

## COSMIC RAYS ABOVE THE SECOND KNEE FROM CLUSTERS OF GALAXIES AND ASSOCIATED HIGH-ENERGY NEUTRINO EMISSION

KOHTA MURASE<sup>1</sup>, SUSUMU INOUE<sup>2,3</sup>, AND SHIGEHIRO NAGATAKI<sup>1</sup>

*Submitted*

### ABSTRACT

Accretion and merger shocks in clusters of galaxies are potential accelerators of high-energy protons, which can give rise to high-energy neutrinos through  $pp$  interactions with the intracluster gas. We discuss the possibility that protons from cluster shocks make a significant contribution to the observed cosmic rays in the energy range between the second knee at  $\sim 10^{17.5}$  eV and the ankle at  $\sim 10^{18.5}$  eV. The accompanying cumulative neutrino background above  $\sim$ PeV may be detectable by upcoming neutrino telescopes such as IceCube or KM3NeT, providing a test of this scenario as well as a probe of cosmic-ray confinement properties in clusters.

*Subject headings:* acceleration of particles — cosmic rays — galaxies: clusters — neutrinos

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Clusters of galaxies (CGs) represent the largest gravitationally bound objects in the universe (e.g., Voit 2005). According to standard, hierarchical scenarios of cosmological structure formation, they are the latest systems to virialize and continue to grow through merging and accretion of dark matter and baryonic gas, thereby generating powerful shock waves on Mpc scales. In particular, accretion shocks with high Mach numbers are expected on the outskirts of massive CGs, potentially leading to efficient acceleration of high-energy particles (e.g., Miniati et al. 2000; Ryu et al. 2003). Here “accretion” signifies not only infall of diffuse intergalactic gas, but also minor merger events that induce sufficiently strong shocks near the virial radii. Moderate Mach number shocks arising further inside the CG could also be important in certain situations (e.g., Ryu et al. 2003). Predictions for the associated nonthermal radiation, notably high-energy gamma-rays, have been discussed by a number of authors (e.g., Völk et al. 1996; Berezhinsky et al. 1997; Colafrancesco & Blasi 1998; Loeb & Waxman 2000; Inoue et al. 2005; Ando & Nagai 2008).

Cosmic rays (CRs) are observed over 11 decades of energy from  $\sim 10^9$  eV to  $\gtrsim 10^{20}$  eV, and their origin is under intense debate. The all-particle spectrum is characterized by broken power-laws with a number of breaks: the knee at  $\sim 10^{15.5}$  eV where the spectral index changes from  $\sim -2.7$  to  $\sim -3.0$ , the second knee at  $\sim 10^{17.5}$  eV where it changes from  $\sim -3.0$  to  $\sim -3.2$ , and the ankle at  $\sim 10^{18.5}$  eV where it changes from  $\sim -3.2$  to  $\sim -2.7$  (Nagano & Watson 2000). Galactic supernova remnants (SNRs) are widely believed to be responsible for CRs at least up to the knee, and probably up to somewhat higher energies (Hillas 2005, and references therein). In contrast, ultra-high-energy CRs (UHECRs) with energies above the ankle are generally thought to be extragalactic (e.g., Nagano & Watson 2000; Gaisser & Stanev 2006; Bergman & Belz 2007). The Pierre Auger Observatory has revealed an anisotropy in the arrival directions of UHE-

CRs that supports this view (Abraham et al. 2007; 2008; see however Abbasi et al. 2008) but the actual identity of the sources remain unknown (e.g., Kachelrieß 2008; Inoue 2008). The origin of CRs with energies between the second knee and the ankle is even more controversial, and both extragalactic and Galactic viewpoints have been advocated. The sources may be the same as those for UHE-CRs (Berezhinsky et al. 2006; Aloisio et al. 2007), or something entirely different such as specific types of supernovae, hypernovae, Galactic winds, etc (Gaisser & Stanev 2006; Bergman & Belz 2007; Wang et al. 2007; Budnik et al. 2008, and references there in).

In this letter, we discuss high-energy neutrino emission from CGs in light of the possibility that accretion and/or merger shocks in CGs are important sources of CRs with energies between the second knee and the ankle. The observability by near future telescopes such as IceCube (Ahrens et al. 2004) or KM3NeT (Katz 2006) is addressed. Note that this view is different from scenarios in which cluster shocks are the main sources of UHECRs above the ankle (Norman et al. 1995; Kang et al. 1996; Kang et al. 1997; Inoue et al. 2007). More detailed discussions including the accompanying hadronic gamma-ray emission will be presented in a subsequent paper. We adopt the  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmological parameters  $\Omega_b = 0.04$ ,  $\Omega_m = 0.3$ ,  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$  and  $h = 0.7$ .

### 2. COSMIC-RAY PRODUCTION

We first estimate the maximum energy of the accelerated CRs. The virial radius of a CG with mass  $M = 10^{15} M_{15} M_\odot$  is  $r_{\text{vir}} \simeq 2.4 \text{ Mpc} M_{15}^{1/3} F(z, \Omega_m) (h/0.7)^{-1} (1+z)^{-1}$ , where  $F(z, \Omega_m)$  is a factor of order unity that depends weakly on redshift  $z$  and  $\Omega_m$  (Voit 2005). We write the shock radius as  $r_{\text{sh}} \equiv \lambda_{\text{sh}} r_{\text{vir}}$ , with  $\lambda_{\text{sh}} \sim 1 - 10$  expected for accretion shocks (e.g., Ryu et al. 2003). The typical shock velocity  $V_{\text{sh}}$  should be comparable to the velocity of the infalling gas  $V_{\text{ff}} \simeq 2000 \text{ km s}^{-1} M_{15}^{1/2} (r_{\text{sh}}/1 \text{ Mpc})^{-1/2}$  (Inoue et al. 2005).

The typical shock acceleration time for CRs with energy  $\varepsilon$  and charge  $Z$  is  $t_{\text{acc}} \approx 20 \kappa_{\text{sh}} / V_{\text{sh}}^2 = (20/3) (c\varepsilon / ZeBV_{\text{sh}}^2) \xi$  (see, e.g., Blandford & Eichler 1987, for reviews). Here  $B$  and  $\kappa_{\text{sh}}$  are respectively the magnetic field and diffusion coefficient at the shock, and  $\xi \equiv (B/\delta B)^2$  where  $\xi \rightarrow 1$  in the Bohm limit. Although the magnetic fields at cluster shocks are uncertain, we take  $B \sim 1 \mu\text{G}$ , as supported by recent X-ray observations of diffuse radio relics near  $r_{\text{vir}}$  for sev-

<sup>1</sup> YITP, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Oiwake-cho, Kitashirakawa, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan; kmurase@yukawa.kyoto-u.ac.jp

<sup>2</sup> Division of Theoretical Astronomy, National Astronomical Observatory of Japan, Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan

<sup>3</sup> Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Oiwake-cho, Kitashirakawa, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

eral CGs (Ferretei & Neumann 2006; Hubert Chen et al. 2008; Nakazawa et al. 2008). We also postulate  $\xi \sim 1$ , as observed to be the case for some SNRs (Uchiyama et al. 2007), and which can be expected if the fields are generated locally at the shocks by mechanisms such as the CR streaming instability (see, e.g., Bell & Lucek 2001; Bell 2004; Vladimirov et al. 2006; Bykov et al. 2008).

The maximum energy of the accelerated CRs  $\varepsilon_{\max}$  can be estimated by equating  $t_{\text{acc}}$  with various limiting time scales, such as the diffusive escape time from the shock  $t_{\text{esc}} \approx r_{\text{sh}}^2/6\kappa_{\text{sh}}$ , and the energy loss time due to photo-hadronic and/or photodisintegration interactions with the CMB and the infrared (IR) background (Kang et al. 1997; Inoue et al. 2007). When the shock is due to a transient merger-like event, the lifetime of the shock may also be relevant, which can be estimated by the dynamical time  $t_{\text{dyn}} = r_{\text{sh}}/V_{\text{sh}}$ . In the latter case,  $\varepsilon_{\max}$  would generally be determined by  $t_{\text{dyn}}$  so that  $\varepsilon_{\max} \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{18} \text{ eV} Z \xi^{-1} M_{15}^{2/3} B_{-6} \lambda_{\text{sh}}^{1/2}$ , where  $B = B_{-6} \mu\text{G}$ . Hence, we expect that cluster shocks can accelerate at least protons up to around the ankle (Norman et al. 1995).

Next we consider the energetics. Assuming a total mass accretion rate  $\dot{M} \approx 0.1 V_{\text{ff}}^3/G$  and gas fraction  $f_g = \Omega_b/\Omega_m \sim 0.13$ , the dissipation rate of infalling gas kinetic energy through the accretion shock of a CG with mass  $M$  is estimated to be  $L_{\text{ac}} \approx f_g G \dot{M} / r_{\text{sh}} \simeq 7 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg s}^{-1} (f_g/0.13) M_{15}^{5/3}$  (Keshet et al. 2004). Taking the local density of massive CGs  $n_{\text{CG}}(M \gtrsim M_{15}) \sim 2 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$  (Jenkins et al. 2001) and a CR injection efficiency  $\varepsilon_{\text{acc}} \sim 0.2$ , the CR power from CGs per logarithmic energy interval at  $\varepsilon = 10^{18} \text{ eV}$  is  $\varepsilon^2 (d\dot{n}/d\varepsilon) \simeq 10^{45} \text{ erg Mpc}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1} (R/50)^{-1}$ . Here  $R(\varepsilon) \equiv \left( \int_{\varepsilon_{\min}}^{\varepsilon_{\max}} d\varepsilon' \varepsilon' (dN/d\varepsilon') \right) / (\varepsilon^2 dN/d\varepsilon)$  depends on the injection CR spectrum; in the case of a single power-law with index  $p$  and minimum energy  $\varepsilon_{\min} = 1 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $R \sim 25$  for  $p = 2.0$ , and  $R \sim 300$  for  $p = 2.2$  (Murase et al. 2008).

In comparison, the observed CR spectrum for  $10^{17} \text{ eV} < \varepsilon < 10^{18.5} \text{ eV}$  is  $\Phi \simeq 9.23 \times 10^{-28} \text{ eV}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ sr}^{-1} (\varepsilon/6.3 \times 10^{18} \text{ eV})^{-3.2}$  (Nagano & Watson 2000). The implied CR source power and spectrum depend on evolution effects and the uncertain CR composition at these energies. Here we assume that they are proton-dominant as in some extragalactic scenarios (Berezinsky et al. 2006), and cases with a more general composition will be discussed in the future work. The required CR power at  $\varepsilon = 10^{18} \text{ eV}$  is then  $\varepsilon^2 (d\dot{n}/d\varepsilon) \sim 10^{45} \text{ erg Mpc}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , crudely accounting for energy losses during diffusive intergalactic propagation (Berezinsky et al. 2006). As long as  $R \lesssim 100$ , the two powers would be comparable and CGs energetically viable. However, since intergalactic propagation should steepen the spectral index from the injection value  $p$  by  $\sim 0.5-0.8$  (Berezinsky et al. 2006), the observed index of  $-3.2$  requires  $p \sim 2.4-2.7$  and hence  $R \gg 100$  for single power-law spectra extending down to  $\varepsilon_{\min} = 1 \text{ GeV}$ . Avoiding excessive energy demands motivates a broken power-law form with break energy  $\varepsilon_b$ :  $dN/d\varepsilon \propto \varepsilon^{-p_1}$  for  $\varepsilon < \varepsilon_b$  and  $dN/d\varepsilon \propto \varepsilon^{-p_2} \exp(-\varepsilon/\varepsilon_{\max})$  for  $\varepsilon \geq \varepsilon_b$  (see also Aloisio et al. 2007).

We consider two possibilities as to how such spectra may actually occur. One is through the superposition of hard spectra ( $p_1 \sim 2.0$ ) with a distribution of  $\varepsilon_{\max}$  (Kachelrieß & Semikoz 2006), which can be related to ac-

cretion shocks with a distribution of  $M$ . It was seen that  $\varepsilon_{\max} \propto M^{2/3}$  if the relevant condition is  $t_{\text{acc}} \approx t_{\text{dyn}}$  and if the  $M$ -dependence of  $B$  is not strong. A realistic CG mass function  $n_{\text{CG}}(> M) \propto M^{-1} \exp(-M/1.8 \times 10^{14} M_{\odot})$  can be approximated over a limited range of  $M$  as a power-law  $n_{\text{CG}}(> M) \propto M^{-\alpha}$  (Jenkins et al. 2001) so that  $dN/d\varepsilon \propto \varepsilon^{-\frac{3\alpha}{2}-\frac{1}{3}}$  for  $\varepsilon > \varepsilon_b$ . This could allow  $p_1 \sim 2.0$  and  $p_2 \sim 2.0-3.3$ .

Another possibility is a two-step acceleration process, a first source providing a seed CR population with hard spectra ( $p_1 \sim 2.0$ ) up to  $\varepsilon_b$ , which is then picked up by a second source and accelerated further with softer spectra to  $\varepsilon_{\max}$ . Since CRs with sufficiently low energies are likely to be confined in the intracluster medium (ICM) for very long times (Völk et al. 1996; Berezhinsky et al. 1997), the seed population can come from a number of sources, all accumulated over the history of the CG: the low energy portion of accretion shock CRs, supernova-driven galactic winds (GWs), and the jets of radio-loud active galactic nuclei (AGNs). Their relative importance can be estimated through their contributions to the heating of the ICM, which should be roughly proportional to their CR output as long as the relevant shocks are sufficiently strong. In the absence of GWs or AGNs, high Mach number accretion shocks are expected to contribute  $\sim 10\%$  of the heating of the ICM, while the remainder is mediated by low Mach number merger shocks (e.g., Ryu et al. 2003). GWs are unlikely to play a significant role in ICM heating due to severe radiative losses during their formation (e.g. Kravtsov & Yepes 2000). (Note that CRs of supernova origin escaping from within the host galaxy will also suffer heavy adiabatic losses). In contrast, AGN jets can contribute 1-2 keV per baryon of heat input directly to the ICM (Inoue & Sasaki 2001) (see also Enßlin et al. 1997; Enßlin et al. 1998). For massive clusters with temperatures  $\sim 10 \text{ keV}$ , this implies that CRs from AGNs can be energetically comparable to those from accretion shocks, and may be even higher for less massive clusters. Subsequent acceleration of these seed CRs to  $\varepsilon_{\max}$  may be achieved through merger and/or accretion shocks with moderate Mach numbers  $\mathcal{M} \sim 2.5-5$ , leading to  $p_2 \sim 2.2-2.7$ . The break energy  $\varepsilon_b$  may correspond to the confinement energy  $\varepsilon_{\text{diff}}$  above which CRs begin to escape diffusively out of the ICM. Under Kolmogorov-like turbulence,  $\varepsilon_{\text{diff}} \simeq 1.8 \times 10^{17} \text{ eV} Z (r/1.5 \text{ Mpc})^6 \kappa_{\text{CG},30}^{-3} (\Delta t/1 \text{ Gyr})^{-3}$ , where  $\kappa_{\text{CG}} = 10^{30} \kappa_{\text{CG},30} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$  is the diffusion coefficient in the ICM at  $\varepsilon = 1 \text{ GeV}$ , and  $\Delta t$  is the time elapsed after injection (Völk et al. 1996; Berezhinsky et al. 1997). Within the uncertainties, we see that CGs could be a viable source of CRs with energies between the second knee and the ankle.

### 3. NEUTRINO PRODUCTION

We now evaluate the spectra of associated gamma-rays and neutrinos, which are inevitably generated through  $pp$  interactions with the ambient ICM gas (Völk et al. 1996; Berezhinsky et al. 1997; Colafrancesco & Blasi 1998). In view of the above, we assume that CRs with a broken power-law spectrum is realized with  $p_1 = 2.0$  and  $p_2 = 2.4$ . We choose  $\varepsilon_b = 10^{16.5} \text{ eV}$  or  $10^{17.5} \text{ eV}$ , giving respectively  $R \simeq 78$  or  $35$ . The spatial distribution of the thermal ICM gas is generally well-constrained from X-ray observations (Pfrommer & Enßlin 2004). However, that for the CRs is uncertain, and we consider the following four models. *Model A*: CRs are uniformly distributed within  $r_{\text{sh}}$ , with  $\lambda_{\text{sh}}$  chosen such that  $t_{\text{dyn}} = 1 \text{ Gyr}$ . *Model B*:




FIG. 1.— Expected event rates for muon neutrinos ( $\nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ ) in IceCube-like detectors from five nearby CGs: Virgo, Centaurus, Perseus, Coma and Ophiuchus. Broken power-law CR spectra with  $p_1 = 2.0$ ,  $p_2 = 2.4$  and  $\varepsilon_b = 10^{17.5}$  eV is assumed, and the *Isobaric* model with  $X_{\text{CR}} = 0.029$  is used. Note that IceCube and KM3NeT mainly cover the northern and southern celestial hemispheres, respectively. Neutrino oscillation is taken into account.

CRs are uniformly distributed within  $r_{\text{vir}}$ , giving a conservative estimate compared to other models. *Isobaric*: CRs at each radii have energy density proportional to that of the thermal gas with ratio  $X_{\text{CR}}$  (Pfrommer & Enßlin 2004; Ando & Nagai 2008). *Central AGN*: CRs are distributed as  $dN/d\varepsilon \propto r^{-1}\varepsilon^{-p-\frac{1}{3}}$  for  $\varepsilon \geq (r_c^2/6\kappa_{\text{CG}}\Delta t)^3$  and  $dN/d\varepsilon \propto \varepsilon^{-p}$  for  $\varepsilon < (r_c^2/6\kappa_{\text{CG}}\Delta t)^3$ , corresponding to CRs diffusing out from a central source such as an AGN as discussed in (Berezinsky et al. 1997; Colafrancesco & Blasi 1998); here accretion or merger shocks may not be involved. But, in the two-step acceleration scenario, this model could be more realistic below the break energy. We perform numerical calculations of the neutrino spectra using formulae based on the SIBYLL code at high energies (Kelner et al. 2006).

The neutrino and gamma-ray fluxes can be estimated analytically via the effective optical depth for the  $pp$  reaction as  $f_{pp} \approx 0.8\sigma_{pp}n_N t_{\text{int}}$ , where  $n_N$  is the target nucleon density in the ICM,  $\sigma_{pp}$  is the  $pp$  cross section and  $t_{\text{int}} \sim t_{\text{dyn}}$  or  $\max[r/c, t_{\text{diff}}]$  is the  $pp$  interaction time. Because  $n_N \sim 10^{-4.5} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  at  $r \sim 1.5$  Mpc (Colafrancesco & Blasi 1998; Pfrommer & Enßlin 2004) and  $\sigma_{pp} \sim 10^{-25} \text{ cm}^2$  in the 100 PeV range (Kelner et al. 2006), we obtain

$$f_{pp} \sim 2.4 \times 10^{-3} n_{N,-4.5} (t_{\text{int}}/1 \text{ Gyr}). \quad (1)$$

Roughly speaking, high-energy neutrinos from charged-pion decay have typical energy  $\varepsilon_\nu \sim 0.03\varepsilon$  (true only in the average sense, because charged particles have wide energy distributions and high multiplicities as expected from the KNO scaling law) (Kelner et al. 2006). Hence, neutrinos  $\gtrsim$  PeV are directly related to CRs above the second knee.

First we obtain numerically the neutrino spectra and expected event rates from five nearby CGs, utilizing the  $\beta$  model or double- $\beta$  model description in Tables. 1 and 2 in Pfrommer & Enßlin 2004 for the thermal gas profile of each CG (Fig. 1). Our gamma-ray fluxes for single power-law spectra agree with the results of Pfrommer & Enßlin 2004. As is apparent in Fig. 1, the detection of neutrino signals from individual CGs could be challenging even for nearby objects. It may be achievable, however, through a detailed stacking analysis.




FIG. 2.— Cumulative neutrino ( $\nu_e + \bar{\nu}_e + \nu_\mu + \bar{\nu}_\mu + \nu_\tau + \bar{\nu}_\tau$ ) background from CGs for broken power-law CR spectra with  $p_1 = 2.0$  and  $p_2 = 2.4$ . The break energies are  $\varepsilon_b = 10^{17.5}$  eV (thick lines) and  $\varepsilon_b = 10^{16.5}$  eV (thin lines), respectively. The CR power is normalized to  $\varepsilon^2(d\dot{n}/d\varepsilon) = 2 \times 10^{45} \text{ erg Mpc}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  at  $\varepsilon = 10^{18}$  eV, as required to account for CRs above the second knee. For *isobaric*, the corresponding  $X_{\text{CR}}$  is 0.029 and 0.067. For *central AGN*, Kolmogorov-like turbulence is assumed with  $\kappa_{\text{CG}} = 10^{30} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . We take  $t_{\text{dyn}} = \Delta t = 1$  Gyr and  $z_{\text{max}} = 2$ . WB represents the Waxman-Bahcall bounds (Waxman & Bahcall 1998).

More promising would be the cumulative background signal. A rough estimate of the neutrino background is (e.g., Murase 2007; Waxman & Bahcall 1998)

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_\nu^2 \Phi_\nu &\sim \frac{c}{4\pi H_0} \frac{1}{3} \min[1, f_{pp}] \varepsilon^2 \frac{dN}{d\varepsilon dt} n_{\text{CG}}(0) f_z \\ &\sim 1.5 \times 10^{-9} \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ str}^{-1} f_z \\ &\times \left( \frac{f_{pp}(\varepsilon = 10^{18} \text{ eV})}{2.4 \times 10^{-3}} \right) \left( \frac{\varepsilon_\nu}{10 \text{ PeV}} \right)^{-p+2.1}, \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

where CGs are assumed to be the main sources of CRs from the second knee to the ankle. Here,  $n_{\text{CG}}(0)$  is the local density of massive CGs and  $f_z$  is a correction factor for the source evolution (Murase 2007; Waxman & Bahcall 1998). For detailed numerical calculations of the background, we treat more distant CGs following (Colafrancesco & Blasi 1998), adopting the mass function of (Jenkins et al. 2001). The results for the broken power-law case are shown in Fig. 2. With  $\varepsilon_b = 10^{17.5}$  eV, the expected event rates above 0.1 PeV in IceCube (Ahrens et al. 2004) are  $\sim 2 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for *model A*,  $\sim 1 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for *model B*,  $\sim 5 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for *isobaric* and  $\sim 3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for *central AGN*.

Hence, upcoming telescopes may be able to find multi-PeV neutrino signals from CGs, providing a crucial test of our scenario. From Eq. (2), we can also estimate the corresponding gamma-ray background from  $\pi^0$  decay, which is  $\varepsilon_\gamma^2 \Phi_\gamma \sim (10^{-9} - 10^{-8}) \text{ GeV cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ str}^{-1}$  for the broken power-law case. This is only (0.1–1)% of the EGRET limit, consistent with the nondetection so far for individual CGs. Note that the expected gamma-ray background flux would increase if  $\varepsilon_b$  can be decreased, requiring larger CR power from CGs.

#### 4. IMPLICATIONS AND DISCUSSION

To test the CG origin of second knee CRs, high-energy neutrinos should offer one of the most crucial multi-messenger signals. Unlike at the highest energies, CRs themselves in the  $10^{18}$  eV range offer no chance of source identification as

they should be severely deflected by Galactic and extragalactic magnetic fields. Moreover, due to magnetic horizon effects, extragalactic CRs  $\lesssim 10^{17}$  eV may not reach us at all (Lemoine 2005; Kotera & Lemoine 2007), so even the broken power-law spectral form will not be directly observable. Gamma-rays are unaffected by intervening magnetic fields, but those at  $\gtrsim$  PeV energies relevant for the second knee are significantly attenuated by pair-creation processes with the CMB and cosmic IR backgrounds (e.g., Kachelrieß 2008). In contrast, neutrinos in the PeV-EeV energy range should be unscathed during propagation (Bhattacharjee & Sigl 2000, and references there in). Consequently, such neutrinos may also constitute a unique tool for probing the uncertain CR confinement properties of CGs through the dependence on  $\varepsilon_{\text{diff}}$ .

AGNs can complicate the cluster shock neutrino signal, either by emitting PeV-EeV neutrinos themselves, or injecting CRs that produces neutrinos without the intervention of cluster shocks. In principle, cross correlation of the detected events with known CGs and AGNs should be an effective discriminant. In the former case, AGNs inside as well as outside CGs should correlate, whereas in the latter, CGs with powerful AGNs should correlate stronger than those without. For cluster shock neutrinos, correlation with all sufficiently massive CGs is expected.

Gamma-ray observations at GeV-TeV energies would also be crucial. In combination with  $\gtrsim$  PeV neutrino observations, they can probe the CR spectrum over a broad energy range and test our broken power-law assumption. By providing information on the spatial distribution of sub-PeV CRs, they would also help to distinguish among our different models, and to constrain the AGN contribution of CRs and neutrinos. However, if  $\varepsilon_b$  is sufficiently high, their detection may not be trivial except for a few nearby CGs such as Virgo. Other emission processes may also be at work (e.g., Loeb & Waxman 2000; Inoue et al. 2005), complicating the

extraction of the  $\pi^0$  decay component. More details on the gamma-ray emission will be given in a following paper.

Note that high-energy neutrinos can also be produced by photomeson interactions with the IR background (e.g., Takami et al. 2007), which may possibly be enhanced inside CGs (De Marco et al. 2006). The effective optical depth for this process is roughly  $f_{p\gamma} \sim 10^{-3} - 10^{-1}$ . These neutrinos become important above  $\sim 0.1$  EeV, where detection by IceCube or KM3NeT is relatively more difficult. We defer the study of such photomeson-induced neutrinos in CGs to the future.

Our neutrino predictions were based on simplified models for the CR distribution in CGs. More realistic evaluations need to include the inhomogeneous structure of accretion and merger shocks, the magnetic field distribution inside and outside CGs, and the associated CR acceleration and propagation processes. The CR confinement properties are especially crucial. Although somewhat extreme, if CR confinement in CGs is more efficient than we have assumed, the contribution to the CR flux would decrease while the relative neutrino flux would increase. Confinement may possibly be effective even on larger scales such as filaments or superclusters, in which case the CR contribution could increase relative to the neutrino flux, as our Galaxy resides in the local supercluster.

K.M. and S.I. thank the referee, T. Kitayama, R. Blandford, F. Takahara and H. Takami for useful comments. K.M. is supported by a JSPS fellowship. S.I. is supported in part by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of E.C.S.S.T. (MEXT) of Japan, Nos. 19047004 and 19540283. S.N. is likewise partially supported by Nos. 19104006, 19740139 and 19047004. Support also comes from the Grant-in-Aid for the Global COE Program "The Next Generation of Physics, Spun from Universality and Emergence" from MEXT.

#### REFERENCES

- Abbasi, R. U. et al. 2008, arXiv:0804.0382  
 Abraham, J., et al. 2007, *Science*, 318, 938  
 — 2008, *Astropart. Phys.*, 29, 188  
 Ahrens, J., et al. 2004, *Astropart. Phys.*, 20, 507  
 Aloisio, R., et al. 2007, *Astropart. Phys.*, 27, 76  
 Ando, S., & Nagai D. 2008, *MNRAS*, 385, 2243  
 Bell, A.R. 2004, *MNRAS*, 353, 550  
 Bell, A.R., & Lucek, S.G. 2001, *MNRAS*, 321, 433  
 Berezhinsky, V. S., Blasi, P., & Ptuskin, V. S. 1997, *ApJ*, 487, 529  
 Berezhinsky, V. S., Gazizov, A. Z., & Grigorieva, S. I. 2006, *Phys. Rev. D*, 74, 043005  
 Bergman, D. R., & Belz, J. W. 2007, *J. Phys. G*, 34, R359  
 Bhattacharjee, P. & Sigl, G. 2000, *Phys. Rep.* 327, 109  
 Blandford, R.D., & Eichler, D. 1987, *Phys. Rep.*, 154, 1  
 Budnik, R., Katz, B., MacFadyen, A. & Waxman, E. 2008, *ApJ*, 673, 928  
 Bykov, A.M., Dolag, K., & Durret, F. 2008, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 134, 119  
 Colafrancesco, S., & Blasi, P. 1998, *Astropart. Phys.*, 9, 227  
 De Marco, D., Hansen, P., Stanev, T., & Blasi, P. 2006, *Phys. Rev. D*, 73, 043004  
 Enßlin, T. A., Biermann, P. L., Kronberg, P. P., & Wu, X.-P. 1997, *ApJ*, 477, 560  
 Enßlin, T. A., Wang, Y., Nath, B. B. & Biermann, P. L. 1998, *A&A*, 333, L47  
 Feretti, L., & Neumann, D. M. 2006, 2006, *A&A*, 450, L21  
 Gaisser, T.K., & Stanev, T. 2006, *Nuc. Phys. A*, 777, 98  
 Hillas, A. M. 2005, *J. Phys. G*, 31, R95  
 Hubert Chen, C. M., et al. 2008, *MNRAS*, 383, 1259  
 Inoue, S. 2008, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.*, 120, 062001 (arXiv:0809.3205)  
 Inoue, S., Aharonian, F. A., & Sugiyama, N. 2005, *ApJ*, 628, L9  
 Inoue, S. & Sasaki, S. 2001, *ApJ*, 562, 618  
 Inoue, S., Sigl, S., Miniati, F., & Armengaud, E. 2007, preprint (arXiv:astro-ph/0701167)  
 Jenkins, A., et al. 2001, *MNRAS*, 321, 372  
 Kachelrieß, M. 2008, preprint (arXiv:0801.4376)  
 Kachelrieß, M., & Semikoz, D. V. 2006, *Phys. Lett. B*, 634, 143  
 Kang, H., Ryu, D., & Jones, T. W. 1996, *ApJ*, 456, 422  
 Kang, H., Rachen, J. P., & Biermann, P. L. 1997, *MNRAS*, 286, 257  
 Katz, U. F. 2006, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res., Sect. A*, 567, 457  
 Keshet, U., Waxman, E., & Loeb, A. 2004, *ApJ*, 617, 281  
 Kelner, S. R., Aharonian, F. A., & Bugayov, V. V. 2006, *Phys. Rev. D*, 74, 034018  
 Kravtsov, A. V. & Yepes, G. 2000, *MNRAS*, 318, 227  
 Kotera, K., & Lemoine, M. 2007, *Phys. Rev. D*, 77, 023005  
 Lemoine, M. 2005, *Phys. Rev. D*, 71, 083007  
 Loeb, A., & Waxman, E. 2000, *Nature*, 405, 156  
 Miniati, F., et al. 2000, *ApJ*, 542, 608  
 Murase, K. 2007, *Phys. Rev. D*, 76, 123001  
 Murase, K., Ioka, K., Nagataki, S., & Nakamura, T. 2008, *Phys. Rev. D*, 78, 023005  
 Nagano, N., & Watson, A. A. 2000, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 72, 689  
 Nakazawa, K. et al. 2008, *PASJ*, submitted  
 Norman, C. A., Melrose, D. B., & Achterberg, A. 1995, *ApJ*, 454, 60  
 Frommer, C., & Enßlin, T. A. 2004, *Astron. Astrophys.* 413, 17  
 Ryu, D., et al. *ApJ*, 593, 599 (2003)  
 Takami, H., Murase, K., Nagataki, S., & Sato, K. 2007, preprint (arXiv:0704.0979)  
 Uchiyama, Y. et al. 2007, *Nature* 449, 576  
 Vladimirov, A., Ellison, D. C., & Bykov, A. 2006, *ApJ*, 652, 1246  
 Völk, H. J., Aharonian, F. A., & Breitschwerdt, D. 1996, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 75, 279  
 Voit, G. M. 2005, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 77, 207  
 Wang, X. Y., Razzaque, S., Mészáros, P., & Dai, Z. G. 2007, *Phys. Rev. D*, 76, 083009

Waxman, E., & Bahcall, J. 1998, Phys. Rev. D, 59, 023002