

Galactic Center Gamma-Ray Excess from Dark Matter Annihilation: Is There A Black Hole Spike?

Brian D. Fields, Stuart L. Shapiro, and Jessie Shelton

Departments of Physics and of Astronomy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

If the supermassive black hole Sgr A* at the center of the Milky Way grew adiabatically from an initial seed embedded in an NFW dark matter (DM) halo, then the DM profile near the hole has steepened into a spike. We calculate the dramatic enhancement to the gamma ray flux from the Galactic center (GC) from such a spike if the 1-3 GeV excess observed in *Fermi* data is due to DM annihilations. We find that for the parameter values favored in recent fits, the point source-like flux from the spike is 35 times greater than the flux from the inner 1° of the halo, far exceeding all *Fermi* point source detections near the GC. We consider the dependence of the spike signal on astrophysical and particle parameters and conclude that if the GC excess is due to DM, then a canonical adiabatic spike is disfavored by the data. We discuss alternative Galactic histories that predict different spike signals, including: (i) the nonadiabatic growth of the black hole, possibly associated with halo and/or black hole mergers, (ii) gravitational interaction of DM with baryons in the dense core, such as heating by stars, or (iii) DM self-interactions. We emphasize that the spike signal is sensitive to a different combination of particle parameters than the halo signal, and that the inclusion of a spike component to any DM signal in future analyses would provide novel information about both the history of the GC and the particle physics of DM annihilations.

The indirect detection of high-energy particles originating in dark matter (DM) annihilations or decays is a cornerstone in the search for DM (see, e.g., [1] for a recent review). Annihilations in the Galactic halo may lead to a signal from the Galactic center (GC) at rates that are observable by the current generation of high-energy experiments. The excess of $\sim 1 - 3$ GeV gamma rays from the inner few degrees of the GC observed in *Fermi* telescope data may be such a signal [2–11]. A recent analysis [11] of the *Fermi* data with improved angular resolution [12] has sharpened the case for a DM interpretation of the excess, demonstrating a clear preference for a component of emission from a spherically symmetric, extended source with an energy spectrum apparently independent of position.

A supermassive black hole (SMBH) exists at the site of Sgr A* [13, 14]. Such an object should steepen the DM density profile in its sphere of influence. If the SMBH grows adiabatically from a smaller seed, the resulting density spike yields a strong enhancement of any DM annihilation signal [15–17]. Here we construct a canonical GC model containing an adiabatic density spike. We adopt the best-fit halo and particle parameters found in [11] to calculate the expected gamma-ray flux and spectrum from both the spike and ambient Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW [18]) halo regions. We find that the expected flux from the spike in our canonical model considerably exceeds the flux from any of the pointlike sources near the GC cataloged by *Fermi*. To reconcile the discrepancy we discuss plausible alternatives for our model for the Galactic halo and spike, as well as different allowed choices for the DM particle physics properties. We emphasize the importance of incorporating both SMBH spike and halo components in future analyses of GC annihilation fluxes.

The effects of adiabatic black hole-induced DM spikes on the isotropic diffuse gamma-ray background have been considered in [19], while the effects on gamma rays of potential spikes in dwarf galaxies were studied in [20].

The Canonical Model: Galactic Center Halo and Spike. We assume that the DM is collisionless and adopt a cuspy, spherical, DM matter density profile obeying a NFW like-halo profile. A DM density spike due to the presence of the central, supermassive black hole (SMBH) Sgr A* forms inside the radius of gravitational influence of the SMBH, $r_h = M/v_0^2$ ($G \equiv 1$). Here M is the mass of the hole and v_0 is the (1-d) velocity dispersion of DM in the halo outside the spike. We assume that the spike forms in response to the adiabatic growth of the SMBH [15–17, 21]. Our adopted DM density profile may then be approximated by connected power-law profiles of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(r) &= 0, \quad r < 4M \quad (\text{capture region}), \\ &= \frac{\rho_{\text{sp}}(r)\rho_{\text{in}}(t,r)}{\rho_{\text{sp}}(r) + \rho_{\text{in}}(t,r)}, \quad 4M \leq r < r_b \quad (\text{spike}), \\ &= \rho_b(r_b/r)^{\gamma_c}, \quad r_b \leq r < R_H \quad (\text{cusp}), \\ &= \rho_H(R_H/r)^{\gamma_H}, \quad R_H \leq r \quad (\text{outer halo}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $r_b = 0.2r_h$, $\rho_b = \rho_D(D/r_b)^{\gamma_c}$, $\rho_{\text{sp}}(r) = \rho_b(r_b/r)^{\gamma_{\text{sp}}}$, $\rho_{\text{in}}(t,r) = \rho_{\text{ann}}(t)(r/r_{\text{in}})^{-\gamma_{\text{in}}}$, and $\rho_H = \rho_D(D/R_H)^{\gamma_c}$. Here ρ_D is the DM density in the solar neighborhood, a distance D from the GC. The density ρ_{ann} is the so-called DM “annihilation plateau” density $\rho_{\text{ann}} = m_\chi/\langle\sigma v\rangle t$, reached by $\rho_{\text{sp}}(r)$ in the innermost region of the spike at $r = r_{\text{in}}$, where m_χ is the mass of the DM particle, σ is the annihilation cross section, v is the relative velocity and $t = t_{\text{ann}}$ is the lifetime over which annihilations have occurred (\approx the age of the SMBH). The radius R_H denotes the outer halo, and joining it onto the halo cusp

yields $\rho_H = \rho_D(D/R_H)^{\gamma_c}$.

For the velocity dispersion profile, assumed isotropic, we take

$$\begin{aligned} v^2(r) &= \frac{M}{r} \frac{1}{1 + \gamma_{in}} \left[1 + \frac{r}{r_{in}} \left(\frac{\gamma_{in} - \gamma_{sp}}{1 + \gamma_{sp}} \right) \right], \\ & \quad 4M \leq r < r_{in} \quad (\text{inner spike}), \quad (2) \\ &= \frac{M}{r} \frac{1}{1 + \gamma_{sp}}, \quad r_{in} \leq r < \frac{r_h}{1 + \gamma_{sp}} \quad (\text{outer spike}), \\ &= v_0^2 = \text{const}, \quad \frac{r_h}{1 + \gamma_{sp}} \leq r \quad (\text{cusp \& outer halo}). \end{aligned}$$

Here we take the dispersion in the DM halo to be nearly constant outside the spike and match it onto an approximate, piece-wise continuous solution of the Jeans equation in the spike. We neglect relativistic corrections near the SMBH (see [22]) but set the DM density to zero inside $4M$, the radius of marginally bound circular orbits and the minimum periastron of all parabolic orbits about a Schwarzschild black hole.

We adopt the following parameter values for our canonical Milky Way DM halo and adiabatic spike: $M = 4 \times 10^6 M_\odot$ [13, 14], $\rho_D = 0.008 \pm 0.003 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-3} = 0.3 \pm 0.1 \text{ GeV cm}^{-3}$ [23], $v_0 = 105 \pm 20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ [24], $D = 8.5 \text{ kpc}$ [11], $R_H = 16 \text{ kpc}$ [25], and $t_{\text{ann}} = 10^{10} \text{ yrs}$. With these parameters we find a spike radius of $r_h = 1.7 \text{ pc}$, corresponding to 0.012° , well below the resolution of *Fermi* [26] and even below the resolution envisioned for successor telescopes such as *Gamma-Light* [27]. The inner boundary of the spike is at $r = 4M = 6 \times 10^6 \text{ km}$.

We note that $\gamma_c = 1$ and $\gamma_H = 3$ are the standard NFW values for the inner and outer halo regions, respectively. For our canonical choice we instead take $\gamma_c = 1.26$, the best-fit value reported in Ref. [11] and consider variations about this value. We adopt $\gamma_H = 3$. For a spike of collisionless matter that forms about an adiabatically growing SMBH we have $\gamma_{sp} = (9 - 2\gamma_c)/(4 - \gamma_c)$, which yields $\gamma_{sp} = 2.36$ for our canonical choice. We note that for $0 \leq \gamma_c \leq 2$ the spike power-law γ_{sp} varies at most between 2.25 and 2.50 [15]. In the innermost region, annihilations weaken (but do not flatten) an isotropic spike, whereby $\gamma_{in} = 1/2$ [28].

We note that the effects of baryons may lead to significant departures in the above profiles, but this issue has not been settled. For example, the heating of DM by gravitational scattering off stars could lower the DM density inside the spike considerably over 10 Gyr [16, 17]. The original calculations suggested that this heating would drive γ_{sp} down to ~ 1.8 in 10 Gyr, ultimately reaching a final equilibrium profile in $\gtrsim 20$ Gyr with $\gamma_{sp} = 3/2$. Such scattering could even replenish the annihilated DM in the spike and lift the annihilation plateau, ρ_{ann} . However, these early results were based on the belief that there exists a steeply rising density of stars in the Milky Way inside r_h . Careful observations in 2009 showed that the dominant old, late-type

stars in fact had a distribution that was flat, or even decreasing, toward the GC (see [29] for a discussion), resulting in long relaxation timescales and corresponding heating timescales well above 10 Gyr. But a shallow spike profile with $\gamma_{sp} = 3/2$ could also arise inside cored halos, which might form if, for example, the halo underwent mergers, cannibalism, or other cataclysmic dynamical changes such as strong supernova feedback that led to large potential field fluctuations prior to the adiabatic growth of Sgr A*. There are other possibilities that could weaken the spike: the formation history of the Milky Way and Sgr A*, the influence of an unseen distribution of stars (e.g. compact objects) in the spike, or DM self-interactions [30]. In the opposite limit from adiabatic growth, were the SMBH to appear instantaneously (e.g., via a rapid sub-halo merger) the spike would be quite shallow: $\gamma_{sp} = 4/3$ [31]. The sudden formation of a seed SMBH followed by its adiabatic growth would lead to intermediate slopes. Off-center ($\gtrsim 50 \text{ pc}$) formation of the SMBH might flatten the spike entirely unless appreciable growth occurred after the hole's arrival at the GC.

For our canonical DM annihilation cross section and mass we adopt as a default model the reference point of Ref. [11]: a self-conjugate DM particle with mass $m_\chi = 35.25 \text{ GeV}$ annihilating to $b\bar{b}$ with a cross-section $\langle\sigma v\rangle = 1.7 \times 10^{-26} \text{ cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$, strikingly close to the expectation for a thermal relic origin of DM. For this particle model, the annihilation plateau is $\rho_{\text{ann}} = 1.7 \times 10^8 M_\odot \text{ pc}^{-3} = 6.6 \times 10^9 \text{ GeV cm}^{-3}$, reached at a radius $r_{in} = 3.1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ pc}$ in the spike. The GC excess can be fitted by DM models with a range of possible masses and cross sections [11, 32–38], further considered below.

We take the DM annihilation cross section to be velocity-independent, $\langle\sigma v\rangle = \text{const}$, i.e., dominated by s -wave interactions; this choice renders the radial dependence of the velocity dispersion of Eq. 2 irrelevant for the DM annihilation signal. At the inner boundary of the spike velocity dispersions reach $v \sim c/5$, nearing the velocity range that pertains during thermal freezeout of a cold relic. Terms beyond the leading s -wave contribution to the annihilation cross section could thus be important. However, the dominant contribution to the spike signal comes from the region $r \approx r_{in}$, where the velocity dispersion is still small: in our canonical model, $v(r_{in}) \approx 1300 \text{ km/sec} \ll c$. Thus as long as s -wave contributions are present, the region around r_{in} will still provide most of the spike signal and contributions from higher-order terms in the velocity expansion will remain small.

Gamma-Ray Flux from the Canonical Adiabatic Spike. The differential gamma-ray (number) emissivity from (self-conjugate) DM annihilations is

$$q_E(r) = \frac{\rho(r)^2}{4\pi m_\chi^2} \frac{\langle\sigma v\rangle}{2} \frac{dN_\gamma}{dE_\gamma}. \quad (3)$$




FIG. 1: GC gamma-ray flux. Points are the *Fermi* source 2FGL J1745.6-2858 near Sgr A* [39]. Curves show the DM annihilation signal from the spike and halo [11] within 1° . Top: the canonical adiabatic spike plus halo ($\gamma_c = 1.26$, $\gamma_{sp} = 2.36$). Middle: same as top, but for $\gamma_{sp} = 1.8$. Bottom: same as top, but for $\gamma_{sp} = 1.5$. The dashed black line shows the inner 1° of the halo alone. Shaded bands vary the halo index between $1.2 \leq \gamma_c \leq 1.3$.

The differential number flux on earth from annihilations within an angle θ is then

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dE}(<\theta) = \int I_E \cos\theta d\Omega = \int_0^\theta \cos\theta d\Omega \int_{\text{los}} q_E(r) ds. \quad (4)$$

where the inner integral employs the intensity along the line-of-sight at an angle θ from the GC, and where $r(\theta, s) = \sqrt{D^2 + s^2 - 2sD \cos\theta}$.

The spike signal appears as a point source at the GC, superimposed upon the smooth halo annihilation signal as well as any astrophysical emission from the direction of the center. Thus the spike and halo signals will both contribute within one point spread function (PSF) at the center. To approximate this smoothing we will compare the spike flux to the integrated halo flux within 1° [46].

The 2nd *Fermi* point source catalog [39] lists four sources within 1° of the GC, the brightest of which has a location consistent with that of Sgr A*. This source, 2FGL J1745.6-2858, has a flux $\Phi(1-100 \text{ GeV}) = (7.74 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{-8} / \text{cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, and is within 1.79 arcmin of Sgr A*. We take this source as the candidate for the signal containing the spike emission.

The *Fermi* measurements of the point source flux likely include emission from the many astrophysical sources towards and near the GC in addition to any DM signal. Moreover, the DM spike signal will in general contain a contribution from the halo emission that was not included in the *Fermi* point source analysis; groups that include a component $\propto \rho_{\text{NFW}}(r)^2$ in their models of the GC find that the flux associated to the Sgr A* point source is substantially reduced, though the degree of reduction depends on the details of the fit [5, 8, 10]. We thus regard




FIG. 2: Ratio of the canonical adiabatic spike flux to the flux of the inner 1° of the halo. The solid blue line indicates the predictions from the best-fit parameters of Ref. [11]. The blue band shows the effect of varying $1 \leq \gamma_c \leq 1.4$. The overlapping green band shows the effect of varying the annihilation plateau ρ_{ann} .

the *Fermi* spectrum of 2FGL J1745.6-2858 as an *upper limit* to the annihilation signal from the GC.

Fig. 1 shows our fiducial predictions for the GC DM annihilation gamma-ray spectrum (curves), as well as *Fermi* observations (points). We include the flux from the innermost 1° of the smooth DM halo along with the contributions from three possible spikes: the canonical adiabatic spike, the limiting equilibrium spike from stellar heating with $\gamma_{sp} = 1.5$, and an intermediate spike with $\gamma_{sp} = 1.8$. We conservatively include primary photons only; secondary photons arising from the interaction of DM annihilation products with gas, dust, and magnetic fields in the GC would further increase the flux at low energies.

With the best-fit particle and halo parameters from Ref. [11], the spike emission lies more than an order of magnitude above the observed point source emission. The energy-integrated flux due to the spike is $\Phi_{\text{spike}}(1-100 \text{ GeV}) = 1.1 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$, while the inner 1° contributes only $\Phi_{\text{halo}}(1-100 \text{ GeV}) = 3.2 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$. The canonical halo signal inside 1° lies *below* the *Fermi* data for $\gamma_c = 1.26$, so the mismatch is entirely due to the black hole spike signal.

Thus, *emission from a canonical adiabatic black hole spike is inconsistent with a DM interpretation of the GC gamma-ray excess given the results of Ref. [11].*

The steep power law dependence of the canonical adiabatic black hole spike makes it a very bright signal, allowing us to reach this sharp conclusion. However it also renders the signal sensitive to variations in the Galactic halo parameters. For example, the spike signal varies significantly with the DM velocity dispersion v_0 , as we demonstrate in Fig. 2. The velocity dispersion determines the size of the spike through r_h which, in turn, establishes the radius r_{in} at which $\rho_{sp} = \rho_{\text{ann}}$ and near

which most of the emission emanates.

The spike signal grows more rapidly than the halo signal as the halo index γ_c increases, owing to the increase in r_{in} when the spike grows on top of a larger initial density at the GC. Fig. 2 shows the result of varying $1 \leq \gamma_c \leq 1.4$, as well as the effect of varying $\rho_{\text{ann}} = m/\langle\sigma v\rangle t$. In all cases the spike is more than 5 times brighter than the inner 1° of the halo.

Because of its dependence on ρ_{ann} , the spike signal probes a *different* combination of particle physics parameters than does the halo signal alone. Thus particle models that yield the same prediction for the halo flux will predict different values of the spike-to-halo ratio, as illustrated in Fig. 3. Here we show predicted spike signals for some representative particle models that have been advanced for the excess: (i) our reference model [11]; (ii) a 9 GeV self-conjugate particle annihilating to $\tau^+\tau^-$ 80% of the time and $b\bar{b}$ 20% of the time with cross-section $\langle\sigma v\rangle = 0.7 \times 10^{-26} \text{cm}^3/\text{s}$ [11]; (iii) a 22 GeV non-self-conjugate particle annihilating to 16 GeV kinetically mixed dark vector bosons with cross-section $\langle\sigma v\rangle = 3.4 \times 10^{-26} \text{cm}^3/\text{s}$ [37]; (iv) a 60 GeV non-self-conjugate particle annihilating with cross-section $\langle\sigma v\rangle = 6.1 \times 10^{-26} \text{cm}^3/\text{s}$ to 40 GeV scalars which subsequently decay to pairs of gluons [37]. All photon spectra have been computed using Pythia 8 [40]. The spike signals vary by $\sim 50\%$ for particle models that make nearly identical predictions for the halo signal.

In summary, if the GC excess is indeed due to DM, an adiabatic spike at the location of Sgr A* can only be reconciled with observation if *multiple* input parameters differ significantly from their central values: for instance, if the velocity dispersion in the Milky Way is 1σ or more higher than the central value $v_0 = 105 \text{ km/sec}$ and the inner NFW halo index is shallower than indicated by fits, $\gamma_c \lesssim 1.1$ and the annihilation density ρ_{ann} is reduced by a factor of 0.75. Our PSF smoothing of 1° is a conservative choice. Smaller angular values, as appropriate for the $\gtrsim 1 \text{ GeV}$ photons in the excess, would give higher spike/halo ratios and exacerbate the tension between predictions for the canonical adiabatic spike and observations of the point source.

As the canonical adiabatic spike is thus disfavored by observation, other possible scenarios yielding different DM density spikes are interesting. The lower two curves in Fig. 1 show the flux predictions for shallower spikes, as expected in the presence of (e.g.) stellar heating. For $\gamma_{sp} = 1.8$, the annihilation signal is dominated by the spike, while for $\gamma_{sp} = 1.5$, the annihilation signal is mostly due to the halo; contributions from shallower spikes will be largely overshadowed by the halo emission. Both scenarios are in accord with the data, and lie intriguingly close to the observed emission at high energies (1-10 GeV). At low energies, where the observed spectrum exceeds the DM prediction, other astrophysical sources of gamma rays would be expected to contribute




FIG. 3: Canonical adiabatic spike signals for different particle models of the GC excess. Shown are the models (i)–(iv) discussed in the text.

to the observed emission.

The 2nd *Fermi* Catalog does not make a firm identification of 2FGL J1745.6-2858, proposing that it may be one of only three pulsar wind nebulae seen without identified pulsars. Given the spectrum of the GC excess, a DM origin from a shallow spike $\gamma_{sp} \lesssim 1.8$ is an interesting alternate explanation. On the other hand, if future work (e.g., pulsar discovery) does associate 2FGL J1745.6-2858 with an astrophysical source, such as the Sgr A East supernova remnant, then the case for a DM spike would weaken even more.

Is there a Canonical Spike? *Fermi* observations do not agree with our predicted signal from a canonical SMBH spike for DM interpretations of the GC excess. The predicted signal exceeds observations by over an order of magnitude. Plausible alternatives for the spike include: (i) replacing the assumption of the adiabatic growth of the SMBH from a smaller seed by more violent processes, such as mergers or cannibalism, or (ii) the gravitational heating of DM by baryons. These processes flatten the spike and thereby reduce emission. Abandoning DM isotropy in the GC, which does not arise in simulated or most analytical halos [28], only steepens the profile near r_{in} , worsening the discrepancy. Particle physics alternatives are perhaps more extreme, and include: (i) reducing ρ_{ann} while holding $\langle\sigma v\rangle/m^2$ fixed, and thereby reducing the spike signal relative to the halo, although bringing the canonical spike down to levels compatible with observations by altering ρ_{ann} alone requires reducing ρ_{ann} by two orders of magnitude; (ii) arranging for a cancellation between s -wave and higher partial wave processes that becomes relevant for $v \sim 10v_0$, which does not seem especially well-motivated in light of the near-thermal values of the s -wave cross-section required to fit the GC excess; or (iii) DM particle self-interactions. The latter can not only core the NFW halo but also soften

the SMBH spike [30] and thus will significantly modify the spike and halo emission [41].

Improved angular resolution, as from [27], would help clarify the magnitude and spectrum of the point source and distinguish it from the spatially extended excess. Other higher-resolution instruments that can probe the GC environment (e.g., the *Cerenkov Telescope Array* [42], *GAMMA-400* [43], the *Event Horizon Telescope* [44], and even *Planck* [45]) may further refine our understanding.

A point-like SMBH spike is an inescapable component of any DM signal from the GC, and should be incorporated in analyses. The relative strengths of the spike and halo emission convey unique information about the Galactic formation history as well as the particle properties of DM.

Acknowledgments. We are happy to acknowledge useful conversations with T. Linden and T. Slatyer. This paper was supported in part by NSF Grants PHY-0963136 and PHY-1300903 as well as NASA Grants NNX13AH44G and NNX10AC86G at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

-
- [1] J. Buckley, D. Cowen, S. Profumo, A. Archer, M. Cahill-Rowley, et al. (2013), 1310.7040.
- [2] L. Goodenough and D. Hooper (2009), 0910.2998.
- [3] D. Hooper and L. Goodenough, *Phys.Lett.* **B697**, 412 (2011), 1010.2752.
- [4] D. Hooper and T. Linden, *Phys.Rev.* **D84**, 123005 (2011), 1110.0006.
- [5] K. N. Abazajian and M. Kaplinghat, *Phys.Rev.* **D86**, 083511 (2012), 1207.6047.
- [6] D. Hooper, C. Kelso, and F. S. Queiroz, *Astropart.Phys.* **46**, 55 (2013), 1209.3015.
- [7] D. Hooper and T. R. Slatyer, *Phys.Dark Univ.* **2**, 118 (2013), 1302.6589.
- [8] C. Gordon and O. Macias, *Phys.Rev.* **D88**, 083521 (2013), 1306.5725.
- [9] W.-C. Huang, A. Urbano, and W. Xue (2013), 1307.6862.
- [10] K. N. Abazajian, N. Canac, S. Horiuchi, and M. Kaplinghat (2014), 1402.4090.
- [11] T. Daylan, D. P. Finkbeiner, D. Hooper, T. Linden, S. K. N. Portillo, et al. (2014), 1402.6703.
- [12] S. K. N. Portillo and D. P. Finkbeiner (2014), 1406.0507.
- [13] R. Genzel, F. Eisenhauer, and S. Gillessen, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **82**, 3121 (2010), 1006.0064.
- [14] A. M. Ghez, S. Salim, N. N. Weinberg, J. R. Lu, T. Do, J. K. Dunn, K. Matthews, M. R. Morris, S. Yelda, E. E. Becklin, et al., *Astrophys. J.* **689**, 1044 (2008), 0808.2870.
- [15] P. Gondolo and J. Silk, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **83**, 1719 (1999), astro-ph/9906391.
- [16] D. Merritt, *Physical Review Letters* **92**, 201304 (2004), astro-ph/0311594.
- [17] O. Y. Gnedin and J. R. Primack, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 061302 (2004), astro-ph/0308385.
- [18] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White, *Astrophys. J.* **462**, 563 (1996), astro-ph/9508025.
- [19] A. Belikov and J. Silk, *Phys.Rev.* **D89**, 043520 (2014), 1312.0007.
- [20] A. X. Gonzalez-Morales, S. Profumo, and F. S. Queiroz (2014), 1406.2424.
- [21] P. J. E. Peebles, *General Relativity and Gravitation* **3**, 63 (1972).
- [22] L. Sadeghian, F. Ferrer, and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 063522 (2013), 1305.2619.
- [23] J. Bovy and S. Tremaine, *Astrophys. J.* **756**, 89 (2012), 1205.4033.
- [24] K. Gultekin, D. O. Richstone, K. Gebhardt, T. R. Lauer, S. Tremaine, et al., *Astrophys.J.* **698**, 198 (2009), 0903.4897.
- [25] F. Nesti and P. Salucci, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **7**, 16 (2013), 1304.5127.
- [26] http://www.slac.stanford.edu/exp/glast/groups/canda/lat_Performance.htm.
- [27] A. Morselli, A. Argan, G. Barbiellini, W. Bonvicini, A. Bulgarelli, et al. (2014), 1406.1071.
- [28] E. Vasiliev, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 103532 (2007), 0707.3334.
- [29] D. Merritt, *Dynamics and Evolution of Galactic Nuclei*, (Princeton University Press, 2013).
- [30] S. L. Shapiro and V. Paschalidis, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 023506 (2014), 1402.0005.
- [31] P. Ullio, H. Zhao, and M. Kamionkowski, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 043504 (2001), astro-ph/0101481.
- [32] D. Hooper, N. Weiner, and W. Xue, *Phys.Rev.* **D86**, 056009 (2012), 1206.2929.
- [33] T. Lacroix, C. Boehm, and J. Silk (2014), 1403.1987.
- [34] C. Boehm, M. J. Dolan, and C. McCabe (2014), 1404.4977.
- [35] P. Ko, W.-I. Park, and Y. Tang (2014), 1404.5257.
- [36] M. Abdullah, A. DiFranzo, A. Rajaraman, T. M. Tait, P. Tanedo, et al. (2014), 1404.6528.
- [37] A. Martin, J. Shelton, and J. Unwin (2014), 1405.0272.
- [38] A. Berlin, P. Gratia, D. Hooper, and S. D. McDermott (2014), 1405.5204.
- [39] P. L. Nolan, A. A. Abdo, M. Ackermann, M. Ajello, A. Allafort, E. Antolini, W. B. Atwood, M. Axelsson, L. Baldini, J. Ballet, et al., *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* **199**, 31 (2012), 1108.1435.
- [40] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, *Comput.Phys.Commun.* **178**, 852 (2008), 0710.3820.
- [41] B. Fields, S. Shapiro, and J. Shelton (*in preparation*).
- [42] M. Actis et al. (CTA Consortium), *Exper.Astron.* **32**, 193 (2011), 1008.3703.
- [43] A. A. Moiseev, A. M. Galper, O. Adriani, R. L. Aptekar, I. V. Arkhangelskaja, A. I. Arkhangel'skiy, G. A. Avanesov, L. Bergstrom, M. Boezio, V. Bonvicini, et al., *ArXiv e-prints* (2013), 1307.2345.
- [44] T. Lacroix and J. Silk, *A&A* **554**, A36 (2013), 1211.4861.
- [45] T. Lacroix, C. Boehm, and J. Silk, *Phys.Rev.* **D89**, 063534 (2014), 1311.0139.
- [46] Front-converting photons in the *Fermi* LAT have 95% containment angles that grow from $\sim 0.2^\circ$ at 30 GeV to almost 2° at 1 GeV [26].