

# The correlation between isotropic energy and duration of gamma-ray bursts

Z. L. Tu<sup>1</sup> and F. Y. Wang<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *School of Astronomy and Space Science, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China*

<sup>2</sup> *Key Laboratory of Modern Astronomy and Astrophysics (Nanjing University), Ministry of Education, Nanjing 210093, China*

\*fayinwang@nju.edu.cn

## ABSTRACT

In this paper, we study the correlation between isotropic energy and duration of gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) for the first time. The correlation is found to be  $T_d \propto E_{iso}^{0.34 \pm 0.03}$  from the *Swift* GRB sample. After comparing with solar flares from *RHESSI* and stellar superflares from *Kepler* satellite, we find that the correlation of GRBs shows similar exponent with those of solar flares and stellar superflares. Inspired by the physical mechanism of solar flares and stellar superflares which is magnetic reconnection, we interpret the correlation using magnetic reconnection theory. This similarity hints that magnetic reconnection may dominate energy releasing process of GRBs.

## 1. Introduction

Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) are explosive phenomena occurring at cosmological distance (Kumar & Zhang 2015; Wang et al. 2015; Zhang et al. 2016), and play a vital role in multi-messenger astronomy (Willingale & Mészáros 2017, etc.). As the central engine is still mysterious, plenty of works have been proposed to explain the burst prompt emission mechanism or central engine (Beloborodov & Mészáros 2017; Dai et al. 2017; Nagataki 2018), including the internal shock model (Rees & Meszaros 1994; Daigne et al. 2011), the dissipative photosphere model (Spruit et al. 2001; Rees & Mészáros 2005), the electromagnetic model (Lyutikov & Blandford 2003; Lyutikov 2006) and the internal-collision-induced magnetic reconnection and turbulence model (Zhang & Yan 2011). Although they have successfully interpreted some remarkable GRBs, there are still some open questions at meanwhile.

Because there are many models for interpreting the physical mechanism of GRBs, it is essential to statistically analyze basic properties of GRBs. Some empirical correlations

have been found (Wang et al. 2015; Dainotti & Del Vecchio 2017; Dainotti & Amati 2018; Dainotti et al. 2018), e.g. the isotropic energy and spectral peak energy correlation  $E_{\text{iso}} - E_p$  (Amati et al. 2002; Wang et al. 2016), the correlation between  $E_{\text{iso}}$ , spectral peak energy  $E_p$  and rest-frame break time  $t_b$  (Liang & Zhang 2005), X-ray luminosity  $L_X$  and rest-frame time of plateau phase  $T_a^*$  (Dainotti et al. 2015), lag-luminosity correlation  $\tau_{\text{lag}} - L_{\text{iso}}$  (Norris et al. 2000), and fundamental plane of GRBs (Dainotti et al. 2016, 2017b). But the correlation between duration and isotropic energy has not been studied in literature before.

Stellar superflares are violent energy releasing events occurring on stellar surface. Maehara et al. (2012) statistically studied the superflares from solar-type stars, in virtue of continuously long periods observation of *Kepler*. Both long and short cadence data from *Kepler* have been collected later to study superflares in comparing with solar flares (Shibayama et al. 2013; Maehara et al. 2015, etc.). To be specific, Maehara et al. (2015) fitted the correlation between duration and energy of stellar superflares as  $\tau_{\text{flare}} \propto E_{\text{flare}}^{0.39 \pm 0.03}$ , which is comparable to statistical analysis of solar flares.

In this paper, the correlation between duration and isotropic energy of GRBs is fitted. While filling a vacancy of statistical correlation studies of GRBs, we explore if there are some resemblances between stellar flares and GRBs. In order to make comparison, solar flares from *RHESSI* and superflares of solar-type stars from *Kepler* are gathered in this work. Linear regression has been made with different kinds of data. In order to test if our fitting results are strongly credible, statistical methods *t*-test and *F*-test are involved. Through this paper, we adopt cosmological parameters as  $H_0=67.7\text{km/s/Mpc}$ ,  $\Omega_m = 0.31$ ,  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.69$  (Planck Collaboration et al. 2016).

The paper is structured as follows. Samples of GRBs, solar flares from *RHESSI*, and superflares of solar-type stars from *Kepler* are presented in section 2. The results of linear regression in log-log fields are given in section 3. In section 4, we give a reasonable explanation of the correlation basing on magnetic reconnection. Conclusions and discussion are given in section 5.

## 2. Data Samples

This section will specifically introduce the filter conditions of data selection. Methods of calculation for different datasets will also be presented.

## 2.1. Gamma-ray bursts

*Swift* has been operated to observe GRBs from 2004, and over 1,000 GRBs are detected. In this paper, we target on selecting those GRBs with redshift measurements during January 2005 to May 2018. In order to avoid importing system errors from different GRB surveys, we only use GRBs from the website of *Swift* data table <sup>1</sup>. Besides of redshift, duration time  $T_{90}$  and fluence of prompt emission  $S_{\text{GRB}}$  with 90% error can also be obtained from web site. Those GRBs showing absence of duration time, error of fluence are all excluded from the database. Then, we use the redshift measurements for GRBs from Jochen Greiner’s website<sup>2</sup>. There are total 386 GRBs for further study.

Because GRBs occur at cosmological distances, the time should be transferred to rest frame. The duration can be written as

$$T_{\text{GRB,duration}} = \frac{T_{90}}{1+z}. \quad (1)$$

The isotropic energy is

$$E_{\text{GRB,iso}} = \frac{4\pi D_L^2 S_{\text{GRB}}}{1+z}, \quad (2)$$

where  $D_L$  is luminosity distance which relates to cosmological parameters.  $S_{\text{GRB}}$  represents fluence.

## 2.2. Solar flares

Solar flares have been studied for lengthy period from the first observation in 1859 (Carrington 1859). *RHESSI* spacecraft is manipulated successfully over 16 years. More than 120,000 solar flares are observed from 2002 to 2018, which are listed online<sup>3</sup>. Bolometric energy of flare can be calculated by summing energy of each detected photons. In order not to inaccessibly obtain energy spectrum of each flares, we use the total counts to represent total energy of solar flares. The energy is proportional to the total counts, which can be expressed as

$$E_{\text{flare}} \propto C_{\text{total}}. \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/archive/grb\\_table/](https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/archive/grb_table/)

<sup>2</sup><http://www.mpe.mpg.de/~jcg/grbgen.html>

<sup>3</sup>[https://hesperia.gsfc.nasa.gov/hessidata/dbase/hessi\\_flare\\_list.txt](https://hesperia.gsfc.nasa.gov/hessidata/dbase/hessi_flare_list.txt)

Because instrumental sensitivity gets down below  $\sim 5$  keV band, the total counts are taken from 6–12 keV energy range (Christe et al. 2008). The online list includes some flags marking non-solar event (NS) and possible solar flare (PS). After eliminating flares marked as NS or PS, 114,728 solar flares are imported in this work. Their total counts  $C_{\text{total}}$  and duration time  $T_{\text{flares,duration}}$  are directly obtained from flare list.

### 2.3. Superflares of solar type star

In this paper, we also use superflares of solar-type stars. Maehara et al. (2015) selected 23 solar-type stars with 187 white light superflares from 18 quarters of *Kepler* short-cadence data. We obtain the properties of these superflares, including energy of flares  $E_{\text{superflares}}$  and duration  $T_{\text{superflares}}$  (Maehara et al. 2015). To be specific, the duration  $T_{\text{superflares}}$  is derived from  $e$ -folding decay time.

## 3. Methods and results

### 3.1. Linear regression

We use the duration and energy from different datasets to constrain the power-law correlation

$$T = 10^b \times E^k, \quad (4)$$

where energy  $E$  is substituted as  $C_{\text{total}}$  for solar flares, and  $T$  represents duration of different data. We take  $y = \log_{10} T$  and  $x = \log_{10} E$  in log-log fields. Then this correlation can be derived as

$$y = kx + b, \quad (5)$$

where  $k$  and  $b$  are fitted from linear regression in this work.

We use maximum likelihood method to perform linear regression. The general likelihood can be written as (D’Agostini 2005)

$$\mathcal{L} \propto \prod_i \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_v^2 + \sigma_{y_i}^2 + k^2 \sigma_{x_i}^2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{(y_i - kx_i - b)}{2(\sigma_v^2 + \sigma_{y_i}^2 + k^2 \sigma_{x_i}^2)} \right], \quad (6)$$

where  $\sigma_v$  is extra variability.  $\sigma_{x_i}$  and  $\sigma_{y_i}$  are variants taken from observations. We take  $\sigma_{x_i} = 0$  and  $\sigma_{y_i} = 0$  for solar flares and superflares of solar-type stars, due to the errors are not included in database.

### 3.2. Testing significance of regression

In order to test significance of regression,  $t$ -tests and  $F$ -tests methods are imported in this work. In a short words, these methods are used to quantitatively test whether the slope of linear regression can reject null slope hypothesis, and describe compactness between the slope of correlation and data. The  $t_{\text{value}}$  can be written as (Montgomery et al. 2012)

$$t_{\text{value}} = \frac{(k - k_0) \sqrt{(n - 2) \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - kx_i - b)^2}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $k$  and  $b$  are results of regression.  $x_i$  and  $y_i$  are properties from observational data.  $n$  is the number of data points. And  $\bar{x}$  gives the mean value of  $x_i$ . The null hypothesis means  $k_0 = 0$ . If

$$|t_{\text{value}}| > t_{\alpha/2, n-2}, \quad (8)$$

the null hypothesis is rejected at upper percentage point, where  $t_{\alpha/2, n-2}$  represents the rejection regions of  $t$  distribution. Here we take  $\alpha = 5\%$ .

$F$ -test is also imported in this work as replenishment of  $t$ -test. The  $F_{\text{value}}$  can be written as (Montgomery et al. 2012)

$$F_{\text{value}} = \frac{(n - 2) \sum_{i=1}^n (kx_i + b - \bar{y})^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - kx_i - b)^2}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\bar{y}$  gives mean of  $y_i$ . Refer to  $t$ -test, we take the  $F_{\alpha, 1, n-2}$  of  $F$  distribution as rejection regions. If

$$F_{\text{value}} > F_{\alpha, 1, n-2}, \quad (10)$$

the null hypothesis is rejected.  $\alpha = 5\%$  is also applied for  $F$ -test.

### 3.3. Results

Results of regression and statistical variances of different datasets are presented in Table 1. For each kind of data, power-law relation between duration and releasing energy are fitted.

After applying linear regression in log-log fields, we get the relation of GRBs as

$$T_{\text{GRB, duration}} \propto E_{\text{GRB, iso}}^{0.34 \pm 0.032}. \quad (11)$$

Figure 1 gives result of linear regression. The correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.47$ , and  $\sigma_v = 0.66 \pm 0.024$ . The result of  $t$ -test is  $|t_{\text{value}}| \approx 10.32$ , which is bigger than the rejection region at  $t_{2.5\%,308-2} = 1.97$ .  $F$ -test gives  $F_{\text{value}} \approx 106.58$ , which is greater than  $F_{5\%,1,308-2} = 3.87$ . This results strengthen our believe that the duration is correlated with isotropic energy. In Figure 1, four red points are located outside of  $2\sigma_v$  area, which are GRB 111005A, GRB 080517, GRB 101225A and GRB 171205A. They are extraordinary GRBs showing low luminosity or ultra-long duration (Levan et al. 2014; Stanway et al. 2015; Dado & Dar 2017; Michałowski et al. 2018).

It must be noticed that the selection biases may be important, which is out the scope of this work. Kocevski & Petrosian (2013) used simulated GRBs to propose that duration of GRBs may not be dilated by cosmological expansion but decreased by detectors, due to the diminishing ratio of signal-to-noise. At high redshift, only the brightest GRBs can be detected. Some works concluded that duration of GRB is mainly affected by cosmological dilation (e.g. Zhang et al. 2013; Littlejohns & Butler 2014). Recently, Lloyd-Ronning et al. (2018) found an anti-correlation between source frame durations and redshifts of radio-loud GRBs. So in the future, it is required to apply the Efron & Petrosian (1992) method which has been broadly used (e.g. Lloyd & Petrosian 1999; Dainotti et al. 2013, 2015; Yu et al. 2015; Dainotti et al. 2017a; Zhang & Wang 2018) to reveal the nature of  $T_{\text{GRB,duration}} - E_{\text{GRB,iso}}$  correlation.

Linear regression of solar flares gives

$$T_{\text{solar,duration}} \propto C_{\text{total}}^{0.33 \pm 0.001}. \quad (12)$$

This correlation is compatible with the result of solar flares (Veronig et al. 2002). Note that the fitting errors are very tiny. Therefore, 95% confidence regions of fitting uncertainties, and fitting line are overlapped in Figure 2. The correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.72$ , which indicates that the dependency between fitting line and data is moderate.  $t$ -test and  $F$ -test also prove this dependency is obvious, where  $t_{\text{value}} \approx 350.82$  and  $F_{\text{value}} \approx 123076.52$  are much larger than  $t_{2.5\%,114728-2} = 1.96$  and  $F_{5\%,1,114728-2} = 3.84$ .

We use properties of superflares from Maehara et al. (2015). In contrast to their work, we obtain an identical correlation in Figure 3. Note that unlike what we get above for other datasets, the duration here is in unit of minutes. This is completely unrelated to the slope of linear regression. Linear fitting gives

$$T_{\text{superflares}} \propto E_{\text{superflares}}^{0.39 \pm 0.025}. \quad (13)$$

Here, the correlation coefficient is  $r = 0.75$ .  $t_{\text{value}} \approx 15.48$ , and  $F_{\text{value}} \approx 239.52$  are much larger than  $t_{2.5\%,187-2} = 1.97$ , and  $F_{5\%,1,187-2} = 3.89$  respectively. So this linear correlation is strongly subsistent.

#### 4. Correlation between duration and energy

In the above section, we find that the slopes of the correlations for GRBs, solar arcs and superarcs are similar, which indicates the physical mechanism for these phenomena is similar. We try to explain the slope of GRBs using magnetic reconnection theory.

We make the first assumption that GRBs release magnetic energy stored in central engine. This assumption is similar to solar flares, which release magnetic energy stored near sun spots. The relationship between releasing energy and magnetic energy can be written in as

$$E_{GRB} \sim f E_{mag} \propto f B^2 L^3 \sim f B^2 V_{mag}, \quad (14)$$

where  $f$  represents the fraction of energy released by magnetic dissipation.  $L$  corresponds to the typical length of magnetic reconnection scale, and  $L^3$  represents volume  $V_{mag}$ , where magnetic energy is stored.

Moreover, with a view of that the flare energy is mainly released through magnetic reconnection, duration of energy releasing can be comparable with magnetic reconnection time. And this relation can be expressed as

$$T_{\text{duration}} \sim \tau_{\text{rec}} \sim \frac{\tau_A}{M_A} \sim \frac{L}{v_A M_A}, \quad (15)$$

where  $\tau_A = L/v_A$  represents time of plasma traveling with Alfvén speed. Alfvén-Mach number  $M_A$  stands for reconnection rate, which can be treated as a constant. For GRBs, Alfvén speed may close to the speed of light, namely,  $v_A \sim c$  (Jackson 1975; Lazarian & Vishniac 1999). Naturally, the relation between duration and releasing energy for one GRB can be expressed as

$$T_{\text{duration}} \propto E^{\frac{1}{3}}. \quad (16)$$

The correlation is comparable to what we have obtained in section 3.

Magnetic reconnection driving solar flares is widely accepted from theorems and observations (Priest 1982; Tsuneta et al. 1992, etc.). We find the correlation of GRBs as  $T_{\text{GRB,duration}} \propto E_{\text{GRB,iso}}^{0.34 \pm 0.032}$ , and the exponent  $0.34 \pm 0.032$  is also compatible with the exponent  $1/3$  in eq.(16). So, our results hint that magnetic reconnection may also dominate energy releasing of GRBs during prompt emission. To be specific, our findings may support some remarkable works, which set magnetic reconnection as mechanism of powering GRBs emission (Zhang & Yan 2011; Metzger et al. 2011; Zhang & Zhang 2014; Beniamini et al. 2018, etc.). Interestingly, theory (Dai et al. 2006) and observations (Wang & Dai 2013) also support that the magnetic reconnection also account for the X-ray flares of GRBs.

## 5. Conclusions and discussion

In this work, we find the power law correlation between isotropic energy and duration of GRBs for the first time. Linear fitting has been made on these two properties of 386 GRBs, which are observed by *Swift*. We also collect 114,728 solar flares from *RHESSI*, and find that the power law correlation between total counts and duration of flares is comparable with the correlation of GRBs. In order to make comparison, we also apply this relation to superflares of solar-type stars from *Kepler*.

Linear regression in log-log fields of GRBs is showed in Figure 1. We find the correlation of GRBs as  $T_{\text{duration}} \propto E_{\text{iso}}^{0.34 \pm 0.032}$ , which is resemblant with our findings of stellar superflares as  $T_{\text{superflares}} \propto E_{\text{superflares}}^{0.39 \pm 0.025}$ , and solar flares as  $T_{\text{solar,duration}} \propto C_{\text{total}}^{0.33 \pm 0.001}$ . The  $t$ -test and  $F$ -test show the tendency of this correlation is genuinely credible even for different datasets. From another aspect, our results is approximate to the theoretical correlation  $T_{\text{duration}} \propto E^{\frac{1}{3}}$ , which is derived from magnetic reconnection theorems. This comparability firmly support us to believe that magnetic reconnection may dominate the energetic releasing process of GRBs.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the referee for detailed and very constructive suggestions that have allowed us to improve our manuscript. We would like to thank H. Yu, G. Q. Zhang, J. S. Wang and H. C. Chen for suggestions. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant U1831207).

## REFERENCES

- Amati, L., Frontera, F., Tavani, M., et al. 2002, *A&A*, 390, 81
- Beloborodov, A. M., & Mészáros, P. 2017, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 207, 87.
- Beniamini, P., Barniol Duran, R., & Giannios, D. 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 1785
- Carrington, R. C. 1859, *MNRAS*, 20, 13
- Christe, S., Hannah, I. G., Krucker, S., McTiernan, J., & Lin, R. P. 2008, *ApJ*, 677, 1385
- Dado, S., & Dar, A. 2017, arXiv:1712.09319
- Dai, Z. G., Wang, X. Y., Wu, X. F., & Zhang, B. 2006, *Science*, 311, 1127



- Dai, Z., Daigne, F., & Mészáros, P. 2017, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 212, 409.
- D’Agostini, G. 2005, arXiv:physics/0511182
- Daigne, F., Bošnjak, Ž., & Dubus, G. 2011, *A&A*, 526, A110
- Dainotti, M. G., Petrosian, V., Singal, J., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 774, 157.
- Dainotti, M. G., Del Vecchio, R., Shigehiro, N., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 800, 31.
- Dainotti, M. G., Postnikov, S., Hernandez, X., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 825, L20.
- Dainotti, M. G., & Del Vecchio, R. 2017, *New Astronomy Reviews*, 77, 23.
- Dainotti, M. G., Nagataki, S., Maeda, K., et al. 2017a, *A&A*, 600, A98.
- Dainotti, M. G., Hernandez, X., Postnikov, S., et al. 2017b, *ApJ*, 848, 88.
- Dainotti, M. G., & Amati, L. 2018, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 130, 51001.
- Dainotti, M. G., Del Vecchio, R., & Tarnopolski, M. 2018, *Advances in Astronomy*, 2018, 4969503.
- Efron, B., & Petrosian, V. 1992, *ApJ*, 399, 345.
- Jackson, J. D. 1975 *Classical Electrodynamics* (2nd ed.; New York: Wiley)
- Kocevski, D., & Petrosian, V. 2013, *ApJ*, 765, 116.
- Kumar, P., & Zhang, B. 2015, *Phys. Rep.*, 561, 1
- Lazarian, A., & Vishniac, E. T. 1999, *ApJ*, 517, 700
- Levan, A. J., Tanvir, N. R., Starling, R. L. C., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 781, 13
- Liang, E., & Zhang, B. 2005, *ApJ*, 633, 611
- Littlejohns, O. M., & Butler, N. R. 2014, *MNRAS*, 444, 3948.
- Lloyd, N. M., & Petrosian, V. 1999, *ApJ*, 511, 550.
- Lloyd-Ronning, N. M., Gompertz, B., Pe’er, A., et al. 2018, *ArXiv e-prints* , arXiv:1809.04190.
- Lyutikov, M., & Blandford, R. 2003, arXiv:astro-ph/0312347

- Lyutikov, M. 2006, *New Journal of Physics*, 8, 119
- Maehara, H., Shibayama, T., Notsu, S., et al. 2012, *Nature*, 485, 478
- Maehara, H., Shibayama, T., Notsu, Y., et al. 2015, *Earth, Planets, and Space*, 67, 59
- Metzger, B. D., Giannios, D., Thompson, T. A., Bucciantini, N., & Quataert, E. 2011, *MNRAS*, 413, 2031
- Michałowski, M. J., Xu, D., Stevens, J., et al. 2018, *A&A*, 616, A169.
- Montgomery, D. C., Peck, E. A., & Vining, G. G. 2012, Wiley, *Introduction to linear regression analysis* (5th ed.)
- Nagataki, S. 2018, *Reports on Progress in Physics*, 81, 26901.
- Norris, J. P., Marani, G. F., & Bonnell, J. T. 2000, *ApJ*, 534, 248
- Planck Collaboration, Ade, P. A. R., Aghanim, N., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 594, A13
- Priest, E. R. 1982, Dordrecht, Holland ; Boston : D. Reidel Pub. Co. ; Hingham,,
- Rees, M. J., & Meszaros, P. 1994, *ApJ*, 430, L93
- Rees, M. J., & Mészáros, P. 2005, *ApJ*, 628, 847
- Shibayama, T., Maehara, H., Notsu, S., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 209, 5
- Spruit, H. C., Daigne, F., & Drenkhahn, G. 2001, *A&A*, 369, 694
- Stanway, E. R., Levan, A. J., Tanvir, N., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 3911
- Tsuneta, S., Hara, H., Shimizu, T., et al. 1992, *PASJ*, 44, L63
- Veronig, A., Temmer, M., Hanslmeier, A., Otruba, W., & Messerotti, M. 2002, *A&A*, 382, 1070
- Wang, F. Y., & Dai, Z. G. 2013, *Nature Physics*, 9, 465
- Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G., & Liang, E. W. 2015, *New A Rev.*, 67, 1
- Wang, J. S., Wang, F. Y., Cheng, K. S., & Dai, Z. G. 2016, *A&A*, 585, A68
- Willingale, R., & Mészáros, P. 2017, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 207, 63.
- Yu, H., Wang, F. Y., Dai, Z. G. & Cheng, K. S., 2016, *ApJS*, 218, 13

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

Zhang, B., & Zhang, B. 2014, ApJ, 782, 92

Zhang, B., Lü, H.-J., & Liang, E.-W. 2016, Space Sci. Rev., 202, 3

Zhang, F.-W., Fan, Y.-Z., Shao, L., et al. 2013, ApJ, 778, L11.

Zhang, G. Q., & Wang, F. Y. 2018, ApJ, 852, 1

Table 1: Fitting Results.

Dataset	GRBs	Solar flares	Stellar superflares
Satellite	<i>Swift</i>	<i>RHESSI</i>	<i>Kepler</i>
$k$	$0.34 \pm 0.032$	$0.33 \pm 0.00093$	$0.39 \pm 0.025$
$b$	$-16.36 \pm 1.64$	$0.95 \pm 0.0045$	$-12.14 \pm 0.86$
$\sigma_v$	$0.66 \pm 0.024$	$0.24 \pm 0.00051$	$0.25 \pm 0.013$
$r$	0.47	0.72	0.75
$t$	10.32	350.82	15.48
$t_{5\%/2}$	1.97	1.96	1.97
$F$	106.58	123076.52	239.52
$F_{5\%}$	3.87	3.84	3.89

NOTE.

In the table,  $k$  and  $b$  represent slope and intercept of linear regression, respectively.  $\sigma_v$  is extra variability.  $r$  gives correlation coefficient.  $t_{5\%/2}$  and  $F_{5\%}$  are upper limits of  $t$  and  $F$  distribution at 5% possibility. The fitting results of  $t$  and  $F$  are greater than  $t_{5\%/2}$  and  $F_{5\%}$  respectively.




Fig. 1.— Linear fitting of GRBs. Black solid line represents the fitting result in log-log field. Red dotted and dashed lines represent  $1\sigma_v$  and  $2\sigma_v$  regions of extra variabilities, and gray area stands for 95% confidence interval of fitting uncertainties. Four red points located far outside of  $2\sigma_v$  region are GRB 111005A, GRB 080517, GRB 101225A and GRB 171205A.




Fig. 2.— Linear fitting of solar flares. Black solid line represents the result of fitting in log-log field. Red dotted and dashed lines represent  $1\sigma_v$  and  $2\sigma_v$  regions of extra variabilities, and gray area stands for 95% confidence interval of fitting uncertainties. Because error of this fitting result is tiny, black solid line, and gray area are overlapped.




Fig. 3.— Linear fitting of stellar superflares. Black solid line represents the best fitting in log-log field. Red dotted and dashed lines represent  $1\sigma_v$  and  $2\sigma_v$  regions of extra variabilities, and gray area stands for 95% confidence interval of fitting uncertainties.