

# Distribution of gamma-ray burst ejecta energy with Lorentz factor

Jonathan Granot<sup>1</sup> and Pawan Kumar<sup>2★</sup>

<sup>1</sup>KIPAC, PO Box 20450, Mail Stop 29, Stanford, CA 94309, USA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Astronomy, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712, USA

Accepted 2005 November 1. Received 2005 November 1; in original form 2005 October 6

## ABSTRACT

The early X-ray afterglow for a significant number of gamma-ray bursts detected by the *Swift* satellite is observed to have a phase of very slow flux decline with time ( $F_\nu \propto t^{-\alpha}$  with  $0.2 \lesssim \alpha \lesssim 0.8$ ) for  $10^{2.5} \lesssim t \lesssim 10^4$  s, while the subsequent decline is the usual  $1 \lesssim \alpha_3 \lesssim 1.5$  behaviour, which was seen in the pre-*Swift* era. We show that this behaviour is a natural consequence of a small spread in the Lorentz factor of the ejecta, by a factor of  $\sim 2$ – $4$ , where the slower ejecta gradually catch up with the shocked external medium, thus increasing the energy of the forward shock and delaying its deceleration. The end of the ‘shallow’ flux decay stage marks the beginning of the Blandford–McKee self-similar external shock evolution. This suggests that most of the energy in the relativistic outflow is in material with a Lorentz factor of  $\sim 30$ – $50$ .

**Key words:** hydrodynamics – shock waves – gamma-rays: bursts.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Among the discoveries made by the *Swift* satellite within a few months of its launch is the observation that a fraction of long-duration gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) go through an early phase of relatively slow decline in the X-ray afterglow flux that typically starts a few minutes after the burst and lasts for about an hour (Nousek et al. 2005). This phase is followed by a somewhat faster and more typical flux decay that satisfies the expected relation between the temporal decline index  $\alpha$  and the spectral index  $\beta$ , where  $F_\nu \propto \nu^{-\beta} t^{-\alpha}$ , similar to what was observed before the *Swift* era when the monitoring of the afterglow light curves started at least several hours after the GRB. The spectral index does not seem to undergo any change when the light curve transitions (at  $t_{\text{break},2} \sim 10^4$  s) from a shallow decline ( $\alpha_2$ ) to the ‘regular’ decline ( $\alpha_3$ ). It has been argued convincingly by a number of authors that the more slowly declining light curve, like the ‘regular’ flux decay rate that follows it, is produced by the shock-heated circum-burst medium (Nousek et al. 2005; Panaitescu et al. 2005; Zhang et al. 2005). The shallow X-ray flux decay is widely attributed to energy injection into the afterglow shock, which may be caused by either a long-lived activity of the central source, or a short-lived central explosion that produces ejecta with some distribution of Lorentz factor (LF) (cf. Nousek et al. 2005; Panaitescu et al. 2005; Zhang et al. 2005). In either of these scenarios the deceleration of the afterglow shock is reduced because of the energy being added to it, and this in turn produces a slowly declining light curve.

Slow decline of the early optical light curve was also reported before the *Swift* era, although quite rarely – e.g. GRB 021004 (Fox et al. 2003). Li & Chevalier (2003) have made a good case that the slowly declining early optical light curve of GRB 021004 could naturally occur for a stellar wind type external medium when the optical band is below the characteristic synchrotron frequency (and above the cooling break frequency). However, this explanation is unlikely to work for the slowly declining X-ray light curves, since the X-ray band at  $\sim 1$  h after a GRB is expected to lie well above the synchrotron characteristic frequency, and furthermore there is no evidence for a change in the spectral slope across the break in the X-ray light curve at  $t_{\text{break},2}$ . Fox et al. (2003) argued that the early flat optical light curve of GRB 021004 is either due to energy injection into the afterglow shock, or due to angular inhomogeneity (‘patchy shell’; Kumar & Piran 2000). The latter was favoured as it also provided a good explanation for the fluctuations (or ‘bumps’) that appear later in the optical light curve of GRB 021004 (see also Nakar, Piran & Granot 2003). However, the sparse early afterglow data in the pre-*Swift* era made it difficult to distinguish between the different explanations.

Long-lived activity of the central source is not very appealing since it would require the source to be active up to several hours after the GRB, with a very smooth temporal behaviour, where most of the energy is in the outflow that is ejected around  $t_{\text{break},2} \sim 10^4$  s (see, however, Dai 2004); this makes the problem of the observed high efficiency for converting kinetic energy to gamma-ray radiation much worse (Nousek et al. 2005). Another interesting way to produce an early flat phase in the afterglow light curve (Eichler & Granot 2005) is by a line of sight

★E-mail: pk@astro.as.utexas.edu

that is slightly outside the (sharp) edge of a roughly uniform jet (Granot et al. 2002; Granot, Ramirez-Ruiz & Perna 2005). This would, however, naturally be accompanied by a weaker and softer prompt emission, perhaps resulting in an X-ray flash or X-ray-rich GRB rather than a classical GRB; the more pronounced this effect is, the flatter and longer-lived the slow X-ray afterglow decay phase should be. Initial inspection of the data does not show such a correlation, suggesting that viewing angle effects are probably not the predominant cause of the early slow decay phase in the X-ray afterglows, at least under the simplest assumptions.<sup>1</sup>

It is natural to expect that matter ejected in any explosion will have a range of velocities or LFs. After a while (on a time-scale, in the observer frame, of the order of a few times the duration of the central engine activity) the ejecta will rearrange themselves such that the fastest moving plasma is at the head of the outflow and the slowest at the tail end. This can occur either through internal shocks within the outflow, or by a smooth decrease in the LF of the outflow toward the end of the central source activity. If the ejecta have a finite range of LFs, the slower ejecta will gradually catch up with the shocked external medium, injecting energy into the forward shock. If the slower ejecta carry more energy than the faster ejecta, then this added energy will gradually increase the energy of the afterglow shock, causing it to decelerate more gradually. Once the energy in the lower LF ejecta becomes small compared with the energy already in the afterglow shock, the blast wave evolution becomes impulsive (i.e. the subsequent small amount of energy injection hardly effects the evolution of the forward shock), and if radiative losses are unimportant then it approaches the adiabatic Blandford & McKee (1976) self-similar solution. This occurs when the LF of the afterglow shock drops slightly below  $\Gamma_{\text{peak}}$ , the LF where  $dE/d\ln\Gamma$  peaks and where most of the energy in the outflow resides.

In this Letter we use the *Swift* data to determine the time dependence of the blast wave LF. We find that the LF typically drops by a factor of  $\sim 2$ – $4$  during the shallow-decline phase. This is consistent with the basic picture suggested above, where a finite LF distribution for the ejecta causes a more gradual decline of the forward-shock LF, which gives rise to a shallow light curve, and is an intermediate transition stage before the onset of the adiabatic Blandford–McKee solution.

## 2 DEPENDENCE OF BURST KINETIC ENERGY ON LORENTZ FACTOR

The emission from an external shock can be described in terms of the shock front LF ( $\Gamma$ ) and the density profile of the circumstellar medium (CSM). For a uniform CSM the synchrotron characteristic frequency ( $\nu_m$ ), the cooling frequency ( $\nu_c$ ) and the flux at the peak of the spectrum ( $F_{\nu, \text{max}}$ ), in the observer frame, are proportional to  $\Gamma^4$ ,  $\Gamma^{-4}t^{-2}$  and  $t^3\Gamma^8$  respectively, where  $t$  is the observed time. The flux at a frequency between  $\nu_m$  and  $\nu_c$  is proportional to  $t^3\Gamma^{6+2p}$  and for the observed band above  $\nu_m$  and  $\nu_c$  the flux scales as  $t^2\Gamma^{4+2p}$ . The observed flux is strongly dependent on  $\Gamma$  and therefore even a small deviation from the  $\Gamma \propto t^{-3/8}$  scaling has a very large effect on the observed light curve.

The observed flux has a weaker dependence on  $\Gamma$  for a wind-like density stratification of the CSM; the flux in the two regimes considered above scales roughly as  $\Gamma^{1+p}t^{(1-p)/2}$  and  $\Gamma^{2+p}t^{-(p-2)/2}$ , respectively.

More generally, for a power-law external density profile,  $\rho_{\text{ext}} = Ar^{-k}$ , we have  $F_{\nu, \text{max}} \propto \Gamma B R^{3-k} \propto \Gamma^2 R^{3-3k/2} \propto \Gamma^{8-3k} t^{3-3k/2}$ ,  $\nu_m \propto \Gamma B \gamma_m^2 \propto \Gamma^4 R^{-k/2} \propto \Gamma^{4-k} t^{-k/2}$ ,  $\gamma_c \propto 1/\Gamma B^2 t$  and  $\nu_c \propto \Gamma B \gamma_c^2 \propto \Gamma^{-1} B^{-3} t^{-2} \propto R^{3k/2} \Gamma^{-4} t^{-2} \propto \Gamma^{3k-4} t^{-2+3k/2}$ . Therefore

$$F_\nu \approx \begin{cases} F_{\nu, \text{max}}(\nu/\nu_c)^{-1/2} & \propto & \Gamma^{6-3k/2} t^{2-3k/4} & \nu_c < \nu < \nu_m, \\ F_{\nu, \text{max}}(\nu/\nu_m)^{(p-1)/2} & \propto & \Gamma t^{3-k(p+5)/4} & \nu_m < \nu < \nu_c, \\ F_{\nu, \text{max}}(\nu_c/\nu_m)^{(p-1)/2} (\nu/\nu_c)^{-p/2} & \propto & \Gamma^{4-k+p(4-k)/2} t^{2-k(2+p)/4} & \nu > \max(\nu_m, \nu_c). \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Assuming that the LF distribution for the ejecta is  $E(>\Gamma) \propto \Gamma^{-a}$ , we find that  $g \equiv -d \log \Gamma / d \log t$  is smaller by an amount  $\delta$  compared with the standard value of  $(3-k)/2(4-k)$ , i.e.  $3/8$  ( $1/4$ ) for a uniform (wind) CSM, where

$$\delta = \frac{(3-k)a}{2(4-k)[2(4-k)+a]} = \begin{cases} 3a/[8(8+a)] & k=0, \\ a/[4(4+a)] & k=2. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The deviation to the LC (light curve) temporal power-law index ( $\Delta\alpha$ ) from the standard case of the Blandford–McKee self-similar solution ( $\alpha$ ) is easily related to  $\delta$ . For  $\nu_m < \nu < \nu_c$  we have

$$\Delta\alpha = \left[ 6 - \frac{p(4-k)-5k}{2} \right] \delta = \begin{cases} 3(3+p)a/[4(8+a)] & k=0, \\ (1+p)a/[4(4+a)] & k=2, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

while, for  $\nu > \max(\nu_m, \nu_c)$ ,

$$\Delta\alpha = \left[ 4 - k + \frac{p(4-k)}{2} \right] \delta = \begin{cases} 3(2+p)a/[4(8+a)] & k=0, \\ (2+p)a/[4(4+a)] & k=2. \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

We next calculate  $\delta$  for a number of *Swift*-detected GRBs with a shallow LC using the observed spectral index and the change in the temporal power-law index for the X-ray light curve ( $\Delta\alpha$ ) between the shallow and the ‘regular’ parts of the LC. The results for  $\delta$  and the change to the LF during the shallow LC are shown in Table 1.

<sup>1</sup> Eichler & Granot (2005) point out that viewing angle effects might still be the dominant cause of the flat early decay of the afterglow light curves if along some lines of sight the kinetic energy in the afterglow shock is very low while the energy in gamma-rays remains high.

**Table 1.** The change in the Lorentz factor during the energy injection episode.

GRB	$T_{90} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$t_{\text{break},1} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$t_{\text{break},2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$a$	$\delta$	$\xi_{\text{min}}^a$	$\xi_{\text{max}}$	$\Gamma_{\text{peak}}^b$	$\Gamma_0^c$
050128	13.8	<230	$1720_{-570}^{+940}$	$1.1 \pm 0.2$	$0.045 \pm 0.07$	2.0	4.9	–	–
050315	96.0	$400 \pm 20$	$12000 \pm 400$	$2.4 \pm 0.1$	$0.094 \pm 0.03$	2.6	3.9	30	117
050319	10.0	$370 \pm 15$	$40000 \pm 300$	$1.6 \pm 0.5$	$0.063 \pm 0.016$	4.3	13.3	21	279
050401	33.0	<127	$5500_{-1050}^{+1150}$	$1.7 \pm 0.1$	$0.066 \pm 0.003$	3.2	4.9	58	284
050416a	2.4	<80	$1350_{-620}^{+2070}$	$1.1 \pm 0.1$	$0.043 \pm 0.004$	2.6	8.2	28	230
050607	26.5	$510 \pm 50$	$6400 \pm 900$	$1.5 \pm 0.1$	$0.059 \pm 0.004$	2.2	5.7	–	–

Note. The relevant data were taken from Nousek et al. (2005). All of the calculated quantities reported in this table ( $a$ ,  $\delta$ ,  $\xi$  and  $\Gamma_0$ ) assume a uniform-density medium in the vicinity of these bursts. <sup>a</sup>Here  $\xi$  is the ratio of the Lorentz factor of the afterglow shock at the start and at the end of the ‘shallow part’ of the X-ray light curve, and its value is estimated to be between  $\xi_{\text{min}} = (t_{\text{break},2}/t_{\text{break},1})^{3/(8+a)}$  and  $\xi_{\text{max}} = (t_{\text{break},2}/T_{90})^{3/(8+a)}$ . <sup>b</sup>These values of  $\Gamma_{\text{peak}} = \Gamma(t_{\text{break},2})$  were estimated only for the GRBs with known redshifts, by using equation (9) of Nousek et al. (2005) where the isotropic equivalent kinetic energy at  $t_{\text{break},2}$  was taken to be equal to  $E_{\gamma,\text{iso}}$ , and the external density was taken to be  $n = 1 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ . <sup>c</sup>The initial Lorentz factor is simply estimated by  $\Gamma_0 = \xi_{\text{max}} \Gamma_{\text{peak}}$ .

We note that the change to  $\Gamma$  during the shallow phase of the LC was calculated using the appropriate dependence of  $\Gamma$  on  $t$ ; for a uniform CSM this is  $t^{\delta-3/8}$ . It can be seen in Table 1 that  $\Gamma$  changes by a factor of  $\sim 2\text{--}4$  for all the bursts, with a uniform CSM, during the shallow LC phase; these numbers change only by a small amount even if we take the forward shock emission, and the shallow decline, to begin at the end of the GRB.


The function  $dE/d \ln \Gamma$  peaks at  $\Gamma_{\text{peak}} \sim \Gamma(t_{\text{break},2})$ , the LF of the forward shock at the end of the shallow-decline phase of the X-ray light curve. For  $\Gamma > \Gamma_{\text{peak}}$ ,  $dE/d \ln \Gamma \propto \Gamma^{-a}$ . The power-law index  $a$  is given in Table 1 for a number of bursts detected by *Swift* and lies between  $\sim 1$  and  $\sim 2.5$  if the CSM has uniform density [Nousek et al. (2005) report similar values:  $s - 1$  in their notation];  $a \gtrsim 5$  if the medium in the vicinity of GRB is taken to be a wind-CSM<sup>2</sup> or alternatively the central source has to be active for several hours with little variability and a roughly constant rate of energy output in relativistic outflow – neither of these possibilities seems very plausible and so the case of a wind-CSM is not considered any further in this Letter. For  $\Gamma < \Gamma_{\text{peak}}$  the function  $dE/d \ln \Gamma \propto \Gamma^b$  should decrease with decreasing  $\Gamma$  (i.e.  $b > 0$ ) as otherwise more slowly moving ejecta will continue to add a substantial amount of energy to the forward shock, thereby retarding its deceleration and slowing down the decline of the light curve. Since the spectral index and the light-curve power-law decay index after the end of the shallow-decline phase obey the relationship expected for an adiabatic forward shock evolution, we conclude that indeed  $b > 0$ , but its exact value is otherwise unconstrained. Radio calorimetry for a number of GRBs has concluded that there is not a whole lot of energy in GRBs in the form of mildly relativistic ejecta with  $\Gamma \sim 2$  (e.g. Berger, Kulkarni & Frail 2004; Frail et al. 2005). This further strengthens our conclusion that  $b > 0$ , and that this scaling might extend to  $\Gamma \sim 2$ . We note that for a given total energy in the explosion of the order of  $10^{52}$  erg the relation  $dE/d \ln \Gamma \propto \Gamma^{-a}$ , with  $a \sim 1.5$ , must turn over at some  $\Gamma$  of the order of 10 or so otherwise the energy in the relativistic ejecta will exceed the total available energy (energy in relativistic ejecta with  $\Gamma > \Gamma_{\text{peak}} \sim 50$  is of the order of  $10^{51}$  erg). We now have a considerable body of evidence that long-duration GRBs are accompanied by a supernova of Type Ic, which expels a few solar masses of material at velocities of the order of  $10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . Thus  $dE/d \ln u$ , where  $u = \beta\Gamma = (\Gamma^2 - 1)^{1/2}$ , must again turn over and have a peak at  $u \sim 0.05$ . Putting all these together, we show a schematic behaviour of  $E(\beta\Gamma)$  (i.e.  $dE/d \ln u$ ) in Fig. 1.

### 3 CONCLUSION

We have pieced together the distribution of energy in gamma-ray burst ejecta as a function of the four-velocity  $u = \beta\Gamma = (\Gamma^2 - 1)^{1/2}$  for  $0.1 \lesssim u \lesssim 10^2$ . The distribution function,  $dE/d \ln u$ , has two peaks: one at  $u \sim 0.1$  and another at  $u \sim 30\text{--}50$ . For  $u \gtrsim 50$ , it falls off as  $dE/d \ln u \propto u^{-a}$  with  $a \sim 1\text{--}2$ , as is determined from the shallow decline of the X-ray light curve at early times ( $10^{2.5} \lesssim t \lesssim 10^4 \text{ s}$ ) observed for a good fraction of bursts detected by the *Swift* satellite. The distribution at low  $u \sim 0.1$  is obtained by observations of Type Ic supernovae that are associated with GRBs. In the intermediate regime of  $1 \lesssim u \lesssim 30$  the shape of the distribution function  $dE/d \ln u$  is very uncertain, but we argue that it is likely to be at least flat or slowly rising in this range.

A prediction of this model for the shallow decline of the X-ray light curve, which is based on a deviation (at early times) from the constant-energy Blandford–McKee self-similar solution, is that we should see a roughly similar shallow decline in the optical band over the same time interval as in the X-ray data. Since the optical and the X-ray bands in general lie in different segments of the synchrotron spectrum, and because the energy added to the forward shock by more slowly moving ejecta should be accompanied by a mildly relativistic reverse shock that could provide some added flux to the optical light curve, the rate of decline for the X-ray and optical light curves should be similar

<sup>2</sup> The total amount of energy injection during the shallow-decline phase is independent of the stratification of the circumstellar medium. However, for a wind-like CSM  $a \gtrsim 5$ , which means that  $dE/d \ln \Gamma$  must have a very narrow peak of width  $\delta \ln \Gamma \ll 1$  which is unlikely to be realized in nature.



**Figure 1.** Schematic figure showing  $dE/d\ln u$ , in units of  $10^{51}$  erg, as a function of  $u \equiv \Gamma\beta = (\Gamma^2 - 1)^{1/2}$ . It has one relativistic component (solid line) with total energy  $\sim 10^{51}$  erg and a peak at  $u \sim 30\text{--}50$  that produces the GRB and the afterglow radiations. The power-law index above the peak for this component is well constrained by the X-ray data (the shallow part of the light curve) and is  $\sim -1.5$  (see Table 1). The slope below the peak is not constrained and is taken to be 1; in reality it can be close to zero, as the only constraint we have is from late-time radio afterglow observations which suggests that there is not a lot of extra energy in material moving with Lorentz factor of the order of 2. The second component (dotted curve) shows schematically the kinetic energy in non-relativistic ejecta in the supernova accompanying the GRB; the peak for this component is taken to be  $\sim 10^4$  km s $^{-1}$ , the typical velocity for Type Ic supernova ejecta, and the energy is  $\sim 10^{52}$  erg.

but not identical in this model.<sup>3</sup> A highly magnetized outflow could significantly weaken the reverse shock (or even eliminate it altogether) and thus suppress its emission. The alternative explanation of a viewing angle slightly outside the edge of the jet would lead to a gradual steepening of the afterglow light curve (i.e. a gradual increase in  $\alpha$ , as the beaming cone of the afterglow emission gradually approaches and eventually encompasses the line of sight), while a steeper break in the light curve is possible (and, arguably, might also be expected) in the model described in this work, when the stage of energy injection into the afterglow shock ends.

The challenge posed for GRB/supernova models is to understand what physical processes give rise to  $a \sim 2$  and why the LF distribution of the ejecta peaks at a value of roughly  $\Gamma_{\text{peak}} \sim 30\text{--}50$ . Understanding these results should help to illuminate the processes operating during the period in which the central engine of the GRB is active, and the interaction of the relativistic outflow with the collapsing star and its immediate surroundings.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Stan Woosley for useful discussion. This work is supported in part by grants from NASA and NSF (AST-0406878) to PK and by the US Department of Energy under contract number DE-AC03-76SF00515 (JG).

## REFERENCES

- Berger E., Kulkarni S. R., Frail D. A., 2004, *ApJ*, 612, 966  
 Blandford R. D., McKee C. F., 1976, *Phys. Fluids*, 19, 1130  
 Dai Z. G., 2004, *ApJ*, 606, 1000  
 Eichler D., Granot J., 2005, *ApJL*, submitted (astro-ph/0509857)  
 Fox D. W. et al., 2003, *Nat*, 422, 284  
 Frail D., Soderberg A. M., Kulkarni S. R., Berger E., Yost S., Fox D. W., Harrison F. A., 2005, *ApJ*, 619, 994  
 Granot J., Panaitescu A., Kumar P., Woosley S. E., 2002, *ApJ*, 570, L61  
 Granot J., Ramirez-Ruiz E., Perna R., 2005, *ApJ*, 630, 1003  
 Kumar P., Piran T., 2000, *ApJ*, 535, 152  
 Li Z.-Y., Chevalier R. A., 2003, *ApJ*, 589, L69  
 Nakar E., Piran T., Granot J., 2003, *New Astron.*, 8, 495  
 Nousek J. A. et al., 2005, *ApJ*, submitted (astro-ph/0508332)  
 Panaitescu A., Meszaros P., Gehrels N., Burrows D., Nousek J., 2005, *MNRAS*, in press (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2966.2005.09900.x) (astro-ph/0508340)  
 Sari R., Mészáros P., 2000, *ApJ*, 535, L33  
 Zhang B., Fan Y. Z., Dyks J., Kobayashi S., Meszaros P., Burrows D. N., Nousek J. A., Gehrels N., 2005, *ApJ*, submitted (astro-ph/0508321)

<sup>3</sup> For the power-law segments  $\nu_m < \nu < \nu_c$  and  $\nu > \max(\nu_m, \nu_c)$  the temporal decay index  $\alpha$  of the reverse shock emission is slightly smaller (corresponding to a slightly shallower flux decay) than that for the forward shock within the corresponding power-law segments, by  $\Delta\alpha = g(p - 2)$ . For the power-law segments  $\nu_c < \nu < \nu_m$  and  $\nu < \nu_c < \nu_m$  the reverse shock emission decays somewhat more quickly than that of the forward shock at the corresponding power-law segment, by  $\Delta\alpha = g$ .