A lower limit of 50 µG for the Galactic centre magnetic field

David Jones (MPIfK) with: Roland Crocker (MPIfK), J. Ott (NRAO), F. Melia (U. Arizona), & R. Protheroe (U. Adelaide)

Introduction

Background

- The Galactic centre (GC)
- Evidence for a 1 mG field
- Evidence for a 10 μ G field
- The Diffuse Non-thermal Source revisited
 - The DNS spectrum
 - Rejection of the null hypothesis
 - Arguments for a cooling break
 - GC radio and gamma-ray analysis: A lower limit of 50 μ G
- Conclusions



Magnetic fields: properties & origin: Krakow 2010

Galactic Disk

Magnetic fields: properties & origin: Krakow 2010

Galactic Disk

Nuclear Bulge

Magnetic fields: properties & origin: Krakow 2010

Galactic Disk

Nuclear Bulge



Magnetic fields: properties & origin: Krakow 2010

Image from: <u>http://www.astro.ucla.edu/~ghezgroup/gc/journey/index.shtml</u>

Galactic Disk

Nuclear Bulge





SCUTUM

Image from: http://www.astro.ucla.edu/~ghezgroup/gc/journey/index.shtml

Galactic Disk

Nuclear Bulge

Bar

Sagittarius A*

SCUTUM

Image from: <u>http://www.astro.ucla.edu/~ghezgroup/gc/journey/index.shtml</u>

Galactic Disk

Nuclear Bulge

Sagittarius A*

Bar

Sun-GC dist. of ~8.5 kpc ~ 25,000 ly

Magnetic fields: properties & origin: Krakow 2010

The GC at radio wavelengths



Evidence for a 1 mG field



ATCA view of the Radio Arc and non-thermal radio filaments at 1.4 GHz at a resolution of 2"x3"

 $46^{\rm m}30^{\rm s}$ $46^{\rm m}00^{\rm s}$ $45^{\rm m}$

Right Ascension (J2000)

The GC is home to spectacular non-thermal filaments (NTFs); 2cm polarization obs. show that the B-field is along the NTFs (Tsuboi et al. 1986)

For these to be static & straight a counter-balancing field ≥1 mG is required (Yusef-Zadeh & Morris. 1987)

Evidence for a 10 µG field



A large, 6x2 degree discrete GC source with a non-thermal (α =-0.7) spectral index between 74 and 330 MHz.

Assuming **equipartition** (equal energy density in CRs and **B**-field), they argued for a 10 μ G field.

This field strength is also implied, using rotation measures of background galaxies (Roy et al. 2008).

<u>10 µG or 1 mG: which one?</u>

• A 1 mG B-field is measured on scales of the order of 100 pc

- perhaps localised, intense fields? Transient?
- incredibly high for large scales (given local ISM is 6 $\mu G)$
- i.e. Katia Ferriere's talk
- $10 \mu G$ is inferred on scales of 400 pc
 - Inferred on the basis of two frequencies
 - Is equipartition argument valid?
- Definitive evidence of either has been missing for around 30 years

The Diffuse Non-thermal Source revisited What is the spectral behaviour above 330 MHz of the diffuse non-thermal source (DNS) that LaRosa et al. (2005) discovered?

The Diffuse Non-thermal Source revisited What is the spectral behaviour above 330 MHz of the diffuse non-thermal source (DNS) that LaRosa et al. (2005) discovered?

Below is a total intensity image from Handa, et al. (1987) of the DNS at 10 GHz convolved to a resolution of 1.2 x 1.2 degrees with contours at: 10, 20, 40, 80, 160 and 240 Jy/beam.



Galactic Longitude

The Diffuse Non-thermal Source revisited What is the spectral behaviour above 330 MHz of the diffuse non-thermal source (DNS) that LaRosa et al.

(2005) discovered?

Below is a total intensity image from Handa, et al. (1987) of the DNS at 10 GHz convolved to a resolution of 1.2 x 1.2 degrees with contours at: 10, 20, 40, 80, 160 and 240 Jy/beam.



Galactic Longitude

The Diffuse Non-thermal Source revisited What is the spectral behaviour above 330 MHz of the diffuse non-thermal source (DNS) that LaRosa et al. (2005) discovered?

Below is a total intensity image from Handa, et al. (1987) of the DNS at 10 GHz convolved to a resolution of 1.2 x 1.2 degrees with contours at: 10, 20, 40, 80, 160 and 240 Jy/beam.



Galactic Longitude

<u>The Diffuse Non-thermal Source revisited</u> What is <u>the spectral behaviour above 330 MHz of the</u>

diffuse non-thermal source (DNS) that LaRosa et al. (2005) discovered?

Below is a total intensity image from Handa, et al. (1987) of the DNS at 10 GHz convolved to a resolution of 1.2 x 1.2 degrees with contours at: 10, 20, 40, 80, 160 and 240 Jy/beam.



Integrating the total intensity within the DNS ellipse at 1.4, 2.4, 2.7 and 10 GHz using archival single-dish data

Integrating the total intensity within the DNS ellipse at 1.4, 2.4, 2.7 and 10 GHz using archival single-dish data



Integrating the total intensity within the DNS ellipse at 1.4, 2.4, 2.7 and 10 GHz using archival single-dish data



Integrating the total intensity within the DNS ellipse at 1.4, 2.4, 2.7 and 10 GHz using archival single-dish data



Integrating the total intensity within the DNS ellipse at 1.4, 2.4, 2.7 and 10 GHz using archival single-dish data



Integrating the total intensity within the DNS ellipse at 1.4, 2.4, 2.7 and 10 GHz using archival single-dish data



Rejection of the Null Hypothesis



Fitting the spectra, we find that the null hypothesis (single power-law) is only achieves a best fit acceptable at the ~3.4σ level

Magnetic fields: properties & origin: Krakow 2010

Rejection of the Null Hypothesis



Fitting the spectra, we find that the null hypothesis (single power-law) is only achieves a best fit acceptable at the ~3.4σ level

<u>Question</u>: what is causing the spectrum downturn? <u>Hypothesis</u>: there is a cooling break due to the increased efficiency of bremsstrahlung cooling at lower energies

At lower energies, cooling of in-situ electron (le or 2e) populations is more efficient by bremsstrahlung than synchrotron

At lower energies, cooling of in-situ electron (le or 2e) populations is more efficient by bremsstrahlung than synchrotron



At lower energies, cooling of in-situ electron (le or 2e) populations is more efficient by bremsstrahlung than synchrotron



B=1 mG n_{H2}~100 cm⁻³ Cooling

At lower energies, cooling of in-situ electron (le or 2e) populations is more efficient by bremsstrahlung than synchrotron



At lower energies, cooling of in-situ electron (le or 2e) populations is more efficient by bremsstrahlung than synchrotron



Shows "spectral downturn" of **exactly** 0.5 in spectral index. The energy at which this occurs is determined by B and n_{H} .

At lower energies, cooling of in-situ electron (le or 2e) populations is more efficient by bremsstrahlung than synchrotron

The DNS spectrum shows a downturn of 0.6 at about 1.7 GHz -- strongly suggesting a cooling break

B=1 mG

Shows "spectral downturn" of **exactly** 0.5 in spectral index. The energy at which this occurs is determined by B and n_{H} .

- These same electrons will then produce (multi-) GeV non-thermal bremsstrahlung and IC emission
- We can use the GHz radio spectrum and the GeV (and TeV) gamma-ray spectrum to select regions of acceptable phase-space



<u>GC radio and gamma-ray analysis:</u> <u>A lower limit of 50 µG</u>

The upper limits are due to observations by EGRET at 300 MeV and HESS at TeV.



Fit to the radio spectrum for synchrotron (le,2e)+ bremsstrahlung + IC + ioniz.

Predict the GeV--TeV gamma-ray emission from NT bremsstrahlung & IC

Models for **B**-field of 100 µG (solid) and 30 µG (dotted). The lower energy curves are synchrotron emission. The higher are bremsstrahlung plus inverse Compton emission from the same electrons responsible for the synchrotron



Conclusions

- We have shown that **B**-fields below about $50 \ \mu G$ are **ruled out** on size scales of 400 pc in the GC. This can have important consequences for the dynamics of the region.
- In the context of diffuse, ~GeV emission around the GC, we eagerly await results from Fermi whose sensitivity (more than an order of magnitude better than EGRET's) promises, at worst, an increased lower-limit to the largescale magnetic field (and at best, a direct measurement).
- For now we emphasis that it is a novel analysis not new data – that has allowed the new constraint on the GC magnetic field

Extra Slides

- Physics of alternate explanations of the break
- Equilibrium agruments
- The GC as a starbust

Why a cooling break?

- A cut-off feature in the injected electron distribution? We can reject explanations of this type for the following reasons:
 - They do not explain the change in spectral index of ~ 1/2 which is predicted by the synchrotron cooling hypothesis and seen in the data,
 - Hypothesising a cut-off in the injection spectrum this is required to be at $\sim \text{GeV}(B/100 \ \mu\text{G})1/2$ to reproduce the observed break at $\sim \text{GHz}$.
 - Direct evidence from the TeV observations by the HESS instrument of the Galactic centre that within the same field acceleration/injection of electrons beyond a TeV is occurring.
 - The possibility that the radio break is due to electron escape (on a wind):
 - there probably is an outflow but this doesn't change our conclusion about the strength of the magnetic field because, for reasonable outflow speeds (> 100 km/s), one still requires a 100 muG field to get a break

Synchrotron ageing?

- This can be quickly dismissed: a non steady-state situation implies that the particles ultimately responsible for the radio emission diffuse over the entire diffuse non-thermal source over a timescale shorter than t_wait.
- Conservatively, the ultimate source of energy for the relativistic particles is supernova and, for the GC, we have conservatively, t_wait ~ 10^4 years.
- Thus an un-physically large effective diffusion velocity, v > c/3 is required in order that the system be out of steady state while, at the same time, synchrotron emission be observed emanating from the entire region.

ISM phase and equilibrium

- For acceptable **B**-fields, the GC CR electron popⁿ. is sub-equipartition.
- May explain why the equipartition field is too low



<u>Magnetic field amplitude</u> <u>for equilibrium</u>

- The energy density with other GC ISM implies near pressure equilibrium -- as is the case in the Galactic disk.
- A **B**-field value of 100 µG implies equilibrium of **all** ISM phases -- this field amplitude had been predicted by Spergel & Blitz (1992, Nature, 357, 665).



The GC as a miniature starburst

• The pressure equilibrium mirrors that thought to occur in starburst galaxies (Thompson, et al., 2006 ApJ, 645, 186)



Magnetic pressure support

• Magnetic fields of $100 \ \mu G$ is in the range to establish hydrostatic equilibrium, and can lead to the establishment of the Parker Instability

