Revealing the physics of multimessenger events using X-rays

Hendrik van Eerten University of Bath (UK)







Athena X-ray Advances: ASST & ACO Science Webinars Jan 31 2022





• short gamma-ray bursts (sGRBs)





#### Gamma-ray bursts



Gentle upwards slope from synchrotron theory

 $\log F_{\nu}$ 

A non-thermal tail of energetic charged particles makes for extended synchrotron emission

> particles cool too fast to sustain radiation at high frequencies (synchrotron cooling)

plasma opaque to its own emission (synchrotron self-absorption)

no emission beyond the acceleration limit

og





 $\log F_{v}$ 

injecting electrons, starting at  $v_m$ , a non-thermal tail of slope  $-p \approx -2.2$  (in energy)

 $\nu_m$  $\frac{1-p}{2} \cong -0.6$  $^{1}/_{3}$ particles cool too fast  $v_a$ to sustain radiation at high frequencies 2 (synchrotron cooling) no emission beyond the acceleration limit  $\log \nu$ 



injecting electrons, starting at  $v_m$ , a non-thermal tail of slope  $-p \approx -2.2$  (in energy)



![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### The synchrotron spectrum $\log F_{v}$ $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{C}}$ -0.5 $\frac{1}{3}$ X-rays Vm $\frac{p}{2} \cong -1.1$ γ-rays $\rightarrow \log \nu$

#### Gamma-ray prompt emission

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

# GRB prompt emission remains a persistent puzzle 1 2

 $F_{\nu}$ 

0.66

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

Zhang+ 2012

≅ -1.1

### GRB prompt emission remains a persistent puzzle $1 \qquad 2 \qquad 1 \qquad 2 \qquad \frac{F_{\nu}}{\nu} = -1.5 \quad \frac{F_{\nu}}{\nu} = -0.66 \qquad \frac{F_{\nu}}{\nu} = -0.66$

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

Yu+ 2015 A&A 573, A81

Yu, van Eerten+ 2015 A&A 583, A129

Prompt spectrum rise too flat for synchrotron?

 $vF_{v} = 0.5$   $vF_{v} = 1.33$ 

Prompt spectrum turnover too abrupt for synchrotron?

#### A bigger lever arm thanks to X-rays

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

## multi-messenger era dynamics of gamma-ray bursts

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

Old style

New style

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### GW170817 and GRB 170817A

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

Abbott+ 2017, ApJL 848, L12

### GRB 170817A broadband afterglow observable for long time

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

Troja, van Eerten+ 2019, MNRAS 489, 1919

Note how all three light curves look basically the same

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

Troja, van Eerten+ 2019, Haggard+ 2017, Hallinan+ 2017, Mooley+ 2018, D'Avanzo+ 2018, Lyman+ 2018, Dobie+ 2018, Margutti+ 2018, Troja+ 2017, 2018, Lamb+ 2019, ....

### 170817 tightly constrains the energy distribution of shock-accelerated electrons

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Back to 170817's light curve:

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Afterglows and jet lateral structure

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

All GRB jet launching scenarios give rise to a measure of structure in the outflow geometry. NS merger debris might well further add to this

Structure can often be modeled straightforwardly with a simplified power-law/Gaussian

#### initial structure was always there, but only key feature for off-axis observers

![](_page_30_Figure_1.jpeg)

Ryan, van Eerten+ 2020, ApJ 896, 166

STRUCTURED JETS

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

STRUCTURED JETS

![](_page_32_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Follow-up, latest (radio & X-rays)

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

- Blue data points: shifted radio
- Black data points: X-rays
- left figure had X-ray data rebinned

tension as shown above stands at  $3.5\sigma$ , (changes with model tweaks)

see also Hajela+ 2021, Balasubramanian+ 2021, ...

#### Light curve result, no extra luminosity

![](_page_34_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_2.jpeg)

- Fits use Gaussian structured jet (PL fits show similar results)
- Direct co-fit for VLBI observations
- gravitational wave-based prior for orientation
- avoid unphysical electron distribution at late times ('Deep Newtonian regime')

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_36_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Evolution of the posterior of Gaussian jet model

- 1250 days
- Gravitational wave prior (including  $H_0$  assumption)

![](_page_37_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Evolution of the posterior of Gaussian jet model

- 1250 days
- Gravitational wave prior (including  $H_0$  assumption)
- including centroid motion in fit

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

### Evolution of the posterior of Gaussian jet model

- 1250 days
- Gravitational wave prior (including  $H_0$  assumption)
- including centroid motion in fit

X-rays in the multimessenger era

![](_page_39_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Systems that can provide shattering flares

![](_page_40_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Resonance shattering flares in the X-rays

![](_page_41_Figure_1.jpeg)

Neill+ 2021 Submitted, ArXiv: 2111.03686

The point being...

the regular afterglow curve (yellow) will be fainter for observers further off-axis, while the RSF afterglow is quasi-spherical

 $\log F_{v}$ 

![](_page_42_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\log F_{v}$ 

![](_page_43_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_43_Picture_3.jpeg)

#### synchrotron emission

 $\log F_{v}$ 

![](_page_44_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### synchrotron emission

 $\log F_{v}$ 

![](_page_45_Figure_2.jpeg)

synchrotron emission + scattering processes

 $\log F$ 

![](_page_46_Figure_2.jpeg)

afterglow GRB 190114C

#### Blazars: non-thermal emission from fast-moving plasma

![](_page_47_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_47_Figure_2.jpeg)

TXS 0506+056, a flaring (90 days) BL Lac blazar coincident with an Icecube neutrino detection

![](_page_47_Figure_4.jpeg)

img: VERITAS Abeysekara+ 2018

 $\log F_{v}$ 

![](_page_48_Figure_2.jpeg)

synchrotron emission + scattering processes

![](_page_49_Figure_1.jpeg)

afterglow GRB 190114C

(img credit: Petropoulou)

#### A role for the protons in the SED?

![](_page_50_Figure_1.jpeg)

Bethe-Heitler ("pe") process creates electron / positrion pairs that can subsequently produce synchrotron radiation  $p + \gamma \rightarrow p + e^+ + e^- \rightarrow synchrotron emission$ 

#### A toy-model example: Leptonic and lepto-hadronic models for Mrk 421

![](_page_51_Figure_1.jpeg)

### Athena

![](_page_52_Picture_1.jpeg)

#### Athena: not a transient chaser

![](_page_53_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_54_Figure_1.jpeg)

Athena multi-messenger white paper 2021

![](_page_55_Figure_1.jpeg)

Athena multi-messenger white paper 2021

![](_page_56_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_57_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### GRB 170817A and Athena

![](_page_58_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Athena and the rate of successful jets

The VLBI results for GRB 170817A are wonderful, but this might not always be available in order to tell whether there is a directed outflow

![](_page_59_Figure_2.jpeg)

Lamb & Kobayashi 2016 blue: successful burst; red: failed bursts

If the jet Lorentz factor distribution has a tail to low values, many GRB jets will remain opaque to their prompt emission. A failure to break out (a "choked jet") will lead to a quasi-spherical shock-wave

400

The late-time (ie *faint*) light curve slope will reveal whether the jet is collimated or not. Athena can capture this slope best.

Time [d]

200

300

Troja, van Eerten+ 2019

#### Neutron star mergers with Athena

![](_page_60_Figure_1.jpeg)

Athena multi-messenger white paper 2021

### Summary: The joys of X-rays

![](_page_61_Picture_1.jpeg)

- An extra perspective on GRB prompt emission
- Probe the nature of particle shock-acceleration (across many decades for e.g. GRB 170817A)
- Revealing the lateral energy structure of GRB jets
- A detectable afterglow for resonance shattering flares from NS-NS & NS-BH mergers
- Part of the toolkit for constraining the signatures of hadronic emission models (e.g. in blazars), and thus the origin of neutrinos & cosmics rays
- a promising future for transients studies with ATHENA