





Thermal SNRs WG Current Membership

Andy Beardmore(Leicester), Sunil Chandra(CSRNWU), Konrad Dennerl(MPE), Jelle de Plaa(SRON), Gulab Dewangan(IUCAA), Adam Foster(SAO), Michael Freyberg(MPE), Terrance Gaetz(SAO), Brian Grefenstette(Caltech), Frank Haberl(MPE), Jelle Kaastra(SRON), Xi Long(SAO), Kristin Madsen(UMBC), Eric Miller(MIT), Paul Plucinsky(SAO), Andy Pollock(Sheffield), Manami Sasaki(Remeis Observatory & ECAP), Steve Sembay(Leicester), KP Singh(IISERM), Martin Stuhlinger(ESAC), Firoza Sutaria(TIFR), Hiroya Yamaguchi(ISAS)

We met 6 times in 2021 by Zoom



E0102: Recent Use of the IACHEC Model

- IACHEC standard, empirical model published in Plucinsky et al. 2017, A&A, 597, A35
- model available at "https://wikis.mit.edu/confluence/display/iachec/Thermal+SNR"
- used to test the temperature-dependent gain correction on eROSITA by Dennerl and Plucinsky
- small offsets for the single "s" spectra for all cameras, but large offset for the TM3 single+double+triple+quad (sdtq) spectrum (remember eROSITA has 7 cameras)
- Dennerl identified a processing issue and this will be fixed

Dennerl (MPE), Plucinsky(SAO)





Paul Plucinsky

Cas A: Will be used for ACIS gain calibration

- Beardmore (Leicester) developed an IACHEC standard, empirical model, available at "<u>https://</u> wikis.mit.edu/confluence/display/iachec/Cas+A"
- significant spectral variations with position due to different plasma conditions and bulk velocities
- Durham (SAO) developed empirical model to fit ACIS data in different regions and detects energy shifts of the Si XIII complex as described in Willingale at al. (2002), Lazendic et al (2006), Delaney et al. (2010), Rutherford et al. (2014) and Picquenot et al. (2020)



Chandra ACIS S3

Durham (SAO)







N132D

- Most X-ray luminous SNR in the Local Group
- Spectrum is more complicated than E0102, significant Fe-L and Fe-K emission and multiple (identified) temperature components (Behar et al. 2000, Suzuki et al. 2020)
- More spectral variation with position & slightly larger than E0102
- Routine calibration target for XMM and Chandra LP in 2019/2020



Red (0.3-0.75 keV), Green (0.8-1.1 keV), Blue (1.1 – 2.0 keV) Paul Plucinsky

Chandra ACIS

N132D: Update on Model Development

- Current version of the model is available at: "<u>https://wikis.mit.edu/confluence/display/</u> <u>iachec/Current+N132D+model</u>"
- RGS data has driven the empirical model in the 0.3-1.5 keV range. Stuhlinger, Pollock & Guainazzi developed first version in 2012.
- We must develop the model in different stages (energy ranges), given the sensitivities of the various instruments

0.3-1.5 keV: RGS

1.5-4.5 keV: pn, MOS, ACIS, XRT, XIS 4.5-8.0 keV: NuSTAR, pn, MOS, ACIS, XIS

- Thermal SNRs WG has focussed recently on the high energy part of the spectrum taking advantage of the new information from NuSTAR (Grefenstette) and Suzaku (Miller), also Bamba et al. 2018
- Results presented at this meeting will focus on the 4.5-8.0 keV range

N132D: ACIS 2006 data (5532,7259,7266), N132D_E0310_v2.13_20210421, CStat=7944 fit 0.35-10.0 keV, DOF=3970, PChi=1.93, Gl Norm=1.04, S3 Bkg Norm=0.82

N132D Empirical Model

- Empirical model currently consists of:
- two components for absorption (Galactic and LMC)
- 132 Gaussians for the lines
- three nlapec components for the continuum with:
 - $kT_1 = 0.18 \text{ keV}, kT_2 = 1.14 \text{ keV}, kT_3 = 5.48 \text{ keV}$

Current Objective

• agree on the normalization and temperature of the $kT_2 = 1.14$ keV, $kT_3 = 5.48$ keV nlapec components

Process

- fit in the 3.2-8.0 keV range with norms free but temperatures frozen for the $kT_2 = 1.14$ keV, $kT_3 = 5.48$ keV nlapec components and the norm of the Fe XXV Hea triplet free
- average the normalizations for each instrument/telescope to get consensus values
- evaluate fits with the consensus values, are the fits acceptable ?
- IF the fits are acceptable, fit in the 5.5.-8.0 keV range and allow the Fe XXV Heα triplet normalization to vary
- Compare normalizations of the instruments at 6.7 keV

Order of Presentations

ACIS, XISs, pn, MOS
 NuSTAR
 eROSITA

Paul for Adam and Eric Brian Konrad

The Spectral Fitters

Those who did the work:

NuSTAR Suzaku XIS XMM pn & MOS Models XMM-RGS Chandra ACIS Brian Grefenstette (Caltech)
Eric Miller (MIT)
Adam Foster (SAO)
Adam Foster (SAO)
Martin Stuhlinger (ESAC)
Paul Plucinsky (SAO)

Empirical Model Fit Results

• incorporate revised Suzaku results from Eric

Instrument	1.14 keV nlapec norm	5.47 keV nlapec norm	Fe XXV Norm
ACIS	4.27+/-0.10 e-2	7.90+/-1.16 e-4	3.56+/-0.30 e-6
pn	3.34+/-0.03 e-2	9.86+/-0.26 e-4	2.65+/-0.06 e-6
MOS1	3.47+/-0.04 e-2	9.49+/-0.41 e-4	2.97+/-0.10 e-6
MOS2	3.33+/-0.04 e-2	8.21+/-0.38 e-4	2.76+/-0.10 e-6
pn corrected	4.41+/-0.03 e-2	1.14+/-0.03 e-3	3.26+/-0.07 e-6
XIS0	3.71+/-0.07 e-2	1.01+/-0.07 e-3	3.20+/-0.14 e-6
XIS3	3.83+/-0.06 e-2	1.03+/-0.07 e-3	3.23+/-0.14 e-6
XIS1	3.80+/-0.07 e-2	1.06+/-0.07 e-3	3.00+/-0.16 e-6

Suggestion for New Default Values

- adopt one value per mission+instrument: one average value of XISs, one average of MOS1 & MOS2, and pn corrected
- adopt the "pn corrected" values, we believe the XMM effective area will be changed to this value. Keeping the MOS uncorrected values is a hedge against this bet
- average the ACIS, MOS, pn, & XIS values to get the suggested values

Instrument	1.14 keV nlapec norm	5.47 keV nlapec norm	Fe XXV Norm
ACIS	4.27E-02	7.90E-04	3.56E-06
MOS1/MOS2	3.40E-02	8.85E-04	2.87E-06
pn corrected	4.41E-02	1.14E-03	3.26E-06
XIS0/3/1	3.78E-02	1.03E-03	3.14E-06
suggested values	3.97E-02	9.61E-04	3.21E-06

Suzaku XISs: 3.2-8.0 keV with the average norms for the nlapecs. No free parameters.

11 spectra for each XIS	XIS cstat dof
optimally binned	
fit statistic calculated in the 3.2-8.0 keV range but spectra plotted up	XISO 473.7 405
to 12 keV	XIS3 4/1.0 395
lower background of Suzaku in general and FI CCDs in particular is	XIST 510.3 379

helpful in constraining the 5.47 keV component

Miller (MIT) **BI CCD**

Foster (SAO)

XMM MOS and pn: 3.2-8.0 keV with the average norms for the nlapecs. No free parameters.

- MOS1&MOS2: CStat=61891, PChi=64964, DOF=67270
- pn: CStat=16585, PChi=16887, DOF=14415
- continuum model *overpredicts* for the MOS1 & MOS2 in the 3.2-6.0 keV band, we used the released effective area curve for MOS
- continuum model *underpredicts* for the MOS1 & MOS2 in the 3.2-6.0 keV band, we used the candidate effective area curve for pn

MOS1 & MOS2

Suzaku XISs: 5.5-8.0 keV with the average norms for the nlapecs. Fit Fe XXV Hea norm

 energies and relative normalizations for the Fe XXV Heα triplet are fixed in the model, overall normalization can vary through the Fe XXV Heα r line normalization as the f & i line normalizations are linked to the r line normalization

XIS	FeXXV_norm	cstat	dof
XISO	3 20+0 14e-6	208.4	184
XIS0	$3.20\pm0.14c-0$ $3.27\pm0.13e-6$	200.4	176
XISJ XIS1	$3.05\pm0.16e-6$	230.1	176
			- / 0

Miller (MIT)

XMM MOS and pn: 5.5-8.0 keV, average norms for the nlapecs. Fit Fe XXV Hea norm

- MOS1&MOS2: CStat=25079, PChi=34994, DOF=34929, Fe XXV norm= 2.82+/-0.07 x10⁻⁶
- pn: CStat=8561, PChi=8430, DOF=7484, Fe XXV norm= 3.34+/-0.07 x10-6
- norm is lower for MOS, higher for pn, consistent with effective area difference
- evidence for an energy shift, this will need to be investigated as data from many observations are combined to produce these spectra

NuSTAR & eROSITA

Brian presents NuSTAR results Konrad presents eROSITA results

Future Work

- decide on compromise normalizations for the 1.14 keV and 5.48 keV nlapec components
- allow the centroid energy of the Fe XXV Heα complex to vary and explore different ratios for the f,i,r lines in the Fe XXV Heα complex
- finalize the high energy part of the model, release new version for Martin
- Martin refits the lines in the RGS data in the 0.3-1.5 keV range with the new normalization for the 1.14 keV component
- finalize the model in the 0.3-1.5 keV range
- focus on the 1.5-4.5 keV range, this promises to be difficult in that the instruments clearly do not agree with each other