

**MEASUREMENT OF THE
COSMIC DIFFUSE GAMMA-RAY SPECTRUM
FROM 800 KEV TO 30 MEV**

BY

SRINIVAS CHEENU KAPPADATH

B.A., Illinois Wesleyan University, 1991

M.S., University of New Hampshire, 1994

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the University of New Hampshire
in Partial Fulfillment of
the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Physics

May 1998

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

© 1998

SRINIVAS CHEENU KAPPADATH

This dissertation has been examined and approved.

Dissertation Director, Dr. James M. Ryan
Professor of Physics

Dr. Edward L. Chupp
Professor of Physics

Dr. Mark L. McConnell
Research Associate Professor of Physics

Dr. Volker Schönfelder
Professor

Dr. Harvey K. Shepard
Professor of Physics

Date

dedicated to Beth and Nicholas

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The synthesis of this work would not have been possible without the dedication of my advisor Jim Ryan. To him I express my sincere gratitude. I am grateful for his overall vision and valuable advise. His sense of humor has been a welcome relief when dealing with the nerve-wracking COMPTEL background. I wish to acknowledge all members of the COMPTEL collaboration led by Volker Schönfelder. I am indebted to team members Alanna Connors, John Macri and Mark McConnell for their help in understanding instrument operation, statistics and data analysis. I wish to especially thank team members Dan Morris, Rob van Dijk, Martin Varendorff and Georg Weidenspointner whose background studies have contributed to a better understanding of the instrument. Special thanks to Rita Freuder, John Labonte, Tom Milliman and Neil Schonwald for their computer expertise. I thank my fellow graduate students and friends at the University of New Hampshire, particularly Doug Biesecker, Marc Kippen, Vance Pomeroy, Gerhard Rank and Alex Young, for sharing in this experience and encouraging me along the way. Last but not the least, I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my wife Beth, for her support, optimism and sacrifice, and my son Nicholas, for sharing his wonder and enthusiasm, throughout my graduate studies. This work has been supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration grant NAS5-26645.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xviii
ABSTRACT.....	xx
CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE COMPTON INSTRUMENT.....	8
A. Principle of Measurement.....	8
B. Instrument Description.....	10
C. Data Description.....	13
D. Instrument Response.....	14
1. Effective Area.....	14
2. Telescope Event Mechanism.....	16
3. Total Energy Response.....	18
4. Scatter Angle Spectrum.....	19
5. ARM Distribution.....	20
E. CDG Effective-Area Calculation.....	21
F. Time-of-Flight Corrections.....	25
G. The Veto System.....	26
III. OVERVIEW OF THE INSTRUMENT BACKGROUND.....	30
A. Nature of the Space Environment.....	31
B. Nature of the COMPTON Background.....	33
C. Protons, Neutrons and Electrons.....	38

D. Background Event Geometry.....	39
IV. DATA.....	43
A. Observations	43
B. Removal of Atmospheric Gamma Rays.....	47
C. Standard-CDG Data Selections	50
V. THE INSTRUMENT BACKGROUND	52
A. The ToF Spectrum.....	52
1. Overview	52
2. The ToF Fit.....	53
3. Results for the ToF Fit in ETOT.....	54
4. Exponential versus Quadratic ToF Model.....	61
B. The Total Energy Spectrum	61
1. Prompt versus Long-Lived Background.....	61
2. The ToF-Peak Energy Spectrum: Phase-Separated Data.....	63
3. The ToF-Peak Energy Spectrum: Mission-Averaged Data.....	65
4. The Energy Spectra for the Exponential and Constant Components.....	67
C. The Long-Lived Background Component.....	69
1. Overview.....	69
2. The ^{24}Na Isotope	70
3. The ^{22}Na Isotope	73
4. The ^2H Neutron-Capture Line	74
5. The ^{40}K Isotope.....	75
6. The ^{28}Al Isotope.....	77
7. The ^{27}Mg Isotope	78
8. Dataspace and CDG Simulation Characteristics.....	81
9. The E2 Spectrum.....	83
10. The Unidentified Spectral Features.....	88

D. The Veto Rate Measurement	94
1. Gamma-1 Rate Dependence on the Veto Rate	97
2. ToF Components versus Veto2 Rate	98
3. An Improved ToF Fit between 4.2 and 9 MeV	102
E. Prompt Background Component: Veto Growth Curves	105
1. Overview	105
2. The 2.2 MeV VGC	106
3. The VGCs above 4.2 MeV	111
4. The VGCs below 4.2 MeV	119
 VI. THE CDG ANALYSIS METHOD	 128
A. Overview	128
B. The 9-30 MeV CDG Analysis	130
1. The ToF Spectrum	130
2. The VGC Modulation	131
3. Phi 7–22° Selection for 17–30 MeV	134
4. The 9–30 MeV CDG Flux Calculation	137
5. Consistency Check for the Analysis Method	139
C. The 4.2–9 MeV CDG Analysis	140
1. The ToF Spectrum	141
2. Phi 18–38° Selection for 4.2–9 MeV	142
3. The VGC modulation	144
4. The 4.2–9 MeV CDG Flux Calculation	145
5. Consistency Check for the Analysis Method	147
D. The 2.7–4.2 MeV CDG Analysis	148
1. The ToF Spectrum	149
2. Special Data Selections	150
3. The 2.7–4.2 MeV CDG Flux Calculation	156
4. Consistency Check for the Analysis Method	157

E. The 1.8–2.7 MeV CDG Analysis	160
1. The E2 Spectral Fit	160
2. The 1.8–2.7 MeV CDG Flux Calculation	163
3. Consistency Check for the Analysis Method.....	164
F. The 0.8–1.8 MeV CDG Analysis	166
1. The E2 Spectral Fit	166
2. The 1.2–1.8 MeV CDG Flux Calculation	168
3. The 0.8–1.2 MeV CDG Flux Calculation	172
G. Systematic Error Calculation.....	176
1. The ToF Fit Function.....	176
2. The VGC Extrapolation	182
3. The Veto Dome Dependence	183
4. The Long-Lived Background Subtraction.....	186
5. The CDG Response Calculation.....	187
6. Summary of Systematic Errors.....	187
VII. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	189
A. Summary of the CDG Analysis	189
B. The Cosmic Diffuse Gamma-Ray Spectrum.....	190
C. The MeV Bump	194
D. Homogeneity of the CDG Emission	196
E. Discussion.....	199
1. Matter-Antimatter Annihilation Radiation	202
2. Active Galaxies	203
3. Supernovae Contributions.....	207
VIII. CONCLUSIONS.....	208
BIBLIOGRAPHY	211

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	PAGE
II.1	The principle of measurement for a Compton telescope..... 9
II.2	A schematic diagram of COMPTEL..... 11
II.3	A comparison between the COMPTEL effective area determined from calibration measurements and the simulation package..... 15
II.4	The simulated COMPTEL effective area as a function of the incident photon energy for two different incidence angles..... 15
II.5	The simulated COMPTEL effective area as a function of the photon incidence angle at two different energies..... 16
II.6	The fractional composition of simulated telescope events in terms of scattered-events for normal incidence as a function of photon energy..... 17
II.7	Efficiency of mechanisms to produce photons in D1 that consequently trigger D2 to register valid simulated telescope events..... 18
II.8	The simulated total energy response of COMPTEL to a 4.430 MeV monoenergetic point source at normal incidence..... 18
II.9	The simulated total energy response of COMPTEL to a 12.140 MeV monoenergetic point source at normal incidence..... 19
II.10	The decomposition of Compton-scattered telescope events in terms of escaping energy from the D1 and D2 detectors..... 19
II.11	The simulated ϕ spectrum for a 4.430 MeV monoenergetic point source at normal incidence..... 20
II.12	The simulated ϕ spectrum for a 12.143 MeV monoenergetic point source at normal incidence..... 20
II.13	The simulated ARM distribution for a 4.430 MeV monoenergetic point source at normal incidence..... 21
II.14	The simulated ARM distribution for a 12.140 MeV monoenergetic point source at normal incidence..... 21
II.15	The CDG effective area computed using an $E^{-2.5}$ power-law and a 2π isotropic source for standard-CDG event selections..... 24
III.1	The modulation in Gamma-1 event rates, veto2-scaler, rigidity and GCEL observed in a typical day (TJD 9725)..... 34
III.2	The distribution of Gamma-1 event rates as a function of the vertical cutoff-rigidity for a typical viewing period (VP 408)..... 35
III.3	The distribution of Gamma-1 event rates as a function of the veto2-scaler for a typical viewing period (VP 408)..... 36

III.4	A typical time-of-flight spectrum for sky observations.....	37
III.5	The total energy count spectrum for the three different ToF components in linear scale from 800 to 4800 keV.....	38
III.6	A COMPTEL cartoon to illustrate the various background event types.....	40
IV.1	The Phase 1 and Phase 2 Virgo observations.....	45
IV.2	The Phase 3 and Phase 4 Virgo observations.....	45
IV.3	The Phase 5 Virgo and Phase 1 SGP observations.....	46
IV.4	The Phase 4 and Phase 5 SGP observations.....	46
IV.5	A schematic of the CDG field-of-view selection.....	48
IV.6	The correlation between the EHORA and the GCEL angles for TJD 9725.....	48
IV.7	A schematic of the COMPTEL orbital and field-of-view selections.....	49
V.A.1	The ToF spectrum using livetime corrected Gamma-1 and Gamma-2 data.....	53
V.A.2	The ToF fits for 1018–1149 keV in ETOT with the Exponential- and Quadratic-ToF model.....	55
V.A.3	The ToF fits for 2102–2373 keV in ETOT with the Exponential- and Quadratic-ToF model.....	55
V.A.4	The ToF fits for 7038–7942 keV in ETOT with the Exponential- and Quadratic-ToF model.....	56
V.A.5	The ToF fits for 12878–14531 keV in ETOT with the Exponential- and Quadratic-ToF model.....	56
V.A.6	The reduced chi-square values for the two different ToF models.....	57
V.A.7	The gaussian widths for the two different ToF models.....	57
V.A.8	The gaussian positions for the two different ToF models.....	58
V.A.9	The gaussian amplitudes for the two different ToF models.....	59
V.A.10	The fractional difference in the ToF-peak rates between the two ToF-fit models.....	59
V.A.11	The fractional difference in the quadratic and exponential rates between the two ToF-fit models.....	60
V.A.12	The fractional difference in the constant component between the two ToF-fit models.....	61
V.B.1	The COMPTEL altitude history since launch.....	62
V.B.2	The ToF-peak energy spectra for phase-separated data.....	64
V.B.3	The total energy spectrum for the P2345 Virgo data from 800–4800 keV.....	65

V.B.4	The total energy spectrum for the P2345 Virgo data from 800–30000 keV.....	66
V.B.5	The ToF-quadratic energy spectra for phase-separated data	67
V.B.6	The ToF-constant energy spectra for phase-separated data.....	68
V.C.1	The COMPTEL response to the ^{24}Na decay	71
V.C.2	The measured ^{24}Na rates with the ^{24}Na activation model	72
V.C.3	The COMPTEL response to the ^{22}Na decay.....	73
V.C.4	The COMPTEL response to the hydrogen neutron-capture line (2.223 MeV)...	75
V.C.5	The COMPTEL response to the ^{40}K decay.....	76
V.C.6	The COMPTEL response to the ^{28}Al decay.....	77
V.C.7	Residual counts in the 30 minutes after SAA passages.....	78
V.C.8	The COMPTEL response to the ^{27}Mg decay	79
V.C.9	The average rate for the ^{24}Na , ^{22}Na , ^{40}K isotopes, the 2.2 MeV line in ETOT and the 1.41 MeV in E2 spanning the first five years	80
V.C.10	The ETOT spectra for high rigidity (>10 GV) P3V data below ~4.2 MeV.....	81
V.C.11	The E2 spectra for high rigidity (>10 GV) P3V data below ~4.2 MeV	82
V.C.12	The measured ϕ spectrum using P2345V data.....	82
V.C.13	The COMPTEL response to CDG simulations	83
V.C.14	The P2345V E2 spectrum together with the exponential-continuum function..	84
V.C.15	The line emission in the P2345V E2 spectrum.....	84
V.C.16	Fit of the 2.754 MeV line region in the E2 spectrum.....	85
V.C.17	Fit of the 2.2 MeV line photopeak in the ETOT spectrum.....	86
V.C.18	Fit of the 1.8 MeV line region in the E2 spectrum.....	86
V.C.19	Fit of the E2 spectrum with all identified line components.....	87
V.C.20	The four residual features in the E2 spectrum of unidentified origin.....	88
V.C.21	The residual features in the E2 spectrum compared to the total counts.....	88
V.C.22	The P2345V data E2 spectrum showing the contributions from $\phi > 22^\circ$ and $\phi < 22^\circ$ events.....	89
V.C.23	The P2345V data ETOT spectrum showing the contributions from $\phi > 22^\circ$ and $\phi < 22^\circ$ events.....	90
V.C.24	The contribution of the ETOT 2.7–4.2 MeV events to the total E2 spectrum....	90
V.C.25	The fit for the E2 spectrum with E1:270–350 keV and the residuals.	91

V.C.26	The contribution of the ETOT 1.2–1.8 MeV events to the E2 spectrum	92
V.C.27	The contribution of the ETOT 1.8–2.7 MeV events to the E2 spectrum	93
V.D.1	The vertical cutoff-rigidity and the instantaneous veto rate showing a strong anti-correlation (for TJD 9725).....	94
V.D.2	The typical behavior of the four veto scalers showing a similar modulation with time for a typical day (for TJD 9725).....	95
V.D.3	The frequency distribution of the (a) Gamma-1 rates and (b) the cutoff-rigidity.....	95
V.D.4	The frequency distribution of the four veto rates (TJD 9725).....	96
V.D.5	The scatter-plot of the veto2-rate with the other veto-dome rates and the rigidity.....	96
V.D.6	The raw Gamma-1 rate as a function of the veto2-rate for TJD 9725 and the same with EHORA $\geq 45^\circ$ and times >30 minutes after SAA passages	97
V.D.7	The ToF-peak position as a function of their veto2-rate bin from 800–2102 keV.....	98
V.D.8	The ToF-peak position as a function of their veto2-rate bin from 2102–5528 keV.....	99
V.D.9	The ToF-peak position as a function of their veto2-rate bin from 5528–14531 keV.....	99
V.D.10	The ToF-peak position as a function of their veto2-rate bin from 14531–30000 keV.....	100
V.D.11	The fitted ToF-peak widths as a function of their veto2 rate bin	101
V.D.12	The fitted ToF-peak exponential-linear terms as a function of their veto2 rate.	101
V.D.13	The (a) 4.2–6 and (b) 6–9 MeV ToF spectrum using a 1gToF fit.....	102
V.D.14	The ^{24}Na ToF spectrum computed from simulations.....	103
V.D.15	The 4.2–6 MeV all-veto P15VSGP ToF spectrum fit using the 2gToF model..	104
V.D.16	The 6–9 MeV all-veto P15VSGP ToF spectrum fit using the 2gToF model....	104
V.E.1	The 2.2 MeV ETOT fit for the veto-integrated P15VSGP data.	107
V.E.2	The mean 2.2 MeV line width and position for different datasets.	107
V.E.3	The mean 2.2 MeV line count rate for different datasets.	108
V.E.4	The 2.2 MeV line width and line position as a function of veto2 rate.....	108
V.E.5	The 2.2 MeV VGC for P15VSGP data.	109
V.E.6	The 2.2 MeV VGC for (a) P12345V data and (b) P145SGP data.	109
V.E.7	The reduced chi-squares for 2.2 MeV VGC fits.....	110

V.E.8	The x-intercept from linear fits to the 2.2 MeV VGCs for different datasets. ...	111
V.E.9	The P15VSGP VGCs for the three ToF components in 4.2–6 and 6–9 MeV ...	112
V.E.10	The P15VSGP VGCs for the three ToF components in 9–12 and 12–17 MeV	112
V.E.11	The P15VSGP VGCs for the three ToF components in the 17–30 MeV	113
V.E.12	The VGC slopes for the three ToF components above 4.2 MeV	114
V.E.13	The VGC y-intercepts for the three ToF components above 4.2 MeV.....	114
V.E.14	The (a) 4.2–9 MeV and (b) 9–30 MeV exponential-component VGC intercepts	115
V.E.15	The 9–30 MeV and 4.2–9 MeV VGCs for the P12V data.....	116
V.E.16	The 9–30 MeV and 4.2–9 MeV VGCs for the P3V data.....	117
V.E.17	The 9–30 MeV and 4.2–9 MeV VGCs for the P45V data.....	118
V.E.18	The 9–30 MeV and 4.2–9 MeV VGCs for the P1SGP data.....	118
V.E.19	The 9–30 MeV and 4.2–9 MeV VGCs for the P45SGP data.....	119
V.E.20	The (a) VGC intercepts and (b) VGC slope in 9–30 MeV.....	119
V.E.21	The (a) VGC intercepts and (b) VGC slope in 4.2–9 MeV.....	119
V.E.22	P1V data (a) the ^{24}Na VGC and (b) the 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC.....	121
V.E.23	P4V data (a) the ^{24}Na VGC and (b) the 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC.....	121
V.E.24	P5V data (a) the ^{24}Na VGC and (b) the 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC.....	122
V.E.25	P2345V data (a) the ^{24}Na VGC and (b) the 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC.....	122
V.E.26	The non-uniform veto exposure, typical of COMPTEL data.....	124
V.E.27	The veto-excess constructed by averaging two constant rates.....	124
V.E.28	The VGC for the ^{28}Al isotope and the 2-2.4 MeV excess in the E2 spectrum ...	125
V.E.29	The VGCs for ^{22}Na and the 1.41 MeV peaks in the E2 spectrum	126
V.E.30	The 2.58 MeV VGC in Phases 4 and 5 — prompt background.	126
V.E.31	The 2.94 MeV VGC in Phases 4 and 5 — long-lived background.....	127
VI.B.1	The (a) 9–12 and (b) 12–17 MeV ToF spectrum using Virgo data.....	131
VI.B.2	The 17–30 MeV ToF spectrum for CDG selections using Virgo data	131
VI.B.3	The 9–12 MeV VGC for the Virgo and SGP observations.....	133
VI.B.4	The 12–17 MeV VGC for the Virgo and SGP observations.....	133
VI.B.5	The 17–30 MeV VGC for the Virgo and SGP observations.....	134

VI.B.6	The 9–30 MeV ϕ spectrum of the data with the ϕ spectrum obtained from the CDG simulations.....	134
VI.B.7	The Virgo 17–30 MeV VGC illustrating the impact of the two different phi selections.....	137
VI.B.8	The 17–30 MeV VGC for the Virgo and SGP observations with ϕ 7–22°.....	137
VI.B.9	The measured 9–30 MeV CDG flux for the five independent datasets.....	139
VI.B.10	The 9–30 MeV VGC for the five independent datasets.....	140
VI.C.1	The 4.2–6 MeV ToF spectrum fit using the 2gToF model.....	141
VI.C.2	The 6–9 MeV ToF spectrum fit using the 2gToF model.....	141
VI.C.3	The 4.2–9 MeV ϕ spectrum of the data with the ϕ spectrum obtained from the CDG simulations.....	142
VI.C.4	The 2gToF model ToF fit for $\phi \geq 18^\circ$ in 4.2–6 MeV P15VSGP data.....	143
VI.C.5	The 2gToF model ToF fit for $\phi \geq 18^\circ$ in 6–9 MeV P15VSGP data.....	143
VI.C.6	The 4.2–6 MeV VGCs for the four different ToF-peak rate calculations.....	145
VI.C.7	The 6–9 MeV VGCs for the four different ToF-peak rate calculations.....	145
VI.C.8	The 4.2–6 MeV VGC with optimized CDG selections (2gToF+ $\phi > 18^\circ$).....	146
VI.C.9	The 6–9 MeV VGC with optimized CDG selections (2gToF+ $\phi > 18^\circ$).....	146
VI.C.10	The measured 4.2–9 MeV CDG flux for the five independent datasets.....	147
VI.C.11	The 4.2–9 MeV VGC for the five independent datasets.....	148
VI.D.1	The ^{24}Na ToF spectrum.....	150
VI.D.2	The P23a E2 spectrum about the 2.754 MeV line from ^{24}Na decay.....	151
VI.D.3	The ^{24}Na VGC for P23a 2.7–4.2 MeV.....	152
VI.D.4	The (a) 2.6 MeV and (b) the 3.0 MeV VGC for 2.7–4.2 MeV.....	153
VI.D.5	The P23a 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC for all three ToF components.....	154
VI.D.6	The E1–E2 parameter space with lines of constant ETOT and constant ϕ	155
VI.D.7	The P23a ^{24}Na corrected 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC for ϕ 22–38° used to compute the 2.7–4.2 MeV CDG flux.....	156
VI.D.8	The 2.7–4.2 MeV VGC for ϕ 6–38°.....	160
VI.E.1	The P23a E2 spectrum together with the exponential-continuum.....	161
VI.E.2	The continuum-subtracted E2 spectrum with the ^{24}Na , 2.6 and 3.0 gaussians, 2.2 MeV and ^{28}Al components.	162
VI.E.3	The ^{28}Al VGC in ETOT 1.8–2.7 MeV.....	162

VI.E.4	The 1.8–2.7 MeV for ϕ 22–38° selection	164
VI.E.5	The 1.8–2.7 MeV for ϕ 6–38° selection	165
VI.F.1	The E2 line spectrum with (a) the fitted individual line components.....	167
VI.F.2	(a) The ^{22}Na VGC and (b) the 1.4 MeV VGC	167
VI.F.3	The 1.2–1.8 MeV ToF spectrum fit.....	169
VI.F.4	The 1.2–1.8 MeV VGC for all three ToF components.....	169
VI.F.5	The line subtracted 1.2–1.8 MeV VGC	170
VI.F.6	The line subtracted 1.2–1.8 MeV VGC for P23a with ϕ 22–38° selection	172
VI.F.7	The 0.8–1.2 MeV ToF spectrum fit.....	173
VI.F.8	The 0.8–1.2 MeV VGC for all three ToF components.....	174
VI.F.9	The line subtracted 0.8–1.2 MeV VGC for P23a.....	174
VI.G.1	0.8–1.2 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	178
VI.G.2	1.2–1.8 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	178
VI.G.3	1.8–2.7 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	179
VI.G.4	2.7–4.2 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	179
VI.G.5	4.2–6 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	180
VI.G.6	6–9 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	180
VI.G.7	9–12 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	181
VI.F.8	12–17 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	181
VI.G.9	17–30 MeV: Comparison between the CDG count rates derived using a quadratic-ToF function (right) and an exponential-ToF function (left).....	182
VI.G.10	The 9–30 MeV ToF-peak VGCs generated using the four veto-domes.....	185
VI.G.11	The 9–30 MeV CDG count rate using the four veto-domes.....	185
VI.G.12	The 4.2–9 MeV ToF-peak VGCs generated using the four veto-domes.....	186
VI.G.13	The 4.2–9 MeV CDG count rate using the four veto-domes	186

VII.1	The COMPTEL CDG spectrum with the power-law fit together with the results from pre-COMPTEL experiments.....	191
VII.2	The COMPTEL CDG spectrum compared to the results from SMM and extrapolation from EGRET.....	193
VII.3	The COMPTEL $E^2 \times \text{Flux}$ spectrum.....	194
VII.4	The COMPTEL flux at ~ 4.5 GV together with the pre-COMPTEL measurements.....	195
VII.5	Five independent measurements of the 9–30 MeV CDG flux.	196
VII.6	Five independent measurements of the 4.2–9 MeV CDG flux.....	197
VII.7	A comparison of the CDG spectrum for the Virgo and SGP observations.....	198
VII.8	The multiwavelength spectrum of the CDG emission from low-energy X-rays to high-energy gamma rays.....	201
VII.9	The $E^2 \times \text{Flux}$ spectrum COMPTEL values from 4.2–30 MeV.....	206

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
IV.1 The Virgo observations.....	44
IV.2 The SGP observations	45
IV.3 The instrument geometry for the Virgo and SGP observations.....	46
IV.4 Terminology used for different datasets.....	47
V.C.1 A list of the identified long-lived parent isotopes.....	70
V.D.1 Results of the 1gToF and 2gToF fits to the 4.2–6 and 6–9 MeV bins.....	104
V.E.1 The 2.2 MeV VGC fit results.....	110
V.E.2 The 2.2 MeV x-intercepts for different datasets.....	111
V1.B.1 The M_ν and S/B ratios for the Virgo and SGP datasets above 9 MeV.....	132
V1.B.3 The effect of the ϕ 7–22° selection on A_{eff} and $\text{Rate}_{\nu;2000}$	135
V1.B.4 Comparison between the M_ν and S/B ratios for the Virgo and SGP datasets above 9 MeV for the two different ϕ selections.....	135
V1.B.5 Comparison of the CDG flux for the two different ϕ selections above 9 MeV using the Virgo data.....	136
V1.B.6 Comparison of the CDG flux for the two different ϕ selections above 9 MeV using the SGP data.....	136
V1.B.7 The CDG rate and flux between 9 and 30 MeV.....	138
V1.B.8 A comparison between the 17–30 MeV CDG results derived using the two different ϕ selection.	139
V1.B.9 The measured 9–30 MeV CDG flux for the five independent datasets.....	140
VI.C.1 The effect of the ϕ 18–38° selection on A_{eff} and $\text{Rate}_{\nu;2000}$	143
VI.C.2 The M_ν and S/B ratios in the Virgo data between 4.2 and 9 MeV.....	144
VI.C.3 The M_ν and S/B ratios in the SGP data between 4.2 and 9 MeV.....	144
VI.C.4 The CDG rate and flux between 4.2 and 9 MeV using 2gToF+ $\phi > 18^\circ$ selection	147
VI.C.5 The total 4.2–9 MeV flux with 2gToF+ $\phi > 18^\circ$ selection	148
VI.D.1 The results for 2.7–4.2 MeV CDG analysis for P23a data and ϕ 22–38° with the ^{24}Na activity determined using 24Na-E1 selections.....	157
VI.D.2 The 2.7–4.2 MeV CDG rates for subtracting the ^{24}Na intensity before and after extrapolating the ToF-peak VGC (ϕ 22–38° and P23a data).....	158

VI.D.3	The results for 2.7–4.2 MeV CDG analysis for P23a data and ϕ 6–38°	159
VI.E.1	The results for 1.8–2.7 MeV CGD analysis using P23a data and ϕ 22–38°	164
VI.E.2	The effect of ^{28}Al subtraction to the 1.8–2.7 MeV analysis for P23a data	165
VI.E.3	The results for 1.8–2.7 MeV CDG analysis using P23a data and ϕ 6–38°	166
VI.F.1	Results for the 1.2–1.8 MeV CDG analysis using P23a data with standard- CDG data selections.	171
VI.F.2	Results for the 1.2–1.8 MeV CDG analysis using P23a data with ϕ 22–38° selection and the Exponential-ToF model.	172
VI.F.3	Results for 0.8–1.2 MeV CDG analysis using P23a data with standard-CDG selections	175
VI.G.1	Systematic errors from the ToF-fit function.	177
VI.G.2	Systematic errors from the VGC extrapolation	183
VI.G.3	Systematic errors from the choice of veto-dome rate	184
VI.G.4	Systematic errors from the long-lived background subtraction	187
VI.G.5	The total systematic errors for each energy bin	188
VII.1	Summary of CDG data selections	189
VII.2	The COMPTEL CDG flux and its statistical and systematic errors	189
VII.3	Five independent measurements of the 4.2–9 and 9–30 MeV CDG flux (statistical errors only)	197
VII.4	The CDG flux above 4.2 MeV from the Virgo and SGP directions (statistical errors only)	198
VII.5	The 4.2–9 and 9–30 MeV CDG flux ratios from the Virgo and SGP directions (statistical errors only)	199

ABSTRACT

MEASUREMENT OF THE COSMIC DIFFUSE GAMMA-RAY SPECTRUM FROM 800 KEV TO 30 MEV

by

SRINIVAS CHEENU KAPPADATH
University of New Hampshire, May, 1998

The Cosmic Diffuse Gamma-Ray (CDG) spectrum between 800 keV and 30 MeV has been measured with the Imaging Compton telescope COMPTEL, aboard the *Compton* Gamma Ray Observatory. Although COMPTEL is primarily an imaging detector, it is well suited to measure the CDG flux mainly because of its large detection area, wide field-of-view (~ 1.5 sr), low background and long exposure times. The major difficulty in measuring the CDG radiation at MeV energies is the intense instrumental background. The instrumental background in COMPTEL is created mainly in the surrounding material. The striking feature of the pre-COMPTEL CDG spectrum was an apparent flattening between 1 and 10 MeV. A simple power law extrapolation from the X-ray regime showed the presence of an excess, referred to as the *MeV bump*, in the 1 to 10 MeV range.

These CDG flux measurements in the 1 to 10 MeV range are about 5 to 10 times lower than the pre-COMPTEL estimates. They show no evidence of a MeV bump in the 1 to 10 MeV range. The measured CDG emission between 0.8 and 30 MeV is well described by a power-law photon spectrum with an index of -2.4 ± 0.2 and a flux normalization of $(1.05 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-4}$ photons/cm²-s-sr-MeV at 5 MeV. This work represents the first significant detection of the CDG emission in the 9 to 30 MeV range. No statistically significant deviations from isotropy is observed in the 4.2 to 30 MeV CDG emission when comparing the spectrum from the Virgo and the South Galactic Pole directions.

The CDG spectrum was measured using COMPTEL data by first measuring the count rate of gamma rays from high galactic latitudes, during those periods when the Earth was outside the COMPTEL field-of-view. Special data selections were applied to suppress the prompt and

delayed background components. Above 4.2 MeV, in the absence of long-lived background, the count rates were extrapolated to zero cosmic-ray intensity to eliminate the prompt background and arrive at the CDG count rates. The delayed emission from long-lived radioactivity, present only below 4.2 MeV, was determined by fitting the energy spectrum. Below 4.2 MeV, their contributions were subtracted prior to the extrapolation to zero cosmic-ray flux to determine the CDG count spectrum. The CDG flux was determined by deconvolving the resultant count spectrum with the computed instrument response for an isotropic diffuse source having a power-law distribution in energy.

In the light of this work, possible contributions from all processes that explain the MeV bump, such as primordial matter-antimatter annihilations, are significantly lower than previously believed. Our measurements below 3 MeV within errors are consistent with the level predicted by the model where the CDG emission arise from the decay of elements produced in supernovae. A blazar origin for the CDG emission seems likely above ~ 100 MeV. However, the situation is less certain in the 1 to 30 MeV range because the blazar emission at these energies is not well known. A simple continuation of the blazar contribution from higher energies is allowed by the COMPTEL measurements.

The method developed in this work to measure the CDG spectrum is a new method for analyzing COMPTEL data. Such a procedure could be used to study other sources of diffuse emission, for example, the diffuse Galactic emission. This work has led to a better understanding of the physical nature of the COMPTEL background and consequently will improve the COMPTEL imaging capabilities.