e.m. follow-up of the event did not reveal any transient sources within the IceCube error circle. Using the online SSDC *SkyExplorer* tool⁷ and the ASI *Open Universe* web portal⁸, in this work we have performed a new search for possible known e.m. counterparts within the common *AGILE* /IC-170321 confidence error regions. Figure 3, *left panel*, shows the result of a query for cataloged radio, X-ray and gamma-ray sources within 60 arcmin from the IceCube centroid, placed at R.A., Decl. (J2000)=(214.544, -0.3347 deg). The 60 arcmin search radius encompasses the whole IC-160731 error circle and also covers most of the 95% c.l. error circle of the *AGILE* Source A detection (see Fig. 1, *upper panel*).

⁶ The start and stop of the 2-day time integration has been defined *a-priori* since the start of the spinning observation mode.

⁷ <https://tools.ssdsc.asi.it>

⁸ <http://www.openuniverse.asi.it>




Figure 3. *Left panel:* R.A.–Decl. sky map (J2000) obtained using the *SSDC SkyExplorer* tool⁷ and the *ASI Open Universe* tool⁸ showing known radio (red filled circles) and X-ray (open blue circles) sources within 60 arcmin from the IC-160731 centroid (R.A., Decl. (J2000) = (214.544, -0.3347) deg). The blueish circular area represents the position uncertainty (90% c.r.) quoted by the IceCube Coll. for the IC-160731 event (see Table 4). The map also covers most of the 95% c.l. contour of the *AGILE* Source A (already known as AGL J1418 +0008), centered at R.A., Decl. (J2000)=(214.61, 0.13 deg). Black open circles are all known Galaxy Clusters from existing catalogues. Source intensities are related to the circle diameters. Source labeled as 1 was already studied in (Lucarelli et al. 2017b). Blue crosses indicate the positions of 5 uncatalogued X-ray sources detected during a dedicated Swift observation of source 1 (Lucarelli et al. 2017b). Source labeled as 3 is a possible HBL blazar candidate. *Right panel:* SED of the HBL/HSP blazar candidate labeled as 3 in the figure on the left, obtained with archival data from radio to X-rays available at the *SSDC*. Recently, this object have been included in the 3rd edition of the HSP blazar catalog with the name of 3HSP J141457.7-002058 (Chang et al. 2018).

The sky region within the gamma-ray and neutrino error regions does not show any obvious e.m. counterpart, in particular, neither known gamma-ray sources nor known AGN blazars appear within the search radius chosen for the query. The X-ray source 1RXS J141658.0001449 (labeled as 1 in Fig. 3) was suggested in Lucarelli et al. (2017b) as a potential high-peaked BL Lac (HBL) AGN blazar. Nevertheless, a dedicated Swift-XRT observation taken some months after the neutrino event time T_0 , did not confirm any steady X-ray emission from this position, thus the former hypothesis could not be confirmed.

Five uncatalogued X-ray sources were detected during the previous Swift target of opportunity (ToO) (Lucarelli et al. 2017b): their positions are indicated by the blue crosses in Fig. 3. One of them (source labeled as 2) is positionally consistent with the radio source NVSS J141746-001151 and the object SDSS J141746.65-001149.8, which is actually catalogued as star.

Interestingly this region shows the presence of several galaxy clusters (indicated by the black circles in Fig. 3), which could host a possible AGN or a different class of powerful active sources that can be the origin of the IceCube neutrino and the gamma-ray transient emission detected by *AGILE*. In particular, based on its radio/X-ray positional association and flux intensity, one of the most interesting neutrino source candidates within this sky region is the source labeled as 3 in Fig. 3 (R.A.,




Figure 4. R.A.-Decl. sky map (J2000) obtained using the SSDC *SkyExplorer* tool and the ASI *Open Universe* tool showing known radio, X-ray and gamma-ray sources within 90 arcmin from the IC-170321 centroid (R.A.-Decl. (J2000): 98.3, -15.02 (deg)). The blueish circular area represents the uncertainty (90% PSF) on the reconstructed neutrino arrival direction quoted by the IceCube Coll. for the IC-170321 event (see Table 4). The map also covers the whole 95% c.l. error circle of the *AGILE* Source B, centered at R.A., Decl. (J2000)=(98.58, -15.08 deg). Radio (red filled circles) plus X-ray (open blue circles) sources map from existing catalogues. Possible common e.m. candidate counterparts are enclosed by black dashed circles and labeled from 1 to 10. Details of each candidate is reported in Table 2.

Decl. (J2000)=213.74038, -0.34967 deg). The radio and X-ray emissions are positionally consistent with the elliptical galaxy SDSS J141457.72-002058.6, whose broadband spectral properties resemble those ones typical of a high synchrotron peaked (HSP) blazar (see Fig. 3, *right panel*)⁹.

3.0.2. *AGILE* Source B/IC-170321 event

The second IceCube HESE/EHE event, compatible and temporally close to an automatic *AGILE* QL detection, occurred on March 21, 2017 ($T_0 = \text{MJD } 57833.314$). The ML significance of the QL detection is slightly lower than the other ones but it is again confirmed through the standard *AGILE* analysis using a longer integration window around T_0 , applying additionally a more stringent cut on the Earth albedo contamination.

The e.m. follow-up of the event did not reveal any transient source within the IceCube error box: in the HE gamma-ray band, *FERMI*-LAT placed a 95% C.L. upper limit (u.l.) above 100 MeV for point-like emission at the IceCube position over different time intervals near and before T_0 , with the

⁹ Indeed, this object have been recently included in the 3rd edition of the extreme and HSP blazars catalog as 3HSP J141457.7-002058 (Chang et al. 2018).

Table 2. Possible e.m. candidate counterparts for IC-170321 and the *AGILE* Source B detected in the days around T_0 .

ID	Catalog name	R.A. (J2000)	Decl. (J2000)	Other association	Source class	Distance from IC-170321 centroid
		(deg)	(deg)			(arcmin)
1	5BZQ J0631-1410	97.83429	-14.1755	CRATES J063119-141030	FSRQ	58
2	CRATES J063148-143042	97.94638	-14.50844	–	Possible IBL	37
3	PSZ2 G224.01-11.14	97.75250	-14.83520	–	Cluster of Galaxies	34
4	NVSS J063535-151813	98.89838	-15.30361	1RXS J063533.5-151817	Possible HBL	39
5	NVSS J063556-154038	98.98450	-15.67736	1RXS J063558.2-15410	Possible HBL	56
6	3FGL J0627.9-1517	96.9853	-15.29782	WHSP J062753.2-151956	HSP BL Lac	79
7	CRATES J063428-160239	98.6191	-16.0519	–	Flat spectrum radio source	65
8	CRATES J063053-155929	97.7306	-15.9829	–	Flat spectrum radio source	67
9	CRATES J063329-163020	98.38046	-16.5201	–	Possible HBL	89
10	PMN J0635-1415	98.95842	-14.25011	–	Flat spectrum radio source	60

most stringent found to be $5.5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ph cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ in one week of exposure prior to T_0 (Buson et al. 2017).

In the hard X-ray/gamma-ray band, INTEGRAL and Konus-Wind reported upper limits on burst-type emission over short time periods around T_0 (Savchenko et al. 2017; Svinkin et al. 2017). The Swift-XRT follow-up, with a 7-tile mosaic covering only 21% of the 90% error box on the refined IceCube localization, detected only one known X-ray source (1SXPS J063214.5-143300) at a flux level consistent with the cataloged value (Keivani 2017). Archival data from Swift-BAT¹⁰ did not show any transient hard-X-ray emission at this position. No optical follow-up was reported for the event. We explored the All-Sky Automated Survey for SuperNovae (ASAS-SN) transient web page¹¹ and the Palomar Transient Factory (PTF) catalog¹² but did not find any transient optical emission within 1° from the IceCube centroid.

Using the online SSDC *SkyExplorer* tool⁷ and the ASI *Open Universe* web portal⁸, we searched also for this event a possible common e.m. counterpart for the IC-170321 neutrino and the *AGILE* Source B. Figure 4 shows the result of a query for cataloged radio, X-ray and gamma-ray sources within 90 arcmin from the IceCube centroid, which fully contains the *AGILE* Source B error circle. Labels from 1 to 10 in Figure 4 indicate the most interesting neutrino/gamma emitter candidates found in the search, based on their radio/X-ray positional association and flux intensity. Among them, we found two flat spectrum radio quasars (FSRQ), one 3FGL source, 3FGL J0627.9-1517, and three possible blazars of the HBL sub-class. Details of each of the 10 sources are reported in Table 2.

Assuming the HBL sub-class of blazars as one of the most promising neutrino emitter candidates (Padovani et al. 2016; Resconi et al. 2017), one of the most interesting source within the *SkyExplorer* search radius appears to be the 3FGL J0627.9-1517 source (#6 in Fig. 4), which has been recently classified as the high synchrotron peaked (HSP) blazar 2WHSP J062753.2-151956 (Chang et al. 2017). The steady average 3FGL flux above 100 MeV for this source is below $2 \times 10^{-8} \text{ ph cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$.

¹⁰ <https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/results/transients/index.html>

¹¹ <http://www.astronomy.ohio-state.edu/asassn/transients.html>

¹² <http://irsa.ipac.caltech.edu/Missions/ptf.html>




Figure 5. *Left panel:* *AGILE*-GRID intensity map above 400 MeV, in $(\text{ph cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1})$ and Equatorial coordinates (J2000), around the region of the TXS 0506+059 source, over the period $(T_0-4; T_0-1)$ days. The *AGILE* 95% c.l. contour obtained with the *AGILE* standard analysis is shown in white color; the IceCube error box (Blaufuss 2017b) is shown in yellow. The positions of the classified AGNs from the BZCAT Catalog (Massaro et al. 2015) and the FERMI-LAT 3FGL gamma-ray source catalog (Acero et al. 2015) are shown in cyan and red colors, respectively. *Right panel:* *AGILE* gamma-ray lightcurve above 100 MeV on the TXS 0506+059 position, in the days before and after the T_0 of the IceCube IC-170922 event. In red, the corresponding *FERMI*-LAT lightcurve from the same position, obtained with the *FERMI*-LAT online analysis tool publicly available at the SSDC¹³.

The gamma-ray light curve above 1 GeV produced with the *FERMI*-LAT online data analysis tool available at SSDC¹³, with a 7-day binning, did not show any relevant activity in the six months around the neutrino event T_0 , except for one little peak found some days after which it was not confirmed by a further analysis made with the official *FERMI* Science Tools (v10r0p5)¹⁴.

3.0.3. *AGILE* Source C/IC-170922 event

The first *AGILE* detection of a gamma-ray counterpart above 100 MeV consistent with the position of the neutrino event IC-170922 was firstly reported in Lucarelli et al. (2017a). Again, the detection initially appeared as result of the automatic QL daily processing, and was confirmed afterwards using the standard *AGILE* analysis. The e.m follow-up triggered by the GCN Notice and the GCN Circular announcing the identification of an EHE neutrino event by IceCube (Blaufuss 2017b) allowed the identification of the blazar BL Lac TXS 0506+056 (also known as 5BZB J0509+0541 (Massaro et al. 2015)) as the likely counterpart of the IceCube event (Aartsen et al. 2018a).

Using GRID data with energies above 400 MeV in a time interval of three days close to the neutrino event T_0 , we obtained a better positional agreement of the *AGILE* detection with the TXS 0506+059 source, contained within the IC-170922 error box (see Fig. 5, *left panel*), which thus confirms the gamma-ray activity observed from the source during this period (Tanaka et al. 2017; Aartsen et al. 2018a).

¹³ <https://tools.asdc.asi.it/?&searchtype=fermi>

¹⁴ <https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/software/>

As reported in (Aartsen et al. 2018a), the source has been active in gamma-rays since several months before Sept. 2017. Figure 5, *right panel*, shows the *AGILE* gamma-ray lightcurve above 100 MeV from the beginning of August till the end of Sept. 2017, estimated on the TXS 0506+056 position. Superimposed is the corresponding *FERMI*-LAT curve (red points) obtained with the public analysis tool available at SSDC¹³, which shows a good agreement with the flaring activity detected by *AGILE*¹⁵.

A recent IceCube paper claimed a second excess of VHE neutrinos observed from the direction of TXS 0506+056 in the period Sept. 2014 - beginning of 2015 (Aartsen et al. 2018b). The analysis of the *AGILE*-GRID data over this period around the TXS 0506+059 position shows a strong gamma-ray contribution from the near FSRQ source PKS 0502+049 (1.2° away), which was in a high flaring state at that epoch (Ojha et al. 2014; Lucarelli et al. 2014). Using *FERMI*-LAT data, Padovani et al. (2018) show that the gamma-ray emission from the TXS is particularly hard compared to the softer emission from the FSRQ, and becomes predominant only selecting gamma-rays above the GeV. Indeed, our analysis also shows that the contribution from PKS 0502+049 above a few GeV becomes negligible but, due to the limited *AGILE* gamma-ray sensitivity above 1 GeV, we can set a flux UL $< 3.8 \times 10^{-8}$ ph cm⁻² s⁻¹ for E > 1 GeV (for a 95% c.l.) over the emission from the TXS 0506+056 during this period.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We reported the results of the *AGILE* gamma-ray observations of the error regions of 10 IceCube HESE/EHE neutrino events announced since April 2016 through the GCN/AMON system.

Mining the database of automated *AGILE*-GRID *QL* detections, determined on predefined 2-day integration maps, we found three significant gamma-ray detections above 100 MeV within 1.5 degrees from the IceCube best-fit centroids, and within two days from the neutrino event time T_0 . The *AGILE* automatic detections, each of them with a significance at the level of 4σ estimated using the *AGILE* ML algorithm, are compatible in position and time with the three following IceCube events: IC-160731, IC-170321, and IC-170922, all of them classified as EHE.

We dubbed the three *AGILE* sources as A, B, and C. The global post-trial probability found in our study for the *AGILE* /IceCube chance correlation for 3 out of 10 events is quite low (around 4.7 Gaussian standard deviations), and significantly hints towards an astrophysical connection between the *AGILE* detections and the observed IceCube single-track events.

A direct correlation between gamma-rays and neutrinos from astrophysical sources is expected whenever hadronic emission mechanisms are at work. In a hadronic source scenario, we do expect comparable values of the gamma-ray/neutrino observed luminosities (Gaisser et al. 1995). We thus estimate the *AGILE* gamma-ray luminosities for each of the three sources A, B, and C, and compare them with the corresponding neutrino luminosities, assuming a typical timescale of 6 months for neutrino production as a product of an underlying hadron acceleration and interaction (Aartsen et al. 2018a). Being the A and B sources unidentified, we assume two values for their possible distance: 10 kpc (typical of a Galactic object), and redshift $z=1$ (for an extragalactic object). For Source C, we make use of the TXS 0506+056 redshift, $z=(0.3365 \pm 0.0010)$, recently estimated by (Paiano et al. 2018). For the calculation of the neutrino luminosities, we adopt the muon neutrino fluence value of

¹⁵ We notice that the *FERMI*-LAT fluxes estimated with the online tool can be overestimated up to a factor of 2.

Table 3. Gamma-ray and neutrino isotropic luminosities for the three sources detected by *AGILE* possibly related to three IceCube HESE/EHE neutrinos. Gamma-ray luminosities are estimated over a time interval of about ± 1 week around T_0 ; for neutrino luminosities, an active source period of 6 months is assumed. For Sources A and B, two possible values of distance are considered: $D=10$ kpc, for a typical Galactic object, and redshift $z=1$, for an extragalactic one^a. For Source C, only the estimated redshift of TXS 0506+059 ($z=0.3365$) (Paiano et al. 2018) has been used for the calculation.

<i>AGILE</i> source	IceCube event	$\nu F_\gamma(\nu)$ ($\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	$D = 10$ kpc		$z = 1$		$z = 0.3365$	
			L_γ (erg s^{-1})	L_ν (erg s^{-1})	L_γ (erg s^{-1})	L_ν (erg s^{-1})	L_γ (erg s^{-1})	L_ν (erg s^{-1})
A	IC-160731	6.9×10^{-11}	8.2×10^{35}	2.2×10^{36}	2.6×10^{46}	6.8×10^{46}	–	–
B	IC-170321	7.5×10^{-11}	9.0×10^{35}	2.2×10^{36}	2.8×10^{46}	6.8×10^{46}	–	–
C	IC-170922	8.6×10^{-11}	–	–	–	–	3.2×10^{46}	6.8×10^{46}

^aA standard $H_0=70$, $\Omega_M=0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda=0.7$ cosmology has been used here for the calculation of the corresponding luminosity distance.

$2.8 \times 10^{-3} \text{ erg cm}^{-2}$ estimated in Aartsen et al. (2018a), for which we would expect to detect one high-energy neutrino event with IceCube over its entire lifetime¹⁶.

Table 3 displays the gamma-ray energy density fluxes and luminosities above 100 MeV, estimated in a time interval of about ± 1 week around T_0 , and the neutrino luminosities estimated assuming a source active period of 6 months. Interestingly, for each of the three events we obtain similar values of the luminosities in gamma ray and neutrinos. The observed power for the two adopted distances (assumed to be emitted isotropically), is typical of Galactic and extragalactic compact objects being in the range of $10^{36} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ or $10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, respectively.

In case of IC-170922A (Source C) we observed a significant temporal correlation between the neutrino event and the almost simultaneous gamma-ray activity in HE and VHE bands from the IBL/HBL BL Lac type of blazar TXS 0506+056 (Aartsen et al. 2018a). This is suggestive of this AGN sub-class of blazars being one of the main VHE neutrino emitters from hadronic processes. In the other two cases (A and B) there is no clear evidence of flaring activity from any known e.m. source inside the *AGILE* /IceCube common error circles. Search for possible e.m. counterparts within the common *AGILE* /IceCube error regions, initially focused on the identification of unknown HBL/HSP blazar candidates, found no obvious blazar candidates for Source A, as discussed in Lucarelli et al. (2017b). A further investigation made in this work has identified a new possible HBL candidate, the elliptical galaxy SDSS J141457.72-002058.6. Regarding the gamma-ray Source B presented in this paper for the first time, some potential HBL blazars are found within the uncertainty neutrino/gamma regions. Moreover, a *FERMI*-3FGL source, 3FGL J0627.9-1517, recently associated to a HSP blazar, is at the boundary of the 90% IceCube error box, although well outside the smaller *AGILE* error circle obtained on the longer integration around T_0 (see Fig. 2).

Given the lack of clear blazar counterparts for sources A and B, we are led to explore alternative explanations. Different classes of extragalactic sources, potentially hosting hadronic processes (bursts from radio-galaxies, starburst galaxies, eruptions from AGN cores, etc.) might be invoked to explain the gamma/neutrino correlations for A and B. Furthermore, IceCube neutrino fluxes can be produced

¹⁶ A power-law neutrino spectrum is assumed in this estimation with an index equal to -2 between 200 TeV and 7.5 PeV (Aartsen et al. 2018a).

also by gamma-ray hidden sources for which the high matter/radiation density surrounding a central engine enhances the target matter for the $p - p$ or $p - \gamma$ absorption processes. This would result in an observable neutrino flux with a highly suppressed gamma-ray flux from neutral pions decay. The *AGILE* detections of gamma-ray sources near IC-160731 (Source A) and IC-170321 (Source B) indicate the possibility that, from time to time, under particularly favorable conditions the neutrino source may become transparent to MeV/GeV gamma-rays. Taking into account the optimized *AGILE* sensitivity to soft gamma-ray emission in the 100–400 MeV energy band, sources with softer spectrum can also be considered. For example, in such a cases of enhanced target density, we might expect to observe a soft gamma-ray component peaking at MeV/sub-GeV due to the reprocessing of the VHE photons emitted by the pions decay.

The detection of the gamma-ray Source B within the IC-170321 error box is interesting. Its position is close to the Galactic plane with no clear extragalactic known gamma-ray counterpart. This source might be considered to belong to a class of neutrino sources possibly associated with a sub-dominant population of IceCube events apparently aligned near the Galactic plane (Halzen et al. 2017). Future observations will explore this very interesting possibility related to hidden compact objects in our Galaxy. We note that *FERMI*–LAT placed only a 95% c.l. upper limit on the gamma-ray emission above 100 MeV over an interval of 1 week just before T_0 (Buson et al. 2017). Similar cases of *AGILE* sources, both transients and steady, not confirmed by *FERMI*–LAT have been detected in the past (Pittori et al. 2009; Verrecchia et al. 2013; Bulgarelli et al. 2018). Several reasons can explain these discrepancies: source variability; different spectral response of the instruments; source visibility/exposure due to the different observing modes; event classification algorithms; background model (especially important for sources near the Galactic plane). All these factors may become important for relatively short gamma-ray transients (with duration of a few days) at the level of 4σ above the background¹⁷.

This is the first time that evidence of multiple gamma-ray sources in close spatial and temporal coincidence with cosmic neutrinos is presented. *AGILE* continues monitoring the gamma-ray sky and to react to IceCube alerts. More simultaneous neutrino and gamma-ray events are needed to strengthen the correlation indicated in the current *AGILE* data analysis. From our analysis, different classes of neutrino sources should be considered. Continuous blazar monitoring is needed to confirm the association of BL Lac-type sources as in the case of our Source C and, in principle, galactic sources should be also taken into account and included in future searches.

Future studies of neutrino and gamma-ray sources need sensitive detectors and space missions able to reveal transient episodes occurring in the MeV/sub–GeV energy band. The e-ASTROGAM space mission (De Angelis et al. 2017) has been proposed as well as the mission AMEGO, which is in an advanced state of development (McEneaney 2017). They can accomplish this task in the 2030’s along with the upgraded neutrino experiment IceCube-Gen2 (The IceCube-Gen2 Collaboration et al. 2015) and the new generations of gamma-ray and neutrino telescopes such as CTA and KM3NET (Acharya et al. 2013; Adrián-Martínez et al. 2016).

AGILE is an ASI space mission developed with scientific and programmatic support from INAF and INFN. Research partially supported through the ASI grant no. I/028/12/2. We thank ASI personnel

¹⁷ The non-detection of the *AGILE* Source A by *FERMI*–LAT was explained by a very poor visibility of the IC-160731 sky region in the days near T_0 (Lucarelli et al. 2017b).

involved in the operations and data center of the *AGILE* mission. Part of this work is based on archival data, software or online services provided by the Space Science Data Center (SSDC) – ASI. It is also based on data and/or software provided by the High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center (HEASARC), which is a service of the Astrophysics Science Division at NASA/GSFC and the High Energy Astrophysics Division of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. This research has also made use of the SIMBAD database and the VizieR catalog access tool, operated at CDS, Strasbourg, France.

Software: *AGILE* scientific analysis software (BUILD 21 [Chen et al. \(2011\)](#)), XIMAGE.

APPENDIX

A. ESTIMATION OF THE FALSE ALARM RATE (FAR) FOR *AGILE*-GRID IN SPINNING MODE

To evaluate the probability to find an *AGILE* gamma-ray detection above 100 MeV in random coincidence with a candidate IceCube HESE/EHE astrophysical neutrino, we have estimated a *False Alarm Rate* (FAR) for the *AGILE*-GRID data using the whole database of *Quick Look* (QL) detections hosted at the *AGILE* Data Center.

Every day an automatic *AGILE* QL procedure searches for gamma-ray transients above 100 MeV over the whole accessible sky ([Bulgarelli et al. 2014](#)). The *AGILE* QL runs since Nov. 2009, the starting of the spinning observation mode, over predefined data time intervals of 48 hours. Given the *AGILE* effective area and sensitivity, these collecting time intervals are the most appropriate to accumulate enough statistics and to maximize the signal-to-noise ratio in spinning mode.

A blind search for gamma-ray transients is first applied to the data either using the *XIMAGE* detect algorithm or the so-called *spotfinder* method ([Bulgarelli et al. 2014](#)). Then, counts, exposure and diffuse background model maps, centered at the excess positions found previously, are produced using the tasks of the *AGILE* software, and eventually the count excess is evaluated against the expected background counts using the *AGILE* Maximum Likelihood (ML) fit procedure ([Bulgarelli et al. 2012](#))¹⁸. All the gamma-ray detections and their ML best-estimate parameters (source significance as the square root of the ML Test Statistic (\sqrt{TS}), gamma-ray flux and source location) of each candidate source are then stored in the QL detection database.

[Bulgarelli et al. \(2012\)](#) assessed the *AGILE* ML method, computing the chance probability to get a gamma-ray detection with a significance above a certain threshold, both for an empty extragalactic field and crowded Galactic fields. In our study, we need to extend that work in order to statistically determine the chance probability to have an *AGILE* detection above a certain threshold of \sqrt{TS} (over a 2-day time interval) *in temporal and spatial coincidence* with an IceCube neutrino event, having a localization error of the order of 1° in radius.

Practically, to determine the FAR for the *AGILE*-GRID data integrated over a 2-day interval, we proceed as following:

¹⁸ For unknown sources, a simple power law spectral model with an index equal to -2.1 is usually assumed for the ML best-fit estimate procedure.

- a sky position in a relatively empty region of the *AGILE* gamma-ray sky is considered and, using the QL database, the number of gamma-ray detections above a certain value of \sqrt{TS} within a circular region of 20° in radius, centered at the chosen position, is counted;
- the observed \sqrt{TS} counting frequency is divided by the number of 1.5° -radius pixels¹⁹ contained in the sky region under evaluation;
- the \sqrt{TS} counting frequency *per pixel* is divided by the *AGILE* livetime computed since the beginning of the spinning mode (MJD=55139.5).

Since our minimum “time unit” is the 2-day integration time of the QL detections, the *AGILE* livetime was expressed as the number of 2-day “good” maps generated since MJD=55139.5, i.e. having sufficient and uniform exposure to allow a reliable ML source parameter estimation.

In this way, we basically end with a FAR for an *AGILE* QL detection normalised to the solid angle subtended by a cone with half-aperture of 1.5° (i.e. the database search radius) and to the duration time of the QL maps. This FAR, expressed in units of 2-day maps and unit solid angle, can be then used to evaluate the probability of an accidental detection closed both in time and in space with an external event like the IceCube neutrinos.

The number of *2-day good maps* varies according to the sky position considered, due both to the spacecraft rotation mode, in which the solar panels have to be kept fixed towards the Sun, and the seasonal variation of the Sun/Anti-Sun exclusion regions due to the Earth orbital motion²⁰. Figure 6, *left panel*, shows an Hammer-Aitoff projection in Galactic coordinates of the overall *AGILE* exposure (in $\text{cm}^2 \text{s}$), covering the period Nov. 2009 - Sept. 2017 (MJD=55139.5 - 58026.5). The regions around the Ecliptic poles are the most exposed, while the exposure along the Ecliptic plane is affected by the apparent motion of the Sun/Anti-Sun exclusion regions.

The total *AGILE* livetime for the whole spinning period of almost 8 years, expressed in terms of total number of *2-day good maps*, ranges from around 1000 for the regions near the Ecliptic poles down to around 200 for the less exposed sky positions on the Ecliptic plane²¹. For the FAR calculation, we considered a relatively empty region of brilliant gamma-ray sources placed near the south Ecliptic pole (position 1 in Fig. 6, *left panel*). For this position, the number of *2-day good maps* amounts to 1000. The value of FAR estimated on position 1 can be applied to the estimation of the false alarm probability in case of an *AGILE* QL detection consistent with an IceCube HESE/EHE event laying well above the Galactic plane (with Galactic latitude $|b| \geq 20^\circ$).

Since *AGILE* Sources B and C described in the main text are consistent with two IceCube events located nearer the Galactic plane ($b=-10.75$ and -19.56 (deg), respectively), to estimate the chance correlation for this region we considered a 20° region centered at Galactic coordinates $l, b=(217.0, -15)$ (deg) (position 2 in Fig. 6, *left panel*). Due to higher diffuse gamma-ray emission near the plane, the FAR for this region resulted to be roughly a 30% higher than the value obtained at higher or lower Galactic latitudes, ending in a slightly higher value of the *post-trial* false alarm probability P_i for the two events, as shown in Table 1.

¹⁹ Such pixel size is equal to the search cone radius used for the QL database scanning, which has been optimized according to the mean *AGILE* angular resolution in the 100 MeV-1 GeV energy band.

²⁰ On average, the exclusion regions pass over the same sky position almost every three months.

²¹ The number of *2-day good maps* accumulated over the whole spinning period for the two positions considered has been estimated using the *AGILE* online interactive analysis tool based on the *AGILE*-GRID Level-3 (LV3) archive of pre-computed counts, exposure, and diffuse background emission maps (available at the URL: <http://www.asdc.asi.it/mmia/index.php?mission=agilelv3mmia>).




Figure 6. *Left panel:* Hammer-Aitoff projection, in Galactic coordinates, of the total *AGILE* gamma-ray exposure (in $\text{cm}^2 \text{s}$) accumulated since the beginning of the spinning observation mode (MJD=55139.5) up to the end of Sept. 2017 (MJD=58026.5). The overlaid grid defines the Ecliptic coordinate system. Due to the fixed orientation of the solar panels towards the Sun, the regions around the ecliptic poles are the most exposed, while the exposure along the ecliptic plane is affected by the apparent motion of the Sun/Anti-Sun exclusion regions. Positions labeled as 1 and 2 have been used to estimate the False Alarm Rate (FAR) for the *AGILE*-GRID detections over 2-day time intervals. *Right panel:* Distribution, in a Hammer-Aitoff projection in Galactic coordinates, of the reconstructed arrival directions of the IceCube HESE/EHE neutrino events published up to Aug. 2018. A, B, and C indicate the three events with an *AGILE* potential gamma-ray counterpart.

We notice that the FAR (and the false alarm probability) can be over-estimated by 20-30% due to the presence of an un-subtracted non-Poissonian component of *real* gamma-ray transients from unknown sources occurring in the extraction sky region.

B. ICECUBE HESE/EHE EVENTS ANNOUNCED SINCE APRIL 2016

Table 4 shows all the IceCube HESE/EHE events published up to Aug. 2018. Since Apr. 2016, these events are announced through the GCN/AMON notice circuit (Aartsen et al. 2017c), usually followed by a GCN Circular reporting the results of a further refined data analysis which provides improved reconstructed neutrino arrival directions and position uncertainties.

Along with the IceCube event ID, the table shows:

- the neutrino event time (in UT and MJD date);
- the event classification (HESE or EHE);
- the best fitted reconstructed neutrino arrival direction in Equatorial coordinates (J2000) and its uncertainty;
- the corresponding Galactic coordinates l and b ;
- the GCN Circular number reporting about the refined analysis (if available).

Where available, the table shows the refined arrival direction published in the GCN Circular.

Event numbered 34032434 has been rejected after refined analysis ([Icecube Collaboration 2017](#)) while events 65274589 and 32674593 were considered consistent with rare atmospheric muon background events ([Blaufuss 2017c,d](#)) and, thus, they were not considered in our analysis.

Figure 6, *right panel*, shows the distribution of all IceCube events in a Hammer-Aitoff projection of the sky in Galactic coordinates. All events appear well above the Galactic plane, except for one case (IC-170321) which shows a Galactic latitude of -10.75 degrees. The three neutrino events with an *AGILE* possible transient counterpart, A, B, and C, are shown in orange.

Table 4. Public IceCube HESE/EHE alerts published through the GCN/AMON and GCN Circular network, and their main identification parameters.

Event ID	Date Time (UT)	MJD (days)	Event class	R.A. (J2000) (deg)	Decl. (J2000) (deg)	Position uncertainty (arcmin)	<i>l</i> (deg)	<i>b</i> (deg)	GCN Circ. #
67093193 (IC-160427)	16/04/27 05:52:32.00	57505.245	HESE	240.57	9.34	36 (90% c.r.)	20.69	41.68	19363
6888376 (IC-160731)	16/07/31 01:55:04.00	57600.079	HESE/EHE	214.544	-0.3347	45 (90% c.r.)	343.68	55.52	—
26552458 (IC-160806)	16/08/06 12:21:33.00	57606.515	EHE	122.81	-0.8061	34 (50% c.r.)	223.07	17.29	19787
58537957 (IC-160814)	16/08/14 21:45:54.00	57614.907	HESE	199.31	-32.0165	89.4 (90% c.r.)	309.28	30.54	—
38561326 (IC-161103)	16/11/03 09:07:31.12	57695.38	HESE	40.8252	12.5592	66 (90% c.r.)	160.90	-41.92	—
80127519 (IC-161210)	16/12/10 20:06:40.31	57732.838	EHE	46.5799	14.98	60 (50% c.r.)	164.89	-36.67	—
						±30 in R.A.			
						±30 in Decl.			
65274589 (IC-170312) ²⁵	17/03/12 13:49:39.83	57824.576	HESE	305.15	-26.61	(90% PSF)	16.50	-30.40	20857
						±72 in R.A.			
						±72 in Decl.			
80305071 (IC-170321)	17/03/21 07:32:20.69	57833.314	EHE	98.3	-15.02	(90% PSF)	224.42	-10.75	20929
						±180 in R.A.			
						±120 in Decl.			
32674593 (IC-170506) ²⁵	17/05/06 12:36:55.80	57879.526	HESE	221.8	-26	(90% PSF)	332.95	30.03	21075
						-48/+78 in R.A.			
						-24/+42 in Decl.			
50579430 (IC-170922)	17/09/22 20:54:30.43	58018.871	EHE	77.43	5.72	(90% PSF)	195.42	-19.56	21916
						-102/+156 in R.A.			
						-120/+96 in Decl.			
56068624 (IC-171015)	17/10/15 01:34:30.06	58041.066	HESE	162.86	-15.44	(90% PSF)	264.96	38.43	22016
34032434 (IC-171028) ²⁶	17/10/28 08:28:14.81	58054.353	HESE	275.076	34.5011	—	61.96	20.95	22065
						-30/+42 in R.A.			
						-15/+21 in Decl.			
17569642 (IC-171106) ²⁷	17/11/06 18:39:39.21	58063.778	EHE	340.0	7.4	(90% PSF)	75.51	-43.05	22105

²⁵ Possibly consistent with rare atmospheric muon background event.

²⁶ Event candidate retracted in GCN Circular #22065.

²⁷ Event is consistent with being produced by a neutrino with energy in excess of 1 PeV.

REFERENCES

- Aartsen, M. G., Abraham, K., Ackermann, M., Adams, J., et al. 2017a, *ApJ*, 835, 151, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/835/2/151](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/835/2/151)
- Aartsen, M. G., Abraham, K., Ackermann, M., et al. 2013, *Science*, 342, 1242856, doi: [10.1126/science.1242856](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1242856)
- . 2017b, *ApJ*, 835, 45, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/835/1/45](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/835/1/45)
- Aartsen, M. G., Ackermann, M., Adams, J., et al. 2017c, *APh*, 92, 30, doi: [10.1016/j.astropartphys.2017.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2017.05.002)
- . 2018a, *Science*, 361, eaat1378, doi: [10.1126/science.aat1378](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat1378)
- . 2018b, *Science*, 361, 147, doi: [10.1126/science.aat2890](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aat2890)
- Aartsen, M. G., Abraham, K., Ackermann, M., et al. 2015, *Physical Review Letters*, 115, 081102, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.081102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.081102)
- Acero, F., Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., et al. 2015, *Ap. J. Supp.*, 218, 23, doi: [10.1088/0067-0049/218/2/23](https://doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/218/2/23)
- Acharya, B. S., Actis, M., Aghajani, T., Agnetta, G., et al. 2013, *Astroparticle Physics*, 43, 3, doi: [10.1016/j.astropartphys.2013.01.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2013.01.007)
- Adrián-Martínez, S., Ageron, M., Aharonian, F., et al. 2016, *Journal of Physics G Nuclear Physics*, 43, 084001, doi: [10.1088/0954-3899/43/8/084001](https://doi.org/10.1088/0954-3899/43/8/084001)
- Ahlers, M., Bai, Y., Barger, V., & Lu, R. 2016, *PhRvD*, 93, 013009, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.93.013009](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.013009)
- Albert, A., André, M., Anghinolfi, M., Anton, G., et al. 2017, *PhRvD*, 96, 082001, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.96.082001](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.96.082001)
- Anchordoqui, L. A., Barger, V., Cholis, I., et al. 2014, *Journal of High Energy Astrophysics*, 1, 1, doi: [10.1016/j.jheap.2014.01.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jheap.2014.01.001)
- Becker Tjus, J., Eichmann, B., Halzen, F., Kheirandish, A., & Saba, S. M. 2014, *PhRvD*, 89, 123005, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.89.123005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.89.123005)
- Bednarek, W. 2005, *ApJ*, 631, 466, doi: [10.1086/432411](https://doi.org/10.1086/432411)
- Blaufuss, E. 2017a, GRB Coordinates Network, Circular Service, No. 20929, #1 (2017), 20929
- . 2017b, IceCube-170922A - IceCube observation of a high-energy neutrino candidate event.
- . 2017c, GRB Coordinates Network, Circular Service, No. 20857, #1 (2017), 20857
- . 2017d, IceCube-170506A - IceCube update on a high-energy neutrino candidate event
- Bulgarelli, A., Chen, A. W., Tavani, M., et al. 2012, *A&A*, 540, A79, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201118023](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201118023)
- Bulgarelli, A., Fioretti, V., Parmiggiani, N., et al. 2018, Submitted for publication in *ApJ*.
- Bulgarelli, A., Trifoglio, M., Gianotti, F., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 781, 19, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/781/1/19](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/781/1/19)
- Buson, S., Kocevski, D., & Ciprini, S. 2017, GRB Coordinates Network, Circular Service, No. 20971, #1 (2017), 20971
- Chang, Y.-L., Arsioli, B., Giommi, P., & Padovani, P. 2017, *A&A*, 598, A17, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201629487](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201629487)
- Chang, Y.-L., Arsioli, B., Giommi, P., Padovani, P., & Brandt, C. 2018, Submitted for publication in *A&A*.
- Chen, A. W., Bulgarelli, A., Contessi, T., et al. 2011, GRID Scientific Analysis – USER MANUAL, <http://agile.asdc.asi.it>
- Connaughton, V., Burns, E., Goldstein, A., et al. 2016, *ApJL*, 826, L6, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/826/1/L6](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/826/1/L6)
- De Angelis, A., Tatischeff, V., Tavani, M., Oberlack, U., et al. 2017, *Experimental Astronomy*, 44, 25, doi: [10.1007/s10686-017-9533-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10686-017-9533-6)
- Gaisser, T. K., Halzen, F., & Stanev, T. 1995, *PhR*, 258, 173, doi: [10.1016/0370-1573\(95\)00003-Y](https://doi.org/10.1016/0370-1573(95)00003-Y)
- Halzen, F. 2017, *Nature Physics*, 13, 232, doi: [10.1038/nphys3816](https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys3816)
- Halzen, F., Kheirandish, A., & Niro, V. 2017, *Astroparticle Physics*, 86, 46, doi: [10.1016/j.astropartphys.2016.11.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2016.11.004)
- Icecube Collaboration. 2017, GRB Coordinates Network, 22065, 1
- Keivani, A. 2017, IceCube-170321A: Swift-XRT observations.
- Kotera, K., Allard, D., Murase, K., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 707, 370, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/707/1/370](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/707/1/370)
- Lamastra, A., Menci, N., Fiore, F., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 607, A18, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201731452](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201731452)

- Loeb, A., & Waxman, E. 2006, JCAP, 5, 003, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2006/05/003](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2006/05/003)
- Lucarelli, F., Piano, G., Pittori, C., Verrecchia, F., et al. 2017a, The Astronomer's Telegram, 10801
- Lucarelli, F., Pittori, C., Verrecchia, F., Tavani, M., et al. 2014, The Astronomer's Telegram, 6457
- Lucarelli, F., Pittori, C., Verrecchia, F., et al. 2017b, ApJ, 846, 121, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa81c8](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa81c8)
- Mannheim, K. 1995, APh, 3, 295, doi: [10.1016/0927-6505\(94\)00044-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0927-6505(94)00044-4)
- Massaro, E., Maselli, A., Leto, C., et al. 2015, Astrophysics and Space Science, 357, 75, doi: [10.1007/s10509-015-2254-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10509-015-2254-2)
- McEnery, J. E. 2017, in AAS/High Energy Astrophysics Division, Vol. 16, AAS/High Energy Astrophysics Division #16, 103.13
- Mészáros, P. 2017, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science, 67, 45, doi: [10.1146/annurev-nucl-101916-123304](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-nucl-101916-123304)
- Murase, K., Inoue, S., & Nagataki, S. 2008, ApJL, 689, L105, doi: [10.1086/595882](https://doi.org/10.1086/595882)
- Ojha, R., Carpenter, B., Becerra, J., Krauss, F., et al. 2014, The Astronomer's Telegram, 6425
- Padovani, P., Giommi, P., Resconi, E., et al. 2018, MNRAS, 480, 192, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1852](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1852)
- Padovani, P., Resconi, E., Giommi, P., Arsioli, B., & Chang, Y. L. 2016, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 457, 3582, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw228](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw228)
- Paiano, S., Falomo, R., Treves, A., & Scarpa, R. 2018, ApJL, 854, L32, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aaad5e](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aaad5e)
- Pittori, C., Verrecchia, F., Chen, A. W., et al. 2009, A&A, 506, 1563, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200911783](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200911783)
- Resconi, E., Coenders, S., Padovani, P., Giommi, P., & Caccianiga, L. 2017, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 468, 597, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx498](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx498)
- Sabatini, S., Donnarumma, I., Tavani, M., et al. 2015, ApJ, 809, 60, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/809/1/60](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/809/1/60)
- Sahakyan, N., Piano, G., & Tavani, M. 2014, ApJ, 780, 29, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/780/1/29](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/780/1/29)
- Savchenko, V., Santander, M., Keivani, A., et al. 2017, GRB Coordinates Network, Circular Service, No. 20937, #1 (2017), 20937
- Svinkin, D., Golenetskii, S., Aptekar, R., et al. 2017, GRB Coordinates Network, Circular Service, No. 20973, #1 (2017), 20973
- Tanaka, Y. T., Buson, S., & Kocevski, D. 2017, The Astronomer's Telegram, 10791
- Tavani, M., Barbiellini, G., Argan, A., et al. 2009, A&A, 502, 995, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/200810527](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/200810527)
- Tavecchio, F., Righi, C., Capetti, A., Grandi, P., & Ghisellini, G. 2018, MNRAS, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty251](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty251)
- The IceCube-Gen2 Collaboration, :, Aartsen, M. G., et al. 2015, ArXiv e-prints. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.05228>
- Verrecchia, F., Pittori, C., Chen, A. W., et al. 2013, A&A, 558, A137, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201321452](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201321452)
- Vissani, F. 2006, Astroparticle Physics, 26, 310, doi: [10.1016/j.astropartphys.2006.07.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.astropartphys.2006.07.005)
- Wang, X., & Loeb, A. 2016, JCAP, 12, 012, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2016/12/012](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2016/12/012)