

# Search for directional associations between Baikal Gigaton Volume Detector neutrino-induced cascades and high-energy astrophysical sources

V.A. Allakhverdyan,<sup>1</sup> A.D. Avrorin,<sup>2</sup> A.V. Avrorin,<sup>2</sup> V. M. Aynutdinov,<sup>2</sup> Z. Bardačová,<sup>3,6</sup> I.A. Belolaptikov,<sup>1</sup> E.A. Bondarev,<sup>2</sup> I.V. Borina,<sup>1</sup> N.M. Budnev,<sup>4</sup> A.S. Chepurinov,<sup>8</sup> V.Y. Diĭk,<sup>1,5</sup> G.V. Domogatsky,<sup>2</sup> A.A. Doroshenko,<sup>2</sup> R. Dvornický,<sup>3</sup> A.N. Dyachok,<sup>4</sup> Zh.-A.M. Dzhilkibaev,<sup>2</sup> E. Eckerová,<sup>3,6</sup> T.V. Elzhov,<sup>1</sup> L. Fajt,<sup>6</sup> A.R. Gafarov,<sup>4</sup> K.V. Golubkov,<sup>2</sup> N.S. Gorshkov,<sup>1</sup> T.I. Gress,<sup>4</sup> K.G. Kebkal,<sup>7</sup> I. Kharuk,<sup>2</sup> E.V. Khramov,<sup>1</sup> M.M. Kolbin,<sup>1</sup> K.V. Konischev,<sup>1</sup> A.V. Korobchenko,<sup>1</sup> A.P. Koshechkin,<sup>2</sup> V.A. Kozhin,<sup>8</sup> M.V. Kruglov,<sup>1</sup> V.F. Kulepov,<sup>9</sup> Y.E. Lemeshev,<sup>4</sup> M.B. Milenin,<sup>2,\*</sup> R.R. Mirgazov,<sup>4</sup> D.V. Naumov,<sup>1</sup> A.S. Nikolaev,<sup>8</sup> D.P. Petukhov,<sup>2</sup> E.N. Pliskovsky,<sup>1</sup> M.I. Rozanov,<sup>10</sup> E.V. Ryabov,<sup>4</sup> G.B. Safronov,<sup>2</sup> D. Seitova,<sup>1,5</sup> B.A. Shaybonov,<sup>1</sup> M.D. Shelepov,<sup>2</sup> S.D. Shilkin,<sup>2</sup> E.V. Shirokov,<sup>8</sup> F. Šimkovic,<sup>3,6</sup> A.E. Sirenko,<sup>1</sup> A.V. Skurikhin,<sup>8</sup> A.G. Solovjev,<sup>1</sup> M.N. Sorokovikov,<sup>1</sup> I. Štekl,<sup>6</sup> A.P. Stromakov,<sup>2</sup> O.V. Suvorova,<sup>2</sup> V.A. Tabolenko,<sup>4</sup> B.B. Ulzutuev,<sup>1</sup> Y.V. Yablokova,<sup>1</sup> D.N. Zaborov,<sup>2</sup> S.I. Zavyalov,<sup>1</sup> D.Y. Zvezdov,<sup>1</sup> (Baikal-GVD Collaboration), N.A. Kosogorov,<sup>11,12,17,†</sup> Y.Y. Kovalev,<sup>13,11,12</sup> G.V. Lipunova,<sup>14,13</sup> A.V. Plavin,<sup>12</sup> D.V. Semikoz,<sup>15</sup> S.V. Troitsky<sup>2,16</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, 141980 Russia

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Nuclear Research of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 60th October Anniversary Prospect 7a, Moscow 117312, Russia

<sup>3</sup>Comenius University, Bratislava, 81499 Slovakia

<sup>4</sup>Irkutsk State University, Irkutsk, 664003 Russia

<sup>5</sup>Institute of Nuclear Physics ME RK, Almaty, 050032 Kazakhstan

<sup>6</sup>Czech Technical University in Prague, Institute of Experimental and Applied Physics, 11000 Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>7</sup>AO "LATENA" (Joint Stock Company), St. Petersburg, 199106 Russia

<sup>8</sup>Skobel'syn Research Institute of Nuclear Physics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Moscow, 119991 Russia

<sup>9</sup>Nizhny Novgorod State Technical University, Nizhny Novgorod, 603950 Russia

<sup>10</sup>St. Petersburg State Marine Technical University, St. Petersburg, 190008 Russia

<sup>11</sup>Astro Space Center of Lebedev Physical Institute, Profsoyuznaya 84/32, 117997 Moscow, Russia

<sup>12</sup>Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology, Institut'skiy per. 9, Dolgoprudny 141700, Russia

<sup>13</sup>Max-Planck-Institut für Radioastronomie, Auf dem Hügel 69, 53121 Bonn, Germany

<sup>14</sup>Sternberg Astronomical Institute, Lomonosov Moscow State University, Universitetskii pr. 13, Moscow, 119234 Russia

<sup>15</sup>APC, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, CEA/IRFU, Sorbonne Paris Cité, 119 75205 Paris, France

<sup>16</sup>Physics Department, Lomonosov Moscow State University, 1-2 Leninskie Gory, Moscow 119991, Russia

<sup>17</sup>Cahill Center for Astronomy and Astrophysics, MC 249-17 California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

Accepted 2023 August 24. Received 2023 August 22; in original form 2023 July 12

## ABSTRACT

Baikal-GVD has recently published its first measurement of the diffuse astrophysical neutrino flux, performed using high-energy cascade-like events. We further explore the Baikal-GVD cascade dataset collected in 2018-2022, with the aim to identify possible associations between the Baikal-GVD neutrinos and known astrophysical sources. We leverage the relatively high angular resolution of the Baikal-GVD neutrino telescope (2-3 deg.), made possible by the use of liquid water as the detection medium, enabling the study of astrophysical point sources even with cascade events. We estimate the telescope's sensitivity in the cascade channel for high-energy astrophysical sources and refine our analysis prescriptions using Monte-Carlo simulations. We primarily focus on cascades with energies exceeding 100 TeV, which we employ to search for correlation with radio-bright blazars. Although the currently limited neutrino sample size provides no statistically significant effects, our analysis suggests a number of possible associations with both extragalactic and Galactic sources. Specifically, we present an analysis of an observed triplet of neutrino candidate events in the Galactic plane, focusing on its potential connection with certain Galactic sources, and discuss the coincidence of cascades with several bright and flaring blazars.

**Key words:** neutrinos – galaxies: active – quasars: general – radio continuum: galaxies – binaries: general

\* Deceased

† Corresponding author, e-mail: nakosogorov@gmail.com

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, high-energy neutrinos have become a hot topic of astrophysical research. Various sources and processes have been discussed in which these neutrinos could be produced efficiently. The IceCube detector (IceCube Collaboration 2013) demonstrated that the arrival directions of these high-energy neutrinos are distributed mostly isotropically over the sky (Aartsen et al. 2014). While subsequent studies found evidence for a certain Galactic component (Kovalev et al. 2022; Albert et al. 2023; IceCube Collaboration et al. 2023), most of the neutrinos are still expected to arrive from extragalactic sources, like active galactic nuclei (AGN), gamma-ray bursts, tidal disruption events, etc. (e.g. Mészáros 2017; Troitsky 2021). Based on recent studies, AGNs turned out to be very promising sources of neutrino production. For example, the directional coincidence between the neutrino event 170922A detected by IceCube and the blazar TXS 0506+056 as well as its temporal coincidence with a  $\gamma$ -ray flare from the source demonstrated a significant blazar-neutrino association (IceCube Collaboration et al. 2018b,a). Recently a nearby active galaxy NGC 1068 was also singled out as a probable neutrino source (IceCube Collaboration et al. 2022).

Statistical studies of very-long-baseline interferometry (VLBI) sources showed the presence of significant correlation between bright blazars and IceCube neutrino events (Plavin et al. 2020, 2021, 2023). It should be noted that the conclusions from multiple analyses done by different authors deliver varied outcomes, some confirming and some questioning or refuting the presence of the correlation. Typically, these conclusions depend on the sample of blazars and type of neutrino data under investigation. Compare Zhou et al. (2021); Hovatta et al. (2021a); Buson et al. (2022, 2023); Abbasi et al. (2023). Clearly, more observing data and even stronger statistics are needed. Relativistic jets seem to be a great candidate for neutrino emission due to their effective particle acceleration. Such acceleration can produce high-energy protons, and as a consequence generate neutrinos (e.g. Murase et al. 2018; Petropoulou et al. 2020; Kun et al. 2021; Britzen et al. 2021; Sahakyan et al. 2023). On the other hand, neutrinos can be produced in various Galactic sources of high-energy radiation, see e.g. Kheirandish (2020); Troitsky (2021).

With a mission to establish the sources of neutrinos, the Baikal Gigaton Volume Detector (Baikal-GVD; see e.g. Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. 2018; Avrorin et al. 2019a) operates as a large-scale Cherenkov detector tracking neutrinos in the TeV-PeV energy band. In this work we search for directional coincidence between such neutrinos and extragalactic as well as Galactic sources. The first analysis of data from four years of high-energy cascade-like event observations, conducted by the Baikal-GVD neutrino telescope, was presented in Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. (2023). The analysis confirmed the IceCube telescope’s discovery of a diffuse astrophysical neutrino flux (IceCube Collaboration 2013). The new astrophysical neutrino candidates, selected using Baikal-GVD, are extremely intriguing from the perspective of identifying their sources. These early Baikal-GVD cascade data are further analyzed in this work. In particular, a statistical correlation between the neutrino candidate events and a VLBI-bright blazar sample is searched for, similarly to the analysis in Plavin et al. (2020, 2023). Apart from that, we discuss how many events will be needed to reach a certain significance level. The analysis procedure was structured similar to a blind analysis, in the sense that the analysis was not tailored to fit the actual data. We then examine the actual statistics and carry out an analysis of radio flux density correlation. Lastly, we briefly describe the most interesting cascades in our sample and their potential sources.

We describe the data in section 2. In section 3, we study corre-

lations between the Baikal-GVD dataset and a sample of blazars and discuss the most notable coincident Galactic and extragalactic sources. Specifically, we describe all the algorithms in subsection 3.1, investigate a possibility of finding any correlations in subsection 3.2 and examine the actual statistics based on the real data in subsection 3.3. We then describe the most interesting potential neutrino emitters in section 4. Finally, section 5 sums up all the results.

## 2 DATA

### 2.1 Baikal-GVD cascades

The Baikal-GVD is a cubic-kilometer scale neutrino observatory located in Lake Baikal ( $51^{\circ}50'$  N,  $104^{\circ}20'$  E). The lake depth at the facility site is 1366 m. Basic elements of Baikal-GVD are photomultiplier tubes (PMTs) and related electronics contained within pressure-resistant glass spheres; they are referred to as optical modules (OMs). OMs are mounted onto vertical cables forming “strings”. Each string comprises 36 OMs spaced  $\sim 15$  m apart vertically at depths from 750 m to 1275 m. Strings with OMs are collected in clusters. Each cluster is an independent array comprising 8 strings with a total of 288 OMs and is connected to the shore station by its own electro-optical cable. Seven of these eight strings are arranged in a heptagonal grid with  $\sim 60$  m spacing. Inter-cluster distances between the central strings vary from 250 to 300 m. The instrument has been operating since 2016 with the effective volume increasing every year. The current rate of array deployment is about two clusters per year. The operational configuration of Baikal-GVD in 2022 consisted of 10 clusters and comprised a total of 2916 OMs.

Baikal-GVD detects Cherenkov radiation of charged particles, which are produced in neutrino interactions. The Cherenkov radiation detected by the light sensors forms two types of patterns, tracks and cascades. In the case when the incident particle is a muon neutrino, a muon is produced in the charged-current (CC) interaction, which generally traverses several kilometers in water or bed-rock and exit the kilometer-scale detection volume producing a track-like event. Neutral-current (NC) interactions of all types of neutrinos, as well as most of CC interactions of electron and tau neutrinos, yield hadronic and electromagnetic showers (cascades). The showers are quasi point-like, highly anisotropic sources of Cherenkov radiation. The energy of the cascade progenitor neutrino is determined with a good accuracy; however, the angular reconstruction is worse for cascades than for tracks. The cascade channel is thus complementary to the track one.

In this work, we study Baikal-GVD cascade-like neutrino candidate events. The events of this type are observed as showers of charged particles, with the accuracy of cascade energy reconstruction being relatively high (about 10%–30%). At the same time, the direction accuracy is moderate and equals to about 2–4 degrees depending on the location and orientation of a cascade (see more detail in Avrorin et al. 2022).

We use Baikal-GVD data collected between April 2018 and March 2022. The telescope was operated in the configuration with 3 clusters in 2018–2019, 5 clusters in 2019–2020, 7 clusters in 2020–2021, while from April 2021 to March 2022 the telescope comprised 8 clusters.

We have performed data analysis for individual clusters as independent setups. The data sample comprises  $3.49 \times 10^{10}$  events, collected using the basic trigger criteria of the telescope. After applying noise hit suppression, cascade reconstruction and cuts on reconstruction quality parameter, as described in detail in Avrorin et al. (2019b)

and Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. (2023), also with condition on OM hit multiplicity  $N_{\text{hit}} > 12$ , the sample of 6157 cascades with reconstructed energy ranged from 10 TeV to 1200 TeV was selected. The upper limit corresponds to the highest energy cascade in our sample.

Two subsamples of neutrino events were selected from the cascade sample (Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. 2023). One of them comprises high-energy cascades from all sky directions with OM hit multiplicity  $N_{\text{hit}} > 19$  and reconstructed energy  $E_{\text{sh}} \geq 100$  TeV. Parameters of these 13 events are listed in Table 1. The other sample comprises upward moving cascades with OM hit multiplicity  $N_{\text{hit}} > 12$ , reconstructed energy  $E_{\text{sh}} > 10$  TeV and zenith angles  $\cos \theta < -0.25$ . We also denote such events as under horizon cascades. Parameters of these 11 events are listed in Table 2. These two samples were used by Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. (2023) to determine the astrophysical neutrino flux from the Baikal-GVD data, thus confirming the IceCube discovery of extraterrestrial neutrinos with an independent experiment. We note that the tables presented herein are the same as the ones from the referenced article, however, the first one omits three events due to the added constraint of OM hit multiplicity  $N_{\text{hit}} > 19$ .

A skymap showing the high energy and under-horizon cascades with direction uncertainties is shown in Figure 1, along with the positions of the VLBI blazars (see subsection 2.2). The average direction uncertainty for cascades with energies between 10 TeV and 100 TeV is reported as a function of hit multiplicity in Table 3.

## 2.2 VLBI-selected sample of blazars

We follow Plavin et al. (2020, 2023) and select 8 GHz VLBI observations of blazars, which can be found in the Astrogateo<sup>1</sup> database. These observations include geodetic VLBI programs (Petrov et al. 2009; Pushkarev & Kovalev 2012; Piner et al. 2012), the Very Long Baseline Array (VLBA) calibrator surveys (Beasley et al. 2002; Fomalont et al. 2003; Petrov et al. 2005, 2006, 2008; Kovalev et al. 2007; Petrov 2017; Gordon et al. 2016), and other 8 GHz global VLBI, VLBA, EVN (European VLBI Network), LBA (Australian Long Baseline Array) observations (Petrov et al. 2011a; Petrov 2011; Petrov et al. 2011b; Petrov 2012, 2013; Schinzel et al. 2015; Shu et al. 2017; Petrov et al. 2019). These observations determine the positions and flux densities for blazars, which are publicly available from the Radio Fundamental Catalog (RFC)<sup>2</sup>.

We use the ‘blazar’ term in this paper for active galaxies with Doppler-boosted jets pointing at an observer. Most of extragalactic radio sources with flat spectra are compact at parsec scales, while only about 25 % of steep spectrum sources show VLBI-detectable component in their emission (Popkov et al. 2021). During the last dozens of years, VLBI surveys have observed compact extragalactic sources with both flat and steep radio spectrum. All of them are collected in the RFC. We use the complete flux-density limited sample of extragalactic radio sources with integrated flux density at VLBI scales at 8 GHz from the RFC greater than 150 mJy. It is preliminary estimated to be 90-95 % complete on the basis of its contraction. More details on the RFC sample properties will be presented by Petrov & Kovalev (in prep.). Observations of VLBI-selected samples of extragalactic radio sources have shown that about 90 % of them are highly Doppler boosted jets of active galaxies (e.g., Lister et al. 2021; Homan et al. 2021) with small viewing angles of their

jets. That is why, for the sake of simplicity, we call this a sample of blazars.

## 3 SEARCH FOR CORRELATIONS WITH VLBI-BRIGHT BLAZARS

In this section we perform statistical analysis of neutrino data sets and VLBI-bright blazars. A neutrino data set can be the real observed data set (see subsection 2.1) or a Monte-Carlo simulated one. We describe two types of analysis in subsection 3.1. In each of them, we assess the significance of blazar-neutrino association, either using the blazars’ flux densities in the first type of analysis, or using the number of coincident ‘blazar–neutrino’ pairs in the second analysis. We also present details of the Monte-Carlo algorithms utilized in these analyses. In subsection 3.2 we test which potential subset of cascade events can give the most significant result in the analyses and find that the high-energy neutrinos do. We also estimate the number of future events needed to reach a certain significance. We obtain p-values for the current neutrino data from Baikal-GVD and discuss the implications in subsection 3.3.

### 3.1 Monte Carlo algorithms

In order to analyze the possibility of finding directional correlation between cascade events and blazars and calculate test statistic, we create pseudo-experiment datasets with artificial randomized neutrino candidate events. Specifically, we assume a uniform distribution for the time of arrival events, and then implement a reshuffling of the times of all existing cascades for the given zenith and azimuth angles. Following this, we determine the right ascension and declination of the simulated events at the specified geographical coordinates of Baikal-GVD. The algorithm, which has been used to create such simulated datasets, is presented in Algorithm 1.

---

#### Algorithm 1 Pseudo-experiment dataset generation

---

- 1: We take the horizontal coordinates, azimuth and zenith angle, of all 6157 cascade events from the data set, as well as their arrival times.
  - 2: We reshuffle times for all events. To a good approximation, the sensitivity of the experiment only depends on azimuth and zenith angle.
  - 3: Using the Baikal-GVD telescope coordinates (51°50′ N, 104°20′ E), the original events coordinates and the new reshuffled times of arrival, we find the declination and right ascension of simulated events.
  - 4: From the latter, we select a subsample for specific analysis. This may include, for example, the events below the horizon or high-energy neutrinos.
- 

To calculate the significance of coincidence of Baikal-GVD cascades with blazars, we perform analyses of two types (see subsection 3.3). For this, two different statistics are introduced. Systematic errors of arrival directions are included in the error contours.

In the first type of analysis, we assess the significance using the blazars’ flux densities following the procedure from Plavin et al. (2023). Similarly, for blazars that fall inside the 90% error regions of the neutrino candidate events, we average their flux density and take this value as a statistic. We take the geometric average, since the flux densities cover several orders of magnitude. Subsequently, we look

<sup>1</sup> [http://astrogeo.org/vlbi\\_images/](http://astrogeo.org/vlbi_images/)

<sup>2</sup> [http://astrogeo.org/sol/rfc/rfc\\_2023a/](http://astrogeo.org/sol/rfc/rfc_2023a/)

**Table 1.** Parameters of the high-energy cascades: event ID, reconstructed energy, zenith angle, Galactic longitude and latitude, right ascension and declination, radii of the 50% and 90% uncertainty regions and alternative IDs from [Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. \(2021\)](#).

Event ID	E TeV	$\theta$ deg.	$l$ deg.	$b$ deg.	RA deg.	Dec deg.	50% unc. deg.	90% unc. deg.	Alternative ID
GVD181010CA	105	37	142.6	30.4	118.2	72.5	2.3	4.5	GVD2018_3_354_N
GVD181024CA	115	73	164.1	-54.4	35.4	1.1	2.5	4.5	GVD2018_3_383_N
GVD190216CA	398	64	141.4	5.8	55.6	62.4	3.3	6.9	GVD2018_2_656_N
GVD190517CA	1200	61	99.9	54.9	217.7	57.6	2.0	3.0	GVD2019_2_112_N
GVD190604CA	129	50	132.7	0.1	33.7	61.4	3.5	5.5	GVD2019_2_153_N
GVD200826CA	110	71	21.0	-19.2	295.3	-18.9	2.0	7.9	GVD2020_3_175_N
GVD210117CA	246	57	168.8	38.8	131.9	50.2	1.6	3.6	GVD2020_6_399_N
GVD210409CA	263	60	73.3	-6.1	310	31.7	3.3	6.3	GVD2021_7_008_N
GVD210418CA	224	115.5	196.8	-14.6	82.4	7.1	3.0	5.8	GVD2021_1_020_N
GVD210515CA	120	80.2	175.2	17.9	103.4	41.2	2.8	5.2	GVD2021_2_048_N
GVD210716CA	110	58.7	135.5	7.1	46.0	66.7	2.1	4.1	GVD2021_4_131_N
GVD210906CA	138	67.7	202.2	-45.3	57.8	-12.0	2.0	5.6	GVD2021_6_210_N
GVD220221CA	120	67.7	276.9	77.5	187.2	15.8	3.2	5.8	GVD2021_1_399_N

**Table 2.** Parameters of the under-horizon cascade events with  $\cos \theta < -0.25$ . The columns are the same as in [Table 1](#).

Event ID	E TeV	$\theta$ deg.	$l$ deg.	$b$ deg.	RA deg.	Dec deg.	50% unc. deg.	90% unc. deg.	Alternative ID
GVD180504CA	25.1	111.7	299.1	3.6	185.4	-59.0	3.9	6.9	GVD2018_1_041_N
GVD190523CA	91.0	109.0	200.4	-58.4	45.1	-16.7	2.2	4.5	GVD2019_1_114_N
GVD200614CA	39.8	144.1	359.3	10.6	256.2	-23.6	3.4	6.8	GVD2020_7_079_N
GVD201112CA	24.5	136.1	305.0	-15.1	202.2	-77.8	5.4	11.8	GVD2020_3_278_N
GVD210418CA	224	115.5	196.8	-14.6	82.4	7.1	3.0	5.8	GVD2021_1_020_N
GVD210501CA	63.1	112.3	223.4	-67.7	38.1	-28.9	2.6	12.6	GVD2021_2_030_N
GVD210506CA	21.9	114.2	5.9	46.7	230.6	3.1	2.8	6.6	GVD2021_5_032_N
GVD210710CA	24.5	115.5	139.8	-54.2	22.7	7.4	3.6	8.6	GVD2021_7_135_N
GVD210803CA	20.9	136.9	321.0	-50.3	347.0	-63.0	1.9	4.1	GVD2021_6_169_N
GVD220121CA	30.9	110.5	241.3	10.4	126.2	-19.5	3.4	7.1	GVD2021_4_355_N
GVD220308CA	36.3	105.0	203.2	-35.2	67.3	-8.0	2.5	5.6	GVD2021_1_409_N

**Table 3.** The uncertainty of the reconstruction of the arrival directions of Baikal-GVD cascade events with energies between 10 and 100 TeV, averaged for all directions (2-nd column) and for “under-horizon” events (3-rd column). The numbers give the radii of 50%-containment circles, in degrees, for different intervals of hit multiplicity.

$N_{\text{hit}}$	all	under horizon
13–15	6.1	5.7
16–18	4.8	4.5
19–21	3.9	3.5
22–24	3.7	3.3
25–27	3.5	3.2
28–30	3.5	3.2
34–36	3.5	3.1
40–42	3.3	3.1
45–47	2.9	2.8
>50	2.8	2.6


if this value is higher than for randomly selected blazars. The second type of analysis includes finding the significance by the number of coincident “blazar–neutrino” pairs (e.g. [Aublin & Plavin 2022](#)). In this case, the number is taken as our statistic of interest. For the second type of analysis, we utilize a more conservative 50% error region, as the 90% error regions tend to have higher error values.

To calculate the significance, we use Monte-Carlo methods, which are implemented in the following [Algorithm 2](#).

#### **Algorithm 2** Calculation of significance

- 1: We calculate a statistic of interest (either the average flux density or the number of coincident sources) using the coordinates of real cascade events and denote this statistic as  $v_{\text{real}}$ .
- 2: We repeat  $N = 10000$  times the following:
  - 1: Create simulated cascade events as described in [Algorithm 1](#).
  - 2: Calculate statistic  $v_i$  for the simulated neutrinos.
- 3: Count the number  $M$  of simulated cascade events for which  $v_i \geq v_{\text{real}}$ . The resulting  $p$ -value is then  $p = \frac{M+1}{N+1}$ .

Given a certain assumption for the blazar neutrino signal, one can estimate the expected significance of the association between blazars and neutrinos for a given experimental data set. For this, we utilize pseudo-experiments generated from the time-scrambled Baikal-GVD data and determine what significance level can be potentially achieved in [Algorithm 2](#) for specific sub-samples of cascade events. This is achieved as follows. First we generate fictitious sources of neutrinos (“blazar sky”) at positions of some of the pseudo-experiment’s events. In this, real blazars from the RFC catalog are virtually “shifted” to the respective positions of the sim-



**Figure 1.** Arrival directions of high-energy and under-horizon Baikal-GVD neutrino cascades (stars) and their uncertainty (50% and 90%) regions (ellipses) in the sky map (equatorial coordinates). Colour represents energies of the events: green is below 100 TeV, blue is between 100 TeV and 200 TeV, red is between 200 TeV and 1000 TeV, orange is above 1 PeV. Dashed ellipses show under-horizon events, while solid ellipses present events above the horizon. See Table 1 and Table 2 for more details. Positions of blazars from the 8 GHz VLBI sample with flux densities above 0.33 Jy are shown as grey dots. The Galactic plane is indicated as the grey curve.

ulated events. The rest of the pseudo-experiment’s event sample is re-simulated many times, allowing us to calibrate the test statistic behavior. The details of the algorithm are presented in Algorithm 3.

The resulting expected  $p$ -value and corresponding significance depend on the simulated cascade events created at the beginning of Algorithm 3 and can take on a wide range of values. To take this into account, we repeat the procedure described in this algorithm  $K = 100$  times. Then we take the average number and report it as our result.

### 3.2 Monte-Carlo simulations and the expected signal

We perform Monte Carlo simulations for number of coincident blazars with Algorithm 3, described in the previous section. In this analysis, we take 1273 blazars with the 8 GHz flux density above 0.33 Jy (see Figure 1). This cut-off for flux density turned out to be optimal and yielded the minimum  $p$ -value in the analysis of Plavin et al. (2021). It was concluded that the bright blazars above 0.33 Jy dominated the association with neutrinos from IceCube.

We perform our optimization by testing which subset of neutrino candidate events can give us the most significant results. Specifically, we apply different cuts to cascade events based on their position in the sky, energy or hit multiplicity. In particular, we use high energy neutrinos with  $E \geq 100$  TeV (Table 1), all neutrino candidate events and neutrino candidate events below the horizon level (Table 2). The 100 TeV threshold is commonly used in neutrino astrophysics (e.g. Aartsen et al. 2014; Krauß et al. 2018; Grant et al. 2019). Such a threshold ensures a low level of background from atmospheric muons in all directions at once (see Table 4) and it allows comparisons with previous analyses.

To estimate the number of astrophysical neutrinos that could come from blazars, we take into account the atmospheric background. In Table 4 we show the expected contributions of astrophysical and

atmospheric neutrino fluxes for different subsets of the data Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. (2023). The difference between sum of astrophysical and atmospheric neutrino fluxes and total flux is due to atmospheric muons. The astrophysical neutrino flux is normalised to value measured by IceCube (Aartsen et al. 2015). We then use these numbers to find the number of blazars associated with neutrinos by multiplying the corresponding fraction of astrophysical signal and the total number of cascade events for a certain subset. To be more specific, we consider an extreme case in which we assume all astrophysical neutrinos originate from blazars, despite the potential existence of other neutrino-producing astrophysical sources. This provides an optimistic limit to our results.

It is assumed that the number of astrophysical neutrinos and atmospheric neutrinos under the horizon is equal to half of the total number of the corresponding neutrinos for energies  $E > 10$  TeV and  $N_{\text{hit}} > 12$ . This assumption was obtained using the zenith-angle distributions for atmospheric neutrinos and astrophysical neutrinos. Asymmetry of upward and downward events  $A = \frac{N_{\text{up}} - N_{\text{down}}}{N_{\text{up}} + N_{\text{down}}}$  turned out to be 0.06 for atmospheric neutrinos and 0.02 for astrophysical ones.

The summary of our results is given in Figure 2 and Table 5. Our simulations demonstrate that the best potential significance level can be achieved by taking the high-energy cascade events ( $E > 100$  TeV). Such neutrinos provide the best significance since the expected fraction of astrophysical signal compared to the total one for them is the strongest. The reported  $2.5\sigma$  is the average significance of the blazar-neutrino association expected for an experimental sample of 13 high energy events under the extreme assumption that the VLBI blazar sample is responsible for all of the diffuse astrophysical flux. If we find the standard deviation between different artificial neutrino realizations in Algorithm 3, the final significance and its uncertainty is  $2.5\sigma \pm 1\sigma$ .

We have also estimated how many events are needed to reach a

**Table 4.** Expected fractions of astrophysical and atmospheric neutrinos. Remaining fraction is due to atmospheric muons.


	$E > 10$ TeV	$E > 30$ TeV	$E > 60$ TeV	$E > 100$ TeV
$N_{\text{hit}} > 19$ astrophysical $\nu$ :	0.075	0.074	0.137	0.500
atmospheric $\nu$ :	0.104	0.054	0.053	0.116
$N_{\text{hit}} > 15$ astrophysical $\nu$ :	0.020	0.042	0.089	0.257
atmospheric $\nu$ :	0.034	0.035	0.036	0.071
$N_{\text{hit}} > 12$ astrophysical $\nu$ :	0.003	0.013	0.024	0.036
atmospheric $\nu$ :	0.006	0.014	0.014	0.014

**Algorithm 3** Potential significance calculation

- 1: We take (as in Algorithm 2) one pseudo-experiment, which is created with the Algorithm 1 described before.
- 2: We repeat  $N = 100$  times the following:
  - 1: Generate a random number  $n$  from the binomial distribution  $B(N_0, p_0)$  where  $N_0$  is the total number of blazars and  $p_0 N_0$  is the expected rate of occurrences equal to the estimated number of blazar-associated neutrinos (see subsection 3.2 on how this number is determined).
  - 2: Select the given number  $n$  of blazars from the part of the RFC catalog with a certain flux cut, which do not coincide with the pseudo-experiment neutrino cascades generated in the beginning.
  - 3: Change their coordinates so that they coincide with simulated cascade events within the error circles. For simplicity, we assume that each neutrino comes from a separate blazar.
  - 4: Count the total number of blazars,  $n$ , that coincide with cascade events within the error limits, and take this value as the  $v_j$  statistic ( $n$  shifted plus those from catalog that coincide with simulated cascades).
- 5: Repeat  $M = 1000$  times the following:
  - 1: Create new realization of the background-only pseudo-experiment cascade events (using Algorithm 1). The coordinates of blazars used in the outer loop are fixed in the inner loop.
  - 2: Calculate statistics  $v_i$  for this new realization, where index  $i$  refers to the inner loop.
- 6: Count the number of cases  $m_j$  for which  $v_i \geq v_j$ . Index  $j$  refers to the outer loop. Then  $p$ -value for the signal-injected pseudo-experiment  $j$  will be  $p_j = \frac{m_j + 1}{M + 1}$ .
- 3: The average value  $p = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j p_j$  is taken as a measure of the algorithm's sensitivity.

**Table 5.** Expected significance levels of neutrino-blazar correlation obtained with pair counting, for the data sets used in this paper, assuming that all of the astrophysical flux comes from the VLBI blazars.

Event sample	Neutrino number	Expected significance
$E > 100$ TeV	13	$2.5\sigma \pm 1\sigma$
All events	6157	$1\sigma$
Under horizon	11	$1.1\sigma$


**Figure 2.** Expected and observed numbers of blazars coincident with GVD cascades above 100 TeV versus the total number of these events in the sample. The blue line, and its 68% and 95% confidence intervals, depicted as blue shadowed regions, presents the expected number of pairs, obtained with Algorithm 3 under assumption that blazars are responsible for 100% of the astrophysical neutrino flux. In red, the actual number of coincident sources for real high-energy cascade events from Table 1 are shown in chronological order. The green line represents the expected number of pairs assuming there is no association between blazars and neutrinos. The corresponding 68% and 95% confidence intervals are shown as green shadowed regions.

certain significance. In Figure 2 we present the number of coincident blazars with high-energy neutrino cascades and its 68% and 95% confidence intervals as a function of the number of events, assuming the 100% dominance of blazars in the astrophysical neutrino flux. As one can see, in order to reach a  $4\sigma$  significance with high energy cascades, the experiment needs to accumulate about 50 events, a factor 4 more than is available to us now. Such number of events is expected to be detected by Baikal-GVD detector in around 4 years. This estimate does not take into account a constantly growing aperture of the detector.

**3.3 Actual data examination results****3.3.1 Average flux density**

In this section, for the real Baikal-GVD neutrino cascades we perform the association-significance analysis using the average flux density of coincident blazars as the statistic. Such analysis was introduced by Plavin et al. (2020, 2023) for track-like IceCube  $E > 200$  TeV events. Similarly, we put a threshold  $E > 200$  TeV on Baikal-GVD cascades, which results in a very small sample of only 5 events. We employ the blazar catalog with 8-GHz flux densities exceeding 0.15 Jy, maintaining consistency with the aforementioned paper. The resulting  $p$ -value turns out to be 0.18, consistent with expectations for this small sample (ten times smaller than the sample used by Plavin et al. (2020, 2023)).

In our study, we choose not to perform flux density optimisa-



**Figure 3.** Three high energy cascade events (GVD190216CA, GVD190604CA and GVD210716CA from Table 1) close to the Galactic plane (grey line) and their corresponding 90% errors (black). The persistent northern-hemisphere maximum of the IC probability map over 2008–2015 (Aartsen & et al. 2017) is shown by the red plus and circle, drawn as the uncertainty  $0.5^\circ$  at 90% level. Pulsars from the SIMBAD Astronomical Database are shown as dots. Several close high-mass X-ray binaries are indicated.

tion on artificial data. The primary reason behind this decision is the inherent complexity of the flux model of shifted blazars. Estimating the appropriate flux values to assign to blazars in artificial data proves to be a challenging task due to the intricate nature of the model. As a result, we opt to use real data exclusively when working with average flux density significance analysis.

### 3.3.2 Pair counting results

The significance of association between blazars and high-energy neutrinos utilizing the actual data is found also using the number of neutrino-blazar coincidences as the statistic. For this, neutrinos with energies above 100 TeV (13 events) are included. We use Algorithm 2 described in subsection 3.1 and take the number of “blazar–neutrino” pairs as the statistic of interest. This analysis yields no significant detection. The corresponding  $p$ -value is about 0.35 (statistical significance less than  $1\sigma$ ). The actual number of neutrino-blazar coincidences is close to the average number of coincidences in a typical background-only pseudo-experiment. Although our result falls below the estimated  $2.5\sigma$  level as mentioned in subsection 3.2, this significance might still arise by chance (see Figure 2 and its uncertainty region). Therefore, our findings do not necessarily conflict with each other. Simultaneously, the source of this discrepancy might be linked to an overestimation of the astrophysical neutrino flux in our data associated with blazars, potentially due to the inclusion of flux from other astronomical sources. Future studies will aid in discerning between these two possible explanations.

## 4 PROMISING COINCIDENT SOURCES

In this section, we scrutinize potential coincident candidates associated with the Baikal-GVD cascades, incorporating both Galactic and extragalactic ones. A brief summary is presented in Table 6.

### 4.1 Galactic sources

Already first IceCube data had demonstrated possible flux from the Galactic ridge consistent with *Fermi* LAT flux at 100 GeV energies (Neronov et al. 2014). However, the arrival directions of the early IceCube events were subsequently reconsidered. Assuming a certain model of cosmic-ray interactions with interstellar gas, the global contribution of Galactic disk to IceCube and ANTARES data was found not to exceed  $\sim 10\%$  of the total astrophysical neutrino flux (Albert et al. 2018). Recently, in a model-independent search for the Galactic anisotropy, a significant excess of IceCube track-like events from low Galactic latitudes was found, consistent with the Galactic contribution of about 30% of the total flux above 200 TeV (Kovalev et al. 2022). Subsequently, ANTARES reported a hint of the neutrino emission associated with the Galactic ridge (Albert et al. 2023). These results were later supported by an IceCube analysis of cascade data (IceCube Collaboration et al. 2023).

Using the Baikal-GVD high-energy cascade sample, it was noted that the error circles (90% CL) of arrival directions of three events, see Table 1, intersect, forming a triplet close to the Galactic plane (Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. 2023). We estimate the  $p$ -value of finding such a triplet on the sky using Monte Carlo simulations. Specifically, we use Algorithm 1 and slightly modified version of Algorithm 2, for which our statistics of interest is equal to the number of triplets present in the simulated events. The final  $p$ -value turns out to be equal to 0.024 ( $2.26\sigma$ ). While this result is not highly significant (falling short of the  $3\sigma$  standard often used in the scientific community), it nonetheless presents an intriguing implication. This intersection and the computed  $p$ -value of 0.024 can be viewed as a suggestive indicator, pointing towards this specific region near the Galactic plane as being of potential interest. Such hints invite future investigations to delve deeper into this area. We add that the intersection of two of them contains very well-known Galactic sources of high-energy radiation, LSI+61 303 and Swift J0243.6+6124, see Figure 3.

LSI+61 303 is a binary system of compact object and companion star located at  $2.6 \pm 0.3$  kpc from the Solar system (Gaia Collaboration 2018). The J2000.0 coordinates for this source are  $40^\circ 13' 19.17''$ ,  $61^\circ 22' 9.33''$  and its location is consistent with two cascade events (events GVD190216CA and GVD190604CA in Table 1). It is known to be variable, with flares coming periodically in a wide range of the electromagnetic spectrum from radio to TeV. The compact object in this system is most probably a pulsar, which is strongly indicated by pulsations with a period of  $P = 269$  ms ( $> 20\sigma$ ) observed recently by FAST (Weng et al. 2022).

The orbital period of the binary system of LSI+61 303 is 26.496 d. Additionally, flare brightness modulations are observed in all energy ranges with a longer period  $\sim 1659$  d (Jaron 2021). The Baikal-GVD events came at phases 0.3037 and 0.4098 of the orbital period and 0.1403 and 0.2059 of the major period (with zero phase at 43366.275 MJD). Prokhorov & Moraghan (2023) report that the latest of the high  $\gamma$ -ray states of LSI+61 303, most likely associated with superorbital modulation, started in March 2019 and lasted for 96 weeks.

Almost in the same position of sky there is another interesting object, the Galactic X-ray pulsar Swift J0243.6+6124 ( $2 - 6$  kpc, Bailer-Jones et al. 2021; Reig et al. 2020, and references therein). Its coordinates are  $40^\circ 9' 18.437''$ ,  $61^\circ 43' 43.77''$ . The source was discovered in 2017 when a giant flare was taking place in it. Currently, this is the only discovered pulsating ultraluminous X-ray source (PULX) in the Galaxy.

The super-Eddington luminosity of PULX sources ( $\sim 10^{39}$  –

**Table 6.** Summary of the promising neutrino-coincident Galactic and extragalactic sources. See [subsection 4.1](#) and [subsection 4.2](#) for more details.

Source	Type	Key Features	Baikal Cascade Events
LSI+61 303	Binary system	Flares in wide electromagnetic spectrum	GVD190216CA, GVD190604CA
Swift J0243.6+6124	X-ray Pulsar	Ultraluminous X-ray source, super-Eddington luminosity	GVD190216CA, GVD190604CA
2023+335	Blazar	2 Jy VLBI flux density, gamma-ray detection by <i>Fermi</i> LAT	GVD210409CA
2021+317	Blazar	1.5 Jy VLBI flux density, flat spectrum	GVD210409CA
2050+364	Blazar	1.2 Jy VLBI flux density, steep spectrum	GVD210409CA
0529+075	Blazar	1.3 Jy VLBI flux density, variable spectrum	GVD210418CA
0506+056	Blazar	Temporally coincident radio flare	GVD210418CA
0258–184	Blazar	Temporally coincident radio flare	GVD190523CA, GVD210501CA
1935–179	Blazar	Temporally coincident radio flare	GVD200826CA

$10^{41}$  erg/s) is explained by virtue of the intense accretion of matter from a neighboring massive star onto a magnetized neutron star (Mushtukov & Tsygankov 2022; King et al. 2023). Although radio emission from such sources is generally not observed, it should be noted that a radio jet (van den Eijnden et al. 2018) was observed from Swift J0243.6+6124 at the time of the X-ray peak in 2017. The spin period of the neutron star is 9.86 s (Jenke & Wilson-Hodge 2017). The period of the binary is 28.3 d (Doroshenko et al. 2018). In 2019, the source underwent another X-ray outburst, about 6 times dimmer than that of 2017. GVD190216CA happened at its end, and according to Liu et al. (2022) who have analyzed the long-term evolution of optical fluxes in  $V$ ,  $I$ , and  $R$  band, the mid of February 2019 is the time of maximal dissipation of the Be-star’s decretion disc.

We have analysed available archival data in X-ray and gamma from LSI+61 303 and Swift J0243.6+6124 at times of the two Baikal-GVD events. The Swift/BAT 15–50 keV daily average light curve shows a flux increase from LSI+61 303 a few days before the neutrino GVD190604CA. Formally, this was the largest flux from LSI+61 303 for the entire observation period since 2005. However, at the time Swift observed the sky area without ‘dithering’ mode, which indicates a low significance of data. Moreover, around the 140th day of 2019, Swift/BAT shows some increase in daily counts for Swift J0243.6+6124 as well, probably indicating the fluctuation not intrinsic to the source. MAXI, which does not resolve LSI+61 303 and Swift J0243.6+6124 being separated by  $25'45.93''$ , also shows a moderate (twice the background) 2–20 keV flux enhancement in June of 2019. *Fermi* LAT 0.1–300 GeV data indicates enhanced (about two-fold) radiation at the beginning of June 2019 compared with the long-term period-stacked light curves. At the time of the third event from the triplet, GVD210716C, Swift/BAT, MAXI, or HMXT data show no suspicious features for LSI+61 303 and Swift J0243.6+6124. Thus, existing data does not allow a certain conclusion about the association of any triplet cascade events with high-energy electromagnetic radiation from either of the sources.

Recall that only about 50% of events in [Table 1](#) are expected to come from astrophysical objects, while another half are due to background. Thus, two events, GVD190216CA and GVD190604CA, coming from direction to same astrophysical source, LSI+61 303 or Swift J0243.6+6124 (or both), would make this direction the brightest neutrino source in the sky providing a large fraction of the total astrophysical neutrino flux.

Though a neutrino source at this Northern declination should be hardly accessible by IceCube at highest PeV energies because of the Earth opacity, still it would be visible at energies  $\sim 100$  TeV and lower. Intriguingly, the position of one of events in the Baikal-GVD triplet in the sky coincides with the highest-significance Northern

hot spot in the IceCube 7-year sky map (Aartsen & et al. 2017) (see [Figure 3](#)), though other directions bring higher significances in subsequent similar analyses (Aartsen et al. 2020; IceCube Collaboration et al. 2022). The corresponding source has not been reported by IceCube at  $E > 100$  TeV, so its observed flux in Baikal GVD may be an upward fluctuation, and the real flux of this source should be smaller. Notice that, while a continued neutrino emission from the source is not observed by IceCube, a flaring source cannot be ruled out at the moment from a theoretical standpoint (e.g. Neronov & Ribordy 2009; Bykov et al. 2021). At the same time, the arrival of three unrelated high-energy neutrinos from directions close the Galactic plane is also possible and consistent with the recent finding that the IceCube high-energy neutrino flux has a Galactic component (Kovalev et al. 2022; IceCube Collaboration et al. 2023).

## 4.2 Extragalactic sources

Following [Plavin et al. \(2020, 2023\)](#), we select blazars with the brightest radio emission as potential associations with high-energy cascade events. See [subsection 2.2](#) for details on the radio source sample collected on the basis of VLBI observations.

There are four blazars with historical VLBI flux density at 8 GHz above 1 Jy that coincide with the Baikal-GVD high-energy cascade events ([Table 1](#)). Three of them are close to event GVD210409CA. The brightest is 2023+335 ( $z = 0.22$ ): its average VLBI flux density is 2 Jy at 8 GHz, with a flat or slightly inverted spectrum at GHz frequencies. Moreover, 2023+335 is detected by *Fermi* LAT in gamma rays (Kara et al. 2012). Two others are 2021+317 ( $z = 0.36$ ) with 1.5 Jy VLBI flux density at 8 GHz and a flat spectrum as well as 2050+364 ( $z = 0.35$ ) with 1.2 Jy, a steep spectrum, and a lower dominance of parsec-scale structures. The fourth bright blazar is 0529+075 ( $z = 1.25$ , [Sowards-Emmerd et al. 2005](#)) coincident with the event GVD210418CA. Its VLBI flux density is 1.3 Jy at 8 GHz, it has a highly variable spectrum, ranging from falling to inverted.

Additionally, there are several coincidences that show evidence of temporal correlation: an ongoing major radio flare when neutrino is detected from the direction of the source (see [Avrorin et al. \(2022\)](#) for more details). Such behavior is characteristic to neutrino-associated blazars, see [Plavin et al. \(2020\)](#); [Hovatta et al. \(2021b\)](#); [Plavin et al. \(2023\)](#). The most notable is the flaring blazar TXS 0506+056 ( $z = 0.34$ , average 0.5 Jy at 8 GHz) coincident with the event GVD210418CA from [Table 1](#). This association is investigated further in a dedicated paper ([Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. 2022](#)). Other blazars with hints for temporally coincident flares are 0258–184 (events GVD190523CA and GVD210501CA), and 1935–179 (event GVD200826CA). These objects were highlighted

and discussed in Avrorin et al. (2022) together with their radio light curves.

Apart from that, some of the sources discussed above can be further examined in the results of VLBA monitoring observations, including kinematics measurements and VLBI-*Fermi* analysis in, e.g., Lister et al. (2021); Kramarenko et al. (2022). More dedicated single-dish and VLBI monitoring observations are needed to achieve the required level of significance of the neutrino-blazar analysis (see discussions in Liodakis et al. 2022; Kovalev et al. 2023).

## 5 SUMMARY

In this paper, we discuss potential associations of Baikal-GVD cascade events with astrophysical sources. Compared to ice, the use of liquid water allows for better angular resolution, thus making neutrino astronomy with cascades possible. In particular, we have analyzed directional association between VLBI-selected radio blazars and Baikal-GVD events. Monte-Carlo simulations on artificial datasets demonstrate that, among the standard Baikal-GVD cascade data sets, the best significance levels for this association could be achieved by using events with  $E > 100$  TeV, if the number of coincident “blazar-neutrino” pairs is used as the test statistics. We estimate the expected signal as a function of the dataset size. The first set of the April 2018 – March 2022 events demonstrates no significant effect, in agreement with our simulations. However, with the present low statistics, we cannot exclude also the overestimation of the number of neutrinos associated with blazars. This overestimation could arise due to other astrophysical sources of neutrinos. Future data could help in resolving this problem.

Besides pair counting, we have also performed an analysis of the statistics based on the average flux density of coincident sources and events with  $E \geq 200$  TeV. Such analysis represents the most sensitive test (Plavin et al. 2020, 2023). There are only 5 such events in the currently available Baikal-GVD sample. As expected for a small sample, no statistically significant correlations are found,  $p$ -value being equal to 0.18.

We have listed and discussed promising coincident high-energy astrophysical sources, including Galactic and extragalactic ones. The most notable Galactic sources turned out to be LSI +61 303 and Swift J0243.6+6124, which fall within the 90% uncertainty regions of two events. The extragalactic sources that caught our attention are 2023+335, 2021+317, 2050+364, and 0529+075, which have high values of their average flux densities. We note that TXS 0506+056, 0258–184 and 1935–179 demonstrated temporal coincidences of radio flares and times of neutrino arrival.

The overall results indicate that increasing the number of cascades and use of track-like events are necessary for firm astrophysical conclusions. This will be achieved in the nearest future with continuously growing aperture and improving sensitivity and reconstruction methods of the Baikal-GVD neutrino telescope (e.g. Allakhverdyan et al. 2021; Avrorin et al. 2022).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Eduardo Ros for useful comments on the manuscript. We thank Hans Krimm for advice concerning Swift data. This work is partially supported by the European Regional Development Fund-Project “Engineering applications of microworld physics” (CZ 02.1.01/0.0/0.0/16 019/0000766).

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The article uses neutrino data. This paper presents the parameters for the high-energy cascades, as well as those for the under-horizon cascades, in conjunction with Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al. (2023). The data for all other cascades underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author. The analysis utilizes the publicly available Astrogeo<sup>3</sup> database and the Radio Fundamental Catalogue<sup>4</sup>.

## REFERENCES

- Aartsen M. G., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, **835**, 151  
Aartsen M. G., et al., 2014, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **113**, 101101  
Aartsen M. G., et al., 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, **91**, 022001  
Aartsen M. G., et al., 2020, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **124**, 051103  
Abbasi R., et al., 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2304.12675  
Albert A., et al., 2018, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, **868**, L20  
Albert A., et al., 2023, *Physics Letters B*, **841**, 137951  
Allakhverdyan V. A., et al., 2021, *Physics of Atomic Nuclei*, **84**, 1600  
Aublin J., Plavin A., 2022, in 37th International Cosmic Ray Conference. p. 1164, doi:10.22323/1.395.01164  
Avrorin A. D., et al., 2019a, in European Physical Journal Web of Conferences. p. 01003, doi:10.1051/epjconf/201920701003  
Avrorin A. D., et al., 2019b, in European Physical Journal Web of Conferences. p. 05001, doi:10.1051/epjconf/201920705001  
Avrorin A. V., et al., 2022, *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics*, **134**, 399  
Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al., 2018, *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:1808.10353  
Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al., 2021, *PoS, ICRC2021*, 002  
Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al., 2022, *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2210.01650  
Baikal-GVD Collaboration et al., 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, **107**, 042005  
Bailer-Jones C. A. L., Rybizki J., Founesneau M., Demleitner M., Andrae R., 2021, *AJ*, **161**, 147  
Beasley A. J., Gordon D., Peck A. B., Petrov L., MacMillan D. S., Fomalont E. B., Ma C., 2002, *ApJS*, **141**, 13  
Britzen S., et al., 2021, *MNRAS*, **503**, 3145  
Buson S., Tramacere A., Pfeiffer L., Oswald L., de Menezes R., Azzollini A., Ajello M., 2022, *ApJ*, **933**, L43  
Buson S., et al., 2023, *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2305.11263  
Bykov A. M., Petrov A. E., Kalyashova M. E., Troitsky S. V., 2021, *ApJ*, **921**, L10  
Doroshenko V., Tsygankov S., Santangelo A., 2018, *A&A*, **613**, A19  
Fomalont E. B., Petrov L., MacMillan D. S., Gordon D., Ma C., 2003, *AJ*, **126**, 2562  
Gaia Collaboration 2018, *VizieR Online Data Catalog*, p. I/345  
Gordon D., et al., 2016, *AJ*, **151**, 154  
Grant D., Ackermann M., Karle A., Kowalski M., 2019, in *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society*. p. 288 (arXiv:1911.02561), doi:10.48550/arXiv.1911.02561  
Homan D. C., et al., 2021, *ApJ*, **923**, 67  
Hovatta T., et al., 2021a, *A&A*, **650**, A83  
Hovatta T., et al., 2021b, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **650**, A83  
IceCube Collaboration 2013, *Science*, **342**, 1242856  
IceCube Collaboration et al., 2018a, *Science*, **361**, 147  
IceCube Collaboration et al., 2018b, *Science*, **361**, eaat1378  
IceCube Collaboration et al., 2022, *Science*, **378**, 538  
IceCube Collaboration et al., 2023, *Science*, **380**, 1338  
Jaron F., 2021, *Universe*, **7**, 245  
Jenke P., Wilson-Hodge C. A., 2017, *The Astronomer’s Telegram*, **10812**, 1  
Kara E., et al., 2012, *ApJ*, **746**, 159  
Kheirandish A., 2020, *Ap&SS*, **365**, 108  
King A., Lasota J.-P., Middleton M., 2023, *New Astron. Rev.*, **96**, 101672

<sup>3</sup> [http://astrogeo.org/vlbi\\_images/](http://astrogeo.org/vlbi_images/)

<sup>4</sup> [http://astrogeo.org/sol/rfc/rfc\\_2023a/](http://astrogeo.org/sol/rfc/rfc_2023a/)

- Kovalev Y. Y., Petrov L., Fomalont E. B., Gordon D., 2007, *AJ*, **133**, 1236
- Kovalev Y. Y., Plavin A. V., Troitsky S. V., 2022, *ApJ*, **940**, L41
- Kovalev Y. Y., Plavin A. V., Pushkarev A. B., Troitsky S. V., 2023, *Galaxies*, **11**, 84
- Kramarenko I. G., Pushkarev A. B., Kovalev Y. Y., Lister M. L., Hovatta T., Savolainen T., 2022, *MNRAS*, **510**, 469
- Krauß F., et al., 2018, *A&A*, **620**, A174
- Kun E., Bartos I., Tjus J. B., Biermann P. L., Halzen F., Mező G., 2021, *ApJ*, **911**, L18
- Lioudakis I., et al., 2022, *A&A*, **666**, A36
- Lister M. L., Homan D. C., Kellermann K. I., Kovalev Y. Y., Pushkarev A. B., Ros E., Savolainen T., 2021, *ApJ*, **923**, 30
- Liu W., et al., 2022, *A&A*, **666**, A110
- Mészáros P., 2017, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science*, **67**, 45
- Murase K., Oikonomou F., Petropoulou M., 2018, *ApJ*, **865**, 124
- Mushtukov A., Tsygankov S., 2022, *arXiv e-prints*, p. arXiv:2204.14185
- Neronov A., Ribordy M., 2009, *Phys. Rev. D*, **79**, 043013
- Neronov A., Semikoz D. V., Tchernin C., 2014, *Phys. Rev. D*, **89**, 103002
- Petropoulou M., et al., 2020, *ApJ*, **891**, 115
- Petrov L., 2011, *AJ*, **142**, 105
- Petrov L., 2012, *MNRAS*, **419**, 1097
- Petrov L., 2013, *AJ*, **146**, 5
- Petrov L., 2017, *Transactions of IAA RAS*, pp 64–67
- Petrov L., Kovalev Y. Y., Fomalont E., Gordon D., 2005, *AJ*, **129**, 1163
- Petrov L., Kovalev Y. Y., Fomalont E. B., Gordon D., 2006, *AJ*, **131**, 1872
- Petrov L., Kovalev Y. Y., Fomalont E. B., Gordon D., 2008, *AJ*, **136**, 580
- Petrov L., Gordon D., Gipson J., MacMillan D., Ma C., Fomalont E., Walker R. C., Carabajal C., 2009, *Journal of Geodesy*, **83**, 859
- Petrov L., Kovalev Y. Y., Fomalont E. B., Gordon D., 2011a, *AJ*, **142**, 35
- Petrov L., Phillips C., Bertarini A., Murphy T., Sadler E. M., 2011b, *MNRAS*, **414**, 2528
- Petrov L., de Witt A., Sadler E. M., Phillips C., Horiuchi S., 2019, *MNRAS*, **485**, 88
- Piner B. G., et al., 2012, *ApJ*, **758**, 84
- Plavin A., Kovalev Y. Y., Kovalev Y. A., Troitsky S., 2020, *ApJ*, **894**, 101
- Plavin A. V., Kovalev Y. Y., Kovalev Y. A., Troitsky S. V., 2021, *ApJ*, **908**, 157
- Plavin A. V., Kovalev Y. Y., Kovalev Y. A., Troitsky S. V., 2023, *MNRAS*, **523**, 1799
- Popkov A. V., Kovalev Y. Y., Petrov L. Y., Kovalev Y. A., 2021, *AJ*, **161**, 88
- Prokhorov D. A., Moraghan A., 2023, *MNRAS*, **519**, 2680
- Pushkarev A. B., Kovalev Y. Y., 2012, *A&A*, **544**, A34
- Reig P., Fabregat J., Alfonso-Garzón J., 2020, *A&A*, **640**, A35
- Sahakyan N., Giommi P., Padovani P., Petropoulou M., Bégué D., Boccardi B., Gasparyan S., 2023, *MNRAS*, **519**, 1396
- Schinzel F. K., Petrov L., Taylor G. B., Mahony E. K., Edwards P. G., Kovalev Y. Y., 2015, *ApJS*, **217**, 4
- Shu F., et al., 2017, *ApJS*, **230**, 13
- Sowards-Emmerd D., Romani R. W., Michelson P. F., Healey S. E., Nolan P. L., 2005, *ApJ*, **626**, 95
- Troitsky S. V., 2021, *Physics Uspekhi*, **64**, 1261
- Weng S.-S., et al., 2022, *Nature Astronomy*, **6**, 698
- Zhou B., Kamionkowski M., Liang Y.-f., 2021, *Phys. Rev. D*, **103**, 123018
- van den Eijnden J., Degenaar N., Russell T. D., Wijnands R., Miller-Jones J. C. A., Sivakoff G. R., Hernández Santisteban J. V., 2018, *Nature*, **562**, 233

This paper has been typeset from a  $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$  file prepared by the author.