

Gamma Ray Bursts in the HAWC Era

Peter Mészáros^{1,3}, Katsuaki Asano², Kohta Murase¹, Derek Fox¹, He Gao¹, Nicholas Senno¹

Abstract Gamma-Ray Bursts are the most energetic explosions in the Universe, and are among the most promising for detecting multiple non-electromagnetic signals, including cosmic rays, high energy neutrinos and gravitational waves. The multi-GeV to TeV gamma-ray range of GRB could have significant contributions from hadronic interactions, mixed with more conventional leptonic contributions. This energy range is important for probing the source physics, including overall energetics, the shock parameters and the Lorentz factor. We discuss some of the latest observational and theoretical developments in the field.

1 Introduction

Gamma ray bursts have continued to astonish and puzzle us since the early 1970's when they were first publicly discussed. After it became clear that they were extragalactic, and hence had to be the most powerful and concentrated explosive events in the Universe, which furthermore concentrate most of their output at MeV or higher energies, they have become a favored laboratory for exploring the most extreme environments and the highest energy processes in Nature. As such, they are the targets for increasingly sophisticated observing instruments, the latest of which is HAWC.

2 The basic GRB paradigm

In the course of the past 20-25 years of investigations, it has emerged that gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) can be classified in two main groups, “long” GRBs (LGRBs) and “short” GRBs (SGRBs) (e.g. Vedrenne & Atteia (2009)). The former have spectral peaks on average below 0.5 MeV and γ -ray light curves whose duration nominally exceeds 2 s, while the latter have spectral peaks on average above 0.5 MeV and durations which mostly are less than 2 s. The stellar progenitors of LGRBs, which are generally located in star-forming galaxies, appear to be massive stars ($M \gtrsim 28M_{\odot}$), whose core collapses after they have gone through their nuclear fuel burning cycle, while the progenitors of SGRBs are most likely compact binaries (double neutrons stars or neutron star-black hole binaries) whose merger is driven by gravitational wave emission (e.g. Woosley & Bloom (2006); Gehrels et al. (2009)). See Fig. 1.

The mechanism by which these stellar cataclysmic events liberate such huge energies ($\sim 10^{54}$ erg) in such short times (down to milliseconds) is ultimately linked to the liberation of the gravitational energy involved in the compact stellar core or in the merging of two degenerate stars (in both cases in a region of order a few Schwarzschild radii corresponding to a few solar masses withing a dynamic time of order milliseconds), and its conversion into thermal energy plus a final compact object, which ends up as a black hole. This thermal energy, produced explosively, manifests itself initially as a hot fireball (virial temperatures in the MeV range) consisting

¹Dept. of Astronomy & Astrophysics and Dept. of Physics, Center for Particle and Gravitational Astrophysics, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

²Institute for Cosmic Ray Research, The University of Tokyo, 5-1-5 Kashiwanoha, Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8582, Japan

³Date: May 18, 2015. Based on an invited talk at the HAWC inauguration conference, Puebla, Mexico, March 19, 2015. To appear in Pubs. Academia de Ciencias de México, Eds. Alberto Carramiñana, Daniel Rosa, Stefan Westerhoff, Omar Tibolla




Fig. 1 Progenitors of long and short GRBs, after M. Ruffert and H.-Th. Jahnka (1996), duration distribution from Kouveliotou et al. (1993).

of photons, electrons, positrons, nuclei and magnetic fields, as well as neutrinos and gravitational waves. The prompt neutrinos produced are predominantly thermal, in the 10-20 MeV range, similar to those expected in core collapse supernova, and amount to a few $\times 10^{53}$ erg of energy, while the gravitational wave emission is mainly in the $10^2 - 10^3$ Hz range, amounting again to a few $\times 10^{53}$ erg for SGRBs, down to possibly much less for LGRBs, depending on the variability of the total gravitational quadrupole moment during the merger or collapse. Both these neutrinos and the gravitational waves escape in a matter of seconds or less - the progenitor star is essentially transparent to them.

The very high optical depth, however, traps the fireball photons, e^{\pm} , nucleons and magnetic fields, and this trapped thermal energy leads to an accelerating expansion of the fireball, converting thermal into bulk kinetic energy. For an initial ratio of energy to rest mass $\eta = E_0/M_0 c^2 \gg 1$ the ultimately resulting bulk Lorentz factor eventually can become very large, $\Gamma \lesssim \eta$. The observation of GeV photons would imply thermal spectra below the pair threshold ~ 0.5 MeV, unless the expansion Lorentz factor is very large $\Gamma \sim 10^2 - 10^3$ (e.g. Piran (2004); Mészáros (2006); Gehrels et al. (2009)), which in turn requires very low baryon loads in the fireball. The observations, in fact, indicate that this relativistic expansion occurs along a collimated jet, rather than isotropically (Gehrels et al., 2009).

If the photons escaped when the high optical depth had decreased to below unity one would have expected both a low radiative efficiency (most energy is bulk kinetic) and a quasi-thermal spectrum. Both issues, however, are avoided if the radiation arises in shocks, which are expected to occur in the outflow, e.g. Mészáros (2006). Shocks achieve the reconversion of kinetic energy into random particle energy, and Fermi acceleration in shocks leads to relativistic power law particle distributions which in the magnetic fields amplified in the shocks lead to synchrotron and inverse Compton non-thermal spectra, when the shock occur beyond the scattering photosphere (Rees & Mészáros, 1992; Rees & Mészáros, 1994). In addition, a quasi-thermal contribution, possibly with a non-thermal tail, can be expected from the photosphere, which however to be important requires internal dissipation. One expects internal shocks in the outflow when shells ejected with some variability timescale t_v with higher Γ catch up with slower Γ shells around a radius $r_{is} \simeq 2ct_v \Gamma^2 \sim 10^{12} t_{var, -3} \Gamma_2^2$ cm. An external (or termination) shock is expected when the jet starts to be decelerated by a swept up external matter of density n_0 (either ISM or

a progenitor wind), at a radius $r_{es} \simeq (3E_0/4\pi n_0 m_p c^2)^{1/3} \Gamma^{-2/3} \sim 3 \times 10^{16} (E_{51}/n_0)^{1/3} \Gamma_2^{-3/2}$ cm, see Fig 2. The internal shocks (which if magnetic fields are tangled could be a magnetic dissipation region) occur closer in, and are highly variable and prominent at γ -ray energies (Rees & Mészáros, 1994). The external shocks occur further out, producing, as the jet is increasingly decelerated, an increasingly softer and longer duration afterglow spectrum, from X-rays through optical to radio (Mészáros & Rees, 1997). A qualitatively similar spectral-temporal behavior is expected for both long and short bursts.




Fig. 2 GRB jet shocks and emission regions, after Mészáros (2001).

Such systems, consisting of as much as three different emission zones, the external shock furthermore consisting of both a forward shock and a reverse shock propagating onto the ejecta, can give rise to a variety of non-thermal spectra. Upscattering by electrons in the various regions of photons arising in the same region or inner regions can give rise to multiple radiation components, e.g. Mészáros (2006).

3 Observational progress through Swift and Fermi

The observations from the Swift and Fermi satellites, e.g. Gehrels & Mészáros (2012); Omodei et al. (2013), have led to a number of interesting results. Swift was able for the first time to follow GRB afterglow light curves in X-ray and UV/O starting less than a minute after the γ -ray trigger. This led, for instance, to the discovery in many afterglows of sudden drop of the X-ray light curves at the end of the prompt γ -ray emission, followed by a shallow decay lasting as much as 500 s in some cases, after which the canonical power law fireball decay took over (Fig. 3, left). This behavior appears both in long and short GRBs, as expected from afterglows. The sudden drop may be due to the high latitude emission of the jet, while the shallow decay may be due to continued outflow, with occasional X-ray flares (as seen in the figure) due to late internal shocks, e.g. Zhang et al. (2006).

Swift also made possible an explosive growth in the number of ground-based afterglow localizations with redshift determinations (see Fig. 3, right), a smaller number of LGRBs having already been detected earlier by Beppo-SAX and HETE-2. Swift, in addition, localized for the first time the host galaxies of short GRBs, which are detectable at redshifts typically lower than LGRBs, and confirmed that the hosts of SGRBs include many old population (elliptical) galaxies, compatible with an origin in compact double degenerate binaries, e.g. Nakar (2007); Gehrels et al. (2009). A significant fraction of short bursts, after their (previously known) initial short hard gamma-ray emission, also showed a previously unseen longer (~ 100 s) softer tail in their light curve. Another surprise was the first detection of a shock breakout in a supernova accompanied by a low luminosity soft GRB or




Fig. 3 Left: schematic X-ray afterglow from Swift-XRT observations (Zhang et al., 2006). Right: redshift distribution of long and short GRB (after E. Berger, 2014).

X-ray flash, e.g. Campana et al. (2006); Waxman et al. (2007). The range of redshifts detected for LGRBs was dramatically extended, the highest spectroscopic redshift so far being $z = 8.2$, with a record photometric redshift for GRB090429B at $z \simeq 9.4$, e.g. Mészáros & Gehrels (2012); Salvaterra (2015), see Fig. 3, right.

Fermi, with its GeV range LAT and MeV range GBM instruments, showed that many, if not most, burst detected with the LAT show that the GeV radiation starts to arrive seconds after the MeV trigger, an example being shown in Fig. 3. On the other hand, the GeV emission sometimes lasts hundreds of seconds longer than the MeV, suggesting association with the afterglow. Various purely leptonic astrophysical mechanisms may give rise to this behavior, e.g., Kumar & Zhang (2014). In addition, this behavior can be used also to provide interesting constraints on quantum gravity theories, e.g. Abdo & the Fermi Collaboration (2009b).




Fig. 4 Light curves of GRB080916C showing the *GBM* (top two curves) and the *LAT* (bottom three curves) energy ranges Abdo & the Fermi Collaboration (2009a).

Another interesting although not unexpected feature is the presence, in many LAT bursts, of a second spectral component at high (GeV) energies, whose slope is harder than the MeV classical broken power law (Band) spectral shape. More interesting was the fact that in some LAT bursts a second separate component is not statistically

significant, even though after a few seconds the high energy slope of the Band function (which initially is soft and does not extend to GeV) hardens and starts to extend into the GeV range. However, in a larger number of LAT bursts a second component with a harder slope does appear, with some delay relative to the softer MeV Band function, see Fig. 5. Some theoretical interpretations of these features are discussed in the next section.




Fig. 5 Spectra of GRB090926A from *Fermi* at four different time intervals, a= [0.0-3.3s], b= [3.3-9.7s], c= [9.7-10.5s], d= [10.5-21.6s] Ackermann & the Fermi collaboration (2011).

More recently, a new class of ultra-long GRBs is being recognized. Some of them appear not be connected to “usual” GRBs but appear rather to be tidal disruption events (TDEs) of a normal star by a massive black hole at the center of a galaxy. The most prominent example of such a TDE detected in γ -rays by Swift is the long-lasting source Sw J1644+57 (Burrows et al., 2011), where the tidal disruption seems to produce a relativistic jet leading to γ -ray, X-ray, optical and radio emission somewhat similar to a scaled-up and stretched GRB. Other TDEs have been detected in X-rays or optical, e.g. Komossa (2015), leading to an increased interest in TDE model calculations, e.g. Liu et al. (2012); Stone et al. (2013); Coughlin & Begelman (2014); Kelley et al. (2014); Liu et al. (2015); Mimica et al. (2015); Piran et al. (2015a,b).

However some ultra-long GRBs (loosely defined as burst-like objects lasting upwards of 1000 s in gamma-rays) may be due to a longer version of stellar events similar to classical GRBs, e.g. Gruber et al. (2011); Stratta et al. (2013); Levan et al. (2014). One way in which such ultra-long gamma-ray bursts (ULGRBs) could arise is if the progenitor is larger than the usual Wolf-Rayet progenitor (WRs lost through winds their outer envelope and have radii $\sim 10^{10} - 10^{11}$ cm so jet breakout plus accretion times accord with the classical LGRB durations, e.g. Woosley & MacFadyen (1999)). Instead, ULGRBs might arise in blue supergiants, which have an extended envelope, or perhaps even in ultra-massive Pop. III (first generation) stars, e.g. Gendre et al. (2013); Virgili et al. (2013); Zhang et al. (2014); Evans et al. (2014); Boër et al. (2015); Suwa & Ioka (2011); Nagakura et al. (2012); Yoon et al. (2015); Gao & Mészáros (2015). Early jet breakout calculations from blue supergiant progenitors were discussed in Mészáros & Rees (2001), while ultra-long duration X-ray and O/IR signatures of Pop. III stars were estimated in, e.g. Komissarov & Barkov (2010); Mészáros & Rees (2010); Toma et al. (2011), and the possibility of testing for an extended envelope or a Pop III progenitor through a high energy neutrino precursor was considered in Razzaque et al. (2003); Schneider et al. (2002); Gao et al. (2011).

4 Some recent theoretical developments

The afterglow model based on an external forward and reverse shock is, on the whole, able to explain the basic features of the emission in the latter phases. The internal shock model, on the other hand, which is widely used by observers as the work-horse tool for interpreting the data, in its simple form has two problems: one is a low radiative efficiency, due to the low mechanical shock efficiency, and the other its asymptotic theoretical low energy spectrum, which for some bursts is softer than observed. Two main avenues have been explored in the past decade to resolve this issue.




Fig. 6 One version of the evolving paradigm for GRB emission, where the prompt MeV emission is attributed to a dissipative photosphere where non-thermal processes modify the thermal spectrum.

One way to address this is to consider, instead of the usual non-dissipative (and hence inefficient) photosphere plus internal shock, a new paradigm consisting of a photosphere which has a hard low energy slope, with non-thermal high energy contributions from Comptonization and/or additional internal shocks (Mészáros & Rees, 2000). The photosphere can be radiatively efficient if it has internal dissipation, e.g. from sub-photospheric shocks (Rees & Mészáros, 2005), and there would still be also an external shock as well, see Fig. 4. Numerical simulations (Pe’er et al., 2006) including sub-photospheric shocks followed by synchrotron and inverse Compton scattering, i.e. a leptonic mechanism, confirm both a high efficiency and reasonable low and high energy slopes as well as break energies.

Another source of sub-photospheric dissipation is inevitable, if the outflow baryonic load contains both protons and neutrons, which should be the case. This is because the pn fluid, while initially expanding together well coupled by elastic collisions, eventually decouple, the neutrons lagging behind, which leads to inelastic collisions resulting in pions, whose decay produces both neutrinos and relativistic positrons (Derishev et al., 1999; Bahcall & Mészáros, 2000). This also results in efficient dissipation, the non-thermal positrons heating the plasma and leading to escaping photon spectra which again are reasonable (Beloborodov, 2010), see Fig. 7.




Fig. 7 Dissipative photosphere heated by np collisions leading to a non-thermal “Band” spectrum (Beloborodov, 2010). The high energy slope extends into the GeV band thanks to energy injection from the non-thermal decay positrons. In this case it reproduces a single Band function, but adding magnetic fields can add a second high energy component with a harder slope (Vurm et al., 2013).

A more robust way to obtain a second high energy component in such dissipative photospheric models is through the up-Comptonization of the inner photospheric spectrum by the external forward and reverse shock (Veres & Mészáros, 2012), see Fig. 8.




Fig. 8 Left: schematic dissipative photosphere and upscattering by external shock. Right: baryonically dominated dissipative photosphere plus external shock upscattering model leading to a two-component Band plus GeV spectrum (Veres & Mészáros, 2012).

The other main way to address the efficiency and spectral issues of internal shocks is by including the acceleration of hadrons in the same internal shocks, which is ignored in the classical internal shock picture, but which should be essentially unavoidable, if the outflow is baryonic. Hadron acceleration in internal shocks was first considered by Waxman & Bahcall (1997) to predict TeV neutrinos from GRBs, and the associated high energy γ -rays were considered by various authors, e.g. Böttcher & Dermer (1998); Asano et al. (2009b). The high energy components are produced by the synchrotron and inverse Compton of the cascade secondaries, see Fig. 9, left. The delay associated with the acceleration and cascade development can also possibly explain the delay of the GeV emission relative to the MeV radiation (Asano et al., 2009b; Razzaque, 2010; Asano & Mészáros, 2013).




Fig. 9 Left: schematic spectrum internal shock with electron plus hadron acceleration and secondary cascades. Right: numerical calculation of hadronic internal shock leptonic plus cascade secondary spectrum (Murase et al., 2012)

The hadronic secondaries can reproduce both the high energy second component, and also an additional low energy component which appears associated with the high energy component. This is illustrated as the leftmost component in Fig. 9 left, a hint of which is seen in the low energy portion of the data of Fig. 5, and more clearly in GRB090510, a calculation of which is given in Asano et al. (2009a). This component could also give rise to the bright early optical flash seen in some bursts. An interesting possibility is that re-acceleration of the secondaries via Fermi 2nd order mechanism in the turbulence behind the internal shocks can lead to a self-consistent Band spectrum at MeV energies, see Fig. 9 (right), which thus may not need to be due to the photosphere. The radiative efficiency in this case is also high, as well as the spectrum being reasonable, without an unduly high proton luminosity.

5 Multi-messenger approaches

The multi-messenger signatures of GRB are an important direction being actively pursued through multiple channels, both photonic and non-photonic. The latter, e.g. in the form of neutrinos, cosmic rays and gravitational waves, are being pursued by multiple observatories, such as IceCube, Auger, Telescope Array, LIGO and VIRGO, in addition to VHE γ -ray facilities such as HAWC, VERITAS, HESS and others, complementing Fermi, Swift and other existing instruments. An ambitious effort to coordinate the sub-threshold signals from various such facilities is the AMON network (<http://amon.gravity.psu.edu>, see Smith et al. (2013)). An interesting question is, if GRBs accelerate hadrons, can they explain at least partly the Auger CR and IceCube neutrino observations, or do they satisfy the constraints imposed by these observations? And will short GRBs, if they are indeed merging neutrons star binaries, be detected in the near future by gravitational wave observatories?

With IceCube and Auger in full operation, the first question is being already addressed. Auger has measured the ultra-high energy cosmic ray (UHECR) spectrum to great precision (The Pierre Auger Collaboration et al., 2013), but since CRs are deflected by intergalactic and galactic magnetic fields, one can only test whether GRBs can produce the appropriate flux within the GZK radius, as suggested by Waxman (1995). Since the GRB UHECRs would produce via $p\gamma$ TeV-PeV neutrinos (Waxman & Bahcall, 1997), these should not exceed the IceCube limits. The first limits were set by the IceCube initial 40+59 string array (Abbasi et al., 2012), which compared neutrino observations at the locations and time windows corresponding to 300 GRBs detected electromagnetically by satellites, 183 GRBs with the 50 string array and 177 GRBs with the 40 string array. The comparison used the simplified internal shock photo-hadronic model of Waxman & Bahcall (1997) to predict an expected neutrino flux, resulting in an over-prediction of this model compared to the data by a factor ~ 5 . A more generic model independent test, where the detected Auger cosmic rays are attributed to the GRBs was also negative. However, more accurate descriptions of the photo-hadronic interactions as well as inclusion of astrophysical model uncertainties (He et al., 2012; Li, 2012; Hümmer et al., 2012) showed that discrepancies between this model and IceCube might only be expected after several years of observations with the full array. These tests also used stationary radius internal shocks, allowing at most for range of radii (through t_ν).

However, the internal shocks, after forming, continue to move out, and doing so expand, so the time dependence of the varying comoving quantities must be taken into account. Such a time-dependent calculation was performed by Asano & Meszaros (2014), who took into account also the observed range of t_ν as well as the shock expansion and the GRB luminosity function (Wanderman & Piran, 2010) to obtain the expected flux of γ -rays, neutrinos and neutrons escaping from the GRBs - see Fig. 10 (right).

These sources were used then to calculate the expected diffuse fluxes, using the luminosity function of Fig. 10 (left). These predicted diffuse fluxes are compared in Fig. 11 to the IceCube 40+59 limits (Abbasi et al., 2012) and the diffuse Auger UHECR flux (The Pierre Auger Collaboration et al., 2013). Two prescriptions were used for the UHECR escape, one (Fig. 11 left) assuming that they escape as neutrons due to $p\gamma$ interactions and then reconvert to protons once outside the source; the other extreme being simple free escape as protons (Fig. 11 right). It can be seen that such GRB time-dependent internal shocks can explain at least part of the highest energy UHECR in the GZK range, without violating the 40+50 string IceCube neutrino limits.




Fig. 10 Left: observed distribution of variability times t_v (left top) and GRB luminosity function (left, bottom, from Wanderman & Piran (2010)). Right: Time-dependent hadronic internal shock Monte Carlo cascade spectral calculation for a distribution of variability times and observed luminosity function, showing photon, neutron and neutrino spectrum (Asano & Meszaros, 2014)




Fig. 11 Left: the CR (black) and neutrino (red) diffuse intensities for the neutron conversion model, compared to the Icecube 40+59 (Abbasi et al., 2012) and the Auger data (The Pierre Auger Collaboration et al., 2013). Gray shaded area for CRs indicates the uncertainty in the local GRB rate. The thin dash-dotted line is the CR spectrum without the effects of photomeson production and Bethe–Heitler pair production. The cosmogenic neutrino spectrum produced via the GZK process is also shown as the thin red line. Right: same as left, but for the sudden release model. From Asano & Meszaros (2014)

As mentioned earlier in §4, one of the new approaches to describing the prompt GRB γ -ray emission ascribes it to a dissipative photosphere, with a diminished role for the internal shocks (e.g. if the outflow is magnetically dominated, internal shocks might be prevented). Thus, it is necessary to consider also the possible hadron acceleration and neutrino production in the GRB photospheres (Murase, 2008; Wang & Dai, 2009; Gao et al., 2012; Asano & Mészáros, 2013; Zhang & Kumar, 2013; Murase et al., 2013b; Bartos et al., 2013). In addition, modified internal shocks might also include magnetic dissipation, e.g. the ICMART model (Zhang & Yan, 2011), and both these and photospheric models predict qualitatively different neutrino fluxes than classical internal shocks.

A recent IceCube analysis, using 4 years of accumulated data including now the full array, tests such models (IceCube Collaboration et al., 2014), concluding that less than 1% of the electromagnetically detected GRBs (modeled as either classical internal shocks, ICMART shocks or photospheres) can be contributing to the diffuse IceCube neutrino flux.

An exciting development is the discovery by IceCube of a diffuse neutrino flux which appears to be of astrophysical origin (Aartsen et al., 2013; IceCube Collaboration, 2013), with limited (or no) contribution from our own galaxy (Fox et al., 2013; Ahlers & Murase, 2014; Anchordoqui et al., 2014a; Ahlers et al., 2015). This flux has a spectrum extending from about a few PeV down to ~ 10 TeV, with a slope which (if unbroken) appears to be ~ -2.3 to -2.5 . As mentioned above, less than 1% of these can be coming from “classical”, i.e. normal high luminosity GRBs detected by Swift or Fermi (IceCube Collaboration et al., 2014). In fact, looking at Fig. 11, it is clear that such GRBs, while not violating the IceCube observational limits, in fact should not be producing anything near the observed neutrino flux in the TeV-PeV range. The question then is, what are the sources of these PeV neutrinos? If they are connected to GRBs at all, it might perhaps be to “hidden” GRBs, which are electromagnetically weak and do not trigger Swift or Fermi (Murase & Ioka, 2013; Liu & Wang, 2013); these could be either so-called choked-jet GRBs (Mészáros & Waxman, 2001), whose jets never emerged from the progenitor star, or they might be (electromagnetically) low-luminosity GRBs, or LLGRBs, e.g. (Murase et al., 2006; Gupta & Zhang, 2007; Murase et al., 2008).

Other, non-GRB related possible sources of the diffuse TeV-PeV neutrinos could be galaxy cluster accretion shocks and/or starburst galaxies, e.g. Loeb & Waxman (2006); Thompson et al. (2006); Murase et al. (2013a); He et al. (2013); Anchordoqui et al. (2014b); Tamborra et al. (2014); Chang & Wang (2014); Chang et al. (2014); or they could be due to AGN jets, e.g. Becker Tjus et al. (2014); Murase et al. (2014); Krauß et al. (2015); or they could be due to galaxy-galaxy collisions (Kashiyama & Mészáros, 2014).




Fig. 12 Diffuse neutrino flux per flavor (solid black) and γ -rays (dash-dot) from HNe and SNe, for a diffusion coefficient $D \propto \epsilon_p^{1/2}$, in both the host galaxy and cluster. The proton spectral index is $\Gamma = 2$. The black line with white circles denotes the measured atmospheric neutrino flux. The starburst galaxy contributions are in red lines, while the normal star-forming galaxy contributions are represented by blue lines. The contribution from HNe are in solid lines colored while those from the SNe are dashed. The solid green line denotes the total cluster contribution (i.e. HNe and SNe from both types of galaxies). Green data points correspond to the Fermi measurements of the extragalactic diffuse γ -ray background (Ackermann et al., 2015). Black points correspond to the IceCube measurements of astrophysical neutrinos (Aartsen et al., 2015), note that two of the low energy data points are within the gray lines of the error bars of the atmospheric flux. From Senno et al. (2015)

On the other hand, a possible UHECR and TeV-PeV neutrino source closely related to GRBs are hypernovae, or jet-driven supernovae (Wang et al., 2007; Budnik et al., 2008), and these are in fact largely concentrated in star-forming or star-bursting galaxies. While classical long GRBs are often associated with hypernovae, there are many more (90-95%) of hypernovae which do not show signs of a GRB, i.e. non-GRB hypernovae are much numerous than GRBs. Hypernovae have also been investigated as possible sources of the IceCube diffuse astrophysical TeV-PeV neutrino flux (He et al., 2013; Murase et al., 2013a; Liu et al., 2014). The challenge, with these various sources, is to fit the IceCube diffuse spectral flux, arising from pp or $p\gamma$ collisions leading to π^+ , while at the same time not violating the observed Fermi isotropic diffuse γ -ray flux (Abdo & Fermi LAT

Collaboration, 2010; Ackermann et al., 2015). These constraints can be reasonably met when taking into account both the hypernova and normal supernova populations in the observed relative ratios, as seen in Fig. 12, (Senno et al., 2015). The protons accelerated in the hypernovae (HNe) and supernovae (SNe) propagate in the host galaxy and in the host cluster with a diffusion coefficient $D(\varepsilon) \propto \varepsilon^{1/3}$ or $\propto \varepsilon^{1/2}$, where ε is proton energy, and make neutrinos and gamma-rays mainly by pp collisions, with negligible $p\gamma$ contributions. As can be seen in Fig. 12, the IceCube flux may be satisfied (except for one point a few sigma away) if the entire Fermi flux is explained this way. The problem is that AGNs already appears to be responsible for a large fraction of the diffuse Fermi γ -ray flux (Abazajian et al., 2011), hence not all the IceCube flux may be ascribed to HNe and SNe. Future work needs to clarify the roles of the various possible sources. The new all-sky γ -ray survey instrument HAWC (Westerhoff, 2014) will undoubtedly play a large role in the investigation of GRBs (Abeysekara & the HAWC collaboration, 2012; Taboada & Gilmore, 2014; Abeysekara et al., 2015) and other extragalactic as well as galactic sources of cosmic rays and neutrinos.

Acknowledgements We thank NASA NNX13AH50G for support, and P. Veres and K. Kashiyama for collaborations.

References

- Aartsen, M., Ackermann, M., Adams, J., Aguilar, J., Ahlers, M., Ahrens, M., Altmann, D., Anderson, T., Arquelles, C., Arlen, T., et al. 2015, *Physical Review D*, 91, 022001
- Aartsen, M. G., Abbasi, R., Abdou, Y., Ackermann, M., Adams, J., Aguilar, J. A., Ahlers, M., Altmann, D., Auffenberg, J., Bai, X., & et al. 2013, *Physical Review Letters*, 111, 021103
- Abazajian, K. N., Blanchet, S., & Harding, J. P. 2011, *Phys.Rev.D*, 84, 103007
- Abbasi, R., Abdou, Y., Abu-Zayyad, T., Ackermann, M., Adams, J., Aguilar, J. A., Ahlers, M., Altmann, D., Andeen, K., Auffenberg, J., & et al. 2012, *Nature*, 484, 351
- Abdo, A. & the Fermi Collaboration. 2009a, *Science*, 323, 1688
- Abdo, A. A. & Fermi LAT Collaboration. 2010, *Physical Review Letters*, 104, 101101
- Abdo, A. A. & the Fermi Collaboration. 2009b, *Nature*, 462, 331
- Abeysekara, A. U., Alfaro, R., Alvarez, C., Álvarez, J. D., Arceo, R., Arteaga-Velázquez, J. C., Ayala Solares, H. A., Barber, A. S., Baughman, B. M., Bautista-Elivar, N., BenZvi, S. Y., Bonilla Rosales, M., Braun, J., Caballero-Mora, K. S., Carramiñana, A., Castillo, M., Cotti, U., Cotzomi, J., de la Fuente, E., De León, C., DeYoung, T., Diaz Hernandez, R., Dingus, B. L., DuVernois, M. A., Ellsworth, R. W., Fiorino, D. W., Fraija, N., Galindo, A., Garfias, F., González, M. M., Goodman, J. A., Gussert, M., Hampel-Arias, Z., Harding, J. P., Hüntemeyer, P., Hui, C. M., Imran, A., Iriarte, A., Karn, P., Kieda, D., Kunde, G. J., Lara, A., Lauer, R. J., Lee, W. H., Lennarz, D., León Vargas, H., Linnemann, J. T., Longo, M., Luna-García, R., Malone, K., Marinelli, A., Marinelli, S. S., Martinez, H., Martinez, O., Martínez-Castro, J., Matthews, J. A. J., Mendoza Torres, E., Miranda-Romagnoli, P., Moreno, E., Mostafá, M., Nellen, L., Newbold, M., Noriega-Papaqui, R., Oceguera-Becerra, T. O., Patricelli, B., Pelayo, R., Pérez-Pérez, E. G., Pretz, J., Rivière, C., Rosa-González, D., Salazar, H., Salesa Greus, F., Sandoval, A., Schneider, M., Sinnis, G., Smith, A. J., Sparks Woodle, K., Springer, R. W., Taboada, I., Tollefson, K., Torres, I., Ukwatta, T. N., Villaseñor, L., Weisgarber, T., Westerhoff, S., Wisher, I. G., Wood, J., Yodh, G. B., Younk, P. W., Zaborov, D., Zepeda, A., Zhou, H., & HAWC Collaboration. 2015, *Astrophys.J.*, 800, 78
- Abeysekara, A. U. & the HAWC collaboration. 2012, *Astroparticle Physics*, 35, 641
- Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Albert, A., Atwood, W. B., Baldini, L., Ballet, J., Barbiellini, G., Bastieri, D., Bechtol, K., Bellazzini, R., Bissaldi, E., Blandford, R. D., Bloom, E. D., Bottacini, E., Brandt, T. J., Bregeon, J., Bruel, P., Buehler, R., Buson, S., Caliandro, G. A., Cameron, R. A., Caragiulo, M., Caraveo, P. A., Cavazzuti, E., Cecchi, C., Charles, E., Chekhtman, A., Chiang, J., Chiaro, G., Ciprini, S., Claus, R., Cohen-Tanugi, J., Conrad, J., Cuoco, A., Cutini, S., D’Ammando, F., de Angelis, A., de Palma, F., Dermer, C. D., Digel, S. W., Silva, E. d. C. e., Drell, P. S., Favuzzi, C., Ferrara, E. C., Focke, W. B., Franckowiak, A., Fukazawa, Y., Funk, S., Fusco, P., Gargano, F., Gasparrini, D., Germani, S., Giglietto, N., Giommi, P., Giordano, F., Giroletti, M.,

- Godfrey, G., Gomez-Vargas, G. A., Grenier, I. A., Guiriec, S., Gustafsson, M., Hadasch, D., Hayashi, K., Hays, E., Hewitt, J. W., Ippoliti, P., Jogler, T., Jóhannesson, G., Johnson, A. S., Johnson, W. N., Kamae, T., Kataoka, J., Knödseder, J., Kuss, M., Larsson, S., Latronico, L., Li, J., Li, L., Longo, F., Loparco, F., Lott, B., Lovellette, M. N., Lubrano, P., Madejski, G. M., Manfreda, A., Massaro, F., Mayer, M., Mazziotta, M. N., McEnery, J. E., Michelson, P. F., Mitthumsiri, W., Mizuno, T., Moiseev, A. A., Monzani, M. E., Morselli, A., Moskalenko, I. V., Murgia, S., Nemmen, R., Nuss, E., Ohsugi, T., Omodei, N., Orlando, E., Ormes, J. F., Paneque, D., Panetta, J. H., Perkins, J. S., Pesce-Rollins, M., Piron, F., Pivato, G., Porter, T. A., Rainò, S., Rando, R., Razzano, M., Razzaque, S., Reimer, A., Reimer, O., Reposeur, T., Ritz, S., Romani, R. W., Sánchez-Conde, M., Schaal, M., Schulz, A., Sgrò, C., Siskind, E. J., Spandre, G., Spinelli, P., Strong, A. W., Suson, D. J., Takahashi, H., Thayer, J. G., Thayer, J. B., Tibaldo, L., Tinivella, M., Torres, D. F., Tosti, G., Troja, E., Uchiyama, Y., Vianello, G., Werner, M., Winer, B. L., Wood, K. S., Wood, M., Zaharijas, G., & Zimmer, S. 2015, *Astrophys.J.*, 799, 86
- Ackermann, M. & the Fermi collaboration. 2011, *Astrophys.J.*, 729, 114
- Ahlers, M., Bai, Y., Barger, V., & Lu, R. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1505.03156
- Ahlers, M. & Murase, K. 2014, *Phys.Rev.D*, 90, 023010
- Anchordoqui, L. A., Goldberg, H., Paul, T. C., da Silva, L. H. M., & Vlcek, B. J. 2014a, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1410.0348
- Anchordoqui, L. A., Paul, T. C., da Silva, L. H. M., Torres, D. F., & Vlcek, B. J. 2014b, *Phys.Rev.D*, 89, 127304
- Asano, K., Guiriec, S., & Mészáros, P. 2009a, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 705, L191
- Asano, K., Inoue, S., & Mészáros, P. 2009b, *Astrophys.J.*, 699, 953
- Asano, K. & Mészáros, P. 2013, *Jour. Cosmology and Astro-Particle Phys.*, 9, 8
- Asano, K. & Meszaros, P. 2014, *Astrophys.J.*, 785, 54
- Bahcall, J. N. & Mészáros, P. 2000, *Physical Review Letters*, 85, 1362
- Bartos, I., Beloborodov, A. M., Hurley, K., & Márka, S. 2013, *Physical Review Letters*, 110, 241101
- Becker Tjus, J., Eichmann, B., Halzen, F., Kheirandish, A., & Saba, S. M. 2014, *Phys.Rev.D*, 89, 123005
- Beloborodov, A. M. 2010, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 407, 1033
- Boër, M., Gendre, B., & Stratta, G. 2015, *Astrophys.J.*, 800, 16
- Böttcher, M. & Dermer, C. D. 1998, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 499, L131+
- Budnik, R., Katz, B., MacFadyen, A., & Waxman, E. 2008, *Astrophys.J.*, 673, 928
- Burrows, D. N., Kennea, J. A., Ghisellini, G., Mangano, V., Zhang, B., Page, K. L., Eracleous, M., Romano, P., Sakamoto, T., Falcone, A. D., Osborne, J. P., Campana, S., Beardmore, A. P., Breeveld, A. A., Chester, M. M., Corbet, R., Covino, S., Cummings, J. R., D’Avanzo, P., D’Elia, V., Esposito, P., Evans, P. A., Fugazza, D., Gelbord, J. M., Hiroi, K., Holland, S. T., Huang, K. Y., Im, M., Israel, G., Jeon, Y., Jeon, Y.-B., Jun, H. D., Kawai, N., Kim, J. H., Krimm, H. A., Marshall, F. E., P. Mészáros, Negoro, H., Omodei, N., Park, W.-K., Perkins, J. S., Sugizaki, M., Sung, H.-I., Tagliaferri, G., Troja, E., Ueda, Y., Urata, Y., Usui, R., Antonelli, L. A., Barthelmy, S. D., Cusumano, G., Giommi, P., Melandri, A., Perri, M., Racusin, J. L., Sbarufatti, B., Siegel, M. H., & Gehrels, N. 2011, *Nature*, 476, 421
- Campana, S., Mangano, V., Blustin, A. J., Brown, P., Burrows, D. N., Chincarini, G., Cummings, J. R., Cusumano, G., Della Valle, M., Malesani, D., Mészáros, P., Nousek, J. A., Page, M., Sakamoto, T., Waxman, E., Zhang, B., Dai, Z. G., Gehrels, N., Immler, S., Marshall, F. E., Mason, K. O., Moretti, A., O’Brien, P. T., Osborne, J. P., Page, K. L., Romano, P., Roming, P. W. A., Tagliaferri, G., Cominsky, L. R., Giommi, P., Godet, O., Kennea, J. A., Krimm, H., Angelini, L., Barthelmy, S. D., Boyd, P. T., Palmer, D. M., Wells, A. A., & White, N. E. 2006, *Nature*, 442, 1008
- Chang, X.-C., Liu, R.-Y., & Wang, X.-Y. 2014, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Chang, X.-C. & Wang, X.-Y. 2014, *Astrophys.J.*, 1406.1099, 131
- Coughlin, E. R. & Begelman, M. C. 2014, *Astrophys.J.*, 781, 82
- Derishev, E. V., Kocharovsky, V. V., & Kocharovsky, V. V. 1999, *Astrophys.J.*, 521, 640
- Evans, P. A., Willingale, R., Osborne, J. P., O’Brien, P. T., Tanvir, N. R., Frederiks, D. D., Pal’shin, V. D., Svinkin, D. S., Lien, A., Cummings, J., Xiong, S., Zhang, B.-B., Götz, D., Savchenko, V., Negoro, H., Nakahira, S., Suzuki, K., Wiersema, K., Starling, R. L. C., Castro-Tirado, A. J., Beardmore, A. P., Sánchez-Ramírez, R., Gorosabel, J., Jeong, S., Kennea, J. A., Burrows, D. N., & Gehrels, N. 2014, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 444, 250
- Fox, D. B., Kashiyama, K., & Mészáros, P. 2013, *Astrophys.J.*, 774, 74
- Gao, H. & Mészáros, P. 2015, *Astrophys.J.*, 802, 90

- Gao, S., Asano, K., & Meszaros, P. 2012, *Jour. Cosmology and Astro-Particle Phys.*, 11, 58
- Gao, S., Toma, K., & Mészáros, P. 2011, *Phys.Rev.D*, 83, 103004
- Gehrels, N. & Mészáros, P. 2012, *Science*, 337, 932
- Gehrels, N., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., & Fox, D. B. 2009, *Annu.Rev.Astron.Astrophys.*, 47, 567
- Gendre, B., Stratta, G., Atteia, J. L., Basa, S., Boër, M., Coward, D. M., Cutini, S., D’Elia, V., Howell, E. J., Klotz, A., & Piro, L. 2013, *Astrophys.J.*, 766, 30
- Gruber, D., Krühler, T., Foley, S., Nardini, M., Burlon, D., Rau, A., Bissaldi, E., von Kienlin, A., McBreen, S., Greiner, J., Bhat, P. N., Briggs, M. S., Burgess, J. M., Chaplin, V. L., Connaughton, V., Diehl, R., Fishman, G. J., Gibby, M. H., Giles, M. M., Goldstein, A., Guiriec, S., van der Horst, A. J., Kippen, R. M., Kouveliotou, C., Lin, L., Meegan, C. A., Paciesas, W. S., Preece, R. D., Tierney, D., & Wilson-Hodge, C. 2011, *Astron.Astrophys.*, 528, A15
- Gupta, N. & Zhang, B. 2007, *Astroparticle Physics*, 27, 386
- He, H.-N., Liu, R.-Y., Wang, X.-Y., Nagataki, S., Murase, K., & Dai, Z.-G. 2012, *Astrophys.J.*, 752, 29
- He, H.-N., Wang, T., Fan, Y.-Z., Liu, S.-M., & Wei, D.-M. 2013, *Phys.Rev.D*, 87, 063011
- Hümmer, S., Baerwald, P., & Winter, W. 2012, *Physical Review Letters*, 108, 231101
- IceCube Collaboration. 2013, *Science*, 342
- IceCube Collaboration, Aartsen, M. G., Ackermann, M., Adams, J., Aguilar, J. A., Ahlers, M., Ahrens, M., Altmann, D., Anderson, T., Argüelles, C., & et al. 2014, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1412.6510
- Kashiyama, K. & Mészáros, P. 2014, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 790, L14
- Kelley, L. Z., Tchekhovskoy, A., & Narayan, R. 2014, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 445, 3919
- Komissarov, S. S. & Barkov, M. V. 2010, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 402, L25
- Komossa, S. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1505.01093
- Kouveliotou, C., Meegan, C. A., Fishman, G. J., Bhat, N. P., Briggs, M. S., Koshut, T. M., Paciesas, W. S., & Pendleton, G. N. 1993, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 413, L101
- Krauß, F., Wang, B., Baxter, C., Kadler, M., Mannheim, K., Ojha, R., Gräfe, C., Müller, C., Wilms, J., Carpenter, B., Schulz, R., TANAMI, f. t., & the Fermi-LAT Collaborations. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Kumar, P. & Zhang, B. 2014, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1410.0679
- Levan, A. J., Tanvir, N. R., Starling, R. L. C., Wiersema, K., Page, K. L., Perley, D. A., Schulze, S., Wynn, G. A., Chornock, R., Hjorth, J., Cenko, S. B., Fruchter, A. S., O’Brien, P. T., Brown, G. C., Tunnicliffe, R. L., Malesani, D., Jakobsson, P., Watson, D., Berger, E., Bersier, D., Cobb, B. E., Covino, S., Cucchiara, A., de Ugarte Postigo, A., Fox, D. B., Gal-Yam, A., Goldoni, P., Gorosabel, J., Kaper, L., Krühler, T., Karjalainen, R., Osborne, J. P., Pian, E., Sánchez-Ramírez, R., Schmidt, B., Skillen, I., Tagliaferri, G., Thöne, C., Vaduvescu, O., Wijers, R. A. M. J., & Zauderer, B. A. 2014, *Astrophys.J.*, 781, 13
- Li, Z. 2012, *Phys.Rev.D*, 85, 027301
- Liu, D., Pe’er, A., & Loeb, A. 2012, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1211.5120
- . 2015, *Astrophys.J.*, 798, 13
- Liu, R.-Y. & Wang, X.-Y. 2013, *Astrophys.J.*, 1212.1260, 73
- Liu, R.-Y., Wang, X.-Y., Inoue, S., Crocker, R., & Aharonian, F. 2014, *Phys.Rev.D*, 89, 083004
- Loeb, A. & Waxman, E. 2006, *Jour. Cosmology and Astro-Particle Phys.*, 5, 3
- Mészáros, P. 2001, *Science*, 291, 79
- Mészáros, P. 2006, *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 69, 2259
- Mészáros, P. & Gehrels, N. 2012, *Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 12, 1139
- Mészáros, P. & Rees, M. J. 1997, *Astrophys.J.*, 476, 232
- Mészáros, P. & Rees, M. J. 2000, *Astrophys.J.*, 530, 292
- . 2001, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 556, L37
- . 2010, *Astrophys.J.*, 715, 967
- Mészáros, P. & Waxman, E. 2001, *Physical Review Letters*, 87, 171102
- Mimica, P., Giannios, D., Metzger, B. D., & Aloy, M. A. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1501.00361
- Murase, K. 2008, *Phys.Rev.D*, 78, 101302
- Murase, K., Ahlers, M., & Lacki, B. C. 2013a, *Phys.Rev.D*, 88, 121301
- Murase, K., Asano, K., Terasawa, T., & Mészáros, P. 2012, *Astrophys.J.*, 746, 164

- Murase, K., Inoue, Y., & Dermer, C. D. 2014, *Phys.Rev.D*, 90, 023007
- Murase, K. & Ioka, K. 2013, *Physical Review Letters*, 111, 121102
- Murase, K., Ioka, K., Nagataki, S., & Nakamura, T. 2006, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 651, L5
- . 2008, *Phys.Rev.D*, 78, 023005
- Murase, K., Kashiyama, K., & Mészáros, P. 2013b, *Physical Review Letters*, 111, 131102
- Nagakura, H., Suwa, Y., & Ioka, K. 2012, *Astrophys.J.*, 754, 85
- Nakar, E. 2007, *Phys.Rep.*, 442, 166
- Omodei, N., Vianello, G., Piron, F., Vasileiou, V., & Razzaque, S. 2013, in *EAS Publications Series*, Vol. 61, *EAS Publications Series*, ed. A. J. Castro-Tirado, J. Gorosabel, & I. H. Park, 123–128
- Pe’er, A., Mészáros, P., & Rees, M. J. 2006, *Astrophys.J.*, 642, 995
- Piran, T. 2004, *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 76, 1143
- Piran, T., Sadowski, A., & Tchekhovskoy, A. 2015a, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1501.02015
- Piran, T., Svirski, G., Krolik, J., Cheng, R. M., & Shiokawa, H. 2015b, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1502.05792
- Razzaque, S. 2010, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 724, L109
- Razzaque, S., Mészáros, P., & Waxman, E. 2003, *Phys. Rev.*, D68, 083001
- Rees, M. J. & Mészáros, P. 1992, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 258, 41P
- Rees, M. J. & Mészáros, P. 1994, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 430, L93
- . 2005, *Astrophys.J.*, 628, 847
- Salvaterra, R. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1503.03072
- Schneider, R., Guetta, D., & Ferrara, A. 2002, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 334, 173
- Senno, N., Mészáros, P., Murase, K., Baerwald, P., & Rees, M. J. 2015, *Astrophys.J.*, 806, 24
- Smith, M. W. E., Fox, D. B., Cowen, D. F., Mészáros, P., Tešić, G., Fixelle, J., Bartos, I., Sommers, P., Ashtekar, A., Jogesh Babu, G., Barthelmy, S. D., Coutu, S., DeYoung, T., Falcone, A. D., Gao, S., Hashemi, B., Homeier, A., Márka, S., Owen, B. J., & Taboada, I. 2013, *Astroparticle Physics*, 45, 56
- Stone, N., Sari, R., & Loeb, A. 2013, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 435, 1809
- Stratta, G., Gendre, B., Atteia, J. L., Boër, M., Coward, D. M., De Pasquale, M., Howell, E., Klotz, A., Oates, S., & Piro, L. 2013, *Astrophys.J.*, 779, 66
- Suwa, Y. & Ioka, K. 2011, *Astrophys.J.*, 726, 107
- Taboada, I. & Gilmore, R. C. 2014, *Nuclear Instruments and Methods in Physics Research A*, 742, 276
- Tamborra, I., Ando, S., & Murase, K. 2014, *Jour. Cosmology and Astro-Particle Phys.*, 9, 43
- The Pierre Auger Collaboration, Aab, A., Abreu, P., Aglietta, M., Ahlers, M., Ahn, E.-J., Albuquerque, I., Allekotte, I., Allen, J., Allison, P., & et al. 2013, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Thompson, T. A., Quataert, E., Waxman, E., & Loeb, A. 2006, *ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints*
- Toma, K., Sakamoto, T., & Mészáros, P. 2011, *Astrophys.J.*, 731, 127
- Vedrenne, G. & Atteia, J.-L. 2009, *Gamma-Ray Bursts*, ed. Vedrenne, G. & Atteia, J.-L.
- Veres, P. & Mészáros, P. 2012, *Astrophys.J.*, 755, 12
- Virgili, F. J., Mundell, C. G., Pal’shin, V., Guidorzi, C., Margutti, R., Melandri, A., Harrison, R., Kobayashi, S., Chornock, R., Henden, A., Utdike, A. C., Cenko, S. B., Tanvir, N. R., Steele, I. A., Cucchiara, A., Gomboc, A., Levan, A., Cano, Z., Mottram, C. J., Clay, N. R., Bersier, D., Kopač, D., Japelj, J., Filippenko, A. V., Li, W., Svinkin, D., Golenetskii, S., Hartmann, D. H., Milne, P. A., Williams, G., O’Brien, P. T., Fox, D. B., & Berger, E. 2013, *Astrophys.J.*, 778, 54
- Vurm, I., Lyubarsky, Y., & Piran, T. 2013, *Astrophys.J.*, 764, 143
- Wanderman, D. & Piran, T. 2010, *M.N.R.A.S.*, 406, 1944
- Wang, X.-Y. & Dai, Z.-G. 2009, *Astrophys.J.Lett.*, 691, L67
- Wang, X.-Y., Razzaque, S., Meszaros, P., & Dai, Z.-G. 2007, *Phys.Rev.*, D76, 083009
- Waxman, E. 1995, *Physical Review Letters*, 75, 386
- Waxman, E. & Bahcall, J. 1997, *Physical Review Letters*, 78, 2292
- Waxman, E., Mészáros, P., & Campana, S. 2007, *Astrophys.J.*, 667, 351
- Westerhoff, S. 2014, *Advances in Space Research*, 53, 1492
- Woosley, S. E. & Bloom, J. S. 2006, *Annu.Rev.Astron.Astrophys.*, 44, 507
- Woosley, S. E. & MacFadyen, A. I. 1999, *Astron.Astrophys.Supp.*, 138, 499

- Yoon, S.-C., Kang, J., & Kozyreva, A. 2015, *Astrophys.J.* , 802, 16
- Zhang, B., Fan, Y. Z., Dyks, J., Kobayashi, S., Mészáros, P., Burrows, D. N., Nousek, J. A., & Gehrels, N. 2006, *Astrophys.J.* , 642, 354
- Zhang, B. & Kumar, P. 2013, *Physical Review Letters*, 110, 121101
- Zhang, B. & Yan, H. 2011, *Astrophys.J.* , 726, 90
- Zhang, B.-B., Zhang, B., Murase, K., Connaughton, V., & Briggs, M. S. 2014, *Astrophys.J.* , 787, 66