Infill energy spectrum

Ioana C. Mariș, Michael Unger, Franceco Salamida

- FD energy reconstruction
- Observer vs CDAS

- ICRC vs other spectra
- energy resolution

Before ICRC

Correction for the recontruction of FD energy



Attenuation Herald -Observer

for Herald(v5r0) $a = 1.76 \pm 0.09, b = -0.97 \pm 0.38, S_{35} = 50.1 \pm 1.02$ (1) Observer(v7r3)

 $a = 1.58 \pm 0.09, b = -1.12 \pm 0.38, S_{35} = 53.0 \pm 1.1$ (2)



Energy calibration Herald-Observer

Observer

 $\textit{A} = \textit{0.01276} \pm \textit{0.0025}, \gamma = \textit{1.006} \pm \textit{0.051}$

Herald

 $A = 0.0161 \pm 0.003 EeV, \gamma = 0.96 \pm 0.05$



Comparison with regular array













Resolution effects from Toy MC



After ICRC

- maximum likelihood reconstruction for FD energy?
- energy resolution effects on the spectrum
- Production status (OGSJet II): iron: CORSIKA 94.2%, Offline 31.4% proton: CORSIKA 96.1%, Offline 75.9%

After ICRC

- maximum likelihood reconstruction for FD energy?
- energy resolution effects on the spectrum
- Production status (OGSJet II): iron: CORSIKA 94.2%, Offline 31.4% proton: CORSIKA 96.1%, Offline 75.9%

Infill quality cuts



Infill quality cuts + FOV cuts



Data: Infill quality cuts + FOV cuts



(private) Changes in the E_{FD} reconstruction



Energy calibrations ML vs χ^2 corrected



Fit	Events	A [PeV]	В
χ^2	49	12.45 ± 2.4	0.995 ± 0.049
χ^2 corrected	52	12.77 ± 2.3	1.003 ± 0.047
ML	50	13.14 ± 2.5	0.988 ± 0.050
χ^2 - Δ	57	10.98 ± 1.9	1.035 ± 0.046
χ^2 - Δ corrected	60	11.40 ± 1.9	1.040 ± 0.044
ML-A	62	11.76 ± 1.9	1.025 ± 0.044

Energy calibrations ML vs χ^2 corrected (no delta cut)



Fit	Events	A [PeV]	В
χ^2	49	12.45 ± 2.4	0.995 ± 0.049
χ^2 corrected	52	12.77 ± 2.3	1.003 ± 0.047
ML	50	13.14 ± 2.5	0.988 ± 0.050
χ^2 - Δ	57	10.98 ± 1.9	1.035 ± 0.046
χ^2 - Δ corrected	60	11.40 ± 1.9	1.040 ± 0.044
ML-A	62	11.76 ± 1.9	1.025 ± 0.044