

Radio/X-ray Correlation in the Mini-Outbursts of Black Hole X-ray Transient GRS 1739–278

FU-GUO XIE,¹ ZHEN YAN,¹ AND ZHONGZU WU²

¹Key Laboratory for Research in Galaxies and Cosmology, Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
80 Nandan Road, Shanghai 200030, China; fgxie@shao.ac.cn, zyan@shao.ac.cn

²College of Science, Guizhou University, Guiyang 550025, Guiyang, China; zzwu08@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

We present quasi-simultaneous radio and X-ray observations of the black hole X-ray binary GRS 1739–278 of its 2015–2016 mini-outbursts, i.e. between 2015 June 10 and 2016 October 31, with the X-ray-to-radio time interval being less than one day. The monitor campaign was run by *Swift* in the X-rays and by JVLA in the radio (at both 5 GHz and 8 GHz). We find that the brightest radio emission is actually achieved during the soft state, and the spectrum is marginally optically-thick with the spectral index $\alpha \approx -0.28 \pm 0.17$ (flux $F_\nu \propto \nu^\alpha$). For the radio emission in the hard state, we find a large diversity in the spectral index, i.e. a majority of radio spectra are optically-thick with $-0.5 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 0.5$, while a few are optically-thin, with α being lower than -1 in certain cases. We then investigate the correlation between the luminosities in radio (monochromatic at 5 GHz, L_R) and 1–10 keV X-rays (L_X) during the hard state. We find that for more than two orders of magnitude variation in the X-ray luminosity, this source exhibits a flat correlation with $p \approx 0.16$ (in the form of $L_R \propto L_X^p$), i.e. it belongs to the “outlier” (to the standard correlation with $p \approx 0.6$) category that may follow a hybrid correlation. Both the slope and the corresponding luminosity range agree well with those in H1743–322, the prototype of the hybrid correlation. Theoretical implications of our results are discussed.

Keywords: accretion, accretion discs – black hole physics – X-rays: binaries: individual: GRS 1739–278

1. INTRODUCTION

A majority of stellar-mass black hole (BH) X-ray binaries (BHBs) are transients. After a long period of quiescence, they occasionally undergo outbursts. According to the spectral and timing properties, two distinctive states are identified (Zdziarski & Gierliński 2004; Remillard & McClintock 2006; Done et al. 2007; Belloni 2010). One is the soft state, in which the X-ray spectrum is dominated by thermal component from cold accretion disc (Shakura & Sunyaev 1973), and is supplemented by a weak power-law tail with photon index $\Gamma > 2.1$ (X-ray spectrum defined as $F_\nu \propto \nu^{1-\Gamma}$) hard X-rays. The other is the hard state, in which the X-ray spectrum is dominated by emission from the Compton scattering within hot accretion flows, while the thermal emission becomes much weaker. Observationally, the Comptonized emission is shown as a $\Gamma \approx 1.4$ – 1.8 power-law emission which has an exponential high-energy cutoff at around ~ 100 keV (e.g., Zdziarski et al. 1998). Additionally when the thermal and the non-thermal emissions are of comparable significance, it is defined as the intermediate state, which is further divided into hard intermediate and soft intermediate states.

BHBs in their hard state are ubiquitous with compact self-absorbed radio emission that originates from highly-

collimated relativistic jet (for reviews, see Corbel et al. 2004; Fender et al. 2004, 2009; Fender & Gallo 2014). This so-called “continuous jet” or “steady jet” has optically-thick radio spectrum, with $\alpha \sim 0$ (defined as flux $F_\nu \propto \nu^\alpha$; flat or slightly inverted, i.e. $-0.5 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 0.5$). During the hard-to-soft state transition, the continuous jet switches off (being quenched by a factor of $\gtrsim 100$ in the radio band; e.g., Fender et al. 1999; Coriat et al. 2011; Russell et al. 2011, 2019). Meanwhile, discrete bright knots/plasmoids are observed to move outward relativistically (e.g., Mirabel & Rodriguez 1994; Hjellming & Rupen 1995; Fender et al. 1999; Yang et al. 2010; Russell et al. 2019). These plasmoids are interpreted as the “episodic jet” or “transient jet”, and their radio emission is optically-thin ($\alpha < -0.5$; steep spectrum)¹ and highly-polarized (see e.g., Fender et al. 2004, 2009; Yuan et al. 2009a; Zhang & Yu 2015 for summaries). In the soft state, the continuous jet is always quenched, while residuals of the episodic ejecta (created during the hard-to-soft state transition) may still exist (e.g., Brocksopp et al. 2013), possibly due to the interactions between the ejecta and the surrounding environment (e.g., Corbel et al. 2002).

A fundamental tool in investigating the disk–jet connection is to probe the correlation between radio (monochromatic,

¹ For the spectral property of the radio emission, we use optically-thin/steep/ $\alpha < -0.5$ interchangeably, and optically-thick/flat/ $-0.5 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 0.5$ interchangeably as well.

$L_R = \nu L_\nu$ at e.g. 5 GHz) and X-ray (integrated, i.e. $L_X = \int L_\nu d\nu$ in e.g. the 1–10 keV band) luminosities based on their quasi-simultaneous measurements in the hard state (Corbel et al. 2000, 2003, 2013; Gallo et al. 2003, 2012, 2014; Fürst et al. 2015; Plotkin et al. 2017; Islam & Zdziarski 2018; Rodriguez et al. 2019). It found that the radio and X-ray luminosities follow a tight non-linear correlation (hereafter RX correlation), $L_R \propto L_X^p$ with the slope index $p \approx 0.6 \pm 0.1$ (Corbel et al. 2003, 2013).² This represents the standard RX correlation (cf. the black dashed curve in Figure 4). With the BH mass M_{BH} introduced as a new factor, this correlation was later extended to include low-luminosity active galactic nuclei (AGNs) also, and it is renamed the fundamental plane of BH activity in logarithmic space (e.g., Merloni et al. 2003; Falcke et al. 2004; Wang et al. 2006; Panessa et al. 2007; Li et al. 2008; Gültekin et al. 2009, 2019; Qian et al. 2018; Li & Gu 2018). With an emphasis on the slope p instead of the dependence on M_{BH} , below for simplicity it will still be referred as the RX correlation.

Since the discovery, the empirical standard RX correlation is broadly established among a majority of sources. However, different correlation slope p is reported in some specified systems, e.g. the radio-loud AGNs (Wang et al. 2006; Panessa et al. 2007; Li et al. 2008), the narrow-line Seyfert 1 galaxies (Yao et al. 2018), and the faint/quiescent AGNs (Yuan et al. 2009b; Xie & Yuan 2017, but see Mezcuca et al. 2018).³ Even within its typical dynamical range, sources with clear deviations to the standard RX correlation are observed in both BHBs (so called “outliers” for BHBs, e.g., Corbel et al. 2004; Coriat et al. 2011; Jonker et al. 2012; Brockopp et al. 2013) and AGNs (e.g., Bell et al. 2011; King et al. 2011, 2013; Xie et al. 2016). As demonstrated in the prototype BHB H1743–322 (Coriat et al. 2011) and low-luminosity AGN NGC 7213 (Bell et al. 2011; Xie et al. 2016), these outliers likely follow a hybrid correlation, i.e. a steep $p \approx 1.3$ –1.4 branch at the bright L_X regime (see the blue dot-dashed curve in Figure 4) and $p \sim 0$ branch at moderate L_X regime. Hint on the recover back to the standard correlation is also observed in H1743–322 when it is sufficiently weak in L_X (Coriat et al. 2011). We note that the existence of a new RX correlation track is also confirmed from statistics, i.e. through the data-cluster analysis method Gallo et al. (2012) find from a sample of 18 BHBs that, besides of the standard one, there exists another $p \approx 0.98$ correlation at the $L_X > 10^{36} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ regime.

Physically, the standard RX correlation provides strong evidence for a tight connection between the hot X-ray emitting source (usually a hot accretion flow), and the radio

source (usually a continuous jet), and it is understood under the coupled accretion–jet model, where a scale-invariant jet model is considered (e.g., Heinz & Sunyaev 2003; Merloni et al. 2003; Heinz 2004; Yuan & Cui 2005; Xie & Yuan 2016). The physics behind the hybrid RX correlation, as well as its connection to the standard one, on the other hand, remain unclear. One promising solution is to attribute the change in the correlation slope p to the change in the mode of hot accretion flows (rather than that in jet physics. See Xie & Yuan 2016 and Sec. 4.3). Alternative models for the $p \approx 1.3$ –1.4 branch can be found in Meyer-Hofmeister & Meyer (2014); Cao et al. (2014); Qiao & Liu (2015), and alternative models for the $p \sim 0$ branch can be found in Islam & Zdziarski (2018); Espinasse & Fender (2018). For completeness, we note that the episodic jet, which is typically associated with the state transition, may have a different origin. Likely it relates to the formation and catastrophic disruption of the magnetic flux rope above the surface of accretion flow, see Yuan et al. (2009a) for details.

In this work we focus on the the 2015–2016 mini-outbursts of the X-ray transient GRS 1739–278. Located at a distance of 6–8.5 kpc (Greiner et al. 1996; Yan & Yu 2017b), the binary system has an inclination of $i \approx 32.5^\circ$ (Miller et al. 2015). It was discovered in 1996 by SIGMA gamma-ray telescope on board the *Granat* satellite (Vargas et al. 1997), and is classified as a BH candidate based on the similarities in spectral and timing properties to other BHBs, as well as the detection of a strong quasi-periodic oscillation (QPO) in the intermediate state (Borozdin & Trudolyubov 2000). Eighteen years later, in 2014 GRS 1739–278 underwent a new main outburst (Krimm et al. 2014), whose duration is remarkably long, i.e. more than one year. The peak X-ray luminosity of the 2014 outburst reaches $\sim 5 \times 10^{38} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (Yan & Yu 2017b; Wang et al. 2018). Thanks to the intense X-ray monitoring of *Swift* afterwards, a series of mini-outbursts have been discovered, where state transitions are also detected in the first two mini-outbursts (see Yan & Yu 2017a,b and also Figure 1).

This work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we report the data analysis of these mini-outbursts, while in Section 3 we compile these data and investigate the radio properties. We find this source follows a flat RX correlation, for more than two orders of magnitude in the variation of X-ray luminosity. A discussion with a brief summary is given in Section 4. Throughout this work, the distance of GRS 1739–278 is fixed to $d = 7.5 \text{ kpc}$ (Yan & Yu 2017b).

2. OBSERVATION AND DATA REDUCTION

After a main outburst in 2014, GRS 1739–278 underwent a series of mini-outbursts. These mini-outbursts are fainter by a factor of $\gtrsim 10$ –30 to the main outburst in 2014, and have been monitored with a moderate cadence by *Swift* (Yan & Yu 2017a,b; Parikh et al. 2018). As listed in detail in Table 1, it is also covered by the Karl G. Jansky Very Large Array (JVLA) at 32 epochs (see Sec. 3.1 later). Since we are mostly interested in the RX correlation, we only consider quasi-simultaneous observations, where the X-ray-to-radio

² A slight offset in the normalization among the full and failed (defined as the case of no transition into the soft state) outbursts are observed in GX 339–4 (Fürst et al. 2015).

³ Quiescent BHBs seem to follow the standard RX correlation (Gallo et al. 2014; Plotkin et al. 2017), maybe because they are still not dim enough in these observations (e.g., discussions in Xie & Yuan 2017, and a hint in Dincer et al. 2018).

Table 1. Quasi-simultaneous JVLA and *Swift*/XRT observations of GRS 1739–278

JVLA				<i>Swift</i> /XRT				
Date (MJD)	F_5 (mJy)	F_8 (mJy)	Spectral Index α	ObsID	Date (MJD)	Exposure (s)	F_X (erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$)	State
57183.23	$0.19^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	$0.11^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$-1.63^{+1.12}_{-1.12}$	00033812002	57183.11	869.61	$1.07^{+0.02}_{-0.02} \times 10^{-9}$	Hard
57189.28	$0.21^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.11^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-1.79^{+0.89}_{-0.89}$	00033812008	57189.08	984.61	$1.76^{+0.14}_{-0.14} \times 10^{-9}$	Intermediate
57194.21	$1.45^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$1.32^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$-0.28^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$	00033812013	57194.27	619.58	$1.26^{+0.16}_{-0.16} \times 10^{-9}$	Soft
57199.20	$0.26^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.12^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$-2.13^{+1.00}_{-1.00}$	Soft?
57210.23	$0.15^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.17^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.30^{+0.58}_{-0.58}$	00033812017	57210.03	1892.36	$1.24^{+0.06}_{-0.06} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57212.25	$0.14^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.11^{+0.04}_{-0.04}$	$-0.72^{+1.43}_{-1.43}$	00033812018	57212.69	1293.76	$8.06^{+0.63}_{-0.63} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57214.22	$0.45^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.37^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$-0.57^{+0.35}_{-0.35}$	00033812019	57214.22	1534.21	$5.75^{+0.70}_{-0.70} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57217.16	$0.27^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.23^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$-0.42^{+0.44}_{-0.44}$	00033812020	57216.16	1969.95	$9.41^{+1.31}_{-1.31} \times 10^{-12}$	Hard
57218.13	$0.16^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.11^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$-1.10^{+0.95}_{-0.95}$	00033812021	57218.42	2153.76	$4.37^{+0.93}_{-0.93} \times 10^{-12}$	Hard
57222.14	$0.20^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.13^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-1.25^{+0.76}_{-0.76}$	00033812023	57222.02	2127.87	$5.34^{+0.84}_{-0.84} \times 10^{-12}$	Hard
57226.17	$0.52^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.51^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.05^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$	00033812025	57226.20	935.22	$1.95^{+0.25}_{-0.25} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57229.22	$0.58^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.54^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.20^{+0.18}_{-0.18}$	Hard
57234.16	$0.57^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.48^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.50^{+0.25}_{-0.25}$	00033812026	57234.06	3745.90	$1.44^{+0.06}_{-0.06} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57236.08	$0.57^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.50^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$-0.37^{+0.23}_{-0.23}$	00033812027	57236.12	3457.74	$1.84^{+0.12}_{-0.12} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57238.08	$0.47^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.31^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-1.20^{+0.48}_{-0.48}$	00033812028	57238.03	3708.70	$2.15^{+0.08}_{-0.08} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57240.13	$0.62^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	$0.54^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.42^{+0.21}_{-0.21}$	00033812029	57240.76	3978.57	$2.81^{+0.14}_{-0.14} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57242.11	$0.48^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.37^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.73^{+0.31}_{-0.31}$	00033812030	57242.49	4111.97	$5.31^{+0.17}_{-0.17} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57244.07	$0.26^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.23^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.34^{+0.33}_{-0.33}$	Intermediate?
57247.06	$0.04^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.02^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$-1.51^{+2.07}_{-2.07}$	00033812032	57246.82	1844.34	$1.57^{+0.14}_{-0.14} \times 10^{-9}$	Intermediate
57273.98	$0.17^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.15^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.28^{+0.44}_{-0.44}$	00033812043	57273.15	1448.96	$1.65^{+0.07}_{-0.07} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57276.02	$0.36^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.33^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.21^{+0.24}_{-0.24}$	00033812044	57276.21	1948.78	$6.11^{+0.40}_{-0.40} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57280.06	$0.21^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.20^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.13^{+0.36}_{-0.36}$	00033812045	57279.27	2139.22	$2.83^{+0.24}_{-0.24} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57280.97	$0.15^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.14^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.14^{+0.50}_{-0.50}$	00081764002	57280.93	914.03	$1.66^{+0.31}_{-0.31} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57283.95	$0.15^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.14^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.22^{+0.49}_{-0.49}$	00033812046	57284.40	2162.19	$8.01^{+1.30}_{-1.30} \times 10^{-12}$	Hard
57287.02	...	$0.19^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	Hard
57310.97	$0.76^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$0.79^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$0.11^{+0.29}_{-0.29}$	00033812052	57310.67	1813.58	$1.16^{+0.16}_{-0.16} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57327.95	$0.73^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	$0.74^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$0.06^{+0.29}_{-0.29}$	Hard
57329.95	$0.87^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	$0.79^{+0.06}_{-0.06}$	$-0.27^{+0.32}_{-0.32}$	Hard
57656.00	$0.42^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$	$0.43^{+0.05}_{-0.05}$	$0.06^{+0.37}_{-0.37}$	00033812056	57655.89	965.91	$1.90^{+0.12}_{-0.12} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57660.95	$0.56^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$	$0.28^{+0.10}_{-0.10}$	$-1.57^{+0.95}_{-0.95}$	00033812058	57661.07	748.76	$1.00^{+0.20}_{-0.20} \times 10^{-10}$	Hard
57680.93	$0.36^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.41^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.28^{+0.16}_{-0.16}$	00081979002	57681.08	1903.88	$2.64^{+0.32}_{-0.32} \times 10^{-11}$	Hard
57692.86	$0.60^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$0.55^{+0.02}_{-0.02}$	$-0.20^{+0.13}_{-0.13}$	Hard

Notes. F_5 represents radio flux at 5.26 GHz (2015 Jun. 10 – 2015 Nov. 3, i.e. before MJD 57330) or 4.70 GHz (2016 Sep. 25 – 2016 Oct. 31, i.e. since MJD 57656). F_8 and F_X are the radio and X-ray fluxes, respectively, at 7.45 GHz and between 1 keV and 10 keV.

time interval is required to be less than one day. With this quasi-simultaneity requirement, we only have 25 pairs of observations.

Table 1 shows the details of all the observations. In the radio part we include the observation date (the modified Julian date, MJD) and fluxes at two wavebands. The spectral index in radio is also provided. In the X-ray part we include the observation ID and the date of *Swift*/XRT observations, the exposure time, the X-ray flux and the spectral state of

the system. The exact time interval between radio and X-ray observations can then be derived easily.

2.1. *Swift*/XRT Observation and Spectral Analysis

The data reduction and analysis in X-rays are done through standard procedures, i.e. the *Swift*/XRT event data were first processed with XRTPIPELINE (v 0.13.2) to generate the cleaned event data, and then grade 0 events are extracted by XSELECT. For those with high count rate (> 0.6 counts s $^{-1}$ for the photon counting mode, and > 150 counts s $^{-1}$ for the




Figure 1. Light curves in X-rays (1-10 keV, top panel) and radio (middle panel). The bottom panel shows the spectral index α in radio. In all the panels, the accretion states are shown in color, i.e. the soft state in red, the hard state in blue, and the intermediate state in green. In the middle panel, the filled squares are at either 5.26 GHz (i.e. before MJD 57330) or 4.70 GHz (i.e. after MJD 57656), while the filled triangles are at 7.45 GHz. See Sec. 2.2 for details.

windowed timing mode), the events in the central region that suffer pile-up effect are excluded. The details can be found in Yan & Yu (2017b). Below we provide a brief description on the spectral modeling.

The X-ray spectrum is modeled by an absorbed power-law component from the hot accretion flow, and a thermal component from cold disk, i.e. $tbabs*(powerlaw+diskbb)$ in XSPEC notation. The hydrogen column density N_H of the absorption in soft X-rays is constrained to be $\approx 2.5 \times 10^{22}\text{ cm}^{-2}$, which is in good agreement with individual measurements by *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* (Miller et al. 2015; Fürst et al. 2016). The spectral state is of crucial importance for our investigation. We follow Remillard & McClintock (2006); Belloni (2010) to define the hard state if the emission is dominated by a power-law component whose X-ray photon index is also less than 2.1, the soft state as the flux contribution from disk thermal component being larger than 80 per cent, and the in-between spectra are defined as in the intermediate state (see also Yan & Yu 2017a). Note that thanks to the intense monitoring in X-rays, 25 epochs out of total 32 radio observations have quasi-simultaneous X-ray observations, thus their accretion states can be clearly determined. For the rest (7/32) radio epochs that lack the X-ray information, their accretion state is constrained/estimated based on the evolutionary trend as well as X-ray observations

at two adjacent epochs (epochs before and after the radio observation). Take MJD 57229 as an example. X-ray monitoring indicates that GRS 1739–278 is in the hard state during the period of MJD 57220–57243 (more specifically, on MJD 57226 and MJD 57234, see Figure 1 and Yan & Yu 2017a). We thus argue that GRS 1739–278 is also in the hard state on MJD 57229, as listed in Table 1.

We calculate the 1-10 keV X-ray flux from the spectral fitting by the model *cflux*, which are shown in the top panel of Figure 1 (and Table 1), where uncertainties in the flux are evaluated at 90% confidence. At least five mini-outbursts are captured by *Swift*/XRT, among which the first two have monitoring in both the rise and the decay phases. The dynamical range in X-rays is almost three orders of magnitude, between $\sim 4 \times 10^{-12}\text{ erg s}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-2}$ and $\sim 2 \times 10^{-9}\text{ erg s}^{-1}\text{ cm}^{-2}$. Even for those hard state with radio data only, the dynamical range in X-rays is still more than two orders of magnitude.

2.2. JVLA Radio Observation and Data Reduction

Radio observations of GRS 1739–278 were obtained by JVLA (Project code VLA/SB4161 and SH0281, PI: S. Corbel) between 2015 June 10 and 2016 October 31, with a total of 32 epochs. The time interval between two neighboring radio epochs varies, with a typical value of ≈ 2.5 days

during the first two mini-outbursts (cf. Table 1 and Figure 1). It is observed at C band, simultaneously centering at two broad frequencies (hereafter subbands). One subband centers at 7.45 GHz, and the other centers at either 5.26 GHz (2015 Jun. 10 – 2015 Nov. 3, i.e. before MJD 57330) or 4.70 GHz (2016 Sep. 25 – 2016 Oct. 31, i.e. since MJD 57656). Both subbands have a bandwidth of 1 GHz, i.e. the total bandwidth is 2 GHz. The on-source exposure time varies between 18 and 80 minutes. The JVLA observations are in the A configuration, with a typical spatial resolution (full-width-half-maximum, FWHM) of about $900 \text{ mas} \times 350 \text{ mas}$ at 5 GHz and of about $650 \text{ mas} \times 250 \text{ mas}$ at 7.45 GHz (mas is the abbreviation of milliarcsecond; see Figure 2).

The calibration was performed using the standard JVLA pipeline of the Common Astronomy Software Application v5.4.1 (CASA, McMullin et al. 2007). After calibration, the data of target sources is split and exported out (in fits format). Further processes including the imaging are done in Difmap software (Shepherd et al. 1994). Depending on exposure time and wavelength, the $1\sigma_{\text{rms}}$ sensitivity we achieved varies between $\approx 6 \mu\text{Jy beam}^{-1}$ and $\approx 50 \mu\text{Jy beam}^{-1}$. Finally, the flux density at each epoch is derived by fitting a point source in the image plane using the task MODELFIT, and the results are summarized in Table 1. We note that for the 5.26 GHz observation on 2015 Sep. 22 (MJD 57287), the whole calibrated data is flagged out after the pipeline reduction, and is thus not considered in our data analysis. For the uncertainties of the radio flux reported in Table 1, we follow Nyland et al. (2017) to include both σ_{rms} of the image and a systematic 3% uncertainty in the absolute flux density scale, i.e. we have $\sigma_{\text{tot}} = \sqrt{(2\sigma_{\text{rms}})^2 + (0.03 S_{\text{peak}})^2}$, where S_{peak} is the peak intensity (flux per beam).

Once the fluxes at two frequencies are measured, we can then evaluate the spectral index α (see the bottom panel of Figure 1), where the uncertainty in the frequency because of the broad 1 GHz bandwidth is also taken into account.

3. RESULTS

The X-ray lightcurve of GRS 1739–278 of the 2015–2016 mini-outbursts is shown in the top panel of Figure 1. The X-ray properties are analyzed and discussed in detail in Yan & Yu (2017b). As shown in the top panel of Figure 1, state transitions, typically observed in the main outbursts, are also observed in the first two mini-outbursts. Note that Yan & Yu (2017b) found that the much-fainter soft state in mini-outbursts likely follows the same tight $L_{\text{bol}} \propto T^4$ (bolometric luminosity L_{bol} and representative temperature of the cold disk T) relationship as determined by that in the major 2014 outburst, suggesting that the cold disk is also not truncated in these soft states of mini-outbursts.

Below we focus on the radio observations and the disk–jet coupling.

3.1. Image and Spectral Properties in Radio

The spatial morphology of GRS 1739–278 remains compact (i.e. unresolved) among almost all our A-configuration VLA observations. For illustrative purpose we show in

Figure 2 the image at 5.26 GHz (top panels) and 7.45 GHz (bottom panels) in three different states, i.e. in hard state on 2015 Jun. 10 (MJD 57183, left panels), in intermediate state on 2015 Jun. 16 (MJD 57189, middle panels) and in soft state on 2015 Jun. 21 (MJD 57194, right panels). In all the plots, the central position locates at R. A. = $17^{\text{h}}42^{\text{m}}40.030^{\text{s}}$ and Dec. = $-27^{\circ}44'52.699''$ in the J2000 coordinate, which is determined by the VLA observation (in C configuration) of its 1996 outburst (Durouchoux et al. 1996). We do not observe any offset in the position (in neither R.A. nor Dec.) in any spectral states, even in the intermediate and soft states where episodic ejections with superluminal motions are commonly observed (for superluminal ejections, see e.g., Mirabel & Rodriguez 1994; Hjellming & Rupen 1995; Fender et al. 1999; Yang et al. 2010; Russell et al. 2019).

Besides, as shown in Figure 2, we find that the radio location of GRS 1739–278, determined by the JVLA observations in A configuration, whose spatial resolution is higher than that in C configuration, systematically shifts by 78.5 mas in R. A. and -313.9 mas in Dec., i.e. the actual position of GRS 1739–278 determined by JVLA on 2015 Jun. 21 (brightest in radio) is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{R.A. (J2000)} &= 17^{\text{h}}42^{\text{m}}40.022^{\text{s}} \pm 0.002^{\text{s}}, \\ \text{Dec. (J2000)} &= -27^{\circ}44'52.981'' \pm 0.005''. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Here we only include the statistical errors on the fit of beam centroiding, i.e. evaluated as $\text{beam}/2 \times S_{\text{peak}}/\sigma_{\text{rms}}$.

The middle and bottom panels of Figure 1 show respectively the lightcurve and the spectral index in radio. Consistent with other BHBs in hard state, the radio spectrum of the hard state in GRS 1739–278 is typically-thick. There are several hard-state epochs whose radio spectrum seems steep (optically-thin), i.e. on 2015 Jun. 10 (MJD 57183, see also the left panels in Figure 2 for radio images) and on 2016 Sep. 30 (MJD 57661). If real, they may possibly relate to the episodic ejections in the hard state (Yuan et al. 2009a) or the quiescent state (e.g., in our Galaxy center Sgr A*, Dodds-Eden et al. 2011). However, as shown in Figure 1, the value of α at these epochs is not firmly measured, we thus avoid further discussions.

3.2. Radio Evolution in Intermediate and Soft States

We here focus on the radio evolution in intermediate and soft states. The radio evolution in hard state will be addressed subsequently in Sec. 3.3.

Due to the sparse schedule of the radio monitoring, we unfortunately did not catch the jet evolution in the intermediate state during the rise phase of the first mini-outburst (around MJD 57180–57190). Instead, we have two epochs of intermediate state observations during the rise phase of the second mini-outburst (around MJD 57240–57250; see Figure 1), where we likely observe an un-finished jet quenching process within 5 days, i.e. with an increase in X-ray flux by a factor of ~ 3 , the radio flux reduces by a factor of ~ 12 at 5.26 GHz and ~ 18 at 7.45 GHz, from MJD 57242 to MJD 57247 (i.e. during the hard-to-soft state




Figure 2. JVLA radio image of GRS 1739–278 at 5.26 GHz (top panels) and 7.45 GHz (bottom panels). The plots center at R. A. = $17^{\text{h}}42^{\text{m}}40.030^{\text{s}}$ and Dec. = $-27^{\circ}44'52.699''$. From left to right, they are respectively on 2015 Jun. 10 (MJD 57183, hard state), 2015 Jun. 16 (MJD 57189, intermediate state) and 2015 Jun. 21 (MJD 57194, soft state). The shadow in each panel shows the beam size (FWHM). The peak flux per beam (“bm” in the figure) as well as the the first (solid curve) contour are labeled in each panel. The contours increases by a factor of 2, i.e. they follow $(-1, 1, 2, 4, 8, \dots)$.




Figure 3. The spectral modeling of the X-ray spectrum of GRS 1739–278 on MJD 57194. In the upper panel, the two dotted curves are the absorbed emission of *diskbb* (upper one at 5 keV) and *powerlaw* (lower one at 5 keV), and the solid curve represents the sum.

transition). Meanwhile, the radio spectrum also steepens, consistent with transient ejections. We note the jet quenching during the state transition is commonly observed in main outbursts (e.g. [Fender et al. 1999](#); [Coriat et al. 2011](#)), and it has also been observed during the state transition of mini-outbursts in another BH transient MAXI J1535–571 ([Parikh et al. 2019](#)).

Among all the 32 epochs of radio observations, there is only one epoch, i.e. on 2015 Jun. 21 (MJD 57194), that the system is in the soft state.⁴ The X-ray observations show that this source enters into the soft state about 3 days ago, on MJD 57191 (more accurately, between MJD 57190.48 and MJD 57191.67, see [Figure 1](#) and [Yan & Yu 2017b](#)). As shown in [Figure 3](#), the X-ray spectrum on MJD 57194 is well-fitted under the adopted model, where the disk component contributes $\approx 88\%$ of total flux in 1–10 keV. The best-fit values of the inner disk temperature and the photon index are $T_{\text{in}} = 0.66^{+0.03}_{-0.01}$ keV and $\Gamma = 2.13^{+0.93}_{-0.44}$, respectively. All

⁴ The epoch on 2015 Jun. 26 (MJD 57199) is a soft state candidate, where a steep radio spectrum ($\alpha = -2.13 \pm 1.0$) is observed. But without X-ray observation the spectral state cannot be confirmed (cf. [Table 1](#)).




Figure 4. The radio/X-ray correlation. The squares show the data of GRS 1739–278, with color follows Figure 1. Here the filled ones are optically-thick and the open ones are optically-thin. Data of other BHBs, compiled by Bahramian et al. (2018), are shown by grey filled circles and triangles, respectively, for standard ($p \approx 0.61$, see Corbel et al. 2013 and the black dashed curve for the fitting) and hybrid (see Coriat et al. 2011, and blue dot-dashed for the $p \approx 1.3$ branch) RX correlations. The colors of data points of GRS 1739–278 are the same to those of Figure 1.




Figure 5. The radio/X-ray correlation. This plot is the same as Figure 4, except that the rise and decay phases of GRS 1739–278 are shown separately by filled (rise phase) and open (decay phase) squares.

these properties justify our soft state classification on MJD 57194. In this soft state (on MJD 57194) the system reaches maximal radio flux among all the 32 radio observations. Besides, the radio emission is spatially unresolved (see right panels of Figure 2) and the radio spectrum is marginally optically-thick, with $\alpha \approx -0.28 \pm 0.17$ (cf. Figure 1).

3.3. Radio/X-ray Correlation in Hard State

We now investigate the relationship between luminosities in 5 GHz radio and 1-10 keV X-rays for GRS 1739–278. As shown in Figure 4, observations in hard state are focused. In this plot, the 2015-2016 mini-outbursts are shown by blue squares, where optically-thick (spectral index clusters around $\alpha \approx -0.2$) and optically-thin (α clusters around $\alpha \sim -1$) data points are shown respectively in filled and open symbols.

We also show in this plot data points in soft (red squares) and intermediate (green squares) states of GRS 1739–278. For comparison, we also show the RX correlation of other BHBs in their hard states, where the data are taken from the latest compilation of Bahramian et al. (2018).⁵ Sources that follow the standard $p \approx 0.61$ correlation (Corbel et al. 2013, the black dashed curve for the fit) are shown by black filled circles, and those that follow the hybrid correlation (Coriat et al. 2011, the blue dot-dashed curve for the fit of the $p \approx 1.3$ branch) are shown by the black filled triangles.

Several results can be derived immediately. First, we find that for GRS 1739–278, there is no clear difference between optical-thick jets and optical-thin ones. Secondly, the radio flux varies with a rather large scatter at a given X-ray luminosity, with a weak hint on the existence of two tracks, one is systematically fainter than the other by a factor of ~ 4 at given X-ray luminosity. However, the evidence of two tracks is weak. Below we omit this separation.

Thirdly, apart of the large scatters, the RX relationship in GRS 1739–278 shows a clear deviation to the standard $p \approx 0.61$ one. We run a linear fit between $\log L_R$ and $\log L_X$ for all the data points in hard state (including both optical-thick ones and optical-thin ones) and the result is

$$\log(L_R/\text{erg s}^{-1}) = (0.16 \pm 0.09) \log(L_X/\text{erg s}^{-1}) + 23.3 \pm 3.1, \quad (2)$$

i.e. for a range of more than two orders of magnitude in X-ray luminosity this source exhibits a rather flat RX correlation. Interestingly, H1743–322 also follow a flat correlation in this X-ray luminosity regime (transition regime in the notation

⁵ https://github.com/bersavosh/XRB-LrLx_pub

of Coriat et al. 2011), and the dynamical range in X-ray luminosity of this flat correlation branch is also similar to our results, cf. Coriat et al. (2011).

For a detailed RX correlation investigation of GX 339-4, Fürst et al. (2015) find that the rise and decay phases of outbursts follow different tracks (see also Islam & Zdziarski 2018). To examine this possibility in GRS 1739-278, we in Figure 5 separate the rise and decay phases by the solid and open squares, respectively. Note that because of the hysteresis phenomenon, the X-ray luminosity of the rise phase is systematically brighter than that of the decay phase. Except of this difference, there is no clear difference in the RX correlation among these two phases, especially when the large scatters in the data points are considered.

4. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1. Summary

In this work, we analyzed the JVLA radio observations of the 2015-2016 mini-outbursts of GRS 1739-278. The JVLA monitoring campaign has simultaneous detections at 5 GHz and 8 GHz, and runs from 2015 Jun. 10 till 2016 Oct. 31. Among the 32 epochs, 25 epochs have quasi-simultaneous X-ray observations by *Swift*/XRT within one day (see Table 1). The position of GRS 1739-278 constrained by our JVLA observation in A configuration is R. A. = $17^{\text{h}}42^{\text{m}}40.022^{\text{s}}$ and Dec. = $-27^{\circ}44'52.981''$ in the J2000 coordinate.

The main results of this work can be summarized as follows,

- The radio image of GRS 1739-278 remains unresolved in all our A-configuration JVLA observations, whichever state it is and whatever spectral properties it has in radio band. No superluminal motion is observed in this source.
- A majority of radio observations in the hard state show an optically-thick spectrum, consistent with previous findings (see Fender et al. 2004, 2009; Fender & Gallo 2014 for reviews). Occasionally the radio spectrum in the hard state becomes optically thin, and the spectrum can be as steep as $\alpha \sim -1$, but admittedly the uncertainties in α are large.
- The jet quenching process is possibly caught during the intermediate state of the rise phase of the outburst, which represents an ongoing stage of hard-to-soft transition. On the other hand, we also spot an optically-thick ($\alpha \approx -0.28 \pm 0.17$) radio emission in the soft state, which turns out to be the brightest among all the JVLA epochs.
- For the RX correlation during the hard state, there is no clear difference between optical-thin jets and optical-thick ones. Moreover, for more than two orders of magnitude in the variation of X-ray luminosity, GRS 1739-278 follows a flat RX correlation with $p \approx 0.16 \pm 0.09$. Both the correlation slope and the X-ray luminosity regime agree well with the hybrid RX

prototype H1743-322 (Coriat et al. 2011), although neither the $p \approx 1.3$ correlation branch at the bright L_X part nor the recover to the standard correlation branch at the faint L_X part are observed in this source. Coordinated monitoring campaign in radio and X-rays of main and mini outbursts in future is in demand to examine the connection (and possibly the difference) among these two sources.

4.2. Radio Emission in the Soft State

Only on 2015 Jun. 21 the system is confirmed to be in the soft state, during which a very bright but marginally optically-thick ($\alpha \approx -0.28 \pm 0.17$) radio emission is detected. It remains unresolved in JVLA (A-configuration).

The radio emission in soft state, if observable, usually exhibits a steep optically-thin spectrum (see e.g., Fender et al. 2004, 1999; Yuan et al. 2009a; Russell et al. 2019), which is produced by the residual episodic jet that launched during the hard-to-soft state transitions (see Introduction). It can be fairly bright if the ejecta interacts with dense medium (e.g., with stellar wind in Cyg X-3, see e.g., Koljonen et al. 2010). In GRS 1739-278 such optical-thin radio emission in the soft state is indeed observed on MJD 57199 (see Sec. 3.1) and during the 1996 main outburst (Hjellming 1997). The soft state of the 1996 outburst, crudely identified from the hardness ratio measurement in X-rays by *RXTE*/ASM, lasts over 170 days (between MJD 50166 and MJD 50338). VLA observations reveal that the radio emission is always optically-thin during this period (Hjellming 1997).

We note that, in the episodic ejection model a flat spectrum can be observed at the early phase, when the ejecta is small and dense, thus synchrotron self-absorption peaks at a higher frequency. However, this implies that the radio emission peaks on some day later. Considering the low radio flux 5 days later on MJD 57199 (i.e. the candidate soft state), an efficient cooling of the relativistic electrons and/or decline in magnetic field strength in the ejecta will be necessary. For the soft state radio observation on MJD 57194 (2015 Jun. 21), we are thus disfavor the episodic ejection during the state transition, but instead in favor of the interpretation of an optically-thick emission from continuous jet.

Among all the BHBs discovered so far, to our knowledge the only other source with continuous jet in soft state is Cyg X-3 (Zdziarski et al. 2018), where a radio-to-X-ray time lag of $\sim 50\text{d}$ is also observed. However, Cyg X-3 is a well-known high-mass X-ray binary, and the accumulation of magnetic flux supplied by the high-mass companion in the soft state is argued to be crucial for launching of jet in soft state (Cao & Zdziarski 2020). This mechanism cannot operate in low-mass binaries like GRS 1739-278 (Cao & Zdziarski 2020).

Our detection of the optically-thick radio emission during the soft state may imply that, we possibly find in BHBs the counterpart of radio-loud active galactic nuclei (and quasars) that also have continuous jets. These systems are high in Eddington ratio $L_{\text{bol}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$ (Eddington luminosity for a black hole with mass M_{BH} is, $L_{\text{Edd}} = 1.3 \times$

$10^{46} (M_{\text{BH}}/10^8 M_{\odot}) \text{ erg s}^{-1}$), and are dominated by thermal emission from cold disk, as the case of soft state in BHBs. Intense coordinated monitoring in radio and X-rays during the soft state in future are necessary to verify it.

4.3. Theoretical Interpretation of Radio/X-ray Correlation

The physical reason for the hybrid RX correlation, as well as its connection to the standard one, remain poorly understood. Several scenarios have been proposed in literature. Below we examine our data with these existing models.

The first scenario of the hybrid RX emphasizes on the difference between the rise and the decay phases of the outburst. Islam & Zdziarski (2018) analyzed the evolution of H1743–322 and GX 339–4, where they reported that the different branches in the hybrid RX correlation relate to the evolutionary phases (rise or decay) of the outburst, i.e. the $p \approx 1.3$ branch is achieved during the rise phase, while the $p \sim 0$ branch is established during the decay phase. However, this model is disfavored by observations in GRS 1739–278. In this source, both the rise and the decay phases are observed. But as shown in Figure 5, no any clear difference in the slope of the RX correlation among the two phases is observed.

Espinasse & Fender (2018) took another approach. They separated the radio-loud sources from the radio-quiet ones based on their RX correlations, and investigate the distribution of radio spectral indices within each subsample. Note that the radio-loud and -quiet ones correspond to respectively, the standard and the hybrid RX ones in our classification. Espinasse & Fender (2018) found that the spectral index of the radio-quiet subsample (hybrid RX sources), $\alpha \approx -0.2$, is systematically lower than that of the radio-loud subsample (standard RX sources), $\alpha \approx 0.2$ (see also Brocksopp et al. 2013 for a hint of such difference). This interpretation agrees with our data. According to their classification, GRS 1739–278 is a radio-quiet system, where a clustering of α at $\alpha \sim -0.2$ is observed in the hard state. We caution that epochs of even steeper radio spectrum (i.e. $\alpha \sim -1$) are observed in GRS 1739–278 in its hard state, although the spectral index of these observations suffers large uncertainties, see Figure 1.

The above two scenarios are motivated by observations. There is another one that is motivated by the progress on the fundamental properties of accretion physics, i.e. the radiative efficiency of hot accretion flow (Xie & Yuan 2016; see Meyer-Hofmeister & Meyer 2014; Cao et al. 2014; Qiao & Liu 2015 for the $p \approx 1.3$ branch only, and Coriat et al. 2011 for the efficiency requirement from observations). One advantage of this interpretation is that it is based on the truncated accretion–jet model (Esin et al. 1997; Yuan & Narayan 2014), which has been successfully applied to the hard state of BHBs. In this model, the synchrotron radio emission from a jet follows $L_{\text{R}} \propto \dot{M}_{\text{jet}}^{\sim 1.4}$ (Heinz & Sunyaev 2003), where \dot{M}_{jet} the mass loss rate into the jet. If the X-ray emission from hot accretion flow scales with mass accretion rate \dot{M} as $L_{\text{X}} \propto \dot{M}^k$ (parameter k characters the radiative efficiency in X-rays) and $\dot{M}_{\text{jet}} \propto \dot{M}$, then we have

$L_{\text{R}} \propto L_{\text{X}}^{\sim 1.4/k}$ (Heinz & Sunyaev 2003; Coriat et al. 2011). In this picture, different slope in RX correlation is due to the difference in k , i.e. standard one has $k \approx 2.2$ (Esin et al. 1997; Merloni et al. 2003), flat $p \sim 0$ one has $k \gg 1$, and $p \approx 1.3$ has $k \approx 1$. Interestingly, such change in k is indeed observed in hot accretion flows, where depending on \dot{M} three distinctive accretion modes are found (Xie & Yuan 2012). We emphasize that the change in accretion mode will also result in a change in the spectral properties, which is confirmed in both BHBs and AGNs (see e.g., Yang et al. 2015; Ruan et al. 2019; Li 2019).

This efficiency-related model by Xie & Yuan (2016) also predicts that the viscosity parameter of hot accretion flow, α_{hot} , should be small in hybrid RX sources (e.g., BHB H1743–322: Xie & Yuan 2016, and AGN NGC 7213: Xie et al. 2016). Although α_{hot} is difficult to measure, it can be crudely estimated from the critical luminosity of the hard-to-soft state transition L_{crit} , since theoretically we have $\alpha_{\text{hot}} \propto L_{\text{crit}}^{-1}$ (Xie & Yuan 2012; Xie et al. 2016). Interestingly, both GRS 1739–278 and MAXI J1535–571 (Russell et al. 2019; Parikh et al. 2019) are hybrid RX sources with state transitions observed in the mini-outbursts, thus they agree well with this predication.

4.4. Disk–Jet Coupling During the Mini-Outbursts

So far the disk–jet coupling during the mini-outbursts has been investigated only in two BH transients: one is GRS 1739–278 in this work, the other is MAXI J1535–571 in Parikh et al. (2019). In both systems, the peak luminosities and durations of these mini-outbursts are at least one order of magnitude smaller than those of the main outburst, but still have state transitions at such low luminosities (Yan & Yu 2017b; Parikh et al. 2019). Besides, the hard-to-soft state transition luminosity and the peak luminosity follows the same correlation that is established in the main outbursts of BHBs, implying that there is no intrinsic physical difference among these two types of outbursts (Yan & Yu 2017b).

The jet properties in those short-duration mini-outbursts are also similar to those in main outbursts. There is no radio observation of GRS 1739–278 during the hard state of the main outburst, but observations of MAXI J1535–571 (Parikh et al. 2019) suggest that both the main and the mini outbursts follow the hybrid RX correlation in the hard state. Moreover, considering the difference in the X-ray luminosity among main and mini outbursts, the $p \approx 1.3$ branch of the hybrid RX correlation may only exist in the main outburst, cf. the case of MAXI J1535–571 (Russell et al. 2019, admittedly there are only two data points).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We appreciate the referee and Thomas Russell for careful reading and insightful suggestions. This work was supported in part by the National Program on Key R&D Project of China (Grants 2016YFA0400804), the Natural Science Foundation of China (grants 11763002, 11773055, 11873074, U1838203, U1938114 and U1931203), the K.C. Wong Education Foundation of CAS, and the Key Research

Program of Frontier Sciences of CAS (No. QYZDJ-SSW-SYS008). F.G.X. and Z.Y. were also supported in part by

the Youth Innovation Promotion Association of CAS (ids. 2016243 and 2020000).

Facilities: JVLA, Swift

Software: XSPEC, CASA, Difmap

REFERENCES

- Bahramian, A., Miller-Jones, J., Strader, J., et al. 2018, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.1252036
- Belloni, T. M. 2010, in Belloni, T., ed., *Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. 794, The Jet Paradigm. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, p. 53
- Bell, M. E., Tzioumis, T., Uttley, P., et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 411, 402
- Brocksopp, C., Corbel, S., Tzioumis, A., Broderick, J. W. et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 432, 931
- Borozdin, K., Trudolyubov, S. P., 2000, *ApJL*, 533, L131
- Cao, X. F., Wu, Q., Dong, A. J., 2014, *ApJ*, 788, 52
- Cao, X., Zdziarski, A. A., *MNRAS*, 492, 223
- Corbel, S., Coriat, M., Brocksopp, C., et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, 428, 2500
- Corbel S., Fender R. P., Tzioumis A. K., Nowak M., McIntyre V., Durouchoux P., Sood R., 2000, *A&A*, 359, 251
- Corbel S., Fender R. P., Tzioumis A. K., Tomsick, J. A., Orosz, J. A., Miller, J. M., Wijnands, R., Kaaret, P., 2002, *Science*, 298, 196
- Corbel, S., Fender, R. P., Tomsick, J. A., et al. 2004, *ApJ*, 617, 1272
- Corbel, S., Nowak, M. A., Fender, R. P., Tzioumis A. K., Markoff S., 2003, *A&A*, 400, 1007
- Coriat, M. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 414, 677
- Dincer, T., Bailyn, C. D., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., Buxton, M., MacDonald, R. K. D., 2018, *ApJ*, 852, 4
- Dodds-Eden, K., Gillessen, S., Fritz, T. K. et al., 2011, *ApJ*, 728, 37
- Done, C., Gierlinski, M., Kubota, A., 2007, *A&A Rv*, 15, 1
- Dong, A. J., Wu, Q., & Cao, X. F. 2014, *ApJL*, 787, L20
- Durouchoux, P., Smith, I. A., Hurley, K. et al., 1996, *IAUC6383*, 1
- Esin, A. A., McClintock, J. E., Narayan R., 1997, *ApJ*, 489, 865
- Espinasse, M., Fender, R., 2018, *MNRAS*, 473, 4122
- Falcke, H., Körding, E., Markoff, S., 2004, *A&A*, 414, 895
- Fender, R. P., Belloni, T. M., Gallo, E. 2004, *MNRAS*, 355, 1105
- Fender, R. P., Gallo, E. 2014, *SSRv*, 183, 323
- Fender, R. P., Garrington, S. T., McKay, D. J., et al. 1999, *MNRAS*, 304, 865
- Fender, R. P., Homan, J., Belloni, T. M. 2009, *MNRAS*, 396, 1370
- Fürst F., Nowak, M. A., Tomsick J. A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 808, 122
- Fürst F., Tomsick J. A., Yamaoka K., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 832, 115
- Gallo, E., Fender, R. P., & Pooley, G. G., 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 60
- Gallo, E., Miller B. P., & Fender, R. P., 2012, *MNRAS*, 423, 590
- Gallo, E., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., Russell, D. M., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 445, 290
- Greene J. E., Ho L. C., Ulvestad J. S., 2006, *ApJ*, 636, 56
- Greiner, J., Dennerl, K., & Predehl, P. 1996, *A&A*, 314, L21
- Gültekin K., Cackett E. M., Miller J. M., et al. 2009, *ApJ*, 706, 404
- Gültekin, K., King, A. L., Cackett, E. M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 871, 80
- Heinz, S., 2004, *MNRAS*, 355, 835
- Heinz, S., Sunyaev, R. A., 2003, *MNRAS*, 343, L59
- Hjellming, R. M. 1997, *IAU Colloq. 163: Accretion Phenomena and Related Outflows*, 53
- Hjellming, R. M., & Rupen, M. P. 1995, *Nature*, 375, 464
- Islam, N., & Zdziarski, A. A. 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 4513
- Jonker, P. G., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., Homan, J. et al., 2012, *MNRAS*, 423, 3308
- King, A. L., et al., 2011, *ApJ*, 729, 19
- King, A. L., Miller, J. M., Reynolds, M. T., Gültekin K., Gallo E., Maitra D., 2013, *ApJ*, 774, L25
- Koljonen, K. I. I., Hannikainen, D. C., McCollough, M. L., Pooley, G. G., Trushkin, S. A. 2010, *MNRAS*, 406, 307
- Krimm, H. A., Barthelmy, S. D., Baumgartner, W., et al. 2014, *The Astronomer's Telegram*, 5986, 1
- Li, S. L., 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 3793
- Li, S. L., Gu, M., 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, L45
- Li, Z. Y., Wu, X. B., Wang, R. 2008, *ApJ*, 688, 826
- McMullin, J. P., Waters, B., Schiebel, D., Young, W., Golap, K. 2007, in *ASP Conf. Ser. 376, Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems XVI*, eds. R. A. Shaw, F. Hill, D. J. Bell (San Francisco, CA: ASP), p. 127
- Merloni, A., Heinz, S., di Matteo, T., 2003, *MNRAS*, 345, 1057
- Meyer-Hofmeister, E., Meyer, F., 2014, *A&A*, 562, 142
- Mezcua M., Hlavacek-Larrondo J., Lucey J. R., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 474, 1342
- Miller, J. M. et al., 2015, *ApJL*, 799, L6
- Mirabel, I. F., Rodriguez, L. F., 1994, *Nature*, 371, 46
- Nyland, K., Davis, T. A., Nguyen, D. D. et al., 2017, *ApJ*, 845, 50
- Parikh, A. S., Wijnands, R., Degenaar, N., et al. 2018, *ATel*, 11869, 1
- Parikh, A. S., Russell, T. D., Wijnands, R., et al. 2019, *ApJL*, 878, L28
- Panessa, F., Barcons, X., Bassani, L., et al. 2007, *A&A*, 467, 519
- Plotkin, R. M., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., Gallo, E. et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 834, 104

- Qian, L., Dong, X. B., Xie, F. G., Liu, W., Li D., 2018, *ApJ*, 860, 134
- Qiao, E., Liu, B. F., 2015, *MNRAS*, 448, 1099
- Qiao, E., Liu, B. F., Panessa, F., Liu, J. Y., 2013, *ApJ*, 777, 102
- Remillard, R. A., McClintock, J. E., 2006, *ARA&A*, 44, 49
- Rodriguez, J., Urquhart, R., Plotkin, R. M. et al., *ApJ* (in press), arXiv: 1912.01029
- Ruan, J. J., Anderson, S. F., Eracleous, M., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 883, 76
- Russell, D. M., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., Maccarone, T. J., et al. 2011, *ApJL*, 739, L19
- Russell, T. D., Tetarenko, A. J., Miller-Jones, J. C. A., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 883, 198
- Shakura, N. I., Sunyaev, R. A., 1973, *A&A*, 24, 337
- Shepherd, M. C., Pearson, T. J., & Taylor, G. B. 1994, *BAAS*26, 987
- Vargas, M., Goldwurm, A., Laurent, P., et al. 1997, *ApJL*, 476, L23
- Wang, R., Wu, X. B., Kong, M. Z. 2006, *ApJ*, 645, 890
- Wang, S., Kawai, N., Shidatsu, M., et al. 2018, *PASJ*, 70, 67
- Xie, F. G., Yuan, F., 2012, *MNRAS*, 427, 1580
- Xie, F. G., Yuan, F., 2016, *MNRAS*, 456, 4377
- Xie, F. G., Yuan, F. 2017, *ApJ*, 836, 104
- Xie, F. G., Zdziarski A. A., Ma R., Yang Q. X. 2016, *MNRAS*, 463, 2287
- Yan, Z., & Yu, W. 2017a, *ATel*, 10137, 1
- Yan, Z., & Yu, W. 2017b, *MNRAS*, 470, 4298
- Yang, J., Brocksopp, C., Corbel, S., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 409, L64
- Yang, Q. X., Xie, F. G., Yuan, F., Zdziarski, A. A., Gierlinski, M., Ho, L. C., Yu, Z., 2015, *MNRAS*, 447, 1692
- Yao, S., Qiao, E., Wu, X.-B., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 477, 1356
- Yuan, F., 2003, *ApJ*, 594, L99
- Yuan, F., Bu, D., Wu, M., 2012, *ApJ*, 761, 130
- Yuan, F., Cui, W., 2005, *ApJ*, 629, 408
- Yuan, F., Narayan, R., 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 529
- Yuan, F., Lin, J., Wu, K., et al. 2009a, *MNRAS*, 395, 2183
- Yuan, F., Yu, Z., Ho, L. C. 2009b, *ApJ*, 703, 1034
- Zdziarski, A. A., Gierliński, M. 2004, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement*, 155, 99
- Zdziarski, A. A., Malyshev, D., Dubus, G., et al. 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 4399
- Zdziarski, A. A., Poutanen, J., Mikolajewska, J., et al. 1998, *MNRAS*, 301, 435
- Zhang, H., Yu, W., 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 1740