

Observed Luminosity Difference Between Isolated and Binary MSPs

Andrea N. Lommen¹, Richard A. Kipphorn¹, David J. Nice², Eric M. Splaver³, Ingrid H. Stairs⁴, and Donald C. Backer⁵

¹ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Franklin and Marshall College
501 Harrisburg Pike, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, 17603

² Physics Department, Bryn Mawr College
Bryn Mawr, PA 19010

³ Physics Department, Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08544

⁴ Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of British Columbia
6224 Agricultural Road, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z1, Canada

⁵ Department of Astronomy and Radio Astronomy Laboratory
University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720

Abstract. We perform a brief census of velocities of isolated versus binary millisecond pulsars. We find the velocities of the two populations are indistinguishable. However, the scale height of the binary population is twice that of the isolated population and the luminosity functions of the two populations are different. We suggest that the scale height difference may be an artifact of the luminosity difference. We examine the magnetic fields of the two populations as a possible source of the luminosity difference.

1. Introduction

We expect MSPs to have lower velocities than the population of regular pulsars, because the kick from the supernova progenitor had to be small enough to leave the binary intact. Producing an isolated MSP requires an even more particular scenario. The binary must remain intact during and after the supernova, and then after the spin-up phase the companion must leave the system or be evaporated. Several authors have debated whether isolated MSP velocities are lower, higher, or indistinguishable from those of the general population of MSPs. McLaughlin et al. (2004) suggest we might expect isolated MSPs to have higher velocities. They argue that if isolated MSPs are formed by ablation, we would expect them to form from the tighter binaries which are more susceptible to ablation. The correlation between tight binaries and higher velocities is suggested by Tauris & Bailes (1996). McLaughlin et al. (2004) present the argument for faster velocities for isolated MSPs as a counterpoint to their timing proper motion and scintillation measurements which suggest the opposite, as do the measurements of Johnston, Nicastro, & Koribalski (1998)

and Toscano et al. (1999b). Hobbs et al. (2005), however, find the velocities of the populations to be indistinguishable. In Lommen et al. (2006) we measured the transverse velocity of PSR J0030+0451 which is unusually small, even compared to the isolated MSP population. In this brief article, we have used this as an excuse to reconsider the question of the velocity of isolated MSPs as compared to the binary MSP population.

2. MSP velocities

The 29 MSPs in the Galactic Disk with measured proper motions are shown in Table 1. PSR J1730-2304, which has no measured declination proper motion, has been included in the table for completeness but has not been included in any of the following calculations. We corrected each pulsar’s velocity to its LSR as follows. We used the measured proper motion and distance to calculate a three dimensional vector representing the (two dimensional) transverse motion of the pulsar in the reference frame of the Sun. We then removed the solar motion and rotated the resulting vector from the LSR of the sun to the LSR of the pulsar. Finally, we recovered those two components of the vector which are perpendicular to the line of sight. This computation required selecting a value for the unknown LOS velocity of the pulsar; we chose a value appropriate for a star at rest in the pulsar’s LSR.

This corrected velocity is listed in the second to last column of Table 1. The average corrected velocity of the isolated MSPs is 86 ± 19 km s⁻¹ whereas the average corrected velocity of all the binary MSPs is 91 ± 28 km s⁻¹. (The uncorrected averages are 79 and 90 km s⁻¹ respectively). If one allows the sample to include only those proper motions which have been measured to better than 2σ the average corrected velocities are 86 ± 19 km s⁻¹ and

$99 \pm 33 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ respectively. (Uncorrected averages are 79 and 99 km s^{-1} .) In each case the isolated MSP population is indistinguishable from the binary MSP population. The 2σ cutoff in velocity introduces a selection of higher velocity pulsars. Thus, the average velocities are higher in that case.

An alternative statistic for evaluating the dynamics of pulsar populations is the distribution of heights above or below the galactic plane, z . For the pulsars listed, one finds that the standard deviation from zero for the binary MSP population is twice that of the isolated MSP population: $570 \pm 90 \text{ pc}$ vs $280 \pm 65 \text{ pc}$. Figure 1 shows a histogram of z for each population. The isolated MSP population is represented in the upper half of the figure, the binary MSP population in the lower half.

Figure 1 shows that the known isolated MSPs are closer to the Plane than are the known binary MSPs. This could be either a reflection of differences in the intrinsic spatial distributions of the two types of MSPs, or a selection effect. A smaller intrinsic spread in scale heights for isolated MSPs is only possible if that population also has a smaller intrinsic velocity distribution, so that the objects do not travel as far from the Plane as they oscillate in the Galaxy’s potential. Our determination that the two velocity distributions are in fact indistinguishable makes this scenario unlikely. However, with identical velocity distributions, a difference in intrinsic *luminosity* distributions would cause the less-luminous population to be detected only to smaller distances and hence only to smaller scale heights. In fact, Bailes et al. (1997) find that luminosities of isolated and binary MSPs are different at the 99.5% confidence level, with the isolated MSPs being intrinsically dimmer. We have confirmed their results with an updated catalog; also, a simple examination of the median distance of the isolated population (510 pc) compared to the median distance of the binary population (1155 pc) suggests that the isolated MSPs must be less luminous.

3. Magnetic field

If the luminosity difference is real then perhaps we could actually observe a magnetic field difference between the populations. We did a “quick and dirty” census of magnetic fields simply using the Parkes pulsar catalog¹. Figure 2 shows a histogram of the magnetic fields of the two populations. As you can see, our brief investigation into this matter was inconclusive. We intend to do a more complete study in the near future.

4. Conclusion

We conclude that isolated MSPs are less luminous than binary MSPs. As a starting point for a search for the cause of the difference we compared the magnetic fields of the two




Fig. 1. Histograms of height above the galactic plane for the isolated MSP population (upper) and the binary MSP population (lower).




Fig. 2. A histogram of isolated and binary pulsar magnetic field strength for field MSPs in which a period derivative is measured.

populations but found they were similar. Ablation is currently the favored scenario for creation of isolated MSPs, but it is not known how ablation could render MSPs less luminous or why MSPs more likely to ablate their companions would be less luminous to begin with. Currently we only know of two ablating MSPs in the disk: PSR B1957+20 and J2051-0827 Stappers et al. (2003, 1998). The discovery of more MSPs, and in particular of more ablating MSPs will aid finding the source of the difference in luminosities.

Acknowledgements. The Arecibo Observatory is a facility of the National Astronomy and Ionosphere Center, operated by Cornell University under a cooperative agreement with the Na-

¹ <http://www.atnf.csiro.au/research/pulsar/psrcat/>

Table 1. Velocities of Millisecond Pulsars in the Galactic Disk

Pulsar	μ_α (mas yr ⁻¹)	μ_δ (mas yr ⁻¹)	Distance (pc)	v_t (km s ⁻¹)	Reference
Isolated MSPs					
J0030+0451	$\mu_\lambda = -5.84 \pm 0.09$	$ \mu_\beta < 10$	310 ^P	<20	Lommen et al. (2006)
J0711-6830	-15.7 \pm 0.5	15.3 \pm 0.6	860 ⁿ	113	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J1024-0719	-41 \pm 2	-70 \pm 3	200 ^o	70	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J1730-2304	20.5 \pm 0.4	...	510 ⁿ	>50	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J1744-1134	18.64 \pm 0.08	-10.3 \pm 0.5	360 ^P	31	Toscano et al. (1999a)
B1937+21	-0.130 \pm 0.008	-0.469 \pm 0.009	3600 ⁿ	87	Kaspi, Taylor, & Ryba (1994)
J1944+0907	12.0 \pm 0.7	-18 \pm 3	1800 ⁿ	173	Champion et al. (2005)
J2124-3358	-14 \pm 1	-47 \pm 1	270 ⁿ	48	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J2322+2057	-17 \pm 2	-18 \pm 3	790 ⁿ	79	Nice & Taylor (1995)
Binary MSPs					
J0437-4715	121.438 \pm 0.006	-71.438 \pm 0.007	140 ^P	84	van Straten et al. (2001)
J0613-0200	2.0 \pm 0.4	-7 \pm 1	1700 ⁿ	60	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J0751+1807	$\mu_\lambda = 0.35 \pm 0.03$	$\mu_\beta = -6 \pm 2$	1150 ⁿ	22	Nice et al. (2005)
J1012+5307	2.4 \pm 0.2	-25.2 \pm 0.2	840 ^o	107	Lange et al. (2001)
J1045-4509	-5 \pm 2	6 \pm 1	1940 ⁿ	119	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J1455-3330	5 \pm 6	24 \pm 12	530 ⁿ	71	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J1640+2224	1.66 \pm 0.12	-11.3 \pm 0.2	1160 ⁿ	67	Löhmer et al. (2005)
J1643-1224	3 \pm 1	-8 \pm 5	2320 ⁿ	96	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J1709+2313	-3.2 \pm 0.7	-9.7 \pm 0.9	1390 ⁿ	57	Lewandowski et al. (2004)
J1713+0747	4.917 \pm 0.004	-3.933 \pm 0.010	1100 ^P	30	Splaver et al. (2005)
B1855+09	-2.94 \pm 0.04	-5.41 \pm 0.06	910 ^P	17	Kaspi, Taylor, & Ryba (1994)
J1909-3744	-9.6 \pm 0.2	-35.6 \pm 0.7	820 ^P	131	Jacoby et al. (2003)
J1911-1114	-6 \pm 4	-23 \pm 13	1220 ⁿ	128	Toscano et al. (1999a)
B1953+29	-1.0 \pm 0.3	-3.7 \pm 0.3	4610 ⁿ	128	Wolszczan et al. (2000)
B1957+20	-16.0 \pm 0.5	-25.8 \pm 0.6	2490 ⁿ	325	Arzoumanian et al. (1994)
J2019+2425	-9.41 \pm 0.12	-20.60 \pm 0.15	1490 ⁿ	142	Nice, Splaver, & Stairs (2001)
J2051-0827	1 \pm 2	-5 \pm 3	1040 ⁿ	42	Stappers et al. (1998)
J2129-5721	7 \pm 2	-4 \pm 3	1340 ⁿ	48	Toscano et al. (1999a)
J2229+2643	1 \pm 4	-17 \pm 4	1440 ⁿ	130	Wolszczan et al. (2000)
J2317+1439	-1.7 \pm 1.5	7.4 \pm 3.1	820 ⁿ	20	Camilo et al. (1996)

^P Distance from parallax.

ⁿ DM distance from NE2001.

^o Some other method used to acquire distance. The text of the cited reference should be consulted for details.

tional Science Foundation (NSF). ANL acknowledges a Research Corporation award in support of this research. DJN is supported by NSF grant AST-0206205. IHS holds an NSERC UFA and is supported by a Discovery Grant. DCB acknowledges support from NSF AST-9987278 for ABPP instrumentation and NSF AST-0206044 for the science program.

References

- Arzoumanian, Z., Nice, D. J., Taylor, J. H., & Thorsett, S. E. 1994, *ApJ*, 422, 671
- Bailes, M., Johnston, S., Bell, J. F., Lorimer, D. R., Stappers, B. W., Manchester, R. N., Lyne, A. G., Nicastro, L., D’Amico, N., & Gaensler, B. M. 1997, *ApJ*, 481, 386
- Camilo, F., Nice, D. J., Shrauner, J. A., & Taylor, J. H. 1996, *ApJ*, 469, 819
- Champion, D. J., Lorimer, D. R., McLaughlin, M. A., Xilouris, K. M., Arzoumanian, Z., Freire, P. C. C., Lommen, A. N., & Cordes, J. M. 2005, *MNRAS*, 363, 929
- Hobbs, G., Lorimer, D. R., Lyne, A. G., & Kramer, M. 2005, *MNRAS*, 360, 974
- Jacoby, B. A., Bailes, M., van Kerkwijk, M. H., Ord, S., Hotan, A., Kulkarni, S. R., & Anderson, S. B. 2003, *ApJL*, 599, L99
- Johnston, S., Nicastro, L., & Koribalski, B. 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, 108
- Kaspi, V. M., Taylor, J. H., & Ryba, M. F. 1994, *ApJ*, 428, 713
- Löhmer, O., Lewandowski, W., Wolszczan, A., & Wielebinski, R. 2005, *ApJ*, 621, 388
- Lange, C., Camilo, F., Wex, N., Kramer, M., Backer, D. C., Lyne, A. G., & Doroshenko, O. 2001, *MNRAS*, 326, 274
- Lewandowski, W., Wolszczan, A., Feiler, G., Konacki, M., & Soltysinski, T. 2004, *ApJ*, 600, 905
- Lommen, A. N., Kipporn, R. A., Nice, D. J., Splaver, E. M., Stairs, I. H., & Backer, D. C. 2006, *ApJ*, 642,

1012

- McLaughlin, M. A., Lorimer, D. R., Champion, D. J., Arzoumanian, Z., Backer, D. C., Cordes, J. M., Fruchter, A. S., Lommen, A. N., & Xilouris, K. M. 2004, In ASP Conf. Ser. 328: Binary Radio Pulsars, p. 43
- Nice, D. J., & Taylor, J. H. 1995, *ApJ*, 441, 429
- Nice, D. J., Splaver, E. M., & Stairs, I. H. 2001, *ApJ*, 549, 516
- Nice, D. J., Splaver, E. M., Stairs, I. H., Lohmer, O., Jessner, A., Kramer, M., & Cordes, J. M. 2005, *ApJ*, 634, 1242
- Splaver, E. M., Nice, D. J., Stairs, I. H., Lommen, A. N., & Backer, D. C. 2005, *ApJ*, 620, 405
- Stappers, B. W., Bailes, M., Manchester, R. N., Sandhu, J. S., & Toscano, M. 1998, *ApJL*, 499, L183
- Stappers, B. W., Gaensler, B. M., Kaspi, V. M., van der Klis, M., & Lewin, W. H. G. 2003, *Science*, 299, 1372
- Tauris, T. M., & Bailes, M. 1996, *A&A*, 315, 432
- Toscano, M., Sandhu, J. S., Bailes, M., Manchester, R. N., Britton, M. C., Kulkarni, S. R., Anderson, S. B., & Stappers, B. W. 1999a, *MNRAS*, 307, 925
- Toscano, M., Britton, M. C., Manchester, R. N., Bailes, M., Sandhu, J. S., Kulkarni, S. R., & Anderson, S. B. 1999b, *ApJL*, 523, L171
- van Straten, W., Bailes, M., Britton, M., Kulkarni, S. R., Anderson, S. B., Manchester, R. N., & Sarkissian, J. 2001, *Nature*, 412, 158
- Wolszczan, A., Doroshenko, O., Konacki, M., Kramer, M., Jessner, A., Wielebinski, R., Camilo, F., Nice, D. J., & Taylor, J. H. 2000, *ApJ*, 528, 907