Upper limits on TeV gamma-ray emission from core-collapse supernovae observed with H.E.S.S.

R. Simoni¹, N.Maxted^{2*}, M.Renaud³, J.Vink¹ On behalf of the H.E.S.S. collaboration

1. API/GRAPPA Universiteit Van Amsterdam 2. University of New South Wales (Canberra) 3. LUPM, Université de Montpellier * Presenter

Supernovae as PeV cosmic rays sources?

- No evidence is found that supernova remnants (SNRs) accelerate cosmic ray (CR) particles beyond the Knee ($\sim 3 \times 10^{15} \text{ eV}$). If the supernova (SN) is the driving force, perhaps higher energy acceleration is occurring in the early stage of SNR evolution.
- Theoretical studies predict that PeV particles shall be produced if the core collapse SN shock propagates in a very dense circumstellar medium (CSM) as the growth of plasma instabilities

10 SNe selected

• Core-collapse : 9 SNe are type IIP,

SN 2016adj is type Ib

- Host galaxy with z < 0.01
- Observed by H.E.S.S. within 1yr since SN discovery

driven by the particle acceleration itself, leads to a fast magnetic field amplification. (e.g [1][2] [3][4]).

- The type of SNe that exhibit these high-density stellar winds are type IIP, IIb and IIn SNe. (e.g. [5],[6]).
- Dense CSM is also a requirement for sufficient number of pion production, and hence gamma-ray/neutrino emission.
- We studied SNe observed by H.E.S.S to investigate whether there are bright gamma-ray sources among them. As we see no emission for noone of the object we present upper limits (UL) on their flux.

SNe	Host Galaxy	Distance (Mpc)	Exposure (hrs)	Upper Limit (95%CL) on F(>1 TeV)(10 ⁻¹³ cm ⁻² s ⁻¹)	Mass Loss Rate UL (10 ⁻⁵ M⊙yr ⁻¹ km ⁻¹ s)
SN2004cx	NGC 7755	26 ± 5	39.9	1.9	6.7
SN2005dn	NGC 6861	38.4 ± 2.7	53.1	0.41	3.8
SN2008bk	NGC 7793	4.0 ± 0.4	9.6	4.8	1.4
SN2008ho	NGC 922	41.5 ± 2.9	1.4	7.7	9.4
SN2008bp	NGC 3095	29 ± 6	4.7	5.5	15.9
SN2009js	NGC 918	16 ± 3	4.8	11	3.1
SN2009hf	NGC 175	53.9 ± 3.8	4.0	5.3	19.9
SN2011ja	NGC 4945	5.28 ± 0.38	3.8	5.2	1.77
SN2012cc	NGC 4419	~20	3.0	10	11.6
SN2016adi	Cen A	3.8 ± 0.1	13	1.7	0.25



Constraints on the mass loss rate

None of the 10 SNe have been detected in TeV gamma-rays. Probably because the CSM densities were not be high enough for the 9 objects observed.

Using the model developed in [7], we can put limits on the mass loss rates, which determines the circumstellar density. We found ULs values spanning from ~ 2.5 x 10⁻⁵ $M_{\odot}yr^{-1}$ up to ~ 1.6 x 10⁻³ $M_{\odot}yr^{-1}$, considering a wind velocity of 10 km.s⁻¹. These values can be compared to the estimate mass loss rate of SN 1993J of 3.5 10^{-5} M_{\odot}yr⁻¹ [8].

We could put our ULs on the flux in perspective of the mass loss rate of the progenitor before outburst versus the distance to the source (see Fig.3).





Sketch for the gamma rays emission at SN shock front with typical type IIp values (inspired by Smith & Chornock 2006)

Conclusion

- This non detection can be related to similar studies as SNe have not been observed in VHE gamma rays so far [9][10][11].
- This result does not disprove that SNe accelerate cosmic rays, as the CSM densities may be too low for detectable gamma-ray emission.
- Fig 3. shows that a type IIP SNe with a mass loss rate of 10⁻⁴ M_☉yr⁻¹, occuring at a distance of 10 Mpc, shall be detectable with H.E.S.S. 20 days after outburst. CTA could detect a type IIP SNe with a mass loss rate of 10⁻⁴ $M_{\odot}yr^{-1}$, occuring at 30 Mpc.
- SNe within 10 Mpc occur regularly, and should be followed up with gamma-ray observations. However SNe with dense CSM are more rare.

Distance in Mpc

Fig. 3 : Predicted Flux(>1TeV) represented as a function of the distance to the source. We use eq. 9 in [7] with Vsh = 10 000 kms⁻¹, m = 0.85. Mass loss rates are in unit $M_{\odot}yr^{-1}$, with $u_w = 10 \text{ kms}^{-1}$. Different values for the period of observation are considered : t = 20 days (full lines) and t = 150 days (dotted lines) after SNe explosion. Our 2 sigma ULs on the flux are represented as well.

Cherenkov telescopes may observe gamma-ray emission from SNe in the future. The observations shall be made within weeks after outburst : a trigger on observation seem to be the right strategy to adopt.

[1] Katz, B., N. Sapir, and E. Waxman, 2011, IAU Proceedings, 7.S279: 274-281. [6] Chevalier, R. A. & Fransson, C. 2016, ArXiv e-prints [arXiv:1612.07459] [2] Marcowith, A., M. Renaud, V. Dwarkadas et al., 2014, NuPhS, 256, 94M [7] Dwarkadas, V. V. 2013, MNRAS, 434, 3368 [3] Marcowith, A., Dwarkadas, V. V., Renaud, M., Tatischeff, V., & Giacinti, [8] Tatischeff, V. 2009, A&A, 499, 191

G. 2018, MNRAS, 479, 4470 [4] Cardillo, M., E. Amato, and P. Blasi, 2015, Astroparticle Physics 69: 1-10. [5] Zirakashvili, V. N. & Ptuskin, V. S. 2015, ArXiv e-prints [arXiv:1505.08144] [9] Lennarz, D., 2013, 33th ICRC Proceedings Pos No.1183. [10] Ackermann M, et al. (Fermi Collaboration) 2015, ApJ, 807, 169 [11] Ahnen, M. L., Ansoldi, S., Antonelli, L. A., et al. 2017, A&A, 602, A98

Acknowledgement: please see standard acknowledgement in HESS papers, not reproduced here due to lack of space





