Multi-messenger light curves from gamma-ray bursts

Mauricio Bustamante

Center for Cosmology and AstroParticle Physics (CCAPP)
The Ohio State University

NSSTC Space Seminar

Huntsville — August 02, 2016

THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CCAPP

Ultra-high-energy cosmic rays

After 50+ years of UHECR measurements —

GAISSER, STANEV, TILAV,
Front. Phys. China **8**, 748 (2013)

The electromagnetic sky

The era of neutrino astronomy has begun!

IceCube has reported 54 events with 30 TeV – 2 PeV in 4 years

Conv. atmospheric ($\nu_e + \nu_\mu$)
Prompt atmospheric ($\nu_e + \nu_\mu$, 90% C.L.)
Astrophysical ($\nu_e + \nu_\mu + \nu_\tau$)

ICECUBE, *ApJ* **809**, 98 (2015)

We have started listening to compact object mergers —

What about the sources of HE neutrinos?

Arrival directions compatible with an isotropic distribution –

$+$: shower
$\times$: muon track

No association with sources found yet

We will use gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) as a concrete source example

Why are GRBs interesting as potential ν sources?

1. They are the best candidates for detection of coincident high-energy e.m.–neutrino emission at PeV ν energies

2. Neutrinos from GRB afterglows are expected to be important at EeV energies (observable by radio neutrino detectors)

   [K. MURASE, *PRD* **76**, 123001 (2007)] [S. RAZZAQUE, L. YANG, *PRD* **91**, 043003 (2015)]

3. Dark, "failed" GRBs might contribute an important part to the diffuse flux seen by IceCube

   [P. MÉSZÁROS, E. WAXMAN, *PRL* **87**, 171102 (2001)]

> Here we will focus on issue 1
> and explore the prompt emission of neutrinos in GRBs

Why is *now* a good time to do this?

better, bigger detectors + loads of data + bright future

Neutrinos

- IceCube: diffuse flux of HE astrophysical ν's
- No point sources *yet*
- GRBs: low bg due to time and direction cuts
- IceCube-Gen2

GRBs

- *Fermi*: ~ 250 GRBs yr^{-1} in 8 keV – 40 MeV
- ~ 12 GRBs yr^{-1} in 20 MeV – 300 GeV
- different wavelengths: INTEGRAL, *Swift*
- 1000's GRBs detected so far

UHECRs

- Auger: 69 events > 57 EeV
- Telescope Array: 72 events
- surface + fluorescence
- future: LHAASO, JEM-EUSO

GRBs – good candidates for UHE CR & ν sources

GRBs are among the best candidate sources for CRs *and* ν's:

- radiated energy of $\sim 10^{52} - 10^{53}$ erg
- intense magnetic fields of $\sim 10^5$ G
- magnetically-confined *p*'s shock-accelerated to $\sim 10^{12}$ GeV
- plus: low backgrounds (for ν's) due to small time window

Problem: experiments (IceCube, ANTARES) are starting to strongly constrain the simplest joint emission models

Solution: we need to build more realistic models!

GRBs – good candidates for UHE CR & ν sources

GRBs are among the best candidate sour

- ▶ radiated energy of $\sim 10^{52} - 10^{53}$ erg
- ▶ intense magnetic fields of $\sim 10^5$ G
- ▶ magnetically-confined p's shock-accelerated to $\sim 10^{12}$ GeV
- ▶ plus: low backgrounds (for ν's) due to small time window

|	
10^{20} erg	H bomb
10^{26} erg	killer asteroid
10^{40} erg	Death Star
10^{33} erg s^{-1}	Sun
10^{41} erg s^{-1}	supernova
10^{45} erg s^{-1}	galaxy

Problem: experiments (IceCube, ANTARES) are starting to strongly constrain the simplest joint emission models

Solution: we need to build more realistic models!

GRBs – what are they?

GRBs: the most luminous explosions in the Universe

- ▶ **brief** flashes of gamma rays:
  from 0.1 s to few 100's s
- ▶ isotropically distributed in the sky
- ▶ they are **far**: most occur
  at $\sim$ 1 Gpc from us ($z \approx 2$)
- ▶ they are **rare**: $\sim$ 0.3 Gpc^{-3} yr^{-1}
- ▶ two populations:
  - ▶ **short-duration (< 2 s):** neutron star-
    neutron star or NS-black hole mergers
  - ▶ **long-duration (> 2 s):** associated to
    hypernovae
- ▶ powered by matter accretion
  onto a black hole

# GRBs – a zoo of light curves

GRB light curves come in different shapes:

variability timescale (width of pulses) $\equiv t_v \approx 1$ ms

GRBs explained – the fireball model

Developed by Mészáros, Reese, Goodman, Pachinsky, *et al.* in the 1990s

Internal collisions

Relativistically-expanding blobs of plasma collide with each other, merge, and emit UHE particles —

Producing the UHE ν's, CRs, γ rays – a first look

Joint production of UHECRs, ν's, and γ's:

power law $\sim E^{-\alpha_p}$ broken power law

$$p\,\gamma \to \Delta^+(1232) \to \begin{cases} n\pi^+, & BR = 1/3 \\ p\pi^0, & BR = 2/3 \end{cases}$$

$$\pi^+ \to \mu^+ \nu_\mu \to \bar{\nu}_\mu\, e^+ \nu_e \nu_\mu$$

$$\pi^0 \to \gamma\gamma$$

$$n \text{ (escapes)} \to p e^- \bar{\nu}_e$$

(Δ^+: $\sim$50% of all $p\gamma$ interactions)

After propagation, with flavor mixing:

$$\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau : p = 1 : 1 : 1 : 1$$
$$(\text{"one } \nu_\mu \text{ per cosmic ray"})$$

This neutron model of CR emission is now strongly disfavoured

ICECUBE, *Nature* **484**, 351 (2012)
M. AHLERS *et al. Astropart. Phys.* **35**, 87 (2011)

To calculate the ν flux from a GRB, we need:

- its gamma-ray luminosity L_γ^{iso} [erg s^{-1}] [measured]

- its variability timescale t_v [s], from the light curve [measured]

- the break energy of its photon spectrum $\epsilon_{\gamma,\text{break}}$ [MeV] [measured]

- the bulk Lorentz factor of its jet Γ [estimated]

- the energy in electrons, magnetic field, protons [estimated]

Now let us cook up the neutrinos ▶

Normalizing neutrinos with observed gamma rays

energy in neutrinos $\propto$ energy in gamma rays

In detail, for each GRB,

$$\int_0^\infty dE_\nu E_\nu F_\nu \left(E_\nu \right) = \frac{1}{8} \underbrace{\left[1 - \left(1 - \langle x_{p \to \pi} \rangle \right)^{\Delta R / \lambda_{p\gamma}} \right]}_{f_\pi} \frac{1}{f_e} \int_{1\,\text{keV}}^{10\,\text{MeV}} d\epsilon_\gamma \epsilon_\gamma F_\gamma \left(\epsilon_\gamma \right)$$

f_π: fraction of total proton energy transferred to pions
ΔR: size of the emitting region
$\lambda_{p\gamma}$: mean free path for $p\gamma$ interactions
$\langle x_{p \to \pi} \rangle$: avg. fraction of p energy transferred to a π in one interaction
f_e^{-1}: ratio of energy in protons to energy in photons/electrons

$$\frac{\Delta R}{\lambda_{p\gamma}} = \left(\frac{L_\gamma^{\text{iso}}}{10^{52}\,\text{erg s}^{-1}} \right) \left(\frac{0.01}{t_v} \right) \left(\frac{10^{2.5}}{\Gamma} \right)^4 \left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{\varepsilon_{\gamma,\text{break}}} \right)$$

The original recipe: conventional fireball model

Observed gamma-ray fluence [GeV^{-1} cm^{-2}]

$$\mathcal{F}_\gamma\left(\varepsilon_\gamma\right) \propto \begin{cases} \left(\varepsilon_\gamma/\varepsilon_{\gamma,\text{break}}\right)^{-1} & , \ \varepsilon_\gamma < \varepsilon_{\gamma,\text{break}} = 1 \text{ MeV} \\ \left(\varepsilon_\gamma/\varepsilon_{\gamma,\text{break}}\right)^{-2.2} & , \ \varepsilon_\gamma \geq \varepsilon_{\gamma,\text{break}} \end{cases}$$

+

Assumed proton spectrum in the source

$$N'_p\left(E_p\right) \propto E_p'^{-2}$$

=

Neutrino spectrum from $p\gamma$, via Δ resonance

$$F_\nu(E_\nu) \propto \begin{cases} \left(\dfrac{E_\nu}{E_{\nu,\text{break}}}\right)^{-\alpha_\nu} & , \ E_\nu < E_{\nu,\text{break}} \\ \left(\dfrac{E_\nu}{E_{\nu,\text{break}}}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} & , \ E_{\nu,\text{break}} \leq E_\nu < E_{\nu,\mu} \\ \left(\dfrac{E_\nu}{E_{\nu,\text{break}}}\right)^{-\beta_\nu} \left(\dfrac{E_\nu}{E_{\nu,\mu}}\right)^{-2} & , \ E_\nu \geq E_{\nu,\mu} \end{cases}$$

Neutrino spectrum – conventional fireball

E. WAXMAN, J. N. BAHCALL, *PRL* **78**, 2292 (1997)
D. GUETTA *et al.*, *Astropart. Phys.* **20**, 429 (2004)

The *one-collision* burst assumption

All internal collisions are identical and occur at the same radius —


$l' = \Gamma c t_v (1+z) \sim 9 \times 10^4 (1+z)$ km

$\Gamma = 300$
typical values: $t_v = 10^{-3}$ s
$T_{90} = 10$ s

$R_C = 2c\Gamma^2 t_v/(1+z) \sim 5 \times 10^7/(1+z)$ km

- ▸ Average speed Γ inferred from afterglow observations
- ▸ "Variability timescale" t_v measured from the light curve
- ▸ Redshift z measured for the host galaxy
- ▸ "Isotropically-equivalent volume": $V'_{\text{iso}} = 4\pi R_C^2 l'$
- ▸ $N_{\text{coll}} \approx T_{90}/t_v \sim 100$–$1000$ identical collisions

Neutron model of UHECR emission under tension?

In 2012, IceCube ruled this analytical version of the fireball model –

- ▶ assumed a fixed baryonic loading of 10
- ▶ extrapolated diffuse ν flux from 117–215 GRBs ("quasi-diffuse")
- ▶ analytical calculation – in tension with upper bounds

IceCube, *Nature* **484**, 351 (2012)
M. Ahlers *et al. Astropart. Phys.* **35**, 87 (2011)
D. Guetta *et al. Astropart. Phys.* **20**, 429 (2004)

NeuCosmA: (revised) GRB particle emission – I

Two ingredients:

$$\underbrace{N'_p\left(E'_p\right)}_{\substack{\text{proton density at the source [GeV}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-3}]}} \quad \overset{\text{NeuCosmA}}{\otimes} \quad \underbrace{N'_\gamma\left(E'_\gamma\right)}_{\substack{\text{photon density at the source}}}$$

$$= \quad \underbrace{Q'_\nu\left(E'_\nu\right)}_{\substack{\text{emitted neutrino spectrum [GeV}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-3}\text{ s}^{-1}]}}$$

▶ Photons (same shape as observed at Earth):

$$N'_\gamma\left(E'_\gamma\right) = \begin{cases} \left(E'_\gamma/E'_{\gamma,\text{break}}\right)^{-1} & , \ E'_{\gamma,\text{min}} = 0.2 \text{ eV} \leq E'_\gamma < E'_{\gamma,\text{break}} = 1 \text{ keV} \\ \left(E'_\gamma/E'_{\gamma,\text{break}}\right)^{-2.2} & , \ E'_\gamma \geq E'_{\gamma,\text{break}} \\ 0 & , \ \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

▶ Protons: $N'_p\left(E'_p\right) \propto E'^{-\alpha_p}_p e^{-E'_p/E'_{p,\text{max}}} \quad (\alpha_p \gtrsim 2)$

Two ingredients:

$$\underbrace{N_p'\left(E_p'\right)}_{\text{proton density at the source [GeV}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-3}]} \quad \overset{\text{NeuCosmA}}{\otimes} \quad \underbrace{N_\gamma'\left(E_\gamma'\right)}_{\text{photon density at the source}}$$

$$= \quad \underbrace{Q_\nu'\left(E_\nu'\right)}_{\text{emitted neutrino spectrum [GeV}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-3}\text{ s}^{-1}]}$$

▶ Photons (same shape as observed at Earth):

$$N_\gamma'\left(E_\gamma'\right) = \begin{cases} \left(E_\gamma'/E_{\gamma,\text{break}}'\right)^{-1} & , \ E_{\gamma,\text{min}}' = 0.2 \text{ eV} \leq E_\gamma' < E_{\gamma,\text{break}}' = 1 \text{ keV} \\ \left(E_\gamma'/E_{\gamma,\text{break}}'\right)^{-2.2} & , \ E_\gamma' \geq E_{\gamma,\text{break}}' \\ 0 & , \ \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$t_{\text{acc}}'\left(E_{p,\text{max}}'\right) = \min\left[t_{\text{dyn}}', t_{\text{syn}}'\left(E_{p,\text{max}}'\right), t_{p\gamma}'\left(E_{p,\text{max}}'\right)\right]$$

▶ Protons: $N_p'\left(E_p'\right) \propto E_p'^{-\alpha_p} e^{-E_p'/E_{p,\text{max}}'} \quad (\alpha_p \gtrsim 2)$

Normalize the particle densities at the source —

▶ Photons:

$$\underbrace{\text{photon energy density per collision}}_{\int E'_\gamma \; N'_\gamma \left(E'_\gamma \right) \, dE'_\gamma} = \frac{\overbrace{E^{\text{iso},'}_{\gamma,\text{tot}} \sim 10^{53} \text{ erg (from observed fluence)}}^{}}{\underbrace{\text{number of collisions}}_{N_{\text{coll}}} \cdot \underbrace{\text{volume of one collision}}_{V'_{\text{iso}}}}$$

Here the numerator bracket reads: total gamma-ray energy of burst

▶ Protons: *baryonic loading* (energy in *p*'s / energy in *e*'s + γ's), *e.g.*, 10

$$\underbrace{\text{proton energy density per collision}}_{\int E'_p \; N'_p \left(E'_p \right) \, dE'_p} = \frac{1}{f_e} \cdot \text{photon energy density per collision}$$

NeuCosmA: (revised) GRB particle emission – III

Injected/ejected spectrum of secondaries (π, K, n, ν, etc.):

$$x \equiv E'/E'_p \qquad y \equiv E'_p E'_\gamma / \left(m_p c^2 \right)$$

$$Q'\left(E'\right) = \int_{E'}^{\infty} \frac{dE'_p}{E'_p} N'_p\left(E'_p\right) \int_0^{\infty} c \, dE'_\gamma \, N'_\gamma\left(E'_\gamma\right) \, \underset{\text{response function}}{R}\left(x, y\right)$$

R contains cross sections, multiplicities for different channels

What does NeuCosmA include?

- ▶ $p\gamma \rightarrow \Delta^+ (1232) \rightarrow \pi^0, \pi^+, \dots$
- ▶ extra K, n, π^-, multi-π prod. modes
- ▶ synchrotron losses of secondaries
- ▶ adiabatic cooling
- ▶ full photon spectrum
- ▶ neutrino flavor transitions

NeuCosmA – how the neutrino spectrum changes

For example, GRB080603A:

1. Correction to analytical model (IC-FC → RFC)

2. Change due to full numerical calculation

IC-FC: IceCube-Fireball Calculation
RFC: Revised Fireball Calculation
NFC: Numerical Fireball Calculation

S. Hümmer, P. Baerwald, W. Winter, *PRL* **108**, 231101 (2012)

Repeat the IceCube GRB neutrino analysis, with NeuCosmA —

- Same GRB sample and parameters

- Calculate ν fluence for each burst and stacked fluence $F_\nu (E_\nu)$

- Quasi-diffuse flux ($N_{\text{GRB}} = 117$):

$$\phi_\nu (E_\nu) = F_\nu (E_\nu) \frac{1}{4\pi} \frac{1}{N_{\text{GRB}}} \frac{667 \text{ bursts}}{\text{yr}}$$

Flux $\sim$ 1 order of magnitude lower!

S. HÜMMER, P. BAERWALD, W. WINTER,
PRL **108**, 231101 (2012)

Improved IceCube limits (2016)

- ▶ 3 yr of showers (all flavors) + 4 yr of upgoing tracks with > 1 TeV
- ▶ Larger GRB catalogue (807 bursts)
- ▶ Six coincident events found (five showers + one track)
- ▶ Low statistical significance
- ▶ $\lesssim$ 1% of the diffuse flux can be from prompt GRB emission

Improved IceCube limits (2016)

- ▶ 3 yr of showers (all flavors) + 4 yr of upgoing tracks with > 1 TeV
- ▶ Larger GRB catalogue (807 bursts)
- ▶ Six coincident events found (five showers + one track)
- ▶ Low statistical significance
- ▶ $\lesssim 1\%$ of the diffuse flux can be from prompt GRB emission

Caveat: one-zone GRB emission model only

What about low-luminosity and choked GRBs?

- ▶ Low-luminosity and choked GRBs might be in the same family as high-luminosity long GRBs
- ▶ Due to lower jet speeds (Γ_b), they do not break out
- ▶ They might explain the TeV region of the IceCube diffuse ν flux:

I. TAMBORRA, S. ANDO, *PRD* **93**, 053010 (2016)

The neutron model hinges on:

1. *p*'s magnetically confined, only *n*'s escape

2. *p*'s interact at most once, *n*'s do not (*optically thin source*)

However, under the "one ν_μ per CR" hypothesis, GRBs are disfavored as the sole sources of UHECRs (AHLERS *et al.*).

M. AHLERS, M. GONZÁLEZ-GARCÍA, F. HALZEN, *Astropart. Phys.* **35**, 87 (2011)

Going beyond the neutron model

The neutron model hinges on:

1. *p*'s magnetically confined, only *n*'s escape
2. *p*'s interact at most once, *n*'s do not (*optically thin source*)

However, under the "one ν_μ per CR" hypothesis, GRBs are disfavored as the sole sources of UHECRs (AHLERS *et al.*).

What if ❶ and ❷ are violated?

- ► *p*'s "leak out", not accompanied by (direct) ν production
- ► multiple *p* interactions enhance the ν flux
- ► in *optically thick sources*, only *n*'s at the borders escape

M. AHLERS, M. GONZÁLEZ-GARCÍA, F. HALZEN, *Astropart. Phys.* **35**, 87 (2011)

Going beyond the neutron model

We have improved the model – now UHECRs escape as either:

- ▶ neutrons, which decay into protons outside the source; or
- ▶ protons that leak out without interacting inside the source

Relative contributions determined by $\tau_n \equiv \left(t_{p\gamma}^{-1} / t_{\mathrm{dyn}}^{-1} \right)\Big|_{E'_{p,\max}}$

$\tau_n < 1$
optically thin to n escape

p's trapped in bulk by magnetic field

p's can leak from borders

$\tau_n \geq 1$
optically thick to n escape

p's trapped in bulk by magnetic field

p's, n's trapped in bulk by $p\gamma$ and $n\gamma$ interactions

p's, n's can leak from borders

A two-component model of UHECR emission

Sample neutrino fluences –

Optically **thin** source

Optically **thick** source

emission

propagation

γ

detection

ν

p

Because of the cosmological expansion:

$$\text{energy at Earth} = \frac{\text{energy at production time}}{1 + z}$$

Cosmological photon backgrounds:


◀ they evolve with redshift, *i.e.*, $n_\gamma(\epsilon, z)$

p

$$p + \gamma_b \rightarrow \Delta^+ \rightarrow \begin{cases} n + \pi^+ \\ p + \pi^0 \end{cases}$$

$$\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma + \gamma$$

Cosmogenic ν's: $\pi^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_\mu$

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

From the sources to us

γ's and $e^{\pm}$'s dump energy into e.m. cascades through
  - ▶ pair production, $\gamma + \gamma_b \rightarrow e^+ + e^-$
  - ▶ inverse Compton scattering, $e^{\pm} + \gamma_b \rightarrow e^{\pm} + \gamma$

Lower-energy (GeV–TeV) gamma-rays detected by Fermi-LAT

γ

ν

p

From the sources to us

p's are deflected by extragalactic magnetic fields
⇒ except for the most energetic ones, they are **not** expected to point back to the sources

Pierre Auger found weak correlation with known AGN positions

They lose energy through:

▶ pair production, $p + \gamma_b \rightarrow p + e^+ + e^-$
▶ photohadronic interactions, $p\gamma_b$

depend on the redshift evolution of the cosmological γ backgrounds

ν

p

Initial UHE ν flavor fluxes: $\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau = 1 : 2 : 0$

Probability of $\nu_\alpha \to \nu_\beta$ transition: $P_{\alpha\beta}(E_0, z)$

Flavor oscillations redistribute the fluxes
– at Earth: $\nu_e : \nu_\mu : \nu_\tau \approx 1 : 1 : 1$ (might be changed by exotic physics!)

MB, Beacom, Winter, *PRL* **115**, 161302 (2015)

What do the diffuse fluxes look at Earth, then?

## Neutron model vs. two-component model: prompt and cosmogenic ν's

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *ApJ* **768**, 186 (2013)
P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)
See also: H. HE *et al.*, *ApJ* **752**, 29 (2012)

Constraints from experimental data

Fit the UHECR flux to Telescope Array data & enforce the IceCube GRB ν and cosmogenic ν upper limits —

P. BAERWALD, MB, AND W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

More relativistic (higher Γ) GRBs are needed

Going further: an evolving burst

Consider an evolving fireball –

- the fireball expands with time

- $\sim$ 1000 shells propagate with different speeds

- they have different masses

- they collide at different radii (collisions no longer identical)

What is different?

The particle (γ, p) densities fall as the fireball expands – particle production conditions change with time/radius

S. KOBAYASHI, T. PIRAN, R. SARI, *ApJ* **490**, 92 (1997)
F. DAIGNE, R. MOCHKOVITCH, *MNRAS* **296**, 275 (1998)

Initial distribution of shell speeds

Distribution of initial shell speeds (Lorentz factors):

$$\ln\left(\frac{\Gamma_{k,0}-1}{\Gamma_0-1}\right) = A_\Gamma \cdot x$$

x follows a Gaussian distribution, $P(x)\,dx = dx\,e^{-x^2/2}/\sqrt{2\pi}$

$A_\Gamma < 1$

Speeds too similar, collisions only at large radii

$A_\Gamma \gg 1$

Spread too large, too many collisions at low radii

$A_\Gamma \approx 1$

Just right, burst has high efficiency of conversion of kinetic to radiated energy

Anatomy of an internal collision

1 Propagation

f: fast shell
s: slow shell

Anatomy of an internal collision

1 Propagation   **2** Collision

Anatomy of an internal collision

1 Propagation   **2** Collision   **3** Radiation

Part of the initial kinetic energy radiated as γ's, ν's, p's, and n's:

$$E_{coll}^{iso} = \left(E_{kin,f}^{iso} - E_{kin,m}^{iso} \right) + \left(E_{kin,m}^{iso} - E_{kin,s}^{iso} \right)$$

1/12
$$\underbrace{\epsilon_e E_{coll}^{iso}}$$
energy in photons

1/12
$$\underbrace{\epsilon_B E_{coll}^{iso}}$$
energy in magnetic fields

5/6
$$\underbrace{\epsilon_p E_{coll}^{iso}}$$
energy in baryons

Each collision occurs in a different emission regime –

Sub-photospheric: $\tau_{e\gamma} > 1$

$\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ fluence

Limited by $\gamma + \gamma \rightarrow e^+ + e^-$

maximum p energy

maximum γ energy

(observer's frame)

(source frame)

Synthetic light curves

An emission pulse is assigned to each collision
– their superposition yields a synthetic light curve:

Synthetic light curves

An emission pulse is assigned to each collision
– their superposition yields a synthetic light curve:

Energy in gamma-rays: $E_{\gamma,\text{tot}}^{\text{iso}} = 10^{53}$ erg

$T_{90} \approx 59$ s

1000 initial shells $\mapsto$ 990 collisions

MB, P. BAERWALD, K. MURASE, W. WINTER
Nature Commun. **6**, 6783 (2015)

Emission of different species peaks at different collision radii –

Why?

As the fireball expands, photon and proton densities fall

Why does it matter?

GRB parameters derived from gamma-ray observations might not be adequate to describe ν and UHECR emission

MB, P. BAERWALD, K. MURASE, W. WINTER, *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 6783 (2015)

A robust minimal diffuse ν flux from GRBs

- Take the simulated burst as stereotypical
- Quasi-diffuse neutrino flux, assuming 667 identical GRBs per year:

MB, P. Baerwald, K. Murase, W. Winter
Nature Commun. **6**, 6783 (2015)

What makes a GRB bright in neutrinos?

- ▶ **Goal:** to use the morphology of the GRB gamma-ray light curve to assess whether the burst is neutrino-bright
- ▶ The central engine determines the features of the light curve

Undisciplined GRB engine

- ▶ Broad Γ distribution
- ▶ *E.g.*, engine emits shells with log-normal Γ distrib.

Disciplined GRB engine

- ▶ Narrow Γ distribution
- ▶ *E.g.*, engine emits shells with oscillating Γ

MB, Murase, Winter, 1606.02325

Light curves

Undisciplined GRB engine
- Fast variability dominates
- No broad pulses

Disciplined GRB engine
- Broad pulses dominate
- Fast variability on top

MB, Murase, Winter, 1606.02325

How many optically thick collisions?

Undisciplined GRB engine

- Shells have very different speeds
- Collide quickly, close to engine
- High p and γ densities
- ~ 10 optically-thick bursts near the photosphere

Disciplined GRB engine

- Shells have similar speeds
- Collide far from engine
- Low p and γ densities
- All (superphotospheric) collisions are optically thin

MB, MURASE, WINTER, 1606.02325

So which burst is neutrino-bright?

Compare the quasi-diffuse neutrino fluxes:

Undisciplined GRB engine
$\sim 10^{-11}$ GeV cm^{-1} s^{-1} sr^{-1}

Disciplined GRB engine
$\sim 5 \cdot 10^{-13}$ GeV cm^{-1} s^{-1} sr^{-1}

MB, Murase, Winter, 1606.02325

$\therefore$ An undisciplined engine makes a GRB neutrino-bright

Time delays in gamma-ray light curves

Neutrino-weak bursts show time delays in different energy bands —

Conclusions . . . and the future

- GRBs *are* good UHECR and ν source candidates
- *But* the CR-ν-γ connection is trickier than originally thought
- Contribute to the diffuse HE astrophysical ν flux at the few % level
- Likely to be the first point neutrino sources to be resolved
- Need next-gen neutrino telescopes (IceCube-Gen2, KM3NeT) . . .
- . . . while Auger, Telescope Array, CTA, *etc.* gather extensive UHECR statistics
- Based on gamma-ray light curve morphology, we may build better GRB catalogues for ν searches

Backup slides

GRBs – an accidental discovery

After the 1963 Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the U.S. launched six pairs of *Vela* satellites:

- ▶ They carried X-ray, gamma-ray, and neutron detectors

- ▶ *Vela* 5a-b had enough spatial resolution to pinpoint the direction of events

- ▶ Intense gamma-ray emission from a nuclear explosion lasts $\lesssim 10^{-6}$ s . . .

- ▶ . . . however, longer-lasting emissions were detected

VELA 5A/B SATELLITES (NASA)

First GRB detected: July 2, 1967, 14:19 UTC

Detected by *Vela* 3, 4a, 4b (found on archival data)

What do they *look* like?

e.g., GRB060218 seen by *Swift*

SDSS, Swift Collab., Sloan Foundation, NSF, NASA

Two populations of GRBs:

BATSE, 1992

T_{90}: time during which 90% of gamma-ray energy is recorded

Improved IceCube bounds (2014)

- Only upgoing ν_μ's with > 1 TeV used
- Four years of data (IC-40, -59, -79, -86)
- Larger GRB catalogue (506 bursts)
- One coincident event found, with low statistical significance
- $\lesssim 1\%$ of the diffuse flux can be from prompt GRB emission

[IceCube, *ApJ* **805**, L5 (2015)]

A two-component model of CR emission

Optical depth:

$$\tau_n = \left. \frac{t_{p\gamma}^{-1}}{t_{\text{dyn}}^{-1}} \right|_{E_{p,\max}} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \lesssim 1 \;, & \text{optically } \textbf{thin} \text{ source} \\ > 1 \;, & \text{optically } \textbf{thick} \text{ source} \end{array} \right.$$

Particles can escape from within a shell of thickness λ'_{mfp}:

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \lambda'_{p,\text{mfp}}\left(E'\right) = \min\left[\Delta r', R'_L\left(E'\right), ct'_{p\gamma}\left(E'\right)\right] \\ \lambda'_{n,\text{mfp}}\left(E'\right) = \min\left[\Delta r', ct'_{p\gamma}\left(E'\right)\right] \end{array} \right\} f_{\text{esc}} = \frac{\lambda'_{\text{mfp}}}{\Delta r'}$$

fraction of escaping particles

We *need* direct proton escape

Scan of the GRB emission parameter space –

acceleration efficiency $\longrightarrow$ $\eta = 0.1$ $\qquad\qquad\qquad$ $\eta = 1.0$

no *n* escape at high efficiencies!

direct escape

optically thin to *n* escape

optically thick to *n* escape

P. BAERWALD, MB, AND W. WINTER, *ApJ* **768**, 186 (2013)

we need high efficiencies $\Rightarrow$ direct proton escape *is* required

Star-formation-rate vs. GRB redshift evolution

The exclusion from cosmogenic ν's grows if the number of GRBs evolves more strongly with redshift:

$n_{\text{GRB}}(z) \propto \rho_{\text{SFR}}(z)$
(star formation rate)

$n_{\text{GRB}}(z) \propto \rho_{\text{SFR}}(z) \times (1+z)^{1.2}$

Contributions to $(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu)$ flux from $\pi^\pm$ decay divided in:

- $\Delta(1232)$-resonance

P. BAERWALD, S. HÜMMER, AND W. WINTER,
Phys. Rev. **D83**, 067303 (2011)

Contributions to $(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu)$ flux from $\pi^\pm$ decay divided in:

- $\Delta(1232)$-resonance

- Higher resonances

P. BAERWALD, S. HÜMMER, AND W. WINTER, *Phys. Rev.* **D83**, 067303 (2011)

Contributions to $(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu)$ flux from $\pi^\pm$ decay divided in:

- $\Delta(1232)$-resonance

- Higher resonances

- t-channel (direct production)

Contributions to $(\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu)$ flux from $\pi^\pm$ decay divided in:

- Δ(1232)-resonance

- Higher resonances

- t-channel (direct production)

- High energy processes (multiple π)

P. BAERWALD, S. HÜMMER, AND W. WINTER, *Phys. Rev.* **D83**, 067303 (2011)

Especially "Multi π" contribution leads to change of flux shape; neutrino flux higher by up to a factor of 3 compared to WB treatment

NeuCosmA – further particle decays

$$\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$
$$\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu$$

$$\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$$
$$\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu$$

$$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

NeuCosmA – further particle decays

Resulting ν_e flux (at the observer)

$$\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$
$$\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu$$

$$\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$$
$$\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu$$

$$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

NeuCosmA 2010

Total flux

WB flux

from μ

from n

$E^2 \cdot \phi_{\bar{\nu}_e + \nu_e} / (\text{GeV sr}^{-1} \, s^{-1} \, \text{cm}^{-2})$

E/GeV

NeuCosmA – further particle decays

$$\pi^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$
$$\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ + \nu_e + \bar{\nu}_\mu$$

$$\pi^- \rightarrow \mu^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu,$$
$$\mu^- \rightarrow e^- + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu$$

$$K^+ \rightarrow \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$

$$n \rightarrow p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

Resulting ν_μ flux (at the observer)

NeuCosmA 2010

Total flux

from μ

WB flux

from π

from K

$E^2 \cdot \phi_{\bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_\mu} / (\text{GeV sr}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2})$

E/GeV

S. HÜMMER, P. BAERWALD, W. WINTER,
Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 231101 (2012)

Corrections to the analytical model:

▶ shape revised:

  ▶ shift of first break (correction of photohadronic threshold)

  ▶ different cooling breaks for μ's and π's

  ▶ $(1 + z)$ correction on the variability scale of the GRB

▶ Correction cf_π to π prod. efficiency:

  ▶ f_{C_γ}: full spectral shape of photons

  ▶ $f_\approx = 0.69$: rounding error in analytical calculation

  ▶ $f_\sigma \simeq 2/3$: from neglecting the width of the Δ-resonance

▶ Correction c_S:

  ▶ energy losses of secondaries

  ▶ energy dependence of the mean free path of protons

Electron neutrino spectrum

Muon neutrino spectrum

Characteristic double peak structure from μ and π decay in both flavors, additional peak from K^+ decay at 10^8 to 10^9 GeV

The need for km-scale neutrino telescopes

Expected ν flux from cosmological accelerators (Waxman & Bahcall 1997 & 1998):

$$E^2 \Phi_\nu \sim 10^{-8} \frac{f_\pi}{0.2} \left(\frac{\dot{\varepsilon}_{\text{CR}}^{[10^{10}, 10^{12}]}}{10^{44} \text{ erg Mpc}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}} \right) \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1}$$

Integrated flux above 1 PeV:

$$\Phi_\nu \left(> 1 \text{ PeV} \right) \sim \int_{1 \text{ PeV}}^{\infty} \frac{10^{-8}}{E^2} \, dE \sim 10^{-20} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1}$$

Number of events from half of the sky (2π):

$$N_\nu \simeq 2\pi \cdot \Phi_\nu \left(> 1 \text{ PeV} \right) \cdot 1 \text{ yr} \cdot A_{\text{eff}} \approx \left(2.4 \times 10^{-10} \text{ cm}^{-2} \right) A_{\text{eff}} \,,$$

where A_{eff} is the effective area of the detector

To detect $N_\nu > 1$ events per year, we need an area of

$$A_{\text{eff}} \gtrsim 0.4 \text{ km}^2$$

Therefore, we need km-scale detectors, like IceCube

Cosmogenic neutrinos

We have seen that protons interact with the cosmological photon fields (CMB, etc.), *e.g.*,

$$p + \gamma \to \Delta^+ \to \pi^+ + n \,,$$

and neutrinos are created in the decays of the secondaries:

$$\pi^+ \to \mu^+ + \nu_\mu$$
$$\mu^+ \to \bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_e + e^+$$
$$n \to p + e^- + \bar{\nu}_e$$

These are called *cosmogenic neutrinos*

Cosmogenic neutrinos

P. Baerwald, MB, W. Winter, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Interaction with the photon backgrounds – I

- Energy loss rate (GeV s^{-1}):

$$b(E) \equiv \frac{dE}{dt}$$

- For pair production $p\gamma \longrightarrow pe^+e^-$:

$$b_{e^+e^-}(E,z) = -\alpha r_0^2 \left(m_e c^2\right)^2 c \int_2^\infty d\xi n_\gamma \left(\frac{\xi m_e c^2}{2\gamma}, z\right) \frac{\phi(\xi)}{\xi^2}$$

- n_γ: isotropic photon background (GeV^{-1} cm^{-3})
- ξ: photon energy in units of $m_e c^2$
- proton energy: $E = \gamma m_p c^2$ ($\gamma \gg 1$)
- $\phi(\xi)$: (tabulated) integral in energy of outgoing e^-

G. BLUMENTHAL, *Phys. Rev.* **D 1**, 1596 (1970)
H. BETHE, W. HEITLER, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **A146**, 83 (1934)

Photohadronic interactions – $p\gamma$ interaction rate (s^{-1} per particle):

$$\Gamma_{p\gamma \to p' b}(E, z) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_p^2}{E^2} \int_{\frac{\epsilon_{th} m_p}{2E}}^{\infty} d\epsilon \frac{n_\gamma(\epsilon, z)}{\epsilon^2} \int_{\epsilon_{th}}^{2E\epsilon/m_p} d\epsilon_r \epsilon_r \sigma_{p\gamma \to p' b}^{tot}(\epsilon_r)$$

1. For given values of E and z, NeuCosmA calculates the cooling rate $t_{p\gamma}^{-1} \equiv -(1/E) b_{p\gamma}$ (s^{-1}) as

$$t_{p\gamma}^{-1}(E, z) = \sum_i^{\text{all channels}} \Gamma_{p \to p}^i(E, z) K^i,$$

with $K^i E$ the loss of energy per interaction

2. From this, we calculate back $b_{p\gamma}$ (GeV s^{-1}) ...

3. ... and the corresponding energy-loss term in the transport equation, $\partial_E(b_{p\gamma} Y_p)$.

S. HÜMMER, M. RÜGER, F. SPANIER, W. WINTER, *Astrophys. J.* **721**, 630 (2010) [1002.1310]

Note that $L_{\mathrm{CIB}} \gg L_{\mathrm{CMB}}$:

Matches, *e.g.*, H. TAKAMI, K. MURASE, S. NAGATAKI, K. SATO, *Astropart. Phys.* **31**, 201 (2009) [0704.0979]

Mauricio Bustamante (CCAPP OSU)   Multi-messenger GRB light curves   65 / 47

UHE ν's in the GRB internal shock model

Secondary injection of neutrons, neutrinos (GeV^{-1} cm^{-3} s^{-1})

$$Q'(E') = \int_{E'}^{\infty} \frac{dE_p'}{E_p'} N_p'(E_p') \int_0^{\infty} cd\varepsilon' N_\gamma'(\varepsilon') R(E', E_p', \varepsilon')$$

Normalisation to the observed GRB photon flux F_γ

$$\int \varepsilon' N_\gamma'(\varepsilon') d\varepsilon' = \frac{E_{\rm iso}'^{\rm sh}}{V_{\rm iso}'} \propto F_\gamma, \quad \int E_p' N_p'(E_p') dE_p' = \frac{1}{f_e} \frac{E_{\rm iso}'^{\rm sh}}{V_{\rm iso}'} \propto \frac{F_\gamma}{f_e}$$

Fluence per shell, at Earth (GeV^{-1} cm^{-2})

$$\mathcal{F}^{\rm sh} = t_v V_{\rm iso}' \frac{(1+z)^2}{4\pi d_L^2} Q'$$

UHE ν's in the GRB internal shock model

$$Q'(E') = \int_{E'}^{\infty} \frac{dE_p'}{E_p'} N_p'(E_p') \int_0^{\infty} cd\varepsilon' N_\gamma'(\varepsilon') R(E', E_p', \varepsilon')$$

▶ Photon density, shock rest frame (GeV^{-1} cm^{-3}):

$$N_\gamma'(\varepsilon') \propto \begin{cases} (\varepsilon')^{-\alpha_\gamma}, & \varepsilon'_{\gamma,\text{min}} = 0.2 \text{ eV} \leq \varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon'_{\gamma,\text{break}} \\ (\varepsilon')^{-\beta_\gamma}, & \varepsilon'_{\gamma,\text{break}} \leq \varepsilon' \leq \varepsilon'_{\gamma,\text{max}} = 300 \times \varepsilon'_{\gamma,\text{min}} \end{cases}$$

$$\varepsilon'_{\gamma,\text{break}} = \mathcal{O}(\text{keV}), \alpha_\gamma \approx 1, \beta_\gamma \approx 2$$

▶ Proton density:

$$N_p'(E_p') \propto (E_p')^{-\alpha_p} \times \exp\left[-\left(E_p'/E_{p,\text{max}}'\right)^2\right] \quad (\alpha_p \approx 2)$$

Maximum proton energy limited by energy losses:

$$t_{\text{acc}}'\left(E_{p,\text{max}}'\right) = \min\left[t_{\text{dyn}}', t_{\text{syn}}'\left(E_{p,\text{max}}'\right), t_{p\gamma}'\left(E_{p,\text{max}}'\right)\right]$$

UHE ν's in the GRB internal shock model

Secondary injection of neutrons, neutrinos (GeV^{-1} cm^{-3} s^{-1})

$$Q'\left(E'\right) = \int_{E'}^{\infty} \frac{dE_p'}{E_p'} N_p'\left(E_p'\right) \int_0^{\infty} c d\varepsilon' N_\gamma'\left(\varepsilon'\right) R\left(E', E_p', \varepsilon'\right)$$

Normalisation to the observed GRB photon flux F_γ

$$\int \varepsilon' N_\gamma'\left(\varepsilon'\right) d\varepsilon' = \frac{E_{\text{iso}}'^{\text{sh}}}{V_{\text{iso}}'} \propto F_\gamma \; , \;\; \int E_p' N_p'\left(E_p'\right) dE_p' = \frac{1}{f_e} \frac{E_{\text{iso}}'^{\text{sh}}}{V_{\text{iso}}'} \propto \frac{F_\gamma}{f_e}$$

UHE ν's in the GRB internal shock model

Secondary injection of neutrons, neutrinos (GeV^{-1} cm^{-3} s^{-1})

$$Q'\left(E'\right) = \int_{E'}^{\infty} \frac{dE_p'}{E_p'} N_p'\left(E_p'\right) \int_0^{\infty} cd\varepsilon' N_\gamma'\left(\varepsilon'\right) R\left(E', E_p', \varepsilon'\right)$$

Normalisation to the observed GRB photon flux F_γ

$$\int \varepsilon' N_\gamma'\left(\varepsilon'\right) d\varepsilon' = \frac{E_{\text{iso}}'^{\text{sh}}}{V_{\text{iso}}'} \propto F_\gamma \ , \ \ \int E_p' N_p'\left(E_p'\right) dE_p' = \frac{1}{f_e} \frac{E_{\text{iso}}'^{\text{sh}}}{V_{\text{iso}}'} \propto \frac{F_\gamma}{f_e}$$

Fluence per shell, at Earth (GeV^{-1} cm^{-2})

$$\mathcal{F}^{\text{sh}} = t_v V_{\text{iso}}' \frac{(1+z)^2}{4\pi d_L^2} Q'$$

A fast-rise-exponential-decay (FRED) gamma-ray pulse is emitted in every collision:

$$L_\gamma^{\text{peak}} \sim R_C^{-2}$$

The prediction *is* robust

Simulations show only weak dependence of the **flux** on the boost Γ . . .

. . . and on the GRB engine variability time δt_{eng}

Accelerating iron

▶ Photodisintegration destroys nuclei close to the center ($\sim 10^8$ km)
e.g., ANCHORDOQUI *et al.*, *Astropart. Phys.* **29**, 1 (2008)

▶ However, they can survive at large radii:

MB, BAERWALD, MURASE, WINTER
Nature Commun. **6**, 6783 (2015)

Propagating the UHECRs to Earth

We use a Boltzmann equation to transport protons to Earth:

- Comoving number density of protons (GeV^{-1} cm^{-3}):

$$Y_p(E, z) = n_p(E, z) / (1 + z)^3 \ ,$$

with n_p the real number density

- Transport equation (comoving source frame):

$$\dot{Y}_p = \boxed{\partial_E(HEY_p)} + \boxed{\partial_E(b_{e^+e^-} Y_p)} + \boxed{\partial_E(b_{p\gamma} Y_p)} + \boxed{\mathcal{L}_{CR}}$$

adiabatic losses

pair production losses

photohadronic losses

CR injection from sources

$$Q_{CR}(E) \propto E^{-\alpha_p} e^{-E/E_{p,\max}}$$

Contribution of GRBs to the diffuse ν flux

- ▶ **Three populations:** high-luminosity long GRBs (HL-GRB), low-luminosity long GRBs (LL-GRB), short GRBs (sGRB)
- ▶ **Sub-PeV:** GRBs contribute a few % to the IceCube diffuse flux
- ▶ **PeV:** contribution could be higher

I. TAMBORRA, S. ANDO, *JCAP* **1509**, 036 (2015)

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1 Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1.0$

NeutCosmA 2014

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})
2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1.0$

NeutCosmA 2014

L_{iso} [erg s^{-1}]

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})
2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)
3. Find the best-fit point (diamond), and the 90% (red), 95% (yellow), and 99% (blue) C.L. regions

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1$

$\chi^2_{min}/\mathrm{dof} = 13.89/13$
@ $\log_{10}(L_{iso}) = 53.0$, $\Gamma = 257$

NeuCosmA 2014

L_{iso} [erg s^{-1}]

Γ

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})
2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)
3. Find the best-fit point (diamond), and the 90% (red), 95% (yellow), and 99% (blue) C.L. regions

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1$

$\chi^2_{min}/dof = 13.89/13$
@ $\log_{10}(L_{iso}) = 53.0$, $\Gamma = 257$

NeuCosmA 2014

L_{iso} [erg s^{-1}]

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})

2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)

3. Find the best-fit point (diamond), and the 90% (red), 95% (yellow), and 99% (blue) C.L. regions

4. Find the baryonic loading (*i.e.*, relative energy of p's to e's) at each point

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1$

$\chi^2_{min}/dof = 13.89/13$
@ $\log_{10}(L_{iso}) = 53.0$, $\Gamma = 257$

$2 = \log_{10} f_e^{-1}$

NeuCosmA 2014

Γ

L_{iso} [erg s^{-1}]

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})

2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)

3. Find the best-fit point (diamond), and the 90% (red), 95% (yellow), and 99% (blue) C.L. regions

4. Find the baryonic loading (*i.e.*, relative energy of p's to e's) at each point

5. Identify the region corresponding to pure n escape and to n escape + CR leakage

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1$

$\chi^2_{min}/dof = 13.89/13$
@ $\log_{10}(L_{iso}) = 53.0$, $\Gamma = 257$

$2 = \log_{10} f_e^{-1}$

CR leakage

n model

NeuCosmA 2014

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

① Generate the UHECR spectrum at every

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1$

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Mauricio Bustamante (CCAPP OSU) Multi-messenger GRB light curves 72 / 47

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})

2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)

3. Find the best-fit point (diamond), and the 90% (red), 95% (yellow), and 99% (blue) C.L. regions

4. Find the baryonic loading (*i.e.*, relative energy of p's to e's) at each point

5. Identify the region corresponding to pure n escape and to n escape + CR leakage

6. Find the region where the number of prompt ν_μ's is > 2.44, *i.e.*, the excluded region at 90% C.L.

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1.0$

$\chi^2_{min}/\mathrm{dof} = 13.89/13$
@ $\log_{10}(L_{iso}) = 53.0$, $\Gamma = 257$

$2 = \log_{10} f_e^{-1}$

P. BAERWALD, MB, W. WINTER, *Astropart. Phys.* **62**, 66 (2015)

Using UHECR + neutrino constraints

We can already limit the parameter space by using the UHECR observations and ν upper bounds:

1. Generate the UHECR spectrum at every point in parameter space (*e.g.*, in Γ vs. L_{iso})

2. Fit each spectrum to UHECR data (TA, PAO, HiRes)

3. Find the best-fit point (diamond), and the 90% (red), 95% (yellow), and 99% (blue) C.L. regions

4. Find the baryonic loading (*i.e.*, relative energy of p's to e's) at each point

5. Identify the region corresponding to pure n escape and to n escape + CR leakage

6. Find the region where the number of prompt ν_μ's is > 2.44, *i.e.*, the excluded region at 90% C.L.

7. After 15 yr of exposure and no detection, cosmogenic neutrinos also exclude

direct p escape, $\alpha_p = 2$, $\eta = 1.0$

$\chi^2_{min}/dof = 13.89/13$ @ $\log_{10}(L_{iso}) = 53.0$, $\Gamma = 257$

Initial number of plasma shells in the jet: $\gtrsim 1000$


Initial values of shell parameters:

- Width of shells and separation between them: $l = d = c \cdot \delta t_{\text{eng}}$
- Equal kinetic energy for all shells ($\sim 10^{52}$ erg)
- Shell speeds $\Gamma_{k,0}$ follow a distribution (log-normal or other)

During propagation:

- ▶ speeds, masses, widths **do not change** (only in collisions)

- ▶ the new, merged shells continue propagating and can collide again

Evolution stops when either:

- ▶ a single shell is left; or

- ▶ all remaining shells have reached the circumburst medium ($\gtrsim 6 \times 10^{11}$ km)

final number of collisions
$\approx$
number of initial shells ($\gtrsim 1000$)

S. Kobayashi, T. Piran, R. Sari, *ApJ* **490**, 92 (1997)

F. Daigne, R. Mochkovitch, *MNRAS* **296**, 275 (1998)

How is the new prediction different?

- The top-contributing collisions are at the photosphere
- Pion production efficiency there is independent of Γ:

$$f_{p\gamma}^{\mathrm{ph}} \sim 5 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{0.25} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1} \cdot \frac{1 \text{ keV}}{\epsilon'_{\gamma,\mathrm{break}}}$$

  ε: energy dissipation efficiency
  ϵ_e: fraction of dissipated energy as e.m. output (photons)

- $\Rightarrow$ Time-integrated neutrino fluence dominated is independent of Γ:

$$\mathcal{F}_\nu \propto \frac{N_{\mathrm{coll}}\,(f_{p\gamma} \gtrsim 1)}{N_{\mathrm{coll}}^{\mathrm{tot}}} \times \min\left[1, f_{p\gamma}^{\mathrm{ph}}\right] \times \frac{\epsilon_p}{\epsilon_e} \times E_{\gamma-\mathrm{tot}}^{\mathrm{iso}}$$

- Compare to standard predictions, which have a $\langle \Gamma \rangle^{-4}$ dependence
- Raising ϵ_p automatically decreases ϵ_e, so the photosphere grows, but still ~ 10 photospheric collisions dominate

How is the new prediction different?

- The top-contributing collisions are at the photosphere
- Pion production efficiency there is independent of Γ:

$$f_{p\gamma}^{\text{ph}} \sim 5 \cdot \frac{\varepsilon}{0.25} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_e}{0.1} \cdot \frac{1 \text{ keV}}{\epsilon'_{\gamma,\text{break}}}$$

ε: energy dissipation efficiency
ϵ_e: fraction of dissipated energy as e.m. output (photons)

- ⇒ Time-integrated neutrino fluence dominated is independent of Γ:

$$\mathcal{F}_\nu \propto \frac{\overset{\sim\, 10}{N_{\text{coll}} \, (f_{p\gamma} \gtrsim 1)}}{\underset{\sim\, 1000}{N_{\text{coll}}^{\text{tot}}}} \times \min\left[1, f_{p\gamma}^{\text{ph}}\right] \times \overset{10}{\left(\frac{\epsilon_p}{\epsilon_e}\right)} \times \overset{10^{53} \text{ erg}}{E_{\gamma-\text{tot}}^{\text{iso}}}$$

- Compare to standard predictions, which have a $\langle \Gamma \rangle^{-4}$ dependence
- Raising ϵ_p automatically decreases ϵ_e, so the photosphere grows, but still ~ 10 photospheric collisions dominate