Clusters WG session report

IACHEC meeting, Napa, 2012

1) Data in IACHEC Wiki page

- Ideas for improving the page:
 - XMM processing scripts
 - Background info
 - * Patters, flags
 - * Images
 - * Coordinates
 - MOS1 and MOS2 separately

2) Suzaku extension (K. Kettula et al., in prep.)

XIS soft band

- XIS1/XIS3 kT differ a bit (7%) but not very significantly (2.5 σ)
- XISO yields 30% and 20% lower (10σ) temperatures. Is this seen in other sources?



XIS1/XIS0 residuals

- XIS1 data divided by the best-fit XIS0 model folded through XIS1 response (crosses)
- Prediction too high at 0.5 keV: If XISO is correctly calibrated, XIS1 effarea is overestimated by 20-40% at 0.5 keV



 The fits are statistically acceptable (chisq ~ 1) → the energy dependence of the contaminate can explain the XIS soft band temperature discrepancies



- The resulting ΔN_0 values 1-3 x 10¹⁷ cm⁻² are quite high... IS THIS ACCPTABLE?
- The curves show the implemented O column density in CALDB 20110608 at 4.5 arcmin distance from the center of the FOV (IT WOULD BE VERY **USEFUL TO HAVE** THE ACTUAL O COLUMN VALUE AS A **KEYWORD IN THE** HEADER
 - The data points show the required O columns, if XISO is correct
 - These contradict the direct O measurements of 1E010?



- Use XIS1, instead of XISO as a reference instrument, because XIS1 contaminate is best measured. Is it?
- Check Suzaku extraction regions
- Check XIS1 gain
- Check XIS1 bad regions
- Check NXB normalisation with the > 10 keV band count rate, like XMM
- Check how XIS Crab results (Eric) and Ishida et al 2011 compare with clusters
- PSF scatter from central cool region to 3-6 annulus evaluated soon (Eric)
- Larry will provide ACIS data for some of the clusters for comparison
- Circulate new draft within a month for comments
- Aim for submission in May

3) Chandra/XMM soft band temperature problems

ACIS data / pn model

- ACIS data / pn model exhibit a linear trend with energy
- In pn effarea is correct, ACIS effarea too high by ~10% at 0.5 keV



- Not a contamination issue, because behaviour constant with time
- Neither XMM nor Chandra has much room for adjustment
- Confirm the systematic effects with different objects? Read better Ishida 2011 paper

XMM blazar/cluster differences



CLUSTERS



 Clusters do not show the steep rise of residuals at 3.0-4.0 keV as blazars do

trouble

Public effarea, pre/post rev 500

- Clusters show no steep rise at 3-4 keV, i.e. clusters and blazars behave differently with the public effarea at rev > 500
- Clusters yield 5% higher MOS1/pn fluxes at rev > 500 than in rev < 500. A similar trend perhaps in M. Smith's blazar sample.





- Jukka and Matteo will investigate blazar/cluster difference in detail in May or June
- M. Smith will help in the analysis
- Check cluster fluxes for each cluster as a function of time. Does the MOS flux increase and pn remain constant as suggested by blazars?
- Look at blazar residuals object-by-object, and as a function of time
- Cluster temperatures tell about the effarea shape around the cutoff, blazar power-law indices in the full band. Investigate.
- Hot SN?

NuStar

- Discussion with NuStarr people (Kerstin, Karl, Fiona) about adding some clusters into calibration program
- Agreement that Coma, A1795 and A2029 will be observed
- These are hottest clusters in the IACHEC sample, well observed with many different X-ray missions
- The brightest central regions covered within a few arcmin to minimise vignetting



 12th Commandment: When IACHEC papers written, circulate with WG chairpersons prior to submission to check the consistence with other results