MeV Gamma-Ray Source Contribution to the Inner Galactic Diffuse Emission

NAOMI TSUJI ^(D),^{1,2,3} YOSHIYUKI INOUE ^(D),^{4,2,5} HIROKI YONEDA,⁶ RESHMI MUKHERJEE,⁷ AND HIROKAZU ODAKA^{8,5}

¹Faculty of Science, Kanagawa University, 2946 Tsuchiya, Hiratsuka-shi, Kanagawa 259-1293, Japan

² Interdisciplinary Theoretical & Mathematical Science Program (iTHEMS), RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan ³ Department of Physics, Rikkyo University, 3-34-1 Nishi Ikebukuro, Toshima-ku, Tokyo 171-8501, Japan

⁴Department of Earth and Space Science, Graduate School of Science, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan

⁵Kavli Institute for the Physics and Mathematics of the Universe (WPI), The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8583, Japan

⁶Nishina Center, RIKEN, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

⁷Department of Physics and Astronomy, Barnard College, Columbia University, New York, NY, 10027, USA ⁸Department of Physics, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

(Received January 6, 2023; Revised MM DD, YYYY; Accepted MM DD, YYYY)

Submitted to ApJ

ABSTRACT

The origin of the inner Galactic emission, measured by COMPTEL with a flux of $\sim 10^{-2}$ MeV cm⁻² s⁻¹ sr⁻¹ in the 1–30 MeV energy range from the inner Galactic region, has remained unsettled since its discovery. In this paper, we elaborate on a model of individual MeV gamma-ray sources unresolved by COMPTEL. This is conducted for sources crossmatched between the *Swift*-BAT and *Fermi*-LAT catalogs by interpolating the energy spectra in the hard X-ray and GeV gamma-ray ranges, as well as unmatched sources between the two catalogs. We find that the source contribution to the COMPTEL emission would be at least ~20%. Combined with the Galactic diffuse emission, which is not well constrained, the COMPTELemission can be roughly reproduced in some cases.

Keywords: Galactic cosmic rays (567) — Diffuse radiation (383) — Gamma rays (637) — Gamma-ray sources (633)

1. INTRODUCTION

The MeV gamma-ray domain, in particular $\sim 1-100$ MeV, is the only unexplored window among recent multiwavelength observations in astrophysics, often referred to as the "MeV gap". The MeV gamma-ray diffuse emission, which has been hinted by the observations of COMPTEL (Strong et al. 1996), is one of the unsolved problems in MeV gamma-ray astrophysics. Investigation of this diffuse emission covers several important facets, including the Galactic diffuse emission from low-energy (sub-GeV) cosmic rays (CRs), individual MeV gamma-ray objects, and/or new populations of MeV gamma-ray radiation originated from dark matter or neutrinos. Thus, the study of the MeV gamma-ray diffuse emission would have a lot of influence on these broad topics, especially in the next decade when some missions will give us a new insight into the MeV gap.

The Imaging Compton Telescope COMPTEL onboard the Compton Gamma-Ray Observatory (CGRO) (Schoenfelder et al. 1993) reported the detection of diffuse emission of 10^{-2} MeV cm⁻² s⁻¹ sr⁻¹ in 1–30 MeV from the inner Galactic region (Strong et al. 1996). This measurement revealed that the emission was actually diffuse, also confirmed by OSSE (Strong et al. 1996), and consistent with the result of COS-B (Strong et al. 1988). The COMPTEL diffuse emission was calculated as follows. The gamma-ray intensity model consisted of Galactic Diffuse Emission (GDE) (i.e., radiation from interactions of CRs with gas and photon fields), source (only Crab), and an isotropic term. The

TSUJI ET AL.

instrumental background, which dominated the detected gamma-ray events, was implemented with a fixed spectral shape (Strong et al. 1994). The overall fit was performed by combining the gamma-ray intensity model weighted by the response function and the instrumental background. Based on the best-fit parameters of GDE, the aforementioned diffuse emission was estimated. As shown in Figure 1, there are several results of the COMPTEL diffuse emission obtained with different models, data (observation phase), and size of the inner Galactic region (Strong et al. 1994, 1996, 2004; Bouchet et al. 2011), and the latest one with $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$ (Bouchet et al. 2011) is used in this paper.



Figure 1. Measurements of the inner Galactic diffuse emission in the MeV gamma-ray range.

The origin of the inner Galactic diffuse emission by COMPTEL has been in active debate. Almost two decades since its discovery, an all-sky gamma-ray survey by *Fermi*-LAT unveiled the detailed spectroscopy of the diffuse emission in the GeV energy band. It revealed that the diffuse emission observed by *Fermi*-LAT was fairly explained by a combination of the GDE, resolved GeV gamma-ray sources, and extragalactic gamma-ray background (i.e., cosmic gamma-ray background (CGB)) (Ackermann et al. 2012). Note that some locally characteristic radiation, such as the Fermi bubble and the Galactic center excess, still remain elusive (Su et al. 2010; Ackermann et al. 2017; Murgia 2020). If the GDE model of *Fermi*-LAT is extrapolated to the MeV energy range, there is an apparent excess component to account for the COMPTEL emission (e.g., Strong et al. 2004), which is commonly referred to as the COMPTEL excess. There are several scenarios for reproducing the COMPTEL excess: (1) Individual MeV gamma-ray sources should be taken into consideration. Only the Crab was considered when calculating the COMPTEL emission, although COMPTEL detected 25 steady sources (Schönfelder et al. 2000). Furthermore, sources which were not resolved by COMPTEL would also have a fraction of the contribution. (2) There are non-negligible uncertainties on the model of GDE, since it has a lot of unconstrained parameters (e.g., photon field densities, CR source distribution, CR injection spectra, and propagation mechanism). Enhancement of one or more of these parameters can make GDE higher to reach the COMPTEL excess (Bouchet et al. 2011). (3) New populations, such as annihilation or decay of dark matter (Boddy & Kumar 2015; Christy et al. 2022; Binder et al. 2022) and/or cascaded gamma rays accompanying cosmic neutrinos (Fang et al. 2022), might be present.

We address a few updates on observations of the MeV gamma-ray diffuse emission since COMPTEL. *INTEGRAL*-SPI measured a spectrum of the diffuse emission in 0.02-2.4 MeV, which comprised a continuum component and four gamma-ray lines (i.e., positron annihilation, ²⁶Al and ⁶⁰Fe lines) (Bouchet et al. 2011). The continuum component is consistent with the emission by COMPTEL in the overlapping energy range of 1–2.4 MeV, as shown in Figure 1. Bouchet et al. (2011) argued that the diffuse emission by *INTEGRAL*-SPI can be roughly reproduced by the standard model of GDE. The fit, however, became much improved if they increased the normalization of the primary CR electron spectrum or the interstellar radiation field in the Galactic bulge or a large Galactic CR halo. The latest result of the 0.5–8 MeV observation by *INTEGRAL*-SPI was presented in Siegert et al. (2022). Using the new analysis with the lower level of signal-to-noise ratio, they confirmed that the obtained diffuse emission showed a mismatch of a factor

of 2–3 in normalization with respect to the baseline model of GDE. The *INTEGRAL*-SPI spectra are also illustrated in Figure 1. Besides *INTEGRAL*-SPI, the electron-tracking Compton camera (ETCC) aboard the balloon mission of SMILE-2+ retrieved a gamma-ray lightcurve in 0.15–2.1 MeV during flight, showing enhanced gamma rays when it was pointing at the vicinity of the Galactic center (Takada et al. 2022).

In this paper, we quantitatively estimate how much the unresolved MeV gamma-ray sources would contribute to the COMPTEL excess. Section 2 presents descriptions of the sources and GDE. The results and discussion are given in Section 3. Section 4 summarizes this study.

2. COMPONENTS OF THE INNER GALACTIC DIFFUSE EMISSION

2.1. MeV gamma-ray sources

Although the previous studies (e.g., Strong et al. 1996; Orlando 2018; Siegert et al. 2022) proposed that the COMP-TEL excess would be attributed by radiation from individual unresolved sources, the quantitative estimation has not been done yet. We estimate this source contribution from a MeV gamma-ray source catalog in Tsuji et al. (2021), which presented a crossmatching between the 105-month *Swift*-BAT (Bird et al. 2016) and 10-yr *Fermi*-LAT catalogs (Abdollahi et al. 2020; Ballet et al. 2020), resulting in 156 point-like and 31 extended crossmatched sources¹. Note that among them, 136 point sources and 15 extended sources are firmly matched (i.e., the hard X-ray and GeV gamma-ray emission are originated from the same source), and 16 sources were actually detected by COMPTEL (Tsuji et al. 2021). These crossmatched sources, which are both hard X-ray and GeV gamma-ray emitters, are prominent sources in the MeV gamma-ray sky.

19 point sources and 14 extended sources in Tsuji et al. (2021) are located in the inner Galactic region with $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$. The point sources compose three blazars, three pulsars, one X-ray binary (RX J1826.2-1450), Galactic center (Sgr A^{*}), one globular cluster (ESO 520-27), four unidentified sources, and six false matches². The extended sources are six PNWe, two SNRs, four spp³, an unidentified source, and a false match.

We jointly fit the spectral energy distributions (SEDs) of *Swift*-BAT in 14–195 keV and *Fermi*-LAT in 50 MeV–300 GeV (see also Appendix A). We adopt a log-parabola model first. The log-parabola model can be applied to most of the sources, in particular blazars like flat-spectrum radio quasars (FSRQs) or pulsars, of which the MeV gamma-ray radiation is originated from a single electron population. We find that nine sources (one pulsar, three false-matched sources, one globular cluster, one unidentified, Galactic center, one PWN, and one spp) cannot be well fitted by the log-parabola model, inferred from a large reduced chi-squared of >10. For these sources, we adopt a two-component model, which is a superposition of the models in the *Swift*-BAT and *Fermi*-LAT catalogs. Additionally, we also use the same two-component model for RX J1713.7–3946, because it is a supernova remnant (SNR), of which the X-ray and gamma-ray emission do not originate from the same process. Likewise, a choice of the fitting model may cause uncertainty on the source flux. We checked that the choice of the fitting model (i.e., log-parabola or broken power-law models) does not have a large effect (less than 50% with respect to the adopted source model shown in Figure 2) on the undermentioned result.

Based on the best-fit model, we estimate spectra in the MeV gamma-ray energy range, sum up all the spectra of the 33 sources in the inner Galactic region, and divide it by the region size. The result is shown in Figure 2. The contribution of all crossmatched sources to the COMPTEL excess is about 10%, and the ratio of the point sources to the extended sources is roughly 1–1.5. It should be noted that if we select only the firmly matched sources in the inner Galactic region (nine point-like and 12 extended sources), the total source contribution is reduced to 60–80% of the spectrum shown in Figure 2.

Figure 3 shows a cumulative distribution of the estimated flux of the crossmatched sources in the inner Galactic region (the so-called log N-log S plot). Most of the crossmatched sources have a flux larger than 10^{-12} erg cm⁻² s⁻¹, and the number of sources decreases towards the higher flux. In the higher energy part with $S > 10^{-11}$ erg cm⁻² s⁻¹, the distribution is roughly described by $N(>S) \approx S^{-0.7}$. It is unknown how this feature is extrapolated or turned over in the lower energy part due to lacking the knowledge of sub-threshold, faint sources, which we discuss in the next paragraph.

¹ The MeV gamma-ray source catalog is available in https://tsuji703.github.io/MeV-All-Sky.

² Falsely matched sources indicate spatially crossmatched sources, but the hard X-ray (*Swift*-BAT) and gamma-ray (*Fermi*-LAT) sources are different origins (Tsuji et al. 2021).

³ Sources that are candidates of SNR or PNW.



Figure 2. The SEDs of GDE (dashed black line) and the sources (solid red line for all the sources, dashed red for the crossmatched sources, and dotted red for the unmatched sources). The combined spectrum of these two components is illustrated with a solid black line. The results with GDE Models 1, 2, and 3 are respectively shown in the upper left, upper right, and lower left. The COMPTEL emission (Bouchet et al. 2011) is indicated by light green points with its systematic error (Strong et al. 1994).

Besides the crossmatched sources in Tsuji et al. (2021), there exist many unmatched sources that would have a significant contribution accumulatively. In the region with $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$, there are 152 *Swift*-BAT and 708 *Fermi*-LAT (4FGL-DR2) sources, where the crossmatched sources are excluded. We assume that these unmatched sources (860 in total) are fainter than 10^{-12} erg cm⁻² s⁻¹ in the MeV energy band since they are not detected by *Swift*-BAT or *Fermi*-LAT, with the sensitivity being approximately 10^{-12} erg cm⁻² s⁻¹. Then, the accumulative source flux is ~ 10^{-3} MeV cm⁻² s⁻¹ sr⁻¹, which is roughly comparable to that of the crossmatched sources. Combined with the GeV gamma-ray source component by *Fermi*-LAT (Ackermann et al. 2012) in the region with $|\ell| \leq 80^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$, our source spectrum is roughly in agreement within a factor of ~2 at 200 MeV. The estimation of the accumulated source flux for the different regions, as shown in Figure 1, is given in Appendix C. Detailed modeling of the unmatched sources will be presented in a future publication.

2.2. Galactic diffuse emission

To evaluate Galactic Diffuse Emission (GDE), we make use of GALPROP (version 54 of WebRun), which is designed to calculate astrophysics of CRs (i.e., propagation and energy loss) and photon emissions in the radio to gamma-ray energy bands (Porter et al. 2017, 2022; Vladimirov et al. 2011). In this paper, we consider three models of GDE in the literature: one model from Ackermann et al. (2012) and two models from Orlando (2018) (see Appendix B and



Figure 3. The log N-log S plot of the MeV gamma-ray sources in the inner Galactic region with $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$. The flux is integrated in 1–10 MeV.

Table 1 for details⁴). These models are constructed to be reconciled with the gamma-ray observations by *Fermi*-LAT and the observed CR spectra by several CR experiments. Using the results of the latest CR measurements with *Voyager*, Orlando (2018) modified the GDE models in the literature, especially the injection parameters of electrons and propagation parameters. In this paper, a baseline model of ${}^{S}S{}^{2}4{}^{R}20{}^{T}150{}^{C}5{}^{5}$ is selected as a representative of the models in Ackermann et al. (2012) and referred to as Model 1. From Orlando (2018), we adopt the DRE (i.e., diffusion and re-acceleration) and DRELowV (modified DRE) models, hereafter referred to as Model 2 and Model 3, respectively.

The GDE spectra of Model 1, shown in Figure 4, consist of three components of radiation: inverse Compton (IC) scattering, Bremsstrahlung, and pion-decay radiation. In the energy channel of COMPTEL, IC is dominant, while Bremsstrahlung is subdominant because of ionization loss of electrons at the lower energy, and the hadronic component is less effective due to the pion bump. The IC scattering in the MeV gamma-ray range is attributed to sub-GeV electrons that up-scatter seed photon fields of optical, infrared, and Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB).

Figure 4 also compares the aforementioned GDE models, Models 1–3. Since GDE below ~100 MeV is dominated by the IC component, the difference in Models 1–3 arises from CR electrons in 0.1–1 GeV (Figure 6 in Appendix B). Models 2 and 3 are respectively the highest and lowest with the difference of a factor of few, and Model 1 is in the middle of them. Model 2 almost can reach to the COMPTEL emission, while it is slightly lower than the flux at the lower energy bins. This trend is the same for the diffuse emission measured in the different sizes in Figure 1 (Appendix C). Although there is such uncertainty on the GDE models, $\gtrsim 30\%$ of the COMPTEL excess is contributed by GDE.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

⁴ Galdef files of the models are available in https://tsuji703.github.io/MeV-All-Sky.

⁵ This model assumes that the source distribution of CRs is SNRs, the Galactic disk is characterized by the height of z = 4 kpc and the galactocentric radius of R = 20 kpc, and $T_s = 150$ K and E(B - V) = 5 mag cut is adopted for determining the gas-to-dust ratio (see Ackermann et al. 2012 for details).



Figure 4. The spectra of the inner Galactic diffuse emission taken by COMPTEL in light green, shown with the continuum emission and gamma-ray lines by *INTEGRAL*-SPI in black and magenta, respectively (Bouchet et al. 2011). The components of GDE of Model 1 (Ackermann et al. 2012) are shown in solid lines: total in black, Bremsstrahlung in blue, π^0 -decay in red, and IC in green. The flux points observed by *Fermi*-LAT, including the diffuse emission and the gamma-ray sources, are indicated by black circles with the grey shadow being the error, although it was obtained from the region with $|\ell| \leq 80^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 8^{\circ}$ (Ackermann et al. 2012). The total GDE of Model 2 and Model 3 (Orlando 2018) are illustrated with black dashed and dash-dotted lines, respectively.

Figure 2 compares the COMPTEL data points and our models with the three different models of GDE. We show the spectrum of MeV gamma-ray sources, GDE Models 1–3, and combined spectra of these two components. It should be noted that this direct comparison did not take into account energy dispersion, which may have a significant effect on the result, as described in the data analysis of *INTEGRAL*-SPI (Strong et al. 2005). The issue might be large in the COMPTEL data due to its property of functioning as a Compton telescope. Applying the energy response function, however, is beyond the scope of this study, and it is currently impossible because the COMPTEL response is not available. Although a small ($\sim 1\sigma$) difference between the data points of COMPTEL and the models might not be counted as an excess unless the energy dispersion is properly considered, in the following we report the results of the direct comparison between the data and the models.

We find that the combination of GDE and the sources can roughly reproduce the COMPTEL excess: the entire spectrum can be sufficiently explained with Model 2 (Figure 2 upper right), and the lowest and highest energy bins of the COMPTEL data can be reproduced with Model 1 (Figure 2 upper left). In the case of Model 3 (Figure 2 lower left), which is the GDE model with the smallest flux among the models considered in this paper, the combined spectrum of GDE and the sources is slightly lower than the COMPTEL excess.

The inner Galactic diffuse emission is roughly 10^{-2} MeV cm⁻² s⁻¹ sr⁻¹ for all the previous studies, however the extracted region is different; $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$ in Bouchet et al. (2011), $|\ell| \leq 60^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$ in Strong et al. (2004), $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 5^{\circ}$ in Strong et al. (1999), $|\ell| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ in Siegert et al. (2022), as illustrated in Figure 1. This region difference is crucial for calculating the model. The trend in Figure 2 is similar if we adopt for the region with $|\ell| \leq 60^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$ or $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 5^{\circ}$ (see Appendix C for the results with the different regions). In the region with $|\ell| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$, the model fails to reproduce the emission since it is extended to the high-latitude region, where GDE becomes faint and the number of sources decreases.

The spectral shape would provide us with a new constraint. The power-law spectral index is $s \sim -1.9 (dN/dE \propto E^s)$ for the COMPTEL excess from the inner Galaxy, while it is harder with s = -1.39 for the latest measurement of the *INTEGRAL*-SPI emission in the region extended to the higher latitude (Siegert et al. 2022). Figure 2 shows that the spectrum of the accumulated sources is almost flat in the SED with a spectral index of $s \sim -2$. Since the GDE models have $s \sim -1.5$, the MeV gamma-ray sources should play an important role in reproducing the observed spectrum by COMPTEL with $s \sim -1.9$. More precise measurements of the spectrum of each source will enable constraining the

accumulative source spectrum, which in turn will be useful to determine the GDE spectrum, especially the index of the primary electrons responsible for the IC radiation.

Since the dominant component in the energy range of the COMPTEL excess is GDE, the uncertainty of GDE prevents us from reaching a robust conclusion. The uncertainty of GDE arises from (1) the amount of CR electrons and (2) the photon fields being up-scattered by the electrons. The CR electrons in 100–1000 MeV, which produce 1-30 MeV photons via IC scattering, are different by a factor of ~4, depending on the models. To distinguish these models is important in the perspective of CR feedback on galaxy evolution: CRs can produce a non-thermal pressure gradient and enhance the degree of ionization in molecular clouds, significantly affecting a star-forming activity (e.g., Jubelgas et al. 2008; Hopkins et al. 2021; Owen et al. 2021). The density of the photon fields across the Galaxy is not well constrained, which also makes the GDE model somewhat uncertain in the MeV gamma-ray band. If we assume that the interstellar radiation field is locally enhanced, such as in the Galactic bulge or a large Galactic CR halo, GDE in the inner Galactic region is increased enough to reach the flux level of the COMPTEL excess (Bouchet et al. 2011).

3.1. Cosmic gamma-ray background

Here, we discuss the uncertainty on the subtraction of CGB. When calculating the COMPTEL emission, there is an isotropic term, I_B , in Equation (1) in Strong et al. (1994, 1996), which likely corresponds to CGB. Later, Strong et al. (1999, 2004); Bouchet et al. (2011) presented the COMPTEL diffuse emission with CGB being removed, as the base level (i.e., the zero-flux level) was set to the high-latitude sky. We need to be cautious, however, of the treatment of the isotropic term: First, since the isotropic term is a term with only the normalization being free, the spectral shape of CGB was not taken into account. Second, the uncertainty of the background subtraction might be included in the isotropic term, although the uncertainty of the overall fit was dominated by systematic errors, estimated to be of order of ~25% (Strong et al. 1994). Therefore, there might be a possibility that the isotropic term could not completely represent CGB.

CGB in the MeV gamma-ray band derived from COMPTEL (Weidenspointner 2000; Kappadath et al. 1997; Kappadath 1998) is reproduced by a broken power-law model:

$$I(E) = 2.2 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{E}{3 \text{ MeV}}\right)^{-\Gamma} \text{ (MeV cm}^2 \text{ s sr})^{-1},$$
(1)

where the spectral slope Γ is 3.3 for $E \leq 3$ MeV and 2 for E > 3 MeV. This is roughly comparable with the observation of the Solar Maximum Mission (SMM) Gamma-Ray Spectrometer (GRS) (Watanabe 2000). A fraction of CGB (Equation 1) to the COMPTEL excess is approximately 20%, except for the lowest energy bin of which the fraction is 60%. Since this fraction at the higher energy bins is smaller than the systematic uncertainty of 25%, the COMPTEL data points include the uncertainty of the subtraction of CGB.

3.2. Prospects for future missions

In order to have an advanced understanding of the inner Galactic diffuse emission, observations with much better performance (i.e., greater angular resolution and larger effective area) are desired. Such observations have not been achieved in the two decades since COMPTEL. There are several ongoing or planned projects of the MeV gamma-ray observation, such as COSI-SMEX (Tomsick et al. 2019) to be launched as a satellite in 2026, e-ASTROGAM (De Angelis et al. 2018), AMEGO-X (Fleischhack 2021), GRAMS (Aramaki et al. 2020), SMILE-3 (Takada et al. 2022), GECCO (Moiseev & GECCO collaboration 2021), and a CubeSat for MeV observations (MeVCube) (Lucchetta et al. 2022). With these future missions, we need to resolve the individual MeV gamma-ray sources first. In the inner Galactic region ($|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$), our source model predicts that there are 5, 26, and 28 sources with the flux in 1–10 MeV being larger than 10^{-10} , 10^{-11} , and 10^{-12} erg cm⁻² s⁻¹, respectively. These sources can be detectable by the observatory whose sensitivity is improved by 1–2 orders of magnitude from COMPTEL. After subtracting the source contribution and CGB, we can constrain GDE with higher accuracy, then we can clarify the presence of the COMPTEL excess.

Although more investigation is necessary to reveal whether there indeed is an excess in the inner Galactic diffuse emission in the MeV gamma-ray energy band, we address the other scenarios besides GDE, the sources, and CGB. For example, as indicated by Model 3, we would need additional component(s) to reconcile with the COMPTEL emission. Possible explanations are low-mass (≤ 280 MeV) annihilating dark matter coupling to first-generation quarks (Boddy & Kumar 2015; Christy et al. 2022) and/or cascaded gamma rays accompanying cosmic neutrinos (Fang et al. 2022), which would open up a new window for these studies.

TSUJI ET AL.

4. CONCLUSION

To clarify the origin of the COMPTEL excess, we elaborated on models consisting of MeV gamma-ray objects and GDE. The crossmatched sources (both the hard X-ray and GeV gamma-ray emitters) have contributions of $\sim 10\%$ to the COMPTEL diffuse emission, and the contribution of the unmatched sources (either of the hard X-ray or GeV gamma-ray emitters) is also at the same level. Although the most uncertain component of GDE prevents us from a robust conclusion, we found that the combination of all the components can roughly reproduce the COMPTEL excess, except for the GDE model with the smallest flux. With future missions, we would be able to discriminate between the GDE models, enabling us to determine the amount of low-energy CR electrons and characterize their role in the galaxy evolution, and confirm the existence of the COMPTEL excess, opening up a new window for dark matter or neutrinos if it exists.

We thank the anonymous referee for their advice, which was very helpful to improve our manuscript. We also thank Dmitry Khangulyan, Nagisa Hiroshima, Susumu Inoue, Andrew W. Strong, and the GRAMS collaboration for the fruitful discussion. This work made use of data from the *Swift* and *Fermi* observatories and the GALPROP code. N.T. acknowledges support from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI grant No. 22K14064. H.Y. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant No. 20K22355, Y.I. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant Nos. 18H05458 and 19K14772, and H.O. is supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant Nos. 19H01906, 19H05185, and 22H00128. This work was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant No. 22K18277.

Facilities: Swift-BAT, Fermi-LAT Software: GALPROP (Porter et al. 2017)⁶

APPENDIX

A. EXAMPLE SEDS OF SOURCES

Figure 5 shows the example SEDs of the MeV gamma-ray sources PKS 1830-21, RX J1713.7-3946, Circinus Galaxy, and MSH 15-52. The log-parabola model is applied to PKS 1830-21, the two-component model is applied to RX J1713.7-3946 (see Section 2.1 for details), and we adopt the source-dependent model for Circinus Galaxy and MSH 15-52. We provide SEDs of all of the MeV gamma-ray sources of Tsuji et al. (2021) in https://tsuji703.github.io/ MeV-All-Sky.

In the case of the extraction region with $|\ell| \leq 60^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$, Circinus galaxy and MSH 15–52 cannot be well-fit by neither log-parabola nor two-component models. Therefore, they are fitted with a source-dependent model as follows (Figure 5). The hard X-ray emission of Circinus galaxy (a Seyfert galaxy) is reproduced by accretion disk emission, while its gamma-ray emission is unknown (Hayashida et al. 2013). We apply a combination of a Gaussian model in the hard X-ray band and a power-law model from 4FGL. The emission in the hard X-ray to GeV gamma-ray bands from MSH 15–52 could be given by a superposition of emission from the central pulsar and its nebula, for which we adopt log-parabola and power-law models, respectively (Abdo et al. 2010).



Figure 5. Example SEDs of PKS 1830–21, RX J1713.7–3946, Circinus Galaxy, and MSH 15–52. The flux points obtained by *Swift*-BAT and *Fermi*-LAT are shown in blue. The best-fit models (log parabola for PKS 1830–21, two-component model for RX J1713.7–3946, and source-dependent model for Circinus Galaxy and MSH 15–52) are illustrated with red lines. For the two-component model, each component is also shown in green and orange.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3			
Ref.	Ackermann et al. (2012)	Orlando (2018) DRE	Orlando (2018) DRELowV			
Propagation	_					
$v_{ m Alf}$	- 33	38	20			
$D0_{\rm xx} \ (10^{28} \ {\rm cm}^2 \ {\rm s}^{-1})$	5.2	15	15			
$D_{\rm br}~({ m GV})$	4.0	40	40			
γ_1	0.33	0.33	0.33			
γ_2	0.33	0.33	0.33			
Injection (Proton & Nucleus)						
$E_{\rm br}~({\rm GV})$	11	18	2.7			
s_1	1.9	1.9	1.4			
82	2.4	2.5	2.5			
Injection (Electron)						
$E_{\rm br,0} ({\rm MV})$	2.2×10^{3}	320	170			
$E_{\rm br,1}~({\rm GV})$	2.2×10^3	6.3	4.5			
s_0	1.6	2.9	2.2			
s_1	2.4	0.80	1.7			
s_2	4.0	2.7	2.7			

Table 1. GDE models.

NOTE— The diffusion coefficient is given by $D(\rho) = \beta D 0_{\rm xx} (\rho/D_{\rm br})^{\gamma}$, where $\beta = v/c$ and $\rho = cp/(Ze)$.

B. COMPARISON OF GDE MODELS

This section gives brief descriptions of each GDE model. The characteristic parameters of the GDE models of Models 1–3 are summarized in Table 1. Figure 6 shows a comparison of CR spectra around the Solar System, calculated by the GDE models in Table 1. The observed CR spectra by *Voyager* and AMS-02 are also illustrated. Note that the spectra of AMS-02 are affected by solar modulation below a few GeV, and this solar modulation is not accounted for the shown GDE models.

Ackermann et al. (2012) searched for parameters of GDE which are reconciled with the gamma-ray observations by *Fermi*-LAT and the observed CR spectra by several CR experiments (ACE, AMS, JACEE, HEAO-3, BESS, CREAM, and ISOMAX). Their models successfully reproduce both the spectral and spatial distributions observed by *Fermi*-LAT in the 0.1–100 GeV gamma-ray band. In this paper, a baseline model of ${}^{S}S{}^{Z}4{}^{R}20{}^{T}150{}^{C}5$ is selected as a representative of the models in Ackermann et al. (2012) and referred to as Model 1.

The models, however, are constructed to be in agreement with the local CR spectra, causing a discrepancy with the sub-GeV CR spectra outside the Solar System taken by *Voyager*. Particularly, the spectral model of CR electrons turned out to be lower than the *Voyager* data by a factor of 4–10 (Figure 6). Taking into consideration the latest measurements of CRs with *Voyager*, Orlando (2018) modified the GDE models in the literature, especially the injection parameters of electrons and propagation parameters. The new models in Orlando (2018) are consistent with both the CR and gamma-ray observations. Among them, we adopt models of DRE (i.e., diffusion and re-acceleration) and DRELowV (modified DRE), respectively corresponding to the models with the largest and lowest amount of CR electrons in the energy range of 0.1–1 GeV (Orlando 2018). The DRE and DRELowV models are respectively referred to as Model 2 and Model 3. Note that the spectral model of CR proton in Models 2–3 is roughly comparable with Model 1, while that of electron is higher below GeV.



Figure 6. Comparison of CR spectra of electrons (left) and protons (right) around the Sun (R=8 kpc from the Galactic center) for the different GDE models: Model 1 taken from Ackermann et al. (2012) in blue; Model 2 from Orlando (2018) in red; and Model 3 from Orlando (2018) in green. The black filled circles and open squares indicate the CR data of AMS-02 (The AMS Collaboration et al. 2014, 2015) and *Voyager* (Cummings et al. 2016), respectively.

Table 2. Summary of the MeV gamma-ray inner Galactic diffuse emission and sources in different regions.

Region	Matched source	Unmatched source	Source contribution	Reference	
$ \ell \leq 30^{\circ} \text{ and } b \leq 15^{\circ}$	33	860	20–25%	Bouchet et al. (2011)	
$ \ell \leq 60^\circ$ and $ b \leq 10^\circ$	40	1162	20 – 30%	Strong et al. (1996)	
$ \ell \leq 30^{\circ} \text{ and } b \leq 5^{\circ}$	25	551	20 – 30%	Strong et al. (1999)	
$ \ell \le 45.7^{\circ}$ and $ b \le 45.7^{\circ}$	46	1923	825%	Siegert et al. (2022)	

NOTE—Unmatched source number is the sum of *Swift*-BAT and *Fermi*-LAT sources within the region, excluding the matched sources.

C. DEPENDENCE ON REGION

This section presents the results for the different regions, $|\ell| \leq 60^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$ (Strong et al. 1996), $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 5^{\circ}$ (Strong et al. 1999), and $|\ell| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ (Siegert et al. 2022), respectively shown in Figure 7, Figure 8, and Figure 9. The results are summarized in Table 2. The numbers of matched and unmatched sources are 40 and 1162 in the region with $|\ell| \leq 60^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$, 25 and 551 with $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 5^{\circ}$, and 46 and 1923 with $|\ell| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$. In the cases of the former two regions, the total (matched plus unmatched) source contribution to the COMPTEL emission is 20–30%, and the COMPTEL emission can be roughly reproduced by a combination of GDE and the sources, likewise the region with $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 15^{\circ}$ (Figure 2). In the case of $|\ell| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ (Siegert et al. 2022 and Figure 9), the total source contribution is 8–25% with respect to the *INTEGRAL*-SPI emission, and there is an apparent difference between the emission and the model. In such a high-latitude region, GDE becomes faint and the number of sources decreases. Especially, there is no contribution of extended (i.e., Galactic) sources.

REFERENCES

Abdo,	Α.	Α.,	Ackermann,	М.,	Ajello,	М.,	et	al.	2010,	The

Astrophysical Journal, 714, 927,

doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/714/1/927

Abdollahi, S., Acero, F., Ackermann, M., et al. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 247, 33, doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/ab6bcb



Figure 7. Same as Figure 2, but calculated for $|\ell| \leq 60^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 10^{\circ}$ (Strong et al. 1996).



Figure 8. Same as Figure 2, but calculated for $|\ell| \leq 30^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 5^{\circ}$ (Strong et al. 1999).

Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Atwood, W. B., et al. 2012, The Astrophysical Journal, 750, 3, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/750/1/3

Ackermann, M., Ajello, M., Albert, A., et al. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal, 840, 43, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aa6cab Aramaki, T., Adrian, P. O. H., Karagiorgi, G., & Odaka, H. 2020, Astroparticle Physics, 114, 107, doi: 10.1016/j.astropartphys.2019.07.002
Ballet, J., Burnett, T. H., Digel, S. W., & Lott, B. 2020, arXiv:2005.11208 [astro-ph].

http://arxiv.org/abs/2005.11208



Figure 9. Same as Figure 2, but calculated for $|\ell| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ and $|b| \leq 45.7^{\circ}$ (Siegert et al. 2022).

- Binder, T., Chakraborti, S., Matsumoto, S., & Watanabe, Y. 2022, A Global Analysis of Resonance-enhanced Light Scalar Dark Matter, Tech. Rep. arXiv:2205.10149, arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.10149
- Bird, A. J., Bazzano, A., Malizia, A., et al. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 223, 15, doi: 10.3847/0067-0049/223/1/15
- Boddy, K. K., & Kumar, J. 2015, Physical Review D, 92, 023533, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.92.023533
- Bouchet, L., Strong, A. W., Porter, T. A., et al. 2011, The Astrophysical Journal, 739, 29, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/739/1/29
- Christy, J. G., Kumar, J., & Rajaraman, A. 2022, Indirect Detection of Low-mass Dark Matter Through the \$\pi^0\$ and \$\eta\$ Windows, Tech. Rep. arXiv:2205.09356, arXiv. http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.09356
- Cummings, A. C., Stone, E. C., Heikkila, B. C., et al. 2016, The Astrophysical Journal, 831, 18, doi: 10.3847/0004-637X/831/1/18
- De Angelis, A., Tatischeff, V., Grenier, I. A., et al. 2018, Journal of High Energy Astrophysics, 19, 1, doi: 10.1016/j.jheap.2018.07.001
- Fang, K., Gallagher, J. S., & Halzen, F. 2022, arXiv:2205.03740 [astro-ph]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.03740
- Fleischhack, H. 2021, AMEGO-X: MeV gamma-ray Astronomy in the Multimessenger Era, arXiv, doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2108.02860

- Hayashida, M., Stawarz, L., Cheung, C. C., et al. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 779, 131, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/779/2/131
- Hopkins, P. F., Butsky, I. S., Panopoulou, G. V., et al. 2021, arXiv:2109.09762 [astro-ph, physics:physics]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2109.09762
- Jubelgas, M., Springel, V., Enßlin, T., & Pfrommer, C. 2008, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 481, 33, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20065295
- Kappadath, S. C. 1998, PhD thesis, UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1998PhDT......3K

- Kappadath, S. C., Ryan, J., Bennett, K., et al. 1997, in AIP Conference Proceedings (Williamsburg, Virginia (USA): AIP), 1218–1222, doi: 10.1063/1.54105
- Lucchetta, G., Ackermann, M., Berge, D., & Bühler, R. 2022, arXiv:2204.01325 [astro-ph]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2204.01325
- Moiseev, A., & GECCO collaboration. 2021, in Proceedings of 37th International Cosmic Ray Conference — PoS(ICRC2021) (Berlin, Germany - Online: Sissa Medialab), 648, doi: 10.22323/1.395.0648
- Murgia, S. 2020, Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science, 70, 455,

doi: 10.1146/annurev-nucl-101916-123029

Orlando, E. 2018, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 475, 2724, doi: 10.1093/mnras/stx3280

- Owen, E. R., On, A. Y. L., Lai, S.-P., & Wu, K. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 913, 52, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/abee1a
- Porter, T. A., Jóhannesson, G., & Moskalenko, I. V. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal, 846, 67, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aa844d
- —. 2022, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 262, 30, doi: 10.3847/1538-4365/ac80f6
- Schoenfelder, V., Aarts, H., Bennett, K., et al. 1993, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 86, 657, doi: 10.1086/191794
- Schönfelder, V., Bennett, K., Blom, J. J., et al. 2000, Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement Series, 143, 145, doi: 10.1051/aas:2000101
- Siegert, T., Berteaud, J., Calore, F., Serpico, P. D., & Weinberger, C. 2022, Astronomy & Astrophysics, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/202142639
- Strong, A. W., Bloemen, H., Diehl, R., Hermsen, W., & Schönfelder, V. 1999, Astrophysical Letters and Communications, 39, 209. https://ui.adsabs.harvard. edu/abs/1999ApL&C..39..209S/abstract
- Strong, A. W., Diehl, R., Halloin, H., et al. 2005, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 444, 495, doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20053798
- Strong, A. W., Moskalenko, I. V., & Reimer, O. 2004, The Astrophysical Journal, 613, 962, doi: 10.1086/423193
- Strong, A. W., Bloemen, J. B. G. M., Dame, T. M., et al. 1988, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Vol. 207, p. 1-15 (1988), 207, 1. https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/ 1988A%26A...207....1S/abstract

- Strong, A. W., Bennett, K., Bloemen, H., et al. 1994, Astronomy and Astrophysics, Vol. 292, p. 82-91 (1994), 292, 82. https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/1994A%26A. ..292...82S/abstract
- —. 1996, Astronomy and Astrophysics Supplement, v.120, p.381-387, 120, 381. https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/ 1996A%26AS..120C.381S/abstract
- Su, M., Slatyer, T. R., & Finkbeiner, D. P. 2010, The Astrophysical Journal, 724, 1044, doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/724/2/1044
- Takada, A., Takemura, T., Yoshikawa, K., et al. 2022, arXiv:2107.00180 [astro-ph]. http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.00180
- The AMS Collaboration, Aguilar, M., et al. 2014, Physical Review Letters, 113, 121102, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.121102
- —. 2015, Physical Review Letters, 114, 171103, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.114.171103
- Tomsick, J. A., Zoglauer, A., Sleator, C., et al. 2019, arXiv:1908.04334 [astro-ph]. http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.04334
- Tsuji, N., Yoneda, H., Inoue, Y., et al. 2021, The Astrophysical Journal, 916, 28, doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/ac0341
- Vladimirov, A. E., Digel, S. W., Jóhannesson, G., et al. 2011, Computer Physics Communications, 182, 1156, doi: 10.1016/j.cpc.2011.01.017
- Watanabe, K. 2000, in AIP Conference Proceedings, Vol. 510 (Portsmouth, New Hampshire (USA): AIP), 471–475, doi: 10.1063/1.1303252
- Weidenspointner, G. 2000, in AIP Conference Proceedings, Vol. 510 (Portsmouth, New Hampshire (USA): AIP), 467–470, doi: 10.1063/1.1307028