GRB 130310A: very high peak energy and thermal emission
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Abstract

Note: Our editorial staff made changes to the language in your article in order to correct spelling and grammar errors and to make the meaning clear to the reader according to our interpretation. Please carefully read the edited text and if some editorial change does not agree with your intended meaning, please indicate this. The special GRB 130310A was observed by Fermi Gamma-Ray Burst Monitor and Large Area Telescope, with $T_{90} \sim 2.4$ s. With a combination of a Band function and a blackbody (BB) function, the time-resolved spectral analysis of GRB 130310A presented confirmed that there is a sub-dominant thermal component in the early period (e.g., $T_0 + [4.03 - 4.14]$ s) spectrum with a blackbody temperature ($kT$) being $\sim 7 \sim 5$ keV, which can be interpreted as photosphere emission. The precursor of GRB 130310A can be well fitted well with a BB component with $kT \sim 45$ keV, which is higher than those of the main burst. It suggests that the radiation of GRB 130310A is in transition from thermal to non-thermal. Such a transition is an indication of the change in jet composition from a fireball to a Poynting-flux-dominated jet. A very high peak energy is obtained in the first time bin, with the peak energy $E_p$ of the Band component for Band+BB and Band model are being $\sim 8.5 \sim 5.2$ MeV and $\sim 11.1 \sim 7.4$ MeV, respectively. Afterwards, the $E_p$ drops to $\sim 1$ MeV. The $E_p$ evolution patterns with respect to the pulses in the GRB 130310A light curves show a hard-to-soft evolution. The interpretation of the high peak energy $E_p$ within the photosphere and internal shock model is difficult. It also suggests that at least for some bursts, the Band component must invoke a non-thermal origin in the optically thin region of a GRB outflow. Assuming the redshift is $z \sim 0.1 \sim 8$, the radius of the jet base $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm to allow $(1 + \sigma_{15}) > 1$ in line with the calculation results of the magnetization parameter at $\sim 10^{15}$ cm ($\sigma_{15}$). Do you mean However, the value of $(1 + \sigma_{15})$ is $\sim 1$ in the zone $z$ around 3 for $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm, suggesting the non-excluded possibility that the origin is from ICMART with a low value? Please confirm if you agree with these changes. The photosphere-internal shock seems capable of interpreting the high peak energy, which requires the electron Lorentz factor $\gamma_e \sim 60$ and $\epsilon_e \sim 0.06$.

Key words: gamma rays bursts: general — gamma-ray burst: individual (GRB 130310A) — radiation mechanisms: thermal — radiation mechanisms: non-thermal

1 INTRODUCTION

Gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) are the most powerful electromagnetic explosions in the Universe (e.g., Kumar & Zhang 2015; Zhang 2018). Multi-wavelength observations reveal at least two types of GRBs, among which one has typical long durations, believed to be deaths of some special massive stars (e.g., Narayan et al. 1992; Woosley 1993; MacFadyen & Woosley 1999; Berger et al. 2005; Tanvir et al. 2005; Fruchter et al. 2006; Zhang 2006) and the other one has typical short durations, associated with compact objects such as neutrons stars and black holes (e.g., Paczynski 1986; Eichler et al. 1989; Paczynski 1991; Abbott et al. 2017). According to the standard model, the broadband afterglow stems from the external shock as the fireball is decelerated by the ambient medium (e.g., Mészáros & Rees 1997; Sari et al. 1998; Wang et al. 2015), and the prompt gamma-ray emission is due to some internal dissipation processes.
The origin of gamma-ray burst (GRBs) prompt emission remains still not fully understood after more than 40 years of observations and remains an open question. Many GRB prompt emission models have been discussed, e.g., fireball internal shock model (e.g., Rees & Meszaros 1994; Kobayashi et al. 1997; Mészáros & Rees 2000; Daigne & Mochkovitch 1998), magnetized engine-internal shock model (e.g., Bošnjak et al. 2009; Zhang & Pe’er 2009; Daigne et al. 2011; Hascoët et al. 2013), dissipative photosphere model (e.g., Thompson 1994; Ghisellini et al. 2007; Rees & Mészáros 2005; Giannios 2008a; Beloborodov 2010; Ioka 2010; Lazzati et al. 2010; Veres et al. 2012; Bégué & Pe’er 2015), and internal collision-induced magnetic reconnection and turbulence (ICMART) model (Zhang & Yan 2011). Besides in addition, quasi-thermal (blackbody (BB) component) and non-thermal component emission have been predicted by models in spectra of GRBs (e.g., Mészáros & Rees 2000; Zhang & Mészáros 2002; Daigne & Mochkovitch 2002; Ramírez-Ruiz et al. 2002; Pe’er et al. 2006; Ghisellini et al. 2007; Pe’er et al. 2012; Toma et al. 2011; Zhang & Yan 2011; Piro et al. 2014; Nakar & Piran 2017; Pe’er & Ryde 2017).

Most observational spectra are consistent with a non-dissipative photosphere to reach the observed peak energy of the Band function such as GRB 100724B (Guiriec et al. 2011), GRB 110721A (Axelsson et al. 2012; Zhang et al. 2012), GRB 120323A (Guiriec et al. 2013) and GRB 141207A (Arimoto et al. 2016). Do you mean Most of GRBs exhibit a phenomenon such that their thermal components are essentially suppressed, e.g., spectra of GRB 080916C can be well described by the Band function in five different time bins over 6 – 7 orders of magnitude in energy (Abdo et al. 2009; Zhang & Yan 2011).? Please confirm if you agree with these changes.

In view of the fact that the broadening mechanism incorporates both physical broadening (Compton upscattering of the seed thermal photons) and geometric broadening (the effect of equal-arrival-time volume), the Band function itself is argued to possibly be emission from a dissipative photosphere (e.g., Rees & Mészáros 2005; Giannios 2008b; Pe’er 2008; Giannios 2012; Beloborodov 2010; Ioka 2010; Lazzati & Begelman 2010; Pe’er & Ryde 2011; Vurm et al. 2011; Lundman et al. 2013; Bégué & Pe’er 2015; Meng et al. 2018; Liu et al. 2018; Parsonat et al. 2018; Ryde et al. 2019; Bhattacharya & Kumar 2020). Do you mean This model argues purports that photosphere emission has a high efficiency and the photosphere temperature could reach above MeV, which is in the range of the observed $E_p$ distribution. The photosphere model has also been argued to be able to interpret the Amati relation and other correlations (e.g., Amati et al. 2002; Fan et al. 2012; Giannios 2012; Ito et al. 2019). There is one case that is in which Fermi observations of GRB 110721A have revealed an unusually high peak energy $E_p \sim 15$ MeV at the early epochs that exceeds the “death line” of the photosphere emission (Zhang et al. 2012), signifying that the thermal origin of $E_p$ is ruled out in this burst, since it exceeds the maximum temperature for a non-dissipative photosphere to reach the observed luminosity (Zhang et al. 2012; Veres et al. 2012). The question of whether the dominant radiation mechanism is quasi-thermal or non-thermal remains a debate in the GRB community (e.g., Zhang 2014), which is also relevant to the origin of the “Band” spectral component observed in most GRBs, that is the dominant spectral component of GRB prompt emission. The corresponding answer is of great importance to the research on other open questions in the physics of the GRB, e.g., central engine, jet composition, and energy dissipation mechanisms (e.g., Zhang 2011, 2015; Pe’er 2015; Dai, Daigne & Mészáros 2017).? Please confirm if you agree with these changes.

A special Fermi GRB 130310A is a case that is similar to the GRB 110721A, with a very high peak energy $E_p$ of the Band function and a sub-dominant thermal component in the early period spectrum. In this paper, we present an analysis of a special GRB 130310A. Details
the Fermi observation, as well as the analysis of time-intergrated and time-resolved spectra, are presented described in Section 2. The thermal emission of GRB 130310A is presented in Section 3. The very high $E_{p}$ and its possible physical interpretations are reported on in Section 4. The conclusion and discussion are presented provided in Section 5. Throughout the paper, a concordance cosmology with parameters $H_0 = 71 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_M = 0.30$; and $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.70$ is considered, $F \propto t^{-\beta}$ is adopted. Moreover, the convention $Q = 10^5 Q_n$ is adopted for cgs units.

2 OBSERVATIONS AND ANALYSIS

2.1 Observations and Data Reduction

Do you mean GRB 130310A was triggered recorded (trigger 384638984/130310840) by Fermi Gamma-Ray Burst Monitor (GBM) on 2013 March 10, 2013 at 20:09:41.50 UT (defined as $T_0$; UT dates are used throughout this paper) with $T_{90} \sim 2.4$ s (50-300 keV) (Xiong & Chaplin 2013).? Please confirm if you agree with these changes. It was detected by the Fermi/Large Area Telescope (LAT), on 2013 March 10, 2013 at 20:09:44 UT, about 3 s after the Fermi/GBM trigger time (Guiriec et al. 2013). Do you mean Also, GBM 130310A has been observed by Konus-Wind (Golenetskii et al. 2013), Suzaku/WAM (Kawano et al. 2013), INTEGRAL/SPICAS, MESSENGER/GRNS, and Mars Odyssey/HEND (Golenetskii et al. 2013), with no doubt certainly Swift/XRT or optical candidate detected (Sbarufatti et al. 2013; Butler et al. 2013; Cucchiara et al. 2013).? Note: It is difficult for our editorial staff to understand your meaning in this sentence. If our interpretation of your meaning is not correct, please explain your meaning more clearly.

We downloaded the GBM and LAT data of GRB 130310A from the public science support center at the official Fermi web site. GBM has 12 sodium iodide (NaI) scintillation detectors covering energy from 8 keV to 800 keV and two bismuth germanate (BGO) scintillation detectors sensitive to higher energies between 200 keV and 40 MeV (Meegan et al. 2009). There are three different types of signals from Fermi-GBM detectors. CTIME, CSPEC and TTE. We extract the time-intergrated and time-resolved spectra from the TTE data files. The background spectra of the GBM data are extracted from the CSPEC format data with user-defined intervals before and after the prompt emission phase. Two types of LAT data are available, the LAT low-energy (LLR) data in the 20 MeV–1 GeV band and the high-energy LAT data in the 100 MeV–300 GeV band, which were reduced utilizing the gtBurst package and the PTRANSIENT 020E response function. The event energy flux (8-1000 keV) from Fermi/GBM is $1.02 \pm 0.21 \times 10^{-5}$ erg cm$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ in the time-intergrated spectrum. With the gtBurst package, we perform spectral analysis using data from the NaI, NaIc and the BGO 1 detectors. Also, the LLE data are included. As are shown displayed in Figure 1, the light curves of GRB 130310A consist of two pulses and a precursor (Xiong & Chaplin 2013).

1 http://legacy.gsfc.nasa.gov/fermi/data/
2 The continuous time (CTIME) data include eight energy channels and have a finer time resolution of 64 ms. The continuous spectroscopy (CSPEC) data include 128 energy channels, and a time resolution of 1.024 s. The time-tagged event (TTE) data consist of individual detector events, each tagged with arrival time, energy (128 channels), and detector number.

3 http://sourceforge.net/projects/gtburst/
2.2 Spectral Analysis

We firstly employed the typical empirical Band function to fit *Fermi* data of GRB 130310A. The Band function (Band et al. 1993) is described as a smoothly broken power law,

\[
N_{\text{Band}}(E) = \begin{cases} 
A_1 \left( \frac{E}{100 \text{ keV}} \right)^{\alpha} \exp\left( -\frac{E}{E_0} \right), & (E < (\alpha - 3) E_0) \\
A_1 \left( \frac{E}{100 \text{ keV}} \right)^{\beta} \exp\left( \frac{E - (\alpha - 3) E_0}{kT} \right), & (E \geq (\alpha - 3) E_0)
\end{cases}
\]

where \(A_1\) is the normalization of the Band spectrum, \(\alpha\) and \(\beta\) are the low- and high-energy photon spectral indices, respectively; \(E\) is the observational photon energy; \(E_0\) is the break energy of the spectrum; the peak energy \((E_p)\) of the spectrum is related to \(E_0\) through \(E_p = (2 + \alpha)E_0\). The above fitting results of GRB 130310A are listed in Table 1. The time-integrated spectrum \((T_0 + [4.03 - 5.0] \text{ s})\) can be fitted with the Band function, with \(E_p = 2446.2 \pm 226.6 \text{ keV}\), \(\alpha = -1.03 \pm 0.01\), \(\beta = -2.58 \pm 0.09\) and \(P_{\text{GSTAT}}/dof = 454/391\) (as shown plotted in Fig. 2).

**Do you mean** To investigate the properties of time-resolved spectra, we divided the spectrum into four slices, e.g., Slice a \((T_0 + [4.03 - 4.14] \text{ s})\), Slice b \((T_0 + [4.14 - 4.23] \text{ s})\), Slice c \((T_0 + [4.23 - 4.45] \text{ s})\) and Slice d \((T_0 + [4.45 - 5.0] \text{ s})\). In terms of the data of time-resolved spectra, a promising interpretation is to have a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) >35 in each time-bin. **Note:** It is difficult for our editorial staff to understand your meaning in this sentence. If your interpretation of your meaning is not correct, please explain your meaning more clearly.

The analysis of time-resolved spectral results shows a noticeable feature in GRB 130310A in that a considerably high peak energy \(E_p = 92650 \pm 1380.4 \text{ keV}\) is obtained in the first slice a, with \(\alpha = -1.15 \pm 0.02\), \(\beta = -3.69 \pm 2.77\) and \(P_{\text{GSTAT}}/dof = 434/391\). Then, the \(E_p\) declines very fast, with the values of \(E_p = 1656.2 \pm 257.8\) and \(888.1 \pm 133.1 \text{ keV}\) for Slice b and c, respectively. For the second pulse (Slice d), the peak energy is \(E_p = 1076.3 \pm 272.4 \text{ keV}\), with \(\alpha = -1.03 \pm 0.01\), \(\beta = -2.84 \pm 0.67\) and \(P_{\text{GSTAT}}/dof = 393/346\).

A thermal component is invoked to describe the fireball photosphere emission (e.g., Rees & Mészáros 2005; Giannios 2008b; Beloborodov 2010). **Do you mean** A sub-dominant thermal component has been found in some cases, e.g., GRB 110721A, 100724B, and 120323A. **Please confirm if you agree with these changes.** Besides, we also try to test if there is thermal emission for the GRB 130310A, with a Band function plus a *Blackbody* function (Band + BB). The *Blackbody* function can be described as,

\[
N_{\text{BB}}(E) = \frac{A_2 \times 8.0525E^2dE}{(kT)^4(e^{E/kT}) - 1},
\]

where \(A_2\) is the normalization of the *Blackbody* spectrum and \(kT\) is the *Blackbody* temperature. The Band + BB has more free parameters than the Band model. A tool for model selection (e.g., Kass & Raftery 1995; Wei et al. 2016; Li et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2018), the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC), prefers the model with the lowest BIC value. If \(\Delta\text{BIC} = 2 - 6\) \((\Delta\text{BIC}=\text{BIC}_1-\text{BIC}_2)\), where the subscript represents different models, it represents strong evidence for improvement in model 2; if \(\Delta\text{BIC} = 6 - 10\), it represents strong evidence for model 2; if \(\Delta\text{BIC} > 10\), it represents very strong evidence for model 2. The results are shown in Table 1. By comparing their BIC, we found that Slice a can be well fitted with the Band+BB model (as shown depicted in Fig. 2 and Fig. 3), with \(\Delta\text{BIC} = 53\). In this slice, a relatively lower \(kT\) value is \(6.2 \pm 0.5 \text{ keV}\) and a high Band peak energy value is \(7376.2 \pm 947.8 \text{ keV}\). The results of \(\Delta\text{BIC}\) for other slices and time-integrated spectra suggest that the Band model is more favored. There are no obvious spectral lags \\(\tau\) found in GRB 130310A.

Since the spectral evolution is initially very rapid in the Slice a, we adjust the SNR > 20 to provide higher temporal resolution time bins, to further investigate the evolution of the Band/BB component. As the burst is very bright, we can divide the first time bin (Slice a) into three. The results (as listed in Table 1) affirm that there also exist the features of very high \(E_p\) ~ 11.1 MeV and a sub-dominant thermal component. The peak energy \(E_p\) of the Band component for the Band+BB and Band model is ~ 8.5 ~ 5.2 MeV and ~ 11.1 ~ 7.4 MeV. The \(kT\) value varies from 7.1 to 5.0 keV.

Furthermore, we also try to do the spectral fitting of the precursor of GRB 130310A (Slice e in Fig. 1). The best fitting parameters of the Band function model are \(\alpha = -0.22\) and \(\beta = -1.73 \pm 0.33\) with \(P_{\text{GSTAT}}/dof = 412/346\). Our results show that the \(\alpha\) of the precursor of GRB 190109A is significantly harder than the typical value \(\alpha \sim 1\) (e.g., Preece et al. 2000; Zhang & Yan 2011; Nava et al. 2011; Bosnjak et al. 2013). The \(\alpha\) value of Slice e is also harder than those predicted by the synchrotron regime of the fast cooling case \((\alpha = -3/2)\) and the slow cooling case \((\alpha = -2/3)\), also called the synchrotron line of death (e.g., Preece et al. 1998). According to some GRBs (e.g., GRB 090902B), the related spectral width is found to be very narrow, suggesting the probable existence of a quasi-thermal component. Then we also fit the precursor with a BB function. The best fitting parameters of the BB model are \(kT = 45.4 \pm 7.0 \text{ keV}\) and \(P_{\text{GSTAT}}/dof = 418/348\). Comparing the BIC between Band and BB model, we found that the BB model is more stronger than the Band
model in the Slice e, with ΔBIC = 7.1 (as shown displayed in Fig. 4 and Table 1).

3 THE THERMAL EMISSION IN THE GRB 130310A

The results of spectral analysis indicate the existence of thermal emission during the early period, e.g., Slice a. Do you mean Compared with BIC, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) (Akaike 1974) is relatively loose, which and can also be applied to their astronomy (e.g., Burnham & Anderson 2002; Liddle 2004, 2007; Tan & Biswas 2012; Wei et al. 2013; Melia & Maier 2013)? Please confirm if you agree with these changes. If the AIC is utilized to compare the fitting results between the Band and Band+BB models, thermal emission seems to be not completely ruled out in Slice b, with blackbody temperature \( kT \sim 3 \text{ keV} \). Do you mean Possibly, the reasons lie in that the thermal emission is weak and the lower BB temperature which could not satisfy the BIC? Note: It is difficult for our editorial staff to understand your meaning in this sentence. If our interpretation of your meaning is not correct, please explain your meaning more clearly. Although the AIC is not as strict as the BIC, results from the AIC can be employed to explore the physical properties of the GRB photosphere. It is interesting that the precursor can be well fitted well by a pure BB model, with a higher \( kT \) value than those of the main burst. It suggests that the radiation of GRB 130310A is in transition from thermal to non-thermal. In the precursor, the pure BB component suggests that the jet composition has a hot fireball origin. In the main burst, it consists of a sub-dominant thermal component and a dominant synchrotron component (Poynting-flux-dominated), suggesting a likely hybrid jet composition. Such a transition is an indication of the change in jet composition from a fireball to a Poynting-flux-dominated jet.

The jet composition of GRBs is suggested to be diverse (e.g., Zhang & Yan 2011; Gao & Zhang 2015), for the various spectral behaviors of GRB prompt emission may be concerned with disparate \( \sigma_0 \) values at the central engine, where \( \sigma_0 \) represents the ratio between Poynting flux and matter flux at the central engine. There are three types: the first one is very small \( \sigma_0 \) \( (\sigma_0 \ll 1) \), with the observed spectrum dominated by the photosphere emission component (e.g. in GRB 090902B); the second one is moderately high \( \sigma_0 \), with the suppressed thermal emission of sub-dominant photosphere emission component in the observed spectrum (e.g., in GRB 110721A, GRB 120323A); the last one has extremely high \( \sigma_0 \), with the completely suppressed photosphere component, and
4 THE VERY HIGH PEAK ENERGY IN GRB 130310A AND POSSIBLE PHYSICAL IMPLICATION

As was mentioned in Section 2.2, the very high peak energy is obtained in the first time bin (Slice a, $T_0 + [4.03 - 4.14]$ s). Here the peak energy of the Band component for Band+BB and Band model is $\sim 8.5 \sim 5.2$ MeV and $\sim 11.1 \sim 7.4$ MeV, respectively. After the first time bin, the $E_p$ drops to $1$ MeV. In regards to $E_p$ evolution patterns with respect to the pulses in the light curves, they seem to show hard-to-soft evolution and intensity tracking in the first pulse ($T_0 + [4.03 - 4.45]$ s) and the second pulse ($T_0 + [4.45 - 5.0]$ s), respectively (as shown depicted in Fig. 8). Previous research suggests that the $E_p$ evolution behavior of the second pulse with intensity-tracking may be generated by the superposition of two hard-to-soft pulses (Lu et al. 2012; Hakkila & Preece 2011). We also present the best-fit $\nu F_\nu$ model curves in different time intervals in Figure 3. The evolution of the spectral shape of the Band component shows a similar $\alpha$ value to that of gradually shallowing $\beta$, which reflects extremely high similarity to the result from Lu et al. (2012) in that the higher $E_p$ may be the superimposed spectrum. This

the observed spectrum dominated by the non-thermal Band component. GRB 130310A is similar to GRB 110721A, which has been suggested to belong to the second type. Following a hybrid photosphere emission model of Gao & Zhang (2015), we derive the parameters of the photosphere, e.g., the radius of the photosphere $r_{ph}$, the Lorentz factor of the photosphere $\Gamma_{ph}$, the magnetization parameter at the photosphere $\sigma_{ph}$, as well as the dimensionless entropy of hot fireball component $\eta$ and $\sigma_0$. Assuming the radius of the jet base is $r_0 \sim 10^7 \sim 10^9$ cm and redshift is $z \sim 0.1 \sim 8$, the calculation results of GRB 130310A are shown depicted in Figures 5–7. For $r_0 \sim 10^7$ cm in the first time bin, the value of $(1+\sigma_{ph})$ is $[1.2, 8.7]$; the value of $\eta$ is $[114.4, 778.6]$; the value of $r_{ph}$ is $[3.13 \times 10^{12}, 1.22 \times 10^{14}]$ cm; the value of $\Gamma_{ph}$ is $[118.8, 1246.7]$; the value of $(1+\sigma_{ph})$ is $\sim 1$. Concerning $r_0 \sim 10^8$ cm in the first time bin, the value of $(1+\sigma_{0})$ is $[5.4, 40.5]$; the value of $\eta$ is $[2.5, 167.8]$; the value of $r_{ph}$ is $[3.13 \times 10^{12}, 1.22 \times 10^{14}]$ cm; the value of $\Gamma_{ph}$ is $[97.7, 1246.7]$; the value of $(1+\sigma_{ph})$ is $\sim 1$. For $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm in the first time bin, the value of $(1+\sigma_{0})$ is $[25.0, 96.8]$; the value of $\eta$ is $[3.1, 103.8]$; the value of $r_{ph}$ is $[1.65 \times 10^{12}, 7.04 \times 10^{13}]$ cm; the value of $\Gamma_{ph}$ is $[54.9, 877.0]$; the value of $(1+\sigma_{ph})$ is $[3.3, 14.1]$. As mentioned in this section, while the AIC is less strict than the BIC, results from the former can be used to probe the physical properties of the GRB photosphere, suggesting that a thermal component could not be ruled out in the second time bin as well. The derived $(1+\sigma_{ph})$ increases with time from the first to the second time bin, which is consistent with the expectation of some central engine models (e.g., Metzger et al. 2011; Gao & Zhang 2015; Lei et al. 2017). For photosphere emission in the precursor, concerning $r_0 \sim 10^7$ cm, the values of $\eta$, $r_{ph}$ and $\Gamma_{ph}$ are $[211.9, 3662.2], [1.64 \times 10^{10}, 4.65 \times 10^{11}]$ cm and $[69.5, 729.4]$, respectively.
demonstrated that the $E_p$ evolution patterns are dominated by hard-to-soft evolution in the global light curves of GRB 130310A, and the Band component should share an identical physical origin in different epochs.

We try to test the high peak energy $E_p$ in disparate GRB models, e.g., non-photosphere, dissipative photosphere, ICMART, internal shock and photosphere-internal shock.

- We first assume that a GRB spectrum is dominated by the photosphere emission. For a certain observed isotropic gamma-ray luminosity $L = L_{ph}$ ($L_{ph}$ is photosphere luminosity), the $E_p$ could not exceed the death line of baryonic photosphere emission, which could be defined as $E_p \leq \zeta kT_0 \simeq 1.2$ MeV $\zeta L_{\nu}^{1/2} T_0^{1/2}$, with $\zeta$ being a factor that denotes the $\nu F_\nu$ peak of the photosphere spectrum (Zhang et al. 2012). Figure 9 features the rest-frame $E_p - L$ plot for time-resolved spectra of GRB 130310A with summing redshift $z \sim 0.1 \sim 8$. Furthermore, the special GRB 110721A with a very high peak energy ($\sim 15$ MeV) and a sub-sample of Lu et al. (2012) is also presented together there. Two death lines that correspond to $r_0 \sim 10^8$ cm are drawn. According to Figure 9, the unusually observed very high $E_p$ of GRB 130310A in the first time bin is close to the maximum temperature allowed by the non-saturated dissipative photosphere model.

---

**Fig. 5** The calculation results of photosphere parameter for GRB 130310A, including the magnetization at the central engine $\sigma_0$; (b) the dimensionless $\eta$, the radius of the photosphere $r_{ph}$, the Lorentz factor of the photosphere $\Gamma_{ph}$, the magnetization parameter at the photosphere $\sigma_{ph}$ and the magnetization parameter at $z \sim 10^{15}$ cm $\sigma_{15}$. Here, we assume the size of the jet base $r_0 \sim 10^7$ cm and redshift $z \sim 0.1 \sim 8$ (as marked in the legend).

**Fig. 6** The same as Fig. 5, but for $r_0 \sim 10^8$ cm.
A dissipative photosphere has been employed to explain the very high peak energy $E_p$ of GRB 110721A (Veres et al. 2012). The magnetic dissipative photosphere model predicts a high $E_p \sim 8$ MeV (Bégué & Pe’er 2015). Compared with GRB 110721A, the very high $E_p$ of GRB 130310A is found together with a thermal component supposed to be the photosphere origin in the first time bin. Then, the primary Band component must be another component. Since the Band component extends below the thermal component, it must not be self-absorbed in the emission region, which means this component comes from an optically-thin region far above the photosphere (Zhang & Yan 2011). Furthermore, the very rapid hard-to-soft $E_p$ evolution of GRB 130310A is also a challenge to the photosphere model (e.g., Zhang & Yan 2011). Therefore, the very high energy $E_p$ of GRB 130310A is likely to stem from an optically thin region with accelerated non-thermal particles.

Within the ICMART model, the hard-to-soft $E_p$ evolution is naturally expected, since the one pulse corresponds to one radiation unit and magnetic field strength falls as the emitter expands (Uhm & Zhang 2014; Zhang 2018). To check whether ICMART is responsible for the non-thermal emission, we also derive the magnetization parameter at $\sim 10^{15}$ cm. If the $\sigma_{15} \ll 1$ $(1 + \sigma_{15}) \simeq 1$, it means that $10^{15}$ cm is already in the coasting regime, and thus internal shock should be the key mechanism for non-thermal energy dissipation (Daigne et al. 2011). If the $(1 + \sigma_{15}) > 1$, significant non-thermal emission is suggested to be generated through ICMART (Zhang & Yan 2011). The results (as shown displayed in Figs. 5–7(f)) show the value of $(1 + \sigma_{15}) \simeq 1$ for $r_0 = 10^7$ and $10^8$ cm, and that of $(1 + \sigma_{15}) > 1$ for $r_0 = 10^9$ cm (noting that the $(1 + \sigma_{15}) \simeq 1$ for $z \sim 3$), respectively. If the high peak energy $E_p$ in the Band component of GRB 130310A originates from the ICMART, it needed the $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm. However, the value of $(1 + \sigma_{15}) \simeq 1$ in the zone $z$ around 3 for $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm, signifying the low possibility that the origin is from ICMART.

It is supposed that the internal shock model can interpret the hard-to-soft $E_p$ evolution in GRBs (e.g., Preece et al. 2014). For a low $\sigma$ internal model, the peak energy could be defined as

$$E_p \simeq (200\text{keV})\varepsilon_{x1}\varepsilon_{x2}^2\sin^2\Psi(L_{152}/r_{13})\gamma^{-1}(1 + z)^{-1}$$

(Zhang & Mészáros 2002), where $\varepsilon_{x1} = 0.82\gamma/(1 + \gamma)^{1/2} + 1.4(\xi_1\varepsilon_{B, -1}\theta_p)^{1/2}$; $\varepsilon_{x2} = \langle f(p)/(1/6)\rangle(\varepsilon_e/\xi_e)\theta_p$; $\Psi$ is the mean pitch angle of the electrons; $\xi$ is the compressive ratio (at least 7 for strong shocks); $\theta_p = (\gamma_i/\gamma_f + \gamma_f/\gamma_i)/2 - 1$; $\langle f(p)/(1/6)\rangle = (p - 2)/(p - 1)$; $r_i$ and $r_f$ are the Lorentz factors of the two colliding shells; $\xi_e$ is the injection fraction of the electrons; $\varepsilon_e$ and $\varepsilon_B$ are the fraction of shock energy to electron energy and magnetic field energy, respectively; $p$ is the electron spectral index. Here the minimum Lorentz factor of the injected electrons $\gamma_e = f(p)(m_p/m_e)(\varepsilon_e/\xi_e)\theta_p \simeq 310\varepsilon_{x2}$, where $m_p$ and $m_e$ are the mass of the proton and the electron, respectively. Thus, it is hard for the low $\sigma$ internal shock model to explain the high energy $E_p$ of GRB 130310A.

In the model of photosphere-internal shock, the photospheric emission of the jet in GRBs can be Compton up-scattered in the internal shocks (e.g., Toma et al. 2011). In this scenario, the peak photon energy of the Band function and photosphere emission has a relation of $E_p \sim E_{ph}\gamma_e^2$. For this burst, $E_{ph} \sim 24$ keV and $E_p = 7.4$ MeV can be required, with the electron Lorentz factor $\gamma_e$ supposed to be around 60. Since $\gamma_e = f(p)(m_p/m_e)(\varepsilon_e/\xi_e)\theta_p \simeq 310\varepsilon_{x2}$ (e.g.,
Very High Peak Energy and Thermal Emission

5 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

In this paper we have presented the time-integrated and time-resolved spectral analysis of the Fermi GRB 130310A. Do you mean Meanwhile we arrive at the following interesting results? Please confirm if you agree with these changes.

1. The spectral analysis results of GRB 130310A suggest that there is a sub-dominated thermal component in the early period spectrum (the first time bin, \( \Delta t = 0 + [4.03 - 4.14] \) s), with the derived blackbody BB temperature \( kT = \sim 7 \sim 5 \) keV. Do you mean The precursor of GRB 130310A can be well fitted well with a blackbody component with \( kT = 45.4 \pm 7.0 \) keV, which is higher than those that of the main burst. Please confirm if you agree with these changes. It suggests that the radiation of GRB 130310A is in a transition from thermal to non-thermal. Such a transition is an indication of the change of jet composition from a fireball to a Poynting-flux-dominated jet.

2. In the first time bin (Slice a, \( T_0 + [4.03 - 4.14] \) s), the very high peak energy is obtained, with the peak energy \( E_p \) of the Band component for Band+BB and Band model being \( \sim 8.5 \sim 5.2 \) MeV and \( \sim 11.1 \sim 7.4 \) MeV, respectively. Afterwards, the \( E_p \) drops to \( \sim 1 \) MeV. \( E_p \) evolution patterns regarding the pulses in the GRB 130310A light curves exhibit the hard-to-soft evolutionary trend.

GRB 130310A and GRB 110721A are alike in that the photosphere emission component is sub-dominant in the observed spectrum, where the photosphere emission is related to the value of \( \sigma_0 \). Based on a hybrid photosphere emission model of Gao & Zhang (2015), we derive the parameters of the photosphere, e.g., \( \sigma_0, \eta, r_{ph}, \Gamma_{ph} \) and \( \sigma_{ph} \). Assuming \( r_0 \sim 10^6 \sim 10^9 \) cm and redshift \( z \sim 0.1 \sim 8 \), we obtained a series of results that are consistent within the model that the thermal component is produced by the fireball when it becomes transparent.

To explain the high peak energy \( E_p \), we test the high peak energy \( E_p \) in different GRB models, e.g., non-photosphere, dissipative photosphere, ICMART, internal shock and photosphere-internal shock. The \( E_p - L \) plot indicates that the observed very high \( E_p \) of GRB
130310A in the first time bin, found together with a thermal component compared with that of GRB 110721A, is higher than the maximum temperature allowed by the non-saturated dissipative photosphere model, meaning that the Band component comes from an optically-thin region far above the photosphere. Besides, the hard-to-soft $E_p$ evolution of GRB 130310A poses a challenge to the photosphere model. Although the internal shock and the ICMART are supposed to interpret the hard-to-soft $E_p$ evolution in GRBs, the low $\sigma$ internal shock model with typical value is lower than $\sim 1$ MeV, which is also hard to explain for the high energy $E_p$ of GRB 130310A to explain. Do you mean See from The calculation of $\sigma_{15}$ shows confirms that it needed the $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm is essential to allow $(1 + \sigma_{15}) > 1$. Note: It is difficult for our editorial staff to understand your meaning in this sentence. If our interpretation of your meaning is not correct, please explain your meaning more clearly. However, the value of $(1 + \sigma_{15})$ is $> 1$ in the zone $z$ around $3$ for $r_0 \sim 10^9$ cm. It suggests that the possibility of the origin from ICMART is not ruled out, but the value is very low. Seemingly, the photosphere-internal shock can interpret the high peak energy, which requires the electron Lorentz factor $\gamma_e \sim 60$ and $\epsilon_e \sim 0.06$. Together with GRB 110721A, it also suggests that, at least for some Band components, the Band component must invoke a non-thermal origin in the optically thin region of a GRB outflow.

It is worth noting that there is no observed redshift for GRB 130310A. The calculation for parameters of GRB 130310A (e.g., $\sigma_0$, $\sigma_{15}$, $\eta$, $r_{ph}$, $\Gamma_{ph}$, $\sigma_{ph}$ and the value of $E_p$ predicted in GRB theory models) relies on the $r_0$ and $z$. Do you mean Thus, we presume a series of values of the redshift $z \sim 0.1 \sim 8$, to promise which enable us to discuss investigate the high peak energy $E_p$ of GRB 130310A in the first time bin. Note: It is difficult for our editorial staff to understand your meaning in this sentence. If our interpretation of your meaning is not correct, please explain your meaning more clearly.
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