Marisa Geyer, Aris Karastergiou at Oxford University Collaborators: Members of LOFAR PWG

PHASE SPACE

## ANOMALOUS PULSAR SCATTERING AT LOFAR FREQUENCIES THE LABYRINTH OF THE UNEXPECTED UNFORESEEN TREASURES IN IMPOSSIBLE REGIONS OF

Marisa Geyer, Aris Karastergiou at Oxford University Collaborators: Members of LOFAR PWG

## ANOMALOUS PULSAR SCATTERING AT LOFAR FREQUENCIES THE LABYRINTH OF THE UNEXPECTED

UNFORESEEN TREASURES IN IMPOSSIBLE REGIONS OF PHASE SPACE



# CONTENTS

- 1. OVERVIEW PULSAR SCATTERING
- 2. THEORETICALLY EXPECTED RESULTS
- 3. FITTING TECHNIQUES
- 4. ANALYSIS OF LOFAR DATA
- **5. IMPLICATIONS AND DISCUSSION**

#### PULSAR SCATTERING THEORY

- Multi-path propagation of radio waves due to electron density gradients in the ISM
- Observe scattering tails in average pulse profiles at low frequencies



#### PULSAR SCATTERING THEORY – THIN SCREEN MODEL

 Scattering takes place at single location along the line of sight

### PULSAR SCATTERING – BROADENING FUNCTIONS



Isotropic Scattering	Anisotropic Scattering
Scattering screen scatters isotropically	Distribution scattering angles shows directionality
Simple case: circularly symmetric Gaussian distribution in <b>a</b>	Simple case: asymmetric Gaussian distribution distribution $\sigma_X \neq \sigma_y$
$f_t = \tau^{-1} e^{-t/\tau} U(t)$ $\tau = D'_s \sigma_a^2 / c$ $D'_s = D_s (1 - \frac{D_s}{D}),$ plasma scattering, $\sigma_a \propto \nu^{-2}$ leads to $\tau \propto \nu^{-4}$	$f_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau_x \tau_y}} e^{-\frac{t}{2}(\frac{1}{\tau_x} + \frac{1}{\tau_y})} I(0, \frac{t}{2}(\frac{1}{\tau_x} - \frac{1}{\tau_y}))$ in the extreme case 1D scattering $f_t = e^{-t/\tau} / (\sqrt{\pi t \tau}) U(t)$

#### PULSAR SCATTERING – BROADENING FUNCTIONS



#### EXTERNAL EVIDENCE FOR ANISOTROPIC SCATTERING

- VLBI image of PSR B0834+06 at 327 MHz
- Brisken et al. 2010



- Organized patterns in dynamic spectra
- Parabolic arcs in secondary (power) spectra
- Enhanced for elongated (anisotropic) images





8

### THEORETICAL EXPECTATIONS

- Gaussian scattering:  $\tau \propto \nu^{-4}$
- Kolmogorov Turbulence:  $\tau \propto \nu^{-4.4}$ LITERATURE MEASURED  $\alpha$  VALUES
- Löhmer et al. 2001:  $\alpha = 3.44$  (9 sources, at high DMs)
- Lewandowski et al. 2013: α = 2.77 4.59 (25 sources)
- Lewandowski et al. 2015: **α** = 2.61 5.61 (60 sources)
- Smirnova et al. 2014 using RadioAstron: B0950+08, α = 3.00



#### FITTING TECHNIQUE – 'TRAIN MODELS'





#### 3. FITTING TECHNIQUES

#### FITTING TECHNIQUE – 'TRAIN MODELS'



- Train Method simplest, fastest
- Deals effectively with high levels of scattering where pulses are smeared into one another
- Keeps track of flux 'lost' due to high levels of scattering



#### FITTING TECHNIQUE – 'TRAIN + DC MODEL'

30

25

20

15

10

Ő.34

0.36

- Fits for underlying Gaussian parameters (mu, sigma, A)
- Fits for scattering timescale tau

Freq: 60 MHz

1.3

1.4

1.2

 $\tau$  (sec)

Train

Train + DC

Best check

1.5

1.6

- Add DC offset
- It works

30

25

20

15

10

5

0.9

1.0

1.1

counts



Geyer , Karastergiou MNRAS (2016) 462 (3)

#### **LOFAR SOURCES**

- Selected 13 slow (non-ms) pulsars
- Observed with LOFAR Core stations
- Scattered at HBA frequencies (110 190 MHz)
- LOFAR: Provides a large bandwidth at low frequencies (80MHz/150MHz)
- Simple profile shapes (approximated by single Gaussian component)
- ▶ DM range: 50 220 pc cm<sup>-3</sup>
- Selected from Commissioning data, Census data (190, DEC > 8) and some overlapping Cycle 5 LOFAR timing data

#### PSR J0614+2229 (B0611+22)



- RED FIT: Isotropic model, BLUE FIT: Extreme Anisotropic (1D) model
- scattering indices (α) are lower than theoretical models predict
- often closer to theoretical values for anisotropic models
- recover the flux lost due to scattering

#### PSR J1922+2110 (B1920+21)



measure DM corrections due to scattering effects

most often an overestimation

#### **RESULTS TABLE**

Pulsar	Isotropic Scattering			Extreme (1D) Anisotropic Scattering		
	$\tau_{150}~({\rm ms})$	α	$\Delta DM \ (pc \ cm^{-3})$	$\tau_{150}$ (ms)	α	$\Delta {\rm DM}~({\rm pc~cm^{-3}})$
J0040+5716	$40 \pm 2$	$2.2\pm0.2$	$0.0378 \pm 0.0024$	$86 \pm 8$	$2.7\pm0.3$	$0.0143 \pm 0.0022$
J0117+5914 (Co)	$7\pm0$	$2.2\pm0.1$	$0.0082 \pm 0.0009$	$14 \pm 1$	$3.5\pm0.4$	$0.0041 \pm 0.0011$
J0117+5914 (Ce)	$8 \perp 1$	$1.9 \pm 0.2$	$0.0064 \pm 0.0006$	$16 \perp 2$	$2.6 \pm 0.2$	$0.0038 \pm 0.0006$
J0543 + 2329	$10 \pm 1$	$2.6\pm0.2$	$0.0155 \pm 0.0020$	$17\pm2$	$2.7\pm0.3$	$0.0031 \pm 0.0020$
J0614+2229 (Co)	$15 \pm 1$	$1.9\pm0.1$	$0.0030 \pm 0.0007$	$44 \pm 4$	$2.4 \pm 0.3$	$-0.0033 \pm 0.0006$
J0614+2229 (Cy)	$15\pm0$	$2.1\pm0.1$	$-0.0053 \pm 0.0006$	$44\pm3$	$3.1 \pm 0.3$	$-0.0109 \pm 0.0008$
J0742 - 2822	$20 \pm 2$	$3.8 \pm 0.4$	$0.0013 \pm 0.0027$			
J1851 + 1259	$6\pm1$	$4.0 \pm 0.4$	$0.0264 \pm 0.0022$	$10 \pm 1$	$4.7 \pm 0.4$	$0.0158 \pm 0.0017$
J1909+1102	$42 \pm 3$	$3.5\pm0.4$	$0.0351 \pm 0.0085$	$120\pm27$	$6.4\pm0.7$	$-0.0276 \pm 0.0077$
J1913-0440 (Co)	$9\pm0$	$2.7\pm0.2$	$0.0240 \pm 0.0009$	$16 \pm 1$	$3.5\pm0.3$	$0.0161 \pm 0.0011$
J1913-0440 (Cy)	$7\pm0$	$3.3\pm0.1$	$0.0457 \pm 0.0003$	$12 \pm 0$	$4.1\pm0.2$	$0.0381 \pm 0.0003$
J1917 + 1353	$11 \pm 1$	$2.8\pm0.4$	$-0.1004 \pm 0.0025$	$21\pm2$	$3.6\pm0.6$	$-0.1167 \pm 0.0028$
J1922+2110	42 + 2	$2.0 \pm 0.2$	$0.0829 \pm 0.0025$	$85 \pm 6$	$3.3 \pm 0.4$	$0.0663 \pm 0.0023$
J1935 + 1616	$20 \pm 1$	$3.4 \pm 0.2$	$-0.0635 \pm 0.0030$	$46 \perp 4$	$3.9 \pm 0.5$	$-0.0836 \pm 0.0038$
J2257 + 5909	$31 \pm 2$	$2.6\pm0.4$	$-0.0317 \pm 0.0058$	$68 \pm 9$	$3.4 \pm 0.6$	$-0.0530 \pm 0.0050$
J2305 + 3100	$9\pm0$	$1.5\pm0.1$	$0.0184 \pm 0.0035$	$11\pm0$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$0.0144 \pm 0.0023$
$\langle lpha  angle$		$2.7\pm0.2$			$3.5\pm0.4$	

#### **ORIGIN OF LOW SCATTERING INDICES?**



Löhmer 2001 suggested lower  $\alpha$  with an increase in DM

We see low  $\alpha$  at low DMs

Truncated screens - can reproduce the  $\alpha$  distribution with ~100 AU screens

The dominance of truncated screen could decrease with increase in distance/DM



#### SIDE NOTE: 'TRUNCATED PROFILES'

Simulated midway screen 120 AU, distance 1.5 kpc

#### Pulsars appear much less scattered



#### 4. IMPLICATIONS AND DISCUSSION



- Does our data require anisotrop scattering models?
- Not strictly
- Tempting in some cases (4 pulsars):
  - goodness of fit ( $\chi^2$ , KS) slightly better for anisotropic model
  - anisotropic ΔDM corrections between epochs lead to more similar DMs
  - α values isotropic and anisotropic models are well separated
  - anisotropic α values closer to theoretical values



Geyer et al. MNRAS (2016) 462 (3)

### **ANISOTROPY REQUIRED?**

- Does our data require anisotropic scattering models?
- Not strictly
- It definitely is a mechanism that can cause perceived low α values
- Simulated data: shown that fitting anisotropic data (e.g. A = 3) with isotropic model lead low α values
- Existing evidence for anisotropy e.g Brisken pulsar, parabolic arcs in secondary spectra



Geyer et al. MNRAS (2016) 462 (3)

#### **EVOLUTION OF SPECTRAL INDICES WITH FREQUENCY?**



- $\tau$  at 1 GHz vs DM
- Compare Bhat 2004
- Our data (along with Lewandowski et al. 2013 and 2015) promote higher τ at low DM
- For Bhat relation to hold at 1GHz, α must change with frequency
- Implications?

## NEXT...

- Time domain analysis is not the most sensitive to analyzing IISM properties
- But even in time domain we see anomalous effects
- Interferometric imaging, including space-ground experiments, could be key in investigating the typical sizes of scattering surfaces
- Scintillation results are required for precise scattering measurements at higher frequencies to aid the investigation of the frequency dependence of α. (Break in power law?)
- Best tests for anisotropy come from high resolution dynamic spectra
- Test whether estimated flux loss is regained in pulsar imaging ongoing work (Will not be so, if flat spectra are due to inner scale instead)



# THE END