The High Time Resolution Universe survey – XI. Discovery of five recycled pulsars and the optical detectability of survey white dwarf companions


1 INTRODUCTION

Although pulsars are commonly born with short spin periods (e.g. Migliazzo et al. 2002, and references therein), the spin-down rate is such that pulsars are often observed to have spin periods of the order of 1 s. However, the millisecond pulsars (MSPs) spin with periods \( \lesssim 30 \text{ ms} \). The MSPs are located in a region of the \( P-\dot{P} \) diagram distinct from ordinary pulsars. In order to be rotating so rapidly, MSPs are thought to have undergone a spin-up phase in their evolutionary history. Spin-up involves accretion of matter from an orbiting companion on to the neutron star (NS; Alpar et al. 1982), which begins when the companion star ages and expands, in some cases, to overflow its Roche lobe. During the accretion phase, systems are thought to be observed as X-ray binaries, both as high-mass (HMXB) and low-mass X-ray binaries (LMXB) depending upon the companion mass.

The evolutionary link between X-ray binaries and MSPs was strengthened with the discovery of SAX J1808.4–3658, an X-ray binary exhibiting periodic intensity fluctuations with a
period of 2.4 ms (Wijnands & van der Klis 1998). More recently, PSR J1023+0038 was argued to have switched from an LMXB to a radio pulsar phase (Archibald et al. 2009), and now has undergone a transition back to an LMXB (Stappers et al. 2014). The radio pulsar J1824−2425 was the first to be observed to switch to an LMXB phase for a period of around a month, before radio pulsations were once again detected (Papitto et al. 2013). All three systems further strengthen the spin-up model of MSP formation.

Some HMXBs may have a donor sufficiently massive to undergo a core-collapse supernova (ccSN), providing a strong kinematic kick to the system. This kick and mass-loss from the companion will either disrupt the binary totally or impart a significant eccentricity to the orbit (Chaurasia & Bailes 2005). What remains is therefore an eccentric double neutron star (DNS) system, for example PSR B1913+16 (Hulse & Taylor 1975) and PSR J0737−3039 (Burgay et al. 2003; Lyne et al. 2004), or two separate NSs. In both cases, one NS has undergone a spin-up phase (the recycled pulsar) while the other is a young NS (either of which may be observable as a pulsar).

The LMXBs are systems where the companion has a lower mass than the pulsar. The companions reach the end of their lives as a red giant with expulsion of the outer layers of the star, leaving a degenerate core—a white dwarf (WD). The long-lived period (~10⁶ yr; Tauris & van den Heuvel 2003) of stable mass transfer acts to circularize the orbit after the ccSN of the NS progenitor (Bhattacharya & van den Heuvel 1991), explaining why Galactic field MSP–WD binaries usually have a low orbital eccentricity (Phinney 1992).

The fact that most MSPs are found in binaries is in agreement with the spin-up evolutionary scenario; however, ~20 per cent of observed MSPs in the Galactic field are isolated. Besides the formation of isolated MSPs from disruption of the orbit during a second ccSN as the HMXB phase ends, MSPs may destroy their companions through ablation due to the wind from the pulsar (Ruderman, Shaham & Tavani 1989). Systems undergoing this process are known as black widow systems (Fruchter, Stinebring & Taylor 1988), consisting of an MSP with an ultralow-mass companion (Mₚ ~ 0.02 M☉). Radio emission from the pulsar is sometimes observed to be eclipsed by ionized material surrounding the companion and, if the orbital inclination is favourable, the companion itself (for example PSR B1957+20; Fruchter et al. 1988). The timescale for total ablation of the companion is, however, too long to explain the observed number of isolated MSPs (Eichler & Levinson 1988).

So-called redback binary systems (Roberts 2011), such as PSR J1740−5340A in globular cluster NGC 6397, also exhibit orbital eclipses of the pulsar emission (D’Amico et al. 2001). Redback systems have a more massive companion, (Mₚ ~ 10⁻¹ M☉) often seen to be non-degenerate in optical studies (Roberts 2011). These systems have Roche lobe filling factors of 0.1–0.4, and as such are possibly an interesting intermediate stage between X-ray binaries and Galactic field MSP binary systems (Breton et al. 2013).

Using the 64 m Parkes radio telescope the High Time Resolution Universe (HTRU) survey (Keith et al. 2010) is providing a comprehensive search of the entire southern sky with high time and frequency resolution for pulsars. It uses the 20 cm multibeam receiver which was also used by the Parkes Multibeam Pulsar Survey (PMPS; Manchester et al. 2001) combined with a digital backend system with superior spectral and temporal resolution to the analogue filterbank system used in the PMPS.

This paper outlines the discovery and subsequent observation of five recycled pulsar systems. Section 2 outlines the observations taken to discover and observe these pulsars. In Section 3, we present the results of our timing programme to date, including details of the pulse profiles and, where possible, multifrequency observations. Finally, in Section 4, we present calculations of predicted WD optical brightnesses for all published MSP–WD systems discovered in the HTRU survey.

### 2 DISCOVERY AND TIMING

The five pulsars presented here were discovered in the HTRU survey for pulsars and transients (for a full discussion, see Keith et al. 2010). Survey observations were made with the 64 m Parkes radio telescope using the 13 beam 21 cm multibeam receiver. The survey has an observing band centred at 1352 MHz and has a useful bandwidth of 340 MHz. The HTRU survey is split into three areas: the low-, mid- and high-Galactic latitude regions. The discoveries presented here are from the mid-latitude survey, which tiles −120° < l < 30° and |b| ≤ 15° with observations of 540 s.

The data were processed using the Fourier transform based pulsar search pipeline described in Keith et al. (2010). The discoveries presented here were initially identified using an artificial neural network which aims to highlight the best candidates from the survey for human inspection (Eatough et al. 2010; Bates et al. 2012). After inspection, confirmation observations were taken at the sky positions of the survey beams deemed to contain the best candidates. These confirmations were performed with the Parkes or Lovell telescopes. Four of the five pulsars presented here, PSRs J1227−6208, J1405−4656, J1431−4715, and J1653−2054, are in orbit with a binary companion, while one, PSR J1729−2117, is isolated. PSR J1227−6208 was also independently discovered in the PMPS by two separate groups (Mickaliger et al. 2012; Knispel et al. 2013). All observations, timing, and analysis of PSR J1227−6208 presented here are independent work.

After confirmation, the new pulsars were timed regularly with digital filter bank backend systems; PSRs J1653−2054 and J1729−2117 with the 76 m Lovell telescope at Jodrell Bank Observatory and PSRs J1431−4715, J1405−4656, and J1227−6208 with the 64m radio telescope at Parkes (see Table 1). The pulsars were observed by the Lovell telescope were observed approximately once per fortnight, whereas those observed using the Parkes radio telescope were observed more sporadically, while maintaining phase coherence, with one case of an approximately 80 d gap between observations.

Each observation resulted in a pulse time-of-arrival (TOA) measurement. Parameters were fitted to the TOAs using the TEMPO2 software package (Hobbs, Edwards & Manchester 2006) and the
### Table 2. Observed and derived parameters for the five MSPs. The DM distance has been estimated using the NE2001 model of Cordes & Lazio (2002), while a pulsar mass of 1.4 $M_\odot$ has been assumed in calculating companion masses. Estimates of the contribution to the period derivative from the Shapiro effect have been included, where significant proper motions have been measured. ELL1 refers to the timing model outlined in the appendix of Lange et al. (2001) and ELL1H is a modification to this model to allow the Shapiro delay to be parametrized in terms of $h_2$ and $h_4$ (see the text and equation 3). Note all parameter errors have been multiplied by $\sqrt{2}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>J1227−6208</th>
<th>J1405−4656</th>
<th>J1431−4715</th>
<th>J1653−2054</th>
<th>J1729−2117</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DM distance (kpc)</td>
<td>8.32 ± 0.58</td>
<td>1.53 ± 0.21</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.12</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.08</td>
<td>1.63 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orbits (d)</td>
<td>6.72 ± 0.013374(4)</td>
<td>8.956 ± 0.41988(7)</td>
<td>0.449 ± 0.7391377(7)</td>
<td>1.226 ± 0.815259(9)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASC (MJD)</td>
<td>55991.1937918(2)</td>
<td>55132.23096(2)</td>
<td>55756.1047771(4)</td>
<td>55584.728649(3)</td>
<td>55505.2893668(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T0 (MJD)</td>
<td>55991.7000(2)</td>
<td>55694.0(4)</td>
<td>55756.23(2)</td>
<td>55584.9(5)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_1$</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.5238(3)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.005(2)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.023(8)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.002(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_2$</td>
<td>0.001 ± 0.0229(3)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.004(2)</td>
<td>–0.000 ± 0.003(7)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.002(2)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega$ (deg)</td>
<td>0.001 ± 0.1494(3)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.007(2)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.023(8)</td>
<td>0.000 ± 0.01(3)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapiro delay parameters</td>
<td>7.3 ± 2.7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$h_3$ ($\times 10^{-6}$)</td>
<td>4.4 ± 3.2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. $m_c$ ($M_\odot$)</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. $m_c$ ($M_\odot$)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rms of fit (µs)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced $\chi^2$</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.8$^\dagger$</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEPOCH</td>
<td>55991.2</td>
<td>55692.7</td>
<td>55756.1</td>
<td>55694.6</td>
<td>55505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When TOAs around superior conjunction are removed.

**3 RESULTS**

The pulse periods for the new discoveries range from 2.01 ms for PSR J1431−4715, placing it among the 20 fastest spinning pulsars, to 66.29 ms for PSR J1729−2117, one of the longer periods for a partially recycled pulsar (Manchester et al. 2005). One, PSR J1729−2117, has not exhibited any detectable periodic variation of the pulse period over the three years of timing, indicating that it is one of just two isolated recycled pulsars discovered in the HTRU XI.
survey to date. The five pulsars represent some of the different types of known recycled pulsar and binary systems.

3.1 Period derivatives

The measured spin-down rate, \( \dot{P}_{\text{meas}} \), of a pulsar with period \( P \) can differ from the intrinsic spin-down via the Shklovskii effect (Shklovskii 1970). A proper motion of \( \mu \), for a pulsar with period \( P \) at distance \( d \), leads to an extra contribution to the period derivative as

\[
\dot{P}_{\text{Shk}} \simeq 2.43 \times 10^{-21} \left( \frac{P}{s} \right) \times \left( \frac{\mu^2}{\text{mas yr}^{-1}} \right) \times \left( \frac{d}{\text{kpc}} \right),
\]

where \( c \) is in units of m s\(^{-1}\), which can be a considerable contribution for some MSPs since their rotational periods are so short, the measured \( \dot{P} \) so small, and transverse velocities are typically \( \sim 85 \) km s\(^{-1}\) (Toscano et al. 1999). This being the case, the Shklovskii effect is likely to give only small contributions (of the order \( \lesssim 10 \) per cent) to the measured \( \dot{P} \) for PSRs J1227−6208 and J1653−2054 (for which no significant proper motion has been measured), but for PSR J1729−2117, the Shklovskii effect could easily contribute a significant fraction, \( \gtrsim 30 \) per cent, of the measured \( \dot{P} \).

In the cases of PSRs J1405−4656 and J1431−4715, which have measured, significant proper motions of 48 and 11 mas yr\(^{-1}\), respectively. The Shklovskii effect then contributes \( \sim 90 \) and \( \sim 5 \) per cent of the measured \( \dot{P} \) for these pulsars. In Table 2, we include corrections for the Shklovskii effect, where it may be calculated. However, the errors on the value of \( \dot{P}_{\text{Shk}} \) (and, hence, the intrinsic period derivative) are rather large, especially in the case of PSR J1405−4656, due mainly to contributions from the error on the proper motion and the distance derived from the electron distribution model, which we have assumed to be 30 per cent.

3.2 PSR J1227−6208

PSR J1227−6208 is located in the region of the \( P−\dot{P} \) diagram where mildly recycled pulsars are found (see Fig. 1). This is consistent with it having been spun-up during unstable, short-lived mass transfer in an HMXB phase. Pulse profiles from observations at 1.4 and 3.1 GHz are shown in Fig. 2.
It has an orbital eccentricity, \( e = 0.00115 \), orbital period \( P_{\text{orb}} = 6.72 \text{ d} \), and a projected semimajor axis, \( a_p \sin i = 23.2 \text{ls} \). Assuming \( M_\text{p} = 1.4 \text{M}_\odot \), this leads to a minimum companion mass of \( M_{\text{c, min}} = 1.29 \text{M}_\odot \) for an edge-on orbit. The low eccentricity and high minimum companion mass are unusual: there are only three other systems known with \( e < 0.1 \) and \( M_{\text{c, min}} > 1.0 \text{M}_\odot \).

PSR J1227–6208 is similar to other so-called intermediate-mass binary pulsars (IMBPs); for example PSR J1435–6100 (Camilo et al. 2001) and PSR J2222–0137 (Boyles et al. 2013). PSR J1227–6208’s spin parameters are also similar to PSR J0609+2130 – an isolated pulsar thought to be the result of an HMXB which disrupted during the second ccSN (Lorimer et al. 2004). In an IMBP, it is thought that the companion was not sufficiently massive to undergo a ccSN, resulting instead in the formation of a heavy CO or ONeMg WD. The minimum mass for the companion to PSR J1227–6208 is common for ONeMg WDs, which have a mass range of around 1.1–1.3 \text{M}_\odot (Tauris, Langer & Kramer 2012). This is, however, the minimum mass the companion may have; it is already close to the upper limit of ONeMg WDs, and to the Chandrasekhar mass limit.

For inclinations \( i < 71^\circ \), \( M_\text{c} \gtrsim 1.4 \text{M}_\odot \), and therefore PSR J1227–6208 might be part of a DNS system. If the companion is an NS, though not one which is visible to date as a pulsar, it would have formed from a massive progenitor (8–10 \text{M}_\odot), and the system would have evolved through an HMXB phase, hence leaving PSR J1227–6208 partially recycled. Compared to the known DNS systems, listed in Table 3, the eccentricity is small, and the formation of DNS systems with such a small eccentricity appears to be unlikely (Chaurasia & Bailes 2005). Simulations by Dewi, Podsiadlowski & Pols (2005) and Chaurasia & Bailes (2005) do, however, suggest that such low-eccentricity DNS systems could exist because of the possibility of very small and retrograde ccSN kinematic kicks, although they would be extremely rare.

Due to the loss of binding energy (\( \delta M \gtrsim 0.1 \text{M}_\odot \)) during an SN explosion, the mass-loss induces a finite eccentricity, \( e = (M + \delta M)/M - 1 \gtrsim 0.035 \), into the system, which is \( \sim 30 \text{ times} \) that of PSR J1227–6208. The only way this can be lessened is if the exploding star receives a retrograde kick into an exceptionally small volume of phase space to reduce the angular momentum and, hence, eccentricity (Chaurasia & Bailes 2005). For NSs receiving a random kick from a large kick velocity distribution, the probabily is vanishingly small (\( < 0.1 \text{ per cent} \)), but the double pulsar’s eccentricity of 0.09 (Lyne et al. 2004) demonstrates that not all NSs receive large kicks. Even if the kick was constrained to be small and confined to the pre-SN orbital plane, PSR J1227–6208’s eccentricity of 0.001 would occur less than \( e_{\text{SN}}/e_{\text{pulsar}} \sim 3 \text{ per cent} \) of the time as most random kicks act to increase, not decrease, the orbital eccentricity induced by mass-loss. On the other hand, such low-eccentricity systems would not lose energy via gravitational wave emission as quickly as eccentric systems, and consequently will survive longer before merging.

With DM = 362.6 cm\(^{-3}\)pc, the NE2001 electron density model predicts PSR J1227–6208 to be located at a distance of 8.3 kpc. This would make an optical detection of a WD companion (for the case of a large orbital inclination) extremely difficult. Consequently, the best chance of measuring the masses in the system comes from the potential measurement of post-Keplerian parameters.

3.2.1 Periastron advance

It is possible to predict relativistic changes to the orbit due to general relativity. One of the easiest post-Keplerian parameters to measure for systems with eccentric orbits is a changing longitude of periastron, \( \omega = 39.73 \text{ yr}^{-1} (P_{\text{orb}}/\text{h})^{-5/3} \left( \frac{1}{1-e^2} \right) (\frac{M_\text{c} + M_\text{p}}{\text{M}_\odot})^{2/3} \),

where \( P_{\text{orb}} \) is the orbital period, \( e \) is the orbital eccentricity, and \( M_\text{c} \) and \( M_\text{p} \) are the companion and pulsar masses respectively. A measured \( \dot{\omega} \) constitutes a measurement of the combined masses, \( M_\text{c} + M_\text{p} \), and consequently constrains the companion mass. While the orbital eccentricity of PSR J1227–6208 is small, it is significantly higher than is typical for systems which have likely evolved through an LMXB phase (Phinney 1992). Equation (2) predicts \( \dot{\omega} = 0.017 \text{ yr}^{-1} \) for the PSR J1227–6208 system if we assume pulsar and companion masses of 1.4 \text{M}_\odot. For a low inclination, and \( M_\text{c} = 10 \text{M}_\odot \), we would then expect \( \dot{\omega} = 0.042 \text{ yr}^{-1} \).

Current observations have not made a significant measurement of \( \dot{\omega} \); however, we can make some quantitative statements about the value of \( \dot{\omega} \). Using the FAKE plugin for TEMPO2, TOAs were generated for PSR J1227–6208 using the parameters listed in Table 2, varying \( \dot{\omega} \) from 0.01 to 0.05 \text{ yr}^{-1}. Fitting those TOAs using TEMPO2 over the current data span, \( \dot{\omega} \) was only measured at the 2\( \sigma \) level for \( \dot{\omega} \gtrsim 0.04 \text{ yr}^{-1} \). Since we are unable to make a significant measurement, it is likely that \( \dot{\omega} \lesssim 0.04 \text{ yr}^{-1} \). Extending these simulated TOAs into the future, in all cases another two years of data constrain \( \dot{\omega} \) at the \( \sim 3\sigma \) level, which would allow a direct measurement of \( M_\text{p} \) and \( M_\text{c} \) at the 2\( \sigma \) level.

3.2.2 Shapiro delay

The radio pulses from a pulsar in a binary system are delayed as they cross the gravitational potential of the companion in a phenomenon called Shapiro delay (Shapiro 1964). The magnitude of the delay, \( \Delta t_\text{S} \), is quantified by two post-Keplerian parameters, the range, \( r \), and the shape, \( s \). For low-eccentricity systems

\[
\Delta t_\text{S}(\Phi) = -2\ln(1 - s \sin \Phi),
\]

where \( \Phi \) is the orbital phase (\( \Phi = 0 \) is the ascending node), \( r = T_\odot M_\text{c}, s = \sin i, \) and \( T_\odot = G M_\odot/c^2 \). The Shapiro delay is the same for every orbit of the system and so when the TOA residuals are folded modulo \( P_{\text{orb}} \) a characteristic shape in the timing residuals may be measured.

Since the companion mass for PSR J1227–6208 is relatively high, implying a large value of \( r \), an observing programme was undertaken using the 64 m Parkes radio telescope to obtain TOAs
across the expected epoch of superior conjunction, and attempt to
observe Shapiro delay in this system. A global timing solution was
made (given in Table 2) using the parametrization for the Shapiro
delay given by Freire & Wex (2010), where the fitted parameters $h_3$
and $h_4$ are related to the Shapiro $r$ and $s$ parameters as

$$r = \frac{h_3^4}{h_4^3}, \quad s = \frac{2h_3 h_4}{h_3^3 + h_4^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

A best-fitting value of $h_1$, which is consistent with zero implies a
non-detection of the Shapiro delay, and a measurement of $h_4$ allows
the orbital inclination to be constrained.

Timing residuals for PSR J1227–6208, shown in Fig. 3 were
observed to show some evidence of Shapiro delay due to the
apparent non-Gaussianity of the residuals. Fitting for $h_3$ and $h_4$,
we obtained best-fitting values of $h_1 = (7.3 \pm 2.7) \times 10^{-6}$ and
$h_4 = (4.4 \pm 3.2) \times 10^{-6}$; however, both of these measurements
are to a low significance, and corresponding errors in $M_e$ and $i$
are large. Nevertheless, the resulting values of range and shape are
$r = (3.3 \pm 8.8) \times 10^{-5} M_{\odot}$s and $s = \sin i = 0.88^{+0.12}_{-0.03}$, respectively.

To estimate when the Shapiro delay might become well-
constrained, as in Section 3.2.1, TOAs were generated for
PSR J1227–6208 using the \textsc{tempo2} plugin \textsc{FAKE}. Keeping the rms
fixed at 22 $\mu$s, a further nine years of timing data were needed
in order to constrain both $h_3$ and $h_4$ at the 3$\sigma$ level. Alternatively,
using the current data span, $h_3$ and $h_4$ were constrained at the 3$\sigma$
level when the rms was reduced to 10 $\mu$s. Therefore, a combination
of improved timing and a longer data span may enable precise
measurement of $h_3$ and $h_4$ in under nine years.

3.3 PSR J1431–4715

PSR J1431–4715 has the 14th shortest spin period of all known
pulsars, $P = 2.01$ ms, and a small period derivative, $\dot{P} = 1.4 \times 10^{-20}$. These values place PSR J1431–4715 firmly amongst the
fully recycled MSPs in the bottom left of the $P$–$\dot{P}$ diagram (see
Fig. 1).

Observations of PSR J1431–4715 at multiple frequencies (see
Fig. 2) reveal significant pulse profile evolution with observing
frequency, as well as evidence of pulse delays and eclipses when the
pulsar is at superior conjunction. At 1.4 GHz, the pulse profile
is double peaked, with a smaller and wider leading component,
Using multiple observations during different eclipses, we find that there appear to be significantly different delays at the same orbital phase within the eclipse region. The TOAs were measured during observations which were separated by several months, that is \( \sim 10^3 \) orbital periods. As such, the amount, or density, of dispersive material must be variable on this time-scale. The width of the eclipsing region appears to be constant, suggesting that it is the free-electron density which is variable as opposed to depth of the eclipsing region.

From the orbital separation and the mass ratio, we determine the approximate distance of the Roche lobe from the companion, \( R_L \), using

\[
R_L = \frac{0.49 A q^{2/3}}{0.6 q^{2/3} + \ln(1 + q^{1/3})}
\]

from Eggleton (1983), where \( A \) is the separation of the pulsar and its companion, and \( q = m_c/m_p \) is the mass ratio of the system. In this case, \( R_L = 0.6 R_{\odot} \), about half the size of the eclipse radius.

A significant amount of the material in the eclipsing region is therefore outside the companion’s Roche lobe. Material which is close to the Roche lobe can easily be removed by a relativistic pulsar wind (Breton et al. 2013). This would mean some eclipsing material was not gravitationally bound to the companion and must therefore be continually replenished (Stappers et al. 1996).

The spin-down dipole radiation \( \dot{E} \) of the pulsar at the distance of the companion is \( \dot{E}/A^2 \sim 1.5 \times 10^{33} \text{erg s}^{-1} \text{ls}^{-2} \). This is typical of other eclipsing systems in general and in the HTRU sample (Roberts 2011; Breton et al. 2013). Incident spin-down energy at the companion is significantly larger for eclipsing systems than non-eclipsing binaries, an indication that the pulsar’s energy output is at least partly responsible for the dispersive material surrounding the companion.

### 3.4 PSR J1653–2054

PSR J1653–2054 is a fully recycled MSP with \( P = 4.129 \text{ ms} \) and \( \dot{P} = 1.14 \times 10^{-20} \). The pulse profile at 1.4 GHz is shown in Fig. 2. The minimum mass of the companion to PSR J1653–2054 is just \( 0.08 M_{\odot} \), placing it between typical black widow and redback systems. The measurement of \( \dot{E}/A^2 \sim 3.7 \times 10^{33} \text{erg s}^{-1} \text{ls}^{-2} \) is however somewhat lower than for the redback and black widow systems (and PSR J1431–4715). It is, therefore, possible that the incident spin-down energy at the surface of the companion is too low to blow the companion, which would explain why no eclipses have been observed. The orbital period is at least a factor of 2 longer than known Galactic redback and black widow systems (Roberts 2011). The wide orbit means that any ionized region would subtend a smaller angle, making eclipses less likely. If, however, the orbit is not being viewed edge-on then the companion mass would be higher, for instance, if \( i < 25^\circ \), then \( M_c > 0.2 M_{\odot} \), indicative of a typical HeWD. A detection or constraint on the magnitude of the optical companion to this system may help us resolve the nature of the companion and whether this is an example of a wide orbit black widow or redback.

### 3.5 PSR J1729–2117

This system, with period \( P = 66.29 \text{ ms} \) and period derivative \( \dot{P} = 1.6 \times 10^{-19} \), has very similar spin parameters to PSR J0609+2130 (Lorimer et al. 2004) and PSR J2235+1506 (Camilo, Nice & Taylor 1993). Camilo et al. suggested that PSR J2235+1506 was spun-up in an HMXB system in which the second ccSN resulted in the disruption of the binary. It may be that similar arguments can be applied to PSR J1729–2117. As discussed by Burgay et al. (2013), this pulsar was only detected owing to an enhanced flux density due to scintillation during the discovery observation. Subsequent observations have revealed it to have a low luminosity (Table 2).

If this pulsar really was spun up in a binary, then PSR J1729–2117 might be expected to have a high velocity (Bailes 1989), and as the system is relatively close (the distance from NE2001 is \( d = 1.09 \text{ kpc} \)), the proper motion should be measurable with further timing. Pulse profiles at 0.7, 1.4, and 3.1 GHz are shown in Fig. 2.

### 3.6 Orbital periods and companion masses

The five MSPs presented here show quite diverse orbital properties. One, PSR 1729–2117, appears to be isolated and has presumably lost its companion at some point since it was recycled. Three pulsars, PSRs J1405–4656, J1431–4715, and J1653–2054, all have low- to intermediate-mass companions of \( \sim 0.1–0.2 M_{\odot} \), and finally PSR J1227–6208 has a high-mass companion of \( \gtrsim 1.3 M_{\odot} \).

Tauris & Savonije (1999) derived a relationship between orbital period and companion mass for binary MSPs with WD companions which have formed via an LMXB phase (see Fig. 5). This relationship is based on a predictable core mass for a main-sequence star as a function of stellar radius. During spin-up in an LMXB, the edge of the star is at the position of the Roche lobe, which is a function of only the two masses and the orbital separation (see equation 6). After the companion star exhausts its fuel and the outer layers are blown off, the stellar core becomes a WD. The WD mass is therefore linked to the orbital period at cessation of mass transfer/spin-up.
Of the binary systems described here, PSR J1653–2054 has a shorter orbital period than those described by Tauris & Savonije (1999), who only considered $P_{\text{orb}} > 2$ d. PSRs J1405–4656 and J1431–4715 are in agreement with this relationship, and since PSR J1227–6208 did not form via an LMXB phase, on which this relationship is based, it does not lie on the predicted curve. Indeed, its minimum companion mass is considerably higher than a low-mass WD.

### 3.7 Non-detection with the Fermi telescope

A large number of MSPs have been discovered by radio observations of point sources first identified by the Large Area Telescope (LAT) on board the Fermi Gamma-Ray Space Telescope (e.g. Cognard et al. 2011; Keith et al. 2011; Ransom et al. 2011). We searched the Fermi LAT second source catalogue (Nolan et al. 2012) for point sources which could be associated with the five newly-discovered pulsars presented here, but found no matches. Pulsar detections with Fermi are usually parametrized in terms of $\log(\sqrt{E}/d^2)$ (for a spin-down energy loss, $E$, measured in erg s$^{-1}$ and distance, $d$, in kpc; see Abdo et al. 2010), which is usually $>17$ for pulsars that are detected. For PSR J1431–4715, $\log(\sqrt{E}/d^2) = 17$, so this pulsar might be considered to be right on the margins of detection by Fermi, if indeed the DM distance is correct. The other MSPs presented here all have values of $\log(\sqrt{E}/d^2) \lesssim 16.5$.

### 4 POSSIBILITY OF OPTICAL DETECTION FOR HTRU MSP COMPANIONS

Observations of companions of binary pulsars can allow the determination of parameters which may not be measurable through pulsar timing alone. Of particular interest here are MSPs with low-mass helium-core WD companions, where a dichotomy in the thickness of the hydrogen envelope surrounding the helium-core of the WD leads to residual hydrogen burning, significantly slowing down the cooling (Alberts et al. 1996; Driebe et al. 1998; Althaus, Serenelli & Benvenuto 2001). As a result, helium-core WDs with masses below approximately 0.2 $M_\odot$ are typically intrinsically brighter than mass WDs. For those systems where the WD is bright enough for optical photometry, it is possible to measure its temperature and cooling age, providing independent constraints on the pulsar age (e.g. van Kerkwijk et al. 2000; Bassa, van Kerkwijk & Kulkarni 2003). Furthermore, if the WD has suitable absorption lines, phase-resolved optical spectroscopy of the WD can be used to determine the mass ratio and model the WD atmosphere to constrain both the WD and pulsar mass (e.g. van Kerkwijk, Bergeron & Kulkarni 1996; Callanan, Garnavich & Koester 1998; Bassa et al. 2006; Antoniadis et al. 2013 and see van Kerkwijk et al. 2005, for a review).

In Table 4, we present predictions for the apparent brightness of helium-core WD companions to MSPs discovered in the HTRU survey. The binary systems and their properties are listed in Table 4. We use predictions from WD cooling models from Bergeron, Wesemael & Beauchamp (1995) and Serenelli et al. (2001) to estimate the absolute magnitude by comparing the predicted WD cooling age with the characteristic spin-down age of the pulsar. The masses of the WDs are constrained through the timing measurements of the orbital period and projected semimajor axis. Assuming a pulsar mass of 1.4 $M_\odot$ and a range of probable orbital inclinations, we obtain the masses listed in Table 4.

Combining the observed pulsar dispersion measures with the NE2001 model of the Galactic electron distribution (Cordes & Lazio 2002) yields the distance estimates listed in Table 4. Since some of the HTRU MSPs are at low Galactic latitude, absorption can be significant. The Galactic extinction model of Amôres & Lépine (2005) was used to obtain estimates of the V-band absorption $A_V$ for the distance to and line of sight of each MSP. Together, these provide the V-band distance modulus with which the apparent magnitude can be estimated.

Fig. 6 combines all these estimates; the characteristic spin-down age $\tau_c$ of the pulsar with the predicted cooling age of the WD. As pulsar spin-down ages may not be a reliable age estimator for the pulsar (Tauris 2012), we conservatively compare a pulsar spin-down ages from 0.1$\tau_c$ to $\tau_c$. The WD cooling models then predict the absolute V-band magnitude $M_V$. Combining these with the V-band distance modulus ($m - M_V$) gives the predicted apparent V-band magnitude $m_V$. These estimates are also listed in Table 4.

Optical detection in imaging observations with an 8 m class telescope typically requires an apparent magnitude less than 24.

### Table 4. Predicted optical magnitudes for the HTRU MSPs with helium-core WD companions. Limits are calculated using a lower limit on the pulsar spin-down age of 0.1$\tau_c$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>$d$ (kpc)</th>
<th>$\tau_c$ (Gyr)</th>
<th>$M_{V,\text{med}}$</th>
<th>$A_V$</th>
<th>$(m - M_V)$</th>
<th>$M_V$</th>
<th>$m_V$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1017–7156</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>12.55</td>
<td>&gt;13</td>
<td>&gt;25.5</td>
<td>Keith et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1056–7117</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>&lt;22.5</td>
<td>Ng et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1125–5825</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>1.765</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>&lt;13</td>
<td>&lt;26.8</td>
<td>Bates et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1405–4656</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>37.64</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>&gt;16</td>
<td>&gt;25.7</td>
<td>This paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1431–4715</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>13.21</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>&gt;23.2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1528–3828</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>13.16</td>
<td>11–16</td>
<td>&gt;24.2</td>
<td>Ng et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1543–5149</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>4.413</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>10–14</td>
<td>&gt;26.3</td>
<td>Keith et al. (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1545–4550</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>2.580</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>10–12</td>
<td>&gt;24.2</td>
<td>Burgay et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1708–3506</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>2.534</td>
<td>14.75</td>
<td>11–16</td>
<td>&gt;25.8</td>
<td>Bates et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1755–3716</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>13.36</td>
<td>11–16</td>
<td>&gt;24.4</td>
<td>Ng et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1801–3210</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>44.60</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>&gt;23.7</td>
<td>Bates et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1811–2405</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>11.360</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>&gt;33.6</td>
<td>Bates et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1825–0319</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>10.61</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>9.210</td>
<td>21.62</td>
<td>&gt;12</td>
<td>&gt;33.8</td>
<td>Burgay et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2236–5527</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>12–16</td>
<td>&gt;21.7</td>
<td>Burgay et al. (2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing characteristic pulsar spin-down ages with WD cooling ages. Predictions of WD cooling age as a function of WD mass following the models by Bergeron et al. (1995, dashed lines/open circles) and Serenelli et al. (2001, solid lines/filled circles) are shown for a set of absolute V-band magnitudes $M_V$. Plotted with the filled circles are the estimated companion masses $M_{\text{c,mod}}$ (assuming a 1.4 $M_\odot$ pulsar and an $i = 60^\circ$ inclination) against the characteristic spin-down age $\tau_c$ of the pulsar. The vertical line extends from the circles down to 0.1$\tau_c$ to denote a conservative range of pulsar ages. Finally, the size of the circles concentric with the dots denoting the characteristic pulsar age and companion mass, scales with the V-band distance modulus $(m - M)_V$, where larger circles indicate lower distance moduli. From the distance modulus and the absolute V-band magnitude, the apparent V-band magnitude for each companion for a given characteristic age can be calculated as $m_V = M_V + (m - M)_V$. The Hubble time is indicated by the dotted horizontal line at $14$ Gyr.

For WDs brighter than 23rd magnitude, optical spectroscopy may be feasible provided suitable absorption lines are present in the spectrum. Based on the estimates from Table 4 and Fig. 5, the HTRU MSPs expected to have the WD companions that can be detected with 8 m class telescopes are PSRs J1056−7117, J1431−4715, and J2236−5527, especially if the characteristic pulsar age is an overestimate of the real age of the system. In the case of PSR J1125−5825, a detection may be possible if the characteristic age vastly overestimates the system's age.

5 SUMMARY

The discovery of five new MSPs from the HTRU survey has been presented. These pulsars represent members of a wide range of known recycled pulsar types, including possibly the heaviest WD known in orbit around an NS, an eclipsing redback system, and an isolated, mildly recycled pulsar, indicating that it probably came from a HMXB which was disrupted during the second ccSN.

Only one of these MSPs, PSR J1227−5825, is within the PMPS region. This pulsar was in fact co-discovered in recent re-analyses of the PMPS data (Mickaliger et al. 2012; Knispel et al. 2013). The superior temporal and spectral resolution of HTRU data means that even with shorter pointings (in the mid-latitude region) than PMPS, HTRU is able to discover MSPs initially missed by previous surveys which used similar instrumentation to PMPS (Edwards et al. 2001; Burgay et al. 2006; Jacoby 2009).

It would be interesting to attempt detections of some WDs in the HTRU sample in order to test the reliability of MSP spin-down ages. PSRs J1056−7117, J1125−5825, J1431−4715, and J2236−5527 are the most likely to result in positive detections. An optical observation of PSR J1431−4715 would also be informative for other reasons; if it is a redback system then its companion may be non-degenerate and it instead could be at the end of the spin-up phase (Roberts 2011). The companion may also be distinctly non-spherical, and measurements of an orbitally modulated light curve can constrain the inclination (Stappers et al. 2001; Reynolds et al. 2007). If spectroscopy as a function of orbital phase is possible for the companion then component masses can be constrained (van Kerkwijk, Breton & Kulkarni 2011; Romani et al. 2012).
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