THE PEAK ENERGY DISTRIBUTION OF THE F SPECTRA AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE JET STRUCTURE MODELS OF GAMMA-RAY BURSTS

E.W.Liang^{1;2;3} and Z.G.Dai¹

¹D epartm ent of A stronom y, N an jing U niversity, N an jing 210093, C hina; ew liang@ n ju edu.cn.

²D epartm ent of P hysics, G uangxi U niversity, N anning 530004, C hina.

³N ational A stronom ical O bservatories/Y unnan O bservatory, C hinese A cadem y of Sciences, K unm ing 650011,

China.

D raft version M arch 20, 2024

ABSTRACT

We study the peak energy (E_p) distribution of the F spectra of gam ma-ray bursts (GRBs) and X-ray ashes (XRFs) with a sample of 57 bursts observed by High Energy Transient Explorer 2 (HETE-2) French G am ma Telescope and discuss its implications for the jet structure models. Combining the observed E_p distribution of HETE {2 GRBs/XRFs with that of BATSE GRBs, we nd that the observed E_p distribution of GRBs/XRFs is a bim odal one with peaks of < 30 keV and 160 250 keV. A coording to the recently-discovered equivalent-isotropic energy-E_p relationship, such a bim odal distribution in plies a two-component structure of GRB/XRF jets. A simple simulation analysis shows that this structured jet m odel does roughly reproduce a bim odal distribution with peaks of 15 and 200 keV. We argue that future observations of the peak of 15 keV in the E_p distribution would be evidence supporting this m odel. Swift, which covers an energy band of 0.2{150 keV, is expected to provide a key test for our results.

Subject headings: gam m a rays: bursts | gam m a rays: observations | ISM : jets and out ows | m ethods: statistical

1. INTRODUCTION

X-ray ashes (XRFs) have being gotten a lot of attention in the last 2 years (Heise et al. 2001; K ippen et al. 2003). They are thought to be a low erenergy extension of the known gam ma-ray burst (GRB) population, based on the fact that their spectral behaviors are similar to those of GRBs (K ippen et al. 2003; Barraud et al. 2003; Sakam oto et al. 2004; Lamb et al. 2003a, b, 2004). The nature of a narrow cluster of the observed E_p distribution of BAT SE GRBs remains poorly understood, which m ight be related to the jet structure of GRBs. XRFs broaden the energy coverage of prom pt GRB em ission and may bring m ore signatures of the jet structure of GRBs (Lamb et al. 2003a, b, 2004).

The jet structure models are currently under heavy debate. Any model should present a uni ed description for GRBs and XRFs. Two currently competing models are the structured jet m odel (M eszaros, Rees & W ijers 1998; Dai & Gou 2001; Rossi, Lazzati, & Rees 2002; Zhang & M eszaros 2002; G ranot & K um ar 2003; K um ar and G ranot 2003; Panaitescu & Kum ar 2003; W ei & Jin 2003) and the uniform model (e.g., Rhoads 1999; Frailet al. 2001). Zhang et al. (2004) show that the current GRB/XRF prompt em ission/afterglow data can be described by a quasi{Gaussian-type (or sim ilar structure) structured jet with a typical opening angle of 6° and with a standard 10⁵¹ ergs. A lternatively, based on the jet energy of High Energy Transient Explorer 2 (HETE-2) observations, Lamb et al. (2003a, b, 2004) propose that the uniform 'et model can reasonably describe the unied scheme of GRBs/XRFs. Very recently, the two-com ponent jet m odel was advocated by Berger et al. (2003) based on observations of GRB 030329, which has two di erent jet breaks

in an early optical afferglow light curve (0.55 days, Price et al. 2003) and in a late radio light curve (9.8 days). M illim eter observations of this burst further support the two{component jet model (Sheth et al. 2003). Num ericalcalculations of such a model were perform ed by H uang et al. (2004). This model suggests that a GRB/XRF jet has two components: a narrow, highly relativistic one, and a wide, mildly relativistic one. When the line of sight of an observer is within the narrow component, the observed burst is a typical GRB, but when the line of sight is pointing to the wide{component, it is an XRF.

A broad spectral energy distribution could constrain the jet structure models. A low peak energy of the F spectrum (E_p < 50 keV) and weak gamma{ray uxes (F < 0.2 photons cm² s¹, 50{300 keV energy range) distinguish XRFs from typicalGRBs (Kippen et al. 2003; Mochkovitch et al. 2003). It is well known that the observed E $_{\rm p}$ distribution of BAT SE GRBs is narrow ly clustered. Does the observed E p distribution of X R F s exhibit a sim ilar feature? In this Letter, we focus on this question. W e analyze the observed E_p distribution with a sam ple of 57 bursts observed by HETE-2/French G am m a Telescope (FREGATE). C om bining the observed E_p distribution of HETE-2GRBs/XRFswith that of BATSE GRBs, we nd that the observed E $_{\rm p}$ distribution of GRBs/XRFs is a bimodalone peaking at < 30 keV and 160 250 keV.W ith respect to this result, we suggest that the two { com ponent tet m odel is a reasonable candidate m odel for GRB/XRF jets. A simulation analysis con m s this suggestion.

2. DISTRIBUTION OF E_P

W em ake a search for HETE-2 GRBs/XRFs reported in literature and on the HETE-2 W eb site¹. All the bursts with E_p or uences (S) in the available energy bands 7{

30 keV and 30{400 keV are included in our sample. We obtain a sam ple that includes 57 bursts. Am ong them , 49 of the bursts are taken from Barraud et al. (2003), Atteia (2003), Sakam oto et al. (2004), Lam b et al. (2003a, b, 2004), and the HETE {2 W eb site. Their Ep values are derived from spectral trings. P lease note that the E p values ofGRB 010923, 011216, and 021004 presented in Barraud et al. (2003) are incorrect, and they are taken from Lamb et al. (2003a, b, 2004). For the other eight bursts, GRB 030824, 030823, 030725, 030913, 030528, 030519, 030418, and 030416, only uences in the energy bands of 7{30 keV and 30{400 keV are available. For these bursts, we estim ate their $E_{\rm p}$ by their spectral hardness ratios, which are de ned as R = S $_{\rm 30~400~keV}$ =S $_{\rm 7~30~keV}$. Since the spectra of GRBs/XRFs can be well tted by the B and function (Band et al. 1993) with sim ilar spectral indices (K ippen et al. 2003; Barraud et al. 2003), their Ep should be proportional to R.A best t to the data presented in Barraud et al. (2003) derives $\log E_p = (1.52 \ 0.05) + (0.92 \ 0.07) \log R$ with a linear coe cient of 0.93 and a chance probability p < 0.0001 (N = 32, without considering GRB 010923, 011216, or 021004). We thus estim ate the E_p values of the above eight bursts by using this relation.

W e show the E_p distribution in a range of $\log E_p$ = keV = 0:6 3:0 with a step of 0.23 for these bursts in Figure 1a. It is found that the distribution has three peaks at 30, 160, and 450 keV.W e note that the peaks of 160 and 450 keV seem to be embedded in one peak, and the gap at $E_p = 275$ keV is likely to be fake. The spectral analysis for a bright BATSE GRB sample by Preece et al. (2000) has shown that the E $_{\rm p}$ values are clustered at 100-1000 keV with a peak of 250 keV (the dotted line in panel (a) of Figure 1). We thus suspect that the peaks of 160 keV and 450 keV are likely to be embedded in one peak which is similar to that of BATSE GRB sample. If the case really shows one peak, the E $_{\rm p}$ distributions observed by HETE {2 and by BATSE in the range of 100 1000 keV should be consistent. We exam ine this hypothesis by a Kolm ogorov-Sm irno (K-S) test (Press et al. 1997, p.617). The result of the K-S test is described by a statistic of P_{K} s: a sm all value of P_{K} s indicates a signi cant di erence between two distributions ($P_{K} = 1$ indicates that two distributions are identical, and P_{K} s < 0.0001 suggests that the consistency of two distributions should be rejected; e.g., B loom 2003). We obtain $P_{K} = 0.22$, indicating that the consistency of the two distributions is acceptable. However, their di erence is still quite significant. This di erence might be due to a strong sample selection e ect in the BATSE GRB sample presented by P reece et al. (2000), who considered only those bursts with total uence 5 10⁵ ergs cm² or peak uxes higher than 10 photons on 2 s^{1} in a 1.024 s timescale. To avoid such a sample selection e ect, we further compare the distributions of the hardness ratios of HETE-2 bursts and BAT SE bursts in Figure 1b. In Figure 1b, the BAT SE GRB sample includes all of the long-duration bursts without any sam ple selection e ect (1213 events, from BATSE Current Catalog). A K {S test to the two distributions in the range of $\log R = 0.3$ 1:5 derives $P_{KS} = 0.95$, strongly suggesting a consistency between the two distributions in that range. Thus, we suggest that the E_p distribution in 100{1000 keV should form one sole peak, centering at 160 250 keV.

The peak of E_p 30 keV or R 1 seems to be a unique one. A sharp cuto occurs on its left side. This might be caused by the lim it of HETE-2. Hence, we suggest that the E_p distribution should exhibit another peak of an energy < 30 keV.

Based on the above analysis, we propose that the E $_{\rm p}$ distribution of GRBs/XRFs is a bim odal one, peaking at an energy < 30 keV and $~160~~250~{\rm keV}$.

3. MPLICATIONS FOR THE JET STRUCTURE AND UNIFIED MODELS OF GRBS/XRFS

The observed bim odal distribution of E_p for GRBs/XRFs m ight strongly constrain the jet structure m odels of GRBs/XRFs.

From $E_{iso;52}$ ' $E_{p;2}(1 + z)$ ², where $E_{iso;52} = E_{iso}=10^{52}$ ergs and $E_{p;2} = E_p=10^2$ keV (A mati et al. 2002; L byd-R onning & R am irez-Ruiz 2002; A tteia 2003; Sakam oto et al. 2004; L amb et al. 2003a, b, 2004; L iang, D ai & W u 2004; Y onetoku et al. 2004), and $E_{iso;52}(1 \cos j) = 0.133$, where j is the jet opening angle (Frailet al. 2001; P anaitescu & K um ar 2001; P iran et al. 2003; B erger, K ulkarni, & Frail 2003), we can derive

$$j = \arccos 1 \frac{0.133}{\mathbb{E}_{p,2}(1+z)^2}$$
: (1)

In the uniform jet model, one expects that both XRFs and GRBs should obey Eq. (1). However, this relation cannot simply extend to any bursts with $E_p(1 + z) < 35$ keV, because of the limit of $_j < =2$. The redshifts of the two extremely soft XRFs, 020903 and 030723, are 0.251 (Soderberg et al. 2003) and less than 2.1 (Fynbo et al. 2004), respectively; but their E_p values are less than 20 keV. The two XRFs violate this relationship. In addition, the uniform jet modelm ay not accommodate the observed bim odal distribution of E_p .

A quasi-universal G aussian-type jet model may also present a uni ed picture for GRB s/XRFs. L byd-R onning, D ai, & Zhang (2003) found that this model can reproduce the relation of the equivalent { isotropic energy to the view ing angle, and Zhang et al. (2004a) further showed that the current GRB/XRF prom pt em ission/afferglow data can be described by this model (or sim ilarly structured jet) with a typical opening angle of 6 and with a standard jet energy of 10^{51} ergs. How ever, the observed bim odal distribution of E_p is di cult to be explained by this model.

A coording to the equivalent-isotropic energy (E_p relationship discovered recently by Am ati et al. (2002), the bim odal E_p distribution seems to im ply a two-component structure of GRB/XRF jets. To investigate whether or not this model can reproduce the observed bim odal distribution of E_p , we make a sim ple simulation analysis. We describe the energy per solid angle of the two{component m odel by two G aussian jets,

$$= {}_{0} \left(e^{-\frac{2}{v} = 2 \frac{2}{1}} + e^{-\frac{2}{v} = 2 \frac{2}{2}} \right);$$
(2)

where $_{\rm v}$ is the view ing angle measured from the jet axis, $_0$ is the maximum value of energy per solid angle, is the ratio of E $_{\rm iso}$ in the wide component to narrow com - ponent, and $_1$ and $_2$ are characteristic angular widthes

of the narrow and wide components, respectively. Since E $_{\rm p}$ / $^{0.5}$, the observed E $_{\rm p}$ should be given by

$$E_{p} = E_{p;0} (1 + z) (e^{-\frac{2}{v} = 2 \frac{2}{1}} + e^{-\frac{2}{v} = 2 \frac{2}{2}})^{1=2} :$$
(3)

Similar to Lloyd-Ronning, Dai, & Zhang (2003) and Zhang et al. (2004), we assume that the two components are quasi-universal, where \quasi" means that the param eters of this model have a dispersion but are not invariable. We perform a simple M onte Carlo simulation analysis with the distributions of these parameters. The probability of observing a GRB/XRF with v is proportional to \sin_{v} . One can expect this probability to be random . Thus, we assume that \sin_v is uniform ly distributed in the range of 0 {1. The $E_{p;0}$ distribution should be mainly determ ined by a bright GRB sample. Since the observed E_p for bright BATSE GRBs are narrow ly clustered at 200 400 keV and since the measured redshift distribution is around 1, we take the di erential distribution of $E_{p;0}$ as that of E_p for the bright GRBs, but centered at $\log E_{p;0} = 2.80$ (i.e., $E_{p;0} = 630$ keV), which is given by w (log $E_{p;0}$) = 0:018 expf 2[(log $E_{p;0}$ 2:80)²]=0:45²g, where the coe cient 0.018 is a norm alized constant. W e assume that the redshift distribution is the same as the one of B loom (2003), who assumed that the burst rate as a function of redshift is proportional to the star form ation rate, and who presented the observed redshift distribution incorporating observational biases (model SF1 from Porciani & M adau 2001 is used in this work). W e also restrict 4:5 because the largest z is 4.5 in our present GRB z sample. For 1 and , we cannot reasonably model their distributions with the present data, and thus we simply estim ate their values as follow s. Since the m ean value of the jet opening angles of 16 GRBs presented in B bom et al. (2003) is 0:15 rad (without considering the eight GRBs whose lim its of jet opening angles are presented), we take 0:15 rad. Based on the results shown in Figure 1, 1 we have = $E_{iso;XRF} = E_{iso;GRB}$ / 10^{1:7}. The 2 is the m ost poorly understood am ong these param eters. W e let it be an adjustable variable with a limit of $_2 > _1$. In our simulation analysis, we take $_2 = 0.32$ rad (see below).

We simulate a sam ple of 10⁵ GRBs/XRFs. Our simulation analysis procedure is described as follows. To derive a value of parameter x for a given burst (x is one of $E_{p;0}$, z, and $_{\rm v}$), we rst derive the accumulative probability distributions of these parameters P (x) (0 < P (x))1), then generate a random numberm (0 < m)1), and nally obtain the value of x from the inverse function of P(x) = m; i.e., $x = P^{-1}$ (m). The values of $_1$ and are xed at 0.15 rad and 10 $^{1:7}$, respectively. The value of $_2$ is an adjustable variable with a limit of $_2 > _1$. We not that $_2$ = 0:32 rad can roughly reproduce the E_p distribution shown in Figure 1.W e calculate the E_p for each simulated GRB/XRF with the above param eters using Eq. (3). The E_p distribution is shown in Figure 2. We nd that the distribution is bim odalwith peaks of 15 and 200 keV and with a valley at 50 keV. These results show that the two-Gaussian jet model can roughly reproduce the bim odal distribution of the observed E_p .

In our simulation, we do not consider any instrument threshold setting. The energy bandpass of HETE { 2/FREGATE is 7{400 keV.From Figure 1, we nd a sharp cuto at $\log E_p = \text{keV} = 1:3$ (i.e., $E_p = 20 \text{ keV}$), which is close to the lowest end of the HETE {2 energy bandpass. This E_p value might re ect the e ective threshold of HETE {2. We roughly estimate the ratio of observable GRBs to XRFs for HETE {2 with this threshold in our simulation analysis, and nd that this ratio is about 2.2:1. This is in a good agreement with HETE {2/FREGATE observations (39 HETE {2 GRBs and 18 XRFs in the HETE { 2/FREGATE sample).

4. CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

We have studied the observed E_p distribution of 57 HETE-2/FREGATE bursts, and discuss its implications for the jet structure m odels. Combining the observed E_p distribution of HETE-2 GRBs/XRFs with that of BATSE GRBs, we suggest that the observed E_p distribution of GRBs/XRFs is bim odal with peaks of < 30 keV and

160 250 keV. A coording to the recently (discovered equivalent-isotropic energy (E $_{\rm p}$ relationship, we nd that the bim odal distribution can be explained by the two (component m odel of GRB/XRF jets. A simple simulation analysis shows that this structured jet m odel does roughly reproduce the bim odal distribution with peaks of 15 keV and 200 keV.

The peak of 15 keV in the simulated E_p distribution is key evidence for the two{ component jet model. It is near the lowest end of the energy bandpass of HETE-2/FREGATE.Fortunately, HETE-2 provides a weak clue to this peak. A more sensitive instrument than HETE {2 with an energy bandpass 1 50 keV is required to further con m this peak. Swift, which covers an energy band of 0.2{150 keV (wem ark this region in Figure 2 with diagonal lines)² is expected to provide a key test for it.

Simulations of the propagation and eruption of relativistic jets in massive W olfR ayet stars by Zhang, W oosley, & Heger (2004b) show that an erupting jet has a highly relativistic, strongly collimated core, and a moderately relativistic, less energetic coccon. The coccon expands and becomes visible at larger angles. The energy ratio of the coccon to the core in their simulation is about one order. From our simulation results, we make the tit is

 $(E_{p;GRB}=E_{p;XRF})^2(_{1}=_{2})^2$ 40, being roughly consistent with their results. Their simulations seem to support the two-component jet model. We have noted that the ability of the cocoon to cause an XRF depends sensitively on its Lorentz factor, which is determined by the degree of mixing between the jet and envelope material. Matzner (2003) argued that this mixing might be di cult to resolve in num erical simulations.

A two-component jet was suggested to be universal for GRB/XRF phenomena in this Letter, based on the multiwavelength observations of GRB 0303029 (Berger et al. 2003; Sheth et al. 2003) and the bim odal distribution of E_p . It should be pointed out that other jet models such as uniform jets and single-component-universal jets were proposed to explain num erous observations on the afferglows and some correlations (e.g., Lam b et al. 2003b; Lloyd-R onning et al. 2004; Lloyd-R onning & Zhang 2004). Thus, one would expect strong evidence show ing which jet m odel is m ore reasonable.

We are very grateful to the anonymous referee for

his/hervaluable suggestions. We also sincerely thank Bing Zhang and Johan P.U. Fynbo for their helpful com m ents. These suggestions and comments have enabled us to im prove the manuscript greatly. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China

(grants 10233010 and 10221001), the National 973 P roject (NKBRSF G19990754), the Natural Science Foundation of Yunnan (2001A 0025Q), and the Research Foundation of GuanqxiUniversity.

REFERENCES

- Am ati, L., et al. 2002, A & A , 390, 81
- Atteia, J.-L. 2003, A&A, 407, L1
- Band, D., et al. 1993, ApJ, 413, 281
- Barraud, C., et al. 2003, A & A, 400, 1021
- Berger, E., Kulkami, S.R., & Frail, D.A. 2003, ApJ, 590,379
- Berger, E., et al. 2003, Nature, 426, 154
- Bloom, J., Frail, D.A., & Kulkarni, S.R. 2003, ApJ, 588, 945
- Bloom, J. 2003, AJ, 125, 2865
- Dai, Z.G.& Gou, L.J. 2001, ApJ, 552, 72
- Frail, D.A., et al. 2001, ApJ, 562, L55
- Fynbo, J.P.U. et al. 2004, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0402240)
- Granot, J. & Kumar, P. 2003, ApJ, 591, 1086
- Heise, J., in't Zand, J., Kippen, R.M., & Woods, P.M. 2001, in Proc. 2nd Rom e W orkshop: G am m a-R ay Bursts in the A fterglow Era, eds. E. Costa, F. Fron {tera, J. H jorth (Berlin: Springer { Verlag), 16 Huang, Y.F., Wu, X.F., Dai, Z.G., Ma, H.T., & Lu, T. 2004,
- ApJ, 605, 300
- Kippen, R.M., et al. 2003, in AIP Conf. Proc. 662, Gamma-Ray Burst and A fterglow A stronom y 2001, ed. G. R. Ricker & R. K. Vanderspek (Melville: A IP), 244
- Kumar, P.& Granot, J.2003, ApJ, 591, 1075
- Lamb, D.Q., Donaghy, T.Q., & GrazianiC.2003a, preprint (astro{ ph/0312504)
- Lamb, D.Q., Donaghy, T.Q., & GrazianiC.2003b, preprint (astro{ ph/0312634)
- Lam b, D.Q., et al. 2004, New A Rev., 48, 423
- Lloyd{Ronning, N.M., & Ram irez-Ruiz, E.2002, ApJ, 576, 101
- Lloyd {Ronning, N.M., DaiX.Y., & Zhang, B.2004, ApJ, 601, 371

- Lloyd {Ronning, N.M., & Zhang, B. 2004, ApJ, submitted (astroph/0404107)
- Liang, E.W ., Dai, Z.G., & Wu, X.F. 2004, ApJ, 606, L29
- M atzner, C.D. 2003, M NRAS, 345, 575
- Meszaros, P., Rees, M. J., & Wijers, R.A.M. J. 1998, ApJ, 499, 301
- M ochkovitch, R ., D aigne, F ., B arraud, C ., Atteia, J. 2003, astroph/0303289
- Panaitescu, A. & Kumar, P. 2001, ApJ, 554, 667
- Panaitescu, A. & Kumar, P. 2003, ApJ, 592, 390
- Press, W. H., Teukolsky, S. A., Vetterling, W. T. & Flannerly, B. P 1997, in Numerical Recipes, (Cambride: Cambride University P ress)
- Price, P.A., et al. 2003, Nature, 423, 844
- Piran, T., Kumar, P., Panaitescu, A., & Piro, L. 2001, ApJ, 560, L167
- Porciani, C. & Madau, P. 2001, ApJ, 548, 522
- P reece, R.D., et al. 2000, ApJS, 126, 19
- Rhoads, J.E. 1999, ApJ, 525, 737
- Rossi, E., Lazzati, D., & Rees, M.J. 2002, MNRAS, 332, 945 Sakam oto, T., et al. 2004, ApJ, 602, 875
- Sheth, K., et al. 2003, ApJ, 595, L33
- Soderberg, A.M., et al. 2003, GCN 1554
- Wei, D.M., & Jin, Z.P. 2003, A&A, 400, 415
- Yonetoku, D., et al. 2003, A pJL, in press (astro-ph 0309217) Zhang, B. & M eszaros P. 2002, A pJ, 571, 876
- Zhang, B., DaiX.Y., Lloyd-Ronning, N.M., & Meszaros, P.2004a, ApJ, 601, L119
- Zhang, W ., W oosley, S.E., & Heger, A. 2004b, ApJ, in press, astroph/0308389



Fig. 1. Observed E_p [panel (a)] and hardness ratio [panel (b)] distributions of em HETE-2/FREGATE GRBs/XRFs. In panel (a), the dashed line is the observed E_p distribution of a bright BATSE GRB sample taken from Preece et al. (2000). In panel (b), the dashed line is the observed hardness ratio distribution of all long-duration BATSE GRBs without any sam ple selection e ect (from BATSE Current C atalog).



Fig. 2. | Simulated E p distribution of the two-quasi-universal G aussian jet m odel. The diagonal line region is the energy band of Swift.