ASSOCIATING FAST RADIO BURSTS TO THEIR HOST GALAXIES

Tarraneh Eftekhari Edo Berger arXiv: 1705.02998

Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics June 13, 2017



LOCALIZING FAST RADIO BURSTS

- Critical for constraining
 progenitor models, host
 demographics
 and distance scale
- Formation channels
 can be tested with less
 than IO localizations



Nicholl et al. 2017

Can rule out SGRBS and other channels that trace cosmic stellar mass or star formation rate with ~ 10 localizations in 0.5 L^{*} galaxies

How robustly can we claim an association?

• Probability of a chance coincidence: (assuming Poisson distribution of galaxies)



Chatterjee et al. 2017

 $P_{\rm cc} = 1 - e^{-\pi R^2 \sigma} (\leq m)$ Effective radius Number of galaxies above some limiting magnitude m

How robustly can we claim an association?

• Parameterizing the effective localization radius:

$$\begin{split} R = \max[2R_{\mathrm{FRB}}, \sqrt{R_0^2 + 4R_h^2}] \\ & \swarrow \\ & \texttt{Galaxy offset} \end{split} \quad \texttt{Half-light radius} \end{split}$$

How robustly can we claim an association?

• Parameterizing the effective localization radius:

$$\begin{split} R = \max[2R_{\mathrm{FRB}}, \sqrt{R_0^2 + 4R_h^2}] \\ & \swarrow \\ & \texttt{Galaxy offset} \end{split} \quad \texttt{Half-light radius} \end{split}$$

Adopt R_0 and R_h from SLSNe and LGRBs (Lunnan et al. 2015; Blanchard et al. 2015)

For $R_{\rm FRB} \lesssim 0.3''$ relevant scales are galaxy offset or half-light radius

Using galaxy number counts to determine number of galaxies within a localization region

$$P_{\rm cc} = 1 - e^{-\pi R^2 \sigma(\le m)}$$



Eftekhari and Berger 2017

Galaxy number counts from Driver et al. 2016 — GAMA, HST, COSMOS









- Number counts alone are insensitive to redshift information
- DM can be used to constrain redshift and discard galaxies above redshift range of interest

- Number counts alone are insensitive to redshift information
- DM can be used to constrain redshift and discard galaxies above redshift range of interest
 Eftekhari and Berger 2017



Luminosity functions from Blanton et al. 2003 and Beare et al. 2015

• Inhomogeneities introduce some uncertainty in DM-z relation

Inhomogeneities introduce some uncertainty in DM-z relation



Most conservative estimate of z_{max} when baryons trace dark matter halos (assuming NFW profiles)

Improving the association likelihood

- Factor of 2 fewer galaxies at high redshifts (z ~ 1.2) compared to number counts scenario
- Factor of 10 fewer
 galaxies at low redshifts
 (z~0.4)



Eftekhari and Berger 2017

Improving the association likelihood

- Factor of 2 fewer galaxies
 at high redshifts (z ~ 1.2)
 compared to number
 counts scenario
- Factor of 10 fewer
 galaxies at low redshifts
 (z~0.4)



Eftekhari and Berger 2017

Allows for robust associations even with poorer localizations







Characterizing the host galaxy in the absence of a robust association

• Determine apparent magnitude corresponding to a single galaxy within the field as a function of localization region

Cannot make a robust association...

...but can place constraint on maximum luminosity of the host.





Eftekhari and Berger 2017



Eftekhari and Berger 2017



Observed DM \longrightarrow Add uncertainty $\longrightarrow z_{max} \longrightarrow$





Eftekhari and Berger 2017





Radio number counts from Condon 2007

Eftekhari and Berger 2017 in prep

SUMMARY

• Require sub-arcsecond localizations for galaxies fainter than $m_r = 25$ for $P_{cc} < 1\%$ (as in the case of FRB 121102)

 \longrightarrow 0.01 L* galaxies at z < 0.5 or L* galaxies at z < 1.5

- Use of DM to constrain redshift only useful for low DM values, where it reduces the number of galaxies significantly, and where spectroscopic redshifts can be obtained
- Can place interesting upper limits on the luminosity of the host even in the absence of a robust association, but this still requires positions of a few arcsec
- Few localizations with < 2-3" will allow for constraints on FRB formation channel