

Status of XMM-Newton cross-calibration using SASv13.5

Martin Stuhlinger EPIC BOC, MPE 26.03.2014

European Space Agency



> All EPICs in FF mode without pile-up.





> All EPICs in FF mode with pile-up (10 arcsec).





> All EPICs in SW mode without pile-up.





All EPIC in SW mode with increasing pile-up: H1426+428, 3C273, PKS2155-304





All EPIC in SW mode with increasing pile-up: H1426+428, 3C273, PKS2155-304





All EPIC in SW mode with increasing pile-up: H1426+428, 3C273, PKS2155-304



Examples: Galaxy clusters



> FF mode annuli. Single mekal model.

kT ~ 7.1 keV ► A2029: ► A262: kT ~ 2.3 keV





European Space Agency

Example: SNR 1E0102.2-7219





EPIC-MOS contamination model: RXJ1856





EPIC-MOS contamination model: XCAL AGN





- Low energy flux distributions of EPIC-pn and EPIC-MOS2 more consistent, MOS2 distribution more extended.
- > EPIC-MOS1 fluxes closer as well, still few percent below the other two EPICs.

Flux distributions



Again XSPEC statistics: C-stat (un-binned) versus chi²-statistic (min 25 binned)



Summary



- EPIC-MOS contamination model improved consistence between all instruments at low energies. Current level might need a revisal.
- EPIC-MOS return about 5-7% higher fluxes compared to EPIC-pn at all energies above 0.5 keV, less at Si/Au-edge band.
- EPIC-pn show line shifts to higher energies in most recent observations (effect of long term CTI model).

Discussion opened again:

- Selection of XSPEC statistics changes the cross-calibration interpretation between EPIC and RGS:
 - C-statistics (background treatment): agreement of RGS and EPIC-pn above ~0.5 keV, below RGS returns higher fluxes.
 - Chi²-statistics (weighting bias): agreement of RGS and EPIC below ~0.5 keV, above RGS returns lower fluxes.
- C-statistics indicate too large spread (~15%) between EPIC-pn and EPIC-MOS. We don't find this in the data/model ratios.