# <span id="page-0-0"></span>Cosmic-ray self-generated turbulence in galactic sites

### Carmelo Evoli

Gran Sasso Science Institute, L'Aquila (Italy) INFN/Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso (LNGS), Assergi (Italy)

1st Workshop on Gamma-ray Halos around Pulsars December 2, 2020



Evoli, Linden and Morlino, PRD 2018, arXiv:1807.09263 Evoli, Amato, Blasi and Aloisio, arXiv:2010.11955

## The spatial diffusion coefficient

Jokipii, ApJ 1966

- *▷* The transport of CRs in our Galaxy is still better understood in terms of the so-called QLT
- *▷* Here we assume that a charged particle propagates in a turbulent B-field which is a small fluctuation with respect to the regular component

$$
\langle \delta B^2 \rangle (k) \ll B_0^2 \text{ for } k \gg k_0
$$

*▷* As a consequence the particle is subjected to pitch-angle scattering:

$$
D_{\mu\mu} = \frac{\pi}{4} \, \Omega \, k_{\text{res}} W(k_{\text{res}})
$$

where

$$
\Omega = \frac{qB_0}{mc\gamma} = \frac{v}{r_L} \text{ and } k_{\text{res}} = \frac{\Omega}{v\mu}
$$

- *▷* The particle interacts resonantly with the waves, when the condition *k −*1 res *∼ r<sup>L</sup>* is met
- *▷* The isotropisation time *τ*<sup>s</sup> is the time in which particles lose memory of the initial pitch angle

$$
\tau_{\rm S} \simeq \frac{1}{D_{\mu\mu}} \simeq \frac{1}{\Omega k_{\rm res} W(k_{\rm res})}
$$

*▷* Finally the spatial diffusion coefficient can be derived as

$$
D_{\parallel}(E) \simeq v \lambda \simeq v^2 \tau_{\rm S} \simeq \frac{v^2}{\Omega} \frac{1}{k_{\rm res} W(k_{\rm res})}
$$

C. Evoli (GSSI) | Galactic cosmic-ray propagation 2/12/2020 1 / 20

 $\overline{Q}$ 

## Origin of the waves: the interstellar turbulence

Armstrong+, ApJ 1995, Chepurnov & Lazarian, ApJ 2010, Lee & Lee, Nature Astr. 2019



Electron-density fluctuations in the ISM  $\eta_B = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}$ (according to Jokipii) and the according to  $\mathcal{L}$  and Voyager 1 augmented recently from Voyager 1 or "The (second) Great Power-Law in the Sky"

Bubble, are cavit<mark>ies blown by supernovae [6]; also, see</mark> 7]; also, see [7]; also, see

- *▷* Turbulence is stirred by Supernovae at a typical scale *L ∼* 10 *−* 100 pc
- *▷* Fluctuations of velocity and magnetic field are Alfvénic *→ v<sup>A</sup>*
- *▷* They have a Kolmogorov *α ≃* 5/3 spectrum (density is a passive tracer so it shares the same spectrum:  $\delta n_e \sim \delta B^2$ ):

$$
kW(k) \simeq \frac{\langle \delta B \rangle_k^2}{B_0^2} \sim \eta_B(\alpha - 1) \left(\frac{k}{k_0}\right)^{1-\alpha}
$$

*⊳* where  $k_0 = L^{-1}$  and the level of turbulence is

$$
\eta_B = \int_{k_0}^{\infty} dk W(k) \sim 0.1
$$

### Charged particle in a turbulent field Jokipii, ApJ 1966

*▷* The parallel diffusion coefficient becomes:

$$
D_{\parallel}(E) = \frac{r_L v}{3} \frac{1}{k_{\text{res}} W(k_{\text{res}})} = D_{\text{B}}(E) \frac{1}{k_{\text{res}} W(k_{\text{res}})}
$$

where  $k_{\rm res} = r_L^{-1}$  and  $D_{\rm B}(E)$  is the Bohm diffusion coefficient, namely the minimum diffusion coefficient possible as it corresponds to  $r_L \simeq \lambda$ 

*▷* The ISM diffusion coefficient depends on the turbulence injection scale *L ∼* 10 pc and the level turbulence  $\eta_B \sim 0.1$ 

$$
D_{\parallel}(E) \simeq 10^{29} \,\mathrm{cm}^2 \,\mathrm{s}^{-1} \left(\frac{\eta_B}{0.1}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{E}{\mathrm{TeV}}\right)^{2-\alpha} \left(\frac{B}{\mu\mathrm{G}}\right)^{-\alpha+2} \left(\frac{L}{10 \,\mathrm{pc}}\right)^{\alpha-1}
$$

since  $r_L \simeq 10^{-3} \, E_{\text{TeV}} B_{\mu\text{G}}^{-1}$  pc

*▷* For *α* = 5/3 we obtain the Kolmogorov diffusion coefficient:

$$
D_{\parallel}(E) \simeq 10^{29} \,\mathrm{cm}^2 \,\mathrm{s}^{-1} \left(\frac{E}{\mathrm{TeV}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \quad \longrightarrow \quad \lambda(E) \sim 3D/v \simeq 3 \,\mathrm{pc} \left(\frac{E}{\mathrm{TeV}}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}}
$$

Calactic cosmic-ray pro

*<sup>▷</sup>* As a reference *<sup>k</sup>*TeV*W*(*k*TeV) *<sup>∼</sup>* <sup>10</sup>*−*<sup>4</sup> *<sup>→</sup>* little things affect big things

### Reducing diffusivity





- *▷ L ↓ D<sup>∥</sup> ↓* (Lopez-Coto, Giacinti, MNRAS 479, 2018)
- *▷ k*res*W*(*k*res) *↑ D<sup>∥</sup> ↓*
- *▷* Pressure gradients by not-resonant instability (Schroer et al., arXiv:2011.02238)

### Self-generated waves

Kulsrud's book

- *▷* As we assume that CRs are isotropized by the waves (in the rest frame of the waves), there must be momentum transfer between CRs and waves.
- *▷* The momentum before scattering (*v<sup>D</sup>* = CR streaming velocity):

 $P_{\text{CR}}^b = n_{\text{CR}} m \gamma_{\text{CR}} v_D$ 

and after scattering (*v<sup>A</sup>* is the wave speed):

$$
P_{\rm CR}^a = n_{\rm CR} m \gamma_{\rm CR} v_A < P_{\rm CR}^b
$$

*▷* The momentum lost has gone to the waves

$$
\frac{dP_{CR}}{dt} \sim \frac{P_{CR}^b - P_{CR}^a}{\tau_s} = \frac{n_{CR} m \gamma_{CR}}{\tau_s} (v_D - v_A) \longrightarrow \frac{dE_W}{dt} \sim 2 \Gamma_{CR} \frac{(\delta B)^2}{8 \pi}
$$

where

$$
\Gamma_{\text{CR}} \propto \frac{n_{\text{CR}}(r_g > k^{-1})}{n_i} \left(\frac{v_D}{v_A} - 1\right)
$$

*▷* If CR stream faster than the waves, the net effect of diffusion is to make waves grow and make CR diffusive motion slow down: this process is known as self-generation of waves (notice also that self-generated waves have *k ∼ rL*)



### Wave damping

Wentzel (1974), Zirakashvili (2014)

*▷* In the warm partially ionized ISM (e.g. disk) the damping is due to ion-neutral collisions

$$
\Gamma_{\rm ion} = \frac{1}{2} v_{\rm th} \sigma_{\rm ex} n_n \rightarrow \tau_{\rm d,ion} \sim 10 \, {\rm yr}
$$

where *n<sub>n</sub>* ∼ 1 cm<sup>−3</sup> is the number density of neutrals, *v*<sub>th</sub> ∼ 10 km/s is the thermal velocity of plasma and  $\sigma$ <sub>ex</sub> = 10<sup>−14</sup> cm<sup>2</sup> is the charge exchange cross-section.

*▷* In fully ionized ISM damping (e.g. halo) due to wave-wave interactions (non-linear Landau damping)

$$
\Gamma_{\rm nl}(E) = c_k v_A k \sqrt{k W(k)} \sim \frac{v_A}{r_L} \frac{\delta B(k)}{B_0} \to \tau_{\rm d,nl} \sim \text{kyr} \left(\frac{E}{\rm TeV}\right) \left(\frac{\delta B(k)}{B_0}\right)^{-1}
$$

*▷* The diffusion coefficient of self-generated turbulence can be simply estimated by equating damping and growth:

$$
\Gamma_{\text{CR}} = \Gamma_{\text{nl}} \rightarrow \frac{P_{\text{CR}}(>1\,\text{GeV})}{P_B} \frac{v_A}{H} \frac{1}{kW(k)} = c_k k v_A \left[kW(k)\right]^{1/2}
$$

assuming equipartition  $P_{\text{CR}} = P_B$ :

$$
kW(k)_{\text{sg}} \simeq \left[ \left( \frac{r_L}{r_{L,0}} \right)^{-0.7} \frac{r_L}{H} \frac{1}{c_k} \right]^{\frac{2}{3}} \to D_{\text{sg}} \simeq 10^{28} \left( \frac{E}{\text{GeV}} \right)^{-0.7} \text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}
$$

#### Non-linear cosmic ray transport in the Galaxy Blasi, Amato & Serpico, 2012, PRL; Evoli, Blasi, Morlino & Aloisio, 2018, PRL



- *▷* Turbulence spectrum without (dotted) and with (solid) CR self-generated waves at different distance from the galactic plane.
- *▷* Large-scale injected waves (Kolmogorov spectrum) dominates above the break.
- *▷* Self-generated turbulence predominant between *∼* 1 *−* 100 GeV.





#### Self-generation close to sources D'Angelo+, Malkov+, Nava+



*▷* CR transport near sources is strongly non-linear (large CR density and density gradients) [D'Angelo+, MNRAS 2016,2018]

*▷* Particles are self-trapped around the source to an extent that depends upon the level of ionization of the surrounding ISM [Nava+, MNRAS 2016,2019]

*▷* Ineffective above *∼* TeV



#### Self-generated cosmic-ray confinement in Pulsar halos Evoli, Linden and Morlino, PRD 98 (2020)



*▷* Main result: Pairs may grow waves!

*▷* We assume that the time-dependent pair injection follows the spin-down power  $L_e(t) = L_0 (1 + t/\tau_0)^2$  where  $\tau_0 \sim 10$  kyr and  $L_0 \sim 10^{37}$  erg/s to match the actual luminosity *<sup>L</sup>*now *<sup>∼</sup>* <sup>10</sup><sup>34</sup> erg/s

. *▷* cooling time of 10 TeV electrons is *∼* 10 kyrs *→* today only few %'s of the total energy available to sustain turbulence

### Self-generated cosmic-ray confinement in Pulsar halo Evoli, Linden and Morlino, PRD 98 (2020)



- *▷* Predicts energy-dependent features in cosmic-ray diffusion
- *▷* As the increasing size of TeV halos as a function of the pulsar age but only for young objects
- *▷* Kraichnan turbulence induces a significantly slower relaxation time *→* low D for a longer time









### Pulsars as positron galactic factories





- *▷* PWNe pre-dicted as galactic positron factories even before PAMELA [Harding & Ramaty, ICRC 1987; Boulares, ApJ 342 (1989); Atoyan, Aharonian & Völk, PRD 52 (1995)]
- *▷* Particle acceleration at the highest speed shocks in nature (10<sup>4</sup> *<* Γ *<* 10<sup>7</sup> ) *→* only sources showing direct evidence for PeV particles [Bykov+, Space Sci. Rev. 2017]
- *▷* HAWC has detected bright and spatially extended TeV gamma-ray sources surrounding the Geminga and Monogem pulsars [HAWC coll., Science 358 (2017)]

Galactic cosmic-ray pro

*▷* TeV halos detected also in FERMI [Linden+, PRD 2019; Di Mauro+, PRD 2019]

#### Nuclei and electron timescales

Delahaye+, A&A 201; Evoli, Amato, Blasi & Aloisio, PRL (2020)



- *▷* Leptons lose their energy through e.m. interactions mainly with the interstellar radiation fields (ISRFs) and the magnetic fields
- *▷* The Milky Way is a very inefficient calorimeter for nuclei and a perfect calorimeter for leptons
- *▷* Translate losses into propagation scale: *λ ∼* √ 4*D*(*E*)*τ*loss *→* horizon

#### Modelling the sources of leptons in the Galaxy Evoli et al., arXiv:2010.11955



- *▷* Spiral arm structure of our Galaxy is of the utmost importance for the prediction of the lepton flux
- *▷* Most SN explosions are located in star-forming regions which in turn cluster inside the spiral arms of the Galaxy and in the Galactic bar  $\rightarrow$  we assume a SNR of  $\mathcal{R} = 1/30$  years
- *▷* The sources that can contribute to the flux at Earth at a given energy *E* are



### The CR positron flux with a primary component by PWNe

Hooper+, JCAP 2009; Grasso+, APh 2009; Delahaye+, A&A 2010; Blasi & Amato 2011; Manconi+, PRD 2020



- *▷* The *e ±* pairs created in the pulsar magnetosphere become part of the relativistic wind into which pulsars convert most of their rotational energy
- *▷ γ*/X-ray emissions by these objects are described by a flat spectrum (with 1 *< α<sup>L</sup> <* 2) at low energies, which then steepens to *∼ E −*2*.*5 beyond *∼* few hundred GeV [Bucciantini+, MNRAS 2011]
- *▷* Efficiency of conversion: *∼* 20% of the energy released after the Bow-Shock phase

#### The electron spectrum Evoli et al., arXiv:2010.11955



- *▷* Electrons injected with a spectrum steeper than protons by *∼* 0*.*3 and a cutoff a *∼* 30TeV
- *▷* The only aspect that is different between e*<sup>−</sup>* and *p* is the loss rate *→* negligible inside the sources unless *B* is very strongly amplified [Diesing & Caprioli, PRL 2020]
- *▷* The rising positron fraction is naturally reproduced by the pulsar contribution to the positron flux. At energies of a few hundred GeV, the fraction starts declining slightly.





- *▷* The existence of a fine structure at *∼* 42 GeV was first noted by the AMS02 collaboration (and erroneously attributed to more than one CR electron population)
- *▷* Thomson regime only valid for *γeEph* ≲ *mec* 2
- *<sup>▷</sup>* For the UV background, the typical temperature is *<sup>T</sup> <sup>∼</sup>* <sup>10</sup>4<sup>K</sup> [Moskalenko, Porter and Strong, ApJ 640 (2006), Popescu et al., MNRAS 470 (2017)] hence the KN effects become important at *E ∼* 50 GeV.
- . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . *▷* We proved that the feature in the *e −* spectrum is the result of KN effects in the ICS on the UV bkg





#### **Conclusions**

- *▷* Impressive progress on the experimental side in the GeV-TeV range over the past *∼* 20 years, both in direct (AMS-02, CALET, DAMPE, PAMELA) and indirect (HAWC, HESS, MAGIC, VERITAS) observations. [Gabici, Evoli et al., IJMPD (2019)]
- *▷* Diffusion of CRs is intrinsically non linear in nature due to momentum conservation.
- *▷* Non-linearities might play an essential role for propagation (as they do for CR acceleration) *→* possible explanation for some unexpected features in CR local spectra.
- *▷* Non-linear transport more efficient near CR sources *→* leading to several implications (additional grammage, cavities, coccons...). Ongoing investigations.
- *▷* Still a number of puzzles implore for an explanation: Electrons and protons injected with different slopes, the source spectra of H, He and heavier nuclei have to be different (and steeper than 2!)...
- *▷* Does the environment surrounding sources play a relevant role?

# Thank you!

#### Carmelo Evoli

- **<sup>8</sup>** GRAN SASSO SCIENCE INSTITUTE
- Viale Francesco Crispi, 7, L'Aquila (Italy)
- mailto: carmelo.evoli@gssi.it
- @carmeloevoli
- C carmeloevoli
- **a** e.carmelo
- 0000-0002-6023-5253
- slides available at:
	- https://zenodo.org/communities/carmeloevoli\_talks