

On the origin of radio emission in radio quiet quasars

Ari Laor^{1*} and Ehud Behar^{1,2 *}

¹*Physics Department, Technion, Haifa 32000, Israel*

²*Current address: Senior NPP Fellow, NASA / Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt MD 20771*

24 October 2018

ABSTRACT

The radio emission in radio loud quasars originates in a jet carrying relativistic electrons. In radio quiet quasars (RQQs) the relative radio emission is $\sim 10^3$ times weaker, and its origin is not established yet. We show here that there is a strong correlation between the radio luminosity (L_R) and X-ray luminosity (L_X) with $L_R \sim 10^{-5} L_X$, for the radio quiet Palomar-Green (PG) quasar sample. The sample is optically selected, with nearly complete radio and X-ray detections, and thus this correlation cannot be due to direct selection biases. The PG quasars lie on an extension of a similar correlation noted by Panessa et al., for a small sample of nearby low luminosity type 1 AGN. A remarkably similar correlation, known as the Güdel-Benz relation, where $L_R/L_X \sim 10^{-5}$, holds for coronally active stars. The Güdel-Benz relation, together with correlated stellar X-ray and radio variability, implies that the coronae are magnetically heated. We therefore raise the possibility that AGN coronae are also magnetically heated, and that the radio emission in RQQ also originates in coronal activity. If correct, then RQQ should generally display compact flat cores at a few GHz due to synchrotron self-absorption, while at a few hundred GHz we should be able to see directly the X-ray emitting corona, and relatively rapid and large amplitude variability, correlated with the X-ray variability, is likely to be seen. We also discuss possible evidence that the radio and X-ray emission in ultra luminous X-ray sources and Galactic black holes may be of coronal origin as well.

Key words: quasars: general.

1 INTRODUCTION

AGN emit continuum radiation from the radio to the hard X-rays, and in some objects beyond. The overall spectral energy distribution (SED) of AGN has a characteristic shape, with a relatively small dispersion (e.g. Sanders et al. 1989, Elvis et al. 1994), except in the radio band, where the relative strength of the radio emission spans a range of $> 10^6$, from the most radio loud AGN to the most radio quiet AGN, where the radio emission is undetectable. Furthermore, there is evidence that the distributions of absolute radio power (Miller et al. 1990) and relative radio power, commonly measured using $R \equiv f_{6\text{ cm}}/f_{4400\text{ \AA}}$, are bimodal (Kellerman et al. 1989), with radio loud (RL) AGN having $R \sim 10^2 - 10^5$ and radio quiet (RQ) AGN having $R \lesssim 0.1 - 10$, though the strength of the bi-modality may be weaker than initially estimated (White et al. 2007). The radio emission of RL AGN originates in a fast jet carrying relativistic electrons, as clearly established through high resolution radio imaging (e.g. Begelman et al. 1984, and citations thereafter), how-

ever the origin of the radio emission in RQ AGN is not established yet.

Early radio imaging of RQ AGN confined the radio emission to arcsec scale, which allowed the option of supernovae related radio emission from compact starburst activity (Wilson & Willis 1980; Ulvestad & Wilson 1984; Sopp & Alexander 1991; Condon et al. 1991; Terlevich et al. 1992). However, sub arcsecond imaging of RQ AGN (Kellerman et al. 1994; Kukula et al. 1995, 1998; Leipski et al. 2006), followed by higher resolution VLBI imaging (Blundell et al. 1996, Blundell & Beasley 1998; Ulvestad & Ho 2001; Nagar et al. 2002; Anderson et al. 2004; Ulvestad et al. 2005), found significant compact radio emission on mas, i.e. pc scale. Most recently, radio variability monitoring of RQ AGN confine the radio emission to $\lesssim 0.1$ pc in luminous AGN (Barvainis et al. 2005), and $\lesssim 10^{-4} - 10^{-2}$ pc in low luminosity AGN (Anderson & Ulvestad 2005), which clearly indicates a compact non thermal source. Unlike high resolution imaging of RL AGN, which often resolves a significant fraction of the total radio flux already on arcsec (i.e. kpc) scale, in RQ AGN the emission is mostly unresolved at arcsec scale, and often remains largely unresolved down to mas. *What produces this radio emission?* A plausible explanation is a scaled down version

* E-mail: laor@physics.technion.ac.il (AL); behar@physics.technion.ac.il (EB)

of the RL AGN mechanism, i.e. a low power jet (Miller et al. 1993; Falcke et al. 1996), which dissipates before leaving the core, explaining the general lack of resolved emission. However, the bimodal distribution in jet power remains to be understood.

Further hints on the origin of the radio emission in RQ AGN can be provided by correlating it with other emission properties. In this paper we focus on the correlation of the radio emission with the X-ray emission (hereafter the R-X relation). Earlier studies of this relation (Brinkmann et al. 2000; Salvato et al. 2004; Wang et al. 2006), indicated a roughly linear relation for luminous RQ AGN. These studies were based on a correlation of the ROSAT all sky survey, and large area radio surveys (VLA FIRST and NVSS). Most objects in flux limited surveys tend to cluster close to the flux limit, and thus a linear relation would appear if the range in luminosities is significantly larger than the range in fluxes, as the luminosity in both bands is then necessarily correlated with the redshift. More recently, Panessa et al. (2007) found a linear R-X relation in an optically selected sample of nearby low luminosity AGN (see also Terashima & Wilson 2003). This sample is still somewhat affected by selection effects and incompleteness, and a significant fraction of the objects there may be affected by X-ray absorption, which cannot be accurately corrected.

To avoid a correlation induced by selection effects, one needs a well defined and complete sample of AGN, which is selected independently of the radio and X-ray emission properties, and yet includes complete radio and X-ray detections. The best sample for this purpose is PG Bright Quasar Survey sample (Schmidt & Green 1983). This sample is selected based on flux ($B < 16.16$), morphology (point like on the Palomar Schmidt Survey plates), and color ($U - B < -0.44$). It includes the 114 brightest AGN in 1/4 of the sky (at high celestial and Galactic latitudes). The completeness of the sample has been debated, and the recent thorough study of Jester et al. (2005) finds a somewhat different effective cut ($U - B < -0.7$), but with no systematic incompleteness (at $z < 0.5$). The PG quasars are representative of B band selected quasars, and are generally similar to bright quasars selected in other wavelengths. The bright magnitude limit facilitates studies of this sample in many other bands, including the X-ray and radio bands. An unpublished study (Ian George, private communication), based on *ASCA* observations of 26 PG quasars (George et al. 2000), indicated a strong R-X relation. Motivated by this result, and the presence of a similarly strong R-X relation in coronally active stars, we study here the R-X relation in a complete sample of 87 $z \leq 0.5$ PG quasars (Boroson & Green 1992). We find that both coronally active stars and active galaxies appear to follow the same relation, as further discussed below. In section 2 we present the R-X relation for the PG quasars, and expand the luminosity range to include a smaller sample of low luminosity AGN, ultraluminous X-ray sources, Galactic Black Holes (GBHs), and coronally active stars. In section 3 we discuss various implications for the origin of the radio emission in RQ AGN, and possible future tests of the suggested origin.

2 THE RADIO - X-RAY RELATION

2.1 The PG Quasar Sample

As noted above, we study the R-X relation in AGN using the optically selected PG quasar sample. We use the Boroson & Green (1992, hereafter BG92) subsample of 87 PG quasars with $z \leq 0.5$, which was studied extensively over a wide range of energies. The radio fluxes are taken from the relatively deep radio observations by Kellerman et al. (1989, 1994) with the Very Large Array (VLA), which detected $\sim 90\%$ (78/87) of the objects in the sample. The X-ray fluxes are taken from Brandt, Laor & Wills (2000) and Laor & Brandt (2002), who provide detections for $\sim 97\%$ (84/87) of the objects based on *Rosat* observations. Table 1 presents all the data used for the current analysis. Specifically, column (2) lists the redshifts determined using the peak of the [O III] $\lambda 5007$ line (T. Boroson, private communication). Column (3) lists M_V taken from BG92. Column (4) lists $\log R$, taken from Kellerman et al. (1989, 1994). Column (5) lists the spectral slope calculated between rest frame 3000 Å and 2 keV, α_{ox} , taken from Brandt et al. (2000) and Laor & Brandt (2002). Column (6) lists the observed flux density at rest frame 1 keV. Columns (7) and (8) list νL_ν at observed 6 cm, L_R , and the integrated X-ray luminosity over rest frame 0.2-20 keV, L_X . Finally, column (9) lists the CIV line absorption equivalent width, taken from Laor & Brandt (2002).

We integrate over 0.2-20 keV in order to get an estimate of the bolometric accretion disk coronal emission. The typical AGN emission rises steeply below 0.2 keV, most likely due to photospheric accretion disk emission, while above ~ 20 keV the spectrum becomes steeper, as indicated by the shape of the X-ray background (e.g. Gilli et al. 2007). Thus, the 0.2-20 keV should represent the bulk of the coronal emission. However, rather than perform a direct integration for each object, we use the following surprisingly accurate approximation, $L_X = C\nu L_\nu(1 \text{ keV})$ with $C = 6.25$. The value of C is obtained through the following consideration. According to Brocksopp et al. (2006), the 0.3-10 keV spectra of most PG quasars is well described by a broken power-law with a break energy around 1.5 keV (Fig.2 there). The soft (below the break) spectral slopes range from -2.2 to -1.35 , and the hard (above the break) spectral slopes range from -1.4 to -0.85 . Furthermore, there is a remarkably tight correlation between the soft and hard spectral slopes (correlation coefficient 0.97, Fig.4 there). Integrating the flattest X-ray spectrum from 0.2 to 20 keV ($-1.35/-0.85$ soft/hard) we find that $C = 5.9$, while for the steepest spectrum ($-2.2/-1.4$ soft/hard) we get $C = 6.6$. Thus, assuming a fixed $C = 6.25$ for all objects leads to an error of at most $\sim 5\%$ in the bolometric conversion from $\nu L_\nu(1 \text{ keV})$ to L_X , which is negligible for our purpose here.

Figure 1 presents the distribution of the 87 BG92 objects in the L_R vs. L_X plane. There are 71 radio quiet and 16 radio loud AGN in this sample, where we use the Kellerman et al. (1989) definition for radio loud AGN as having observed frame $R > 10$. As seen in Fig.1, radio loud AGN typically have a 10^3 higher L_R compared to radio quiet AGN, at a given L_X (see also Terashima & Wilson 2003; Capetti & Balmaverde 2007). The origin of the radio emission in radio loud AGN is well established, and we therefore do not consider these objects further here. There is strong ev-




Figure 1. The distribution of the PG quasars in the L_R vs. L_X plane. RL AGN are designated by stars, and their L_R/L_X is about a factor of 10^3 higher than for RQ AGN. Circles mark objects with C IV absorption $EW > 1 \text{ \AA}$ (some of which are RL), where left attached arrows mark upper limits to L_X . These UV absorbed AGN tend to be underluminous by a factor of 10-30 in L_X for a given L_R (and also for a given optical luminosity), most likely due to absorption. Squares are RQ AGN without C IV absorption, where the filled/empty squares mark objects with radio detections/upper limits. Note the small scatter in the L_R vs. L_X correlation in *optically* selected AGN, once RL and UV absorbed AGN are excluded.

idence that X-ray and UV absorption occur simultaneously in AGN (Crenshaw et al. 1999; Brandt et al. 2000). In some specific cases, there is also kinematic similarity between the UV and X-ray absorbers (Gabel et al. 2003). We therefore also exclude from our sample all 17 objects having C IV line absorption equivalent width $> 1 \text{ \AA}$ (Laor & Brandt 2002¹),

of which 12 are radio quiet. This leaves us with a sample of 59 RQQ which are most likely unaffected by X-ray absorption. Radio detections are available for 50 of these 59 objects, and the distribution of the remaining 9 objects in the L_R vs. L_X plane is consistent with the distribution of the 50 objects with X-ray and radio detections. As clearly seen in Fig.1, the exclusion of RLQ and of quasars with C IV

¹ The Laor & Brandt measurements are based on high S/N UV spectra available for only 56 of the 87 BG92 objects. However, a more comprehensive study of the C IV line profile of 81 of the 87 BG92 objects, including lower quality UV spectra (Baskin &

Laor 2005) indicates there are no other objects with strong C IV absorption

absorption reduces significantly the scatter of the optically selected quasars in the L_R vs. L_X plane.

Figure 2a presents L_R vs. L_X for the 59 unabsorbed RQQ together with the best fit linear correlations. Minimizing the scatter in L_R (L_X being the independent variable) gives a best fit linear relation

$$\log L_{R,39} = -0.21 \pm 0.08 + (1.08 \pm 0.15) \log L_{X,44} \quad (1)$$

with a dispersion of $\sigma = 0.51$ in $\log L_R$, where $L_{R,39} = L_R/10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, and $L_{X,44} = L_X/10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Minimizing the scatter in L_X (L_R independent) gives

$$\log L_{X,44} = 0.21 \pm 0.05 + (0.48 \pm 0.06) \log L_{R,39} \quad (2)$$

with a dispersion of $\sigma = 0.34$ in $\log L_X$. The Spearman rank order correlation coefficient is $R_S = 0.71$, which has a chance probability of $P_r = 6.5 \times 10^{-9}$. The X-ray flux is correlated with the radio flux with $R_S = 0.50$ and $P_r = 2 \times 10^{-5}$, which indicates that the correlation of L_X and L_R is not induced by z , as expected for a sample with almost no flux limits in either bands. The small dispersion in the L_R vs. L_X correlation is remarkable, since the X-ray emission is known to be significantly variable in AGN (e.g. Mushotzky et al. 1993), and the radio observations, which also show some variability (Barvainis et al. 2005), were taken about 10 years before the X-ray observations (early 80s vs. early 90s), suggesting that the intrinsic scatter in the R-X relation is smaller than measured here.

The tight relation between the radio and X-ray emission, despite the disparity by a factor of $> 10^7$ in energy, may provide a hint for the origin of the radio emission in RQQ, as further discussed below.

2.2 The Palomar-Ho et al. sample of low-luminosity AGN

How far down in luminosity does the R-X relation extend? Unfortunately, there is no comparable optically selected sample of low luminosity type 1 AGN with nearly complete X-ray, UV, and radio detections, as the PG sample used above. However, the Palomar optical spectroscopic survey of nearby galaxies (Ho et al. 1995, hereafter PH sample) comes close. The sample includes 486 galaxies which were carefully classified by Ho et al. (1997), who found that 52 are Seyfert galaxies, of which 13 are of type 1.0 to type 1.5, i.e. show prominent broad Balmer lines, and are therefore unobscured. One of these, NGC 1275 (3C 084) is a well known radio loud AGN, and we therefore exclude it from the sample of low luminosity unobscured RQ AGN. Systematic analysis of Radio (Ho & Ulvestad 2001) and X-ray (Panessa et al. 2006) observations is available for all 12 objects. There is no similar study of the UV spectra of these objects, but the spectra of 8 of the objects can be found in various studies (Evans & Koratkar, 2004; Maoz et al., 1998; Crenshaw et al., 1999; 2001; Kaspi et al. 2004) which often show some absorption. Given the small size of this sample, and the non complete UV coverage, we do not exclude objects based on the presence of UV absorption. One should keep in mind, however, that some absorption may affect the L_X measurements (though heavily absorbed ‘‘Compton thick’’ objects were excluded by Panessa et al. 2006). Also, X-ray variability, which tends to be more prominent in lower luminosity

objects, will contribute towards increasing the scatter in correlation studies for this population.

Figure 2b shows a ‘‘zoom-out’’ of the R-X relation to include the 12 lower luminosity PH AGN. The values of L_R from Ho & Ulvestad (2001) were corrected for the revised distances in Panessa et al. (2006), excluding NGC 4395, where the more recent Thim et al. (2004) value of 4.3 Mpc is used. We also corrected L_R in Ho & Ulvestad (2001) in objects where mas scale observations indicate that the VLA core is resolved. Specifically, we used a flux of 8 mJy instead of 23.8 mJy in NGC 3227 (Mundell et al. 1995), 10 mJy instead of 77.6 mJy in NGC 4151 (Ulvestad et al. 1998), and 21 mJy instead of 37.7 mJy in NGC 4579 (Hummel et al. 1987). The 2-10 keV luminosities in Panessa et al. (2006) were converted to the 0.2-20 keV luminosities, i.e. L_X , by multiplying $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}}$ by 2.86, which applies for a uniform energy slope of -1 . The typical spectral slopes are somewhat steeper below ~ 1 keV, and flatter above ~ 1 keV, and the resulting bolometric correction error is not a significant source of scatter. Since NGC 4395 shows very large and rapid X-ray variability, we have used the time-averaged absorption-corrected $L_{2-10 \text{ keV}} = 8.8 \times 10^{39} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, measured by Moran et al. (2005, corrected for a distance of 4.3 Mpc). Clearly, it would be useful to carry out a more complete study of the radio and X-ray emission properties of the PH sample.

The 12 PH AGN extend the R-X relation from the range of $\log L_X = 43 - 45$ probed by the PG sample, to the range of $\log L_X = 40 - 43$. The solid line in Fig.2b is not a fit, but just a line marking $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$, a typical value for the PG quasars. The PH AGN sample together with the PG sample, suggest a tight linear R-X relation from the lowest luminosity type 1 AGN, NGC 4395 at $\log L_X \simeq 40$ (left most AGN in Fig.2b), up to luminous quasars at $\log L_X \simeq 45$, with a slope of unity (consistent with eq.1). This trend can only be taken as suggestive, as the PH sample is rather fragmentary, and a much larger complete sample with high quality data is required.

2.3 The Most Luminous RQ AGN

There is yet no study of the X-ray and radio emission properties of a complete sample of the most luminous RQ AGN. However, some indications can be obtained by combining the results of independent studies of the X-ray emission and of the radio emission in the most luminous AGN (Steffen et al. 2006). More specifically, Just et al. (2007) find that $L_{2\text{keV}} \propto L_{2500\text{\AA}}^{0.64-0.81}$, using a large compilation of AGN extending to $\nu L_{\nu}(2500\text{\AA}) = 4 \times 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, about a factor of 100 more luminous than the RQ PG quasars. The slope range of 0.64–0.81 comes from treating $L_{2\text{keV}}$ either as the dependent or the independent variable. Thus, the X-ray to UV luminosity ratio decreases with increasing luminosity. A similar trend of a decreasing radio to UV luminosity ratio was recently found by White et al. (2007) in stacking analysis of undetected luminous quasars from the FIRST radio survey. They found $L_R \propto L_{2500\text{\AA}}^{0.85}$ (with no error quoted for the slope) for AGN with a luminosity extending to $\nu L_{\nu}(2500\text{\AA}) = 6.5 \times 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (corresponding to $M_{2500\text{\AA}} = -30.25$). Thus, both the radio and X-ray emissions become relatively weaker with increasing

UV luminosity. Combining the two correlations above gives $L_R \propto L_X^{1.05-1.33}$, i.e. marginally consistent with a slope of unity suggested for lower luminosity AGN. Deep radio observations of a complete sample of the most luminous AGN are required to probe directly the extension of the R-X relation to the highest luminosities. All these studies of X-ray and radio luminosity relations find no redshift dependence, suggesting perhaps they are due to fundamental physics.

2.4 Ultraluminous X-ray Sources

At yet lower luminosities, possible counterparts to accreting massive black holes are the Ultraluminous X-Ray Sources (ULXs). These are point like, off-nuclear sources, detected in nearby galaxies, with isotropic luminosities of up to $\log L_X \simeq 41$. The high luminosity can be interpreted either as isotropic emission from intermediate-mass black holes ($M_{\text{BH}} \sim 10^2 - 10^3 M_\odot$) accreting at $L \sim L_{\text{Eddington}}$, or as strongly beamed jet emission from stellar mass black holes, presumably within a massive X-ray binary (e.g. Mushotzky 2006 for a recent review).

In Fig.2b we plot four ULXs that have candidate radio counterparts. Little information is available about the radio emission properties of ULXs. Following a literature search we found four objects with relatively secure radio identifications. For simplicity, in all cases we extrapolated the unabsorbed X-ray luminosities reported in the literature to the full 0.2-20 keV band assuming an energy spectral slope of -1 (also used for the radio). In most cases, the unabsorbed X-ray luminosities are obtained from fitted models with column densities above Galactic, which could introduce further uncertainty. However, this uncertainty is likely small compared with the large dynamic range covered in Fig. 2b.

For the ULX in NGC 5408 (Kaaret et al. 2003) we infer $L_X = 1.5 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ and $L_R = 3.5 \times 10^{34} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. For L_X of the ULX in Holmberg II we take the average of the low and high states to obtain $L_X = 1.7 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (Dewangan et al. 2004) and $L_R = 4.7 \times 10^{34} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (Miller et al. 2005). The third and most luminous ULX, X-1 in M 82 (Kaaret et al. 2006), was observed simultaneously with *Chandra* and the VLA. The luminosities obtained are $L_X = 3 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (extrapolated from 0.3–7.0 keV) and $L_R = 6.7 \times 10^{34} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (on 2005 Feb. 5). We note that the radio identification of this ULX was questioned by Körding et al. (2005). Another likely association was found for ULX 2 in NGC 7424 (Soria et al. 2006), where $L_X = 1.06 \times 10^{40} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (using the power-law model), and $L_R = 1.05 \times 10^{35} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. The radio source is offset by $\simeq 1.4$ arcsec, or 80 pc, from the X-ray position, but given the lack of other nearby point sources, the probability of a chance coincidence is low (Soria et al. 2006).

Interestingly, the four ULXs are located close to the $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$ line (Fig.2b). Since the radio and X-ray emission of the PG and PH AGN are most likely unbeamed, this may imply that the ULX radio and X-ray emission is unbeamed as well, as indicated by various other arguments (Mushotzky 2006). Furthermore, this may indicate that similar physical processes generate the radio and X-ray emission in ULXs and in AGN. Clearly, this is a very small sample of ULXs and more radio identifications and reliable flux measurements will be required to more systematically constrain the L_R/L_X behavior of these intriguing sources. In particular, it should be interesting to see if there are also ULXs

significantly below the Güdel-Benz relation (i.e., with hot disks akin to GBHs, see section 2.6) or above it (i.e., similar to radio-loud AGN).

2.5 Coronally Active Stars

A strong correlation is known to exist between the quiescent radio and X-ray emission in coronally active cool stars (Güdel & Benz 1993), where $L_R/L_X \simeq 10^{-5}$, also known as the Güdel-Benz relation. In Figure 2c we further increase the luminosity range of the R-X plot to include coronally active stars. We plot a compilation of radio and X-ray luminosities of various types of coronally active stars from Benz & Güdel (1994). Quite remarkably, *both coronally active stars and active galaxies appear to follow a similar R-X relation*, despite the ~ 15 orders of magnitude in luminosity between these two types of active objects.

The X-ray emission in coronally active stars is due to free-free and line emission from hot thermal plasma ($T \sim 10^7 \text{ K}$), while the radio is synchrotron emission from non-thermal electrons embedded in a magnetic field. The stellar R-X relation indicates that the coronae are magnetically heated, as also indicated by correlated X-ray and radio variability. Note that the data points from the Sun are for different kinds of solar *flares* that may deviate from the general stellar coronae linear relation (Benz & Güdel 1994). The R-X relation can be understood as follows. A magnetic reconnection event in the corona accelerates electrons, generating a beam of electrons which produces a spike in the synchrotron radio emission. The beam dumps most of its energy by collisions in the cooler chromospheric gas, heating it to coronal temperatures, and thus increasing the total coronal X-ray emission. Strong support for this mechanism is provided by the Neupert effect (Neupert 1968, originally observed on the Sun), where a radio flare is followed by an X-ray flare, where the two light curves are related through

$$L_R \propto dL_X/dt \quad (3)$$

(Güdel 2002, and references therein). Such a relation is expected when the X-ray cooling time is significantly longer than the radio cooling time, so the X-ray emitting gas serves as a bolometer for the time integrated heating, while the radio emission provides a measure for the instantaneous heating rate.

The fact that RQ AGN and coronally active stars follow a similar R-X relation may indicate similar physical processes in both objects, as further discussed in section 3.

2.6 Galactic Black Holes

The R-X relation was also extensively explored in massive Galactic X-ray binary systems (GBHs, e.g. Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004). Do GBHs also follow the Güdel-Benz relation? In Figure 3 we show the R-X relation for eight GBHs, in the low hard state, from the compilation of Merloni et al. (2003, including multiple observations of some of the objects). The GBHs are clearly displaced downwards from the Güdel-Benz relation, having $L_R/L_X \simeq 10^{-7}-10^{-6}$, or less. In other words, GBHs are more radio quiet than RQ AGN. The radio and X-ray emission of GBHs in the low hard state is commonly interpreted as arising from jet




Figure 2. Panel a, same as in Fig.1, including only the RQ AGN with no UV absorption. The Spearman rank order correlation strength and its significance is indicated in the upper left corner. The two lines mark least square fits minimizing the deviations in either L_R or L_X . Panel b, zoom out which includes the 12 low luminosity RQ type 1 AGN from the Palomar sample, and four ULXs with radio and X-ray detections. Most objects are within a factor of few from the solid line which marks $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$. Panel c, further zoom out to include coronally active stars, and individual solar flares. Coronally active stars follow the Güdel-Benz relation, i.e. $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$, which most likely originates from coronal radio and X-ray emission. This raises the possibility that both L_R and L_X in RQ AGN also originate in coronal emission.

emission, although spatially resolved jets are generally not observed. Spatially resolved jets in RL AGN often display $L_R/L_X \gtrsim 10^{-2}$ (e.g. Miller et al. 2006b; Sahayanathan & Misra 2005; Hardcastle et al. 2007), as also observed for the spatially integrated radio and X-ray emission in these objects (Panessa et al. 2007; Capetti & Balmaverde 2007). Thus, the jets in GBHs should be different from those in radio loud AGN, possibly due to a strong M_{BH} dependence of the radio/X-ray emission ratio of jets (e.g. Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004). Another possible model invokes

advection-dominated accretion with a truncated inner disk (recently reviewed by Narayan & McClintock 2008). Alternatively, if the X-ray and radio emission of GBHs in the low hard state does originate in an accretion disk corona, the properties of GBH coronae should be somewhat different from the coronae of AGN and of coronally active stars.

We note in passing, that the least luminous GBH observed, A0620–00, detected at the quiescent state by Gallo et al. (2006), with $\text{Log } L_X=31.31$ and $\text{Log } L_R=26.80$, overlaps in Fig.3 with the coronally active stars. Gallo et al.




Figure 3. Upper panel, the position of GBHs in the L_R vs. L_X plane. The data include eight GBHs in the low hard state (including repeat observations), taken from the compilation of Merloni et al. (2003). All GBHs are located downwards from the $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$ relation by a factor of 10 – 1000. GBHs are thus more radio quiet than radio quiet AGN. An additional GBH, A0620-00, detected at the quiescent state by Gallo et al. (2006) is also included. At $\text{Log } L_X = 31.31$ and $\text{Log } L_R = 26.80$ it overlaps with the coronally active stars. Lower panel, the distribution of L_R/L_X values, including RLQ. Note the similar distribution of values for RQQ and coronally active stars.

argued that the radio and X-rays cannot be coronal emission from the companion star, based on its spectral type. The overlap of this object with coronally active stars may provide an important clue to understanding the origin of the radio and X-ray emission in GBHs, as further discussed below (section 3.3.1).

3 SOME IMPLICATIONS

3.1 The Radio Emission Isotropy

The small scatter in the R-X relation for RQ AGN, described above, implies that the angular distribution of the emission in both bands is not significantly different. The strength of the X-ray emission in AGN is correlated with the broad line emission strength (e.g. Kriss et al. 1980). Since the broad line emission cannot be relativistically beamed, the X-ray emission is generally not relativistically beamed as well. Indeed, the X-ray emission is commonly thought to originate

from relatively static hot coronal gas above the accretion disk (see below). Thus, we conclude that the radio emission in RQ AGN is also generally not relativistically beamed. If the radio emission of RQ AGN occurs in jet emission, then the jet cannot be highly relativistic, as seen in the radio for some RL AGN.

Blundell et al. (2003) suggested a detection of superluminal motion in a RQQ based on high brightness temperature. However, extended structures in VLBA observations of other RQQs were not confirmed by Ulvestad et al. (2005), indicating that there is yet no direct evidence for superluminal motion in RQQs.

3.2 The analogy between AGN and coronally active stars

The power-law X-ray emission of AGN is distinctly non-thermal, i.e. it does not originate from free-free emission of photoionized or collisionally ionized plasma. The energetically least demanding non-thermal mechanism is Comptonization of the optical-UV disk continuum by hot thermal ($T \gtrsim 10^9$ K), or non-thermal electrons residing in a magnetically confined gas above the accretion disk (e.g. Shapiro et al. 1976; Sunyaev & Titarchuk 1980). The existence of magnetically confined and heated hot gas above the accretion disk is plausible given the differential rotation in Keplerian accretion disks, and the likely presence of turbulence (required to generate macroscopic viscosity). These conditions are similar to those in coronally active stars, which are rapidly rotating and have a turbulent surface layer (reviewed by Güdel 2004). Furthermore, magnetic fields within the accretion disk are invoked as a plausible viscosity mechanism (Eardley & Lightman 1975; Balbus & Hawley 1998), and the rise of buoyant flux tubes from the disk can serve as a natural confining mechanism of the hot coronal gas, while magnetic reconnection can serve as a natural coronal heating mechanism (Galeev et al. 1979; Blackman & Field 2000), again in analogy to observations of Coronally active stars.

Observational implications of the X-ray emitting corona model have been worked out in relation to the expected X-ray continuum (e.g. Haardt & Maraschi 1993; Dove et al. 1997; Niedźwiecki 2005), X-ray spectral features (e.g. Ross & Fabian 1993; Matt et al. 1997; Nayakshin et al. 2000; Ballantyne et al. 2001) and X-ray variability (e.g. Poutanen & Fabian 1999; Merloni & Fabian 2001b; Czerny et al. 2004). However, little attention was given to the emission at longer wavelengths. Notable exceptions are Field & Rogers (1993), di Matteo et al. (1997), and Merloni et al. (2000) who addressed the inevitable cyclotron or synchrotron emission from the magnetically confined thermal and non-thermal electrons, though none of these papers attempted to ascribe the observed radio emission of RQ AGN to coronal activity.

The fact that AGN follow the Güdel-Benz relation, seen in objects where both the radio and X-ray emission are of coronal origin, together with the fact that the X-ray emission in AGN is likely of coronal origin, leads naturally to the suggestion that the radio emission in RQ AGN is also coronal in origin.

Typical luminous AGN are approximately 13–14 orders of magnitude more luminous than stellar coronae (Fig. 2), *why should similar physics apply to stellar and AGN coro-*

nae? Although luminous AGN are vastly more luminous than stars, their peak emission generally occurs in the near UV (e.g. Zheng et al. 1997), indicating maximal surface disk temperatures of $T_s \sim 5 \times 10^4$ K, within an order of magnitude of the photospheric temperatures of coronally active stars. The dimensions of the X-ray emitting region in luminous AGN is of the order of a light day, i.e. $\sim 10^{15}$ cm, corresponding to a volume of $\sim 10^{45}$ cm³. Stellar coronal volumes, on the other hand, are of the order of $0.01R_*^3 - 0.1R_*^3 \sim 10^{31} - 10^{32}$ cm³, based on loop half-length measurements ($l \sim R_*$) and cross-section radius estimates ($r \sim 0.1l$). Thus, the coronal volume in AGN is likely to be $\sim 13 - 14$ orders of magnitude larger than in stars. If the coronal luminosity is proportional to the coronal volume $\times B^2$, then the value of B^2 may be comparable in stellar and in AGN coronae. The potential similarity of T_s and B^2 in stellar and AGN coronae may then imply similar local physical processes, despite the vast difference in scales.

3.3 Is the X-ray and radio emission of GBHs also of coronal origin?

3.3.1 The dependence of L_R/L_X on T_s

The radio emission of GBHs lies a factor of 10-100 below the Güdel-Benz relation. *Can the radio and X-ray emission of GBHs also be explained as coronal emission?* Merloni & Fabian (2002) suggested that the level of coronal activity in GBHs is related to T_s , such that the coronal activity diminishes with increasing T_s , as indicated by the disappearance of the X-ray power law component and the radio emission in the high soft state of GBHs. One may extend this suggestion, and speculate that the overall low L_R/L_X in GBHs is related to their overall high accretion disk T_s compared to AGN. Specifically, the effective accretion disk surface temperature at a given dimensionless $r = R/R_g$, where $R_g \equiv GM_{\text{BH}}/c^2$, is

$$T_{\text{eff}} \propto \left(\frac{\dot{m}}{r^3 m}\right)^{1/4}, \quad (4)$$

where $\dot{m} \equiv L/L_{\text{Eddington}}$, and $m = M_{\text{BH}}/M_{\odot}$ (e.g. Shakura & Sunyaev 1973). In luminous GBHs $\dot{m}/m \sim 10^{-2}$, while in luminous AGN $\dot{m}/m \sim 10^{-10}$, implying that T_s in GBHs is ~ 100 times higher than in AGN (assuming $T_s \simeq T_{\text{eff}}$), as indeed observed (peak emission at keV in GBHs versus tens of eV in AGN). Thus, one may speculate that the L_R/L_X in the corona scale roughly as T_s^{-1} , leading to ~ 100 times lower L_R/L_X in GBHs compared to AGN. A potentially key object in that respect is A0620–00, the least luminous GBH detected (section 2.6), which is $\sim 10^7$ times less luminous than typical luminous GBHs. In this object $\dot{m}/m \sim 10^{-9}$, and thus if it harbors an optically thick accretion disk, as indicated by observations of a broad fluorescence Iron $K\alpha$ line in other low state GBHs (Miller et al. 2006a, Rykoff et al. 2007; but see counter arguments for a truncated inner disk in a review by Done et al. 2007, section 4.3 there), then its T_s will be similar to that of AGN. Indeed, this GBH lies on the Güdel-Benz relation (Fig.3), consistent with the suggestion that L_R/L_X is set by T_s .

We note in this context that if ULXs are powered by intermediate mass BHs ($m \sim 10^3 - 10^4$) they may also be expected to be intermediate in their L_R/L_X between luminous AGN and GBHs. The scant available data (Fig.2) indicates

they may lie somewhat below the Güdel-Benz relation, but the scatter is too large to reach any solid conclusion.

Interestingly, Merloni et al. (2003) found a "fundamental plane" relation connecting GBHs and AGN through $L_R \propto L_X^{0.6} m^{0.78}$ (see also Falcke et al. 2004). Their sample includes 5 RL AGN, and 23 Seyfert 2 galaxies. Objects of this type are not present in our sample. When these objects are excluded one gets a slightly modified relation

$$L_R \propto L_X^{0.54 \pm 0.14} m^{0.78 \pm 0.13}, \quad (5)$$

(A. Merloni, private communication). This relation can be recast in the form

$$L_R/L_X \propto L_X^{-0.46 \pm 0.14} m^{0.78 \pm 0.13}. \quad (6)$$

Using the Just et al. (2007) relation $L_X \propto L_{UV}^{0.64-0.81}$, or roughly $L_X \propto L_{UV}^{0.725 \pm 0.085}$, and assuming $L_{bol} \propto L_{UV}$, which appears to apply in both high and low luminosity AGN (Maoz 2007), we get

$$L_R/L_X \propto L_{bol}^{-0.33 \pm 0.11} m^{0.78 \pm 0.13}, \quad (7)$$

or

$$L_R/L_X \propto (\dot{m}/m)^{-0.33 \pm 0.11} m^{0.12 \pm 0.26}. \quad (8)$$

where we use $\dot{m} \propto L_{bol}/m$. For a Shakura & Sunyaev accretion disk, this can be recast in the form

$$L_R/L_X \propto T_{eff}^{-1.32 \pm 0.44} m^{0.12 \pm 0.26}, \quad (9)$$

i.e. consistent with the suggestion that the radio and X-ray emissions are both coronal in origin and that $L_R/L_X \propto T_{eff}^{-1}$. Thus, T_{eff} may be the physical parameter which drives the "fundamental plane" relation noted by Merloni et al. (2003) and Falcke et al. (2004).

We do not see a significant correlation between L_R/L_X and T_{eff} , or equivalently we do not see the Merloni et al. relation for the PG sample only. This may be due to the small range in values of T_{eff} in this sample (a factor of ~ 10) compared to the large scatter in L_R/L_X values (a factor of ~ 100 , Fig.3), which makes it difficult to see such a trend, if it exists. Interestingly, it is hard to discern X-ray (or radio) luminosity dependence on spectral type in stellar coronae as well, perhaps due to the small range of cool-star photospheric temperatures (but see the recent result of Scelsi et al. 2007). The scatter in L_R/L_X values must be partly due to the non-simultaneous X-ray and radio observations, and may be partly intrinsic as well. The "fundamental plane" relation is not detectable for the GBH-only population either (Fig.3), most likely for the same reasons. Interestingly, individual GBHs often show a non-linear relation $L_X \propto L_R^{0.7}$ in a given object (e.g. Corbel et al. 2000; Gallo et al. 2003, 2006), consistent with the "fundamental plane" relation at a fixed m (eq.5). It would thus be interesting to explore if this non-linear relation is seen in individual AGN as well.

3.3.2 Correlated variability

Malzac et al.(2003) found an intriguing pattern of variability in the GBH XTE J1118+480, where

$$L_{opt} \propto -dL_X/dt. \quad (10)$$

The optical luminosity is interpreted as synchrotron emission from a jet, and the X-ray as coronal emission. This

unusual variability pattern is reminiscent of the Neupert effect (section 2.5), seen in coronally active stars, where L_{opt} is replaced by L_R , and the sign in eq. (3) is positive, rather than negative. Malzac et al.(2004) suggested a model to explain this pattern, where both the jet and the corona are powered by a common magnetic energy reservoir. The Neupert effect is interpreted as the signature of a coronal reconnection event. The "Malzac effect" may thus be driven by similar processes, and it may therefore be a pure coronal effect with no need to invoke a jet component. The relativistic electrons may be part of the corona, which may be the agent through which they are heated, rather than reside in a separate jet component. However, a significant difference between the two effects is in the sign of the derivative, and the fact that both flares and dips are observed in GBHs, but only flares are seen in stellar coronae. These differences remain to be understood.

3.4 The jet interpretation

The currently favored interpretation for the R-X relation in GBHs and in AGN is that it results from a disk/jet coupling (e.g. Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004) or more specifically from a corona/jet coupling, as the corona feeds the base of the jet (e.g. Merloni & Fabian 2002; Markoff et al. 2005). If RQ AGN are powered by weak jets, then it is also not clear why RQ AGN are often unresolved even on mas scale, in clear contrast to RL AGN which are generally well resolved already on much larger scales. In addition, the low power jet interpretation does not provide a natural explanation as to why AGN appear to follow the Güdel-Benz relation. The above does not rule out the low-power jet interpretation for RQ AGN, but the coronal interpretation appears as a viable alternative.

3.5 The size of the radio emitting region

3.5.1 The synchrotron emission mechanism

Below we derive a lower limit on the size of the radio emitting region in RQ AGN, based on the maximum flux per unit area emitted by a synchrotron source. The observed flux density from an isotropically emitting source is

$$f_\nu = I_\nu \Omega, \quad (11)$$

where I_ν is the intensity (independent of angles), and Ω is the angular size of the source. For a source with a projected shape of a circle with a radius R , $\Omega = \pi R^2/d^2$, where d is the angular size distance. In a homogeneous source

$$I_\nu = S_\nu(1 - e^{-\tau_\nu}), \quad (12)$$

where $S_\nu \equiv P_\nu/4\pi\alpha_\nu$ is the source function, P_ν the power emitted per unit volume per unit frequency and α_ν is the absorption coefficient. The minimum emitting area required to produce an observed f_ν is obtained when I_ν is maximal, i.e. $I_\nu = S_\nu$ which is obtained when the source is optically thick. Below we briefly review the derivation of S_ν based on the theory of synchrotron emission formulated by Ginzburg & Syrovatskii (1969) and later presented by Rybicki & Lightman (1979, hereafter RL).

We assume a homogeneous synchrotron source, with a uniform magnetic field B , and a uniform distribution of relativistic electrons, having a power-law energy distribution of the form

$$dn/d\gamma = C_\gamma \gamma^{-p}, \quad \gamma_0 < \gamma < \gamma_1. \quad (13)$$

The electrons radiate synchrotron emission with a power per unit volume per unit frequency of (equation 6.36 in RL),

$$P_\nu = \frac{\sqrt{3}q^3}{mc^2(p+1)} \left(\frac{3q}{2\pi mc} \right)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} C_\gamma B_\perp^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{p-1}{2}} \Gamma_1 \Gamma_2, \quad (14)$$

where B_\perp is the component of B perpendicular to the direction of motion of the electrons, and

$$\Gamma_1 = \Gamma \left(\frac{3p+19}{12} \right), \quad \Gamma_2 = \Gamma \left(\frac{3p-1}{12} \right)$$

The absorption coefficient is given by

$$\alpha_\nu = \frac{\sqrt{3}q^3}{8\pi c^2 m^2} \left(\frac{3q}{2\pi mc} \right)^{\frac{p}{2}} C_\gamma B_\perp^{\frac{p+2}{2}} \nu^{-\frac{p+4}{2}} \Gamma_3 \Gamma_4, \quad (15)$$

as derived from equation 6.53 in RL, by replacing C from equation 6.20a there (G. Rybicki, private communication), with C_γ . Here

$$\Gamma_3 = \Gamma \left(\frac{3p+22}{12} \right), \quad \Gamma_4 = \Gamma \left(\frac{3p+2}{12} \right).$$

The synchrotron source function is therefore

$$S_\nu = \frac{1}{p+1} \sqrt{\frac{8\pi m^3 c \nu^5}{q B_\perp}} \frac{\Gamma_1 \Gamma_2}{\Gamma_3 \Gamma_4}, \quad (16)$$

or

$$S_\nu = \frac{6.29 \times 10^{-31}}{p+1} B_\perp^{-1/2} \nu^{5/2} R_\Gamma \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ Hz}^{-1} \text{ Ster}^{-1} \quad (17)$$

where the ratio of the Γ functions $R_\Gamma = 1.37$, for $p = 2$, and 1.197 for $p = 2.5$. The luminosity density of the source is $L_\nu = f_\nu 4\pi d^2$, which together with equation 11 gives the radius of the synchrotron radio-sphere

$$R^{\text{RS}} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{L_\nu}{S_\nu}} \quad (18)$$

where we assume that the luminosity and angular size distances, d , are the same (a good approximation for the low- z objects studied here). Thus the minimum size of the area emitting L_ν in synchrotron emission from a homogeneous source with a given B_\perp , and electrons with $p = 2$ is

$$R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} = 0.54 L_{30}^{1/2} \nu_{\text{GHz}}^{-5/4} B^{1/4}, \quad (19)$$

where $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}}$ is the radius of the radio-sphere in pc, $L_{30} = L_\nu / 10^{30} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ Hz}^{-1}$, and ν_{GHz} is the observed frequency in GHz. For $p = 2.5$ the prefactor is 0.63, instead of 0.54.

In the special case where the magnetic energy density is in equipartition with the photon energy density,

$$B_{\text{eq}}^2 / 8\pi = L_{\text{bol}} / 4\pi R^2 c, \quad (20)$$

where L_{bol} is the bolometric luminosity, the magnetic field can be estimated by:

$$B_{\text{eq}} = 0.27 R_{\text{pc}}^{-1} L_{46}^{1/2} \text{ Gauss}, \quad (21)$$

where $L_{46} = L_{\text{bol}} / 10^{46}$. Assuming $B = B_{\text{eq}}$ in equation 19 then gives

$$R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} = 0.47 L_{30}^{0.4} L_{46}^{0.1} \nu_{\text{GHz}}^{-1}. \quad (22)$$

Note that $B \propto R^{-1}$ as in eq.21 is also expected if there is a large scale current flow along the disk axis (the field of a wire). A steeper dependence, $B \propto R^{-2}$, is expected for flux freezing in an expanding magnetized outflow.

3.5.2 The implied range of sizes for the emitting region

Does the observed radio spectral slope indicates that the emitting source is optically thick? A homogeneous synchrotron source, with a semi-infinite slab geometry, produces in the optically thick limit a spectrum with $f_\nu \propto \nu^{2.5}$ (eq.17), and in the optically thin limit $f_\nu \propto \nu^{-\frac{p-1}{2}}$ (eq.14), or $f_\nu \propto \nu^{-0.5}$ for a likely power-law slope $p = 2$ of the radiating electrons. The observed spectral slopes in RQQ at $\nu \sim 1 - 10$ GHz are in the range $-1 < \alpha < 1$ (e.g. Barvainis et al. 1996, 2005; Ulvestad et al. 2005), indicating that the radio source is either optically thin or is marginally optically thick. Thus $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} \gtrsim 0.1$, or about 100 light days, in luminous ($L_{30} \sim 1$, $L_{46} \sim 1$) AGN, with a steep spectral slope at $\nu_{\text{GHz}} = 5$ (using eq.22). This radius is ~ 100 times larger than the likely size of the smallest X-ray emitting region in such objects (~ 1 light day based on variability). Similarly, in the lowest luminosity type 1 AGN ($L_{30} \sim 10^{-5}$, $L_{46} \sim 10^{-5}$) $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{-4}$, or a light crossing time of $\gtrsim 30$ ks, which is also ~ 100 times larger than the smallest X-ray emitting region, as indicated by the most rapid variability seen in e.g. NGC 4395 (Iwasawa et al. 2000; Moran et al. 2005). The similar ratio of 100 for the 5 GHz to X-ray emitting sizes in high and low luminosity AGN reflects the fact that the fastest X-ray variability appears to scale as $L^{1/2}$, similar to the scaling predicted for the radio (eq. 19).

The fact that the radio spectra never show a clear optically thick signature, i.e. a spectral slope $\alpha = 2.5$, despite the fact that this is a relatively robust prediction, independent of the details of the electrons energy distribution, indicates that the simple homogeneous source scenario is not valid. A plausible simple extension of the homogeneous source model is a spherical source with a radial gradient in both B and in the number density of the relativistic electrons (e.g. de Bruyn 1976; Marscher 1977). In photospheric emission the flux at a given ν comes mostly from the region which is transiting from optically thick to optically thin at that ν . Using equation 19, we find that the transition frequency ν_0 is

$$\nu_{0,\text{GHz}} = 0.61 L_{30}^{2/5} (R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}})^{-4/5} B^{1/5}, \quad (23)$$

or for $B = B_{\text{eq}}$

$$\nu_{0,\text{GHz}} = 0.47 L_{30}^{0.4} L_{46}^{0.1} (R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}})^{-1}. \quad (24)$$

Thus we can relate each emission radius with a corresponding frequency ν_0 . Since the synchrotron self-absorption coefficient $\alpha_\nu \propto \nu^{-(p+4)/2} \sim \nu^{-3}$, higher frequencies originate at smaller radii, and the emissivity integrated over the emitting volume can produce a flat spectrum, as invoked in RL AGN (e.g. Blandford & Konigl 1979 and citations thereafter). To probe synchrotron emission coming from the X-ray emitting volume, say from a region which is ~ 100 times smaller than the ~ 5 GHz emitting region, requires a frequency 100 times higher, i.e. ~ 500 GHz, or $\lambda \sim 0.6$ mm (assuming $L_\nu \sim$ constant).

3.5.3 The shortest wavelengths dominated by synchrotron emission

Is the emission at $\lambda \sim 1.2$ mm in RQ AGN dominated by synchrotron emission? The FIR emission of RQ AGN is dominated by dust (e.g. Sanders et al. 1989), and one needs to go to long enough wavelengths to make sure that dust contamination of the synchrotron emission is insignificant. The observed mean spectral energy distribution (SED) of RQ AGN gives $L_{\text{IR}}/L_R \sim 10^6$, where $L_{\text{IR}} = \nu L_\nu(30\mu\text{m})$. The coldest dust is found at $T \sim 30$ K (e.g. Hass et al. 2000), and the dust emission drops steeply at $\lambda > 100 \mu\text{m}$ with a spectral slope for L_ν of $2 + \kappa$, where $\kappa \simeq 2$ is the characteristic dust absorption opacity index (e.g. Draine & Li 2007). The observed mean SED of RQ AGN indeed shows a sharp break with a 10^5 drop in νL_ν , from $100 \mu\text{m}$ to 1 mm (e.g. fig.7 in Polletta et al. 2000). Thus, dust contamination should be gone at $\lambda \gtrsim 1$ mm, and the mm wavelength range can provide a valuable direct probe of the relativistic electron population within the X-ray emitting region.

3.5.4 Constraints from the brightness temperature

An independent constraint on the minimum possible size of a synchrotron emitting region can be obtained using the source brightness temperature T_b , given by

$$T_b = \frac{2c^2}{\pi k_B} \frac{f_\nu}{\theta^2 \nu^2}, \quad (25)$$

where $\theta = 2R/d$ is the angular diameter of the source. Recasting f_ν/θ^2 in terms of luminosity and emitting radius, we get

$$T_b = 8.7 \times 10^9 L_{30} (R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}})^{-2} \nu_{\text{GHz}}^{-2}. \quad (26)$$

To avoid synchrotron self-Compton as the dominant cooling mechanism requires $T_b \lesssim 10^{12}$ K (Kellermann & Pauliny-Toth 1969). In addition, Readhead (1994) finds that equipartition between the electron energy density and the magnetic energy density is obtained for $T_b \sim 10^{11}$ K. Thus, the lower limits of $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} \gtrsim 0.1$ at $\nu_{\text{GHz}} \sim 5$ in $L_{30} \sim 1$ objects imply T_b that is just below the Readhead limit of $T_b \lesssim 10^{11}$.

When the source is optically thick, T_b can be expressed in a simple form, independent of R and L_ν ,

$$T_b = \frac{c^2}{2\nu^2 k_B} S_\nu, \quad (27)$$

which for $p = 2$ gives

$$T_b = 2.96 \times 10^{10} \nu_{\text{GHz}}^{1/2} B^{-1/2}. \quad (28)$$

Thus, equipartition between the electrons and the B field is obtained if the electrons emitting at ν are subject to $B \simeq 0.1\nu_{\text{GHz}}$, and synchrotron self-Compton losses dominate if $B < 10^{-3}\nu_{\text{GHz}}$.

3.5.5 Observational evidence for extended radio emission in AGN, ULXs, and GBHs

We conclude that the 5 GHz emission in AGN must be coming from a “radio-sphere” which is ~ 100 times larger than the 1 keV emitting region. In cool coronally active stars, interferometric mas scale radio imaging reveal that transient

emission originates in compact cores associated with flare regions, but quiescent radio emission often originates on scales of a few stellar radii (Güdel 2002), most likely from a population of cooling electrons from previous flares, or possibly from electrons accelerated locally on extended scales in shocks associated with coronal mass ejections (CMEs, Bastian et al. 1998; Bastian 2007). If AGN coronae are magnetically dominated, then CMEs are likely to occur there as well, as suggested by Merloni & Fabian (2002, see also a related “aborted jet” mechanism by Ghisellini et al. 2004), and such CMEs may well be the source for the extended radio emission in RQ AGN. Thus, similar mechanisms may be driving the non-co spatial radio and X-ray emission in stars and AGN.

The extended pc scale radio emission seen in nearby RQ Seyferts appears to originate in non-relativistic and relatively poorly collimated plasma flows (e.g. Ulvestad et al. 1999; Middelberg et al. 2004), which may correspond to CMEs from the accretion disk. These outflows can be traced to kpc scale in nearby AGN (Gallimore et al. 2006), where they produce very low power, and appear as slow buoyantly driven plasma which gradually dissipates and disappears.

It is interesting to note that in ULXs the radio emission also tends to be offset from the X-ray source, and is marginally resolved (Soria et al. 2006), indicating it is coming from a more extended scale compared to the X-ray emission, and may thus also be explained by emission from CMEs. However, the physical scale of a few tens of pc implied by the offset (section 2.4) is much larger than predicted for R^{RS} , and thus if the coronal mechanisms is valid, higher quality observations should reveal that most of the radio flux originates from a compact core which overlaps with the X-ray position.

Spatially resolved jet-like emission in the radio is seen in Cygnus X-1 (Stirling et al. 2001) and in GRS 1915+105 (Dhawan et al. 2000). However, Heinz (2006) finds that the standard relativistic jet models for Cygnus X-1 appears to be inconsistent with the evidence for interaction with the surrounding ISM (Gallo et al. 2005). One of the suggested solutions is a much more massive outflow. It will be interesting to explore whether a non relativistic CME flow is a viable solution for Cygnus X-1.

Gallo et al. (2003) suggested that the radio emitting outflows in GBHs in the low hard state are only mildly relativistic (cf. Heinz & Merloni 2004). Clearly, a relatively slow and weakly collimated jet may be just an alternative name for a CME, in particular when taken together with the suggestion that such a jet is fed by the accretion disk corona (Markoff et al. 2005). The identification of the radio emission in GBHs with CMEs may allow us to gain some insight on GBHs from studies of stellar coronae (e.g. on correlated radio and X-ray variability, Section 3.3.2).

3.6 B and γ

Below we derive limits on the value of B and γ of the emitting electrons within the radio-sphere based on the observed and predicted variability timescales. We also provide constraints on these properties within the much more compact X-ray emitting corona.

3.6.1 The radio-sphere

Barvainis et al. (2005) and Anderson & Ulvestad (2005) studied the variability timescales at 8.5 GHz in luminous ($L_{30} \sim 1$) RQ PG quasars, and in very low luminosity ($L_{30} \sim 10^{-5}$) AGN, respectively. The shortest variability timescale in luminous AGN was found to be $t_{\text{var}} \sim 10^7$ s, and $\sim 10^5$ s in the very low luminosity AGN. These timescales provide upper limits on the size of the radio emission region, $R < t_{\text{var}}c$, based on the indications that the emission is not relativistically beamed (section 3.1). Interestingly, these upper limits are within a factor of $\sim 2-5$ of the minimum size predicted for optically thick synchrotron emission (eq.22), suggesting that the synchrotron source is indeed close to being optically thick. It also indicates that t_{var} could be dominated by the light crossing time of the emitting regions, and thus the intrinsic variability timescale could be shorter. What can we learn from the observed t_{var} on the electron cooling mechanism? Below we briefly explore the following cooling mechanisms; synchrotron emission, Compton scattering, Coulomb losses, and adiabatic expansion, and the constraints they provide on B and γ .

The time for an electron with an energy $\gamma m_e c^2$ to lose half its energy through synchrotron emission is

$$t_{\text{synch}} = 5.1 \times 10^8 \gamma^{-1} B^{-2} \text{ s} , \quad (29)$$

and the peak of the synchrotron emission occurs at

$$\nu_{\text{GHz}} = \gamma^2 B / 820 \quad (30)$$

(RL). If indeed one observes at the peak frequency, these two simple relations provide a lower limit on B and an upper limit on γ from the observed cooling timescale, t_{var} , independently of any other properties of the emitting source, except the assumption that synchrotron cooling dominates other cooling processes. Specifically, assuming $t_{\text{var}} > t_{\text{synch}}$ gives

$$B > 6.8 \times 10^4 t_{\text{var}}^{-2/3} \nu_{\text{GHz}}^{-1/3} , \quad (31)$$

and

$$\gamma < 0.11 t_{\text{var}}^{1/3} \nu_{\text{GHz}}^{2/3} \quad (32)$$

(for $\gamma \gg 1$). Thus, for the luminous PG quasars, where $t_{\text{var}} \sim 10^7$ s at 8.5 GHz, we find that the emission originates in electrons with $\gamma < 100$, i.e. $E < 50$ MeV, which reside in a $B > 0.7$ Gauss field. In very low luminosity AGN $t_{\text{var}} \sim 10^5$ s, implying $\gamma < 21$ and $B > 15$ Gauss.

The time for a relativistic electron to lose half its energy through Compton scattering is given by

$$t_C = \frac{3cm}{4\sigma_T U_{\text{ph}} \gamma} , \quad (33)$$

(RL) where σ_T is the Thomson electron scattering cross section, i.e.

$$t_C = 1.1 \times 10^{10} \gamma^{-1} L_{46}^{-1} R_{\text{pc}}^2 \text{ s} . \quad (34)$$

The requirement that $t_C \lesssim t_{\text{var}} \approx R/c$ implies that Compton cooling will be fast enough for electrons having

$$\gamma \gtrsim 110 L_{46}^{-1} R_{\text{pc}} . \quad (35)$$

In luminous $L_{46} \sim 1$ quasars, where the 8.5 GHz radio-sphere occurs at say $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} = 0.055$ (eq.22), Compton cooling will be fast enough for $\gamma \gtrsim 6$, relevant for all synchrotron

emitting electrons at 8.5 GHz (eq.30). However, in the lowest luminosity AGN, say where $L_{46} \sim 10^{-5}$ and $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} = 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$, Compton cooling will be fast enough only for $\gamma \gtrsim 1870$, much higher than the likely γ values of the 8.5 GHz emitting electrons (eq.30). Thus, Compton cooling will be faster than the light crossing time only in luminous quasars.

The relative importance of Compton vs. synchrotron cooling can also be estimated directly by comparing U_{ph} and U_B . In luminous quasars the requirement that $t_{\text{synch}} < t_{\text{var}}$ led to $B \gtrsim 0.7$ (see above), where synchrotron self-absorption implies $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} \gtrsim 0.034$ (eq.19). For equipartition $B_{\text{eq}} = 7.9$ (eq.21) at this radius, and thus Compton cooling can be comparable or faster than the synchrotron cooling if $B \lesssim B_{\text{eq}}$. This Compton cooling will not be spectrally detectable. Compton scattered photons peak at $\sim \gamma^2 E_{\text{ph}}$, which for $\gamma \lesssim 100$ and $E_{\text{ph}} \sim 10 - 20$ eV (the UV bump peak) occurs at $E_{\text{ph}} \lesssim 100-200$ keV. This luminosity of the X-ray Compton peak will be only of the order of the radio luminosity (as t_{synch} and t_C are not dramatically different), which is lower by a few orders of magnitude from the observed X-ray emission. In the lowest luminosity AGN ($L_{30} = 10^{-5}$) the 8.5 GHz radio-sphere, for $B \gtrsim 15$, is located at $R_{\text{pc}}^{\text{RS}} \gtrsim 2.3 \times 10^{-4}$, where $B_{\text{eq}} = 3.7$ Gauss, and since $B > B_{\text{eq}}$ synchrotron cooling likely dominates.

Adiabatic cooling occurs on the sound crossing time, $t_{\text{ad}} \sim R/c_s$, which must be longer than the light crossing time, R/c , and thus likely is too long to explain t_{var} . Introducing clumping will reduce t_{ad} to l/c_s , where $l \ll R$ is the size of each clump. However, the extent of the emitting region will now have to be much larger than the size of a monolithic emitting region (eq.19), since the observed luminosity density provides a lower limit on the total emitting surface area. If this area is comprised of small clumps which cover only a small fraction of the total surface area, then the size of the area must be correspondingly larger. Light travel time will then lead to variability which is slower than t_{var} (which is within a factor of few of R^{RS}/c).

The energy loss timescale of relativistic electrons through elastic Coulomb collisions is

$$t_{\text{coll}} = 2 \times 10^{12} \gamma n^{-1} \text{ s} , \quad (36)$$

where n is the ambient gas number density (Petrosian 1985). To obtain $t_{\text{coll}} < t_{\text{var}}$ requires $n \gtrsim 10^7 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in luminous quasars, and $n \gtrsim 3 \times 10^8 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the lowest luminosity AGN. The implied column in both cases is $\gtrsim 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, which becomes optically thick to electron scattering, and therefore excluded as it would obscure the AGN. However, we cannot exclude such high densities if the synchrotron emission preferentially occurs in high column dense gas off our line of sight (a.k.a. "the torus"). The ambient gas will be heated by the Coulomb collisions with the relativistic electrons, but this heating is unlikely to be observationally detectable as $L_R \ll L_X < L_{\text{UV}}$.

The free-free cooling time

$$t_{\text{ff}} = 10^{17} (\ln \gamma)^{-1} n^{-1} \text{ s} , \quad (37)$$

(Petrosian 1985) is $\sim 10^4$ times longer than t_{coll} , and is therefore generally insignificant for cooling mildly relativistic electrons. Blundell & Kuncic (2007) suggested that the radio emission of RQQs is entirely due to thermal free-free emission of hot ($T > 10^7$ K) plasma and not due to synchrotron. A basic difficulty we find with this conjecture is

the prohibitively large free-free X-ray flux it involves. The ratio of free free luminosity density at 1 keV and at 5 GHz in a $kT = 1$ keV plasma is (e.g., eq. 5.14 in RL)

$$\frac{L_{\nu_{1\text{keV}}}}{L_{\nu_{5\text{GHz}}}} = e^{-h(\nu_X - \nu_R)/kT} \frac{\bar{g}_{\text{ff}}(1\text{keV})}{\bar{g}_{\text{ff}}(5\text{GHz})} \approx 0.1 e^{-\frac{1\text{keV}}{kT}} \left(\frac{kT}{1\text{keV}}\right)^{1/2} \quad (38)$$

where \bar{g}_{ff} are the gaunt factors and the weak logarithmic dependence of $\bar{g}_{\text{ff}}(5\text{GHz})$ on $kT/h\nu$ has been neglected. This ratio increases with T and already overestimates by a few orders of magnitude the observed ratio of

$$\frac{L_{\nu_{1\text{keV}}}}{L_{\nu_{5\text{GHz}}}} = \frac{L_X/6.25\nu_{1\text{keV}}}{L_R/\nu_{5\text{GHz}}} = \frac{2 \times 10^5}{3 \times 10^8} = 6.7 \times 10^{-4} \quad (39)$$

where we have used $L_X \approx 6.25\nu_{1\text{keV}}L_{\nu_{1\text{keV}}}$ (§1) and $L_X/L_R \approx 2 \times 10^5$ (eq. 1); Not to mention the small contribution free-free emission must have to L_X given the observed X-ray spectral slope of AGN, which is consistent with Comptonization.

To summarize, Compton cooling is effective only in luminous AGN, Coulomb losses are effective only in dense gas, adiabatic losses are likely not fast enough, and free-free cooling of the relativistic electrons is insignificant. Synchrotron cooling is a plausible mechanism, which implies $B \gtrsim 1 - 15$ Gauss for $t_{\text{var}} \sim 10^5 - 10^7$ s seen in AGN.

An additional important conclusion from the fact that $t_{\text{var}} \gtrsim R^{\text{RS}}/c$, is that the electrons must be accelerated locally, as the time it would take them to reach the radio-sphere from the nucleus is likely to be much longer than the light crossing time. Such local acceleration is observed in solar CMEs, presumably through the interaction of a tangled magnetic field with the ambient medium (Bastian 2007), and a similar effect may be taking place in AGN.

3.6.2 The X-ray corona

As noted above, the $\sim 1 - 2$ mm emission can come directly from the compact coronal region, having $R \sim 0.01R^{\text{RS}}$, which produces the rapidly variable soft X-ray (~ 1 keV) emission. Extrapolating L_ν assuming a flat spectral slope ($\alpha = 0$) from 5 GHz to say 200 GHz, implies $\nu L_\nu/L_X \sim 4 \times 10^{-4}$, or a total radio to X-ray cooling ratio of $R/X \sim 10^{-3}$ from the coronal region. What constraints can be obtained from this ratio on the coronal heating mechanisms?

In the magnetically heated corona paradigm magnetic energy is converted to kinetic energy of fast electrons through reconnection, the fast electrons dissipate their energy and heat the corona, and the corona then cools by X-ray emission. In short, magnetic energy is converted to X-ray photons, and the average rate at which magnetic energy is annihilated must equal the X-ray luminosity (Merloni & Fabian 2001a). *What is the required minimum value for B ?* Assuming a uniform spherical shell with a radius r , within which reconnection propagates at a velocity v_{rec} , leading to complete annihilation of B , yields a maximal luminosity of

$$L_X = B^2 r^2 v_{\text{rec}}/2. \quad (40)$$

The equipartition field ($U_B = U_{\text{ph}}$) at a distance R obeys $L_{\text{bol}} = B_{\text{eq}}^2 R^2 c/2$. Combining both expressions gives

$B/B_{\text{eq}} \simeq R/r \sqrt{c/v_{\text{rec}}(L_X/L_{\text{bol}})^{1/2}}$. Since both R/r and c/v_{rec} are likely $\gg 1$, and only a fraction of B is annihilated, we get that in a magnetically heated corona $B \gg B_{\text{eq}}$.

Can the power-law X-ray emission be produced directly by the fast electrons through Compton scattering? To produce the $R/X \sim 10^{-3}$ ratio requires $U_B/U_{\text{ph}} = 10^{-3}$, however above we concluded that $U_B/U_{\text{ph}} \gg 1$, and thus the observed X-ray emission cannot originate from Compton scattering by the fast electrons which produce the mm radio emission. The X-ray emission then most likely originates from Compton cooling of the ambient non relativistic electrons in the corona, which is the commonly assumed mechanism for the X-ray power-law emission (note that cooling of these background electrons through low frequency cyclo-synchrotron emission is suppressed due to strong self-absorption, e.g. Ghisellini et al. 1998).

How do the fast electrons lose 99.9% of their energy to the background gas? (to maintain $R/X \sim 10^{-3}$). The remaining mechanism is Coulomb collisions. The synchrotron/Coulomb cooling rate ratio is $4 \times 10^3 \gamma^2 B^2 n^{-1}$, and thus if the corona is non-homogeneous, synchrotron losses will be largest for the highest γ electrons, at the regions with the highest B and lowest n , and Coulomb losses will dominate for the lower γ electrons, in particular at regions with high n and low B . To obtain rough quantitative constraints on n we assume a steady state power-law electron energy distribution (eq.13), embedded in a homogeneous corona with a uniform B and n . The ratio of synchrotron to Coulomb cooling rates is

$$\dot{E}_{\text{synch}} = \int_{\gamma_0}^{\gamma_1} \frac{\gamma m_e c^2}{t_{\text{synch}}} \frac{dn}{d\gamma} d\gamma, \quad \dot{E}_{\text{coll}} = \int_{\gamma_0}^{\gamma_1} \frac{\gamma m_e c^2}{t_{\text{coll}}} \frac{dn}{d\gamma} d\gamma \quad (41)$$

which gives

$$\frac{\dot{E}_{\text{synch}}}{\dot{E}_{\text{coll}}} = 4 \times 10^3 \gamma_0^2 B^2 n^{-1} \frac{1-p}{3-p} \frac{(\gamma_1/\gamma_0)^{3-p} - 1}{(\gamma_1/\gamma_0)^{1-p} - 1}. \quad (42)$$

For $\gamma_1/\gamma_0 \gg 1$ and say $p = 2$, we get

$$\frac{\dot{E}_{\text{synch}}}{\dot{E}_{\text{coll}}} = 4 \times 10^3 \gamma_0 \gamma_1 B^2 n^{-1}, \quad (43)$$

which together with the requirement $\dot{E}_{\text{synch}}/\dot{E}_{\text{coll}} = 10^{-3}$, gives

$$n = 4 \times 10^6 B^2 \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \text{ cm}^{-3}. \quad (44)$$

For example, for plausible values of $B = 100$ Gauss (e.g. r^{-1} extrapolation from the radio-sphere in luminous AGN), $\gamma_0 = 10$, $\gamma_1 = 100$, we get $n = 4 \times 10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, i.e rather high densities which are likely to occur close to the surface of the accretion disk. In the above estimate we assumed that the plasma is optically thin to the synchrotron radiation. As discussed above this is true only above some threshold electron energy (which is a function of B). Inclusion of synchrotron self-absorption will reduce \dot{E}_{synch} , and thus lower the implied n .

Interestingly, the column heated by coulomb collisions is

$$\Sigma_{\text{coll}} = ct_{\text{coll}} n = 6 \times 10^{22} \gamma \quad (45)$$

or

$$\tau_{\text{es}} = 0.04\gamma. \quad (46)$$

Thus, for plausible γ of a few to a few tens for the fast electrons, the collisionally heated pathlength along the direction of B has $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 0.1 - 1$, which would lead to a significant Compton scattering optical depth for the photospheric disk emission (unless B is close to parallel to the disk surface). Compton scattering conserves the number of photons, and the observed number of photons in the X-rays is $\sim 10^{-3}$ of the UV bump photons (assuming the X-ray luminosity is $\sim 10\%$ of the UV luminosity, and the mean photon energy is ~ 100 times larger). This implies that $C \times \tau_{\text{es}} \sim 10^{-3}$, or a coronal covering factor $C \sim 10^{-2} - 10^{-3}$ for $\tau_{\text{es}} \sim 0.1 - 1$. Thus, the corona may be confined to small “active” regions, presumably reconnecting coronal loops, as seen in solar flare activity (see also Haardt et al. 1994; Stern et al. 1995). The scarce covering of the accretion disk by the Comptonizing medium can also explain the vastly different amplitudes of X-ray and optical/UV variability and the complex (or lack of) connection between the two bands in some AGN (e.g., Maoz et al. 2002). The slope of the Comptonized power-law emission is set by τ_{es} and the electron temperature T_e . The observed slope, of order unity, implies then $T_e \sim$ a few 10^9 K (e.g. Eq. 7.45b in RL). *Will the corona cool mostly by Compton scattering?* Another potentially significant cooling mechanism is thermal emission (essentially pure free-free at this temperature), where the total cooling per unit volume is

$$\dot{E}_{\text{ff}} = 8 \times 10^{-23} n^2 T_9^{1/2} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-3}, \quad (47)$$

where $T_9 = T_e/10^9$ K (Fig.7.1 in Dopita & Sutherland 2003), implying an electron cooling time of

$$t'_{\text{ff}} = \frac{3}{2} n k T_e / \dot{E}_{\text{ff}} = 2.6 \times 10^{15} n^{-1} T_9^{1/2} \text{ s} \quad (48)$$

(note that this is somewhat shorter than t_{ff} for relativistic electrons). The Compton cooling time of the thermal electrons is estimated as follows. The mean energy lost by a thermal electron upon scattering from a photon of energy $\epsilon = h\nu$ is

$$\Delta\epsilon = \frac{4kT_e}{m_e c^2} \epsilon, \quad (49)$$

assuming $\epsilon \ll 4kT$ (RL). The total Compton cooling per unit volume is then

$$\dot{E}_{\text{C}} = n\sigma_{\text{es}} \int \frac{F_\nu}{ch\nu} \frac{4kT_e}{m_e c^2} h\nu d\nu, \quad (50)$$

where F_ν is the incident (mono directional) flux density, or

$$\dot{E}_{\text{C}} = n\sigma_{\text{es}} \frac{4kT_e}{m_e c^2} F, \quad (51)$$

where $F = \int F_\nu d\nu$. The Compton cooling time of the thermal electrons is then

$$t_C^{\text{th}} = \frac{3}{2} n k T_e / \dot{E}_{\text{C}}, \quad (52)$$

which gives the following simple expression

$$t_C^{\text{th}} = \frac{3}{8} \frac{m_e c^2}{\sigma_{\text{es}} F} = 81.5 T_5^{-4} \text{ s} \quad (53)$$

where $F = \sigma T_{\text{eff}}^4$ is the underlying flux of the (assumed infinite slab) disk, and $T_5 = T_{\text{eff}}/10^5$ K.

Compton cooling dominates when $t_C^{\text{th}} < t'_{\text{ff}}$, i.e. at

$$n < 3 \times 10^{13} T_5^4 T_9^{1/2} \text{ cm}^{-3}, \quad (54)$$

which is interestingly close to the lower limit on n from the requirement that the fast electrons dump 99.9% of their energy as heat in the coronal gas.

3.6.3 A chromosphere?

An additional potential implication, based on solar analogy, is the presence of a transition “chromospheric” layer between the corona and the UV emitting photosphere. Such a layer can be heated by the smaller fraction of faster electrons (say $\gamma > 100$), or ions, which deposit their energy at a larger depth, creating a deeper and cooler layer below the coronal layer. Such a chromospheric layer, if at $T \sim 10^6$ K, will cool mostly by far UV and soft X-ray line emission (e.g. Sutherland & Dopita 1993), and it may be responsible for the ubiquitous soft excess emission feature seen below ~ 0.7 keV, which is generally too strong to be explained by reprocessing of the harder X-ray continuum (e.g. Gierliński & Done 2004; Done & Nayakshin 2007). We can estimate the chromospheric density n_{ch} by the following relation

$$L_{\text{ch}} = 2\pi R_{\text{ch}}^2 C \Sigma_{\text{ch}} n_{\text{ch}} \Lambda \quad (55)$$

where the cooling function is $\Lambda \simeq 10^{-22} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^3$ at $T = 10^6$ K (Sutherland & Dopita 1993), the size of the X-ray coronal region in luminous AGN $R_{\text{ch}} \sim 3 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}$, the chromospheric column $\Sigma_{\text{ch}} = 6 \times 10^{24} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (for $\gamma = 100$), C is the coronal covering fraction, and $L_{\text{ch}} = 10^{44} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$, assuming the soft X-ray feature carries $\sim 10\%$ of the X-ray luminosity, which is $\sim 10\%$ of the bolometric luminosity in a luminous $L_{\text{bol}} = 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ AGN. These values give $n_{\text{ch}} \sim 3 \times 10^{12} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, which is comparable to the coronal density inferred above (the apparent lack of a large density gradient between the corona and chromosphere is consistent with a disk which is hydrostatically balanced by radiation pressure, rather than by a gas pressure gradient). The major difference in the microphysics of such a chromosphere, compared to earlier calculations of X-ray irradiated accretion disks (e.g. Ross et al. 1999; Nayakshin et al. 2000), is that the chromosphere is collisionally heated by fast electrons, rather than photoionized by X-rays. This difference may lead to predictably different emission line ratios (e.g. Feldman et al. 2007), but it may be difficult to discern such differences as the chromospheric lines are expected to be highly blended due to the large broadening by the Doppler effect in the inner disk.

3.6.4 Correlated X-ray and mm variability

Additional constraints on the typical B and γ within the corona can be obtained from measurements of the mm emission variability timescale, as estimated above using the 5 GHz emission variability. In particular, for the 200 GHz emission in luminous AGN to vary on a coronal light crossing time (10^5 s), requires $B > 5.4$ Gauss. As discussed above, the magnetically driven corona paradigm requires B well above the radiation equipartition value ($B_{\text{eq}} \sim 300$ Gauss in luminous AGN). If the covering factor of the coronally active loops is small, then the required B to generate the observed L_{X} will be higher, and may reach values of $\sim 10^3 - 10^4$ Gauss seen in stellar coronally active regions. This is also the expected value of B if the coronal loops are driven by buoyancy out of the disk (as seen in the Sun) from regions at

$T \simeq 10^5$ K dominated by radiation pressure. The 200 GHz emitting electrons at $B = 10^4$ Gauss have $\gamma \sim 4$, implying a cooling time of ~ 1 s. Thus, the observed mm emission can vary rapidly, and the observed variability will be dominated by the light crossing time effects over the coronally active regions.

Current mm arrays are generally not sensitive enough to detect RQ AGN, which are mostly mJy sources. However, more sensitive future mm arrays, in particular ALMA, will be able to detect the predicted rapid (minutes to hours) mm variability at the sub mJy level in RQ AGN. Such studies, in particular with simultaneous X-ray monitoring, can provide valuable insight on the coronal heating mechanism in AGN.

4 CONCLUSIONS

We find that RQ AGN lie on the Güdel-Benz relation, $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$, found for coronally active stars. Since the X-ray emission in AGN most likely originates from a hot corona, and the corona is likely to be magnetically heated, it is natural to associate the radio emission in RQ AGN with a coronal origin as well.

The “coronal paradigm” for the radio emission implies a very compact source, which is synchrotron self-absorbed at the GHz range. This implies that a compact flat spectrum source should generally be present in RQ AGN. Self-absorption will become negligible at mm wavelengths, and this emission should originate from the same volume producing the X-ray emission. The mm emission is likely to be strongly variable, and it should be correlated with the X-ray variability, possibly as seen in the Neupert effect of stellar coronal flares.

Despite the factor of $\sim 10^{10} - 10^{15}$ difference in L_R and L_X between AGN and coronally active stars, the estimated values of B in the active regions of the two systems are comparable ($\sim 10^3 - 10^4$ Gauss), which may imply similar underlying microphysics in both coronae. The physical mechanism underlying the $L_R/L_X = 10^{-5}$ ratio in these coronae remains a puzzle.

Applying the stellar analogy to the extended radio emission, we suggest that it originates from coronal mass ejections. This emission mechanism differs from the alternative jet interpretation in that the outflow is relatively slow, and is not well confined, as suggested in observations of some nearby RQ Seyfert galaxies.

There are two additional populations of active radio and X-ray emitting objects, intermediate between stars and AGN. ULXs, where the four objects with radio and X-ray data also fall close to the Güdel-Benz relation, and overlap with the position of NGC 4395, the lowest luminosity type 1 AGN. This is consistent with ULXs being scaled down AGN, rather than strongly beamed GBHs. The other population is GBHs, where L_R is a factor of 10-100 lower than expected from the Güdel-Benz relation. This offset may result from a dependence of L_R/L_X on the local disk temperature. We show that the Merloni et al. “fundamental plane” relation, which incorporates both GBHs and AGN, can be recast as a dependence of L_R/L_X on the surface accretion disk effective temperature. This may indicate that the radio emission in GBHs has a significant coronal component as well, in particular given the observed variability pattern, where

$L_o \propto -dL_X/dt$, which is reminiscent of the Neupert effect in stellar coronae.

We thank M. Güdel for providing data in electronic form and A. Merloni for the fundamental-plane relation in his radio-quiet sub-sample. We thank R. Antonucci and S. Jester for valuable comments on the manuscript. We thank the referee for many useful comments that helped us improve the manuscript. This research was supported in part by the Asher Space Research Institute at the Technion.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. M., Ulvestad, J. S., & Ho, L. C. 2004, ApJ, 603, 42
- Anderson, J. M., & Ulvestad, J. S. 2005, ApJ, 627, 674
- Balbus, S. A., & Hawley, J. F. 1998, Reviews of Modern Physics, 70, 1
- Ballantyne, D. R., Ross, R. R., & Fabian, A. C. 2001, MNRAS, 327, 10
- Barvainis, R., Lonsdale, C., & Antonucci, R. 1996, AJ, 111, 1431
- Barvainis, R., Lehár, J., Birkinshaw, M., Falcke, H., & Blundell, K. M. 2005, ApJ, 618, 108
- Baskin, A., & Laor, A. 2005, MNRAS, 356, 1029
- Bastian, T. S., Benz, A. O., & Gary, D. E. 1998, ARA&A, 36, 131
- Bastian, T. S. 2007, ArXiv e-prints, 704, arXiv:0704.3108
- Begelman, M. C., Blandford, R. D., & Rees, M. J. 1984, Reviews of Modern Physics, 56, 255
- Benz, A. O., & Güdel, M. 1994, A&A, 285, 621
- Blackman, E. G., & Field, G. B. 2000, MNRAS, 318, 724
- Blundell, K. M., Beasley, A. J., Lacy, M., & Garrington, S. T. 1996, ApJ, 468, L91
- Blundell, K. M., & Beasley, A. J. 1998, MNRAS, 299, 165
- Blundell, K. M., Beasley, A. J., & Bicknell, G. V. 2003, ApJ, 591, L103
- Blundell, M. B. & Kuncic, Z. 2007, ApJ, 668, L103
- Boroson, T. A., & Green, R. F. 1992, ApJS, 80, 109 (BG92)
- Brandt, W. N., Laor, A., & Wills, B. J. 2000, ApJ, 528, 637
- Brinkmann, W., Laurent-Muehleisen, S. A., Voges, W., Siebert, J., Becker, R. H., Brotherton, M. S., White, R. L., & Gregg, M. D. 2000, A&A, 356, 445
- Brockopp, C., Starling, R. L. C., Schady, P., Mason, K. O., Romero-Colmenero, E., & Puchnarewicz, E. M. 2006, MNRAS, 366, 953
- Capetti, A., & Balmaverde, B. 2007, A&A, 469, 75
- Condon, J. J., Huang, Z.-P., Yin, Q. F., & Thuan, T. X. 1991, ApJ, 378, 65
- Corbel, S., Fender, R. P., Tzioumis, A. K., Nowak, M., McIntyre, V., Durouchoux, P., & Sood, R. 2000, A&A, 359, 251
- Crenshaw, D. M., Kraemer, S. B., Boggess, A., Maran, S. P., Mushotzky, R. F., & Wu, C.-C. 1999, ApJ, 516, 750
- Crenshaw, D. M., Kraemer, S. B., Bruhweiler, F. C., & Ruiz, J. R. 2001, ApJ, 555, 633
- Crenshaw, D. M., Kraemer, S. B., Gabel, J. R., Schmitt, H. R., Filippenko, A. V., Ho, L. C., Shields, J. C., & Turner, T. J. 2004, ApJ, 612, 152

- Czerny, B., Róžańska, A., Dovčiak, M., Karas, V., & Dumont, A.-M. 2004, *A&A*, 420, 1
- de Bruyn, A. G. 1976, *A&A*, 52, 439
- Dewangan, G. C., Miyaji, T., Griffiths, R. E., & Lehmann, I. 2004, *ApJ*, 608, L57
- Dhawan, V., Mirabel, I. F., & Rodríguez, L. F. 2000, *ApJ*, 543, 373
- di Matteo, T., Celotti, A., & Fabian, A. C. 1997, *MNRAS*, 291, 805
- di Matteo, T., Celotti, A., & Fabian, A. C. 1999, *MNRAS*, 304, 809
- Done, C., & Nayakshin, S. 2007, *MNRAS*, 377, L59
- Done, C., Gierliński, M., & Kubota, A. 2007, *A&A Review*, 15, 1
- Dopita, M. A., & Sutherland, R. S. 2003, *Astrophysics of the diffuse universe*, Berlin, New York: Springer, 2003. *Astronomy and astrophysics library*, ISBN 3540433627
- Dove, J. B., Wilms, J., & Begelman, M. C. 1997, *ApJ*, 487, 747
- Draine, B. T., & Li, A. 2007, *ApJ*, 657, 810
- Eardley, D. M., & Lightman, A. P. 1975, *ApJ*, 200, 187
- Elvis, M., et al. 1994, *ApJS*, 95, 1
- Evans, I. N., & Koratkar, A. P. 2004, *ApJS*, 150, 73
- Falcke, H., Sherwood, W., & Patnaik, A. R. 1996, *ApJ*, 471, 106
- Falcke, H., Körtling, E., & Markoff, S. 2004, *A&A*, 414, 895
- Feldman, U., Landi, E., & Doschek, G. A. 2007, *ApJ*, 660, 1674
- Field, G. B., & Rogers, R. D. 1993, *ApJ*, 403, 94
- Gabel et al. 2003, *ApJ*, 583, 178
- Galeev, A. A., Rosner, R., & Vaiana, G. S. 1979, *ApJ*, 229, 318
- Gallimore, J. F., Axon, D. J., O’Dea, C. P., Baum, S. A., & Pedlar, A. 2006, *AJ*, 132, 546
- Gallo, E., Fender, R. P., & Pooley, G. G. 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 60
- Gallo, E., Fender, R., Kaiser, C., Russell, D., Morganti, R., Oosterloo, T., & Heinz, S. 2005, *Nature*, 436, 819
- Gallo, E., Fender, R. P., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., Merloni, A., Jonker, P. G., Heinz, S., Maccarone, T. J., & van der Klis, M. 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 1351
- George, I. M., Turner, T. J., Yaqoob, T., Netzer, H., Laor, A., Mushotzky, R. F., Nandra, K., & Takahashi, T. 2000, *ApJ*, 531, 52
- Ghisellini, G., Haardt, F., & Svensson, R. 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, 348
- Ghisellini, G., Haardt, F., & Matt, G. 2004, *A&A*, 413, 535
- Gierliński, M., & Done, C. 2004, *MNRAS*, 349, L7
- Gilli, R., Comastri, A., & Hasinger, G. 2007, *A&A*, 463, 79
- Ginzburg V. L. & Syrovatskii S. I. 1969, *ARA&A*, 7, 375
- Güdel, M. 2002, *ARAA*, 40, 217
- Güdel, M. 2004, *A&A Review*, 12, 71
- Güdel, M., & Benz, A. O. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, L63
- Haardt, F., & Maraschi, L. 1993, *ApJ*, 413, 507
- Haardt, F., Maraschi, L., & Ghisellini, G. 1994, *ApJ*, 432, L95
- Haas, M., Müller, S. A. H., Chini, R., Meisenheimer, K., Klaas, U., Lemke, D., Kreysa, E., & Camenzind, M. 2000, *A&A*, 354, 453
- Hardcastle, M. J., Croston, J. H., & Kraft, R. P. 2007, *ApJ*, in press, *ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints*, arXiv:0707.2865
- Heinz, S. 2006, *ApJ*, 636, 316
- Heinz, S., & Merloni, A. 2004, *MNRAS*, 355, L1
- Ho, L. C., Filippenko, A. V., & Sargent, W. L. 1995, *ApJS*, 98, 477
- Ho, L. C., Filippenko, A. V., & Sargent, W. L. W. 1997, *ApJS*, 112, 315
- Ho, L. C., & Ulvestad, J. S. 2001, *ApJS*, 133, 77
- Hummel, E., van der Hulst, J. M., Keel, W. C., & Kennicutt, R. C., Jr. 1987, *A&A Supplement*, 70, 517
- Iwasawa, K., Fabian, A. C., Almaini, O., Lira, P., Lawrence, A., Hayashida, K., & Inoue, H. 2000, *MNRAS*, 318, 879
- Jester, S., et al. 2005, *AJ*, 130, 873
- Just, D. W., Brandt, W. N., Shemmer, O., Steffen, A. T., Schneider, D. P., Chartas, G., & Garmire, G. P. 2007, *ApJ*, 665, 1004
- Kaaret, P., Corbel, S., Prestwich, A. H., & Zezas, A. 2003, *Science*, 299, 365
- Kaaret, P., Simet, M. G., & Lang, C. C. 2006, *ApJ*, 646, 174
- Kaspi, S., Brandt, W. N., Collinge, M. J., Elvis, M., & Reynolds, C. S. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 2631
- 1999, *ApJ*, 516, 750
- Kellermann, K. I., & Pauliny-Toth, I. I. K. 1969, *ApJ*, 155, L71
- Kellermann, K. I., Sramek, R., Schmidt, M., Shaffer, D. B., & Green, R. 1989, *AJ*, 98, 1195
- Kellermann, K. I., Sramek, R. A., Schmidt, M., Green, R. F., & Shaffer, D. B. 1994, *AJ*, 108, 1163
- Körtling, E., Colbert, E., & Falcke, H. 2005, *A&A*, 436, 427
- Körtling, E. G., Jester, S., & Fender, R. 2006, *MNRAS*, 372, 1366
- Kukula, M. J., Pedlar, A., Baum, S. A., & O’Dea, C. P. 1995, *MNRAS*, 276, 1262
- Kukula, M. J., Dunlop, J. S., Hughes, D. H., & Rawlings, S. 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, 366
- Kriss, G. A., Canizares, C. R., & Ricker, G. R. 1980, *ApJ*, 242, 492
- Laor, A., & Brandt, W. N. 2002, *ApJ*, 569, 641
- Leipski, C., Falcke, H., Bennert, N., Huettemeister, S. 2006, *A&A*, 455, 161
- Malzac, J., Belloni, T., Spruit, H. C., & Kanbach, G. 2003, *A&A*, 407, 335
- Malzac, J., Merloni, A., & Fabian, A. C. 2004, *MNRAS*, 351, 253
- Maoz, D., Markowitz, A., Edelson, R., Nandra, K. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 1988
- Maoz, D. 2007, *MNRAS*, 377, 1696
- Maoz, D., Koratkar, A., Shields, J. C., Ho, L. C., Filippenko, A. V., & Sternberg, A. 1998, *AJ*, 116, 55
- Markoff, S., Nowak, M. A., & Wilms, J. 2005, *ApJ*, 635, 1203
- Marscher, A. P. 1977, *ApJ*, 216, 244
- Matt, G., Fabian, A. C., & Reynolds, C. S. 1997, *MNRAS*, 289, 175
- Merloni, A., Di Matteo, T., & Fabian, A. C. 2000, *MNRAS*, 318, L15
- Merloni, A., & Fabian, A. C. 2001a, *MNRAS*, 321, 549
- Merloni, A., & Fabian, A. C. 2001b, *MNRAS*, 328, 958
- Merloni, A., & Fabian, A. C. 2002, *MNRAS*, 332, 165
- Merloni, A., Heinz, S., & di Matteo, T. 2003, *MNRAS*, 345, 1057
- Middelberg, E., et al. 2004, *A&A*, 417, 925
- Miller, L., Peacock, J. A., & Mead, A. R. G. 1990, *MNRAS*,

- 244, 207
- Miller, P., Rawlings, S., & Saunders, R. 1993, *MNRAS*, 263, 425
- Miller, J. M. 2005, *Astrophysics & Space Science*, 300, 227
- Miller, J. M., Homan, J., Steeghs, D., Rupen, M., Hunstead, R. W., Wijnands, R., Charles, P. A., & Fabian, A. C. 2006a, *ApJ*, 653, 525
- Miller, B. P., Brandt, W. N., Gallagher, S. C., Laor, A., Wills, B. J., Garmire, G. P., & Schneider, D. P. 2006b, *ApJ*, 652, 163
- Moran, E. C., Eracleous, M., Leighly, K. M., Chartas, G., Filippenko, A. V., Ho, L. C., & Blanco, P. R. 2005, *AJ*, 129, 2108
- Mundell, C. G., Holloway, A. J., Pedlar, A., Meaburn, J., Kukula, M. J., & Axon, D. J. 1995, *MNRAS*, 275, 67
- Mushotzky, R. F., Done, C., & Pounds, K. A. 1993, *ARAA*, 31, 717
- Mushotzky, R. 2006, *Advances in Space Research*, 38, 2793
- Nagar, N. M., Falcke, H., Wilson, A. S., & Ulvestad, J. S. 2002, *A&A*, 392, 53
- Narayan, R., & McClintock, J. E. 2008, *New Astronomy Review*, 51, 733
- Nayakshin, S., Kazanas, D., & Kallman, T. R. 2000, *ApJ*, 537, 833
- Neupert, W. M. 1968, *ApJ*, 153, L59
- Niedźwiecki, A. 2005, *MNRAS*, 356, 913
- Panessa, F., Bassani, L., Cappi, M., Dadina, M., Barcons, X., Carrera, F. J., Ho, L. C., & Iwasawa, K. 2006, *A&A*, 455, 173
- Panessa, F., Barcons, X., Bassani, L., Cappi, M., Carrera, F. J., Ho, L. C., & Pellegrini, S. 2007, *A&A*, 467, 519
- Petrosian, V. 1985, *ApJ*, 299, 987
- Polletta, M., Courvoisier, T. J.-L., Hooper, E. J., & Wilkes, B. J. 2000, *A&A*, 362, 75
- Ponti, G., Miniutti, G., Cappi, M., Maraschi, L., Fabian, A. C., & Iwasawa, K. 2006, *MNRAS*, 368, 903
- Pounds, K. A., Reeves, J. N., King, A. R., & Page, K. L. 2004, *MNRAS*, 350, 10
- Poutanen, J., & Fabian, A. C. 1999, *MNRAS*, 306, L31
- Readhead, A. C. S. 1994, *ApJ*, 426, 51
- Ross, R. R., & Fabian, A. C. 1993, *MNRAS*, 261, 74
- Ross, R. R., Fabian, A. C., & Young, A. J. 1999, *MNRAS*, 306, 461
- Rybicki, G. B., & Lightman, A. P. 1979, *Radiative Processes in Astrophysics*, New York, Wiley-Interscience, 1979 (RL)
- Rykoff, E. S., Miller, J. M., Steeghs, D., & Torres, M. A. P. 2007, *ArXiv Astrophysics e-prints*, arXiv:astro-ph/0703497
- Sahayanathan, S., & Misra, R. 2005, *ApJ*, 628, 611
- Salvato, M., Greiner, J., & Kuhlbrodt, B. 2004, *ApJ*, 600, L31
- Sanders, D. B., Phinney, E. S., Neugebauer, G., Soifer, B. T., & Matthews, K. 1989, *ApJ*, 347, 29
- Scelsi, L., Maggio, A., Micela, G., Briggs, K., & Güdel, M. 2007, *A&A*, 473, 589
- Schmidt, M., & Green, R. F. 1983, *ApJ*, 269, 352
- Shakura, N. I., & Syunyaev, R. A. 1973, *A&A*, 24, 337
- Shapiro, S. L., Lightman, A. P., & Eardley, D. M. 1976, *ApJ*, 204, 187
- Sikora, M., Stawarz, L., & Lasota, J.-P. 2007, *ApJ*, 658, 815
- Sopp, H. M., & Alexander, P. 1991, *MNRAS*, 251, 14P
- Soria, R., Kuncic, Z., Broderick, J. W., & Ryder, S. D. 2006, *MNRAS*, 370, 1666
- Steffen, A. T., Strateva, I., Brandt, W. N., Alexander, D. M., Koekemoer, A. M., Lehmer, B. D., Schneider, D. P., & Vignali, C. 2006, *AJ*, 131, 2826
- Stern, B. E., Poutanen, J., Svensson, R., Sikora, M., & Begelman, M. C. 1995, *ApJ*, 449, L13
- Stirling, A. M., Spencer, R. E., de la Force, C. J., Garrett, M. A., Fender, R. P., & Ogle, R. N. 2001, *MNRAS*, 327, 1273
- Sunyaev, R. A., & Titarchuk, L. G. 1980, *A&A*, 86, 121
- Sutherland, R. S., & Dopita, M. A. 1993, *ApJS*, 88, 253
- Terashima, Y., & Wilson, A. S. 2003, *ApJ*, 583, 145
- Terlevich, R., Tenorio-Tagle, G., Franco, J., & Melnick, J. 1992, *MNRAS*, 255, 713
- Thim, F., Hoessel, J. G., Saha, A., Claver, J., Dolphin, A., & Tammann, G. A. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 2322
- Ulvestad, J. S. & Wilson, A. S. 1984, *ApJ*, 278, 544
- Ulvestad, J. S., & Ho, L. C. 2001, *ApJ*, 562, L133
- Ulvestad, J. S., Roy, A. L., Colbert, E. J. M., & Wilson, A. S. 1998, *ApJ*, 496, 196
- Ulvestad, J. S., Wrobel, J. M., Roy, A. L., Wilson, A. S., Falcke, H., & Krichbaum, T. P. 1999, *ApJ*, 517, L81
- Ulvestad, J. S., Antonucci, R. R. J., & Barvainis, R. 2005, *ApJ*, 621, 123
- Wang, R., Wu, X.-B., & Kong, M.-Z. 2006, *ApJ*, 645, 890
- White, R. L., Helfand, D. J., Becker, R. H., Glikman, E., & de Vries, W. 2007, *ApJ*, 654, 99
- Wilson, A. S. & Willis, A. G. 1980, *ApJ*, 240, 429
- Zheng, W., Kriss, G. A., Telfer, R. C., Grimes, J. P., & Davidsen, A. F. 1997, *ApJ*, 475, 469

Table 1. PG Quasar Data.

Name	z	M_V	Log R	α_{ox}	Log $f_{1\text{keV}}$ μJy	Log L_R erg s^{-1}	Log L_X erg s^{-1}	C IV EW \AA
0003+158	0.4505	-26.92	2.24	-1.38	-0.08	42.99	45.55	0
0003+199	0.0260	-22.14	-0.57	-1.50	0.60	38.36	43.80	0
0007+106	0.0893	-23.85	2.29	-1.43	0.20	41.93	44.49	0.8
0026+129	0.1452	-24.71	0.03	-1.50	0.02	39.97	44.70	0
0043+039	0.3859	-26.16	-0.92	< -2.00	< -1.45	39.44	<44.05	22.3
0049+171	0.0643	-21.81	-0.49	-1.27	0.04	38.27	44.05	-
0050+124	0.0587	-23.77	-0.48	-1.56	0.21	38.97	44.18	0.4
0052+251	0.1544	-24.64	-0.62	-1.37	0.17	39.35	44.93	0
0157+001	0.1632	-24.61	0.33	-1.60	-0.57	40.13	44.23	-
0804+761	0.1005	-24.44	-0.22	-1.52	0.39	39.88	44.78	-
0838+770	0.1318	-23.83	< -0.96	-1.54	-0.46	<38.59	44.16	-
0844+349	0.0644	-23.31	-1.52	-1.54	-0.01	37.81	43.99	0.6
0921+525	0.0352	-21.25	0.17	-1.41	0.03	38.62	43.52	-
0923+129	0.0287	-21.59	0.32	-1.41	0.37	38.94	43.69	-
0923+201	0.1929	-24.56	-0.85	-1.57	-0.54	39.16	44.38	0.8
0934+013	0.0505	-21.43	-0.42	-1.39	-0.07	38.13	43.73	-
0947+396	0.2059	-24.21	-0.60	-1.33	-0.28	39.07	44.72	0
0953+414	0.2341	-25.65	-0.36	-1.50	-0.13	39.98	44.98	0.1
1001+054	0.1610	-24.07	-0.30	-2.13	-2.05	39.38	42.74	11.8
1004+130	0.2404	-25.97	2.36	-1.82	-0.63	42.70	44.48	16.6
1011-040	0.0584	-22.70	-1.00	-2.01	-1.32	38.09	42.60	1.0
1012+008	0.1865	-24.79	-0.30	-1.66	-0.85	39.50	44.06	-
1022+519	0.0449	-21.40	-0.64	-1.34	-0.04	37.75	43.66	-
1048+342	0.1667	-24.02	< -1.00	-1.52	-0.60	<38.61	44.22	-
1048-090	0.3461	-25.83	2.58	-1.41	-0.26	42.97	45.16	-
1049-005	0.3596	-25.93	-0.60	-1.56	-0.67	39.81	44.78	0.3
1100+772	0.3115	-25.86	2.51	-1.39	-0.10	42.92	45.24	0.4
1103-006	0.4232	-25.96	2.43	-1.51	-0.68	42.88	44.90	0
1114+445	0.1438	-24.01	-0.89	-1.62	-0.83	38.65	43.87	4.0
1115+407	0.1542	-23.74	-0.77	-1.45	-0.43	38.65	44.33	0.3
1116+215	0.1765	-25.57	-0.14	-1.57	-0.04	40.20	44.83	0
1119+120	0.0500	-22.49	-0.82	-1.58	-0.30	38.05	43.48	-
1121+422	0.2248	-24.38	< -1.00	-1.59	-1.00	<38.68	44.10	0
1126-041	0.0601	-23.00	-0.77	-2.13	-1.63	38.44	42.32	5.8
1149-110	0.0489	-21.90	-0.06	-1.42	0.05	38.80	43.83	-
1151+117	0.1759	-24.07	< -1.15	-1.46	-0.44	<38.54	44.43	-
1202+281	0.1654	-23.75	-0.72	-1.27	-0.11	38.74	44.70	0
1211+143	0.0810	-24.60	0.20	-1.57	0.29	40.13	44.54	0
1216+069	0.3318	-26.33	0.22	-1.44	-0.29	40.62	45.10	0
1226+023	0.1575	-27.15	3.06	-1.47	0.90	43.97	45.67	0
1229+204	0.0640	-23.06	-0.96	-1.49	-0.01	38.29	44.00	-
1244+026	0.0480	-21.77	-0.28	-1.60	-0.18	38.62	43.58	-
1259+593	0.4770	-26.82	< -1.00	-1.75	-1.13	<39.70	44.53	0
1302-102	0.2783	-26.60	2.27	-1.58	-0.17	42.99	45.09	0
1307+085	0.1545	-24.56	-1.00	-1.52	-0.16	38.94	44.59	0
1309+355	0.1825	-24.76	1.26	-1.71	-1.01	41.05	43.89	2.2
1310-108	0.0343	-21.35	-1.00	-1.52	-0.19	37.63	43.30	-
1322+659	0.1676	-24.23	-0.92	-1.40	-0.14	38.80	44.68	0
1341+258	0.0864	-22.71	< -0.92	-1.53	-0.44	<38.25	43.83	-
1351+236	0.0553	-22.40	-0.59	-1.52	-0.77	37.93	43.11	-
1351+640	0.0880	-24.08	0.64	-1.78	-0.74	40.29	43.53	5.3
1352+183	0.1508	-24.13	-0.96	-1.50	-0.39	38.76	44.38	0
1354+213	0.3011	-24.34	< -1.10	-1.39	-0.71	<38.64	44.60	-
1402+261	0.1643	-24.48	-0.64	-1.58	-0.36	39.27	44.44	0.7
1404+226	0.0978	-22.93	-0.33	-1.55	-0.60	38.67	43.77	1.5
1411+442	0.0897	-23.54	-0.89	-2.03	-1.56	38.50	42.72	10.3
1415+451	0.1133	-23.41	-0.77	-1.51	-0.51	38.50	43.99	0
1416-129	0.1292	-24.55	0.06	-1.56	0.05	40.27	44.65	0
1425+267	0.3635	-26.18	1.73	-1.63	-1.25	41.82	44.21	2.1
1426+015	0.0863	-24.05	-0.55	-1.46	0.32	39.30	44.58	-
1427+480	0.2203	-24.04	< -0.80	-1.52	-0.75	<38.88	44.30	0
1435-067	0.1288	-24.55	-1.15	-1.63	-0.32	38.79	44.28	-

Table 1. — Continued

Name	z	M_V	Log R	α_{ox}	Log $f_{1\text{keV}}$ μJy	Log L_R erg s^{-1}	Log L_X erg s^{-1}	EW C IV \AA
1440+356	0.0777	-23.49	-0.43	-1.38	0.37	38.94	44.54	0
1444+407	0.2676	-25.18	< -1.10	-1.57	-0.66	<38.99	44.55	0
1448+273	0.0648	-23.30	-0.60	-1.59	-0.16	38.58	43.86	-
1501+106	0.0365	-22.76	-0.44	-1.64	0.14	38.92	43.65	-
1512+370	0.3713	-25.93	2.28	-1.43	-0.45	42.63	45.03	0
1519+226	0.1357	-23.76	-0.05	-1.51	-0.41	39.47	44.24	-
1534+580	0.0305	-21.44	-0.15	-1.38	0.19	38.38	43.54	0
1535+547	0.0389	-22.15	-0.85	< -2.17	< -1.89	37.84	<41.76	3.9
1543+489	0.4009	-25.60	-0.82	-1.67	-1.13	39.44	44.40	0
1545+210	0.2643	-25.63	2.62	-1.38	-0.07	42.91	45.14	0
1552+085	0.1191	-23.72	-0.35	-1.77	-0.98	39.10	43.55	-
1612+261	0.1308	-23.77	0.45	-1.41	-0.08	40.02	44.53	0
1613+658	0.1291	-24.22	0.00	-1.21	0.29	39.55	44.89	-
1617+175	0.1137	-23.95	-0.14	-1.64	-0.34	39.76	44.15	-
1626+554	0.1317	-23.54	-0.96	-1.37	-0.15	38.52	44.48	0
1700+518	0.2892	-26.44	0.37	< -2.29	< -2.39	40.75	<42.90	94
1704+608	0.3721	-26.38	2.81	-1.62	-0.83	43.29	44.64	2.4
2112+059	0.4597	-27.26	-0.49	-2.11	-1.79	40.51	43.87	26.7
2130+099	0.0631	-23.23	-0.49	-1.47	0.39	39.00	44.35	0.6
2209+184	0.0697	-23.14	2.15	-1.49	-0.14	41.45	43.94	-
2214+139	0.0657	-23.39	-1.30	-2.02	-1.41	38.03	42.63	1.1
2233+134	0.3263	-25.18	-0.55	-1.66	-0.95	39.65	44.42	-
2251+113	0.3255	-26.24	2.56	-1.86	-1.28	43.06	44.09	3.5
2304+042	0.0426	-21.58	-0.60	-1.29	0.24	38.14	43.89	-
2308+098	0.4336	-26.24	2.27	-1.35	-0.24	42.76	45.35	0.2