

Answers to the Referee Report for JCAP_005P_0222: Search for solar atmospheric neutrinos with the ANTARES neutrino telescope

April 11th, 2022

Dear Editor,

First of all, we would like to thank the referee for carefully reading of the manuscript and for the positive consideration for publication of our results. We also thank his/her detailed list of comments and suggestions that will surely improve the final quality of the paper. Please find below our response to the questions raised.

Following referee's comments, some paragraphs of the paper have been modified, i.e. re-written according to his/her suggestions. In particular:

- Section 3 has been splitted into 4 subsections: Signal generation, Background generation, Detector response and Reconstruction and event selection.
- Section 4 has been splitted into 2 subsections: Likelihood function and sensitivity, and Systematic uncertainties.

In the following, the answers to the referee requests have been splitted in numbered questions, in order to ease the reviewing process, following the same structure of the revision.

1 Uncertainties

Q1. In this analysis, there are two distinct sources of uncertainty—those arising from uncertainties on signal production, and those from uncertainties of the detector. While the authors address uncertainties in the former category, no comment is made on uncertainties in the latter. I think that the author needs to address this latter category of uncertainties before this paper can be published.

[A new subsection with the different uncertainties has been introduced, and the effect on the final results evaluated.](#)

Q2. The authors consider signal uncertainties by studying effects of the solar composition, primary cosmic ray flux, and geometry of the signal emitting region. I believe the author should also address uncertainty arising from the hadronic interaction model, as I think this can lead to significant changes in the flux as has been shown in this work.

[The \$\approx 30\%\$ uncertainties in the production neutrino flux arising from the hadronic interaction model have been included according to the following references \(included in the text\):](#)

- [\[11\] J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. 06 \(2017\).](#)
- [\[37\] Phys. Rev. D 86 \(2012\).](#)

Q3. Additionally, I think that the authors need to give more details on the effects of different the uncertainties for they do consider. For instance, why do the Ser.+Stein solar density models always yield a slightly lower flux? or, why does the shape of the emitting region change the number of signal events. I am particularly

interested in the answer to this second question because it seems to me that since the Sun is smaller than the angular resolution of ANTARES, it should be safe to treat it as a point source.

The differences resulting from the different shapes considered arise from the smearing of the Point Spread Function (PSF) of the detector, and are presented in Fig. 4, with the source's shape. This results in a slightly worst PSF, effect that is reflected in the performance of the unbinned Likelihood maximisation.

2 Analysis description

2.1 Simulation, reconstruction and event selection

Q4. In general, I just found the description a bit hard to follow. For instance, the description of the event selection starts by outlining which software are used to generate different types of events, then discusses reconstruction of variables and cuts before moving back to listing which signal models are considered. I think it would be more coherent to discuss all true MC quantities before discussing reconstruction and cuts. It was also never clear to me how the signal is generated. The paper talks about primary CR models and solar composition models, but not how these are converted into neutrinos. Are these results from the literature? Is this something that WIMPSim can do?

The text has been re-written following referee's suggestions. Concerning the question of the generation of the signal: yes, the neutrino flux is directly generated from WimpSim, using the "*solar_crnu*" package. The outline of the models used is just to inform the reader which models were employed by WimpSim to generate the neutrino flux. These fluxes are used afterwards as a weight in our Monte Carlo sample to get the signal component in our likelihood at the ANTARES detector site.

Q5. The description of the cuts was also difficult to follow. The sentence "The quality of the track reconstruction is given by the parameter Λ , which is a maximum likelihood estimator obtained with a multi-line reconstruction fit of hits passing a pre-defined threshold condition" left me very confused. What is the pre-defined condition, and what is it meant to select for? What do different values of Λ tell us? I know a reference is provided, but I think the reader needs more context than what is currently provided.

The new Section 3.4 extends the description of the reconstruction method. The algorithm is the standard one for offline ANTARES analyses for the search for point-sources of cosmic neutrinos, refs [33,34] for instance. The reference [35] has been added, in which details and plots for the distribution of the Λ and β parameters are presented. In particular, the Λ parameter is a measurement of the quality of the reconstruction of an event as a (muon) track. Consider that atmospheric muons are a factor 10^4 more numerous with respect to atmospheric neutrinos. A cut only on the reconstructed zenith angle reduces this background by two orders of magnitude. The remaining events are downgoing atmospheric muons mis-reconstructed as upgoing. These events have an associated low Λ value (very bad quality). The Λ parameter plays a crucial role here because a greater Λ value represents a better-reconstructed track, and a cut on Λ rejects the atmospheric muons reconstructed as upgoing. When the selection on the zenith angle >90 degrees is tightened with the additional cuts on the parameters Λ and β , the contribution from mis-reconstructed atmospheric muons is reduced to 15% of the proper events induced by upgoing atmospheric neutrinos.

Q6. It is also worth pointing out that energy reconstruction is discussed in this portion, even though the reconstructed energy does not appear at all in the likelihood.

We agree that there is no need to mention the energy reconstruction method, so this has been removed. Anyway, as explained in the new section 3.4 and later in section 4.1, the number of hits (N_{hits}) used in the reconstruction is used as an energy proxy in the likelihood. Signal and background events enter with a different distribution in likelihood PDF, as shown in Fig. 3 (right)

Q7. Lastly, the paragraph which describes the zenith cut is a bit confusing to me. The paper says that a selection of cuts is applied in order to "*obtain a sample of well reconstructed neutrino events and reject as much background of atmospheric muons and noise as possible*;" however, later it is said that Λ is used to select misreconstructed events from this selection. If Λ is a measure of how good the fit was, why are these events in the well-reconstructed group to begin with?

The section has been rewritten. See also the answer to Q5.

2.2 Analysis

Q8. In general, I found this section quite jumbled. As an example, some of the variables in Table 1 describe the analysis and some which describe the event selection. Furthermore, this table has information which is redundant with Table 2. There are also paragraphs in this section that seem to describe the event selection and thus belong in Section 3. For instance:

The total data sample, after cuts, consists of 7071 tracks, with a livetime of 3022 days. The contribution to the data sample estimated from the MC is: ν_μ CC \approx 84.7

We thank the referee for this suggestion. The analysis section has been re-written and splitted in two subsections: one for the likelihood and sensitivity and the other for the systematics. The aforementioned sentence has been moved to its corresponding section.

Q9. How do Ψ_\odot defined in the three source geometries? In the case of a point source, this is a well-defined quantity, but in the other cases, I think it is a bit fuzzier and should be explained in the text. If it is always the distance from the center of the Sun to the reconstructed direction, this is not a true description of the physical hypothesis. It would be more proper to average angular distances between the reconstructed direction to the and all locations the neutrino could have originated.

We agree that the previous definition of Ψ_\odot was more focused in the point-like scenario. The definition has been changed to: " Ψ_\odot is the reconstructed angular distance to the source".

Q10. I also think that the discussion of the sensitivity calculation needs to be moved from the figure caption and equations to the main text. These are important details of the analysis, and should be described carefully, not be left for the reader to decipher from the figure.

We thank the referee for this suggestion. The definition has been moved to the text.

2.3 Results and conclusions

Q11. A column should be added to table 2 with the limit on the normalization relative to the nominal model. It would be good to see a 1σ band around the sensitivity to give a sense of where the result lines up with respect to expectations.

Table 1 and 2 have been unified. A ratio between the sensitivities with respect to the point-like source is added.

Q12. I think in order to make the statement “detection of the $SA\nu s$ signal relies not only on the detector size, but also on its angular precision ... and energy estimation of the neutrino candidates” one would need some comparison of the angular uncertainties and energy resolution of this analysis compared to the IceCube analysis. Without studying that, I don’t think that one can say that these are what give this analysis a gain over the previous IceCube result. Also, since this analysis does not include any reconstructed energy information, I do not see how one could conclude that energy resolution plays an important role from the results of this paper.

We agree with the statement of the referee. The sentence has been removed.

3 Comments

This is a non-exhaustive list of things I think should be addressed in the text that do not pertain to broad issues.

Q13. Solar atmospheric gamma rays and unexplained issues with them should be discussed in the introduction since they originate in the same CR interactions. Relevant publications for citation are Unexpected dip

in the solar gamma-ray spectrum and First Observations of [Solar Disk Gamma Rays](#) over a [Full Solar Cycle](#) in this section.

Indeed. The references to both publications have been added, with a sentence mentioning the importance of the understanding of the gamma-ray flux to have a robust prediction in the $SA\nu$ flux.

Q14. The sentence “Considering that at sufficiently large depth in the solar medium almost every secondary CR would have decayed, the overall neutrino production occurs on the solar surface.” is confusing to me. What is meant by a secondary cosmic ray?

We thank the referee for pointing this mistake out. We wanted to say "secondary cascades", not cosmic rays. The correction has been implemented.

Q15. I do not think that Figure 2 is helpful in understanding the analysis. Perhaps it would be more useful to change the x-axis to time, the y-axis to zenith, and allow the width of the band to show the zenith range for a day. It would also be use to use a gray shaded region to denote where the analysis does not consider.

We appreciate the referee’s suggestion but we think the plot is pedagogical and, the solely purpose of it is to illustrate the time the Sun is above/below the horizon at the ANTARES site. The gray shaded region has been added.

Q16. The sentence *Since the solar density and composition play a crucial role in the final neutrino flux, several models have been proposed in the literature* makes it seem as though new solar models were proposed because they impact the $SA\nu$ profile. I am not sure that this is true.

The sentence has been modified to avoid making inaccurate affirmations.

Q17. I think the relationship of β to the angular resolution should be specified. It is weird to see the distribution of β peaking around 0.25° when the angular resolution is quoted as closer to 1° .

The β parameter is the estimated angular uncertainty on the muon track direction, and is derived from the angular errors of the azimuthal (σ_ϕ^2) and zenithal (σ_θ^2) angles. The explanation of the β parameter, together with a reference, is now provided in the text.

Q18. The choice of the region of interest should be justified. It seems quite large given the angular resolution.

The region of interest is chosen to be 30° to get a statistically significant sample of events to perform the likelihood analysis. A smaller RoI leads to an insufficient number of detected events. This is now justified accordingly within the text

Q19. It is not clear why WimpSim is being cited here. Just because the model are available through WimpSim does not mean that WimpSim should be cited unless you are using WimpSim to do something else. It is not clear to me the relationship of WimpSim to this paper.

As explained in the text, WimpSim is used to generate the neutrino flux that is used as a "weight" in our Monte Carlo. The text has been modified to point out this fact more clearly.

Q20. In what way is the data scrambled?

The data is scrambled in Right Ascension. A clearer explanation has been added in section 3.2.

Q21. Figure 4 seems like it is more appropriate for a stats reference than this paper. I would prefer to have things written in equations.

We appreciate the suggestion and an equation has been added to the text. We think the figure can be helpful to the readers to clarify and better understand how the statistical criteria are applied, so we would like to keep the figure in the paper.

We hope that the corrections and comments listed above have satisfactorily addressed the comment raised by the referee on his/her report and that the new version of the paper is now suitable for publication in JCAP.

The Authors.