

The soft X-ray afterglow of gamma ray bursts, a stringent test for the fireball model

Mario Vietri

Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma
00040 Monte Porzio Catone (Roma), Italy
E-mail: vietri@coma.mporzio.astro.it

ABSTRACT

I consider the recent discovery of a soft X-ray source inside the error box of the gamma ray burst GB 960720 by the SAX, ASCA and ROSAT satellites, in terms of the fireball model. I show that the ejecta shell, which, after causing the burst is cold and dense, but still relativistic, keeps plowing through the interstellar medium, heating up the just-shocked matter which then emits X-rays. I compute the radiation emitted by this matter. I show that, up to about two months after the burst, in the cosmological scenario a soft X-ray (0.1 – 10 keV) flux of at least $\approx 10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, well within current observational capabilities, is generated, explaining the observations of the three satellites. Instead, in the Galactic Halo scenario a flux 3 orders of magnitude lower is expected. Detection of this non-thermal, declining flux in a statistically significant number of objects would simultaneously establish the fireball model and the cosmological nature of gamma ray bursts.

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts – radiation mechanisms: nonthermal – X rays: general – hydrodynamics – relativity – shock waves

1. Introduction

Our current theoretical understanding of gamma ray bursts (GRBs) is mostly based upon the fireball model (Mészáros, Laguna, Rees 1993). However, though this model has won great critical acclaim because of its ability to explain two otherwise mysterious features (the bursts' time duration and the nonthermal spectra), it still has made no testable predictions that would allow gauging it against observations. This is mostly due to our ignorance of the physics of electron acceleration at relativistic shocks. To get a feeling of how serious this problem is, notice that the very same, simplified analysis of the radiation emitted behind the shock was carried out in two papers treating exactly the same physical problem, but separated by twenty years, Blandford and McKee (1977, dealing with AGNs) and Sari, Narayan, Piran (1996, dealing with GRBs), and that furthermore the first one was published before particle acceleration at shocks was even discovered (Bell 1978).

It is the aim of this paper to derive a prediction from the fireball model, by (nearly completely) circumventing the problem of electron acceleration at relativistic shocks. Surprisingly, the prediction is different for cosmological and Galactic Halo scenarios. The opportunity to do this is offered by the detection, by the X-ray satellite SAX (Piro *et al.*, 1995), of the gamma ray burst GB960720, both in the hard X-ray/soft γ -ray band, where its results are confirmed by simultaneous observations by BATSE in a nearly identical band, and in the soft X-ray band (Piro *et al.*, 1996a). Subsequent observations of GB 960720 (Piro *et al.*, 1996b, Murakami *et al.*, 1996, Greiner *et al.*, 1996) made ≈ 45 days after the burst,

have shown that a weak source, which is not an AGN, is present inside the WFCs' error box, $\approx 5 \text{ arcmin}$, with a flux $\approx 2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ in the band $0.1 - 10 \text{ keV}$.

It is thus interesting to speculate about what a systematic search for GRBs' afterglow ought to yield, in the fireball model. This afterglow has a simple interpretation: it is the cooling of matter swept up by the (still relativistic) shell of ejecta, plowing through the interstellar medium. In the next Section, I compute the expected soft X-ray fluxes from GRBs some time after the burst, for the fireball model, both in the cosmological and in the Galactic Halo scenarios. In the last Section, I discuss how the theoretical computations relate to the SAX, ASCA and ROSAT observations, and why the soft X-ray band is ideal for carrying out a statistical search for a soft X-ray afterglow.

2. Predictions for the cosmological and Galactic Halo scenarios

In the fireball model (Mészáros, Laguna, Rees, 1993), an initial energy E is released, together with a contaminating mass of baryons $M_{ej} = E/\eta c^2$, with $\eta \gtrsim 10^2$, as required by observations. In the cosmological scenario, $E = 10^{51} E_{51} \text{ erg}$, and $M_{ej} \gtrsim 10^{28} g$. For reasons to be explained later, I shall concentrate on long ($\gtrsim 1 s$) bursts, for which $\gamma \approx 100$ (Sari and Piran 1995). In this case, after a phase of free expansion, when the expanding ejecta have swept up an ISM mass $\approx M_{ej}/\eta \ll M_{ej}$, a shock with the ISM forms, at a distance from the site of energy injection

$$R_{sh} = 5 \times 10^{16} n_1^{-1/3} E_{51}^{1/3} \left(\frac{100}{\eta} \right)^{2/3} \text{ cm} , \quad (1)$$

where $n = 1 n_1 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ is the ISM density. At this point, a reverse shock propagates backward toward the still freely expanding ejecta, converting their directed kinetic energy into internal energy, whose prompt release (on a timescale of seconds) leads to the GRB.

Conventional analysis halts here, but the shell still has a Lorentz factor $\eta/2$ (Sari and Piran 1995), so that it will continue to expand relativistically into the interstellar medium. Post-shock material has cooling times of order $\approx 10^3 s$ in the shock frame (Mészáros, Rees, Laguna 1993, Sari, Narayan, Piran 1996), depending on various details, but always negligible with respect to hydrodynamical evolution times of the post-burst shell which, as will be shown later, are of order ≈ 1 month. Thus, the shell can be regarded as cold and dense; its evolution is given by Blandford and McKee (1976) as

$$\gamma - 1 = \frac{2}{\frac{M^2}{M_{ej}^2} \frac{\eta+2}{\eta-2} - 1} \quad (2)$$

where I used the fact that the shell has initial Lorentz factor $\eta/2$. This equation is exact for any shock (and shell) speed, sub or super relativistic. Here M is the present mass in the shell, $M = M_{ej} + nm_p V$ where V is the volume swept up. From the above equation, we see that the shell is relativistic ($\gamma \gtrsim 2$) until $M \approx \sqrt{3} M_{ej}$, *i.e.*, till it reaches a radius

$$R_{rel} \approx \eta^{1/3} R_{sh} = 2.4 \times 10^{17} n_1^{-1/3} E_{51}^{1/3} \left(\frac{100}{\eta} \right)^{1/3} \text{ cm} . \quad (3)$$

As long as the expansion is relativistic, eq. 2 can be rewritten, defining an adimensional time since the burst $x \equiv ct/R_{sh}$, as

$$\gamma = 1 + \frac{2}{\left(1 + \frac{(1+x)^3 - 1}{\eta} \right) \frac{\eta+2}{\eta-2} - 1} . \quad (4)$$

Since the cooling time is much shorter than the shock evolutionary time, the total energy radiated per unit time, a relativistic invariant, also follows from hydrodynamical arguments (Blandford and McKee 1976):

$$\dot{E} = 4\pi R^2 v \gamma (\gamma - 1) n m_p c^2 \quad (5)$$

where R , γ and v are the shock position, Lorentz factor and speed, respectively. It is convenient to rewrite Eq. 5 as

$$\dot{E} = 4\pi R_{sh}^2 n m_p c^3 f(x) = 10^{42} n_1^{1/3} E_{51}^{2/3} \left(\frac{100}{\eta} \right)^{4/3} f(x) \text{ erg s}^{-1}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$f(x) \equiv (1+x)^2 (\gamma-1) \sqrt{\gamma^2-1}. \quad (7)$$

Because of the superluminal expansion effect, the time as measured by an observer on Earth, t_\oplus , is given by $dt_\oplus = (1-v/c)dt$; I define an adimensional Earth time as

$$dy \equiv \frac{c dt_\oplus}{R_{sh}} = \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{\gamma^2-1}}{\gamma} \right) dx; \quad (8)$$

Eqs. 8 and 7 together define parametrically the dependence of the luminosity in terms of Earth time; this is plotted in Fig. 1, for the range of time for which the shell is relativistic. From this (and Eq. 3) we see that the shell is relativistic for ≈ 2 month after the burst. From Eq. 3, it can be seen that the total distance (and thus the time) before slowdown to sub-relativistic speed is only mildly dependent upon η (like $\eta^{1/3}$), so that the total lapse of time before afterglow turnoff is reasonably well determined and, as pointed out to me by the referee, roughly the same for both short and long bursts, which are thought to differ mostly because of their different η -values. Also, from Fig. 1 it can be seen that $f(y)$ is a curve with some curvature, so that no power-law dependence of \dot{E} on time t is meaningful. Lastly, notice that the exact shape of Fig. 1 is somewhat sensitive to η , though not its normalization after ≈ 1 month.

In the cosmological scenario, for a typical source distance $D = 1$ Gpc, I obtain for the total flux radiated by the shell in the relativistic snowplow phase, from Eq. 6

$$F = 10^{-14} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} n_1^{1/3} E_{51}^{2/3} \left(\frac{100}{\eta} \right)^{4/3} \left(\frac{1 \text{ Gpc}}{D} \right)^2 f(y) \quad (9)$$

from which we see that, in the whole first month after the burst, the total flux level always exceeds $\approx 3 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^2$.

Before estimating which fraction of this flux ends up in the soft X-ray regime, I derive the total flux in the Galactic Halo scenario. Since in this case sources are $\approx 10^4$ times nearer, the total energy released is 10^8 times lower, $E = 10^{43} \text{ erg}$. Since approximately the same value of $\eta = 10^2$ is required both by burst duration and by the spectra, the contaminating baryon mass is now $M_{ej} = E/\eta c^2 = 10^{20} \text{ g}$ (Begelman, Mészáros, and Rees, 1993). In this scenario, a reasonable ISM density is $n_1 \approx 10^{-3}$.

To estimate the total luminosity after about one month, I find that the total distance covered by the shell, if it were still relativistic, would be $R = 10^{17} \text{ cm}$, containing a mass $M_{sw} = 2n_1 \times 10^{27} \text{ g}$. From Eq. 2 we see that the shell cannot be relativistic, because $M_{sw}^2/M_{ej}^2 \approx n_1^2 10^{14} \gg 1$.

Rather than integrating Eq. 2 exactly, the following simple argument will be used. The shell ceases to be relativistic for $R_{rel} \approx \eta^{1/3} R_{sh}$ as before, and, from Eq. 1, I find $R_{rel} \approx 1.1 \times 10^{15} \text{ cm}$. This occurs

3.5×10^4 s after the burst. From that moment on, the expansion is subrelativistic and the distinction between t and t_{\oplus} ceases to be important. In this limit, Eq. 2 becomes (Blandford and McKee 1976)

$$Mv = 2M_{ej}c \left(\frac{\eta - 2}{\eta + 2} \right)^{1/2} \approx 2M_{ej}c, \quad (10)$$

which is the well-known nonrelativistic snowplow model, for which the shock position and speed scale as $R \propto t^{1/4}$, $v \propto t^{-3/4}$. Using as initial values the previously determined position and time at which the shell becomes subrelativistic, I find that, a month after the burst, the shock speed is $v \approx 10^9$ cm s⁻¹, and $R = 3.5 \times 10^{15}$ cm. With these values the total flux emitted can be computed from the subrelativistic limit of Eq. 5, $\dot{E} = 4\pi R^2 v^3 n m_p$. Using a typical source distance of 100 kpc, I find

$$F = 1. \times 10^{-16} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} \left(\frac{3 \times 10^6 \text{ s}}{t} \right)^{7/4} \left(\frac{100 \text{ kpc}}{D} \right)^2 \left(\frac{10^{-3} \text{ cm}^{-3}}{n} \right)^{1/4} \quad (11)$$

for the Galactic Halo scenario. A month after the burst, the flux is three orders of magnitude below that of the cosmological scenario, and, even if it were totally emitted in the soft X-ray band, totally inaccessible to current observational apparatus. Thus an easy discrimination between the two models is possible.

I now estimate the fraction of all flux radiated in the soft X-ray band, in the cosmological scenario. To do so, I have to resort to the customary treatment (Blandford and McKee 1977, Mészáros, Laguna and Rees 1993, Sari, Narayan and Piran 1996) of electrons behind relativistic shocks. Thus I shall suppose that about half of the total internal energy is in a power-law distribution of electrons with index $p = 2.5$, giving rise to a synchrotron spectrum of index $q = (p - 1)/2 = 0.75$ (Band *et al.*, 1993, Sari, Narayan and Piran 1996). Inverse Compton cooling does not contribute to emission in the relatively low energy bands I am interested in, so that the fraction f_X of the total energy emitted in a band with photon energy $\epsilon_l < h\nu < \epsilon_u$ is

$$f_X = \frac{\epsilon_u^{(3-p)/2} - \epsilon_l^{(3-p)/2}}{\epsilon_m^{(3-p)/2}} \quad (12)$$

where ϵ_m is the energy, in the observer's frame, of the typical bremsstrahlung photons emitted by the highest energy electrons (*i.e.*, those having Lorentz factor γ_m in the shell's frame):

$$\epsilon_m = \frac{\hbar e B}{m_e c} \gamma_m^2 \gamma; \quad (13)$$

the Lorentz factor of the shell, γ , appears here to convert the photons' energy from the shell's frame to the observer's. I estimate γ_m by equating, as usual, the electron acceleration timescale with the synchrotron slow-down timescale, finding $\gamma_m \approx 10^7 B^{-1/2}$ (Mészáros, Laguna and Rees 1993). Inserting this into Eq. 13 shows that ϵ_m does not depend upon the magnetic field, and so it is independent of another major uncertainty of the problem, the efficiency with which equipartition magnetic fields are built up behind a relativistic shock. From Eq. 12 and Eq. 13, in the band 0.1 – 10 keV, for $p = 2.5$, I find

$$f_X \approx \frac{0.2}{\gamma^{1/4}}. \quad (14)$$

Thus, the expected soft X-ray flux is

$$F_X = 10^{-14} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2} n_1^{1/3} E_{51}^{2/3} \left(\frac{100}{\eta} \right)^{4/3} \left(\frac{1 \text{ Gpc}}{D} \right)^2 f(y) f_X \quad (15)$$

where the function $f(y)f_X$ is also plotted in Fig. 1. The soft X-ray flux is of order $\approx 10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. The above equation shows why I concentrated on long bursts: short bursts having $\eta \approx 10^3$ (Sari and Piran 1995) have soft X-ray fluxes which are lower than long bursts by about a factor of 20. This makes them unobservable with current satellites, even though still brighter than in the Galactic Halo model.

A major uncertainty in estimating f_X lies in postulating that the nonthermal electron population absorbs about half of all internal energy generated at the shock, but uncertainty in the slope of the spectrum also contributes. For $p = 2$, in fact, I would have found $f_X \approx 0.1/\gamma^{1/2}$, while, using $\gamma_m = 10^8$, would have resulted in $f_X \approx 0.01/\gamma^{1/2}$.

By analogy with supernova remnants, as the shock slows down, the fraction of total internal energy absorbed by the nonthermal electron distribution probably decreases, and becomes even harder to estimate. For this reason the theoretical prediction has not been extended to subrelativistic speeds of the shock.

3. Discussion

The most promising way to attack this problem is to try to identify afterglow emission from GRBs' error box in the soft X-ray on a statistical basis. The advantage of doing this in the soft X-ray rather than in lower energy bands, where source contamination is also low, is that the expected fluxes from Eq. 12 can be seen to be at least an order of magnitude higher. Higher-energy bands, instead, do not have the angular resolution necessary to avoid source confusion. In the radio band, where lower fluxes are offset by much larger collecting areas, a behaviour similar to that of the soft X-ray band is of course expected, but theoretical computation is made difficult by several subtleties. Consideration of this effect is thus postponed to a forthcoming paper.

The small angular resolution of the WFCs onboard SAX (5 *arcmin*) allows follow up observations by narrow field instruments with the hope of little source confusion. This is exactly what has been done by Greiner *et al.*(1996), who identified three sources with the ROSAT HR Imager inside SAX error box. Of these, two sources are AGNs, while the third one, accounting for about half of the total flux (*i.e.*, $\approx 2 \times 10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$) detected by SAX and ASCA, has no optical counterpart, indicating a very unusual object.

From Fig. 1, where the tickmark indicates the position of 43 post-burst days, and Eq. 15, we see that the expected flux, $5 \times 10^{-14} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, compares remarkably well (and perhaps fortuitously, since we do not know the source distance) with the observation of $10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ (Piro *et al.*, 1996b, Murakami *et al.*, 1996, Greiner *et al.*, 1996). Also, it should be noticed that Piro *et al.*(1996a) have set an upper limit to the soft X-ray flux from the burst region, immediately after the burst, of $10^{-10} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. Using Eq. 15 and Fig. 1 it can be seen that the highest flux expected in this model is $\lesssim 10^{-11} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. Thus, the current model reproduces correctly, for the most trivial choice of parameters, the observed features of the afterglow of GB960720. Hopefully, future observations ought to show that the afterglow has disappeared on a timescale of a few months, even though for this source it will be impossible to determine whether the light curve follows Fig. 1.

Also, the apparent lack of interstellar absorption is consistent with the fireball model. The total baryon contamination $\approx 10^{27}g$ (times at most a factor of 2 to include the mass swept up when the shell is still relativistic) when spread out over a spherical surface of radius $R_{sh} < R < R_{rel}$ (Eqs. 1 and 3) provides a total column depth $N_H \approx 10^{16} - 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, well within observational constraints. If furthermore,

as has been suggested, GRBs are related to mergers of neutron star binaries, they are expected to be distributed somewhat like pulsars, *i.e.* outside the galactic disk, where column depths do not approach the observational bounds.

Lastly, I would like to point out the reason why detection of soft X-rays about a month after the burst can discriminate between cosmological and Galactic Halo models, since it is rather amusing. In the fireball model, there are 5 dimensional parameters: $E, M_{ej}, \rho_{ISM}, c, D$, where ρ_{ISM} is the density of the circumstellar matter, and D is source distance. Of these, c is a universal constant, and ρ_{ISM} is an external parameter, which ought to be considered as given, and which is, furthermore, relatively well-known, compared with the uncertainty in parameters such as E, M_{ej}, D , each spanning several orders of magnitude. We can thus regard it as fixed. Thus, specifying that the two observational constraints, flux and time duration at Earth, be reproduced means fixing 2 of the 3 free parameters, leaving only one (say, D) undetermined. This corresponds to having a one-parameter (D) family of homologous solutions, each fitting observational data, each located at different distances from the observer. By making observations at a fixed time after the burst, about a month, we are observing cosmological and Galactic Halo models at non-homologous moments, thus breaking the similarity law that links them: in fact, the shock is still relativistic in the cosmological scenario, and well subrelativistic in the Galactic Halo scenario.

In short, I have argued that, in the cosmological scenario of the fireball model, detectable fluxes (Eq. 15 and Fig. 1) of soft X-rays should be emitted in the two months following a gamma ray burst, with a non-thermal spectrum and a characteristic decrease (Fig. 1), while no detectable flux can arise in the Galactic Halo scenario. In particular, the expected flux of $10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ compares remarkably well with the observations of GB960720 made about 40 days after the burst, by Piro *et al.*(1996b), Murakami *et al.*, (1996) and Greiner *et al.*(1996). But the model also predicts the time-dependence of the afterglow (Fig. 1) and its disappearance after a few months, and is thus subject to more elaborate testing. Detection of the afterglow in a statistically meaningful sample of gamma ray bursts would simultaneously establish both the fireball model **and** the cosmological nature of GRBs.

I am indebted to L. Stella and especially to Luigi Piro, for fruitful scientific conversations, and to an anonymous referee for constructive criticisms.

REFERENCES

- Band, D., *et al.*, 1993, ApJ, 413, 281.
 Begelman, M.C., Mészáros, P., Rees, M.J., 1993, MNRAS, 265, L13.
 Bell, A.R., 1978, MNRAS, 182, 145.
 Blandford, R.D., McKee, C.F., 1976, Phys. Fluids, 19, 1130.
 Blandford, R.D., McKee, C.F., 1977, MNRAS, 180, 343.
 Greiner, J., Hagen, H.J., Heines, A., 1996, IAU Circ. no. 6487.
 Mészáros, P., Laguna, P., Rees, M.J., 1993, ApJ, 415, 181.
 Murakami, T., *et al.*, 1996, IAU Circ. no. 6481.
 Piro, L., Scarsi, L., Butler, R.C., 1995, in *X-ray and EUV/FUV Spectroscopy and Polarimetry*, S. Fineschi ed., SPIE 2517, 169.

Piro, L. *et al.*, 1996a, Nature, submitted.

Piro, L. *et al.*, 1996b, IAU Circ. no. 6480.

Sari, R., Narayan, R., Piran, T., 1996, ApJ, submitted.

Sari, R., Piran, T., 1995, ApJ, 455, L143.

This preprint was prepared with the AAS L^AT_EX macros v4.0.

Fig. 1.— Solid line: plot of $f(y)$ (from Eq. 7), against adimensional time ct_{\oplus}/R_{sh} where R_{sh} is defined in Eq. 1, with $\eta = 100$. Dashed line: plot of the product $f(y)f_X$, where f_X comes from Eq. 14. The tickmark represents, in scaled units, 43 days after the burst, the moment at which the follow up observations of GB 960720 were carried out by Piro *et al.* (1996b).

Log f(y), Log f(y)f_x

