

The Physics of Supernova Remnant Blast Waves. II. Electron-Ion Equilibration in DEM L71 in the Large Magellanic Cloud

Cara E. Rakowski¹, Parviz Ghavamian¹,
and

John P. Hughes¹

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers The State University of New Jersey, 136 Frelinghuysen Road, Piscataway NJ 08854-8019

ABSTRACT

We present analysis and modeling of X-ray spectra from the blast wave shock of DEM L71 in the Large Magellanic Cloud. This remnant exhibits widespread Balmer-dominated emission characteristic of nonradiative shocks in partially neutral gas. We have used both *Chandra* ACIS-S data and optical Fabry-Perot spectra of the blast wave to measure the electron and proton temperatures, respectively. In principle, when combined, these measurements can determine the degree of electron-ion temperature equilibration ($g_0 \equiv T_e/T_p$) immediately behind the shock front. In our X-ray analysis we fit *Chandra* spectra of three nested regions behind the blast wave under three different scenarios: (1) a planar, initially unequilibrated shock ($g_0 = m_e/m_p$), where the downstream electron and proton temperatures equilibrate through Coulomb collisions, (2) a planar, immediately equilibrated shock ($g_0 = 1$) and (3) a spherical, equilibrated shock under Sedov evolution. Using independent measurements of T_e and T_p we find that the X-ray spectra from the fastest blast wave locations ($V_s \sim 700 - 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) are consistent with little or no equilibration at the shock front and are inconsistent with full equilibration. In contrast, spectra from regions showing slower blast wave speeds ($V_s \sim 400 - 600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) allow full equilibration but exclude zero equilibration. In order to directly constrain the initial equilibration, we incorporated our knowledge of the proton temperatures into our X-ray models to build planar shock models that allowed for a variable g_0 . This model confirmed and strengthened the above results. Specifically, we found that X-ray spectra from an intermediate velocity shock ($V_s \sim 800 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) were consistent with intermediate equilibration, excluding both $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ and $g_0 = 1$ at greater than 1σ . Overall, our results support the picture of decreasing electron-ion equilibration with increasing shock speed found from previous studies of optical spectra in other Balmer-dominated supernova remnants.

Subject headings: ISM: individual (DEM L71, 0505–67.9) – shock waves – supernova remnants – X-rays: ISM

1. Introduction

The outer blast wave of DEM L71 provides a valuable laboratory to address the question of electron-ion equilibration at collisionless shocks. These shocks have been traditionally explained by their Rankine-Hugoniot jump conditions (e.g.,

Spitzer 1978), which quantify the partition of energy into thermal and bulk kinetic forms. However, for collisionless shocks the actual heating is not straightforward because at extremely low densities, the shock front is thinner than the mean free path for collisions. Therefore, the heating of particles at the shock-front must be produced by something else, generally assumed to be plasma waves (for a review see for instance, Draine & McKee

¹E-mail: rakowski@physics.rutgers.edu, parviz@physics.rutgers.edu, jph@physics.rutgers.edu

1993; Laming 2000). Since the heating is not collisional there is no guarantee that it will produce a thermal distribution, and in fact both simulations and in-situ observations of solar-wind shocks suggest that it does not. The plasma heating mechanisms, to both thermal and cosmic-ray energies, are as yet poorly understood. These collisionless shocks are ubiquitous in astrophysical situations, but are only spatially resolved in interplanetary shocks (at lower speeds) and SNRs. The partition of energy into thermal and non-thermal populations at collisionless shocks has broad reaching implications for the dynamics of the ISM, shocks from merging galaxies, and hot gas in clusters of galaxies. Our previous work on E0102.2–7219 studied the partition of energy into thermal electrons versus cosmic rays (Hughes, Rakowski, & Decourchelle 2000). Here we examine the partition of energy between the two main thermal populations, electrons and protons.

In a small sub-sample of supernova remnants (SNRs), the X-ray and radio emission from the blast wave is accompanied by optical ($H\alpha$, Balmer) line emission. The line profiles of these Balmer-dominated spectra provide a direct measurement of the proton temperature at the shock front, thus also placing limits on the shock velocity. The optical spectra of Balmer-dominated SNRs are produced by collisional excitation when partially neutral interstellar hydrogen is overrun by the blast wave (Chevalier & Raymond 1978). Like other non-radiative shocks, post-shock cooling losses are negligible for Balmer-dominated remnants. Each Balmer emission line consists of a narrow and a broad velocity component (Chevalier, Kirshner & Raymond 1980). The narrow component is produced when cold H I, overrun by the shock, is collisionally excited by electrons and protons before being ionized. The cold neutral hydrogen can also charge exchange with fast post-shock protons, producing fast neutrals. These can then be collisionally excited, producing the broad velocity component (Chevalier et al. 1980). The Balmer emission arises in a thin ($\lesssim 10^{15}$ cm) ionization zone; therefore, the width of a broad Balmer line yields the proton temperature immediately behind the shock and hence also limits the range of possible shock velocities (Chevalier et al. 1980, Smith et al. 1991). Combining this information with the broad-to-narrow flux ratio

allows us to estimate the degree of electron-ion temperature equilibration, $g_0 \equiv (T_e/T_p)_0$, due to plasma processes at the shock front (Tycho, SN 1006 & RCW 86; Ghavamian et al. 2001).

A more straightforward method of estimating the initial temperature equilibration in a collisionless shock is to combine the proton temperature estimated from the FWHM of the broad Balmer line with the electron temperature measured from X-ray spectra. For this purpose, the Large Magellanic Cloud remnant DEM L71 is particularly appropriate because it is completely encircled by Balmer-dominated filaments (Tuohy et al. 1982). We have utilized Fabry-Perot imaging spectroscopy to measure the width of the $H\alpha$ broad component along most of the rim of DEM L71 (Ghavamian et al. 2003; hereafter GRHW03). Here we report results comparing T_e from our *Chandra* analysis with T_p from our Fabry-Perot analysis to infer the value of g_0 for multiple apertures around the blast wave of DEM L71.

Davies, Elliot, & Meaburn (1976) first identified DEM L71 as a SNR candidate in an optical survey of the Large Magellanic Cloud (LMC) because of its shell-like morphology that extended $83''$ by $60''$ in diameter. The detection of X-ray emission from DEM L71 in the *Einstein* survey of the LMC by Long, Helfand and Grabelsky (1981), confirmed its nature as a SNR. DEM L71 is extremely faint in the radio band, where it has only been detected at 843 GHz with a flux of 10 mJy by Mills et al. (1984). In optical follow-up, Tuohy et al. (1982) detected filamentary $H\alpha$ emission but only a few faint knots of [O III] and [S II], and thus categorized it as a Balmer-dominated SNR. Smith et al. (1991) included DEM L71 in their study of 6 Balmer-dominated remnants. Using longslit spectroscopy of the brightest portions of the shock in DEM L71 they estimated shock velocities of 300 – 800 km s $^{-1}$ from the $H\alpha$ broad component widths. In a recent *ASCA* study of LMC SNRs, Hughes, Hayashi & Koyama (1998) fit the X-ray spectrum of DEM L71 and showed that the data were well described by a non-equilibrium ionization (NEI) Sedov model, particularly for the case of only minimal initial equilibration between electrons and ions.

Further investigations into the nature of DEM L71 utilizing the *Chandra* observation are given in two

companion papers. GRHW03 discusses the details of the Fabry-Perot analysis of the blast wave, and implications for the evolutionary state of the remnant. In Hughes et al. (2003) we investigated general properties of the remnant and the composition of the ejecta. DEM L71 exhibits a prominent double shock morphology with a clear spatial separation between the reverse shock (ejecta) and blast wave (ISM). The mass ($\sim 1.5M_{\odot}$) and composition of the ejecta (Fe and Si-rich), strengthen the case for a Type Ia SN origin for DEM L71.

2. Observations and Data Reduction

2.1. RFP optical observations

Optical spectra of DEM L71 were obtained using the Rutgers Fabry-Perot (RFP) imaging spectrometer as described in GRHW03. For completeness we summarize the relevant analysis here. The 14 RFP scans, centered on the wavelength of $H\alpha$ at the systemic velocity of the LMC, provide essentially monochromatic images of the SNR. $H\alpha$ line emission spectra can then be extracted from any position on the remnant. We defined 16 apertures around the blast wave, which contained approximately equal numbers of counts and avoided any stars or radiative filaments. Fits of the $H\alpha$ line profile determined the broad component widths and broad-to-narrow flux ratios for each aperture. For the purpose of comparison to the X-ray results, larger regions were required to obtain reasonable statistics in the *Chandra* X-ray spectra. Adjacent regions with consistent broad component widths and broad-to-narrow ratios were combined to provide five final optical apertures (Figure 1, Table 1). The $H\alpha$ line profiles from these apertures were then refitted. The proton temperature, T_p , and shock velocity, V_s , were calculated from the measured broad component width for the full range of g_0 (GRHW03). The values computed for the extrema of $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ and $g_0=1$ are reprinted here in Table 2.

2.2. *Chandra* X-ray observations

We observed DEM L71 using the back-side-illuminated chip (S3) of the Advanced CCD Imaging Spectrometer (ACIS-S) in full-frame timed exposure mode starting on 2000 January 04 for 45.4 ks (OBSID 775). At this time, the ACIS focal plane temperature was -110° C. The starting

point of the reduction was the events lists from the revision 2 level of the standard processing. The CCD events were corrected for charge transfer inefficiency (CTI) using software developed at Penn State University (Townsend et al. 2000). Once these corrections are applied the entire chip can be modeled with a single response function. Subsequently, the event file was screened for grade (retaining only values 0, 2-4, or 6), bad pixels, high background times and times with incorrect aspect. The final filtered events file corresponds to a livetime-corrected exposure of 34.5 ks.

Using the optical image of DEM L71 as a template, we verified that the *Chandra* X-ray positions are accurate to $\sim 0.5''$. This method was used because none of the 16 X-ray point sources detected on the S3 chip were coincident with an optical counterpart from the USNO-A2.0 star catalog.

The spectrum of the blast wave is dominated by emission below 0.8 keV. Therefore, this soft band was used to define the blast wave regions matched to each optical aperture. We adaptively smoothed the soft band image using IMSMOOTH from the *Chandra Interactive Analysis of Observations* (CIAO) package (with a minimum signal-to-noise ratio of 4), then chose a contour level of 0.8 counts per pixel to define the edge of the blast wave. Three polygonal regions, each four pixels wide ($\sim 2''$), were defined inward of the outer contour towards the local center of curvature (Figure 2). Blast wave spectra were extracted from the filtered events file using these nested regions. The three succeeding regions were constructed in order to determine not only the blast wave electron temperature but also its downstream evolution. The largest temperature gradient is expected close to the current shock front. This and the fact that shortly behind our defined regions other shock fronts and the interior (reverse shock) emission become evident, limited the distance over which we could extract blast wave spectra. In turn, this limited the number of nested regions to three because we required the extraction regions to be wider than the *Chandra* point-spread-function as well as wide enough to obtain sufficient statistics. Note that the length of each X-ray extraction region was defined to match the full extent of the corresponding optical apertures.

Separate ancillary response files (ARFs) for each spectral extraction region around the blast

wave were generated using standard CIAO procedures. Although these were retained in the final fits, we note here that no significant differences between the ARFs were found. For all spectra, background was taken from a large annulus outside the remnant covering radii $1'-2'$. We did not attempt to account for the recently discovered degradation in the low energy quantum efficiency of the CCD.² Instead we compensate for this effect by allowing the column density in our fits to be a free parameter.

3. X-ray modeling

3.1. Theory

To measure the electron temperature at the blast wave, one has to make some assumptions about the evolution of both the temperature and ionization state downstream. These assumptions may bias the measured electron temperature and hence the final derived value g_0 . To address this concern we chose to investigate three very different nonequilibrium ionization (NEI) evolutionary models for the blast wave: (1) a fully equilibrated ($g_0 = 1$), constant velocity, planar shock model, (2) an initially unequilibrated ($g_0 = m_e/m_p$) planar shock model with post shock equilibration on Coulomb collisional timescales (Spitzer 1978), and (3) a fully equilibrated ($g_0 = 1$) Sedov model. In all three models there are only two important dynamical parameters, the current average temperature at the shock front, $T_{ave,s}$, and the final ionization timescale, $n_e t$ of the innermost shock region. All other temperatures and timescales are constrained to follow the appropriate evolution. The temperatures within a parcel of gas that may evolve as a function of time are the electron temperature T_e , the proton temperature T_p , and their number-density-weighted average temperature, T_{ave} . Note that throughout this paper, "average temperature" is used to denote the number-density-weighted average over the particles, and not a spatial or temporal average. All ions were considered to have the same temperature as the protons for the sake of the average temperature, a small effect for the metal-poor LMC interstellar medium.

²see the calibration area of the *Chandra* website for the announcement and details: http://cxc.harvard.edu/cal/Acis/Cal_prods/qeDeg/index.html

Planar shocks are a reasonable approximation for (1) straight or small shock segments where the curvature is unimportant for the density profile, and (2) time periods that are short enough that the deceleration of the blast wave due to the accumulation of swept up material is negligible. The planar model has a constant velocity and hence a constant average temperature behind the shock. Initially, we chose to model the two extreme cases for the initial degree of electron ion equilibration, $g_0 = 1$ and $g_0 = m_e/m_p$. For $g_0 = 1$, all temperatures (T_e , $T_{ave,s}$, and T_p) are equal and constant throughout the shock and only the ionization timescale varies behind the shock. For $g_0 = m_e/m_p$, T_e and T_p slowly equilibrate to $T_{ave,s}$ via Coulomb collisions (Spitzer 1978). We use the expressions for the time variation of temperature from Itoh (1978) and Cox & Anderson (1982) to describe the variation of T_e as a function of $n_e t$ behind the shock. Note that while this formulation was derived for Sedov evolution, it is actually equally appropriate for planar shocks. For examples of the evolution of planar shocks see section 5.

Considering the advanced age of DEM L71 (~ 4400 years, GRHW03) it was important to include a Sedov solution model. Even under full temperature equilibration, the Sedov solution implies a spatially varying electron temperature behind the shock, which could mimic the temperature variation from Coulomb equilibration in a $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ planar model. The Sedov solution used here assumes a spherical geometry and uniform preshock medium. For simplicity, we only modeled the case of full electron-ion equilibration, i.e., $T_e = T_{ave} = T_p$. There are two mechanisms that determine the evolution of T_{ave} and $n_e t$. First, the shock decelerates as it sweeps up interstellar gas, causing $T_{ave,s}$ to decrease with time. Second, the volume adiabatically expands as the shocked material moves out at $(3/4)V_s$, i.e., the interior density and temperature decrease. Parcels of gas that are shocked at different radii, r_i , and times t_i started off with different $T_{ave,s}$ and V_s . Hence each parcel will follow a unique temperature and density evolution.

The beauty of the Sedov solution lies in its self-similarity. All shock quantities can be related by dimensional analysis, and the interior profiles can be expressed in terms of dimensionless re-

duced variables. Hence it is possible to construct a generic set of reduced temperature and density histories as a function of current fractional radius (see Figures 3 and 4). We start with the Sedov solutions for the shock quantities and the interior profiles, herein denoted as the shock and interior solutions respectively (see Sedov 1959). The shock solutions can be written to relate the current radius (R_s), temperature ($T_{ave,s}$), velocity (V_s), and the swept up mass (M_{SU}) to the explosion energy, the hydrogen number density of the ambient medium (n_0), and the time since the explosion (t). Following Cox & Franco (1981), we express the interior solutions in terms of the dimensionless quantity β which ranges from 0.8 to 1 from the center to the edge of the blast wave and finely samples the outermost radii.³ This variable is also convenient because it only depends on nondimensional combinations of the parameters in the problem. These interior solutions describe the profiles of reduced variables, the ratios of physical quantities relative to the immediate post-shock values: radius (r), density (x), pressure (y), initial radius (r_i), and the mass enclosed (μ) within that β . The reduced temperature is just the ratio of the reduced pressure to the reduced density. For clarity, we note that for a given parcel of gas there are three times of importance in the formulation of the temperature and density histories: the time at which the parcel was shocked, t_i ; the time at which the evolution is being evaluated, t ; and the current epoch, t_c .

To derive the density and temperature histories of a parcel of gas as a function of t , we need to connect the shock and interior solutions. We make use of the fact that the mass enclosed behind the radius of a given parcel of gas is constant, i.e., that portions of the post-shock material never overtake the gas ahead of them. This allows us to match the equations for the swept up mass at the time the parcel was shocked, $M_{SU}(t_i)/M_{SU}(t)$ with those for the fraction of the total swept-up mass that is enclosed within a given interior radius, $\mu(\beta) = M_{enclosed}/M_{SU}$ to get $\beta(t_i/t)$. This β history defines where any given parcel was within the remnant as a function of time, as well as its

³There is a minor typographical error in the Cox & Franco (1981) definition of β : the coefficient three tenths should be inverted to ten thirds, in order to match the solutions given by Sedov (1959).

density and temperature relative to the shock values. We can then combine this with the shock solutions which relate the shock quantities at t to the current shock quantities. Thus we obtain final solutions for the ratio of the evolving T_{ave} and $n_e t$ of each parcel to the current shock values in terms of the ratio of t to t_c . These generic temperature and ionization timescale histories can be multiplied by any chosen time, density and temperature to give specific solutions.

There are a number of important features of the Sedov solution that can be seen in the generic temperature and ionization timescale histories shown in figures 3 and 4. The three curves shown correspond to the current fractional radii of the three X-ray spectral extraction regions behind the shock in DEM L71. They represent the evolution of parcels of gas whose final radii are at the innermost edges of these three regions. Note the steep decrease in temperature both in time and current radius. Material that now lies at $0.85r_s$ was shocked at about one-fifth the lifetime of the remnant when the shock was almost six times as hot. Even the current temperatures across the three spatial zones vary by more than a factor of two. This leads to a spatial gradient in the electron temperature for the Sedov model that is far larger than the variation in temperature across regions for the minimally equilibrated ($g_0 = m_e/m_p$) planar shock model, which is at most 40% (see Table 5).

The ionization timescale of the Sedov model also has a very different evolution than in the planar case. Adiabatic expansion of the post shock gas causes both a decrease in temperature as well as a decrease in the density, reducing the rate of increase of $n_e t$. The global maximum value of $n_e t$ is reached for parcels that are now at $\sim 0.9R_s$. However, the temperature of the parcel which is currently at $0.85r_s$ was more than three times hotter than the current $T_{ave,s}$ for almost half of its evolution. Since the ionization rates depend on the temperature, the final $n_e t$ by itself is not a very accurate measurement of the ionization state profile behind the shock. This complicates a direct comparison of the $n_e t$ values between the planar and Sedov models.

3.2. NEI implementation

Other authors have implemented non-equilibrium ionization in Sedov and planar geometries (Shull 1982; Hamilton et al. 1983; Kaastra & Jansen 1993; Hughes et al. 1998; Borkowski, Lyerly & Reynolds 2001) but for the sake of flexibility and the specific needs of the selected regions in DEM L71, we chose to modify our own NEI code (Hughes & Singh 1994). In all cases we construct one evolving shock model that is then used to fit the three nested regions simultaneously.

For both the $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ and $g_0 = 1$ planar models, we divided the post-shock region into 200 logarithmically spaced regions in n_{et} . Since the average shock temperature is constant in the planar model, all parcels of gas will undergo the same electron temperature and ionization state history. At a constant shock velocity, the n_{et} steps represent both the time since the material was shocked and the distance behind the shock. This allows us to calculate the emission at each timestep and sum them to find the total emission from the shock. For each step we calculated the ionization state and emission using the electron temperature at that time determined by the solution of Itoh (1978) and advanced the ionization state of the material during that n_{et} interval as in Hughes & Singh (1994). The final ionization state from each step was then used as the initial ionization state for the following interval. The emissions were summed, weighting by Δn_{et} , which for a planar shock is also the width perpendicular to the shock. For the purpose of fitting the nested DEM L71 blast wave spectra, each model was cut into 3 sections linearly spaced in n_{et} . We assumed that the current blast wave lies at the outer edge of the outermost aperture. However, the fitted temperatures were not particularly sensitive to the exact choice of blast wave location. Finally, we included a simple spherical projection of the three modeled spatial regions to account for the contribution of the outer emission zones to the inner spectral regions. The projection in this case was done only for the three large data extraction regions and not the individual n_{et} intervals, so that the different values of R_s for each aperture could be accounted for during the fits.

For the Sedov NEI model, first the generic histories were scaled to a given current shock temperature and product of the ambient density with the

remnant age. The ionization state of the material at every radius (parcel) was calculated separately using its T_e and n_{et} history, then the emission was computed for the current temperature of that parcel. A grid of 100 points in β (over its full allowed range of 0.8 to 1.0) was used for both the time evolution histories and the emission as a function of radius. A single set of nominal fractional radii (0.85, 0.89, 0.95, calculated for an 8.8 pc current radius) was used for all regions in DEM L71, despite their slightly different radii (see GRHW03 figures 7 and 8), so that a common grid of models could be applied to all spectra. At these nominal fractional radii spherical projection of every individual segment in β was used to weigh the contribution of any given parcel to each of the nested regions behind the shock. Note that the Sedov model is inherently spherical, in contrast to the case described in the preceding paragraph where we were simply adding a spherical projection to an otherwise planar model.

4. X-ray spectral fits

In the preceding section, we introduced the dynamical variables, $T_{ave,s}$ and n_{et} that we wish to measure with our X-ray fits. However, the spectra also depend on the composition of the gas and the absorbing column density to the SNR. Ideally, one would like to allow the abundance and column density parameters to be free for each region to allow for variations in the composition of the interstellar medium around the rim of the remnant, and any local absorption. Furthermore, assuming a particular abundance set may bias the temperature measurements, because they are not independent variables. For example, choosing lower abundances will often bias the fits towards higher temperatures. Unfortunately our preliminary fits revealed that the current statistics are insufficient to constrain these additional parameters.

For both planar and Sedov fits the abundances of O, Ne and Fe were at first allowed to be free, with all other species fixed at the LMC abundances of Hughes et al. (1998). The absorbing column density, N_H , was also free in these preliminary fits. The abundances included in our column density parameter were kept at solar values. Since the total column densities we found were similar to the minimum absorbing gas col-

umn in the Galaxy along the line of sight to the LMC ($5 - 6 \times 10^{20}$ atoms cm^{-2} , Heiles & Cleary 1979), no additional LMC component was deemed necessary. From these preliminary fits we determined the average abundances and column density across all regions and all models. Most regions did not have high enough statistics to constrain the individual abundances. Furthermore, the F-test showed that freeing the abundance and N_{H} parameters did not significantly improve the fit over using the average values. Hence a common set of abundances for all models and regions was used in order to allow a more straightforward comparison both between different regions and for a single region under different models. In the final fits we fixed the abundances and column density to three sets: the average values and the average values plus or minus their root mean square (RMS) deviations. The final values are listed in Table 3. They are all reasonable for the interstellar medium in the LMC compared to the abundances of Hughes et al. (1998). We fitted the spectra using the RMS deviations in the column density and abundances in order to incorporate the uncertainty in the temperature and timescale due to (1) the uncertainty in our estimate of the average abundances and column and (2) possible variations in abundances and column density around the outer rim of the remnant. This estimate of the errors is quite conservative since the RMS errors are much larger than the errors in any given preliminary fit and include any variations due to the choice of model.

The uncertainty in the abundance and column density parameters prevented us from distinguishing the three shock models on the basis of their χ^2 values. Not only was every model the “best” choice for some region based on χ^2 , but the variation in χ^2 across models was always smaller than across the RMS deviations in abundance and column density (not shown).

The nested spectra for each of the five apertures are shown in Figure 5, plotted against the $g_0 = m_e/m_p$, planar model for comparison. The best-fit parameters of the final fits for all regions and all shock models are given in Table 4. The average shock temperatures predicted by the three shock models are very different because the X-ray emission depends primarily on the current electron temperature. Roughly speaking then, the values for $T_{ave,s}$ are just those that give the correct T_e for

the “dominant” region in any given aperture under the assumptions of that shock model. The implied average shock temperatures are useful, however, for comparison with the optically determined proton temperatures.

Under the assumption of full equilibration, $g_0 = 1$, the electron, proton and average temperatures are all equal at the shock. Hence if either the planar or the Sedov $g_0 = 1$ models are correct the optically measured T_p should match the X-ray fitted $T_{ave,s}$. This is the case only for region X5, the blast wave region with the slowest shock speed. For all other regions T_p is much greater than the $T_{ave,s}$ values for full equilibration, implying that the electron temperature at the shock is lower than the proton temperature. The $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ planar fits confirm this result. Under the $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ assumption, $T_p \simeq (n_e + n_p)T_{ave}/n_p$ or $T_p \simeq (2.3/1.1)T_{ave}$. For all regions except X5, the X-ray implied T_p is consistent with the H α proton temperature within the 1σ errors. This agreement occurs on the low side of our allowed $T_{ave,s}$ range hinting that partial equilibration may be preferred.

All three NEI models indicate the same general result: by comparing the average shock temperatures to the H α proton temperatures, we can already exclude the case of full electron-ion equilibration in four out of five apertures, independent of the global model. In contrast, region X5, which has the slowest shock speed, is consistent with $g_0 = 1$ but not with $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ under the assumption of a constant velocity shock, and is marginally consistent with $g_0 = 1$ under the Sedov model.

In addition to a comparison with the optically measured proton temperature, the parameters of the X-ray fit also imply a certain evolution of the electron temperature and ionization state. Table 5 lists the implied values of T_e and $n_e t$ for each of the nested regions behind the shock in the three NEI models. The different model assumptions lead to contrasting spatial gradients in the electron temperatures. The ionization timescale values also differ strongly from model to model, but this can be understood in terms of their underlying assumptions. For the $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ constant velocity model the fitted $n_e t$ values are larger by factors of 10% to 100% than those for the $g_0 = 1$ constant velocity model. Early on the electron tempera-

tures were lower and hence ionization progressed less rapidly. The fits therefore require a larger $n_e t$ value to reach the same ionization state. For the fully equilibrated Sedov model, the final ionization timescales are much lower than the $g_0 = 1$ planar case, because earlier the material was much hotter than now, so the ionization occurred more rapidly.

Deeper observations, with sufficient statistics to constrain the electron temperature and ionization state in each of the nested regions separately, would clearly be able to discriminate between the three models given here, based on their strong differences in the implied evolutions.

5. Estimates of the Initial Electron-Ion Temperature Equilibration

In the previous section we showed that our independent measurements of the electron and proton temperatures led to a consistent picture of the initial temperature equilibration at each blast wave region regardless of which NEI model was used. Here we will assume a constant velocity shock and present an estimate of g_0 from the independent T_e and T_p measurements, and a direct determination of g_0 using the proton temperature to constrain our X-ray models.

In figure 6 we plot the electron temperature as a function of ionization timescale for three types of constant velocity shock models, using region X1 for illustration. The diamonds denote the electron temperatures and ionization timescales implied by the fitted values of $T_{ave,s}$ and $n_e t$ for the fully equilibrated X-ray model, while the crosses are those for the $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ model. The curves plot the Coulomb evolution of the electron temperature given the best-fit value of the proton temperature, and the full range of possible g_0 values. All curves eventually equilibrate (flatten out) to the average temperature. The average temperature is not the same for all g_0 values, because the initial proton temperature is kept constant: $T_{ave,s}$ will be lower if the electrons are not fully heated initially. Hence, the top curve represents full initial temperature equilibration, where T_e , T_p , and T_{ave} are equal and remain constant, while the bottom curve represents the minimal initial heating case, $g_0 = m_e/m_p$.

From Figure 6 it is evident that the electron and proton temperatures are indeed consistent under

a planar model with some degree of initial electron heating followed by Coulomb equilibration. The actual estimate of g_0 will depend on which X-ray model is used to derive the electron temperature to compare to the proton temperature, as well as which region behind the shock is chosen. However, the relative electron temperatures and the ionization timescale differences across the three regions are simply fixed by the model assumptions. For a first estimate of g_0 , we chose to use the $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ planar model to constrain T_e at the outermost region (i.e., shortest ionization timescale, $n_e t$). We compared this to the electron temperature at that timescale implied by the proton temperature as a function of g_0 . These estimates are listed in Table 6. The errors include those due to T_p , T_e , and abundances summed in quadrature, which were all of approximately equal importance. As seen before from the comparison between $T_{ave,s}$ and T_p , only X5, the aperture with the slowest shock speed, is consistent with $g_0 = 1$. All others are consistent with $g_0 = m_e/m_p$. The large errors in both T_p and T_e when added in quadrature lead to large errors in g_0 .

Given that our independent measurements have confirmed that the blast wave temperatures are consistent with a planar shock with some degree of initial electron-ion equilibration, it is now possible to constrain g_0 by incorporating our knowledge of the proton temperature into the X-ray model fits. We expect this to greatly reduce the errors in our determination of g_0 for two reasons. Firstly, T_e , T_p , $n_e t$ and the abundances are all correlated variables and hence summing their errors in quadrature over-predicts the actual error. Secondly, our three nested regions give us some constraint not only on the average electron temperature but also its spatial gradient. Allowing g_0 to vary gives us access to different temperature evolutions, beyond the three extreme cases tested before.

We adapted the planar model to consider a single T_p and allow for different values of g_0 from m_e/m_p to 1. For each aperture we built a grid of models for the best-fit T_p as well as its 1σ error limits. The only free parameters are then g_0 and $n_e t$. The average shock temperature and velocity are dependent on T_p and g_0 (see the above discussion of Figure 6). For any given g_0 , the electron temperature varies with distance behind the shock as the downstream gas undergoes Coulomb colli-

sions. For consistency, the abundances and column density values were fixed to the same values used in the previous fits.

The fits to the variable g_0 model are as good as the previous three. The resultant g_0 values (listed in Table 7) are consistent with the previous cruder estimates but with tighter constraints. In many regions $n_e t$ and T_p work together to give very similar g_0 values within the 1σ range on T_p . One aperture, X4, is found to be of intermediate equilibration, excluding both $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ and $g_0 = 1$ (at the 1σ level).

What do these g_0 values imply for the relationship between velocity and initial equilibration in collisionless shocks? In Figure 7 we compare our DEM L71 results on g_0 as a function of V_s with previous work on other remnants using optical observations of the H α line alone (Ghavamian et al. 2001). *The results are consistent and indicate a decreasing level of equilibration with increasing shock speed.* The method presented in the current paper is considerably different than the previous work modeling the H α broad-to-narrow ratios. H α emission is only produced extremely close to the shock front, so the g_0 values modeled by this method truly reflect the initial equilibration, modulo assumptions about the preshock ionization fraction. In contrast the X-ray emitting region is extended. We measure the electron temperature some distance downstream of the shock and then infer the initial equilibration, assuming that only Coulomb collisions have equilibrated the temperatures thereafter. That these two different methods lead to consistent g_0 values as a function of shock velocity validates both methods. Furthermore it suggests that there are no significant additional heating mechanisms beyond Coulomb collisions that operate downstream of the immediate shock zone. The real test, of course, will come when both methods can be applied to the same shock front. Unfortunately this was not possible here, because the broad-to-narrow ratios were anomalously low, most likely due to precursor contamination of the narrow component of the H α emission (see GRHW03 for more details).

6. Summary & Concluding Remarks

We have compared the post-shock electron and proton temperatures in DEM L71 to deter-

mine the initial electron-ion equilibration, $g_0 \equiv (T_e/T_p)_0$, over a range of shock speeds. First, we conducted independent measurements of T_e from spatially resolved *Chandra* ACIS-S X-ray spectra of the outer rim, using three different nonequilibrium ionization models for the post-shock temperature evolution. The first two models assumed a constant velocity shock, one with full initial equilibration, $g_0 = 1$, the other with only minimal initial equilibration, $g_0 = m_e/m_p$, followed by post-shock Coulomb collisional equilibration. The third model was a fully equilibrated ($g_0 = 1$) NEI Sedov solution. In all cases the ionization state was allowed to progress downstream. We compared the inferred average shock temperatures with the proton temperatures from the H α line profiles reported in GRHW03. The slowest shock was consistent with full equilibration in both the constant velocity and Sedov models, but not with minimal heating. In contrast all the faster shocks were consistent with $g_0 = m_e/m_p$ but not $g_0 = 1$.

Our independent measurements of T_e and T_p showed that all regions were consistent with a planar shock model, where the electron and proton temperatures started at some initial degree of equilibration, g_0 , and then slowly equilibrated downstream due to Coulomb collisions. Given this agreement, we constructed a planar X-ray model which incorporated the measured value of T_p and allowed for a variable g_0 . With the additional constraints from the proton temperature we found one region, X4, with intermediate shock velocity, for which both full and minimal equilibration could be ruled out, albeit only at 1σ . Our results support the hypothesis from Ghavamian et al. (2001), that there is an anti-correlation between shock speed and initial equilibration.

The method presented here, of comparing the optically determined T_p to the X-ray measured T_e , is a powerful new technique for constraining the initial temperature equilibration of SNR shock fronts. Its strength lies in the fact that neither the proton nor the electron temperature are strongly model dependent, as this work shows. On the other hand, DEM L71 was a particularly good remnant for this study. We do not expect cosmic-ray emission to contaminate our blast wave spectra because DEM L71 has the lowest radio flux of any of the 25 LMC SNRs in Mathewson et al. (1983) and there is no evidence in the X-

rays for a high energy continuum from synchrotron emission (Hughes et al. 2003). Additionally, the clear separation between the ejecta and the blast wave allowed us to obtain blast wave spectra that are uncontaminated by SN ejecta. Other Balmer-dominated SNRs, such as Tycho or SN1006, may suffer more from an intermingling of ejecta into the blast wave zone, and complications to the fit from a cosmic ray synchrotron component.

All the shocks we studied in DEM L71 are in the interesting velocity range where intermediate initial equilibrations appear to occur. However, due to the large errors on our current measurements of g_0 , only one region was shown to be of intermediate equilibration, although two other regions were best fit by intermediate values of g_0 . In the current fits these errors were dominated by the fitted error on the electron temperature, by the root-mean-square error on the abundances and column density, and to a lesser extent by the error in the proton temperature. We have been awarded a re-observation of DEM L71 with *Chandra* to quadruple the total exposure time. With this observation we will constrain the abundances of all elements with prominent lines separately for each aperture and obtain tighter limits on the electron temperature. The increased statistics will also allow us to constrain the temperatures and timescales of each nested region separately. Hence we will be able to directly determine the temperature variation downstream of the shock, and verify whether it follows the evolution given by our shock models. Additional optical spectroscopy of the non-radiative shock regions identified with the Fabry-Perot would be useful to reduce the uncertainties in the proton temperatures, and better sample the broad $H\alpha$ component.

We are grateful for the use of Leisa Townsley's CTI-correction algorithm and associated response matrices. We are pleased to acknowledge useful discussions with A. Sluis and T. B. Williams. Partial support was provided by NASA/Chandra grants GO0-1035X, G01-2052X, and G02-3068X; CER was supported by a NASA Graduate Student Researchers Program Fellowship.

REFERENCES

- Borkowski, K. J., Lyerly, W. J., & Reynolds, S. P. 2001, *ApJ*548, 820
- Chevalier, R. A., & Raymond, J. C. 1978, *ApJ*, 225, L27
- Chevalier, R. A., Kirshner, R. P. & Raymond, J. C. 1980, *ApJ*, 235, 186
- Cox, D. P., & Anderson, P. R. 1982 *ApJ*, 253, 268
- Cox, D. P., & Franco, J. 1981, *ApJ*, 251, 687
- Davies, R. D., Elliott, K. H. & Meaburn, J. 1976 *MmRAS*, 81, 89
- Draine, B. T., & McKee, C. F. 1993 *ARA&A*, 31, 373
- Ghavamian, P., Raymond, J., Smith, R. C., & Hartigan, P. 2001, *ApJ*, 547, 995
- Ghavamian, P., Rakowski, C. E., Hughes, J. P. & Williams, T. B. 2003, *ApJ*, submitted, GRHW03
- Hamilton, A. J. S., Sarazin, C. L., & Chevalier, R. A. 1983, *ApJS*, 51, 115
- Heiles, C., & Cleary, M. N. 1979, *Australian J. Phys. Astrophys. Suppl.*, 47, 1
- Hughes, J. P., Ghavamian, P., Rakowski, C. E., & Slane, P.O. 2003, *ApJ*, 582, 95
- Hughes, J. P., Hayashi, I., & Koyama, K. 1998, *ApJ*, 505, 732
- Hughes, J. P., Rakowski, C. E., & Decourchelle, A. 2000, *ApJ*, 543, 61
- Hughes, J. P., & Singh, K. P. 1994, *ApJ*, 422, 126
- Itoh, H. 1978, *PASJ*, 30, 489
- Kaastra, J. S., & Jansen, F. A. 1993, *A&AS*, 97, 873
- Laming, J. M. 2000, *ApJS*, 127, 409
- Long, K. S., Helfand, D. J., & Grabelsky, D. A. 1981, *ApJ*, 248, 925
- Mathewson, D. S., Ford, V. L., Dopita, M. A., Tuohy, I. R., Long, K. S., & Helfand, D. J. 1983, *ApJS*, 51, 345
- Mills, B. Y., Turtle, A. J., Little, A. G., & Durdin, J. M. 1984, *Australian J. Phys.*, 37, 321
- Sedov, L. I. 1959, *Similarity and Dimensional Methods in Mechanics* (New York, Academic Press)
- Shull, J. M 1982 *ApJ*, 262, 308
- Smith, R. C., Kirshner, R. P., Blair, W. P., & Winkler, P. F. 1991, *ApJ*, 375, 652
- Spitzer, L. 1978, *Physical Processes in the Interstellar Medium* (New York: Wiley-Interscience)
- Tuohy, I. R., Dopita, M. A., Mathewson, D. S., Long, K. S., & Helfand, D. J. 1982, *ApJ*, 261, 473
- Townsley, L. K., Broos, P. S., Garmire, G. P. & Nousek, J. A. 2000, *ApJ*, 534, 139

Fig. 1.— $H\alpha$ image of DEM L71. Rutgers Fabry-Perot (RFP) image of supernova remnant (SNR) DEM L71 at the wavelength of the narrow $H\alpha$ line. Blast wave regions from which we extracted spectra are as marked.

Fig. 2.— *Chandra* soft X-ray image of DEM L71 (0.2–0.75 keV). X-ray spectra were extracted from three consecutive regions behind the shock at each aperture.

Fig. 3.— Sedov temperature evolution. The Sedov solution for the ratio, $T_{ave}/T_{ave,s}$, of the average temperature of a parcel of gas to the current average shock temperature as a function of the ratio, t/t_c , of the evolving time to the current time. The evolution is plotted for the innermost parcel of material in each of the three regions behind the shock, labeled by their current fractional radii. Note that for the $g_0 = 1$ case $T_e = T_{ave}$.

Fig. 4.— Sedov ionization timescale evolution. The Sedov solution for the ratio of the evolving ionization timescale, $n_e t$, to the product of the ambient electron density with the current age of the remnant. This is plotted as a function of t/t_c for the innermost parcel of material in each of the three regions behind the shock, labeled by their current fractional radii.

Fig. 5.— X-ray spectra of the blast wave. For each aperture we plot the *Chandra* X-ray spectra from three consecutive regions behind the shock, outermost to innermost, bottom to top. The model shown is a non-equilibrium ionization (NEI) planar shock with minimal initial temperature equilibration, $g_0 = m_e/m_p$.

Fig. 6.— Temperature evolution behind a planar shock. Comparison between the T_p measured optically and the T_e measured in the X-rays for aperture X1. The data points represent T_e for three consecutive regions behind the shock for the best-fit minimally equilibrated ($g_0 = m_e/m_p$), crosses, and fully equilibrated ($g_0 = 1$), diamonds, planar shocks. In both cases, the three data points were not measured independently but rather were fitted together for a single average temperature. The error bars include the 1σ errors on T_e as well as the RMS errors on the abundances and column density. The curves represent T_e as a function of ionization timescale implied by the optically de-

termined T_p for various g_0 : 1.0, 0.8, 0.6, 0.4, 0.2, m_e/m_p , from solid to dashed.

Fig. 7.— The degree of initial electron-proton equilibration. The ratio of the initial electron to proton temperatures, g_0 , is plotted as a function of shock speed for the five regions in DEM L71 (solid error bars). These are consistent with the anticorrelation between g_0 and shock speed found from modeling the broad-to-narrow flux ratios for the Balmer filaments in other remnants (dotted boxes, Ghavamian et al. 2001). The uncertainties in the equilibration for the DEM L71 regions include the 1σ error bars on the best-fit g_0 at the nominal T_p , the range in g_0 within the 1σ error bars on T_p , and the range in g_0 within the RMS errors on the abundance and column density, all summed in quadrature. The range of velocities comes from the 1σ range in proton temperatures at the best-fit g_0 . For the other remnants the boxes represent the allowed range of velocities and equilibrations for which both the width of the broad line and the broad-to-narrow ratio could be modeled.

TABLE 1

RFP apertures	<i>Chandra</i> apertures
3, 4	X1
5, 6	X2
7, 8, 9	X3
11, 12	X4
13, 14	X5

TABLE 2
RFP H α RESULTS FOR SELECTED REGIONS IN THE DEM L 71 BLAST WAVE

H α profile fits		$(T_e/T_p)_0 = 1$		$(T_e/T_p)_0 = m_e/m_p$		
Aperture	V_{FWHM} (km s $^{-1}$)	I_B/I_N	V_{shock} (km s $^{-1}$)	kT_p (keV)	V_{shock} (km s $^{-1}$)	kT_p (keV)
1	840 $^{+115}_{-100}$	0.51 $^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	1050 $^{+140}_{-130}$	1.29 $^{+0.38}_{-0.30}$	815 $^{+115}_{-100}$	1.29 $^{+0.38}_{-0.30}$
2	985 $^{+210}_{-165}$	0.54 $^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	1240 $^{+290}_{-210}$	1.81 $^{+0.95}_{-0.56}$	960 $^{+215}_{-165}$	1.81 $^{+0.90}_{-0.57}$
3	805 $^{+140}_{-115}$	0.49 $^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$	1005 $^{+170}_{-150}$	1.18 $^{+0.44}_{-0.32}$	775 $^{+140}_{-115}$	1.18 $^{+0.46}_{-0.32}$
4	735 $^{+100}_{-85}$	0.66 $^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$	915 $^{+130}_{-105}$	0.99 $^{+0.29}_{-0.21}$	710 $^{+100}_{-80}$	0.98 $^{+0.29}_{-0.21}$
5	450 $^{+60}_{-60}$	0.44 $^{+0.06}_{-0.05}$	555 $^{+75}_{-70}$	0.36 $^{+0.10}_{-0.09}$	430 $^{+60}_{-55}$	0.36 $^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$

TABLE 3
AVERAGE N_H AND ABUNDANCES

model	N_H 10 20 atoms cm $^{-2}$	O dex	Ne dex	Fe dex
$g_0 = 1$, planar	5.8 \pm 1.8	8.39 $^{+0.09}_{-0.12}$	7.64 $^{+0.11}_{-0.15}$	6.86 $^{+0.09}_{-0.11}$
$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	6.0 \pm 1.7	8.40 $^{+0.10}_{-0.13}$	7.66 $^{+0.11}_{-0.15}$	6.86 $^{+0.11}_{-0.14}$
$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	7.1 \pm 2.3	8.41 $^{+0.10}_{-0.13}$	7.78 $^{+0.07}_{-0.08}$	6.83 $^{+0.09}_{-0.12}$
combined	6.3 \pm 1.9	8.40 $^{+0.09}_{-0.12}$	7.70 $^{+0.10}_{-0.14}$	6.86 $^{+0.09}_{-0.11}$

TABLE 4

Chandra X-RAY BEST-FIT MODEL PARAMETERS FOR SELECTED REGIONS IN THE DEM L71 BLAST WAVE

Aperture	NEI model	$kT_{ave,s}$ (keV)	$\log(n_e t_{final})$ cm ³ s	χ^2	r- χ^2
1	$g_0 = 1$, planar	$0.75^{+0.22}_{-0.17}$	$10.83^{+0.11}_{-0.20}$	129.45	1.455
1	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	$0.95^{+0.62}_{-0.32}$	$11.03^{+0.10}_{-0.18}$	124.78	1.402
1	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	$0.57^{+0.12}_{-0.13}$	$10.34^{+0.09}_{-0.13}$	143.93	1.617
2	$g_0 = 1$, planar	$0.94^{+0.30}_{-0.39}$	$10.68^{+0.18}_{-0.30}$	85.84	1.431
2	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	$1.26^{+0.79}_{-0.72}$	$10.97^{+0.15}_{-0.23}$	79.76	1.323
2	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	$0.74^{+0.43}_{-0.36}$	$10.23^{+0.14}_{-0.34}$	82.79	1.380
3	$g_0 = 1$, planar	$0.66^{+0.05}_{-0.12}$	$11.27^{+0.10}_{-0.12}$	158.69	1.430
3	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	$0.70^{+0.08}_{-0.11}$	$11.42^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	144.36	1.301
3	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	$0.34^{+0.05}_{-0.01}$	$11.13^{+0.15}_{-0.06}$	174.74	1.574
4	$g_0 = 1$, planar	$0.72^{+0.20}_{-0.16}$	$10.95^{+0.11}_{-0.18}$	73.54	0.994
4	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	$0.94^{+0.70}_{-0.42}$	$11.11^{+0.14}_{-0.23}$	78.15	1.056
4	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	$0.66^{+0.16}_{-0.22}$	$10.37^{+0.09}_{-0.18}$	76.25	1.030
5	$g_0 = 1$, planar	$0.416^{+0.033}_{-0.036}$	$11.9^{+0.08}_{-0.12}$	164.85	1.459
5	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	$0.42^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	$11.93^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$	159.37	1.410
5	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	$0.25^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$11.72^{+0.17}_{-0.77}$	152.21	1.348

TABLE 5

VARIATION IN kT_e AND $n_e t$ ACROSS THE 3 NESTED REGIONS IMPLIED BY EACH SHOCK MODEL

Aperture	NEI model	outer region		middle region		inner region	
		kT_e keV	$\log(n_e t)$ cm ³ s	kT_e keV	$\log(n_e t)$ cm ³ s	kT_e keV	$\log(n_e t)$ cm ³ s
1	$g_0 = 1$, planar	0.75	10.35	0.75	10.65	0.75	10.83
1	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	0.60	10.55	0.73	10.85	0.80	11.03
1	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	0.72	10.31	0.96	10.38	1.25	10.34
2	$g_0 = 1$, planar	0.94	10.20	0.94	10.50	0.94	10.68
2	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	0.67	10.49	0.83	10.79	0.93	10.97
2	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	0.93	10.20	1.23	10.27	1.60	10.23
3	$g_0 = 1$, planar	0.66	10.79	0.66	11.09	0.66	11.27
3	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	0.62	10.94	0.67	11.24	0.69	11.42
3	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	0.42	11.11	0.56	11.18	0.73	11.14
4	$g_0 = 1$, planar	0.72	10.47	0.72	10.77	0.72	10.95
4	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	0.63	10.63	0.75	10.93	0.82	11.11
4	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	0.82	10.34	1.09	10.41	1.42	10.37
5	$g_0 = 1$, planar	0.416	11.42	0.416	11.72	0.416	11.90
5	$g_0 = \frac{m_e}{m_p}$, planar	0.42	11.45	0.42	11.75	0.42	11.93
5	$g_0 = 1$, Sedov	0.31	11.69	0.41	11.76	0.53	11.71

TABLE 6
INITIAL ELECTRON-ION EQUILIBRATION

Aperture	RFP H α	<i>Chandra</i> outermost region		
	kT_p (keV)	kT_e (keV)	$\log(n_e t)$ cm^3s	$g_0 \equiv (T_e/T_p)_0$
1	$1.29^{+0.38}_{-0.30}$	$0.60^{+0.18}_{-0.12}$	$10.55^{+0.10}_{-0.18}$	$0.41^{+0.31}_{-0.41}$
2	$1.81^{+0.95}_{-0.57}$	$0.67^{+0.18}_{-0.25}$	$10.49^{+0.15}_{-0.23}$	$0.33^{+0.32}_{-0.33}$
3	$1.18^{+0.46}_{-0.32}$	$0.62^{+0.05}_{-0.08}$	$10.94^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$0.26^{+0.39}_{-0.26}$
4	$0.98^{+0.29}_{-0.21}$	$0.63^{+0.22}_{-0.19}$	$10.63^{+0.14}_{-0.23}$	$0.64^{+0.36}_{-0.54}$
5	$0.36^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	$0.42^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	$11.45^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$	$1.0_{-0.13}$

TABLE 7
VARIABLE g_0 MODEL

Aperture	V_s (km s $^{-1}$)	kT_p (keV)	g_0
1	855^{+120}_{-105}	$1.29^{+0.38}_{-0.30}$	$0.24^{+0.12}$
2	980^{+230}_{-170}	$1.81^{+0.95}_{-0.57}$	$0.10^{+0.29}$
3	775^{+140}_{-110}	$1.18^{+0.46}_{-0.32}$	$0.01^{+0.03}$
4	785^{+110}_{-90}	$0.98^{+0.29}_{-0.21}$	$0.46^{+0.18}_{-0.15}$
5	555^{+75}_{-70}	$0.36^{+0.11}_{-0.09}$	$1.0_{-0.16}$













