Precision Scintillation Distance Measurements

Siqi Liu[1,3]⋆, Ue-Li Pen[1,2]†, J-P Macquart, Walter Brisken, Adam Deller

[1] *Canadian Institute for Theoretical Astrophysics, University of Toronto, M5S 3H8 Ontario, Canada*
[2] *Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Program in Cosmology and Gravitation*
[3] *Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Toronto, M5S 3H8, Ontario, Canada*

25 March 2015

ABSTRACT
We show how interstellar scintillations, combined with VLBI measurements, can be used to measure pulsar distances. Two lensing screens are needed. We apply the technique to archival data on PSR B0834+06. Rough distance estimates, consistent with direct parallax measurements, are obtained. If observations over a two week period were available at that epoch, we anticipate a 1% distance determination.

With longer ground-based baselines and wider frequency coverage, we speculate that distance determination perhaps as accurate as 0.1% could be possible. This would enable coherent pulsar gravitational wave timing and imaging.

Key words: Pulsar

1 INTRODUCTION

Pulsars have long provided a rich source of astrophysical information due to their compact emission and predictable timing. One of the weakest measurements for most pulsars is their direct geometric distance. For some pulsars, timing parallax or VLBI parallax has resulted in direct distance determinations. For most pulsars, the distance is a major uncertainty for precision timing interpretations, including mass, moment of inertia, and gravitational wave direction(Boyle & Pen 2012).

Direct VLBI observation of PSR B0834+06 shows multiple images lensed by the interstellar plasma. Combining the angular positions and scintillation delays, the authors published the derived effective distance(Brisken et al. 2010) of approximately 1168±23 pc. This represents a precise measurement compared to all other attempts to derive distances to this pulsar. This effective distance is the harmonic sum (twice the harmonic mean) of pulsar-screen and earth-screen distances, and does not allow a separate determination of the individual distances.

A second lensing screen breaks the degeneracy.

2 LENSING

3 B0834+06

Our analysis is based on the reduced apex catalog from Brisken et al. (2010). Each identified apex includes a delay, delay rate, RA and Dec, one for each of 4 frequency bands.

⋆ E-mail: sqliu@cita.utoronto.ca
† E-mail: pen@cita.utoronto.ca

[h]

Differential Frequency f_D(mHz)	sample standard deviation_fD(mHz)	Time delay tau(ms)	sample standard deviation_tau(ms)
-35.06	0.52	0.95	0.002
-38.31	0.64	0.976	0.0009
-40.17	0.55	1.005	0.0079
-41.27	0.54	1.037	0.003
-43.08	0.44	1.066	0.005

Table 1. 1ms apex position

[h]

Differential frequency f_D (mHz)	sigma_fD	tau(ms)	sigma_tau (ms)
-12.94	0.19	0.0845	0.0005
-16.8	0.28	0.14125	0.00085
-18.92	0.23	0.188	0.002
-20.4	0.49	0.222	0.003
-21.17	0.61	0.236	0.002
-22.32	0.47	0.2633	0.0003
-24.63	0.4	0.3265	0.0025
-24.94	0.44	0.33775	0.00025
-26.09	0.36	0.37425	0.00063

We mapped a total of 9 apexes from the 0.4ms cluster, and 5 from the 1ms cluster, across the 4 frequency bands. This results in an estimate for the mean value, and standard deviation. These are listed in Table **??**. A least squares effective distance results in $D_e^M = 1071 \pm 2.8$ for the main 0.4ms cluster and $D_e^S = 1243 \pm 64.1$ for the secondary 1ms cluster. This seems to indicate that the secondary screen is closer to the pulsar.

4 LENS SOLUTION

In order to interpret the data, we adopt the lensing model of Pen & Levin (2014). In the absence of a lens model, the

fringe rate, delay and angular position cannot be uniquely related. In this model, the lensing is due to projected fold caustics of a thin sheet closely aligned to the line of sight.

5 DISCUSSION

The lens solution appears consistent with the premise of the inclined sheet lensing model(Pen & Levin 2014). The secondary lens only images a subset of the primary lens images. This could happen if the secondary lens screen is just under the critical inclination angle, such that only $3-\sigma$ waves lead to a fold caustic. If the primary lens were at a critical angle, the chance of encountering a somewhat less inclined system is of order unity.

More surprising is the absence of a single deflection image of the pulsar, which is expected at position E. This could happen if the maximum deflection angle is just below critical, such that only rays on the appropriately aligned double deflection can form images. This scenario predicts that at lower frequencies, or a few days earlier in time, the pulsar should be seen at position E.

6 POSSIBLE IMPROVEMENTS

We discuss several strategies which can improve on the solution accuracy. The single biggest improvement would be to monitor over a week, when the pulsar crosses each individual lens, including both lensing systems.

Angular resolution can be improved using longer baselines, for example adding a GMRT-GBT baseline doubles the resolution. Observing at multiple frequencies over a longer period allows for a more precise measurement: when the pulsar is between two lenses, the deflection angle is small, and one expects to see the lensing at higher frequency, where the resolution is higher, and distances between lenses positions can be measured to much higher accuracy.

Holographic techniques(Walker et al. 2008; Pen et al. 2014) may be able to measure delays, fringe rates, and VLBI positions sbstantially more accurately. Combining these techniques, the interstellar lensing could conceivably achieve distance measurements an order of magnitude better than the current published effective distance errors. This could bring most pulsar timing array targets into the coherent timing regime, enabling arc minute localization of gravitational wave sources, lifting any potential source confusion.

7 CONCLUSIONS

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Boyle L., Pen U.-L., 2012, Phys. Rev. D, 86, 124028

Brisken W. F., Macquart J.-P., Gao J. J., Rickett B. J., Coles W. A., Deller A. T., Tingay S. J., West C. J., 2010, ApJ, 708, 232

Pen U.-L., Levin Y., 2014, MNRAS, 442, 3338

Pen U.-L., Macquart J.-P., Deller A. T., Brisken W., 2014, MNRAS, 440, L36

Walker M. A., Koopmans L. V. E., Stinebring D. R., van Straten W., 2008, MNRAS, 388, 1214