HE Neutrinos vs Blazar flares in Radio & Optical

* Kouch et al. 2023, submitted to A&A

Pouya M. Kouch, Elina Lindfors, Talvikki Hovatta, Ioannis Liodakis, Karri Koljonen, et al.

Image credit: Quanta Magazino



September 2023 - TeVPA, Naples



Blazars as candidate neutrino emitters

- Blazars: AGN with relativistic plasma jets pointed at us
- Two main emission components:
 - LE (Radio UV) \rightarrow synchrotron emission by leptons
 - HE $(X VHE-\gamma) \rightarrow$ debated: leptonic vs hadronic
- Hadronic models typically involve pγ interactions:
 → HE neutrinos released as byproduct
- TXS0506+056 remains the most convincing individual blazarneutrino association with several other associations following it
- A high σ population-based correlation is yet to come...







Radio as tracer of jet activity

- Following Plavin et al. 2020 (which showed $\sim 3\sigma$ correlations in radio) •
- Using high-cadence radio light curves via long term monitoring •
 - E.g. OVRO blazar monitoring program \rightarrow 1795 AGN monitored @15 GHz \rightarrow 1157 CGRaBS blazars since 2008
 - E.g. Metsähovi blazar monitoring program • \rightarrow 1000 AGN monitored (~400 regularly) @37 GHz \rightarrow some light curves 40+ years long \rightarrow 183 with enough data be included
- 56 HE (\geq 200TeV) IceCube neutrino track events ٠



Hovatta et al. 2021

http://www.astro.caltech.edu/ovroblazars/

CalTech's 40-m OVRO (Owen's Valley Radio Observatory)







A few associated light curves

Hovatta et al. 2021



INIVERSITY

TURKU

The statistics

 Look for spatial association between neutrinos (56) and blazars (of different samples)

<u>TS — SPATIAL only</u>:

Calculate \bar{S} of the spatially associated blazars and average globally

• <u>TS — SPATIO-TEMPORAL 1</u>:

Calculate AI of spatially associated blazars around the neutrino arrival time and average globally

• <u>TS — SPATIO-TEMPORAL 2</u>:

Globally count spatially associated blazars significantly flaring (AI > threshold) at neutrino arrival time

- Randomized by shifting neutrino RA positions
- Compare observed test statistic to random ones to obtain p-value







The spatio-temporal results

Hovatta et al. 2021







The update study

- Most statistically complete sample: CGRaBS $_{5}|(A)$ Radio ٠
 - \rightarrow **1157** blazars
 - \rightarrow OVRO light curves since 2008 (extended by 3 years)
 - \rightarrow complete to 65 mJy @4.8 GHz
 - \rightarrow caveat: dominated by FSRQs
- Optical band analysis ٠
 - \rightarrow using all-sky survey light curves \rightarrow via long-term trends (seasonal)
- Most up-to-date IceCube data ٠
 - \rightarrow 283 HE neutrino events (IceCat-1 & Abbasi et al. 2022)
- More sophisticated analysis





Old vs updated neutrinos

Kouch et al. 2023





8

OF TURKU

The updated analysis

- No E, S, or Ω cuts \rightarrow many poorly reconstructed events
- Handled by adding weights



- Handling of the unknown IceCube systematic errors
 - \rightarrow estimated upper limit is 1° (Aartsen et al. 2013)
 - \rightarrow we consider two scenarios
 - (A) **<u>MINIMAL</u>**: systematic errors added = 0.0°
 - (B) **MAXIMAL**: systematic errors added = 1.0°







- Most of the highest weighted spatio-temporal associations are only in MAX (not in MIN)
- In MAX:
 - > The previous conclusion is reaffirmed and extended to the optical regime
 - > The strongest correlation occurs with simultaneous Radio+Optical flaring activity
 - \rightarrow N.B. this arises from four associations only



It is unlikely to have such significant radio and/or optical flaring activity at the same time as a neutrino event by random chance alone





The sky-map of the associations

In maximal scenario of 1157 blazars:

[915] no spatial assoc

[203] spatial but no temporal assoc

[25] spatio-temporal assoc in RADIO only

[10] spatio-temporal assoc in OPTICAL only

[4] spatio-temporal in RADIO + OPTICAL





OF TURKU

J0211+1051

Kouch et al. 2023









Conclusions



- Our population analysis results in a spatio-temporal blazarneutrino correlation in both the radio and optical bands
- The results critically depend on the unknown nature of the lceCube systematic errors



