# Correlated spectral and timing Correlated spectral and timing properties of neutron stars properties of neutron stars

## Mariano Méndez



*Kapteyn Astronomical Institute, University of Groningen, The Netherlands* 

## **Marginally Stable Orbit (MSO)**



$$
V_{\text{eff}}(R) = V(R) + \frac{\ell^2}{2mR^2}
$$

## **Marginally Stable Orbit (MSO)**



## Kilohertz quasi-periodic oscillations (QPOs)



### The frequencies of the two QPOs change with time.

 $Sco X-1$ 



### **Systematic frequency variations**



## **Marginally Stable Orbit**



As the radius of the inner As the radius of the inner edge of the accretion disc edge of the accretion disc decreases, probably driven by decreases, probably driven by the rate of mass accretion the rate of mass accretion through the disc, the orbital through the disc, the orbital frequency at that radius frequency at that radius increases. increases.

But this frequency cannot be But this frequency cannot be higher than the Keplerian higher than the Keplerian frequency at the MSO. frequency at the MSO.



### **MSO: Observational evidence?**



### Detailed view



**4U 1820–30 4U 1820–30**

### "Parallel Tracks"



### MSO: Upper frequency bound?



### The other properties of the (kHz) QPOs

- Either width (≡ FWHM) or **coherence (Q = ν/ FWHM;** a.k.a. Quality Factor)
- Amplitude (% rms <sup>≡</sup> *<sup>r</sup>*) Amplitude (% Amplitude (% rms<sup>≡</sup> *<sup>r</sup>*)



### Drop of Q and rms at high frequencies: MSO?



### 4U 1636–53 4U 1636–53

*also Di Salvo et al. 2001, 2003; Mendez also Di Salvo et al. 2001, 2003; Mendez et al 2001; van Straaten et al. 2002, 2003 et al 2001; van Straaten et al. 2002, 2003* 



### Coherence of the kHz QPOs across sources



Jonker et al. 2000; *van der Klis et al. 1997; Jonker et al. 2000; van der Klis et al. 1997; Jonker et al. 2000; Mendez et al. 2001; Di Salvo et al. 2003*Mendez et al. 2001; Di Salvo et al. 2003 *Mendez et al. 2001; Di Salvo et al. 2003* van der Klis et al.

### Amplitude of the kHz QPOs across sources





### *Mendez 2006 Mendez 2006*



*Mendez 2006 Mendez 2006 Barret et al. 2006 Barret et al. 2006*



*Mendez 2006 Mendez 2006 Barret et al. 2006 Barret et al. 2006*





*Mendez 2006 Mendez 2006*

### About Z's and Atolls



## Individual sources vs. the population:<br>Similar mechanism? Similar mechanism?

### Individual sources: Individual sources:

• QPO coherence and amplitude drop at high QPO frequencies. • QPO coherence and amplitude drop at high QPO frequencies. − Higher frequencies generally imply source is brighter − Sources become softer as they become brighter. – Higher frequencies generally imply source is brighter – Sources become softer as they become brighter.

→ *QPO coherence and amplitude drop when the source becomes*  → *QPO coherence and amplitude drop when the source becomes brighter and softer. brighter and softer.*

### The population of sources: The population of sources:

• Maximum QPO coherence and amplitude drop in brighter sources. • Maximum QPO coherence and amplitude drop in brighter sources. − Brighter sources (Z) are softer than weaker sources (Atoll). Brighter sources (Z) are softer than weaker sources (Atoll).

 $\rightarrow$  *Maximum QPO coherence and amplitude drop for bright and soft sources. sources.*

### The transient XTE J1701–462: The first Z source to convert into an Atoll source



### The transient XTE J1701–462: The first Z source to convert into an Atoll source





### The transient XTE J1701–462: The first Z source to convert into an Atoll source



### The transient XTE J1701–462: The Z and Atoll type of kHz QPOs The Z and Atoll type of kHz QPOs The Z and Atoll type of kHz QPOs



### The transient XTE J1701–462: Amplitude vs. frequency



Upper limit for *Q*=20,50 Upper limit for *Q*=20,50 Atoll phase, in 256s Atoll phase, in 256s

Upper limit for *Q*=100 Upper limit for *Q*=100 Z phase, in 128s, 256s Z phase, in 128s, 256s and 512s

### The transient XTE J1701–462: Coherence vs. frequency



Minimum *Q* for a 3-sigma Minimum *Q* for a 3-sigma detection of a 5% QPO in detection of a 5% QPO in 256s, Atoll phase, 3PCUs 256s, Atoll phase, 3PCUs

Minimum *Q* for a 3-sigma Minimum *Q* for a 3-sigma detection of a 5% QPO in detection of a 5% QPO in 128s, Z phase, 4 PCUs 128s, Z phase, 4 PCUs

### **Oscillation vs. Modulation**

- *Oscillator:* Probably in the disc; e.g.: - *Oscillator:* Probably in the disc; e.g.:

- Orbital, radial or vertical epicyclic frequencies, Orbital, radial or vertical epicyclic frequencies,
- Resonances. Resonances.

- *Modulator:* Probably in a Comptonizing corona or boundary layer: - *Modulator:* Probably in a Comptonizing corona or boundary layer:

- QPO amplitudes larger than disc contribution to total flux. QPO amplitudes larger than disc contribution to total flux.
- QPO rms spectrum increases steeply with energy. QPO rms spectrum increases steeply with energy.
- High amplitude at energies where disc contribution is negligible. High amplitude at energies where disc contribution is negligible.
- Coherence of the QPO: Either lifetime of the oscillator, or time Coherence of the QPO: Either lifetime of the oscillator, or time dependent efficiency of the modulator. dependent efficiency of the modulator.
- Amplitude of the QPO: Energy-dependent efficiency of the Amplitude of the QPO: Energy-dependent efficiency of the modulator. modulator.

$$
f(t) \propto A(E) \times e^{-t/\tau} \sin(2\pi \nu t)
$$

### Modulation mechanism

– Using a time-dependent Comptonization model, Lee & – Using a time-dependent Comptonization model, Lee & Miller (1998) find that the ability of a Comptonizing corona to Miller (1998) find that the ability of a Comptonizing corona to modulate the oscillations decreases as the corona becomes modulate the oscillations decreases as the corona becomes cooler and more optically thick; this is also the regime at cooler and more optically thick; this is also the regime at which the high-energy part of the emission becomes softer which the high-energy part of the emission becomes softer (e.g. Gierlinski & Done 2002). (e.g. Gierlinski & Done 2002).

– Gilfanov et al. (2003) find that the rms spectrum of the QPOs – Gilfanov et al. (2003) find that the rms spectrum of the QPOs in 2 sources can be explained as variability in the flux of the in 2 sources can be explained as variability in the flux of the boundary layer. They also find that the relative contribution of boundary layer. They also find that the relative contribution of the boundary layer to the total flux decreases as inferred the boundary layer to the total flux decreases as inferred mass accretion rate increases (i.e., when sources become mass accretion rate increases (i.e., when sources become brighter). brighter).

### **Conclusions**

1. Similar behavior of *Q* and *r* in individual sources and in 1. Similar behavior of *Q* and *r* in individual sources and in the population of sources suggests that these QPO the population of sources suggests that these QPO parameters are most likely determined by the same parameters are most likely determined by the same mechanism in both cases. mechanism in both cases.

2. 4U 1701-462 converted from a *bright and soft* Z 2. 4U 1701-462 converted from a *bright and soft* Z source into a *hard and weak* Atoll source; the source into a *hard and weak* Atoll source; the amplitude and coherence of the kHz QPOs changed amplitude and coherence of the kHz QPOs changed accordingly, in line with what was known for other Z accordingly, in line with what was known for other Z and Atoll sources. and Atoll sources.

The MSO cannot be the (only) cause of the drop The MSO cannot be the (only) cause of the drop of *r* and *Q* at high QPO frequencies in individual of *r* and *Q* at high QPO frequencies in individual sources sources