## A simulation study of the effects of diffractive collisions on observables of air showers experiments K. Ohashi, H. Menjo, Y. Itow (Nagoya Univ.) T. Sako (Univ. of Tokyo), K. Kasahara (Shibaura Institute of Technology)

1

Ken Ohashi - CORSIKA workshop 2020 (virtual)

The paper of this study have uploaded on arXiv: 2005.12594

# **Diffractive collision**

### **One of collision types of inelastic collisions**

Elasticity of diffractive collision is higher than other collision types.

#### Schematic view of the diffractive collision :



#### **Differences between** interaction models

- Cross-sections of each type
- Modeling of diffractive ulletdissociation (mainly affect for pSD and DD cases)

# **Diffractive collision**

### **One of collision types of inelastic collisions**

Elasticity of diffractive collision is higher than other collision types.

#### Schematic view of the diffractive collision :



#### **Differences between** interaction models

- Cross-sections of each type
- Modeling of diffractive dissociation (mainly affect for pSD and DD cases)

### one of the source of uncertainty in air shower simulations

# **Diffractive collision**

### **Three differences:**

- 1. Difference between Non-diffractive and diffractive collisions
- 2. Difference between collision types in diffractive collisions
- 3. Difference between models

#### **Differences between interaction models**

- Cross-sections of each type
- Modeling of diffractive dissociation (mainly) affect for pSD and DD cases)

Modeling of diffractive dissociation can change the elasticity for pSD and DD cases, while they does not change the elasticity for tSD and CD cases.



- How these differences affect air showers? simulation: CONEX 6.40, 40,000 events Primary particle is proton. Modify outputs:
- **1.** Collision type information 2. Diffractive mass (important parameter of diffractive dissociation)

Focus on the first interaction for simplicity in this presentation

# Effects of collision types on air shower profiles

### Using the collision type at the first interaction



If the first interaction is the diffractive collision, Air shower developments are deeper.

pSD and DD: number of muons are decreased. tSD and CD: number of muons are larger for deeper part.

# **Effects of collision types on** $\langle X_{max} \rangle$

### Using the collision type at the first interaction



# Differences in diffractive collisions is $15 \text{ g/cm}^2$ for SIBYLL 2.3c Size of differences between models depend on the collision type.

#### <u>Large differences in $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ between ND and diffractive</u>

=> differences in cross-section fractions between models

<u>Differences between models depend on the collision type</u> = modeling of diffractive dissociation affect  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$ 

# Effects of differences between models



#### How these differences affect air shower simulation?



#### **Differences in modeling of** diffractive dissociation

- **Differential cross-section of** diffractive mass (diffractive mass spectrum)
- **Diffractive mass dependent** particle productions



# **Effects of cross-section fractions**

### **Cross-section Fractions**

To understand the effects of differences in cross-section fractions between models, Calculate  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$  for each collision type at the first interaction and change weight of cross-section fractions artificially.



#### **Predictions of ratios by 3 interaction models**

Ratio	Minimum	Maximum
$R_1$	0.07	0.18
$R_2$	0.50	0.91
$R_3$	0.32	0.51

$$\langle X_{max}^{modified} \rangle = \sum f^i \langle X_{max}^{i} \rangle$$

Use as uncertainty in ratios:

$$R_1$$
: 0.07 - 0.18  
 $R_2$ : 0.50 - 0.91  
 $R_3$ : 0.32 - 0.51



 $\begin{pmatrix} i \\ max \end{pmatrix}$ 

# **Effects of cross-section fractions**

### **Cross-section Fractions**

To understand the effects of differences in cross-section fractions between models, Calculate  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$  for each collision type at the first interaction and change weight of cross-section fractions artificially.



# $\langle X_{max}^{modified} \rangle = \sum f^i \langle X_{max}^i \rangle$

uncertainty in ratios:

<i>R</i> <sub>1</sub> : 0.07 - 0.18	<b>4.4</b> g/
<i>R</i> <sub>2</sub> : 0.50 - 0.91	<u>0.4 g/</u>
<i>R</i> <sub>3</sub> : 0.32 - 0.51	Less

Statistical error:  $\pm 0.4 \text{ g/cm}^2$ 

Differences between Non-diff and diffractive show large effects, while differences in diffractive collision show small effects.

#### **Predictions of ratios by 3 interaction models**

Ratio	Minimum	Maximum
$R_1$	0.07	0.18
$R_2$	0.50	0.91
$R_3$	0.32	0.51



- Difference of  $\langle X_{max}^{modified} \rangle$  between maximum  $R_i$  and minimum  $R_i$  $/\mathrm{cm}^2$ 
  - $/\mathrm{cm}^2$
  - <u>than 0.1 g/cm<sup>2</sup></u>

For EPOS-LHC case

# **Effects of diffractive mass**

### **Diffractive mass**



10

Due to differences in modeling of particle productions and secondary interactions.

# Effects of uncertainty in diffractive mass



# Effects of differences between models



**Differences in cross-section fractions between ND and diffractive** collisions show large effects while differences in diffractive collisions show smaller effects at the first interaction.



#### **Differences in modeling of** diffractive dissociation

- **Differential cross-section of** diffractive mass
- (diffractive mass spectrum)
- At the first interaction:
- **0.4** g/cm<sup>2</sup> on  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$
- **Diffractive mass dependent** particle productions

At the first interaction:

# Summary

- Diffractive collision is one of the source of uncertainty in air shower simulations.
- Diffractive collisions show larger elasticity than others, and there are large differences in elasticity between collision types in diffractive collisions.
- To understand the effects of uncertainty of diffractive collisions between models, we estimate the effects of uncertainty at the first interactions.
- Differences in cross-section fractions between ND and diffractive collisions show large effects on  $\langle X_{max} \rangle$  while differences in diffractive collisions show smaller effects at the first interaction.
- We have uploaded the paper on arXiv. [arXiv: 2005.12594]
  - including discussion about effects on  $\langle X_{max}^{\mu} \rangle$  and  $N_{\mu}$ .
  - Not only at the first interaction, but also effects for whole air shower are discussed.

# Backup

# Effects of collision types ( $N_{\mu}$ )

### Using the collision type at the first interaction



 $\langle X_{\rm max} \rangle$ 

Differences between ND and pSD are 20-30  $g/cm^2$ . proton primary cases while 10 g/cm<sup>2</sup> for  $10^{19}$  eV cases.

 $N_{\mu}$ 

Differences between ND and tSD (CD) are ~2%. Differences between ND and pSD (DD) depend on model, ~2% for SIBYLL 2.3c and very small difference for QGSJET II-04

# Differences in diffractive collisions are 20 g/cm<sup>2</sup> for $10^{17}$ eV

## Effects of differences between models ( $N_{\mu}$ )

### **Diffractive mass**



 $\log_{10}(\xi) = \log_{10}(M_X^2/s),$  $\sqrt{s}$ : center of mass energy Diffractive mass: Invariant mass of Dissociation system  $M_X$ 

Important parameter in modeling of diffractive dissociation

Low  $M_X$  -> higher elasticity High  $M_X$  -> lower elasticity



#### If we assume an extreme diffractive mass spectrum, size of effects on pSD is 10 %.

Projectile particles dissociate only for pSD and DD (~10% in total) -> effects on  $\langle X_{\text{max}} \rangle$  is 1% at max. (at the first interaction)

Due to differences in modeling of particle productions and secondary interactions.

## Effects of cross-section fraction for whole air shower

### Change $R_1$ for collisions with energy > $10^{15}$ eV



```
If collision with energy > 10^{15} eV..
```

```
1. Randomly select the collision type using
```

2. Generate a collision. If the collision type is not same as selected in (1), regenerate a

Original	Modified	Difference
807.5	809.5	2.0
819.6	828.5	4.4
792.2	796.6	8.9
27.4	5 31.9	

Size of statistical errors:  $\pm$  0.3 g/cm<sup>2</sup>

# **Calculation of diffractive mass**

