

HOT DISK CORONA AND MAGNETIC TURBULENCE IN RADIO-QUIET ACTIVE GALACTIC NUCLEI: OBSERVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS

JIAN-MIN WANG^{1,2}, KEN-YA WATARAI¹ AND SHIN MINESHIGE¹
 Received 2004 March 3; accepted 2004 April 16; published 2004 April 20

ABSTRACT

We compile a sample consisting of 56 radio-quiet active galactic nuclei so as to investigate statistical properties of hot corona of accretion disks from ASCA observations. The black-hole masses in the sample are estimated via several popular methods and the bolometric luminosities from the multi-wavelength continuum. This allows us to estimate the Eddington ratio ($\Gamma = L_{\text{Bol}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$) so that the undergoing physical processes can be tested via hard X-ray data. We find a strong correlation between F_X ($L_{2-10\text{keV}}/L_{\text{Bol}}$) and Γ as $F_X \propto \Gamma^{-0.54}$ with a multivariate regression. This indicates that the release of gravitational energy in the hot corona is controlled by the Eddington ratio. On the other hand, the correlation between the hard X-ray spectral index (α) and Γ depends critically on the types of objects: α is nearly constant ($\alpha \propto \Gamma^0$) in broad-line Seyfert 1's (BLS1s), whereas $\alpha \propto \log \Gamma^{0.18}$ in narrow-line Seyfert 1's (NLS1s), although not very significant. We can set constraints on the forms of magnetic stress tensor on the condition that F_X is proportional to the fraction f of gravitational energy dissipated in the hot corona and that f is proportional to magnetic energy density in the disk. We find that the shear stress tensor t_r / P_{gas} is favored by the correlation in the present sample, where P_{gas} is the gas pressure.

Subject headings: accretion, accretion disks - magnetic fields - galaxies: active - galaxies: Seyfert

1. INTRODUCTION

Accretion onto a supermassive black hole is generally regarded to be powering active galactic nuclei (AGNs). For a steady Keplerian accretion disk around a black hole with mass M_{BH} , the released energy via viscosity dissipation is given by

$$Q_{\text{vis}} = 8\pi \dot{m} m_{\text{BH}}^{-1} r^{-3} \mathcal{J}(r); \quad (\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2}) \quad (1)$$

where $\dot{m} = \dot{M} c^2 / L_{\text{Edd}}$, the Eddington luminosity $L_{\text{Edd}} = 4\pi c G M_{\text{BH}} \kappa_{\text{es}}$, $\kappa_{\text{es}} = 0.34$, $r = R c^2 / 2GM_{\text{BH}}$, $\mathcal{J}(r) = 1 - (3/r)^{1/2}$ and $m_{\text{BH}} = M_{\text{BH}} / M_{\odot}$ (Shakura & Sunyaev 1973). It is important to note that Q_{vis} is independent of the specific mechanism of viscosity stress. In the regime of the standard accretion disk around a massive black hole, the disks can not produce X-ray emission. Models of the accretion disks with hot corona have been suggested in order to explain the observed X-ray emission (Liang & Price 1977). In a popular model, a fraction f of Q_{vis} is assumed to be released in the hot corona and the left $(1-f)$ in cold disk, but the transportation of angular momentum is mainly taking place in cold disk (Haardt & Maraschi 1991; Svensson & Zdziarski 1994; Kawaguchi et al. 2001). However, the factor f remains open since we poorly understand how the process happens in the disk.

The important roles of the magnetic field turbulence have been realized in transportation of angular momentum (Balbus & Hawley 1991, Tout & Pringle 1992, Turner et al. 2002, 2003) and formation of the hot corona (Galeev et al. 1979, Stella & Rosner 1984, Merloni & Fabian 2002, Liu et al. 2002, Turner 2004, Kuncic & Bicknell 2004). The Maxwell stress is capable of transporting the angular momentum in the disk (Balbus 2003). Numerical simulations show the actual physical processes inside the disks are very complicated (Balbus & Hawley 1991, Stone et al. 1996; Blaes 2002; Blaes & Socrates 2003; Machida & Matsumoto 2003; Igumenshchev et al. 2003; Sano et al. 2003, Kato et al. 2004). We noted that these simulations are based on the assumption of radiative inefficiency, and can

not be directly applied to explain observations. The seminal paper by Galeev et al. (1979) showed that the gravitational energy will be mainly released in the hot corona since the strong buoyancy and magnetic field reconnection inevitably lead to the formation of the hot corona above cold disk (Stella & Rosner 1984). The formation of the hot corona is most likely naturally related with the transportation of angular momentum, the factor f can be thus obtained if the magnetic stress and energy transportation are assumed (Merloni & Fabian 2002). This may lend us a possible opportunity to test the working magnetic stress from hard X-ray observations. There is growing evidence in the Galactic black hole candidates for that the hot corona becomes weak when \dot{m} increases (see a review of McClintock & Remillard 2004). However it is elusive how the hot corona changes with \dot{m} in AGN disks. Two problems remain open: 1) what is the proper magnetic field stress? 2) how to connect the two processes of angular momentum transportation and the energy release in the hot corona?

In this *Letter*, we look into the hard X-ray data of radio-quiet AGNs to see \dot{m} -dependence of hard X-rays and consider the roles of magnetic turbulence in the disks. We found a strong correlation between the factor f and the Eddington ratio, implying that the energy release is driven by the Eddington ratio and the importances of magnetic turbulence.

2. THE SAMPLE AND CORRELATIONS

Table 1 gives the data of the present sample, which is composed of 56 objects consisting of 29 narrow line Seyfert 1 galaxies (NLS1s) and 27 broad Seyfert 1 galaxies (BLS1s). Col (1) is the name of the objects, Col (2) the 2-10keV luminosity from ASCA observations in units of erg s^{-1} , Col (3) the photon index between 2-10 keV, Col (4) the bolometric luminosity in units of erg s^{-1} , Col (5) the black hole mass in the units of solar mass. Col (6) gives some notes on the objects, indicating the references of X-ray luminosity and photon index as well as the

¹ Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-852, Japan

² Laboratory for High Energy Astrophysics, Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing 100039, P. R. China.

references or methods of the estimations of the black hole mass, bolometric luminosity. The black hole masses are estimated by

TABLE 1 THE SAMPLE

Name (1)	$\log L_X$ (2)	$\log L_{\text{Bol}}$ (3)	$\log m_{\text{BH}}$ (4)	Notes (5)	Notes (6)
Mrk 335	43.42	1.94	44.69	6.69	T, 1
IZw 1	43.73	2.25	45.47	7.26	T, 2
Ton S180	44.00	2.46	45.70	6.91	T, 3
F 9	44.26	1.91	45.23	7.91	T, 1
RX J0148-27	43.81	2.06	45.68	6.97	T, 3
Nab 0205+024	44.52	2.27	45.45	7.86	T, 1
Mrk 1040	42.83	1.56	44.53	7.64	T, 1
LB 1727	44.59	1.56	46.37	8.47	T, Rev
3C 120	44.34	1.89	45.34	7.42	T, 1
Akn 120	44.07	1.91	44.91	8.27	T, 1
MCG+8-11-11	43.54	1.56	44.16	7.24	T, Rev
1H0707-495	42.95	2.27	44.43	6.30	T, Rev
NGC 3227	42.01	1.61	43.86	6.76	T, 4
RE 1034+396	43.05	2.35	44.52	6.45	T, 3
NGC 3516	43.43	1.83	44.29	7.36	T, 1
NGC 3783	43.25	1.70	44.41	6.94	T, 1
Mrk 42	42.54	2.14	43.91	5.61	T, Rev
NGC 4051	41.56	1.92	43.56	6.13	T, 1
NGC 4151	43.01	1.57	43.73	7.13	T, 1
Mrk 766	43.08	2.16	44.23	6.05	T, 3
NGC 4593	43.06	1.78	44.09	6.91	T, 1
IRAS 13224-3809	43.11	1.97	45.74	6.75	T, Rev
MCG-6-30-15	43.11	2.02	43.59	6.21	T, Rev
EXO 055620-3	43.97	1.70	44.37	7.21	T, Rev
IC 4329A	43.06	1.71	44.78	6.77	T, 1
Mrk 279	43.99	2.04	44.55	7.83	T, Rev
PG 1404+226	43.49	2.07	45.29	6.76	T, Rev
NGC 5548	43.76	1.79	44.83	8.03	T, 1
Mrk 478	43.83	2.06	45.42	7.27	T, Rev
Mrk 841	43.83	1.77	45.84	8.10	T, 1
Mrk 290	43.53	1.68	44.35	7.04	T, Rev
3C 390.3	44.41	1.63	44.88	8.55	T, 1
Mrk 509	44.38	1.82	45.03	7.86	T, 1
Akn 564	43.38	2.70	44.47	6.04	T, Rev
MCG-2-58-22	44.43	1.73	45.30	8.48	T, Rev
E 0015+162	45.10	1.99	45.31	8.31	R, 5
PHL 909	44.24	1.11	45.47	8.90	R, 1
HE 1029-1401	44.44	1.81	46.03	9.08	R, 1
PG 1114+445	44.01	1.71	45.65	8.41	R, 2
PG 1116+215	44.47	2.09	46.22	8.50	R, 2
PG 1211+143	43.70	2.06	45.89	7.88	R, 2
PG 1216+069	44.70	1.57	46.45	9.17	R, 2
PG 1404+226	42.95	1.77	45.27	6.74	R, Rev, 6
PG 1416-129	44.48	1.78	45.90	8.50	R, 2
PHL 1092	44.10	1.99	46.07	7.61	V, Rev
RX J0439-45	44.04	2.25	45.66	7.12	V, Rev
PKS 0558-504	44.67	1.81	45.80	7.56	V, Rev
PG 1244+026	42.10	2.35	44.62	6.29	V, 2
PG 1543+489	44.16	2.46	46.11	7.79	V, Rev
IRAS 1702+454	43.74	2.20	44.74	6.54	V, Rev
Mrk 507	42.62	1.61	44.54	6.34	V, Rev
IRAS 20181-224	43.87	2.33	45.43	6.80	V, Rev, 7
Mrk 142	43.18	2.12	44.55	6.65	L, 3
IRAS 13349+2438	44.12	2.31	45.35	7.74	L, 3
Kaz 163	43.19	1.92	45.02	7.11	L, Rev
NGC 7469	43.26	1.91	45.28	6.84	N, 1

NOTES/REFERENCES: - T: Turner et al. (1999); R: Reeves & Turner (2000); V: Vaughan et al. (1999); L: Leighly (1999); N: Nandra et al. (2000); 1: Woo & Urry (2002); 2: Vestergaard (2002); 3: Grupe et al. (2004); 4: McLure & Dunlop (2001); 5: Örndahl et al. (2003); 6: Boroson & Green (1992); 7: Elizalde & Steiner (1994); Rev: reverberation relation from the magnitude M_B from Véron-Cetty & Véron Catalog; * data is taken from Turner et al (2001).

1) the empirical reverberation relation with calibrations, $R_{\text{BLR}} = 30.2 L_{5100} = 10^{44} \text{ }^{0.66} \text{ lt-days}$, where L_{5100} is the luminosity at 5100\AA (Vestergaard 2002); 2) reverberation mapping technique (Kaspi et al. 2000); 3) relation between BH mass and its host galaxy magnitude $\log M_{\text{BH}} = M = -0.5 M_R - 2.96$ (McLure & Dunlop 2002); 4) relation between the dispersion velocity and

BH mass $M_{\text{BH}} = 1.35 \cdot 10^8 (\sigma = 200)^{4.02}$ (Tremaine et al. 2002). The black hole masses in Table 1 are taken from Woo & Urry (2002) and Vestergaard (2002), otherwise we use the empirical




FIG. 1.— The plots of hard X-ray spectrum index and the ratio of ASCA luminosity to bolometric luminosity versus the Eddington ratio. The open and filled circles represent the narrow line Seyfert 1 galaxies (FWHM $H < 2000 \text{ km/s}$) and the broad Seyfert 1 galaxies, respectively. The object IRAS 13324-3809 is a NLS1 with $\text{FWHM}(H) = 620 \text{ km/s}$ and 2-10keV luminosity 10^{43} erg/s much fainter than its $M_B = -24.2$ (Véron-Cetty & Véron's catalog), with $m_{\text{BH}} = 10^{6.95}$, the ratio $L_{2-10\text{keV}} = L_{\text{Edd}} \cdot 10^{-3}$ and $L_{\text{Bol}} = L_{\text{Edd}} \cdot 10^{0.88}$.

reverberation method to estimate M_{BH} . L_{5100} is obtained from the absolute M_B given in Véron-Cetty & Véron's quasar catalog (11th edition) through an extrapolation of a power law spectrum in optical band as $F \propto \lambda^{-0.5}$. The bolometric luminosities L_{Bol} are taken from Woo & Urry (2002) and Grupe et al. (2003), otherwise they are estimated via $L_{\text{Bol}} = 9L_{5100}$ (Kaspi et al. 2000). We use the Hubble constant $H_0 = 75 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and deceleration factor $q_0 = 0.5$ in this paper.

Fig 1 shows the plot of photon index, Γ , and fraction of X-ray emission, $F_X = L_{2-10\text{keV}}/L_{\text{Bol}}$, versus the Eddington ratio, $E = L_{\text{Bol}}/L_{\text{Edd}}$. Except for PHL 909, the X-ray photon indices almost keep a constant for BLS1s with a mean value of $\Gamma = 1.78 \pm 0.17$. There is a trend for NLS1s: the higher is accretion rate, the steeper is the X-ray spectrum as $\Gamma \propto \log E^{0.18}$. We find the Pearson's correlation coefficient of $\Gamma - E$ is 0.37 for NLS1s. The difference of $E - \Gamma$ relations in BLS1s and NLS1s show an interesting evidence for the bi-modal accretion in Seyfert 1 galaxies. However, it is interesting to note that there is a strong correlation of Γ and the Eddington ratio E for the entire sample,

$$\Gamma = (2.05 \pm 0.04) + (0.26 \pm 0.05) \log E; \quad (2)$$

with the Pearson's coefficient $r = 0.61$ and probability $p = 5.4 \cdot 10^{-7}$. We use the least square method of multivariate

TABLE 2. MAGNETIC TURBULENCE AS VISCOSITY AND PROPERTIES OF HOT CORONA

viscosity stress	References	factor f	P_{rad}	P_{gas}	P_{gas}	P_{rad}	Comments
1) $t_r = -P_{\text{tot}}$	SS73	/ $1=2$	$f = \text{const.}$	$f = \text{const.}$	$f = \text{const.}$	$f = \text{const.}$	p
2) $t_r = -P_{\text{gas}}$	SR84	/ $1=2 a_s=c_s$	f / \underline{m}^-	$f ! \text{ const.}$	$f ! \text{ const.}$	$f ! \text{ const.}$	
3) $t_r = -P_{\text{rad}}$	WL91	/ $1=2 1-(a_s=c_s)^2$	$f / 1=2$	$f ! 0$	$f ! 0$	$f ! 0$	
4) $t_r = -\frac{P_{\text{rad}}P_{\text{tot}}}{P_{\text{gas}}P_{\text{tot}}}$	S90	/ $1=2 \frac{1-(a_s=c_s)^2}{a_s=c_s}$	$f / 1=2$	$f ! 0$	$f ! 0$	$f ! 0$	
5) $t_r = -\frac{P_{\text{gas}}P_{\text{tot}}}{P_{\text{gas}}P_{\text{tot}}}$	TL84, B85, MF02	/ $1=2 \frac{1-(a_s=c_s)^2}{a_s=c_s}$	$f / \underline{m}^- =2$	$f ! \text{ const.}$	$f ! \text{ const.}$	$f ! \text{ const.}$	
6) $t_r = -\frac{P_{\text{gas}}P_{\text{rad}}}{P_{\text{gas}}P_{\text{rad}}}$	LN 89	/ $1=2 \frac{1-(a_s=c_s)^2}{a_s=c_s}$	$f / 1=2 \underline{m}^- =2$	$f ! 0$	$f ! 0$	$f ! 0$	

REFERENCES:– B85: Burm (1985); MF02: Merloni & Fabian (2002). LN89: Laor & Netzer (1989); S90: Szuszkiewicz (1990); SS73: Shakura & Sunyaev (1973); SR84: Stella & Rosner (1984); TL84: Taam & Lin (1984); WL92: Wandel & Liang (1992). Here \underline{m} is a positive constant, and $a_s = (P_{\text{gas}} =)^{1=2}$ the gas sound speed.

regression and find a very strong correlation $\log L_X = (0.36 \pm 0.09) \log L_{\text{Bol}} + (0.47 \pm 0.09) \log L_{\text{Edd}} + (6.13 \pm 3.57)$ with coefficient $r = 0.83$ and $F = 58.7$ of the F -test (much larger than $F = 3.2$ at 99% level of confidence). This correlation can be rewritten as

$$\log F_X = -0.64 \log E - 0.17 \log L_{\text{Edd}} + 6.13; \quad (3)$$

from which an interesting conclusion follows: the hot corona is mainly controlled by the Eddington ratio. Fig 1b. shows this correlation.

The correlation shows that the corona becomes dramatically weak with increases of the Eddington ratio. While the Eddington ratio is low, a larger fraction of the energy will be released in the hot corona. A naive expectation is that the magnetic stress responsible for the transportation of angular momentum increases with the accretion rates. Otherwise the accretion would be halted because of the inefficient transportation. However, this does not agree with the observed correlation, which indicates that the dissipation in the cold disk (not in the hot corona) becomes more efficient with increases of the accretion rates. Successful models of the hot corona should address this issue explicitly.

The correlation of $E -$ shows that the hard X-ray spectrum becomes harder with increases of E , confirming the results of Lu & Yu (1999) and Gierlinski & Done (2004). This is usually explained by that the seed photons efficiently cool the hot corona with increases of \underline{m} . However, this explanation could be replaced by that the hot corona really becomes weak since $F_X / E^{-0.64}$. Indeed this agrees with that the broad line Seyfert 1 galaxies have strong reprocessing of hard X-ray, such as in NGC 5548 (Clavel et al. 1992; Chiang et al. 2000), evidenced by that optical and UV variations follow the hard X-ray. In NSL1s the reprocessing is rather weak, such as Akn 564 (Shemmer et al. 2001), NGC 4051 (Done et al. 1990) and IRAS 13224-3809 (Young et al. 1999).

3. MAXWELL STRESS AND HOT CORONA

Assuming that the energy transportation from the cold disk to the hot corona is by buoyancy driving the magnetic tubes across extent of the disk, Merloni & Fabian (2002) proposed the fraction of the energy transported by magnetic buoyancy to be $f = P_{\text{mag}} / P_{\text{tot}}$, where v is the transporting velocity, P_{mag} the magnetic pressure and the dissipated energy $Q_+ = -\frac{3}{2} c_s t_r$ via viscosity stress t_r . We have

$$f = \frac{2b}{3k_0} \frac{A}{c_s} = \frac{2^{3=2} b}{3k_0} \frac{P_{\text{mag}}}{P_{\text{tot}}}^{1=2}; \quad (4)$$

where $t_r = -k_0 P_{\text{mag}}$, $A = B(4 \pi \rho)^{1=2}$ Alfvén velocity and the constant $b = \frac{P_{\text{mag}}}{P_{\text{tot}}}$. Here $P_{\text{tot}} = P_{\text{rad}} + P_{\text{gas}}$ and $c_s^2 = P_{\text{tot}} =$.




FIG. 2.— The plot of factor f and the Eddington ratio in theoretical models. The lines labeled by MF02 and SR84 are results of Merloni & Fabian (2002) and Stella & Rosner (1984), respectively. We take $2^{3=2} b = 3k_0 = 1$ and $b = 1$. The solid, dashed, and dot-dash-dot-dash lines are results for $\underline{m} = 0.05; 0.1; 0.4$ for $m_{\text{BH}} = 10^8$. The two thick lines are for $m_{\text{BH}} = 10^6$ and $\underline{m} = 0.05$. $E = \underline{m}$ is used, where the accretion efficiency $\eta = 0.1$.

According to eq.(4), Table 2 gives the properties of the factor f for six distinct types of the magnetic stresses based on different assumptions. Comments are given in Table 2 based on the correlation (eq. 3). Cases 1), 3), 4) and 6) predict properties inconsistent with the correlations in Figure 1b, thus they could be ruled out. Only Cases 2) and 5) are possible since they provide characters of the hot corona consistent with the correlation.

Specifying the magnetic stress, we can solve the structure of disk and the factor f at each radius formulated in Svensson & Zdziarski (1994) as described by Merloni & Fabian (2002) and Merloni (2003). We define the radial-averaged fraction $\langle f \rangle$,

$$\langle f \rangle = \frac{\int_{R_1}^{R_2} f(r) Q_+(r) r dr}{\int_{R_1}^{R_2} Q_+(r) r dr}; \quad (5)$$

so that we can compare with the observation, if the magnetic stress is assumed.

In Case 2) the magnetic pressure $t_r = -P_{\text{gas}}$ is originally suggested by Stella & Rosner (1984), who argued the buoyancy controls the growth of the magnetic field. The magnetic stress is simply scaled by the gas pressure. Such a stress can stabilize the thermal instability of the cold disk (Svensson & Zdziarski 1994). On the other hand, Ichimaru (1975) argued that the growth of the magnetic field may be controlled by the reconnection and gave a magnetic pressure tensor $t_r = -\frac{P_{\text{gas}} P_{\text{tot}}}{P_{\text{gas}} P_{\text{tot}}}$

(Case 5). This stress has been extensively studied by many authors (Burm 1985, Szuszkiewicz 1990). Recently Merloni & Fabian (2002) and Merloni (2003) derived this simple formulation based on analytical work (Blaes & Socrates 2001) and 3-D MHD numerical simulation (Turner et al. 2002) of magneto-rotational-instability in radiative accretion disks.

Figure 2. shows the results of hf_i for the magnetic stresses $t_r = -P_{\text{gas}}$ and $t_r = -\frac{P}{P_{\text{gas}}P_{\text{tot}}}$. We find that hf_i is not sensitive to the black hole mass. More interesting thing in Figure 2 is that the slope of $E - hf_i$ (for $E = 0.05$) is insensitive to both the black hole mass and the viscosity ν , but only sensitive to the magnetic stress. These properties of the theoretical relation of $E - hf_i$ allow us to test the working magnetic stress in disk. We have $hf_i / E^{-0.44}$ for the Merloni & Fabian's model whereas $hf_i / E^{-0.77}$ for the Stella & Rosner's. MF02 predicts a flatter slope than the observation. SR84 model has a steeper slope, but it matches the observational correlation $hf_i / E^{-0.64-0.09}$ within the uncertainties in the present sample.

A more fiducial test on the magnetic stress requires the accurate estimations of the black hole masses, bolometric luminosity and the total hard X-ray luminosity from observations. The

near future observations of *INTEGRAL* can provide entire hard X-ray spectra of a large sample so as to test the disk-corona models. The future 3-D MHD numerical simulations including the hot corona should be tested by the plot of $E - L_X = L_{\text{Bol}}$.

4. CONCLUSIONS

With the estimations of the black hole masses in radio-quiet AGNs, we find the hard X-ray spectrum index and $L_{2-10\text{keV}} = L_{\text{Bol}}$ strongly correlate with the Eddington ratio. These correlations directly indicate that the fraction f is controlled by the Eddington ratio. Such a correlation can be explained by the magnetic turbulence that plays two roles in transporting angular momentum and forming the hot corona. The correlation $E_X / E^{-0.64-0.09}$ favors the magnetic stress t_r / P_{gas} in the present sample.

This research is supported by Grant for Distinguished Young Scientists from NSFC, 973 project and a Grant-in-Aid of the 21st Century COE "Center for Diversity and Universality in Physics".

REFERENCES

- Balbus, S.A. & Hawley, J.F., 1991, ApJ, 376, 214
 Balbus, S.A., 2003, ARA&A, 41, 555
 Blaes, O.M., 2002, astro-ph/0211368
 Blaes, O.M. & Socrates, A., 2001, ApJ, 553, 987
 Blaes, O.M. & Socrates, A., 2003, ApJ, 596, 509
 Boroson, T. & Green, R.F., 1992, ApJS, 80, 109
 Burm, H., 1985, A&A, 143, 389
 Chiang, J., et al. 2000, ApJ, 528, 292
 Clavel, J. et al., 1992, ApJ, 393, 113
 Done, C., Madejski, G.M. & Życki, P.T., 1990, MNRAS, 243, 713
 Elizalde, F. & Steiner, J.E., 1994, MNRAS, 268, L47
 Galeev, A.A., Rosner, R. & Vaiana, G.S., 1979, ApJ, 229, 318
 Gierlinski, M. & Done, C., 2004, MNRAS, in press, astro-ph/0312271
 Grupe, D., Wills, B., Leighly, K.M., Meusinger, H., 2004, AJ, 127, 156
 Haardt, F. & Maraschi, L., 1991, ApJ, 380, L51
 Ichimaru, S., 1975, ApJ, 202, 528
 Igumenshchev, I.V., Narayan, R. & Abramowicz, M.A., 2003, ApJ, 592, 1042
 Kaspi, S., et al., 2000, ApJ, 533, 631
 Kato, Y., Mineshige, S. & Shibata, K., 2004, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0307306)
 Kawaguchi, T., Shimura, T. & Mineshige, S., 2001, ApJ, 546, 966
 Kuncic, Z.A. & Bicknell, G.V., 2004, ApJ, astro-ph/0402421
 Laor, A., & Netzer, H., 1989, MNRAS, 238, 897
 Leighly, K.M., 1999, ApJS, 125, 317
 Liang, E.P.T. & Price, R.H., 1977, ApJ, 218, 247
 Liu, B.F., Mineshige, S. & Shibata, R., 2002, ApJ, 572, L173
 Lu, Y. & Yu, Q., 1999, ApJ, 526, L5
 McClintock, J.E. & Remillard, R.A., 2003, astro-ph/0306213
 McLure, R.J. & Dunlop, J.S., 2001, MNRAS, 327, 1999
 Merloni, A., 2003, MNRAS, 341, 1051
 Merloni, A. & Fabian, A.C., 2002, MNRAS, 332, 165
 Mineshige, S. et al. 2000, PASJ, 52, 499
 Nandra, K., et al., 2000, ApJ, 544, 734
 Örndahl, E., Rönnback, J. & van Groningen, R.E., 2003, A&A, 404, 883
 Reeves, J.N. & Turner, M.J.L., 2000, MNRAS, 316, 234
 Sano, T., Inutsuka, S., Turner, N.J. & Stone, J.M., 2004, ApJ, astro-ph/0312480
 Shakura, I. & Sunyaev, R., 1973, A&A, 24, 337
 Shemmer, O. et al., 2001, ApJ, 561, 162
 Stella, L. & Rosner, R., 1984, ApJ, 277, 312
 Stone, J., et al., 1996, ApJ, 463, 656
 Svensson, R. & Zdziarski, A., 1994, ApJ, 436, 599
 Szuszkiewicz, E., 1990, MNRAS, 244, 377
 Taam, R. & Lin, D.N.C., 1984, ApJ, 287, 761
 Tremaine, S., et al., 2002, ApJ, 574, 740
 Tout, C.A. & Pringle, J.E., 1992, MNRAS, 259, 604
 Turner, N.J., 2004, ApJ, astro-ph/0402539
 Turner, N.J., Stone, J.M. & Sano, T., 2002, ApJ, 566, 148
 Turner, N.J., Stone, J.M., Krolik, J.H. & Sano, T., 2003, ApJ, 593, 992
 Turner, T.J., Goerge, I., Nandra, K. & Turcan, D., 1999, ApJ, 524, 667
 Turner, T.J., et al., 2001, ApJ, 561, 131
 Vaughan, S., Reeves, J., Warwick, R. & Edelson, R., 1999, MNRAS, 309, 113
 Véron-Cetty, M.-P. & Véron, P., 2003, A&A, 412, 399
 Vestergaard, M., 2002, ApJ, 571, 733
 Wandel, A., & Liang, E.P.T., 1991, ApJ, 380, 84
 Woo, J.-H. & Urry, M.C., 2002, ApJ, 579, 530
 Young, A.J., et al., 1999, MNRAS, 304, L46