

One large glitch in PSR B1737–30 detected with the TMRT

Jie Liu^{1,4}, Zhen Yan^{1,6}, Jian-Ping Yuan², Ru-Shuang Zhao^{1,5}, Zhi-Peng Huang^{1,4}, Xin-Ji Wu³, Na Wang² and Zhi-Qiang Shen^{1,4,6}

¹ Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Shanghai 200030, China; yanzhen@shao.ac.cn

² Xinjiang Astronomical Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Xinjiang 830011, China

³ School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

⁴ School of Physical Science and Technology, ShanghaiTech University, Shanghai 201210, China

⁵ University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

⁶ Key Laboratory of Radio Astronomy, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Nanjing 210008, China

Received 20xx month day; accepted 20xx month day

Abstract One large glitch was detected in PSR B1737–30 using data spanning from MJD 57999 to 58406 obtained with the newly built Shanghai Tian Ma Radio Telescope (TMRT). The glitch took place at the time around MJD 58232.4 when the pulsar underwent an increase in the rotation frequency of $\Delta\nu$ about 1.38×10^{-6} Hz, corresponding to a fractional step change of $\Delta\nu/\nu \sim 8.39 \times 10^{-7}$. Post-glitch ν gradually decreased to the pre-glitch value. The frequency derivative was observed to undergo a step change of about $-9 \times 10^{-16} \text{ s}^{-2}$. Since July 1987, there are 36 glitches already reported in PSR B1737–30 including this one. According to our analysis, the glitch size distribution is well described by the power law with index of 1.13. The distribution of the interval between two adjacent glitches (waiting time ΔT) follows a Poissonian probability density function. For PSR B1737–30, the interval is prone to be long after a large glitch. But no correlation is found between glitch size and the interval since previous glitch.

Key words: stars: neutron — pulsars: general — pulsars: individual: B1737–30

1 INTRODUCTION

In general, pulsars rotate with high stability, making it possible to predict arrival time of each pulse over long time. However, two kinds of timing irregularities have been detected in pulsar rotation evolutions: the timing noise and the glitch. The timing noise is a kind of long-term stochastic fluctuation in residuals. It is related to pulsar characteristic age $\tau_c = P/(2\dot{P})$ and the spin-down rate $|\dot{\nu}|$ (Hobbs et al. 2010). By comparison, the glitch is a sudden change in the rotation frequency.

Since the first glitch was detected in Vela pulsar (B0833–45) (Radhakrishnan & Manchester 1969; Reichley & Downs 1969), there are about 520 glitches detected in 180 pulsars (Manchester 2018). Almost all frequency jumps ($\Delta\nu$) caused by glitches are positive except two negative cases in PSRs J1522–5735 (Pletsch et al. 2013) and J2301+5852 (Archibald et al. 2013). The distribution of $\Delta\nu$ widely ranges from 10^{-11} to 10^{-4} Hz (Espinoza et al. 2011; Fuentes et al. 2017). The smallest glitch was detected in PSR J0631–0200 with a $\Delta\nu/\nu$ about 2.5×10^{-12} (McKee et al. 2016), and the largest glitch was observed in PSR J1718–3718 with a $\Delta\nu/\nu$ about 3.325×10^{-5} (Manchester & Hobbs 2011).

Post-glitch rotation frequency relaxes back towards the pre-glitch value in most cases. Exponential processes are observed in the relaxation process for some glitches. The time scale of relaxation evidently differs from one glitch to another ranging from minutes to years (Lyne et al. 1996; Dodson et al. 2007).

Half century has passed since the first pulsar glitch was detected, but glitch events are still not well understood. The vortex model (Anderson & Itoh 1975; Alpar et al. 1984; Haskell & Melatos 2015) is commonly used to explain the internal mechanism of glitch. In this scenario, neutrons in the pulsar interiors are assumed to be superfluid (Baym et al. 1969). Vortices are pinned to nuclei in solid crust or the core of pulsars and limited to move outward due to the interaction with ions in the neutron star, so the superfluid cannot lose vorticity to spin down and rotates faster than crust. Once Magnus force frees vortices, the angular momentum is transferred rapidly from superfluid to crust, giving the rise of crust rotation. Soon after glitch, the vortices are repinned to other regions, causing the relaxation of rotation frequency towards initial value. There is another kind of timing irregularity named slow glitch, where ν gradually increases after glitch and the $|\dot{\nu}|$ undergoes a quick decrease accompanied by an exponential recovery (Zou et al. 2004; Shabanova 2005). It is predicted that the temperature fluctuation of neutron star will cause the gradual increase in rotation frequency (Greenstein 1979). Slow glitch happens if the local temperature in inner crust increases suddenly (Link & Epstein 1996). The decrease in $|\dot{\nu}|$ may be a response to the decrease in the braking torque (Shabanova 2005).

Table 1: Parameters of PSR B1737–30.

Name		RA	DEC	P	\dot{P}	τ_c	DM	S_{1400}
B1950	J2000	(h m s)	(d m s)	(s)	(10^{-13} s/s)	(kyr)	(pc cm $^{-3}$)	(mJy)
B1737–30	J1740–3015	17:40:33.82	–30:15:43.5	0.60688662425	4.66124	20.6	151.96	8.9

Note: All these parameters are referenced from ATNF pulsar database (<http://www.atnf.csiro.au/research/pulsar/psrcat/>). S_{1400} is the flux density at 1.4 GHz.

PSR B1737–30 was detected in the high-radio-frequency survey at Jodrell Bank (Clifton & Lyne 1986) in 1986. Its rotation period is 0.607 s and the period derivative is about 4.66×10^{-13} s/s (Yuan et al. 2010), suggesting a young characteristic age τ_c of 20.6 kyr. The parameters of PSR B1737–30 are listed in Table 1. PSR B1737–30 exhibits frequent glitch events with 35 glitches reported during MJD 46991 (July 15, 1987) and 57499 (April 21, 2016). The timing properties of this pulsar were also monitored by the Shanghai Tian Ma Radio Telescope (TMRT) which is a newly built radio telescope with the diameter of 65 m. In this paper, we present one large glitch detected by the TMRT. The structure of this paper is organized as below. Observations together with data analysis are described in section 2. Detail results are shown in section 3. The discussion and a short conclusion are presented in section 4 and 5.

2 OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

Timing observations of PSR B1737–30 were carried out at the wavelength of 13 cm with the TMRT between MJD 57999 (September 3, 2017) and 58406 (October 15, 2018), using the S-band cryogenically cooled, dual-polarization receiver. The effective frequency coverage of the receiver ranges from 2.2 to 2.3 GHz (Yan et al. 2018). The full bandwidth is divided into channels with the typical width of 1 MHz for the convenience to remove the dispersion effect and the radio frequency interference (RFI). Data sampling and recording are accomplished using the digital backend system (DIBAS) with time resolution of 40.96 μ s (Yan et al. 2017). The incoherent dedispersion on-line folding observation mode was used in the timing observations with subintegration time of 30 s (Yan et al. 2015). The folding parameters are obtained from ATNF pulsar catalogue (Manchester et al. 2005)¹. The observation data are written out as 8-bit PSRFITS files. Each period is divided into 1024 phase bins. Duration of observations were mostly from 10 to 20 min, depending on observation conditions (e.g., weather, RFI, etc.).

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

In the pulsar timing observations, the time was kept with local hydrogen atomic clock corrected to GPS. Data reduction and analysis were performed using the PSRCHIVE (Hotan et al. 2004) and the TEMPO2 (Hobbs 2012). Data from all channels and subintegrations were scrunched together to get the mean pulse profile for each single observation. Pre- and post-glitch pulse profiles were integrated separately. The integrated normalized pulse profiles are shown in Fig 1. There is no obvious difference between widths of pulse profiles before and after glitch (Fig 2). Local pulse times of arrival (TOAs) were generated through the cross-correlation of observed pulse profiles with a high signal to noise ratio (SNR) pulse profile (template). They were converted to TOAs at the Solar-system barycenter with the Jet Propulsion Laboratories DE405 ephemeris (Standish 1998). TOA errors are mostly in the range of 20-50 μ s. The pulse phase ϕ at Solar-system barycenter given by model is a Taylor series which can be described as a function of time t as below:

$$\phi(t) = \phi_0 + \nu(t - t_0) + \frac{1}{2}\dot{\nu}(t - t_0)^2 + \frac{1}{6}\ddot{\nu}(t - t_0)^3 + \dots, \quad (1)$$

where ϕ_0 , ν , $\dot{\nu}$, $\ddot{\nu}$ are the phase at t_0 , rotation frequency with its first and second time-derivatives, respectively.

Post-glitch frequency typically relaxes back towards pre-glitch value in the form of:

$$\nu(t) = \nu_0(t) + \Delta\nu_p + \Delta\dot{\nu}_p t + \Delta\nu_d e^{-t/\tau_d}, \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{\nu}(t) = \dot{\nu}_0(t) + \Delta\dot{\nu}_p + \Delta\dot{\nu}_d e^{-t/\tau_d}, \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta\nu_p$, $\Delta\dot{\nu}_p$, τ_d and $\Delta\nu_d$ are permanent changes in ν and $\dot{\nu}$ relative to pre-glitch values, time constant and amplitude of exponential decay, respectively. The total frequency increment caused by glitch is

$$\Delta\nu = \Delta\nu_p + \Delta\nu_d, \quad (4)$$

The degree of recovery can be described by the parameter Q :

$$Q = \Delta\nu_d / \Delta\nu, \quad (5)$$




Fig. 1: The integrated normalized pulse profiles of pre- and post-glitch.




Fig. 2: Distribution of W_{10} in unit of degree. The dashed vertical line implies the epoch of glitch.

Results of PSR B1737–30 were obtained using observation data ranging from MJD 57999 to 58406. Timing residual is the difference between barycentric arrival time and the predicted TOA, which randomly distributes around zero if the rotation of pulsar is well described by the simple slow-down model. Once a glitch happens, the rotation suddenly speeds up (or down), causing the earlier (or later) arrival of pulses than predicted by model. So the timing residuals will obviously decrease towards negative (or positive) value. Timing residuals of PSR B1737–30 in the left panel of Fig 3 show an obvious downward trend after MJD 58232.4 (April 24, 2018), suggesting a large glitch at that time. In order to confirm whether this glitch event is caused by improperly corrected jump and drift of clocks or not, we did further timing analysis of the millisecond pulsar B1937+21 (Backer et al. 1982), which was also monitored at TMRT with same setups. The timing residuals are shown in the right panel of Fig 3. As no obvious change was found in residuals of PSR B1937+21 around MJD 58232.4, the distinct change in the residuals of PSR B1737–30 was caused by the glitch. Since the data interval around glitch is about 11 days, the final glitch epoch was estimated in two steps. Firstly, it was estimated as the middle point of the interval. Then, we fitted all the glitch parameters using TEMPO2 while changing the glitch epoch. The final epoch value was selected when chi-square (χ^2) became minimum. The error of glitch epoch was taken as the region of epochs corresponding to $\Delta\chi^2 \leq 1$ from the minimum. Pre- and post-glitch frequency parameters were revealed by fitting ν , $\dot{\nu}$, $\ddot{\nu}$ with data before and after glitch separately. In order to know the evolution of ν and $\dot{\nu}$ around glitch, we figured out frequency residuals at various epochs. They were obtained by fitting Equation 1 (omitting the $\ddot{\nu}$ term) over a series of overlapping data sections (Table 2). The time scales of data sections range from 13 to 80 d. The epoch of each fit was set to be the middle date of the data section.

3 RESULTS

The timing solutions of PSR B1737–30 around MJD 58232.4 are listed in Table 3 together with glitch parameters. The glitch parameters were obtained by fitting Equation 2 and 3 with TEMPO2. Timing residuals relative to the pre-glitch rotation model are shown in Fig 3 (left panel). The residuals between MJD 57999 and 58227 randomly distributed around zero, implying that the model fits well. After the occurrence of glitch, residuals continuously decreased towards negative value. The root mean square (RMS) residual is 201.27 μs after subtracting the fitted glitch model, which corresponds to ~ 0.001 turns. Evolution behaviours of ν and $\dot{\nu}$ are shown in Fig 4. The variations in ν with pre-glitch model

Table 2: Timing solutions of data sections.

Data section (MJD)	Epoch (MJD)	ν (s^{-1})	$\dot{\nu}$ (10^{-12} s^{-2})	Numbers of TOAs
57999-58012	58006	1.6474050385(1)	−1.2639(7)	5
58012-58039	58025	1.6474050387(1)	−1.2647(4)	5
58038-58063	58050	1.64740503873(4)	−1.2638(1)	6
58063-58124	58113	1.64740503875(5)	−1.2641(8)	7
58114-58185	58132	1.64740503876(6)	−1.2638(6)	8
58139-58220	58199	1.64740503883(4)	−1.2641(3)	7
58184-58227	58225	1.6474050387(1)	−1.2649(7)	10
58237-58252	58244	1.6474064190(2)	−1.2668(8)	5
58286-58301	58293	1.6474064104(1)	−1.2643(9)	10
58316-58353	58335	1.6474064051(1)	−1.2649(2)	10
58347-58370	58350	1.6474064033(2)	−1.2653(7)	11
58360-58385	58373	1.6474064013(1)	−1.2655(6)	11
58363-58406	58395	1.6474063999(3)	−1.2652(1)	10

Table 3: Timing solutions and glitch parameters.

Parameter	Pre-glitch	Post-glitch
ν (Hz)	1.64740503872(5)	1.647406475(2)
$\dot{\nu}$ (10^{-12} s^{-2})	−1.26397(2)	−1.2678(2)
$\ddot{\nu}$ (10^{-23} s^{-3})	−1.6(2)	7.8(7)
Frequency epoch (MJD)	58113	58322
Data span (MJD)	57999-58227	58237-58406
TOA numbers	32	38
GlitchEpoch (MJD)	58232.4(4)	
$\Delta\nu$ (10^{-9} Hz)	1381.7(8)	
$\Delta\nu/\nu$ (10^{-9})	838.7(5)	
$\Delta\dot{\nu}$ (10^{-16} s^{-2})	−9.0(4)	
$\Delta\dot{\nu}/\dot{\nu}$ (10^{-3})	0.71(3)	
$\Delta\nu_d$ (10^{-9} Hz)	9.5(6)	
τ_d (d)	71(6)	
RMS residual (μs)	201.27	

subtracted are plotted in panel (a). It shows a remarkable increment about $1.38 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Hz}$, corresponding to a $\Delta\nu/\nu \sim 8.39 \times 10^{-7}$. This increment is also demonstrated by pre- and post-glitch ν values listed in Table 3. After subtraction of the mean values separately for pre- and post-glitch ν , it is obviously shown in panel (b) that ν exponentially decayed towards initial value after glitch. The time constant of the exponential decay τ_d was fitted to be 71 d. The amplitude of $\Delta\nu_d$ is about $9.5 \times 10^{-9} \text{ Hz}$, possibly implying a small value of recovery index Q . Panel (c) shows that the spin-down rate $|\dot{\nu}|$ underwent an increase about $9 \times 10^{-16} \text{ s}^{-2}$, corresponding to a $\Delta\dot{\nu}/\dot{\nu} \sim 7.1 \times 10^{-4}$. It decreased back towards initial value after glitch. There was an increase in $\ddot{\nu}$ (see Table 3), which was caused by the post-glitch recovery.

4 DISCUSSION

As of April 2018, PSR B1737–30 has been observed to exhibit 36 glitches, including this one. Information of glitch epoch, glitch interval, $\Delta\nu/\nu$ and reference for all the 36 glitches are listed in Table 4. The fractional increase of $\Delta\nu/\nu$ widely ranges from 7×10^{-10} to $\sim 2.66 \times 10^{-6}$. The $\Delta\nu/\nu$ of the glitch detected by the TMRT is about 8.39×10^{-7} , making it to be the 4th largest glitch known in this pulsar.

The parameter A_g is defined as the mean fractional frequency variation per year caused by glitches

$$A_g = \frac{1}{T_g} \sum \frac{\Delta\nu}{\nu}, \quad (6)$$




Fig. 3: Timing residuals of PSRs B1737–30 (left) and B1937+21 (right). The dashed vertical line implies the epoch of the glitch.




Fig. 4: Frequency variations of PSR B1737–30 relative to pre-glitch solutions. (a): Residuals of $\Delta\nu$ after subtracting pre-glitch spin-down model; (b): $\Delta\nu$ with mean values removed separately before and after glitch; (c): The evolution of frequency derivative $\dot{\nu}$ corresponds to an initial value of $|\dot{\nu}|$. The dashed vertical line implies the epoch of the glitch.

where the $\sum (\Delta\nu/\nu)$ is the sum of fractional increments in ν of all glitches during the interval T_g (McKenna & Lyne 1990). The A_g depends on not only how frequently the glitches occurred, but also the size of glitches. This makes it to be a good indicator of glitch events on long time-scale, as it is mainly dominated by large glitch and insensitive to small glitch which is sometimes difficult to be distinguished from timing noise. The glitch activity parameter A_g of PSR B1737–30 is about $3.17 \times 10^{-7} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

Beside PSR B1737–30, there are other pulsars with various glitches reported. Parameters of eight pulsars with at least 10 glitches record are listed in Table 5. The glitch size $\Delta\nu/\nu$, time span and τ_c

Table 4: Information of 36 glitches in PSR B1737–30.

Number	Epoch (T_i) (MJD)	Interval (ΔT_i) (d)	$\Delta\nu/\nu$ (10^{-9})	Reference
1	46991(19)	290(19)	421(4)	7
2	47281(2)	51(16)	33(5)	1
3	47332(16)	126(16)	7(5)	1
4	47458(2)	212.2(20)	30(8)	1
5	47670.2(2)	487.8(10)	600.9(6)	1
6	48158(1)	33.7(10)	10(1)	7
7	48191.69(0)	26.3(20)	659(7)	7
8	48218(2)	213.3(20)	48(10)	2
9	48431.3(4)	616.2(6)	16(2)	7
10	49047.5(5)	191.6(5)	17(1)	7
11	49239.07(2)	212.6(4)	169.7(2)	7
12	49451.7(4)	92.2(4)	9.5(5)	4
13	49543.93(8)	1030.62(8)	3.0(6)	4
14	50574.5497(4)	367.0685(4)	439.3(2)	4
15	50941.6182(2)	743(21)	1443.0(3)	3,4
16	51685(21)	142(21)	0.7(4)	5
17	51827(2)	221(9)	0.9(3)	7
18	52048(9)	197(9)	2(3)	7
19	52245(2)	21(2)	4(1)	7
20	52266.0(2)	81.7(2)	16(1)	7
21	52347.66(6)	228.3(30)	152(2)	6
22	52576(3)	203.7(30)	0.9(2)	7
23	52779.70(4)	79.08(5)	1.7(2)	7
24	52858.78(3)	83.7(1)	18.6(3)	7
25	52942.5(1)	81.0(1)	20.2(2)	7
26	53023.52(0)	450.04(1)	1850.9(3)	6,7
27	53473.56(1)	976.63(1)	0.8(2)	7
28	54450.19(1)	245(0)	45.9(3)	7
29	54695.19(2)	115.7(1)	3.0(2)	7
30	54810.9(1)	117.7(1)	5.2(3)	7
31	54928.6(1)	291(14)	2.3(2)	7
32	55220(14)	2076(14)	2664.50(15)	8
33	57296.5(9)	49.5(11)	1.30(4)	9
34	57346.0(6)	153.4(6)	1.94(2)	10
35	57499.371(4)	732.0(4)	227.29(3)	10
36	58232.4(4)		838.7(5)	this work

Note: These parameters are referenced from ATNF pulsar database. The glitch interval ΔT_i is defined as: $\Delta T_i = T_{i+1} - T_i$. Reference: 1. McKenna & Lyne (1990); 2. Shemar & Lyne (1996); 3. Urama (2002); 4. Krawczyk et al. (2003); 5. Janssen & Stappers (2006); 6. Zou et al. (2008); 7. Espinoza et al. (2011); 8. Yu et al. (2013); 9. Jankowski et al. (2015); 10. Jankowski et al. (2016)

are referenced from ATNF pulsar database. The parameter T_g is calculated as the length of time span in years. This table is listed in sequence of τ_c . From last two columns, the A_g generally decreases when the τ_c increases for pulsars with $\tau_c \geq 4$ kyr. But the Crab pulsar (B0531+21) (Staelin & Reifenstein 1968) is an exception. Most of the 25 glitches detected in this pulsar are small or middle-size glitches. Only two relatively large glitches are measured to be $\Delta\nu/\nu$ about 2.14×10^{-7} and 4.8×10^{-7} on MJD ~ 53067.1 and 58064.6 , respectively. There is a possible explanation for relative weak glitch events of the Crab. Very young pulsars with τ_c smaller than 2 kyr have higher temperature which reduces the effect of pinning force and makes it more easier for superfluid vortices to move outward. So that, angular momentum are transferred more smoothly from superfluid to the crust, causing the glitch size more likely to be small (McKenna & Lyne 1990).

If glitches are resulted from the avalanche process, their sizes follow a power law distribution in the form of:

$$P(\Delta\nu) = \frac{\Delta\nu^{(1-\alpha)} - \Delta\nu_{\min}^{(1-\alpha)}}{\Delta\nu_{\max}^{(1-\alpha)} - \Delta\nu_{\min}^{(1-\alpha)}} \quad , \quad (7)$$

Table 5: Glitch activity parameters of eight frequently glitching pulsars.

Name	N_g	$\sum (\Delta\nu/\nu)$ (10^{-9})	Time span (MJD)	T_g (yr)	A_g (10^{-9} yr^{-1})	τ_c (kyr)
B0531+21	25	977.7(8)	40491.8(3)-58064.555(3)	48.14(0)	20.31(2)	1.26
J0537-6910	23	6614(23)	51285.7(8.6)-53951.2(1.5)	7.26(0)	911(3)	4.93
B0833-45	19	34811(20)	40280(4)-56922(3)	45.59(1)	743.4(4)	11.3
B1338-62	23	11226(6)	47989(21)-55088(16)	19.45(7)	577.2(3)	12.1
B1737-30	36	9765(3)	46991(19)-58232.4(4)	30.80(5)	317.1(1)	20.6
J0631+1036	14	5082.9(6)	50183.5(2)-55702(3)	15.12(1)	336.17(4)	43.6
B1758-23	10	2118(1)	46907(21)-55356(3)	23.15(6)	91.68(6)	58.3
B1822-09	12	242.7(8)	49615(8)-54115.78(4)	12.33(2)	19.68(6)	232

Note: The N_g is the number of glitches. The $\sum (\Delta\nu/\nu)$ is the cumulative fractional glitch size of each pulsar, its error is taken as the variance of errors from each $\Delta\nu/\nu$ for every pulsar. The T_g equals the interval of time span in years.

where α , $\Delta\nu_{\max}$ and $\Delta\nu_{\min}$ are the power law index, the maximum and minimum frequency jumps, respectively (Melatos et al. 2008). The Kolomogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test statistic D and its associated P_{K-S} are referenced to measure the agreement between data and power law fit. The parameter D is the maximum difference between two data sets, and the P_{K-S} means the probability that two sets of data follow the same distribution, equally implies how well the glitch size distribution is described by the power law. For PSR B1737-30, the cumulative glitch size distribution based on glitches before MJD 53190 (July 4, 2004) was fitted by a power law function (Melatos et al. 2008). According to their calculation, the P_{K-S} is 0.992 relative to the best fitted $\alpha = 1.1$, suggesting a good description for cumulative glitch size distribution by the power law. As ten more glitches occurred in PSR B1737-30 after MJD 53190, it is necessary to fit the cumulative glitch size distribution again to test whether it still follows the power law distribution. The power law fit was performed on 36 glitches listed in Table 4. The final α value 1.13 ± 0.03 was chosen when the P_{K-S} became maximum. The relative error was estimated as the range corresponding to the $P_{K-S} \geq 0.985$ confidence. The K-S statistic was calculated to be $D = 0.07$ with an associated $P_{K-S} = 0.9996$. This implies that the glitch size distribution of PSR B1737-30 still well obeys the power law distribution, although more glitches with different sizes occurred. Cumulative glitch size distribution of PSR B1737-30 is shown in Fig 5, together with the power law fit described in Equation 7 (dashed curve).

Pulsar glitches are statistically independent if they are caused by an avalanche process. This can be explained by a system in the state of Self Organised Criticality (SOC). The system is described as a combination of many metastable reservoirs separated from each other by relaxed regions. Stress cumulated in every reservoir is released out during one avalanche process. The following avalanche happens randomly and is typically far from previous one. No interference is found between two adjacent avalanches (Jensen 1998). The interval between two adjacent glitches is defined as waiting time ΔT . Based on the statistical independence of glitches, considering that the system is driven by the local nearest force at a mean rate, the avalanche model predicts that ΔT follows the Poisson statistics. So the distribution of ΔT can be described by a Poissonian probability density function as:

$$p(\lambda, t) = \lambda^{-1} e^{-t/\lambda}, \quad (8)$$

where λ is the mean waiting time. Melatos et al. (2008) fitted waiting time distribution of PSR B1737-30 over glitches before MJD 53190 with the best fitted $\lambda \sim 242$ d. They proposed that the λ is not expected to vary obviously in a range of forty years. We calculated waiting times based on all detected glitches, got the best fitted $\lambda = 267$ d of the Poisson model. This means a good consistence with the result calculated in Melatos et al. (2008). The cumulative waiting time distribution and the best model fit (dashed curve) are plotted in Fig 6. The K-S statistic between data and the Poisson model was calculated to be $D = 0.086$ with the associated $P_{K-S} = 0.999$, implying a good agreement between data and model.

There are 36 glitches record on PSR B1737-30, making it a good sample to test the correlation between ΔT and glitch size ($\Delta\nu/\nu$). In the left panel of Fig 7, the glitch size is plotted against the ΔT since previous glitch (ΔT_p). As data points are so obviously diffuse with the Spearman Rank correlation




Fig. 5: Cumulative frequency increment distribution of PSR B1737–30, and the power law fit given by Equation 7 with index $\alpha = 1.13$ (dashed curve).

coefficient $\rho = -0.079$, no correlation is found between them. However, a weak correlation ($\rho = 0.4$) between the ΔT_p and the glitch sizes of the Crab was proposed that large glitches are more possible to take place after long glitch intervals (Shaw et al. 2018). It is necessary to mention that the large glitch at MJD 58064 dominates this correlation of the Crab, and few small glitches of the Crab happened after long waiting times. This correlation could possibly result from the so called “reservoir effect”. In this scenario, the angular momentum are firstly stored then completely released into the crust during a glitch (Haskell & Melatos 2015; Shaw et al. 2018). The ΔT before next glitch (ΔT_n) is plotted against glitch size in the right panel of Fig 7. There is little correlation ($\rho = 0.308$) between this two terms that the ΔT_n prefers to be long after a large glitch. An apparent correlation ($\rho = 0.931$) was demonstrated between glitch size and ΔT_n in PSR J0537–6910 too (Antonopoulou et al. 2018; Melatos et al. 2018). It is much stronger than that in PSR B1737–30, but is not universal.

5 CONCLUSION

We present one large glitch in PSR B1737–30 detected with the TMRT around MJD 58232.4. PSR B1737–30 is the most frequently glitching pulsar with 36 glitches already detected. The glitch at MJD 58232.4 underwent a frequency increment of $\sim 1.38 \times 10^{-6}$ Hz, corresponding to the fractional increase of $\Delta\nu/\nu \sim 8.39 \times 10^{-7}$. The parameter A_g is a good indicator of glitch events. For PSR B1737–30, the value of A_g is about $3.17 \times 10^{-7} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Based on the statistics of glitches in eight pulsars with at least 10 glitch events, we find a correlation between A_g and characteristic age τ_c . For pulsars whose τ_c are greater than 4 kyr, the A_g generally decreases when the τ_c becomes larger. Glitch size distribution of PSR B1737–30 follows the power law distribution with index of 1.13. The distribution of ΔT obeys the Poissonian probability density function with best fitted $\lambda = 267$ d. No correlation is found between glitch size and the waiting time ΔT_p , but the ΔT_n after large glitch is more likely to be long. Since pulsar glitches differ a lot from one to another even in the same pulsar, a larger glitch sample is valuable for characterizing glitch activities.




Fig. 6: Cumulative ΔT distribution of PSR B1737–30 corresponding to 35 waiting times and the Poisson model fit in Equation 8 with $\lambda = 267$ d (dashed curve). Errors of ΔT are ignored.




Fig. 7: The relation between ΔT_p and glitch size $\Delta\nu/\nu$ (left panel) together with the relation between $\Delta\nu/\nu$ and ΔT_n (right panel). Errors of $\Delta\nu/\nu$ and ΔT are ignorable for most points.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to professor R.N.Manchester and anonymous reviewers for their good suggestions on this work. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants NO. U1631122, NO. 11403073 and NO. 11633007), the strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant NO. XDB23010200), the Knowledge Innovation Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant NO. KJCX1-YW-18) and the National

Key R&D Program of China (Grant NO. 2018YFA0404602). The hard work of all member of the TMRT team is vital for high quality observation data used in this paper.

References

- Alpar, M. A., Pines, D., Anderson, P. W., & Shaham, J. 1984, *ApJ*, 276, 325 2
- Anderson, P. W., & Itoh, N. 1975, *Nature*, 256, 25 2
- Antonopoulou, D., Espinoza, C. M., Kuiper, L., & Andersson, N. 2018, *MNRAS*, 473, 1644 9
- Archibald, R. F., Kaspi, V. M., Ng, C.-Y., et al. 2013, *Nature*, 497, 591 1
- Baym, G., Pethick, C., & Pines, D. 1969, *Nature*, 224, 673 2
- Backer, D. C., Kulkarni, S. R., Heiles, C., Davis, M. M., & Goss, W. M. 1982, *Nature*, 300, 615 4
- Clifton, T. R., & Lyne, A. G. 1986, *Nature*, 320, 43 2
- Cognard, I., & Backer, D. C. 2004, *ApJ*, 612, L125
- Dodson, R., Lewis, D., & McCulloch, P. 2007, *Ap&SS*, 308, 585 2
- Espinoza, C. M., Lyne, A. G., Stappers, B. W., & Kramer, M. 2011, *MNRAS*, 414, 1679 1, 7
- Fuentes, J. R., Espinoza, C. M., Reisenegger, A., et al. 2017, *A&A*, 608, A131 1
- Greenstein, G. 1979, *ApJ*, 231, 880 2
- Haskell, B., & Melatos, A. 2015, *International Journal of Modern Physics D*, 24, 1530008 2, 9
- Hobbs, G. 2012, *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1205.6273 3
- Hobbs, G., Lyne, A. G., & Kramer, M. 2010, *MNRAS*, 402, 1027 1
- Hotan, A. W., van Straten, W., & Manchester, R. N. 2004, *PASA*, 21, 302 3
- Jankowski, F., Bailes, M., Barr, E., et al. 2015, *The Astronomer’s Telegram*, 6903, 1 7
- . 2016, *The Astronomer’s Telegram*, 9054 7
- Janssen, G. H., & Stappers, B. W. 2006, *A&A*, 457, 611 7
- Jensen, H. J. 1998, *Self-Organized Criticality: Emergent Complex Behavior in Physical and Biological Systems* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press) 8
- Krawczyk, A., Lyne, A. G., Gil, J. A., & Joshi, B. C. 2003, *MNRAS*, 340, 1087 7
- Link, B., & Epstein, R. I. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, 844 2
- Lyne, A. G., Kaspi, V. M., Bailes, M., et al. 1996, *MNRAS*, 281, L14 2
- Manchester, R. 2018, *ArXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1801.04332 1
- Manchester, R. N., & Hobbs, G. 2011, *ApJ*, 736, L31+ 1
- Manchester, R. N., Hobbs, G. B., Teoh, A., & Hobbs, M. 2005, *AJ*, 129, 1993 2
- McKee, J. W., Janssen, G. H., Stappers, B. W., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 461, 2809 1
- McKenna, J., & Lyne, A. G. 1990, *Nature*, 343, 349 6, 7
- Melatos, A., Peralta, C., & Wyithe, J. S. B. 2008, *ApJ*, 672, 1103 8
- Melatos, A., Howitt, G., & Fulgenzi, W. 2018, *ApJ*, 863, 196 9
- Pletsch, H. J., Guillemot, L., Allen, B., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 779, L11 1
- Radhakrishnan, V., & Manchester, R. N. 1969, *Nature*, 222, 228 1
- Reichley, P. E., & Downs, G. S. 1969, *Nature*, 222, 229 1
- Shabanova, T. V. 2005, *MNRAS*, 356, 1435 2
- Shaw, B., Lyne, A. G., Stappers, B. W., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 478, 3832 9
- Shemar, S. L., & Lyne, A. G. 1996, *MNRAS*, 282, 677 7
- Staelin, D. H., & Reifenstein, III, E. C. 1968, *Science*, 162, 1481 7
- Standish, E. M. 1998, *JPL Planetary and Lunar Ephemerides, DE405/LE405*, Memo IOM 312.F-98-048 (Pasadena: JPL), <http://ssd.jpl.nasa.gov/iau-comm4/de405iom/de405iom.pdf> 3
- Urama, J. O. 2002, *MNRAS*, 330, 58 7
- Yan, Z., Shen, Z.-Q., Wu, X.-J., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 814, 5 2
- Yan, Z., Shen, Z. Q., Wu, Y. J., Zhao, R. B., & Liu, Q. H. 2017, in *Xxxiind General Assembly and Scientific Symposium of the International Union of Radio Science*, 1–4 2
- Yan, Z., Shen, Z.-Q., Manchester, R. N., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 856, 55 2
- Yu, M., Manchester, R. N., Hobbs, G., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 429, 688 7
- Yuan, J. P., Wang, N., Manchester, R. N., & Liu, Z. Y. 2010, *MNRAS*, 404, 289 2

Zou, W. Z., Wang, N., Manchester, R. N., et al. 2008, MNRAS, 384, 1063 [7](#)

Zou, W. Z., Wang, N., Wang, H. X., et al. 2004, MNRAS, 354, 811 [2](#)