Monitoring Chandra Observations of the Quasi-persistent Neutron Star X-Ray Transient MXB 1659-29 in Quiescence: The Cooling Curve of the Heated Neutron Star Crust
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ABSTRACT

We have observed the quasi-persistent neutron star X-ray transient and eclipsing binary MXB 1659–29 in quiescence on three occasions with Chandra. The purpose of our observations was to monitor the quiescent behavior of the source after its last prolonged (∼2.5 yr) outburst that ended in 2001 September. The X-ray spectra of the source are consistent with thermal radiation from the neutron star surface. We found that the bolometric flux of the source decreased by a factor of 7–9 over the timespan of 1.5 yr between our first and last Chandra observations. The effective temperature also decreased, by a factor of 1.6–1.7. The decrease in time of the bolometric flux and effective temperature can be described using exponential decay functions, with e-folding times of ∼0.7 and ∼3 yr, respectively. Our results are consistent with the hypothesis that we observed a cooling neutron star crust that was heated considerably during the prolonged accretion event and that is still out of thermal equilibrium with the neutron star core. We could only determine upper limits for any luminosity contribution because of the thermal state of the neutron star core. The rapid cooling of the neutron star crust implies that it has a large thermal conductivity. Our results also suggest that enhanced cooling processes are present in the neutron star core.

Subject headings: accretion, accretion disks — stars: individual (MXB 1659–29) — stars: neutron — X-rays: stars

1. INTRODUCTION

Neutron stars in low-mass X-ray binaries accrete matter from solar mass companions. Among those systems, the subgroup of neutron star transients spend most of their time in quiescence during which hardly any or no accretion occurs. However, these transients sporadically become very bright (∼1036–1038 erg s −1) owing to a huge increase in the accretion rate onto their neutron stars. During those outbursts, these sources can be readily studied with the available X-ray instruments, but obtaining high-quality quiescent data remains a challenge. In spite of this, several systems have now been studied in detail: they typically exhibit 0.5–10 keV luminosities of 1035–1039 erg s −1, and their spectra are usually dominated by a soft component that can be described by a thermal model. This emission is thought to be due to the cooling of the neutron star that has been heated during the outbursts (Brown, Bildsten, & Rutledge 1998; Campana et al. 1998a).

Most neutron star transients are active for only weeks to months, but several systems have remained active for years and even decades (the “quasi-persistent” neutron star transients; Wijnands et al. 2003). Wijnands et al. (2001) realized that those systems are excellent targets to study the effects of accretion on the behavior of neutron stars by observing them in quiescence. The accreting material is expected to have a larger effect on the neutron stars in such systems than on the neutron stars in short-duration transients (Wijnands et al. 2001; Rutledge et al. 2002). In the latter systems, the crust is only marginally heated during the outbursts and will quickly return to thermal equilibrium with the core after the end of the outbursts. In the quasi-persistent transients, however, the crust is heated to high temperatures and becomes significantly out of thermal equilibrium with the core (Rutledge et al. 2002). After the end of the prolonged outbursts, it will cool until it returns to equilibrium with the core. The exact cooling time depends on the thermal conductivity of the crust, the core cooling processes, and the accretion history of the source.

KS 1731–260 was the first quasi-persistent transient to be studied in detail in quiescence. It was observed using Chandra shortly after the end of its ∼12.5 yr outburst (Wijnands et al. 2001), and it was found to have a luminosity of ∼1035 ergs s −1 (for a distance d = 7 kpc; 0.5–10 keV). Half a year later it was observed with XMM-Newton, and it was found that its luminosity had decreased by a factor of 2–3 (Wijnands et al. 2002a). Using the cooling curves calculated by Rutledge et al. (2002), this drop in brightness can be explained if the neutron star has a large crustal conductivity and enhanced core cooling processes. In 2001 September, a second quasi-persistent neutron star transient (MXB 1659–29) turned off after having accreted for ∼2.5 yr. Wijnands et al. (2003) obtained a Chandra observation of this source within a month after the end of its outburst and detected it at a luminosity of ∼3 × 1033 ergs s −1 (0.5–10 keV; d = 10 kpc). Several years before this outburst, the source was observed with ROSAT but could not be detected (Verbunt 2001). The flux upper limit was ∼10 times lower than the Chandra flux (Oosterbroek et al. 2001; Wijnands 2002). Wijnands et al. (2003) concluded that during the Chandra observation the observed radiation was due to a hot crust and not associated with the core.

2. OBSERVATIONS, ANALYSIS, AND RESULTS

Chandra observed MXB 1659–29 twice for ∼27 ks: on 2002 October 15 (the 2002 observation) and on 2003 May 9 (the 2003 observation). We also used the ∼19 ks observation performed on 2001 October 15–16 (the 2001 observation; Wijnands et al. 2003). During all observations the ACIS-S3 chip was used. The data were reduced and analyzed using CIAO version 3.0. To make use of the latest calibration products, we reprocessed the
The 2003 observation. A minor background flare occurred during the 2003 observation (factor of ~2, lasting ~2 ks). Its effect on the quality of the source data was negligible, and we did not remove this flare from the data. No flares occurred during the other observations.

For each observation, we extracted the number of source photons, the light curve, and the spectrum, using a circle with a radius of 3” as source extraction region and an annulus with an inner radius of 7” and an outer radius of 22” as the background region. We detected 948 ± 31, 263 ± 16, and 107 ± 10 counts (0.3–7 keV; background corrected) for the 2001, 2002, and 2003 observations, respectively, resulting in corresponding count rates of 0.050 ± 0.002, 0.0097 ± 0.0006, and 0.0039 ± 0.0004 counts s⁻¹. Wijnands et al. (2003) observed an eclipse and dipping behavior during the 2001 observation (similar to the outburst behavior of the source; Lewin 1979; Cominsky et al. 1983; Cominsky & Wood 1984, 1989). To search for eclipsing behavior during the 2002 and 2003 observations, we determined the orbital phase range covered by those observations using the time of the eclipse in the 2001 observation as the reference time. Given the orbital phase range traced during each observation, we expect to see a single eclipse per observation, and as anticipated, we did not detect any photons during the expected eclipse intervals. However, we also found that no photons were detected during several time intervals (of equal duration as the lengths of the eclipses) at different phases of the orbital period. Therefore, without prior knowledge of the eclipsing nature of MXB 1659–29, we could not have concluded that we saw eclipses during the 2002 and 2003 observations. Owing to the limited statistics of the 2002 and 2003 observations, no conclusions can be drawn about possible dipping behavior during these observations.

When extracting the spectra, we used all data, including those taken during the intervals of eclipses and possible dipping behavior. The eclipses could not be removed from the data before extracting the spectra because the uncertainties in the ephemers presented by Oosterbroek et al. (2001) are sufficiently large so that the exact start and end times of the expected eclipses could not be determined. Instead we decreased the exposure time in the resulting spectral files by 900 s since the eclipse duration during outburst was found to be ~900 s (Wachter et al. 2000) and Wijnands et al. (2003) reported an eclipse duration of 842 ± 90 s for the 2001 observation. Small differences in the eclipse duration might be present between the observations, but the expected effects on the resulting fluxes will be marginal. We also did not remove the data obtained during the dipping interval observed in the 2001 observation. Such dipping intervals are likely present during the other two observations, but they cannot be identified in the light curves because of limited statistics. For those two observations all data had to be used, and to obtain a homogeneous data selection across observations, we included the dipping interval observed during the 2001 observation. Wijnands et al. (2003) found evidence that this dipping behavior is likely due to a change in internal absorption in the system and not to actual changes in the neutron star properties. Therefore, the inclusion of the (possible) dipping intervals will likely result in a somewhat higher column density (N_H) in the spectral fits than the true interstellar N_H toward the source but should not significantly impact other source properties.

We grouped the spectra in bins of 15 counts to validate the use of the χ² fitting method and simultaneously fitted the three spectra using Xspec (Arnaud 1996). A variety of one-component models could fit the individual spectra satisfactorily, but since we expect that the X-rays from MXB 1659–29 are due to the cooling of the neutron star surface, for this Letter we only fitted the data using a neutron star hydrogen atmosphere (NSA) model (for weakly magnetized neutron stars; Zavlin et al. 1996). In such models the normalization is given by 1/d², with d in units of pc. The distance should be constant between observations, and therefore we left the normalization tied among the different spectra (when leaving the normalizations free between observations, we find that they are consistent with each other). We expect the N_H toward the source to be very similar between observations (only minor variations are expected due to variable internal absorption), and this parameter was also tied. We assume a “canonical” neutron star with a radius of 10 km and a mass of 1.4 M☉.

From the fits, we found that the normalization was 1.4±0.8 × 10⁻⁴, which yields a source distance of 5–13 kpc. This is consistent with the distance range given in the literature (10–13 kpc; Oosterbroek et al. 2001; Muno et al. 2001). However, we found that the errors on the fit parameters were dominated by the large uncertainties in the normalization and did not allow us to realize the full potential of the data. If the source distance was established through an independent method, we could fix the normalization in the NSA models, resulting in considerably smaller errors on the remaining fit parameters. Therefore, instead of leaving the normalization as a free parameter, we fixed it so that it corresponded to a distance of 5, 10, and 13 kpc, covering the full range of allowed distances obtained when the normalization was a free parameter. To estimate the bolometric fluxes (F_bol) we extrapolated the model to the energy range 0.01–100 keV, which gives approximate bolometric fluxes. To calculate the flux errors, we fixed each free fit parameter (only one at a time) either to its minimum or to its maximum allowed value. After that we refitted the data and recalculated the fluxes. This process was repeated for each free parameter, and the final flux range determined the flux errors. The fit parameters obtained are listed in Table 1, and the spectra are shown in Figure 1.

This table shows that T_eff and F_bol decreased in time (Fig. 2). We fitted the T_eff and F_bol curves with an exponential decay function y(t) = c₀ e⁻^(t−t₀)σ, with c₀ a normalization constant, t₀ the start time, and σ the e-folding time. We found that the other fit parameters were not very sensitive to the value of t₀, but when t₀ was left free it had adverse effects on the errors on those parameters. Therefore, we fixed t₀ to MJD 52,159.5, which corresponds to midday 2001 September 7 (the last day MXB 1659–29 was found to be active; Wijnands et al. 2002b) and which can be regarded as an approximation of the time when T_eff and F_bol began to decrease. The assumed exponential functions could adequately describe the decrease in T_eff and F_bol (Fig. 2; alternative functions did not provide adequate fits). We found that σ and c₀ for the F_bol curve were 289 ± 37, 6

For example, a power-law model could fit the spectra but with an index of 4.7–5.8 suggesting soft thermal spectra. We also fitted an NSA plus power-law model to determine the upper limits on the contribution of such a power-law tail to the 0.5–10 keV flux. Those limits are less than 20%–25%, less than 35%–45%, and less than 50%–100%, for the 2001, 2002, and 2003 observation, respectively. The range of upper limits is due to the range assumed in photon indices (between 1 and 2).

We verified that the 0.01–100 keV fluxes approximate F_bol by calculating the bolometric luminosity L_bol = 4πR²T_eff³, with σ Stefan-Boltzmann constant, T_eff the effective temperature (at infinity), and R, the neutron star radius (at infinity). The 0.01–100 keV fluxes were indeed consistent with the calculated F_bol. We use the measured fluxes because their errors take into account the uncertainties in N_H and the T_eff obtained for all observations. The F_bol errors are only calculated using the T_eff errors during one specific observation.
TABLE 1

SPECTRAL RESULTS FOR MXB 1659–29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTANCE ASSUMED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (kpc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ne (10^{21} cm^{-2})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kT_{\text{eff}} (keV);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flux (10^{-14} ergs cm^{-2} s^{-1}; 0.5–10 keV; unabsorbed):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.004 0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolometric flux (10^{-12} ergs s^{-1}; unabsorbed):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.002 0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\chi^2/dof</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.—The error bars represent 90% confidence levels. We used a neutron star mass of 1.4 M_\odot and radius of 10 km and the neutron star hydrogen atmosphere model for weakly magnetized neutron stars of Zavlin et al. (1996).

262 ± 33, and 254 ± 29 days and 70 ± 9, 48 ± 6, and (43 ± 6) × 10^{-14} ergs cm^{-2} s^{-1}, when assuming a distance of 5, 10, or 13 kpc, respectively, in the spectral fits. The corresponding \tau and c_o for the T_{\text{eff}} curve were 1153 ± 160, 1060 ± 126, and 1055 ± 112 days and 0.099 ± 0.004, 0.126 ± 0.004, and 0.139 ± 0.004 keV. We saw no evidence that the curves approached a rock-bottom value: we found an upper limit on such a value of (3.5–7.5) × 10^{-14} ergs cm^{-2} s^{-1} for the F_{\text{bol}} curve [resulting in bolometric luminosity limits of (2.2–7.0) × 10^{-15} ergs s^{-1}] and 0.06–0.07 keV for the T_{\text{eff}} curve.

3. DISCUSSION

We have presented monitoring Chandra observations of MXB 1659–29 in quiescence. The first observation was taken only a month after the end of its last outburst that lasted 2.5 yr; the second and third observations were taken ~1 and ~1.5 yr after this initial one. Because it is expected that the emission should be dominated by thermal emission from the hot neutron star...
crust (see Wijnands et al. 2003), we fitted the data with an NSA model for weakly \(B < 10^5-10^8\) G magnetized neutron stars. We found that \(F_{\text{bol}}\) decreased by a factor of \(~8\) in \(\sim 1.5\) yr, and the rate of decrease followed an exponential decay function. Furthermore, \(T_{\text{eff}}\) also decreased, and the rate of decrease again followed an exponential decay function. We found that the \(e\)-folding time of the \(T_{\text{eff}}\) curve was consistent with 4 times that of the \(F_{\text{bol}}\) curve, as expected if the emission is caused by a cooling blackbody for which the bolometric luminosity is given by \(L_{\text{bol}} = 4\pi R_{\ast}^2 T_{\text{eff}}^4\) (see footnote 7): if \(T_{\text{eff}}\) decays exponentially, \(L_{\text{bol}}\) (and thus \(F_{\text{bol}}\)) will also decay exponentially but with an \(e\)-folding time 4 times smaller than that of \(T_{\text{eff}}\), exactly what we observe.

Our results support the suggestion that the crust was heated to high temperatures during the prolonged accretion event, which ended a month before our first observation, and that it is now cooling until it reaches thermal equilibrium with the core. Rutledge et al. (2002) calculated cooling curves for the neutron star in KS 1731–260, assuming different behaviors of the crustal microphysics and the core cooling processes. Those curves can be used as a starting point to investigate how our results of MXB 1659–29 could be explained. Of those curves, only the one that assumes a large crustal conductivity and the presence of enhanced core cooling processes exhibits a large luminosity decrease in the first 2 years after the end of the last outburst, suggesting that the neutron star in MXB 1659–29 has similar properties. This conclusion was already tentatively reached by Wijnands et al. (2003) based on a comparison of the luminosity seen during the 2001 October Chandra observation with the significantly lower luminosity upper limit found with ROSAT. But detailed cooling curves for the neutron star in MXB 1659–29 need to be calculated to fully explore (and exploit) the impact of our observations on our understanding of the structure of neutron stars. The cooling curves calculated by Rutledge et al. (2002) for KS 1731–260 give us only a hint of the behavior of MXB 1659–29 because they depend on the long-term (>10**3 yr) accretion history of the source. For KS 1731–260, this long-term accretion behavior was quite unconstrained because of large uncertainties in the averaged duration of the outbursts, the time-averaged accretion rate during the outbursts, and the time the source spent in quiescence. However, the accretion history of MXB 1659–29 over the last three decades is much better constrained (Wijnands et al. 2003), which will help to reduce the uncertainties in its long-term averaged accretion history allowing for more detailed cooling curves to be calculated for MXB 1659–29. This might help to constrain the physics of the crust better for MXB 1659–29 than for KS 1731–260. The only significant uncertainty left is that of the source distance; however, we found that this affects only the exact values of the bolometric fluxes and the effective temperatures, not their rate of decay.

Our 0.5–10 keV flux during the 2003 May Chandra observation is still higher than the upper limit found with ROSAT, suggesting that the crust will cool even further in quiescence and that we have not yet reached thermal equilibrium between the crust and core. Further monitoring observations are needed to follow the cooling curve of the crust to determine the moment when the crust is thermally relaxed again. When this occurs, no significant further decrease of the quiescent luminosity is expected, and from this bottom level the state of the core can be inferred. As of yet, we have found no evidence that the flux and temperature are reaching a leveling-off value, associated with the temperature of the core, although the limits that we obtained are not very stringent.

Jonker, Wijnands, & van der Klis (2004) suggested that the difference in luminosity of MXB 1659–29 between the ROSAT nondetection and the 2001 Chandra observation might be due to differences in residual accretion rate onto the surface. Residual accretion could indeed produce soft spectra (e.g., Zampieri et al. 1995), but to explain the exponential decay we observe for \(F_{\text{bol}}\) and \(T_{\text{eff}}\), the residual accretion rate must also decrease exponentially with a timescale of a year. Although this cannot be completely ruled out, we believe that this is unlikely since other neutron star transients have been observed to reach their quiescent states on timescales of only tens to several tens of days at the end of their outbursts (e.g., Campana et al. 1998b; Jonker et al. 2003), and the variations in accretion rate tend to be more stochastic. Moreover, if the neutron star has a significant magnetic field strength, this might inhibit material from reaching the surface when accreting at the inferred low rates.
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