

## Deciphering the $\sim 18$ TeV photons from GRB 221009A

SARIRA SAHU,<sup>1</sup> B. MEDINA-CARRILLO,<sup>2</sup> G. SÁNCHEZ-COLÓN,<sup>2</sup> AND SUBHASH RAJPOOT<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,  
Circuito Exterior, C.U., A. Postal 70-543, 04510 Mexico DF, Mexico*

<sup>2</sup>*Departamento de Física Aplicada, Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del IPN,  
Unidad Mérida. A.P. 73, Cordemex, Mérida, Yucatán 97310, México*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Physics and Astronomy, California State University,  
1250 Bellflower Boulevard, Long Beach, CA 90840, USA*

### ABSTRACT

On 9 October, 2022, an extremely powerful gamma-ray burst, GRB 221009A, was detected by several instruments. Despite being obstructed by the Milky Way galaxy, its afterglow outburst outshone all other GRBs seen before. LHAASO detected several thousands very high energy photons extending up to 18 TeV. Detection of such energetic photons are unexpected due to the large opacity of the Universe. It is possible that in the afterglow epoch the intrinsic very high energy photon flux from the source might have increased manifolds, which could compensate the attenuation by pair-production with the extragalactic background light. We propose such a scenario and show that very high energy photons can be observed on the Earth from the interaction of very high energy protons with the seed synchrotron photons in the external forward shock region of the GRB jet.

*Keywords:* Particle astrophysics (96), Blazars (164), Gamma-ray bursts (629), Relativistic jets (1390)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

On October 9, 2022, at  $T_0 = 13 : 16 : 59.000$  UT (Veres et al. 2022), a long duration gamma-ray burst (GRB), identified as GRB 221009A (also known as Swift J1913.1+1946) was detected in the direction of the constellation Sagitta by the Gamma-ray Burst Monitor (GBM) (Meegan et al. 2009) onboard the Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope. The prompt emission was also detected by several other space observatories, such as the Fermi Large Area Telescope (LAT), Swift (S.Dichiara et al. 2022; Krimm et al. 2022), AGILE (Ursi et al. 2022; Piano et al. 2022), INTEGRAL (Gotz et al. 2022), Solar Orbiter (Xiao et al. 2022), SRG (Lapshov et al. 2022), Konus (Frederiks et al. 2022), GRBAlpha (Ripa et al. 2022), and STPSat-6 (Mitchell et al. 2022). GRB 221009A is located at the coordinate  $RA = 288.282$  and  $Dec = 19.495$  (Pillera et al. 2022). The Fermi-LAT detected the most energetic photon of energy 99.3 GeV (at  $t_0 + 240$  s). It is the highest energy photon ever detected by Fermi-LAT from a GRB in the prompt phase (Bissaldi et al. 2022; Pillera et al. 2022). The afterglow emission was also observed at different wavelengths (Das & Razzaque 2022), and the optical follow-up observation estimated a very low redshift of  $z \simeq 0.151$  (de Ugarte Postigo et al. 2022). The total emitted isotropic-equivalent gamma-ray energy from GRB 221009A is estimated to be  $(2 - 6) \times 10^{54}$  erg (de Ugarte Postigo et al. 2022; Kann & Agui 2022). This is the brightest, long-duration GRB, and arguably, one of the nearest, and possibly, the most energetic GRB ever observed. It has also been reported that GRB 221009A produced a significant

sarira@nucleares.unam.mx

benjamin.medina@cinvestav.mx

gabriel.sanchez@cinvestav.mx

Subhash.Rajpoot@csulb.edu

ionization of the Earth’s lower ionosphere ( $\sim 60 - 100$  km) (Hayes & Gallagher 2022) and is the strongest ionization effect ever recorded from a GRB.

The Large High Altitude Air Shower Observatory (LHAASO) with the water Cherenkov detector array (WCDA) and the larger air shower kilometer square area (KM2A) detector observed more than 5000 very high energy (VHE) photons within  $T_0 + 2000$  s in the 500 GeV to 18 TeV energy range, making them the most energetic photons ever observed from a GRB (Huang et al. 2022). Surprisingly, the ground-based Cherenkov detector Carpet-2 at Baksan Neutrino Observatory reported the detection of undoubtedly a very rare air-shower originating from a 251 TeV photon 4536 s after the GBM trigger from the direction of the GRB 221009A (Dzhappuev et al. 2022). Observations of these unusually VHE gamma-rays by LHAASO and Carpet-2 from GRB 221009A are incomprehensible, and led to the speculations of non-standard physics explanations of these observed events. However, there is a caveat concerning the observation of 251 TeV gamma-ray. The angular resolution of the Carpet-2 is several degrees and the two previously reported Galactic VHE sources, 3HWC J1928+178 and LHASSO J1929+1745, are located close to the position of the GRB 221009A (Fraija et al. 2022). It remains uncertain whether the observed 251 TeV photon is from the GRB 221009A or from either of these Galactic sources. Nevertheless, the temporal and spatial coincidence of this event with the GRB 221009A is worth exploring (Finke & Razzaque 2022; Alves Batista 2022; Mirabal 2022). In the present context, we will delve into the VHE emission observed by LHAASO.

The VHE  $\gamma$ -rays observed by the Cherenkov telescopes from the extragalactic sources undergo energy-dependent attenuation by interacting with the extragalactic background light (EBL) through electron-positron pair production (Stecker et al. 1992; Ackermann et al. 2012). As a result, the shape of the spectrum at very high energies changes significantly. Several well known EBL models have been developed to study the attenuation at different redshifts. These models have been used successfully by the highly sensitive Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Telescopes (IACTs) such as VERITAS (Holder et al. 2009), HESS (Hinton 2004), and MAGIC (Cortina 2005), to analyze the observed VHE gamma-rays from sources of different redshifts. The observed VHE gamma-ray flux from the source can be written in terms of the intrinsic flux  $F_{in}$  and the survival probability of the VHE photon as (Hauser & Dwek 2001)

$$F_{\gamma}(E_{\gamma}) = F_{in}(E_{\gamma}) e^{-\tau_{\gamma\gamma}(E_{\gamma})}, \quad (1)$$

where  $E_{\gamma}$  is the observed VHE photon energy and  $\tau_{\gamma\gamma}$  is the optical depth for the pair-production process. The optical depth for a 18 TeV photon at a redshift of  $z = 0.151$  is 18.3 in EBL model of Franceschini et al. (2008) and 19.4 in the EBL model of Dominguez et al. (2011) which corresponds to the survival probability of the VHE photon  $e^{-\tau_{\gamma\gamma}} \sim 1.1 \times 10^{-8}$  and  $3.6 \times 10^{-9}$  respectively in both these models. Thus, for a 18 TeV photon energy, the observed flux will be suppressed by a factor of  $\sim 10^{-9} - 10^{-8}$ . As the observation of 18 TeV photon from a source at redshift  $z = 0.151$  is difficult to comprehend, it is viewed as signature of new physics such as Lorentz invariance violation (Zhu & Ma 2022; Li & Ma 2022; Baktash et al. 2022; Finke & Razzaque 2022), oscillation of photon to a pseudo-scalar particle (axion-like particle (ALP)) (Galanti et al. 2022; Lin & Yanagida 2022; Troitsky 2022), ALP abundance enhanced with its mass caused by a first-order phase transition in a hidden sector (Nakagawa et al. 2022), heavy neutrino as the means of propagation to avoid the energy attenuation (Cheung 2022), and sterile neutrinos produced via mixing with active neutrinos (Brdar & Li 2022). On the other hand, from the standard physics point of view, these gamma-rays are argued to be the secondaries arising from the interactions between the ultra-high energy cosmic rays emanating from GRB 221009A and the cosmological photon background on their way to the Earth (Alves Batista 2022). Also, observation of neutrinos from such a bright GRB is discussed (Murase et al. 2022).

Since the VHE spectra of most of the flaring high energy blazars (HBLs) of different redshifts are explained very well using the EBL models of Franceschini et al. (2008) and Dominguez et al. (2011), the recent observation of  $\sim 18$  TeV photon from the GRB 221009A falls short of this expectation. The obvious question is, can it be due to the intrinsic flux from the source? If we look into Eq.(1), the depletion in the flux due to  $e^{-\tau_{\gamma\gamma}}$  can, in principle, be compensated by increasing the intrinsic flux. However, this may not be possible in most of the situations. As noted previously, GRB 221009A is very special as its afterglow outburst outshone all other GRBs seen before, despite the fact that GRB 221009A is obstructed by the Milky Way galaxy. Furthermore, the burst was so powerful that it ionized Earth’s atmosphere and disrupted long wave radio communications. It is estimated that, at low redshifts, such energetic GRBs are extremely rare events and may occur once in a century (Atteia 2022). Thus, it is possible that the intrinsic VHE flux from the source might have increased manifolds, which could compensate the depletion from the EBL effect. In this letter, we would like to pursue such a scenario and its impact on the observation of  $\sim 18$  TeV photons by LHAASO.

## 2. COMMON FEATURES OF BLAZAR AND GRB

The emission mechanisms in blazars (a subclass of active galactic nuclei (AGN)) and GRBs have many features in common (Urry & Padovani 1995; Gehrels & Razzaque 2013). Such common features are found to prevail in the synchrotron luminosity and Doppler factor between GRBs and active galactic nuclei (AGNs) (Wu et al. 2011). In several studies it was observed that the jets in blazars and GRBs share common features despite large differences in their masses and bulk Lorentz factors (Nemmen et al. 2012; Wang & Wei 2011; Wu et al. 2016). It is natural to use such mechanisms and processes to study the multi-TeV flaring of high energy blazars to study the afterglow phases of GRBs.

Previously we have used the photohadronic process to study the multi-TeV flaring from HBLs (Sahu 2019; Sahu et al. 2019, 2020). In the photohadronic scenario, protons in the blazar jet are accelerated to very high energies and then collide with the background seed photons to produce  $\Delta$ -resonance ( $p\gamma \rightarrow \Delta^+$ ) with the following kinematical condition (Sahu 2019)

$$E_p \epsilon_\gamma = 0.32 \Gamma \mathcal{D} (1+z)^{-2} \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (2)$$

where  $E_p$  and  $\epsilon_\gamma$  are the proton energy and the background seed photon energy respectively in the observer's frame. In the process, the observed VHE photon carries about 10% of the proton energy,  $E_\gamma \simeq 0.1 E_p$ . The bulk Lorentz factor and the Doppler factor respectively are given by  $\Gamma$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ . As the jets of the observed HBLs and GRBs beam towards us,  $\Gamma \simeq \mathcal{D}$ . The  $\Delta$ -resonances decay to neutral pions that subsequently decay to VHE gamma-rays. These are the blueshifted photons observed by the Cherenkov telescopes on Earth. This model is very successful in explaining the VHE gamma-ray spectra from several HBLs, and the intrinsic flux  $F_{\text{in}}$  is given by

$$F_{\text{in}} = F_0 E_{\gamma, \text{TeV}}^{-\delta+3}, \quad (3)$$

where  $E_{\gamma, \text{TeV}}$  is the photon energy in TeVs. The normalization constant  $F_0$  can be fixed from the observed spectrum and the spectral index  $\delta = \alpha + \beta$  is the free parameter in the model (Sahu 2019; Sahu et al. 2019). Note that  $F_{\text{in}}$  is independent of  $\Gamma$  and  $\mathcal{D}$ . The high energy protons in the jet have a power-law differential spectrum  $dN/dE_p \propto E_p^{-\alpha}$ ,  $E_p$  is the proton energy and we take  $\alpha = 2$  (Dermer & Schlickeiser 1993), a generally accepted value. For HBLs, the seed photon flux also follows a power-law  $\Phi_\gamma \propto \epsilon_\gamma^\beta \propto E_\gamma^{-\beta}$  (Sahu 2019; Sahu et al. 2019). For HBLs, the value of  $\delta$  always lies in the range  $2.5 \leq \delta \leq 3.0$ , which corresponds to a  $\beta$  value in the range  $0.5 \leq \beta \leq 1.0$ , indicating that the seed photons are in the low energy tail region of the SSC spectrum (Sahu et al. 2019). Recently, it has been shown that for GRBs, the value of  $\beta$  can be positive or negative (Sahu & Fortín 2020).  $\beta > 0$  implies that the seed photons are in the self-Compton regime.  $\beta < 0$  locates seed photons in the synchrotron regime. It was previously shown that the VHE spectra of the GRB 190114C and GRB 190829A are due to the interaction of the high energy protons with the low energy tail region of the background synchrotron self Compton (SSC) photons in the jet with  $\beta > 0$  (Sahu & López Fortín 2020; Sahu et al. 2022). Also shown there was that the VHE spectrum of GRB 180720B is from the interaction of high energy protons with the synchrotron seed photons in the jet environment with  $\beta < 0$  (Sahu & López Fortín 2020). This negative value of  $\beta$  corresponds to the falling part of the synchrotron spectrum.

## 3. RESULTS


LHAASO, with its two detectors WCDA and KM2A, detected  $\geq 5000$  photons above 500 GeV from the GRB 221009A within  $T \sim 2000$  s of the prompt emission. The number of photons  $N_\gamma$  detected at a time interval  $T$  by any of these detectors at zenith angle  $\theta$  and effective area  $A(E_\gamma, \theta)$  is (Zhao et al. 2022)

$$N_\gamma = T \int_{0.5 \text{ TeV}} \frac{dN_\gamma}{dE_\gamma} A(E_\gamma, \theta) e^{-\tau_\gamma(E_\gamma)} dE_\gamma, \quad (4)$$

where the differential photon spectrum can be written as

$$\frac{dN_\gamma}{dE_\gamma} = F_0 E_{\gamma, \text{TeV}}^{-\delta+1} \text{ TeV}^{-2}. \quad (5)$$

The source was observed at a zenith angle of  $30^\circ \lesssim \theta \lesssim 35^\circ$  that we adopt in Eq.(4). Taking into account the areas of LHAASO-WCDA and LHAASO-KM2A (Cao et al. 2022), we evaluate the integral in Eq.(4) for  $\delta = 2.5, 1.7$  and  $1.2$ . For the present analysis, we consider the EBL model of Franceschini et al. (2008). We assume that these two



**Figure 1.** Using the effective area of the detector LHAASO-WCDA the VHE Spectrum for GRB 221009A is given for different values of the spectral index  $\delta$ , by fixing  $N_\gamma = 5500$ . The intrinsic flux for each  $\delta$  also shown. The LHAASO sensitivity curve for with 2000 s exposure is also shown. The vertical line corresponds to 18 TeV photon energy. The shaded region is  $\pm 50\%$  relative energy resolution of LHAASO-WCDA for  $E_\gamma \simeq 18$  TeV.


detectors observe photons above 500 GeV in the range  $5000 \leq N_\gamma \leq 6500$ . By fixing the value of  $N_\gamma$ , we calculate the value of  $F_0$  which is then used to calculate the VHE photon flux and the integrated flux  $F_\gamma^{int}$  in the energy range  $100 \text{ GeV} \leq E_\gamma \leq 18 \text{ TeV}$ .

In Fig. 1 we have shown the predicted spectra for  $\delta = 2.5, 1.7$  and  $1.2$  by taking into account the effective area of the LHAASO-WCDA detector and fixing  $N_\gamma = 5500$ . The relative energy resolution of LHAASO-WCDA is  $\simeq 50\%$  at energies around 18 TeV (Fig. 26 of Chapter 1 of Cao et al. (2022)). For  $\delta = 2.5$  the flux starts from a maximum value of  $F_\gamma \sim 10^{-8} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at  $E_\gamma = 100$  GeV, and decreases slowly up to  $\sim 4$  TeV. Beyond  $\sim 4$  TeV it falls faster due to the EBL effect. The spectrum intersects with the sensitivity curve of LHAASO with 2000 s exposure at  $E_{cut} = 9.94$  TeV which is at the lower edge of the energy resolution (at 9 TeV). The  $\delta = 2.5$  value implies  $\beta = 0.5$  with the intrinsic flux  $F_{in} \propto E_{\gamma, TeV}^{0.5}$ . This corresponds to seed photons in the lower tail region of the SSC spectrum in the GRB jet. The accelerated high energy protons in the jet interact with these seed photons to produce VHE gamma-rays, a situation very similar to the VHE flaring of HBLs.

We repeat the calculation for  $\delta = 1.7$  which corresponds to  $\beta = -0.3$ . As discussed previously, negative value of the seed photon spectral index  $\beta$  corresponds to photons in the descending part of the synchrotron spectrum towards higher  $\epsilon_\gamma$  values and  $\Phi_\gamma \propto \epsilon_\gamma^{-0.3}$ . Thus, in this case, the high energy protons interact with the seed photons in the synchrotron regime of the external forward shock region to produce gamma-rays. The spectrum starts with  $F_\gamma \sim 10^{-9} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  at  $E_\gamma = 100$  GeV and increases very slowly up to  $\sim 4$  TeV and then falls faster as the exponentially decaying term from the EBL dominates. The curve intersects with the LHAASO sensitivity curve at  $E_{cut} = 11.53$  TeV. The intrinsic flux increases as  $F_{in} \propto E_{\gamma, TeV}^{1.3}$ .

Finally, we consider a smaller value of  $\delta = 1.2$  which is shown in Fig. 1. This value of  $\delta$  gives  $\beta = -0.8$ . In the photohadronic context, this corresponds to  $\Phi_\gamma \propto \epsilon_\gamma^{-0.8}$  which is the descending part of the synchrotron spectrum towards higher  $\epsilon_\gamma$  values like the ones for  $\delta = 1.7$ . However, in this case, the seed synchrotron spectrum in the external forward shock region falls faster than the one for  $\delta = 1.7$ . The spectrum increases and reaches a maximum flux at  $E_\gamma \sim 4.5$  TeV, and then decreases exponentially for large values of  $E_\gamma$  intersecting the LHAASO curve at  $E_{cut} = 12.44$  TeV. The intrinsic flux in this case behaves like  $E_{\gamma, TeV}^{1.8}$ .

We repeat the calculation by using the effective area of LHAASO-KM2A for  $\delta = 2.5, 1.7, 1.2$  and  $N_\gamma = 5500$ . The results are shown in Fig 2. For 18 TeV photons the relative energy resolution of LHAASO-KM2A is  $\simeq 36\%$  (Fig. 2,



**Figure 2.** This is same as Fig. 1 but using the detector area of LHAASO-KM2A and the shaded region here is  $\pm 36\%$  relative energy resolution of LHAASO-KM2A for  $E_\gamma \simeq 18$  TeV.


**Table 1.** Using the LHAASO-WCDA ( $30^\circ \leq \theta \leq 45^\circ$ ) and LHAASO-KM2A effective detector areas and different values of  $\delta$  and number of events,  $N_\gamma$ , we have calculated the flux normalization factor  $F_0$  in units of  $10^{-8} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , the integrated flux  $F_\gamma^{int}$  in units of  $10^{-8} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , in the energy range 100 GeV to 18 TeV along with the corresponding luminosity  $L_{\gamma,48}$  in units of  $10^{48} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ .  $E_{cut}$  is the value of  $E_\gamma$  in TeV unit where it intersects with the LHAASO sensitivity curve with 2000 s exposure time. The bracketed values are the results using the LHAASO-KM2A detector area.

$\delta$	$N_\gamma$	$F_0$	$F_\gamma^{int}$	$L_{\gamma,48}$	$E_{cut}$
2.5	5500	2.11 (0.54)	2.49 (0.63)	1.63 (0.41)	9.94 (8.17)
	6500	2.50 (0.63)	2.95 (0.75)	1.92 (0.49)	10.18 (8.41)
1.7	5500	1.41 (0.48)	1.22 (0.41)	0.80 (0.27)	11.53 (10.48)
	6500	1.67 (0.56)	1.44 (0.49)	0.94 (0.32)	11.70 (10.63)
1.2	5500	0.92 (0.36)	1.07 (0.42)	0.70 (0.27)	12.44 (11.32)
	6500	1.08 (0.42)	1.26 (0.50)	0.83 (0.32)	12.55 (11.50)

Chapter 1 of Cao et al. (2022)) which put the observed photon energy in the range 11.52 TeV to 24.48 TeV. For a given  $\delta$ , both LHAASO-WCDA and LHAASO-KM2A spectra the pattern is similar but the  $E_{cut}$  value for LHAASO-KM2A is smaller than that of LHAASO-WCDA. Also, the  $E_{cut}$  for LHAASO-KM2A is less than 11.52 TeV which shows that LHAASO-KM2A may not be able to detect these photons.

To account for the behavior of the VHE spectrum for different  $N_\gamma$ , we fix  $N_\gamma = 5500$  and 6500 to calculate  $F_0$ , the integrated flux  $F_\gamma^{int}$ , the luminosity  $L_\gamma$  and  $E_{cut}$  values using the effective areas of the detectors LHAASO-WCDA and LHAASO-KM2A detectors. These are given in Table 1. The results of LHAASO-KM2A are the bracketed values in the table. It can be seen that increasing  $N_\gamma$  from 5500 to 6500 leads to increment in all quantities. This implies that by knowing  $N_\gamma$  and the maximum value of  $E_\gamma$  we can predict the VHE gamma-ray spectrum, provided the EBL contribution is well understood.

For a given value of  $N_\gamma$ , the  $E_{cut}$  value increases and approaches  $\sim 18$  TeV as  $\delta$  decreases from 2.5 to 1.2. Moreover, by further decreasing  $\delta$ , one can reach  $E_{cut} \sim 18$  TeV which corresponds to a very stiff synchrotron spectrum and may be problematic. Also, for a given  $\delta$ , by increasing  $N_\gamma$ , the  $E_{cut}$  value increases. From our analysis we observed that, the LHAASO-WCDA is more likely to observe photons of energy  $\sim 18$  TeV than the LHAASO-KM2A. From the dependence of  $E_{cut}$  on  $\delta$  we infer that the interaction of high energy protons with the descending part of the synchrotron



**Figure 3.** The percentage of chance probability for  $N_\gamma \geq 1$  for  $E_\gamma = 18$  TeV is plotted as a function of  $\sigma$ .

seed photon spectrum is more likely to produce  $\sim 18$  TeV photons than the high energy protons interaction with the low energy tail region of the seed SSC photons in the GRB jet.

Additionally, we calculate the chance probability of  $N_\gamma \geq 1$  for  $E_\gamma \sim 18$  TeV by taking the normalization constant  $F_0$  as a variable in the range  $10^{-10} \leq F_0$  (erg cm $^{-2}$  s $^{-1}$ )  $\leq 2 \times 10^{-7}$  for a fixed  $\delta = 1.2$ . We fix the total number of observed photons above 500 GeV to be 5500 and  $T = 2000$  s. We assume that the noise in the data has a Gaussian distribution with an unknown standard deviation of  $\sigma$  and variance  $\sigma^2$  (Gregory 2010). Bayesian inference is implemented by using the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) method to estimate the posterior probability distribution function (PDF) as a function of  $F_0$  for a given  $\sigma$  value. This we have done for  $\sigma$  in the range  $100 \leq \sigma \leq 1500$ . Using the PDFs for different  $\sigma$  values and  $E_\gamma \sim 18$  TeV we evaluate

$$N_\gamma(E_\gamma) = T \int_{(1-\delta_E/2)E_\gamma}^{(1+\delta_E/2)E_\gamma} \frac{dN_\gamma}{dE'_\gamma} A(E'_\gamma, \theta) e^{-\tau_\gamma(E'_\gamma)} dE'_\gamma, \quad (6)$$

using the Monte Carlo simulation. Here  $\delta_E = 0.5$  is the value for the 50% uncertainty in the energy around 18 TeV for the LHAASO-WCDA. For a given value of  $\sigma$  we repeat the procedure for  $10^6$  times. This way we obtain the percentage of chance probability of  $N_\gamma \geq 1 = 10^{-4} \times \text{No. of times } N_\gamma(18 \text{ TeV}) \geq 1$ . The results are plotted in Fig. 3. It is observed that if the posterior PDF is symmetric around the mid-point, then the percentage of chance probability of detection of  $N_\gamma \geq 1$  is very small. Similarly, for an asymmetric PDF with the weight factor leaning more towards smaller values of  $F_0$ , the percentage of chance probability is also very small. However, for the asymmetric PDFs with the weight factor leaning more towards larger values of  $F_0$ , the percentage of chance probability is large with a maximum value of 40%.

#### 4. CONCLUSION



In conclusion, the recent observation of  $\sim 18$  TeV photons by LHAASO from GRB 221009A sheds doubts on the applicability of the well-known EBL models for photons of energy  $> 10$  TeV at a redshift of  $\gtrsim 0.151$  even though these EBL models work very well in explaining the VHE spectra of so many other TeV sources. This incompatibility has led towards new physics solutions. However, there is still a conventional way to delve into the problem, which we proposed here. We argue that high energy protons interacting with the synchrotron photon background in the GRB jet will be able to produce photons of energy close to 18 TeV. Assuming that the error in the data has a Gaussian distribution and using the area of LHAASO-WCDA, we obtain maximum 40% chance probability of observing  $N_\gamma \geq 1$  for  $E_\gamma \sim 18$  TeV. Our analysis shows that LHAASO-WCDA is more likely to observe photons of energy  $\sim 18$  TeV than the LHAASO-KM2A. We anticipate that the publication of GRB 221009A results should be able to either confirm or rule out either most or all of the explanations discussed here.

The authors are indebted to Miguel Enrique Iglesias Martínez and Jose Guerra Carmona for helping in the Bayesian analysis. We are also thankful to the anonymous referee for making useful suggestions. S.S. is thankful to S. Salokya for reading the manuscript. The work of S.S. is partially supported by DGAPA-UNAM (Mexico) Projects No. IN103522. B. M-C and G. S-C would like to thank CONACyT (México) for partial support. Partial support from CSU-Long Beach is gratefully acknowledged.

## REFERENCES

- 
- Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Allafort, A., et al. 2012, *Science*, 338, 1190, doi: [10.1126/science.1227160](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1227160)
- Alves Batista, R. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.12855>
- Atteia, J.-L. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32793
- Baktash, A., Horns, D., & Meyer, M. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.07172. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.07172>
- Bissaldi, E., Omodei, N., & Kerr, M. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32637
- Brdar, V., & Li, Y.-Y. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.02028>
- Cao, Z., et al. 2022, *Chin. Phys. C*, 46, 035001. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1905.02773>
- Cheung, K. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.14178>
- Cortina, J. 2005, *Astrophys. Space Sci.*, 297, 245, doi: [10.1007/s10509-005-7627-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10509-005-7627-5)
- Das, S., & Razzaque, S. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.13349>
- de Ugarte Postigo, A., Izzo, L., Pugliese, G., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32648
- Dermer, C. D., & Schlickeiser, R. 1993, *ApJ*, 416, 458, doi: [10.1086/173251](https://doi.org/10.1086/173251)
- Dominguez, A., et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 410, 2556, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17631.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2010.17631.x)
- Dzhappuev, D. D., Afashokov, Y. Z., Dzaparova, I. M., et al. 2022, *The Astronomer's Telegram*, 15669, 1
- Finke, J. D., & Razzaque, S. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.11261. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11261>
- Fraija, N., Gonzalez, M., & HAWC Collaboration. 2022, *The Astronomer's Telegram*, 15675, 1
- Franceschini, A., Rodighiero, G., & Vaccari, M. 2008, *A&A*, 487, 837, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:200809691](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:200809691)
- Frederiks, D., A.Lysenko, Ridnaia, A., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32668
- Galanti, G., Roncadelli, M., & Tavecchio, F. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.05659. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.05659>
- Gehrels, N., & Razzaque, S. 2013, *Front. Phys. (Beijing)*, 8, 661, doi: [10.1007/s11467-013-0282-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11467-013-0282-3)
- Gotz, D., Mereghetti, S., Savchenko, V., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32660
- Gregory, P. 2010, *Bayesian Logical Data Analysis for the Physical Sciences*, Cambridge University Press, UK
- Hauser, M. G., & Dwek, E. 2001, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, 39, 249, doi: [10.1146/annurev.astro.39.1.249](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.astro.39.1.249)
- Hayes, L. A., & Gallagher, P. T. 2022, *Research Notes of the AAS*, 6, 222, doi: [10.3847/2515-5172/ac9d2f](https://doi.org/10.3847/2515-5172/ac9d2f)
- Hinton, J. A. 2004, *New Astron. Rev.*, 48, 331, doi: [10.1016/j.newar.2003.12.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newar.2003.12.004)
- Holder, J., et al. 2009, *AIP Conf. Proc.*, 1085, 657, doi: [10.1063/1.3076760](https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3076760)
- Huang, Y., Hu, S., Chen, S., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32677
- Kann, D. A., & Agui, J. F. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32762
- Krimm, H. A., Barthelmy, S. D., Dichiaro, S., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32688
- Lapshov, I., Molkov, S., Mereminsky, I., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32663
- Li, H., & Ma, B.-Q. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.06338. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.06338>
- Lin, W., & Yanagida, T. T. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.08841. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.08841>
- Meegan, C., Lichti, G., Bhat, P. N., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 702, 791, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/702/1/791](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/702/1/791)
- Mirabal, N. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.14243. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.14243>
- Mitchell, L. J., Philips, B. F., Johnson, W., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32746

- Murase, K., Mukhopadhyay, M., Kheirandish, A., Kimura, S. S., & Fang, K. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.15625. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.15625>
- Nakagawa, S., Takahashi, F., Yamada, M., & Yin, W. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.10022>
- Nemmen, R. S., Georganopoulos, M., Guiriec, S., et al. 2012, *Science*, 338, 1445, doi: [10.1126/science.1227416](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1227416)
- Piano, G., Verrecchia, F., Bulgarelli, A., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32657
- Pillera, R., Bissaldi, E., Omodei, N., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32658
- Ripa, J., Pal, A., Werner, N., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32685
- Sahu, S. 2019, *Rev. Mex. Fis.*, 65, 307, doi: [10.31349/revmexfis.65.307](https://doi.org/10.31349/revmexfis.65.307)
- Sahu, S., Fortín, C. E. L., & Nagataki, S. 2019, *ApJ.*, 884, L17, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab43c7](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab43c7)
- Sahu, S., & Fortín, C. E. L. 2020, *ApJL.*, 895, L41, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab93da](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab93da)
- Sahu, S., & López Fortín, C. E. 2020, *ApJL.*, 895, L41, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab93da](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab93da)
- Sahu, S., López Fortín, C. E., Iglesias Martínez, M. E., Nagataki, S., & Fernández de Córdoba, P. 2020, *MNRAS.*, 492, 2261, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa023](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa023)
- Sahu, S., Polanco, I. A. V., & Rajpoot, S. 2022, *ApJ.*, 929, 70, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac5cc6](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac5cc6)
- S.Dichiara, Gropp, J. D., Kennea, J., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32632
- Stecker, F. W., de Jager, O. C., & Salamon, M. H. 1992, *ApJL*, 390, L49, doi: [10.1086/186369](https://doi.org/10.1086/186369)
- Troitsky, S. V. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.09250. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.09250>
- Urry, C. M., & Padovani, P. 1995, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 107, 803, doi: [10.1086/133630](https://doi.org/10.1086/133630)
- Ursi, A., Panebianco, G., Pittori, C., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32650
- Veres, P., Burns, E., Bissaldi, E., et al. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32636
- Wang, J., & Wei, J. Y. 2011, *ApJL*, 726, L4, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/726/1/L4](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/726/1/L4)
- Wu, Q., Zhang, B., Lei, W.-H., et al. 2016, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 455, L1, doi: [10.1093/mnras/slv136](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/slv136)
- Wu, Q., Zou, Y.-C., Cao, X., Wang, D.-X., & Chen, L. 2011, *ApJL.*, 740, L21, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/740/1/L21](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/740/1/L21)
- Xiao, H., Krucker, S., & Daniel, R. 2022, *GCN Circ.* 32661
- Zhao, Z.-C., Zhou, Y., & Wang, S. 2022. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.10778>
- Zhu, J., & Ma, B.-Q. 2022, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2210.11376. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11376>