

AMS-02 antiprotons are consistent with a secondary astrophysical origin

Mathieu Boudaud

LPTHE - CNRS & Sorbonne Université

arXiv:1906.07119

MB, Y. Génolini, L. Derome, J. Lavalle, D. Maurin, P.
Salati and P. D. Serpico

*The Delta Rana warship firing a beam of jacketed
antiprotons and positrons - Star Trek*



LPTHE
LABORATOIRE DE PHYSIQUE
THEORIQUE ET HAUTES ENERGIES

S SORBONNE
UNIVERSITÉ
CRÉATEURS DE FUTURS
DEPUIS 1257



secondary antiprotons



State of the art:

- Data (AMS-02)
 - CR fluxes: H, He, C, O *PRL 114 171103 (2015), PRL 119 251101 (2017)*
 - CR ratio: B/C *PRL 117 231102 (2016)*
- Models
 - CR transport in the Galaxy *Derome+(2019), Génolini+(2019)*
[Y. Génolini Mon. 16:30, L. Derome Mon. 17:45, M. Vecchi Mon. 18:00, CRD]
 - antiproton production cross sections (XS) *Winkler(2016), Korsmeier+(2018)*
[F. Donato, poster 32, Sat. - Mon.]

⇒ prediction of the secondary antiprotons flux

v.s.

AMS-02 antiprotons *PRL 117 091103 (2016)*

Do secondary antiprotons explain the AMS-02 data?

Preamble: data vs model

- χ^2 : quadratic distance between data and model

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$


Preamble: data vs model

- χ^2 : quadratic distance between data and model

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

- **Visual inspection**

- standard z-score $z_i = x_i / \sigma_i$



Preamble: data vs model

- χ^2 : quadratic distance between data and model

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

• Visual inspection



- standard z-score $z_i = x_i / \sigma_i$
- rotated z-score (diagonal in new basis)

$$\tilde{x}_i = U_{ij} x_j, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}} = U \mathcal{C} U^T$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is diagonal with elements $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{ii} = \tilde{\sigma}_i^2$

$$\tilde{z}_i = \tilde{x}_i / \tilde{\sigma}_i$$

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \tilde{z}_i^2 \quad \tilde{R}_i = \sum_j U_{ij}^2 R_j, \quad \tilde{R}_i \simeq R_i$$



Preamble: data vs model

- χ^2 : quadratic distance between data and model

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

• Visual inspection



- standard z-score $z_i = x_i / \sigma_i$
- rotated z-score (diagonal in new basis)

$$\tilde{x}_i = U_{ij} x_j, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}} = U \mathcal{C} U^T$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is diagonal with elements $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{ii} = \tilde{\sigma}_i^2$

$$\tilde{z}_i = \tilde{x}_i / \tilde{\sigma}_i$$

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \tilde{z}_i^2 \quad \tilde{R}_i = \sum_j U_{ij}^2 R_j, \quad \tilde{R}_i \simeq R_i$$



Preamble: data vs model

- χ^2 : quadratic distance between data and model

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

• Visual inspection

- standard z-score $z_i = x_i / \sigma_i$
- rotated z-score (diagonal in new basis)

$$\tilde{x}_i = U_{ij} x_j, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{C}} = U \mathcal{C} U^T$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ is diagonal with elements $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{ii} = \tilde{\sigma}_i^2$



$$\tilde{z}_i = \tilde{x}_i / \tilde{\sigma}_i$$

$$\chi^2 = \sum_i \tilde{z}_i^2 \quad \tilde{R}_i = \sum_j U_{ij}^2 R_j, \quad \tilde{R}_i \simeq R_i$$

• Statistical test

- χ^2 test
- Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test
- etc.

} $\Rightarrow \mathbf{p\text{-}value}$



how consistent are the data with the model?


- 
- 1. Theoretical prediction**
 - 2. Uncertainties**
 - 3. Statistical test**

$$\frac{d\sigma_{ij}}{dT_{\bar{p}}}(T_i, T_{\bar{p}}) = p_{\bar{p}} \int d\Omega \sigma_{\text{inv}}^{ij}(T_i, T_{\bar{p}}, \theta),$$

Lorentz invariant XS

$$\sigma_{\text{inv}} = E \frac{d^3\sigma}{d^3p}(\sqrt{s}, x_R, p_T), \quad x_R = \frac{E^\star}{E_{\max}^\star}$$

- **p-p interactions:**



data: NA49, BRAHMS, Dekkers+(1965)

+ NA61/SHINE: $\sqrt{s} = 7.7, 8.8, 12.3$ and 17.3 GeV ($T_p = 31, 40, 80$ and 158 GeV) *Aduszkiewicz+(2017)*

model: functional form of σ_{inv} from *Winkler(2016)*


⇒ **parametrisation:** II from *Korsmeier+(2018)*

$$\frac{d\sigma_{ij}}{dT_{\bar{p}}}(T_i, T_{\bar{p}}) = p_{\bar{p}} \int d\Omega \sigma_{\text{inv}}^{ij}(T_i, T_{\bar{p}}, \theta),$$

Lorentz invariant XS

$$\sigma_{\text{inv}} = E \frac{d^3\sigma}{d^3p}(\sqrt{s}, x_R, p_T), \quad x_R = \frac{E^\star}{E_{\max}^\star}$$

- **p-p interactions:**




data: NA49, BRAHMS, Dekkers+(1965)

+ NA61/SHINE: $\sqrt{s} = 7.7, 8.8, 12.3$ and 17.3 GeV ($T_p = 31, 40, 80$ and 158 GeV) *Aduszkiewicz+(2017)*

model: functional form of σ_{inv} from *Winkler(2016)*

⇒ **parametrisation:** II from *Korsmeier+(2018)*

- **nucleus-nucleus interactions:**



data: NA49: $p + C \rightarrow p\bar{p} + X$, $\sqrt{s} = 17.3$ GeV ($T_p = 158$ GeV) *Anticic+(2010)*

LHCb: $p + He \rightarrow p\bar{p} + X$, $\sqrt{s} = 110$ GeV ($T_p = 6.5$ TeV) *Aaij+(2018)*

model: functional form of the nucleon scaling $f^{A1A2}(\sqrt{s}, x_F)$ from *Winkler(2016)*


⇒ **parametrisation:** B from *Korsmeier+(2018)*

Production XS: antihyperons and antineutrons

- **Antihyperons decay:** $p + p \rightarrow \{\bar{\Lambda}, \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \bar{p}\} + X$

Parametrisation from [Winkler\(2016\)](#)

$$\Delta_{\Lambda}(\sqrt{s}) = (0.81 \pm 0.04)(\bar{\Lambda}/\bar{p})$$



Production XS: antihyperons and antineutrons

- **Antihyperons decay:** $p + p \rightarrow \{\bar{\Lambda}, \bar{\Sigma} \rightarrow \bar{p}\} + X$




Parametrisation from [Winkler\(2016\)](#)

$$\Delta_{\Lambda}(\sqrt{s}) = (0.81 \pm 0.04)(\bar{\Lambda}/\bar{p})$$

- **Antineutrons decay:** $p + p \rightarrow \{\bar{n} \rightarrow \bar{p}\} + X$

Isospin asymmetry: $\sigma_{pn \rightarrow \bar{p}} > \sigma_{pp \rightarrow \bar{p}} \Rightarrow \sigma_{pp \rightarrow \bar{n}} > \sigma_{pp \rightarrow \bar{p}}$

[\(NA49\) Anticic+ \(2010\), Winkler\(2016\)](#)



Courtesy M. Winkler

$$\Delta_{IS} = \frac{\sigma_{pp \rightarrow \bar{n}}}{\sigma_{pp \rightarrow \bar{p}}} - 1$$

$$\Delta_{IS}(\sqrt{s}) = c_0(x + c_2)^{c_3} \exp(-x/c_1), \quad x = \log(\sqrt{s})$$

CRs transport in the Galaxy

- Two-zone diffusion model

Galactic disc - $h \sim 100$ pc


stars, gas and dust distributed in the arms

Magnetic halo - $1 \lesssim L \lesssim 20$ kpc

diffusion zone of the model

$$\begin{aligned} - \vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ K(E) \vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}} \psi_{\alpha} - \vec{V}_c \psi_{\alpha} \right\} + \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \left\{ b_{\text{tot}}(E) \psi_{\alpha} - \beta^2 K_{pp} \frac{\partial \psi_{\alpha}}{\partial E} \right\} + \sigma_{\alpha} v_{\alpha} n_{\text{ism}} \psi_{\alpha} + \Gamma_{\alpha} \psi_{\alpha} \\ = q_{\alpha} + \sum_{\beta} \left\{ \sigma_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} v_{\beta} n_{\text{ism}} + \Gamma_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} \right\} \psi_{\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Semi-analytical method implemented in **USINE v3.5** <https://dmaurin.gitlab.io/USINE/> Maurin(2018)



CRs transport in the Galaxy


- **Two-zone diffusion model**

Galactic disc - $h \sim 100$ pc

stars, gas and dust distributed in the arms

Magnetic halo - $1 \lesssim L \lesssim 20$ kpc

diffusion zone of the model




$$\begin{aligned}
 - \vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}} \left\{ K(E) \vec{\nabla}_{\mathbf{x}} \psi_{\alpha} - \vec{V}_c \psi_{\alpha} \right\} + \frac{\partial}{\partial E} \left\{ b_{\text{tot}}(E) \psi_{\alpha} - \beta^2 K_{pp} \frac{\partial \psi_{\alpha}}{\partial E} \right\} + \sigma_{\alpha} v_{\alpha} n_{\text{ism}} \psi_{\alpha} + \Gamma_{\alpha} \psi_{\alpha} \\
 = q_{\alpha} + \sum_{\beta} \left\{ \sigma_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} v_{\beta} n_{\text{ism}} + \Gamma_{\beta \rightarrow \alpha} \right\} \psi_{\beta}
 \end{aligned}$$

Semi-analytical method implemented in **USINE v3.5** <https://dmaurin.gitlab.io/USINE/> Maurin(2018)

- **2-break diffusion coefficient**

$$K(R) = \underbrace{\beta^{\eta}}_{\text{non-relativistic regime}} K_{10} \underbrace{\left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{R}{R_l} \right)^{\frac{\delta_1 - \delta}{s_1}} \right\}^{s_1}}_{\text{low-rigidity regime}} \underbrace{\left\{ \frac{R}{(R_{10} \equiv 10 \text{ GV})} \right\}^{\delta}}_{\text{intermediate regime}} \underbrace{\left\{ 1 + \left(\frac{R}{R_h} \right)^{\frac{\delta - \delta_h}{s_h}} \right\}^{-s_h}}_{\text{high-rigidity regime}}$$



LR: Yan+(2004), Putsin+(2005)
 HR: Génolini+(2017), Tomasetti(2012), Aloisio+(2015)

[Y. Génolini Mon. 16:30, CRD]

Fitting B/C cosmic-ray data in the AMS-02 era: a cookbook

Model numerical precision, data covariance matrix of errors,
cross-section nuisance parameters, and mock data

L. Derome^{1*}, D. Maurin^{1**}, P. Salati^{4***},
M. Boudaud^{2†}, Y. Génolini^{3‡}, and P. Kunzé¹

Derome+(2019)

BASELINE





Courtesy Y. Génolini

Parameters	BIG	SLIM	QUAINT
χ^2/dof	$61.7/61=1.01$	$61.8/63=0.98$	$62.1/62=1.00$
Intermediate-rigidity parameters			
$K_{10} [\text{kpc}^2 \text{Myr}^{-1}]$	$0.30^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$0.28^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.33^{+0.03}_{-0.06}$
δ	$0.48^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	$0.51^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.45^{+0.05}_{-0.02}$
Low-rigidity parameters			
$V_c [\text{km s}^{-1}]$	$0^{+7.4}$	N/A	0.0^{+8}
$V_A [\text{km s}^{-1}]$	67^{+24}_{-67}	N/A	101^{+14}_{-15}
η	1 (fixed)	1 (fixed)	$-0.09^{+0.35}_{-0.57}$
δ_1	$-0.69^{+0.61}_{-1.26}$	$-0.87^{+0.33}_{-0.31}$	N/A
$R_1 [\text{GV}]$	$3.4^{+1.1}_{-0.9}$	$4.4^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	N/A
High-rigidity break parameters (nuisance parameters)			
Δ_h	0.18	0.19	0.17
$R_h [\text{GV}]$	247	237	270
s_h	0.04	0.04	0.04

Cosmic-ray transport from AMS-02 boron to carbon ratio data: Benchmark models and interpretation

Y. Génolini,^{1,*} M. Boudaud,^{2,†} P.-I. Batista,³ S. Caroff,⁴ L. Derome,⁵ J. Lavalle,^{6,‡} A. Marcowith,⁶ D. Maurin,⁵ V. Poireau,⁷ V. Poulin,⁶ S. Rosier,⁷ P. Salati,⁸ P. D. Serpico,^{8,§} and M. Vecchi^{3,¶}

Génolini+(2019)






Antiprotons parents: combined fit of AMS-02 H, He, C and O

PRL 114 171103 (2015), PRL 119 251101 (2017)

- most abundant CRs \Rightarrow main pbar parents
- spectrum at source: $q(R) = q_0 R^{-\alpha}$
- $T_n > 6 \text{ GeV/n}$: pbar production threshold

Free parameters

Source	High energy break
$\alpha_H, \alpha_{He}, \alpha_{Z>2},$ $q_H, q_{He}, \dots, q_{Si}$	δ_h, R_h, s_h



Secondary antiprotons prediction


⇒ prediction of the antiprotons flux
(not a fit)



Is there an excess?

Wait, because:

- no model uncertainties
- no correlation in AMS-02 data



- 
1. Theoretical prediction
 2. Uncertainties
 3. Statistical test


Model uncertainties

- Production XS (fit collider data): 13 parameters
- Transport (fit B/C): 7 parameters
- Parents (fit H, He, C and O): 10 parameters

Correlation between parameters (covariance matrix)

⇒ sampling method to propagate the uncertainties:

1. draw from covariance matrix of best-fit parameters 10000 pbar predictions for each source of uncertainties (XS, Transport, Parents)
2. determine the 1σ confidence intervals




Covariance matrix of model uncertainties

$a \in (\text{XS}, \text{Transport}, \text{Parents})$

$$\mathcal{C}_{ij}^a = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N (\Phi_{i,n}^a - \mu_i^a) (\Phi_{j,n}^a - \mu_j^a)$$

μ_i^a : mean prediction at the rigidity bin i

$$c_{ij}^\alpha = \frac{\mathcal{C}_{ij}^\alpha}{\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{ii}^\alpha} \sqrt{\mathcal{C}_{jj}^\alpha}} : \text{associated correlation matrix}$$




Data uncertainties

PRL 117 091103 (2016)

AMS-02 antiprotons uncertainties (from publication)

- broken-down uncertainties
(Cut-off, Sel., Templ., XS, Unf., Scale, Acc)
- no correlations between data



Covariance matrix of data uncertainties *Derome+ (2019)*


$\alpha \in (\text{Cut-off}, \text{Sel.}, \text{Templ.}, \text{XS}, \text{Unf.}, \text{Scale}, \text{Acc})$

$$(C^\alpha)_{ij} = \sigma_i^\alpha \sigma_j^\alpha \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{(\log_{10}(R_i/R_j))^2}{(l_\rho^\alpha)^2}\right)$$

Correlation length

Scale	4,0
Unf.	1,0
Acc.	0,1
Cut-off	1,0
Sel.	0,5
Templ.	0,5
XS	1,0

[L. Derome Mon. 17:45, CRD]



Secondary antiprotons prediction


⇒ prediction of the antiprotons flux
(not a fit)




Is there an excess?

model uncertainties

correlation in AMS-02 data



- 
- 1. Theoretical prediction**
 - 2. Uncertainties**
 - 3. Statistical test**

Statistical test

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j, \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\text{data}} + \mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$$

χ^2/dof	p-value (χ^2 -test)
0.77	0.90

Good agreement
between data and model

Statistical test

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j, \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\text{data}} + \mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$$

χ^2/dof	p-value (χ^2 -test)
0.77	0.90

Good agreement
between data and model



Limitation of χ^2 -test in this context

- Relies on the notion of degrees of freedom which is not well defined when correlations matter
- Does not assess a possible overestimate of errors

Statistical test

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j, \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\text{data}} + \mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$$

χ^2/dof	p-value (χ^2 -test)	p-value (KS-test)
0.77	0.90	0.27

Good agreement
between data and model



Limitation of χ^2 -test in this context

- Relies on the notion of degrees of freedom which is not well defined when correlations matter
- Does not assess a possible overestimate of errors

Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS-test)

- Does not rely on the notion of degrees of freedom
- Assesses a possible overestimate of errors

Statistical test

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j, \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\text{data}} + \mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$$

χ^2/dof	p-value (χ^2 -test)	p-value (KS-test)
0.77	0.90	0.27

Good agreement
between data and model

⇒ AMS-02 data are consistent with ‘standard’ secondary antiprotons

Conclusion robust wrt:

- error mismodelling of model or data (several cases explored, see paper)
- statistical test (χ^2 vs KS)

Summary

Prediction (not a fit) of the secondary antiprotons flux from the state of the art:

- Data (AMS-02)
 - CR fluxes: H, He, C, O *PRL 114 171103 (2015), PRL 119 251101 (2017)*
 - CR ratio: B/C *PRL 117 231102 (2016)*
- Models
 - CR transport in the Galaxy *Derome+(2019), Génolini+(2019)*
 - antiprotons production cross sections (XS) *Winkler(2016), Korsmeier+(2018)*

⇒ AMS-02 data are consistent with ‘standard’ secondary antiprotons

Summary

Prediction (not a fit) of the secondary antiprotons flux from the state of the art:

- Data (AMS-02)
 - CR fluxes: H, He, C, O *PRL 114 171103 (2015), PRL 119 251101 (2017)*
 - CR ratio: B/C *PRL 117 231102 (2016)*
- Models
 - CR transport in the Galaxy *Derome+(2019), Génolini+(2019)*
 - antiprotons production cross sections (XS) *Winkler(2016), Korsmeier+(2018)*

⇒ AMS-02 data are consistent with ‘standard’ secondary antiprotons


Thank you for your attention!

Questions?

Back up

Production XS: total

$$\sigma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{tot}} = \sigma_{\text{inv}}(2 + \Delta_{\text{IS}} + 2\Delta_{\Lambda})$$




- 20 - 50% correction wrt standard calculations assuming isospin symmetry ($\Delta_{\text{IS}} = 0$)
- peculiar energy dependent feature
- 5 - 10% uncertainties

Antiprotons parents: heavy species

Reference


- CRs network: $^1\text{H} \rightarrow ^{30}\text{Si}$
- ISM: H, He
- ⇒ fast calculation

- 3% correction wrt standard calculation
- peculiar energy dependent feature
- ⇒ correction included in the following



Heavier species

- CRs network: $^1\text{H} \rightarrow ^{58}\text{Fe}$
- ISM: H → Fe
- ⇒ slow calculation



Statistical test

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,j} x_i (\mathcal{C}^{-1})_{ij} x_j, \quad x_i = \text{data}_i - \text{model}_i$$

$$\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}^{\text{data}} + \mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$$

	Error considered	χ^2/dof	p-value (χ^2)	p-value (KS)	
data uncertainties only	σ_{stat}	23	0	0	$(\sigma_{\text{tot}} = \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{stat}}^2 + \sigma_{\text{syst}}^2})$
	σ_{tot}	1.69	8.3×10^{-4}	0	
	$\mathcal{C}^{\text{data}}$	0.84	0.79	0.98	
data + model uncertainties	σ_{stat} and $\mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$	1.32	0.05	0.99	
	σ_{tot} and $\mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$	0.37	1.0	0.04	
	$\mathcal{C}^{\text{data}}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{\text{model}}$	0.77	0.90	0.27	



Limitation of χ^2 -test in this context

- Relies on the notion of degrees of freedom which is not well defined when correlations matter
- Does not assess a possible overestimate of errors

Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS-test)

- Does not rely on the notion of degrees of freedom
- Assesses a possible overestimate of errors