

# High-energy neutrinos and gamma rays from winds and tori in active galactic nuclei

Susumu Inoue,<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup> Matteo Cerruti,<sup>4,5,†</sup> Kohta Murase,<sup>6,7,8,‡</sup> and Ruo-Yu Liu<sup>9,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Faculty of Education, Bunkyo University, Koshigaya, Japan*

<sup>2</sup>*Astrophysical Big Bang Laboratory, RIKEN, Wako, Japan*

<sup>3</sup>*Interdisciplinary Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences Program (iTHEMS), RIKEN, Wako, Japan*

<sup>4</sup>*Université Paris Cité, CNRS, Astroparticule et Cosmologie, F-75013 Paris, France*

<sup>5</sup>*Universitat de Barcelona, ICCUB, IEEC-UB, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain*

<sup>6</sup>*Department of Physics; Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics,  
Center for Multimessenger Astrophysics of Institute for Gravitation  
and the Cosmos, Penn State University, University Park, USA*

<sup>7</sup>*School of Natural Sciences, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, New Jersey 08540, USA*

<sup>8</sup>*Yukawa Institute of Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan*

<sup>9</sup>*Nanjing University, Nanjing, China*

(Dated: December 23, 2022)

Powerful winds with wide opening angles, likely driven by accretion disks around black holes (BHs), are observed in the majority of active galactic nuclei (AGN) and can play a crucial role in AGN and galaxy evolution. If protons are accelerated in the wind near the BH via diffusive shock acceleration,  $p\gamma$  processes with AGN photons generate neutrinos as well as pair cascade emission from the gamma-ray to radio bands. The TeV neutrinos detected by IceCube from the obscured Seyfert galaxy NGC 1068 can be interpreted consistently if the shock velocity is appreciably lower than the local escape velocity, which may correspond to a failed, line-driven wind that is physically well motivated. Although the  $p\gamma$ -induced cascade is  $\gamma\gamma$ -attenuated above a few MeV, it can still contribute significantly to the sub-GeV gamma rays observed from NGC 1068. At higher energies, gamma rays can arise via  $pp$  processes from a shock where an outgoing wind impacts the obscuring torus, along with some observable radio emission. Tests and implications of this model are discussed. Neutrinos and gamma rays may offer unique probes of AGN wind launching sites, particularly for objects obscured in other forms of radiation.

Active galactic nuclei (AGN) are likely powered mainly by accretion disks around supermassive black holes (BHs) [1]. Less than 10% of all AGN in the present Universe are of the radio-loud class that produce powerful, collimated jets of plasma with ultra-relativistic outflow velocities [2]. The majority of AGN are instead classified as radio-quiet and do not possess prominent jets. Nonetheless, there is widespread evidence that most AGN can eject winds of thermal plasma with wide opening angles ( $2\theta_w \gtrsim 60$ -100 deg) and a range of outflow velocities ( $v_w \sim$  few 100 km/s -  $0.4c$ ), observable as blue-shifted atomic absorption features in the ultraviolet (UV) to X-ray bands [3–5]. The fastest winds in X-rays are known as ultrafast outflows (UFOs) and seen in  $\gtrsim 40\%$  of all nearby AGN, of both radio-loud and radio-quiet types [6, 7]. Inferred to occur on sub-pc scales, their kinetic power can reach a substantial fraction ( $L_w \lesssim 20$ -40%) of the bolometric luminosity  $L_{\text{bol}}$  [8, 9]. In relatively nearby AGN, winds can also be discerned in the kinematics of their narrow emission line regions (NLR) on sub-kpc scales [3] [10].

Such AGN-driven winds may be launched from accretion disks by mechanisms involving radiative and/or magnetic processes [5, 11]. Winds are potentially ubiquitous in AGN with sufficiently high Eddington parameter  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$  (ratio of AGN bolometric luminosity  $L_{\text{bol}}$  to Eddington luminosity [12]) [13]. AGN winds may play crucial roles in the collimation of jets in radio-loud AGN [2], as well as in the evolution of supermassive BHs and

their host galaxies through their feedback effects onto their environment [10, 14, 15].

The kinetic energy of AGN winds may be partly dissipated and channelled into high-energy electrons and protons via mechanisms such as diffusive shock acceleration (DSA) [16, 17]. This can induce non-thermal emission, e.g. from external shocks where the wind interacts with the host galaxy gas [18–21]. Despite some tentative evidence [22, 23], such emission is yet to be clearly observed.

Also likely generic to all relatively luminous AGN is a geometrically thick torus of dusty, clumpy gas surrounding the nucleus on pc scales [24, 25]. Depending on its inclination relative to the observer, such tori can substantially absorb the optical to X-ray emission from the accretion disk, resulting in the known differences between type-1 (unobscured) and type-2 (obscured) AGN. The absorbed energy is reprocessed into the observed infrared (IR) emission [26].

NGC 1068, an archetypal type-2 Seyfert galaxy at distance  $D \sim 12$ -16 Mpc [27], is a known source of GeV gamma rays [28] as well as TeV neutrinos [29, 30]. Although UV-X-ray signatures of winds on sub-pc scales are unobservable due to high obscuration by its torus [31–33], its NLR on larger scales exhibit an outflow with  $v_{w,\text{NLR}} \lesssim 2000$  km/s and  $L_{w,\text{NLR}} \lesssim 10^{43}$  erg/s, likely driven by the accretion disk [34–38]. The nature of the gamma rays detected by Fermi-LAT at energies  $E_\gamma \sim 0.1 - 20$  GeV [28] is unclear, exceeding the inferred

level associated with star formation in the host galaxy (i.e.  $pp$   $\pi^0$ -decay gamma rays from interaction of cosmic rays from supernovae and interstellar gas) [39, 40].

Neutrino observations by IceCube [30] reveal that the most significant position in the northern hemisphere in a full-sky scan is coincident with that of NGC 1068. Independently, a  $4.2\sigma$  excess over background expectations is found at its position in a source catalog search. The spectrum is quite soft, with muon neutrino flux best fit as  $f_{\nu\mu} \propto \varepsilon_\nu^{-3.2}$  at energies  $\varepsilon_\nu \sim 1.5$ -15 TeV, and inferred luminosity  $\varepsilon_\nu dL_{\nu\mu}/d\varepsilon_\nu \sim 3 \times 10^{42}$  erg/s in this range. Meanwhile, upper limits for gamma rays above 0.2 TeV [41] rule out models in which TeV gamma rays and neutrinos escape the source with similar flux [42]. Some recent proposals invoke proton acceleration and neutrino production in hot coronal regions near the BH where X-rays are emitted via thermal Comptonization, either accretion disk coronae [43, 44] or accretion shocks [45, 46], or that accompanying gamma rays would be significantly absorbed via  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions with AGN photons [10].

Here we propose an alternative picture where protons are accelerated in the inner regions of the wind relatively near the BH in NGC 1068, which has various advantages over the coronal region models [10]. DSA, a well established mechanism for particle acceleration, is assumed. This region may be identified with a “failed” wind that is plausibly expected in radiative, line-driven wind models for the conditions corresponding to NGC 1068 [47]. Neutrinos are mainly generated via  $p\gamma$  interactions with the AGN radiation, while  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions mediate the associated pair cascade emission, which we evaluate across the full EM spectrum. For the GeV gamma rays, we invoke a separate region where the wind interacts with the torus, accelerates protons via DSA and induces  $pp$  interactions with the torus gas. This allows GeV photons to escape, while TeV photons are  $\gamma\gamma$ -absorbed by IR photons from the torus. All relevant emission processes are modeled self-consistently with a detailed numerical code. We use the notation  $X_a = X/10^a$  for normalized variables.

**Formulation.** DSA at collisionless shock waves with sufficiently high Mach numbers can convey a sizable fraction of the energy of bulk plasma motion into that of non-thermal particles [16, 17]. In the inner regions of AGN winds near the BH, shocks may naturally form [48] in failed winds that are robustly expected in models of line-driven winds from the accretion disk [49–53], particularly for the BH mass  $M_{\text{BH}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$  inferred for NGC 1068 [10, 47]. Such flows are initially launched from the inner parts of the disk (typically at radii  $R \lesssim 100R_s$ , where  $R_s = 2GM_{\text{BH}}/c^2$  is the Schwarzschild radius), but do not reach the escape velocity  $v_{\text{esc}} = (2GM_{\text{BH}}/R)^{1/2}$  due to overionization [10] and eventually fall back, thereby interacting with gas flowing out subsequently. Henceforth we assume that protons are accelerated by DSA in the inner regions of the wind, with the total proton power  $L_p$  as a parameter.

At the same time, a successful wind exceeding  $v_{\text{esc}}$  can be line-driven from the outer parts of the disk, mainly in the equatorial direction that is shielded from ionization [10]. This outer wind can propagate farther and impact the torus [37, 54], potentially inducing strong shocks and DSA of protons [55], for which we assume a total proton power  $L_{p,o}$ . The model geometry is illustrated in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1. Schematic sketch of the model. The accretion disk around the black hole (BH) drives an outflowing wind. Inner region: winds from the inner disk dissipate their kinetic energy via shocks near the BH, caused by failed line-driven winds that fall back. Protons undergo diffusive shock acceleration (DSA) and  $p\gamma$  interactions with photons from the disk and corona, inducing neutrino and electromagnetic cascade emission, modulated by  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions. Outer region: successful winds from the outer disk propagate farther, partially impact the torus and trigger shocks. Protons undergo DSA and  $pp$  interactions with the torus gas, inducing gamma-ray emission, affected by  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions with photons from the torus. Indicated scales are only approximate.

Employing a numerical code that builds on previous work [56, 57], we model the multi-messenger (MM) emission induced by a population of high-energy protons interacting with magnetic fields, radiation and/or gas [10]. For either the inner region of the failed wind or the outer region of the wind-torus interaction, the emission region is a uniform, stationary sphere of radius  $R_x$  with a tangled magnetic field of amplitude  $B_x$ , through which all charged particles are advected with the bulk flow velocity  $v_{r,x}$ . The index  $x$  is denoted  $o$  for the outer region, while it is dropped when referring to the inner region.

The inner region is permeated by radiation from the AGN that are the dominant targets for  $p\gamma$  and  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions as well as seed photons for inverse Compton (IC) processes. Adopting  $D = 14$  Mpc, its spectrum is of a standard, geometrically thin accretion disk [12, 58] around a BH with  $M_{\text{BH}} = 3 \times 10^7 M_\odot$  [59, 60], peaking in the optical-UV at  $\varepsilon_{\text{disk}} \simeq 32$  eV with total luminosity  $L_{\text{disk}} \simeq L_{\text{bol}} = 10^{45}$  erg/s [61] (implying  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} \simeq 0.27$ ), plus an X-ray emitting corona with photon index  $\Gamma_{\text{cor}} = 2$ , exponential cutoff energy  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}} = 128$  keV [31] and 2-10 keV luminosity  $L_{\text{cor},2-10} = 7 \times 10^{43}$  erg/s [32], adopting parameters consistent with observations

of NGC 1068 [10] (Fig.2). We neglect  $pp$  interactions for the inner region, although they can be relevant if dense clouds exist in the wind [62].

The outer region is the part of the torus that interacts strongly with the outer wind, mostly where the latter grazes the torus funnel, rather than near the disk where gas must be inflowing [37] (Fig.1). It contains gas with average density  $n_o$  as  $pp$  targets, and is also immersed in thermal radiation that serve mainly as  $\gamma\gamma$  targets, emitted from the inner torus of radius  $R_{\text{tor}} = 0.1 \text{ pc} \gtrsim R_o$  and temperature  $T_{\text{tor}} = 1000 \text{ K}$ , as constrained by near IR observations of NGC 1068 [10, 37, 63]. We also set  $v_o = 5000 \text{ km/s}$  for physical consistency with an outer, successful wind in scenarios of line-driven winds [47].

For each region, protons are injected with total power  $L_{p,x}$  and a power-law distribution in energy,  $dN_p/dE_p \propto E_p^{-2}$ , from  $E_{p,\text{min}} = m_p c^2$  up to an exponential cutoff characterized by  $E_{p,\text{max},x}$  [64]. Subsequent  $p\gamma$  (photomeson and photopair or Bethe-Heitler; BeH) and/or  $pp$  interactions lead to production of secondary hadrons, leptons and photons, of which charged pions and muons decay into neutrinos. Photons with sufficient energy trigger pair cascades via  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions. The charged particles generate photons by synchrotron and IC processes. The steady state distribution of all particles and the resulting MM emission are obtained self-consistently by solving the coupled kinetic equations that account for their radiative losses and advective escape [10] [65]. As  $v_{r,x} < c$ , Doppler effects are weak, and the emission is quasi-isotropic [66].

The value of  $E_{p,\text{max},x}$  is set where DSA is limited by the available time or radiative losses,  $t_{\text{acc},x}(E_p) = \min[t_{\text{dyn},x}, t_{\text{rad},x}(E_p)]$ , where  $t_{\text{acc},x}(E_p) = (10/3)(c\eta_{g,x}E_p/eB_x v_{r,x}^2)$  is the DSA timescale and  $\eta_{g,x} \gtrsim 1$  parameterizes the strength of magnetic turbulence [67],  $t_{\text{dyn},x} = R_x/v_{r,x}$  is the dynamical timescale, and  $t_{\text{rad},x}(E_p)$  is the radiative loss timescale, primarily photopion and BeH losses for the inner region,  $t_{\text{rad}} = (t_{p\gamma\pi}^{-1} + t_{\text{BeH}}^{-1})^{-1}$ , and  $pp$  loss for the outer region,  $t_{\text{rad},o} = t_{pp}$ .

The main parameters are  $R$ ,  $v_r$ ,  $B$ ,  $\eta_g$ ,  $L_p$  for the inner region and  $R_o$ ,  $n_o$ ,  $B_o$ ,  $L_{p,o}$  for the outer region [68]. These are adjusted to best describe the MM data, also considering physical plausibility. Relative to the power of the inner failed wind  $L_{fw}$ ,  $L_p = \epsilon_p L_{fw}$  with  $\epsilon_p \lesssim 0.3$  [69] and  $B^2/8\pi = \epsilon_B L_{fw}/4\pi c R^2$  with  $\epsilon_B \lesssim 0.5$  may be physically reasonable. Although  $L_{fw}$  is not directly constrained from observations, arising from the innermost disk regions where the most gravitational energy is dissipated, we posit that  $L_{fw} \sim 0.3 L_{\text{bol}}$  can be realized, as seen in some UFOs [8, 9] as well as in numerical simulations of line-driven winds for high  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$  [53]. With  $L_{fw} = 3 \times 10^{44} \text{ erg/s}$ ,  $B(R) = (2\epsilon_B L_{fw}/cR^2)^{1/2} \simeq 510 \text{ G} \epsilon_{B,-1}^{1/2} \bar{R}_1^{-1}$ , where  $\bar{R} = R/R_s$  and  $R_s = 0.89 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}$  [10]. Meanwhile,  $L_{p,o} = f_p L_{w,o}$  is observationally constrained to some extent, as the power in the outer, successful wind  $L_{w,o} \gtrsim L_{w,\text{NLR}} \simeq 10^{43} \text{ erg/s}$ .

**Analytic estimates.** First we conduct analytic estimates [10] that justify our choice of parameters and are generally consistent with our numerical results. Photopion interactions for protons with  $E_p$  occur typically against photons with energy  $\varepsilon \simeq 1.4 \times 10^{17} \text{ eV}^2 E_p^{-1}$  [70], inducing neutrinos with  $\varepsilon_\nu \simeq 0.05 E_p$ . For the TeV-range neutrinos observed from NGC 1068, we require  $E_p \sim 20 \text{ TeV}(\varepsilon_\nu/1 \text{ TeV})$  and  $\varepsilon \sim 7 \text{ keV}(E_p/20 \text{ TeV})^{-1}$ , i.e. X-rays as the main  $p\gamma$  targets. For our assumed corona spectrum, the photon density per log  $\varepsilon$  at  $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_{\text{cor}}$  in the inner region  $n_{\text{cor}}(\varepsilon) \simeq 4.6 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3} \bar{R}_1^{-2} (\varepsilon/2 \text{ keV})^{-1}$  and the photopion timescale  $t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}(E_p) \simeq 5.5 \times 10^5 \text{ s} \bar{R}_1^2 (E_p/20 \text{ TeV})^{-1}$ . The typical photon energy for BeH interactions is  $\varepsilon \simeq 4.8 \times 10^{15} \text{ eV}^2 E_p^{-1}$ . For  $E_p \sim 10\text{--}10^3 \text{ TeV}$ , BeH losses with optical-UV photons from the disk can be significant [43]. Around its spectral peak, the photon density in the inner region  $n_{\text{disk}}(\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{disk}}) = 1.0 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-3} \bar{R}_1^{-2}$  and the BeH timescale  $t_{\text{BeH,disk}} \simeq 4.1 \times 10^4 \text{ s} \bar{R}_1^2$  for  $E_p \sim 150 \text{ TeV}$ , comparable to  $t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}$ .

As  $t_{\text{acc}} \simeq 1.3 \times 10^3 \text{ s} \eta_g \epsilon_{B,-1}^{-1/2} \bar{R}_1 v_{r,3}^{-2} (E_p/20 \text{ TeV})$  where  $v_{r,3} = v_r/1000 \text{ km/s}$ ,  $E_{p,\text{max}}$  is limited by  $t_{\text{rad}}$  rather than  $t_{\text{dyn}} = 0.89 \times 10^6 \text{ s} \bar{R}_1 v_{r,3}^{-1}$ . Assuming for brevity  $t_{\text{rad}} \sim (t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}^{-1} + t_{\text{BeH,disk}}^{-1})^{-1} \sim f_{\text{rad}} t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}$ ,  $E_{p,\text{max}} \simeq 190 \text{ TeV} \eta_g^{-1/2} \epsilon_{B,-1}^{1/4} f_{\text{rad},-0.3}^{1/2} \bar{R}_1^{1/2} v_{r,3}$ , so the maximum neutrino energy  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{max}} \approx 0.05 E_{p,\text{max}} \simeq 9.6 \text{ TeV} \eta_g^{-1/2} \epsilon_{B,-1}^{1/4} f_{\text{rad},-0.3}^{1/2} \bar{R}_1^{1/2} v_{r,3}$ .

Accounting for mixing among the three neutrino flavors during propagation, the neutrino luminosity per flavor per log  $\varepsilon_\nu$  is  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu) \approx (1/8) f_{p\gamma,\text{net}}(E_p = 20\varepsilon_\nu) \mathcal{L}_p(E_p = 20\varepsilon_\nu)$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_p(E_p)$  is the injected proton power per log  $E_p$  and  $f_{p\gamma,\text{net}} = t_{p\gamma\pi}^{-1} (t_{p\gamma\pi}^{-1} + t_{\text{BeH}}^{-1} + t_{\text{dyn}}^{-1})^{-1}$  is the net photopion efficiency [43]. At low  $E_p$  when  $t_{\text{dyn}} \ll t_{p\gamma\pi}, t_{\text{BeH}}$ , protons are unaffected by  $p\gamma$  losses, and neutrinos are produced inefficiently with  $f_{p\gamma,\text{net}} \ll 1$ . Since  $t_{p\gamma\pi} \propto E_p^{-1}$  for  $E_p \gtrsim 1 \text{ TeV}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_p \propto E_p^0$  for  $E_p \ll E_{p,\text{max}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu) \propto \varepsilon_\nu (f_{\nu_\mu} \propto \varepsilon_\nu^{-1})$ . At higher  $E_p$  when  $t_{p\gamma\pi}, t_{\text{BeH}} \ll t_{\text{dyn}}$ ,  $p\gamma$  losses steepen the steady-state proton spectrum. Assuming  $t_{\text{rad}} \sim f_{\text{rad}} t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu) \propto \varepsilon_\nu^0 \exp(-\varepsilon_\nu/\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{max}})$  ( $f_{\nu_\mu} \propto \varepsilon_\nu^{-2} \exp(-\varepsilon_\nu/\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{max}})$ ), roughly similar to the spectrum of injected protons.

The neutrino luminosity generally peaks at  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{br}} \approx 0.05 E_{p,\text{br}} \simeq 0.62 \text{ TeV} \bar{R}_1 v_{r,3}$ , where the proton break energy  $E_{p,\text{br}} \simeq 13 \text{ TeV} \bar{R}_1 v_{r,3}$  can be estimated from  $t_{\text{rad}}(E_p) = t_{\text{dyn}}$  with  $t_{\text{rad}} \sim t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}$  as suitable for this  $E_p$  range (Fig. 3). To plausibly account for the neutrinos observed from NGC 1068,  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{br}} < 1 \text{ TeV}$  is required so that most can be produced with optimal efficiency ( $f_{p\gamma,\text{net}} \sim 1$ ) for given  $L_p$  in the conditions inferred for NGC 1068. This constrains the combination  $Rv_r$  such that  $v_r \lesssim 1600 \text{ km/s} \bar{R}_1^{-1}$ , which is always much less than  $v_{\text{esc}} \simeq 0.94 \times 10^5 \text{ km/s} \bar{R}_1^{-1/2}$ . This is the main motivation for invoking the failed wind regions predicted in line-driven models of AGN winds, where  $v_r \lesssim v_{\text{esc}}$  can be realized



[47] [71]. Approximating  $\mathcal{L}_p \sim L_p \ln(E_{p,\max}/E_{p,\min})$ , to reproduce  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu = 1 \text{ TeV}) \sim 10^{42} \text{ erg/s}$  as observed,  $L_p \sim 8f_{pp,\text{net}}^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu} \ln(10^6) \sim 10^{44} \text{ erg/s}$ , which is somewhat optimistic but within a plausible range, as discussed above. With other parameters fixed,  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\max}$  is plausibly highest when  $\epsilon_B = 0.5$  and  $\eta_g = 1$ . Somewhat lower  $\epsilon_B$  and/or higher  $\eta_g$  give lower  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\max}$  that may be more compatible with the current IceCube data [44].

The optical depth for  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions with corona photons  $\tau_{\gamma\gamma,\text{cor}}(\varepsilon) \simeq 410(\varepsilon/1\text{GeV})\bar{R}_1^{-1}$  [10], so gamma rays co-produced with neutrinos are attenuated above a few MeV, similar to the coronal region models.

For the outer torus region,  $E_{p,\max,o} \sim 460 \text{ TeV} \eta_{g,o}^{-1}(B_o/1 \text{ mG})(R_o/0.1 \text{ pc})$ , limited by  $t_{\text{dyn},o} = R_o/v_o \simeq 6.2 \times 10^8 \text{ s}(R_o/0.1 \text{ pc})$ . The  $pp$  gamma-ray luminosity per  $\log \varepsilon$  is  $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varepsilon) \approx (1/3)2f_{pp,\text{net}}\mathcal{L}_p(E_p = 10\varepsilon)$  [10] where the net  $pp$  efficiency  $f_{pp,\text{net}} = t_{pp}^{-1}(t_{pp}^{-1} + t_{\text{dyn}}^{-1})^{-1}$  and the  $pp$  loss timescale  $t_{pp} \simeq 1.6 \times 10^9 \text{ s}(n_o/10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3})^{-1}$  [72]. Reproducing  $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varepsilon = 1 \text{ GeV}) \sim 3 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg/s}$  as observed [28] is feasible with e.g.  $R_o = 0.1 \text{ pc}$ ,  $n_o = 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$  and  $L_p \sim 3f_{pp,\text{net}}^{-1}\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu} \ln(10^6) \sim 2.5 \times 10^{42}(f_{pp,\text{net}}/0.5)^{-1} \text{ erg/s}$ . An ambient blackbody radiation field with  $T_{\text{tor}} = 1000 \text{ K}$  and  $R_{\text{tor}} = 0.1 \text{ pc}$  implies  $\tau_{\gamma\gamma,\text{tor}} \gtrsim 1$  for  $\varepsilon \gtrsim 0.2 \text{ TeV}$  [10], consistent with TeV observations [41] [73].

**Numerical results.** Numerical calculations generally confirm our analytic estimates for the neutrinos, and also allow detailed studies of the broadband EM emission caused by complex hadronic cascade processes. Guided by the estimates above, we fiducially adopt for the inner region  $R = 10R_s \simeq 0.89 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}$ ,  $v_r = 1000 \text{ km/s}$ ,  $B = 510 \text{ G}$  ( $\epsilon_B = 0.1$ ) and  $\eta_g = 4$ , the latter two implying  $E_{p,\max} \simeq 97 \text{ TeV}$  [74]. We also study other sets of  $R$  and  $v_r$  that keep  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{br}} \propto Rv_r$  constant as well as a range of  $B$  and  $\eta_g$ , as  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\max}$  is observationally less constrained. Comparison with MM data then sets  $L_p$ , which is fiducially  $L_p = 10^{44} \text{ erg/s}$ ; much higher values will be energetically demanding. For the outer region, we choose  $R_o = 0.1 \text{ pc}$  and  $n_o = 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ , and adjust  $B_o$  and  $L_{p,o}$  to be consistent with the EM data.

Fig. 2 presents the fiducial numerical results compared with the available MM data for NGC 1068. As analytically estimated,  $p\gamma$  neutrinos from the inner region exhibit a spectral break at  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\text{br}} \sim 1 \text{ TeV}$  and a cutoff at  $\varepsilon_{\nu,\max} \sim 5 \text{ TeV}$ , generally consistent with the current IceCube data. Values of  $\eta_g \sim 1\text{--}40$  may be compatible (Fig. 6) [10]; improved constraints are anticipated via future measurements with higher statistics by IceCube-Gen2 [75]. There is also a sub-dominant contribution of  $pp$  neutrinos from the outer region.

EM emission from the inner region is dominated by the BeH cascade [79]. Despite considerable  $\gamma\gamma$  attenuation above a few MeV as expected, it is luminous enough to contribute significantly to the observed sub-GeV emission, mostly via IC upscattering of AGN pho-




FIG. 2. Model vs. observations of the multi-messenger spectrum of NGC 1068 for fiducial parameters. Inner region:  $R = 10R_s$ ,  $v_r = 1000 \text{ km/s}$ ,  $B = 510 \text{ G}$  ( $\epsilon_B = 0.1$ ),  $\eta_g = 4$ ,  $L_p = 10^{44} \text{ erg/s}$ . Outer region:  $R_o = 0.1 \text{ pc}$ ,  $n_o = 10^6 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ,  $B_o = 7 \text{ mG}$ ,  $L_{p,o} = 1.3 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg/s}$ . Total emission from the inner (red solid), outer (blue solid), and both (black solid) regions shown. Left: Electromagnetic spectrum. Components dominating each band highlighted: total  $p\gamma$  Bethe-Heitler (BeH) cascade (ochre dashed), external inverse Compton (EIC) from first-generation BeH pairs (ochre dot-dashed),  $pp \pi^0$  decay (green dotted),  $pp \pi^\pm$  decay pair synchrotron (cyan double-dot-dashed). Assumed disk+corona (cyan thin) and torus (magenta thin) components overlaid. Data plotted for radio to X-rays on sub-pc scales [76] (black circles), distinguishing bands affected by obscuration (empty circles), high resolution ALMA (ochre diamonds) [46], Fermi-LAT [77, 78] (black and magenta squares) and MAGIC [41] (blue triangles). Intrinsic X-ray flux (gray box) indicated [32]. Right: Muon neutrino spectrum. Best fit line (thick), 1- (medium) and 2- (light)  $\sigma$  error regions from IceCube denoted [30].

tons by first-generation BeH pairs [80]. At higher energies,  $pp$  gamma rays from the outer region take over, where  $L_{p,o} = 1.3 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg/s}$  [81]. Above  $\sim 0.1 \text{ TeV}$ , the  $pp$  gamma rays are severely  $\gamma\gamma$ -attenuated by the torus IR radiation, in agreement with the current upper limits.

The cascade emission from the inner region extends down to the radio-far IR bands, but this may be currently unobservable due to synchrotron self absorption (SSA) below a few THz for the fiducial case [82]. More observationally relevant may be GHz-band synchrotron emission from the outer region by secondary pairs from  $pp$ -induced  $\pi^\pm$  decay [83]. For consistency with the current upper limit at a few GHz, we choose  $B_o = 7 \text{ mG}$ , within the range inferred from independent polarization measurements for the inner torus of NGC 1068 [84]. This implies  $E_{p,\max,o} = 300 \text{ TeV}$ , set by  $t_{\text{acc},o} = t_{\text{dyn},o}$  if  $\eta_{g,o} = 10$ .

Keeping  $Rv_r$  constant, for larger  $R$ , the EM emission is more luminous at both  $\lesssim \text{THz}$  and  $\gtrsim \text{GeV}$ , affected by SSA and  $\gamma\gamma$ , respectively. This makes a consistent description of the MM data including neutrinos more difficult (Fig. 7) [10], disfavoring  $R \gg 10R_s$  [85].

**Caveats.** The principal assumption here for the inner region is that near the BH at  $R \lesssim 100R_s$ , protons are accelerated on a timescale  $\gtrsim r_g c/v_r^2 = cE_p/eBv_r^2$  with total power  $L_p \sim 0.1L_{\text{bol}}$ , and undergo  $p\gamma$  interactions with ambient photons on a timescale  $\sim R/v_r$ . Assuming an outflow with  $v_r$ , plausibly accounting for the neutrinos observed from NGC 1068 entails  $v_r \ll v_{\text{esc}}$  [86]. We identify this with regions of failed winds that are robustly expected in line-driven models of AGN winds [10].

Although shocks in failed, line-driven winds are seen in numerical simulations [48], they are yet to be analyzed in detail. Failed winds have been proposed to be the origin of some other known features of AGN, such as dense X-ray obscurers near the nucleus (possibly present in NGC 1068 [33]), part of the broad line region, and the soft X-ray excess [10, 47, 87]. Further studies, both theoretical and observational, are warranted to clarify the existence and properties of failed winds in AGN, and how they compare with the current model.

For the outer region, future work should account for the clumpy structure of the torus, synchrotron and IC emission from primary electrons, as well as an underlying starburst contribution [10].

**Tests and implications.** Similar to the coronal region models [43–46], the prominent MeV–GeV cascade emission (Fig. 2) may be decipherable with current GeV and/or future MeV–GeV instruments [88] for NGC 1068 and other nearby AGN. As the sub-GeV emission arises from  $\lesssim 100R_s$ , variability is expected on timescales down to hours, albeit with limited amplitude due to the weak Doppler effects. MM variability correlations between neutrinos, sub-GeV and/or optical emission on longer timescales caused by variations in the mass accretion rate  $\dot{M}$  provide a potential test [10]. The  $\gamma\gamma$  origin of the TeV gamma-ray break can be tested with CTA [89].

Although detailed discussions are beyond the current scope, we may speculate on expectations of this model for AGN other than NGC 1068. In coronal region models, the neutrino luminosity would correlate with the X-ray luminosity, and the fact that NGC 1068 is the brightest AGN for IceCube is attributed to its intrinsic X-ray brightness [43, 46], combined with its favorable declination for the detector [44]. In the current wind model, an additional factor may be high  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$ , required for high wind power [47, 53] (also valid for the Circinus galaxy [10].) The extent of the region of failed winds may depend systematically on  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$ ,  $\dot{M}_{\text{BH}}$  and the UV–X-ray spectra of AGN [47]. This implies important differences from other models for the neutrino and cascade EM emission of different AGN, as well as the diffuse neutrino background from all AGN, to be explored in the future.

Most intriguingly, neutrinos and gamma rays may be unique probes of the inner regions of AGN where winds are launched from the accretion disk and interact with their immediate environment, especially in obscured objects. Future high-energy MM observations may provide

important new insight into the physics of AGN winds, which are widely believed to play a critical role in the evolution of supermassive BHs and galaxies.

We thank Mariko Nomura, Ken Ohsuga, Keiichi Wada, Yoshiyuki Inoue and Aya Ishihara for valuable discussions. S.I. is supported by KAKENHI Nos. 17K05460 and 20H01950. M.C. received financial support through the Postdoctoral Junior Leader Fellowship Programme from la Caixa Banking Foundation, grant No. LCF/BQ/LI18/11630012. K.M. is supported by NSF Grant Nos. AST-1908689, AST-2108466 and AST-2108467, and KAKENHI Nos. 20H01901 and 20H05852. R.-Y.L. is supported by NSFC Grant No. U2031105.

---

\* [sinoue@bunkyo.ac.jp](mailto:sinoue@bunkyo.ac.jp)

† [cerruti@apc.in2p3.fr](mailto:cerruti@apc.in2p3.fr)

‡ [murase@psu.edu](mailto:murase@psu.edu)

§ [ryliu@nju.edu.cn](mailto:ryliu@nju.edu.cn)

- [1] J. H. Krolik, *Active galactic nuclei : from the central black hole to the galactic environment* (1999).
- [2] R. Blandford, D. Meier, and A. Readhead, *ARA&A* **57**, 467 (2019), [arXiv:1812.06025](https://arxiv.org/abs/1812.06025).
- [3] S. Veilleux, G. Cecil, and J. Bland-Hawthorn, *ARA&A* **43**, 769 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0504435](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0504435).
- [4] A. King and K. Pounds, *ARA&A* **53**, 115 (2015), [arXiv:1503.05206](https://arxiv.org/abs/1503.05206).
- [5] S. Laha, C. S. Reynolds, J. Reeves, G. Kriss, M. Guainazzi, R. Smith, S. Veilleux, and D. Proga, *Nature Astronomy* **5**, 13 (2021), [arXiv:2012.06945](https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.06945).
- [6] F. Tombesi, M. Cappi, J. N. Reeves, R. S. Nemmen, V. Braito, M. Gaspari, and C. S. Reynolds, *MNRAS* **430**, 1102 (2013), [arXiv:1212.4851](https://arxiv.org/abs/1212.4851).
- [7] F. Tombesi, F. Tazaki, R. F. Mushotzky, Y. Ueda, M. Cappi, J. Gofford, J. N. Reeves, and M. Guainazzi, *MNRAS* **443**, 2154 (2014), [arXiv:1406.7252](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.7252).
- [8] J. Gofford, J. N. Reeves, D. E. McLaughlin, V. Braito, T. J. Turner, F. Tombesi, and M. Cappi, *MNRAS* **451**, 4169 (2015), [arXiv:1506.00614](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.00614).
- [9] E. Nardini and K. Zubovas, *MNRAS* **478**, 2274 (2018), [arXiv:1805.00040](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.00040).
- [10] See Supplemental Material at [URL] for more details on AGN winds, formulation, analytic estimates, results and discussion.
- [11] K. Ohsuga and S. Mineshige, *Space Sci. Rev.* **183**, 353 (2014).
- [12] J. Frank, A. King, and D. J. Raine, *Accretion Power in Astrophysics: Third Edition* (2002).
- [13] Objects that so far lack evidence of winds may simply have unfavorable viewing angles [47, 52] and/or have not been observed when the variable absorption features are visible [90].
- [14] A. C. Fabian, *ARA&A* **50**, 455 (2012), [arXiv:1204.4114](https://arxiv.org/abs/1204.4114).
- [15] C. M. Harrison, T. Costa, C. N. Tadhunter, A. Flütsch, D. Kakkad, M. Perna, and G. Vietri, *Nature Astronomy* **2**, 198 (2018), [arXiv:1802.10306](https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.10306).
- [16] R. Blandford and D. Eichler, *Phys. Rep.* **154**, 1 (1987).
- [17] A. R. Bell, *Astroparticle Physics* **43**, 56 (2013).
- [18] C.-A. Faucher-Giguère and E. Quataert,

- MNRAS **425**, 605 (2012), [arXiv:1204.2547](#).
- [19] X. Wang and A. Loeb, MNRAS **453**, 837 (2015), [arXiv:1506.05470](#).
- [20] A. Lamastra, F. Fiore, D. Guetta, L. A. Antonelli, S. Colafrancesco, N. Menci, S. Puccetti, A. Stammera, and L. Zappacosta, A&A **596**, A68 (2016), [arXiv:1609.09664](#).
- [21] R.-Y. Liu, K. Murase, S. Inoue, C. Ge, and X.-Y. Wang, ApJ **858**, 9 (2018), [arXiv:1712.10168](#).
- [22] N. L. Zakamska and J. E. Greene, MNRAS **442**, 784 (2014), [arXiv:1402.6736](#).
- [23] F. Panessa, R. D. Baldi, A. Laor, P. Padovani, E. Behar, and I. McHardy, Nature Astronomy **3**, 387 (2019), [arXiv:1902.05917](#).
- [24] H. Netzer, ARA&A **53**, 365 (2015), [arXiv:1505.00811](#).
- [25] C. Ramos Almeida and C. Ricci, Nature Astronomy **1**, 679 (2017), [arXiv:1709.00019](#).
- [26] The torus may naturally form within the inflow of gas toward the BH due to radiation pressure and other effects [24, 91].
- [27] J. Bland-Hawthorn, J. F. Gallimore, L. J. Tacconi, E. Brinks, S. A. Baum, R. R. J. Antonucci, and G. N. Cecil, Ap&SS **248**, 9 (1997).
- [28] M. Ackermann *et al.* (Fermi-LAT Collab.), ApJ **755**, 164 (2012), [arXiv:1206.1346](#).
- [29] M. G. Aartsen *et al.* (IceCube Collab.), Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 051103 (2020), [arXiv:1910.08488](#).
- [30] IceCube Collaboration *et al.*, Science **378**, 538 (2022), [arXiv:2211.09972](#).
- [31] F. E. Bauer *et al.*, ApJ **812**, 116 (2015), [arXiv:1411.0670](#).
- [32] A. Marinucci *et al.*, MNRAS **456**, L94 (2016), [arXiv:1511.03503](#).
- [33] A. Zaino *et al.*, MNRAS **492**, 3872 (2020), [arXiv:2001.05499](#).
- [34] G. Cecil, J. Bland, and R. B. Tully, ApJ **355**, 70 (1990).
- [35] F. Müller-Sánchez, M. A. Prieto, E. K. S. Hicks, H. Vives-Arias, R. I. Davies, M. Malkan, L. J. Tacconi, and R. Genzel, ApJ **739**, 69 (2011), [arXiv:1107.3140](#).
- [36] S. García-Burillo *et al.*, A&A **567**, A125 (2014), [arXiv:1405.7706](#).
- [37] S. García-Burillo *et al.*, A&A **632**, A61 (2019), [arXiv:1909.00675](#).
- [38] M. Revalski *et al.*, ApJ **910**, 139 (2021), [arXiv:2101.06270](#).
- [39] T. M. Yoast-Hull, I. Gallagher, J. S., E. G. Zweibel, and J. E. Everett, ApJ **780**, 137 (2014), [arXiv:1311.5586](#).
- [40] B. Eichmann and J. Becker Tjus, ApJ **821**, 87 (2016), [arXiv:1510.03672](#).
- [41] V. A. Acciari *et al.* (MAGIC Collab.), ApJ **883**, 135 (2019), [arXiv:1906.10954](#).
- [42] These include models involving kpc-scale wind external shocks [20].
- [43] K. Murase, S. S. Kimura, and P. Mészáros, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 011101 (2020), [arXiv:1904.04226](#).
- [44] A. Kheirandish, K. Murase, and S. S. Kimura, arXiv e-prints, [arXiv:2102.04475](#) (2021), [arXiv:2102.04475](#).
- [45] Y. Inoue, D. Khangulyan, S. Inoue, and A. Doi, ApJ **880**, 40 (2019), [arXiv:1904.00554](#).
- [46] Y. Inoue, D. Khangulyan, and A. Doi, ApJ **891**, L33 (2020), [arXiv:1909.02239](#).
- [47] M. Giustini and D. Proga, A&A **630**, A94 (2019), [arXiv:1904.07341](#).
- [48] S. A. Sim, D. Proga, L. Miller, K. S. Long, and T. J. Turner, MNRAS **408**, 1396 (2010), [arXiv:1006.3449](#).
- [49] N. Murray, J. Chiang, S. A. Grossman, and G. M. Voit, ApJ **451**, 498 (1995).
- [50] D. Proga, J. M. Stone, and T. R. Kallman, ApJ **543**, 686 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/0005315](#).
- [51] D. Proga and T. R. Kallman, ApJ **616**, 688 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0408293](#).
- [52] M. Nomura, K. Ohsuga, H. R. Takahashi, K. Wada, and T. Yoshida, PASJ **68**, 16 (2016), [arXiv:1511.08815](#).
- [53] M. Nomura, K. Ohsuga, and C. Done, MNRAS **494**, 3616 (2020), [arXiv:1811.01966](#).
- [54] E. Y. Bannikova, N. A. Akerman, M. Capaccioli, P. P. Bercezik, V. S. Akhmetov, and M. V. Ishchenko, arXiv e-prints, [arXiv:2205.14455](#) (2022), [arXiv:2205.14455](#).
- [55] G. Mou and W. Wang, MNRAS **507**, 1684 (2021), [arXiv:2012.02997](#).
- [56] M. Cerruti, A. Zech, C. Boisson, and S. Inoue, MNRAS **448**, 910 (2015), [arXiv:1411.5968](#).
- [57] M. Cerruti *et al.*, arXiv e-prints, [arXiv:2107.06377](#) (2021), [arXiv:2107.06377](#).
- [58] N. I. Shakura and R. A. Sunyaev, A&A **24**, 337 (1973).
- [59] L. J. Greenhill, C. R. Gwinn, R. Antonucci, and R. Barvainis, ApJ **472**, L21 (1996), [arXiv:astro-ph/9609082](#).
- [60] J. F. Gallimore, S. A. Baum, C. P. O’Dea, E. Brinks, and A. Pedlar, ApJ **462**, 740 (1996).
- [61] J.-H. Woo and C. M. Urry, ApJ **579**, 530 (2002), [arXiv:astro-ph/0207249](#).
- [62] S. Inoue, M. Cerruti, K. Murase, and R. Y. Liu, in *37th International Cosmic Ray Conference. 12-23 July 2021. Berlin* (2022) p. 1013.
- [63] Gámez Rosas *et al.*, Nature **602**, 403 (2022), [arXiv:2112.13694](#).
- [64] For simplicity, injection of primary electrons is not considered in this work.
- [65] The treatment of energy losses on the proton distribution is not fully numerical and only approximate [10].
- [66] This refers to the emission before obscuration by the torus.
- [67] More precisely, what enters in the expression for  $t_{\text{acc}}$  should be the shock velocity  $v_s$  that can differ from the flow velocity  $v_r$  by a factor of order unity, but we make the simplification  $v_s \sim v_r$ .
- [68] The parameters  $v_o$  and  $\eta_{g,o}$  are not critical for the results; see below.
- [69] Although  $\epsilon_p \sim 0.1$  is typically assumed for acceleration of hadrons, values up to  $\sim 0.5$  have been observationally inferred in some cases [92, 93].
- [70] C. D. Dermer and G. Menon, *High Energy Radiation from Black Holes: Gamma Rays, Cosmic Rays, and Neutrinos* (2009).
- [71] See however “Additional caveats” in Supplemental Material.
- [72] F. A. Aharonian, *Very high energy cosmic gamma radiation : a crucial test for the standard model* (2004).
- [73] As gamma rays corresponding to  $E_{p,\text{max},o}$  are unobservable,  $v_o$  and  $\eta_{g,o}$  are not crucial. However,  $B_o \lesssim 10$  mG is required for consistency with radio observations.
- [74] Compared to the analytic estimate simply assuming  $t_{\text{rad}} \sim 0.5t_{p\gamma\pi,\text{cor}}$ ,  $E_{p,\text{max}}$  determined from  $t_{\text{acc}} = t_{\text{rad}}$  (Fig.3) can be either somewhat higher or somewhat lower.
- [75] M. G. Aartsen *et al.*,



- Journal of Physics G Nuclear Physics* **48**, 060501 (2021), [arXiv:2008.04323](#).
- [76] M. A. Prieto, J. Reunanen, K. R. W. Tristram, N. Neumayer, J. A. Fernandez-Ontiveros, M. Orienti, and K. Meisenheimer, *MNRAS* **402**, 724 (2010), [arXiv:0910.3771](#).
- [77] M. Ajello *et al.*, *ApJS* **232**, 18 (2017), [arXiv:1702.00664](#).
- [78] S. Abdollahi *et al.*, *ApJS* **247**, 33 (2020), [arXiv:1902.10045](#).
- [79] See Fig.4 for a detailed description of different emission components for the inner region.
- [80] This was also seen but not clearly emphasized for the coronal region models [43, 46].
- [81] See Fig.5 for a detailed description of different emission components for the outer region.
- [82] However, accounting for the observed sub-mm emission may be feasible by considering a suitable radial distribution of physical properties, beyond our one zone model.
- [83] The general origin of radio emission in radio-quiet AGN is under debate, one possibility being nonthermal emission from AGN winds [23]. Here we suggest a specific emission site on sub-pc scales in the context of winds, although it would only explain a part of the radio spectrum of NGC 1068.
- [84] E. Lopez-Rodriguez *et al.*, *MNRAS* **452**, 1902 (2015), [arXiv:1506.07170](#).
- [85] K. Murase, arXiv e-prints, [arXiv:2211.04460](#) (2022), [arXiv:2211.04460](#).
- [86] See however “Additional caveats” in Supplemental Material.
- [87] M. Giustini and D. Proga, in *Nuclear Activity in Galaxies Across Cosmic Time*, Vol. 356, edited by M. Pović, P. Marziani, J. Masegosa, H. Netzer, S. H. Negu, and S. B. Tessema (2021) pp. 82–86, [arXiv:2002.07564](#).
- [88] K. Engel *et al.*, arXiv e-prints, [arXiv:2203.07360](#) (2022), [arXiv:2203.07360](#).
- [89] Cherenkov Telescope Array Consortium *et al.*, *Science with the Cherenkov Telescope Array* (2019).
- [90] Z. Igo *et al.*, *MNRAS* **493**, 1088 (2020), [arXiv:2001.08208](#).
- [91] K. Wada, M. Schartmann, and R. Meijerink, *ApJ* **828**, L19 (2016), [arXiv:1608.06995](#).
- [92] E. A. Helder, J. Vink, C. G. Bassa, A. Bamba, J. A. M. Bleeker, S. Funk, P. Ghavamian, K. J. van der Heyden, F. Verbunt, and R. Yamazaki, *Science* **325**, 719 (2009), [arXiv:0906.4553](#).
- [93] H. E. S. S. Collaboration *et al.*, *Science* **376**, 77 (2022), [arXiv:2202.08201](#).
- [94] D. M. Crenshaw, S. B. Kraemer, and I. M. George, *ARA&A* **41**, 117 (2003).
- [95] G. Bruni, J. I. González-Serrano, M. Pedani, C. R. Benn, K. H. Mack, J. Holt, F. M. Montenegro-Montes, and F. Jiménez-Luján, *A&A* **569**, A87 (2014), [arXiv:1407.7987](#).
- [96] E. Nardini *et al.*, *Science* **347**, 860 (2015), [arXiv:1502.06636](#).
- [97] D. Kazanas, *Galaxies* **7**, 13 (2019).
- [98] F. Tombesi, R. M. Sambruna, A. P. Marscher, S. G. Jorstad, C. S. Reynolds, and A. Markowitz, *MNRAS* **424**, 754 (2012), [arXiv:1205.1734](#).
- [99] S. Veilleux, R. Maiolino, A. D. Bolatto, and S. Aalto, *A&A Rev.* **28**, 2 (2020), [arXiv:2002.07765](#).
- [100] N. Arav, Z.-Y. Li, and M. C. Begelman, *ApJ* **432**, 62 (1994).
- [101] G. Risaliti and M. Elvis, *A&A* **516**, A89 (2010), [arXiv:0911.0958](#).
- [102] M. Nomura and K. Ohsuga, *MNRAS* **465**, 2873 (2017), [arXiv:1610.08511](#).
- [103] M. Mizumoto, M. Nomura, C. Done, K. Ohsuga, and H. Odaka, *MNRAS* **503**, 1442 (2021), [arXiv:2003.01137](#).
- [104] J. I. Castor, D. C. Abbott, and R. I. Klein, *ApJ* **195**, 157 (1975).
- [105] J. S. Kaastra *et al.*, *Science* **345**, 64 (2014), [arXiv:1406.5007](#).
- [106] N. J. Schurch and C. Done, *MNRAS* **371**, 81 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0606091](#).
- [107] R. Moderski, M. Sikora, P. S. Coppi, and F. Aharonian, *MNRAS* **363**, 954 (2005), [arXiv:astro-ph/0504388](#).
- [108] S. R. Kelner, F. A. Aharonian, and V. V. Bugayov, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 034018 (2006), [arXiv:astro-ph/0606058](#).
- [109] M. Mori, *Astroparticle Physics* **31**, 341 (2009), [arXiv:0903.3260](#).
- [110] A. Franceschini and G. Rodighiero, *A&A* **603**, A34 (2017), [arXiv:1705.10256](#).
- [111] K. Murase, D. Guetta, and M. Ahlers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 071101 (2016), [arXiv:1509.00805](#).
- [112] K. Murase, Y. Inoue, and C. D. Dermer, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 023007 (2014), [arXiv:1403.4089](#).
- [113] P. S. Coppi and R. D. Blandford, *MNRAS* **245**, 453 (1990).
- [114] S. Inoue and F. Takahara, *ApJ* **463**, 555 (1996).
- [115] R. D. Blandford and D. G. Payne, *MNRAS* **199**, 883 (1982).
- [116] K. Fukumura, D. Kazanas, C. Shrader, E. Behar, F. Tombesi, and I. Contopoulos, *Nature Astronomy* **1**, 0062 (2017), [arXiv:1702.02197](#).
- [117] T. J. Moriya, M. Tanaka, T. Morokuma, and K. Ohsuga, *ApJ* **843**, L19 (2017), [arXiv:1706.06855](#).
- [118] A. S. Wilson and J. S. Ulvestad, *ApJ* **319**, 105 (1987).
- [119] J. F. Gallimore, S. A. Baum, and C. P. O’Dea, *ApJ* **464**, 198 (1996).
- [120] A. L. Roy, A. S. Wilson, J. S. Ulvestad, and J. M. Colbert, in *EVN Symposium 2000, Proceedings of the 5th European VLBI Network Symposium*, edited by J. E. Conway, A. G. Polatidis, R. S. Booth, and Y. M. Pihlström (2000) p. 7, [arXiv:astro-ph/0009408](#).
- [121] J. Alvarez-Muñiz and P. Mészáros, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 123001 (2004), [arXiv:astro-ph/0409034](#).
- [122] A. Pe’Er, K. Murase, and P. Mészáros, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 123018 (2009), [arXiv:0911.1776](#).
- [123] G. Mou, L. Dou, N. Jiang, T. Wang, F. Guo, W. Wang, H. Wang, X. Shu, Z. He, R. Zhang, and L. Sun, *ApJ* **908**, 197 (2021), [arXiv:2009.10420](#).
- [124] K. Murase and E. Waxman, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 103006 (2016), [arXiv:1607.01601](#).
- [125] F. Marin, *MNRAS* **479**, 3142 (2018), [arXiv:1806.04415](#).
- [126] R. Abbasi *et al.* (IceCube Collab.), *ApJ* **920**, L45 (2021), [arXiv:2109.05818](#).
- [127] L. J. Greenhill, R. S. Booth, S. P. Ellingsen, J. R. Herrnstein, D. L. Jauncey, P. M. McCulloch, J. M. Moran, R. P. Norris, J. E. Reynolds, and A. K. Tzioumis, *ApJ* **590**, 162 (2003), [arXiv:astro-ph/0302533](#).

- [128] A. S. Wilson, P. L. Shopbell, C. Simpson, T. Storchi-Bergmann, F. K. B. Barbosa, and M. J. Ward, *AJ* **120**, 1325 (2000), [arXiv:astro-ph/0006147](#).
- [129] S. Adrián-Martínez *et al.*, *Journal of Physics G Nuclear Physics* **43**, 084001 (2016), [arXiv:1601.07459](#).
- [130] M. Hayashida, L. Stawarz, C. C. Cheung, K. Bechtol, G. M. Madejski, M. Ajello, F. Massaro, I. V. Moskalenko, A. Strong, and L. Tibaldo, *ApJ* **779**, 131 (2013), [arXiv:1310.1913](#).
- [131] X.-L. Guo, Y.-L. Xin, N.-H. Liao, and Y.-Z. Fan, *ApJ* **885**, 117 (2019), [arXiv:1905.04723](#).
- [132] R. Aladro, S. Viti, E. Bayet, and D. Riquelme, in *Cosmic Rays in Star-Forming Environments*, Astrophysics and Space Science Proceedings, Vol. 34, edited by D. F. Torres and O. Reimer (2013) p. 21, [arXiv:1207.0355](#).
- [133] J. J. D’Agostino, L. J. Kewley, B. A. Groves, A. M. Medling, E. Di Teodoro, M. A. Dopita, A. D. Thomas, R. S. Sutherland, and S. Garcia-Burillo, *MNRAS* **487**, 4153 (2019), [arXiv:1906.07907](#).
- [134] D. Kazanas and D. C. Ellison, *ApJ* **304**, 178 (1986).
- [135] M. C. Begelman, B. Rudak, and M. Sikora, *ApJ* **362**, 38 (1990).
- [136] F. W. Stecker, C. Done, M. H. Salamon, and P. Sommers, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 2697 (1991).
- [137] Y. Inoue, D. Khangulyan, and A. Doi, *Galaxies* **9**, 36 (2021), [arXiv:2105.08948](#).
- [138] K. Murase and F. W. Stecker, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2202.03381](#) (2022), [arXiv:2202.03381](#).
- [139] L. A. Anchordoqui, J. F. Krizmanic, and F. W. Stecker, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2102.12409](#) (2021), [arXiv:2102.12409](#).
- [140] S. S. Kimura, K. Toma, T. K. Suzuki, and S.-i. Inutsuka, *ApJ* **822**, 88 (2016), [arXiv:1602.07773](#).
- [141] S. S. Kimura, K. Tomida, and K. Murase, *MNRAS* **485**, 163 (2019), [arXiv:1812.03901](#).
- [142] J. P. Lenain, C. Ricci, M. Türler, D. Dorner, and R. Walter, *A&A* **524**, A72 (2010), [arXiv:1008.5164](#).
- [143] I. Tamborra, S. Ando, and K. Murase, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.* **2014**, 043 (2014), [arXiv:1404.1189](#).
- [144] J. Nims, E. Quataert, and C.-A. Faucher-Giguère, *MNRAS* **447**, 3612 (2015), [arXiv:1408.5141](#).
- [145] G. T. Richards, T. V. McCaffrey, A. Kimball, A. L. Rankine, J. H. Matthews, P. C. Hewett, and A. B. Rivera, *AJ* **162**, 270 (2021), [arXiv:2106.07783](#).
- [146] P. Padovani, A. Turcati, and E. Resconi, *MNRAS* **477**, 3469 (2018), [arXiv:1804.01386](#).
- [147] The Fermi-LAT Collaboration, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2105.11469](#) (2021), [arXiv:2105.11469](#).
- [148] A. L. Müller and G. E. Romero, *A&A* **636**, A92 (2020), [arXiv:2003.12438](#).
- [149] A. L. Müller, M.-H. Naddaf, M. Zajaček, B. Czerny, A. Araudo, and V. Karas, *ApJ* **931**, 39 (2022), [arXiv:2204.05361](#).
- [150] P. Sotomayor and G. E. Romero, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2206.10731](#) (2022), [arXiv:2206.10731](#).
- [151] B. Eichmann, F. Oikonomou, S. Salvatore, R.-J. Dettmar, and J. Becker Tjus, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2207.00102](#) (2022), [arXiv:2207.00102](#).

## SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

### OVERVIEW OF AGN WINDS

There is widespread evidence that the majority of AGN can commonly eject winds of thermal plasma with wide opening angles and a range of outflow velocities, observable as blue-shifted atomic absorption features in the ultraviolet (UV) to X-ray bands [3–5, 94]. Those with velocities from a few 100 to a few 1000 km s<sup>-1</sup> are known as warm absorbers (WAs) in X-rays and narrow absorption line outflows in the UV. Those with still higher velocities, up to mildly relativistic values of  $\sim 0.4c$ , are called ultrafast outflows (UFOs) in X-rays and broad absorption line (BAL) outflows in the UV. BAL outflows are observed in  $\sim 20\%$  of quasars, primarily of the radio-quiet type [95]. UFOs are seen in  $\sim 40\%$  of all nearby AGN, of both radio-loud and radio-quiet types [6, 7]. WAs are detected in  $\sim 65\%$  of nearby AGN, albeit being relatively rarer in radio-loud objects. The opening angles of such winds are estimated to be  $2\theta_w \gtrsim 60\text{--}100$  deg [3, 96], much wider than jets.

AGN winds may be launched from accretion disks by various mechanisms involving thermal, radiative and/or magnetic processes [11, 47, 97]. UFOs and WAs may correspond to winds ejected from the disk at different ranges of radii [6, 97].

AGN winds may be crucial for the collimation of relativistic jets in radio-loud AGN [2, 98]. They may also be the primary conduits through which supermassive BHs exert feedback onto their host galaxies, resulting in the known BH-galaxy scaling relations, and possibly the quenching of star formation in massive galaxies [4, 14, 15]. Massive outflows of atomic and molecular material from AGN observed on kpc scales may be a manifestation of such effects [99].

### FAILED LINE-DRIVEN WINDS

Although the actual mechanism for the formation of accretion-disk driven winds in AGN is not yet established, one of the leading candidates is radiative, line-driven winds [49–53, 100–103]. Analogous to mechanisms discussed for winds from massive stars [104], such winds utilize the enhanced pressure on gas by radiation at the frequencies of atomic line transitions, and are effective for high UV luminosities of the accretion disk. However, simultaneously high X-ray luminosities of the disk corona can fully ionize the wind gas (“overionization”) and suppress momentum transfer in the inner parts of the disk, leading to outflows that are initially launched but fail to reach the escape velocity  $v_{\text{esc}}$  and eventually fall back toward the disk. Such failed winds may be the origin [87] of the dense X-ray obscurers seen in some type-1 AGN [105] (possibly also in NGC 1068 [33]), a part of



the broad line region (BLR) on sub-pc scales [51], or the soft X-ray excess common to many type-1 AGN [106]. Successful winds exceeding  $v_{\text{esc}}$  can still be driven from the outer parts of the disk that is shielded from ionizing X-rays, mainly in the equatorial direction. The relative extent of the inner failed wind and the outer successful wind can vary with the UV to X-ray luminosity and spectrum, which in turn depend on the BH mass  $M_{\text{BH}}$  and the Eddington parameter  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$ . For  $M_{\text{BH}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$  inferred for NGC 1068, inner regions of failed winds are quite plausible [47].

Shocks can occur within the inner, failed wind region due to interactions among gas falling back and flowing out, as indicated by some numerical simulations [48]. At the same time, the successful part of the wind can propagate farther and impact the torus [37, 54], potentially inducing strong shocks in an outer region [55].

We note that the spatial scale  $R$  of the failed wind region is not well constrained quantitatively, from either theory or observations. Although a range of  $R \lesssim 30 - 100R_s$  has been invoked for numerical simulations [50–53, 102], explicit calculations of line-driven winds are currently limited to  $> 30R_s$  due to computational costs, even with simplified treatments for the radiative transfer. It also depends on whether the standard, thin accretion disk extends down to  $\sim 3R_s$  or is physically truncated at a larger radius, which is presently unclear for AGN. Better constraints await further theoretical and observational developments.

## FORMULATION DETAILS

The basic formulation for the model is overviewed in the main text. The numerical treatment of neutrino and hadronic cascade emission is detailed in Refs. [56] and [57] and not repeated here. Here we provide some additional information not described elsewhere.

For  $p\gamma$  and  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions, we always consider situations where external photons originating outside the emission region are dominant. The calculations take into account both synchrotron and inverse Compton (IC) radiation for the cascade emission, as well as Klein-Nishina loss effects according to Ref. [107] for the equilibrium pair distribution. For  $pp$  interactions, the treatment of secondary photon, lepton, and neutrino production follows Ref. [108]. The contribution of nuclei heavier than helium for both accelerated hadrons and target gas are accounted for by the enhancement factor  $\varepsilon_M = 2.0$  [109]. The associated pair cascades are computed as for the  $p\gamma$ -induced cascades.

For the inner region, protons can suffer significant energy losses via  $p\gamma$  interactions (Fig. 3). Instead of a fully numerical treatment, the steady-state energy distri-

bution of protons is calculated approximately as

$$\frac{dN_p(E_p)}{dE_p} = Q_p(E_p) \left( \frac{1}{\tau_{p\gamma\pi}(E_p)} + \frac{1}{\tau_{BeH}(E_p)} + \frac{1}{\tau_{dyn}} \right)^{-1} \quad (1)$$

where  $Q_p(E_p) \propto E_p^{-2} \exp(-E_p/E_{p,\text{max}})$  is the proton injection rate in units of  $\text{cm}^{-3} \text{s}^{-1}$ .

We provide some details on the assumed external radiation fields. For the accretion disk,

$$\varepsilon \left( \frac{dL(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} \right)_{\text{disk}} = L_{\text{disk},0} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{disk}}} \right)^{4/3} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{disk}}}\right), \quad (2)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{\text{disk}} = 2.82k_B T_{\text{max}}$ ,  $T_{\text{max}} = 0.488T_{\text{in}}$  is the maximum disk temperature, and  $T_{\text{in}} = (GM_{\text{BH}}\dot{M}/72\pi\sigma_{\text{SB}}R_s^3)^{1/4}$  is the temperature at the innermost disk radius  $r_{\text{in}} = 3R_s$  [12]. Normalization is given by  $L_{\text{disk,tot}} = \int d\varepsilon(dL(\varepsilon)/d\varepsilon) = L_{\text{bol,obs}}$ . Numerically,

$$\varepsilon_{\text{disk}} = 31.5 \text{ eV} \left( \frac{L_{\text{disk}}}{10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} \right)^{1/4} \left( \frac{M_{\text{BH}}}{3 \times 10^7 M_\odot} \right)^{-1/2} \quad (3)$$

and  $L_{\text{disk},0} = 1.12L_{\text{disk}}$ . We adopt  $L_{\text{bol,obs}} = 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$  [61]. The corresponding photon density in the emission region is

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\text{disk}}(\varepsilon) &= \left( \frac{dL(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} \right)_{\text{disk}} \frac{1}{4\pi c R^2} \quad (4) \\ &= \frac{L_{\text{disk},0}}{4\pi c R^2 \varepsilon_{\text{disk}}} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{disk}}} \right)^{1/3} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{disk}}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\frac{L_{\text{disk},0}}{4\pi c R^2 \varepsilon_{\text{disk}}} \simeq 2.8 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}^{-3} \quad (5)$$

$$\times \left( \frac{\varepsilon_{\text{disk}}}{31.51 \text{ eV}} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{R}{10R_s} \right)^{-2} \left( \frac{L_{\text{disk}}}{10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} \right) \quad (6)$$

If there is an outer radius  $r_{\text{out}}$  at which the disk is truncated, the spectrum should transition from  $\propto \varepsilon^{1/3}$  to  $\propto \varepsilon^2$  below  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{out}} = 2.82k_B T_{\text{out}}$ , where  $T_{\text{out}} = T_{\text{in}}(r_{\text{out}}/r_{\text{in}})^{-3/4}$ . In the current model, this may effectively occur for  $r \gtrsim R$ , where the dilution with distance decreases their relative contribution to the emission region. Numerically,

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_{\text{out}} &= 4.7 \text{ eV} \left( \frac{L_{\text{disk}}}{10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} \right)^{1/4} \left( \frac{M_{\text{BH}}}{3 \times 10^7 M_\odot} \right)^{-1/2} \quad (7) \\ &\quad \times \left( \frac{R/r_{\text{in}}}{100/3} \right)^{-3/4}. \end{aligned}$$

For the corona,

$$\varepsilon \left( \frac{dL(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} \right)_{\text{cor}} = L_{\text{cor},0} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0} \right)^{2-\Gamma_{\text{cor}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{cor}}}\right), \quad (8)$$

where  $\varepsilon_0$  is a reference energy that can be chosen for convenience, e.g.  $\varepsilon_0 = 2 \text{ keV}$ . Normalization is

given by the observed 2-10 keV luminosity  $L_{2-10\text{keV,obs}}$ . Since usually  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}} \gg 10$  keV, for  $\Gamma_{\text{cor}} = 2$ ,  $L_{\text{cor},0} = L_{2-10\text{keV,obs}}/\ln(5)$ , whereas for  $\Gamma_{\text{cor}} \neq 2$ ,  $L_{\text{cor},0} = (2 - \Gamma_{\text{cor}})L_{2-10\text{keV,obs}}/(5^{2-\Gamma_{\text{cor}}} - 1)$ .

Ref. [31] give  $\Gamma_{\text{cor}} = 2.10_{-0.07}^{+0.06}$  and  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}} = 128_{-44}^{+115}$  keV. Ref. [32] observed a putative unveiling event (temporary decrease of obscuring material along the line of sight), giving  $L_{2-10\text{keV,obs}} = 7_{-3}^{+7} \times 10^{43} \text{erg s}^{-1}$ . We adopt  $\Gamma_{\text{cor}} = 2.0$ ,  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}} = 128$  keV (quite irrelevant as long as  $\varepsilon_{\text{cor}} \gg 10$  keV) and  $L_{2-10\text{keV,obs}} = 7 \times 10^{43} \text{erg s}^{-1}$ , which implies  $L_{\text{cor},0} = 4.35 \times 10^{43} \text{erg s}^{-1}$ . The corresponding photon density in the emission region is

$$\begin{aligned} n_{\text{cor}}(\varepsilon) &= \left( \frac{dL(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} \right)_{\text{cor}} \frac{1}{4\pi c R^2} \\ &= \frac{L_{\text{cor},0}}{4\pi c R^2 \varepsilon_0} \left( \frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_0} \right)^{1-\Gamma_{\text{cor}}} \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon_{\text{cor}}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{L_{\text{cor},0}}{4\pi c R^2 \varepsilon_0} &\simeq 4.6 \times 10^{12} \text{cm}^{-3} \\ &\times \left( \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2\text{keV}} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{R}{10R_s} \right)^{-2} \left( \frac{L_{2-10\text{keV,obs}}}{7 \times 10^{43} \text{erg s}^{-1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

For the innermost region of the torus, a blackbody description is an adequate approximation for our purposes, with fiducial radius  $R_{\text{tor}} = 0.1$  pc and temperature  $T_{\text{tor}} = 1000$  K [63]. The temperature alone gives the photon density,

$$n_{\text{tor}}(\varepsilon) = \frac{8\pi}{c^3 h^3} \frac{\varepsilon^3}{\exp(\varepsilon/k_B T_{\text{tor}}) - 1} \quad (11)$$

As a numerical example, at  $\varepsilon = 2.82 k_B T_{\text{tor}} = 0.243$  eV ( $T_{\text{tor}}/1000\text{K}$ ),  $n_{\text{tor}}(\varepsilon = 0.243 \text{ eV}) = 1.19 \times 10^{10} \text{cm}^{-3}$ .

We neglect the effect of intergalactic gamma-ray attenuation due to  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions with the extragalactic background light, which at  $D = 14$  Mpc is only important above a few tens of TeV [110], above the range of our interest.

## ANALYTIC ESTIMATE DETAILS

Some analytic estimates are described in more detail below. Photopion interactions for protons with  $E_p$  occur typically against photons with energy  $\varepsilon \approx 0.5 m_p c^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_\Delta / E_p \simeq 1.4 \times 10^{17} \text{eV}^2 E_p^{-1}$ , where  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_\Delta \sim 0.3$  GeV [70, 111]. For our assumed corona spectrum (Fig. 2), the photon density per log  $\varepsilon$  at  $\varepsilon \ll \varepsilon_{\text{cor}}$  in the inner region is  $n_{\text{cor}}(\varepsilon) \equiv \varepsilon dn_{\text{cor}}/d\varepsilon = L_{\text{cor},2-10}/4\pi c R^2 \varepsilon \ln 5 \simeq 4.6 \times 10^{12} \text{cm}^{-3} \bar{R}_1^{-2} (\varepsilon/2 \text{keV})^{-1}$ . The relevant photopion timescale is [43, 111]  $t_{p\gamma\pi, \text{cor}}(E_p) \approx [\eta_{p\gamma} \hat{\sigma}_{p\gamma\pi} c n_{\text{cor}}(\varepsilon = 0.5 m_p c^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_\Delta / E_p)]^{-1} \simeq 5.5 \times 10^5 \text{s} \bar{R}_1^2 (E_p/20 \text{TeV})^{-1}$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_{p\gamma\pi} = 0.7 \times 10^{28} \text{cm}^2$  is the product of the inelasticity and cross section, and  $\eta_{p\gamma} = 2/3$  for  $\Gamma_{\text{cor}} = 2$ .

The typical photon energy for BeH interactions is  $\varepsilon \approx 0.5 m_p c^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_{\text{BeH}} / E_p \simeq 4.8 \times 10^{15} \text{eV}^2 E_p^{-1}$ , where  $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{\text{BeH}} \approx 10(2m_e c^2) \simeq 10$  MeV. Around the optical-UV spectral peak of the disk, the photon density in the inner region is  $n_{\text{disk}}(\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{disk}}) = 1.0 \times 10^{15} \text{cm}^{-3} \bar{R}_1^{-2}$ . The corresponding BeH timescale for  $E_p \sim 150$  TeV is  $t_{\text{BeH,disk}} \approx [\eta_{p\gamma} \hat{\sigma}_{\text{BeH}} c n_{\text{disk}}(\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\text{disk}})]^{-1} \simeq 4.1 \times 10^4 \text{s} \bar{R}_1^2$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{BeH}} \sim 0.8 \times 10^{-30} \text{cm}^2$  [43].

The neutrino luminosity per flavor per log  $\varepsilon_\nu$  is  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu) \equiv \varepsilon_\nu dL_{\nu_\mu}/d\varepsilon_\nu \approx (1/8) f_{p\gamma, \text{net}}(E_p = 20\varepsilon_\nu) \mathcal{L}_p(E_p = 20\varepsilon_\nu)$ , where  $\mathcal{L}_p(E_p) \equiv E_p dL_p/dE_p$  is the injected proton power per log  $E_p$ , and  $f_{p\gamma, \text{net}} = t_{p\gamma\pi}^{-1} (t_{p\gamma\pi}^{-1} + t_{\text{BeH}}^{-1} + t_{\text{dyn}}^{-1})^{-1}$  is the net photopion efficiency [43, 112]. Two spectral regimes are most relevant. 1) At low  $E_p$  when  $t_{\text{dyn}} \ll t_{p\gamma\pi}, t_{\text{BeH}}$  (Fig. 3), protons are unaffected by  $p\gamma$  losses, and neutrinos are produced inefficiently with  $f_{p\gamma, \text{net}} \ll 1$ . Since  $t_{p\gamma\pi} \propto E_p^{-1}$  for  $E_p \gtrsim 0.5 m_p c^2 \tilde{\varepsilon}_\Delta / \varepsilon_{\text{cor}} \simeq 1$  TeV and  $\mathcal{L}_p \propto E_p^0$  for  $E_p \ll E_{p, \text{max}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu) = (1/8) (t_{\text{dyn}}/t_{p\gamma\pi}) \mathcal{L}_p \propto \varepsilon_\nu$  ( $f_{\nu_\mu} \propto \varepsilon_\nu^{-1}$ ). 2) At higher  $E_p$  when  $t_{p\gamma\pi}, t_{\text{BeH}} \ll t_{\text{dyn}}$  (Fig. 3),  $p\gamma$  losses steepen the steady-state proton spectrum. Assuming  $t_{\text{rad}} \sim f_{\text{rad}} t_{p\gamma\pi, \text{cor}}$ ,  $\mathcal{L}_{\nu_\mu}(\varepsilon_\nu) \approx (1/8) (1 + t_{p\gamma\pi}/t_{\text{BeH}})^{-1} \mathcal{L}_p \sim (1/16) f_{\text{rad}, -0.3} \mathcal{L}_p \propto \varepsilon_\nu^0 \exp(-\varepsilon_\nu/\varepsilon_{\nu, \text{max}})$  ( $f_{\nu_\mu} \propto \varepsilon_\nu^{-2} \exp(-\varepsilon_\nu/\varepsilon_{\nu, \text{max}})$ ).

The optical depth for  $\gamma\gamma$  interactions with corona photons is [113]  $\tau_{\gamma\gamma, \text{cor}}(\varepsilon) \approx 0.2 \sigma_T R n_{\text{cor}}(\varepsilon' = (m_e c^2)^2/\varepsilon) \simeq 410 (\varepsilon/1\text{GeV}) \bar{R}_1^{-1}$ .

For the outer torus region, the  $pp$  gamma-ray luminosity per log  $\varepsilon$  is  $\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\varepsilon) \equiv \varepsilon dL_\gamma/d\varepsilon \approx (1/3) \varepsilon_M f_{pp, \text{net}} \mathcal{L}_p(E_p = 10\varepsilon)$ , where the net  $pp$  efficiency  $f_{pp, \text{net}} = t_{pp}^{-1} (t_{pp}^{-1} + t_{\text{dyn}}^{-1})^{-1}$ , the  $pp$  loss timescale  $t_{pp} = (\kappa \sigma_{pp} c n_o)^{-1} \simeq 1.6 \times 10^9 \text{s} (n_o/10^6 \text{cm}^{-3})^{-1}$ ,  $\kappa \sigma_{pp} \simeq 2 \times 10^{-26} \text{cm}^2$  for the relevant energies [70, 72], and  $\varepsilon_M \simeq 2.0$  is a factor accounting for the effect of nuclei [109].

## ADDITIONAL RESULTS

Here we present more details on the fiducial results, as well as results for some non-fiducial range of parameters. Fig. 3 compares the physically relevant timescales for inner region in the fiducial case: the dynamical timescale  $t_{\text{dyn}}$ , the acceleration timescale  $t_{\text{acc}}$ , and radiative loss timescales due to photopion  $t_{p\gamma\pi}$ , Bethe-Heitler  $t_{\text{BeH}}$ , and proton synchrotron  $t_{\text{psyn}}$ . Comparison among these determines the value of  $E_{p, \text{max}}$ .

Figs. 4 and 5 clarify the separate contributions of different emission processes to the inner and outer regions, respectively, for the fiducial case. For the inner region, Bethe-Heitler (BeH) cascade dominates all bands, while photopion cascade can be comparable in some bands. Proton synchrotron is subdominant. For the outer region, each band is dominated by a different component. Going from low to high energy:  $pp$   $\pi^\pm$  decay pair synchrotron,  $\gamma\gamma$  cascade,  $pp$   $\pi^\pm$  decay pair external inverse




FIG. 3. Comparison of timescales for the inner region in the fiducial case. Dynamical time  $t_{\text{dyn}}$  (black), photopion loss time  $t_{p\gamma\pi}$  (red), Bethe-Heitler loss time  $t_{\text{BeH}}$  (blue), proton synchrotron loss time  $t_{\text{psyn}}$  (ochre) for  $B = 510$  G ( $\epsilon_B = 0.1$ ) and for  $B = 1130$  G ( $\epsilon_B = 0.5$ ), total radiative loss time (gray), acceleration time  $t_{\text{acc}}$  (green) for  $\{B = 510 \text{ G}, \eta_g = 4\}$  and  $\{B = 1130 \text{ G}, \eta_g = 1\}$ .

Compton (EIC), and  $pp \pi^0$  decay.




FIG. 4. Model vs. observations of the electromagnetic spectrum of NGC 1068 for fiducial parameters, clarifying the contribution of different emission components for the inner region, as indicated in the legend. Total (red solid),  $p\gamma$  Bethe-Heitler (BeH) cascade (ochre dashed), external inverse Compton (EIC) from first-generation BeH pairs (ochre dot-dashed), photopion cascade (purple short dashed), proton synchrotron (blue double-dot-dashed). Otherwise the same as the left panel of Fig.2.

Fig.6 shows cases with different combinations of  $B$  and




FIG. 5. Model vs. observations of the electromagnetic spectrum of NGC 1068 for fiducial parameters, clarifying the contribution of different emission components for the outer region, as indicated in the legend. Total (blue solid),  $pp \pi^0$  decay (green dotted),  $pp \pi^\pm$  decay pair synchrotron (cyan double-dot-dashed),  $pp \pi^\pm$  decay pair EIC (cyan dot-dashed),  $\gamma\gamma$  cascade (magenta triple-dot-dashed). Otherwise the same as the left panel of Fig.2.

$\eta_g$  compared to the fiducial case. Values of  $\eta_g \sim 1$ -40 and  $B \sim 500$ -1000 G appear compatible with the current MM data.




FIG. 6. Model vs. observations of the multi-messenger spectrum of NGC 1068 for varying combinations of  $B$  and  $\eta_g$  for the inner region, as indicated in the legend. Total emission from both regions shown for  $B = 510$  G ( $\epsilon_B = 0.1$ ) and  $\eta_g = 1, 4$  and  $40$  (solid), and  $B = 1130$  G ( $\epsilon_B = 0.5$ ) and  $\eta_g = 4$ . (dashed). Otherwise the same as Fig.2.

For non-fiducial combinations of  $R$  and  $v_r$  while keeping  $Rv_r$  constant, we note that  $R \lesssim 10R_s$  is unlikely as the inner disk radius is  $3R_s$ , and  $v_r \lesssim 100$  km/s is unlikely as it approaches the sound velocity of the inner disk and shocks may not form. Thus, fixing



$\eta_g = 4$  and  $\epsilon_B = 0.1$  so that  $B \propto R^{-1}$ , we focus on two cases for  $\{R/R_s, v_r, B\}$ :  $\{30, 300, 170\}$  and  $\{100, 100, 50\}$ , with  $L_p$  adjusted to the MM data for each case. Fig.7 shows the comparison with the fiducial case.




FIG. 7. Model vs. observations of the multi-messenger spectrum of NGC 1068 for  $\eta_g = 4$  and varying combinations of  $R$ ,  $v_r$ ,  $B$  and  $L_p$  for the inner region, as indicated in the legend. Total emission from both regions shown for  $R = 10R_s$  (fiducial, dark shaded),  $R = 30R_s$  (medium shaded) and  $R = 100R_s$  (light shaded), along with total emission from outer region (fiducial, thin solid). Otherwise the same as Fig.2.

As expected,  $\epsilon_{\nu,br} \sim 1$  TeV remains similar for all cases. As  $t_{rad} \propto R^2$  and  $t_{acc} \propto Rv_r^{-2} \propto R^3$ ,  $E_{p,max}$  (and hence  $\epsilon_{\nu,max}$ ) given by  $t_{acc} = t_{rad}$  decrease with  $R$ , being  $\sim 52$  TeV and  $\sim 33$  TeV for  $R/R_s = 30$  and  $100$ , respectively. The EM emission becomes more luminous with  $R$  in bands affected by opacity, for both  $\gamma\gamma$  absorption at GeV and SSA at submm. Thus, to remain consistent with existing data in those bands,  $L_p$  must be decreased accordingly, to  $L_p/\text{erg/s} = 4.1 \times 10^{43}$  and  $1.4 \times 10^{43}$  for  $R/R_s = 30$  and  $100$ , respectively. This entails much lower neutrino fluxes and disfavors cases with larger  $R$  compared to the fiducial case. However, we note that in reality, there can be additional  $\gamma\gamma$  absorption outside the inner region by radiation from the outer disk and the BLR, whose inclusion may still allow the larger  $R$  cases to be compatible. We also note that accounting for the sub-mm data including ALMA may be possible by considering a suitable radial distribution of physical properties, beyond our one zone model. These aspects will be studied in the future.

### ADDITIONAL CAVEATS

Some caveats are discussed in addition to those in the main text. Our formulation is based on some assumptions often made for modeling non-thermal emission from outflows, such as injection of shock-accelerated particles and their radiative cooling in a region within a coher-

ent outflow with bulk velocity  $v_r$ , so that DSA occurs on a timescale  $t_{DSA} \gtrsim r_g c/v_r^2 = cE_p/eBv_r^2$ , and the particles radiatively cool during a dynamical timescale  $t_{dyn} \sim R/v_r$ . With this formulation, we were led to the requirement  $v_r \ll v_{esc}$  in order to account for the neutrinos observed from NGC 1068. We propose that this region corresponds to that of failed line-driven winds launched from the accretion disk.

However, the actual flow of gas in failed disk winds should be more complicated than a coherent outflow, since: 1) in poloidal directions, outflows as well as inflows of matter falling back are expected, resulting in circulatory motions overall as seen in numerical simulations [50–53, 102]; 2) in toroidal directions, significant flows are likely, as the wind is launched from the accretion disk where gas is in Keplerian motion with azimuthal velocity  $v_\phi \sim v_{esc}$ . Thus, if some of the latter’s kinetic energy is dissipated in shocks after flowing out of the disk, the relevant shock velocity can be  $v_s \sim v_{esc}$ , seemingly at odds with the picture above.

Nonetheless, the most essential point in explaining the neutrinos from NGC 1068,  $\epsilon_{\nu,br} \lesssim 1$  TeV (Eq.??), is that the bulk of the protons within  $R$  can cool efficiently via photopion processes during a timescale  $\gg R/c$ . Unlike coherent outflows where non-thermal particles escape via advection on a timescale  $t_{dyn} \sim R/v_r$ , in circulatory flows associated with disk rotation or failed winds, it is possible that particles are confined in regions near the BH on timescales  $t_{conf} \gg R/c$  that are not directly related to the flow velocity, while  $v_s \sim v_{esc}$  for the actual shock velocities therein (although this also depends on the currently unknown configuration of magnetic fields in failed disk winds). On the other hand, as  $t_{DSA}$  still depends on  $v_s$ ,  $v_s \sim v_{esc}$  may imply  $\epsilon_{\nu,max}$  much higher than is consistent with the current IceCube data (Eq.??), unless  $\eta_g \gg 1$  as inferred for the case of electron acceleration in blazars [114].

More realistic discussion of such scenarios warrants a modified formulation with more parameters, which we defer to the future. The current study is still valuable in clarifying that if we simply assume a coherent outflow with  $v_r$ , it is not trivial to account for the observed neutrinos from NGC 1068 with the naive expectation  $v_r \sim v_{esc}$ .

On the other hand, rather than circulating flows inducing an ensemble of shocks and DSA, it is possible that the actual flow in failed winds is closer to turbulence. If so, particle acceleration may still occur via mechanisms such as stochastic acceleration or magnetic reconnection, as envisaged in some corona models [43, 44]. The resulting neutrino spectrum would then depend on the properties of the relevant turbulence, which is quite uncertain.

As an alternative to line-driven mechanisms, AGN winds may form primarily by magnetohydrodynamic processes [97, 115, 116]. Then  $v \sim v_{esc}$  is expected for the terminal velocity of each streamline originating from the

disk at different radii. For dissipation of  $L_w$  and particle acceleration to occur at  $R \lesssim 100R_s$ , some extrinsic process is required, e.g. interaction with ambient BLR clouds [62, 117]. In this case, it is not obvious whether shocks can result with the properties required for our model.

Similar considerations apply to the jet known to exist in NGC 1068, extending to  $R \sim 0.8$  kpc and aligned with the NLR outflow [118, 119], with estimated velocity  $v_j \sim 0.04c$  [120] and power  $L_j \sim 2 \times 10^{43}$  erg/s [36], much smaller and weaker than the jets of radio-loud AGN [2]. In principle, protons may be accelerated therein [121, 122], but it is unclear if the conditions discussed above can be met.

For the outer region, our discussion focused only on  $pp$  processes with simplifying assumptions. More realistically, 1) the torus gas is likely clumpy and the structure of the wind-torus interface can be non-trivial [123], 2) synchrotron and IC emission from primary electrons can dominate [55], and 3) a starburst contribution to the GeV-TeV emission can be non-negligible [28, 39, 40, 124]. These aspects will be considered in future work.

### ADDITIONAL TESTS

We discuss additional tests of the model. Variations in the mass accretion rate  $\dot{M}$  will be reflected in those of the disk plus corona luminosity as well as the wind power, especially if the latter is radiatively driven. This can cause correlated variability between neutrinos, sub-GeV and optical-X-ray emission, which may be observationally tractable on timescales of months to years. Even when the latter is largely obscured as in NGC 1068, it can still be probed to some extent through the polarized IR-UV emission [125]. However, these expectations may also apply to the coronal region models. Possible evidence for year-timescale variability of neutrinos from NGC 1068 has been presented [126].

Gamma rays  $\gtrsim 1$  GeV may also exhibit some variability due to changes in the clumpy structure of the wind-torus interface on timescales  $t_{\text{dyn,o}} \lesssim 20$  yr. In contrast, virtually no variability is expected if their origin is the wind external shock or the host galaxy. Some correlation with neutrinos due to  $\dot{M}$  variations may also occur, but probably only on timescales  $\sim R_{\text{tor}}/v_o \gtrsim 60$  yr.

As a candidate source other than NGC 1068, deeper studies are particularly warranted for the Circinus galaxy, the nearest Seyfert galaxy at  $D \sim 4$  Mpc, with  $M_{\text{BH}} \simeq 2 \times 10^6 M_\odot$  and  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}} \simeq 0.2$  [127], harboring a prominent wind [128]. Although neutrino detection may need to await KM3NeT [129] due to its southern location [44], its GeV gamma-rays are of unknown nature, with luminosity possibly in excess of the star-formation contribution [130], and marginal evidence of variability [131].

Besides non-thermal MM emission, the high density of

energetic protons around the nucleus implied here may lead to other observable signatures, e.g. characteristic effects on the molecular chemistry of the torus [132], which is worth investigating. For the wind-torus interaction, thermal and/or kinematic signatures in emission lines characteristic to shocks [133] would be valuable, although separating the contribution from the inner torus region may be challenging.

### COMPARISON WITH OTHER STUDIES

Earlier models of neutrino emission from AGN cores [134–136] postulated proton acceleration in accretion shocks with very high efficiency, at a time when non-thermal pair cascades were considered promising as the origin of the X-ray emission from radio-quiet AGN. However, such models have been disfavored since the detection of hard X-ray spectral cutoffs instead of prominent electron-positron annihilation features in nearby Seyfert galaxies, which strongly supported thermal Comptonization as the X-ray emission mechanism [137, 138].

In view of the predominantly thermal nature of X-ray emission in radio-quiet AGN, more recent models of neutrino emission invoke proton acceleration with more moderate efficiency in hot coronal regions near the BH, either accretion disk coronae [43, 44] or accretion shocks [45, 46, 139]. However, despite indications from test particle simulations of stochastic acceleration [140, 141] and radio to sub-mm observations of some nearby AGN [23, 137], acceleration of non-thermal particles in such coronal regions is not yet unequivocally established from either observations or theory. Some proposed mechanisms such as stochastic acceleration and magnetic reconnection entail large uncertainties [44]. In such regions,  $\gamma\gamma$  absorption is effective down to the MeV range, so the observed gamma rays at  $\gtrsim$  GeV must arise from a separate region. These studies also did not discuss the potential contribution of electromagnetic (EM) emission from the consequent electron-positron pair cascade down to the radio band. Some of these issues were addressed here in the context of DSA in the inner regions of AGN disk-driven winds.

The small-scale jets of radio-quiet AGN have also been discussed as sites of high-energy emission, e.g.  $p\gamma$  neutrino emission by accelerated protons [121], and IC emission by accelerated electrons to account for the GeV gamma rays from NGC 1068 [142].

For AGN winds, theoretical studies have addressed the observability of non-thermal emission from external shocks where the winds interact with the host galaxy gas [18–21, 143, 144]. Tentative evidence of such emission in the radio band has been presented [22, 23, 145], but are not yet conclusive. Searches for positional correlations between IceCube neutrinos and AGN with prominent winds have so far been negative [146].

Evidence was recently presented for GeV gamma-ray emission in a stacked sample of AGN in which UFOs have been detected, and proposed as  $pp$  gamma-rays from external shocks induced by AGN winds in the host galaxy interstellar medium (ISM) [147]. The reality of the association between the gamma-ray emission and AGN winds can be questioned, since currently available samples of UFOs are subject to unknown biases concerning their viewing angle dependence [47, 52] and time variability [90]. Even if the connection between GeV emission and AGN winds is real, the above interpretation may be problematic, as the propagation of winds from the sub-pc scales of UFOs to the kpc scales of the host galaxy entails significant time delays,  $\gtrsim 10^5$  yr. In this respect, the GeV emission mechanisms discussed here induced by failed winds and/or wind-torus interaction may be more viable, as the the processes occur on scales comparable to those of UFOs.

Non-thermal EM emission assuming DSA in shocks due to collisions between BLR clouds and the accretion disk has been proposed [148]. However, for relatively high  $\lambda_{\text{Edd}}$  objects like NGC 1068, it is unclear whether BLR clouds can impact the disk at all; more likely they will be pushed out by the disk radiation pressure. Moreover, even if the impact can somehow occur with sufficient velocity, the disk gas density can be high enough so that the resulting shock is collisional, suppressing DSA.

As this work was being completed, we became aware of other related studies. The discussion of BLR cloud - disk collisions was updated in the context of a specific model of BLR origin [149]. A model of non-thermal EM emission triggered by interaction of super-Eddington winds with BLR clouds was proposed [150] (see also [62]). A composite interpretation of the MM data for NGC 1068 was presented, attributing neutrinos to the corona, and gamma rays to the host galaxy ISM [151].