GRB e ciency and Possible Physical Processes Shaping the Early Afterglow

Y izhong Fan^{1;2;3?} and T sviP iran¹ y

¹The Racah Inst. of Physics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

² Purple M ountain O bærvatory, Chinese A cadem y of Science, N an jing 210008, China

³N ational A stronom ical O bservatories, C hinese A cadem y of Sciences, B eijing 100012, C hina

A coeptedR eceived; in original form

ABSTRACT

The discovery by Swift that a good fraction of G am m a Ray Bursts (G RB s) have a slow ly decaying X -ray afterglow phase led to the suggestion that energy injection into the blast wave takes place several hundred seconds after the burst. This im plies that right after the burst the kinetic energy of the blast wave was very low and in turn the e ciency of production of -rays during the burst was extrem ely high, rendering the internal shocks m odel unlikely. We re-exam ine the estimates of kinetic energy in G RB afterglow s and show that the e ciency of converting the kinetic energy into

rays is moderate and does not challenge the standard internal shock model.We also exam ine several models, including in particular energy injection, suggested to interpret this slow decay phase.We show that with proper parameters, all these models give rise to a slow decline lasting several hours. However, even those models that t all X-ray observations, and in particular the energy injection model, cannot account self-consistently for both the X-ray and the optical afferglows of well monitored GRBs such as GRB 050319 and GRB 050401.We speculate about a possible alternative resolution of this puzzle.

Key words: Gamma Rays: bursts ISM : jets and out ows { radiation mechanisms: nonthermal X - rays: general

1 IN TRODUCTION

The X -ray telescope (XRT) on board Swifthas provided high quality early X -ray afterglow light curves of m any G am m aray Bursts (GRBs). One of the most remarkable and unexpected features discovered by Swift was that many of these X-ray afterglow light curves are distinguished by a slow decline The ux F decreases with observer's time t as F / t^[0; 0:8], lasting from a few hundred seconds to few hours (Nousek et al. 2005, Campana et al. 2005; Vaughan et al. 2005; Cusum ano et al. 2005; de Pasquale et al. 2005). Such a phase is unexpected in the standard reball model. A simple explanation is that the slow decline arises due to a signi cant energy injection (Zhang et al. 2005; Nousek et al. 2005; Panaitescu et al. 2006, Granot & Kum ar 2006), as suggested previously (For baryon-rich in jection: Rees & M eszaros 1998; Panaitescu et al. 1998; K um ar & Piran 2000; Sari & Meszaros 2000; Zhang & Meszaros 2002; Granot, Nakar & Piran 2003. For Poynting ux dominated in jection¹: D ai & Lu 1998a; Zhang & M eszaros 2001; D ai 2004). It has been argued that consequently the resulted G R B e ciency, i.e., the ratio of the energy em itted in ray energy to the total energy (the sum of the ray energy and the kinetic energy of the ejecta powering the afferglow), should be 90% or higher. Som e extrem e assumptions are needed (Bebborodov 2000; K obayashi & Sari 2001) to reach such a high e ciency within the fram ework of the standard internalshocksm odel (Paczynski & Xu 1994; R ees & M eszaros 1994; Sari & Piran 1997a, 1997b; K obayashi, Piran & Sari 1997; D aigne & M ochkovitch 1998; Piran 1999).

W e re-exam ine this issue focusing on two critical aspects of the analysis. The estim ate of the kinetic energy of the ejecta from the afterglow observations and in particular from

[?] Lady Davis Fellow, E-m ail: yzfan@ pm o.ac.cn

y tsvi@ phys.hu ji.ac.il

¹ If the out ow ejected from the central engine after the gam m a ray burst phase is highly magnetized, at a radius 10^{15} cm, the M HD condition breaks down. Signi cant magnetic eld dissipation processes are expected to happen which converts energy into radiation. As long as the highly magnetized out ow is steady enough, strong and slow ly decaying X -ray em ission is possible (see Fan, Zhang & Proga [2005a] and the references therein).

the X -ray ux and the need of energy injection. We show in x^2 that even for these Swift GRBs with long duration X - ray attening the -ray conversion e ciency is high but not unreasonable.

We then turn to the puzzling slow decline seen in the rst few hours of the X -ray afterglow . W e explore in x3 severalm odels that m ay give rise to slow ly decaying X -ray afterglows: (i) Energy injection. (ii) A small e, in which only 1 of the electrons are accelerated to a sm all fraction, e high energies and contribute to the radiation process. (iii) Evolving shock parameters, where the microscopic shock param eters $_{\rm e}$ and/or $_{\rm B}$ (the fraction of shock energy given to the magnetic led) vary in time and are inversely proportional to the Lorentz factor of the ejecta. (iv) A very low variable external density model, in which the number density of the medium is not only very low but it also a function of the radius. (v) Highly magnetized out ow where attening m ight arise because of a slow conversion of the m agnetic energy to kinetic energy of the external matter. W e present in x3 analytical derivation as well as num erical calculations of the expected light curves in all these models except the last one. In x4 we com pare the models to the observations of GRB 050319 and GRB 050401. W e sum m arize our results and discuss their in plications in x5.W e conclude with a speculation on the nature of the solution to this puzzle.

2 IS THERE A GRB EFFICIENCY CRISIS?

O ne of the critical factors that characterize the emitting of a G R B is the energy conversion e ciency. The -ray e ciency is de ned as:

$$\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{E} + \mathbf{E}_{k}); \tag{1}$$

where E is the isotropic equivalent energy of the ray emission and E_k is the isotropic equivalent energy of the out ow powering the afterglow. Following the Swift observations of attening in the X-ray afterglow light curve of many GRBs, it has been argued that typical values of could be as high as 90% or even higher (Zhang et al. 2005; Nousek et al. 2005; Ioka et al. 2005; for the discussion of pre-Swift GRBs, see Llod-Ronning & Zhang 2004, hereafter LZ04). This very high e ciency would challengem ost -rays emission models and in particular it challenges the standard reball model that is based on internal shocks.

These claims arise from revised estimates of the kinetic energy immediately following the GRB. Therefore, in order to explore this issue we re-exam ine the estimates of the kinetic energy from the X-ray observations. As we show below, at a late afferglow epoch, the X-ray band is above the cooling frequency. In this case the X-ray ux is independent of the poorly constrained n and the X-ray luminosity is a good probe of E_k (Freedman & W axm an 2001, K um ar 2000, LZ04).

In the standard GRB afferglow model (e.g., Sari, Piran & Narayan 1998; Piran 1999), the X-ray afferglow is produced by a shock propagating into the circum-burst matter. The equations that govern the emission of this shock are $(Y \text{ ost et al. } 2003)^2$

 2 To derive these equations, the deceleration of the reballisgoverned by the energy conservation $^2M\ c^2$ = E $_k$, where M $\,$ is the

$$F_{max} = 6.6 \text{ m Jy } \left(\frac{1+z}{2}\right) D_{L;28:34} {}^{1=2}_{B; 2} E_{k;53} n_0^{1=2}; \qquad (2)$$

$$m = 7:6 \qquad 10^{11} \text{ H z E}_{k;53}^{1=2} \frac{1=2}{B}; \frac{2}{2} \text{ e}; \ 1C_{p}^{2} \left(\frac{1+z}{2}\right)^{1=2} t_{d}^{3=2}; \quad (3)$$

$$_{c} = 1:4 \quad 10^{15} \text{ H z E}_{k;53}^{1=2} B_{;2}^{3=2} n_{0}^{1} (\frac{1+z}{2})^{1=2} t_{d}^{1=2} \frac{1}{(1+Y)^{2}};(4)$$

where z is the redshift, D_L is the corresponding lum inosity distance, p is the power-law index of the shocked electrons, we use p = 2.3 throughout this work, C_p 13 (p 2)= β (p 1) and to is the observer's time in unit of days. Y = (1+ 1+4 $_{KN} e^{=} B$)=2 is the Compoton parameter, where = m infl; ($_m = c$)^{(p 2)=2}g (e.g. Sari, N arayan & Piran 1996; W ei & Lu 1998, 2000), 0 $_{KN}$ 1 is a coe e cient accounting for the K lein-N ishina e ect, which is e (the random Lorentz factor of the electron) dependent (see Appendix A for detail). Here and throughout this text, the convention $Q_x = Q = 10^x$ has been adopted in cgs units.

For the typical parameters taken here, m crosses the observer frequency $x = 10^{17}$ H z at $t_d = 4 = 10^{4}$. It is quite reasonable to assume $x > m \exp[c; m]$, and the predicted X ray ux is

$$F_{x} = F_{max} c_{m}^{1=2} (p \ 1)=2 \ p=2 \\ = 3.8 \ 10^{4} \ m \ Jy \ (\frac{1+z}{2})^{(2+p)=4} D_{L;28:34}^{2} (p \ 2)=4 \ p \ 1 \\ E_{k;53}^{(p+2)=4} (1+Y)^{-1} t_{d}^{(2-3p)=4} \ p=2 ;$$
(5)

The ux recorded by XRT is

$$F = \int_{x^{2}}^{x^{2}} F_{x} dx$$

$$= 12 \quad 10^{12} \text{ ergs s}^{1} \text{ cm}^{2} \left(\frac{1+z}{2}\right)^{(p+2)=4} D_{L^{2};28;34}$$

$$\int_{B^{2};2}^{(p-2)=4} e_{r}^{1} E_{k;53}^{(p+2)=4} (1+Y)^{-1} t_{d}^{(2-3p)=4}; \quad (6)$$

where $x_1 = 0.2$ keV and $x_2 = 10$ keV. This equation is now inverted to obtain E_k from the observed ux.

In some special cases, $_{\rm m}$ < $_{\rm X}$ < $_{\rm c}$, the ux recorded by XRT should be

$$F = 1.5 \quad 10^{11} \text{ ergs s}^{1} \text{ cm}^{2} (\frac{1+z}{2})^{(p+3)=4} D_{L,28:34}^{2}$$

rest m ass of the shocked m edium (e.g., B landford & M cK ee 1976; Sari et al. 1998; Piran 1999). The distribution of the fresh electrons accelerated by the shock is assumed to be dn=d $_{\rm e}$ / $_{\rm e}$ $^{\rm p}$ for _e e_{m} , where $e_{m} = (m_{p}=m_{e})[(p 2)=(p 1)]e($ 1), governed by the strict shock jump conditions (B landford & M c-Kee 1976). The other crucial param eter is the cooling Lorentz factor $e_{c} = 6(1 + z) m_{e} c = [T B^{2} t(1 + Y)]$, above which the energy loss due to the synchrotron/inverse-C om poton radiation is important (Sari et al. 1998; Piran 1999), where T is the Thompson cross section and B is the magnetic eld of the shocked medium. $_{\rm m}$ and $_{\rm c}$ are the corresponding synchrotron radiation frequency of electrons with Lorentz factor em and $_{\rm e;c},$ respectively. The maximum speci c $\,$ ux is estimated as $(1 + z)M = {}^{3}B = (4 m_{p}m_{e}c^{2}D_{L}^{2})$ (Sariet al. 1998; W i-F ;m ax jers & Galam a 1999), where e is the charge of electron. The $_{
m c}$ and F im ax taken here are comparable with that of most previous works (e.g., G ranot et al 1999; W ijers & G alam a 1999; P anaitescu & Kumar 2002; LZ04). The m is close to that taken in Sariet al. (1998), G ranot et al. (1999) and W ijers & G alam a (1999), but is about 30 40 times smaller than that taken in Panaitescu & K um ar (2002) and LZ04. Such a large divergency m ay arise if one ignores the term (p 2)=(p 1) when evaluating e_{m} .

$${}^{(p+1)=4}_{B; 2} {}^{p}_{e; 1} {}^{1}n_{0}^{1=2} E_{k;53}^{(p+3)=4} t_{d}^{3(1 p)=4};$$
(7)

2.1 The e ciency of the pre-Swift G R B s

W ith equation (6), the corresponding X -ray lum inosity at $t_d = 0.4$ (10h, to compare with the results of LZ04) is

which in turn yields

$$E_{k} = 92 \quad 10^{52} \operatorname{ergs} R \ L_{X;46}^{4=(p+2)} \left(\frac{1+z}{2}\right)^{(2-p)=(p+2)} \\ \underset{B;2}{\overset{(p-2)=(p+2)}{=}} \left(\frac{4}{1}\right)^{(2-p)=(p+2)} \left(1+Y\right)^{4=(p+2)};$$
(9)

 $[t(10h)=T_{90}]^{17 e^{-16}}$ is a factor accounting for the where R energy radiative loss during the sst 10 hours following the prompt gam m a-ray em ission phase (Sari 1997; LZ04), T₉₀ is the duration of the GRB. The num erical factor of our equation (9) is larger than that of equation (7) of LZ04 by a factor of $9.2(1 + Y)^{4=(p+2)}$ due to the facts that (1) The $_{\rm m}\,$ taken here, which m atches the num erical result better (one can verify this with a sim ple code to calculate the dynam ical evolution as well as m num erically), is about one and half orders sm aller than that taken in LZ04. (2) The inverse C om pton e ect has been taken into account. Sim ilar conclusions have been reached by Granot, Konigl & Piran (2006). However, it is not easy to estimate Y since it depends on B sensitively (see Appendix B for discussion). One good way to estimate the GRB e ciency may be to take Y 0 and (1 + Y) $(e = B)^{1=2}$, respectively. In both (Table 1) are signi cantly lower cases, our estimates of than those of LZ04. Sm aller may be possible in view of that both $_{e}$ and $_{B}$ might be signi cantly lower than the standard param eters taken here (Panaitescu & Kum ar 2002). W e suggest that the typical G R B e ciency of these pre-Swift bursts is 0:1 (see Table 1 for detail). Such values are well understood within the internal shock model.

A dditional support for this conclusion arises from late energy estimates. Berger, Kulkarni & Frail (2004) used the late time radio observation to estimate the kinetic energy at this stage. The nd high energies and correspondingly low -ray e ciency. For GRB 970508 and GRB 970803, the e ciencies are 0.03 and 0.2 respectively, which coincide with our estimates (see Table 1).

The coe cient of our equation (9) are very di erent from that of equation (7) of LZ04.Below we check its validity num erically. The code used here has already been used



F igure 1. X -ray (0.2-10 keV) afterglow light curves: A nalytical (dashed line) lightcurve, and num erical (solid line) when Inverse C om poton e ect has been ignored. The divergence is about a factor of 2. Num erical estimates when the inverse C om poton e ect has been taken into account with (dotted line) and without (dashed - doted line) a K lein-N ishina correction. C learly, the K lein-N ishina correction is unim portant for the ducial parameters listed in the gure.

in Zhang et al. (2005) and has been tested by J. Dyks independently (Dyks, Zhang & Fan 2005). Here we just describe brie y the technical treatment. The dynam ical evolution of the out ow is calculated with the form ulae presented in Huang et al. (2000), which are able to describe the dynam ical evolution of the out ow in both the relativistic and the non-relativistic phases. The electron energy distribution is calculated by solving the continuity equation with the power-law source function $Q = K_e^p$, norm alized by a local injection rate. The cooling of the electrons due to both synchrotron and inverse C om pton (M oderski, Sikora & Bulik 2000) has been taken into account.

Fig. 1 depicts the num erical results. One can see that the num erical results m atch the analytical ones to within a factor of 2. We therefore conclude that equation (6) and equation (9) are reasonable approximations to the full solution of the problem.

2.2 The GRB e ciency of Swift GRBs with X -ray attening

Early attening is evident for a good fraction of the X -ray afterglow light curves recorded by the Swift X RT. Determ ination of the G R B e ciency of these G R B s is quite challenging since, as we see in x4 the underlying physical process that controls the slow decline is unclear. A common interpretation for this at decay is energy in jection, which essentially increases the required initial G R B e ciency. In spite of the uncertainties concerning the applicability of this model we consider its in plication to the e ciency.

The energy injection is characterized by a factor f such that fE_k (f a few ten, in the following discussion, we take f = 5) is the energy injected into the reball (Zhang et al. 2005). The initial GRB e ciency should be

 $^{^3}$ W hile our results are very close to the recent calculations of G ranot, K onigl& P iran (2006), they also show that the estim ates of E $_{\rm k}$ are very sensitive to the exact expressions used for $_{\rm c}$, $_{\rm m}$, and F $_{\rm max}$. Sim ilar conclusion can be drawn by comparing previous results of G ranot et al (1999), W ijers & G alam a (1999), Freedm an & W axm an (2001), P anaitescu & K um ar (2002) and LZ04. Therefore, an alternative explanation for the apparent high e ciencies is that the blast wave energy estim ates using L $_{\rm X}$ are sim ply inaccurate.

Table 1. GRB energies and e ciencies, L $_X$ used in equation (9) and E are all taken from LZ04. The num erical values quoted in parentheses are for (1 + Y) ' ($_{e=B}$)¹⁼².

(10)

GRB	E =10 ⁵² ergs	$E_k = 10^{52} \text{ ergs}$	e ciency
970228	1.42	17.5 (47.5)	0.08 (0.03)
970508	0.55	9.1 (24.8)	0.06 (0.02)
970828	21.98	37.4 (101.5)	0.37 (0.18)
971214	21.05	78.0 (212)	0.21 (0.09)
980613	0.54	11.2 (30.5)	0.05 (0.02)
980703	6.01	22.2 (60.2)	0.21 (0.09)
990123	143.8	186.6 (507)	0.43 (0.22)
990510	17.6	121.1 (329)	0.13 (0.05)
990705	25.6	3.1 (8.5)	0.89 (0.75)
991216	53.5	337.1 (916)	0.14 (0.06)
000216	16.9	4.6 (12.5)	0.78 (0.58)
000926	27.97	91.7 (249.3)	0.23 (0.1)
010222	85.78	209.7 (569.8)	0.29 (0.13)
011211	6.72	12.1 (33)	0.36 (0.17)
020405	7.2	42.3 (115)	0.15 (0.06)
020813	77.5	203.9 (554)	0.28 (0.12)
021004	5.56	76.8 (208.8)	0.07 (0.03)
XRF 020903	0.0011	0.09 (0.25)	0.01 (0.004)

 \sim E = (E + E_k) = f = [1 + (f 1)]

where $E = (E + fE_k)$ is the GRB e ciency derived at $t_d = 0.4$. LZ04 nd that > 0.4, and therefore, $\sim > 0.8$, which is too high within the fram ework of the standard (internal-shocks) reball model. How ever, as shown in x2.1,

presented in LZ04 has been overestim ated signi cantly. We suggest that 0:1, therefore even when correcting for the additional energy ~ 0:3, which is still consistent with this model.

As an example we consider the -ray e ciency of GRB 050319. Both the optical (M ason et al. 2005) and the X-ray (Cusum ano et al. 2005) light curves are well recorded for this burst and can be used to constrain the e ciency (see x4.1 for a detailed discussion). (1) The time averaged opticalto-X-ray spectrum (t 200 900 s) is a single power law with an index = 0:8 (M ason et al. 2005). This implies that $_{\rm m}$ (t 100 s) < $_{\rm R}$ = 4:3 10⁴ Hz. (2) The very early R-band observation suggests that F _m ax (t 100 s) 1 mJy (assuming that energy injection takes place at t 400 s). (3) $_{\rm c}$ > $_{\rm X}$ 10⁴⁷ H z holds up to t 10° s, as suggested by the XRT spectrum . We have (see equations 31 33) $_{\rm e}$ 4 10², $_{\rm B}$ 4 10⁵, and $E_{\rm k}$ 1:3 104 ergs (the energy carried by the initial out ow). W ith Kcorrection, the isotropic energy of the ray emission of GRB 050319 is E 1:2 $1b^3$ ergs (N ousek et al. 2005), $so \sim = E = (E + E_k)$ 0:1. It is su ciently low to be well understood within the standard reball model.

3 MODELS FOR A SLOW LY DECAY ING X-RAY AFTERGLOW

W e turn now to explore (both analytically and num erically) models that can give rise to a slow ly decaying X-ray afterglow phase. The models we discuss include: (i) Energy injection. (ii) A small $_{\rm e}$. (iii) Evolving shock parameters. (iv) A very low nonconstant circum burst density. We also exam ine the possibility of the X-ray attening is attributed to a highly magnetized out ow. In the numerical calculations that we present the parameters are chosen to reproduce the XRT light curve of GRB 050319 (for t > 380 s). We also present the corresponding R-band light curve.

3.1 Energy injection

In the standard reball model, the reball that is sweeping the circum burst matter decelerates and its bulk Lorentz factor evolves with the time as $/t^{3=8}$. With continuous signi cant energy injection, the reball decelerates more slow by and slow by decaying multi-wavelength afferglows are expected. This model has been analytically investigated by many authors (Sari & Meszaros 2000, Zhang et al. 2005; Nousek et al. 2005; Panaïtescu et al. 2006; G ranot & Kum ar 2006). As shown in Zhang et al. (2005), for dE inj=dt / t ^q we nd m / t ^{(2+q)=2}, c / t^{(q 2)=2}, and F max / t^{1 q}. In this subsection, we take q = 0.5 and nd:

Following Zhang et al. (2005), we consider an energy injection rate of the form $(1 + z)dE_{inj}=dt = Ac^2 (t=t_0)^q$ for $t_0 < t < t_e$, where A is a constant. W ith the energy injection, the equation (8) of H uang et al. (2000) should be replaced by (see also W ei, Yan & Fan 2005)

$$d = \frac{(1 \ ^{2})dm + A (t=t_{0}) \ ^{q} [dt=(1 + z)]}{M_{ej} + m + 2(1) m};$$
(12)

where M_{ej} is the rest m ass of the initial GRB ejecta, m is the m ass of the medium swept by the GRB ejecta, which is governed by dm $= \frac{4 R^2 nm_p dR}{2}$, m_p is the rest m ass of proton, dR = (+ $\frac{p^2 nm_p dR}{2}$) cdt=(1 + z), = e^{-1} is the radi-



F igure 2. The X -ray (0.2-10 keV) afterglow light curve and the R-band light curve for the energy injection m odel.

ation e ciency.Our num erical results, the R-band em ission and the 0.2-10 keV em ission, are shown in Fig.2.

3.2 Small e

In the standard afferglow model, it is assumed that a fraction $_{\rm e}$ of the shock energy is given to all the fresh electrons that are swept by the shock front. However, it is possible that only a fraction $_{\rm e}$ of fresh electrons has been accelerated, as suggested by Papathanassiou & M eszaros (1996). W ith this correction, equations (2) and (3) take the form

$$F_{max} = 6.6 \text{ m Jy} = (\frac{1+z}{2}) D_{L;28:34} B_{;2}^{2} E_{k;53} n_{0}^{1=2}; \quad (13)$$

$$m = 7.6 \quad 10^{11} \text{ H z} = {}^{2} \text{E}_{k;53}^{1=2} {}^{2}\text{e}; \quad 10^{2} \text{ C}_{p}^{2} (\frac{1+z}{2})^{1=2} \text{t}_{d}^{3=2}; \quad (14)$$

respectively.

For $_{\rm c}$ < $_{\rm X}$ < $_{\rm m}$, F $_{\rm X}$ / t $^{1=4}$. A steeper decline is possible (the steepest one is F $_{\rm X}$ / t $^{4=7}$), depending on the radiative correction, as shown in the upper panel of F ig. 2 of Sariet al. (1998).

The transition of the slow decline to a norm al decline (F $_x$ / t ^{1:2}) usually takes place at t 0:1 day or earlier, when $_x$ = $_m$. So we have

$$e' 0:016E_{k;53}^{1=4} e; 1 B; 2t_{d;1}^{3=4}C_{p} [2=(1+z)]^{1=2}:$$
(15)

The numerical light curves is presented in Fig. 3.0 ne can see that a long time multi-wavelength attening is evident with a small $_{\rm e}$.

Before and after the tem poral decline transition, the energy spectrum of the XRT observation should be F / $^{1=2}$ and F / $^{p=2}$, respectively. In other words, after the break in the light curve, the X-ray spectrum should be much softer (see also Zhang et al. 2005), which is inconsistent with most XRT observations (Nousek et al. 2005). In addition, in this model, the spectral index of the XRT afterglows in the slow decline phase is 1=2. It is much harder than that of most Swift X-ray afterglows (see Table 1 of Nousek et al. 2005). The Sw ift observations therefore provide us robust evidences



F igure 3. The X -ray (0.2-10 keV) afterglow light curve and the R-band light curve for the sm all $_{\rm e}$ m odel.

of that signi cant part of, rather than a small fraction of electrons, have been accelerated in the shock front.

3.3 Evolving shock param eters

In the standard afterglow model, the shock parameters e and B are assumed to be constant. However, it is also possible that e or B, or both, vary with time (see Yost et al. (2003) for detailed discussion). Fan et al. (2002) and W ei et al. (2006) modeled the optical ares detected in GRB 990123 and GRB 050904 and found that both $_{\rm e}$ and $_{\rm B}$ of the forward shock (ultra-relativistic) and reverse shock (mild-relativistic to relativistic) were very dierent. This provides an indication evidence for a dependence of the shock param eters on the strength of the shock. Possible evidence for the shock strength dependent $_{\rm B}$ was also found by Zhang, Kobayashi & Meszaros (2003), Kumar & Panaitescu (2003), M cM ahon, K um ar & Panaitescu (2004), Panaitescu & Kumar (2004), Fan, Zhang & Wei (2005b) and Blustin et al. (2006). Yost et al. (2003) and Ioka et al (2005) considered afterglow emission assuming B and e are timedependent, respectively. Here we simply take $(_{e}; _{B})$ / $(^{a};^{b})$ for $>_{o}$; otherwise $(_{e};_{B})$ const:, where $_{\circ}$ is the Lorentz factor of the out ow at the X -ray decline translation, both a and b are taken to be positive. For sim plicity, we discuss only the case of a = b for $> _{o}$. Below o, the solution is the usual one.

The typical synchrotron radiation frequency m satis es

$$_{m}$$
 / (= $_{o}$) $^{5a=2}t^{3=2}$ / $t^{(15a \ 24)=16}$; (16)

where $25E_{iso,53}^{1=8}$ [2=(1 + z)] $^{3=8}t_{d;1}^{3=8}n_0^{1=3}$.

The cooling frequency $_{\rm c}$ satis es

$$_{c} / (= _{o})^{3a=2} t^{1=2} / t^{(8+9a)=16};$$
 (17)

The maximum spectral ux F ;m ax satis es

$$F_{max} / (=_{o})^{a=2} / t^{3a=16}$$
: (18)

The observed ux behaves as (in this subsection, we take a = 1):



Figure 4. The X-ray (0.2-10 keV) and R-band afterglow light curves for the evolving shock parameter model. The parameters are listed in the gure.

$$F_{max} c^{1=3} / t^{\frac{4+9a}{24}} t^{0:55};$$
for x < c < m;

$$F_{max} c^{1=2} / t^{\frac{8+3a}{32}} t^{0:35};$$

$$F_{max} m^{1=3} / t^{\frac{4-a}{8}} t^{0:38};$$

$$F_{max} m^{1=3} / t^{\frac{4-a}{8}} t^{0:38};$$
for x < m < c;

$$F_{max} \frac{p^{-1}}{m^{2}} / t^{\frac{15ap}{32} + 24p + 24} t^{0:2};$$
for m < x < c;

$$F_{max} c^{1=2} \frac{p^{-1}}{m^{2}} / t^{\frac{16-18a}{32} + 24p + 15ap} t^{0:65};$$
for x > maxf c; m g.

The afferglow light curves are shown in Fig. 4.A s both $_{\rm e}$ and $_{\rm B}$ increase with time, the ux of the early X-ray emission is dimmer than that of the constant shock parameters model and the decline is much slower. Both are consistent with the current Swift XRT observations (Nousek et al. 2005).

3.4 A very low nonconstant density

In the standard ISM afferglow model, the number density of the medium is taken as a constant. In the wind model, the number density n decreases with the radius R as n / R 2 (M eszaros, Rees & W ijers 1998; Dai & Lu 1998; Chevalier & Li 2000). Here we discuss the general case n / R k (0 k < 3).

First, we show that for a reball decelerating in the BM self-sim ilar regime (B landford & M cK ee 1976), no X-ray attening is expected regardless of the choice of k. The energy of the reball is nearly constant and it is given by E iso ${}^{2}M$ c², where M / R^{3 k} is the total m ass of the swept medium. So / R ${}^{(3 k)=2}$. Considering that dR / ${}^{2}dt$ / R ${}^{(3 k)}dt$, we have R / $t^{1=(4 k)}$ and / t ${}^{(3 k)=[2(4 k)]}$.

Now m decreases with tas

$$_{\rm m}$$
 / ${}^{4}{\rm R}$ ${}^{\rm k=2}$ / t ${}^{3=2}$; (20)

and c and F ;m ax satisfy



Figure 5.X-ray (0.2-10 keV) afterglow light curve for a very low nonconstant density: $n = 10^{4}$ cm 3 for $R < 10^{16}$ cm; $n = 10^{4}$ ($R = 10^{16}$) 1 cm 3 for $10^{16} < R < 10^{19}$ cm and $n = 10^{7}$ cm 3 for $R > 10^{19}$ cm.

$$_{c}$$
 / ${}^{4}R^{3k=2}t^{2}$ / $t^{(3k-4)=[2(4-k)]}$; (21)

$$F_{max} / R^{3} \frac{3k=2}{2} / t^{k=[2(4 \ k)]};$$
 (22)

respectively. This results in:

(15) 8

$$< t^{3(p-1)=4} = [2(4 \ k)];$$
 for $m < x < c;$
 $F_x / t^{1=4};$ for $c < x < m;$ (23)
 $: t^{(3p-2)=4};$ for $x > maxf_m; cg.$

The last two are independent of k. So no X-ray attening appears.

However, if the number density is su ciently low, the deceleration timescale (/ n $^{1=3}$) can be very long and even as long as 10^4 s. In this case, a slow ly decaying X -ray afferglow may be obtained. One example has been plotted in Fig. 5, in which the density pro le of the medium is taken as n = 10^{-4} cm 3 for R 10^{16} cm, n = 10^{-4} R₁₆ $^{-1}$ cm 3 for 1 R₁₆ 10^3 , and n = 10^{-7} cm 3 for R₁₆ > 10^3 . An X -ray attening appears when the shock front reaches R = 10^{-19} cm . How ever, while the shape of the light curve is correct the X-ray ux is too low to account for most XRT light curves.

3.5 M agnetized out ow

A Poynting ux dom inated out ow (U sov 1994; Thom pson 1994; Lyutikov & Blandford 2003) is an alternative to the standard baryonic reballm odel.W ithin the context of this discussion it is of interest since it may also give rise to a slow ly decaying X-ray afterglow (Zhang et al. 2005). We investigate, here, brie y this possibility, extended discussion will be presented elsew here.

W e assume that the electrom agnetic energy E_p will be transformed continuously into the kinetic energy of the forward shock. The dynam ical evolution of the shocked medium is governed by (H uang et al. 2000; W ei et al. 2006):

$$d = \frac{\binom{2}{1}dm + dE_p = c^2}{M_{ej} + m + 2(1) m'};$$
(24)

where $E_p = {}^{2}VB^{C2} = (4)$, V is the volume of the magnetized out ow (m easured by the observer) and B⁰ is the com oving strength of the magnetic eld.

If the magnetic pressure is higher than the thermal pressure of the shocked medium, the magnetic pressure works on the shocked medium and the kinetic energy of the forward shock increases. A pressure balance between the shocked medium and the magnetized out ow is established, so we have (see also Lyutikov & Blandford 2003) B^{G2}=(8) = p_{gas} ' 4 ² nm pc²=3, where p_{gas} is the thermal pressure of the shocked medium. Therefore E p can be estimated by⁴

$$E_p = 2^{2} P_{gas} V = 8^{4} nm_p c^2 V = 3$$
: (25)

 $dE_p = c^2$ can be calculated as follows. A sum ing that the whole system (the shocked medium and the magnetized outow) is adiabatic (i.e., the radiation e ciency = 0), the energy conservation yields

 $2^{2} p_{gas} V + 3^{2} p_{gas} (V_{tot} V) = E_{tot} (M_{ej} + m) c^{2}; (26)$

where V_{tot} 4 R^2 is the total volume of the system, is the width of the system, which is described by d = (fsh)dR and fsh $\frac{1}{2} = 1 = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{4+3} \end{bmatrix}$ is the velocity of the forward shock. D i erentiating equation (26) we obtain:

$$dE_{p}=c^{2} = 2f(16^{3}nm_{p}V_{tot} + M_{ej} + m)d + 16^{4}Rnm_{p}$$

$$[R(f_{sh}) + 2]dR + dmq: (27)$$

A fler simple algebra, equation (24) can be rearranged as: (note that now we take = 0)

$$d = \frac{(^{2} + 2A \quad 1)dm + B dR}{M_{ej} + 2 m + 2A (16^{-3} nm_{p}V_{tot} + M_{ej} + m)}; \quad (28)$$

where A = 1 for $dE_p=dR$ 0, otherwise A = 0; B = 32A nm $_p$ 4R [($_{fsh}$)R + 2].

W ith proper boundary conditions and the relations dm = 4 nm $_{\rm p}R^2 dR$, $dR = c^2(1 +)dt=(1 + z)$, $V_{\rm tot} = 4 R^2$ and $d = (_{\rm fsh}) dR$, equation (28) can be solved num erically. In our num erical example, we take $E_k = 10^{52}$ ergs, $n = 1 \text{ cm}^3$, $E_p = 10E_k$ and the width of the out ow is taken as 3 10^{11} cm. The starting point of our calculation is at $R = 2 = 10^{16}$ cm ($R_{\rm dec}$, the deceleration radius of the out ow, where $E_k=2$ has been given to the shocked m edium), at which = 360 5 . We nd out that most of the

 4 Providing that V / R^{2+ c} d , E $_p$ / $^{8+2c}$ $^dt^{2+c}$ / t (c, d, and are all larger than 0), we have / t $^{(2+ c+)=(8+2c-d)}$, which should be atter than $^{3=8}$ (the canonical dynamical evolution of a ejecta without energy injection). It requires that 2c+3d < 8 8, otherwise dE $_p$ =dt < 0 has been violated. It is evident that in the spreading phase, i.e., c = 1 and d = 2, E $_p$ can not be converted into the kinetic energy of the forward shock e ectively.

⁵ At that radius, the reverse shock has crossed the ejecta and a pressure balance between the shocked medium and the magnetized out ow is reached. In this work, we do not calculate the reverse shock emission (see Fan, W ei& W ang (2004a) for the reverse shock emission with mild magnetization and Zhang & K obayashi (2005) for reverse shock emission with arbitrary magnetization). W ith the ideal M HD jump condition, the reverse shock can not convert the magnetic energy into the kinetic energy of the forward shock e ectively, as shown in K ennel & C oronitti (1984), Fan, W ei & Zhang (2004b) and Zhang & K obayashi (2005) both analytically and num erically.

m agnetic energy has been converted into the kinetic energy of the forward shock in a very short time 50(1 + z) s. A similar result has been obtained by Lyutikov & Blandford (2003). Though this tim escale is much longer than the crossing time of the reverse shock, it is not long enough to account for the X-ray attening detected in most GRBs.

4 CASE STUDIES:CONSTRAINING THE MODELS

GRB 050319 and GRB 050401, have well recorded X -ray and optical afterglows, with which the models discussed in x3 can be constrained. We discuss these constraints in detail here. For most Swift GRBs only the X -ray afterglow is well detected. Such bursts provide, of course, much weaker constraints on the model. We discuss one example, GRB 050315, brie y.

4.1 GRB 050319

Both the optical and X -ray afterglows of GRB 050319 have been well recorded (W ozniak et al. 2005; M ason et al. 2005; Cusum ano et al. 2005; Nousek et al. 2005). The optical ux declines with a power law slope of = 0.57 between 200s after the burst on set until it fades below the sensitivity threshold of the UVOT after 5 10⁴ s. The optical V-band em ission lies on the extension of the X -ray spectrum , with an spectral slope = 0:8 (M ason et al. 2005). The tem poral behavior of the X-ray afterglow is more complicated. A fter a steep decay (= 5:53) up to t = 370s, the light curve shows a slow decay with a tem poral index of = 0.54. It steepens to = 1:14 at t = 2:60 10s. The spectral indices in the slow decline phase and the norm aldecay phase are = 0:7 and = 0:8, respectively (Cusum ano et al. 2005; Nousek et al. 2005; However, see Quim by et al. 2006). Below we exam ine whether the models discussed above (in x3) can explain both the optical and the X-ray afterglows self-consistently.

Energy in jection: The energy in jection model is believed to able to explain the observation (e.g., Zhang et al. 2005; M ason et al. 2005; C usum ano et al. 2005). As shown in x3.1, for q = 0.6 and p = 2.4, both the optical and the X-ray afterglows decline as F $_{\rm X}$ / t $^{0.54}$ when $_{\rm m}$ < $_{\rm R}$ < $_{\rm X}$ < $_{\rm c}$, the corresponding spectral index should be = (p 1)=20:7. All these values are consistent with the observation. How ever, the non-detection of the further X -ray break caused by the spectral translation ($_{\rm c}$ < $_{\rm X}$) up to 10 s after the trigger suggests that 5 10^3 and n 10^3 cm 3 (Cusum ano et al. 2005). The problem is that F $_{\rm x}$ depends on n and $_{\rm B}$ sensitively for x < c (see equation (7)). The smaller n and B, the smaller F , .W e show below that it is quite di cult to reproduce the detected X -ray and optical light curves with the energy injection model.

The earliest R-band data is collected at 200 s (note that the real onset of GRB 050319 is about 130 s before the Swift trigger time taken in W oznik et al. (2005), see Cusum ano et al. (2005) for clari cation), and the ux is about F $_{\rm R}$ 0:7 m Jy. At that time, the total energy of the out ow is still dom inated by the initial E $_{\rm k}$, and F $_{\rm max}$ and $_{\rm m}$ are still described by equations (2) and (3), respectively.

The conditions F $_{\rm m\,\,ax}$ 0:7 m Jy and $_{\rm m}$ (t 200 s) $_{\rm R}$ yield

respectively. The condition $_{\rm c}~_{\rm X}~10^{17}$ H z holding up to t 10^{6} s gives

$$E_{k;53}^{1=2} B_{;2}^{3=2} n_0^{-1} (1 + Y_0)^{-2} 940$$

) B 10⁴ E_{k;53}^{1=3} n_0^{-2=3} (1 + Y_0)^{-4=3}; (31)

where Y_o is the C om pton param eter at 10° s. To derived this relation, we assume that at 200 s, $_c$ is described by equation (4), and $_c / t^{(q-2)=2} t^{0:7}$ up to $t 2:6 10^\circ$ s (i.e., in the energy injection phase), then $_c / t^{1=2}$ up to $t 10^\circ$ s. C om bing equations (29–31), we have

$$E_{k;53} = 13n_0^{1=5} (1 + Y_0)^{4=5};$$
 (32)

$$e \qquad 0.06E_{k:53}^{1=6}n_0^{1=6}(1+Y_o)^{1=3}: \qquad (33)$$

Now Y_0 0 (see the Appendix for detail), we have $E_k > 1.3 \quad 10^{64} \text{ ergs } n_0^{-1=5}$. On the other hand, the energy injection coe cient A ⁰ A $\stackrel{2}{c}$ (1 + z) $E_k = t_0$ 1:4 $10^{52}n_0^{-1=5}$ ergs s ¹ for t_0 370 s. P lease note that A⁰ is comparable to the recorded lum inosity of m ost G R B s and the X-ray lum inosity recorded by X RT is just

 10^{48} ergs s¹. The out ow accounting for the late time injection is so energetic that strong soft X-ray to ray emission powering by shocks or magnetic dissipation are expected. They will quite likely dominate over the corresponding forward shock emission, which is inconsistent with the observation.

This model is also disfavored by the di erent temporal behavior of the X-ray and the optical afterglows at t > 2.610⁴ s.W e therefore conclude that the energy injection model can't account for the multi-wavelength afterglows of GRB 050319.W e tried to tboth the R-band and X-ray afterglows with reasonable parameters num erically but failed.

Provided that the energy injection model works (i.e., there is a mechanism to keep such energetic out ow steady enough and there is no magnetic dissipation), the initial GRB e ciency in this case is as low as $\sim = E = (E + E_k) 0.08 n_0^{1-5}$.

Sm all <code>e:Thism</code> odel is disfavored by two facts. One is that in the X-ray attening phase, <code>c < x < m</code>, the corresponding spectral index is 1=2, which only marginally m atches the observation 0:7. The other is that after the tem poral transition at t 10^4 s, <code>c < m < x</code>, the spectral index should be = p=2 1.2, which is inconsistent with the observation.

Evolving shock param eters: A s shown in x3.3, for m < R < x < c, p = 2:4 and a = b = 0.6, (F $_R$; F $_x$) / t $^{0.54}$ and the spectral index = (p 1)=2 0:7, are all consistent with the observation. A first the shock param eters saturate at t 2:6 10 s, F $_x$ / t $^{1:1}$ and = 0:7 as long as x < c, which also m atches the observation. How – ever, the optical light curve should be m uch steeper since m < R < c also holds. The UVOT observation and the ground based R-band observation suggest that the decline of optical em ission does not change up to t 2 10 s, though the scatter of the ux is quite large (K iziloglu et al. 2005;

Sharapov et al.2005; see M ason et al.2005 for a sum m ary). Therefore the evolving shock param eterm odel is disfavored.

Very low nonconstant density:W ith proper parameters as well as proper density pro le, an X-ray attening does appear (see Fig.5). However, as already mentioned, the ux is too low to match most observations, here we do not discuss it further.

O -beam annular jet model. Recently, Eichler & G ranot (2005) suggested that the at part of the X RT light curve may be a combination of the decaying tail of the prompt ray emission and the delayed onset of the afferglow emission observed from viewing angles slightly outside of the edge of the jet (i.e., o -beam). This model, like others mentioned above, can account for the slow decline of m any X -ray afferglows, but m ay be unable to explain both the optical and the X -ray afferglows of G R B 050319 self-consistently, as shown below.

Following Eichler & Granot (2005), we assume that the o-beam angle is $1=_{int}$, where $_{int}$ is the initial Lorentz factor of the out ow. Larger is less favored since the slowly decaying R-band afterglow has been well recorded as early as t 200 s, which in plies that the afterglow onset has not been delayed so much. In the o-beam case, the typical synchrotron radiation frequency should be

$$\pi = 7.6 \quad 10^{1} \text{ H z E}_{k;53}^{1=2} \stackrel{1=2}{_{\text{B};2}} \stackrel{2}{_{\text{e};1}} C_{\text{p}}^{2} \left(\frac{1+z}{2}\right)^{1=2} a^{1=2} t_{\text{d}}^{3=2}; (34)$$

where a $[1 + (_{int})^2]$ 2 is the D oppler factor. Therefore the condition $_m$ (t 200 s) < $_R$ results in

$$e \qquad 0:017 E_{k;53} B_{;2}^{1=4} (a=2)^{1=4}: \qquad (35)$$

For $1=_{int}$, the late time (i.e., the normal decline phase) afterglow emission is quite similar to the on-beam case (E ichler & G ranot 2005).

W e use equation (7) to estimate the late time X -ray ux, though the predicted ux of the annular jet model should be somewhat dierent from that of our conical jet model (G ranot 2005; Eichler & G ranot 2005). The XRT ux 8 10¹² ergs s¹ cm² at t_d 0.3 gives

$$E_{k;53} = 0.33_{e; 1}^{4(1 p)=(p+3)} B_{; 2}^{(p+1)=(p+3)} n_0^{2=(p+3)}:$$
(36)

The condition $_{\rm c}$ > $_{\rm X}$ 10⁷ Hz holding up to t 10⁶ s yields

$$_{\rm B} < 3 \quad 10^{4} {\rm E}_{\rm k;53}^{1=3} {\rm n}_{0}^{2=3}$$
: (37)

C om bing equations (35-37), we have $E_k > 10^{55}$ ergs $n_0^{1=5}$ (a=2)^{3 (p-1)=10}. W hile we manage to t both X-ray and optical data, the energy needed is too large for any realistic progenitor models. We therefore suggest that the o-beam annular jet model is also unable to account for the afferglows of GRB 050319.

4.2 GRB 050401

The early X -ray light curve is consistent with a broken power law with = 0:63 and 1:41 respectively, the break is at t_b 4480 s (de Pasquale et al. 2006). The X -ray spectral indices before and after the break are nearly constant

0:90. Therefore the sm all $_{\rm e}$ m odel is ruled out directly. Zhang et al. (2005) also show that the at electron distribution m odel (1 < p < 2) is unable to account for the X-ray afferglow observation. The afferglow has also been detected in R-band, which decays as a simple power law / t $^{0:76}$ up to t 3.5 10 s (Ryko et al. 2005).

Energy injection (p 2.3). A fler the break, the light curve is consistent with an ISM model for $_{\rm m}$ < $_{\rm X}$ < $_{\rm c}$ with p 2.8. Before the break, it is consistent with the same m odel with q = 0.5 (see also Zhang et al. 2005). As far as the R-band afferglow emission is concerned, there are two possibilities. One is that $_{\rm m}$ < $_{\rm R}$ < $_{\rm c}$, the optical afferglow should follow the temporal behavior of the X-ray afferglow, which is not the case. The other is that $_{\rm R}$ < $_{\rm m}$ fort t, the afferglow increases as t^{0.9} for q 0.5 (see x3.1), which is inconsistent with the observation. We therefore conclude that the popular energy injection m odel is unable to account for the data in this burst as well.

Evolving shock parameters (p 2:8). The light curve after the break is consistent with an ISM model for $_{\rm m}$ < $_{\rm X}$ < $_{\rm c}$ with p 2:8.Before the break, it is consistent with the same model with a = b = 0:7. Can it reproduce the optical afterglow? The answer is negative. Provided that $_{\rm R}$ < $_{\rm m}$ fort $_{\rm B}$, the optical afterglow should increase as t^{0:4} (see x3.3), which is inconsistent with the data. The case of $_{\rm m}$ < $_{\rm R}$ is nuled out directly in view of the di erent tem poral behavior of X-ray and R-band afterglow s.

4.3 GRB 050315

A fiter a steep decay up to $t_{b1} = 308$ s, the X-ray light curve shows a at \plateau" with a temporal index of = 0.06 (the spectral index of XRT data is = 0.73). It then turns to = 0.71 at $t_{b2} = 1.2 \ 10^6$ s, the spectral index is = 0.79. Finally there is a third break at $t_{b3} = 2.5 \ 10^5$ s, after which the temporal decay index is = 2.0 and the spectral index is = 0.77 (N ousek et al. 2005; B arthelm y et al. 2005).

There are two possible interpretations for the long term constant spectral index 0.7. One is that maxf c; mg < x after t = 308 s and the power law index of the shocked electron p 1.5. The other is that m < x < c for $t_{b1} < t < t_{b3}$ and p 2.5.

Energy injection (p 2:5). To obtain the slow decline for $t_{b1} < t < t_{b2}$, energy injection with q 0.2 is needed.q 0:9 is needed to reproduce the X-ray afferglows at $t_{b2} < t < t_{b3}$. The late time sharp decay appears when the boundary of a non-spreading jet becomes visible.

Evolving shock parameters (p 2.5). As shown in x3.3, with a = b = 1.2, we have a slow decline slope =

0:06 between t_{b1} and t_{b2} . To get a decline slope = 0:71 between t_{b2} and t_{b3} , a = b = 0.45 are needed. The late time sharp decay appears when the boundary of a non-spreading jet becomes visible and a = b = 0.45.

We nd that both models can explain the observed X – ray light curves of GRB 050315.

5 SUMMARY & DISCUSSION

D uring the past severalm onths, the Swift X RT has collected a rich sample of early X -ray afferglow data. A good fraction of these afferglows show a slow decline phase lasting between a few hundred to several thousand seconds. The energy injection m odel is the leading m odel to account for these slow ly decaying X -ray afterglows (e.g., Zhang et al. 2005; N ousek et al. 2005; P anaitescu et al. 2006; G ranot & K um ar 2006). It has been suggested that in this m odel, the G R B e ciency m ight be as high as 90%. Such a high e - ciency challenges the standard internal shock m odel for the prom pt ray em ission.

In this work, we have re-exam ined the GRB e ciency of several pre-Swift GRBs and one Swift GRB. In addition, we have explored several mechanism which might give rise to a slowly decaying X-ray light curve and we have compared the predictions of these models with the well recorded multiwavelength afterglows of GRB 050319 and GRB 050401. We draw the following conclusions:

1. The GRB e ciency of pre-Swift GRBs that has been derived directly from the X-ray ux 10 hours after the burst has been overestim ated. For these Swift GRBs with long time X-ray attening, the GRB e ciency is also moderate (around 0.5), even when taking into account the possibility of energy injection. Such e ciency can be understood within the standard internal shock model.

2.W ith a proper choice of parameters, the slow decline slope of X-ray afterglow like the one detected in GRB 050319 can be well reproduced by several models the energy in jection model, evolving shock parameter model (in which the shock param eters are assum ed to increase with the decrease of the shock strength for $t < 10^4$ s), the small $_{\rm e}$ model (in which the shock energy has been give to a fraction e of electrons, rather than total) and the very low nonconstant density m odel. O ut of these m odels, the last two are ruled out by the X-ray data itself. In the last model, the resulting X-ray afterglow is too dim to match most XRT observations. The sm all e m odel is also disfavored since (1) In the slow decline phase, the XRT spectrum are usually much softer than $^{1=2}$; (2) A fter the light curve break, no spectral steepening has been detected in most cases, which is inconsistent with the model. The other models, including the energy injection model and the evolving shock param eter model seem to be consistent with the X-ray afterglow observations.

3. W hile two models: the energy injection model and the evolving shock parameter model are consistent with the X-ray data, they fail to reproduce both the X-ray and the optical afterglow s of G R B 050319 and G R B 050401. In each burst, the optical ux declines slow ly up to 10^5 s. On the other hand, the X-ray light curve decays slow ly up to t 10^4 and then turns to the norm alfaster decay (F / t ^{1:2} or so). The tem poral index of the slow decay X-ray phase is close to that of the optical light curve. The XRT spectrum is unchanged before and after the X-ray break. This means that the break is not caused by a cooling break in which c crosses the observed frequency.

The failure of all models that we considered to t both the X-ray and the optical afterglow light curves suggests that we should look for another alternative. An intriguing possibility is based on fact that the extrapolation backwards of the late X-ray light curve is in agreem ent with (or 1 to 2 order lower than) the prom pt X-ray em ission. This suggests that we face a "m issing energy problem ". N am ely, during the slow decay phase (in which the X-ray ux is rather low) we m iss X-ray em ission. Is it possible that during this phase this energy is dissipated into a di erent channel and not into Synchrotron X-rays and that this di erent channel becom es ine ective at around ten hours? Put di erently, during this phase the electrons within the forward shock em it Synchrotron X -rays ine ciently. A possibility of this kind (that we have considered and found not to work) is if the X -ray em itting electrons are cooled e ciently via inverse C om pton (and hence their Synchrotron X -ray em ission is weaker). A s already m entioned inverse C om pton cooling is im portant in determ ining the X -ray ux. Furtherm ore, due to the K lein-N ishina cuto this cooling becom es unim portant at approxim ately one day. How ever, this transition is not sharp enough to produce the observed slow ly decaying X -ray light curves. W hile inverse C om pton cooling does not work it is possible that another, yet unexplored, process of this kind is responsible for the observed light curves.

ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e thank A .Panaitescu and E .W axm an for their constructive com m ents.W e also thank the referee for helpful suggestion.Y.Z.Fan thanksD.M.W eifor his help and J.D yks for checking Fig. 5. This work is supported by US-Israel BSF. TP acknow ledges the support of Schwartzm ann U niversity Chair.YZF is also supported by the N ational N atural Science Foundation (grants 10225314 and 10233010) of China, and the N ational 973 P roject on Fundam entalR essarches of China (N K BR SF G 19990754).

REFERENCES

- A kerlof C ., et al. 1999, N ature, 398, 400
- Barthelm y S.D., et al. 2005, ApJ,635, L133
- Blandford R.D., & McKee C.F. 1976, Phys. Fluids., 19, 1130
- Beloborodov A.M., 2000, ApJ, 539, L25
- Berger E., KulkamiS.R., FrailD.A., 2004, ApJ, 612, 966
- Blustin A.J., et al. 2006, ApJ, 637, 901
- Cam pana S. et al. 2005, A pJ, 625, L23
- Chevalier R.A., LiZ.Y., 2000, ApJ, 536, 195
- Cusum ano G., et al. 2005, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0509689)
- DaiZ.G., 2004, ApJ, 606, 1000
- DaiZ.G., Lu T., 1998a, A & A, 333, L87
- DaiZ.G., Lu T., 1998b, MNRAS, 298, 87
- Daigne F., Mochkovitch R., 1998, MNRAS, 296, 275
- de Pasquale M .et al.2006, M NRAS, 365, 1031
- Dyks J., Zhang B., Fan Y. Z., 2005, ApJ, submitted (astroph/0511699)
- Eichler D , G ranot J., 2005, A pJ, subm itted (astro-ph/0509857)
- Fan Y.Z., DaiZ.G., Huang Y.F., Lu T., 2002, Chinese J.A stron. A strophys., 2, 449 (astro-ph/0306024)
- Fan Y.Z., WeiD.M., Wang C.F., 2004a, A&A, 424, 477
- Fan Y .Z ., W eiD .M ., Zhang B ., 2004b, M NRAS, 354, 1031
 Fan Y .Z ., Zhang B ., Proga D ., 2005a, ApJ, 635, L129
- Fan Y. Z., Zhang B., W eiD. M., 2005b, ApJ, 628, L25
- Freedm an D. L., W axm an E. 2001, ApJ, 547, 922
- G ranot J. 2005, A pJ, 631, 1022
- G ranot J., KoniglA., Piran T., 2006, MNRAS submitted (astroph/0601056)
- G ranot J., P iran T., Sari R., 1999, A pJ, 513, 679
- G ranot J., K um ar P., 2006, M NRAS, 366, L13
- G ranot J., N akar E., P iran T., 2003, N ature, 426, 138
- Huang Y.F., Gou L.J., DaiZ.G., Lu T., 2000, ApJ, 543, 90
- Ioka K , Tom a K , Yam azaki R , Nakam ura T .2005, A & A subm itted (astro-ph/0511749)
- KennelC.F., & CoronittiE.V., 1984, ApJ, 283, 694

- K iziloglu U., et al., 2005, GCN Circ. 3139 K obayashiS., Piran T., SariR., 1997, ApJ, 490, 92 K obayashiS., SariR., 2001, ApJ, 551, 943 K um ar P. 2000, ApJ, 538, L125
- K um ar P., Panaitescu A., 2003, M N R A S, 346, 905
- Kum ar P., P iran T., 2000, ApJ, 532, 286
- Llod-Ronning N.M., Zhang B., 2004, ApJ, 613, 477 (LZ04)
- Lyutikov M ., B landford R ., 2003 (astro-ph/0312347)
- M cM ahon E ., K um ar P ., Panaitescu A ., 2004, M N R A S, 354, 915
- M ason K.O., et al., 2005, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0511132)
- M abon K . O ., et al., 2003, A po, in piess (astro ph/0511152)
- M eszaros P., Rees M. J., W ijers R. A. M. J., 1998, ApJ, 499, 301
- ModerskiR., Sikoram., Bulik T., 2000, ApJ, 529, 151
- Nousek J.A., et al., 2005, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0508332)
- PaczynskiB., XuG.H., 1994, ApJ, 427, 708
- Panaitescu A., Kum ar P., 2002, ApJ, 571, 779 Panaitescu A., Kum ar P., 2004, MNRAS, 353, 511
- Panaitescu A , M eszaros P , G ehrels N , B urrow s D , N ousek J. 2006, M N R A S, in press (astro-ph/0508340)
- Panaitescu A., Meszaros P., Rees M. J., 1998, ApJ, 503, 314
- Papathanassiou H., Meszaros P., 1996, ApJ, 471, L91
- Piran T., 1999, Phys. Rep., 314, 575
- Quim by R.M., et al., 2006, ApJ, 638, 920
- Ryko E.S., et al. 2005, ApJ, 631, L121
- Rees M . J., M eszaros P., 1994, ApJ, 430, L93
- Rees M . J., M eszaros P., 1998, ApJ, 496, L1
- SariR.1997,ApJ,497,L17
- SariR., M eszaros P., 2000, ApJ, 535, L33
- Sari R., Narayan R., Piran T., 1996, ApJ, 473, 204
- SariR., Piran T., 1997a, MNRAS, 287, 110
- SariR., Piran T., 1997b, ApJ, 485, 270
- Sari R., Piran T., Narayan R. 1998, ApJ, 497, L17
- Sharapov D., Ibrahim ov M., Karim ov R., Kahharov B., Pozanenko A., Rum yantsev V., Beskin G., 2005, GCN Circ. 3140 Thom pson C., 1994, MNRAS, 270, 480
- U SOV V.V., 1994, M N R A S, 267, 1035
- Vaughan S. et al. 2005, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0510677)
- WeiD.M.,LuT.,1998,ApJ,505,252
- WeiD.M., LuT., 2000, A&A, 360, L13
- WeiD.M., Yan T., Fan Y.Z., 2006, ApJ, 636, L29
- W ijers R.A.M.J., & Galama T.J.1999, ApJ, 523, 177
- W ozniak P.R., Vestrand W.T., W em J.A., W hite R.R., Evans, S.M., Casperson D., 2005, ApJ, 627, L13
- Yost S., Harrison F.A., SariR., FrailD.A., 2003, ApJ, 597, 459
- Zhang B ., Fan Y .Z ., D yks J ., K obayashi S ., M eszaros P ., B urrow s D . N ., N ousek J. A ., G ehrels N . 2005, A pJ, in press (astrop/0508321).
- Zhang B., KobayashiS., 2005, ApJ, 628, 315
- Zhang B., Kobayashi S., M eszaros P., 2003, ApJ, 595, 950
- Zhang B ., M eszaros P ., 2001, A pJ, 552, L35
- Zhang B., M eszaros P., 2002, ApJ, 566, 712

APPENDIX A: THE GENERAL FORM OF THE INVERSE COMPTON PARAMETER

For the photons with frequency higher than ^, the C om pton parameter should be suppressed signi cantly since it is the K lein-N ishina regime, where ^ is governed by $(1 + z)_{eh}^{h}$ m $_{ec}^{2}$, i.e.,

^ 12 10^{20} Hz (1 + z) 1 $_{e}^{1}$: (A 1)

W e extend the derivation of the C om pton parameter Y given by Sari et al. (1996) to the general form, in the limit of single scattering. The ratio of the inverse C om pton power ($P_{\rm IC}$) to the synchrotron power ($P_{\rm syn}$) of an electron with random Lorentz factor $_{\rm e}$ is given by

$$Y (_{e}) = \frac{P_{IC}}{P_{syn}} = \frac{K_{N} U_{syn}}{U_{B}} = \frac{K_{N} e}{[1 + Y (_{e})]_{B}}; \quad (A2)$$

where $_{K,N}$ is the fraction of synchrotron radiation energy of total electrons em itted at frequencies below ^.So we have

$$Y(_{e}) = (1 + \frac{1}{1 + 4} + \frac{1}{K_{N}} + \frac{1}{e} = \frac{1}{B}) = 2:$$
 (A3)

Below we estimate the parameter $_{_{\rm K \ N}}$ in dimension of the parameter $_{_{\rm K \ N}}$

A.Slow cooling.

$$F = F_0 \qquad (=_c)^{(p-1)=2}; \quad \text{for } _m < <_c; \\ (=_c)^{p=2}; \quad \text{for } _c < <_M.$$
(A4)

where $_{\rm M}$ 2:8 $1\hat{\theta}^2 = (1 + z)$ H z is the maximal synchrotron radiation frequency of the electrons accelerated by the forward shock. For p > 2, the total energy emitted is F d = $\frac{2F_0}{(3-p)} c^{(p-1)-2} [\frac{1}{(p-2)} c^{(3-p)-2} m^{(3-p)-2}]$, where the photons with frequencies below $_{\rm m}$ have been ignored. Throughout the Appendix, $_{\rm c}$ is still described by equation (4) but without the correction of $1 = (1 + Y)^2$. We have

$$\kappa_{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0; & \text{for } ^{<} m; \\ \frac{A(3-p)=2}{(p-2)} & \frac{(3-p)=2}{(2-p)=2}; & \text{for } m < ^{<} < c; \\ \frac{1}{(p-2)} & \frac{(3-p)-2}{(2-p)-2} & \frac{(3-p)-2}{(2-p)-2}; & \text{for } c < ^{<} \\ 1 & \frac{(3-p)}{c} & \frac{(3-p)-2}{(p-2)} & \frac{(3-p)}{2}; & \text{for } c < ^{\wedge} \\ \end{pmatrix}$$

For $1 , the total energy em itted is <math>F d = \frac{2F_0}{(2 p)(3 p)} c^{(p 1)=2}S_1$, where $S_1 = [(3 p)_c^{1=2} (2 p)=2 M$

B.Fast cooling.

$$F = F_0 \qquad (=_m)^{1=2}; \text{ for }_c < <_m; (=_m)^{p=2}; \text{ for }_m < <_M.$$
(A7)

For p > 2, the total energy emitted is $\stackrel{R}{F} d = 2F_0 \prod_{m}^{1=2} [(\frac{p-1}{p-2}) \prod_{m}^{1=2} c^{1=2}]$, where the emission below $_c$ has been ignored. The $_{KN}$ is estimated as

$$\mathbb{R}_{N} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0; & \text{for } ^{<} c; \\ \frac{1^{1-2} - \frac{1-2}{c}}{(\frac{p-1}{p-2}) \frac{1-2}{m} - c}; & \text{for } c < ^{<} m; \\ 1 & \frac{(p-1) - 2^{-2} - (2-p) - 2}{(p-1) - \frac{1-2}{m} - c}; & \text{for } m < ^{<}. \end{array}$$

For 1 {}^{R} f d = $\frac{2F_{0}}{2} \frac{1-2}{p} S_{2}, \text{ where } S_{2} = \left[{}^{(p-1)=2}_{m} {}^{(2-p)=2}_{M} \right] (p-1)^{1=2}_{m} (2$ p) ${}^{(1=2)}_{c} \right]. W \text{ e have}$ $\begin{cases} 8 \\ \gtrless \\ 0; \\ (2-p) {}^{(n+2)}_{c} (2-p) (2-p) (2-p)_{c} (2-p)_{c}$

APPENDIX B: WHEN IS THE KLEIN -N ISH IN A CORRECTION IMPORTANT?

In the shock front, the magnetic eld strength B is

$$B = 0.04 \quad {}^{1=2}_{B,:} n_0^{1=2} :$$
(B1)

The typical synchrotron radiation frequency of an electron with random Lorentz factor $_{\rm e}$ is

$$(_{e}) = \frac{2.8 \times 10^{6}}{1+z} Hz _{e}^{2} B;$$
 (B2)

A.The XRT lightcurve

For x 10^{17} Hz, we have $_{e}(x) = 1.3$ 10^{5} [2=(1 + z)] $^{1=2}$ $_{1}$ 1 $_{B; 2}$ n_{0} $^{1=4}$ and

^ 5
$$10^{5} \text{Hz} [(1 + z)=2]^{1=2} \frac{2}{1} \frac{1=4}{B} \frac{1=4}{B} n_{0}^{1=4};$$
 (B3)

Therefore, the Klein-Nishina correction seems to be unimportant (i.e., $_{\rm K\,N}$ 1) for t 1 (when ^ $_{\rm c}$) and $_{\rm B}$ 0:01.

B.The R-band lightcurve

For $_{R}$ 4:3 $1\dot{0}^{4}$ Hz, we have $_{e}(_{R}) = 8$ $1\dot{0}^{3}$ [2=(1 + z)] $_{1}^{1=2}$ $_{1}^{1}$ $_{B}^{1=4}$ $_{2}$ $n_{0}^{1=4}$ and

^ 8
$$10^{6} \text{Hz} [(1 + z)=2]^{1=2} \frac{2}{1} \frac{1}{\text{B}} \frac{1}{z} \frac{1}{z} n_{0}^{1=4};$$
 (B4)

Then, with $_{\rm B}$ 0:01, the K lein-N ishina correction seem sto be unin portant for a long time. On the other hand, the factor ' m infl; ($_{\rm m} = _{\rm c}$)^{(p 1)=2}g 1 for $_{\rm b} < 1$. As a consequence, the inverse C om pton e ect is very in portant both for the long wavelength afterglow calculation and for the X-ray lightcurve calculation. How ever, it may be unin – portant for a lower $_{\rm B}$ since $_{\rm c} / _{\rm B}^{3-2}$.