

ASCA OBSERVATIONS OF THE JET SOURCE XTE J1748–288

T. Kotani⁰, N. Kawai¹, F. Nagase², M. Namiki¹, M. Sakano³, T. Takeshima⁰, Y. Ueda², K. Yamaoka², R. M. Hjellming⁴

kotani@milkyway.gsfc.nasa.gov, nkawai@riken.go.jp, nagase@astro.isas.ac.jp,
namiki@riken.go.jp, sakano@cr.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp,
takeshim@olegacy.gsfc.nasa.gov, ueda@astro.isas.ac.jp, yamaoka@astro.isas.ac.jp,
rhjellmi@aoc.nrao.edu

ABSTRACT

XTE J1748–288 is a new X-ray transient with a one-sided radio jet. It was observed with ASCA on 1998/09/06 and 1998/09/26, 100 days after the onset of the radio-X-ray outburst. The spectra were fitted with an attenuated power-law model, and the 2–6-keV flux was $4.6_{-0.8}^{+1.0} \times 10^{-11}$ erg s^{−1} cm^{−2} and $2.2_{-0.6}^{+0.8} \times 10^{-12}$ erg s^{−1} cm^{−2} on 09/06 and 09/26, respectively. The light curve showed that the steady exponential decay with an *e*-folding time of 14 days lasted over 100 days and 4 orders of magnitude from the peak of the outburst. The celestial region including the source had been observed with ASCA on 1993/10/01 and 1994/09/22, years before the discovery. In those period, the flux was $\lesssim 10^{-13}$ erg s^{−1} cm^{−2}, below ASCA’s detection limit. The jet blob colliding to the environmental matter was supposedly not the X-ray source, although the emission mechanism has not been determined. A possible detection of a K line from highly ionized iron is discussed.

Subject headings: stars: binaries — stars: individual (XTE J1748-288)

1. Introduction

XTE J1748–288 showed an X-ray outburst on 1998/06/04 and detected by the ASM/RXTE and BATSE/CGRO (Smith, Levine, & Wood 1998; Harmon et al. 1998). The 2-10-keV X-ray flux reached to 600 mCrab on 1998/06/05 (Strohmayer et al. 1998), and decayed with an *e*-folding time of ~ 20 days (ASM/RXTE Team, 1999; Sidoli et al. 1999). The radio counterpart was located

⁰Code 661, Laboratory for High-Energy Astrophysics, NASA/GSFC, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

¹Cosmic Radiation Laboratory, RIKEN, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

²High-Energy Astrophysics Division, ISAS, Kanagawa 229-8510, Japan

³Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

⁴National Radio Astronomy Observatory, Socorro, NM 87801-0387, USA

with the VLA at R.A. = 17h48m05s.06, Decl. = $-28^{\circ}28'25''.8$ (equinox 2000.0; uncertainty $0''.6$; Strohmayer et al. 1998). The spectral index of the radio counterpart was $0.2 \sim 0.6$ (Hjellming et al. 1998a; Rupen & Hjellming 1998), and the radio activity reached to the maximum of 350 mJy at 2.25 GHz around 1998/06/16 (GBI Team 1999). Rupen & Hjellming discovered a one-sided jet of 20 mas day^{-1} in the VLA images, which corresponds to a velocity of $0.93 c$ assuming a distance of 8 kpc. The time of the jet ejection was estimated to be around 1998/06/01, extrapolating the proper motion (Hjellming et al. 1998b). The radio activity of the core lasted 3 months, suggesting a continuous ejection of jet material. Thus this source is considered to be a jet system, probably similar to SS 433, which has a persistent jet. Around 1998/08/09, the expansion of the leading edge slowed to a rate of $\sim 5 \text{ mas day}^{-1}$ and the leading edge of the jet brightened dramatically (Hjellming et al. 1998b). Hjellming et al. suggested that the ejected jet material has run into external gas and formed a shock which is seen as a “hot spot.” On 1998/09/26, an ASCA TOO observation of this source was performed (Kotani et al. 1999, 2000). And the celestial region including the source had been observed with ASCA on 1993/10/01, 1994/09/22, 1994/09/24, and 1998/09/20. In this paper we report the result of all of these observations of the remarkable black hole candidate with a jet, which is possibly interacting with the circumstellar matter as that of SS 433.

2. Observation

The log of the observations of XTE J1748–288 with ASCA is shown in Table 1. In observation no. 4, XTE J1748–288 was near the center of the FOV and data from both the GIS and SIS were obtained. Other observations were performed as parts of the Galactic-plane-survey program (Koyama et al. 1997) or the Galactic-center-region observations (Maeda et al. 1999; Sakano et al. 1999), and yet no SIS data were obtained because XTE J1748–288 was out of SIS’ FOV. Observation 2B were performed soon after 2A, and they are regarded as one data set hereafter. A simultaneous observation with RXTE was performed during observation no. 4 (Revnivtsev, Trudolyubov, & Borozdin 2000).

In all observations, the PH mode with the nominal bit assignment was used for the GIS (Tanaka, Inoue, & Holt 1994). In observation no. 4, the 1-CCD FAINT mode was used for the SIS. All data were processed with the standard event-selection criteria and the data-reduction method (ASCA Guest Observer Facility 1999), unless specified in text.

3. Data Analysis

3.1. Image

The GIS image taken in no. 4, when XTE J1748–288 was near the center of the FOV, is shown in Fig. 1. Because XTE J1748–288 was rather faint at that time, other sources are recognizable by

eye in the figure. In addition to XTE J1748–288, 1E 1743.1–2843, which is the brightest source in the FOV, Sgr B2, and an unidentified source at R.A. = 17h47m04 ± 15s, Decl. = –28°53′ ± 1′ are seen in the image. The extended source in the background of these sources is the galactic ridge emission. Sgr B2, 1E 1743.1–2843, and the galactic ridge emission can be sources of background photons. Especially, Sgr B2 and the galactic ridge are significant iron-line emitters (Murakami et al. 2000), and their photons should be removed carefully from the spectrum of XTE J1748–288.

3.2. Light Curve

Temporal activity of XTE J1748–288 was estimated from the GIS data. We collected photons within 6′ of XTE J1748–288 for no. 3, when the source was rather bright, and 2′ for other data sets. To estimate the background spectrum of each observation, photons were collected from the annular region around the source for each data set. The thickness of the annulus was 6′ – 10′ for no. 4, and 6′ – 8′ for others. Assuming that the background count rate is proportional to the sampling area, we estimated the contribution by the background component in the source region for each data set from the photons in the annular region.

The source was significantly detected from no. 3 and 4, but not from 1 or 2. The 2–6-keV flux was determined to be $4.6^{+1.0}_{-0.8} \times 10^{-11}$ erg s^{–1} cm^{–2} and $2.2^{+0.8}_{-0.6} \times 10^{-12}$ for no. 3 and 4, respectively. The 90 % upper limit of 2–6-keV flux was 9.3×10^{-13} erg s^{–1} cm^{–2} and 4.9×10^{-13} , for no. 1 and 2, respectively. The light curve is shown in Fig. 2 together with the ASM/RXTE and BeppoSAX data.

3.3. Spectrum

In no. 3, XTE J1748–288 was rather bright, and that made the background-component estimation less difficult. The background spectrum used to plot the light curve was also used for spectral fits. The GIS spectrum of no. 3 is shown in Fig. 3. Because the flux level of XTE J1748–288 was almost marginal to detect on 1998/09/26, no. 4, the background component should be subtracted very carefully. The 6′ – 8′ annular region used for the background estimation to plot the light curve is not sufficiently accurate, since the extended background source has a structure finer than a few arcmin as seen in Fig. 1. To minimize the uncertainty due to the selection of a background region, we obtained a background spectrum from the same sky region as the source region. We collected photons within 2′ of XTE J1748–288 from no. 1 and 2, when the source was inactive and fainter than the detection limit, and used them as the background component. The intensity of the non X-ray background depends on the position in the FOV, and might cause a systematic error in the background estimation (Makishima et al. 1996). However, the position dependence is significant in the soft band below 1 keV, and did not affect the discussion following. After correction of the vignetting effect of the GIS, the resultant background was subtracted from the source spectrum

of no. 4. The GIS spectrum of no. 4 are shown in Fig. 4. Even after these careful treatment, the background estimation might have a systematic uncertainty. The negative data points below 2 keV might be due to over-estimation of the background component.

We tried spectral fits of the GIS data with several spectral models. The statistics did not allow us to determine emission mechanism uniquely. The spectra are well expressed by an attenuated power-law model, an attenuated thin-thermal plasma emission (Mewe et al. 1985), and an attenuated blackbody model. The best-fit parameters of each model are shown in Table 2.

Although the goodness of the fits was already satisfactory, inclusion of a Gaussian line at iron K energy into the power-law model improved the fit. The parameters of the Gaussian model are shown in Table 3. Even after the inclusion of a Gaussian line at 6.9 keV into the fit model, the residuals of no. 3 still showed a feature which can be fitted with a line model at 5.9 keV (Kotani et al. 2000).

XTE J1748–288 was in the FOV of the SIS only in no. 4, but not in other observations. That made the background subtraction of the SIS difficult. Since the FOV of the SIS is not so large as that of the GIS, photons farther than $4.5'$ from the source in the CCD chip were used for the background estimation. Because the effective exposure time of no. 4 is only 20 ks, the statistics of the resultant background spectrum was not good. Spectral fits of the SIS were found to be consistent with those of the GIS.

4. Discussion

4.1. Temporal behavior

In the light curve, the ASCA no. 3 (MJD = 51062) is on the extrapolation line from ASM and BeppoSAX data. It is remarkable that the exponential decay with an e -folding time of $12 \sim 16$ days lasted till no. 3 from the peak of the outburst, over 100 days and 4 orders of magnitude. This is one of the best examples of the steady exponential decay following an outburst shown by a black-hole candidate. On the other hand, the data point of no. 4 (MJD = 51082) is below the extrapolation line by one order of magnitude. There might be a transition from the exponential-decay phase to another phase, say, off-state phase, in the period between the two ASCA observations. In decaying phase of black-hole candidates, it is usual to observe a hump in the light curve or a relaxation of the time scale of decay. The sudden drop in the light curve of XTE J1748–288 is distinctive from the behaviors of such black-hole candidates.

The flux of no. 4 was inconsistent with the value of 10 mCrab obtained with RXTE (Revnivtsev et al. 2000). Spectral analysis with the RXTE is supposed to be difficult when the source is faint because of the many background sources in RXTE’s FOV. As Revnivtsev et al. suggested in their paper, the RXTE flux might be contaminated by nearby sources.

It was fortunate that the source had been monitored with ASCA five years before the discovery. Although the data of no. 1 and 2 provided only upper limits, they constrain the flux level of black-hole candidates before onset of activity. The mass-overflow instability model (e.g., Hameury et al. 1986) predicts a certain hard X-ray luminosity to trigger an outburst even in quiescent phase. Assuming a power-law spectrum with parameters same as no. 3 in Table 2 and a distance of 8 kpc, the upper limit of luminosity above 7 keV in no. 1 and 2 would be 6.1×10^{33} erg s $^{-1}$ and 3.2×10^{33} erg s $^{-1}$, respectively. Such a low luminosity level of hard X ray is difficult to trigger an outburst via the mass-overflow instability, unless the companion star is lighter than $0.4 M_{\odot}$, according to the estimation by Mineshige et al. (1992). That favors the disk-instability scenario (e.g. Osaki 1996) rather than the mass-overflow-instability as the cause of the outburst of XTE J1748–288.

4.2. Emission mechanism

It is a difficult question to answer whether the iron line detected in no. 3 and 4 was intrinsic to XTE J1748–288, or that it was originated in the background Galactic ridge emission, even after the careful background subtraction described above. The negative flux below 2 keV of no. 4 suggests that the background component was slightly over-estimated, and thus the excess at the iron K energy was a significant real structure. We tried several background-subtraction methods other than given above, and recognized the iron line in all cases. On the other hand, the absence of any iron line in the BeppoSAX spectrum of XTE J1748–288 on 1998/08/26 casts a serious doubt, though the source was at off-center of the MECS, where the energy resolution is not the best (Sidoli et al. 1999). The possibility that the iron line was not related to XTE J1748–288 could not be rejected at this stage. The origin of the iron line shall be determined by a future observation with a mission of higher sensitivity and spatial resolution.

If the iron line was of XTE J1748–288 origin, the emission mechanism may be thin-thermal or fluorescent. A hot jet is of special interest among possible sources such as an illuminated accretion disk, optically thin advection disk, and accretion column. Physical parameters of the system may be determined from the iron line of a jet. If the line was Doppler-shifted Fe xxv $K\alpha$, the Doppler-shift parameter z was determined as $(1 - z)^{-1} = 1.012^{+0.025}_{-0.027}$. From the proper motion $\mu = 0.93 \times (D/8 \text{ kpc})$ (Rupen & Hjellming 1998), the Lorentz factor γ and inclination j were estimated as $1 + 0.41 \times (D/8 \text{ kpc})^2 < \gamma < 1 + 0.44 \times (D/8 \text{ kpc})^2$ and $1.9 < \tan j < 2.2$, respectively. Considering that D may be larger than 8 kpc, we constrained β and j as $\beta > 0.71$ and $j < 72^\circ$. Kotani et al. (1996) modeled SS 433’s jet as a conical plasma flow cooling by radiation and expansion to explain ASCA data. We adopted the code for XTE J1748–288, and estimated the mass outflow rate. In the numerical calculation, the velocity and the inclination of the jet, and the distance to the source were set to $\beta = 0.73$, $j = 64^\circ$, and $D = 8 \text{ kpc}$, respectively. Other input parameters were set to the same values as those of SS 433 (Kotani 1998). Assuming that the X-ray source is a hot jet, we estimated the mass outflow rate to be the order of $10^{-5} M_{\odot} \text{ y}^{-1}$ and $10^{-6} M_{\odot} \text{ y}^{-1}$ on no. 3 and 4, respectively. The mass outflow rate of no. 3 is comparable to that of SS 433

(Kotani 1998).

The ejected blob of XTE J1748–288 had been observed to brighten and decelerate to $0.23 \times (D/8 \text{ kpc}) c$ (Rupen & Hjellming 1998), probably crashing to circumstellar matter. The shock temperature of the blob decelerated from $0.93 c$ to $0.23 c$ would be $\sim 100 \text{ MeV}$, if the blob consists of baryonic plasma. Such plasma might emit X ray via bremsstrahlung or synchrotron process. The spectrum would not have a line due to the high temperature. However, the temporal behavior of the X-ray luminosity of such plasma would be different from the observations. Plasma cooling via radiation or expansion will not show an exponential decay, but a power-law light curve. Thus the colliding blob was supposedly not the dominant X-ray source, i.e., the X rays from the blob had decayed quickly before no. 3, or it was faint. If plasma with a temperature of 100 MeV was cooled within 10 days due to radiation, the density must be larger than 10^{11} cm^{-3} , a quite large value for a jet blob at the end. If the colliding blob was faint, the upper limit of the flux, $2.2_{-0.6}^{+0.8} \times 10^{-12}$, gives an upper limit of the density of the blob, $\lesssim 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$, assuming a blob dimension of 10^{16} cm . That gives an upper limit of the ejected mass of 10^{28} g , or $10^{-6} M_{\odot}$.

As conclusion, the colliding jet blob was not the dominant X-ray source in observation no. 3, whether the line in Table 3 was related with XTE J1748–288 or not. The featureless spectrum may be explained in terms of hard power-law like emission seen in black hole candidates in low state. As for no. 4, the possibility of the emission from the colliding blob could not be rejected based on the temporal behavior. The X rays in no. 4 might be emitted from or contaminated by the blob.

5. Summary

The new Galactic jet source XTE J1748–288 was observed with ASCA four times, twice in the quiescent phase before the outburst, and twice 100 days after the onset of the outburst. The flux was below $10^{-13} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ in the quiescent phase, and $4.6_{-0.8}^{+1.0} \times 10^{-11} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $2.2_{-0.6}^{+0.8} \times 10^{-12}$ on 09/06 and 09/26, respectively. The light curve decayed exponentially with an e -folding time of 12 – 16 days, over 100 days and 4 orders of magnitude. The temporal behavior suggested that the colliding jet blob was not the dominant X-ray source, at least on 1998/09/06. There was an indication of an iron line in the spectra after the careful background subtraction. A hot jet, an accretion column, or an accretion disk may account the X-ray emission. Assuming that the jet being ejected was the X-ray source, we constrained the velocity and the inclination of the jet as $\beta > 0.71$ and $j < 72^\circ$, respectively. The upper limit of the flux would be constrained the ejected matter less than 10^{28} g .

The ASCA data were obtained in a TOO observation by courtesy of the ASCA Team, and in the Galactic plane survey program. The radio data were provided via the public archive of the Green Bank Interferometer, which is a facility of the National Science Foundation operated by the

NRAO in support of NASA High Energy Astrophysics programs. TK is supported by the research associateship program of the National Research Council.

References

- ASCA Guest Observer Facility, 1999, <http://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/asca/abc/abc.html>
- ASM/RXTE Team 1999, quick-look results provided via http://space.mit.edu/XTE/ASM_lc.html
- GBI Team 1999, quick-look results provided via <http://www.nrao.edu/~rhjellmi/gbint/plgbi.html>
- Hameury, J-M., King, A.R., & Lasota, J-P. 1986, *a*, 162, 71
- Harmon, B. A., McCollough, M. L., Wilson, C. A., Zhang, S. N., & Paciesas, W. S. 1998, *IAUC*, 6933
- Hjellming, R. M., Rupen, M. P., Ghigo, F., Fender, R. P., & Stappers, B. W. 1998a, *IAUC*, 6937
- Hjellming, R. M., Rupen, M. P., Mioduszewski, A. J., Smith, D. A., Harmon, B. A., Waltman, E. B., Ghigo, F. D., & Pooley, G. G. 1998b, *A&AS*, 193, 10308
- Kotani, T., Kawai, N., Matsuoka, M., & Brinkmann, W. 1996, *PASJ*, 48, 619
- Kotani, T. 1998, Doctoral Thesis, University of Tokyo
12. Kotani, T., Band, D., Cherepashchuk, A. M., Hjellming, R. M., Kawai, N., Matsuoka, M., Namiki, M., Oka, T., Shirasaki, Y., Tsutsumi, T. 1999, *Astronomische Nachrichten* 320, 335
- Kotani, T., Kawai, N., Nagase, F., Namiki, M., Sakano, M., Takeshima, T., Ueda, Y., & Matsuoka, M. 2000, *Astrophys. Lett. Communications*, submitted
- Koyama, K., Yamauchi, S., Sugizaki, M., & The ASCA Galactic Plane Survey Team, 1997, in *All-Sky X-Ray Observations in the Next Decade*, M. Matsuoka & N. Kawai (Saitama, RIKEN), 45
- Maeda, Y., Koyama, K., Imanishi, K., Murakami, H., Nishiuchi, M., Sakano, M., Tsujimoto, M., Yokogawa, J., & Yamauchi, S. 1999, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 320, 177
- Makishima, K., Tashiro, M., Ebisawa, K., Ezawa, H., Fukazawa, Y., Gunji, S., Hirayama, M., Idesawa, E., Ikebe, Y., Ishida, M., Ishisaki, Y., Iyomoto, N., et al. 1996, *PASJ*, 48, 171
- Mewe, R., Gronenschild, E. H. B. M., & van den Oord, G. H. J. 1985, *A&AS*, 62, 197
- Mineshige, S., Ebisawa, K., Takizawa, M., Tanaka, Y., Hayashida, K., Kitamoto, S., Miyamoto, S., & Terada, K. 1992, *PASJ*, 44, 117
- Murakami, H., Koyama, K., Sakano, M., Tsujimoto, M., & Maeda, Y. 2000, *ApJ*, in press
- Osaki, Y. 1996, *PASP*, 108, 39
- Revnivtsev, M. G., Trudolyubov, S. P. and Borozdin, K. N. 2000, *MNRAS*, 312, 151

Rupen, M. P., & Hjellming, R. M. 1998, IAUC, 6938

Sakano, M., Koyama, K., Yokogawa, J., Murakami, H., Nishiuchi, M., Maeda, Y., & Yamauchi, S. 1999, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, 320, 330

Sidoli, L., Mereghetti, S., Israel, G. L., Chiappetti, L., Treves, A., & Orlandini, M. 1999, *ApJ*, 525, 215

Smith, D.A., Levine, A., & Wood, A. 1998, IAUC, 6932

Strohmayer, T., Marshall, F. E., Hjellming, R.M., & Rupen M. P. 1998, IAUC, 6934

Tanaka, Y., Inoue, H., & Holt, S. S. 1994, *PASJ*, 46, L37

Fig. 1.— GIS image taken in observation no. 4. The energy band of 2.9–5.9 keV was used. Data of both GIS2 and GIS3 were combined and convolved with a 2-dimensional Gaussian ($\sigma = 3$ pixels). The X rays from the calibration sources were removed. XTE J1748–288, the nearby sources 1E 1743.1–2843 and Sgr B2 are indicated. There is a point source at R.A. = 17h47m04s, Decl. = $-28^{\circ}53'$.

Fig. 2.— Light curve of XTE J1748–288. The data of the ASM/RXTE (ASM/RXTE Team 1999), the MECS/BeppoSAX (Sidoli et al. 1999), and ASCA are plotted. The dashed line is an exponential decay with an e -folding time of 14 days. The convergence of the ASM data to ~ 0.07 Crab is artificial due to the data selection threshold applied here.

Fig. 3.— GIS spectrum of XTE J1748–288 of no. 3. Sum of the two sensors. The histogram is the best-fit power-law model. The data were rebinned for display.

Fig. 4.— GIS spectrum of XTE J1748–288 of no. 4. Sum of the two sensors. The histogram is the best-fit power-law model. The data points below 2 keV are negative probably due to over-estimation of the background flux, while the points around iron K energy show an excess. The data were rebinned for display.

Table 1: Observation log

No.	Start (MJD)	End (MJD)	Effective Time (ks)	Remark
1	1993/10/01 21:20 (49261.89)	1993/10/02 10:20 (49262.43)	15	GIS only
2A	1994/09/22 03:50 (49617.16)	1994/09/23 12:10 (49618.51)	58	GIS only
2B	1994/09/24 02:00 (49619.08)	1994/09/24 14:40 (49619.08)	20	GIS only
3	1998/09/06 09:10 (51062.38)	1998/09/06 17:50 (51062.74)	5	GIS only
4	1998/09/26 03:30 (51082.15)	1998/09/26 16:30 (51082.69)	20	GIS+SIS

Table 2: Best-fit parameters

Power Law			
No.	N_{H} (cm^{-2})	Γ	red. χ^2 (d.o.f.)
3	$6.0^{+1.3}_{-1.1} \times 10^{22}$	$1.56^{+0.34}_{-0.31}$	0.94 (180)
4	$18.5^{+10.9}_{-7.8} \times 10^{22}$	$8.1^{+8.3}_{-3.2}$	1.05 (187)
Blackbody			
No.	N_{H} (cm^{-2})	kT (keV)	red. χ^2 (d.o.f.)
3	$2.86^{+0.80}_{-0.68} \times 10^{22}$	$1.72^{+0.21}_{-0.18}$	1.00 (180)
4	$13.3^{+21.4}_{-6.1} \times 10^{22}$	$0.39^{+0.30}_{-0.19}$	1.05 (187)
Thin-Thermal Plasma			
No.	N_{H} (cm^{-2})	kT (keV)	red. χ^2 (d.o.f.)
3	$5.65^{+0.89}_{-0.91} \times 10^{22}$	> 11.2	0.94 (180)
4	$14.5^{+22.6}_{-5.7} \times 10^{22}$	$0.67^{+0.67}_{-0.45}$	1.05 (187)

Note. — For flux, see the text.

Table 3: Best-fit Gaussian parameters

No.	Centroid Energy (keV)	σ (keV)	Flux (ph cm ⁻² s ⁻¹)	d.o.f. (Δ d.o.f.)	$\Delta\chi^2$
3	$6.73^{+0.23}_{-0.12}$	< 0.28	$2.7^{+2.0}_{-2.0} \times 10^{-4}$	177 (–3)	–4.51
4	$6.92^{+0.16}_{-1.26}$	< 0.66	$2.5^{+2.0}_{-1.9} \times 10^{-5}$	184 (–3)	–5.35





