

A giant-flare-like origin for the subluminescent GRB 170817A associated with GW170817

H. Tong¹, C. Yu²

ABSTRACT

The gamma-ray burst GRB 170817A associated with GW170817 is subluminescent and subenergetic compared with other typical short GRBs. It may be due to a relativistic jet viewed off-axis, or a structured jet, or cocoon emission etc. Giant flares from magnetars may possibly be ruled out. However, the luminosity and energetics of GRB 170817A is coincident with that of magnetar giant flares. After the coalescence of the binary neutron star, a hypermassive neutron star may be formed. The hypermassive neutron star may have magnetar-strength magnetic field. The subsequent collapse of this hypermassive neutron star to a black hole may launch a relativistic jet. However, the prompt emission of the jet (if it exists) may have been missed due to a large viewing angle. During the collapse of the hypermassive neutron star, the magnetic field energy will also be released. This giant-flare-like event may explain the the luminosity and energetics of GRB 170817A. In this scenario, the kilonova emission, and later X-ray/radio afterglow are unaffected. Bursts with similar luminosity and energetics are expected in future neutron star-neutron star or neutron star-black hole mergers.

Subject headings: stars: magnetar – stars: neutron – gamma-ray burst: individual (GRB 170817A) – gravitational waves

1. Introduction

GW170817 is the gravitational wave event of a binary neutron star inspiral (Abbott et al. 2017a). This event also has multi-wavelength electromagnetic counterpart (Abbott et al. 2017b): a possible short gamma-ray burst (GRB), GRB 170817A (Abbott et al. 2017c; Goldstein et al. 2017; Savchenko et al. 2017); ultraviolet/optical/infrared emissions from a kilonova (Villar et al. 2017 and references therein); delayed X-ray and radio emission, which may be the afterglow of a

¹School of Physics and Electronic Engineering, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou 510006, China
 htong_2005@163.com

²School of Physics and Astronomy, Sun Yat-sen University, Zhuhai 519082, China
 yucong@mail.sysu.edu.cn

relativistic jet (Margutti et al. 2017; Alexander et al. 2017). Both the gravitational wave and electromagnetic observations are the product of a binary neutron star merger (Murguia-Berthier et al. 2017; Kasliwal et al. 2017).

Detailed analysis show that GRB 170817A is subluminal and subenergetic compared with other cosmological short gamma-ray bursts (Abbott et al. 2017c; Goldstein et al. 2017; Savchenko et al. 2017; Fong et al. 2017). Its isotropic energy and luminosity are: $E_{\text{iso}} = 3.1 \times 10^{46}$ erg, and $L_{\text{iso}} = 1.6 \times 10^{47}$ erg s⁻¹, respectively, in the 1 keV-10 MeV range. It is 2 to 6 orders of magnitude less energetic than other short GRBs (Abbott et al. 2017c). The physics for the subluminal of this GRB may be: (1) a relativistic jet viewed off-axis, (2) a structured jet, or (3) cocoon emission etc (Abbott et al. 2017c; Murguia-Berthier et al. 2017; Kasliwal et al. 2017). For an off-axis jet, later deceleration may explain the delayed X-ray and radio afterglow emission (Margutti et al. 2017; Alexander et al. 2017). However, in order to see the prompt emission of the jet, a fine tuning of the line of sight may be required. In a very limited sky range can we see this GRB (Abbott et al. 2017c). Furthermore, the energetics and luminosity of GRB 170817A is similar to the giant flare seen in a magnetar (Hurly et al. 2005; Mereghetti 2008). This coincidence may be accidental. If not, it may suggest that GRB 170817A and magnetar giant flares share similar physical processes (Savchenko et al. 2017). The later probability is explored in the following.

The association of GRB 170817A with a binary neutron star merger event, softer spectrum, and lack of tail emission may argue against a magnetar giant flare origin (Abbott et al. 2017c; Goldstein et al. 2017). However, the remnant of the binary neutron star merger may be a hypermassive neutron star (Abbott et al. 2017d; Murguia-Berthier et al. 2017). The neutron star may have magnetar strength magnetic field due to interactions between convection and differential rotation during the formation process. Subsequent collapse of the hypermassive neutron star to a black hole will also result in the release of the neutron star’s magnetic energy. This giant-flare-like event may be responsible for the subluminal GRB 170817A, especially its coincidence with magnetar giant flare energetics. The explains for the kilonova and X-ray/radio afterglow emissions are unaffected in this scenario.

2. Description of the scenario

The binary neutron merger may result in a remnant with mass 2.7-2.8 M. (Abbott et al. 2017a). This mass lies in the hypermassive range for many neutron star equation of state (Abbott et al. 2017c). The presence of a blue kilonova may also indicate the presence of a hypermassive neutron star (Murguia-Berthier et al. 2017). A hypermassive neutron star has mass larger than the maximum mass of a uniformly rotation neutron star. It is supported by the differential rotation. Subsequent dissipation of the differential rotation will result in a collapse of the hypermassive neutron star, to a black hole (Baumgarte et al. 2000; Hotokezaka et al. 2013). The magnetic braking or viscous dissipation timescale is about 100 ms (Hotokezaka et al. 2013). However, for a nascent hypermassive neutron star, collapse can happen only when the its thermal energy is

carried away by neutrinos (Sekiguchi et al. 2011). The typical neutrino cooling timescale is order of seconds. This may corresponds to the 1.7 s delay of GRB 170817A and the merger time of GW170817.

A rough estimation of the neutron star maximum mass can be made from the above scenario. The nascent hot neutron star may be $0.1 M_{\odot}$ heavier than the maximum mass of a cold supramassive neutron star (Hotokezaka et al. 2013 and references therein). The maximum mass of a cold supramassive neutron star is about 1.2 times the maximum mass of a cold nonrotating neutron star. Assuming a remnant mass of $2.75 M_{\odot}$ (Abbott et al. 2017a), the above scenario results in a maximum mass of a cold non-rotating neutron star about $2.2 M_{\odot}$. This rough estimation is consistent with results of more detailed analysis (Margalit & Metzger 2017; Shibata et al. 2017; Rezzolla et al. 2017; Ruiz et al. 2017).

Prior study of the double pulsar system shows that the binary neutron star may be made up of a normal neutron star and a recycled one (Lyne et al. 2004). For a merger time scale of 10 Gyr (Blanchard et al. 2017), the magnetic field of the two neutron stars may have decayed significantly. During the collision and birth of the hypermassive neutron star, it may acquire rapid rotation, and strong magnetic field (Zrake & MacFadyen 2013; Giacomazzo & Perna 2013; Ciolfi et al. 2017). The turbulent dynamo process for normal magnetars may also take place in the case of nascent hypermassive neutron stars (Duncan & Thompson 1992). Its magnetic field can be as high as the magnetar magnetic field, e.g. up to 10^{15} - 10^{16} G. For a volume about the cube of the neutron star radius 10^{18} cm³, the stored magnetic energy is about 4×10^{46} - 4×10^{48} erg. This energy is enough to power the soft gamma emissions of GRB 170817A (Abbott et al. 2017c; Goldstein et al. 2017). The spike magnetar giant flares lasts about 0.5 s (Mereghetti 2008). The magnetic field may be dragged by the expanding ejecta and lead to formation of current sheet (Lyutikov 2006; Yu & Huang 2013). During the escape of the ejecta, the magnetic dissipation inside the current sheet would give rise to flares and the duration timescale is determined by the escape velocity of the expanding ejecta, which depends closely on the magnetic reconnection inflow velocity. Our detailed calculation shows that the inflow Mach number $M_A = V_{\text{inflow}}/V_A \sim V_{\text{inflow}}/c$ around 10^{-3} can well reproduce the observed flare duration timescale (Yu et al. in prep.). This may also explain why the initial pulse of GRB 170817A also lasts about 0.5 s (Goldstein et al. 2017; Savchenko et al. 2017). Then the luminosity of the initial pulse should be around 10^{47} erg s⁻¹. Therefore, a giant-flare-like origin can explain the both the subluminescent and subenergetic GRB 170817A, associated with GW170817. Both the observation of a magnetar’s giant flare (Hurley et al. 2005), and a simple estimation supports this idea. The soft emission following the initial pulse (Goldstein et al. 2017) may be due to subsequent reconnection process.

Relativistic reconnection is believed to be operating in GRBs. Magnetars, originally proposed to account for short GRBs (Duncan & Thompson 1992), share similar behavior of low luminosity GRBs. Observations of GRB 080916C indicates that the GRB central engine likely launches magnetically-dominated plasma and magnetic reconnection leads to the GRB prompt emissions (Zhang & Yan 2011; McKinney & Uzdensky 2012) which provides a promising mechanism to pro-

mote rapid conversion of magnetic energy to radiation. Relativistic reconnection facilitate magnetic energy release and give rise to high energy emissions. The reconnection inflow velocity is roughly $V_{\text{inflow}} = M_A V_A$, where V_A is the Alfvén velocity. In the magnetically dominated environment, the Alfvén velocity is approximately the speed of light. The magnetic reconnection model for GRBs indicates that, in the vicinity of the central engines, the Sweet-Parker reconnection dominates and magnetic reconnection rate is rather low. Fast reconnection switches on at a rather distant radius $\sim 10^{13}$ cm. We also note that fast reconnection would also destroy the jet formation feasibility by the Blandford-Znajek mechanism (Blandford & Znajek 1977). For these reasons, we adopt a small value of Alfvén Mach number 10^{-3} . The toroidal electric field E_ϕ inside the current sheet is approximately $B_{\text{dipole}} \times (V_{\text{inflow}}/c)$. The Poyting flux inside the current sheet is roughly $M_A c \times (B/10^{14} \text{ G})^2 (r/15 \text{ km})^2 \sim 10^{47} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Here the magnetic field we adopt is the average magnetic field.

The magnetic field is so strong that the dynamics is dominated by the magnetic field. Under such circumstances, the mass of the ejecta can be estimated as $\sim 10^{30} \times (B/10^{16} \text{ G})^2 (R/15 \text{ km})^3 \text{ g}$, This is consistent with the ejecta mass of kilonova. Detail simulations showed that the velocity of the ejecta can reach 0.3 c. This is consistent with that inferred from kilonova observations (Villar et al. 2017). Detailed simulation results will be shown elsewhere (Yu et al. in prep.).

In the case of giant flares from normal magnetars, the central neutron star is always there. And the large scale strong dipole magnetic field is always present. This may ensure that magnetar giant flares can have a hard spectra, especially for the initial spike (Elenbaas et al. 2017). However, in the giant-flare-like origin for GRB 170817A, the central neutron star collapses to a black hole. During the magnetic reconnection process, the magnetic field will decrease with time. This may explain why the initial pulse of GRB 170817A has a soft spectra compared with that of magnetar giant flares (Goldstein et al. 2017; Li et al. 2018). The emission following the initial pulse is even softer (Goldstein et al. 2017). This is also consistent with the expectation when the large scale magnetic field keeps decreasing with time. For the magnetar 1E 2259+586, it has a relatively low dipole magnetic field compared with other magnetars (Olausen & Kaspi 2014). Its emission in the hard X-ray range is also relatively weak (Enoto et al. 2010; Vogel et al. 2014). The observation of this magnetar is also consistent with the above explanations.

During the collapse of the hypermassive neutron star to a blackhole, both matter and magnetic field can be ejected. The ejection of magnetic field energy is also employed to explain the energy of fast radio bursts (Falche & Rezzolla 2014, for the collapse of a supramassive neutron star). Both theory and observations of magnetar giant flares indicate that the magnetic energy can be converted to high energy X-ray emissions (Thompson & Duncan 1995; Elenbaas et al. 2017; Mereghetti 2008). It is not clear whether the magnetic energy can be converted to prompt radio emission. However, it can not be excluded that a fast radio burst is also generated during the collapse of a hypermassive neutron star.

3. Discussion

Here we provide another explanation for the subluminal GRB 170817A, associated with GW170817. Compared with other explanations (off-axis jet, structured jet, cocoon etc), a giant-flare-like origin naturally results in a burst luminosity similar to that of magnetar giant flares. The predictions for future observations is also very clear. Since the giant flares of magnetars are not assumed to have a strong beaming (Lyutikov 2006), so is the giant-flare-like event. Bursts with similar luminosities may also be observed in future binary neutron star merger events, provided that they are close enough. If we are lucky that the prompt emission of the jet is also seen, then we should see two bursts following the gravitational wave event. The internal collision of shocks may results in a delay between the prompt emission and magnetic energy release. This will result in a precursor (which is due to the giant-flare-like event), followed by a classical GRB. Previous observations found some possible precursors of short GRBs (Troja et al. 2010). It is possible that these precursors are also due to magnetic energy release of the central engine.

The association with a binary neutron star merger event, softer spectrum, and lack of tail emission may argue against a magnetar giant flare origin for GRB 170817A (Abbott et al. 2017c; Goldstein et al. 2017). However, a long lived neutron remnant can not be ruled out, because (1) a nascent neutron can be born during a merger event, (2) the spectrum depends on the magnetic field strength of the emission region, (3) the upper limits on tail emission are not very constraining. Future long-term observations may reveal some activities of the central engine, if it is a long lived neutron star (Yu et al. 2017). During the merger of a neutron star/black hole system, giant-flare-like event may also happen if strong magnetic field can also be generated (Wan 2017).

During the preparation process, we noted the paper of Salafia et al. (2017), who employed a fireball powered by a giant flare to explain both GRB 170817A and the X-ray/radio afterglow. It is different from our scenario. In our scenario, (1) the time delay between GRB 170817A and GW170817 is due to delayed collapse of the hypermassive neutron star, (2) the giant-flare or magnetic energy release is due to collapse the hypermassive neutron star to a black hole, (3) the giant flare is only responsible for the subluminal GRB 170817A, (4) the X-ray/radio afterglow is due to a jet, whose early emission is not seen due to a large viewing angle.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank X.Y. Wang, Z. Li, S.L. Xiong, P.H.T. Tam, and H.G. Wang for discussions. H.Tong is supported by NSFC (11773008). C.Y. has been supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants 11373064, 11521303, 11733010), Yunnan Natural Science Foundation (Grant 2014HB048) and Yunnan Province (2017HC018).

REFERENCES

- Abbott, B. P., et al., 2017a, PRL, 119, 161101
- Abbott, B. P., et al., 2017b, ApJL, 848, L12
- Abbott, B. P., et al., 2017c, ApJL, 848, L13
- Alexander, K. D., Burger, E., Fong, W., et al., 2017, ApJL, 848, L21
- Baumgarte, T. W., Shapiro, S. L., & Shibata, M., 2000, ApJL, 528, L29
- Blanchard, P. K., Burger, E., Fong, W., et al., 2017, ApJL, 848, L22
- Blandford, R. D., Znajek, R. L., 1977, MNRAS, 179, 433
- Ciolfi, R., Kastaun, W., Giacomazzo, B., et al., 2017, PRD, 95, 063016
- Duncan, R. C., & Thompson, C. 1992, ApJ, 392, L9
- Elenbaas, C., Huppenkothen, D., Omand, C., et al., 2017, MNRAS, 471, 1856
- Enoto, T., Nakazawa, K., Makishima, K., et al., 2010, ApJL, 722, L162
- Falcke, H., & Rezzolla, L., 2014, A&A, 562, A137
- Giacomazzo, B., & Perna, R., 2013, ApJL, 771, L26
- Goldstein, A., Veres, P., Burns, E., et al., 2017, ApJL, 848, L14
- Hurley, K., Boggs, S. E., Smith, D. M., et al., 2005, Nature, 434, 1098
- Hotokezaka, K., Kuichi, K., Kyutoku, K., et al., 2013, PRD, 88, 044026
- Kasliwal, M. M., Narkar, E., Singer, L. P., et al., 2017, Science, 10.1126/science.aap9455
- Li, T. P., Xiong, S. L., Zhang, S. N., et al., 2018, Science China Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy, 61, 031011
- Lyne, A. G., Burgay, M., Kramer, M., et al., 2004, Science, 303, 1153
- Lyutikov, M., 2006, MNRAS, 367, 1594
- McKinney, J. C., & Uzdensky, D. A., 2012, MNRAS, 419, 573
- Mereghetti, S., 2008, A&ARv, 15, 225
- Margalit, B., & Metzger, B. D., 2017, arXiv:1710.05938
- Margutti, R., Burger, E., Fong, W., et al., 2017, ApJL, 848, L20

Murguia-Berthier, A., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., Kilpatrick, C. D., et al., 2017, *ApJL*, 848, L34

Olausen, S. A., & Kaspi, V. M., 2014, *ApJS*, 212, 6

Rezzolla, L., Most, E. R., & Weih, L. R., 2017, arXiv:1711.00314

Ruiz, M., Shapiro, S. L., & Tsokaros, A., 2017, arXiv:1711.00473

Salafia, O. S., Ghisellini, G., Ghirlanda, G., et al., 2017, arXiv:1711.03112

Savchenko, V., Ferrigno, C., Kuulkers, E., et al., 2017, *ApJL*, 848, L15

Sekiguchi, Y., Kiuchi, K., Kyutoku, K., et al., 2011, *PRL*, 107, 051102

Shibata, M., Fujibayashi, S., Hotokezaka, K., et al., 2017, arXiv:1710.07579

Thompson, C., & Duncan, R. C., 1995, *MNRAS*, 275, 255

Troja, E., Rosswog, S., & Gehrels, N., 2010, *ApJ*, 723, 1711

Villar, V. A., Guillochon, J., Burger, E., et al., 2017, arXiv:1710.11576

Vogel, J. K., Hascoet, R., Kaspi, V. M., et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 789, 75

Wan, 2017, *PRD*, 95, 104013

Yu, C., & Huang, L., 2013, *ApJL*, 771, L46

Yu, Y. W., & Dai, Z. G., 2017, arXiv:1711.01898

Zhang, B., & Yan, H., 2011, *ApJ*, 726, 90

Zrake, J., & MacFadyen, A. I., 2013, *ApJL*, 769, L29