AtmoHEAD Ischia, Italy

# Estimation of the atmospheric transmission profile with the IACT background data

<u>Mario Pecimotika</u>\*, Julian Sitarek, Natalia Żywucka, Dorota Sobczyńska, Abelardo Moralejo, Dario Hrupec

C

\* Ruđer Bošković Institute, Zagreb, Croatia

mario.pecimotika@cta-consortium.org

# Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Technique

- IACT indirect observations of gamma-ray sources by the detection of Cherenkov light generated in a cascade of secondary particles.
- The atmosphere acts as a medium in which the Cherenkov light is both generated and propagated
  → Continuous atmospheric monitoring.
- LIDARs require calibration and additional assumptions, while very powerful LIDARs can only be used in the time between telescope repositioning.
- Can we get the transmission profile from the IACT data itself?





#### Methodology: Derivation of the atmo. profile

- The method is very similar to that previously presented by Natalia (cf. Żywucka et al. 2024).
- Sitarek et. al (2024) JHEAP 42, 87-95
- It involves construction of a sum of the longitudinal distributions of the observed Cherenkov light.
- By comparing these distributions between cloudy and clear atmosphere, it is possible to obtain the transmission of the cloud.  $\xi$



- ang. dist. from the primary particle direction
- (preliminary reconstructed) impact parameter
- *H* Cherenkov photons emission height
- $\theta$  Zenith angle of observations

#### Methodology: Derivation of the atmo. profile

• We have calculated the mean angular offset (and its std. dev.) for the light emitted at a certain height and compared it with the geometric model.





#### Methodology: Simulations

- COsmic Ray SImulations for KAscade (CORSIKA) + sim\_telarray
- Proton-induced air shower, Zenith: 20 deg, Azimuth: 180 deg
- Atmospheric profiles modelling: MODerate resolution atmospheric TRANsmission (MODTRAN) band model
- Baseline cloud:

T = 0.587,  $H_{\text{base}} = 6.5$  km a.g.l., 2 km thick

• We have also tested method for other clouds with different transmissions, base heights and thicknesses, cf. Table 1 in Sitarek et. al (2024)





## Methodology: Analysis

- ctapipe<sup>1</sup> + lstchain<sup>2</sup>
- Selection criteria applied at the stereoscopic reconstruction level:
  - images with at least 20 pixels and only one island,
  - |Time gradient | > 1 ns/m to avoid single muons,
  - exclude events with the centre of gravity outside of the cleaned image.
- Second set of selection criteria:
  - 5 ns/m < |Time gradient | < 15 ns/m.
- These images were used to calculate the longitudinal Cherenkov light profile.

<sup>1</sup> <u>https://github.com/cta-observatory/ctapipe</u>
<sup>2</sup> <u>https://github.com/cta-observatory/cta-lstchain</u>



#### Performance of the method



 The relative difference in the reconstructed transmission is on the order of 10%, while the thickness of the cloud is overestimated by ≈ 1 km. Geometrical centre of the cloud was reconstructed with ~ 0.5 km bias.



#### Performance of the method





#### Performance of the method

- The transmission is reconstructed within a few per cent of absolute accuracy.
- In all the simulated cases there is a bias underestimating the height of the cloud
  → reconstructing the cloud base at lower heights.
- Broadness of the angular offset distribution at a given emission height
   → cloud structures narrower than ~ 3 km
   have overestimated geometrical
   thickness.





## Systematics: Other background sources

- Protons are not the only source of background in IACT, but also helium and higher nuclei.
- To test their influence on the proposed method, we created a data set of helium-induced air showers in the presence of clouds.
- The addition of helium nuclei in the data sample had no siginifcant effect on the obtained longitudinal distribution of the observed Cherenkov light and the reconstructed transmission profile.





#### Systematics: Changes in the optical PSF

- To investigate the effects of telescope agening, we simulated cloud-affected data sets for cases where the optical point spread function (PSF) of the Cherenkov telescope is changed by  $\pm$  10%.
- The calculated rate of the images changes by less than 1% compared to the nominal rate.
- The relative difference in the reconstructed transmission is < 2%.





## Systematics: Changes in the mirror reflectivity

- We also simulated additional cloudaffected data sets for which the mirror reflectivity is changed by ± 8% compared to the nominal one.
- The calculated rate of the images changes by ≈ 8% compared to the nominal rate.
- The relative difference in the reconstructed transmission is on the order of 6%.





# Systematics: Increased night sky background

- Cloudless and cloud-affected data may not cover the same field of view, i.e. they may be exposed to different levels of night sky background (NSB).
- We also simulated an additional cloud-affected data set for which NSB was increased by 25%.
- Increasing the NSB by 25% does not lead to any significant changes in the transmission value obtained
  an absolute difference of ≤ 4%.





# Systematics: Pointing direction (Azimuth)

- We investigated the impact of pointing direction on the performance of our method.
- The study demonstrated that data taken at different azimuth angles can be reliably used.
- Comparing cloud-affected southpointing data with reference cloudless north-pointing data introduced an absolute difference in reconstructed cloud transmission of only 3%.





## Systematics: Pointing direction (Zenith)

- We also generated proton-induced air shower in cloudless and cloud-affected observation for three additional zenith angles: 5°, 45° and 60°.
- Reconstructed distribution of the emission height shows a strong dependence on the zenith angle.
- For higher zenith angles, the geometrical thickness of the cloud and its centre are overestimated.





#### Systematics: Pointing direction (Zenith)

- When zenith angles do not match, we propose to use the scaling method.
- Assuming reference observations at zenith  $\theta_0$  with height distribution  $M(h_o; \theta_0)$ , the goal is to scale this distribution to the zenith  $\theta_c$  at which cloud-affected data were taken, resulting in the height distribution  $M'(h_c; \theta_c)$ :

$$M'(h_c; \theta_c) = M(h_o; \theta_0) \cdot \frac{\Delta h_0}{\Delta h_c}$$





#### Summary and conclusions

- Estimation of the transmission profile from IACTs based on the summation of the longitudinal distributions of the observed Cherenkov light from isotropic background events (proton-induced air showers).
- Helium and heavier nuclei, minor changes in mirror reflectivity or optical PSF due to telescope ageing, azimuth dependence, and increased NSB have negligible effects on the performance of the method.
- The main limitation of the method is the zenith angle a scaling method to mitigate the bias caused by different zenith distributions is proposed for cases where no cloudless reference dataset with the same zenith exists.







#### Acknowledgments

This work is supported by

The Narodowe Centrum Nauki grant number 2019/34/E/ST9/00224

and the Croatian Science Foundation grant IP-2022-10-4595.

**Backup slides** 

#### Parameters of the simulated clouds

Transmission	Base height [km]	Thickness [km]
0.388	6.5	2
0.587	5.5	2
0.587	6.5	2
0.587	6.0	3
0.587	5.5	4
0.587	7.0	1
0.587	7.5	2
0.800	6.5	2
1		

Sitarek et. al (2024) *JHEAP* 42, 87-95



#### Nominal Monte Carlo simulations parameters

- Proton-induced air showers
  - Spectral index = -2
  - Energy range: [0.02, 300] TeV
  - Zenith: 20 deg, Azimuth: 180 deg, VIEWCONE = [0, 10] deg
  - NSCAT = 20, CSCAT = 1400 M, NSHOW (total) = 10<sup>9</sup>
- Helium-induced air showers
  - Spectral index = -2
  - Energy range: [0.04, 1200] TeV
  - Zenith: 20 deg, Azimuth: 180 deg, VIEWCONE = [0, 10] deg
  - NSCAT = 20, CSCAT = 1400 M, NSHOW (total) = 10<sup>9</sup>

