



## Recent Results from the CALorimetric Electron Telescope (CALET) on the International Space Station



<u>Yoichi Asaoka</u> for the CALET collaboration WISE, Waseda University

WASEDA



## **CALET Collaboration Team**



O. Adriani<sup>25</sup>, Y. Akaike<sup>2</sup>, K. Asano<sup>7</sup>, Y. Asaoka<sup>9,31</sup>, M.G. Bagliesi<sup>29</sup>, E. Berti<sup>25</sup>, G. Bigongiari<sup>29</sup>, W.R. Binns<sup>32</sup>, S. Bonechi<sup>29</sup>, M. Bongi<sup>25</sup>, P. Brogi<sup>29</sup>, A. Bruno<sup>15</sup>, J.H. Buckley<sup>32</sup>, N. Cannady<sup>13</sup>,
G. Castellini<sup>25</sup>, C. Checchia<sup>26</sup>, M.L. Cherry<sup>13</sup>, G. Collazuol<sup>26</sup>, V. Di Felice<sup>28</sup>, K. Ebisawa<sup>8</sup>, H. Fuke<sup>8</sup>, T.G. Guzik<sup>13</sup>, T. Hams<sup>3</sup>,
N. Hasebe<sup>31</sup>, K. Hibino<sup>10</sup>, M. Ichimura<sup>4</sup>, K. Ioka<sup>34</sup>, W. Ishizaki<sup>7</sup>, M.H. Israel<sup>32</sup>, K. Kasahara<sup>31</sup>, J. Kataoka<sup>31</sup>, R. Kataoka<sup>17</sup>,
Y. Katayose<sup>33</sup>, C. Kato<sup>23</sup>, Y.Kawakubo<sup>1</sup>, N. Kawanaka<sup>30</sup>, K. Kohri<sup>12</sup>, H.S. Krawczynski<sup>32</sup>, J.F. Krizmanic<sup>2</sup>, T. Lomtadze<sup>27</sup>,
P. Maestro<sup>29</sup>, P.S. Marrocchesi<sup>29</sup>, A.M. Messineo<sup>27</sup>, J.W. Mitchell<sup>15</sup>, S. Miyake<sup>5</sup>, A.A. Moiseev<sup>3</sup>, K. Mori<sup>9,31</sup>, M. Mori<sup>20</sup>,
N. Mori<sup>25</sup>, H.M. Motz<sup>31</sup>, K. Munakata<sup>23</sup>, H. Murakami<sup>31</sup>, S. Nakahira<sup>9</sup>, J. Nishimura<sup>8</sup>, G.A De Nolfo<sup>15</sup>, S. Okuno<sup>10</sup>,
J.F. Ormes<sup>25</sup>, S. Ozawa<sup>31</sup>, L. Pacini<sup>25</sup>, F. Palma<sup>28</sup>, V. Pal'shin<sup>1</sup>, P. Papini<sup>25</sup>, A.V. Penacchioni<sup>29</sup>, B.F. Rauch<sup>32</sup>,
S.B. Ricciarini<sup>25</sup>, K. Sakai<sup>3</sup>, T. Sakamoto<sup>1</sup>, M. Sasaki<sup>3</sup>, Y. Shimizu<sup>10</sup>, A. Shiomi<sup>18</sup>, R. Sparvoli<sup>28</sup>, P. Spillantini<sup>25</sup>, F. Stolzi<sup>29</sup>,
S. Sugita<sup>1</sup>, J.E. Suh<sup>29</sup>, A. Sulaj<sup>29</sup>, I. Takahashi<sup>11</sup>, M. Takayanagi<sup>8</sup>, M. Takita<sup>7</sup>, T. Tamura<sup>10</sup>, N. Tateyama<sup>10</sup>, T. Terasawa<sup>7</sup>,
H. Tomida<sup>8</sup>, S. Torii<sup>31</sup>, Y. Tunesada<sup>19</sup>, Y. Uchihori<sup>16</sup>, S. Ueno<sup>8</sup>, E. Vannuccini<sup>25</sup>, J.P. Wefel<sup>13</sup>, K. Yamaoka<sup>14</sup>,
S. Yanagita<sup>6</sup>, A. Yoshida<sup>1</sup>, and K. Yoshida<sup>22</sup>

1) Aoyama Gakuin University, Japan

- 2) CRESST/NASA/GSFC and
  - Universities Space Research Association, USA
- 3) CRESST/NASA/GSFC and University of Maryland, USA
- 4) Hirosaki University, Japan
- 5) Ibaraki National College of Technology, Japan
- 6) Ibaraki University, Japan
- 7) ICRR, University of Tokyo, Japan
- 8) ISAS/JAXA Japan

9) JAXA, Japan

- 10) Kanagawa University, Japan
- 11) Kavli IPMU, University of Tokyo, Japan
- 12) KEK, Japan
- 13) Louisiana State University, USA
- 14) Nagoya University, Japan
- 15) NASA/GSFC, USA
- 16) National Inst. of Radiological Sciences, Japan
- 17) National Institute of Polar Research, Japan

- 18) Nihon University, Japan
- 19) Osaka City University, Japan
- 20) Ritsumeikan University, Japan
- 21) Saitama University, Japan
- 22) Shibaura Institute of Technology, Japan
- 23) Shinshu University, Japan
- 24) University of Denver, USA
- 25) University of Florence, IFAC (CNR) and INFN, Italy
- 26) University of Padova and INFN, Italy
- 27) University of Pisa and INFN, Italy
- 28) University of Rome Tor Vergata and INFN, Italy
- 29) University of Siena and INFN, Italy
- 30) University of Tokyo, Japan
- 31) Waseda University, Japan
- 32) Washington University-St. Louis, USA
- 33) Yokohama National University, Japan
- 34) Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Japan



## **CALET Collaboration Team**



O. Adriani<sup>25</sup>, Y. Akaike<sup>2</sup>, K. Asano<sup>7</sup>, Y. Asaoka<sup>9,31</sup>, M.G. Bagliesi<sup>29</sup>, E. Berti<sup>25</sup>, G. Bigongiari<sup>29</sup>, W.R. Binns<sup>32</sup>, S. Bonechi<sup>29</sup>, M. Bongi<sup>25</sup>, P. Brogi<sup>29</sup>, A. Bruno<sup>15</sup>, J.H. Buckley<sup>32</sup>, N. Cannady<sup>13</sup>,
G. Castellini<sup>25</sup>, C. Checchia<sup>26</sup>, M.L. Cherry<sup>13</sup>, G. Collazuol<sup>26</sup>, V. Di Felice<sup>28</sup>, K. Ebisawa<sup>8</sup>, H. Fuke<sup>8</sup>, T.G. Guzik<sup>13</sup>, T. Hams<sup>3</sup>,
N. Hasebe<sup>31</sup>, K. Hibino<sup>10</sup>, M. Ichimura<sup>4</sup>, K. Ioka<sup>34</sup>, W. Ishizaki<sup>7</sup>, M.H. Israel<sup>32</sup>, K. Kasahara<sup>31</sup>, J. Kataoka<sup>31</sup>, R. Kataoka<sup>17</sup>,
Y. Katayose<sup>33</sup>, C. Kato<sup>23</sup>, Y.Kawakubo<sup>1</sup>, N. Kawanaka<sup>30</sup>, K. Kohri<sup>12</sup>, H.S. Krawczynski<sup>32</sup>, J.F. Krizmanic<sup>2</sup>, T. Lomtadze<sup>27</sup>,
P. Maestro<sup>29</sup>, P.S. Marrocchesi<sup>29</sup>, A.M. Messineo<sup>27</sup>, J.W. Mitchell<sup>15</sup>, S. Miyake<sup>5</sup>, A.A. Moiseev<sup>3</sup>, K. Mori<sup>9,31</sup>, M. Mori<sup>20</sup>,
N. Mori<sup>25</sup>, H.M. Motz<sup>31</sup>, K. Munakata<sup>23</sup>, H. Murakami<sup>31</sup>, S. Nakahira<sup>9</sup>, J. Nishimura<sup>8</sup>, G.A De Nolfo<sup>15</sup>, S. Okuno<sup>10</sup>,
J.F. Ormes<sup>25</sup>, S. Ozawa<sup>31</sup>, L. Pacini<sup>25</sup>, F. Palma<sup>28</sup>, V. Pal'shin<sup>1</sup>, P. Papini<sup>25</sup>, A.V. Penacchioni<sup>29</sup>, B.F. Rauch<sup>32</sup>,
S.B. Ricciarini<sup>25</sup>, K. Sakai<sup>3</sup>, T. Sakamoto<sup>1</sup>, M. Sasaki<sup>3</sup>, Y. Shimizu<sup>10</sup>, A. Shiomi<sup>18</sup>, R. Sparvoli<sup>28</sup>, P. Spillantini<sup>25</sup>, F. Stolzi<sup>29</sup>,
S. Sugita<sup>1</sup>, J.E. Suh<sup>29</sup>, A. Sulaj<sup>29</sup>, I. Takahashi<sup>11</sup>, M. Takayanagi<sup>8</sup>, M. Takita<sup>7</sup>, T. Tamura<sup>10</sup>, N. Tateyama<sup>10</sup>, T. Terasawa<sup>7</sup>,
H. Tomida<sup>8</sup>, S. Torii<sup>31</sup>, Y. Tunesada<sup>19</sup>, Y. Uchihori<sup>16</sup>, S. Ueno<sup>8</sup>, E. Vannuccini<sup>25</sup>, J.P. Wefel<sup>13</sup>, K. Yamaoka<sup>14</sup>,
S. Yanagita<sup>6</sup>, A. Yoshida<sup>1</sup>, and K. Yoshida<sup>22</sup>





# Outline

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Calibration
- 3. Operations
- 4. Results
  - Electrons
  - Hadrons
  - Gamma-Rays
  - Space Weather
- 5. Summary

```
Y.Asaoka, Y.Akaike, Y.Komiya, R.Miyata, S.Torii et al.
(CALET Collaboration), Astropart. Phys. 91 (2017) 1.
Y.Asaoka, S.Ozawa, S.Torii et al.
(CALET Collaboration), Astropart. Phys. 100 (2018) 29.
O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collaboration),
Phys.Rev.Lett. 119 (2017) 181101.
O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collaboration),
Phys.Rev.Lett. 120 (2018) 261102.
O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collab.), ApJL 829 (2016) L20.
O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collab.), ApJ 863 (2018) 160.
N.Cannady, Y.Asaoka et al. (CALET Collab.),
```

ApJS 238 (2018) 5.

R.Kataoka et al., JGR,

10.1002/2016GL068930 (2016).

## **ISS as Cosmic Ray Observatory**



AMS Launch May 16, 2011



CALET Launch August 19, 2015



ISS-CREAM Launch August 14, 2017



HEPA2019

## ISS as Cosmic Ray Observatory



AMS Launch May 16, 2011

#### Magnet Spectrometer

- Various PID
- Anti-particles
- $E \leq TeV$

#### Calorimeter

- Carbon target
- Hadrons
- Including TeV region



ISS-CREAM Launch August 14, 2017



#### Calorimeter

- Fully active
- Electrons
- Including TeV region



CALET Launch August 19, 2015







#### Overview of CALET Observations

- Direct cosmic ray observations in space at the highest energy region by combining:
  - ✓ A large-size detector
  - Long-term observation onboard the ISS (5 years or more is expected)
- Electron observation in 1 GeV 20 TeV will be achieved with high energy resolution due to optimization for electron detection
- Search for Dark Matter and Nearby Sources
- Observation of cosmic-ray nuclei will be performed in energy region from 10 GeV to 1 PeV
- Unravelling the CR acceleration and propagation mechanism
- Detection of transient phenomena is expected in space by long-term stable observations
   EM radiation from GW sources, Gamma-ray burst, Solar flare, etc.



## **CALET** Payload







Launched on Aug. 19<sup>th</sup>, 2015 by the Japanese H2-B rocket

Emplaced on JEM-EF port #9 on Aug. 25<sup>th</sup>, 2015 (JEM-EF: Japanese Experiment Module-Exposed Facility)

JEM/Port #9



- Mass: 612.8 kg
- JEM Standard Payload Size: 1850mm(L) × 800mm(W) × 1000mm(H)
- Power Consumption: 507 W (max)
- Telemetry: Medium 600 kbps (6 5GE

Medium 600 kbps (6.5GB/day) / Low 50 kbps

# CALET Instrument



~	Plastic	Scintillator + PMT + 64anode PM	er T Scintillator(PWO) + APD/PD or PMT (X1)	CALORIMETER		
				CHD-FEC CHD-FEC MC-FEC IMC-FEC		
		IMC IMC	TASC	TASC-FEC TASC TASC FEC		
		CHD (Charge Detector)	IMC (Imaging Calorimeter)	TASC (Total Absorption Calorimeter) Energy, e/p Separation		
	Measure	Charge (Z=1-40)	Tracking , Particle ID			
	Geometry	Plastic Scintillator 14 paddles x 2 layers (X,Y): 28 paddles	448 Scifi x 16 layers (X,Y) : 7168 Scifi 7 W layers (3X <sub>0</sub> ): 0.2X <sub>0</sub> x 5 + 1X <sub>0</sub> x2	16 PWO logs x 12 layers (x,y): 192 logs log size: 19 x 20 x 326 mm <sup>3</sup> Total Thickness : 27 X <sub>0</sub> , ~1.2 λ <sub>1</sub>		
	(Material)	Paddle Size: 32 x 10 x 450 mm <sup>3</sup>	Scifi size : 1 x 1 x 448 mm <sup>3</sup>	Iotal Inickness : 27 $X_0$ , "1.2 $X_1$		
	(Material) Readout	Paddle Size: 32 x 10 x 450 mm <sup>3</sup> PMT+CSA	Scifi size : 1 x 1 x 448 mm <sup>3</sup> 64-anode PMT+ ASIC	APD/PD+CSA PMT+CSA (for Trigger)@top layer		



## Event Examples of High-Energy Showers

Electron, E=3.05 TeV



fully contained even at 3TeV

#### Fe(Z=26), ∆E=9.3 TeV



energy deposit in CHD consistent with Fe

clear difference from electron shower

Gamma-ray, E=44.3 GeV



no energy deposit before pair production



Intrinsic Advantage of the Fully Active Total Absorption Calorimeter:

EM Shower Energy Measurement = Energy Deposit Sum × "Small" Correction

- Active and thick calorimeter absorbs most of the electromagnetic energy (~95%) up to the TeV region in the case of CALET instrument.
- □ In principle, energy measurement with small systematic error is possible.
- **CALET** Detector features:
  - Fine energy resolution of ~ 2 %
  - Wide dynamic range to measure shower energy from 1GeV to 1000 TeV.
- It requires to obtain the ADC unit to energy conversion factor and to calibrate the whole dynamic range channel by channel.
  "MIP" peak in PWO: Obs. vs. MC
- On orbit : Energy conversion factor using "MIP" of p or He
- Position and temperature dependence
- Latitude dependence due to rigidity cutoff
   On ground: Linearity measurements
   for the whole dynamic range
- CHD/IMC Charge injection
- TASC UV Laser irradiation (end-to-end)





### Position and Temperature Calibration, and Long-term Stability





### Energy Measurement in Dynamic Range of 1-10<sup>6</sup> MIP in TASC



## Energy Deposit Distribution of All Triggered-Events



carried out in the dynamic range of 1 GeV - 1 PeV.



## ISS Orbit and CALET On-orbit Operations

ISS orbit: inclination 51.6 degree, ~400 km



#### Dependence of the count rate on geomagnetic latitude





## Observation with High Energy Trigger (>10GeV)

Y.Asaoka, S.Ozawa, S.Torii et al. (CALET Collaboration), Astropart. Phys. 100 (2018) 29.



Observation by High Energy Trigger for 1115 days : Oct.13, 2015 – Oct. 31, 2018
 □ The exposure, SΩT, has reached to ~97.6 m<sup>2</sup> sr day for electron observations by continuous and stable operations.

Total number of triggered events is ~730 million with a live time fraction of 84.2 %.

# All-Electron ( $e^++e^-$ )

O.Adriani et al. (CALET collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 119 (2017) 181101 O.Adriani et al. (CALET collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 120 (2018) 261102

# Cosmic-Ray All-Electron Spectrum (e<sup>+</sup>+e<sup>-</sup>)



# Cosmic-Ray All-Electron Spectrum ( $e^++e^-$ )

Possible fine structures in all-electron (electron + positron) spectrum







 Reliable tracking well-developed shower core

2. Fine energy resolution full containment of TeV showers

 B. High-efficiency electron ID 30X<sub>0</sub> thickness, closely packed logs

⇒CALET is best suited for observation of possible fine structures in the all-electron spectrum up to the trans-TeV region.



# **Event Selection**

#### Analyzed Flight Data:

- 627 days (October 13, 2015 to June 30, 2017)
- 55% of full CALET acceptance (Acceptance A+B; 570cm<sup>2</sup>sr)
- 1. Offline Trigger
- 2. Acceptance Cut
- 3. Single Charge Selection
- 4. Track Quality Cut
- 5. Shower Development Consistency
- 6. Electron Identification
  - 1. Simple two parameter cut
  - 2. Multivariate Analysis using Boosted Decision Trees (BDT)



# **Event Selection**

#### Analyzed Flight Data:

- 627 days (October 13, 2015 to June 30, 2017)
- 55% of full CALET acceptance (Acceptance A+B; 570cm<sup>2</sup>sr)
- 1. Offline Trigger
- 2. Acceptance Cut
- 3. Single Charge Selection
- 4. Track Quality Cut

## Pre-selection:

- Select events with successful reconstructions
- Rejecting heavier particles
- Equivalent sample between flight and MC data
- 5. Shower Development Consistency
- 6. Electron Identification
  - 1. Simple two parameter cut
  - 2. Multivariate Analysis using Boosted Decision Trees (BDT)







## **Electron Identification**



F<sub>E</sub>: Energy fraction of the bottom layer sum to the whole energy deposit sum in TASC R<sub>E</sub>: Lateral spread of energy deposit in TASC-X1 Separation Parameter K is defined as follows:

 $K = \log_{10}(F_E) + 0.5 R_E (/cm)$ 

#### **Boosted Decision Trees**

In addition to the two parameters making up K, TASC and IMC shower profile fits are used as discriminating variables.





## **Electron Efficiency and Proton Rejection**



- Constant and high efficiency is the key point in our analysis.
- Simple two parameter (BDT) cut is used in the energy region E<475GeV (E>475GeV) while the small difference in resultant spectrum between two methods are taken into account in the systematic uncertainty.
- Contamination is ~5% up to 1TeV, and <15% in the 1—3 TeV region.</li>
   VHEPA2019



## Absolute Calibration of Energy Scale using Geomagnetic Rigidity Cutoff





## Cutoff Rigidity Measurements and Comparison with Calculation

Measured cutoff rigidity is compared with calculated one (denoted as Tracer) which trace particle in earth's magnetic field (IGRF12).



VHEPA2019



## Cutoff Rigidity Measurements and Comparison with Calculation

Measured cutoff rigidity is compared with calculated one (denoted as Tracer) which trace particle in earth's magnetic field (IGRF12).



Since universal energy-scale calibration between different instruments is very important, we adopt the energy scale determined by rigidity cutoff to derive our spectrum.



### All-Electron Spectrum Measured with CALET from 10 GeV to 3 TeV

#### CALET: PRL 119 (2017) 181101, 3 November 2017





## All-Electron Spectrum Comparison w/ DAMPE

## and other space based experiments

29





## All-Electron Spectrum Comparison w/ DAMPE

## and other space based experiments





# Extending the Analysis to Full Acceptance

#### Analyzed Flight Data:

- 780 days (October 13, 2015 to November 30, 2017)
- Full CALET acceptance at the high energy region (Acceptance A+B+C+D; 1040cm<sup>2</sup>sr). In the low energy region fully contained events are used (A+B; 550cm<sup>2</sup>sr)





## (other than energy scale uncertainty)

#### Stability of resultant flux are analyzed by scanning parameter space

- Normalization:
  - Live time
  - Radiation environment
  - Long-term stability
  - Quality cuts
- Energy dependent:
  - 2 independent tracking
  - charge ID
  - electron ID (K-Cut vs BDT)
  - BDT stability (vs efficiency & training)
  - MC model (EPICS vs Geant4)

The energy scale uncertainty does not have energy dependence, because of the full containment of the EM showers well into the TeV region. Errors due to calibration of lower gain ranges are found to be negligible.





## (other than energy scale uncertainty)

### Stability of resultant flux are analyzed by scanning parameter space

- Normalization:
  - Live time
  - Radiation environment
  - Long-term stability
  - Quality cuts
- Energy dependent:
  - 2 independent tracking
  - charge ID
  - electron ID (K-Cut vs BDT)
  - BDT stability (vs efficiency & training)
  - MC model (EPICS vs Geant4)

- Divided into 4 sub-periods (195days each)
- spectrum in each sub-period is compared with the one from the whole period.
- standard deviation of the relative difference distribution is taken as systematic uncertainty (1.4%)





## (other than energy scale uncertainty)

# Stability of resultant flux are analyzed by scanning parameter space

- Normalization:
  - Live time
  - Radiation environment
  - Long-term stability
  - Quality cuts
- Energy dependent:
  - 2 independent tracking
  - charge ID
  - electron ID (K-Cut vs BDT)
  - BDT stability (vs efficiency & training)
  - MC model —— (EPICS vs Geant4)

- Divided into 4 sub-periods (195days each)
- spectrum in each sub-period is compared with the one from the whole period.
- standard deviation of the relative difference distribution is taken as systematic uncertainty (1.4%)





## (other than energy scale uncertainty)

### Stability of resultant flux are analyzed by scanning parameter space

- Normalization:
  - Live time
  - Radiation environment
  - Long-term stability
  - Quality cuts
- Energy dependent:
  - 2 independent tracking
  - charge ID
  - electron ID (K-Cut vs BDT)
  - BDT stability (vs efficiency & training)
  - MC model (EPICS vs Geant4)

Flux Ratio vs Efficiency for BDT @ 1TeV

#### Energy Dependence of BDT stability

BDT-Cut Efficiency [%]



Number of Trials

# Extended Measurement by CALET

Approximately doubled statistics above 500GeV by using full acceptance of CALET



# Extended Measurement by CALET

Approximately doubled statistics above 500GeV by using full acceptance of CALET



37



# Extended Measurement by CALET

Approximately doubled statistics above 500GeV by using full acceptance of CALET





# Comparison with DAMPE's result



# Comparison with DAMPE's result

What happens if we shifted our energy binning...



# **Prospects for CALET All-Electron Spectrum**

Five years or more observations  $\Rightarrow$  3 times more statistics, reduction of systematic errors



# Hadrons



# Preliminary Nuclei Measurements (p, He, Z < P)

(p, He,  $Z \le 8$ )

#### P.S.Marrocchesi et al., ICRC 2017, PoS 205.



Charge resolution using multiple dE/dx measurements from the IMC scintillating fibers



Non-linear response to  $Z^2$  is corrected both in CHD and IMC using a model.

Charge resolution combined CHD+IMC





\*) Plots are truncated to clearly present the separation.

A clear separation between p, He, up to Z=8, can be seen from CHD+IMC data analysis.



## Preliminary Flux of Primary Components



Entries



## Preliminary Energy Spectra of Carbon and Oxygen



# Gamma-Rays

O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collab.), ApJL 829 (2016) L20. O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collab.), ApJ 863 (2018) 160. N.Cannady, Y.Asaoka et al. (CALET Collab.), ApJS 238 (2018) 5.



# CALET Sky Map w/ LE- $\gamma$ Trigger (E>1GeV)

While exposure is not uniform, we have clearly identified the galactic plane and bright GeV sources.



#### Galactic coordinate



+90





## Effective Area and $\gamma$ -ray Flux from On/Off Plane



Effective area as a function of energy. Four representing zenith angle ranges are shown.



Analysis methodology, performance: N.Cannady, Y.Asaoka et al. (CALET Collab.), ApJS 238 (2018) 5.

Comparison with charged particle simulation





## **Bright Point-Source Spectra**



The observed point source spectra are well consistent with Fermi-LAT's parameterizations. Therefore, it was found that current selection criteria has a validated sensitivity and can be used to set limit on GW counterpart flux.



## CALET UPPER LIMITS ON X-RAY AND GAMMA-RAY COUNTERPARTS OF GW 151226

#### Astrophysical Journal Letters 829:L20(5pp), 2016 September 20

The CGBM covered 32.5% and 49.1% of the GW 151226 sky localization probability in the 7 keV - 1 MeV and 40 keV - 20 MeV bands respectively. We place a 90% upper limit of  $2 \times 10^{-7}$  erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> in the 1 - 100 GeV band where CAL reaches 15% of the integrated LIGO probability (~1.1 sr). The CGBM 7  $\sigma$  upper limits are  $1.0 \times 10^{-6}$  erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (7-500 keV) and 1.8  $\times 10^{-6}$  erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (50-1000 keV) for one second exposure. Those upper limits correspond to the luminosity of 3-5  $\times 10^{49}$  erg s<sup>-1</sup> which is significantly lower than typical short GRBs.

#### CGBM light curve at the moment of the GW151226 event



Figure 1. The CGBM light curves in 0.125 s time resolution for the high-gain data (left) and the low-gain data (right). The time is offset from the LIGO trigger time of GW 151226. The dashed-lines correspond to the 5  $\sigma$  level from the mean count rate using the data of  $\pm 10$  s.

## Upper limit for gamma-ray burst monitors and Calorimeter



Figure 2. The sky maps of the 7  $\sigma$  upper limit for HXM (left) and SGM (right). The assumed spectrum for estimating the upper limit is a typical BATSE S-GRBs (see text for details). The energy bands are 7-500 keV for HXM and 50-1000 keV for SGM. The GW 151226 probability map is shown in green contours. The shadow of ISS is shown in black hatches.

Calorimeter:





Figure 3. The sky map of the 90% upper limit for CAL in the 1-100 GeV band. A power-law model with a photon index of -2 is used to calculate the upper limit. The GW 151226 probability map is shown in green contours.



### Complete Search Results for GW Events during O1&O2 O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collabolation), ApJ 863 (2018) 160.

- CALET was not operational, yet, at the time of GW150914.
- For GW151226, we set 90% C.L. limit of 9.3 x 10<sup>-8</sup> erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (1-10GeV) covering 15% of the summed LIGO probabilities in the time window [T0-525s, T0+211s] (LE trigger).
- For GW170104, we set 90% C.L. limit of 8.3 x 10<sup>-6</sup> erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (10-100GeV) covering 30% of the summed LIGO probabilities in the time window [T0-60s,T0+60s] (HE trigger).
- Unfortunately, other GW events (GW170608, GW170814, GW170817) occurred during O2 are all out of the CALET-CAL FOV.





#### Complete Search Results for GW Events during O1&O2 O.Adriani et al. (CALET Collabolation), ApJ 863 (2018) 160.

- CALET was not operational, yet, at the time of GW150914.
- For GW151226, we set 90% C.L. limit of 9.3 x 10<sup>-8</sup> erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (1-10GeV) covering 15% of the summed LIGO probabilities in the time window [T0-525s, T0+211s] (LE trigger).
- For GW170104, we set 90% C.L. limit of 8.3 x 10<sup>-6</sup> erg cm<sup>-2</sup> s<sup>-1</sup> (10-100GeV) covering 30% of the summed LIGO probabilities in the time window [T0-60s,T0+60s] (HE trigger).
- Unfortunately, other GW events (GW170608, GW170814, GW170817) occurred during O2 are all out of the CALET-CAL FOV.

GW	Time T <sub>0</sub> (UTC)	Location area (deg <sup>2</sup> )	Luminosity distance (Mpc)	Event Type	References	CALET Results [Time Window]			
event						Mode	Summed LIGO probability	Upper Limits (90% C.L.)	
								Energy Flux (erg cm <sup><math>-2</math></sup> s <sup><math>-1</math></sup> )	Luminosity (erg s <sup>-1</sup> )
GW150914	2015 Sep 14 09:50:45	600	$440^{+160}_{-180}$	BH–BH	(a)			Before operation	
GW151226	2015 Dec 26 03:38:53	850	$440^{+180}_{-190}$	BH–BH	(b)	LE	15%	$[T_0 - 525 \text{ s}, T_0 + 211 \text{ s}]$ 9.3 × 10 <sup>-8</sup> 2.3 × 10 <sup>48</sup>	
GW170104	2017 Jan 04 10:11:58	1200	$880^{+450}_{-390}$	BH–BH	(c)	HE	30%	$[T_0 - 60 \text{ s}, T_0 + 60 \text{ s}]$ 6.4 × 10 <sup>-6</sup> 6.2 × 10 <sup>50</sup>	
GW170608	2017 Jun 08 02:01:16	520	$340^{+140}_{-140}$	BH–BH	(d)	HE		$[T_0 - 60 \text{ s}, T_0 + 60 \text{ s}]$ Out of FOV	
GW170814	2017 Aug 14 10:30:43	60	$540^{+130}_{-210}$	BH–BH	(e)	HE		$[T_0 - 60 \text{ s}, T_0 + 60 \text{ s}]$ Out of FOV	
GW170817	2017 Aug 17 12:41:04	28	$40^{+8}_{-14}$	NS-NS	(f)	HE		$[T_0 - 60 \text{ s}, T_0 + 60 \text{ s}]$ Out of FOV	

Table 1

Summary of *CALET* Observations of Gravitational Events Reported by the Virgo and LIGO Scientific Collaborations (BH: black hole, NS: Neutron Star) and Representative Results from *CALET* Observation (See the Text for Other Time Windows)

# CALET Sensitivity to GeV Gamma-Rays

Short GRBs accompanied by GeV gamma-ray emissions could be detected by CALET-CAL given the closeness of GW candidates.





## **Summary and Future Prospects**

- □ CALET was successfully launched on Aug. 19, 2015, and the detector is being very stable for observation since Oct. 13, 2015.
- As of October 31, 2018, total observation time is 1115 days with live time fraction to total time close to 84%. Nearly 730 million events are collected with high energy trigger (E>10 GeV)
- Careful calibrations have been adopted by using "MIP" signals of the non-interacting p & He events, and the linearity in the energy measurements up to 10<sup>6</sup> MIPs is established by using observed events.
- All electron spectrum has been extended in statistics and in the energy range up to 4.8TeV. This result is published in PRL again on June 2018.
- Preliminary analysis of nuclei have successfully been carried out to obtain the energy spectra in the energy range: Protons in 55 GeV~22 TeV, Ne-Fe in 500 GeV~100 TeV.
- CALET's CGBM detected nearly 60 GRBs (~20 % short GRB among them ) per year in the energy range of 7keV-20 MeV, as expected (not included in this talk).
   Follow-up observation of the GW events is carried out and published in ApJL.
- □ GW counterpart searches with CALET calorimeter were extended to cover the whole LIGO/Virgo O2 and published in ApJ (August 2018). In addition, onboard performance of gamma-ray observation is published in ApJS (September 2018).
- □ The so far excellent performance of CALET and the outstanding quality of the data suggest that a 5-year observation period is likely to provide a wealth of new interesting results.