X-ray spectroscopy of the brightest gamma-ray nova ASASSN-18fv = N Car 18 = V906 Car

Kirill Sokolovsky Michigan State University, SAI Moscow State Univ., ASC Lebedev in collaboration with Elias Aydi, Laura Chomiuk, Adam Kawash Michigan State Univ., Koji Mukai NASA/GSFC, Raimundo Lopes Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Thomas Nelson Univ. of Pittsburgh, Brian D. Metzger, Elad Steinberg Columbia University

Nova Car 2018 and η Car nebula imaged by Joseph Brimacombe



- 1) X-ray fireball in first hours of explosion, never observed
- 2) Shock waves heat plasma and accelerate particles weeks months after explosion
- 3) Hydrogen-burning white dwarf "Super-Soft Source"
- 4) When accretion restarts, the gas hitting WD surface gets shocked and heated to X-ray temperatures



- 1) X-ray fireball in first hours of explosion, never observed
- 2) Shock waves heat plasma and accelerate particles weeks-months after explosion
- 3) Hydrogen-burning white dwarf "Super-Soft Source"
- 4) When accretion restarts, the gas hitting WD surface gets shocked and heated to X-ray temperatures



- 1) X-ray fireball in first hours of explosion, never observed
- 2) Shock waves heat plasma and accelerate particles weeks-months after explosion by A. Wuethel
- 3) Hydrogen-burning white dwarf "Super-Soft Source"
- 4) When accretion restarts, the gas hitting WD surface gets shocked and heated to X-ray temperatures



- 1) X-ray fireball in first hours of explosion, never observed
- 2) Shock waves heat plasma and accelerate particles weeks-months after explosion
- 3) Hydrogen-burning white dwarf "Super-Soft Source"
- 4) When accretion restarts, the gas hitting WD surface gets shocked and heated to X-ray temperatures



- 1) X-ray fireball in first hours of explosion, never observed
- 2) Shock waves heat plasma and accelerate particles weeks-months after explosion
- 3) Hydrogen-burning white dwarf "Super-Soft Source"
- 4) When accretion restarts, the gas hitting WD surface gets shocked and heated to X-ray temperatures

ASASSN-18fv = N Car 2018 = V906 Car



ASASSN-18fv and η Car nebula imaged by Joseph Brimacombe

Discovered 2018-03-20.32 UT by the **ASAS-SN survey**



Opical/y-ray lightcurve of V906 Car



Opical/y-ray lightcurve of V906 Car



X-ray observations of V906 Car Swift (0.3–10 keV): fast repointing

-> can do long-term monitoring

NuSTAR (3–78 keV): high sensitivity to hard X-rays

XMM-Newton: high-resolution spectroscopy (0.33–2.1 keV) with
X-ray gratings + high sensitivity at 0.3–10 keV

Multiavelengths emission from V906 Car



Swift lightcurve



Swift/XRT lightcurve of V906 Car



Swift/XRT lightcurve of V906 Car



Swift/XRT lightcurve of V906 Car



Late-time XMM obs. to get abundances



XMM/EPIC+RGS spectrum of V906 Car



	EPIC+RGS
PHABS	
$N_H (\times 10^{21} \text{cm}^{-2})$	$2.4^{+0.4}_{-0.3}$
VPHABS	
$N_H (\times 10^{21} \text{cm}^{-2})$	$0.12\substack{+0.03 \\ -0.03}$
BVAPEC	
kT (keV)	$1.07^{+0.04}_{-0.01}$
redshift	-2.9×10^{-3}
velocity (km s ^{-1})	378 ^(*)
N/N⊙	345^{+93}_{-70}
O/O _☉	29^{+7}_{5}
Ne/Ne _O	$2.2^{+0.6}_{-0.5}$
Mg/Mg _o	$0.6^{+0.2}$
Si/Si	$1.1^{+0.2}$
Fe/Fe _☉	< 0.1
v^2	1.15
d.o.f.	1837

XMM/EPIC+RGS spectrum of V906 Car







Ejecta includes a lot of WD material CNO cycle is a catalytic cycle, fusion in nova **does not enrich ejecta in CNO** elements, just alters relative abundances



Ejecta includes a lot of WD material

so we can infer the WD composition! The absence of strong Mg and Ne emission suggests it's a **CO WD**, rather than ONe



Two NuSTAR epochs



NuSTAR spectra of V906 Car





(data-model)/error

NuSTAR observations of novae

Five novae observed so far:

- V745 Sco (WD+RG) detected (Orio et al. 2015)
- V339 Del not detected (Mukai et al. in prep.)
- V5668 Sgr not detected (Mukai et al. in prep.)
- V5855 Sgr detected while still γ-ray bright (Nelson et al. 2019)
- V906 Car detected while still γ-ray bright

Spectra consistent with thermal emission in all cases

Ejecta mass: Hubble flow model

Vmin Vmax

The inner/outer shell velocity ratios from the literature

Nova	$v_{\rm min}/v_{\rm max}$	Reference		
Nova V1324 Sco V959 Mon V5589 Sgr V1723 Aql T Pyx V723 Cas V1974 Cyg V351 Pup V838 Her V827 Her V827 Her V1819 Cyg QU Vul	$\frac{v_{\min}/v_{\max}}{0.447^{+0.10}_{-0.079}}$ 0.083 0.84 0.17 0.25 0.24 ± 0.1 0.46 ^a 0.74 ^b 0.042 0.25 0.2 0.2 0.87	Reference Finzell et al. (2018) Chomiuk et al. (2014a) Weston et al. (2016b) Weston et al. (2016a) Nelson et al. (2016a) Nelson et al. (2014) Heywood et al. (2005) Hjellming (1996) Wendeln et al. (2017) Hjellming (1996) Hjellming (1996) Hjellming (1996) Hjellming (1996) Hjellming (1996) Hjellming (1996)		
V1500 Cyg FH Ser HR Del	0.036 0.048 0.44	$\begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{Hjellming et al.}} & (1979) \\ \underline{\text{Hjellming et al.}} & (1979) \\ \underline{\text{Hjellming et al.}} & (1979) \end{array}$		

median 0.25

^{*a*} Ivinson et al. (1993) report $v_{\min}/v_{\max} = 0.16$. ^{*b*} Hjellming (1996) found $v_{\min}/v_{\max} = 0.069$.

Ejecta mass estimate from NuSTAR absorbing column

Model/Velocity	$600\mathrm{km/s}$	$2400{\rm km/s}$
Thin shell $T_0 + 36$	$7.1 imes 10^{-5} \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-3} \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$
Thin shell $T_0 + 57$	$2.4 imes 10^{-5} \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$	$3.9 imes10^{-4}~{ m M}_\odot$
Thin shell late ejection	$8.0 imes 10^{-6}~{ m M}_{\odot}$	$1.3 imes 10^{-4} \ \mathrm{M_{\odot}}$
Hubble flow $T_0 + 36$	$1.4 imes 10^{-5} \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$	$2.3 imes 10^{-4}~{ m M}_{\odot}$
Hubble flow $T_0 + 57$	$4.9 imes 10^{-6} \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$	$7.8 imes10^{-5}~{ m M}_{\odot}$
Hubble flow late ejection	$1.6 imes 10^{-6} \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$	$2.6 imes 10^{-5}~{ m M}_{\odot}$

Ejecta mass estimate from NuSTAR absorbing column



Shocks in novae

- Accelerate particles producing GeV γ-ray (and synchrotron radio) emission
- Heat plasma emitting hard X-rays

Simultaneously observing thermal and non-thermal emission from shocks we can constrain particle acceleration efficiency (<u>Vurm & Metzger, 2018</u>]!

Fermi/NuSTAR flux ratio on day 36 <u>Steinberg & Metzger (2018)</u> argue, that the shocks in novae are radiative: emit most of their energy in X-rays and spend 2% of energy or less on particle acceleration

- Measured Lγ/Lx~80, not 0.02!
- What we see with NuSTAR is not the shock responsible for the GeV emission
- NuSTAR data are consistent with a very bright emission Ly/Lx~0.01... if it's soft (kT~0.5 keV): constant*phabs*vphabs*vapec: $\chi^2_{red} = 1.0547$, d.o.f. = 200, p = 0.28

constant*phabs*vphabs*(vapec+vapec): $\chi^2_{red} = 1.0292$, d.o.f. = 196, p = 0.37

Summary

- No sharp transition from hard to SSS emission
- Ejecta has **highly non-solar abundances**, includes a lot of WD material
- **CO WD** (no Mg, Ne emission)
- Ejecta mass 10⁻⁵ 10⁻⁶ Msun
- Most of it ejected 24 days after explosion
- Hard X-rays confirm the presence of **shocks**
- Surprising Ly/Lx~80 ratio

Thanks!



NuSTAR observations of V906 Car

NuSTAR observing log

ObsID	Epoch	Start	Stop	Exposure	Exposure	Net count rate	Net count rate
	(days)	UT	UT	FPMA (ks)	FPMB (ks)	FPMA (cts/s)	FPMB (cts/s)
80301306002 90401322002	36.3 57.2	2018-04-20 14:46 2018-05-11 16:26	2018-04-22 02:01 2018-05-12 18:01	48.8 47.5	48.5 47.4	$\begin{array}{c} 0.01582 \pm 0.00066 \\ 0.04343 \pm 0.00102 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.01630 \pm 0.00067 \\ 0.04184 \pm 0.00101 \end{array}$

Column designation: Col. 1 – observation identification number; Col. 2 – time since outburst; Col. 3 and 4 – start and stop time of the observation (interrupted by Earth occultations and South Atlantic Anomaly passes); Col. 5 and 6 – total on-source exposure time for FPMA and FPMB, respectively; Col. 7 and 8 – source count rate (background-subtracted) for FPMA and FPMB, respectively.

NuSTAR observations of V906 Car

Parameters of the NuSTAR spectral model constant*vphabs*vapec

$\begin{array}{c} \text{Epoch} \\ \text{(days)} \end{array}$	$\stackrel{N_{\rm HI}}{(\times 10^{22}{\rm cm}^{-2})}$	kT (keV)	FeCoNi abundances	CNO abundances	$C_{\rm FPMB}$	$\begin{array}{l} {\rm Model~3.5\text{-}78.0keV} \\ {\rm flux~log_{10}(ergs/cm^2/s)} \end{array}$	Unabsorbed 3.5-78.0 keV flux $\log_{10}({\rm ergs/cm^2/s})$		
	Fe-deficient model: $\chi^2_{red} = 1.0281$, d.o.f. = 199, $p = 0.38$								
36	293.1 ± 20.3	8.04 ± 0.91	0.086 ± 0.030	1.0	1.109 ± 0.062	-11.570 ± 0.012	-11.068 ± 0.012		
57	44.82 ± 2.72	4.43 ± 0.17			1.006 ± 0.034	-11.454 ± 0.007	-11.179 ± 0.007		
		CNO-ov	verabundance n	nodel: $\chi^2_{\rm red} = 1.0$	0457, d.o.f. = 199,	p = 0.31			
36	4.287 ± 2.288	8.59 ± 0.88	1.0	209.6 ± 110.4	1.107 ± 0.062	-11.564 ± 0.012	-11.142 ± 0.012		
57	0.568 ± 0.288	4.38 ± 0.17			1.006 ± 0.034	-11.454 ± 0.007	-11.221 ± 0.007		
	XMM-derived abundances model: $\chi^2_{red} = 1.0552$, d.o.f. = 200, $p = 0.28$								
36	19.30 ± 1.33	8.62 ± 0.85	0.10	$C=0,\;O=29,$	1.105 ± 0.062	-11.565 ± 0.012	-11.119 ± 0.012		
57	2.648 ± 0.160	4.34 ± 0.17		N = 345	1.005 ± 0.034	-11.455 ± 0.007	-11.208 ± 0.007		
XMM abundances and fixed Galactic column model: constant*phabs*vphabs*vapec: $\chi^2_{red} = 1.0547$, d.o.f. = 200, $p = 0.28$									
36	19.29 ± 1.32	8.63 ± 0.84	0.10	$C=0,\;O=29,$	1.1054 ± 0.062	-11.565 ± 0.012	-11.119 ± 0.012		
57	2.636 ± 0.160	4.34 ± 0.17		N = 345	1.005 ± 0.034	-11.455 ± 0.007	-11.208 ± 0.007		
Two-temperature plasma model: constant*phabs*vphabs*(vapec+vapec): $\chi^2_{red} = 1.0292$, d.o.f. = 196, $p = 0.37$									
36	27.60 ± 4.26	$6.90\pm0.72,\ 0.567\pm0.066$	0.10	$C=0,\;O=29,$	1.116 ± 0.062	-11.540 ± 0.025	-9.599 ± 0.025		
57	3.516 ± 1.483	$4.05\pm0.42,\ 0.579\pm0.171$;	N = 345	1.005 ± 0.034	-11.421 ± 0.030	-11.074 ± 0.030		

	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3	Case 4	Case 5
	EPIC+RGS	EPIC+RGS	EPIC+RGS	RGS	RGS
PHABS					
$N_H (\times 10^{21} \mathrm{cm}^{-2})$	$1.8^{+0.3}_{-0.2}$	$1.8^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	$2.4^{+0.4}_{-0.3}$	$2.1^{+0.5}_{-1.0}$	$2.0^{+2.1}_{-1.0}$
VPHABS					
$N_H (\times 10^{21} \mathrm{cm}^{-2})$	$0.08\substack{+0.02\\-0.02}$	$0.13^{+0.03}_{-0.02}$	$0.12^{+0.03}_{-0.03}$	< 0.4	< 0.4
BVAPEC					
kT (keV)	$1.06\substack{+0.01\\-0.01}$	$1.11^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$1.07^{+0.04}_{-0.01}$	$0.79^{+0.04}_{-0.10}$	$0.98^{+0.15}_{-0.12}$
redshift	$(-2.9\pm0.1)\times10^{-3}$	$(-2.9\pm0.2)\times10^{-3}$	$-2.9 \times 10^{-3*}$	$(-3.1\pm0.2)\times10^{-3}$	$-2.9 \times 10^{-3(*)}$
velocity $(\rm kms^{-1})$	$394{\pm}70$	378 ± 72	$378^{(*)}$	386^{+72}_{-76}	378^{*}
N/N_{\odot}	728^{+232}_{-150}	403^{+99}_{-73}	345^{+93}_{-70}	230^{+236}_{-81}	212^{+197}_{-87}
$\rm O/O_{\odot}$	30^{+7}_{-6}	24^{+4}_{-5}	29^{+7}_{-5}	14^{+15}_{-5}	17^{+12}_{-5}
$\rm Ne/Ne_{\odot}$	$0.7^{+0.6}_{-0.5}$	$2.3^{+0.6}_{-0.5}$	$2.2^{+0.6}_{-0.5}$	$1.1^{+1.3}_{-0.5}$	$1.5^{+1.3}_{-0.7}$
${ m Mg}/{ m Mg}_{\odot}$	$1.0^{+0.2}_{-0.2}$	$0.7^{+0.2}_{-0.1}$	$0.6^{+0.2}_{-0.1}$	$1.0^{+1.0}_{-0.3}$	$0.9^{+0.6}_{-0.3}$
${ m Si/Si_{\odot}}$	$1.6_{-0.3}^{+0.4}$	$1.2_{-0.2}^{+0.2}$	$1.1_{-0.2}^{+0.2}$	$1.0^{+2.1}_{-0.7}$	$2.0^{+1.3}_{-0.5}$
$\rm Fe/Fe_{\odot}$	$0.17\substack{+0.08\\-0.05}$	< 0.1	< 0.1	< 0.13	< 0.04
χ^2_{ν}	1.25	1.16	1.15	1.01	1.01
d.o.f.	1847	1488	1837	987	977

Notes:

Model CONSTANT*PHABS*VPHABS*BVAPEC in four different cases:

Case 1: in the whole spectral coverage, without Gaussian lines;

Case 2: excluding spectral regions associated with (r,i,f) lines: 0.4-0.45 keV, 0.55-0.6 keV, 0.85-0.95 keV, and 1.3-1.4 keV;

Case 3: in the whole spectral coverage, including Gaussian lines associated with r,i,f lines (Table 3);

Case 4: only RGS, without Gaussian lines;

Case 5: only RGS, with Gaussian lines associated with r,i,f lines (Table 3);

Abundance table: aspl: Asplund M, Grevesse N., Sauval A.J. & Scott P., 2009, ARAA, 47, 481;

GeV and MeV emission from novae

Review by Hernanz (2014 ASPC, 490, 319)

- E>100 MeV continuum emission detected from 14 novae by Fermi (AGILE saw one)
- MeV emission from radioactive decay predicted, but not found

