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Abstract

Ground-based gamma-ray astronomy, which provides access to photons in the TeV energy range, has been a rapidly developing discipline over the past decades. In this thesis, the performance of the current- and next-generation imaging atmospheric Cherenkov telescopes VERITAS and CTA is evaluated using Monte Carlo simulations. Special emphasis is given to the possible extension of the duty cycle of CTA. It is shown that an increase of about 30% in observation time can be achieved through operation under partial moonlight without significant losses in performance. The increased observation time is especially important when studying astronomical objects which are variable at very high energies (VHE; \( E > 50 \) GeV), such as active galactic nuclei (AGN), as this allows the extension of monitoring or multi-wavelength campaigns on these occasionally flaring sources.

AGN represent to date about one third of the population of known VHE gamma-ray sources. Most of them are blazars, whose emission is dominated by non-thermal radiation of relativistic jets closely aligned to the line of sight of the observer. The blazar B2 1215+30 has been observed by VERITAS for nearly 100 hours between 2008 and 2012. The data analysis presented in this thesis yields a detection significance of 9.0\( \sigma \) and shows long-term variability with a relatively bright flux state in 2011. Multi-wavelength data are used to construct the spectral energy distribution of B2 1215+30 which is well described by a one-zone leptonic model. The model is presented in detail and possible constraints are investigated. The results of the modeling are discussed and put in context with other VHE-detected blazars.
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1. Introduction

Gamma-ray astronomy studies astronomical objects using the most energetic form of electromagnetic radiation. Gamma-ray photons are at least one hundred thousand times more energetic than an optical photon. These high-energy gamma rays cannot penetrate the Earth’s atmosphere which makes it impossible to observe the radiation emitted from the astronomical object directly from ground. To detect those photons directly, one has to place the detector above the atmosphere. This method has been successfully applied to measure photons from X-ray up to MeV/GeV energies. However, with increasing photon energy, space-borne instruments become more and more ineffective due to the steeply decreasing fluxes of the astronomical objects and hence the limited number of photons which can be collected with the about 1 m$^2$ detector area.

To detect very-high-energy (VHE; E$>50$ GeV) gamma rays much larger detector areas are needed, so far only achievable from ground. Although these gamma rays cannot be detected directly from ground, they interact with the atmosphere and initiate so-called air showers. These air showers consist of highly relativistic particles which emit Cherenkov radiation and two main methods exist to detect their interacting products. One is based on the detection of the shower particles itself, while the other detects the Cherenkov light emitted within the air shower. The particle detector arrays have the advantage of a large duty cycle ($\sim 100\%$) and a large field of view ($\sim 1$ sr) but their performance is restricted by an inefficient rejection of the (much more abundant) cosmic-ray background, as well as by the reconstruction of the energy and direction of the incoming gamma ray. Therefore, even though current (or past) particle detector arrays like MILAGRO$^1$, Tibet AS$\gamma$2, and ARGO-YBJ$^3$ have done some interesting gamma-ray observations, this technique will probably not be competitive with the Cherenkov experiments until the arrival of the next generation of instruments like HAWC$^4$ or LHAASO$^5$ (Panaque, 2012). The Cherenkov experiments on the other hand can further been divided into non-imaging (e.g.,

---

1 http://www.lanl.gov/milagro
2 http://www.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/em/index.html
3 http://argo.na.infn.it/
4 http://www.hawc-observatory.org/
5 http://english.ihep.cas.cn/ic/ip/LHAASO/
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STACEE\(^6\) or HiSCORE\(^7\) and imaging (e.g., H.E.S.S.\(^8\), MAGIC\(^9\), VERITAS\(^10\), or FACT\(^11\)). The latter experiments use arrays of imaging telescopes consisting of a reflecting surface which focusses the Cherenkov light onto a fast recording, pixelized camera. They have a typical field of view of 3-5\(^\circ\) and a duty cycle of about 10% (∼1000 hours/year), as the faint bluish Cherenkov light from air showers cannot be detected during daylight. This technique has proven to be the most powerful approach to detect gamma rays in the energy range from several tens of GeV to a few tens of TeV as it combines a good angular and energy resolution with a high background rejection efficiency. For a review of the detection techniques see, e.g., Hinton & Hofmann (2009) or Panaque (2012).

Figure 1.1.: Sky map in galactic coordinates of the TeV sources detected by IACTs. Each point represents a gamma-ray source and the colors represent different source classes as explained in the legend. Image credit: Wakely & Horan (2013).

The number of known VHE gamma-ray emitters detected by Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Telescopes (IACTs) currently exceeds 150 sources (Wakely & Horan, 2013) and includes morphological, spectroscopic and temporal studies. The objects are of galactic and extragalactic origin, as shown in Figure 1.1. Among the galactic objects, source types include supernova remnants (SNRs), pulsars and pulsar wind nebulae (PWNe), binary systems, interacting stellar winds as well as unidentified sources without any obvious counterparts in other wavelength regimes. Out-

\(^6\) http://www.astro.ucla.edu/~stacee/
\(^7\) http://www.iexp.uni-hamburg.de/groups/astroparticle/score/en/
\(^8\) http://www.mpi-hd.mpg.de/hfm/HESS/
\(^9\) http://magic.mppmu.mpg.de/
\(^10\) http://veritas.sao.arizona.edu/
\(^11\) http://www.isdc.unige.ch/fact/
side our Galaxy, starburst galaxies and various types of active galactic nuclei (AGN) have been detected to emit VHE gamma rays. Several additional source classes are thought to be possible VHE emitters, but have not yet been detected. These include, for example, gamma-ray bursts (GRBs), galaxy clusters and microquasars as well as possible signatures from dark matter. The reader is referred to Aharonian et al. (2008) or Rieger et al. (2013) for a general overview of the status of VHE gamma-ray astronomy.

Many of the observations over the last decade have shown the large discovery potential in the VHE regime and have raised new questions, especially about the origin of these high-energy photons. For this reason, scientists around the world have come together to build a new instrument – the Cherenkov Telescope Array (CTA\textsuperscript{12}). The aim of CTA is to make significant progress over the existing experiments. CTA will be able to detect probably more than 1000 sources over the whole sky, including many AGN, and thus might answer many of the persisting questions about the underlying processes in those sources. CTA has as well a large discovery potential for “new physics” as the domain of VHE gamma rays is sensitive to energy scales important for particle physics (the 100 GeV scale expected for cold dark matter, the TeV scale where super-symmetry may emerge, and even perhaps the unification scale for the strong and electroweak forces). For more details about the scientific motivation of future IACT arrays, the reader is referred to Buckley et al. (2008) and Actis et al. (2011).

In this thesis, VHE observations of the blazar-type AGN B2 1215+30 with VERITAS are used to derive a deeper understanding of the physical processes in this source by modeling its broadband emission. The reconstruction of the properties of astronomical objects at very high energies requires a precise knowledge of the detector and its performance. Therefore, the performance for the current- and next-generation ground-based gamma-ray observatories VERITAS and CTA is evaluated.

The thesis is structured as follows. Chapter 2 details the detection principle of VHE gamma rays by imaging atmospheric Cherenkov telescopes. It is followed by a description of the VERITAS experiment and the analysis chain used throughout this thesis in Chapter 3. In the same chapter, a first performance estimate for the VERITAS upgrade with new cameras in 2012 is presented. A further step towards an increased sensitivity to VHE gamma-ray sources is expected from the future CTA observatory, described in Chapter 4. Monte Carlo (MC) simulations are used to determine the performance characteristics of CTA and to explore the feasibility of operations under partial moonlight to increase the duty cycle of the instrument. Chapter 5 gives an overview of the observations of blazars and presents in detail the long-term observations of B2 1215+30 with VERITAS and additional multi-wavelength instruments. To understand the

\textsuperscript{12} https://www.cta-observatory.org/
underlying processes in AGN, the observed spectral energy distribution (SED) is modeled. The model and possible constraints on its input parameters are demonstrated in Chapter 6 before it is applied to the SED of B2 1215+30. The obtained results are discussed and compared to other VERITAS-detected blazars. Chapter 7 summarizes the results of this thesis.
2. Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Technique

In this chapter, the detection principle of VHE gamma rays by Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Telescopes (IACTs) is presented. It starts with an introduction of the basic properties of air showers and their emission of Cherenkov light (Section 2.1). Then, the detection principle itself is outlined (Section 2.2) and current IACT facilities are briefly presented.

2.1. Air showers

An air shower is a cascade of particles generated by the interaction of a high-energy cosmic-ray particle with the molecules of the atmosphere (Gaisser, 1990). The number of particles in the cascade at first multiplies while the energy of the primary particle is distributed among the secondary particles. The cascade then reaches a maximum and attenuates as more and more particles fall below the energy threshold for further particle production and the shower dies out. Depending on the type of the primary particle, the development of the shower differs. In case of a primary photon or electron/positron, most of the interactions are of electromagnetic type and the initiated shower is called electromagnetic shower. In case of a primary hadron, the shower develops in a complex way as a combination of electromagnetic sub-showers and hadronic multi-particle production while interactions via the strong and the weak force occur. This kind of shower is called hadronic shower. As hadrons are much more numerous than gamma rays, they contribute most to the background measured by IACTs.

2.1.1. Electromagnetic air showers

An electromagnetic air shower initiated by a high-energy photon starts with the production of an electron-positron pair within the Coulomb field of an atmospheric nucleus\(^1\). The energy \(E_0\) of the primary photon is, on average, shared in equal parts by the electron and the positron. The high-energy electrons and positrons undergo bremsstrahlung in the presence of an electromagnetic field of an atomic nucleus and radiate gamma rays. This process, together with the pair production, repeats itself and the particle cascade starts to develop. As a result, the number of

\(^1\) Muon–anti-muon production is negligible as the cross section in air is only \(\sim 12\mu\text{b}\), compared to \(\simeq 500\ \text{mb}\) for electron-pair production.
particles in the shower increases exponentially with atmospheric depth. As the shower evolves, the energy of each individual particle reaches the critical energy $E_c$, where energy losses through ionization become the dominant process for electrons ($E_c \approx 83$ MeV in air). At this point, the maximum number of particles is reached and the particles are gradually absorbed by ionization. Further on, the mean photon energy reduces and the cross section for pair production decreases until it becomes of the same order of Compton scattering and photoelectric absorption (few MeV). Eventually, the particle cascade dies out.

The variation of the number of particles with atmospheric depth (or in dependence of the radiation length\(^2\)) is often called *longitudinal shower development*. It is shown in Figure 2.1 and demonstrates some of the basic properties of the electromagnetic air shower development (e.g., Heitler, 1954; Rossi & Greisen, 1941): (i) the number of particles increases exponentially in the initial phase of the cascade development, (ii) the maximum number of particles is proportional to the energy of the primary particle ($N_{\text{max}} \propto E_0$), and (iii) the depth of the shower maximum grows logarithmically with the primary energy ($X_{\text{max}} \propto \ln E_0$). For low energetic primaries, the electromagnetic cascade develops early in the atmosphere (i.e. at high altitudes) and the cascade dies out relatively soon. Additionally, much fewer particles are created within the cascade compared to showers initiated by high-energy gamma rays.

![Figure 2.1](image-url): Longitudinal shower development of electromagnetic air showers for different primary energies. Sea level corresponds to about 27 radiation lengths. Figure taken from Aharonian et al. (2008).

\(^2\) The radiation length for photons and electrons in air is $X_0 \simeq 37 \text{g/cm}^2$. The atmosphere therefore corresponds to a depth of 27 radiation lengths.
The lateral spread of an electromagnetic shower is due to the deflection of charged particles within the Earth’s magnetic field and multiple Coulomb scatterings of low-energy electrons within the air shower. The Coulomb scattering scales with the Molière radius $R_{mol}$, which depends on the radiation length $X_0$ and the critical energy in a given material: $R_{mol} = 21.2 \text{MeV} \cdot \frac{X_0}{E_c}$. In the atmosphere, the distance corresponding to $X_0$ varies with the density. It is $R_{mol} = \frac{9.6 \text{g cm}^{-2}}{\rho}$, which is approximately 80 m at sea level (Heck et al., 1998). On average, 90% of the shower energy is deposited inside a cylinder around the shower axis with radius $R_{mol}$.

### 2.1.2. Hadronic air showers

When a high-energy cosmic-ray particle like a proton (or a heavier nucleus) enters the Earth’s atmosphere, it interacts with the nuclei of air molecules and initiates a hadronic air shower. This air shower consists of three components: a hadronic core, a muonic component and electromagnetic sub-showers. This is illustrated schematically in Figure 2.2.

![Figure 2.2: Schematic model of a hadronic air shower generated by a cosmic ray. Note that the length of the arrows does not correspond to the distance traveled in the particle’s lifetime.](image)

Within the shower, mesons like pions, kaons as well as light baryons are produced. Most neutral pions decay almost immediately into two gamma rays ($\pi^0 \to \gamma \gamma$, mean lifetime $\tau = 0.84 \times 10^{-16}$ s).
These photons initiate electromagnetic sub-showers through electron-positron pair production. This makes the energy transfer from the hadronic to the electromagnetic component of an air shower very efficient. In fact, about one third of the hadronic energy is transferred to the electromagnetic component at every hadronic interaction length (Gaisser, 1990).

The charged pions and kaons produce a new generation of mesons through interactions with the atmosphere. The multiplication will continue until the energy drops below the critical energy, where the decay of $\pi^\pm$ and $K^\pm$ into muons becomes more likely than their interaction. Thus, pions and kaons of lower energy decay and feed the muonic component of the shower. Nucleons and other high-energy hadrons contribute further to the hadronic component. Since most hadrons re-interact, most of the primary energy is transferred to the electromagnetic component.

Compared to electromagnetic air showers there are some significant differences in the development of hadronic cascades, illustrated on the example of a 100 GeV gamma-ray (left) and a 100 GeV proton shower (right) in Figure 2.3. The general differences can be summarized as follows:

- The secondary particles of hadronic showers receive a high transverse momentum, e.g. by inelastic scattering and decay processes. This leads to a much larger lateral extension compared to electromagnetic showers where the lateral spread is determined by elastic multiple Coulomb scattering for which the mean scattering angle for high-energy photons is very small.

- Hadronic air showers are less regular and have larger fluctuations due to the complex multi-particle processes in their development, compared to the rather compact developments of electromagnetic air showers.

- The nuclear interaction length $\lambda_N$ of hadrons in air is $\lambda_{\text{proton}} \approx 83 \, \text{g/cm}^2$ and $\lambda_{\text{pion}} \approx 107 \, \text{g/cm}^2$. This is larger than the radiation length for Bremsstrahlung $\lambda_{\text{Brems}} \approx 35 \, \text{g/cm}^2$ or the mean free path for pair production $\lambda_{\text{pair}} \approx 35 \, \text{g/cm}^2$. Therefore, hadrons penetrate deeper into the atmosphere than gamma rays or cosmic-ray electrons/positrons.

These differences in the air shower development are used later to discriminate between gamma-ray and hadronic (background) showers.

### 2.1.3. Cherenkov emission of air showers

Most of the charged particles in an air shower emit Cherenkov radiation (Čerenkov, 1937) when they travel through the atmosphere. This light is emitted in a narrow cone around the direction of the particle (see left side of Figure 2.4). The angle $\theta$ between the particle track and the
2.1. Air showers

Figure 2.3.: Air shower simulations initiated by a 100 GeV photon (left) and proton (right). The upper plot shows the longitudinal development (dimension in y-direction 30 km) and the lower part shows the lateral extension (±5 km). Shown are the particle tracks, where red are electrons, positrons and gamma rays, green are muons and blue are hadrons. The first interaction height is fixed to 30 km height. Images taken from Schmidt (2005).
emission direction depends on the velocity $v = \beta c$ of the particle and the velocity of light $c' = c/n$ in the medium (with the refractive index $n$ and the speed of light in vacuum $c$):

$$\cos \theta = \frac{c'}{v} = \frac{1}{\beta n}.$$  \hfill (2.1)

It implies that light emission can only take place if $\beta \geq 1/n$. This leads to a minimum energy of the particle needed to emit Cherenkov light:

$$E_{\text{min}} = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - \beta^2}} = \frac{mc^2}{\sqrt{1 - n^{-2}}}.$$  \hfill (2.2)

The mass dependence of $E_{\text{min}}$ indicates that light particles like electrons dominate the Cherenkov light emission in air showers. Above the energy threshold, the number of Cherenkov photons emitted within a certain wavelength interval $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2]$ can be described by the Frank-Tamm formula (Tamm & Frank, 1937):

$$\frac{dN}{dx} = 2\pi\alpha Z^2 \int_{\lambda_1}^{\lambda_2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n(\lambda)^2\beta^2}\right) \lambda^{-2} d\lambda$$  \hfill (2.3)

where $\beta$ and $Z$ are the velocity and the charge of the charged particle, $\lambda$ the wavelength and $\alpha \simeq 1/137$ the fine structure constant. The amount of light emitted by particles thus depends on the index of refraction in air.

As the density of air, and hence the refractive index, is not constant within the atmosphere, the energy threshold and the Cherenkov angle depend on the atmospheric altitude $h$. Under the assumption of an isothermal atmosphere one can use the barometric formula (Beringer et al., 2012) and obtains

$$n = n(h) = 1 + \eta_0 \cdot e^{-h/h_0}$$  \hfill (2.4)

with $\eta_0 = 2.9 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $h_0 = 7.1 \text{ km}$. Inserting this in Eq. 2.1, gives the dependence of the Cherenkov angle on the height of emission. At high altitudes (where the refractive index is close to unity) the emission angle is small and then grows with increasing density to about $\theta \approx 1.4^\circ$ at sea level. As a result, the light emitted from particles at the different altitudes superimposes at observation level, as illustrated schematically in Figure 2.4 (right).

Most of the Cherenkov light within an air shower is emitted around the shower maximum. Since the number of particles at the shower maximum is proportional to the primary energy of the particle, the energy of the primary gamma ray can be derived by measuring the number of Cherenkov photons on ground. This is illustrated in Figure 2.5 for vertical gamma-ray showers, showing an example of the arrival directions of the Cherenkov photons (left) and the average
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Figure 2.4.: (Left) Emission of Cherenkov radiation (blue) along the particle track of a charged, fast moving particle (red). (Right) The light emitted from each point of the particle track arrives as a ring on the ground. Due to the height-dependence of the Cherenkov angle, the superposition of the light emitted from the different particles at different altitudes leads to the characteristic Cherenkov light profile on ground.

lateral Cherenkov light distribution on ground (right). Up to distances of about 120 m from the shower track the Cherenkov photon density is fairly flat and is usually denoted as the “Cherenkov light pool” of the shower. Beyond the radius of the light pool, the number of photons decreases exponentially. It should be noted that the number density of Cherenkov photons is relatively small, i.e. for an energy of 100 GeV less than 10 photons/m$^2$ reach the ground (at $\sim 1270$ m altitude). To detect these low-energetic showers, the detector size and thus the mirror area of the telescope has to be large in order to detect the few emitted photons.

The differences in the shower development between a hadron-induced and a gamma-ray-induced air shower are reflected in the shape and the time structure of the Cherenkov light distribution at ground. Air showers develop nearly with the speed of light, resulting in very short Cherenkov flashes. Typically, the front of Cherenkov photons produced in an electromagnetic air shower arrives at ground within an interval of 2-5 ns, whereas hadronic showers have a wider time spread (10-15 ns), mainly due to the development of many electromagnetic sub-showers and the larger transverse momentum of hadronic interactions. For the same reason, the lateral distribution of hadronic air showers is much more heterogeneous and asymmetric than from photon-induced cascades. Both the differences (in shape and time structure) can be used in IACTs to discriminate between hadronic cosmic-ray background and gamma-ray events.
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Figure 2.5.: Simulations of the Cherenkov photon density of vertical gamma-ray air showers at an altitude of 1270 m using VERITAS site specific parameters (i.e., magnetic field strength and the winter atmospheric profile). (Left) An example of the number of Cherenkov photons on ground level for a 80 GeV gamma-ray. (Right) Average lateral Cherenkov light distribution in the wavelength range from 200 to 750 nm for vertical gamma-ray showers of different energy (averaged over 100 showers).

2.1.4. Simulation of air showers

The propagation of particles through the atmosphere can be described by analytical and numerical models. While the analytical models predict, in general, the correct average values of the observables, the numerical treatment via Monte Carlo (MC) simulations is essential to correctly account for fluctuations between showers (Hansen et al., 2011).

Throughout this thesis, the air shower simulations are done with CORSIKA (COsmic Ray SImulations for KAscade; Heck et al., 1998). The CORSIKA program allows to simulate interactions and decays of nuclei, hadrons, muons, electrons, and photons up to primary particle energies of some $10^{20}$ eV. The development of air showers is simulated by tracing the single particles through the atmosphere. Environmental properties, such as the atmospheric density (mainly its vertical profile), its chemical composition as well as the geo-magnetic field, are taken into account. The main challenges in simulating the development of air showers initiated by cosmic rays are hadronic interactions, which play a central role. These interactions are still not well understood at very high energies and several reaction models are available within CORSIKA. In this thesis, hadronic interactions are described with UrQMD (at low energies) and QGSJET-II (at high energies). In addition, the shower development is strongly influenced by atmospheric conditions. As the atmosphere serves as target medium for the high-energy cosmic-
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ray particles and as transport medium for the Cherenkov photons, a good knowledge about the local atmosphere is essential for the simulations.

Due to absorption and scattering processes in the atmosphere (Bernlöhr, 2000), not all the Cherenkov light emitted within an air shower reaches the ground. The most important processes are absorption bands of molecules, molecular (Rayleigh) scattering, and scatter on aerosols (Mie scattering). All of these processes are wavelength-dependent. While the Cherenkov photon spectrum shows, in general, a $\lambda^{-2}$-dependency of the number of photons (following Eq. 2.3), the observed photon spectrum on ground is different from the one emitted at a given altitude (see Figure 2.6). The most pronounced feature in the photon spectrum at ground is the peak at UV/blue wavelengths\(^3\). Therefore, photo-detectors which are most sensitive in this part of the spectrum are used in IACTs to efficiently detect the emitted photons. One should also note that these absorption effects depend on the local atmosphere and are usually subject to temporal variations which have to be taken into account in the simulation of air showers.

Figure 2.6: Cherenkov photon spectrum emitted by a vertical gamma-ray shower of different primary energies. Solid lines correspond to all emitted Cherenkov photons within the air shower while dashed lines are after taking absorption processes in the atmosphere into account. Simulations are at 1270 m altitude, taking VERITAS site specific parameters into account.

\(^3\) At wavelengths below $\sim 300$ nm the Cherenkov photons are strongly absorbed due to atmospheric ozone.
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2.2. Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Detectors

Imaging atmospheric Cherenkov detectors use the Earth’s atmosphere as a calorimeter to sample the Cherenkov light from air showers (Galbraith & Jelley, 1953). As the Cherenkov radiation is very faint, detecting the showers, especially in the low energy regime (less than a few TeV), requires large reflectors to gather as much light as possible. It also requires fast responsive cameras as the light flashes are only a few nanoseconds in duration. A major challenge of this indirect detection method is to separate the high-energy gamma rays from the much more numerous cosmic rays, initiating as well particle cascades in the atmosphere. In the following, the detection principle is explained before a brief overview of IACT facilities is given.

2.2.1. Principle

The basic principle of imaging Cherenkov telescopes is illustrated in Figure 2.7. The light emitted in the air shower is reflected onto a camera located in the focal plane of the telescope. The camera itself consists of several hundreds of light-sensitive detectors, usually photomultiplier tubes (PMTs). Due to the typical dimensions of a gamma-ray air shower (longitudinal extension $\sim 10\text{ km}$, transversal extension $\sim 50\text{ m}$ for an energy $E_\gamma \approx 1\text{ TeV}$) the obtained image in the camera has elliptical shape and is used to infer information about the primary particle. The light content of the image is the main estimator of the energy as the number of Cherenkov photons on ground is proportional to the energy of the primary gamma ray. The orientation of the image in the camera is used to determine the direction of the incoming particle.

In the stereoscopic approach, the air shower is detected by two or more telescopes simultaneously (Kohnle et al., 1996). The telescopes are separated by a distance comparable with the radius of the Cherenkov light pool. This allows different viewing angles on the shower. The combination of the images results in a better reconstruction of the shower properties. A system of two or more imaging Cherenkov telescopes has the additional advantage of an increased effective detection area and therefore an enhanced sensitivity (Fegan, 1997).

2.2.2. The background

The major challenge for IACTs is to distinguish between gamma-ray induced air showers and those initiated by other particles (background). Particles, which can mimic gamma-ray showers in the camera are cosmic hadrons (basically protons and helium nuclei), cosmic electrons and muons (Fegan, 1997; Maier & Knapp, 2007).

Hadrons are the most prominent background contribution as they are about one thousand times more numerous then gamma rays. In general, those air showers are longer, wider...
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Figure 2.7.: Detection principle of an air shower using IACTs. By locating an IACT inside the Cherenkov light pool, the light from the shower is mapped onto the pixelated camera in the focal plane of the telescope. The detected light forms an image in the camera (figure inset upper left) which can be parameterized by an ellipse (see Section 3.2.2). When more than one telescope is used, the shower can be viewed stereoscopically and the images from the cameras can be overlaid in the camera coordinate system to reconstruct the shower direction (see Section 3.2.3). Picture adapted from Hinton & Hofmann (2009).

and more irregular then gamma-ray showers (as shown in Section 2.1). Therefore, they can be rejected based on the shape of the Cherenkov image (see Section 3.2.4). However, for low-energetic hadrons statistical fluctuations in the air shower development do effect much more the recorded image and the suppression power based on the shape of the image is reduced. An additional rejection of hadrons is based on their arrival direction. As hadrons are charged particles, they are deflected within the interstellar magnetic fields and thus arrive isotropically on Earth. They can therefore be discriminated easily from a gamma-ray point source (see Section 3.2.5).

Electrons are almost indistinguishable from gamma-ray primaries, as they also initiate an electromagnetic air showers. Their rejection is based on their arrival direction.
Muons which are considered as background for IACTs are high-energetic secondary particles produced within the air shower. Due to the small light pool of an energetic muon, multiple telescope images occur only if telescopes are very close to each other and they can be efficiently rejected based on the stereoscopic approach.

Another source of background is the light from the night sky. A number of different components contribute to this night sky background (NSB) light, e.g. air-glow (light emitted by atoms and molecules in the upper atmosphere - its intensity increases with increasing zenith angle), zodiacal light (sunlight which scattered by interplanetary dust near the ecliptic - it is most prominent shortly after sunset or before sunrise), starlight, and man-made light (depending on the location of the Cherenkov telescope system). Additionally, the scattered light from the Moon or the moonlight itself can also contribute significantly to the NSB. As the typical yield of Cherenkov photons is roughly $100 \text{photons m}^{-2} \text{TeV}^{-1}$, the light of the NSB, with intensities of the order of $10^{12} \text{photons m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1}$, represents a significant limitation for the performance of IACTs. It defines the minimum Cherenkov light yield which can be reliably detected with the telescope, and hence its energy threshold (Preuss et al., 2002). As the Cherenkov light from air showers is only a few nanoseconds long and the background light due to night sky is random in time and space the installation of fast electronics allows to suppress a huge amount of background light to be recorded by the camera.

2.2.3. IACT facilities

While the success of early detectors has been limited by the overwhelming background of cosmic rays, the development of the imaging technique by Whipple (e.g., Weekes et al., 1989; Kildea et al., 2007) has addressed this problem by exploiting the differences in the air shower development seen in the Cherenkov light distribution. Further improvement has been achieved by HEGRA (Daum et al., 1997) with the introduction of stereoscopic observations. Additionally, the deployment of fast read-out electronics combined with finer pixels by CAT (Barrau et al., 1998) improved the resolution of the recorded image and marks another important step towards the current generation of imaging Cherenkov telescope arrays. Pictures of those three facilities are shown in Figure 2.8 and the interested reader is referred to Watson (2011) and Hillas (2013) for a historical review of the detection methods.

Further developments of the detectors and in the discrimination of background lead to the foundation of ground-based gamma-ray astronomy using IACTs. The three major IACT observatories of the current generation are: H.E.S.S. in Namibia (Aharonian et al., 2006), MAGIC on the Canary Islands (Aleksić et al., 2012a), and VERITAS in southern Arizona (see next chapter). They are shown in Figure 2.9 and their key characteristics are given in Table 2.1. They
Figure 2.8.: Pictures of the different telescopes which mark the most important steps towards the current generation of IACTs. (Left) Whipple 10 m telescope. Image credit: VERITAS collaboration (Upper right) CAT. Image credit: CAT collaboration (Lower right) One of the HEGRA telescopes. Image credit: HEGRA collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Lat (°)</th>
<th>Long (°)</th>
<th>Alt (m)</th>
<th>Telescopes</th>
<th>Mirror Area (m²)</th>
<th>Pixels</th>
<th>FoV (°)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whipple</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-111</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEGRA</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E.S.S.</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.E.S.S. II</td>
<td>-23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>2048</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAGIC</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>1039</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERITAS</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-111</td>
<td>1275</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1.: Basic characteristics and properties of three historical and the major three currently operational IACTs. H.E.S.S. II denotes the fifth telescope in the middle of the H.E.S.S. array. Table adapted from Acharya et al. (2013).
all employ stereoscopic observations combined with large mirror areas. They consist of 2 – 5 Cherenkov telescopes, separated by distances of the same order as the Cherenkov light pool. This provides a large effective area of about $10^5 \text{m}^2$ and the recording of simultaneous images of the air shower can be used to pinpoint the location of the source with high accuracy. All three experiments also use fast electronics and their cameras consist of several hundred PMTs. The size of the PMTs is matched to the size of the air shower in the atmosphere to allow for efficient background suppression due to the image shape. The improvements in background rejection compared to the predecessor instruments, boosted the sensitivity to very high-energy gamma-ray sources over a wide range of energies. The current instruments reach sensitivities of about 1% of the Crab Nebula flux for observing times of about 25 hours (Acharya et al., 2013).

Figure 2.9.: Pictures of the different IACTs of the current generation. (Left) One of the four VERITAS telescopes, for a picture of the full array see Figure 3.1. (Upper right) H.E.S.S. array consisting of five Cherenkov telescopes. Image credit: H.E.S.S. collaboration (Lower right) The two MAGIC telescopes. Image credit: MAGIC collaboration

---

4 The Crab Nebula is the brightest steady source in VHE gamma rays which is usually used as a reference flux in VHE astronomy. Its flux at 1 TeV is $\approx 2 \times 10^{-11} \text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ (Hillas et al., 1998).
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The Very Energetic Radiation Imaging Telescope Array System (VERITAS) is a ground-based gamma-ray observatory consisting of four imaging Cherenkov telescopes; probing the high-energy Universe with photon energies of $\sim 85$ GeV to about 30 TeV. Details about the VERITAS array characteristics and its observations of the gamma-ray sky are given in Section 3.1. The reconstruction of the data is described in Section 3.2 in which also the Monte Carlo (MC) simulation chain is introduced. These MC simulations are not only used for the analysis, but also to estimate the performance of the instrument. One of these performance estimates has been carried out by the author and is presented in Section 3.3. It is dedicated to the study of improvements at lowest energies, expected from the VERITAS upgrade in summer 2012.

3.1. The VERITAS array

VERITAS is operating at the Fred Lawrence Whipple Observatory in southern Arizona, USA ($+31^\circ 
40' 30.21'', -110^\circ 57' 7.77''$), at an altitude of about 1270 m above sea level (Holder et al., 2011). VERITAS started as a single telescope in early 2005 and was completed as an array of four IACTs in 2007. The sensitivity of VERITAS has steadily increased since the array was commissioned in summer 2007 through improvements in the analysis as well as implementations of new hardware. The first major improvement happened in summer 2009 with the relocation of one of the four telescopes. This made the overall array layout more symmetric, as shown in Figure 3.1, and resulted in an increase of sensitivity of about 30%. This reduced the observation time needed to detect a 1% Crab Nebula-like source with 5 standard deviations ($5\sigma$) from 48 hours to less than 30 hours (Perkins et al., 2009). The second major upgrade happened in summer 2012 when the PMTs in all four cameras were replaced by high-quantum-efficiency devices. As all data presented in this thesis was taken before summer 2012, the description of the VERITAS instrument in the following concentrates on the 4-telescope array before the camera upgrade and covers hardware, calibrations, and observations.
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3.1.1. The telescopes

The primary components of each of the four VERITAS telescopes are a reflector of 12 m diameter, a camera, a trigger system, and a data acquisition system. They are described in the following.

Telescope mechanics and tracking

The basic mechanical structure of each VERITAS telescope consists of an altitude-over-azimuth positioner and a tubular steel optical support structure (OSS). The camera is mounted on a quadrupod and a mechanical bypass of the upper quadrupod arm transfers the camera load directly to counter-weight supports located at the rear of the OSS (Holder et al., 2006).

The maximum slew speed of the telescopes during normal operations is one degree per second. The positioner encoder measurements are logged to a database at a rate of 4 Hz. These values are used to monitor any pointing discrepancies of the telescopes. The mechanical pointing accuracy of a VERITAS telescope is typically better than $\pm 0.01^\circ$ (Holder et al., 2006).
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Telescope optics

The optics of each VERITAS telescope follows the Davies-Cotton design (Davies & Cotton, 1957) and has a 12 m diameter reflector and a 12 m focal length. The total reflector area is about 110 m$^2$ and consists of 350 identical hexagonal spherical mirror facets. The mirror reflectivity is 85% over the Cherenkov light wavelength regime (between 280 nm and 450 nm) with reflectivities typically $\geq 90\%$ at 320 nm (see Figure 3.2). In order to maintain the high mirror reflectivity, mirrors are continuously re-coated (Roache et al., 2007).

The individual mirror facets are manually aligned so that the entire reflector will act as a single dish with a relatively small point spread function (PSF). The PSF describes the response of an imaging system to a point source of light at infinity and the 80% containment radius of the optical PSF of VERITAS is less than $\sim 0.05^\circ$ at operational elevations (McCann et al., 2010).

![Figure 3.2.: (Left) A close-up view of the hexagonal VERITAS mirror facets. The three adjustment points which are used in aligning each facet can be easily seen. Image taken from Holder et al. (2006). (Right) Reflectivity measurements of the VERITAS telescope mirrors as a function of wavelength. The design specified reflectivities of 90% at 320 nm and $>85\%$ between 280 nm and 450 nm. Taken from Roache et al. (2007).](image)

Camera and electronics

Each camera is located in the focus of the reflector and consists of 499 PMTs as shown in Figure 3.3. The PMTs (Photonis model XP2970/02) are UV-sensitive with a fast rise-time (1.9 ns) and a quantum efficiency of $\sim 20\%$ at 320 nm. In front of each PMT is a light concentrator which reduces dead space between the PMTs and focusses the light on the center of the PMT photo-cathode. The angular pixel spacing is $0.15^\circ$ and results in a total field-of-view (FoV) of $3.5^\circ$.
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The PMT high voltage is provided by a multi-channel power supply which allows each PMT to be controlled individually. The PMTs are typically operated at a voltage of $700 - 800$ V which yields a nominal gain of $\sim 2 \times 10^5$. A high-bandwidth pre-amplifier is integrated into the base of the PMTs to provide an extra gain of 6.6 to the PMT signals. The pre-amplifier also provides a direct DC output for anode-current monitoring purposes (Nagai et al., 2007). It enables the detection of long-term changes in tube performance and is especially important during moonlight observations, when too high currents could result in a damage of the camera.

Signals from the pre-amplifier are transmitted to the trigger electronics and data acquisition system as it is schematically illustrated in Figure 3.4.

**Trigger system**

The VERITAS trigger system is designed to distinguish light coming from potentially gamma-ray initiated air showers from NSB as well as local muons. The trigger consists of three hierarchical conditions and is explained in detail in Weinstein et al. (2007).

The first trigger works on the single-pixel level (L1) and is a programmable constant fraction discriminator (CFD). It produces a 10 ns logic output pulse if the sum of the voltages from the PMT pulse and a time-delayed copy crosses a set threshold. Additionally, the VERITAS CFD design has a rate feedback (RFB) circuit that reduces timing jitter and stabilizes the CFD trigger rate in the presence of changing NSB levels (Hall et al., 2003).

After the CFD triggered, the logic pulse is sent as input to the camera-level trigger (L2). The L2 triggers an output pulse when several (typically three) adjacent pixels surpass the L1
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discriminator threshold within a coincidence time window of about 6 ns. This camera-pattern trigger successfully rejects fluctuations due to NSB and PMT afterpulsing, and preferentially selects compact images from air showers.

A positive L2 trigger decision is sent to the array-level trigger (L3). The main purpose of the L3 is to reject local muons by requiring a trigger on multiple telescopes in the array. It requires typically two or more telescopes within 50 ns and ensures a stereoscopic view of the event. Since muons dominate the low energy background, a reduction of triggers due to muons enables a further reduction of the CFD threshold. Thus, it lowers the energy threshold of the telescope array at trigger level. When an L3 trigger occurs, a logic signal is sent back to all four telescopes which initiates the readout of the buffer by the DAQ system (see Figure 3.4). During this time no new trigger can be accepted; introducing a dead time to the system which is about 10% for an L3 trigger rate of 250 Hz.

![Diagram of the VERITAS trigger and DAQ system](image)

**Figure 3.4.:** Schematic view of the VERITAS trigger and DAQ system. Analog signals are sent from the camera PMTs to the three-level trigger system (upper part). A second copy of these analog signals is fed to the data acquisition system (lower part), where it is digitized and buffered until the readout is initiated by the L3 system and the events are assembled. The data is finally written to a database and archived. A description of each component is given in the text.

To estimate the settings for the best trigger conditions (i.e. low energy threshold, low NSB contribution, and stable rates), so-called “bias-curves” are taken (see Figure 3.5). Therefore, the trigger rates of each camera (L2) and the array trigger (L3) are recorded by the system in dependence of the L1 discriminator threshold. The optimal CFD trigger threshold is just above the inflection point; the point where the steeply falling NSB accidental rate and the relatively flat rate due to cosmic-ray background cross each other. For dark sky conditions, the CFD thresholds for each pixel are set to $45 - 50$ mV, corresponding to approximately $4 - 5$ photoelectrons.
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![Bias Curve for run 58680](image)

Figure 3.5.: Bias curve taken under dark sky conditions. Shown are the trigger rates in dependence of the CFD threshold. The black crosses are the L3 trigger rate and the colors represent the different L2 telescope rates (T1: red, T2: green, T3: blue, T4: magenta). One can clearly see the steeply falling NSB rate at very low thresholds and the nearly constant rate due to cosmic rays above 50 mV.

**Data acquisition system**

The core of the DAQ system (Hays et al., 2007, see Figure 3.4) is a 500 Mega-sample per second flash analog-to-digital converter (FADC\(^1\)). These FADCs digitize continuously the analog PMT signal (Rebillot et al., 2003). A ring buffer holds the digitized information with a memory depth of 32 µs while awaiting an L3 trigger signal. When the L3 trigger signal is received, the DAQ system reads out a section of this buffer (typically 32 to 48 ns) for each PMT signal. By default, the signal traces follow the high-gain path to the FADC. If the signal saturates the 8-bit range of the FADC, an analog switch connects the FADC chip to a delayed low-gain path instead, thus extending the dynamic range from 256 to 1500 digital counts (dc).

The digitized signals from the FADC boards are then sent to a telescope-level event-building computer, where complete events are integrated, tested and passed to a data harvester machine. The harvester machine combines the telescope-level event information with array-level information from the L3 (e.g. event numbers and timing information) into a custom VERITAS data format and stores them on disk for later offline analysis.

\(^1\) The benefit of FADCs over simple charge integrating ADCs is the possible application of digital signal processing techniques. They allow, for example, to dynamically place and minimize the charge integration window during the analysis, thus improving the signal-to-noise per PMT and lowering the effective energy threshold (Cogan et al., 2007).
As the events are being assembled, the observing conditions, such as the trigger settings and high-voltage values, are continuously recorded in a database. The database also records any changes in settings by observers and acquisition information for a given run including run types, source names or positions, selected trigger types and diagnostic information such as weather and PMT currents. The database is later queried for relevant details by the offline data analysis.

3.1.2. Calibrations

In order to understand the signal size and energy scale, calibrations (absolute and relative) are performed regularly. The absolute calibrations are used as input for the detector simulations to properly address the overall photon conversion factor while the relative calibrations measure the channel-to-channel variations which are applied later in the data analysis.

The overall photon conversion factor of a telescope is a combination of mirror reflectivity, collection and quantum efficiency of the PMT cathode, and the conversion factor of the electronic chain. The mirror reflectivity and the PMT photo cathode characteristics can be determined from laboratory measurements. The conversion factor of the electronic chain is measured in situ with an LED flasher system, providing a uniform and simultaneous illumination of the camera. It is used to determine the absolute gains in the camera by directly measuring the position of the single photo-electron peak in the pulse-size spectrum as described in Hanna et al. (2010).

To measure channel-to-channel variations, a short (5-minute) flasher run is taken each night to determine time differences and relative gains across the camera. The time differences between channels arise mainly from cable lengths and electronic delays. A typical distribution of the time offsets, relative to the arrival time of the flasher pulse in the whole camera, is shown in Figure 3.6 (left). This correction is applied to each channel during the data analysis. The relative gain calibration accounts for inhomogeneities in the amount of charge produced in each channel. It depends on the response of the light concentrator, the quantum efficiency of the photo cathode and the gain through the photomultiplier stages of each PMT. An example of the relative gain variations is shown in Figure 3.6 (right). These corrections are applied in the data analysis (see Section 3.2.2) in order to obtain a uniform camera response. In case that the RMS of the relative gain distributions is larger than $\sim 10\%$, the cameras are “flat-fielded”. During this procedure, the high voltages of the PMTs are adjusted to equalize the PMT response to a uniform light source, resulting in a narrower spread in relative gain.

Auxiliary data

In addition to the camera calibrations the quality of the sky, i.e. the atmospheric conditions and the night-sky brightness, is continuously monitored and logged into the database. In this way,
3. The Very Energetic Radiation Imaging Telescope Array System (VERITAS)

Figure 3.6.: Distributions of time offset (left) and relative gains (right) in the cameras as obtained for flasher run 56002 (Telescope 4). They are used in the analysis to correct for the inhomogeneities in the camera.

The operating conditions can later be retrieved to assist a correct interpretation of the data.

To quantify the quality of the atmosphere, the temperature of the sky is monitored using infrared pyrometers. As water vapor and droplets act as infrared emitters, a rise in sky temperature in the FoV of the pyrometers indicates the presence of clouds or haze. The pyrometers values are logged every 10 seconds to the VERITAS database and are used in the analysis to perform a run quality selection.

The brightness of the night sky is highly variable and depends on the observing conditions, such as the observed FoV or the presence of the Moon. To determine the pixel’s response to the current NSB condition, the L3 system artificially triggers the readout at a rate of 1 Hz during normal data taking. These events, so-called pedestal events, are used in the analysis to provide a baseline measurement of the pixel behavior in the absence of Cherenkov light and to diagnose and remove problematic pixels.

3.1.3. Observations

VERITAS observations are usually carried out during clear, dark nights. This leads to a typical observation time per year of about 750 hours\(^2\). Most of the observations are taken in “wobble mode” where the source position is offset by 0.5° from the camera center to allow for simultaneous background measurements (Fomin et al., 1994). A typical run duration is about 20-30 minutes after which the wobble position is changed to another cardinal direction, or the telescopes are pointed to another source.

\(^2\) It should be noted that VERITAS cannot observe in the summer months of July and August due to local monsoon. The instrument is shut down during this time to avoid damage to hardware and electronics.
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Figure 3.7.: Average currents (in $\mu A$) in the VERITAS cameras in dependence of the Moon phase (= Moon illumination) and the Moon elevation. Courtesy of Jeffrey Power.

To increase the duty cycle of VERITAS, observations are routinely carried out when the Moon is above the horizon. This increases the observation time by about 25% compared to dark nights only. The major restrictions for observations under moonlight are the influence of the increased NSB and a possible damage of the PMTs due to high currents. The NSB flux under moonlight conditions is highly variable and depends on the angle between the Moon and the telescope pointing direction as well as on the Moon phase and its elevation. This is illustrated in Figure 3.7 which shows the average currents in the cameras as a function of the Moon elevation and the Moon phase. For low Moon phases nearly no increase in the average currents is visible when the Moon is above the horizon. As the Moon gets more illuminated, the average currents rise and depend more and more on the elevation of the Moon itself. At some point, the currents are too high to safely operate the instrument and no observations are possible anymore. Depending on the average currents in the cameras different operation modes are defined within VERITAS, ranging from dark sky observations to a full moon break as described in Table 3.1.

Observation & scientific plans

The VERITAS Time Allocation Committee (TAC) is in charge of organizing the observation plan. This committee, consisting of representatives elected from the collaboration on a yearly basis, collects and ranks the submitted observing proposals. It also carries out the scheduling
### Table 3.1.: VERITAS observation modes defined by the average currents in the cameras. The upper two are the standard observation modes and no differentiation in their hardware settings (i.e. their trigger settings) is made between them. The bright and very bright moonlight modes were introduced in 2012 and their performance evaluation is still ongoing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Settings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dark sky</td>
<td>Sun and Moon are below the horizon. The average currents in the camera depend on observations of extragalactic or brighter galactic sky patches and are around 4−7µA, respectively.</td>
<td>50 mV CFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low moonlight</td>
<td>Typically up to a Moon phase of 35%; similar to dark-sky operations with average camera currents ≤ 10µA.</td>
<td>50 mV CFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Moon</td>
<td>Rising or setting bright Moon (phase ≥ 35%); operations with increased CFD trigger threshold to reduce NSB accidental rate; average currents in the camera are 10−15µA.</td>
<td>60 mV CFD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Moon</td>
<td>Moon phase approx. 35 − 65%; the high voltage (HV) is reduced resulting in reduced gains and lower camera currents.</td>
<td>85% HV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bright Moon</td>
<td>Moon phase is ≥ 65%; operations with reduced HV are not feasible anymore; special bandpass filter are employed which let only the UV light pass.</td>
<td>UV filter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Moon</td>
<td>No observations, typically 4 nights around full Moon.</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the overall observing program, taking into account the long-term Science Plan of VERITAS. This science plan is dedicated to the study of the physical processes responsible for gamma-ray emission in a large variety of sources and astrophysical environments. It is based on four major themes of scientific exploration (Galante et al., 2012):

1. **Particle Physics and Fundamental Physics Laws** including the following questions: What is the nature of dark matter? How is the distribution of dark matter in the Galactic halo? What are the constraints on physical laws at energies well beyond the reach of terrestrial accelerators (Lorentz invariance violation)? Search for primordial black holes and search for axion-like particles.

2. **Cosmology** with emphasize on constraining the epoch of re-ionization and the history of star and galaxy formation through gamma-ray opacity measurements as well as the study of cosmic rays in star-burst galaxies and ultra-luminous infrared galaxies.

3. **Black Holes** at the center of active galaxies are believed to power relativistic jets through
accretion of matter. How accretion and particle acceleration in active galactic nuclei (AGNs) works and if AGNs accelerate ultra-high-energy particles are among the still open questions around black holes.

4. Galactic Tevatrons and Pevatrons are studied to possibly identify the sources of cosmic rays in the Galaxy. They can be used to understand the mechanisms of particle acceleration (maybe up to PeV energies) and to obtain constraints on their magnetic fields.

In order to explore this wide range of science topics and open questions, many different objects are observed by VERITAS. Those include specifically (1) possible dark matter targets like spheroidal dwarf galaxies and the Galactic center; (2) gamma-ray bursts, galaxy clusters, and distant AGNs; (3) AGNs like blazars and radio galaxies; and (4) galactic sources like pulsars, pulsar wind nebulae, supernova remnants and binary systems. Most of these source classes have already been detected by VERITAS and show a large variety of photon fluxes and spectral behavior. A brief overview of VHE observations of AGNs, i.e. blazars, will be given in Section 5.1.2. The reader is referred to Holder et al. (2011) for a review of the scientific highlights of VERITAS.

3.2. VERITAS data analysis

The data analysis is based on Monte Carlo (MC) simulations which are essential in order to understand the measured signals and to reconstruct the properties of the primary particle from the detected Cherenkov light. The software package used within this thesis is eventdisplay. It was originally designed as display for the VERITAS prototype data by Gernot Maier (DESY) and Jamie Holder (University of Delaware), but evolved into a full analysis package.

In the following the VERITAS analysis chain is explained. It starts with an overview of the MC simulations used (Section 3.2.1) before the reconstruction is outlined. The reconstruction starts with the trace analysis and parameterization of the image in each camera (Section 3.2.2). The information from those camera images are combined to reconstruct the direction and energy of the event (Section 3.2.3). Afterwards, a gamma-hadron separation is performed (Section 3.2.4) and the signal is extracted (Section 3.2.5). Once the gamma-ray signal is obtained, the determination of the instrument response functions from MC simulations (Section 3.2.6) allows us to convert the count rate into a flux measurement of the astronomical object and to derive an energy spectrum and a light curve (Section 3.2.7).
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3.2.1. Monte Carlo simulations

The MC simulations consist of two parts: the air shower development in the atmosphere including the emission of Cherenkov light and the detector response on these Cherenkov photons. The shower development is simulated with the CORSIKA program (version 6.960; Heck et al., 1998). For the Cherenkov light emission the IACT option is used (Bernlöhr, 2008b), in which the detectors are defined as fiducial spheres around a detector position. Any Cherenkov light intersecting these spheres is recorded. The VERITAS site specific parameters, like altitude, geomagnetic field and telescope positions, are used together with two different atmospheric profiles, corresponding to summer and winter atmospheres\(^3\). Corrections for atmospheric extinction are applied to the Cherenkov photons after the shower simulation. The systematic uncertainty due to the variations of the local atmosphere is estimated to $\sim 15\%$.

The number of recorded Cherenkov photons depends on the primary particle’s energy, the angle of the incoming particle, the distance of the telescope to the impact point of the incident particle, as well as on the geomagnetic field. For this reason, the shower simulations used here cover several steps in zenith angle (from $0^\circ$ to $65^\circ$), which can be observed with the VERITAS telescopes. The full range of azimuth angles ($0^\circ$ – $360^\circ$) is simulated due to the rather strong geomagnetic field at the VERITAS site which causes deflection of the particles within the air shower. Showers are simulated up to a radius of 750 m from the array center. Primary particles are gamma rays in the energy range from 30 GeV to 200 TeV, following an $E^{-2}$ spectrum. During the analysis, the MC events are weighted to account for the difference between the simulated spectral shape and that of the potential source.

The detector simulation is done with the GrISU package\(^4\) and is two-fold: the propagation of Cherenkov photons through the optical system and the response of the camera and electronics. The geometrical properties of the telescope are fully implemented, taking into account the mirror reflectivity, their surface roughness and random scatter in their alignment. Shadowing effects from the telescope structure are as well accounted for during the ray-tracing. In a second step, the electronics and readout are simulated. Cherenkov photons hitting a PMT produce a single photo-electron pulse which is digitized into 2 ns samples with a trace length reflecting the FADC properties. Noise arising from NSB photons is simulated seperately for different NSB conditions and is added to the trace during the analysis. The trigger simulation uses a simplified model of the CFD as the first stage and a full realization of the pattern trigger; requiring three adjacent pixels above threshold within 6 ns. The trigger threshold generally used is 50 mV; corresponding to about 4 – 5 photo-electrons. It should be noted, that this simplified

---

\(^3\) The two atmospheric profiles are models based on daily radiosonde measurements. See Appendix B.1 for a brief discussion on the transition between these two atmospheres.

\(^4\) [http://www.physics.utah.edu/gammaray/GrISU/](http://www.physics.utah.edu/gammaray/GrISU/)
trigger model shows good agreement between data and simulations above the energy threshold. However, at lowest energies the trigger due to NSB photons have a significant contribution and need to be taken into account. This is realized with a new simulation package (CARE\textsuperscript{5}) which is used for the performance studies of the PMT upgrade. The output of the telescope simulation, i.e. the FADC traces for all PMTs, are written to disk in the VERITAS specific raw data format. The input to the detector simulations are hardware specific parameters like the positions of the mirror facets and the PMTs as well as the absolute gain measurements, the pulse shape of a single photo-electron, and the quantum and collection efficiencies of the PMTs. A systematic uncertainty from the detector simulation is estimated to be $\sim 15\%$. The major uncertainties arise from the determination of the quantum efficiency and the mirror reflectivity; both time dependent and subject to differences between single devices.

Once the simulations are done, they are analyzed in the same way as the real data and are used to validate the different reconstruction steps as well as to obtain the instrument response functions needed for the flux determination. The overall systematic uncertainty on the flux is estimated to be $\sim 20\%$. This takes as well $\sim 5\%$ systematics into account which arise from the analysis (e.g., from the influence of dead pixels and differences between different analysis packages).

3.2.2. Image parameterization

In the first step of the analysis, the charge in each pixel is determined by a trace analysis, an image cleaning is performed to reduce the noise contribution and the remaining image is parameterized.

Trace analysis

Two typical FADC traces, as recorded by the VERITAS cameras, are shown in Figure 3.8. The left part of the figure corresponds to a signal from Cherenkov photons. It shows the typical pulse shape of a PMT and is characterized by a fast rise to a maximum value (recorded as negative values in digital counts) and a slightly slower decay back to a baseline value, so-called pedestal. The arrival time $T_0$ is defined as the time where the trace rises to half its maximum value. It is corrected for relative time differences in the camera (see Section 3.1.2). The right part of Figure 3.8 shows the absence of Cherenkov light in the PMT, fluctuating around the pedestal value. The pedestal is an artificial negative offset which is added to the analog PMT signal while the fluctuations arise mainly from NSB photons and electronic noise. To determine the pedestal

\textsuperscript{5} CARE (CAmera and REadout) is a simulation package developed by Nepomuk Otte; 
git clone http://www.gtlib.gatech.edu/pub/IACT/CARE.git.
value, the externally triggered pedestal events (see Section 3.1.2) are analyzed by summing up the digital counts in each pixel. The mean of this charge distribution is the pedestal and is approximately 16 digital counts (dc). The charge in each pixel is finally determined by summing up the signal of each FADC trace within a given time window, subtracting its pedestal value and applying the relative gain corrections (Section 3.1.2).

Figure 3.8.: Two typical FADC traces with a sampling rate of 500 Mega-samples per second (i.e. 2 ns). (Left) Temporal pulse profile in response to Cherenkov photons hitting the PMT. (Right) The FADC trace in the absence of Cherenkov photons shows only fluctuations around the pedestal value (note the different ranges on the y-axes). The horizontal lines represent the pedestal value while the vertical dashed lines indicate the arrival time $T_0$. The grey shadow indicates the summation window used in the analysis for the charge extraction.

To minimize the contribution from NSB photons\textsuperscript{6} which are continuously recorded and digitized, a short summation window, covering the pulse from the Cherenkov light only, is used. This is typically done in two stages, so-called double-pass method (Holder et al., 2005). In the first stage, a wide integration window (typically 18 samples) is applied to each FADC trace and is used to calculate the charge and the arrival times. The resulting images are then cleaned and parameterized (as described in the next sections). In a second stage, a smaller integration window (typically 7 or 12 samples) is positioned upon every trace in the camera. To determine the optimal position of the short integration window, the temporal development of the air shower has to be taken into account. Therefore, the arrival times as a function of the PMT position

\textsuperscript{6} For dark-sky observations of a Crab Nebula-like FoV, approximately 0.13 photo-electrons/ns from the NSB are recorded. This number can increase dramatically when the Moon is above the horizon.
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along the major axis (determined from the first-stage image parameterization) are fitted by a straight line. The slope of this fit is the *time gradient* and its value is used to define the start position of the integration window in the second stage. This method allows to use short integration windows with optimal signal-to-noise ratios for small pulses and at the same time prevents signal losses due to significant time gradients in large, far distant showers.

**Image cleaning**

After the charge in each pixel is determined, an image cleaning is performed. It removes random background fluctuations from the compact shower image by applying tail cuts. These tail cuts can be either fixed or are based on the signal-to-noise ratio in each pixel\(^7\). The main motivation to use variable tail cuts is that the NSB conditions during a typical observation run can change, especially when operating under moonlight conditions. Therefore, every pedestal event within a given time slice (typically three minutes) is selected and the RMS of the pedestal distribution (its *pedvar*) is determined. This *pedvar* is proportional to the NSB (noise) level as the pedestal events characterize the pixel behavior in the absence of Cherenkov light signals.

To determine whether a given pixel belongs to the shower image is done in two stages. In the first stage, each pixel with a charge greater than 5 times its *pedvar* is selected and forms an *image pixel*. In a second stage, a lower cut value of 2.5 times the *pedvar* is used with the condition that at least one of the neighboring pixels is already identified as an image pixel. If this cut is passed, the pixel belongs to the shower image and forms a *border pixel*. In case, an image pixel does not have any neighbor pixel surviving the cleaning procedure, it is removed as well. The remaining image and border pixels then define the image of the Cherenkov shower.

**Hillas parameterization**

Once the shower images have been calibrated and cleaned, each image is parameterized. The parameterization is based on the so-called Hillas parameters (Hillas, 1985). They are derived by the zeroth order (amplitude or size), first order (center of gravity) and second order (length, width, orientation) moments of the elliptical image of the shower and are listed in Table 3.2. These parameters describe the shape and the orientation of the image in the camera and are calculated using the formulas given in Fegan (1997).

As images at the edge of the cameras are difficult to reconstruct with this method, they are usually excluded from the analysis by cuts on the distance between the camera center and the image centroid or the *loss* parameter (the fraction of image size contained in edge pixels).

---

\(^7\) In VERITAS, the signal-to-noise ratio is used while for the CTA analysis (see Section 4.3.2) fixed cleaning thresholds are applied.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Short description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>size</td>
<td>Total intensity of the image = sum of the integrated charge of all pixels (relates to the energy of the primary particle).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>The rms spread of charge deposit along the minor axis of the image (relates to the projected lateral development of the cascade).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>length</td>
<td>The rms spread of charge deposit along the major axis of the image (relates to the projected longitudinal development of the cascade).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centroid</td>
<td>Coordinates of the center of gravity of the image in the camera ($\theta_x, \theta_y$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance</td>
<td>The distance from the centroid of the image to the center of the field of view of the camera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fui</td>
<td>The fraction of image size under the image ellipse. (can be used to remove less compact images)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loss</td>
<td>The fraction of image size contained in edge pixels. (can be used to remove strongly truncated images at the camera edge)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2.: Image parameters describing the shape and the orientation of the image in the camera.

These quality cuts result in improved energy and angular resolution at the expense of less reconstructed gamma-ray events at multi-TeV energies. To recover those truncated images at the edge of the camera, a simple log-likelihood fitting algorithm is applied (Maier, 2010). The underlying assumption of the fitting method is that the image of a gamma-ray shower can be described by a two-dimensional normal distribution. Asymmetry is ignored to limit the number of fit parameters which are image centroid position, image width, image length and image size. Noise is estimated by assuming Poisson fluctuations. The starting values for the fit parameters are obtained from the standard image analysis. The following expression is minimized using the MIGRAD method of MINUIT (James, 1998):

$$L = -\sum(n_i \ln S_i - S_i - n_i \ln n_i + n_i)$$

(3.1)

where $n_i$ is the measured integrated charge for pixel $i$, and $S_i$ is the estimated charge from the fit function. In general, this log-likelihood reconstruction method works well for loss values smaller than 50%. It results in an increase of effective area at high energies compared to the standard analysis.
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3.2.3. Event reconstruction

Image quality cuts

Before the event is reconstructed, quality cuts are applied to the parameterized images. These include a minimum number of image/border pixels \( N > 4 \), a minimum image size \( \text{size} > 400 \text{ dc} \) and a maximum loss value \( \text{loss} < 0.5 \). Furthermore, a minimum number of three telescope images is required.

Geometrical reconstruction

The reconstruction of the direction of the event is based on the stereoscopic approach and follows in principal algorithm 1 in Hofmann et al. (1999). The direction of the shower is obtained by superimposing the camera images into a single camera plane coordinate system, as illustrated in the left part of Figure 3.9. As the major axis of the camera image represents the shower axis, the intersection point of the major axes corresponds to the shower direction in camera coordinates. It is determined from a weighted average of the intersection of all pairs of major axes. The weights include the sine of the angle between two axes, the size of the images, and the ratio of width-over-length from each image. In this way more weight is given to high quality (i.e. brighter and more elongated) image pairs.

Then the shower core, needed for the energy reconstruction and the gamma-hadron separation, is reconstructed. This parameter is defined in the plane perpendicular to the arrival direction of the shower (the shower plane) and corresponds to the position where the incoming gamma ray would have hit the ground. For each camera, the axis passing through the center of gravity of the image and the reconstructed source position is projected into the shower plane, as illustrated in Figure 3.9 (right). The intersection point between the different image axes is determined and the shower core position is then given by the weighted average of the intersection of all pairs. The distance from the shower core to a given telescope position within the shower plane coordinate system is the so-called impact parameter. As far distant showers tend to produce parallel images, the angular resolution\(^8\) worsens as a function of impact parameter. To avoid this problem, a cut on the shower core position of 250 m from the array center is applied.

In addition to the direction and shower core, the emission height of the shower can be calculated (Aharonian et al., 1997). The emission height refers to the point in the development of the air shower which contains the maximum number of Cherenkov emitting particles. This parameter is pair-wise calculated and the final value is the mean of all telescope pairs weighted by the corresponding image size. Additionally, the \( \chi^2 \)-value is determined. Both parameters can

\(^8\) The angular resolution is defined as the angular distance from a point-like source position within which 68% of the reconstructed gamma-ray events are contained.
be used as background discriminant since hadronic showers and single muons penetrate deeper into the atmosphere than gamma-ray initiated showers.

**Energy reconstruction**

The energy reconstruction exploits the fact that the energy of a gamma-ray initiated air shower is proportional to the number of Cherenkov photons within the air shower. The energy is therefore related to the total charge contained in the image (size) and depends on the observing conditions, i.e. the shower direction (zenith, azimuth, wobble offset), the impact parameter, and the NSB level. To cover this wide parameter space, the energy estimation is based on gamma-ray MC simulations using so-called lookup tables. These lookup tables are filled with the median and the 90%-width ($\sigma$) values of the logarithm of the image size as a function of the primary gamma-ray energy and the impact parameter. An example of both for a fixed shower direction and NSB level is shown in Figure 3.10.

For each telescope image, an energy estimate $E_i$ is derived by inverting the lookup table of the
median, weighted by $1/\sigma_i^2$. As the simulations are done in finite steps of zenith angle, wobble offset and NSB level, the estimated values are obtained by interpolating between the results from the different tables. The energy of the event $E_{\text{event}}$ is finally determined by averaging the energy estimates from all $N$ telescopes, weighted by one over the square of the 90%-width value:

$$E_{\text{event}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} E_i/\sigma_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} 1/\sigma_i^2}$$ (3.2)

Additionally, the $\chi^2$-value of the energy estimation is derived

$$\chi^2(E_{\text{event}}) = \frac{1}{N - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left( \frac{E_{\text{event}} - E_i}{\sigma_i^2} \right)$$ (3.3)

which can later be used in the gamma-hadron separation. It exploits the fact that the energy estimates from the individual images differ much more for the irregular hadronic showers than for the regular, compact gamma-ray images.

Figure 3.10.: Lookup table for the median (left) and the sigma value (right) used for the energy estimation of the reconstructed event. Both tables are shown for 20° zenith angle, a noise level corresponding to observations of a Crab Nebula-like FoV, and a wobble offset of 0.5°. The number of filled bins at low energies is limited by the requirement of the minimum number of pixels per image and at high energies by MC statistics and the finite size of the camera. At large impact distances, the decreasing Cherenkov photon density is the limiting factor for the detection of the shower and hence the filling of the lookup table with MC events.
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3.2.4. Gamma-hadron separation

Once the event is reconstructed, the challenge is to separate the gamma-ray primary from the much more numerous background events (see Section 2.2.2). This is done by cuts on the image shape and arrival direction of the events\(^9\).

**Shape cuts**

The shape of the image is parameterized with the width and length parameters. As both parameters depend on the energy of the primary particle, the shower direction (and impact parameter) and the NSB level, lookup tables based on gamma-ray MC simulations are used. The lookup tables contain the median and the 90%-width values of the expected image width \((w_{\text{MC}}, \sigma_{\text{width,MC}})\) or length \((l_{\text{MC}}, \sigma_{\text{length,MC}})\) as a function of impact parameter \(R\) and the image size \(s\). From these lookup tables, the mean-scaled width is derived as

\[
MSCW = \frac{1}{N_{\text{images}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{images}}} \left( \frac{\text{width}_i - w_{\text{MC}}(R, s)}{\sigma_{\text{width,MC}}(R, s)} \right)
\]

and similar for the mean-scaled length. By this definition, the mean-scaled parameters for gamma-ray showers are centered on zero and are normal distributed. As hadronic showers are less compact and more irregular, their images are longer and most notably wider than gamma-ray showers. Hence, the \(MSCW\) and \(MSCL\) distributions of the primaries are different, as shown in Figure 3.11. The cut values to discriminate background from signal events have been determined \textit{a priori} by optimizing the sensitivity to detect a source with 5% of the flux of the Crab Nebula. They are listed in Table 3.3.

3.2.5. Signal extraction

To remove the isotropic cosmic-ray background, a cut on the arrival direction \(\theta\), defined as the angle on the sky between the assumed source position and the reconstructed shower direction, is applied. The cut value itself depends on the analyzed source. For a standard point-source analysis it is \(\theta^2 < 0.008\,\text{deg}^2\) while for extended (galactic) sources this value is in general larger. Together with the shape cuts, a background rejection of more than 99.5% can be achieved for a point-source analysis. These cuts, used later in this thesis, are summarized in Table 3.3.

---

\(^9\) Cuts on the emission height and its \(\chi^2\)-value as well as the \(\chi^2\)-value of the estimated energy are additionally used in the CTA analysis (see Section 4.2.3).
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Figure 3.11.: Event distribution of the mean-scaled parameters as obtained from an analysis of the Crab Nebula (y-axis are the number of events). The black points show all reconstructed events in the ON region and the peak around zero arises from gamma-ray events. The red curves show events from the OFF regions and arise from background events. Hadron-initiated showers are thus much longer and most notably wider than gamma-ray initiated showers (see Section 3.2.5 for explanation of ON and OFF regions).

Estimation of the remaining background

The remaining background consists of gamma-like cosmic-ray events. To determine the statistical excess of gamma rays at the source position, the irreducible background has to be estimated. Therefore, the reconstructed shower direction for each gamma-ray-like event is filled into a so-called sky map. Within this sky map, two regions are defined: an ON region and an OFF region. The ON region is defined by a circular region of radius $\theta$ and is centered on the potential source position. For the OFF region, two different models are usually used: the reflected-region or the ring-background model. Both background-region models are illustrated in Figure 3.12 (see, e.g., Berge et al., 2007).

In the reflected-region model, the background is estimated using several circular regions (same size as the ON region) equidistant from the pointing position. The combined events from these regions are used to estimate the remaining background, scaled by the relative area between ON and OFF regions. As the OFF regions are at the same distance from the center of the camera as the ON region, no correction for the relative camera acceptance is required. The camera acceptance, as shown in Figure 3.13 worsens with increasing distance to the camera center and is, in general, assumed to be radial symmetric.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image quality cuts</th>
<th>Moderate source cuts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>minimum number of tubes &gt; 4</td>
<td>distance of core position to telescope &lt; 250 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum size ≥ 500 dc</td>
<td>distance from the camera center &lt; 1.50°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum loss cut ≤ 0.50</td>
<td>angular distance: $\theta^2 &lt; 0.008 \text{ deg}^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum fraction under image &lt; 0.60</td>
<td>mean-scaled width: $-1.2 &lt; MS CW &lt; 0.35$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean-scaled length: $-1.2 &lt; MS CL &lt; 0.7$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3.: Moderate source cuts used for the VERITAS data analysis of point sources.

Figure 3.12.: Background estimation using the reflected-region model (left) and the ring-background model (right).

In the ring-background model, the OFF region is defined as a ring placed around the ON region. The radii of the ring are chosen such that the ratio between ON and OFF area is approximately 1:10. The normalization $\alpha$ is given by the area ratio modified by the radial acceptance of the camera. Such a radial acceptance curve (see Figure 3.13) can be obtained from gamma-ray-like events or MC simulations. The agreement between MC simulations and data is well up to camera distances of 1.5°. Therefore, a cut on the relative distance of the reconstructed event from the camera center of 1.5° is applied in the VERITAS data analysis.

By comparing the number of events in the ON region ($N_{\text{ON}}$) with the normalized number of events in the OFF region ($N_{\text{OFF}}$), the number of excess events,

$$N_{\text{excess}} = N_{\text{ON}} - \alpha N_{\text{OFF}},$$

(3.5)

can be determined. To avoid possible under- or over-estimation of the background, regions
around known gamma-ray emitters as well as bright stars (V magnitude brighter than 7) are excluded from the background regions. The resulting detection significance of the excess is calculated according to Eq. 17 in Li & Ma (1983) and is

\[ S = \sqrt{2} \left\{ N_{\text{ON}} \ln \left[ \frac{1 + \alpha}{\alpha \left( \frac{N_{\text{ON}}}{N_{\text{ON}} + N_{\text{OFF}}} \right)} \right] + N_{\text{OFF}} \ln \left[ (1 + \alpha) \left( \frac{N_{\text{OFF}}}{N_{\text{ON}} + N_{\text{OFF}}} \right) \right] \right\}^{1/2}. \] (3.6)

For the significant detection of a gamma-ray point source, the traditional requirement is a five standard deviation statistical significance \( S \geq 5 \), usually denoted as “5σ”.

3.2.6. Effective areas & energy threshold

The effective area describes the efficiency of the instrument for detecting gamma rays. The detector efficiency is derived from gamma-ray simulations that are fully propagated through the
The effective area is defined as

\[ A_{\text{eff}}(E) = (\pi R^2) \frac{N_{\text{selected}}(E)}{N_{\text{simulated}}(E)} \]  

(3.7)

where \( \pi R^2 \) is the simulated area (in the shower plane) over which the impact points of the primary particle are uniformly distributed, \( N_{\text{selected}} \) are the number of showers which are selected, and \( N_{\text{simulated}} \) is the number of showers simulated. In general, \( N_{\text{selected}} \) can be the number of events which trigger the telescopes or the number of events which pass the selection cuts. For the flux calculation, the effective area is calculated from the number of showers after cuts. It should be noted that the effective area depends on several observing parameters, i.e. the zenith and azimuth angle, the pointing offset from the source position and the background noise level, but as well on the applied cuts.

Typical effective area curves as function of reconstructed energy are shown in Figure 3.14 for different zenith angles. At energies above approximately 1 TeV, the effective area is relatively flat and of the order of \( 10^5 \) m\(^2\). At energies below 1 TeV, the effective area drastically decreases; showing a strong dependence on the zenith angle. This can be understood in terms of shower development since low-energy showers develop early in the atmosphere and create much less Cherenkov light than high-energy showers. This emitted light has to travel a much longer path through the atmosphere for large zenith angles and the probability of photons getting absorbed is much higher than for low zenith angles.

The energy threshold can be defined as the peak in the differential counting rate assuming a Crab Nebula-like photon spectrum, as listed in Appendix A. In Figure 3.14, the energy threshold corresponding to the different zenith angles is given. One can clearly see, that it increases with increasing zenith angle. This makes it especially important to observe gamma-ray sources with a steep spectrum like blazars at low zenith angle to obtain the lowest possible energy threshold.

### 3.2.7. Flux determination and spectral reconstruction

The effective area allows to convert any measured count rate into a flux from the gamma-ray source. The integral flux \( \Phi \) above the energy \( E_{\text{thr}} \) is defined as the number of particles per unit area per unit time,

\[ \Phi(E > E_{\text{thr}}) = \frac{N}{T \langle A \rangle} \]  

(3.8)

where \( \langle A \rangle \) is an averaged effective area over the whole integrated energy regime. To obtain the averaged effective area, it is assumed that the source spectrum follows a spectral shape,
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Figure 3.14.: Effective areas for the VERITAS array for moderate source cuts. The curves are shown for different zenith angles as a function of reconstructed energy and the energy threshold \( E_{\text{thr}} \) is given in the legend. It is defined as the peak in the differential counting rate assuming a Crab Nebula-like photon spectrum. The curves correspond to a Crab Nebula-like spectrum with a pointing offset of 0.5° and a noise level corresponding to observations of a galactic FoV.

expressed as

\[
\phi(E) = \phi_0 \left( \frac{E}{E_0} \right)^{-\alpha} \tag{3.9}
\]

where \( \phi_0 \) is the normalization constant, \( E_0 \) a given normalization energy, and \( \alpha \) is the photon spectral index. Assuming no change in spectral shape during the observation time, the flux can be calculated as follows:

\[
\Phi(E > E_{\text{thr}}) = \frac{N(> E_{\text{thr}})}{N_{\text{theory}}(> E_{\text{thr}})} \times \int_{E_{\text{thr}}}^{\infty} \phi_0 \left( \frac{E}{E_0} \right)^{-\alpha} dE \tag{3.10}
\]

where \( N(> E_{\text{thr}}) \) is the number of excess events (or the upper limit on the number of excess events) above the given energy threshold, and \( N_{\text{theory}}(> E_{\text{thr}}) \) is the expected excess using the assumed spectral shape. It is given by

\[
N_{\text{theory}}(> E_{\text{thr}}) = t_{\text{obs}} \times \int_{E_{\text{thr}}}^{\infty} \phi_0 \left( \frac{E}{E_0} \right)^{-\alpha} A_{\text{eff}}(E) dE \tag{3.11}
\]
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where $t_{\text{obs}}$ the dead-time corrected observing time and $A_{\text{eff}}(E)$ is the effective area at the given energy. It should be noted that the resulting flux values depend on the assumed spectrum since the effective area has to be averaged over a finite energy bin width and the finite energy resolution will lead to spill-overs where events will migrate from one energy bin to another.

In order to produce a differential photon spectrum of the source, the flux is determined in energy bins whereas the bin width is at least the energy resolution of the instrument. The basic requirement used within this thesis is that the statistical significance (calculated using Eq. 3.6) of a spectral point has to be at least $2\sigma$, otherwise an upper limit (using the method of Helene, 1983) is used to represent the flux measurement. A power-law function is then fitted to these discrete flux measurements and the associated errors to obtain the differential source spectrum.

To determine the temporal evolution of the source, especially important for transient sources like AGN, the integrated flux versus time is calculated. This is a so-called light curve and can be produced with different binnings (e.g. nightly, monthly, or yearly). When the time bin does not contain enough number of events an flux upper limit is derived using the method of Helene (1983).

3.3. The VERITAS camera upgrade

In summer 2012, the PMTs in each of the cameras have been replaced to lower the energy threshold and improve the overall sensitivity of VERITAS. The new photon detectors are 1-inch PMTs of Hamamatsu (type R10560-100-20; hereafter called R10560). They have a UV glass entrance window and a super-bialkali photo cathode resulting in a considerably higher quantum efficiency than classical bialkali photo cathodes used before. The hardware characteristics have been discussed in Otte et al. (2011) and Kieda et al. (2011). In this section, the study of the camera upgrade, carried out before the installation of the new PMTs, is presented with focus on the estimation of the overall and the low-energy performance.

3.3.1. Simulations of the VERITAS upgrade

To estimate the performance of the VERITAS array after the camera upgrade, the new PMTs are characterized and implemented into the MC simulation chain. The main differences of the new PMTs compared to the Photonis PMTs used before summer 2012 are the photon detection efficiency (PDE) and the pulse shape. Both are shown in Figure 3.15.

The Hamamatsu PMTs are significantly faster than the Photonis XP2970. The single photo-electron pulse shape has a full width at half maximum (FWHM) of 4.2 ns for the R10560, which is about 40% narrower than the pulse shape of the XP2970 (6.8 ns). This narrower pulse shape
can, for example, be used to improve the signal-to-noise ratio in the analysis by reducing the summation window in the trace analysis.

Figure 3.15.: Characterization of the PMTs as used in the simulations. (Left) Pulse shape produced by a single photo-electron. (Right) Photon detection efficiency as a function of wavelength. Black squares are before the upgrade (XP2970), red triangles are after the upgrade (R10560). Curves are obtained from measurements performed at UCSC and WashU (VERITAS Collaboration).

The PDE of both devices shows a typical curve. The efficiency increases up to wavelengths of about 320 nm, reaches a plateau, and decreases again at wavelengths larger than 400 – 450 nm. This shows that the PMTs are very sensitive in the UV to blue wavelength regime, where the Cherenkov photon spectrum on ground has its maximum (as shown in Figure 2.6). At longer wavelengths, the sensitivity decrease of the PMTs has the advantage that the detection of light from the NSB is also reduced as its contribution increases at wavelengths longer than 400 nm (see e.g. Hampf et al., 2011). To quantify the increase in efficiency, the performance values for both PMTs at 320 nm are usually compared. For the XP2970 PMT (before the upgrade), the PDE-value is 23% while the efficiency for the Hamamatsu devices is at 34%. Folding the PDE curve with the Cherenkov light spectrum in the focal plane of a VERITAS telescope, on average 23% of the Cherenkov photons will be detected with the R10560 PMT, which is a 35% higher light yield than that of the Photonis XP2970.

As with the higher light yield also the recording of NSB by the camera increases, the trigger thresholds have to be adjusted in order to cope with the higher NSB. The NSB trigger rate as a function of the trigger threshold is simulated; equivalent to taking a bias curve during normal operations. For the simulations a Crab Nebula-like NSB level is chosen, which is 130 MHz per pixel for the Photonis PMTs and 175 MHz for the Hamamatsu PMTs; the latter accounting for the 35% higher light yield. Under the assumption that the accidental telescope trigger rate
after the installations of the new PMTs is kept at 1 kHz (as prior to the upgrade; Figure 3.5), the obtained CFD threshold is 65 mV for the Hamamatsu PMTs and is kept at 50 mV for the Photonis PMTs. The camera trigger condition, i.e. three adjacent pixels within 6 ns, is kept for the upgrade simulations.

Once the trigger thresholds are determined, a full set of MC simulations is set-up for the upgrade and pre-upgrade array. The PMT characterizations (PDE, pulse shape and afterpulsing) are implemented into the detector simulation program. The photon conversion factor is kept the same as before the installation of the new PMTs, assuming that the new PMTs will be operated at the same nominal gain of \( \sim 2 \times 10^5 \). All simulations are done at a zenith angle of 20° with a pointing offset of 0.5°; the standard operation in VERITAS performing best at lowest energies. Simulated primary particles include gamma rays, protons and electrons.

### 3.3.2. Performance estimation

In Figure 3.16 the gamma-ray detection efficiencies on trigger level are shown. One can clearly see an increase in effective area at low energies (< 300 GeV) with the high-quantum efficiency PMTs compared to the Photonis ones. This directly translates into a lower energy threshold at trigger level. It is about 95 GeV with the Photonis PMTs and reduces down to approximately 75 GeV with the Hamamatsu PMTs, as obtained from the peak in the differential counting rate. Thus, the installation of the new PMTs in the cameras enables the detection of gamma-ray showers of much lower energy as more Cherenkov photons can be recorded. On the other hand it should be noted, that the array trigger rate due to cosmic rays will also increase (from about 250 Hz up to approximately 500 Hz). Without any changes to the readout, this will introduce a dead time of the order of 20% to the system\(^{10}\).

In order to evaluate possible improvements in the overall performance after the camera upgrade, the simulations are analyzed with eventdisplay. To take advantage of the 40% shorter pulses after the upgrade the summation window in the trace analysis is reduced from 7 samples to 5 samples. This almost immediately cancels out the increased NSB contribution in the integrated charge per pixel. Further on, no cut optimization has been performed for the new PMTs and cuts used are similar to those of a standard point source analysis (as listed in Table 3.3), but without an image size cut.

The results of the analysis, i.e. the effective areas for gamma rays after cuts, are shown in Figure 3.17. At lowest energies, the lower energy threshold of the new PMTs leads to a clear increase in effective area while at higher energies the effective area is similar before and after the

---

\(^{10}\) In order to reduce the dead time of the system several possibilities have been tested during the camera commissioning phase in fall 2012. Those included a shorter trigger coincidence time window and a reduced readout window, resulting at a dead time of about 15% for trigger rates of \( \sim 450 \text{ Hz} \).
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Figure 3.16.: Effective area and differential counting rate on trigger level assuming a Crab Nebula-like spectrum. Black squares are before the upgrade (XP2970), red triangles are after the upgrade (R10560).

Another way to look at the improvements of the camera upgrade is to determine the sensitivity of the array. Traditionally, the representation of the sensitivity is in terms of integral sensitivity, including all events reconstructed above a given energy within an observation time of 50 hours. This representation is highly dependent on the source spectrum and thus might be misleading.

A different way to represent the sensitivity of VERITAS (and later as well of CTA) is in terms of differential sensitivity. The differential sensitivity represents the lowest flux in a given energy bin which results in a significant detection after a certain observation time $t_{\text{obs}}$. It is calculated in small energy bins, i.e. five bins per decade in energy are used within this thesis. An observation time of $t_{\text{obs}} = 50$ hours and a signal-free background region five times larger than the signal region ($\alpha = 0.2$) are assumed in the following. The basic requirements for a significant detection per bin are a $5\sigma$ statistical significance, at least 10 events and the number of gamma rays is 5% above the background rate. They can be summarized as follows:

\begin{equation}
S \geq 5 \\
N_\gamma \geq 10 \\
N_\gamma / (\alpha \cdot N_{\text{OFF}}) \geq 0.05
\end{equation}

To obtain the differential sensitivity, a Crab Nebula spectrum for the gamma rays is assumed
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Figure 3.17.: Effective area for gamma-ray simulations at 20° zenith angle after analysis cuts. Black squares are before the upgrade (XP2970), red triangles are after the upgrade (R10560).

following the HEGRA measurements while proton and electron spectra are weighted according to measurements as listed in Appendix A. The errors in the sensitivity calculation are derived from the uncertainties in the gamma-ray and cosmic-ray background effective areas. The resulting sensitivity curve, multiplied by $E^2$, is shown in Figure 3.18. Even without a re-optimization of the cuts for the new PMTs, the sensitivity over the whole energy range is slightly increased for the high-quantum efficiency PMTs compared to the Photonis PMTs before the camera upgrade.

At the lowest energies, the increase in effective area (shown in Figure 3.17) and the lower energy threshold for the new PMTs results in an additional low energy bin in the sensitivity curve. The main limiting factor in this energy regime are the fluctuations in the air-shower development and hence the background. However, for short duration phenomena like flares from AGN or pulsed emission from pulsars, the increase in effective area will enable the detection of more gamma-rays which will lead to better flux estimates at lowest energies.

At moderate energies (between 300 GeV and 2 TeV), no increase in gamma-ray effective area could be achieved with the new PMTs but an improved sensitivity can be seen. This can be understood in terms of background rejection power. Due to higher light yield of the new PMTs, also more Cherenkov photons from background events (i.e. protons) are recorded and the images surviving the image cleaning are longer and wider. This makes a background rejection with shape cuts more efficient. In this energy regime, further improvements are expected after a proper cut optimization.
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At high energies (above a few TeV), neither the sensitivity curves nor the effective areas before and after the upgrade show significant deviations from each other. In this energy range, the sensitivity of the array is photon statistics limited and improves inversely proportional to the observation time. A possible improvement in this energy regime from the high-quantum efficiency PMTs might arise from the detection of farther distant showers, but this effect has not been investigated as a cut on the maximum distance from the array of 250 m has always been applied.

Figure 3.18.: Differential sensitivity curve of the VERITAS array for 50 hours of observations using the standard requirements given in Eq. 3.12. Simulations at 20° zenith and background includes cosmic-ray protons and electrons; cuts are not optimized cuts for the new PMTs. Black curve corresponds to before the upgrade (XP2970), red curve to after the upgrade (R10560).
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The CTA project is an initiative to build the next-generation ground-based gamma-ray instrument. The design foresees a factor of 5-10 improvement in sensitivity in the current VHE gamma-ray domain of about 100 GeV to some 10 TeV, and an extension of the accessible energy range from well below 100 GeV to above 100 TeV, going far beyond of what can be reached by upgrading existing IACTs. The general concept of CTA is briefly presented in Section 4.1. To determine the arrangement and characteristics of the future CTA telescopes Monte Carlo (MC) simulations are employed. An overview of the simulated layouts used within this thesis is given in Section 4.2 where the baseline performance of CTA is also characterized. One of the basic assumptions in this standard set of simulations is that observations are carried out under dark sky conditions. Those dark sky conditions lead to about 1000 hours of observation time per year. An increase in observing time can be achieved when observations under partial moonlight are considered additionally. To explore the feasibility of these observations in terms of expected performance, a modified MC production has been set-up and analyzed by the author. It is presented in Section 4.3 and compared to the baseline performance.

4.1. The concept of CTA

The concept of CTA builds on the proven technique of IACTs (see Section 2.2). Through the deployment of the order of 50 to 100 telescopes, CTA aims to make significant progress over the existing experiments and further explore the Universe in the VHE regime (Actis et al., 2011). It will consist of two sites, one in the southern and one in the northern hemisphere, allowing full-sky coverage and, consequently, access to more potential VHE gamma-ray sources. For the first time in this energy range, CTA will be operated as an open observatory and will provide tools and support for data analysis to the astronomy and astroparticle-physics community.

4.1.1. Performance goals

The performance of CTA is driven by the scientific goals and motivations of the field (e.g., Hinton & Hofmann, 2009; Aharonian et al., 2008). A comparison between the scientific goals, costs and technical availability lead to the following performance goals (Acharya et al., 2013):
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Sensitivity. CTA aims to be about a factor of ten more sensitive than any existing instrument in its energy range. As a consequence it will allow for the detection and in-depth study of a large number of known source types, it will explore a wide range of classes of suspected gamma-ray emitters and be sensitive to possible new phenomena that lie beyond the sensitivity of current instruments. From 100 GeV to several TeV, CTA intends to have a sensitivity a factor of one thousand below the flux of the strongest steady source of VHE gamma rays, the Crab Nebula.

Energy range. Broad coverage of the electromagnetic spectrum is crucial to understand the physical processes occurring in VHE sources. With a single facility CTA is aiming to cover four orders of magnitude in energy, from a few tens of GeV to a few hundred TeV, again a factor of ten more than any existing instrument. This will enable astrophysicists to distinguish between key hypotheses such as the leptonic or hadronic origin of gamma-ray emitting sources.

Angular resolution. Current instruments are able to resolve extended sources like SNRs, but they cannot probe the fine structures visible in other wavebands. As with CTA a gamma-ray-induced cascade is detected simultaneously by many telescopes, CTA intends to reach an angular resolution in the arc minute range, a factor of five better than the typical values for current instruments. This will help to identify possible counterparts at other wavelengths and may even allow the localization of VHE emission region(s) in some nearby AGNs.

To achieve an optimal performance over the full energy range considered, different telescope types are needed and the instrumentation has to be optimized in energy sub-ranges. In general, one can think about three different energy ranges: the low energies ($\leq 100$ GeV), the medium or core energies ($100$ GeV–$10$ TeV), and the high energies ($> 10$ TeV).

In the low-energy range, the event rates are high and the few photons from showers with energies down to a few tens of GeV can be efficiently detected with closely placed large size telescopes. The area of this part of the array can be relatively small, being of the order of a few $10^4$ m$^2$. The major challenge in this energy regime is the reconstruction of the small images, the contamination by NSB photons and the gamma-hadron separation.

In the medium-energy range, the deployment of several tens of telescopes over a wide area will provide an array size which will be much larger than the Cherenkov light pool of a shower. This ensures that images will be uniformly sampled across the light pool and that a number of images are recorded close to the optimum distance from the shower axis (about $70 – 150$ m), where the light intensity is large and intensity fluctuations are small. The improved sensitivity
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In this energy regime is obtained by the increased area covered, the higher quality of the shower reconstruction and improved background rejection.

In the high-energy range, the key limitation is the low gamma-ray flux and thus the number of detectable gamma-ray showers. Two implementation options can be considered: either a large number of small telescopes with mirror areas of a few m² and spacing matched to the size of the light pool of 100–200 m, or a smaller number of medium size telescopes which can see showers up to distance of ≥500 m, and can hence be deployed with a spacing of several hundred meters.

Determining the arrangement and characteristics of the CTA telescopes is a complex optimization problem, requiring a balance of cost against performance in different energy bands. In order to do this, Monte Carlo simulations have to be carried out which will be explained in detail in Section 4.2.

4.1.2. Technological concept

As the concept of CTA builds mainly on proven techniques, the major challenge is the large number of telescopes, i.e. their reliability, their maintainability as well as their construction on site. Current design efforts consider three telescope implementations: large size telescopes (LSTs), medium size telescopes (MSTs), and small size telescopes (SSTs) as shown in Figure 4.1.

![Figure 4.1: Baseline design for the CTA telescopes; not to scale. (Left) Large size telescope with a 23 m diameter parabolic dish. (Middle) Medium size telescope with a 12 m diameter dish structure. (Right) Schwarzschild-Coude design for a possible MST or small-size telescope. Images taken from Acharya et al. (2013).](image)

The LST design is similar to the MAGIC design, i.e. optimized for best performance at the lowest possible energy threshold. It consists of a 23 m diameter reflector. The optical dish structure is parabolic in order to keep the time dispersion smaller then the intrinsic time spread of the shower. Additionally, the LST is designed to be of a light-weight structure for fast re-pointing to catch transient sources like GRBs.
The MST in its current design is a 12 m reflector with 7–8° FoV, operating in the medium-energy range of CTA. Its optical dish structure is intermediate between Davies-Cotton and parabolic designs and combines the advantages of both designs, i.e. good imaging properties as well as small time dispersion. A full-scale mechanical prototype has been built in Berlin-Adlershof (Bähr et al., 2012). In addition, CTA is exploring a design for a dual-mirror MST of Schwarzschild-Couder (SC) optics (Vassiliev & Fegan, 2007). This allows to reach a large FoV (10°) with a very small camera size. The small size of the camera allows for finer pixelation and the use of cheaper photo sensors in the camera. As this is a new concept for IACTs, a prototype will be constructed at the VERITAS site to prove its viability.

Several concepts for the SST design are currently being explored with the aim of combining a large field of view (∼10°) with a good resolution of the shower images, as well as minimizing costs. One concept is of Davies-Cotton optics with a 4 m diameter reflector equipped with a fully digital camera based on Geiger-mode avalanche photo diodes (GAPDs), as pioneered by FACT\(^1\). Another concept is based on SC optics, which uses a secondary mirror to reduce the camera size and allows for a wide field of view with a light-weight camera, e.g. using GAPDs or multi-anode PMTs (e.g., Niemiec et al., 2013; Zech et al., 2013).

Altogether, CTA is now in the middle of a three-year preparatory phase aimed to be “construction ready” towards the end of 2014 after which the five-year construction phase will be started (Figure 4.2) at the candidate sites. Sites under consideration are located in Argentina, Namibia and Chile in the southern hemisphere and on the Canary Islands, in Arizona, Mexico, China and India in the northern hemisphere. Currently, all sites are being investigated in terms of geographical, observational and environmental conditions while additionally the local infrastructure and accessibility are considered. A site selection is anticipated in late 2013.

![Figure 4.2: Current timeline of the CTA project. Taken from Acharya et al. (2013).](http://www.isdc.unige.ch/fact/)

\(^{1}\) http://www.isdc.unige.ch/fact/
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MC simulations of CTA are crucial to understand the performance and optimize the design prior to construction. The major challenge is to find an optimum\(^2\) configuration which depends on the general design layout of the array (including telescope sizes and locations), but also on more technical aspects like telescope optics, camera field-of-view, pixel size, trigger logic and readout schemes. This is addressed by the simulation of a large array intended as a superset of many different candidate array layouts, known as CTA production-1. The configuration parameter choice is based on the technical design studies and the estimated costs involved. Before the array configuration is presented (Section 4.2.2) and the baseline performance of the configuration is evaluated (Section 4.2.3), the MC simulation chain is introduced briefly in the following.

4.2.1. Shower & detector simulation

The simulation of an IACT array consists of two parts: the simulation of the air shower development and emission of Cherenkov light by the shower particles and the detection of light and the recording of the signal by the detector. The CTA simulation chain is described in Bernlöhr (2008a).

The shower simulations are done with CORSIKA (version 6.735; Heck et al., 1998) using the IACT option for the Cherenkov light emission. The altitude of the CTA observatory is set to 2000 m (typical for several sites under consideration) with a geomagnetic field strength intermediate between that found in southern Africa and the Canary Islands. All showers are simulated at 20° zenith angle and primary particles include gamma rays, electrons and protons. The air shower simulations are generally carried out following an \(E^{-2}\) spectrum and the events are weighted in the analysis to achieve results equivalent to other spectral shapes.

The recorded Cherenkov photons are then passed to the detector simulation program, termed \texttt{sim_telarray} (Bernlöhr, 2008b). The simulation of the detector response includes the optical ray-tracing of the photons from the mirrors to the PMTs in the camera, the electronics and the digitization of the signals, as well as the trigger and readout system. Noise arising from NSB and electronics are added to the signal.

\(^2\) The optimum configuration can be understood as the one which gives the best performance results within the given budget of CTA. As the “best” performance depends on the different physics cases, e.g. very low energy threshold for AGNs as well as sensitivity to the highest energies for cosmic-ray accelerators like SNRs, this task is non-trivial.
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Much of the work from early CTA MC studies by Bernlöhr et al. (2007) laid the foundations for what became known as the CTA production-1 array configuration, with the goal to characterize the performance of as many, and as varied, CTA candidate configurations as possible.

The production-1 configuration consists of 275 telescopes with five different telescope types and different spacings between the telescopes (Bernlöhr et al., 2013). The layout is shown in Figure 4.3. In the center of the array ten large-size telescopes (LSTs) are located with separation distances of about 60 to 200 m. This allows us to test the performance of subsets of two to six LSTs with different spacings in the low energy domain. Around the center, a large number of medium-size telescopes (MSTs) are placed covering a large area and wide range of possible spacings. This is needed to explore the trade-off between event quantity (large area coverage) and event quality (high telescope multiplicity) in this core energy range. To explore the high-energy domain, a multi-km² collection area is needed. Two possible solutions are implemented in the 275-telescope configuration: small-size telescopes (SSTs) with moderate spacing and widely spaced medium-size telescopes with a wide field-of-view (MST-WFs). These telescopes are arranged around the MSTs with grid-like and island-like layouts incorporated.

The main parameters of the different telescope types used in the simulations are summarized in Table 4.1. In addition, the most crucial assumptions for the production-1 are the following (denoted as the “standard” or “dark sky” production-1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Type 1 (LST)</th>
<th>Type 2 (MST)</th>
<th>Type 3 (SST)</th>
<th>Type 4 (MST-WF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diameter $D$ (m)</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dish shape‡</td>
<td>parab.</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirror area (m²)</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal length $f$ (m)</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f/D$</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoV diameter (deg)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camera diam. (m)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of pixels</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>1417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pixel diam. (deg)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1.: Geometrical parameters of the four main telescope types assumed in the CTA MC simulations (Bernlöhr et al., 2013).

‡ Parabolic or Davies-Cotton (DC).

Night sky background. The flux of the NSB assumed in the simulations corresponds to an extragalactic sky and is $\phi = 2.2 \cdot 10^{12}$ photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$sr$^{-1}$ (Preuss et al., 2002). This
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results in a NSB rate of the order of 100 MHz per pixel, i.e. one photo-electron per 10 ns. The NSB is assumed to be uniform across the whole camera.

Trigger. To suppress accidental camera triggers from the NSB, a 3-level-trigger scheme is used. In the first level, it is required that the signal in a pixel exceeds a certain (discriminator) threshold $q$. In the second level, a camera trigger is formed if at least three neighboring pixels (out of seven pixels on a hexagonal grid) passed the given threshold within a certain time window$^3$. The threshold $q$ is adjusted such that the camera trigger rate due to pure NSB events remains lower than 100 Hz for each camera type. Finally, an array trigger is applied before the readout is initiated, requiring at least two camera triggers from the same telescope type within a given time window$^4$.

$^3$ The coincidence time window for the camera trigger is 3 ns for LSTs, 6 ns for MSTs and 16 ns for the SSTs and MST-WFs. It is matched to the temporal development of the shower in the different energy regimes.

$^4$ The coincidence time window for the array trigger is 120 ns for LSTs, 300 ns for the closely placed MSTs, and 800 ns for the SSTs and MST-WFs, again matched to the temporal development of the shower.
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Readout. For the readout scheme, a set-up similar to the H.E.S.S. telescopes is chosen, with two channels at a factor of 15 different gain, each read out by 12-bit ADCs at a frequency of 1 GHz. Sixteen samples (i.e. 16 ns) are added up in an integration window defined by the moment when the camera trigger fired.

In order to estimate the performance of CTA, candidate-array layouts (of comparable cost) are selected out of the 275-telescope configuration. Three of the possible candidate arrays are shown in Figure 4.4: Array B, C, and E. Array B consists of five LSTs with a $5^\circ$ FoV and 37 MSTs with a FoV of $8^\circ$. This array is fairly compact and would be a low-energy implementation of CTA. Array C on the other hand is covering a wide area, consisting of 27 MSTs ($8^\circ$ FoV) surrounded by 26 wide field-of-view ($10^\circ$) MSTs. No LSTs are included as the focus lies on the exploration of the high-energy regime. The Array E consists of four LSTs ($4.6^\circ$ FoV) in the center, 23 relatively closely spaced MSTs ($8^\circ$ FoV) and is surrounded by 32 SSTs with $10^\circ$ FoV. This candidate array can be considered as balanced across the full energy range.

![Array B](image1)
![Array C](image2)
![Array E](image3)

Figure 4.4.: Layout of the three CTA candidate arrays used in this thesis. LSTs are shown in red, MSTs in black, SSTs in green, and MST-WFs in magenta.

4.2.3. Baseline performance of production-1

In the following, the analysis of these “standard” simulations is demonstrated on Array E using the performance curves provided by G. Maier. The results are discussed here and serve as reference for the later comparison with the performance under moonlight conditions.

Analysis description

To determine the performance of CTA production-1, the MC simulations are analyzed using the *eventdisplay* package. The relevant analysis steps are (Maier, 2011): (1) conversion of
the simulation output from sim_telarray to eventdisplay format, (2) parameterization of the image and reconstruction of the event, (3) gamma-hadron separation (using TMVA methods), and (4) determination of instrument response functions and sensitivity estimation.

In the converter, the candidate arrays are selected out of the 275-telescope configuration. Afterwards, the images in the cameras are parameterized as explained in Section 3.2.2. As only ADCs are simulated in the CTA production-1, no trace analysis is needed and the signals are the integrated charges within a time window of 16 ns. The image cleaning is a fixed two-stage tail-cut cleaning which will be explained in more detail in Section 4.3.2. Image quality cuts are applied (listed in Table 4.2) before the event is reconstructed (see Section 3.2.3). To account for the differences of the different telescope types, the lookup tables for the energy estimation and mean-scaled parameters are filled for each telescope type separately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>LST</th>
<th>MST</th>
<th>SST</th>
<th>MST-WF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>image cleaning tail cuts [pe]</td>
<td>11.0/5.5</td>
<td>11.0/5.5</td>
<td>9.2/4.6</td>
<td>16.8/8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum number of pixels per image</td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
<td>&gt; 3</td>
<td>&gt; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximum loss value</td>
<td>≤ 0.2</td>
<td>≤ 0.5</td>
<td>≤ 0.5</td>
<td>≤ 0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.: For each telescope type, the image cleaning tail cuts are listed as image/border (in photo-electrons) and the quality cuts on the minimum number of pixels per image and the maximum loss value are given.

The major difference compared to the VERITAS data analysis is the gamma-hadron separation. Due to the wide energy range covered, the cuts are optimized in dependence of the reconstructed energy of the event. The cut on the arrival direction \( \theta \) is set to the angular resolution (80% containment radius) after quality cuts. For the optimization, boosted decision trees (BDTs) as implemented in the TMVA package\(^5\) are used. The BDTs are trained and applied in several overlapping energy bins (typically 12 bins while the best suited energy bin is chosen for each event). The different input variables for the optimization are: mean-scaled width (MSCW) and length (MSCL), second largest image amplitude per events (SizeSecondMax), \( \chi^2 \)-value of the energy estimate (EChi2), height of the maximum emission (EmissionHeight), and \( \chi^2 \)-value of the emission height estimation (EmissionHeightChi2). Their distributions for gamma rays and protons are shown in Figure 4.5 and Figure 4.6 for low energies \( (E < 60\,\text{GeV}) \) and high energies \( (E \approx 10\,\text{TeV}) \), respectively.

The BDT output is a single cut variable in the interval -0.5 to 0.5. The optimal cut is selected at the value giving the highest significance, assuming a Crab Nebula-like gamma-ray spectrum and a proton background spectrum as listed in Appendix A. Figure 4.7 shows the signal and

\(^5\) http://tmva.sourceforge.net/
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Figure 4.5.: Distribution of cut variables for events with low energies ($E < 60 \text{ GeV}$). Signal events (blue) are simulated gamma rays, background events (red) consist of protons only. Figure taken from Maier (2011).

Figure 4.6.: Distribution of cut variables for events with high energies ($E \approx 10 \text{ TeV}$). Signal events (blue) are simulated gamma rays, background events (red) consist of protons only. Figure taken from Maier (2011).
background efficiencies and the significance in dependence of the BDT cut value. For the low energy events, the most important cut parameters are the emission height and the $\chi^2$-value of the energy estimation while for the high energy events the mean-scaled width and the second largest image size are the most effective gamma-hadron discriminants. It should be noted, that this optimization procedure might be limited by proton statistics at very high energies (above several tens of TeV). In these cases, the optimal cut value from the last bin with sufficient statistics is used.

In the following, these optimized cuts are used to determine the baseline performance parameters effective area, angular and energy resolution, and sensitivity for Array E. For a comparison of the different candidate arrays and the different analysis chains used within CTA, the reader is referred to Stamatescu et al. (2012) and Bernlöhr et al. (2013).

**Effective area**

The effective area describes the efficiency of the instrument to detect air showers and is shown in Figure 4.8 for gamma rays. It covers a wide energy range and is smoothly increasing with increasing energy. In the low energy regime, the increase in effective area for Array E compared to the VERITAS effective area arises from the large mirror area of the LSTs, able to detect more Cherenkov light from these low-energy gamma-ray showers. In the core energy regime, the amount of 23 closely spaced MSTs with their large field-of-view results in an effective area

![Figure 4.7.: (Left) Example of signal (black) and background (red) efficiencies as a function of the BDT cut value. (Right) Significance as function of the BDT cut value as explained in the text. The blue line shows the smoothed version of the actual values (black points) and is used for the determination of the maximum of the curve (vertical dashed line in both plots). Figures taken from Maier (2011).](image)
increase of approximately one order of magnitude compared to VERITAS. At higher energies the wide area covered by the SSTs further increases the effective area to more than $10^6 \text{ m}^2$.

![Effective area after cuts for gamma-ray events using Array E (blue curve). The VERITAS upgrade effective area from Figure 3.17 is shown for reference (grey curve).](image)

**Angular and energy resolution**

The angular resolution of IACTs is typically defined as the angular distance (or radius) from the (simulated) source position within which 68% or 80% of the reconstructed events are contained. The 68% confidence level is the one used for the results presented in this thesis and is shown for Array E in Figure 4.9 (left). In general, the angular resolution improves with increasing energy. For low-energy events, the Cherenkov photon density is relatively low and thus fewer telescope images can be used in the geometrical reconstruction. With increasing energy, more images are recorded by the array and the high telescope multiplicity results in an improved angular resolution; reaching about three arc minutes at 1 TeV. It should be noted that with cuts optimized on angular resolution rather than on significance, the performance goal of arc minute resolution at TeV energies is likely to be reached.

The energy resolution of an array of Cherenkov telescopes is a measure of the uncertainty in how well the system can infer the energy of the primary gamma-ray photon that initiates the air shower. The energy resolution at the 68% confidence level is shown on the right side of Figure 4.9 for Array E. In general, the energy resolution is improving towards higher energies and is below 10% at energies above 1 TeV. For low energetic events, statistical fluctuations in the air shower developments, especially upward fluctuations in the Cherenkov light emission are
more likely to be triggered by the telescopes and thus, limit the energy resolution in this energy regime.

Figure 4.9.: Angular (left) and energy (right) resolution at the 68% confidence level for Array E as a function of energy.

**Sensitivity**

To evaluate the performance of CTA over the full energy range, the differential sensitivity is determined for 50 hours of observations and an on-to-off source ratio of 1/5. The standard requirements, using five bins per energy decade, are: a significance above $5\sigma$ (Eq. 17 in Li & Ma, 1983), at least 10 events per bin and the number of gamma rays is 5% above the background rate (see Eq. 3.12). The errors in the sensitivity curve are derived from the uncertainties in the gamma-ray and cosmic-ray background effective areas. They are dominated by the limited number of simulated proton events. Sensitivity calculations at the lowest and highest energies are in many cases limited by the available number of proton events after gamma-hadron separation cuts.

The resulting differential sensitivity curve, multiplied by $E^2$, for Array E is shown in Figure 4.10. It covers a large range in energy (four orders of magnitude) and shows a clear improvement compared to the sensitivity of VERITAS. In the low-energy regime ($\leq$ a few hundred GeV), the poor angular/energy resolution results in a limited gamma-hadron separation and thus a high background rate. Therefore, the sensitivity in this energy regime is typically limited by background systematics and shower fluctuations. In the medium-energy range (few hundred GeV to a few TeV), the best differential sensitivity is reached. This is due to the large number of
images available for the reconstruction, which results in a good angular/energy resolution and allows a very good gamma-hadron separation. At higher energies (above several TeV), where the background rates are low due to their steeply falling spectra, the sensitivity is signal limited and the wide area covered by the SSTs results in a sensitive instrument up to energies of about 100 TeV.

Figure 4.10.: Differential sensitivity curve for Array E (blue curve) for 50 hours observations using the standard requirements given in Eq. 3.12. Simulations are done at 20° zenith angle and background includes cosmic-ray protons and electrons. The grey curve corresponds to the VERITAS upgrade sensitivity for reference.

4.3. Moonlight observations with CTA

Observations with ground-based gamma-ray telescopes are normally carried out during clear, dark and moon-less nights. This leads to about 1000 hours of observing time per year. This time can be increased when observations under partial moonlight are performed, as it is routinely done by MAGIC (Britzger et al., 2009) and VERITAS (Section 3.1.3). To determine if CTA should be operated under moonlight conditions, its performance under this special aspect is estimated. Therefore, a new MC simulation has been set-up and analyzed. The obtained
results are compared with the performance of the candidate arrays under standard (dark-sky) conditions.

4.3.1. Moonlight simulation settings

It has been shown in Section 3.1.3, that the NSB level under moonlight conditions is highly variable and depends on the Moon phase, its elevation and the separation angle between the Moon and the telescope pointing. As it is impractical to simulate all possible background levels due to CPU time and disk-space requirements, only one increased NSB level is considered. The NSB level is chosen to be 4.5 times higher then in the standard simulation. This is comparable with observations where the Moon phase is approximately 50% and would add approximately 30% observation time. With this increased background from NSB photons, the accidental trigger rate is expected to be higher for the same trigger settings. In order to keep the trigger rates at a reasonable level, the pixel (discriminator) thresholds $q$ have to be adapted. Therefore, the accidental trigger rate due to pure NSB is simulated in dependence of the discriminator threshold. Two different camera triggers are tested, requiring three (or four) neighboring pixels above the threshold value $q$ within a certain coincidence time window.

The results of these NSB simulations are presented in Figure 4.11, showing that the accidental trigger rates for all telescope types are much higher under moonlight conditions compared to the standard NSB settings used in the production-1. Additionally, for the 3-pixel coincidence the discriminator threshold at a given NSB trigger rate is higher compared to the 4-pixel coincidence due to the more pronounced afterpulsing effects.

To determine the optimum pixel threshold for both camera trigger conditions under moonlight conditions, the same criteria as for the dark sky NSB settings is applied, i.e. the single telescope trigger rate has to be below 100 Hz. The obtained values for the pixel threshold are summarized in Table 4.3. Comparing these values to the dark-sky simulations shows that the pixel threshold for the same trigger scheme (i.e. 3-fold pixel coincidence) is increased by more then 50% for all telescope types under moonlight conditions. This will naturally lead to an increase of the detection energy threshold for each telescope type.

In order to judge which trigger condition will perform best at lowest energies, the trigger effective areas at the chosen pixel threshold as well as the energy thresholds are determined. The increase in the discriminator threshold reduces the effective area on trigger level compared to the standard thresholds, as shown in Figure 4.12. This effect is most pronounced at low energies. However, there is no clear difference between a 3-fold or 4-fold camera trigger. The calculation of the energy thresholds, defined as the peak in the differential trigger rate for a Crab Nebula-like spectrum, results in the same energy threshold for both applied trigger conditions.
under increased NSB. The values are given in Table 4.3 and are about twice as high as the energy threshold under dark sky conditions.

To estimate the performance of the full CTA observatory during moonlight a Monte Carlo production has been set up, including shower and slightly modified detector simulation for the 275-telescope layout. As the NSB is added to signal within the detector simulation, no modifications to the shower simulation need to be made, while the modifications to the detector simulations are: (a) increase of the NSB value by a factor of 4.5, (b) change of the camera trigger condition from a 3-fold to 4-fold pixel coincidence, and (c) adjustment of the pixel threshold to the values listed in Table 4.3.

---

A 4-fold pixel coincidence was used, as no difference in performance at trigger level could be seen and the afterpulsing effects are less pronounced in this case.
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Figure 4.12.: Effective areas in dependence of the simulated MC energy \( E_{\text{true}} \) on trigger level for the different telescope types. Shown are the curves for a dark sky patch (gray), moonlight with 3-pixel coincidence (red) and moonlight with 4-pixel coincidence (green).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Telescope Type</th>
<th>NSB (p.e./ns)</th>
<th>Pixel Thresh. (mV)</th>
<th>Energy Thresh. (GeV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dark sky</td>
<td>moonlight</td>
<td>dark sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 (LST)</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2 (MST)</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 (SST)</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4 (MST-WF)</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3.: NSB level for dark-sky and moonlight conditions for the different telescope types in production-1. The pixel thresholds for moonlight conditions are using a 3-pixel (4-pixel) next neighbor camera trigger. The energy threshold is defined as the peak in the differential counting rate for a Crab Nebula-like spectrum.
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4.3.2. Analysis of moonlight simulations

As already mentioned in Section 2.2.2, the light from the NSB adds noise to the Cherenkov light recorded by the camera and can result in additional uncertainties in the determination of orientation, intensity and shape of the image. To reduce the noise contribution from the shower images, an image cleaning is performed. The image cleaning used here is a two-stage tail-cut cleaning with fixed image and border thresholds. It requires a pixel to have an integrated signal greater than \( n_i \) (image pixel) and a neighboring pixel to have at least an integrated signal above \( n_b \) (border pixel) with \( n_i > n_b \). The tail cuts are adjusted for the higher NSB levels according to

\[
\text{tailcut} = \frac{n_i}{n_b} \times \sqrt{\frac{\text{NSB}}{100 \, \text{MHz}}}
\]

and hence vary between the telescope types. Isolated pixels (a single pixel above \( n_i \) without bordering pixels) are cleaned away with this routine. This cleaning method is different to the VERITAS analysis where the image and border thresholds are variable (determined by their signal-to-background ratio, see Section 3.2.2).

Since the determination of the optimum image cleaning thresholds is non-trivial two sets of fixed tail-cuts are used which are based on experience rather than on an optimization process. For the first set (hereafter called 10/05) the cleaning thresholds are \( n_i = 10 \) and \( n_b = 5 \) and for the second set (hereafter called 07/04) they are \( n_i = 7 \) and \( n_b = 4 \). The absolute values given in photo-electrons are listed in Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSB condition</th>
<th>cleaning levels</th>
<th>Type 1 (LST)</th>
<th>Type 2 (MST)</th>
<th>Type 3 (SST)</th>
<th>Type 4 (MST-WF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dark sky</td>
<td>10/05</td>
<td>11.0/5.5</td>
<td>11.0/5.5</td>
<td>9.2/4.6</td>
<td>16.8/8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moonlight</td>
<td>10/05</td>
<td>23.4/11.7</td>
<td>23.2/11.6</td>
<td>19.6/9.8</td>
<td>35.1/17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moonlight</td>
<td>07/04</td>
<td>16.4/9.4</td>
<td>16.2/9.3</td>
<td>13.7/7.8</td>
<td>24.6/14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4.: Absolute image cleaning values (in p.e.) for different night sky background conditions. The values are listed as “image/border”.

To illustrate the influence of the different tail cuts for the increased NSB level, Figure 4.13 shows the same event seen in one telescope with the two different cleaning values: (left) the tail cuts used for dark sky conditions, (right) the 07/04 tail cuts adapted for the increased NSB level. It is clearly visible that without scaling the tail cuts according to the NSB the image parameterization is distorted by the noise contribution in the camera, resulting in a poor reconstruction of the image. Using the NSB-adapted 07/04 tail cuts, the image is nicely reconstructed.
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Figure 4.13.: Camera display (LST) for the same event using different image cleaning values for the moonlight simulation. (Left) Tail cuts as used for dark sky conditions (10/05 dark) lead to a wrong parameterization of the image due to noisy pixels. (Right) Tail-cut values are accounted for the increased NSB level (07/04 moon).
The absolute values in photo-electrons are listed in Table 4.4. The star indicates the simulated (black) and reconstructed (magenta) arrival direction of the gamma ray in the camera.

The cleaned shower image is then parameterized and the event is reconstructed, applying the same quality cuts as given in Table 4.2. Since the higher NSB level has influence on the distribution of the reconstructed image parameters, lookup tables are filled for each image cleaning set separately. They are then used to estimate the energy and the mean-scaled parameters of each event. For the gamma-hadron separation, BDTs, as previously mentioned, were used.

4.3.3. Performance of CTA under moonlight conditions

To evaluate the performance of CTA under moonlight conditions the instrument response functions and the sensitivity curves are obtained for the different arrays. Three of the possible candidate arrays are used for illustration: Array B, C, and E. Their performance parameters are compared to the performance obtained under dark-sky conditions.

---

\footnote{All commonly used candidate arrays have been analyzed by the author, but it became apparent that they can be grouped into three classes in terms of performance. Therefore, only one candidate array for each of these classes is used and presented in more detail.}
Effective area & energy threshold

Figure 4.14 shows the gamma-ray effective areas after gamma-hadron separation cuts for the selected arrays for moonlight conditions (using both image cleaning sets) as well as for dark sky conditions. For all candidate arrays the effective area under moonlight conditions is reduced with respect to the dark-sky simulations. This is expected from the studies of the single telescope effective areas at the trigger level (Figure 4.12). The difference between dark-sky and moonlight conditions in effective area is less pronounced at the analysis level than on trigger level. A possible reason for this effect is that the image cleaning thresholds are too strict for the dark-sky conditions and we thus lose showers at low energies in the analysis. Additionally, the loss of effective area occurs in different energy ranges, depending on the selected candidate array. This could be due to the overlapping energy regimes of the different telescope types and the fact that the pre-selection cuts were not optimized (e.g. minimum number of pixels used per image) for each sub-array separately.

Another way to look at the effective area of gamma-ray events is in terms of the energy threshold of the instrument. The energy threshold of a Cherenkov telescope array has previously been defined as the energy at the maximum in the differential counting rate. However, this definition is not very sensitive to the lowest accessible energies in CTA due to the different telescope types used. Therefore, one can compare the energies at a fixed effective area. The values are listed in the plots of Figure 4.14 for an effective area of $10^4$ m$^2$. The errors on these
energy values are approximately ±0.1 in $\log_{10}(\text{energy}[\text{TeV}])$. This demonstrates several things: firstly, the energy threshold for moonlight conditions increases compared to dark sky conditions. Depending on the image cleaning (and the sub-array) this effect can be quite small and one nearly reaches the energy threshold under dark sky conditions. Secondly, for most of the sub-arrays the energy threshold under moonlight conditions is still below 100 GeV (only exception are those arrays without LSTs which hardly reach the 100 GeV at $10^4 \text{m}^2$ for dark sky conditions).

**Angular & energy resolution**

The angular resolution for the different candidate arrays (Figure 4.15) shows a very good agreement between dark-sky and moonlight conditions. The same good agreement can be seen in the energy resolution (Figure 4.16) for the different arrays. For Array B the angular resolution at high energies gets worse because it is very compact and most of the high energy showers are located outside the array. This also means that most of the images tend to be close to parallel. By applying a less strict tail-cut cleaning, noisy pixels are added to the image and the reconstruction of the impact parameter and hence the angular and/or energy resolution worsens. However, this effect is already visible in the standard analysis and a method to reconstruct those nearly parallel images better is currently under investigation (e.g., the disp method, Senturk et al., 2011).

![Angular resolution plots](image.png)

Figure 4.15.: Angular resolution (68% containment radius) as a function of energy for different sub-arrays for dark sky (blue) and moonlight conditions with the different cleanings (red: 10/05, green: 07/04).
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Sensitivity

In Figure 4.17 the sensitivity curves for the three candidate arrays are shown for moonlight conditions using both image cleaning sets as well as for dark sky conditions. Comparing the sensitivities of the different arrays obtained under dark-sky to those under moonlight conditions shows that the sensitivity under moonlight is slightly worse over the whole energy range, especially at the lowest energies. Additionally, the looser image cleaning applied to the moonlight simulations (07/04) mostly performs better over the whole energy range compared to the 10/05 cleaning applied to the moonlight simulations. Exceptions are those candidate arrays without LSTs where the low energy performance is much worse for the moonlight conditions than under dark sky which may hint to too strict cuts for the MSTs.

4.4. Summary & Outlook of CTA simulations

The analysis of the CTA simulations presented here clearly demonstrates that the main performance goals of CTA can be met. With an array configuration similar to Array E and an image-moment-based analysis, an improvement of the order of one magnitude in energy range and sensitivity is possible to reach. Furthermore, an increase in observation time by up to 30% can be achieved if operations under partial moonlight are performed. The analysis shown here results in a very good agreement in angular and energy resolution between moonlight and dark-sky conditions and the differential sensitivity under moonlight conditions is comparable within a factor of two to the results obtained for dark sky conditions. These results have been confirmed by an independent analysis (Farnier & Lenain, 2011) using this special MC simulation set pro-
Figure 4.17.: Sensitivity for different sub-arrays for dark-sky (blue) and moonlight conditions with the different cleanings (red: 10/05, green: 07/04).
vided by the author. It is therefore likely, that moonlight observations will become a regular operation mode in CTA.

The MC simulations used here were only the first iteration in layouts and technical implications, more studies are ongoing. A new array layout, the production-2 configuration, is now under study, where the lessons learnt from the first production are accounted for. Special emphasis is given to a more realistic implementation of site parameters (geomagnetic field, observation level) and the technical developments carried out within the collaboration. Developments of the analysis are as well ongoing which are expected to improve the overall performance of CTA even further.
5. Blazars as Targets for VHE Astronomy

Blazars are a subclass of active galactic nuclei. They represent to date about one third of the population of VHE gamma-ray emitter and are dominated by non-thermal emission. A general overview about AGN, with focus on the observations of blazars, is given in Section 5.1. Long-term observations of the blazar B2 1215+30 with VERITAS are presented in Section 5.2. These VHE measurements are complemented with contemporaneous multi-wavelength observations.

5.1. Active Galactic Nuclei

Active galactic nuclei (AGN) are among the most powerful objects in the Universe. The nucleus in AGN produces more radiation than the entire galaxy. The luminosity from this core region is typically in the range of $10^{45}$ to $10^{49}$ erg/s, compared to $10^{44}$ erg/s for the rest of the galaxy. The emitted radiation is usually highly variable and is dominated by non-thermal emission. AGN are observed across the whole electromagnetic spectrum, from radio to gamma rays.

There are several sub-classes of AGN which were historically discerned, e.g., by their radio emission (radio-loud or radio-quiet) or their optical emission line properties (see, e.g., Antonucci, 1993). Radio-loud objects emit collimated beams or jets of plasma while most of the AGN ($\sim 90\%$) do not show these large scale jets and are classified as radio-quiet (e.g., the so-called Seyfert Galaxies). So far, only radio-loud objects have been detected at very high energies. These radio-loud objects can be further sub-divided based on their radio morphology into compact (blazars) and extended radio sources (Fanaroff-Riley Galaxies; FR I and FR II). Presently, it is believed that the various AGN sub-classes are connected to each other and that the observed characteristics of AGN can be attributed to the geometry of the system; in particular, the orientation of the jets with respect to the observer. In this unified scheme (Blandford & Königl, 1979; Urry & Padovani, 1995), illustrated in Figure 5.1, an AGN consist of the following constituents:

**Black hole.** A super-massive black hole (SMBH) of $10^6$ to $10^{10}$ solar masses lies in the center of the galaxy. Even though other massive, dense, and non-luminous objects (e.g., a cluster of neutron stars or white dwarfs) could also explain the motion of stars and gas near the
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Figure 5.1.: Illustration of the current paradigm of an AGN (not to scale; example lengths in parentheses). The central black hole (for an $M = 10^9 M_\odot$ black hole (BH), the Schwarzschild radius is $R_S \sim 1 \times 10^{-4}$ pc) is surrounded by an accretion disk ($\sim 0.01$ pc). The broad emission lines originate in clouds orbiting above the disk (at $\sim 1$ pc). A thick dusty torus (inner radius $\sim 10$ pc) obscures the broad-line region (BLR) when the AGN is seen from the side; narrow lines are produced in clouds much further from the central source ($\sim 1000$ pc) which form the narrow-line region (NLR). Radio jets (extending to about $10^6$ pc) emanate from the region near the black hole in the case of radio-loud AGN. The graph is adapted from Middelberg & Bach (2008) with the typical dimensions taken from Rosswog & Brüggen (2007).

center of the active galaxy, the black hole is the most likely candidate as the central engine (see, e.g., Frank et al. (2002) for a discussion).

**Accretion disk.** The SMBH accretes matter which forms an accretion disk. The gravitational energy is converted into heat and electromagnetic radiation inside the disk which emits radiation mainly at optical/ultraviolet (UV) wavelengths.

**Broad-line region.** The thermal radiation from the disk ionizes the gas clouds close to the black hole. As these clouds move very fast, their emission lines, seen in the UV/optical, are broadened due to the Doppler effect.

**Narrow-line region.** In addition to the broad emission lines, slower moving gas clouds further away from the black hole are responsible for narrow-line absorption and emission spectrum of the AGN.
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Dusty torus. The optical and UV radiation are obscured along the equatorial line of sight by a torus or wrapped disk of gas and dust well outside the accretion disk. This torus absorbs parts of the radiation emitted from the central region and re-emits the energy at infrared wavelengths.

Jets. Under favorable conditions, some of the material escapes the system as collimated outflows of plasma which appear in directions perpendicular to the accretion disk. Observations in radio (and optical) reveal detailed information about jets (Figure 5.2) and show that these outflows can extend from sub- up to hundreds of kilo-parsecs. Additionally, different jet morphologies exist: from bright and highly collimated jets (as in FR II) to low-luminous and less collimated jets (as in FR I galaxies).

It is not yet known what jets are made of and which of the components (e.g., protons, electrons, Poynting flux) carries the dominant fraction of the jet energy and momentum. In a similar fashion, it is not firmly established how jets form and what collimates them over vast distances (see, e.g., Böttcher et al. (2012) and references therein).

Figure 5.2.: Images of the radio galaxy M 87 at different spatial scales and different wavelengths. The Very Large Array radio image (top left) shows the kpc-scale jet inflating radio lobes. The Hubble Space Telescope optical image (top right) shows the structure of the kpc-scale jet. The Very Large Baseline Array image (bottom center) shows the sub-pc scale jet very close to the black hole. Credits: National Radio Astronomy Observatory/National Science Foundation, NASA and John Biretta (STScI/JHU), National Radio Astronomy Observatory/Associated Universities, Inc.
Radio observations of AGN jets also reveal that individual components propagate away from the core with apparent motions exceeding the speed of light. Such “superluminal” motion can be explained by a near-alignment of the jet with the line of sight of the observer combined with highly-relativistic motion of the radio plasma. Let us assume that the radio knot moves with a relativistic speed $v = \beta \Gamma c$ along the jet, which is directed at a small angle $\theta$ with respect to our line of sight ($c$ being the speed of light). The apparent motion, measured by the observer, is given by

$$\beta_{\text{app}} = \frac{\beta \Gamma \sin \theta}{(1 - \beta \Gamma \cos \theta)}.$$  

(5.1)

The velocity distribution of the fastest measured radio jet components peaks at $\beta_{\text{app}} \sim 10$, but seems to possess a tail extending up to $\sim 50$ (Lister et al., 2009; Piner et al., 2012). This indicates that characteristic flow speeds in AGN jets may reach bulk Lorentz factors, $\Gamma = (1 - \beta^2)^{-1/2}$, up to $\sim 50$, thus being highly relativistic.

5.1.1. Blazars

According to unified schemes, blazars are AGN with a relativistic jet closely aligned to the line of sight of the observer and therefore constitute a relatively rare class of objects. They are sub-divided in two classes: flat spectrum radio quasars (FSRQs) and BL Lacertae objects (BL Lacs). FSRQs are typically distinguished from BL Lac objects by the presence of strong and broad optical emission lines. Other observational features, such as superluminal motion (e.g., Jorstad et al., 2001) and rapid variability (e.g. Valtaoja et al., 1992), suggest that relativistic beaming effects play a key role in blazars. Using the definition of the relativistic Doppler factor

$$D \equiv \frac{1}{\Gamma(1 - \beta \Gamma \cos \theta)}$$  

(5.2)

and applying relativistic transformations, it turns out that the observed flux from an astronomical object at frequency $\nu$ is related to the emitted flux in the rest frame of the source via

$$F_{\text{obs}}(\nu_{\text{obs}}) = D^3 F_{\text{em}}(\nu_{\text{em}}),$$

$$\nu_{\text{obs}} \propto D \nu_{\text{em}},$$

$$\Delta t_{\text{var}}^{\text{obs}} \propto D^{-1} \Delta t_{\text{var}}.$$  

(5.3)

The observed flux is thus highly amplified as the plasma is moving along the jet towards the observer while the measured variability time scales are shortened. The strong boost of the flux means as well that the observed emission from the jet dominates the overall energy output and
radiation from other parts (e.g., from the disk) are likely to be outshined.

The spectral energy distribution (SED\(^1\)) of blazars spans about 20 orders of magnitude in energy as shown in Figure 5.3. A typical blazar SED consists of two distinct, broad components. The low-energy component ranges from radio to UV/X-rays and can be covered by several (hundreds) different observatories. The second, high-energy component peaks between X-rays and gamma rays and observations in this energy regime can be performed with space-borne detectors like the Fermi-LAT and ground-based IACTs.

![Figure 5.3: Spectral energy distribution of two blazars during multi-wavelength campaigns with the participating instruments indicated in the figure. Both objects show the two-bump structure typical for blazars. (Left) Mrk 421 in 2009 (Abdo et al., 2011). (Right) Mrk 501 in 2009 (Abdo et al., 2011). Mrk 501 additionally shows a third component at about \(10^{14}\) Hz which is the contribution of the host galaxy.](image)

The non-thermal, continuum spectrum of blazars is commonly attributed to the radiation of particles that are accelerated to highly relativistic energies within the jets. It is thought that this double-bumped structure is produced by synchrotron and inverse Compton emission of relativistic electrons, which is supported by the high polarization observed at radio and optical frequencies (e.g., Wills et al., 1992). However, alternative models to explain this structure exist and an overview of the emission processes in blazars is given in Section 6.1.

### 5.1.2. VHE observations of blazars

Most of the detected extragalactic VHE gamma-ray sources belong to the blazar class which currently (May 2013) counts 52 objects (Wakely & Horan, 2013). The majority of them (> 75%) are high-synchrotron-peaked BL Lacs with their low-energy component peaking at \(\nu_{\text{peak}} >

---

\(^1\) A blazar SED is usually shown in a \(\nu F_\nu\) representation, where the photon flux \(F_\nu\) times the frequency \(\nu\) is given as a function of \(\log \nu\). Such a plot directly shows which part of the spectrum carries most of the energy as the area below the curve is proportional to the energy emitted by the photons in a certain \(\log \nu\) interval.
10^{15} \text{ Hz}, but also blazars with lower synchrotron-peak frequencies have been detected, including three FSRQs (3C 279, PKS 1510-089, and 4C +21.35).

At present, blazars up to redshift $z > 0.5$ (i.e., PKS 1424+240 at $z \geq 0.6035$ and 3C 279 at $z = 0.536$) have been detected in VHE gamma rays. The measurement of VHE emission from such distant sources has been a surprising result, as the high-energy photons emitted by the sources are absorbed by the interaction with low-energy photons from the extragalactic background light (EBL; e.g., Dole et al., 2006). When traveling cosmological distances, the attenuation of VHE photons by gamma-gamma interaction producing an electron-positron pair can alter the observed spectra substantially, resulting in a spectral steepening at very high energies. This absorption feature in the gamma-ray spectrum can also be used to measure the EBL flux density (see, e.g., Ackermann et al., 2012; Abramowski et al., 2013) which is, for direct detection methods, limited by strong foreground emission in the UV, optical and infrared wavelengths.

The VHE emission of blazars shows clear variability on different time scales spanning from longer than months down to a few minutes (Aharonian et al., 2007; Aleksic et al., 2011; Arlen et al., 2013). The observed VHE fluxes are typically in the range of a few percent of the Crab Nebula flux for the average states. The sensitivity of the current generation of IACTs limits the detection of much lower flux states within reasonable observation times. Fluxes in states of high activity have reached up to $\sim 10$ times the Crab Nebula flux in the VHE regime, as seen in Mrk 421 in 2013 (Cortina et al., 2013) and PKS 2155-304 in 2006 (Aharonian et al., 2007). With increasing activity in the VHE regime, a spectral hardening has been observed in a few blazars (e.g. Mrk 421, Acciari et al., 2011a; Mrk 501, Acciari et al., 2011b; PKS 2155-304, Abramowski et al., 2010). While such a behavior can be explained with an increase of the Doppler boost, the softening of the spectrum with increasing flux observed during the quiescent state of PKS 2155-304 (Abramowski et al., 2010), is quite puzzling and gave for the first time a hint of intrinsic differences between the low and the high state in these objects. The fast VHE variability (sometimes measured during high flux states) can be used to constrain the size (and location) of the emission region. These rapid flux variations can also be used to derive constraints on an energy-dependent violation of Lorentz invariance, as predicted in various models of quantum gravity (e.g., Albert et al., 2008).

Observations at other wavelengths, simultaneous with the VHE observations, reveal the complexity of the phenomena at play in these objects. In some blazars a clear evidence for a correlation between VHE gamma-ray and X-ray emission, especially during increased flux states, has been observed (e.g. Mrk 421, Fossati et al., 2008). This lead to the assumption that the non-thermal continuum emission of blazars originates from the same electron population accelerated to TeV energies within the jet. However, the connection is only weak for other blazars (e.g.
Mrk 501, Gliozzi et al., 2006) or even non-existing, as seen during a so-called “orphan” flare of 1ES 1959-650 in 2002, where the TeV gamma-ray flux increased by a factor of ten without a noticeable flux increase in X-rays (Krawczynski et al., 2004).

Recently, some new VHE gamma-ray sources have been detected following triggers indicating a high state of these sources in the optical regime (Reinthal et al., 2012). Even though this points toward a possible correlation between TeV and optical emission, this study is still inconclusive.

5.2. An example of VHE blazar observations: B2 1215+30

B2 1215+30 is one of the first BL Lac-type objects to be identified (Browne, 1971) and was one member of the small set of objects used to define the class. It was first detected in the Bologna Northern Cross telescope survey conducted at 408 MHz (Colla et al., 1970) and is also referred to as ON 325 or 1ES 1215+303. The distance to this blazar is uncertain and two different redshift values can be found in the literature: \( z = 0.130 \) (Akiyama et al., 2003; NED\(^2\)) and \( z = 0.237 \) (Lanzetta et al., 1993; Simbad\(^3\)). While both redshift values have been obtained based on spectroscopic measurements, none of the claimed spectral features could be confirmed with high-resolution measurements: neither with the FAST instrument on the FLWO 60” telescope in 2011 (E. Falco, priv. comm.) nor with a high signal-to-noise spectrum obtained with the Lick Observatory Kast double spectrograph on the Shane 3-m telescope in 2013 (M. Fumagalli, priv. comm.).

In the following the results of VERITAS observations taken in the direction of B2 1215+30 between December 2008 and March 2012 are presented. This blazar is in the same field of view as the bright VHE blazar 1ES 1218+304\(^4\) which is regularly observed by VERITAS (Benbow et al., 2011). The analysis of this VERITAS long-term data set has been carried out by the author. These data are complemented with high-energy gamma-ray observations taken by Fermi-LAT. Results from multi-wavelength observations\(^5\) obtained in 2011, quasi-simultaneous with VERITAS, are used to construct the SED of B2 1215+30.

5.2.1. Very-high-energy observations with VERITAS

The VERITAS observations reported here include observations of B2 1215+30 and 1ES 1218+304; two sources separated by 0.76° and thus within the same field of view. Most of the observations had 1ES 1218+304 as the principal target, resulting in different pointing offsets from the

---

\(^2\) NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database: http://ned.ipac.caltech.edu/

\(^3\) SIMBAD Astronomical Database: http://simbad.u-strasbg.fr/simbad/

\(^4\) B2 1215+30 and 1ES 1218+304 are 0.76° away from each other.

\(^5\) The analysis of the MWL data sets was carried out by members of the VERITAS Collaboration, presented in Prokop et al. (2012) and Aliu et al. (2013).
position of B2 1215+30 (from 0.3° to 1.3°) as all data were taken in “wobble mode”, with a pointing offset of 0.5° from the camera center. Combining the observations on both sources, VERITAS observed B2 1215+30 for more than 92 hours between December 2008 and March 2012. The run quality selected data (see Appendix B.2 for the complete runlist) are divided into three data sets, corresponding to yearly observation epochs. The first one spans 34 hours from December 2008 to May 2009 at a mean zenith angle of 20 degrees, the second data set was recorded between January and June 2011 (42 hours) at a mean zenith angle of 15 degrees, and the third data set was taken from January to March 2012 (16 hours) with a mean zenith angle of 13 degrees. Due to the different pointing positions and the non-uniform radial acceptance of the camera, the average sensitivity for the VERITAS exposure on B2 1215+30 is reduced. Correcting for this effect, the total effective exposures on B2 1215+30 (in 0.5° wobble offset), are 29, 38, and 14 hours for the different observation epochs, respectively.

The data analysis is performed with eventdisplay as explained in Section 3.2 using the cuts given in Table 3.3. The remaining background is estimated using a ring background model with \( \theta^2 \leq 0.008 \text{deg}^2 \) and a ring, placed around the ON region, with inner and outer radii of 0.46° and 0.54°, respectively. Regions around bright stars (V magnitude brighter than 7) as well as the region around the position of 1ES 1218+304 were excluded from the background estimation.

The analysis of the total data set over the time period from December 2008 to March 2012 yields 261 excess events and a detection significance of 9.0\( \sigma \) according to Eq. 17 in Li & Ma (1983). The results of the three observing periods are presented in Table 5.1 and show a clear detection with a significance of 10.4\( \sigma \) in 2011, while in 2008/2009 and in 2012 the source is not detected with a significance greater than 3.4\( \sigma \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data set</th>
<th>Exposure [hours]</th>
<th>Zenith [deg]</th>
<th>( N_{ON} )</th>
<th>( N_{OFF} )</th>
<th>( \alpha )</th>
<th>Significance [( \sigma )]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008/2009</td>
<td>34 (29)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>2288</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>42 (38)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2325</td>
<td>0.1161</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>16 (14)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>0.1179</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>92 (81)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>5441</td>
<td>0.1198</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1.: VERITAS results of B2 1215+30 for the three different observing epochs. The exposure time is given in hours, while the value in brackets gives the effective time on B2 1215+30 (in 0.5° wobble offset equivalent). \( N_{ON} \) and \( N_{OFF} \) are the number of events in the ON and OFF region, while \( \alpha \) is the acceptance corrected area ratio of both regions and the resulting significance of the detection of B2 1215+30 is calculated according to Eq. 3.6.
Before presenting the results of these two latter periods, I concentrate on the 2011 data set where the significant detection allows a spectral analysis. Figure 5.4 (left) shows the significance sky map for the 2011 data set. The derived differential photon spectrum of the 2011 data set is shown in Figure 5.4 (right). It can be fitted by a power law \( \chi^2/\text{ndf} = 1.25/2 \):

\[
\frac{dN}{dE} = (2.3 \pm 0.5_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.9_{\text{syst}}) \left( \frac{E}{300 \text{ GeV}} \right)^{-3.6 \pm 0.4_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.3_{\text{syst}}}.
\]

Figure 5.4.: (Left) VERITAS significance sky map of B2 1215+30 in 2011. The black cross shows the position of B2 1215+30 and the white star indicates the position of 1ES 1218+304. Both sources are point-like, but appear to have a different size due to the saturation of the color scale. (Right) Differential photon spectrum of B2 1215+30 obtained with VERITAS in 2011. The spectral points are fitted with a power-law. The error bars denote 1\(\sigma\) uncertainties, and an 95% upper limit is drawn for a spectral point with less than 2\(\sigma\) significance.

The flux above 200 GeV is \((8.0 \pm 0.9_{\text{stat}} \pm 3.2_{\text{syst}}) \times 10^{-12} \text{ cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}\). This corresponds to 3.4% of the Crab Nebula flux (Hillas et al., 1998) above the same energy threshold. A monthly binned\(^6\) light curve above 200 GeV is produced and shown in Figure 5.5. A constant fit to these flux points shows no evidence for deviation from a steady flux \(\chi^2/\text{ndf} = 4.7/5\). No significant flux variations within any monthly bin were detected either.

The analysis of the data available outside the 2011 season revealed lower gamma-ray fluxes, as shown in Figure 5.6. The 2008/2009 data set analysis resulted in a gamma-ray excess of 1.1\(\sigma\)

\(^6\) A monthly bin corresponds to a period of 29.5 days (= duration of the lunar cycle), starting on the night of the full Moon.
Figure 5.5.: Monthly binned VERITAS light curve above 200 GeV as measured in 2011. Vertical error bars show 1σ statistical uncertainties on the flux, horizontal error bars indicate the width of the corresponding observing interval within the monthly bins. A fit to a constant gives $\chi^2/\text{ndf} = 4.7/5$, showing no evidence for variability on monthly time scales. The light curves for the other VERITAS seasons are given in Appendix B.3.

significance at the source location. Using the method of Helene (1983), this excess corresponds to a 99% upper limit above 200 GeV of $4.5 \times 10^{-12} \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, assuming the same spectral index as derived in 2011, and is $<2\%$ of the Crab Nebula flux above the same energy threshold. In 2012, the source is observed with a significance of 3.4σ. Given that it is an established VHE emitter a flux is derived: $F(E > 200\text{GeV}) = (2.9 \pm 1.1_{\text{stat}} \pm 1.1_{\text{syst}}) \times 10^{-12} \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$, corresponding to about 1.2% of the Crab Nebula flux above the same energy threshold. The hypothesis of a constant flux between the three VERITAS seasons is excluded at the level of 4.3σ ($\chi^2/\text{ndf} = 22.4/3$). This shows that the source was significantly fainter in 2008/2009 and 2012 compared to the relatively bright flux state in 2011.

This bright flux state and hints for long-term variability of B2 1215+30 were also reported by MAGIC, who discovered this BL Lac object in early January 2011 during observations triggered by an optical high state (Mariotti et al., 2011). In 2011, MAGIC observed B2 1215+30 for 21 hours between January and February and derived an integral flux above 200 GeV of $(7.7 \pm 0.9_{\text{stat}}) \times 10^{-12} \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ with a photon spectral index of $\Gamma = 2.96 \pm 0.14_{\text{stat}}$ (Aleksić et al., 2012b); consistent with the results obtained here. Observations between January and February 2010 by MAGIC revealed a 3.5σ excess at the source location, which can be translated into an integral flux of $(3.4 \pm 1.0_{\text{stat}}) \times 10^{-12} \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$. Combining the results from VERITAS and MAGIC shows long-term variability of B2 1215+30, as presented in Figure 5.6. No short-term variability has been detected by any of the two instruments between December 2008 and March 2012.
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Figure 5.6.: Long-term observations of B2 1215+30 in the VHE regime between December 2008 and March 2012. Flux points are shown for VERITAS (black points) and MAGIC (gray open points). Vertical error bars show 1σ statistical uncertainties, horizontal error bars indicate the width of the corresponding observing interval. It shows a bright flux state in 2011 compared to the fainter flux states during the other seasons.

Figure 5.7.: Bi-weekly binned light curve of B2 1215+30 as obtained by Fermi-LAT using the first 48 months of the Fermi mission. Flux points are shown with 1σ error bars and an 95% upper limit is calculated for bins with a TS-value less than 4. The gray shaded areas indicate the time periods when quasi-simultaneous observations in the VHE regime were obtained by VERITAS and/or MAGIC.
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5.2.2. High-energy observations with Fermi-LAT

The Large Area Telescope (LAT) on board the Fermi satellite is a pair-conversion gamma-ray telescope sensitive to photon energies from 20 MeV to a few hundred GeV (Atwood et al., 2009). It is continuously observing the high-energy gamma-ray sky, and thus also B2 1215+30, since June 2008. B2 1215+30 is listed in the Fermi bright source list (Abdo et al., 2009a), and appears in all later Fermi catalogs (e.g. Ackermann et al., 2011). In the following, all data from the first 48 months of operation are used.

A binned likelihood analysis was performed using the LAT ScienceTools (version v9r23p1) and P7SOURCE_V6 instrument response functions. “Diffuse” class events with $0.2 < E/\text{GeV} < 100$ in a square region of interest (ROI) of $20^\circ \times 20^\circ$ around B2 1215+30 were selected. As the bright FSRQ 4C +21.35 is $8.87^\circ$ away from B2 1215+30 it would fall right at the edge of the ROI. To avoid truncation of the source contribution in the analysis, the center of the ROI was shifted by $4^\circ$ towards 4C +21.35 (to fully include it in the ROI). Further quality selection was performed by rejecting events with a zenith angle $> 100^\circ$ and a rocking angle $> 52^\circ$ in order to avoid contamination from albedo photons from the Earth’s limb.

A background model was constructed including nearby gamma-ray sources and diffuse emission. All known gamma-ray sources from the second Fermi catalogue (2FGL; Nolan et al., 2012) within the ROI were included in the model. As in the 2FGL catalogue, a log-parabola function was used for sources with significant spectral curvature. Otherwise, spectra were described as power laws. The spectral parameters of the sources inside the ROI were left free during the fitting procedure. Sources outside the ROI, but within $5^\circ$ of the ROI edges, were also included to account for possible photon contamination due to the large LAT point spread function, but their spectral parameters were fixed to the 2FGL catalog values. The galactic and extragalactic diffuse gamma-ray emission together with the residual instrumental background were modeled using the publicly-available files\footnote{The files used were gal\_2yearp7v6\_v0.fits for the Galactic diffuse and iso\_p7v6source.txt for the isotropic diffuse component as available at \url{http://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/access/lat/BackgroundModels.html}.}

A 14-day binned light curve above 200 MeV was produced using the first 48 months of the Fermi mission which is shown in Figure 5.7. As already reported in Nolan et al. (2012), B2 1215+30 showed variability within this period with a very bright flux state at the beginning of the mission. A fit to a constant taking all flux points into account yielded a $\chi^2/\text{ndf}$ of 224.8/95, thus excluding a constant flux with a significance of 7.1σ. In the following, I will concentrate on the time periods contemporaneous with the VHE observations, starting with the bright VHE flux state in 2011.

During the epoch quasi-simultaneous with the 2011 VERITAS observations (MJD 55560 –
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55720), the flux above 200 MeV is compatible with being constant ($\chi^2/ndf = 11.1/10$) and a spectrum was derived using this subset of observations only. During that 160-day period, B2 1215+30 is detected with a test statistic value of $TS = 363$, corresponding to a significance of about 19 $\sigma$. Potential contamination from the nearby source 1ES 1218+304 (at 0.76$^\circ$ distance) was checked by producing a residual $TS$ map; no features or asymmetries in the TS distribution of B2 1215+30 were seen. The spectrum, shown in Figure 5.8, is compatible with a power law with a photon index $\Gamma = 1.97 \pm 0.08$. This is consistent with the photon index given in the 2FGL catalog of $\Gamma_{2FGL} = 2.02 \pm 0.04$. The integral flux above 200 MeV during this period is $(3.45 \pm 0.34) \times 10^{-8}$ cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$.

![Energy Band Fits Maximum Likelihood Model](image)

Figure 5.8: *Fermi*-LAT spectrum quasi-simultaneous with the 2011 VERITAS observations. Courtesy of Manel Errando.

Given the long-term variability seen in the VHE regime, an integral flux above 200 MeV quasi-simultaneous with the VERITAS and MAGIC observations was derived. The values are listed in Table 5.2 together with the VHE observing periods. The hypothesis of a constant gamma-ray flux above 200 MeV contemporaneous with the different VHE observing periods could be rejected at the 3$\sigma$-level. No significant short-term flux variations within those time periods (covering several months) have been detected due to the uncertainties on the flux estimation.

5.2.3. A multi-wavelength picture of B2 1215+30 in 2011

In 2011, contemporaneous with the bright VHE flux state, MWL observations were obtained at optical (Super-LOTIS, MDM, *Swift*-UVOT) and X-ray (*Swift*-XRT) frequencies in addition
to the high-energy gamma-ray observations by Fermi-LAT detailed above. They are used to construct the SED of B2 1215+30 and will later be used to model the emission of this BL Lac object.

### X-ray observations with Swift-XRT

The X-ray telescope (XRT) on board of the Swift satellite is designed to measure X-rays in the 0.2 – 10 keV energy range (Burrows et al., 2005). Target of opportunity observations were obtained in January 2011 (MJD 55565 – 55573), following the detection of VHE emission from B2 1215+30, as well as in April/May 2011 (MJD 555673 – 55686). All data presented here were taken in photon counting mode with negligible pile-up effects.

The data reduction and calibration were done using HEASoft, XSPEC version 12.6.0 and the swxpc0to12s6_20070901v011.rmf response function. The data were grouped, requiring a minimum of 20 counts/bin, and then fitted with an absorbed power law model. The galactic column density of $N_H = 1.74 \times 10^{20}\text{cm}^{-2}$ was used, taken from the LAB neutral hydrogen survey (Kalberla et al., 2005). When it was left free during the fit, the column density value was consistent with what was found by the LAB survey.

The spectral analysis of data showed the blazar in different states, as shown in Figure 5.9. The observations performed in January indicate a harder and brighter flux state, allowing the data to be fitted with an absorbed power law up to 10 keV. The highest integrated flux was found on January 4 (MJD 55565) with $F_{[2-10\text{keV}]} = (3.31 \pm 0.22) \times 10^{-12}\text{erg cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$ and a photon index of $2.46 \pm 0.05$. The observations taken in April/May show the object in a lower flux state, with too poor statistics in the energy bins above 5 keV to constrain a spectral fit.
However, combining the exposures from all the observations of April/May allows a fit in the 0.4 to 10 keV range with an integrated flux of $F_{0.4-10\text{keV}} = (4.25 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-12} \text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ and a photon index of $2.74 \pm 0.04$.

An X-ray flux-index correlation study, performed on the entire data set, resulted in a correlation coefficient of $r = -0.88$ with an uncertainty of $< 0.1$. This implied a strong (negative) correlation between spectral index and integrated flux of the X-ray observations.

![Figure 5.9.](image)

Figure 5.9.: *Swift*-XRT observations of B2 1215+30 in 2011. (Left) X-ray light curve for the integrated flux (lower panel) and the spectral index (upper panel) showing the blazar in a brighter and harder flux state in January (black points) compared to April/May (gray points). (Right) Flux-spectral index correlation in the X-ray regime in 2011. The correlation coefficient is $r = -0.88$, implying a strong (negative) correlation. Analysis courtesy: A. Furniss & J. Grube.

**UV and optical observations with Swift-UVOT, Super-LOTIS and MDM**

In the ultraviolet (UV) and optical regime, *Swift*-UVOT (Roming et al., 2005) observations were taken in January and April/May 2011. All exposures (covering different pass bands) were taken in *image mode*, where the image is accumulated on board the satellite discarding the photon timing information within each single exposure to reduce the telemetry volume and the time of transmission.

The photometry was computed using the 5 arcsec aperture and, where possible, the recommended background region (annulus, 20 to 30 arcsec radius) following the prescription in Poole et al. (2008) and Breeveld et al. (2010). A dedicated inter-calibration study between optical, UV and X-ray datasets was carried out, adopting the $N_H$ parameter for the hydrogen column (ob-
tained from the LAB survey). The results were reddening corrected using $E(B-V) = 0.023$ mag (Schlegel et al., 1998). Then, the corresponding optical/UV galactic extinction coefficients were computed ($R_V = 2.667$) and applied (Fitzpatrick, 1999). The host galaxy contribution of B2 1215+30 was estimated using the PEGASE-HR code (Le Borgne et al., 2004) extended for the ultraviolet UVOT filters and by using the R-band photometric results of Nilsson et al. (2007).

For each filter, the integrated flux was computed by using the related effective frequency and not convolving the filter transmission with the source spectrum. This may produce a moderate overestimation (around 10%) of the integrated flux. The total upper limit systematic uncertainty is 15% and the resulting light curve is shown in Figure 5.10.

In the optical regime, B2 1215+30 was monitored using the Super-LOTIS (Livermore Optical Transient Imaging System\(^8\)) robotic telescope over the period December 2010 – June 2011. In addition to these R-band observations, B2 1215+30 was observed with the 1.3 m McGraw-Hill telescope of the MDM observatory\(^9\) during one week in May 2011 (MJD 55706 – 55709), using standard V, R, and I filters.

The optical data were bias-subtracted and flat-fielded using the routines of the Image Reduction and Analysis Facitily (IRAF; Tody, 1993, 1986). Comparative photometry with stars of known magnitude was performed and the resulting light curve in Figure 5.10 showed clear variability. The results obtained here are in line with the variability seen on the publicly available light curves from the Tuorla Observatory\(^10\).

For the construction of the optical SED using MDM observations, the magnitudes were corrected for Galactic extinction according to Schlegel et al. (1998). The values are $A_V = 0.079$, $A_R = 0.064$, and $A_I = 0.046$, as provided by the NED.

**Spectral energy distribution of B2 1215+30 in 2011**

The combination of the results from the MWL data analyzes is a well sampled light curve in time and energy for the first half of 2011, shown in Figure 5.10. It covers a wide range of frequencies and the data are used to construct an SED. As no variability was detected in the high- or very-high-energy regimes, the Fermi-LAT data contemporaneous with the VERITAS observations in 2011 are used (MJD 55560 – 55720). Given the clear variability at lower frequencies, especially in X-rays, two spectra are extracted: one to represent the high X-ray state in January (MJD 55565) and the other one to represent the low X-ray state observed in April/May (using the combined spectrum from all observations between MJD 55673 – 55686). Swift-UVOT data simultaneous with the X-ray observations were used when available, while the quasi-simultaneous optical

---

8 http://slotis.kpno.noao.edu/LOTIS/
9 http://mdm.kpno.noao.edu/
10 http://users.utu.fi/kani/1m/ON_325.html
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Figure 5.10.: Multi-wavelength light curve of B2 1215+30 for the first half of 2011. (a) Monthly binned VHE gamma-ray light curve above 200 GeV as measured by VERITAS. (b) Bi-weekly binned Fermi-LAT light curve above 200 MeV. (c) X-ray light curve measured by Swift-XRT. (d) Swift-UVOT light curve for the different band pass filters (given in the legend). (e) Optical light curve. The black points represent the measurements by Super-LOTIS in the R-band, with a statistical error of $\sim 0.1 - 0.2$ mag. The V, R, and I points illustrate the data from MDM observations.
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5. BLAZARS AS TARGETS FOR VHE ASTRONOMY

The broadband SED, in the $\nu F_\nu$ representation, can be found in Figure 5.11. It shows a two-bump structure typical for blazars. Based on the location of the synchrotron peak between UV and X-rays, B2 1215+30 can be classified as an intermediate- or high-synchrotron-peaked blazar ($\nu_{\text{sync}} \sim 10^{15.16}$) according to Nieppola et al. (2006) or Ackermann et al. (2011), respectively.

![Figure 5.11: Spectral energy distribution of B2 1215+30 in 2011.](image)

What causes this emission and which mechanisms can explain the observed variability, especially in the X-ray regime, are questions which will be addressed in the following chapter by modeling the broadband emission of B2 1215+30.
6. Modeling of Blazar Emission

A powerful tool to gain insight into the physics of blazars is to model their spectral energy distribution (SED). As the emission from blazars is dominated by non-thermal emission, extending up to TeV energies, particles have to be accelerated to relativistic energies inside the jet. A short introduction into gamma-ray production mechanisms is presented in Section 6.1 in which a general overview about existing blazar emission models is given. In Section 6.2, one of these models, i.e., the synchrotron-self Compton (SSC) model, is presented in detail. It is used to model the emission of B2 1215+30 in Section 6.3 where the obtained results are discussed and put in context with other VERITAS-detected blazars.

6.1. Gamma-ray emission in blazars

Except for possible production by top-down processes such as the decay of heavy particles, VHE gamma rays are produced only in the interactions of accelerated charged particles (electrons or protons or both) with ambient matter or radiation fields. In the following, a brief overview of particle acceleration mechanisms is given (Section 6.1.1) and the main non-thermal emission processes are outlined (Section 6.1.2). Some common models for the emission in blazar jets are presented in Section 6.1.3.

6.1.1. Acceleration of charged particles

For the production of the observationally required non-thermal power-law distribution of particles in the jets of AGN (see, e.g., Kirk & Duffy, 1999, for a review), Fermi processes (Fermi, 1949) are the most efficient and plausible mechanisms (Rieger et al., 2007).

First-order Fermi acceleration (e.g., Blandford & Eichler, 1987), sometimes also referred to as diffusive shock acceleration, is a process where particles cross shock fronts multiple times, with an energy gain per crossing proportional to the shock velocity $\beta$. Only a few particles can be accelerated to extreme high energies before they escape, thus naturally accounting for the commonly required power-law particle spectra $n(\gamma) \propto \gamma^{-q}$ with spectral indices $q \simeq 2$. As this process is also a sufficiently fast and efficient mechanism, first-order Fermi
acceleration at strong shocks is among the most common scenarios for particle acceleration in jets.

**Second-order Fermi acceleration** is caused by turbulences downstream of shocks where particles gain or lose energy through scattering. As the probability of gaining energy by head-on scattering is larger than losing energy by rear-on scattering, the energy of particles will statistically increase in the end.

However, Fermi processes cannot account for all observational phenomena (Rieger et al., 2007). Alternative acceleration mechanisms, such as magnetic reconnection (e.g., Schopper et al., 1998), and shear-layer acceleration (e.g., Rieger & Duffy, 2006) have been proposed, e.g. to account for different spectral indices of the non-thermal particle spectrum. In the end, it is most likely that a combination of these different processes takes place in the extreme environment of blazars.

### 6.1.2. Non-thermal emission processes

Once the particles have been accelerated to VHE energies, they emit photons through several processes. The most important are outlined in the following and can be found in textbooks (e.g., Rybicki & Lightman, 1979; Longair, 1992).

**Synchrotron radiation**

Any charged particle moving through a magnetic field $B$ will follow a spiral trajectory and consequently emits radiation. In the case of relativistically moving particles this is called *synchrotron radiation* and is most efficient for light particles like electrons. The average energy-loss rate of an electron in a magnetic field is given by

$$-\left(\frac{dE}{dt}\right)_{\text{sync}} = \frac{4}{3} c \sigma_T u_B \gamma^2$$

where $u_B = B^2 / 8\pi$ is the magnetic field energy density, $\sigma_T$ is the Thomson cross section, and $\gamma$ is the electron energy (defined by $E = \gamma m_e c^2$). The typical time scale in which an electron looses its energy is given by the cooling time

$$\tau_{\text{sync}} = \frac{E}{(dE/dt)_{\text{sync}}} \propto \frac{1}{B^2 E}.$$  

If the electron distribution is a power law of the form $n(\gamma) \propto \gamma^{-p}$, electrons at the high-energy end loose their energy first and will deviate from the original power law. The emitted synchrotron
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The spectrum is of the form

\[ F_\nu \propto B^{(p+1)/2} \nu^{-(p-1)/2}, \tag{6.3} \]

and follows in principle the power-law form of the electron distribution. At a certain minimum energy, the electrons will absorb the synchrotron photons by synchrotron-self absorption (the medium becomes optically thick). Below this minimum frequency the photon spectrum is given by \[ F_\nu \propto B^{-(1/2)} \nu^{5/2}, \] depending only on the magnetic field strength.

**Inverse Compton scattering**

The interaction of relativistic electrons with low-energy photons through inverse Compton (IC) scattering provides one of the principal gamma-ray production processes, where the energy is transferred from the high-energy electrons to the photons. The average loss-rate of the electron in single IC scatterings is

\[ -\left(\frac{dE}{dt}\right)_{\text{IC}} = \frac{4}{3} c \sigma_T u_{ph} \gamma^2 \tag{6.4} \]

where \( u_{ph} \) is the energy density of isotropic seed photons. In the classical Thomson regime (elastic scattering) the photons in the electron rest frame have energies much smaller than the electron rest mass energy. The cross section in that case is approximately constant \((\propto \sigma_T)\) and the maximum energy of the up-scattered photons is \( E_{\text{max}} = 4\gamma^2 E_{ph} \) while their average energy is \( \langle E \rangle = 4/3\gamma^2 E_{ph} \). At high energies, quantum physics effects become important and the scattering is no longer elastic. This is the so-called Klein-Nishina regime in which the scattering cross section begins to decrease dramatically (i.e., when \( h\nu/(mc^2)\gamma \sim 1 \)). This means as well that Compton scattering is not very efficient at very high energies and the maximum outgoing-photon energy is \( E_{\text{max}} = \gamma mc^2 \).

If the electron distribution is a power-law distribution, the resulting IC spectrum can, in general, also be described by a power law. In the Thomson regime, it follows the synchrotron spectrum, i.e. \( F_\nu \propto \nu^{-(p-1)/2}, \) while in the Klein-Nishina limit it is steeper, \( F_\nu \propto \nu^{-p}. \)

**Neutral pion decay**

As the lightest hadrons with \( m_\pi \approx 140 \text{ MeV} \), pions are among the end products of most hadronic cascades. Charged \((\pi^\pm)\) and neutral \((\pi^0)\) pions are produced with the same probability in proton-proton or photon-meson interactions. Most neutral pions decay almost immediately into two gamma rays, while charged pions usually undergo further interactions due to their longer lifetime before they eventually decay into electrons and neutrinos.
Bremsstrahlung

When charged particles are deflected in electric fields, they radiate bremsstrahlung and the emitted photon spectrum follows the power-law form of the accelerated particles with the same spectral index. Ultra-high-energy cosmic rays (UHECR; $E > 10^{19} \text{ eV}$) can emit via bremsstrahlung gamma rays in the TeV regime.

6.1.3. Blazar emission models

Blazar SEDs span a wide range in energy, making simultaneous multi-wavelength observations an important tool to disentangle the underlying non-thermal processes. A review of the different blazar models is given, e.g., in Böttcher (2012).

In the most common models, the SED of blazars is described by emission produced inside the blazar jets and the low-frequency peak is believed to be synchrotron emission from relativistic electrons. For the origin of the high-energy peak, two different scenarios exist which are dominated by either leptonic or hadronic emission, depending on the particles responsible for the emission. Therefore, a good spectral characterization of the high-energy peak is essential to reveal the dominant emission processes which cannot be inferred from the synchrotron peak.

Leptonic models

In leptonic models, the high-energy component arises from inverse Compton scattering of high-energy electrons with low-energy target photons. These seed photons can be either from the synchrotron radiation of the same electron population (synchrotron-self Compton; SSC) or from different radiation fields in the blazar environment (external Compton; EC). In both models, the broadband emission comes from the same particle population within the jet which is supported by the correlation seen between X-ray and VHE gamma-ray variability.

In the SSC models (e.g., Marscher & Gear, 1985; Maraschi et al., 1992; Böttcher & Chiang, 2002), a population of relativistic electrons moves along the magnetized jet, generating synchrotron photons with frequency $\nu_{\text{sync}} \propto B E^2$, where $B$ is the magnetic field strength and $E$ is the energy of the particles. These photons are up-scattered in energy by the same electron population that emitted them, to frequencies $\nu_{\text{IC}} \propto \nu_{\text{sync}} E^2 \propto B E^4$ (see Section 6.2 for a detailed description). While these SSC models have been successfully applied to BL Lac objects like Mrk 421 (Abdo et al., 2011) or Mrk 501 (Abdo et al., 2011), they have difficulties to explain the dominant gamma-ray component observed, e.g., in FSRQs or low-frequency-peaked blazars (Dermer & Lott, 2012).

By introducing external photon fields, the gamma-ray dominance can usually be successfully modeled as an additional gamma-ray component can emerge (as, e.g., in the FSRQ 3C 279).
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Böttcher, 2007). Possible photon fields in EC models are (i) optical/UV/X-ray emission from the disk (e.g., Dermer et al., 1992; Dermer & Schlickeiser, 1993), (ii) reprocessed optical/UV emission from circumnuclear material (e.g. the BLR, Sikora et al., 1994; Dermer et al., 1997) (iii) infrared emission from warm dusk (e.g., Blażejowski et al., 2000) and/or (iv) the cosmic microwave background (CMB, e.g., Harris & Krawczynski, 2002).

In addition to the different target photon sources several variations of multi-zone-jet models have been proposed to account for rapid variability and large Doppler factors, required to describe the SED in some objects. These include the spine-sheath model of Sol et al. (1989) (or Tavecchio & Ghisellini, 2008), the decelerating-jet model of Georganopoulos & Kazanas (2003), as well as several internal-shock models (e.g., Graff et al., 2008; Joshi & Böttcher, 2011).

(Lepto-) Hadronic models

In the dominant hadronic scenarios, the high-energy component is explained by gamma-ray emission from VHE protons. To accelerate protons to the necessary ultra-relativistic energies ($E_p \geq 10^{18}$ eV), high magnetic fields of several tens of Gauss are required (much higher than in leptonic models). These VHE protons can produce secondary gamma rays, e.g., by (i) interaction with matter inside the jet (e.g., via relativistic blast waves, Pohl & Schlickeiser, 2000), (ii) directly via synchrotron emission in a highly magnetized jet (proton-synchrotron model, e.g., Aharonian, 2000), or (iii) indirectly through secondary electrons produced in a cascade induced by proton interactions with external photons ($p-\gamma$ model, e.g., Mannheim, 1993; Mücke & Protheroe, 2001). However, the low plasma density usually found in the jets results in relatively long cooling times, making it challenging to account for short-term variability.

The most attractive feature of hadronic models comes from the multi-messenger link. As hadronic interactions imply neutrino production, a detection of an AGN by a neutrino telescope like IceCube\textsuperscript{1} would clearly favor hadronic models. At the same time it would imply acceleration of particles up to very high energies, strongly suggesting AGN as sources of UHECRs observed on Earth. On the other hand, hadronic models require in general more extreme and fine-tuned model parameters than leptonic models — one of the reasons why in general leptonic models are still preferred.

6.2. Synchrotron-self Compton model

The synchrotron self-Compton (SSC) models stand out by their simplicity, requiring only a small number of parameters to describe the broadband emission of blazars. In Section 6.2.1, the

\textsuperscript{1} http://icecube.wisc.edu/
SSC model from Böttcher & Chiang (2002) is described in detail. The different parameters and possible constraints are discussed in Section 6.2.2 using the model code provided by M. Böttcher.

### 6.2.1. Model description

The radiating plasma is modeled as a spherical emission region (“blob”) of comoving radius \( R \) which is propagating with relativistic speed \( \beta c \) along the jet axis. The jet is directed at a small angle \( \theta \) with respect to the line of sight to the observer. It is fixed to the superluminal angle, \( \theta \approx 1/\Gamma \), for which the (bulk) Lorentz factor \( \Gamma \) equals the Doppler factor \( D = [\Gamma(1 - \beta \cos \theta)]^{-1} \). As the results of the model depend mainly on the Doppler factor, other combinations of \( \theta \) and \( \Gamma \) resulting in the same Doppler factor are also possible.

Into the emission region, a population of ultra-relativistic non-thermal electrons is continuously injected following a power-law distribution with low- and high-energy cutoffs \( \gamma_1 \) and \( \gamma_2 \), respectively, so that

\[
Q_e(\gamma, t) = Q_0(t) V_b \gamma^{-q} \quad (6.5)
\]

while \( Q_0 \) is related to the total particle density \( n_e \) by \( Q_0 = n_e (1 - q)/(\gamma_2^{-q} - \gamma_1^{-q}) \) and \( V_b \) is the co-moving volume of the emission region. As the blob is propagating along the jet, the electrons lose energy through synchrotron emission in a tangled magnetic field of co-moving strength \( B \) and through Compton scattering on the synchrotron radiation field. This is a simple adaption of the internal shock model where the particles, efficiently accelerated at the shock front, fill the downstream region of the shock.

Within the model, a quasi-equilibrium is assumed between particle injection, radiative cooling and particle escape. The latter is described by an escape timescale parameter \( \eta_{\text{esc}} \geq 1 \) with \( t_{\text{esc}} = \eta_{\text{esc}} \cdot R/c \). As a result, a break in the electron distribution will occur self-consistently at a Lorentz factor \( \gamma_b \), where \( t_{\text{esc}} = \tau_{\text{cool}}(\gamma_b) \). Depending on whether \( \gamma_b \) is larger or less than \( \gamma_1 \), the system will be in the slow or fast cooling regime. In the slow cooling regime \( (\gamma_b > \gamma_1) \), the equilibrium-electron distribution (EED) will be a broken power law of the form

\[
n_e(\gamma) \propto \begin{cases} 
\gamma^{-q} & \text{for } \gamma_1 < \gamma < \gamma_b \\
\gamma^{-(q+1)} & \text{for } \gamma_b < \gamma < \gamma_2
\end{cases} \quad (6.6)
\]

while in the fast cooling regime \( (\gamma_b < \gamma_1) \), the broken power law is given by

\[
n_e(\gamma) \propto \begin{cases} 
\gamma^{-2} & \text{for } \gamma_b < \gamma < \gamma_1 \\
\gamma^{-(q+1)} & \text{for } \gamma_1 < \gamma < \gamma_2
\end{cases} \quad (6.7)
\]
6.2. Synchrotron-self Compton model

The resulting spectral index below the break in the fast cooling regime, \( q_1 = 2 \), is rather typical for astrophysical sources and is a direct result of cooling through synchrotron or IC scattering in the Thomson regime. In other SSC models, where the injected electron distribution is described by a broken power law rather than obtained self-consistently, this might be a result of first-order Fermi acceleration at the shock front.

The minimum electron energy is directly related to the radiative cooling in the emission region. It is given by

\[
\gamma_{\text{min}} = \frac{3 m_e c^2}{4 e \sigma_T \tau_{\text{cool}}(u_{ph} + u_B)}
\]

and can, in principle, cool down to \( \gamma \sim 1 \) if the source evolution time is long enough. However, as the minimum energy is inversely proportional to the cooling time, high-energy particles (\( \gamma \sim 10^5 \)) lose their energy more rapidly than low-energy electrons (\( \gamma \sim 10^3 \)). In other words, a minimum Lorentz factor of \( \gamma_{\text{min}} \gg 1 \) is usually obtained in the model, implying that the acceleration process at the shock front is very efficient, which results in a highly relativistic electron distribution.

Once the quasi-equilibrium electron distribution is obtained, the resulting kinetic power in relativistic electrons, is evaluated

\[
L_e = \pi R^2 \Gamma^2 \beta \Gamma c m_e c^2 \int_1^\infty d\gamma n_e(\gamma) \gamma
\]

and compared to the power carried in the magnetic field (Poynting flux),

\[
L_B = \pi R^2 \Gamma^2 \beta \Gamma c u_B
\]

where \( u_B = B^2/(8\pi) \) is the magnetic energy density. The ratio of the two is the resulting relative partition parameter \( \epsilon_B \equiv L_B/L_e \). It can be used to obtain information about the energy balance within the jet which contains information on the jet launching and acceleration mechanisms.

Altogether, the SSC model described here has eight free (but correlated) parameters, listed in Table 6.1, whereas the injection luminosity is related to the electron density in the blob by \( L_{\text{inj}} \propto R^2 D^2 Q_0 \). In all model calculations, the luminosity distance to the source is calculated using the standard \( \Lambda \)CDM cosmology parameters with \( \Omega_m = 0.3 \) and \( \Omega_\Lambda = 0.7 \) and a Hubble constant of \( H_0 = 70 \) (km/s)/Mpc. Additionally, the absorption of VHE gamma rays on the extragalactic background light is taken into account using the EBL model of Finke et al. (2010).²

² This absorption model is consistent with the absorption derived from EBL models of Franceschini et al. (2008) and Gilmore et al. (2009).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electron distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Injection luminosity</td>
<td>$L_{\text{inj}}$ [erg/s]</td>
<td>$4 \cdot 10^{43}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low energy cutoff</td>
<td>$\gamma_1$</td>
<td>$4 \cdot 10^4$</td>
<td>Magnetic field strength</td>
<td>$B$ [G]</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High energy cutoff</td>
<td>$\gamma_2$</td>
<td>$5 \cdot 10^5$</td>
<td>Escape time parameter</td>
<td>$\eta_{\text{esc}}$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spectral index</td>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Emission region radius</td>
<td>$R$ [cm]</td>
<td>$3 \cdot 10^{15}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1.: Input parameters for the SSC model used within this thesis. The different parameters are explained within the text. The listed values are obtained from the modeling of the emission of Mrk 421 in 2006 ($z = 0.031$, Acciari et al., 2009a). They are referred to in Section 6.2.2 as a baseline emission model.

6.2.2. Model parameter and constraints

In general, most of the SSC input parameters can be constrained by simultaneous observations in different wave bands (Tavecchio et al., 1998). They are most stringent if fast variability and/or correlations between different frequency bands are observed. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to go through all possible constraints, but I will show on a few examples how the modeled emission changes in dependence of some of these input parameters.

As a baseline parameter set, the values used to model the emission of the prototype VHE blazar Mrk 421 ($z = 0.031$) in April 2006 are used (Acciari et al., 2009a, listed in Table 6.1). In the first step of the model, the equilibrium-electron distribution (EED) is obtained, shown in the right side of Figure 6.1. It shows a broken power law with a break at $\gamma_b = 4 \cdot 10^4 = \gamma_1$ and is thus in the fast cooling regime (Eq. 6.7) with a minimum electron Lorentz factor of $\gamma_{\text{min}} \simeq 5 \cdot 10^3$. The overall radiative output is shown in the right side of Figure 6.1 in the typical $\nu F_\nu$-representation and yields results close to equipartition ($\epsilon_B \simeq 0.4$).

The first peak in the SED is due to synchrotron emission and shows several distinct spectral features. The low-energy break (around $10^{15}$ Hz) arises from the low-energy cutoff in the electron distribution below which the spectral shape of the synchrotron emission is determined by the low-frequency synchrotron spectrum of a mono-energetic electron. The synchrotron-peak frequency (at around $10^{17}$ Hz) is proportional to the break energy of the EED, given by $\nu_{\text{sync}} \propto \gamma_b^2 B$ (Kino et al., 2002). The spectral shape below and above the peak are given by Eq. 6.3 and follow the shape of the cooled electron distribution. This means that through observations in the optical to X-ray regime, the spectral index of the electron distribution can be constrained. At around $10^{19}$ Hz, a steep cutoff in the synchrotron emission occurs which is purely determined by the maximum energy of the accelerated electrons. In other words, if a cutoff in the synchrotron peak of the SED is observed, one can directly obtain the maximum Lorentz factor $\gamma_2$ of the electron.
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\[ \nu_{\text{comp}} \simeq \left( \frac{4}{3} \right) \gamma^2 \nu_{\text{sync}} \]

Figure 6.1.: SSC model for Mrk 421 in 2006 (black lines) using the input parameter listed in Table 6.1. (Right) The obtained equilibrium-electron distribution shows a broken power-law distribution in the fast-cooling regime. (Left) SED as obtained by the applied SSC model. The black curve represents the baseline model parameters, while the rainbow-colored SEDs show the observed emission from the same EED by changing the Doppler factor from \( D = 5 \) to \( D = 50 \) in steps of five. See text for details.

The second peak in the SED is due to inverse Compton scattering which follows, in general, the shape of the synchrotron peak. The IC-peak frequency is related to the synchrotron-peak frequency as \( \nu_{\text{comp}} \simeq \left( \frac{4}{3} \right) \gamma^2 \nu_{\text{sync}} \). In the MeV/GeV range, the IC spectrum comes mainly from scattering in the Thomson regime. Therefore, the spectral index of this emission should be similar to the index of the scattered radiation field. However, the complexity of the scattering (several different regimes from the synchrotron emission) produces a curved spectrum below the IC peak and spectral features, as observed in the synchrotron emission, are smeared out (Katarzyński, 2012). In the GeV/TeV regime, the observed fluxes decrease steeply, due to Klein-Nishina effects and (especially for more distant blazars) EBL absorption.

**Doppler factor**

As already mentioned in Section 5.1.1, the Doppler factor links the emission in the rest frame of the jet to the observed emission. Changing the Doppler factor thus changes the observed luminosities and frequencies. By keeping the same equilibrium-electron distribution, the frequencies are “blue-shifted” for increasing Doppler factors (\( \propto D \)) while the luminosities are
strongly boosted \( \propto D^4 \), as indicated by the color-coded SEDs in Figure 6.1. As in the model the Doppler factor is equivalent to the bulk Lorentz factor, a constrain on its upper value can be obtained by the unification schemes: a very high Doppler factor means a very small viewing angle (e.g., \( D = 50 \) means \( \theta_{sl} \approx 1.15^\circ \)) which is statistically unlikely if blazars are a sub-class of the overall AGN population. For small Doppler factors\(^3\), the boosting is relatively moderate, resulting in low fluxes which makes it difficult to observe them, especially in the VHE regime. A lower limit on the Doppler factor can usually be obtained from superluminal motion measurements (Section 5.1) and/or the transparency of the source to VHE gamma rays (Dondi & Ghisellini, 1995).

**Magnetic field**

The influence of the magnetic field strength \( B \) inside the blob is demonstrated in Figure 6.2. An increase of the magnetic field inside the blob results in shorter cooling time scales (Eq. 6.2) and changes the equilibrium-electron distribution. The high-energy electrons cool faster and thus a larger number of low-energy electrons fill the blob before they escape. This results in a lower minimum Lorentz factor of the EED. Since the injection luminosity of the uncooled electron distribution is kept constant, the normalization (e.g., at the break energy) gets lower.

The obtained SEDs are shown in the left side of Figure 6.2. An increase of the magnetic field strength increases the synchrotron-peak frequency by the same order. This dependency can, in general, be used to constrain the break frequency \( \gamma_b \) (= \( \gamma_1 \) in the fast cooling regime) and the magnetic field. In the Thomson regime, this can be expressed as (Tavecchio et al., 1998):

\[
B = \frac{1 + z}{D} \frac{\nu_{\text{sync}}^2}{2.8 \times 10^6 \nu_{\text{comp}}} \tag{6.11}
\]

and is one of the major constraints on the magnetic field. In addition to the shift of the synchrotron-peak frequency, a smaller value for \( \gamma_{\text{min}} \) shifts the low-frequency cutoff of the synchrotron peak towards lower frequencies. This results in a different shape of the low-energy part of the IC spectrum. The total luminosity of the synchrotron peak and the total luminosity of the Compton peak are related to each other by \( L_{\text{comp}}/L_{\text{sync}} = u_{\text{sync}}/u_B \) which can be expressed in terms of the magnetic field by:

\[
B^2 \propto \frac{1}{R^2 D^4} \frac{\nu_{\text{sync}} L_{\text{sync}}^2(\nu_{\text{sync}})}{\nu_{\text{comp}} L_{\text{comp}}(\nu_{\text{comp}})} \tag{6.12}
\]

\(^3\) The lowest Doppler factor is set to \( D = 5 \) \( (\theta_{sl} \approx 11^\circ) \). Lower values of \( D \) would result in larger jet viewing angles and hence would not be classified as blazar.
where $\nu L_\nu$ is the observed luminosity at the synchrotron/inverse Compton-peak frequency.

Figure 6.2.: Results of the SSC model as obtained by changing the magnetic field strength. The rainbow colors represent the values from $B = 0.25$ G to $B = 2.5$ G in steps of 0.25 G. All other input parameter are kept constant, as listed in Table 6.1. The left part of the figure shows the SEDs as obtained by the applied SSC model. The colors correspond to the observed emission from the equilibrium-electron distribution shown on the right side. See text for details.

**Size of the emission region**

Following causality arguments, any observed variability leads to an upper limit on the size of the emission region through

$$R \leq c \delta t_{\text{var}} \frac{D}{1 + z}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6.13)

Thus, measuring very fast variability results in a very small emission region which poses severe problems to one-zone models: the smaller the emission region is, the higher gets the electron density in this region and the shorter is the mean free path for the electrons. Thus, less synchrotron photons are emitted and the observed synchrotron emission cannot be accounted for in the model. A possible solution to this problem would be to increase the Doppler factor to very large values. However, this would also increase the high-energy-peak luminosities and such large Doppler factor are generally considered as unlikely. Therefore, it is argued that the fast variability seen in the VHE regime originates from a different region than, e.g., the X-ray or radio emission; supporting models with multiple emission zones.
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6.3. Modeling the emission of B2 1215+30

In the following, the SED of B2 1215+30, obtained from quasi-simultaneous observations in 2011 presented in Section 5.2.3, is modeled with the SSC model detailed above. In the first step, all obtained data are taken into account assuming a redshift of $z = 0.13$. As the data in the radio to micrometer wavelength regime are archival only, their influence on the obtained model parameters is evaluated by ignoring them during the modeling. Due to the distance uncertainty, it will later be discussed how the results are affected if a redshift of $z = 0.237$ is adopted instead.

**SSC model applied to the full data set**

The lines in Figure 6.3 represent the results of the SSC model for which the archival data in the micrometer wavelength regime are taken into account. The overall SED for both X-ray states in 2011 can be well described by the model. The model parameters used are listed in Table 6.2 (Column A).

The used Doppler factor is $D = 30$. Following the discussion above, a lower Doppler factor would require a lower magnetic field and hence a larger emission region, resulting in variability time scales longer than days or even weeks. This lower Doppler factor scenario would contradict the measurements of X-ray variability during the January observations. The magnetic field strength is found to be quite low, resulting in a very small relative partition parameter. A magnetic field far below equipartition ($\epsilon_B \approx 0.1 - 1$), as found here, might indicate a particle-dominated jet, in which the magnetic field in the emission region is self-generated and/or amplified in shocks. In contrast, a magnetic field near or above equipartition would be consistent with a Poynting-flux-dominated jet in which magnetic field energy is transferred to particles, reaching approximate equipartition in the high-energy emission zone.

In order to account for the two different X-ray states observed in 2011, the electron injection spectral index together with the magnetic field strength within the modeled emission region were changed. The injection index during the high X-ray state in January ($q = 2.8$) is found to be harder than during the low X-ray state in April/May ($q = 3.4$); both tightly constrained by the energy spectrum measured with *Swift*-XRT. Under the assumption that the particles in the jet are accelerated within relativistic shocks, the spectral change in the electron distribution may be explained by a change in the shock field obliquity: a larger angle between magnetic field and shock front results in a harder particle spectrum (see, e.g., Sironi & Spitkovsky, 2009). This change of the injection spectrum also leads to flux variations in the high-energy peak. However, neither *Fermi*-LAT nor VERITAS are sensitive to those variations given the flux level of the source during the observation period reported here.
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Figure 6.3.: Spectral energy distribution of B2 1215+30 during 2011 together with the SSC model assuming a redshift of $z = 0.130$ (solid lines) and a redshift of $z = 0.237$ (dashed lines). The data points are the following (from low to high frequencies): (♦) archival data, (●) optical data from MDM, (▼) high X-ray state observed by Swift-XRT & UVOT, (▲) low X-ray state observed by Swift-XRT & UVOT, (●) Fermi-LAT, ( ■) VERITAS, and (○) MAGIC. The blue lines represents the model for the low X-ray state in January and the red lines the model for the high X-ray state in April/May, respectively. The right side of the figure is a zoom into the high-energy peak. The model parameters are given in Table 6.2. See text for details.

**SSC model applied to contemporaneous data only**

The results above are obtained by taking the archival data at around $10^{11}$ Hz into account. At those frequencies, a spectral break occurs in the modeled emission due to the low-energy cutoff in the equilibrium electron distribution. The position of this break is determined by the escape time scale, resulting in a large value for $\eta_{\text{esc}}$. Due to possible variability in this wave band, the SED of B2 1215+30 is also modeled ignoring those archival data. This is illustrated in Figure 6.4 for the January data set. The only changes made to the model parameters are to reduce the value of $\eta_{\text{esc}}$ and, at the same time, reduce the electron injection power $L_{\text{inj}}$ by the same order. In this way, the high-energy part of the EED is kept the same while the minimum Lorentz factor increases. This means that the escape time scale gets shorter and the low-energy break in the SED occurs at higher frequencies. It was found that a value up to ten times smaller for $\eta_{\text{esc}}$ could be used to model the SED while the lowest value is constrained by the low-energy data points of the Fermi-LAT spectrum. The values are listed in Column B of Table 6.2 for the January
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High X-ray state in January</th>
<th>Low X-ray state in Apr/May</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A)</td>
<td>(B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$z$</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_{\text{inj}}$ [erg/s]</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{46}$</td>
<td>$2.5 \times 10^{45}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_1$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^4$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_2$</td>
<td>$8.0 \times 10^5$</td>
<td>$8.0 \times 10^5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\eta_{\text{esc}}$</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$B$ [G]</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D$</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$ [cm]</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{16}$</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_e$ (jet) [erg/s]</td>
<td>$5.0 \times 10^{44}$</td>
<td>$2.9 \times 10^{44}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_B$ (jet) [erg/s]</td>
<td>$3.4 \times 10^{42}$</td>
<td>$3.4 \times 10^{42}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_B = L_B/L_e$</td>
<td>$6.78 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>$1.16 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta t_{\text{var}}$ [h]</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: SSC model parameters for B2 1215+30 in 2011 for the low- and high-X-ray state.

The upper part of the table are the input parameters, the lower are the output parameters derived from the model. The columns are the following: (A) all data including archival micro-meter wavelength data; (B) contemporaneous data only; (C) same as (A) but with a different redshift assumption. See text for details.

and April/May observations. With this lower escape time scale value, the system is closer to equipartition because the injection power for the electron distribution is lower (with the same value for the magnetic field strength). This clearly shows that due to the lack of simultaneous data in the $10^{11}$ Hz domain, $\eta_{\text{esc}}$ and $L_e$ are unconstrained, resulting in a range of parameter combinations that describe the observed SED well.

**SSC model assuming a different redshift**

Another difficulty of the modeling and the possible interpretation is the uncertainty on the redshift. The same model is therefore applied to the SED using $z = 0.237$, shown in Figure 6.3. It turned out that both X-ray states can as well be modeled by a change of the electron injection spectral index together with the magnetic field strength. In this case, the Doppler factor needs to be larger ($D = 50$, see Column C in Table 6.2) to compensate for the EBL absorption at high energies and the model-predicted fluxes are found to be slightly below the VERITAS spectral points. Nevertheless, this is still compatible with the VERITAS measurement considering systematic errors, therefore, this redshift cannot be excluded.
6.3. Modeling the emission of B2 1215+30

Figure 6.4.: Results of the SSC model for the January data set as obtained by changing the escape time scale parameter \( \eta_{\text{esc}} \) and the injection luminosity (by the same order). The rainbow colors represent values from \( \eta_{\text{esc}} = 330 \) to \( \eta_{\text{esc}} = 3300 \) as given in the legend, data points are explained in Figure 6.3. All other input parameters are kept constant, as listed in Column A of Table 6.2. (Left) SEDs as obtained by the applied SSC model. (Right) Equilibrium-electron distribution. See text for details.

6.3.1. Discussion

To put the above presented results of the modeling of B2 1215+30 into a wider context, they are compared to those obtained by modeling other VHE blazars. Therefore, all the VERITAS-detected blazars which have contemporaneous MWL data and have been modeled with the same SSC model (i.e., the one of Böttcher & Chiang, 2002) are used. In total, nine blazars are found and the parameters extracted from the modeling are listed in Table 6.3. Three of those blazars — 1ES 0806+524 (Acciari et al., 2009b), Mrk 421 (Acciari et al., 2009a), and W Comae (Acciari et al., 2008, 2009c) — were found in different flux states during the MWL observations and have more than one set of model parameters. PKS 1424+240 (Acciari et al., 2010a) and 3C 66A (Abdo et al., 2011) have been modeled using different redshift assumptions. While PKS 1424+240 will not be included in the comparison study due to the current lack of redshift constraint, two redshift values are given in Table 6.3 for 3C 66A, i.e. \( z = 0.3 \) and \( z = 0.444 \), as they enclose the recently published redshift limits which were found to be in the range of \( 0.3347 < z \leq 0.41 \) (Furniss et al., 2013).

As one can see in Table 6.3, most of the parameters used to model the SED of B2 1215+30 are well within the range of those used for previously detected blazars. The Doppler factor, for
### Table 6.3: SSC model parameters for B2 1215+30 for the high and low X-ray states in 2011 and other VERITAS-detected blazars using the same model. The columns are the following: $z$ is the redshift (* denotes the assumed redshift within the model, see text for more details); $L_e$ is the jet luminosity; $\gamma_1$ is the low energy cutoff; $q$ is the spectral index of the electron injection spectrum; $B$ is the magnetic field strength; $R$ is the emission region radius; $D$ is the Doppler factor; and $\eta_{esc}$ is the escape time parameter. Additionally, two output parameters are given: $\epsilon_B$ is the resulting relative partition parameter of the energy distribution $\gamma_2$ is the high energy cutoff; $\delta t_{var}$ is the resulting minimum variability time scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$z$</th>
<th>$L_e$</th>
<th>$\gamma_1$</th>
<th>$q$</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$D$</th>
<th>$\eta_{esc}$</th>
<th>$\epsilon_B$</th>
<th>$\delta t_{var}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B2 1215+30 (high)</td>
<td>0.130*</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>0.00678</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 1215+30 (low)</td>
<td>0.130*</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>0.00874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS 0413</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ES 0414+009</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RX J0648+1516</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB 0710+591</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.449</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ES 0806+524</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ES 0806+524</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrk 421</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.0776</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrk 421</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Comae</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.00059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Comae</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C 66A</td>
<td>0.300*</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C 66A</td>
<td>0.444*</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References: (1) Aliu et al. (2012a); (2) Aliu et al. (2012b); (3) Aliu et al. (2011); (4) Acciari et al. (2010b); (5) Acciari et al. (2009b); (6) Acciari et al. (2009a); (7) Acciari et al. (2008); (8) Acciari et al. (2009c); (9) Abdo et al. (2011).
example, is usually found to be in the range of $D = 20 - 30$ for the applied model. This is in agreement with the results of other SSC models which have been successfully applied to VHE blazars, e.g. Tavecchio et al. (2010). However, there are two parameters which are outside this “standard range”: the magnetic field strength $B$ and the escape time parameter $\eta_{\text{esc}}$. The first one is relatively low for B2 1215+30 and results in a very low relative partition parameter. For some of the other blazars, e.g. W Comae and 3C 66A, this behavior has also been seen. In those cases, an SSC model with an external radiation field resulted in model parameters with larger magnetic field strengths and closer to equipartition. However, in the case of B2 1215+30 no improvement could be found by adding an EC component to the model - neither in the representation of the shape of the SED nor by bringing the system closer to equipartition. In general, the magnetic field strength values obtained for the different sources are consistent with results from other leptonic blazar models. The second parameter, $\eta_{\text{esc}}$, is high compared to the model parameters of the other blazars. Such a high value for $\eta_{\text{esc}}$ implies long escape time scales. This could hint at a relatively well ordered (laminar) magnetic field in the emission region. However, it has already been shown in the previous section that the value for $\eta_{\text{esc}}$ can be lowered significantly when the archival data are ignored, without losing the ability to reproduce the shape of the SED. This value is then closer to the ones found for other VERITAS-modeled blazars. In summary, the model parameters derived here for the applied SSC model are in the range of those derived from previous VERITAS blazar modeling. In this sense B2 1215+30 is a typical VHE-detected blazar.
7. Summary and Concluding Remarks

The field of ground-based gamma-ray astronomy is prospering and offers new insights into the high-energy processes of the Universe. Astronomical objects, such as active galactic nuclei (AGN), can accelerate particles up to relativistic energies. These particles produce very-high-energy (VHE; $E > 50$ GeV) gamma rays, detectable on Earth with imaging atmospheric Cherenkov telescopes (IACTs) like VERITAS. The imaging Cherenkov detectors are still evolving and the latest technical improvement for VERITAS happened in summer 2012: the PMTs in each of the VERITAS cameras were replaced with higher quantum efficiency devices. In this thesis, the sensitivity of this camera upgrade has been estimated using new Monte Carlo (MC) simulations. The analysis of these simulations yielded a reduction of the energy threshold at trigger level from $\sim 100$ GeV down to about 75 GeV and an increase in effective area after cuts, especially at energies below 300 GeV. The result is an improved sensitivity to VHE gamma rays.

The next-generation ground-based gamma-ray observatory CTA aims to be a factor of about ten more sensitive than any existing IACT system. While this goal is likely to be reached, one of the limitations of the Cherenkov technique stays: observations can only be carried out during clear, dark nights, leading to an observation time of about 1000 hours per year. This time can be substantially extended through observations under partial moonlight. As the light from the Moon contributes to the background noise in the cameras, new MC simulations have been set-up to determine the performance of CTA under those special conditions. It has been demonstrated in this thesis that with raised trigger thresholds and small adjustments in the image analysis, the differential sensitivity under moonlight conditions is comparable within a factor of two to the sensitivity reachable under dark-sky conditions. This result makes observations under partial moonlight a very likely operation mode for CTA, adding about 30% observation time per year and thus clearly increasing the scientific outcome of this future VHE gamma-ray observatory. The enlarged duty cycle can be used, e.g., to extend monitoring and/or multi-wavelength (MWL) campaigns on variable sources, such as AGN.

Currently, AGN represent about one third of the population of known VHE gamma-ray sources. Most of these AGN belong to the sub-class of blazars whose relativistic jets are closely aligned to the observer’s line of sight. VERITAS has detected 24 out of 52 VHE-emitting blazars.
The observations of the BL Lac B2 1215+30 have been presented in this thesis. The analysis of the full data set, comprising nearly 100 hours of data taken between December 2008 and March 2012, resulted in a detection significance of $9.0\sigma$ and revealed long-term variability. In 2011, the object was found in a relatively bright flux state and a power-law fit to the differential photon spectrum yielded a spectral index of $3.6 \pm 0.4_{\text{stat}} \pm 0.3_{\text{syst}}$ with an integral flux above 200 GeV of $(8.0 \pm 0.9_{\text{stat}} \pm 3.2_{\text{syst}}) \times 10^{-12}\text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$. Contemporaneous with the VERITAS observations, MWL observations were obtained at optical (Super-LOTIS, MDM, Swift UVOT), X-ray (Swift XRT) and gamma-ray (Fermi LAT) frequencies. These MWL data have been used to construct the spectral energy distribution (SED) of B2 1215+30 for the first half of 2011.

To investigate the underlying physical processes, the SED has been modeled with a one-zone leptonic model. The model assumes that the emission arises from synchrotron and synchrotron-self Compton (SSC) radiation of a highly relativistic electron population within the jet. Possible constraints on the input parameters of the model have been reviewed and the influence of the Doppler factor and the magnetic field strength on the overall emission has been demonstrated in this thesis. The application of the SSC model to the MWL data of B2 1215+30 results in a good description of the overall SED. The low required magnetic field strength ($B = 0.01 - 0.02 \text{ G}$) in the emission region implies a magnetic field energy density several orders of magnitude below the corresponding particle energy density, hinting towards a particle-dominated jet as opposed to magnetically dominated jets predicted by jet formation models (e.g., Blandford & Znajek, 1977; McKinney, 2006). Through a comparative study with other SSC-modeled blazars detected by VERITAS, it has been found that most VHE-detected blazars also show the dominance of the particle energy density over magnetic energy density, even though not as extreme as for the case of B2 1215+30. This challenges jet formation models which require strong magnetic fields for launching and collimating the jets — one of the puzzles in AGN research. Most of the other parameter values used to model the broadband emission of B2 1215+30 are in the range of other VERITAS-detected blazars and in this sense, B2 1215+30 is a typical VHE-detected blazar.

Despite the numerous VHE-detections of AGN, many questions remain (e.g., Beckmann & Shrader, 2013): Why do some AGN develop jets while apparently most do not? What powers the jets in AGN and how are they formed? Once the matter is launched and collimated into a jet, what is the acceleration mechanism leading to the relativistic particles producing the observed spectral energy distribution and where is the emission region located? Which mechanisms are responsible for the observed variability? Which particles dominate the outflow in AGNs (leptonic or hadronic) and are AGN the sources of ultra-high-energy cosmic rays? How do AGN outflows interact with the interstellar and intergalactic medium and what is the role of AGN in the evolution of the Galaxy?
To contribute towards answering these questions, observations in the high- and very-high-energy gamma-ray regime are crucial as they sample the second peak of the SED. These observations are needed to identify the dominant emission processes (leptonic versus hadronic) and provide information about the acceleration mechanisms at very high energies. As the models for acceleration and/or emission processes in AGN are becoming more complex, we need precise spectral and temporal measurements to tightly constrain their input parameters. To disentangle between different mechanisms responsible for the observed variability, long-term observations are beneficial and a larger number of sources is needed to disentangle general properties of gamma-ray emission in AGN from characteristics of individual sources (Reimer & Böttcher, 2013).

The Cherenkov Telescope Array (CTA) will be a key observatory in this high-energy regime. With its increased sensitivity, CTA will be able to detect more VHE gamma-ray emitting AGN with different physical properties; ideally from an extragalactic sky survey to avoid biases due to pre-selection from other wavelengths. Its large effective area makes CTA an ideal instrument for the study of timing properties in blazars down to sub-minute time scales. Detecting characteristic temporal features, such as minimal variability time scales or (quasi-) periodic events, could contribute towards answering the question about the size and possible location of the VHE emission region (Sol et al., 2013). This will not only allow us to derive information about the physical processes responsible for variability, but provides as well the opportunity for testing Lorentz invariance (Ellis & Mavromatos, 2013). The increased sensitivity together with the lower energy threshold of CTA will enable the detection of more distant sources and thus enlarge our knowledge of the extragalactic background light and its sources (Dwek & Krennrich, 2013). The combination of temporal and spatial information between AGN measured by the next-generation radio and X-ray telescopes with observations in the gamma-ray regime will provide a deep insight into the high-energy Universe.
A. Cosmic-ray spectra

The gamma-ray and cosmic-ray spectra used throughout this thesis are listed in the following.

For gamma rays, the Crab Nebula spectrum as measured by the HEGRA collaboration (Aharonian et al., 2004) is:

$$\Phi_{\gamma} = \Phi_0 \left( \frac{E}{\text{TeV}} \right)^{-2.62} \text{TeV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1}.$$  \hfill (A.1)

For cosmic-ray protons, the spectrum according to the ATIC measurement is

$$\Phi_{\text{proton}} = \Phi_0 \left( \frac{E}{\text{TeV}} \right)^{-2.62} \text{TeV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1}.$$  \hfill (A.2)

For cosmic-ray electrons, the spectrum follows a fit to the Fermi-LAT (Abdo et al., 2009b) and the H.E.S.S. data (Aharonian et al., 2009) applying a broken power-law function:

$$\Phi_{\text{electron}} = \Phi_0 \left( \frac{E}{E_b} \right)^{-\Gamma_1} \left( 1 + \left( \frac{E}{E_b} \right)^{1/\alpha} \right)^{-(\Gamma_2 - \Gamma_1)\alpha}.$$  \hfill (A.3)

with $\Phi_0 = 2.3 \times 10^{-9} \text{TeV}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \text{m}^{-2} \text{sr}^{-1}$, $\alpha = 0.4$, $\Gamma_1 = 3.07$, $\Gamma_2 = 5$, and $E_b = 1.7$ TeV.
B. VERITAS data

This appendix details additional information about the observational data used within this thesis.

B.1. VERITAS atmosphere

As already mentioned in Section 3.2.1, in VERITAS two different (site specific) atmospheric profiles are used; corresponding to summer and winter. These two profiles are models to daily radiosonde measurements obtained at the nearby Tucson airport (Daniel, 2007) using all available data from January 1995 to July 2010. The winter atmosphere covers December to March and the summer atmosphere covers the non-monsoon months between June and September. The transition between these two atmospheres is rather smooth and the time of the transition can vary between the different observing periods. Therefore, the radiosonde measurements from the specific years are analysed and compared to the atmospheric profiles used within the simulations. An example of the density profiles is shown in Figure B.1 for 2011, where the monthly averaged measurements are overlaid with the models for winter and summer. To avoid that the estimated fluxes of the analysed source are systematically different between two consecutive nights, the transition between the two atmospheric profiles is chosen to be on a full Moon break. In 2011, the transition between winter and summer is therefore set to the 2011 April 18, mainly determined from the differences in the 5 to 10 km range, where most of the energy of the air shower is deposited. A similar scheme is applied to all other data sets used in this thesis. For the 2008/2009 data set the transition date is set to 2009 May 9 while the transition date in 2012 is after the last data taken in March.

B.2. B2 1215+30 runlist

Runlist of all runs passing the quality selection (bad weather or hardware malfunctioning) in chronological order. Runs include pointings on 1ES 1218+304 (N,S,W) and B2 1215+30 (N,S,E,W) which have at least three telescopes participating in the array.
Figure B.1.: Atmospheric density profile in 2011, obtained from daily radiosonde measurements (monthly averaged). Overlaid are the two atmospheric profiles used in the simulations, where ATM21 corresponds to winter and ATM22 to summer.

2008 – 2009 data set

Winter atmosphere:
43777, 43778, 43779, 43780, 43812, 43813, 43814, 43955, 43956, 43957, 43961, 43967, 43968, 43969, 44153, 44159, 44275, 44276, 44278, 44279, 44313, 44314, 44316, 44345, 44346, 44347, 44348, 44349, 44350, 44351, 44352, 44353, 44354, 44355, 44375, 44378, 44379, 44380, 44381, 44384, 44385, 44386, 44387, 44388, 44389, 44427, 44430, 44431, 44432, 44439, 44443, 44444, 44457, 44458, 44459, 44460, 44464, 44465, 44471, 44475, 44476, 44477, 44478, 44479, 44491, 44492, 44493, 44508, 44587, 44704, 44706, 44707, 44730, 44731, 44732, 44733, 44735, 44737, 44795, 44907, 44908, 44910, 44913, 45067, 45068, 45069, 45071, 45152, 45528, 45529, 45530, 45531, 45695, 45696, 45697, 45698, 45701, 45702

Summer atmosphere:
46014, 46017, 46018, 46019, 46099, 46100, 46119, 46120

2010 – 2011 data set

Winter atmosphere:
54109, 54110, 54304, 54305, 54306, 54307, 54364, 54365, 54366, 54392, 54393, 54442, 54443,
B.3. B2 1215+30 light curve analysis and fluxes

54454, 54455, 54664, 54830, 54933, 54934, 54935, 54937, 54938, 54963, 55026, 55027, 55076, 55177, 55179, 55232, 55407, 55479, 55480, 55580, 55707, 55724, 55725, 55726, 55754, 55755, 55756, 55776, 55777, 55839, 55841, 55842, 55843, 55901, 55902, 55938, 55939, 55940, 55942, 56005, 56007, 56008, 56081, 56082, 56085, 56086, 56111, 56113, 56114, 56115, 56116, 56119, 56145, 56147, 56148, 56163, 56237, 56238, 56239, 56240, 56261, 56263, 56294, 56295, 56296, 56298, 56319, 56320, 56321, 56322, 56359, 56360, 56362, 56363, 56384, 56386, 56389, 56390, 56480, 56481, 56484, 56485, 56507, 56509, 56510, 56511, 56534, 56535, 56536, 56537, 56538, 56554, 56559, 56562, 56610, 56611, 56612, 56613, 56725, 56726, 56746, 56763, 56764, 56791, 56841, 56842, 56929, 56930, 56932, 57012, 57079, 57080, 59846, 59907, 59908, 59941, 59990, 60073, 60074, 60173, 60174, 60176, 60177, 60178, 60202, 60203, 60223, 60239, 60240, 60257, 60258, 60259, 60276, 60277, 60404, 60407, 60408, 60478, 60480, 60481, 60538, 60567, 60568, 60569, 60629, 60630, 60657, 60659, 60660, 60694, 60856, 60892, 60894, 60895, 61144, 61206, 61207, 61209, 61344, 61345, 61349, 61633, 61634

Summer atmosphere:

2011 – 2012 data set

Winter atmosphere:

B.3. B2 1215+30 light curve analysis and fluxes

In the following the light curves from the different seasons and the fluxes per “dark run” (corresponding to 29.5 days, where the bin edge is chosen to be on the full Moon) are given. The tables contain the following information:

- **MJD**: The start and end date of the observations.
- **Time**: The exposure time in minutes is given in effective time on B2 1215+30 (in 0.5° wobble offset equivalent).
- **Elev.**: The mean elevation angle of the observations.
- **Non**: The number of events in the ON region.
- **Noff**: The the number of events in the OFF region.
- **α**: The normalisation given as the acceptance corrected area ratio between ON and OFF region.
- **Signif.**: The significance of the flux point above the energy threshold.
- **$F(E > 200\text{GeV})$**: The flux above 200 GeV, calculated using the spectral index derived in 2011, with 1-sigma statistical error bars.
- **UL$(E > 200\text{GeV})$**: The 99% upper limit above 200 GeV, calculated using the method of Helene.
Figure B.2.: VERITAS light curve above 200 GeV for the 2008/2009 data set. Vertical error bars show 1σ statistical uncertainties on the flux, horizontal error bars indicate the width of the corresponding observing interval within the monthly bins. A fit to a constant (using the flux-point representation of the bin) yields $\chi^2/ndf = 9.7/5$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MJD</th>
<th>Time [min]</th>
<th>Elev. [deg]</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Noff</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Signif.</th>
<th>$F(E &gt; 200\text{GeV})$ [in units of $10^{-12} \text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$]</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54829 - 54839</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>0.1255</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-$2.4 \pm 3.6$</td>
<td>&lt; 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54856 - 54868</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>0.1236</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>$2.5 \pm 1.9$</td>
<td>&lt; 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54881 - 54891</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$3.7 \pm 3.9$</td>
<td>&lt; 13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54907 - 54916</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$6.7 \pm 4.8$</td>
<td>&lt; 18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54938 - 54944</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>$-6.8 \pm 3.1$</td>
<td>&lt; 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54967 - 54976</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.1251</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$2.1 \pm 5.2$</td>
<td>&lt; 15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.1.: VERITAS results of B2 1215+30 for 2008/2009.
2010 – 2011 data set

Figure B.3.: VERITAS light curve above 200 GeV for the 2010/2011 data set. Vertical error bars show 1σ statistical uncertainties on the flux, horizontal error bars indicate the width of the corresponding observing interval within the monthly bins. A fit to a constant (using the flux-point representation of the bin) yields $\chi^2/ndf = 4.7/5$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MJD</th>
<th>Time [min]</th>
<th>Elev. [deg]</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Noff</th>
<th>$\alpha$ [°]</th>
<th>Signif.</th>
<th>$F(E &gt; 200\text{GeV})$ [$10^{-12} \text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55563 - 55577</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0.1167</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.5 ± 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55590 - 55605</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>0.1172</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.4 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55617 - 55633</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>0.1156</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.1 ± 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55645 - 55663</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>0.1182</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.4 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55673 - 55688</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>0.1137</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.8 ± 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55702 - 55718</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>0.1181</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.1 ± 3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.2.: VERITAS results of B2 1215+30 for 2010/2011.
Figure B.4.: VERITAS light curve above 200 GeV for the 2011/2012 data set. Vertical error bars show 1σ statistical uncertainties on the flux, horizontal error bars indicate the width of the corresponding observing interval within the monthly bins. A fit to a constant (using the flux-point representation of the bin) yields $\chi^2/ndf = 1.5/2$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MJD</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Elev.</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Noff</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Signif.</th>
<th>$F(E &gt; 200\text{GeV})$</th>
<th>UL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55944 - 55960</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>0.1178</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>$4.6 \pm 1.9$</td>
<td>$&lt; 8.9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55972 - 55989</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>0.1180</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$1.7 \pm 1.7$</td>
<td>$&lt; 5.6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56000 - 56017</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.1180</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>$2.0 \pm 2.7$</td>
<td>$&lt; 8.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B.3.: VERITAS results of B2 1215+30 for 2011/2012.
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