

International Cosmic Ray Conference Madison, Wisconsin, USA 27 July 2019



## Spectra of solar energetic particles and galactic cosmic rays over Myrs reconstructed using <sup>26</sup>Al from lunar rocks

#### Stepan Poluianov<sup>1</sup> G. Kovaltsov<sup>2</sup> and I. Usoskin<sup>1</sup>

 Space climate research unit and Sodankylä geophysical observatory, University of Oulu, Finland
 Ioffe physical-technical Institute, St. Petersburg, Russia

### <sup>26</sup>Al produced in situ at the Moon

- Nuclides stay where they have been produced. No transport. No time resolution.
- Depth distribution of nuclides → information about the spectrum.
- Outside the magnetosphere → solar energetic particles significantly contribute to the total nuclide production.

• In this talk:

only Al-26 (lifetime 1.03 Myr).



(NASA, AS15-87-11847, cropped)

### Lunar samples

Deep drill core 1500x (Apollo-15)

[Rancitelli et al., 1975, Nishiizumi et al., 1984]

Al-26 meas. down to ~400 g/cm<sup>2</sup>

Lunar rock 64455 (Apollo-16)

[Nishiizumi et al., 2009]

Al-26: 0.1-6 g/cm2

• Lunar rock 74275 (Apollo-17)

[Fink et al., 1998]

Al-26: 0.1-15.8 g/cm2







(Meyer, 2007; NASA S72-40132, S73-16018)

### Measured depth profile



Al-26

### **GCR and SEP contributions**



### <sup>26</sup>Al production model

• Yield function approach - common model for GCR and SEP;

$$Q(h) = \sum_i \int Y_i(E,h) \cdot J_i(E) \cdot dE$$

- Monte Carlo modelling of energetic particle transport in deep layers;
- Geant4.10 toolkit (QGSP + BIC + High-precision neutron model);
- Analytical at shallow depths.
- Appropriate chem. compositions, geometries, errosion rates for each of the samples;
- Individual yield func. for incident protons and α-particles;
- Cross-sections: Nishiizumi et al., 2009; Reedy, 2007; Tatischeff et al., 2006; Reedy, 2013;
- The pion contribution is included (Li et al., 2017).

### <sup>26</sup>Al yield function

Sample 64455, depths in g/cm2



## Galactic cosmic ray fit



#### Ideal integral spectrometer



## Effective energy and converstion coefficient

Int. particle flux:

 $F(>E^*(d)) = K(d) \cdot A_{meas}(d)$ 

Conversion coef.  $K = F_{model}(>E^*) / A_{model}(d)$ ,

**Effective energy E\*** 

SEP int. spectra:

**EXP:**  $\mathbf{F}_{model} = \mathbf{F}_{0 EXP} \cdot \exp(-\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{R}_0)$ 

**POW:**  $\mathbf{F}_{model} = \mathbf{F}_{0 \text{ POW}} \cdot \mathbf{E}^{-\gamma}$ 

## Effective energy and converstion coefficient

**EXP:**  $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_0 \cdot \exp(-\mathbf{R}/\mathbf{R}_0)$ 

**POW:**  $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}_0 \cdot \mathbf{E}^- \mathbf{y}$ 



# Effective energy and converstion coefficient



# Reconstructed SEP int. flux F(>E) at the Myr time scale



# SEP occurance probability distribution





Al-26 in Apollo-15 lunar deep-drill core:

- The average modulation potential is estimated as  $\phi$ =496±40 MV on the Myr time scale.
- It is close to the Holocene value 449±70 MV and lower than one for the Modern Grand maximum (660±20 MV).

Al-26 in lunar samples 64455 and 74275:

- SEP integral spectrum F(>E) reconstruced without any a-priori asumptions on its shape in the range 20-80 MeV.
- SEP flux on the Myr time scale is comparable with one over the last several decates.
- SEP occurance probability: no expected events with annual fluence
  >30 MeV above 10<sup>11</sup> part./(cm<sup>2</sup> yr) on the Myr time scale.

## Thank you!

# Reconstructed SEP int. flux F(>E) at the Myr time scale



### **Reconstruction of the AI-26 content**

