Searching for Faraday Complexity in the ATCA Beta Test Fields

A Brief Overview & Preliminary Results

Craig Anderson SIfA |CASS

FACULTY OF SCIENCE

Collaborators: Bryan Gaensler (USYD) Ilana Feain (CASS) Thomas Franzen (CASS)







Motivation: Dodging The Spatial Resolution Constraint





One Application: AGN Science

- Magnetic processes dominate AGN phenomenology
 - behaviour of accretion disks
 - jet launching and collimation
 - particle acceleration
 - cluster B field seeding



- > Typically studied with VLBI
 - Highly effective but limited poor survey capability & small bandwidth coverage
- Imagine we had a 'super-resolution' technique for studying B fields > a complimentary approach to studying critical AGN processes.
 - >> RM Synthesis gives us that capability.





Refresher: Faraday Effect



- The *Faraday Effect* > Polarisation angle of EM radiation rotated as a linear function of wavelength-squared (Eqn. 1)

- Characterised by the '<u>Rotation Measure</u>', or '<u>Faraday Depth</u>' > Measure of the 'depth' of magnetic field from which radiation has emanated.



Refresher: RM Synthesis

RM Synthesis



- Gives 'Faraday Dispersion Function' – the intensity of polarised emission emanating from each Faraday Depth.

- Resolves emission spectrally rather than spatially!





ATCA Beta Test Fields

Two 30 degree² mosaiced fields located in Circinus & Fornax observed with ATCA. My work currently focuses on Fornax field only.





ATCA Beta Test Fields

- 1) Imaging: linear mosaics of 8 MHz MFS images through entire band.
- 2) Source finding (T. Franzen)
- 3) Stokes I, Q, U, QU_{noise} extraction across full band (5x5 boxed extraction)
- 4) RM synthesis & rmclean using Q/I and U/I (decouples SI effects)
- 5) Sources classified as simple or complex/structured based on second moment ('spread') of clean-component distribution in Faraday Depth space (algorithm: S. Brown)



Off-axis instrumental pol a major concern > several checks performed to date with available data, but more characterisation work to do.



Initial breakdown of Faraday structure classifications (probably too simplistic):

- 77% effectively unpolarised
- ~18% polarised with simple Faraday structure (to first order)
- ~5% polarised with complexity apparent in Faraday structure





Example: A 'Simple' Source

Example of a source classified as 'simple':





Example: A Complex Source

Example of a source classified as complex:





Example: A Complex Source



11



Example: Another Complex Source

Another example of a source classified as complex:





Example: Another Complex Source





How do we Interpret Complex FDFs?





Speculative Interpretation of Example





Just One Possibility for Interpretation of an Example...





- > Further checks of off-axis instrumental polarisation effects
- > Further analysis of data to shore up Faraday simple/complex classifications
- > Attempt to identify different types of FDF complexity
- > Spectral index of sources where is the emission coming from?
- Attempts to model Q and U behaviour with constructed FDFs and/or analytic models of spectropolarimetric behaviour
- More observations! Targeted radio observations of ~30 individual complex objects, 1-9 GHz (not drawn from Beta obs at this stage). Multi-wavelength obs.



Thankyou

Thankyou for your time. Questions?



Median Fractional Pol vs. Dist. From Pointing Centre





Fractional Pol vs. Dist. From Pointing Centre

