First search for atmospheric and extraterrestrial neutrino-induced cascades with the IceCube detector
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The origin of high-energy cosmic-rays is an area of active research in astrophysics. The sites where cosmic rays are accelerated are expected to produce high energy neutrinos. Many types of objects, ranging from supernovae and gamma-ray bursters to active galactic nuclei, have been proposed as point sources of high energy neutrinos and many searches for such sources have been made, yielding results consistent with background only assumptions. If there are many point sources, each with an unobservably low flux, then the aggregate flux may still be observable as a diffuse flux.

Diffuse searches rely on the energy spectrum of the detected events to separate an extraterrestrial signal from atmospheric neutrinos produced in the interaction of cosmic rays with atomic nuclei in the Earth's atmosphere. Low energy (below ~ 10 GeV) atmospheric muon and electron neutrinos have been observed in underground detectors. At higher energies, from 100 GeV to 400 TeV, neutrino telescopes have measured the spectrum of atmospheric $\nu_\mu$ [4]. In this energy range, the flux of $\nu_e$ is expected to be lower by about a factor of 20 [5] and has not been observed.

The main component of the atmospheric neutrino spectrum is produced by the decays of $\pi^\pm$ and $K^\pm$. Asymptotically it can be parametrized by $dN_{\nu}/dE_{\nu} \propto E_{\nu}^{-3.7}$, where $E_{\nu}$ is the neutrino energy [6]. Decays of hadrons containing charm and bottom quarks form an additional component that is expected to be close to the primary cosmic-ray spectrum, $dN_{\nu}/dE_{\nu} \propto E_{\nu}^{-2.7}$ [7,8], and produces nearly equal numbers of $\nu_\mu$ and $\nu_e$. These prompt neutrinos are expected to dominate the $\nu_e$ spectrum at energies above $\sim$ 30 TeV [5]. The production of $\nu_\tau$ is expected to be negligible.

Fermi acceleration of charged particles in magnetic shocks followed by collisions with matter or radiation between the source and the Earth naturally leads to an energy spectrum for extraterrestrial neutrinos that is harder than that for atmospheric neutrinos, typically
close to $dN_\nu/dE_\nu \propto E_\nu^{-2}$. This allows diffuse extraterrestrial neutrinos to be visible as a hard component to the observed spectrum. The ratio of the $\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau$ flux in a single astrophysical source depends on the neutrino energy [10]. At moderate (high) energies, the neutrino flavor flux ratio behaves like the one from a pure pion (muon-damped) source, leading to an observed 1 : 1 : 1 (1:1.8:1.8) ratio at the Earth after taking into account neutrino oscillations. The energy at which a flavor ratio transition occurs thus depends on the properties of the source [10]. The neutrino flux is not known, although it is expected to be below the Waxman-Bahcall bound [11].

Previous searches for a diffuse flux have been performed with muon neutrinos [6], and with cascades [12,13]. Cascades are the particle showers (electromagnetic and hadronic) initiated by charged current interactions of $\nu_e$ and $\nu_\tau$ and the neutral-current neutrino interactions of all three flavors in a medium. In the charged-current interactions, an average of 80% of the (high energy) neutrino energy goes into the produced lepton [14]. For $\nu_e$, this leads to an electromagnetic shower, while for $\nu_\tau$ the character of the lepton-induced shower depends on the $\tau$ decay mode. The remainder of the energy is transferred to the target nucleon, producing a hadronic cascade. In the neutral-current interactions, the neutrino transfers a fraction of its energy to the target nucleon producing only a hadronic cascade. A typical cascade deposits its electromagnetic energy in a thin cylinder about 30 cm in radius and 5 m in length. Hadronic energy is deposited over a larger volume, about 11 m long and 75 cm in diameter. IceCube observes the Cherenkov radiation produced by the charged secondary particles from neutrino-nucleon interactions through an optical sensor array. While a neutrino-induced muon has a track-like signature in IceCube, a cascade event looks effectively like a point source of Cherenkov light in the detector.

For diffuse searches, cascades from all flavor $\nu$ interactions have two advantages over tracks from $\nu_\mu$ interactions, despite their inherently poor angular resolution compared to muon tracks. The first is that the background from atmospheric neutrinos is lower than for $\nu_\mu$. Second, because of their short shower length, the cascades are well-contained in the detector, with a Cherenkov light output proportional to the shower energy, so the shower energy is well measured. The detector acts as a calorimeter. Since the energy spectrum of extraterrestrial neutrinos is expected to be harder than the atmospheric neutrino spectrum, searching for a break in the energy spectrum with cascades is easier than with muons, both due to the expected break being at a lower energy in the cascade channel than the muon channel (a consequence of lower fluxes of atmospheric $\nu_e$ than $\nu_\mu$), and better intrinsic energy resolution of cascades over muons.

This paper reports on searches for diffuse extraterrestrial and for atmospheric neutrino-induced cascades using 257 days (livetime) of data collected in the year 2007-2008 with a partially completed IceCube detector consisting of 22 of the planned 86 strings. The IceCube detector and data sample are described in section II. Section III describes the analysis. Results are given in section IV and a summary follows in section V.

II. THE ICECUBE DETECTOR AND DATA SAMPLE

The IceCube detector is composed of vertical strings of optical sensors which are deployed in the glacial ice at the South Pole. The sensors detect Cherenkov radiation from charged particles produced in neutrino interactions. The strings are deployed on a 125 m triangular grid. Each string contains 60 digital optical modules (DOMs), mounted between 1450 and 2450 m below the surface (17 m spacing). Each DOM contains a 10-inch photomultiplier tube (PMT) [15], and a data acquisition system in a pressure vessel. The DOMs are most sensitive to photons with wavelengths 300 to 600 nm. The Hamamatsu R7081-02 PMTs have a peak quantum efficiency of $\sim 25\%$ and are operated at a typical gain of $10^7$. The PMT output is linear within 10% up to a current of 50 mA; at a gain of $10^7$, this corresponds to 31
detected photoelectrons per nanosecond. The DOM and string performance is described elsewhere [16, 17].

The data acquisition system records the arrival times of the detected photoelectrons. It uses two waveform digitization systems which record the arrival time with a time accuracy of about 2 ns and a wide dynamic range [16, 18]. One system records data at 300 megasamples/second (MSPS) for 400 ns after the first photon is detected with 14 bits of dynamic range. The second only has 10 bits of dynamic range but records data for 6.4 µs at 40 MSPS. The dead-time of the system is less than 1%. Each DOM is activated (launched) when a single photoelectron is detected, and the data are sent to the surface when two adjacent (nearest or next-to-nearest) neighbors record a hit within 1 µs.

The data were collected between May 2007 and April 2008 when IceCube consisted of 22 active strings with 1320 DOMs. The detector configuration is shown schematically in Figure 1. The point (0,0,0) is the center of the complete 86-string IceCube detector. The main physics trigger was a “simple multiplicity trigger” that required photon signals from at least 8 DOMs, with the additional requirement of accompanying hits in any of the two neighboring DOMs on a string, each above a threshold of 1/6 single photoelectron and within a 5 µs coincidence window. The average trigger rate was ~ 550 Hz, driven by atmospheric muons, and exhibited about ±10% seasonal variation. Online filters were employed to preselect a data sample for satellite transmission, that was used for analysis.

The online filter relevant to this paper used two first-guess reconstruction algorithms [19]. One algorithm assumed that all hits can be projected onto a line consistent with a particle traveling at a specific velocity. The second algorithm quantified the sphericity of the hit topology. It used the center-of-gravity (COG), defined as the photon signal amplitudes weighted mean of all hit DOM positions, as a first-guess vertex position. The response of the algorithms was studied with Monte Carlo simulation. Online selection criteria were developed using these simulations to reject 97.5% of the background events, while retaining 70% of the cascade signal events. The average rate after this filtering was 19 Hz.

III. ANALYSIS

Even after online filtering, the data are dominated by atmospheric muons produced in interactions of cosmic rays with nuclei in the Earth’s atmosphere. It is thus necessary to develop stringent offline selections to reject this background while retaining cascade signal events. Two such analyses were performed independently. One analysis focused on cascade events induced by high energy extraterrestrial neutrino interactions, while the other searched for lower energy atmospheric neutrino-induced cascade signals. The development of the selections for both analyses relies on using 10% of the recorded data while keeping the remaining 90% “blinded”. When the selections have been fixed, the 10% sample is discarded and the remaining data is unblinded. The physics results were evaluated from the remaining 90% of the recorded data only after the analysis selections were finalized and were thus free of statistical bias. In addition, extensive Monte Carlo simulations of background and signal events, as well as the IceCube detector response, were used. These simulations used importance sampling and weighting techniques to overcome computing limitations and are described in section III.A. This is followed by a description of the two analyses in section III.B. Systematic uncertainties are described in section III.C.

A. Monte Carlo Simulations

The Monte Carlo generator ANIS [20] was used to generate neutrinos of all flavors in the energy range from ~ 10 GeV to 1 EeV at the surface of the Earth and to simulate subsequent neutral and charged current interactions in the Earth. The neutrino spectra were generated with energy distributions of \( E^{-2} \) and \( E^{-1} \), and were re-weighted to conventional and prompt atmospheric neutrino flux predictions or to an astrophysical neutrino flux of \( E^2 \Phi = 1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ GeV} \cdot \text{cm}^{-2} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \cdot \text{sr}^{-1} \), depending on the analysis goal. The CTEQ5 parton distribution functions [21] were used in evaluating the neutrino cross sections. The Preliminary Reference Earth Model [22] was used as the density profile to simulate high energy neutrino absorption. The simulations included the Glashow resonance \( \bar{\nu}_e + e^- \rightarrow W^- \rightarrow X \) for \( \bar{\nu}_e \) energies near 6.3 PeV [23].

CORSIKA [24] was used to simulate air showers from cosmic ray collisions in the Earth’s atmosphere and obtain a sample of background atmospheric muons. The cosmic ray spectrum was based on the Hörandel polygonal model [25], and primaries up to iron were simulated in the energy range from 600 GeV up to \( 10^{11} \) GeV. The SIBYLL parameterization [26] was used in CORSIKA to model hadronic interactions. The effects of the Earth’s magnetic field were included in the simulations. By overlaying independent CORSIKA showers, we simulated the coincident muon background, which comes from multiple cosmic ray showers triggering the detector within its readout window.

High energy background muons are likely to incur large radiative energy losses, which may mimic cascade signals. To obtain an adequate sample of such high energy background muons in the simulations, it was necessary to impose additional selections in the CORSIKA event generations. We have imposed threshold selection criteria on the primary cosmic ray energy and on the energy of individual muons, as was done in the AMANDA analysis [13], to increase the effective livetime and Monte Carlo statistics for cosmic rays in the energy range from \( \mathcal{O}(10^5) \) TeV to \( \mathcal{O}(1) \) PeV. The effective livetimes of these simulation samples are given, together with the threshold values,
TABLE I: The effective livetimes of the CORSIKA Monte Carlo simulation samples, generated with standard energy thresholds of 600 GeV for primary cosmic rays and 273 GeV for secondary muons and with high-energy thresholds of 40 TeV and 5 TeV, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Cosmic Ray Energy</th>
<th>Monte Carlo sample</th>
<th>Monte Carlo sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>high-energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[days]</td>
<td>[days]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 TeV</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 TeV</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 PeV</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 PeV</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in Table I for representative cosmic ray energies. The high-energy sample was used only to assess background.

A Muon Monte Carlo simulator [27] was used to propagate secondary muons through the ice. It simulates muon stochastic energy losses from ionization, bremsstrahlung, photo-nuclear interactions, and pair production.

A Cascade Monte Carlo [28] was used to simulate the longitudinal development of electromagnetic and hadronic cascades. It also accounts for the lower Cherenkov light output from hadronic cascades compared to that from electromagnetic cascades.

Cherenkov light emission and subsequent photon propagation through ice was simulated with the Photonics simulation package [29]. In these simulations, the optical properties of the ice were described by a “calibrated ice model”. This model was constructed from extensive AMANDA measurements of light propagation in South Pole ice made with artificial in-situ light sources (pulsed and steady LED sources and nitrogen lasers) [30]. These measurements were largely decoupled from light source and detector characteristics by using timing information of detected single photoelectrons. They determined the relevant wavelength and depth dependences of the optical scattering and absorption lengths, down to the deepest AMANDA depths. Using the fact that scattering and absorption are highly correlated with the concentration of insoluble dust particles in the ice, the model was extrapolated to the greater IceCube depths (from 2100 m down to bedrock at about 2800 m) with dust concentration data from an Antarctic ice core [31], which were scaled to fit the measured scattering and absorption parameters at AMANDA depths. The ice properties are thus less understood at depths greater than 2100 m.

PMT response simulators were used for each DOM in the detector to relate light input and current output. The simulated currents were then propagated through response simulators of the digitization electronics, local coincidence signaling, and event triggering. The same processing and filtering was applied to simulated and recorded data.

B. Event selections

After online filtering and transfer, the data were passed through several maximum-likelihood based reconstruction algorithms [19, 32] in order to suppress muon background while retaining signal events. The algorithms assumed a single track, two track, and a point-like cascade hypothesis and obtained the corresponding vertex positions and times for each event. Following the reconstruction, a sequence of selection criteria was applied to the data. The retained data are identified by different levels, starting from Level-3 (Level-1 refers to triggered online data and Level-2 to the data before offline reconstruction).

At Level-3 only those events were retained for which the single muon track reconstruction found a zenith angle greater than $73^\circ$. In addition, a requirement was imposed on the difference of the log-likelihood, $\mathcal{L}$, of the cascade and track reconstructions for each event, $\mathcal{L}(\text{cascade}) - \mathcal{L}(\text{track}) > -16.2$, to preferentially select cascade-like events. The selection criteria were chosen so that the signal efficiency was about 80% in both the atmospheric and extraterrestrial neutrino searches and the muon background rate was reduced by a factor of $\sim 5$, with respect to the online filter.

Both analyses used the same cascade energy reconstruction algorithm [33] which was applied to events passing Level-3. This analytical cascade-energy calculation takes into account the variation of ice optical properties with depth:

$$E_{\text{reco}}/\text{GeV} = \frac{\sum n_{\text{pe}}}{\sum \mu_0 (\vec{r}_v, \vec{r}_{\text{DOM}})}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The $n_{\text{pe}}$ is the observed number of photoelectrons in a DOM and $\mu_0 (\vec{r}_v, \vec{r}_{\text{DOM}})$ is the number of photoelectrons expected at a given DOM position $\vec{r}_{\text{DOM}}$ from a 1 GeV cascade with a vertex position $\vec{r}_v$. The $\mu_0$ is taken from a table generated by the Photonics Monte Carlo package [29]. In Eq. 1 the noise term has been neglected. It biases the reconstructed energy towards lower values and thus worsens the performance of the cascade energy reconstruction.

The subsequent selections, described below, were optimized separately for the two analyses.

Extraterrestrial event selections

Energetic bremsstrahlung from muon tracks outside the detector and muon tracks that intersect only part of the detector can mimic an uncontained cascade signal. To reject this type of background, events were required to have a topology consistent with a cascade signal that originated inside the IceCube instrumented volume at Level-4. Specifically, the four earliest hits in the event were required to be inside the fiducial volume of the detector in the horizontal $x$-$y$ coordinates, as depicted in Figure 4 (dotted lines). Events were also
rejected if any of the four earliest hits occurred in the eight topmost DOMs. Approximately 5% of the data and 7% of the muon background events from the CORSIKA Monte Carlo remained with respect to the previous selection level. The difference between absolute rates in the data and the CORSIKA Monte Carlo is addressed in section IIIC. ANIS Monte Carlo simulations show that approximately 13% of the signal was retained at Level-4.

At Level-5, events were required to have hits in at least 20 DOMs. To reject events with multiple muon tracks within the IceCube read-out window, an upper limit of 5 ìs was set on the event duration, defined as the time difference between the last and the earliest hit in the event. A two-track reconstruction was performed on the retained events and the tracks were required to coincide to within 1 ìs. The center-of-gravity of the hits and the vertex coordinates from the cascade reconstruction algorithm were required to coincide in x and y to within 60 m. Monte Carlo simulation studies indicate that these selections reduce the coincident muon rate to less than 20% of the 8 mHz expected background muon rate at level 5.

The smaller event sample allowed for the use of more CPU-intensive reconstruction algorithms. At Level-6, the single-track reconstruction was iterated 32 times with randomly selected seed tracks to ensure that the final reconstructed tracks did not originate from local minima.

The zenith angle distribution is shown in the top part of Fig. 2. The selection on zenith angle was refined to reject events with a reevaluated single-track zenith angle smaller than 69°. The comparison of the event reconstruction probabilities with a single-track and a cascade hypothesis was revisited as well. Only those events for which the ratio of the reduced log-likelihood, rL, for the event reconstruction under a single-track and under a cascade hypothesis was greater than 0.95 were retained for further analysis. The rL is defined as the negative log-likelihood normalized by the number of degrees of freedom. The normalized distribution of the track and cascade reduced likelihood ratio is shown in the bottom part of Fig. 2. The Monte Carlo describes the shapes of experimental data distributions very well. The rates observed in the data and obtained from simulations are given in Table II and discussed in section IIIC.

Figures 3 (top) and 4 show comparisons between the Monte Carlo and the data for the reconstructed energy, and the cascade reconstructed vertex positions after Level-6 selections. The shapes agree very well, except vertex position z at the largest depths of the de-
tector where the ice properties are not well described by our simulations. Figure 3 (bottom) shows the absolute event rate as a function of primary Cosmic Ray energy for the standard and high-energy optimized Corsika Monte Carlo after level-6 event selections with an additional selection criterium on the reconstructed cascade energy of 6.3 TeV. Since the two spectra are consistent within uncertainties, at Level-7 we use the high-energy optimized Corsika Monte Carlo.

In order to further distinguish between signal-like and muon-like events, at Level-7 we used the multiplicity and spatial distribution of the hit DOMs. For every event we calculated the distances between each hit DOM and the reconstructed cascade vertex. Event-by-event, the mean distance, $D$, was evaluated and used as the half-radius in determining fill-ratio $F$, defined as a fraction of hit DOMs within a sphere centered on the cascade vertex for the event. Monte Carlo studies of signal and background exhibit different correlations of $D$ and $F$, as shown in Figure 5. For signal-like events, the average $F$ value (sphere density) increases as a function of $D$, while the opposite is true for the single muon events. Most of coincident muon events have very small values of $F$, independent of $D$. Figure 5 also shows the distribution of $D$ and $F$ in the data and Monte Carlo simulations. The background Monte Carlo is in good agreement with the data for the events with the cascade reconstructed vertex position $z > -300$ m as shown in Figure 5 (bottom-right panel). This is not the case for the events with the cascade reconstructed vertex position $z < -300$ m, where the ice is less well understood and makes some muons look like non-contained cascades (spherical shape and high DOM multiplicity). The muon background events were removed by increasing a threshold on the minimum number of hit DOMs to 60 and imposing a threshold $E_{\text{reco}} > 16$ TeV on the reconstructed cascade energy. These selections also suppress contributions from atmospheric neutrinos from pion and kaon decays. After all selections, four events in the muon background simulation samples and no events in the 10% of the data remained [34].

**Atmospheric Neutrino Event Selection**

The atmospheric neutrino analysis used artificial neural networks implemented in the ROOT TMVA package [35] to reject background. The neural networks had two hidden layers, the first with $N + 1$ neurons and the second with $N$ neurons, where $N$ is the number of discriminating variables.

At Level-4, five input variables were used; the track zenith angle of the 32-fold iterative muon reconstruction,
of

FIG. 6: Normalized distributions of the Level-4 neural net-
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FIG. 7: Normalized distributions (after Level-4 atmospheric selections) of (left panel) reconstructed energy (middle panel) number of direct hits (right panel) total number of hits.

FIG. 8: Normalized distributions (after Level-4 atmospheric selections) of (left panel) distance from the cascade vertex to the first hit in the event (middle panel) difference in $z$ vertex positions for the two split cascade reconstructions (right panel) fill-ratio from the mean hit distance.

FIG. 9: Normalized distributions of the neural network classification scores (top) $Q_B$ and (bottom) $Q_C$.

C. Normalization and Systematic Uncertainties

The extraterrestrial and atmospheric analyses have common sources of systematic uncertainty. The largest contributions to our systematic uncertainty estimate arise from our limited knowledge of the optical properties of the ice and from uncertainties in the cosmic-ray flux and composition. Other significant contributions result from uncertainty in the DOM detection efficiency and from uncertainties in the neutrino cross-sections and the light output from the cascades. These sources affect signal and background estimates differently. We describe signal and background separately below.

Muon Background Systematics

CORSIKA Monte Carlo simulations adequately reproduce the shape of the observed spectra in both analyses but systematically underestimate the absolute rate. In the extraterrestrial analysis, an empirical factor to normalize the rate of simulated background to the corresponding data was found to be $3 \pm 1$, where the uncertainty covers the difference between the data and CORSIKA rates at selection levels up to 6 (see Table I). Background events outnumber signal events by at least 3 orders of magnitude in these event samples. In the atmospheric analysis, the same factor $3 \pm 1$ was found for $Q^* < 0.4$, where any cascade signal is expected to
be vanishingly small. The factor was the same, within uncertainties, at larger $Q^\star$ values.

Simulations based on an alternate ice model [36] were performed to assess the possible effects on the empirical normalization factor caused by incomplete description of the optical ice properties and necessary approximations in their implementation in the simulations. The alternate model is based on a global fit to recorded charges in very bright events generated by IceCube LED sources sampling all detector depths. The background rates simulated with the alternate ice model differed from the rates observed in the data by a factor of two. This is consistent, to within the assigned uncertainties, with the difference between the rates simulated using the calibrated ice model and those observed in the data.

The remaining difference in simulated and observed rate is ascribed to the combined effect of uncertainties in the cosmic ray flux for protons in the energy range near the knee and in the absolute energy scale.

**Neutrino Systematics**

Simulations show that neutrino events are much less affected by uncertainty in the ice model. We estimate a 20% uncertainty in the rates by comparing simulations with the calibrated and alternate ice models for both atmospheric and $E^{-2}$ energy spectra.

The uncertainty in the DOM sensitivity is taken as 8%, based on the measured uncertainty in the PMT sensitivity [15]. For an $E^{-2}$ neutrino energy spectrum, coupled with a neutrino interaction probability that scales with $E$, this is equivalent to a 8% uncertainty in flux. For atmospheric neutrinos, the spectrum can be approximated by $E^{-3.7}$ for conventional neutrinos and by $E^{-2.7}$ for prompt neutrinos from charm and bottom quark decays. These lead to uncertainties of 20% and 12%, respectively, for the detector sensitivity. We conservatively use the larger value for all atmospheric neutrinos.

Uncertainty in the atmospheric neutrino flux forms an additional uncertainty in the atmospheric neutrino background to the extraterrestrial cascade search. The expected rates of atmospheric neutrinos are based on predictions from Ref. [37] and Ref. [7] for the conventional and prompt components, respectively. We assign a 20% uncertainty in these rates [13].

In the relevant energy range, uncertainty in the neutrino interaction cross-sections is about 6%, caused largely by uncertainties in the parton densities [39, 40].

The total uncertainty in the atmospheric (extraterrestrial) neutrino detection efficiency was estimated to be 29% (22%) by adding these contributions in quadrature, see Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$\nu_{atm}$</th>
<th>$\nu(E^{-2})$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice Properties</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM Efficiency</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutrino Cross-Section</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Uncertainty</strong></td>
<td><strong>29%</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To check the energy scale, we studied the detector response to a 337 nm $N_2$ laser, known as the standard candle. This laser is on one of the IceCube strings, at a depth of 2153 m. It produces light that is shaped like a Cherenkov cone pointing downward; the light output is calibrated to ±10%. For DOMs that are far enough from the laser to avoid saturation (defined as observing less than 20,000 photoelectrons), the total observed charge is 3% lower than our Monte Carlo prediction for the calibrated ice model, and 12% lower than the expectation for the alternate ice model. This is well within the expectations from the ice model and the DOM efficiency uncertainty.
IV. RESULTS

After the event selections had been finalized, the analyses were unblinded. The 10% of the data, which was used to develop the selections, was discarded from the results. The remaining data correspond to 257 days of livetime.

The effective area $A_{\text{eff}}$, defined as the equivalent area with 100% neutrino interaction probability and detection efficiency, was obtained by passing simulated signal Monte Carlo events through the analyses. Figure 10 shows $A_{\text{eff}}$ for $\nu_e$, $\nu_\mu$, and $\nu_\tau$ versus neutrino energy. The contribution from the Glashow resonance is clearly visible in $A_{\text{eff}}$ for $\nu_e$ at trigger level and at final selection level for the extraterrestrial analysis. The analyses cover complementary energy ranges, with the atmospheric analysis naturally covering lower energies than the extraterrestrial analysis. The analyses have similar $A_{\text{eff}}$ in the region of overlap.

The energy resolution is $\Delta(\log_{10} E_\nu) \sim 0.26 \pm 0.18$ for the $E^{-2}$ (atmospheric) $\nu_e$ energy spectrum. The $x$, $y$ and $z$ position resolution is $\sim$ 10 meters.

A. Atmospheric Neutrino Results

Before unblinding, the event selection criteria for the atmospheric analysis were optimized for a conventional atmospheric neutrino flux with a 5 TeV threshold on the reconstructed cascade energy. Twelve events remained in the 90% of the recorded data after an a-posteriori selection criterium on the multivariate selection variable $Q^{\star}$ at 0.9. The expected atmospheric electron and muon neutrino signal is $7.0 \pm 2.0$ events for these selection criteria. The prompt neutrino component is 25% of the expectation. Only one standard CORSIKA Monte Carlo event passed the final selections. Muon background estimate based on this one Monte Carlo event is $9 \pm 9$. It includes an empirical scaling factor to normalize the simulated background to the data. The limited background Monte Carlo statistics preclude detection of a signal.

Figure 11 shows the distribution of the variable $Q^{\star}$ for the full data set with $E_{\text{reco}} > 5$ TeV and compares it to the corresponding distribution for a simulated signal of cascades from atmospheric electron and muon neutrinos.

FIG. 11: Distribution of the multivariate selection parameter $Q^{\star}$ for data and for a simulated cascade signal from $\nu_e$ and $\nu_\mu$ with reconstructed energies above 5 TeV in the atmospheric analysis.

Figure 12 shows the cumulative number of events as a function of the threshold applied on the $Q^{\star}$ variable. The top panel compares the experimental data to the signal expectation from simulations, shown as a band with a width determined by the systematic uncertainty in the atmospheric neutrino flux. The bottom panel in Fig. 12 shows the ratio of data events over expected signal events as a function of selection threshold. This ratio crosses unity for the most discriminating selection criterion that can be applied without rejecting all the data, and where the remaining few events have the highest probabilities of being due to atmospheric neutrino cascades. This implies that, in using this analysis, the detector becomes sensitive to atmospheric cascade events due to neutrinos, but the exposure is not sufficient for a statistically significant detection.

At a 15 TeV energy threshold and an a-posteriori selection criterium on the multivariate selection variable $Q^{\star} > 0.9$, six events remained in the 90% of the recorded
data. The expected background from atmospheric muons was estimated to be $5.0 \pm 3.8$ events. This estimate was made with high-energy CORSIKA simulations and includes the empirical scaling factor to normalize the simulated background to the data. The expected atmospheric electron and muon neutrino signal is $3.0 \pm 0.9$ events for these selection criteria. The prompt neutrino component is 40\% of the expectation. The observed number of events is compatible with Monte Carlo prediction.

B. Diffuse Flux Limit

A total of 14 events passed all selection levels in the extraterrestrial analysis with an expected total background of $8.3 \pm 3.6$ events. The background was estimated from simulations, which indicate sizable contributions from atmospheric muons and from atmospheric neutrinos (see Table I). The expected total number of signal events and, hence, $\Phi$ is rejected at 90\% confidence level of $\mu$. Conversely, an upper limit on the flux of electron neutrinos is $E^2 \Phi_{90\% \, C.L.} < 3.0 \times 10^{-7}$ GeV $\cdot$ cm$^{-2}$ $\cdot$ s$^{-1}$ $\cdot$ sr$^{-1}$. In these limits, the central 90\% of $\nu$ signal events are in the energy range from 24 TeV to 6.6 PeV with a mean energy of $\sim 220$ TeV. The limits are shown in Fig. 14.

The energy distributions are shown in Fig. 13.

The expected rate of signal neutrino events was evaluated for an assumed flux of $E^2 \Phi_{\text{model}} = 1.0 \times 10^{-6}$ GeV $\cdot$ cm$^{-2}$ $\cdot$ s$^{-1}$ $\cdot$ sr$^{-1}$ for the sum of all flavors and using the effective areas, $A_{\text{eff}}$, given in Figure 10. The results are given in Table II for each flavor. In 257 days of livetime, a total of $46 \pm 10$ signal events is expected, assuming that this $\Phi_{\text{model}}$ receives equal contributions from all flavors ($\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau$ flux is $1 : 1 : 1$ at the Earth). Electron neutrinos contribute about 40\%, tau neutrinos about 45% and muon neutrinos the remaining 15\%.

The energy distributions are shown in Fig. 13.

By using the Feldman-Cousins method [41] as implemented in the software package POLE++ [42] to account for statistical and systematic uncertainties in the estimated background and signal counts, we set an upper limit on the number of signal events at 90\% confidence level of $\mu_{90\%} = 16.6$. This $\mu_{90\%}$ is below the expected total number of signal events and, hence, $\Phi_{\text{model}}$ is rejected at 90\% confidence. Conversely, an upper limit at 90\% confidence can be set at $E^2 \Phi_{90\% \, C.L.} < 3.6 \times 10^{-7}$ GeV $\cdot$ cm$^{-2}$ $\cdot$ s$^{-1}$ $\cdot$ sr$^{-1}$ on the diffuse flux of neutrinos of all flavors assuming that $\Phi \propto E^{-2}$ and that the flux at the detector receives equal contributions from all flavors.

An upper limit on the flux of $\nu_e$ that does not depend on the assumption of equal flux contributions for each flavor was derived by assuming that the $\nu_\mu$ and $\nu_\tau$ fluxes are zero. This upper limit on the flux of electron neutrinos is $E^2 \Phi_{90\%} \, C.L. < 3.0 \times 10^{-7}$ GeV $\cdot$ cm$^{-2}$ $\cdot$ s$^{-1}$ $\cdot$ sr$^{-1}$.

In summary, we report the first search for cascades induced by atmospheric and by diffuse astrophysical neu-
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**Figure 13:** Cascade reconstructed energy distribution after all selections in the extraterrestrial analysis.

![Figure 14](https://example.com/fig14.png)

**Figure 14:** (Color online) Experimental upper limits on the diffuse flux of neutrinos from sources with $\Phi \propto E^{-2}$ energy spectrum and theoretical predictions for neutrino fluxes from astrophysical neutrino sources.

**Figure 10** shows the experimental event with the highest reconstructed energy that passed all selections in both atmospheric and extraterrestrial analyses.

V. SUMMARY

In summary, we report the first search for cascades induced by atmospheric and by diffuse astrophysical neu-
The atmospheric neutrino analysis used one and two dimensional selection criteria and was optimized for higher energies than the atmospheric neutrino analysis. A total of 14 events with energies above 16 TeV remained after event selections, with an expected total background contribution of 8.3 ± 3.6 events. We derive an upper limit at 90% confidence of $E^2 \Phi_{90\% CL} < 3.6 \times 10^{-7}$ GeV·cm$^{-2}$·s$^{-1}$·sr$^{-1}$ on the diffuse flux of astrophysical neutrinos with the assumption that the energy spectrum $\Phi \propto E^{-2}$ and that the flavor composition of the $\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau$ flux is 1 : 1 : 1 at the Earth. In this limit, 90% of the expected signal events have energies between 24 TeV and 6.6 PeV.

This is below the limit that was recently reported from final AMANDA data, corresponding to 1001 days of livetime [13]. Once construction is completed in 2011, IceCube will consist of 86 strings covering a volume of 1 km$^3$. Future IceCube searches will thus benefit from a considerably larger size and are expected to have significantly improved detection sensitivity.
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