The XMM-LSS/CDFS luminosity functions

Piero Ranalli, National Observatory of Athens & INAF-OABO



XMM/LSS

10 deg² x 10 ks; now part of the 5x larger XXL (see talk by M. Pierre)

flux limit at 10% area: $5 \times 10^{-15} \text{ erg/s/cm}^2$



XMM-CDFS covers an area similar to ECDFS and is a bit elongated because of different pointing coordinates in 2001 but area of highest exposure coincides with 4 Ms CDFS

always meant as a spectroscopic complement to Chandra-CDFS (see talk by C. Vignali) (XMM is background dominated, Chandra is still photon-limited at 4Ms)

407 but in hard bands (2-10, 5-10 keV) ECDFS the larger effective area still 381 allows to detect faint (~10-15 erg/s/cm2) CDFS 4M sources 348 304/1150 1149 280 339 objects in 2-10 keV band, 97% redshift completeness 201/1098 176 catalogue: Ranalli et al. 2013 189 186 photo-z from Hsu et al. 2014 85 (see her poster)

XMM/LSS: Numbers

only considering 2-10 keV detections:

2573 objects with hard X-ray flux, point-like 1846 with redshift (specz or photoz)

459 with spec-z (12 with only spec-z, no photo-z) 1834 with photo-z (1383 with only photo-z, no spec-z)

1520 (i.e. 82% of 1846) have X-ray/optical match probability > 95%

catalogue: Chiappetti et al. 2013 photo-z by N. Formanoit (Geneva)

XMM/LSS: Numbers

only considering 2-10 keV detections:

2573 objects with hard X-ray flux, point-like 1846 with redshift (specz or photoz)

459 with spec-z (12 with only spec-z, no photo-z) 1834 with photo-z (1383 with only photo-z, no spec-z)

1520 (i.e. 82% of 1846) have X-ray/optical match probability > 95%

Largest samples already used for LF determination:

```
Ueda+2014:
1791 AGN;

XMM-COSMOS:
826 AGN;

LaFranca+2005
508 AGN;

Ueda+2003:
247 AGN;

Yencho+2009:
782 AGN (spectro-z only, no N<sub>H</sub> correction)
```

(binned LF, following Page & Carrera)



(binned LF, following Page & Carrera)

photo-z considered with their probability density functions (PDFs)



Corrections for intrinsic absorption

based on soft/hard flux ratio

U=unabsorbed/absorbed flux ratio F=soft/hard flux ratio

F is in catalogue; we need U

relation can be derived assuming spectral model: absorbed powerlaw, various Γ and NH, on a grid of redshifts





Corrections for intrinsic absorption



the average luminosity is increased by a factor ${\sim}1.5$

How representative is the Burlon sample?

- complete sample, selected on hard X-rays from Swift/BAT => should favour flat spectra?
- compare with XMM-Atlas (very preliminary)
- in the near future, compare or use XXL 1000 AGN



NH determinations are sensitive to methodology and redshift:



0.65

this is the NH region which affects most the corrections

LSS CDFS



LSS CDFS both



LDDE model

LSS+CDFS



LDDE model



LDDE model



LSS+CDFS LSS CDFS





LDDE model



LDDE model

LSS

CDFS

5-10 keV Fotopoulou: 1.3-1.5



LDDE model

La Franca Ueda₁₀-3 z=2.50 z=3.50 z=1.75 Aird 10-4 10^{-5} 10^{-6} ×10⁻⁷ ر DydLog L +++++ 10⁻³ z=.25 z=.75 z=1.25 10 10^{-5} 10⁻⁶ 10-7 $310^{44}10^{45}$ 10⁴²10⁴³10⁴ 10⁴²10⁴³1 $10^{42}10^{43}10^{44}10^{45}$ 4410^{45} L_{y} (erg/s)

there seems to be an excess of luminous AGN at medium z

but this is strongly dependent on the absorption corrections

LDDE model



LDDE model

LSS

CDFS



A note on software

The LF code will be released when the paper is submitted. The aim is to produce a general-purpose package including:

- a sample corrector, applying photoz-pdf and NH corrections
- a binned LF integrator, following the Page&Carrera method modified to work on the corrected samples
- a likelihood function, to be used in:
 - a maximum-likelihood fitter using Minuit
 - a Bayesian integrator using MultiNest

Everything is in OO Fortran 2008!

See my poster about this and other useful programmes!



Conclusions

- XMM-CDFS is the deepest XMM survey, at 3 Ms, providing good quality spectroscopy and clean samples of 2—10 and 5—10 keV sources, with 97% redshift completeness;
- XMM-LSS is among the widest area XMM surveys, at 11 deg², but redshift completeness among reliable optical counterparts is ~65%
- LF was determined with different methods:
 - binned
 - ML (not shown today)
 - Bayesian
- corrections for absorption are important, but the robustness of the method must be checked (NH/Gamma degeneracy, redshift, fitting method...)
- CDFS seems to require lower L*, lower zcut, flatter gamma1