



Recent results and coming improvements of the GALPROP cosmic-ray propagation code

Elena Orlando (Stanford University) & the GALPROP team

CRBTSM 2016 – San Vito di Cadore



2





Hena Orlando

> Energydependent Diffusion and energy losses



3

Re-acceleration

source





Elena Orlando

a set of a set of a

> Energydependent Diffusion and energy losses



Re-acceleration

Solar modulation measured

source





elena Orlando

alwess of

> Energydependent Diffusion and energy losses



Apparent direction

Re-acceleration

Solar modulation measured

source





elena Orlando

and service of

> Energydependent Diffusion and energy losses





Apparent direction

6

Re-acceleration

Solar modulation measured

Hena Orlando

a second second

source



Cosmic ray

> Energydependent Diffusion and energy losses





Apparent direction

Re-acceleration

Solar modulation measured

source





Cosmic ray

Interstellar emission

and the second

CR Propagation: GALPROP



THE GALPROP TEAM:

I. Moskalenko and A. Strong (original developers),G. Johannesson, E. Orlando, T. Porter, (A. Vladimirov)

http://galprop.stanford.edu

AROUND SINCE '98 WHEN USED FOR COMPTEL AND EGRET!

It solves the transport equation (energy losses, diffusion, acceleration, convection, fragmentation, radioactive decay) for all CR species

Ingredients (and sources of uncertainty)



Latest results: Interpretation of CR measurements

Solar modulation







Solar modulation













Voyager 1

In the interstellar space!



Cummings, Stone, Heikkila, Lal, Webber, Jóhannesson, Moskalenko, Orlando, and Porter, 2015 Fall AGU, ApJ accepted

Voyager 1

GALPROP models were fit to data to obtain the energy density (0.83-1.02 eV cm⁻³) and elemental abundances



Cummings, Stone, Heikkila, Lal, Webber, Jóhannesson, Moskalenko, Orlando, and Porter, ApJ accepted

Bayesian analysis of CR propagation

The Galbayes collaboration



Elena Orlando

Bayesian analysis of CR propagation

G. Jóhannesson, R. Ruiz de Austri, A. C. Vincent, I. V. Moskalenko, E. Orlando, T. A. Porter, A. W. Strong, R. Trotta, F. Feroz, P. Graff, M. P., 2016 ApJ 824...16J Hobson, 2016 ApJ 824, 16

18 Posterior distribution 16 14 (kpc) 12 10 42 8 6 x best fit 2 o Mean posterior 5 10 15 0 $D_0 \ (10^{28} \ {\rm cm}^2 \ {\rm s}^{-1})$

No homogeneous diffusion !

Two different scans:

– p, pbar, He

- Light elements

Bayesian analysis of CR propagation

G. Jóhannesson, R. Ruiz de Austri, A. C. Vincent, I. V. Moskalenko, E. Orlando, T. A. Porter, A. W. Strong, R. Trotta, F. Feroz, P. Graff, M. P., 2016 ApJ 824...16J Hobson, 2016 ApJ 824, 16



Elena Orlando

HelMod

2D Monte Carlo model

http://www.helmod.org



Grandi et al. ECRS Torino '16

HelMod + Galprop

Tuning LIS to reproduce CR data during Solar Cycle 23 and 24

- 1. Solar modulation with HelMod
- 2. GALPROP framework into the Monte-Carlo-Markov-Chain interface: propagation parameters using AMS-02 data as observational constraints, exploring a very large parameter space (Masi et al. ECRS Torino '16)



Della Torre, Grandi, La Vacca, Gervasi, Johannesson, Masi, Moskalenko, Orlando, Porter, Quadrani, Rancoita, Rozza, in prep.

HelMod + Galprop



- Found the best LIS that agrees with data at low- and high- solar activity for AMS-01, Pamela and AMS-02
- Simultaneous inclusion of diffusion, convection and reacceleration is required

Della Torre et al, in prep. (Masi et al. and Della Torre et al. ECRS Torino '16) Elena Orlando Recent results: Interpretation of CR-induced interstellar emission from radio to gamma rays



Strong, Orlando and Jaffe 2011 A&A, 534, 54

Break in local interstellar electron spectrum from <2 to ~3 @ few GeV</p>

Injection spectrum < few GeV is harder than 1.6</p>

> Standard reacceleration models hard to reconcile with synchrotron.

UPDATES

- Planck data
- Reprocessed 408MHz map
- AMS-02 data

Orlando, Strong, Moskalenko, Dickinson, Digel, Jaffe, Jóhannesson, Leahy, et al. ICRC 2015; JPhCS 2016



Orlando & Strong 2013 MNRAS 436, 2127



Orlando & Strong 2013 MNRAS 436, 2127



Based on Orlando & Strong 2013 MNRAS 436,2127

Main results:

- Flat CR source distribution in the outer Galaxy preferres
- Halo height > 4 kpc preferred
- Best fit magnetic field obtained
- -- Residual structures not modeled

The microwave sky



Difficulty on separating components: help from ancillary data and models !

Galprop models & Planck data

 We used the synchrotron Model* for Planck low-frequency component separation to generate the maps officially released (Planck 2015 results. XXV & Planck 2015 results. X A&A accepted)



• The Model* was also used for obtaining the Galactic magnetic field (*Planck intermediate results. XLII A&A accepted*)

*Best fit from Orlando & Strong 2013 MNRAS 436,2127



Planck intermediate results. XLII



Planck polarization and Fermi Bubbles

Planck coll. 2015 ArXiv: 1506.06660

Fermi-LAT > 10 GeV from Ackermann et al 2014 ApJ,793,64 (dust subtracted) Planck polarization map





Interstellar emission needs to be accurately modeled

The gamma-ray interstellar emission

FROM INTERACTIONS OF COSMIC RAYS IN THE INTERSTELLAR MEDIUM



Gamma rays with Fermi-LAT



The physics of the interstellar emissions well understood and described.

Gamma rays with Fermi-LAT

Ackerman et al.2012 ApJ 750,3





Excess:

- Outer Galaxy
- Fermi Bubbles?
- Inner Galaxy

CRs and the outer Galaxy

Emissivity in molecular clouds

(Gamma-ray emission rate per H atom)



Same hints as in Ackerman et al. 2012.

* Also found in the study comparing the synchrotron emission models with radio and microwave data (Orlando & Strong 2013)

Some residuals: Fermi Bubbles



References: Dobler et al. 2010; Su et al 2010, 2012; ..; since then many studies including different wavelength (e.g. Carretti 2013, S-PASS; Dobler 2012, WMAP; Snowden 1997, Su 2012 ROSAT; Kataoka 2013, Tahara 2015, Suzaku, Planck coll 2013; ...)



Elena Orlando

Some residuals: the inner Galaxy

- CRs? - Unresoved sources? - Dark Matter?



Ref:Hooper et all 2010, Goodenough et al. 2011, Abazajian et al. 2012, Hooper et al 2013, Gordon et al. 2013, Daylan eta al. 2014, Calore et al 2015; Mirabal (2013), Petrovic et al (2015), Cholis et al. (2015), Lee et al. 2016, Bartels et al. 2016, Brandt & Kocsis 2015, Carlson et al. 2016 etc

Ajello et al. 2016

GeV excess with respect to usual interstellar models
Inverse Comton dominant and enhanced (ISRF or CR electrons?)

What's cooking?



Stay tuned !

Investigations on the spatial effects in gamma rays of some interstellar models beyond the standard ones used in LAT analyses so far.

Effect of convection



Up to 30% variation in inverse Compton emission

Effect of no reacceleration



Up to 15% variation in inverse Compton emission More than 10% variation in the pion decay emission in Galactic center

Elena Orlando

Effect of different B-field models on the Inverse Compton emission



B-field as in present gamma-ray models

B-field strongly peaked at the Galactic center

B-field is very uncertain, if no spatial constraints from synchrotron are accounted for it can affect the IC in the GC even of a factor of 2.

Effect of anisotropic IC cross-section

Inverse Compton (aniso-iso)/aniso

Variation of a factor of 2

Summary

• CR measurements:



• CR associated emission:





Microwave

• Work in progress



Gamma rays