

# A novel multimessenger study of Starburst galaxies: implications for neutrino astronomy

Antonio Marinelli  
(Università Federico II & INFN Napoli)


in coll. with Ambrosone A., Chianese M., Fiorillo D., Miele G., Pisanti O.

27 th European Cosmic Ray Symposium 25-29/07/2022



# HIGH STAR FORMATION RATE TRACES NEUTRINO PRODUCTION

JCAP (2006)  
Loeb & Waxmann




Looking for a preferential environment of neutrino production: a reservoir of high-energy cosmic rays with a region of high-density gas acting as a proton target

Forecasting scenario obtained for the class of Starburst galaxies 15 years ago, before Fermi-LAT and IceCube

# MULTICOMPONENT FIT OF THE ICECUBE DATA


- High energy part of IceCube SED can be described through **photo-hadronic** neutrino production of blazars (in the plot calibrated with TXS 0506+056 observations).

Gaggero, Grasso, A.M., Urbano, Valli  
APJL (2015); PRD IceCube +Antares  
(2017)



Possible description of  
“reservoir” components:  
Starforming + Starburst galaxies

Palladino et al., ApJ 871 (2019)





MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti

# THE CASE OF NGC 1068

PRL 124 (2020)  
IceCube

The IceCube Collaboration has found a  $2.9\sigma$  excess into the 10-year data


APJL 891 (2020) Inoue et al.  
PRL 125 (2020) Murase et al.



One of the most significant spot in the northern sky observed by IceCube  
need a better understanding: only starburst emission or additional emission  
components related to the AGN activity?

# EXTRAGALACTIC GAMMA-RAY BACKGROUND

Ajello et al.,  
APJL 800 (2015)



- ▶ Fermi-LAT resolved many individual sources belonging to different classes, Blazars dominates the EG samples.
- ▶ Limit on PS above 50 GeV varies from 68% (Lisanti et al. 2016) to 86% (Ackermann et al. 2016) of the EGB

Room for Starforming and Starburst galaxies needs a better definition due to the small number of resolved ones at HE

# HADRONIC PRODUCTION IN THE SBGS

---



The Starburst Galaxy M82

p-p interaction is likely to occur when  
*density of gas higher than density of radiation*  
(for example in Starburst Galaxies)

## Properties of SBGs

- ▶ High Star Formation Rate (**10-100 times higher than Milky Way**)
- ▶ They are abundant ( $\sim 10^4 - 10^5 \text{ Gpc}^{-3}$ )
- ▶ Not very brilliant in gamma-rays (**only a few currently observed**)

Generally, the SBGs are considered with the same properties of a **prototype** galaxy with “known” parameters (Peretti et al., arXiv:1812.01996, arXiv:1911.06163) see also (Loeb & Waxman 06; Bechtol, Ahlers, Di Mauro & Vandebrouke’15; Murase, Ahlers, Lack’13; Tamborra, Ando & Murase’14; Ando, Tamborra & Zandanel’15; Guetta, Ahlers, Murase’16; Palladino, Fedynitch, Rasmussen and Taylor’19 )

# SEMI-ANALYTIC PARAMETRIZATION OF SBGS

All the SBGs are considered with the same properties of a **prototype** galaxy with “known” parameters

- In the calorimeter scenario, three main parameters:

parameter	value
$p_{p,\max}$	$10^2$ PeV
$\alpha$	4.2
$R$	0.25 kpc
$D_L$	3.9 Mpc
$\xi_{\text{CR}}$	0.1
$\mathcal{R}_{\text{SN}}$	$0.06 \text{ yr}^{-1}$
$B$	$200 \mu\text{G}$
$n_{\text{ISM}}$	$100 \text{ cm}^{-3}$
$v_{\text{wind}}$	700 km/s
$U_{\text{rad}}$	$2500 \text{ eV/cm}^3$

Cut-off energy

$\tau_{\text{loss}} > \tau_{\text{esc}}$  in the core

Spectral index


Rate of Supernova explosions

→ The Star Formation Rate

Leaky-box-like model for CR transport

$$f(p) \left( \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{loss}}(p)} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{adv}}(p)} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{diff}}(p)} \right) = Q(p)$$

CR injected and accelerated by SNRs




M82 as prototype

# BLENDING OF SPECTRAL INDEXES USED

- We allow each starburst galaxy to have different a different spectral index

$$\left\langle \phi_{\nu,\gamma}(E|p^{\max}, \alpha) \right\rangle_{\alpha} = \int d\alpha \phi_{\nu,\gamma}(E|p^{\max}, \alpha) p(\alpha)$$

MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti



- 12 SFGs and SBGs have been resolved in gamma-rays


Ajello et al., arXiv:2003.05493



$$p(\alpha) = \mathcal{N}(\alpha|4.2, 0.04)$$

# BLENDING VERSUS PROTOTYPE SCENARIO


MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti



# BLENDING VERSUS PROTOTYPE SCENARIO

MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti

Direct +  
electromagnetic  
cascades  
gamma-ray flux  
EBL taken into  
account




The diffuse gamma contributions are  
almost the same!

# BLENDING VERSUS PROTOTYPE SCENARIO

MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti

With  $p^{\max} = \mathcal{O}(\text{PeV})$  it  
is possible to obtain a  
significant nu  
contribution at around  
100 TeV




Larger contribution around 100 TeV! Potentially,  
It could alleviate the tension between neutrino and gamma-ray data when using hadronic scenarios  
to explain IceCube observations.

# BLENDING VERSUS PROTOTYPE SCENARIO

MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti

A possible contribution  
at higher energies  
from Blazar?  
A possible interplay  
between reservoirs and  
accelerators can explain  
the whole IceCube SED



# THE PROPOSED MULTIMESSENGER FIT

## The Gamma-Ray Contributions:

1. SBGs
2. Blazar + Electromagnetic Cascades
3. Radio Galaxies

For Blazars and Radio Galaxies, we used the estimations given by Ajello et al. 2015 ([ArXiv: 1501.05301](#))

## The Neutrino Contributions:

1. SBGs
2. Blazars

For Blazars, we used the estimations given by Palladino et. Al 2019 ([ArXiv:1806.04769](#))

MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone, Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti

## Observational Samples Used

Extragalactic gamma-ray Background (EGB)

1. 7.5 years HESE  
2. 6 years Cascades


$$\chi^2_{\nu+\gamma}(N_{SBG}, N_{RG}, N_{Blazars}, p^{max}) = \chi^2_\nu + \chi^2_\gamma + \left( \frac{N_{Blazars} - 1}{0.26} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{N_{RG} - 1}{0.65} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{N_{Blazars} - 0.80}{0.11} \right)^2$$

They come from uncertainties of the Non-SBG components


It comes from the positional limit of Point Sources above 50 GeV (Lisanti et al. 2016)

# THE PROPOSED MULTIMESSENGER FIT

MNRAS 503 4032 (2021) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele, Pisanti




**2 sigmas allowed SED  
considering Fermi-LAT EGB and  
IceCube HESE data**



**2 sigmas allowed SED  
considering Fermi-LAT EGB and  
IceCube CASCADE data**

# THE PROPOSED MULTIMESSENGER FIT



At 2 sigma level the “blending” scenario can account up to 40% of IceCube HESE measured flux, moreover at 1 sigma a Pmax up to 50 PeV is permitted, however a cutoff  $\sim 10$  PeV is favored.

# Calorimetric model validation



The calorimetric “prototype” model used needs validation with more resolved SBG at VHE

ApJ 755 (2012)

Fermi-LAT

ApJ 894 (2020)

Ajello et al.



CTA will increase the actuals  
VHE SBG catalog

The measurements of the single SBG SEDs at more than 1TeV will be crucial to constrain the full sky diffuse neutrino expectations

# LOOKING AT CLOSE KNOWN SBGS

The gas density and the star formation rate have been linked through this relation:

$$n_{\text{ISM}} = 175 \left( \frac{\dot{M}_*}{5 M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}} \right)^{2/3} \text{cm}^{-3}$$

(Kennicutt 1998 ; Inoue et al. 2000 ; Hirashita et al. 2003 ; Yuan et al. 2011 ; Kennicutt & Evans 2012 ; Kennicutt & De Los Reyes 2021)

While the star formation rate is expected to be proportional to infra red observations through:

$$U_{\text{rad}} = 2500 \left( \frac{\dot{M}_*}{5 M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}} \right) \text{eV cm}^{-3}$$

APJL 919 (2021) Ambrosone, Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele


Source	Uniform prior	Most-likely values		68% credible intervals		$\chi^2/\text{dof}$
		$\dot{M}_*$	$(\dot{M}_*, \Gamma)$	$\dot{M}_*$	$\Gamma$	
M82	3.0 – 30	(4.5, 2.30)	[4.3, 4.6]	[2.27, 2.33]	1.24	
NGC 253	1.4 – 17	(3.3, 2.30)	[3.14, 3.40]	[2.28, 2.32]	1.32	
ARP 220	60 – 740	(740, 2.66)	[492, 740]	[2.51, 2.68]	1.52	
NGC 4945	0.35 – 4.15	(4.15, 2.30)	[4.05, 4.15]	[2.23, 2.32]	1.52	
NGC 1068	5 – 93	(16, 2.52)	[13, 20]	[2.45, 2.65]	0.65	
NGC 2146	3 – 57	(15, 2.50)	[9, 27]	[2.44, 2.88]	0.50	
ARP 299	28 – 333	(28, 2.15)	[28, 200]	[1.40, 1.90] $\cup$ [2.77, 3.00]	0.18	
M31	0.09 – 0.90	(0.34, 2.40)	[0.31, 0.40]	[2.29, 2.61]	0.52	
M33	0.09 – 0.90	(0.44, 2.76)	[0.19, 0.56]	[2.57, 2.96]	0.44	
NGC 3424	0.4 – 5.4	(5.4, 2.22)	[2.5, 5.4]	[1.92, 2.67]	1.63	
NGC 2403	0.1 – 1.2	(0.75, 2.12)	[0.58, 0.96]	[1.92, 2.36]	0.38	
SMC	0.008 – 0.090	(0.038, 2.14)	[0.037, 0.039]	[2.13, 2.16]	1.90	
Circinus Galaxy	0.1 – 8.1	(6.6, 2.32)	[6.2, 7.8]	[2.15, 2.45]	0.92	

NOTE—The star formation rate  $\dot{M}_*$  is in units of  $M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$ .

For each SBG we check if the fitting of gamma rays assuming a “calorimetric” scenario does not produce a tension between the gas needed and the IR observations

# NEUTRINO EXPECTATIONS FROM KNOWN SBGS

The neutrino normalizations obtained for the 13 SBGs considered have been compared to the expected point-like sensitivities of KM3NeT and IceCube observatories.



APJL 919 (2021)  
Ambrosone, Chianese,  
Fiorillo, A.M., Miele

To describe the neutrino excess observed from NCG1068 additional AGN components are needed.



The considered SBGs can be observed with the current and incoming neutrino telescopes only with several years of observation. The most optimistic cases are the Small Magellanic Cloud and Circinus galaxy visible by KM3NeT in 6 years of data taking.

# CTA answers at VHE

CTA southern sky

APJL 919 (2021)  
Ambrosone, Chianese,  
Fiorillo, A.M., Miele

CTA northern sky



Both CTA northern and southern hemisphere have the sensitivity to observe the expected gamma-ray spectral features of the known SBGs verifying the calorimetric scenario.

# COSMIC-RAY PHYSICS INSIDE SBGN

$$\frac{f(p)}{\tau_{\text{loss}}(p)} + \frac{f(p)}{\tau_{\text{adv}}(p)} + \frac{f(p)}{\tau_{\text{diff}}(p)} = Q(p)$$

injection term

**Model A**

MNRAS 487,168  
(2019) Peretti et al.

$$\frac{f(p)}{\tau_{\text{loss}}(p)} + \cancel{\frac{f(p)}{\tau_{\text{adv}}(p)}} + \frac{f(p)}{\tau_{\text{diff}}(p)} = Q(p)$$



**Model B**

MNRAS 493,2817  
(2020) Krumoltz et al.

$$\tau_{\text{adv}} = R_{\text{SBN}}/v_{\text{wind}}$$

$$R_{\text{SBN}} = 200 \text{ pc}$$





$$v_{\text{wind}} = 500 \text{ km/s}$$



# WHEN TEV GAMMA-RAY CAN BE CRUCIAL

Arxiv220303 (2022) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele


For most of these known SBG  
the TeV observation will disentangle the two scenarios




# IMPLICATION FOR THE EGB DESCRIPTION

Nature 41586 (2021)  
M. Roth et al.

## Model B



Verified on a sample of 35000 galaxies





The Fermi-LAT IGRB would be completely described by the Starburst galaxy emission, therefore the limit of Lisanti et al. 2016 for Blazar component would be exceeded

# IMPLICATION FOR NEUTRINO EXPECTED

Arxiv220303 (2022) Ambrosone,  
Chianese, Fiorillo, A.M., Miele


Nature 41586 (2021)  
M. Roth et al.



The two scenarios proposed for the cosmic-ray transport inside the nucleus of Starburst galaxies can produce a quite different prediction for high energy neutrinos

# MULTIMESSENGER RECAP

PPNP 102 (2018)  
Ahlers & Halzen



APJL 919 (2021)  
Ambrosone, Chianese,  
Fiorillo, A.M., Miele

## Diffuse High Energy neutrino

- Starburst galaxies < 40%
- Blazars < 30%
- Diffuse Galactic < 10%

## Diffuse High Energy gamma rays

- Starburst galaxies up to 30%
- Blazars up to 70% above 50 GeV
- Radio Galaxies ?

# SUMMARY

---

- The increasing number of catalogued gamma-ray SBGs it's a starting point for a more accurate population study of neutrino emission.
- A considerable contribution (up to 40%) of the astrophysical neutrino signal measured by IceCube can be attributed to this class of sources if we arrive up to  $z \sim 4.0$ .
- With incoming gamma-ray telescopes a better constrain of the spectral cutoff and cosmic-ray transport inside these “reservoir” sources will be possible.
- The contribution of the close known SGBs to IceCube astrophysical flux is at the level of  $\sim \%$ , however some of them can produce a visible point-like excess within decade of KM3NeT and IceCube/Gen2 data taking. The Small Magellanic Cloud and Circinus galaxy seems very promising.
- Neutrino statistics of a Global Neutrino Network + CTA survey of the close SBGs can solve the puzzle.

UV

Thank you  
for the  
attention