PROMPT EMISSION POLARIMETRY OF GAMMA RAY BURSTS WITH ASTROSAT CZT-IMAGER.
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ABSTRACT

X-ray and Gamma-ray polarization measurements of the prompt emission of Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) are believed to be an important tool to test the various models of GRBs. Although there are some reports of hard X-ray polarization measurements of the prompt emission of GRBs, the number of measurements are small to provide statistically significant inputs to the GRB models due to the extreme difficulty of measuring them and quantifying their significance. CZTI onboard AstroSat is primarily an X-ray spectroscopic instrument but works as a wide angle GRB monitor due to the increasing transparency of the CZTI support structure. It also has experimentally verified polarization measurement capability in the 100 – 300 keV energy range and thus provides a unique opportunity to attempt spectro-polarimetric studies of GRBs. Here we present the polarization data for the brightest 11 GRBs detected by CZTI during the first year of operation. Most of the GRBs show clear polarization signatures with $\geq 3\sigma$ detection significance for 4 GRBs and $\sim 2.5\sigma$ significance for another 3 GRBs. We could place meaningful upper limits for the remaining 4 GRBs. We provide the details of the various tests performed to validate the polarization measurements. While it is difficult to differentiate the various emission models with the current sample of polarization measurements, CZTI in its minimum lifetime of five years is expected to provide a large sample of polarization measurements which would lead to a better understanding of the prompt emission.

Keywords: polarization, gamma-ray burst: general, gamma-ray burst: individual (151006A, 160106A, 160131A, 160325A, 160509A, 160607A, 160623A, 160703A, 160802A, 160821A, 160910A), instrumentation: detectors, X-rays: general
GRBs are believed to originate during the formation of black holes either by the collapse of massive Wolf-Rayet stars (Woosley 1993; Iwamoto et al. 1998; MacFadyen & Woosley 1999) or by mergers of binary compact objects (Eichler et al. 1989; Narayan et al. 1992). Phenomenologically, GRB emission occurs in two distinct phases — the prompt and the afterglow. The initial burst of high energy emission or the prompt emission is widely accepted as to originate from a jet close to the black hole whereas the long-lasting multi-wavelength emission or the afterglow following the prompt phase happens far from the compact object when the GRB jet interacts with the ambient medium (Piran 2004; Mészáros 2006). In spite of the improvement in our understanding of these sources in the last decade (Gehrels & Mészáros 2012) with the launch of GRB detectors — *Swift* (Gehrels et al. 2004; Barthelmy et al. 2005) and *Fermi* (Meegan et al. 2009), the emission mechanism of the prompt phase have not been accurately traced down (Kumar & Zhang 2015) primarily due to the difficulty of making precise measurements during the very short lived and highly variable (and quite diverse) phase of these emissions (Hakkila & Preece 2014; Basak et al. 2017). It is widely believed that the synchrotron process plays an important role in the emission of prompt high energy photons (Rees & Meszaros 1994; Sari et al. 1998). The other possible explanation is the inverse Compton scattering of the soft X-ray photons by the jet (Ghisellini & Celotti 1999; Ghisellini et al. 2000; Lazzati et al. 2004). On the other hand, there are evidences of thermal blackbody emission thought to be originated from the expanding photosphere (Ryde 2004; Pe’er & Ryde 2011; Basak & Rao 2015; Iyyani et al. 2015). These emission processes are associated with unique polarization signatures and therefore measurement of X-ray and Gamma ray polarization may lead to a proper understanding of the GRB prompt emission (Covino & Gotz 2016; McConnell 2016). A recent study by Toma et al. (2009) indicates that a statistical study of GRB polarization may provide critical inputs to constrain the possible emission mechanisms for the prompt emission.

There have been many attempts to measure the X-ray/gamma-ray polarization of GRBs in the last decade by RHESSI (Coburn & Boggs 2003), IBIS (Götz et al. 2013, 2014) and SPI (McGlynn et al. 2007; Kalemcı et al. 2007; McGlynn et al. 2009) onboard INTEGRAL, BATSE (Willis et al. 2005) onboard CGRO (see the review by McConnell (2016)). Since these instruments are primarily spectroscopic instruments but not optimized for polarimetry, the results are mostly limited by statistical uncertainties and often thought to be unreliable (Rutledge & Fox 2004; Wigger et al. 2004); though the results suggest that the GRB prompt emission is highly polarized. Later GAP (Yonetoku et al. 2006), a dedicated large FOV Compton polarimeter flown in 2011, obtained polarization measurements for three bright GRBs (Yonetoku et al. 2011, 2012). Recently POLAR (Sun et al. 2016; Orsi & Polar Collaboration 2011), a dedicated GRB polarimeter, is launched and it is expected to provide precise polarization measurements of GRB prompt phase in hard X-rays.

*AstroSat* (Singh et al. 2014), India’s first dedicated astronomical satellite, was launched on 2015 September 28, and has been operating successfully. Cadmium Zinc Telluride Imager (CZTI) onboard *AstroSat*, with an array of CZT detectors, is a large area (~1000 cm$^2$) spectroscopic instrument with a coded mask imaging capability in the energy range of 20 – 150 keV (Bhalerao et al. 2016; Vadawale et al. 2016; Chattopadhyay et al. 2016). Due to the significant Compton scattering probability of 5 mm thick CZT detectors and the pixellated plane of CZTI, the flight configuration of CZTI during its ground calibration is shown to possess significant polarization measurement capability in 100 – 300 keV (Chattopadhyay et al. 2014; Vadawale et al. 2015). At these energies, CZTI supporting structure becomes increasingly transparent which makes this large area instrument capable of detecting transient events like GRBs and perform polarimetric studies of these sources. On the very first day of CZTI’s operation, the instrument detected a GRB (GRB 151006A (Bhalerao et al. 2015)) at an angle 60° from the pointing direction. A detailed spectro-polarimetric study of GRB 151006A has been reported in Rao et al. (2016).

Apart from GAP, the previously reported polarization results by RHESSI and INTEGRAL have the drawback that the instruments were never calibrated before flight with polarized and unpolarized sources which draws a lot of criticism and unreliability in the reported results. CZTI on the other hand has been extensively calibrated for polarization before launch. This essentially boosts the confidence on the obtained results. Additionally, because of the large collecting area that the instrument provides and the favourable Compton scattering geometry posed by the pixels, polarimetric sensitivity of CZTI is significantly higher than the contemporary X-ray polarimeters. Given the minimum lifetime of 5 years of *AstroSat*, we expect to have a large sample GRB polarization with CZTI which along with the existing/upcoming GRB polarimetry missions may lead to a better understanding of these objects.

CZTI in the first one year of operation (2015 October 6 to 2016 October 5) has detected a total of 47 GRBs, among which we attempted polarization measurements for 11 bright GRBs. We normally select GRBs with fluence higher
than $10^{-5} \text{ erg/cm}^2$ such that the number of Compton events are sufficient to attempt polarization measurements. Most of the GRBs show signatures of high polarization. In this paper we report the detailed data analysis and the polarization estimations for these GRBs. The scarcity of flux in case of most of the GRBs and the extreme photon hungry nature of X-ray polarimetry on the other hand makes polarization measurement extremely difficult. We have treated the statistical uncertainties and the possible sources of systematics which may introduce false polarimetric signature, with utmost care for each of the GRBs. In 2, we discuss about polarization capability of the CZTI, the analysis procedure, and the details of the individual GRBs in our sample. This is followed by the final results and discussions in 3 and 4 respectively.

2. CZTI AS A GRB POLARIMETER: ANALYSIS PROCEDURE

CZTI consists of an array of 64 CZT modules where each detector is 5 mm thick and provide high quantum efficiency and fine spectral energy resolution in a broad energy band from few keV to few hundred keV. Each detector module is further pixelated in to 256 pixels (with a nominal pixel size of 2.5 mm $\times$ 2.5 mm). CZT detectors in CZTI being equipped with a 0.5 mm thick Tantalum coded mask, provides imaging capability in the 20 – 150 keV region. CZTI also draws the advantage of working in a photon tagging mode with a time resolution of 20 $\mu$s. All these features make CZTI an ideal instrument to study the spectral and timing feature of celestial X-ray objects in the 20 – 150 keV region.

Besides the spectroscopic and timing studies, CZTI also works as a sensitive Compton polarimeter for bright X-ray sources at higher energies. This feature comes from the significant Compton scattering cross-section of 5 mm thick CZT detectors at energies beyond 100 keV and the availability of continuous time tagged events from CZTI. The polarized photons tend to preferentially scatter in the direction perpendicular to the polarization direction which gives rise to a sinusoidal modulation in the distribution of azimuthal scattering angles (Lei et al. 1997; Kaaret 2014). The flight configuration of CZTI during its ground calibration has been shown to possess polarization measurement capability with detailed experiments and simulation studies (Chattopadhyay et al. 2014; Vadawale et al. 2015). Because of the increasing transparency of the collimators and the supporting structure in the 100 – 300 keV range, CZTI works as an open detector and captures transient events like GRBs. Detection of GRB 151006A on the very first day of its operation (Bhalerao et al. 2015), at far off-axis angle demonstrates the capability of CZTI as a wide angle GRB monitor. This opens up an unique possibility to attempt polarization measurements of GRBs with CZTI particularly given the fact that GRB prompt emission is highly polarized.

GRB polarimetry with CZTI is very similar to the ON-axis polarimetry, but with the following key advantages.

- Because CZTI polarimetric observations do not require any change in the hardware configuration, polarimetric analysis can be attempted from data obtained in the standard mode. CZTI detects 4 – 5 GRBs in a month. Polarimetric analysis can in principle be attempted for any detected GRB.
- GRB prompt emission is expected to be highly polarized owing to the non-thermal origin of prompt emission.
- Compared to the bright persistent sources like Crab or Cygnus X-1, GRBs provide higher signal to noise ratio for the Compton events resulting in a higher polarimetric sensitivity for the GRBs.
- Accurate polarimetric background measurements are available just before and after the GRB.

2.1. Criteria for the selection of Compton events

The selection criteria of the Compton events has been discussed in detail in Chattopadhyay et al. (2014). Each event in the CZTI output data has an individual time stamp with a resolution of 20 $\mu$s. Any two events occurring within 20 $\mu$s will have same time stamp. The event file also lists out the pixel and detector ID, the PHA channel of detection, veto and alpha coincidence flag. The scattering events are normally expected to be captured within 20 $\mu$s time window. However, since readout in CZTI is done for one module at a time, if two events are registered in two different pixels in the same module, there is a certain probability that the two events would get two different time stamps. Therefore, we select all the double pixel events happening within coincidence window of 40 $\mu$s, as polarization information of the radiation is embedded in these double pixel events. The three and four or more pixel events within a coincidence window are excluded from analysis, primarily because the probability of such events due to Compton scattering is less and it is difficult to identify the first event out of the multiple events. In case of double pixel events the pixel with the lower energy deposition is considered to be the scattering pixel and the higher energy pixel as the
Figure 1. Observed rate of single and double events in CZTI during GRB 160623A. The blue solid line (plotted against the right axis) is obtained from the detected single events. The events satisfying the Compton criteria (plotted against the left axis) are shown in black and the red data points (plotted against the left axis) are those events not satisfying the Compton criteria. The region between the dashed vertical lines in the light curve shows the prompt phase emission of GRB 160623A. The Compton events in this region are used for further analysis.

absorbing pixel. The 40 $\mu$s time window is quite large which may result in false chance co-incidence events which are filtered out by applying the Compton kinematics criteria: 1) spatial proximity of the pixels and 2) sum and ratio of the deposited energies must be consistent with those expected for true Compton events for the scattering geometry of CZTI. We also exclude all the veto and alpha tagged events from further analysis as these events do not carry any polarization information and therefore contribute indirectly to the background.

Figure 1 shows the light curve of GRB 160623A in single and Compton events in blue line and black data points respectively. A clear detection of the GRB in Compton events show the pertinence of the selection criteria of the Compton events. It is to be noted that CZTI has observed Crab nebula for $\sim$790 ks and we could obtain a clear pulse profile of Crab pulsar in the Compton events in the 100 – 380 keV range (for ON-axis sources, Compton events are selected in 100 – 380 keV energy range) which also independently validates the Compton event selection algorithm (Vadawale et al. 2017). In order to further make sure that the peak in the Compton events is not a mere result of chance coincidence of the GRB photons, we generate a light curve without applying the Compton conditions on the double pixel events. As we see in Figure 1 the GRB does not show up as clearly as in case of Compton events (the red data points). The small peak in the non-Compton events is expected due to the significant probability of chance events because of high flux during the GRB which is expected to be more prominent for brighter GRBs. We discuss on the estimation of these events and their effect on the polarization analysis in a later section.

2.2. The GRB sample for our study

In the first one year of operation of CZTI (2015 October 6 to 2016 September 30) a total of 47 GRBs were detected. Out of the 47 GRBs, we selected 11 GRBs which are bright enough to give sufficient number of Compton events (the number of double events satisfying the Compton criterion greater than 400) to attempt polarization analysis. Out of the 47 GRBs, 33 GRBs were detected by the Fermi/GBM, 14 GRBs were detected with the Swift/BAT and 8 GRBs were detected by both of these instruments. Localization for these GRBs in CZTI co-ordinates were done from the positional information available from Swift and Fermi GRB data bases. The polarization measurements

1 http://astrosat.iucaa.in/czti/?q=grb
are made for the bright GRBs with fluence greater than $10^{-5}$ ergs cm$^{-2}$, as bright GRBs i.e. having high counts will have more Compton double events. The bright GRBs above this fluence are 18 in number on the basis of the Fermi and Swift one year list. AstroSat was in the South Atlantic Anomaly (SAA) or had data gap for 20.5 % of the time in 1 year. Hence the detection of 11 of the 18 bright GRBs in CZTI ($\sim 60\%$) is consistent with the relative down time due to SAA as well as sky blockage due to earth and the Field of View of the different GRB observatories.

The characteristics of the observational properties of these 11 GRBs are listed in Table 1. Seven of these 11 GRBs have triggered Fermi/GBM detectors (listed chronologically in the table), 5 have triggered Swift/BAT detectors, two GRBs have triggered both these detectors. The three GRBs triggered only in Swift/BAT are listed next in the table (again chronologically) and GRB 160623A, which triggered Konus/Wind, is a long GRB (given last in the table) and it was occulted by Earth for a large part for Fermi/GBM: it has, however, localization information from Swift/XRT and prompt spectral information from CZTI detectors. The GRB localization error circles, given in the table, are based on the localization provided by the Swift and Fermi satellites: the localization information is taken, as per availability, from Swift/XRT, Swift/BAT and Fermi/GRB catalogs. The duration of GRBs, $T_{90}$, is measured in 50 – 300 keV and 15 – 350 keV band for the GBM and the BAT GRBs respectively and is collected from the various GCNs as well as the respective websites. For GRB 160623A, however, $T_{90}$ is from CZTI-Veto. The time duration selected for polarization analysis ($t_1$ and $t_2$) are given with respect to the trigger time of Fermi/GBM (for the first 7 GRBs), Swift/BAT (for the next 3 GRBs), and CZTI (for GRB 160623A). There are multiple values of the duration for 3 GRBs, determined based on the availability of the Compton events in the CZTI data. The polar angle ($\theta$) and azimuthal angle ($\phi$) in the CZTI coordinates are also given in the table. If afterglow measurements are made, these are indicated in the table with symbols X (Swift/ XRT X-rays), O (optical), U (Swift/UVOT), R (radio), and NIR (near-Infrared): these information are culled from the various GCNs for these GRBs.

In order to compare the estimated polarization fractions with the theoretical predictions, the peak energy of the GRBs is required (Toma et al. 2009). To obtain peak energies for the selected GRBs, we have carried out a spectroscopic analysis with the data obtained from GBM, BAT, and CZTI. The spectral analysis is done for the same time intervals that have been used for polarization measurements. The GBM and the BAT low-energy events data are retrieved from the Fermi Science Support Center archives2. We fit the photon spectra with the Band model (Band et al. 1993) for the GBM detected 7 GRBs, a powerlaw with an exponential cut-off ($\propto E^{-p}exp(-E/E_c)$) for the BAT detected 3 GRBs. From the spectral parameters, we calculated the fluence in the selected time intervals and energy range 100 – 300 keV as well as the time integrated fluence in the 10 – 1000 keV band (given inside bracket in the last column of the table). For the three BAT-GRBs, we use the Konus/Wind spectral parameters (given in the second line in the table) to determine the 10 – 1000 keV time integrated fluence. For GRB 160623A, we use Konus/Wind spectral parameters and the observed spectrum in CZTI-Veto to determine the fluences. The relevant model parameters are provided in Table 1. The peak energies are in near agreement with the time integrated peak energies as given in the respective catalogs or GCNs. The errors in the parameters quoted here are in the 90 % confidence interval.

The light curves of these 11 GRBs are given in the figure 10. The GBM light curves in 15 – 100 keV and 100 – 300 keV are shown in magenta and black for 7 GRBs whereas the BAT light curves for the 3 GRBs detected only in BAT in 15 – 100 keV are given in magenta. For GRB 160623A, CZTI-Veto light curve in 100 – 300 keV is given in black. The times selected for polarization analysis are shown as vertical lines.

2.3. Background event analysis

In Chattopadhyay et al. (2014) and Vadawale et al. (2015) the various sources of background events have been discussed in detail. The most significant contribution to background comes from the earth’s albedo radiation and diffuse cosmic X-ray background across the side collimators and supporting structure, which go through Compton scattering in CZTI pixels. However, we see that the background rate obtained from the onboard data is 2–3 times higher than the numerically estimated values (Vadawale et al. 2016). In the uncleaned event data from CZTI, we observe cosmic ray showers in the CZTI detectors. Though we filter out the cosmic ray events, there is a certain probability that a fraction of events still passes through the filtering conditions giving rise to a higher than expected background rate.

The various level of transparency by the collimators and the supporting structures results in an unequal effective area across the detector pixels. Observationally we see a shadow pattern in the detector plane for the GRBs. It is possible to

2 https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/access/
suppress the background events significantly by selecting the events only from the pixels with higher effective area. To estimate the pixel-wise effective area, we developed AstroSat mass model inside Geant−4 (GEOmetry ANd Tracking) simulation (Agostinelli et al. 2003) including all the payloads of AstroSat: UVIT, SXT, LAXPC, CZTI and the complete satellite structure. Geant−4 is a C++ based Monte Carlo simulation toolkit which can be used to accurately simulate the passage of particles through matter and the current simulations are done using version 4.10.03. We use Cadmesh interface (Poole et al. 2011) to import the CAD files of the payloads directly into the Geant−4 detector construction. Figure 3 shows the complete mass model of AstroSat simulated in Geant−4. In the simulation, we employ the processes for low energy X-ray photons – G4LowEnPolarizedPhotoElectric, G4LowEnPolarizedRayleigh, G4LowEnPolarizedCompton, G4LowEnBrems, G4LowEnIonization. It is to be noted that the CZTI geometry has

Table 1. The sample of GRBs selected for polarization study with CZTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRB (Detectors)</th>
<th>Localizationa</th>
<th>T90 (s)</th>
<th>(t1, t2)b</th>
<th>α/−β</th>
<th>Spectral Parameters</th>
<th>Afterglowsd</th>
<th>θ &amp; φ</th>
<th>Fluenced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161060A (GBM)</td>
<td>2′.3</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>(−5.5,85.2)</td>
<td>−1.30±0.07</td>
<td>−2.20±0.05</td>
<td>483±286</td>
<td>−150</td>
<td>X, 60.82, 67.57, 0.7(2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161061A (GBM)</td>
<td>1′.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>(−1.5,14.7)</td>
<td>−0.53±0.07</td>
<td>−2.31±0.14</td>
<td>460±45</td>
<td>−40</td>
<td>106.12, 255.69, 3.5(5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160325A (GBM, BAT)</td>
<td>1′.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>(−0.8,15.2)</td>
<td>−0.71±0.07</td>
<td>−2.26±0.20</td>
<td>218±25</td>
<td>−22</td>
<td>X, U, 0.66, 159.44, 0.76(4.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160509A (GBM)</td>
<td>2′.3</td>
<td>371.0</td>
<td>(3.7,20.6)</td>
<td>−0.75±0.02</td>
<td>−2.13±0.03</td>
<td>334±11</td>
<td>−10</td>
<td>X, O, R, 105.74, 85.45, 4.5(47.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160802A (GBM)</td>
<td>1′.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>(−1.0,4.0)</td>
<td>−0.61±0.04</td>
<td>−2.40±0.10</td>
<td>280±17</td>
<td>−14</td>
<td>52.96, 273.12, 2.2(8.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160821A (GBM, BAT)</td>
<td>1′.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>(130,158)</td>
<td>−0.59±0.01</td>
<td>−2.25±0.03</td>
<td>866±25</td>
<td>−24</td>
<td>O, 156.18, 59.31, 20.0(47.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160910A (GBM)</td>
<td>4′.3</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>(5.9,10.4)</td>
<td>−0.36±0.03</td>
<td>−2.38±0.05</td>
<td>330±13</td>
<td>−13</td>
<td>X, O, R, 65.54, 333.45, 0.42(12.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160131A (BAT)</td>
<td>2′.2</td>
<td>325.0</td>
<td>(26.2,42.4)</td>
<td>−1.00±0.14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>388±273</td>
<td>−165</td>
<td>X, U, O, R, 116.86, 184.64, 0.9(6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160607A (BAT)</td>
<td>1′.5</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>(3.3,16)</td>
<td>−0.9±0.1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>131±36</td>
<td>−24</td>
<td>X, O, 138.85, 315.78, 0.8(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160703A (BAT)</td>
<td>3′.9</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>(−4.2,2.9)</td>
<td>−0.95±0.14</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>275±430</td>
<td>−107</td>
<td>X, O, U, R, 10.14, 95.05, 0.6(1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160623A (CZTI)</td>
<td>3′.5</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>(0.7)</td>
<td>−0.88±0.05</td>
<td>−2.95±0.11</td>
<td>648±33</td>
<td>−32</td>
<td>X, O, NIR, 140.46, 118.06, 5.3(18.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aLocalization given with 90 % error radius, taken from Swift/XRT, Swift/BAT, and Fermi/GBM catalogs. For GRB 160910A, the error is only statistical.
b$t_1$ and $t_2$ are w.r.t. GBM/BAT trigger − time; For GRB 160623A w.r.t. CZTI trigger time: UT 204353981.02834 (seconds since Jan 1, 2010 00:00:00 UTC)

Konus/Wind observations of GRB 160131A, GRB 160607A, GRB 160703A and GRB 160623A: Tsvetkova et al. (2016a) (GCN 18974), Tsvetkova et al. (2016b) (GCN 19511), Frederiks et al. (2016a) (GCN 19649) and Frederiks et al. (2016b) (GCN 19554)

cAfterglows: O: optical, X: X-rays, R: radio, NIR: near infra-red and U: UVOT

dFluence in units of $10^{-5}$ ergs cm$^{-2}$ in the range $t_1$ to $t_2$: 100 − 300 keV; Values in bracket are fluence in 10 − 1000 keV band for the time integrated GRB.
GRB prompt emission polarimetry with CZTI

Figure 2. The GRB light-curves are shown here for energy ranges $15 - 100$ keV (magenta) and $100 - 300$ keV (black) (see text for details). The vertical green lines represent the time intervals that have been used to extract double events for polarization measurements.

Figure 3. Mass model of *AstroSat* simulated in Geant−4. with zoomed in view of CZT-Imager.
Figure 4. Integrated effective area of CZT Imager (module-wise) in 100 – 300 keV for GRB 160509A. We simulate the AstroSat mass model in Geant–4 for the same observed photon energy distribution and off-axis viewing angle to estimate the effective area of the modules and pixels. The effective area has been normalized with respect to its maximum value. The contours shown in white, red and blue enclose the pixels with normalized effective area of 15 %, 18 % and 20 % respectively.

been developed in Geant–4 in detail and has been extensively validated during ground calibration and polarization experiments. The mass model for the other instruments and the satellite has been developed for the off-axis polarimetry with CZTI. We validate the mass model by comparing the observed and the simulated count rates for a large sample of GRBs which cover a significant fraction of the full sky. Further validation of the mass model based on the comparison of the observed spectra of GRBs is currently under progress and will be reported elsewhere. In order to estimate the pixel-wise effective area, for each of the GRBs, simulation is done for a large number of photons in the energy range of 100 – 400 keV. Interaction positions, energy depositions and all other relevant information are stored in the output event file. Further analysis of selecting the valid Compton events and effective area estimations are done using an IDL code. Figure 4 shows the estimated effective area of the CZTI detector modules for GRB 160509A ($\theta = 105.7^\circ$, $\phi = 85.5^\circ$, powerlaw index = 0.75) in 100 – 300 keV. The three contours shown in the figure enclose the pixels with effective area of 15 % (white), 18 % (red) and 20 % (blue) of the maximum effective area. In our analysis we select only events from pixels with effective area >10 % and thus filter out a significant fraction of background events resulting in a higher signal to background contrast.

An important step in the background analysis is to estimate the chance co-incidence events during the GRB mimicking as true Compton events. In Figure 1, the red light curve is obtained for double but non-neighboring pixels events with the same Compton criterion. The small peak in the light curve during the GRB is because of 1) chance coincidence events of the GRB photons within 40 $\mu$s time window in the non-neighboring pixels, and 2) the Compton scattering events between the non-neighboring pixels. Probability of Compton events between the non-neighboring pixels can be estimated from Geant–4 simulation. We subtract the Compton events from the total events under the peak to estimate the chance events in the non-neighboring pixels during the GRB. The estimated chance events are found to be small in number compared to the valid Compton events ($<1–2\%$) for the brightest of the GRBs. These numbers agree well with the theoretically computed values based on Poisson’s chance co-incidence rate in a co-incidence window of 40 $\mu$s. We are particularly interested in the chance event rate in the neighboring pixels during the GRB as these events would mimic the Compton events leading to a false polarization estimation. Neighboring pixel chance events are expected to be comparatively smaller in number compared to the non-neighboring chance events since the number of two pixel combinations is $\sim$35 times less than the two non-neighboring pixel combinations (for 256 pixels in a module). Consequently, we expect the chance events to be reduced by a factor of $\sim$35 compared to the non-neighboring pixel chance events (1–2 %) which is negligible.
Figure 5. Left: background subtracted raw eight bin azimuthal angle distribution for GRB 160821A obtained from the Compton events (100−300 keV) are shown in black. The error bars are the Poisson error on each azimuthal bin for 68% confidence level. Azimuthal distribution shown in red is the one obtained by simulating with unpolarized radiation from the same GRB. Right: the geometrically corrected modulation curve for GRB 160821A. The blue solid line is the sinusoidal fit to the modulation curve. The fitted modulation amplitude is $\sim 0.19$ with a detection significance $>3\sigma$. The fitted polarization angle is $\sim -34^\circ$ in the CZTI plane.

2.4. Estimation of modulation amplitude ($\mu$) and polarization angle ($\phi_0$)

In order to obtain the distribution of azimuthal scattering angles for the GRB photons which essentially contain the polarization signature of radiation, we first generate the 8 bin azimuthal angle distribution for background and GRB events (Compton events confined by the vertical dashed lines in Figure 1). The azimuthal angle distribution for the background is then subtracted from the total distribution to obtain the source distribution. The background azimuthal distribution is obtained by adding the individual pre and post-GRB background azimuthal distribution. The azimuthal angle for a given valid event is estimated with respect to the ‘X’ axis on the CZTI plane (perpendicular to the radiator plate) in anti-clockwise direction when viewed from top. Background count rate has been found to vary from orbit to orbit due to different ground traces of the orbits. However, one of the advantages of GRB polarimetry is the availability of pre and post-GRB events just before and after the GRB prompt emission which makes the background azimuthal distribution estimation comparatively easier compared to any other persistent sources. The background subtracted azimuthal angle histogram for GRB 160821A as an example is shown in Figure 5 in black. We see a significant difference in the count rate detected by the edge pixels (angular bin $0^\circ$, $90^\circ$, $180^\circ$ and $270^\circ$) and the corner pixels (angular bin $45^\circ$, $135^\circ$, $225^\circ$ and $315^\circ$). This is due to the unequal solid angles subtended by the edge and corner pixels to the central pixel. The azimuthal angle covered by the edge pixels is much larger and hence more number of photons are detected in the edge pixels (Chattopadhyay et al. 2014). It is to be noted that the azimuthal angle distribution for any off-axis source is supposed to differ significantly from that for an on-axis source. This is because of the break in symmetry of the pixel geometry with respect to the incident photon direction. This complicates the overall shape of the azimuthal angle distribution. However both these effects can be taken care of by normalizing the azimuthal distribution of the GRB by the same for a 100 % unpolarized radiation, provided the off-axis angle and the spectra to generate the off-axis distribution are the same. If $P_i$ stands for polarized photons in $i^{th}$ angular bin, $U_i$ for unpolarized photons in the same angular bin and $\bar{U}$ is the average number of photons for the unpolarized distribution, then the correct distribution for the polarized photons is obtained by,

$$P_{i,\text{corrected}} = \frac{P_i}{U_i} \bar{U}. \quad (1)$$

We obtain $U_i$ or the unpolarized distribution by simulating 100 % unpolarized photons with the AstroSat mass model at the same off-axis angle generated with the originally observed GRB spectra. The red line in Figure 5 shows the raw azimuthal unpolarized distribution (red) in the left panel, whereas the right panel shows the modulation curve for the GRB following the correction according to Equation 1. The blue solid curve is a cosine function fitted to estimate the
modulation factor and the polarization angle in the CZTI detector plane, given by,

\[ C(\phi) = A \cos(2(\phi - \phi_0 + \pi/2)) + B, \]  

where A, B and \(\phi_0\) are are the fitting parameters. The modulation factor which is directly proportional to the polarization of the photons is given by the ratio of A to B, whereas the polarization angle in the detector plane is given by \(\phi_0\). Number of Compton events used to obtain the azimuthal distribution is \(\sim 2500\). A clear modulation in the azimuthal distribution signifies that the GRB is highly polarized with modulation amplitude (\(\mu\)) around 0.19 at an angle \(-34^\circ\) in the detector plane. Measurement of polarization from \(\mu\) requires estimation of modulation factor for 100 % polarized radiation which will be discussed later.

2.4.1. Estimation of uncertainties in \(\mu\) and \(\phi_0\)

The error bars in the modulation curve represent the 1σ uncertainties in each bin which are mostly dominated by the statistics of low photon counts during the GRB prompt emission and the uncertainty in estimating the background azimuthal distribution. We propagate these individual contributions to finally estimate the error in the azimuthal bins as given by Equation 3,

\[ \sigma_C^2(\phi) = \frac{R_G}{T_G} \left( 1 + \frac{R_B}{R_G} \left( 1 + \frac{T_G}{T_B} \right) \right). \]

\(R_G\) and \(R_B\) are the GRB and background count rates respectively. \(T_G\) and \(T_B\) are the duration of GRB and selected background exposure. We see that the error in the count rate depends on the GRB to background contrast as expected whereas the uncertainty in background azimuthal distribution can be made negligible with a sufficiently large background exposure.

Estimation of modulation amplitude and polarization angle and their uncertainties are accomplished by using Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) (Geyer 2011) based on Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Hastings 1970; Chib & Greenberg 1995). The reason to follow the Bayesian statistics approach is the clarity in the fitting procedure and the robustness in the estimation of the parameter uncertainties compared to \(\chi^2\) analysis. It is not correct to assume Gaussian distribution to estimate error on polarization fraction and polarization angle. Vaillancourt (2006), with the use of Rice distribution to compute the polarization probability density, has shown that there is a significant departure from the Gaussian distribution for the low significance measurements of polarization degree. This can be taken care of in the MCMC simulations to estimate the error on polarization fraction and angle properly. MCMC analysis also allows to explore the Bayesian model comparison which is important in our case to achieve a firm confirmation of the detection of polarization. We compute the MCMC simulations for a large number of iterations. For each iteration, the likelihood is estimated based on the randomly sampled model (2) parameter values. A set of parameter values for a given iteration is accepted or rejected by comparing the posterior probability for that iteration with that from the previous iteration (ratio of posterior probabilities should be greater than unity for accepting the parameter values). The posterior probabilities for those iterations with ratio less than unity, is further compared to a random number between 0 and 1. Number of Compton events used to obtain the azimuthal distribution is \(\sim 2500\). A clear modulation in the azimuthal distribution signifies that the GRB is highly polarized with modulation amplitude (\(\mu\)) around 0.19 at an angle \(-34^\circ\) in the detector plane. Measurement of polarization from \(\mu\) requires estimation of modulation factor for 100 % polarized radiation which will be discussed later.

We repeat the same procedure for all the GRBs to first filter the Compton events and then generate the raw azimuthal distribution followed by the correction for pixel geometry and off-axis viewing angles of the GRBs (see 2.1, 2.3 and 2.4). The corrected modulation curves are then fitted using MCMC method to estimate the modulation amplitude and the polarization angles and the respective uncertainties. The next step is to obtain the polarization fractions of the GRBs. Estimation of the polarization fraction requires measurement of modulation factor for 100 % polarized radiation (\(\mu_{100}\)). In order to estimate \(\mu_{100}\), we simulate the AstroSat mass model in Geant—4 with a large number of polarized photons for the same off-axis viewing angles and photon energy distribution of the GRBs. Chattopadhyay et al. (2014) shows that \(\mu_{100}\) strongly depends on the polarization angle and therefore it is important to estimate \(\mu_{100}\) at the fitted polarization angles for the GRBs. This is done by calculating values of \(\mu_{100}\) at different polarization angles using Geant—4 and finally interpolating the \(\mu_{100}\)s corresponding to the observed polarization angles for the GRBs.
Figure 6. Left: Evolution of the MCMC chain with iterations for GRB 160821A. The MCMC simulations are done with total 1 million iterations. In the plot, we show the evolution for intermediate 1000 interpolated iterations. Right: Posterior probability distribution of the fitting parameters $A, B$ and $\phi_0$ as obtained from MCMC iterations. We compute the uncertainties in the parameters by integrating the probability distribution for desired level of confidence levels.

The uncertainty in the measured polarization angle introduces an error in the $\mu_{100}$ estimation which is eventually propagated into the polarization fraction as shown in Equation 4,

$$\sigma_P = \frac{\mu}{\mu_{100}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{\sigma^2_\mu}{\mu^2} + \frac{\sigma^2_{\mu_{100}}}{\mu^2_{100}}\right)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

It is to be noted that the mass model simulations suggest that for off-axis photons the dependence of $\mu_{100}$ on the polarization angle is not as strong as in the case of on-axis photons. Apart from a few GRBs, in most cases the polarization angles have been constrained within $5-10^\circ$ which makes this error negligible compared to the statistical error involved in the measurement of $\mu$. Details of the polarization fractions of the GRBs and the final uncertainties will be discussed in the next section.

Polarization measurements are often susceptible to systematic uncertainties and therefore it is important to take into account all possible sources of systematics for the final error estimations. Here we discuss the possible systematics involved in the polarization measurements with CZTI.

- There can be systematics involved in the selection of background. To investigate this effect, we estimate the modulation amplitude taking both pre and post-GRB background events independently and combined. The estimated modulation factors and polarization angles are found to be within $\sim1\%$ of each other.

- Polarization analysis involves normalization of the observed azimuthal angle distribution with respect to the unpolarized distribution which is obtained from Geant—4 by simulating unpolarized photons at the same GRB off-axis viewing angle. The localization of the GRB in CZTI co-ordinate system is normally done based on the position provided by Swift/BAT or Fermi/GBM or from X-ray afterglow whenever available. The BAT position is accurate to about 3' whereas uncertainty on GBM localizations is around 3.7' (Connaughton et al. 2015). To investigate the effect of the localization uncertainty (in the CZTI co-ordinates) on the estimated modulation amplitude, we did Geant—4 simulation for a large number of photons (so that the statistical uncertainty is
negligible) using the AstroSat mass model in a $5^\circ \times 5^\circ$ region in the sky. We find the variation in modulation amplitude to be within 4% and polarization angle within 2.5%. Therefore for the GRBs localized from BAT position, we expect the uncertainty in modulation amplitude and polarization angle to be extremely small, however can be large ($\sim$5%) for those localized from GBM position. However, for the 11 GRBs discussed here, the localization uncertainties are extremely small, $<1^\circ$ (see Table 1), which results in a negligible uncertainty in the derived polarization results.

- We also investigate the dependence of the simulated azimuthal angle distribution on the model spectra. We did mass model simulation for GRB 160821A at the same off-axis angle but for different powerlaw spectra around the reported powerlaw index. Dependence of modulation amplitude on energy is found to be very weak with $\sim$1% variation in the azimuthal distribution.

- The other possible systematics in the modulation amplitude is the unequal quantum efficiency of the CZTI pixels. However, since we search for GRB Compton events across the full CZTI plane, the relative quantum efficiency of the pixels are expected to be averaged out to some extent. The relative efficiency of the pixels varies within 5% which induces negligible false modulation amplitude.

Considering all these sources, we expect $<3$% systematics for all the GRBs which is negligible compared to the statistical errors involved in the measurement of polarization fraction and angle.

2.4.2. Bayes factor calculation

In spite of the significant modulations as observed for the GRBs (see Figure 5 and Figure 8), any claim on polarization detection requires further investigation on the probability of any unpolarized radiation to mimic such modulations in the azimuthal angle distribution. This is important as modulation amplitude is positive definite quantity and particularly, we are dealing with very small number of photons for most of the GRBs. We explore the Bayesian paradigm to estimate such chance probability by estimating the Bayes factor for the sinusoidal model (for polarized photons) and a constant model (unpolarized photons). Bayes factor is defined as the ratio of marginal likelihoods ($P(M|D)$) of the models as

$$B_{21} = \frac{P(M_2|D)}{P(M_1|D)} = \frac{P(D|M_2)}{P(D|M_1)},$$

where we assume equal prior probabilities for the models ($M_1$ and $M_2$). $P(D|M)$ or the likelihood function is computed by integrating the posterior probability over the parameter space. There are several methods available in the literature for evaluating the integrals. We have implemented the ‘Thermodynamic Integration’ (Lartillot & Philippe 2006; Calderhead & Girolami 2009) method to compare these two models. This method allows the integration in the parameter space using MCMC. We perform MCMC for each model with $P(D|M, \theta)^\beta$ defined as the likelihood ($0 < \beta < 1$), at different $\beta$ values and finally integrate the posterior probabilities over $\beta$. The Bayes Factor is eventually estimated from the ratio of the respective computed marginal likelihoods. Values of Bayes factor, $P(D|M_{unpol}) / P(D|M_{pol})$, greater than 2 are considered as evidence in favor of the polarized model to rule out the possibility of unpolarized radiation mimicking polarization signature in the azimuthal angle distribution. For GRBs with Bayes factor $<2$, we estimate the upper limit of polarization.

To investigate this further, we estimate the false polarization detection probability by simulating 100% unpolarized radiation in Geant4 AstroSat mass model. We repeated simulate unpolarized photons for a large number of times with varying number of Compton events and estimate the modulation amplitude following the same method as mentioned in 2.4. We define false detection probability as the probability of Bayes factor being $\geq 2$ for estimated modulation amplitude equal to or greater than a given value. Figure 7 shows the probability of false polarization detection as a function of detected modulation amplitude and number of Compton events. The results shown here are obtained by simulating for off-axis viewing angle of GRB 160821A. We have repeated the analysis for other viewing angles and the results are found to be similar. We expect the number of Compton events $\sim$3000 – 4000 for the bright GRBs in CZTI ($\sim$2500 for GRB 160821A) and therefore the simulations are done for Compton events in the range 300 – 4000. The false detection probability is found to be as large as $\sim$20% for Compton events $<500$ for detected modulation amplitude of 0.2. The plateau at lower modulation amplitudes (particularly for the smaller number of Compton events) implies that number of false detections does not vary below a critical modulation amplitude value. The plateau level increases for Bayes factors $<2$. Since the GRBs are expected to be highly polarized, for any true polarization detection, we expect modulation amplitude to be greater than 0.2. The number of Compton events expected for moderately bright GRBs is around 700 which makes false detection probability very small. It is to be noted that actual observed azimuthal angle distributions have larger errors due to the background subtraction. The simulated azimuthal distributions do not require any background subtraction and therefore have comparatively smaller
error bars because of which the Bayes factors are slightly over estimated. Therefore the false detection probabilities obtained here represent the worst case scenario.

2.4.3. Calculation of upper limit of polarization

Upper limit estimations on polarization are done for GRBs with values of Bayes factor less than 2. We estimate the upper limit following the method given in Kashyap et al. (2010). The method, popularly known as Power calculation method, has been utilized here for the estimations of polarization upper limit. The calculations are done in two steps. The first step involves the estimation of polarization detection threshold which we determine by limiting the probability of false detection, i.e.

$$Pr(\mu > \mu_\alpha | P = 0, N_{Compt}, N_{bkg}, BF > 2) \leq \alpha,$$

where, $\alpha$ is the maximum allowed probability of false detection, $P$ is the fraction of polarization, $N_{Compt}$ and $N_{bkg}$ are the observed number of Compton events and background events for a given burst respectively and $BF$ is the Bayes factor minimum value of which should be equal to 2. The false probability is estimated using Geant–4 simulation of the AstroSat mass model for the observed Compton and background events for a given GRB with 100% unpolarized photons (as described in 2.4.2). We therefrom estimate the modulation amplitude, $\mu_\alpha$ for the maximum allowed probability of a false detection ($\alpha$). This is called the $\alpha$-level detection threshold. In the next step, we calculate the probability of detection of polarization such that

$$Pr(\mu > \mu_\alpha | P > 0, N_{Compt}, N_{bkg}, BF > 2) \geq \beta,$$

where, $\beta$ is the minimum probability of detection. We simulate the GRB for the given number of source and background events with varying polarization fractions (from 0 to 100%) and estimate $Pr(\mu > \mu_\alpha)$ as a function of polarization fraction. Polarimetric sensitivity of CZTI depends on the polarization angle in the CZTI plane. Therefore, we simulate the polarized photons in Geant–4 for polarization angle corresponding to $\mu_{100}$, averaged over polarization angles in 0 to 45°. The polarization fraction ($P$) for which $Pr(\mu > \mu_\alpha)$ exceeds $\beta$ gives the upper limit of polarization. We use values of $\beta = 0.5$ in conjunction with $\alpha = 0.05$ or 0.01 for the upper limit estimations. It is to be noted that $\beta = 0.5$ actually corresponds to the $\alpha$-level detection threshold if we assume the sampling distribution of the estimated modulation amplitude follows smooth Gaussian statistics with median equal to $P$ (Kashyap et al. 2010). A higher value of $\beta$ would correspond to a higher value of polarization upper limit.
3. RESULTS

Figure 8 shows the modulation curves for the remaining 10 GRBs. The modulation curves are obtained in the energy range 100 – 300 keV. We see a clear polarization signature in most of the GRBs, while for a few GRBs, lack of enough photons leads to a large uncertainty in the estimated modulation amplitude and the polarization angle. The fitted values of the modulation amplitudes and polarization angles are given in the text inside the modulation curves along with the estimated uncertainties. Except for GRB 160325A and GRB 160802A, all the GRBs manifest a single broad pulse. These two GRBs show two clear pulses in their lightcurves. The modulation curves shown here are for the combined Compton events from the both the peaks in order to enhance the signal to noise ratio. However we have seen no significant change in the modulation amplitudes and polarization angles across the pulses in both the GRBs, with the detection significance being reduced significantly as expected. It is to be noted that previously we presented polarization analysis for GRB 151006A in Rao et al. (2016). The analysis was done without the use of detailed AstroSat mass model. With the implementation of the mass model the new result is more accurate and the estimated modulation amplitude is slightly less than that reported earlier. It is to be noted that we do not see any significant modulation for GRB 160623A in the full energy range of 100 – 300 keV. The modulation amplitude is estimated to be low with large uncertainties on both modulation amplitude and polarization angle, signifying that the radiation is unpolarized. Interestingly, at energies below 200 keV, we find significant modulation in the azimuthal angle distribution for GRB 160623A. It is either a change in the polarization angle or unpolarized nature of the photons at higher energies, which leads to a net zero polarization in 100 – 300 keV. Currently, it is not possible to distinguish these two scenarios due to poor statistics at higher energies.

Figure 9 shows the estimated Bayes factors for the GRBs. We obtain high values of Bayes factor for seven GRBs, for which we can definitely claim the detection of polarization. GRB 151006A and GRB 160703A have Bayes factor slightly higher than 1, therefore the possibility that these two GRBs are unpolarized, can not be completely ruled out. The probabilities of GRB 160607A and GRB 160623A being unpolarized are high as shown in Figure 9. For the GRBs with Bayes factors \( \leq 2 \), we estimate the upper limit of polarizations as discussed earlier. Figure 10 shows the estimated polarization fractions and the contours for 68 % (red), 95 % (green) and 99 % (blue) confidence level estimated from MCMC simulations. For GRB 151006A, GRB 160607A, GRB 160623A and GRB 160703A, we see that the polarization fractions and angles are hardly constrained. This is consistent with the fact that Bayes factors for these bursts are \( < 2 \), indicating that these GRBs are either intrinsically unpolarized or the polarizations are below the polarimetric sensitivity level of the instrument. We estimate the upper limits of polarization for these GRBs following the method described in 2.4.3 for \( \alpha = 0.05 \) and 0.01 with \( \beta = 0.5 \). The derived polarization fractions and angles for the GRBs along with the estimated uncertainties for 1 parameter of interest with 68 % confidence level are given in Table 2. We see that most of the GRBs are highly polarized further corroborating the fact that prompt emission is highly polarized along with the reported polarization estimations for a few GRBs by RHESSI, INTEGRAL and GAP. For GRB 160131A, GRB 160802A, GRB 160821A and GRB 160910A the polarization fractions are estimated with \( \geq 3\sigma \) detection significance (for 1 parameter of interest) at 68 % confidence level. On the other hand for GRB 160106A, GRB 160325A and GRB 160509A, polarization fractions are constrained within \( \sim 2.5\sigma \) significance. The rightmost column shows the estimated false polarization detection probabilities for the bursts (described in 2.4.2). False detection probabilities for the bursts are estimated from the estimated modulation amplitudes and Bayes factors of the bursts. It is to be noted that chance probabilities are negligible for the brighter GRBs with significant detection of modulation. The results reported here are till now the most sensitive polarization measurements in X-rays for GRB prompt emission given the moderate fluence level in most of the cases except for a few GRBs.

4. DISCUSSIONS AND SUMMARY

In the fireball scenario (Piran 2004; Mészáros 2006), interaction of highly relativistic material within the jet causes the prompt emission, whereas the interaction of the jet with the ambient medium leads to the afterglow phase. GRB prompt emission is widely believed to be of synchrotron origin from high energy electrons in the jet (Meszaros & Rees 1993). Apart from synchrotron, other possible mechanisms of such high energy radiation are inverse Compton scattering, blackbody radiation and sometimes a mixture of all these processes. The time integrated high polarization observed in many GRBs (as shown in this work and the previously reported GRBs) so far demand the magnetic field to be uniform and time independent (Nakar et al. 2003; Granot & Königl 2003; Waxman 2003), if we assume the prompt emission to be due to synchrotron radiation from high energy electrons. Both the conditions are satisfied if we assume a toroidal magnetic field geometry at large distances from the compact object where the radiation is emitted.
Figure 8. Same as Figure 5 (right panel) for the remaining 10 GRBs.
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Figure 9. Bayes factors for the polarized model (sinusoidal fit) to the unpolarized (constant fit) for all the GRBs. The Bayes factors are estimated using combined MCMC and ‘Thermodynamic Integration’ method (see text for details). For bursts with Bayes factor less than 2, we estimate the upper limit of polarization.

Table 2. Measured polarization fractions and angles for the GRBs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRB Name</th>
<th>Compton events</th>
<th>PF (%)</th>
<th>PA (°)</th>
<th>Chance Probability (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRB 151006A</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>&lt;79.2 (α = 0.05, β = 0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160106A</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>68.5±24</td>
<td>-22.5±12.0°</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160131A</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>94±31</td>
<td>41.2±5.0°</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160325A</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>58.75±23.5</td>
<td>10.9±17.0°</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160509A</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>96±40</td>
<td>-28.6±11.0°</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160607A</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>&lt;75 (α = 0.05, β = 0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160623A</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>&lt;46.4 (α = 0.05, β = 0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;57.1 (α = 0.01, β = 0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160703A</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>&lt;54.5 (α = 0.05, β = 0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;68.1 (α = 0.01, β = 0.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160802A</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>85±29</td>
<td>-36.1±4.6°</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160821A</td>
<td>2549</td>
<td>48.7±14.6</td>
<td>-34.0±5.0°</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRB 160910A</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>93.7±30.92</td>
<td>43.5±4.0°</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This requires the field to be generated very close to the compact object and then carried by the wind which could be either Poynting flux dominated, converting the field energy to the kinetic energy of electrons (Lyutikov et al. 2003) or dominated by the plasma particle density, where the particle energy is dissipated to the energy of the electrons. High polarization can also be achieved even from a random magnetic field (∼40 – 70 %) generated in the shock plane itself, if the jet is narrow and seen from the edge (Γθj ∼ 1) (Medvedev 2007).

Lazzati et al. (2004) have shown that inverse Compton emission from relativistic electrons in a jet propagating within an external photon field (Shaviv & Dar 1995) can result in high observed polarization (60 – 100 %) if the jet is
narrow and is observed along the edge similar to the case of random magnetic field ($\Gamma \theta_j < 5$). The possibility of such a geometric configuration favourable for high polarization is quite small both for the Compton drag model and the random synchrotron radiation model. GRBs without such favourable viewing geometry are expected to be unpolarized according to the geometric models. In this context, GRB 160623A is interesting as we find that the modulation is low with large errors in both polarization fraction and angle consistent with the fact that the burst is unpolarized. On the other hand, we see most of the GRBs are nominally highly polarized (>70%) which apparently favours the Compton drag (CD) model. This can be further verified by investigating the $\Gamma \theta_j$ condition for Compton drag model. We try to test the $\Gamma \theta_j$ condition for the GRBs with known redshifts (GRB 160131A, GRB 160509A and GRB 160623A). The isotropic energy $E_{\gamma, iso}$ in the $\gamma$–ray band is found by integrating the time-integrated spectra over 1 keV – 10 MeV energy range. The cosmological parameters chosen were $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.73$, $\Omega_m = 0.27$ and $H_0 = 70$ km Mpc$^{-1}$ sec$^{-1}$

Figure 10. Contour plots of polarization angle and fraction for all the GRBs as obtained from the MCMC method. The red, green and blue lines represent the 68%, 95% and 99% confidence levels respectively.
Table 3. Parameters of GRB-jets derived from observed prompt and afterglow properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRB</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>$E_{\gamma,iso,52}$</th>
<th>$\Gamma_0$</th>
<th>$\theta_j$</th>
<th>$\theta_j\Gamma_0$</th>
<th>$E_{\gamma,j,50}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(ergs)</td>
<td>(°)</td>
<td>(°)</td>
<td>(ergs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160131A</td>
<td>0.972a</td>
<td>~ 40</td>
<td>459$^{+54}_{-49}$</td>
<td>3$^{+3}_{-1.8}$</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>60$^{+18}_{-5}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160509A</td>
<td>1.17b</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>724$^{+130}_{-111}$</td>
<td>4.0$^{+4.3}_{-2.3}$</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>63$^{+203}_{-51}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160623A</td>
<td>0.367c</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6$^{+4}_{-3}$</td>
<td>311$^{+21}_{-19}$</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c: Malesani et al. (2016) (GCN 19708)

BAT fluence is calculated in 15 – 150 keV energy range
GBM fluence is calculated in 8 – 1000 keV energy range

(Comatsu et al. 2009). We can find bulk Lorentz factors of the jetted emission from the prompt and the afterglow properties by several methods (Wang et al. 2017). We relied here on the $E_{\text{iso}} - \Gamma_0$ correlation (Liang et al. 2010). The Lorentz factor decays during the afterglow phase, so we derived it from a prompt emission correlation. The initial Lorentz factor $\Gamma_0$ is constrained from the limits in the normalization and slope of the correlation. From $\Gamma_0$ we found the beaming angle of the emission ($\sim 1/\Gamma_0$). The jet half opening angles are calculated from the jet-breaks observed in Swift/XRT X-ray light-curves$^3$ (Sari 1999; Frail et al. 2001). The limits on $\theta_j$ are set by selecting the radiation efficiency and the circum-burst density ($\eta, n (cm^{-3})$) in the range between (0.1, 0.001) and (0.9, 10). We could thus find the collimation corrected emission energy of the bursts $E_j = E_{\text{iso}}(1 - \cos \theta_j)$. These values for these GRBs are given in Table 3. Such estimates for a large number of GRBs with polarization measurements would be very useful for a detailed understanding of the GRB prompt emission. For the remaining GRBs with no redshift measurements, we are planning to use the Yonetoku correlation (Yonetoku et al. 2004) to estimate the redshifts of the bursts. The Lorentz factor ($\Gamma_0$) can be calculated in the same way by making use of the $E_{\text{iso}} - \Gamma_0$ correlation. We plan to estimate the jet breaks and therefrom the jet opening angles from the available afterglow measurements. However, given the uncertainties associated with these correlation relations and the uncertainties in the measured polarization fractions of the GRBs, it is difficult to constrain any of these models for the bursts individually. Alternatively, statistical analysis of the prompt emission polarization for a very large sample of GRBs is expected to give a better insight to the emission mechanisms behind the prompt emission (Toma et al. 2009). In Figure 11 we show the estimated polarization fractions for the GRBs as function of their peak energies ($E_{\text{peak}}$). For the GRBs detected only in BAT, we use the $E_{\text{peak}}$ values estimated from Konus/Wind time integrated data (see Table 1). The black data points refer to the bursts studied in this work whereas the red data points stand for the measurements for GRB 100826A, GRB 110301A, GRB 110721A by GAP (Yonetoku et al. 2011, 2012) and GRB 041219A by IBIS onboard INTEGRAL (Götz et al. 2009). The current sample is not sufficient to constrain the emission mechanisms at present. However, given the lifetime of AstroSat of at least five years, CZTI is expected to detect polarization for a large sample of GRBs (>60). The recently launched dedicated GRB polarimeter, POLAR (Sun et al. 2016; Orsi & Polar Collaboration 2011), is expected to provide sensitive polarization measurements in hard X-rays for a large number of GRBs in the near future. All these measurements from CZTI and POLAR can provide critical inputs to distinguish the prompt emission models.

$^3$ http://www.swift.ac.uk/xrt_curves/
Figure 11. polarization fraction as a function of peak energies, $E_{\text{peak}}$, for the GRBs for which polarizations have been estimated. The black points represent the GRBs detected by CZTI (see Table 2), whereas the red points stand for those detected by GAP and INTEGRAL (see text for details).

Though synchrotron emission is widely believed to be the dominant emission mechanism behind prompt emission of GRBs, inverse Compton scattering process and thermal emission from expanding photosphere also appear to be important in many GRBs (Lundman et al. 2014). The dependence of polarization on the spectral and time evolutions have the potential to clearly distinguish between various models of GRB prompt emission. In this context, finding GRB 160623A unpolarized in $100 - 300$ keV is very interesting as the GRB shows high polarization ($\sim 60\%$ with Bayes factor $>1.5$) at energies below $\sim 200$ keV, which indicates a change in the polarization characteristics of the source at higher energies. A detailed spectro-polarimetric study of the bursts, particularly for GRB 160623A is currently in progress. The preliminary spectral analysis shows a deviation from the Band model and an additional thermal blackbody is needed to model the spectrum more precisely for four GRBs (160106A, 160509A, 160802A and 160910A). The GRBs 160106A, 160509A and 160910A are peculiar as the blackbody spectrum peak attains temperature higher than peak energy ($E_p$) of these GRBs. We have 9 GRBs with afterglow observations and 7 of these have both optical and X-ray afterglows. Among them, 5 GRBs also have radio afterglows. A multi-band spectral and timing analysis of the prompt and afterglows emissions together with the polarization measurements can reveal more about the physics of these sources.

In summary, we describe the CZTI polarimetric analysis method for GRBs in details and present the prompt emission polarization measurements for 11 bright GRBs. All the GRBs discussed here were detected within the first year after the launch of AstroSat. We find most of the bursts to be highly polarized, implying either synchrotron emission in a time independent uniform magnetic field or Compton drag to be the reason for the prompt emission. Given the fact that all the GRBs except for a couple of bursts are moderately bright, these results are so far statistically the most significant polarization measurements. CZTI almost doubled the number of GRBs with polarization measurements in one year and is expected to measure polarization for more GRBs at the same rate. Such a large sample of prompt emission polarization from CZTI (along with those from POLAR) is likely to significantly enhance our understanding of the GRB prompt emission.

This publication uses data from the AstroSat mission of the Indian Space Research Organisation (ISRO), archived at the Indian Space Science Data Centre (ISSDC). CZT-Imager is built by a consortium of Institutes across India including Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Mumbai, Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre, Thiruvananthapuram, ISRO Satellite Centre, Bengaluru, Inter University Centre for Astronomy and Astrophysics, Pune, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad, Space Application Centre, Ahmedabad: contributions from the vast technical team from all these institutes are gratefully acknowledged. TC is thankful for the helpful discussions with D. N. Burrows (PennState), P. Meszaros (PennState), D. Fox (PennState), K. Frank (PennState), C. B. Markwardt (NASA/GSFC), V. Kashyap.
(Harvard) and Carson Chow (UPenn). This research has also made use of data obtained through the High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center Online Service, provided by the NASA/Goddard Space Flight Center.
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