

Cosmological Constraints from calibrated Yonetoku and Amati relation imply Fundamental plane of Gamma-ray bursts

Ryo Tsutsui^{1*}, Takashi Nakamura¹, Daisuke Yonetoku², Toshio Murakami²,
Yoshiki Kodama², and Keitaro Takahashi³

¹*Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

²*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Kanazawa University, Kakuma, Kanazawa, Ishikawa 920-1192, Japan*

³*Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*

21 February 2022

ABSTRACT

We consider two empirical relations using data only from the prompt emission of Gamma-Ray Bursts (GRBs), peak energy (E_p) - peak luminosity (L_p) relation (so called Yonetoku relation) and E_p -isotropic energy (E_{iso}) relation (so called Amati relation). We first suggest the independence of the two relations although they have been considered similar and dependent. From this viewpoint, we compare constraints on cosmological parameters, Ω_m and Ω_Λ , from the Yonetoku and Amati relations calibrated by low-redshift GRBs with $z < 1.8$. We found that they are different in $1\text{-}\sigma$ level, although they are still consistent in $2\text{-}\sigma$ level. This and the fact that both Amati and Yonetoku relations have systematic errors larger than statistical errors suggest the existence of a hidden parameter of GRBs. We introduce the luminosity time T_L defined by $T_L \equiv E_{\text{iso}}/L_p$ as a hidden parameter to obtain a generalized Yonetoku relation as $(L_p/10^{52} \text{ erg s}^{-1}) = 10^{-3.88 \pm 0.09} (E_p/\text{keV})^{1.84 \pm 0.04} (T_L/\text{s})^{-0.34 \pm 0.04}$. The new relation has much smaller systematic error, 30%, and can be regarded as "Fundamental plane" of GRBs. We show a possible radiation model for this new relation. Finally we apply the new relation for high-redshift GRBs with $1.8 < z < 5.6$ to obtain $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.16^{+0.04}_{-0.06}, 1.20^{+0.03}_{-0.09})$, which is consistent with the concordance cosmological model within $2\text{-}\sigma$ level.

Key words:

gamma rays: bursts — gamma rays: observation

1 INTRODUCTION

In our previous papers (Kodama et al. 2008; Tsutsui et al. 2008), we calibrated the relation between peak energy E_p and peak luminosity L_p of prompt GRB emission (so called Yonetoku relation (Yonetoku et al. 2004)) by 33 low-redshift GRBs ($z < 1.62$) whose luminosity distances were estimated from SNeIa (Riess et al. 2007; Wood-Vasey et al. 2007; Davis et al. 2007). Then we used the calibrated Yonetoku relation as a distance indicator like the period-luminosity relation of Cepheid variables, and extended the Hubble diagram up to $z = 5.6$. Tsutsui et al. (2008) showed that GRBs constrain cosmological parameters in a different way from SNeIa, and GRBs could be useful to probe cosmological expansion of high-redshift universe where no SNIa has been observed.

The Amati relation (Amati et al. 2002) is another relation for prompt emission property. It involves peak energy E_p and isotropic energy E_{iso} , and was originally derived under a given set of cosmological parameters. Therefore, the circularity problem is accompanied if one applies naively the Amati relation to determine cosmological parameters. To overcome this difficulty, we first calibrate the Amati relation in this Letter, as we did for Yonetoku relation, without assuming any cosmological models but with luminosity distance given by SNeIa for $z < 1.8$. Although these two relations have been considered similar and dependent, we suggest their independence by analyzing the correlation of the residuals from the relations (§-2).

Next, we will extend the Hubble diagram with the obtained relations and make constraints on density parameters, $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)$. It is shown that the two Hubble diagrams differ systematically at high redshifts and, as a result, two different constraints are obtained (§-3). Although the difference

* E-mail: tsutsui@tap.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp (RT)

is not so significant (1- σ level), taking the relatively large systematic errors in the two relations themselves into consideration, it is suggested that there may be a hidden parameter which characterizes the prompt emission and reduces the systematic error of the distance indicator. We introduce the luminosity time ($T_L \equiv E_{\text{iso}}/L_p$) as a possible hidden parameter to derive the generalized Yonetoku relation (L_p - E_p - T_L relation), and put constraints on cosmological parameters (§-4). Finally we give some comments on other relations used as distance indicators in the past, and argue the advantage of our new relation (§-5). Throughout the paper, we fix the current Hubble parameter as $H_0 = 66 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$.

2 CALIBRATION OF AMATI RELATION AT LOW REDSHIFTS

The typical spectrum of the prompt emission of GRBs can be expressed as exponentially connected broken power-law, so called Band function. Then we can determine spectral peak energy E_p , corresponding to the photon energy at maximum in νF_ν spectra. There are two empirical relations that relate prompt emission property with E_p . E_p - E_{iso} relation is the first one found by Amati et al. (2002), which connects E_p with the isotropic equivalent energy E_{iso} . The second one is E_p - L_p relation found by Yonetoku et al. (2004) which was used in our previous papers (Kodama et al. 2008; Tsutsui et al. 2008).

One may think that these two relations are similar since E_p appears in both relations and both E_{iso} and L_p characterize the brightness of the prompt emission. Actually, if the luminosity of GRBs is constant in time, they are completely equivalent. However, in reality, the luminosity is not constant so that two relations can be independent. To see if they are independent, we first calibrate Amati relation in the same way as in our previous papers (Kodama et al. 2008; Tsutsui et al. 2008) and analyze the correlation of the residuals of GRB data from the relations.

We found an empirical formula for the luminosity distance as a function of redshift from 192 SNeIa observations (Riess et al. 2007; Davis et al. 2007; Wood-Vasey et al. 2007),

$$\frac{d_L}{10^{27} \text{ cm}} = 6.96 \times z^{1.79} + 14.79 \times z^{1.02}. \quad (1)$$

The reduced chi-square of the formula is $\chi^2_\nu = 0.995$. Note here that the formula is not unique and a different formula is possible. Note also that we do not assume any cosmological models at this stage, but simply assume that the Type Ia supernovae are the standard candles for $0.168 < z < 1.755$. Furthermore, we neglect the errors in Eq. (1) in the following analysis, which leads to the underestimation of errors in cosmological parameters. Our purpose here is to compare distance indicators and find a better indicator so that this neglect would be reasonable.

We apply this formula to 31 low redshifts GRBs within $z < 1.6$. In Fig. 1 we show the peak energy E_p and the isotropic energy E_{iso} of 31 GRBs with $z < 1.62$. The solid line is the calibrated Amati relation given by,

$$\frac{E_{\text{iso}}}{10^{52} \text{ erg}} = 10^{-3.88 \pm 0.06} \left(\frac{E_p}{1 \text{ keV}} \right)^{2.02 \pm 0.02}, \quad (2)$$




Figure 1. The peak energy (E_p) and isotropic energy (E_{iso}) of 31 GRBs with $z < 1.62$. The solid line is the calibrated Amati relation given by Eq (2) and dashed lines represent the 1-sigma region. The systematic error of this relation is reduced to $\sigma_{\log E_{\text{iso}}}^{\text{sys}} = 0.39$ which is larger than statistical error.

where the statistical errors are indicated and $E_{\text{iso}} = 4\pi d_L^2 S_{\text{bol}} / (1+z)$ where S_{bol} is the bolometric fluence estimated in 1-10000 keV energy range in GRB rest frame. The correlation coefficient is 0.943 and the reduced chi-square is $\chi^2 = 536.02/29$. Actually distribution of the deviations of GRB data from the relation is not Gaussian and the systematic error in the overall normalization is estimated to be $\sigma_{\log E_{\text{iso}}}^{\text{sys}} = 0.39$.

This kind of systematic error was also found in the Yonetoku relation (Kodama et al. 2008),

$$\frac{L_p}{10^{52} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} = 10^{-4.11 \pm 0.09} \left(\frac{E_p}{1 \text{ keV}} \right)^{1.83 \pm 0.04}, \quad (3)$$

where L_p is 1-second peak luminosity. This Yonetoku relation is slightly different from that in the previous work because we include not only L_p error but also E_p error in this paper. The correlation coefficient is 0.948, the reduced chi-square is $\chi^2 = 207/31$, and the systematic error is $\sigma_{\log L_p}^{\text{sys}} = 0.33$. The Amati relation has slightly larger systematic error than the Yonetoku relation and, in both cases, systematic errors are significantly larger than statistical errors.

If these two relations are not independent, the residuals of data from these relations would correlate with each other. Fig. 2 shows the residuals which are defined as the differences between the observed quantities, L_p^{obs} and $E_{\text{iso}}^{\text{obs}}$, and the expected quantities, L_p^{exp} and $E_{\text{iso}}^{\text{exp}}$, from Yonetoku and Amati relations for given observed E_p , respectively. We can see that there is no correlation between Amati and Yonetoku relations. Thus, we have two relations which seem independent and have relatively large systematic errors. This may suggest that there would exist a hidden parameter with which prompt emission would be characterized more properly. We will propose a hidden parameter and a new relation later. Before that, we will extend the Hubble diagram with




Figure 2. Residuals from calibrated Yonetoku relation and Amati relation from the observed E_p . Here, the residuals are the differences between the observed quantities, L_p^{obs} and $E_{\text{iso}}^{\text{obs}}$, and the expected quantities, L_p^{exp} and $E_{\text{iso}}^{\text{exp}}$, from Yonetoku and Amati relations for the given observed E_p , respectively. There seems to be no correlation, which implies the two relations are independent.




Figure 3. Extended Hubble diagram from Yonetoku relation (blue) and Amati relation (red). A systematic difference seems to exist in high redshift, although it doesn't seem in low redshift GRBs.

the two relations, obtain constraints on the cosmological parameters and check their consistency.

3 CONSTRAINTS ON COSMOLOGICAL PARAMETERS

We apply these Amati and Yonetoku relations to 29 GRBs with high redshifts, $1.9 < z < 5.6$, to determine the luminosity distance as a function of z . Fig. 3 shows an extended Hubble diagram up to $z = 5.6$ from Amati relation (red) and Yonetoku relation (blue). A systematic difference between red and green points seems to exist especially in high-redshift region.

Then we derive constraints on cosmological parameters. In the Λ -CDM model with $\Omega_k = \Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda - 1$, the luminosity




Figure 4. Constraints on $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)$ plane from Amati relation (red) and Yonetoku relation (blue). The contours correspond to 68.3%, 95.4% and 99.7% confidence regions, respectively, and black solid line represents the flat universe. They are slightly different, although they are consistent in 2- σ level. See also Table 1.

distance is given by,

$$d_L^{\text{th}}(z, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = \begin{cases} \frac{c}{H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_k}} \sin(\sqrt{\Omega_k} F(z)) & \text{if } \Omega_k > 0 \\ \frac{c}{H_0 \sqrt{-\Omega_k}} \sinh(\sqrt{-\Omega_k} F(z)) & \text{if } \Omega_k < 0 \\ \frac{c}{H_0} F(z) & \text{if } \Omega_k = 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

with

$$F(z) = \int_0^z dz' \left[\Omega_m (1+z')^3 - \Omega_k (1+z')^2 + \Omega_\Lambda \right]^{-1/2}. \quad (5)$$

The likelihood contour is defined by,

$$\Delta\chi^2 = \sum_i \left\{ \frac{\mu_0(z_i) - \mu^{\text{th}}(z_i, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)}{\sigma_{\mu_0, z_i}} \right\}^2 - \chi_{\text{best}}^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\mu^{\text{th}}(z_i, \Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = 5 \log(d_L^{\text{th}}/\text{Mpc}) + 25$ and χ_{best}^2 represents the chi-square value for the best-fit parameter set of Ω_m and Ω_Λ .

In Fig. 4, we show the likelihood contour from Amati (red) and Yonetoku relations (blue), and the best-fit values with 1- σ errors are shown in Table 1. Interestingly, they are slightly different, although they are consistent in 2- σ level.

4 NEW RELATION

In this section, we seek for a hidden parameter which reduces the systematic error in the relation. In the past studies, prompt emission was characterized by a time scale, the duration of most intense parts of the GRB ($T_{0.45}$) (Firmani et al.

	Ω_m	Ω_Λ	χ^2_ν
Amati	$0.08^{+0.08}_{-0.05}$	$1.14^{+0.06}_{-0.58}$	0.81
Amati (flat)	$0.11^{+0.04}_{-0.05}$	-	0.80
Yonetoku	$0.18^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	$1.20^{+0.10}_{-0.87}$	0.51
Yonetoku (flat)	$0.26^{+0.09}_{-0.07}$	-	0.51
E_p - T_L - L_p	$0.16^{+0.04}_{-0.06}$	$1.20^{+0.03}_{-0.09}$	1.24
E_p - T_L - L_p (flat)	$0.20^{+0.06}_{-0.03}$	-	1.28

Table 1. Constraints on $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)$ in non-flat and flat universe with 1- σ errors from Amati, Yonetoku and E_p - T_L - L_p relations and their reduced chi squares. Constraints from Amati and Yonetoku relations are inconsistent in 1- σ level.

2006). Here we adopt a time scale called luminosity time T_L introduced by Willingale et al. (2007) as,

$$T_L = \frac{E_{\text{iso}}}{L_p} = \frac{S_{\text{bol}}}{(1+z)F_p}. \quad (7)$$

The luminosity time does not depend on detector's energy band because it is defined by bolometric flux and fluence.

We assume the correlation among E_p , T_L and L_p to be of the form, $\log L_p \equiv A + B \log E_p + C \log T_L$. Then we obtain,

$$\frac{L_p}{10^{52} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} = 10^{-3.88 \pm 0.09} \left(\frac{E_p}{1 \text{ keV}} \right)^{1.84 \pm 0.04} \left(\frac{T_L}{1 \text{ s}} \right)^{-0.34 \pm 0.04}, \quad (8)$$

from low redshift 30 GRBs in $0.16 < z < 1.7$. In Fig. 5 we show E_p - T_L - L_p relation. The correlation coefficient is 0.971, the reduced chi-square is $\chi^2 = 58.71/26$ and the systematic error is $\sigma_{\log L_p}^{\text{sys}} = 0.12$. The systematic error is substantially reduced compared to those of Amati and Yonetoku relations, and now comparable to the statistical error. Thus this relation could be regarded as "Fundamental plane" of GRB prompt emission.

Here we excluded one outlier, GRB070521, from the fitting of Eq. (8). Actually, the host galaxy of GRB070521 is detected inside an error circle of XRT by Hattori, T., Aoki, K., & Kawai, N. (2007) using Subaru Telescope after 40 minutes from the trigger, but they couldn't detect bright afterglow. Thus, the real redshift may be larger, which is why we exclude GRB070521 from our analysis. For more detailed discussions about E_p - T_L - L_p relation, see Tsutsui et al. (in prep).

We show a possible derivation of the new relation (Eq.(8)) under the photospheric model of the prompt emission of GRBs (Ioka et al. (2007) and references therein). The luminosity is given by

$$L \propto r^2 \Gamma^2 T'^4 \quad (9)$$

where r , Γ and T' are the photospheric radius, the gamma factor and co-moving temperature of the photosphere, respectively. Since Ioka et al. (2007) assume that the energy is supplied by the relativistic collision of the rapid shell of mass m_r and Lorentz factor γ_r with the slow shell of m_s and γ_s . Then under the perfectly inelastic collision model, Γ is given by $\Gamma^2 = (m_r \gamma_r + m_s \gamma_s) / (m_r / \gamma_r + m_s / \gamma_s)$. Since $\gamma_r \gg \gamma_s$ and $m_r \gamma_r + m_s \gamma_s \propto E_{\text{iso}}$, we can reduce $\Gamma^2 \propto E_{\text{iso}} \gamma_s / m_s$. If we regard $E_p \sim \Gamma T'$, we can rewrite Eq.(9) as $L \propto r^2 E_p^4 / \Gamma^2 \propto r^2 m_s E_p^4 / E_{\text{iso}} \gamma_s$. Now let us assume r ,




Figure 5. The $E_p/T_L^{0.185}$ and L_p in 31 GRBs with $z < 1.62$. The correlation is improved than Amati and Yonetoku relations. The solid line shows the best-fit curve without one outlier (green square: GRB070521), and dashed lines represent the 1-sigma region. The correlation coefficient is 0.971 and reduced chi-square is $\chi^2 = 58.71/26$ without GRB070521. The systematic error of this relation is reduced to $\sigma_{\log L_p}^{\text{sys}} = 0.12$ which is comparable to the statistical error.

m_s and $\gamma_s^2 T_L$ are constants. Then we have $L \propto E_p^2 T_L^{-0.25}$. The above relation is essentially the same as Eq.(8) if we consider 2- σ error of the power index in Eq.(8).

Possible reasons for the above three assumptions are as follows. In Ioka et al. (2007) model r is similar to the radius of the progenitor star so that it could be constant. T_L can be regarded as the effective duration of the burst. Then $c \gamma_s^2 T_L$ is the radius that the last rapid shell catches the slow shell and we expect that this is also the order of the radius of the progenitor star, which is constant. We have no reason why m_s is constant. However if m_s obeys the log normal distribution like the other observables in GRBs we may regard it essentially constant. If these assumptions are reasonable, the generalized Yonetoku relation (Eq.(8)) could be derived in the photospheric model of the prompt emission of GRBs like Ioka et al. (2007).

Finally we use this new generalized Yonetoku relation to put constraints on cosmological parameters. Flat universe is out of 1- σ confidence region, but concordance cosmology is still consistent in 2- σ level. The constraints on cosmological parameters are $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda) = (0.16^{+0.04}_{-0.06}, 1.20^{+0.03}_{-0.09})$ and $\chi^2_\nu = 33.59/27$ for non-flat universe, $\Omega_m = 0.20^{+0.06}_{-0.03}$ and $\chi^2_\nu = 35.99/28$ for flat universe. (See Table 1.)

5 DISCUSSION

Recently some authors extended Hubble diagram up to $z \sim 6$ using various luminosity indicators (Amati et al. 2008; Liang et al. 2008; Schaefer 2007; Firmani et al. 2006; Ghirlanda et al. 2006). Ghirlanda et al. (2006), Firmani et al. (2006), and Schaefer (2007) are pioneering works for GRB cosmology, but they are caught in circularity problem because there are few GRBs at low redshift.




Figure 6. Constraint on $(\Omega_m, \Omega_\Lambda)$ plane from E_p - T_L - L_p relation. See also Table 1.

Schaefer (2007) obtained cosmological constraints from lag (τ_{ag})-luminosity relation, variability (V)-luminosity relation, E_p -jet collimated energy (E_γ) relation (so called Ghirlanda relation), minimum rise time (τ_{RT})-luminosity relation, and Yonetoku relation. Liang et al. (2008) calibrated these relations by luminosity distances from SNIa observations.

However, Tsutsui et al. (2008) showed redshift dependence of τ_{ag} - L_p relation analyzing 565 BASTE GRB samples with pseudo-redshifts estimated by Yonetoku relation. This suggests that the relation cannot be used as a distance indicator. The dependence might come from the fact that τ_{ag} s were evaluated from several fixed energy bands depending on the detectors and they are different energy in GRB rest frame, so it suffer from K-correction problem. This argument applies to V s and τ_{RT} s.

Besides, E_p - E_γ cannot avoid circularity problem because when we estimate a jet opening angle (θ_{jet}) from the jet break time, we need E_{iso} . However without assuming cosmological model, we cannot estimate the distance to the GRB and then E_{iso} . Even if we use Liang & Zhang relation for which this circularity problem can be avoided because it directly relate jet break time with L_p and E_p , the number of GRBs whose jet breaks are observed is about only 1/3. More seriously, there are many GRBs without a jet break or with multiple jet breaks (missing or multiple jet break problem) so that it is not certain whether the jet break can be used to characterize GRB emission.

In contrast, our new relation does not suffer from these problems, because it is totally defined by the prompt emission property. Thus we could expect that the new relation would put GRB cosmology to the next promising stage, as Phillips relation and Fundamental plane did for SNeIa and elliptical galaxies. However, we must emphasize that we need detailed studies of the new relation with much larger num-

ber of GRBs and examination of systematic errors in order for GRB to be regarded as a reliable tool for cosmology like SNIa, cosmic microwave background, baryon acoustic oscillation and gravitational lens. Now ongoing Missions like *Swift*, *Fermi* and *Suzaku*, and the collaboration of many observers on ground will promise the progression of GRB cosmology.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT) of Japan, No.19540283, No.19047004(TN), and No.20674002 (DY) and by the Grant-in-Aid for the global COE program *The Next Generation of Physics, Spun from Universality and Emergence* from MEXT of Japan. KT is supported by a Grant-in-Aid for the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Fellows and is a research fellow of JSPS.

REFERENCES

- Amati, L., et al. 2002, AAP, 390, 81
- Amati, L., Guidorzi, C., Frontera, F., Della Valle, M., Finelli, F., Landi, R., & Montanari, E. 2008, ArXiv e-prints, 805, arXiv:0805.0377
- Davis, T. M., et al. 2007, ApJ, 666, 716
- Djorgovski, S., & Davis, M. 1987, ApJ, 313, 59
- Firmani, C., Avila-Reese, V., Ghisellini, G., & Ghirlanda, G. 2006, MNRAS, 372, L28
- Firmani, C., Ghisellini, G., Avila-Reese, V., & Ghirlanda, G. 2006, MNRAS, 370, 185
- Ghirlanda, G., Ghisellini, G., & Firmani, C. 2006, New Journal of Physics, 8, 123
- Hattori, T., Aoki, K., & Kawai, N. 2007, GCN 6444
- Ioka, K., et al. 2007, ApJ, 670, L77-L80
- Kodama, Y., Yonetoku, D., Murakami, T., Tanabe, S., Tsutsui, R., & Nakamura, T. 2008, MNRAS in press, arXiv:0802.3428
- Liang, E., & Zhang, B. 2005, ApJ, 633, 611
- Liang, N., Xiao, W. K., Liu, Y., & Zhang, S. N. 2008, ArXiv e-prints, 802, arXiv:0802.4262
- Phillips, M. M. 1993, ApJL, 413, L105
- Riess, A. G., et al. 2007, ApJ, 659, 98
- Schaefer, B. E. 2007, ApJ, 660, 16
- Tsutsui, R., Nakamura, T., Yonetoku, D., Murakami, T., Tanabe, S., & Kodama, Y. 2008, MNRAS, 386, L33
- Tsutsui, R., Nakamura, T., Yonetoku, D., Murakami, T., Tanabe, S., Kodama, Y., & Takahashi, K. 2008, ArXiv e-prints, 807, arXiv:0807.2911
- Tsutsui, R., Nakamura, T., Yonetoku, D., Murakami, T., Tanabe, S., Kodama, Y., & Takahashi, K. 2008, in preparation
- Willingale, R., O'Brien, P. T., Goad, M. R., Osborne, J. P., Page, K. L., & Tanvir, N. R. 2007, ArXiv e-prints, 710, arXiv:0710.3727
- Wood-Vasey, W. M., et al. 2007, ApJ, 666, 694
- Yonetoku, D., Murakami, T., Nakamura, T., Yamazaki, R., Inoue, A. K., & Ioka, K. 2004, ApJ, 609, 935