**NuSTAR OBSERVATIONS OF GRB 130427A ESTABLISH A SINGLE COMPONENT SYNCHROTRON AFTERGLOW ORIGIN FOR THE LATE OPTICAL TO MULTI-GEV EMISSION**
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**ABSTRACT**

GRB 130427A occurred in a relatively nearby galaxy; its prompt emission had the largest GRB fluence ever recorded. The afterglow of GRB 130427A was bright enough for the *Nuclear Spectroscopic Telescope ARray* (NuSTAR) to observe it in the 3–79 keV energy range long after its prompt emission (∼1.5 and 5 days). This range, where afterglow observations were previously not possible, bridges an important spectral gap. Combined with *Swift*, *Fermi*, and ground-based optical data, NuSTAR observations unambiguously establish a single afterglow spectral component from optical to multi-GeV energies a day after the event, which is almost certainly synchrotron radiation. Such an origin of the late-time *Fermi*/Large Area Telescope >10 GeV photons requires revisions in our understanding of collisionless relativistic shock physics.
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1. **INTRODUCTION**

Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) release within seconds to minutes more high-energy photons than any other transient phenomenon (Kouveliotou et al. 2012). Their prompt gamma-ray emission is followed by a long-lived (typically weeks to months) afterglow, visible from radio to X-rays. The afterglow emission is attributed to synchrotron radiation from relativistic electrons accelerated in the shock produced as the explosion plows into the circumstellar medium. The afterglow synchrotron origin is supported by their broadband spectra (Granot & Sari 2002; Galama et al. 1998) and polarization measurements (Covino et al. 2004).

GRB 130427A triggered the *Fermi*/Gamma-ray Burst Monitor (GBM) at 07:47:06.42 UT on 2013 April 27 (von Kienlin 2013). The intensity and hardness of the event fulfilled the criteria for an autonomous slew maneuver to place the burst within the *Fermi*/Large Area Telescope (LAT) field of view. Its exceedingly bright prompt emission was also detected by other satellites (*AGILE*: Verrecchia et al. 2013; *Konus-Wind*: Golentskii et al. 2013; *RXTE*: Smith et al. 2013; *Swift*: Maselli et al. 2013) and enabled multiple ground- and space-based follow-up observations, allowing for rapid accurate determination of the event location and distance at redshift z = 0.340 (Levan et al. 2013), as well as extensive broadband afterglow monitoring from radio to γ-rays. The extreme X-ray and γ-ray energetics of the burst are described in detail in Preece et al. (2013), Ackermann et al. (2013), and Maselli et al. (2013). The record-breaking duration of the LAT afterglow (∼0.1–100 GeV), which lasted almost a day after the GBM trigger, placed GRB 130427A at the top of the LAT GRBs in fluence (Ackermann et al. 2013).

The extreme intensity, accurate distance measurement and relative closeness of GRB 130427A, made it an ideal candidate for follow-up observations with the *Nuclear Spectroscopic Telescope ARray* (NuSTAR; Harrison et al. 2013). Here we describe our NuSTAR afterglow observations taken during two epochs (Section 2), combined with data from *Fermi*/LAT, *Swift*, and optical observatories. We describe in Section 3 the derivation of the *Fermi*/LAT extrapolation and upper limits (ULs) during the *NuSTAR* epochs. In Section 4 we present afterglow multi-wavelength fits, and discuss our results in Section 5.

2. **NuSTAR OBSERVATIONS**

*NuSTAR* was launched on 2012 June 13; the instrument’s two telescopes utilize a new generation of hard X-ray optics and detectors to focus X-rays in the range 3–79 keV. We observed GRB 130427A at three epochs, starting approximately 1.2, 4.8, and 5.4 days after the GBM trigger, for 30.5, 21.2, and 12.3 ks (live times). We detected the source in all epochs, obtaining for the first time X-ray observations of a GRB afterglow above 10 keV. The *NuSTAR* data thus provide an important
missing spectral link between the Swift/X-Ray Telescope (XRT) observations (0.3 – 10 keV; Maselli et al. 2013) and the Fermi/LAT observations (>100 MeV; Ackermann et al. 2013).

We processed the data with HEASOFT 6.13 and the NuSTAR Data Analysis Software (NuSTARDAS) v. 1.1.1 using CALDB version 20130509. We extracted source light curves and spectra from circular regions with 75″ radius from both NuSTAR modules for the first epoch and 50″ radius for the second and third epochs. We used circular background regions (of 150″, 100″, and 100″ radius for each epoch, respectively) located on the same NuSTAR detector as the GRB. Hereafter, we combine the second and third NuSTAR epochs, which were very close in time, to increase the signal-to-noise ratio, and refer to it as the second epoch.

Figure 1 demonstrates the temporal behavior of the multiwavelength afterglow flux of GRB 130427A. Here we have included data from Swift/XRT, Swift/ Ultra-Violet/Optical Telescope (UVOT), and Fermi/LAT. We also include the extrapolated Fermi/LAT light curve derived as described in Section 3. The weighted average of the decay rates during the two NuSTAR epochs (single power-law (PL) fits) is $\alpha = 1.3$ from optical to GeV (see also the figure inset, and the indices next to each instrument in Figure 1). We discuss the implications of the temporal results in Section 5.

3. Fermi OBSERVATIONS

The Fermi/LAT detected GRB 130427A up to almost a day after the trigger time (Figure 1; Ackermann et al. 2013). Fermi/LAT was also observing during both NuSTAR epochs but did not detect the source. We analyzed the “Pass 7” data with the Fermi Science Tools v9r31p1 and the P7SOURCE_V6 version of the instrument response functions, and using the public Galactic diffuse model and the isotropic spectral template. For each epoch, we selected all the events within a region of interest (ROI) with a radius of 10° around the position of the GRB, excluding times when any part of the ROI was at a zenith angle >100°. The latter requirement greatly reduces contamination from the diffuse gamma-ray emission originating from the Earth’s upper atmosphere, peaking at a zenith angle of ~110°.

3.1. Fermi/LAT Spectra and Upper Limits

For each epoch we performed an unbinned likelihood analysis over the whole energy range (0.1–100 GeV), using a model composed of the two background components (Galactic and isotropic) and a point source with a PL spectrum (the GRB), plus the contribution from all the known gamma-ray point sources in the ROI (Nolan et al. 2012). We did not obtain a detection in either epoch, and so we computed ULs. We froze the normalization of the background components, and fixed the photon index of the GRB model to 2.17, which is the best-fit value from the smoothly broken power-law (SBPL) fit during the first NuSTAR epoch as reported in Section 4 (the ULs change by less than 10% for any choice of the photon index between 2 and 2.5). We then independently fit the GRB model in three energy bands (0.1–1, 1–10, and 10–100 GeV), using an unbinned profile likelihood method to derive the corresponding 95% LAT ULs (Ackermann et al. 2012). The information contained in such ULs is important to constrain the spectrum, but cannot be handled by a standard fitting procedure. We, therefore, turn to an alternative (but equivalent) method to include the LAT observations in a broadband spectral fit. We obtained the count spectrum of the observed LAT signal (source+background) using gtbin, and the background spectrum using gtobkg, which computes the predicted counts from all the components of the best-fit likelihood model except the GRB. Since there is no significant excess above the background, the two spectra are compatible within the errors, although they are not identical. We also ran gtrepogen to compute the response of the instrument in the interval of interest, and loaded these files in XSPEC v.12.7. This software compares the observed net counts to the number of counts predicted by the model folded with the response of the instrument. By minimizing a statistic based on the Poisson probability, we can treat equivalently a spectrum containing a significant signal, and a spectrum which

---

16 Available at http://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/.
is compatible with being just background. While the former will constrain the model to pass through the data points, the latter will constrain it to predict a number of counts above background compatible with zero. The best-fit model obtained using the LAT spectra computed in this way is, as expected, below the ULs computed with the profile likelihood method.

3.2. Extrapolation of the Fermi/LAT Light Curve

The high-energy (>100 MeV) photon and energy flux light curves are well described by a broken power law (BPL) and PL, respectively, as reported in Ackermann et al. (2013). To extrapolate such light curves to the NuSTAR epochs, we adopted a general approach, based on the well-known Markov Chain Monte Carlo technique, which takes into account the uncertainties on the best-fit parameters along with all their correlations, as follows.

Each data point in Figure 2 represents a photon flux derived from a likelihood fit with 1σ confidence intervals (Ackermann et al. 2013). Hence, we can assume a Gaussian joint likelihood function $L$ and minimize the corresponding $\chi^2$ to find the best-fit parameters, which is equivalent to a standard least-squares fit (or to minimize $\chi^2$). We can then apply the Bayes rule that the posterior distribution for the parameters is directly proportional to the likelihood itself. Therefore, sampling the posterior distribution multiplied by the likelihood. If we take an uninformative prior, then the posterior distribution is directly proportional to the prior distribution multiplied by the likelihood. If we take an uninformative prior, then the posterior distribution is directly proportional to the likelihood itself. Therefore, sampling the posterior distribution with a Markov Chain Monte Carlo technique is equivalent to sampling the posterior distribution. By using, e.g., the Goodman & Weare (2010) algorithm, we can then obtain many sets of parameters distributed as in the posterior distribution, with all the relations between them taken into account. Using these sets of parameters, $p_i$, we can build a distribution of a certain quantity of interest $f(p_i)$. Taking the median and the relevant percentiles of the distribution, we can then extract a measure of $f$ and its 1σ confidence interval. In this way, we computed the shaded region in Figure 2 and the expected flux only in the first NuSTAR epoch, which starts shortly after the last detection from Fermi/LAT. The second NuSTAR epoch started too late for any extrapolation to be meaningful.

Figure 2 exhibits the Fermi/LAT photon flux light curve with 1σ confidence intervals derived with such method. We used the same method to compute the flux extrapolation for the first NuSTAR epoch (the magenta dashed cross in Figure 3).

4. BROADBAND AFTERGLOW

We extracted light curves and spectra during the NuSTAR epochs from Swift/UVOT, and Swift/XRT using the standard HEASOFT reduction pipelines and the Swift/XRT team repository (Evans et al. 2009), as well as Liverpool Telescope data using in-house software (Maselli et al. 2013). For the first epoch, we compare the extrapolation of the LAT temporal and spectral behavior (Ackermann et al. 2013) to our multi-wavelength light curves and spectra.

Figure 3 shows two spectral energy distributions (SEDs) spanning from optical ($i'$ band) to γ-rays (~GeV). We first fit both epochs independently (excluding Fermi/LAT data) with two functional forms (Table 1)—single PL and BPL—each multiplied by models for both fixed Galactic and free intrinsic
The Small Magellanic Cloud extinction curve fits our data best and we use it exclusively for continuity.

Sari 2002). The SBPL fit was better (Table 1) and is shown at
the synchrotron radiation theoretical expectation (Granot &
sharpness of the break,\(^\Delta \Gamma\), break is needed.

We then fit the first epoch only with a physically motivated
SBPL spectrum described in Granot & Sari (2002), with a fixed
sharpness of the break,\(^\delta\approx 0.85\), and including the broadband
LAT UL. We performed two fits: (1) keeping the two PL indices
free and (2) requiring them to differ by \(\Delta \Gamma = 0.5\) according
to the synchrotron radiation theoretical expectation (Granot &
Sari 2002). The SBPL fit was better (Table 1) and is shown at
the top panel of Figure 3, together with the LAT ULs, as well
as the extrapolation of the LAT light curve to this epoch; the
extrapolation was not used in the fit but plotted for comparison
with the model. Both are consistent with the SBPL fit—the
curvature in the NuSTAR data is also clearly exhibited in the
inset in the top panel. The lower panel shows the SED with
the second NuSTAR epoch fit with a PL and with the first epoch
fit shifted and superposed on the plot; although the data do
not constrain such a fit, they are consistent with it. Finally, we
performed broadband fits removing the NuSTAR data (including
only optical, Swift/XRT, Swift/UVOT data, and Fermi/LAT
ULs) and found that the break energies could not be constrained.
Therefore, the NuSTAR data are essential in constraining the
shape of the broadband spectra.

Our results are broadly consistent with those of Perley et al.
(2013) who derived radio to GeV afterglow spectra of
GRB 130427A covering 0.007–60 days after trigger. Their
results also suggest that the forward shock emission indeed
dominate at or above the optical during our NuSTAR epochs.

5. DISCUSSION

We have shown above that the NuSTAR data are consistent
with a PL in time and frequency below the cooling-break
photon energy \(E_c\), \(E_c \propto \tau^{-\alpha} \nu^{-\beta}\) with \(\alpha = 1.30 \pm 0.05\) and
\(\beta \equiv \Gamma_1 - 1 = 0.69 \pm 0.01\) (see Table 1). For the likely
PL segment (\(G\) from Granot & Sari 2002) of the synchrotron
spectrum this implies a PL index of the external medium density,
\(\rho_{ext} \propto R^{-\kappa}\), where \(R\) is the distance from the central source, of
\(k = 4/[1 + 1/(2\alpha - 3\beta)] = 1.4 \pm 0.2\). Correspondingly,
the cooling-break energy scales as \(E_c \propto t^{(3k-4)/k}\) = \(t^{1.00 \pm 0.12}\), i.e., it is expected to remain constant (which is consistent with
our spectral fits, the difference between the two epochs being
less than 2\(\sigma\)). The value we obtain for \(k\) is intermediate between
a uniform interstellar medium (\(k = 0\)) and a canonical massive-star
wind (\(k = 2\)), possibly indicating that the massive GRB
progenitor has produced an eruption (e.g., is opacity driven)
prior to its core-collapse, which alters the circumstellar density
profile (Fryer et al. 2006). Such an eruption might also account
for a variable external density profile, where a transition from
a flatter profile to a steeper one might be responsible for the
steepening of the optical-to-X-ray light curves after several hours
(Ackermann et al. 2013; Laskar et al. 2013). The density
profile might have been relatively steep (\(k \sim 1–2\)) during the
first few hundred seconds, shortly after the outflow deceleration
time, possibly accounting for the early reverse shock emission
(Laskar et al. 2013; Perley et al. 2013).

The NuSTAR PL distributions in time and frequency support
an afterglow synchrotron origin (Kumar & Barniol Duran 2009,
2010; Ghisellini et al. 2010). Synchrotron radiation models

\(^{17}\) The Small Magellanic Cloud extinction curve fits our data best and we use it exclusively for continuity.

\(^{18}\) This value corresponds to the cooling break for our inferred photon index and external density profile (Granot & Sari 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model(^1)</th>
<th>Epoch</th>
<th>(\text{O+X}) (^2)</th>
<th>(N) (^2)</th>
<th>(L) (^2)</th>
<th>(\Delta \Gamma) (^2)</th>
<th>(\Gamma_1)</th>
<th>(\Gamma_2)</th>
<th>(E_c) (^2)</th>
<th>(\chi^2/\text{dof})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.72 ± 0.02</td>
<td>(\cdots)</td>
<td>(\cdots)</td>
<td>457.6/422(^\text{a})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.77 ± 0.02</td>
<td>(\cdots)</td>
<td>(\cdots)</td>
<td>105.1/104(^\text{b})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.70 ± 0.01</td>
<td>(1.94^{+0.08}_{-0.04})</td>
<td>9.3^{+13}_{-14}</td>
<td>419.3/420(^\text{c})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>(\cdots)</td>
<td>(\cdots)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.71 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>17 ± 1</td>
<td>428.5/421(^\text{d})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.77 ± 0.01</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>32^{+18}_{-18}</td>
<td>103.7/103(^\text{f})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes.**
1. (PL) power law, (BPL) broken power law, (SBPL) smoothly broken power law.
2. \(\text{O+X} = \text{Optical+Swift/XRT} + \text{Swift/UVOT; N = NuSTAR; L = Fermi/LAT; } \Gamma = \Gamma_2 - \Gamma_1\); \(E_c\) = break energy in keV. This fit includes the LAT spectra. This spectral fit is shown in Figure 3.
3. PL is an adequate fit.
4. PL is a good fit.
5. BPL is a better fit than PL, \(F\)-test = 19.1 \((P = 1.6 \times 10^{-3})\).
6. Cannot constrain break.
7. BPL (\(\Delta \Gamma = 0.5\)) is a better fit than PL, \(F\)-test = 28.5 \((P = 1.5 \times 10^{-7})\).
8. BPL (\(\Delta \Gamma = 0.5\)) is not significantly better fit than PL, \(F\)-test = 1.3 \((P = 0.25)\).
9. PL is not a very good fit.
10. BPL is a better fit than PL, \(F\)-test = 30.5 \((P = 3.9 \times 10^{-13})\), break is needed.
11. SBPL is a better fit than PL, \(F\)-test = 16.9 \((P = 7.2 \times 10^{-13})\).
12. SBPL is a better fit than PL, \(F\)-test = 12.3 \((P = 3.5 \times 10^{-11})\).

\(\chi^2/\text{dof}\) uncertainties estimated using the error propagation method.
must be incorrect, requiring a modification of our understanding of afterglow shock physics. While many authors were aware of this potential problem, the *NuSTAR* results make it much harder to circumvent. One possible solution may lie in changing the assumption of a uniform magnetic field into a lower magnetic field acceleration region and a higher magnetic field synchrotron radiation region (Kumar et al. 2012; Lyutikov 2010). These might arise for diffusive shock acceleration (Fermi Type I) if the tangled shock-amplified magnetic field decays on a short length scale behind the shock front (where most of the high-energy radiation is emitted), while the highest energy electrons are accelerated in the lower magnetic field further downstream (Kumar et al. 2012).

Another possibility is direct linear acceleration in the electric field of magnetic reconnection layers, which have a low magnetic field (Uzdensky et al. 2011; Cerutti et al. 2012, 2013). This would require, however, a significant fraction of the total energy in the flow to reside in magnetic fields of alternating sign. This is not expected in GRB afterglows, but it could occur in the magnetic-reconnection induced decay of the tangled shock-amplified field mentioned above, which initially reaches near-equipartition values just behind the shock. While the exact solution is still unclear, our results provide an important challenge for our understanding of particle acceleration and magnetic field amplification in relativistic shocks.
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