# Lecture (1) Plan- RADIATION FIELDS:

- UHECR Observational Status
- Extragalactic radiation fields
- Cosmic ray proton interaction rates with extragalactic radiation fields
- Cosmic ray nuclei interaction rates with extragalactic radiation fields
- Application- what one can infer from spectral and composition information alone

### **UHECR: The Observational Status**

#### Composition



Pierre Auger Collaboration. ApJ. 935 (2022)

Caccianiga et al. for the Auger and TA Collaborations. PoS (ICRC2023) 521 Andrew Taylor



## **Cosmic Radiation Fields- Energy Density**

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_{\gamma} &= \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma} rac{\mathbf{dn}}{\mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}} \mathbf{dE}_{\gamma} \ &= \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{2}} rac{\mathbf{dn}}{\mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}} \mathbf{dlnE}_{\gamma} \end{aligned}$$

Note- this amounts to a visual inspection version of Laplace's integral method

<sup>3</sup> Andrew Taylor



# **Cosmic Radiation Fields- Energy Density**



# **Cosmic Radiation Fields- Energy Density**



### **Cosmic Radiation Fields- Number Density**

$$\mathbf{n}_{\gamma} = \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} rac{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{E}_{\gamma}} \mathbf{d}\mathbf{E}_{\gamma}$$

$$=\int_{oldsymbol{0}}^{\infty}\mathbf{E}_{\gamma}rac{\mathbf{dn}}{\mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}}\mathbf{dln}\mathbf{E}_{\gamma}$$





### **CMB- Total Number Density**

$$\frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_{\gamma}} = \frac{8\pi}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \frac{\epsilon_{\gamma}^{2}}{\mathbf{e}^{\epsilon_{\gamma}/\mathbf{kT}} - 1}$$

$$\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{BB}} = \frac{8\pi(\mathbf{kT})^{3}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}^{2}}{\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}} - 1} d\mathbf{x}$$

$$\frac{\delta\pi(\mathbf{kT}_{\mathbf{CMB}})^{3}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \approx 170 \text{ cm}^{-3}$$

$$\mathbf{x}^{2} = \frac{8\pi(\mathbf{kT}_{\mathbf{CMB}})^{3}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} = 8\pi \frac{(\mathbf{kT}_{\mathbf{CMB}})^{3}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \gamma(3)\zeta(3) \approx 400 \text{ cm}^{-3}$$

DESI.

# **CMB- Total Number Density**

For a blackbody radiation field distribution, with temperature T,

$${f n}_{\gamma}={f 8}\pirac{({f kT})^{f 3}}{({f hc})^{f 3}}\gamma({f 3})\zeta({f 3})pprox {f 400~cm^{-f 3}}$$

$$\mathbf{U}_{\gamma} = \mathbf{8}\pi \frac{(\mathbf{kT})^{4}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \gamma(4) \zeta(4) = \mathbf{0.25} \,\, \mathbf{eV} \,\, \mathbf{cm}^{-3}$$

$$\langle \mathbf{E}_{\gamma} 
angle = rac{\int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} \mathbf{E}_{\gamma} rac{\mathbf{dn}}{\mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}} \mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}}{\int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} rac{\mathbf{dn}}{\mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}} \mathbf{dE}_{\gamma}} = rac{\Gamma(4)\zeta(4)}{\Gamma(3)\zeta(3)} \mathbf{kT} pprox \mathbf{2.7 \ kT}$$

### **Cosmic Ray Proton Energy Losses**





### **The Interaction Rate**



All values above in lab frame



DESY.

### **The Interaction Rate**

$$\mathbf{R} = \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} \mathbf{d}\epsilon_{\gamma} \frac{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{d}\epsilon_{\gamma}} \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{d}(\cos\theta) \sigma(\cos\theta) (\mathbf{1} + \beta\cos\theta)$$

Since, 
$$\epsilon'_{\gamma} \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}} = \epsilon_{\gamma} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}} (\mathbf{1} + \beta \cos \theta)$$
  
 $(\mathbf{1} + \beta \cos \theta) \mathbf{d} \cos \theta = \frac{\epsilon'_{\gamma} \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}}}{\epsilon_{\gamma} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}}} \frac{\mathbf{d}(\epsilon'_{\gamma} \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}})}{\epsilon_{\gamma} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}}}$ 

DESY.

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} \mathbf{d} \epsilon_{\gamma} \frac{\mathbf{d} \mathbf{n}}{\mathbf{d} \epsilon_{\gamma}} \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{2} \epsilon_{\gamma} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}}} \mathbf{d} (\epsilon_{\gamma}' \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}}) \frac{\epsilon_{\gamma}' \mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}}}{\epsilon_{\gamma}^{2} \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}}^{2}} \sigma(\epsilon')$$

$$=\frac{\mathbf{m_p^2}}{\mathbf{2E_p^2}}\int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} \mathbf{d}\epsilon_{\gamma}\frac{1}{\epsilon_{\gamma}^2}\frac{\mathbf{dn}}{\mathbf{d}\epsilon_{\gamma}}\int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{2}\epsilon_{\gamma}\frac{\mathbf{E_p}}{\mathbf{m_p}}}\mathbf{d}\epsilon_{\gamma}'\epsilon_{\gamma}'\sigma(\epsilon_{\gamma}') \Big|_{\mathbf{12}}$$

### **Cosmic Ray Proton Interactions**



# **Threshold Energy- Proton Pair Production**

$$(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{E}_{\gamma})^{\mathbf{2}} - (\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{E}_{\gamma})^{\mathbf{2}} = (\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{2m}_{\mathbf{e}})^{\mathbf{2}}$$

$$\mathbf{m_p^2} + 2\mathbf{E_p}\mathbf{E_\gamma} + 2\mathbf{p_p}\mathbf{E_\gamma} pprox \mathbf{m_p^2} + 4\mathbf{m_p}\mathbf{m_e}$$

$$egin{aligned} \mathbf{E_p} pprox rac{\mathbf{m_e}}{\mathbf{E_\gamma}} \mathbf{m_p} &pprox \left(rac{\mathbf{0.5} imes \mathbf{10^6}}{\mathbf{6} imes \mathbf{10^{-4}}}
ight) \mathbf{0.9} imes \mathbf{10^9} = \mathbf{8} imes \mathbf{10^{17}} \ \mathbf{eV} \end{aligned}$$

Repeat this calculation for pion production

<sup>14</sup> Andrew Taylor





DESY.



DESY.

# Energy Loss Rates due to Proton Interactions

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{\mathbf{m_p^2 c^4}}{2\mathbf{E^2}} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon_\gamma \frac{1}{\epsilon_\gamma^2} \frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_\gamma} \int_0^{2\mathbf{E}\epsilon_\gamma/(\mathbf{m_p c^2})} d\epsilon_\gamma' \epsilon_\gamma' \sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma}(\epsilon_\gamma') \mathbf{K_p}$$

where R is the energy loss rate

where  $K_{p}$  is the inelasticity



# Energy Loss Rates due to Proton Interactions

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{\mathbf{m_p^2 c^4}}{2\mathbf{E^2}} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon_\gamma \frac{1}{\epsilon_\gamma^2} \frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_\gamma} \int_0^{2\mathbf{E}\epsilon_\gamma/(\mathbf{m_p c^2})} d\epsilon_\gamma' \epsilon_\gamma' \sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma}(\epsilon_\gamma') \mathbf{K_p}$$

where R is the energy loss rate

where  $K_{p}$  is the inelasticity



### **EBL Radiation Field Models**

The EBL isn't actually known with very great accuracy (since it is difficult to measure directly)



This uncertainty should be propagated into theoretical calculations of interaction rates

19 Andrew Taylor

DESY.

### ....with Different IR Backgrounds





### ....with Different IR Backgrounds



### **Cosmic Ray Nuclei Energy Losses**



### **Cosmic Ray Nuclei Interactions**



DESY.

# 



Photo-disintegration-

$$N_{(A,Z)} + \gamma \longrightarrow N'_{(A',Z')} + (Z-Z')p + (A-A'+Z'-Z)n, E_{\gamma} \sim 30 MeV$$

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

24 Andrew Taylor

DESY.

### **Energy Loss Rates due** to Nuclei Interactions

$$\mathbf{R} = rac{\mathbf{A^2 m_p^2 c^4}}{2\mathbf{E^2}} \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\infty} d\epsilon_{\gamma} rac{1}{\epsilon_{\gamma}^2} rac{\mathrm{dn}}{\mathrm{d}\epsilon_{\gamma}} \int_{\mathbf{0}}^{\mathbf{2E}\epsilon_{\gamma}/(\mathbf{Am_p c^2})} d\epsilon_{\gamma}' \epsilon_{\gamma}' \sigma_{\mathbf{N}\gamma}(\epsilon_{\gamma}') \mathbf{K_p}$$

#### where R is the energy loss rate



25

### Cosmic Ray Disintegration During Propagation



### **Cosmic Ray Spectra**

# **Assumptions on Source Population**

#### **Spatial Distribution**

$$\frac{d\mathbf{N}}{d\mathbf{V_C}} \propto (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{z})^{\mathbf{n}}$$

 $\mathbf{z} < \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{max}}$ 

 $n=-6,\,-3,\,0,\,3$ 

#### **Energy Distribution**

 $rac{\mathbf{dN}}{\mathbf{dE}} \propto \mathbf{E}^{-lpha} \exp[-\mathbf{E}/\mathbf{E_{Z,max}}]$ 

 $\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{max}} = (\mathbf{Z}/\mathbf{26}) \times \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Fe},\mathbf{max}}$ 

Note- magnetic field horizon effects are neglected in the following. This amounts to assuming:  $d_s < (ct_H \lambda_{scat})^{1/2}$  ie. the source distribution may be approximated to be spatially continuous (also note, presence of t<sub>H</sub> term comes from temporally continuous assumption)



28

# A Cosmological Distribution of Sources



Andrew Taylor

#### DESY.

## **Proximity of Local Sources?**

Taylor PRD, 84 105007 (2011)



#### Lang et PRD, 102 063012 (2020)



Note- magnetic field horizon effects are neglected here. This amounts to assuming:

 $\mathbf{d_s} < (\mathbf{ct_H} \lambda_{\mathbf{scat}})^{\mathbf{1/2}}$ 

ie. the source distribution may be approximated to be spatially continuous (also note, presence of  $t_H$  term comes from temporally continuous assumption)

### **Magnetic Horizon Effect**



### MCMC Likelihood Scan: Spectral + Composition Fits



### MCMC Likelihood Scan: "Soft" Spectra Solutions



# **Proximity-Spectral Index Relation**

Taylor, PRD 92 (2015) 6

	n = -6		n = -3		n = 0		n = 3	
Parameter	Best-fit Value	Posterior Mean & Standard Deviation						
$\alpha$	1.8	$1.83\pm0.31$	1.6	$1.67\pm0.36$	1.1	$1.33\pm0.41$	0.6	$0.64\pm0.44$
$\log_{10} \left( \frac{E_{\rm Fe, max}}{\rm eV} \right)$	20.5	$20.55 \pm 0.26$	20.5	$20.52\pm0.27$	20.2	$20.38 \pm 0.25$	20.2	$20.16\pm0.18$

#### note trend in index

	PAO, JCAP 04 (2017) 038									
	source e	evolution	$\gamma$	$\log_{10}(R_{\rm cut}/{\rm V})$	D	D(J)	$D(X_{\max})$			
<i></i>		m = +3	$-1.40\substack{+0.35\\-0.09}$	$18.22\substack{+0.05\\-0.02}$	179.1	7.5	171.7			
note trend in index		m = 0	$+0.96^{+0.08}_{-0.13}$	$18.68^{+0.02}_{-0.04}$	174.3	13.2	161.1			
	$(1+z)^m$	m = -3	$+1.42^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$18.85_{-0.07}^{+0.04}$	173.9	19.3	154.6			
ţ		m = -6	$+1.56^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$18.74 \pm 0.03$	182.4	19.1	163.3			
		m = -12	$+1.79{\pm}0.06$	$18.73 \pm 0.03$	182.1	18.1	164.0			
		$z \le 0.02$ (	$+2.69\pm0.01$	$19.50_{-0.07}^{+0.08}$	178.6	15.3	163.3			

### Local source solution calls upon a more acceptable spectral index

# **Proximity-Spectral Index Relation**

Taylor, PRD 92 (2015) 6

	n = -6		n = -3		n = 0		n = 3	
Parameter	Best-fit Value	Posterior Mean & Standard Deviation						
$\alpha$	1.8	$1.83\pm0.31$	1.6	$1.67\pm0.36$	1.1	$1.33\pm0.41$	0.6	$0.64\pm0.44$
$\log_{10}\!\!\left(\frac{E_{\rm Fe,max}}{\rm eV}\right)$	20.5	$20.55 \pm 0.26$	20.5	$20.52\pm0.27$	20.2	$20.38 \pm 0.25$	20.2	$20.16\pm0.18$

#### note trend in index

	PAO, JCAP 04 (2017) 038									
	source e	evolution	$\gamma$	$\log_{10}(R_{\rm cut}/{\rm V})$	D	D(J)	$D(X_{\max})$			
		m = +3	$-1.40\substack{+0.35\\-0.09}$	$18.22\substack{+0.05\\-0.02}$	179.1	7.5	171.7			
note trend in index		m = 0	$+0.96^{+0.08}_{-0.13}$	$18.68^{+0.02}_{-0.04}$	174.3	13.2	161.1			
	$(1+z)^m$	m = -3	$+1.42^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$18.85_{-0.07}^{+0.04}$	173.9	19.3	154.6			
Ļ		m = -6	$+1.56^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$18.74 \pm 0.03$	182.4	19.1	163.3			
		m = -12	$+1.79{\pm}0.06$	$18.73 \pm 0.03$	182.1	18.1	164.0			
		$z \le 0.02$ (	$+2.69\pm0.01$	$19.50_{-0.07}^{+0.08}$	178.6	15.3	163.3			

Evidence that either there aren't many such sources, or that these sources (spectrally) are copies of each other (ie. stability of solution issues) Ehlert PRD, 107 103045 (2020)

# **Proximity-Spectral Index Relation**

Taylor, PRD 92 (2015) 6

	n = -6		n = -3		n = 0		n = 3	
Parameter	Best-fit Value	Posterior Mean & Standard Deviation						
$\alpha$	1.8	$1.83\pm0.31$	1.6	$1.67\pm0.36$	1.1	$1.33\pm0.41$	0.6	$0.64\pm0.44$
$\log_{10} \left( \frac{E_{\rm Fe, max}}{{ m eV}} \right)$	20.5	$20.55 \pm 0.26$	20.5	$20.52 \pm 0.27$	20.2	$20.38 \pm 0.25$	20.2	$20.16\pm0.18$

#### note trend in index

	PAO, JCA	AP 04 (201	7) 038				
	source e	evolution	$\gamma$	$\log_{10}(R_{\rm cut}/{\rm V})$	D	D(J)	$D(X_{\max})$
		m = +3	$-1.40^{+0.35}_{-0.09}$	$18.22\substack{+0.05\\-0.02}$	179.1	7.5	171.7
note trend in index		m = 0	$+0.96^{+0.08}_{-0.13}$	$18.68\substack{+0.02\\-0.04}$	174.3	13.2	161.1
	$(1+z)^m$	m = -3	$+1.42^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$18.85\substack{+0.04 \\ -0.07}$	173.9	19.3	154.6
Ļ	$m = -6  +1.56^{+0.06}_{-0.07} \qquad 18.74 \pm 0.03 \qquad 1$	182.4	19.1	163.3			
		m = -12	$+1.79{\pm}0.06$	$18.73 \pm 0.03$	182.1	18.1	164.0
$\sigma(E_{\text{Auger}}^{\text{TA}} \ge \frac{48.2}{38} \text{ EeV}) - \Psi = 25^{\circ}$		$z \le 0.02$ (	$+2.69\pm0.01$	$19.50_{-0.07}^{+0.08}$	178.6	15.3	163.3
60°							



A single/few local sources solution calls upon a more acceptable spectral index/resolves the - how to square this with the anisotropy data?

## Conclusions

- The attenuation of cosmic ray protons/nuclei due to the presence of background radiation fields is reasonably well understood
- The largest limitation presently is the EBL (dust and stellar emission components)
- Despite these limitations, calculations for the propagation ultra high energy cosmic rays in these background radiation fields are predictive
- A negative evolution of sources allows for softer source injection spectra (more consistent with the Fermi acceleration model)
- The current cosmic ray data at the highest energies is suggestive that the nearest sources should be no further than a few 10s of Mpc



### **End of Lecture**

# **Blackbody- Total Number Density**

$$\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{BB}} = 8\pi \frac{(\mathbf{kT})^{3}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \gamma(3)\zeta(3)$$
  
$$\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{BB}} = \frac{8\pi (\mathbf{kT})^{3}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}^{2}}{\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}} - 1} d\mathbf{x} \int_{0}^{\sqrt{2} - \frac{10^{3}}{27 \text{ kT}}} \int_{0}^{\sqrt{2} - \frac{$$

$$\frac{x^n}{e^x-1}=\frac{e^{-x}x^n}{1-e^{-x}}$$

DESY.

### **CMB- Total Number Density**

$$\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{BB}} = \mathbf{8}\pi rac{(\mathbf{kT})^{\mathbf{3}}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{\mathbf{3}}} \gamma(\mathbf{3})\zeta(\mathbf{3})$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{x}^{\mathrm{n}}}{\mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{x}}-1} = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{x}}\mathrm{x}^{\mathrm{n}}}{1-\mathrm{e}^{-\mathrm{x}}}$$

$$=\sum_{\mathbf{m}=\mathbf{0}}^{\infty}\mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{m}\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{n}}$$

$$=\sum_{\mathbf{m}=\mathbf{1}}^{\infty}\mathbf{e^{-\mathbf{mx}}x^{\mathbf{n}}}$$



### **CMB- Total Number Density**

$$\mathbf{n}_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{BB}} = \mathbf{8}\pi rac{(\mathbf{kT})^{\mathbf{3}}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{\mathbf{3}}} \gamma(\mathbf{3})\zeta(\mathbf{3})$$

$$\int \frac{x^n}{e^x-1} dx = \sum_{m=1}^\infty \int e^{-mx} x^n dx$$

Let 
$$y = mx$$

$$\int \frac{x^n}{e^x - 1} dx = \sum_{m=1}^\infty \int e^{-y} \left(\frac{y}{m}\right)^n d\left(\frac{y}{m}\right)$$

$$\int \frac{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{n}}}{\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{1}} \mathbf{d}\mathbf{x} = \sum_{\mathbf{m}=\mathbf{1}}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{1}}{\mathbf{m}^{\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{1}}} \int \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{n}} \mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{d}\mathbf{y} = \gamma(\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{1}) \zeta(\mathbf{n}+\mathbf{1})$$
41
And rew Taylor

DESY.

# **Threshold Energy- Proton Pion Production**

$$(\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{E}_{\gamma})^{\mathbf{2}} - (\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{p}} - \mathbf{E}_{\gamma})^{\mathbf{2}} = (\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{p}} + \mathbf{m}_{\pi})^{\mathbf{2}}$$

$$\mathbf{m_p^2} + 2\mathbf{E_p}\mathbf{E}_\gamma + 2\mathbf{p_p}\mathbf{E}_\gamma pprox \mathbf{m_p^2} + 2\mathbf{m_p}\mathbf{m}_\pi$$

$$\mathrm{E_p}pprox rac{\mathrm{m}_\pi}{2\mathrm{E}_\gamma}\mathrm{m_p}pprox \left(rac{135 imes10^6}{2 imes6 imes10^{-4}}
ight)0.9 imes10^9=10^{20}~\mathrm{eV}$$



### Energy Loss Rates of Electrons and Photons



Thomson regime electron cooling:

$$\begin{split} \tau_{\mathbf{e}}^{-1} &= \frac{\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{e}}^{2} \mathbf{c}^{4}}{2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{e}}^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} d\epsilon_{\gamma} \frac{1}{\epsilon_{\gamma}^{2}} \frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_{\gamma}} \mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{e}} \int_{0}^{2 \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{e}} \epsilon_{\gamma} / (\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{c}^{2})} d\epsilon_{\gamma}' \epsilon_{\gamma}' \sigma(\epsilon_{\gamma}') \\ &\approx \sigma_{\mathbf{T}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \mathbf{b} \frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_{\gamma}} d\epsilon_{\gamma} = \sigma_{\mathbf{T}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{e}} \epsilon_{\gamma}}{(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{c}^{2})^{2}} \frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_{\gamma}} d\epsilon_{\gamma} = \sigma_{\mathbf{T}} \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{e}}}{(\mathbf{m}_{\mathbf{e}} \mathbf{c}^{2})^{2}} \mathbf{U}_{\gamma} \\ &\xrightarrow{\text{DESY.}} \end{split}$$

### Comparison of Analytic and Monte Carlo Results



### **Photo-Pion Production Rate**

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{\mathbf{m_p^2 c^4}}{2\mathbf{E^2}} \int_0^\infty d\epsilon_\gamma \frac{1}{\epsilon_\gamma^2} \frac{d\mathbf{n}}{d\epsilon_\gamma} \int_0^{2\mathbf{E}\epsilon_\gamma/(\mathbf{m_p c^2})} d\epsilon_\gamma' \epsilon_\gamma' \sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma}(\epsilon_\gamma') \mathbf{K_p}$$

Assuming the cross-section is approximately: Measured  $egin{aligned} \epsilon_\gamma < \mathbf{E} - oldsymbol{\Delta} \ \epsilon_\gamma > \mathbf{E} + oldsymbol{\Delta} \end{aligned}$  $\sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma}(\epsilon_{\gamma}) = \mathbf{0}$ ط [mb]  $\sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma}(\epsilon_{\gamma}) = \sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma} \quad \mathbf{E} - \mathbf{\Delta} < \epsilon_{\gamma} < \mathbf{E} + \mathbf{\Delta}$ 0.1 2000 0 500 1000 1500 2500 3000 3500 Energy [MeV]  $\sigma_{\mathbf{p}\gamma} = \mathbf{0.5} \,\, \mathbf{mb}, \quad \mathbf{E} = \mathbf{300} \,\, \mathbf{MeV}, \,\,\, \mathbf{\Delta} = \mathbf{100} \,\, \mathbf{MeV}$ Where 45 DESY.

### **Photo-Pion Production Rate**



### **Photo-Pion Production Rate**

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{R}(\Gamma) &\approx \mathbf{n_0} \sigma_0 \int_{\mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma)}^{\mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)} \frac{\left(\mathbf{x^2} - \mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma)^2\right)}{\mathbf{e^x} - 1} d\mathbf{x} + \\ &\mathbf{n_0} \sigma_0 \int_{\mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\mathbf{x_2^2}(\Gamma) - \mathbf{x_1^2}(\Gamma)\right)}{\mathbf{e^x} - 1} \\ \mathbf{R}(\Gamma) &\approx \frac{1}{l_0} \left[ \left(\gamma_i(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)) - \gamma_i(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma))\right) - \mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma)^2(\gamma_i(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)) - \gamma_i(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma))) + \\ &\mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)^2(\mathbf{1} - \gamma_i(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma))) - \mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma)^2(\mathbf{1} - \gamma_i(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma))) \right] \end{split}$$

$$\gamma_i(3, x) = 2 - (2 + 2x + x^2) \exp(-x) \quad \gamma_i(1, x) = 1 - \exp(-x)$$

$$\mathbf{R}(\Gamma) \approx \frac{2}{l_0} \left[ \mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{x_1}} (1 - \mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{x_1}} + \mathbf{x_1} (1 - 2\mathbf{e}^{-\mathbf{x_1}})) \right] \right]$$

47 Andrew Taylor

DESY.

### Photo-Pion Production Rate: Blackbody Interactions

$$\begin{split} \mathbf{R}(\Gamma) &\approx \mathbf{n_0} \sigma_0 \int_{\mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma)}^{\mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)} \frac{\left(\mathbf{x^2} - \mathbf{x_1}(\Gamma)^2\right)}{\mathbf{e^x} - 1} d\mathbf{x} + \\ &\mathbf{n_0} \sigma_0 \int_{\mathbf{x_2}(\Gamma)}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\mathbf{x_2^2}(\Gamma) - \mathbf{x_1^2}(\Gamma)\right)}{\mathbf{e^x} - 1} \end{split}$$

$$\mathbf{R}(\Gamma) \approx \frac{2}{l_0} \left[ e^{-\mathbf{x_1}} (1 - e^{-\mathbf{x_1}} + \mathbf{x_1} (1 - 2e^{-\mathbf{x_1}})) \right]$$

 $\label{eq:constraint} \text{Where,} \quad l_0 = 10 \ Mpc \qquad \qquad \mathbf{x_1} = \frac{(E-\Delta)m_p}{2kT_{CMB}E_p} = \frac{10^{20.5 \ eV}}{E_p}$ 

#### DESY.

<sup>48</sup> Andrew Taylor

### Photo-Pion Production Rate: Blackbody Interactions

With,  $kT_{CMB} pprox 2 imes 10^{-4} \ eV$ 



DESY.

# **CMB- Total Energy Density**

$$\rho_{\gamma}^{\mathbf{BB}} = \frac{8\pi (\mathbf{kT})^{4}}{(\mathbf{hc})^{3}} \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathbf{x}^{3}}{\mathbf{e}^{\mathbf{x}} - 1} \mathbf{dx}$$

**DESY.** 





### An Analytic Description of these Results

### **Differential Equation Describing System State**

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{d}}{\mathbf{dt}} \begin{pmatrix} f_{56} \\ f_{55} \\ f_{54} \end{pmatrix} &= \mathbf{\Lambda} \begin{pmatrix} f_{56} \\ f_{55} \\ f_{54} \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{56 \to 55}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{56 \to 54}} + \dots\right) & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\tau_{56 \to 55}} & -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{55 \to 54}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{55 \to 54}} + \dots\right) & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\tau_{56 \to 54}} & \frac{1}{\tau_{55 \to 54}} & -\left(\frac{1}{\tau_{54 \to 53}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{54 \to 52}} + \dots\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{by} & \mathbf{f_q(t)} = \sum\limits_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} \mathbf{A_n f_n(t)} \\ & \text{then} & \mathbf{f_q(t)} = \sum\limits_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} \mathbf{A_n e^{-\lambda_n t} f_n(0)} \end{array}$$

(where  $A_n$  values are set by the initial conditions)

52 Andrew Taylor

**DESY.** 

 $\Lambda =$ 

### **Only Considering Single Nucleon Losses**

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{\tau_{56 \to 55}} & 0 & 0\\ \frac{1}{\tau_{56 \to 55}} & -\frac{1}{\tau_{55 \to 54}} & 0\\ 0 & \frac{1}{\tau_{55 \to 54}} & -\frac{1}{\tau_{54 \to 53}} \end{pmatrix}$$

and

DESY.

$$\mathbf{f_q}(\mathbf{t}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} \mathbf{f_{56}}(\mathbf{0}) \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q}} \tau_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{1}}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} (\tau_{\mathbf{n}} - \tau_{\mathbf{p}})} \mathbf{e}^{-\frac{\mathbf{t}}{\tau_{\mathbf{n}}}}$$

Consider

$$\frac{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{q}}}{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{t}} + \frac{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{q}}}{\tau_{\mathbf{q}}} = \frac{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{1}}}{\tau_{\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{1}}}$$

$$\mathbf{e}^{\left(rac{-\mathbf{t}}{ au_{\mathbf{q}}}
ight)}rac{\mathbf{d}}{\mathbf{dt}}\left[\mathbf{e}^{\left(rac{\mathbf{t}}{ au_{\mathbf{q}}}
ight)}\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{q}}
ight]=rac{\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{1}}}{ au_{\mathbf{q}+\mathbf{1}}}$$

$$\mathbf{f_q} = \mathbf{e}^{\left(rac{-\mathbf{t}}{ au_{\mathbf{q}}}
ight)} \int \mathbf{e}^{\left(rac{\mathbf{t}}{ au_{\mathbf{q}}}
ight)} rac{\mathbf{f_{q+1}}}{ au_{\mathbf{q+1}}} \mathbf{dt}$$

Assume solution is true for q, apply to q+1

$$-\frac{\mathbf{f_{q+1}(t)}}{\mathbf{f_{56}(0)}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n=q+1}}^{\mathbf{56}} \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q+1}} \tau_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{56-q-2}}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p=q+1}}^{\mathbf{56}} (\tau_{\mathbf{n}} - \tau_{\mathbf{p}})} \mathbf{e}^{-\frac{\mathbf{t}}{\tau_{\mathbf{n}}}}$$

Assume solution is true

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f_{q+1}(t)}{f_{56}(0)} &= \sum_{n=q+1}^{56} \frac{\tau_{q+1}\tau_n^{56-q-2}}{\prod_{p=q+1}^{56}(\tau_n - \tau_p)} e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_n}} \\ f_q &= e^{\left(\frac{-t}{\tau_q}\right)} \int e^{\left(\frac{t}{\tau_q}\right)} \frac{f_{q+1}}{\tau_{q+1}} dt \\ \frac{f_q(t)}{f_{56}(0)} &= \sum_{n=q+1}^{56} \frac{\tau_n^{56-q-2}}{\prod_{p=q+1}^{56}(\tau_n - \tau_p)} \left[ \left(\frac{1}{\tau_q} - \frac{1}{\tau_n}\right)^{-1} e^{\frac{-t}{\tau_n}} \right] - c e^{\frac{-t}{\tau_q}} \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbf{f}_{\mathbf{q}}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ 

DESY.

$$\mathbf{c} = \sum_{n=q+1}^{56} \frac{\tau_{q} \tau_{n}^{56-q-1}}{\prod_{p=q}^{56} (\tau_{n} - \tau_{p})}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{f_q}(\mathbf{t})}{\mathbf{f_{56}}(\mathbf{0})} = \sum_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}+1}^{\mathbf{56}} \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{2}}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}}(\tau_{\mathbf{n}}-\tau_{\mathbf{p}})} \mathbf{e}^{\frac{-\mathbf{t}}{\tau_{\mathbf{n}}}} - \sum_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}+1}^{\mathbf{56}} \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q}}\tau_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{1}}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}}(\tau_{\mathbf{n}}-\tau_{\mathbf{p}})} \mathbf{e}^{\frac{-\mathbf{t}}{\tau_{\mathbf{q}}}}$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{f_q(t)}}{\mathbf{f_{56}(0)}} = \sum_{n=q}^{56} \frac{\tau_q \tau_n^{56-q-1}}{\prod_{p=q}^{56} (\tau_n - \tau_p)} e^{-\frac{t}{\tau_n}}$$

These are equivalent if:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}+1}^{\mathbf{56}} \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q}} \tau_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{1}}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} (\tau_{\mathbf{n}} - \tau_{\mathbf{p}})} = \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q}} \tau_{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{1}}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} (\tau_{\mathbf{q}} - \tau_{\mathbf{p}})}$$

Consider:

$$\frac{\mathbf{w}^2}{(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{y})(\mathbf{w} - \mathbf{z})} + \frac{\mathbf{x}^2}{(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z})} + \frac{\mathbf{y}^2}{(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z})} = -\frac{\mathbf{z}^2}{(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{w})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{x})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{y})}$$

$$\frac{\mathsf{DESY.}}{\mathsf{DESY.}}$$

$$\sum_{\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{q}+1}^{\mathbf{56}} \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q}} \tau_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-1}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} (\tau_{\mathbf{n}} - \tau_{\mathbf{p}})} = \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{q}} \tau_{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}-\mathbf{q}-1}}{\prod_{\mathbf{p}=\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{56}} (\tau_{\mathbf{q}} - \tau_{\mathbf{p}})}$$

Consider the case

$$\frac{\mathbf{w}^2}{(\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{w}-\mathbf{z})} + \frac{\mathbf{x}^2}{(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{w})(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{y})(\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{z})} + \frac{\mathbf{y}^2}{(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{w})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{y}-\mathbf{z})} = -\frac{\mathbf{z}^2}{(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{w})(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{x})(\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{y})}$$

$$\begin{vmatrix} 1 & w & w^2 & w^2 \\ 1 & x & x^2 & x^2 \\ 1 & y & y^2 & y^2 \\ 1 & z & z^2 & z^2 \end{vmatrix} = \mathbf{0}$$

57 Andrew Taylor

DESY.

### **Cascade of Nuclei Through Species- single nucleon loss**

Since nuclei Lorentz factor remains ~conserved, and cross-section varies mildly with A (nuclear mass)

 $au_{56 o 55} pprox au_{55 o 54}...$ 

For the case  $au_{56 \rightarrow 55} = au_{55 \rightarrow 54}...$ 

 $f_q = \frac{t^{(q_{max}-q)}}{\tau_q(q_{max}-q)!} e^{-t/\tau_q} \quad \text{ie. Gaisser-Hillas} \\ \text{type function!} \\ \text{(used to describe air showers)} \\ \text{Andrew Taylor} \end{cases}$ 

### Cascade of Nuclei Through Species-Comparison of Approximation







### Composition – an Excellent Probe of the Local Source Distribution (if you know the source composition)



# **Assumptions on Source Population**

**Spatial Distribution** 

motivated by star formation rate evolution

$$\begin{split} &\frac{dN}{dV_C} \propto (1+z)^3 \qquad z < 1.9 \\ &\frac{dN}{dV_C} \propto (1+1.9)^3 \qquad 1.9 < z < 2.7 \\ &\frac{dN}{dV_C} \propto (1+1.9)^3 e^{-z/1.7} \quad z > 2.7 \end{split}$$

**Energy Distribution** 

motivated by Fermi acceleration theory

$$rac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{N}}{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{E}} \propto \mathbf{E}^{-lpha} \exp[-\mathbf{E}/\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{max}}]$$

$$\mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Z},\mathbf{max}} = (\mathbf{Z}/\mathbf{26}) imes \mathbf{E}_{\mathbf{Fe},\mathbf{max}}$$

Note- magnetic field horizon effects are neglected in the following. This amounts to assuming:  $d_s < (ct_H \lambda_{scat})^{1/2}$  ie. the source distribution may be approximated to be spatially continuous (also note, presence of t<sub>H</sub> term comes from temporally continuous assumption)

61