



HETG/LETG — Status

Chandra Quarterly Review No. 56 15 November 2023

David Huenemoerder dph@space.mit.edu

HETG IPI: Prof. Claude R. Canizares MIT Kavli Institute

> LETG IPIs: Dr. Peter Predehl Max Planck Institute

> > Dr. Jelle Kaastra SRON







... current/incoming ...

... moved on ...



Proposal Cycle 23 Jan 2022 (637 ks)

* Stars: π Aqr
* AGN: Circinus Galaxy
* XRB: Cen X-3
* XRB: 4U 1626-67
* XRB: GX 1+4
* ISM: GX 340+0
* ULX/NS: M33 X-8

- 101 ks Winds of the hottest stars
- 69 ks Emission lines, morphology, variability (IXPE-coordinated)
- 61 ks Eclipsing X-ray pulsar; accretion
- 86 ks Ultra-compact binary; monitor Fe lines.
- 92 ks Low-mass XRB; accretion, Compton shoulder study.
- 138 ks Cosmic dust composition
- 90 ks Pulsar wind outflow, absorption

Proposal Cycle 24 Jan 2023 (77 / 745 ks)

★XRB: 4U 1624-490 29/135 ks Accretion disk structure (with NuSTAR, XRISM)
★XRB: Cen X-3 48 ks Eclipsing X-ray pulsar; accretion (ongoing - low visibility)
★AGN: MCG-6-30-15 0/232 ks Time-dependent photoionisation modeling of outflows
★BH: SS 433 0/60 ks Relativistic jet physics (coordinated with HRC, Swift GO)
★ULX: LMC/SMC X-? 0/70 ks Accretion disk outbursts (TOO)
★NS: Terzan 5 X-2 0/200 ks Neutron Star outburst (TOO)





Proposal Cycle 25 start Jan 2024 (758 ks; or 1208 ks if TOOs trigger)

*XRB: 4U 1626-67 0/190 ks Accretion disk structure (with NuSTAR, XRISM)
*Star ζ Puppis 0/190 ks Stellar Winds, long-term monitoring
*XRB GRS 1915+105 0/100 ks micro-Quasar (TOO; coordinated with NICER, NuSTAR)
*ISM GX 9+9 0/180 ks Galactic silicon absorption survey
*ULX M33 X-8 0/85 ks Pulsar wind outflow, absorption
*XRB Her X-1 0/50 ks Neutron star accretion disks (TOO)
*NS: Terzan 5 X-2 0/200 ks Neutron Star outburst (TOO)
*BH: GW Transient 0/300 ks Gravitational wave event followup (TOO)







Proposal Cycle 23: (328 ks)

★ Stars (Predehl/MPE)	LTT 1445A	45 ks	High energy environments of terrestrial exoplanets (ACIS-S)
★ Stars (Predehl/MPE)	L 168-9	24 ks	High energy environments of terrestrial exoplanets (ACIS-S)
\bigstar SNR (Predehl/MPE)	Hoinga	59 ks	Distance determination (HRC-I, ACIS-I)
★ AGN (Predehl/MPE)	WISEA J202040.85-621509.3	30 ks	Confirm eRosita detection of a z=5.9 quasar (ACIS-S)
★ Galaxies (Kaastra/SRON)	Abell 141	170 ks	Intercluster temperatures, merger history (ACIS-S)

Proposal Cycle 24: start Jan 2023 (0/337 ks)

★ AGN: (Predehl/MPE)	WISEA J050222.16-341201.6	0/25 ks	Luminous z>5.6 quasars from eROSITA (ACIS-S)
★AGN: (Predehl/MPE)	WISEA J230341.02-542730.6	0/32	Luminous z>5.6 quasars from eROSITA (ACIS-S)
★AGN: (Predehl/MPE)	WISEA J050411.92-254959.0	0/26	Luminous z>5.6 quasars from eROSITA (ACIS-S)
★ Galaxies: (Predehl/MPE)	eFEDSJ083933	0/88	Shocks in an eROSITA detected galaxy cluster (ACIS-S)
★ AGN: (Kaastra/SRON)	NGC 3783	0/166	Outflows, variability (with XRISM) (ACIS-S)

Proposal Cycle 25 start Jan 2024 (343 ks)

★ISM: (Predehl/MPE)	HD 115247
★ISM: (Predehl/MPE)	HE1338-1423
★ISM: (Predehl/MPE)	LEDA407
★ AGN: (Kaastra/SRON)) A1550

- 0/59 ksGalactic bubbles absorption (w/ eROSITA)0/59 ksGalactic bubbles absorption (w/ eROSITA)0/59 ksGalactic bubbles absorption (w/ eROSITA)
- 0/166 ks Outflows, variability







Performance May 2023 — Oct 2023

HETG/ACIS-S: 842 ks

• 44 observations on 13 targets (26 GO, 9 GTO, 6 TOO, 3 DDT, 0 Cal)

LETG: 603 ks

- 32 LETG/HRC-S observations, 5 targets (368 ks; 14 GO, 11 GTO, 5 TOO)
- 15 LETG/ACIS-S observations, 2 targets (233 ks; 15 Cal contamination)
- 1 LETG/HRC-I observation, 1 target (2 ks; Cal low E response)

All instruments: 11,383 ks

Grating performance is nominal.







http://tgcat.mit.edu

MIT KAVLI INSTITUTE

... has been *off-line Sept—Oct 2023* for maintenance/ system upgrades. It has existed since 2008 — if unfamiliar with it, see Chandra Newsletter #16 (Winter 2009, <<u>https://cxc.harvard.edu/newsletters/news_16/news16_p33.html</u>>) or Huenemoerder et al 2011 (<<u>https://ui.adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/</u> 2011AJ....141..129H/abstract>)

Back on-line as of ...



Example interactive plot: NGC 3783, 10 observations with HETG, 1.2 Ms, allcombined flux plot.

HETG; Chandra Quarterly #56, 15 Nov 2023

6





2

<<u>http://tgcat.mit.edu/dev/tgcat/tgTrend.php</u>>







ACIS High-T Operations: OK to use HETG (but for warmest temperatures, offset to low CHIPY).

HETG 2nd and 3rd order efficiencies: in progress.

Line-spread-function parameters for HETG/HRC-I and off-axis pointings: in progress.





Before scanning ... about 30 binders:





... after scanning: 283 searchable pdf files:



10

HETG Document Library



MIT KAVLI INSTITUTE

Technical details of grating facet fabrication, measurement, modeling, instrument assembly, test, requirements documents, meeting notes, ...

Items of historical interest...



HETG; Chandra Quarterly #56, 15 Nov 2023

Some Scientific Results Published in the Past 6 Months (1/2)

THE ASTROPHYSICAL JOURNAL, 956:65 (13pp), 2023 October 10 © 2023. The Author(s). Published by the American Astronomical Society. **OPENACCESS** https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aced49

Systematic Uncertainties of Atomic Data in Photoionization Modeling





Figure 3. (a) Close-up of the HEG (red) and MEG (blue) 10.5–11.0 Å spectra of the NGC 3783 observation 2090 fitted with a five-component warmabs model (black). (b) *C*-residuals for the baseline model. (c) Same data as in (a) but with the warmabs model modified by the additional Gaussian lines. (d) Additional optical depth $\Delta \tau$ that is added or removed from each bin by the Gaussian components. (e) *C*-residuals for the modified model. As shown here and described in Section 5.1, including additional Gaussians—equivalent to modifying *A*-values for the strongest 500 lines—leads only to minor to moderate improvement of the fit statistics and residuals.



Fitting plasma models to high-quality spectra is a crucial tool for deriving diagnostics about the physical contain various astrophysical sources. Despite decades of model development, this prescription often provide unsatisfying description of observational data. We explore some of the origins of the failure of fits of photoic plasma models to high-resolution X-ray spectra. In particular, we test whether systematic uncertaint underlying atomic data can account for data model discrepancies, and whether including model uncertaint during spectral fitting can provide statistically acceptable fits and reasonable parameter estimates. We fit Cha HETG spectra of NGC 3783 with the photoionized absorber model warmabs. We use the remaining data discrepancies to estimate the systematic uncertainties of bound-bound radiative rates for individual trans quantitatively. We then include these uncertainties into warmabs to return a total model uncertainty. We residual data model discrepancies which are due to systematic errors that cannot be accounted for solely

Abstract

we test whether systematic uncertainties in
 underlying atomic data can account for data model
 discrepancies, and whether including model
 uncertainties during spectral fitting can provide
 statistically acceptable fits and reasonable
 parameter estimates. We fit Chandra/ HETG
 spectra of NGC 3783 with the photoionized
 absorber model warmabs.

6. Conclusions and Outlook

We reanalyzed a set of archival Chandra/HETG observations of NGC 3783 and modeled the warm absorber in this source with the xstar-derived absorption model warmabs in order to characterize the quality of the photoionization model and the underlying atomic data, and to understand the remaining data model residuals that often lead to statistically

We conclude that inaccuracies of radiative
transition rates are not a major source of data
model discrepancies. Our fits to simulated spectra
further show that in the majority of practical cases of
currently available observational data, statistical
uncertainties dominate the accuracy to which plasma
parameters can be constrained.

HETG; Chandra Quarterly #56, 15 Nov 2023

Some Scientific Results Published in the Past 6 Months (2/2)

MIT KAVLI INSTITUTE

Monthly Notices of the ROYAL ASTRONOMICAL SOCIETY MNRAS 522, L66–L71 (2023) Advance Access publication 2023 March 25

https://doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slad040

A detailed analysis of X-ray emission-line velocities of Capella from over 20 yr of *Chandra*/HETG spectroscopy

E. Bozzo⁶.¹* D. P. Huenemoerder.² N. Produit⁶.¹ M. Falanga⁶.^{3,4} S. Paltani¹ and E. Costantini^{5,6}



Figure 1. Plot of the barycentred radial velocity measurements (green and blue points) obtained from all available *Chandral*/HETG observations of Capella (see Table 1). The blue points correspond to observations that were not reported before by 1SH06. The error bars for each radial velocity measurement are given at $l\sigma c.l.$ and are only statistical. The uncertainty on the phase for each green point includes the duration of the observation, as well as the uncertainties associated with the ephemerides. The black and red lines are the expected barycentred radial velocities calculated according to the latest Capella's orbital parameters published by Strassmeier et al. (2020). Uncertainties on these velocities were not included here as they are typically $\ll 1 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The phase 0 is assumed as the epoch of passage at the ascending node. The insert shows, for clarity, a zoom around the orbital phase 0.4 showing six observations closely overlapping in phase.



HETG; Chandra Quarterly #56, 15 Nov 2023



"The 13 new observations reported here for the first time strengthen some of the previous conclusions...

... more firmly establishes that Capella Aa is the dominant X-ray emitter

... an overall uncertainty for the averaged barycentered radial velocity that is of other order of ~20 km s⁻¹ (at 3σ c.l.).

... the stability of the instrument (and the accuracy of the performed in-flight calibrations) achieving now a baseline of over 22 yr."

