# Shutting down the central engine in photospheric models of gamma-ray bursts

Robert Mochkovitch (IAP)

#### The prompt emission





- duration :  $10^{-3} 10^3$  s
- diversity

• spectrum: broken power-law with  $E_{\rm p} \sim 0.1 - 1 \ {\rm MeV}$ 

## The prompt emission results from dissipation in a relativistic jet with $\Gamma > 100$

## Three possible sites



Pros and Cons for each site...

## Pros and Cons for each site...

# • internal shocks

**Pros**: Many aspects of GRB phenomenology recovered; OK with efficiency issue (Beniamini's talk)

**Cons**: Spectral shape; synchrotron spectra too broad (talks by van Eerten, Yu, poster by Axelsson) and too soft  $N(E) \propto E^{-3/2}$  in fast cooling regime (improved by IC; Bosnjak & Daigne, 2014) Shocks suppressed if ejecta is strongly magnetized

## magnetic reconnection

**Pros**: Natural in a magnetized ejecta

**Cons:** Phenomenology less explored (but see Benjamini & Granot, 2015 and next talk by O. Bromberg) Spectral shape (synchrotron + many emitters); continuous acceleration ?

# dissipative photosphere





#### Looking for tests to discriminate among models

The dissipation radius:  $R_{diss}$ 

- internal shocks:  $R_{IS} \approx 2\Gamma^{2}ct_{var} \rightarrow 2\Gamma^{2}ct_{w} \approx 610^{15}\Gamma_{2.5}^{2}t_{w} \text{ cm}$ • reconnection:  $R_{rec} \leq R_{IS} \quad \text{(large range of } R \text{ possible})$ • dissipative photosphere:  $R_{photo} \approx \frac{\kappa_{T} \dot{E}_{K}}{4\pi c^{3}\Gamma^{3}} f_{\pm} \approx 410^{12} \frac{\dot{E}_{53}}{\Gamma_{2.5}^{3}} f_{\pm} \text{ cm} \ll R_{IS}$
- $\rightarrow$  Observational constraints on  $R_{\rm diss}$



## A simple geometrical interpretation for the early steep decay

"high latitude emission" of the last flashing shell (Kumar & Panaitescu, 2000)



#### The early steep decay: an effective behavior of the central engine ?

Is it possible ? What does it tell us about the source extinction ?

- Observed behavior:  $L \propto \left(\frac{t}{t_0}\right)^{-3}$ ,  $E_p \propto L^{\alpha}$  with  $\alpha \sim 1/3$ • Define  $\mathcal{E}_{rad} = \left(\frac{L}{E}\right)$  radiative efficiency of subphotospheric heating  $\stackrel{\bullet}{(E \text{ injected power in jet})}$
- Compute the evolution of  $\Gamma$  and  $R_{\rm ph}$  that reproduce the observed behavior



$$R_{ph} \approx 510^{13} \varepsilon_{rad}^{-2/5} L_{52}^{1/10} \text{ cm}$$
  
 $\Gamma \approx 65 \varepsilon_{rad}^{-1/5} L_{52}^{3/10}$ 

Reasonable evolution: as *L* decreases by a factor 1000  $R_{\rm ph}$  decreases by 2 and  $\Gamma$  by 10

### Some questions and one interesting feature

## <u>Questions</u>

- (i) which sub-photospheric dissipation process ? ( $\mathcal{E}_{rad} \sim 0.1 1$ ) (should operate over a large range of luminosity)
- (ii) why is the ESD more regular than the prompt phase ?(why such a diversity of prompt light curves and a generic behavior for the ESD ?)

# • Photospheric models easily produce "Internal Plateaus"



#### **Summary**

- in photospheric models the simple geometric interpretation for the ESD does not work (if you like the geometric interpretation → (probably) forget about photospheric emission)
- the ESD must correspond to an effective behavior of the central engine possible → provides information on how the source shuts down but some difficult questions: dissipation process, variability
- search for tests of models is important and can provide guidelines to build new scenarios