Particle Acceleration in Galaxy Clusters

Hiroyasu Tajima Stanford Linear Accelerator Center Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology



Outline

- Introduction.
- Science.
- EGRET analysis.



October 26, 2006 GLAST lunch





- Origin of cosmic ray protons?
 - Galactic SNRs (Supernova Remnants) are considered as the best candidates for cosmic-rays below "Knee".
 - Only circumstantial evidence
 - Diffusive shock acceleration. (Blanford&Eichler 1977)
 - CR energy sum consistent with SNR kinetic energy. (Ginzburg&Syrovatskii 1964)
 - No observational evidence for hadronic acceleration.
 - Cosmic-rays above "Knee" are considered extragalactic.
 - Gamma-ray bursts (GRB).
 - Active Galactic Nuclei.
 - Galaxy clusters.









- Strong shock due minor merger of galaxy clusters.
 - Model parameters are tuned to be consistent with existing measurements.
 - Particle acceleration up to 10¹⁹ eV. (Origin of UHE-CR?)
 - Secondary e⁺e⁻ following proton interaction with CMB photon are dominant origin of gamma-rays.







- Large scale shock by merging galaxy clusters. •
 - **Origin of Ultra High Energy Cosmic-ray (UHECR)?**

ROSAT März 2003







- Actively merging galaxy clusters can be good electron accelerators.
 - Electrons lose their energy very efficiently by gamma-ray emissions.
 - Constant acceleration necessary to keep it going.
 - Maximum electron energy
 - Shock acceleration time
 = cooling time by Compton scattering

$$t_{\rm acc} \approx \frac{r_{\rm L}c}{V_s^2} = \frac{\gamma_e m_e c}{eBV_s^2} = 1.6 \times 10^{-4} \frac{\gamma_e}{(B/1\mu {\rm G})(V_s/1000 \,{\rm km/s})^2}$$

$$t_{\rm IC} = \frac{\gamma_e m_e c^2}{(4/3)c\sigma_{\rm T} U_{\rm CMB} \gamma_e^2} = 2.3 \times 10^{12} / \gamma_e (1+z)^4 \qquad r_{\rm L}: \text{ Larmor radius} V_s: \text{ shock velocity}$$

$$\gamma_{e,\text{max}} = 1.2 \times 10^8 \sqrt{B/1\mu {\rm G}} (V_s/1000 \,{\rm km/s}) / (1+z)^2$$





 Observed gamma-ray flux within shock propagation time.

$$\frac{dF}{d\varepsilon_{\gamma}} = \frac{(1+z)}{4\pi d_L^2 t_{\rm shock}} \frac{dN_{\gamma}}{d\varepsilon_{\gamma}}$$

Spectrum normalization

$$\int d\gamma_e m_e c^2 \gamma_e \frac{dN_e}{d\gamma_e} = \xi_e E_{\text{baryon}}, \quad \xi_e \approx 0.05$$

Number of EGRET detectable gamma-ray clusters

$$N(>F) = \int dz \int_{M(z,F)}^{\infty} dM \frac{dV}{dz} R_{\text{form}}(M,z) t_{\text{shock}}$$

$$t_{\text{shock}} \approx 1.5/(1+z)^{3/2} \text{ Gyr} \implies t_{\text{IC}} = 2.1/(1+z)^4 \sqrt{\varepsilon_{\gamma}/\text{GeV}} \text{ Myr}$$

Shock propagation time for $\varepsilon_{\nu} > \text{MeV}$





- Expected logN-logF and EGRET UID population
 - GLAST may find thousands of them.







 Extragalactic gamma-ray BG observed by EGRET can be explained by gamma-ray clusters.







- X-ray (ROSAT limit: ~4x10⁻¹² ergs/cm²/s)
 - IC flux expected in X-ray band: ~1.6x10⁻¹¹ ergs/cm²/s
 - However, X-ray from this class of clusters are more extended than ordinary clusters.
 - CXB confusion raises the detection limit.
 - Deep Suzaku observation would give stringent constraints on this model.
 - Not enough time to heat up the gas.
- Optical
 - Merging clusters are harder to identify by eye since they are more extended than the stabilized ones.
- Radio
 - Synchrotron is too dim due to low *B*.





- Automated cluster-finding technique based on maximum likelihood method.
 - Several associations of CPG (cluster pairs/groups) with EGRET nonvariable UID sources with Ibl>45°(Gehrels 00).



Kawasaki&Totani 02





- 5 out of 7 EGRET nonvariable UID sources are associated with CPGs within 1° radius.
 - If random, 1.5 CPGs expected. Observed 6 CPG is 3.7σ effect.
 - Association with single clusters is consistent with random, i.e. 1.1σ.
- Mean Closest Separation: 0.84°
 - 1.84±0.390 if random. 2.6σ effect.
- Likelihood ratio: dp(r:ID)/dp(r:c)
 - KS test gives 2.3% chance probability
- However,
 - Two sources are variable, another two sources are questionable (Reimer 03, Tompkins 99, Torres 01).
 - AGN contamination?







- Image deconvolution with event-by-event PSF.
 - See my talk at DC2 closeout for details.
 - Incorporated wavelet filtering to reduce the effect of Poisson noise. (thanks to Stefano).
 - Energy dependent EGRET PSF (thanks to Jim).
 - Test with Crab, PSF looks OK.









- Image deconvolution favors extended source.
 - Rejects point source hypothesis at (184.7,-14.1).
 - Need further studies to make statistical significance.







• I just got this picture at 11:55AM today...



