

THE GUARANTEED GAMMA-RAY BACKGROUND

Vasiliki Pavlidou and Brian D. Fields

*Center for Theoretical Astrophysics, Department of Astronomy
University of Illinois, Urbana, IL 61801*

ABSTRACT

The diffuse extragalactic gamma-ray background (EGRB) above 100 MeV encodes unique information about high-energy processes in the universe. Numerous sources for the EGRB have been proposed, but the two systems which are certain to make some contribution are active galaxies (blazars) as well as normal galaxies. In this paper, we evaluate the contribution to the background from both sources. The active galaxy contribution arises from unresolved blazars. We compute this contribution using the Stecker-Salamon model. For normal galaxies, the emission is due to cosmic-ray interactions with diffuse gas. Our key assumption here is that the cosmic-ray flux in a galaxy is proportional to the supernova rate and thus the massive star formation rate, quantified observationally by the cosmic star formation rate (CSFR). In addition, the existence of stars today requires a considerably higher ISM mass in the past. Using the CSFR to compute both these effects, we find that normal galaxies are responsible for a significant portion ($\sim 1/3$) of the EGRB near 1 GeV, but make a smaller contribution at other energies. Finally, we present a “minimal” two-component model which includes contributions from both normal galaxies and blazars. We show that the spectrum of the diffuse radiation is a key constraint on this model: while neither the blazar spectra, nor the galactic spectra, are separately optimal fits to the observed spectrum, the combined emission provides an excellent fit. We close by noting key observational tests of this two-component model, which can be probed by future gamma-ray observatories such as GLAST.

Subject headings: gamma rays: theory — cosmic rays — diffuse radiation — galaxies: evolution

1. Introduction

All-sky γ -ray observations by SAS 2 (Fichtel et al. 1977; Fichtel, Simpson, & Thompson 1978) and most recently by EGRET (Sreekumar et al. 1998) have revealed the existence of

an isotropic diffuse γ -ray emission, presumably of extragalactic origin. This extragalactic gamma-ray background (EGRB) is well-described by a power-law energy spectrum with an index of -2.10 ± 0.03 , while the extragalactic intensity for energies > 100 MeV has an all-sky average value $(1.45 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-5}$ photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{sr}^{-1}$ (Sreekumar et al. 1998; Fichtel 1996).

A variety of possible contributions to the EGRB have been proposed. There are, however, two classes of γ -ray sources whose existence has been observationally established and thus guarantees that these make *some* contribution to the EGRB: blazars and normal galaxies.

Blazars, which are active galactic nuclei with jets almost aligned with the line of sight (Blandford & Königl 1979; Maraschi, Ghisellini, & Celotti 1992; Dermer & Gehrels 1995), comprise the vast majority of the identified γ -ray point sources detected by EGRET (Hartman et al. 1999). In addition, their energy spectra are power laws, with a distribution of indices peaked close to the EGRB energy spectrum index. It is therefore only logical to argue that a population of unresolved blazars with photon fluxes below EGRET sensitivity has to be the origin of a significant portion of the EGRB (Stecker, Salamon, & Malkan 1993). A large AGN contribution to the EGRB has been anticipated as early as the 1970's (e.g., Strong, Wolfendale, & Worrall (1976); Bignami, Fichtel, Hartman, & Thompson (1979); Padovani, Ghisellini, Fabian, & Celotti (1993)). Given the EGRET results on blazars, Salamon & Stecker (1994) and Stecker & Salamon (1996, henceforward SS96) made a detailed calculation of the blazar contribution to the EGRB and indeed found it to be dominant, although the shape of the predicted blazar emission energy spectrum does not match the flatter spectrum of the latest EGRET EGRB determination (Sreekumar et al. 1998).

While the EGRET catalog of point sources is dominated by blazars, the EGRET diffuse flux is dominated by emission from the Galactic plane. The latter is, for the most part, the result of the decay of neutral pions produced when cosmic rays interact with the interstellar medium. The superposition of this diffuse γ -ray emission from all unresolved normal galaxies is the second guaranteed source of extragalactic background γ -ray intensity. The contribution of normal galaxies to the EGRB was calculated by Strong, Wolfendale, & Worrall (1976) for the case of non-evolving galaxies and was found to be a few percent of the observed background. Lichti, Bignami, & Paul (1978) extended this calculation to include galactic evolution, which they found to significantly enhance the predicted background. Their results spanned a range $\Phi(> 100 \text{ MeV}) = 0.3 - 7 \times 10^{-6}$ photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \text{sr}^{-1}$ which comes much closer to the observed level. Silk & Schramm (1992) and Prantzos & Cassé (1994) inferred a similarly large result from spallogenic element abundances.

We define the sum of the γ -ray emission from all unresolved blazars and from all

unresolved normal galaxies to be the guaranteed EGRB. If the intensity level of the guaranteed EGRB can be confidently estimated, then by comparison to the observed EGRB one can constrain the observationally allowed contributions from any other hypothesized sources.

In this paper we present a new calculation of the contribution of normal galaxies to the EGRB. We use observational estimates of the cosmic star formation rate (CSFR), which have recently become available, to model the evolution of normal galaxy γ -ray emission. To the latter, we then add the blazar component of the spectrum as given by SS96. Our results are computed for the currently favored $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$ cosmology. The resulting minimal two-component model will prove to be an excellent fit to the observed EGRET EGRB spectrum for energies up to 15 GeV, where γ -ray extinction is not important.

2. Formalism

The observable quantity which describes the EGRB is the differential intensity $dI_E/d\Omega = dN_\gamma/dtdAdEd\Omega$. We need to calculate theoretically the differential intensity resulting from a collection of unresolved γ -ray sources. The differential intensity detected at the present cosmic epoch due to a population of γ -ray sources with collective comoving differential γ -ray emissivity density $\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}(z, E) = dN_\gamma/dtdV_{\text{com}}dE$ (where V_{com} is the comoving volume) will be

$$\frac{dI_E}{d\Omega} = \int \frac{\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}[z, (1+z)E]}{4\pi a(t_0)^2 r^2} \frac{dV_{\text{com}}}{dzd\Omega} dz, \quad (1)$$

where r is the coordinate distance of a source at a redshift z and $a(t)$ is the dimensionless scale factor of the Friedmann - Robertson - Walker metric at a cosmic time t , so that $a(t_0) = 1$. In a flat universe with matter density parameter Ω_m and vacuum energy density parameter $\Omega_\Lambda = 1 - \Omega_m$, eq. (1) becomes

$$\frac{dI_E}{d\Omega} = \frac{c}{4\pi H_0} \int \frac{\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}[z, (1+z)E]}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_m(1+z)^3}} dz, \quad (2)$$

where H_0 is the present value of the Hubble parameter.

In the case of blazars, SS96 have calculated $\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}$ considering blazars to be in either one of two states, flaring and quiescent. Their calculation was done for an $\Omega_m = 1$ cosmology. We have confirmed that our blazar calculation exactly reproduces their result for their chosen cosmology. We have then adapted their model to our preferred cosmology, keeping all other parameters the same. We have confirmed that in the new cosmology, the derived blazar luminosity function reproduces the EGRET 2nd catalog flux distribution of observed blazars, in exactly the same way as in the original Stecker-Salamon calculation.

In the case of normal galaxies, $\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}$ can be expressed in terms of the CSFR function (mass being converted to stars per unit time per unit comoving volume, denoted by $\dot{\rho}_*(z)$). The star formation rate (SFR, mass converted to stars per unit time) of an individual galaxy will be denoted by ψ . In order to associate the CSFR with $\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}$, we assume that: (1) the high mass end of the initial mass function (IMF) is universal, and thus ψ as deduced from observations of high-mass stars is always proportional to the supernova explosion rate in the same galaxy; (2) the cosmic ray flux in a galaxy is proportional to ψ and the cosmic ray spectral shape is universal (see Fields *et al.* (2001)); and (3) at any cosmic epoch the cosmic ray escape properties are the same as in the present Milky Way, and any γ -rays produced after escape are negligible.

An average galaxy’s γ -ray (number) luminosity is, by virtue of our assumptions,

$$L_\gamma(z, E) = \frac{\psi(z)}{\psi_{\text{MW}}} \frac{\mu(z)}{\mu(0)} L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}(E) \quad (3)$$

where E is the photon energy in the galaxy’s rest frame, and $\mu(z)$ is the gas mass fraction of the galaxy at redshift z . The factor $\mu(z)/\mu(0)$ has been introduced to account for the increase of target atoms at earlier cosmic epochs and assumes a “closed box” galaxy. The emissivity density will then be

$$\dot{n}_{\gamma,\text{com}}(z, E) = L_\gamma n_{\text{gal}} = L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}(E) \frac{\dot{\rho}_*(z)}{\psi_{\text{MW}}} \frac{\mu(z)}{\mu(0)}, \quad (4)$$

where the comoving galaxy number density n_{gal} and star formation rate $\psi(z)$ are related to the CSFR via $\psi n_{\text{gal}} = \dot{\rho}_*$. Note that, due to our assumptions, the conversion of a certain amount of gas into stars will result to the production of the same amount of γ rays from CR-ISM interactions *regardless of the way the star formation is distributed among galaxies*. Therefore, our calculation does not depend on the observational knowledge of both ψ and n_{gal} individually, but only on that of their product, which is the CSFR.

Now the sum of gas mass and star mass in a closed box is constant in time, equal to the baryonic mass of the galaxy. Hence,

$$\mu(z) = 1 - [1 - \mu(0)] \frac{\int_{z_*}^z dz \frac{dt}{dz} \dot{\rho}_*(z)}{\int_{z_*}^0 dz \frac{dt}{dz} \dot{\rho}_*(z)}, \quad (5)$$

where z_* is the assumed redshift at which star formation begins.

Equations (2), (4), and (5) can be combined to give

$$\frac{dI_E}{d\Omega} = \frac{c}{4\pi H_0 \psi_{\text{MW}}} \int_0^{z_*} dz \left\{ \dot{\rho}_*(z) \frac{L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}[(1+z)E]}{\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_m(1+z)^3}} \right.$$

$$\left[\frac{1}{\mu_{0,\text{MW}}} - \left(\frac{1}{\mu_{0,\text{MW}}} - 1 \right) \frac{\int_{z_\star}^z dz \frac{dt}{dz} \dot{\rho}_\star(z)}{\int_{z_\star}^0 dz \frac{dt}{dz} \dot{\rho}_\star(z)} \right] \}. \quad (6)$$

Here ψ_{MW} is the star formation rate of the MW today and $\mu_{0,\text{MW}}$ is the MW gas mass fraction today.

3. Inputs

3.1. Cosmic Star Formation Rate

The observational determination of the CSFR is based on observations of the cosmic luminosity density in various wavebands which are dominated by emission from short-lived stars; these include the UV (e.g., Lilly *et al.* (1996); Madau, Pozzetti, & Dickinson (1998)), the IR (e.g., Chary & Elbaz (2001); Cole *et al.* (2001)) and H α (e.g., Gallego *et al.* (1995); Tresse & Maddox (1998); Hopkins, Connolly, & Szalay (2000)). For $z < 1$ there is a relatively clear picture of the CSFR evolution, and results from different wavebands generally agree that the CSFR increases to peak around $z = 1$ reaching a maximum more than an order of magnitude larger than its present value. For $z = 1 - 4$, however, the uncertainty in the CSFR reaches about an order of magnitude, as the derived CSFR values depend strongly on the assumed amount of dust extinction (see, e.g., the compilation of CSFR estimates using different tracers by Hopkins, *et al.* (2001)).

In computing the normal galaxy contribution to the EGRB we will use the analytic fit of the CSFR evolution given by Cole *et al.* (2001), based on near-infrared observations, a Salpeter mass function and an $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$ cosmology. We will refer to their fit of data points not corrected for dust extinction as the “uncorrected CSFR” and to their fit of data points corrected for dust absorption as the “dust-corrected CSFR.”

3.2. The Observed Galactic Gamma-Ray Spectrum

In performing the integral of eq. (6) we will also need the functional form of the differential diffuse γ -ray (number) luminosity of the Milky Way, $L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}$. We will use EGRET observations of the γ -ray *flux* from the Galactic plane to deduce the shape of the spectrum. We find that the EGRET flux spectrum can be well fitted by a double power law, of spectral indices -1.52 for energies below 850 MeV and -2.39 for higher energies. The normalization of the (number) luminosity spectrum can be determined from the requirement that $\int_{100 \text{ MeV}}^\infty L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}(E) dE = q_\gamma(> 100 \text{ MeV}) \mathcal{N}_{\text{H,MW}}$ where $q_\gamma(> 100 \text{ MeV})$ is the total γ -ray

emissivity per hydrogen atom and $\mathcal{N}_{\text{H,MW}}$ is the number of H atoms in the MW. Using a value of $q_\gamma = 2.4 \times 10^{-25}$ photons s^{-1} (H atom) $^{-1}$ (see, e.g., Pavlidou & Fields (2001) and references therein) and a total gas content of the MW $M_{\text{gas,MW}} \sim 10^{10} M_\odot$ (see, e.g., Fields *et al.* 2001 for a discussion of the uncertainties involved in this estimate) we find $\int_{100 \text{ MeV}}^\infty L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}(E) dE = 2.85 \times 10^{42}$ photons s^{-1} . This gives $L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}(E) = 7.21 \times 10^{38} (E/850 \text{ MeV})^{-\kappa}$ $\gamma \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ MeV}^{-1}$, where $\kappa = 1.52$ for $E \leq 850 \text{ MeV}$ and $\kappa = 2.39$ for $E > 850 \text{ MeV}$.

3.3. Other Inputs

The MW star formation rate is a poorly known quantity, and estimates for its value range from $1.6 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Tan 2000) to $3.5 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (derived from the estimate of Dragicovich, Blair, & Burman (1999) for the MW supernova rate using a Salpeter IMF and a supernova progenitor mass cutoff of $8 M_\odot$). Here, we will use $\psi_{\text{MW}} = 3.2 M_\odot \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (McKee 1989), which lies in the upper range of the available estimates and therefore leads to a conservative estimate of the normal galaxy EGRB component. For the MW gas mass fraction today we will adopt $\mu_{0,\text{MW}} = 0.14$, using $M_{\text{gas,MW}} = 10^{10} M_\odot$ and a star mass value of $M_{\star,\text{MW}} = 7 \times 10^{10}$ (Pagel 1997). Finally, we will use $z_\star = 5$ for the redshift for which star formation begins.

4. Results

The spectrum of the normal galaxy contribution to the EGRB, as derived from eq. (6), and for a dust-corrected CSFR, is plotted in the upper panel of Fig. 1. In the same plot, we have overplotted the blazar contribution as calculated from the SS96 model, for our preferred $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $\Omega_m = 0.3$ cosmology, as well as the “minimal” two-component model of the guaranteed EGRB. This summed spectrum has a flatter shape than either of its constituent spectra due to the fact that the maximum of the convex normal galaxy curve happens to lie in the same energy regime with the minimum of the concave blazar spectrum.

The “minimal model” is in excellent agreement with the observational data points from EGRET (Sreekumar et al. 1998), both in amplitude and in spectral shape, for energies up to 15 GeV. For higher energies, absorption effects due to pair production, which have not been treated here, become important¹. For the first 10 points with energies $\lesssim 15 \text{ GeV}$, the

¹The threshold for intergalactic absorption or downscattering by pair production is at $E_{\gamma,\text{th}} = m_e^2 / \epsilon_{\gamma,\text{bgnd}} = 0.21 \text{ TeV}$ ($\lambda_{\gamma,\text{bgnd}} / 1 \mu\text{m}$). The photon backgrounds with enough energy density to introduce a significant cutoff are the UV, optical, and IR (Madau & Phinney 1996; Salamon & Stecker 1998), so that the practical cutoff is at about $\sim 0.075 \mu\text{m}$ (Madau & Pozzetti 2000, taking their $\sim 0.15 \mu\text{m}$ observed

minimal model has a χ^2 per degree of freedom ν of $\chi_\nu^2 = 0.78$, indicating an excellent fit. For comparison, the blazar contribution alone has $\chi_\nu^2 = 4.68$. Had we made use of the free parameter in the Stecker-Salamon blazar model which allows for the variation of the total amplitude of the blazar contribution, the blazar-only model has a minimum $\chi_\nu^2 = 0.95$, still somewhat larger than that of the summed normal galaxy - blazar spectrum. Moreover, such an increase of the blazar contribution would be ignoring the guaranteed contribution from normal galaxies which, if added to the boosted blazar signal, would overpredict the EGRB. Therefore, we conclude that no modification is needed in the Stecker & Salamon (1996) calculation for energies $\lesssim 15$ GeV.

Uncertainties in our normal galaxy spectrum calculation are introduced due to uncertainties in the determination of $\dot{\rho}_*(z)$, $M_{\text{gas,MW}}$, $\mu_{0,\text{MW}}$ and $q_{\gamma,\text{MW}}$. Of our input parameters, ψ_{MW} and $q_{\gamma,\text{MW}}$ enter our calculation as multiplicative factors and therefore uncertainties in their values do not affect the shape of the spectrum, but only the overall normalization (introducing an overall uncertainty of a factor ~ 4). Our results are relatively insensitive to the value of $M_{\text{gas,MW}}$ since a change in its value affects the calculation through $L_{\gamma,\text{MW}}$ and $\mu_{0,\text{MW}}$ in opposite directions. In addition, our calculation shows that most of the background intensity in the normal galaxy component originates from $z < 1$. Therefore, our results are not affected significantly by the CSFR evolution at $z > 1$ where the CSFR uncertainties can reach an order of magnitude. This fact is demonstrated in the lower panel of Fig. 1, where we have plotted the normal galaxy spectrum for both the dust-corrected CSFR and the uncorrected CSFR, together with the spectrum derived for a dust-corrected CSFR in the extreme case where *no* star formation is assumed to have taken place at $z > 1$. The difference from the full integration up to $z = 5$ is less than a factor of 2. We note that in the latter case, the peak of the spectrum is displaced towards higher energies. On the other hand, if the CSFR was much higher at high redshifts, as suggested recently by Lanzetta *et al.* (2002), this would displace the peak of the spectrum towards lower energies.

5. Discussion

The minimal 2-component model of the EGRB can be tested and improved in various ways when observations from future γ - ray telescopes such as GLAST become available. On the one hand, the improved effective collecting area of GLAST as compared with that

cutoff to correspond to $z \sim 1$). Therefore, the threshold is $E_{\gamma,\text{th}} \sim 15$ GeV, which is interestingly the energy of the first data point deviating from the computed spectrum. For energies above that threshold, the reader should be aware that our spectra should be reduced by about a factor ~ 2 ; we plan to return to this effect in a future publication.

of EGRET, especially at high energies, will allow GLAST to accurately measure the shape of the EGRB for energies up to 1 TeV. This will test whether the spectrum turns over at energies higher than ~ 15 GeV due to electron-pair production via interactions with the IR, UV and optical backgrounds (Madau & Phinney 1996; Salamon & Stecker 1998). Any model in which the EGRB is assumed to be of cosmic origin should exhibit this behavior. If the GLAST data do not confirm that prediction, all extragalactic models are ruled out unless they can predict compensatingly steepening spectra with increasing redshift.

On the other hand, the improved point source sensitivity of GLAST will allow it to resolve a higher number of blazars (~ 100 more than EGRET, Stecker & Salamon 1999), and therefore the blazar contribution to the EGRB will be reduced by about a factor of 2. If unresolved blazars are the only constituent of the EGRB, the *fractional change* of the EGRB will be the same as the fractional change of the background blazar emission. If, however, there is a second component in the EGRB (in our case, that of normal galaxies), the fractional change of the EGRB should be smaller.

In addition, with the blazar component reduced by a factor of 2, our calculated normal galaxy contribution will become comparable to that of blazars for energies ~ 1 GeV. Therefore, if the relative contributions of blazars and normal galaxies to the minimal model are comparable to our estimates, the shape of the EGRB spectrum should start to exhibit a (detectable in principle) deviation from its single power-law form at ~ 1 GeV, corresponding to the normal galaxy spectrum peak. Were this peak detected, the relative contribution of normal galaxies to the EGRB could be determined observationally.

The observations of GLAST can also be used to improve the minimal model and its predictions. The observations of more blazars will allow a more confident determination of the observational inputs for the SS96 blazar model, as pointed out by Stecker & Salamon (1999). As far as the normal galaxy component model is concerned, GLAST is expected to detect several Local Group galaxies (the SMC, LMC, M31 and maybe M33; Pavlidou & Fields 2001), and therefore it will be possible to check our assumption of the universality of the galactic diffuse gamma-ray emission spectrum.

Finally, with both guaranteed EGRB components well-understood, one can better identify or constrain any other components and any new physics which might generate them.

We thank Kostas Tassis for enlightening discussions, and the referee, O.C. de Jager, for helpful suggestions which improved this paper. This work was supported by National Science Foundation grant AST-0092939. The work of VP was partially supported by a scholarship from the Greek State Scholarships Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Bignami, G. F., Fichtel, C. E., Hartman, R. C., & Thompson, D. J. 1979, *ApJ*, 232, 649
- Blandford, R. D. & Königl, A. 1979, *ApJ*, 232, 34
- Chary, R. & Elbaz, D. 2001, *ApJ*, 556, 562
- Cole, S. et al. 2001, *MNRAS*, 326, 255
- Dermer, C. D. & Gehrels, N. 1995, *ApJ*, 447, 103
- Dragicevich, P. M., Blair, D. G., & Burman, R. R. 1999, *MNRAS*, 302, 693
- Fichtel, C. 1996, *A&AS*, 120, C23
- Fichtel, C. E., et al. 1977, *ApJ*, 217, L9
- Fichtel, C. E., Simpson, G. A., & Thompson, D. J. 1978, *ApJ*, 222, 833
- Fields, B. D., Olive, K. A., Cassé, M., & Vangioni-Flam, E. 2001, *A&A*, 370, 623
- Gallego, J., Zamorano, J., Aragon-Salamanca, A., & Rego, M. 1995, *ApJ*, 455, L1
- Hartman, R. C. et al. 1999, *ApJS*, 123, 79
- Hopkins, A. M., Connolly, A. J., & Szalay, A. S. 2000, *AJ*, 120, 2843
- Hopkins, A. M., Connolly, A. J., Haarsma, D. B., & Cram, L. E. 2001, *AJ*, 122, 288
- Lanzetta, K. M., Yahata, N., Pascarelle, S., Chen, H., & Fernández-Soto, A. 2002, *ApJ*, 570, 492
- Lichti, G. G., Bignami, G. F., & Paul, J. A. 1978, *Ap&SS*, 56, 403
- Lilly, S. J., Le Fevre, O., Hammer, F., & Crampton, D. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, L1
- Madau, P. & Phinney, E. S. 1996, *ApJ*, 456, 124
- Madau, P., Pozzetti, L., & Dickinson, M. 1998, *ApJ*, 498, 106
- Madau, P. & Pozzetti, L. 2000, *MNRAS*, 312, L9
- Maraschi, L., Ghisellini, G., & Celotti, A. 1992, *ApJ*, 397, L5
- McKee, C. F. 1989, *ApJ*, 345, 782

- Padovani, P., Ghisellini, G., Fabian, A. C., & Celotti, A. 1993, MNRAS, 260, L21
- Pagel, B. E. J. 1997, Nucleosynthesis and chemical evolution of galaxies /B. E. J. Pagel. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Pavlidou, V., & Fields, B.D. 2001, ApJ, 558, 63
- Prantzos, N. & Cassé, M. 1994, ApJS, 92, 575
- Salamon, M. H. & Stecker, F. W. 1994, ApJ, 430, L21
- Salamon, M. H. & Stecker, F. W. 1998, ApJ, 493, 547
- Silk, J. & Schramm, D. N. 1992, ApJ, 393, L9
- Sreekumar, P. et al. 1998, ApJ, 494, 523
- Stecker, F. W. & Salamon, M. H. 1996, ApJ, 464, 600 (SS96)
- Stecker, F. W. & Salamon, M. H. 1999, Proc. 26th ICRC, 3, 313 (astro-ph/9909157)
- Stecker, F. W., Salamon, M. H., & Malkan, M. A. 1993, ApJ, 410, L71
- Strong, A. W., Wolfendale, A. W., & Worrall, D. M. 1976, MNRAS, 175, 23P
- Tan, J. C. 2000, ApJ, 536, 173
- Thompson, D. J. et al. 1995, ApJS, 101, 259
- Tresse, L. & Maddox, S. J. 1998, ApJ, 495, 691




Fig. 1.— Upper panel: Blazar (dashed line) and normal galaxy (dotted line) contributions to the EGRB, overplotted with the summed “minimal model” spectrum (solid line) and the EGRET data points from Sreekumar et al. (1998). Lower panel: Normal galaxy spectrum for a dust-corrected CSFR (solid line), uncorrected CSFR (dashed line) and dust-corrected CSFR but with the integration only extending up to $z_{\star} = 1$ (dot-dashed line).