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ABSTRACT

Measurements of the high-energy cut-off in the coronal continuum of active galactic nuclei have long been elusive for all but a small number of the brightest examples. We present a direct measurement of the cut-off energy in the nuclear continuum of the nearby Seyfert 1.9 galaxy MCG–05-23-016 with unprecedented precision. The high sensitivity of NuSTAR up to 79 keV allows us to clearly disentangle the spectral curvature of the primary continuum from that of its reflection component. Using a simple phenomenological model for the hard X-ray spectrum, we constrain the cut-off energy to 116+6
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1. INTRODUCTION

The intrinsic X-ray continuum of active galactic nuclei (AGNs) is thought to be produced in the immediate vicinity of the central black hole. Phenomenologically, the nuclear continuum can be described as a power law, typically with a photon index of 1.8–2.0, with an exponential cut-off at 150–350 keV (Dadina 2007; Burlon et al. 2011; Molina et al. 2013; Vasudevan et al. 2013; Malizia et al. 2014; Ballantyne 2014). The currently accepted model for formation of this spectral component is the inverse Compton scattering of the thermal radiation from the accretion disk by relativistic electrons distributed around the black hole in a structure referred to as the corona (e.g., Rybicki & Lightman 1979; Titarchuk 1994; Zdziarski et al. 2000). The shape of the coronal spectrum is a function of the seed photon field, the kinetic temperature of the plasma, the geometry of the corona and the observer orientation.

Previous studies suggest that the corona does not uniformly cover the surface of the accretion disk (Haardt et al. 1994), and that it is likely compact (Reis & Miller 2013). Microlensing measurements on distant quasars confirm the compactness of the X-ray-emitting region (e.g., Dai et al. 2010; Mosquera et al. 2013). However, other physical parameters of AGN coronae are currently poorly constrained due to the lack of direct observations in the hard X-ray band, as well as the degeneracy introduced by contributions from the processed (reflected) spectra from the inner regions of the accretion disk and the dusty molecular torus at larger distances (e.g., George & Fabian 1991; Ghisellini et al. 1994). Disentangling those spectral components requires high-quality hard X-ray data.

We report on the high-energy cut-off measurement and coronal parameters of the active nucleus of the nearby (z = 0.0085; 36 Mpc) Seyfert 1.9 galaxy MCG–05-23-016 (Veron et al. 1980; Wegner et al. 2003), using NuSTAR data in the 3–79 keV band (Harrison et al. 2013). This AGN has been extensively observed in the soft X-ray band (Weaver et al. 1997; Mattson & Weaver 2004; Balestra et al. 2004; Braito et al. 2007; Reeves et al. 2007; Zoghbi et al. 2013), revealing a complex structure of the fluorescent line emission, including both broad and narrow components produced by the disk and the torus reflection, respectively. The high-energy spectrum, however, has been only poorly constrained thus far: e.g., Perola et al. (2002) and Dadina (2007) found high-energy cut-offs at 147+10
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found it at $85^{+35}_{-28}$ keV using INTEGRAL data, Beckmann et al. (2008) combined Swift/BAT and INTEGRAL to support a variable cut-off between 50 and $\gtrsim$100 keV, while other results in the literature only placed lower limits in the 100–200 keV range. The main reason for the discrepant measurements in the past is likely the degeneracy between a cut-off at $\lesssim$200 keV and a strong reflection continuum. The high signal-to-noise ratio achieved in the observations of MCG–05-23-016 with NuSTAR allows us to clearly separate the spectral curvature due to the reflection continuum from the spectral curvature due to the coronal cut-off. In Section 2 we report on the NuSTAR observations and in Section 3 we present our spectral analysis. In Section 4 we discuss the potential issues and the physical properties of the corona, and briefly summarize our results in Section 5.

2. OBSERVATIONS AND DATA

NuSTAR observed MCG–05-23-016 on two occasions: on 2012 July 11–12 (ObsID 10002019), and on 2013 June 3–7 (ObsID 60001046). The first observation was conducted as a part of the NuSTAR calibration campaign. The second observation was a science observation carried out simultaneously with a long Suzaku observation. We defer the broadband (0.5–79 keV) spectral analysis of the simultaneous NuSTAR and Suzaku data taken in 2013 to a forthcoming paper (A. Zoghbi et al., in preparation). Hereafter, we refer to the 2012 and 2013 observations as the calibration and science observations, respectively. The event files were cleaned and processed using the NuSTARDAS software package (version 1.2.1) and the scripts nuproducts and nupipeline (Perri et al. 2013). After the automated processing by the pipeline, the total source exposure is 34 ks for the calibration observation, and 160 ks for the science observation. We extracted the source spectra from circular regions 120' in radius, centered on the peak of the source image. The background spectra were extracted from polygonal regions encompassing the same detector, but avoiding the region within 140' from the source image peak. We estimate that at most 2% of the background counts above 25 keV can be due to contamination by the source. The response matrices were generated using the calibration database (CALDB) version 2013.1223.

The analysis presented here is based predominantly on the higher-quality science observation, while the calibration observation is used to investigate the spectral variability on the timescale of one year. The count rate was variable at the level of $\lesssim$30% during the long NuSTAR science observation, and $\lesssim$20% during the calibration observation. The variability on timescales of $\lesssim$1-ks is addressed in detail in a separate publication (Zoghbi et al. 2014). For the analysis presented in this paper, we use the observation-averaged spectra from each of the two NuSTAR focal plane modules (FPMA and FPMB), and fit them jointly for each of the two observations, allowing for the cross-normalization constant to vary freely in all fits. The normalization offset is found to be smaller than 5% in all cases, as expected from instrument calibration (K. Madsen et al., in preparation).

3. SPECTRAL MODELING

We model the NuSTAR data in Xspec (version 12.8.1; Arnaud 1996) using $\chi^2$ statistics. In order for $\chi^2$ statistics to provide unbiased results we group the data to have a signal-to-noise ratio of at least 10 per bin after background subtraction. All uncertainties on spectral parameters are reported as 90% confidence intervals from marginalized probability distributions determined using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm available in Xspec.

3.1. Phenomenological Models

We start the analysis with a simple absorbed power-law model: $N_{\text{H}}\text{abs} \times z \text{TBabs} \times \text{pow}$ in Xspec. The first absorption component ($N_{\text{H}}\text{abs}$; Wilms et al. 2000) represents Galactic absorption fixed to a column density of $N_{\text{H,gal}} = 8 \times 10^{20}$ cm$^{-2}$ (Kalberla et al. 2005), while the redshifted component ($z \text{TBabs}$) accounts for additional absorption by the host galaxy. The redshift is fixed to $z = 0.0085$ (Wegner et al. 2003), and the host column density is a free parameter in the fit. This model fits the data from the science observation very poorly, with a reduced $\chi^2$ ($\chi^2/\nu$, where $\nu$ is the number of degrees of freedom), in excess of three. The best-fit model for the science observation data and the residuals are shown in Figure 1, in order to highlight the main features that hint toward more appropriate models.

The residuals in the top right panel of Figure 1 show signatures of a reprocessed (reflected) component: a neutral iron Kα emission line (6.4 keV) and a broad Compton hump peaking at 20–30 keV. We therefore replace the continuum of the previous model with a pexrav component (Magdziarz & Zdziarski 1995), and add two Gaussian components (one broad and one unresolved; following Zoghbi et al. 2013) to model the line. pexrav includes both the intrinsic power-law continuum and the reflection of that continuum from optically thick material. We keep the inclination angle fixed at the default value ($\cos i = 0.45$, $i \approx 60'$) and leave chemical abundances fixed at Solar values. For the initial fit, we also keep the energy of the power-law cut-off fixed far above the upper end of the NuSTAR bandpass at 1000 keV.

This model fits the science observation data much better than the previous one ($\chi^2/\nu = 1513/1124 = 1.35$). The best-fit photon index and absorption column density are $\Gamma = 2.00 \pm 0.01$ and $N_{\text{H}} = (2.5 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$, respectively. The broad Gaussian line component ($\sigma_1 = 0.35 \pm 0.03$ keV) is best fitted at a slightly higher energy than the neutral iron Ka line: $E_1 = 6.7 \pm 0.2$ keV. Fitting for the energy of the narrow line component does not improve the best fit significantly ($\Delta \chi^2/\Delta \nu = -1/-1$), so we leave it fixed at 6.4 keV. The reflection is found to be strong, with a relative normalization $R = 0.93 \pm 0.04$, but clearly insufficient to account for all the curvature present in the hard X-ray spectrum – as indicated by the residuals of the best fit displayed in the middle right panel of Figure 1.

Letting the cut-off energy vary in the optimization results in a significant improvement of the best fit: $\chi^2/\nu = 1163/1124 = 1.03$ ($\Delta \chi^2 = -349$ for one additional free parameter). This verifies that a cut-off at $E_{\text{cut}} \approx 115$ keV is robustly detected within the NuSTAR band. The best fit column density is $N_{\text{H}} = (1.1 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$, which is consistent with the much more precise measurement, $N_{\text{H}} = (1.32 \pm 0.02) \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$, from the joint modeling of the simultaneous NuSTAR and Suzaku data (A. Zoghbi et al., in preparation) freezing $N_{\text{H}}$ to $1.32 \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$ results in $\Delta \chi^2/\Delta \nu = +3/+1$. For consistency with our work on the joint data set, we keep $N_{\text{H}}$ fixed hereafter. The best-fit parameters of the pexrav component are $\Gamma = 1.85 \pm 0.01$, $R = 0.87 \pm 0.04$ and $E_{\text{cut}} = 116^{+5}_{-4}$ keV. The broad iron line is best fitted with $E_1 = 6.43 \pm 0.05$ keV and $\sigma_1 = 0.46 \pm 0.06$ keV. The model curve and the residuals are plotted in comparison to the previous ones in Figure 1.

The final form of our phenomenological model is $\text{TBabs} \times z \text{TBabs} \times (\text{zgauss} \times 2 + \text{pexrav})$. Applying this model to the
data from the calibration observation, we find that most of
the best-fit spectral parameters are consistent with those of
the longer science observation (the exception being $R$), albeit
less well constrained due to lower photon statistics. The best-
fit parameters and their 90% confidence intervals are given in
Table 1 for both observations. The flux was (12 ± 1)% lower
in the 2–10 keV band during the calibration observation, but
the two observations can be modeled self-consistently with just
the normalization of the primary continuum and the relative
reflection normalization changing significantly between the ob-
servations. Although we explored other models suggested in
the literature, we find that neither adding a second reflection com-
ponent, nor replacing the pexrav and the line components with
pexmon (linking those components self-consistently; Nandra
et al. 2007), nor modeling the broad iron line with a relativis-
tic broadening model, reaches lower $\chi^2/\nu$. More importantly,
those alternative models confirm the measurement of $E_{\text{cut}}$ to be
robust and, in the worst case, marginally consistent with the
90% confidence interval based on the phenomenological model
presented here. This is discussed further in Section 4.2.

### 3.2. Physical Models of the Corona

In the previous section we established that the coronal
continuum can be approximated as a power law with an
exponential cut-off at high energies. More physical models (such
as the compTT model of Titarchuk 1994) assume a geometry for
the corona and allow for determination of its physical parameters
from the data. In such models, low-energy (∼UV) photons
from the accretion disk are Compton-scattered by hot electrons
in the plasma. The spatial distribution of the coronal plasma
can be approximated with simple geometrical shapes, such as
a sphere centered on the black hole, or a slab covering the
surface of the accretion disk. In Xspec terminology, we replace
the pexrav continuum with a refl1(compTT) component: compTT
models the intrinsic coronal continuum for either a slab
(disk-like) or a spherical geometry, and refl1 convolves it with
reflection features. We fix the thermal photon temperature to
30 eV, which is appropriate for an AGN accretion disk and does
not influence the output spectrum much. We leave the reflector
inclination fixed at $\cos i = 0.45$ and iron abundance fixed at the
Solar value.

We find that both geometries can provide a good description
of the science observation data: the best-fit $\chi^2$ is 1163 for the slab
model, and 1161 for the spherical model, both with 1124 degrees
of freedom. In either geometry the coronal temperature ($kT_c$)
and the optical depth ($\tau_e$) are very well constrained and strongly
correlated, as shown in Figure 2. In the case of a slab geometry
we find $kT_c = 29 \pm 2$ keV and $\tau_e = 1.23 \pm 0.08$, while for the
spherical one the best fit is found for $kT_c = 25 \pm 2$ keV and
$\tau_e = 3.5 \pm 0.2$. All other parameters are found to be consistent
with values determined from the simpler phenomenological
models. We find qualitatively and quantitatively similar results
for the calibration observation data. Finally, we also verify that
consistent results are obtained with a more elaborate coronal
model, compPS (Poutanen & Svensson 1996). While the best-
fit parameters may not agree with the compTT values within the
uncertainties in all cases, the results are qualitatively the same. A
complete summary of the best-fit parameters is given in Table 1.

### 4. DISCUSSION

#### 4.1. The Hard X-Ray Spectrum and Its Variability

Our spectral modeling results are generally consistent with
previous findings, and confirm that the X-ray spectrum of
MCG–05-23-016 resembles that of a classical Compton-thin
Seyfert 2 nucleus (e.g., Walton et al. 2013). The high-energy
cut-off has been previously measured in MCG–05-23-016 with the
BeppoSAX, INTEGRAL and Swift hard X-ray instruments: 147^{+50}_{-30}$ keV (Perola et al. 2002), 190^{+110}_{-60}$ keV (Dadina 2007),
85^{+35}_{-20}$ keV (Molina et al. 2013). Beckmann et al. (2008) claimed
that the cut-off energy is variable within the 50 ∼ 100 keV range, but did not highlight any clear trends. It is important to stress that these inferences required assumptions about the photon index and reflection normalization in most cases, while we determine these spectral parameters directly from the data. The phenomenological model presented in Section 3.1 is the simplest model accounting for the key spectral features observed in the NuSTAR bandpass: the iron lines, the Compton hump, and the high-energy cut-off. We emphasize that it should not be taken as the NuSTAR bandpass: the iron lines, the Compton hump, and the model accounting for the key spectral features observed in the high-quality soft X-ray observations (e.g., Reeves et al. 2007; Zoghbi et al. 2013; also A. Zoghbi et al., in preparation). Although NuSTAR does not have sufficient spectral resolution to resolve details in the iron line complex, we compute equivalent line half-widths of the two Gaussian components used in our modeling (80 ± 10 eV for the broad and 40 ± 10 eV for the narrow component; see Table 1) and find that they are consistent with the highest-quality soft X-ray data. We also test a two-component reflection model, in which the distant reflection is separated from the relativistically broadened and partially ionized reflection off the inner accretion disk. For the disk reflection component we use reflionx hc—an updated version of reflionx (Ross & Fabian 2005) with a variable $E_{\text{cut}}$—and relativistic broadening modeled by a convolution with the Xspec model kdblur. We find that the NuSTAR data are not sensitive to the accretion disk parameters as long as its ionization is low ($\xi \lesssim 50$ erg s cm$^{-2}$), which is suggested by the best fit. Although the exact best-fit $E_{\text{cut}}$ depends on the nuisance parameters, in all cases it is found to be marginally consistent (at the 90% confidence level) with $E_{\text{cut}} = 116^{+16}_{-13}$ keV.

Note: Uncertainties listed here are 90% confidence intervals derived from MCMC chains.

$^a$ Flux in the 2–10 keV band in units of $10^{-11}$ erg s$^{-1}$ cm$^{-2}$ , calculated from the best-fit phenomenological model. Note that this is an extrapolation down to 2 keV, but we provide it here for comparison with the literature.

$^b$ Intrinsic continuum luminosity (de-absorbed and excluding reflection components) in the 2–10 keV band in units of $10^{43}$ erg s$^{-1}$, calculated from the best-fit phenomenological model. Note that this is an extrapolation down to 2 keV.

$^c$ Cross-normalization constant for NuSTAR module FPMB, assuming $C_{\text{FPMA}} = 1$.

**Figure 2.** Marginal probability distributions for parameters $\tau_e$ and $kT_e$ of the compTT model in the spherical geometry (top panel) and slab geometry (bottom panel). The distributions are derived from MCMC chains computed with Xspec and normalized separately. The red (gray) contours are based on fits to the science (calibration) observation data, marking enclosed probability of 68%, 90% and 99% with the solid, dashed and dotted lines.

**Table 1**

Summary of Best-fit Model Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Calibration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start–stop date</td>
<td>2013 Jun 3–7</td>
<td>2012 Jul 11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2–10\text{keV})$</td>
<td>$10.49 \pm 0.02$</td>
<td>$9.13 \pm 0.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L(2–10\text{keV})$</td>
<td>$1.781 \pm 0.003$</td>
<td>$1.530 \pm 0.005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.o.f. ($\nu$)</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent of the continuum model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{\text{FPMB}}$</td>
<td>$1.032 \pm 0.002$</td>
<td>$1.045 \pm 0.005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{line 1}}$ (keV)</td>
<td>$6.43 \pm 0.05$</td>
<td>$6.5^{+0.2}_{-0.1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\text{line 1}}$ (keV)</td>
<td>$0.46 \pm 0.06$</td>
<td>$0.5 \pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{line 1}}$ (eV)</td>
<td>$80 \pm 10$</td>
<td>$80 \pm 20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{line 2}}$ (eV)</td>
<td>$40 \pm 10$</td>
<td>$50 \pm 20$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenomenological continuum model: pexrav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma$</td>
<td>$1.85 \pm 0.01$</td>
<td>$1.83 \pm 0.02$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$0.87 \pm 0.04$</td>
<td>$1.1 \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{\text{cut}}$ (keV)</td>
<td>$116^{+16}_{-13}$</td>
<td>$119^{+16}_{-13}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptonized continuum model: refl(compTT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed corona geometry: slab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$0.82 \pm 0.04$</td>
<td>$1.0 \pm 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$kT_e$ (keV)</td>
<td>$25 \pm 2$</td>
<td>$26 \pm 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_e$</td>
<td>$3.5 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>$3.5 \pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptonized continuum model: compTT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed corona geometry: sphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$0.65 \pm 0.05$</td>
<td>$0.83 \pm 0.09$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$kT_e$ (keV)</td>
<td>$26 \pm 2$</td>
<td>$26 \pm 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_e$</td>
<td>$2.2 \pm 0.1$</td>
<td>$2.2 \pm 0.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed corona geometry: slab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>$0.69 \pm 0.04$</td>
<td>$0.89 \pm 0.08$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$kT_e$ (keV)</td>
<td>$25 \pm 2$</td>
<td>$25 \pm 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_e$</td>
<td>$3.2 \pm 0.2$</td>
<td>$3.3 \pm 0.3$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes.

Figure 2. Marginal probability distributions for parameters $\tau_e$ and $kT_e$ of the compTT model in the spherical geometry (top panel) and slab geometry (bottom panel). The distributions are derived from MCMC chains computed with Xspec and normalized separately. The red (gray) contours are based on fits to the science (calibration) observation data, marking enclosed probability of 68%, 90% and 99% with the solid, dashed and dotted lines.

Table 1 Summary of Best-fit Model Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Calibration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Start–stop date</td>
<td>2013 Jun 3–7</td>
<td>2012 Jul 11–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F(2–10\text{keV})$</td>
<td>$10.49 \pm 0.02$</td>
<td>$9.13 \pm 0.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L(2–10\text{keV})$</td>
<td>$1.781 \pm 0.003$</td>
<td>$1.530 \pm 0.005$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.o.f. ($\nu$)</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variability on the $\lesssim 1$ ks timescale has been shown to be due to reverberation of the primary continuum on the inner accretion disk (Zoghbi et al. 2014). Evaluation of the spectral variability between the two NuSTAR observations (approximately one year apart) is limited by the possible variability of the absorbing column. Our analysis of the joint NuSTAR and Suzaku data set from 2013 gives a relatively low absorption column density compared to the average taken from the literature ($1.32 \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$ compared to $\approx 1.6 \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$, excluding the Galactic contribution), which might or might not have persisted since the calibration observation in 2012. In our modeling, summarized in Table 1, we assume the same absorption column for both observations. If we instead adopt the long-term average column for the calibration observation, we find a cut-off at $\approx 130$ keV, which is only marginally different from the science observation. With no soft X-ray coverage for the calibration observation, the claim that $E_{\text{cut}}$ is variable is therefore not statistically significant.

With the column density kept constant, only the absolute flux and the relative reflection normalization ($R$) seem to have changed significantly. If we separate the reflection from the coronal continuum, we find that the normalization of the former does not change significantly between the two observations and conclude that the change is due to the relative increase of the coronal continuum flux. The flux of the broad iron line component is constant between the observations within the 90% confidence interval. The spectral variability may be due to the time delay between variations in the coronal continuum and its reflection by the distant torus. Alternatively, an effective change in $R$ may be due to a long-term physical change in the coronal geometry, such as its height above the accretion disk, or in the innermost region of the accretion disk itself.

4.2. Robustness of the Cut-off Measurement

As demonstrated in Section 3.1 (see Figure 1), a high-energy cut-off is clearly required by the NuSTAR data. Even though the cut-off energy ($E_{\text{cut}}$) is above the upper end of the NuSTAR bandpass, strong curvature is apparent below 79 keV and allows for determination of $E_{\text{cut}}$ to $\lesssim 5\%$ (statistical uncertainty; 90% confidence). The best-fit value of $E_{\text{cut}}$, however, depends on the assumptions that go into the simple model we fit to the data. One example is the inclination: if left free to vary in optimization, the best fit tends to $i \approx 80^\circ$ and $E_{\text{cut}} \approx 130$ keV, whereas adopting a value from the recent literature ($i \approx 45^\circ$; Braito et al. 2007; Reeves et al. 2007; Zoghbi et al. 2013) leads to $E_{\text{cut}} \approx 110$ keV. Likewise, if we leave the iron abundance to vary freely, the best fit is found for $A_{\text{Fe}} = 0.9 \pm 0.2$ — this is consistent with our assumption of $A_{\text{Fe}} = 1$, but implies $E_{\text{cut}} = 122$ keV, which is at the upper end of the 90% confidence interval found in Section 3.1.

A two-component reflection model leads to best-fit $E_{\text{cut}}$ between 110 and 124 keV, depending on different assumptions. The typical statistical uncertainty on the best-fit $E_{\text{cut}}$ in any particular fit to the science observation data is approximately 7 keV (20–30 keV for the calibration observation), with the iron abundance left free to vary and the ionization and the relativistic broadening parameters fixed close to values found in previous work (e.g., Zoghbi et al. 2013). We emphasize, however, that the systematics introduced by assuming a particular model are comparable to the statistical uncertainties in the case of the science observation of MCG–5–23–016, and are therefore important to consider. With the full flexibility in the shape of the complex reflection continuum, the NuSTAR data robustly constrain $E_{\text{cut}}$ to the slightly broader 105–130 keV interval, skewed toward the lower end and centered around 115 keV (when marginalized over different assumptions).

For high-quality data systematic uncertainty comparable to statistical uncertainty may also arise from arbitrary choices of the source and background extraction regions, and the choice of binning. For the $E_{\text{cut}}$ measurement presented in this paper, we have verified that different choices give results consistent with those discussed above. Systematics are clearly less of an issue with lower-quality data, as demonstrated by the calibration observation data presented here: in that case the constraints on spectral parameters are weakened, and the systematic uncertainty gets absorbed in the statistical uncertainty. This has been the case for the majority of the similar measurements on other AGNs published so far, including the recent ones based on the NuSTAR data (Brenneman et al. 2014a; Marinucci et al. 2014; Ballantyne et al. 2014). As in the case of IC 3299 (Brenneman et al. 2014b), additional constraints come from joint analyses of simultaneous soft and hard X-ray data sets, leading to further improvement in constraining $E_{\text{cut}}$.

4.3. Toward a Physical Model of the AGN Corona

The high-energy cut-offs have been measured with a relative uncertainty of $\lesssim 30\%$ for a relatively small sample of bright nearby AGNs; most of the AGNs observed with the previous generation of hard X-ray instruments provide lower limits on this parameter (e.g., Dadina 2007; Malizia et al. 2014). Using the NuSTAR data, the cut-off energies have recently been measured for IC 3299 ($E_{\text{cut}} = 184 \pm 14$ keV; Brenneman et al. 2014b), SWIFT J2127.4 + 5654 ($E_{\text{cut}} = 108^{+10}_{-11}$ keV; Marinucci et al. 2014) and 3C 382 ($E_{\text{cut}} = 214^{+14}_{-63}$ and $>190$ keV in two distinct spectral states; Ballantyne et al. 2014). The high quality of the NuSTAR spectra in the hard X-ray band up to 79 keV enable reliable independent measurements of the physical parameters of the corona: its temperature, $kT_c$, and optical depth, $\tau_c$. In this paper we present the most precise measurement thus far, with relative uncertainty of 5% (at the 90% confidence level), although, as discussed in Section 4.2, the exact value depends somewhat on nuisance parameters.

We find that, even though the physical parameters such as $kT_c$ and $\tau_c$ are very well constrained by the data, it is still impossible to formally distinguish the geometry. The slab (disk-like) and the spherical geometries, as parameterized by the compTT and compPS models used here, both describe the MCG–05–23–016 spectrum equally well. We note that a similar result was found in observations of the Seyfert 1.2 IC 4329a and the narrow-line Seyfert 1 SWIFT J2127.4 + 5654 with NuSTAR (Brenneman et al. 2014a, 2014b; Marinucci et al. 2014). Both of these AGNs and MCG–05–23–016 are radio-quiet, however, they differ in other properties. With a mass of the super-massive black hole of $\sim 5 \times 10^7 M_\odot$ (Wandel & Mushotzky 1986), the mean intrinsic 2–10 keV luminosity of $1.66 \times 10^{38}$ erg s$^{-1}$ (see Table 1) and a bolometric correction from Marconi et al. (2004),
MCG–05-23-016 is accreting at approximately 5% of the Eddington rate. This is almost an order of magnitude less than the key other two AGNs. Interestingly, SWIFT J2127.4+5654 has the lowest black hole mass and the lowest cut-off, followed by MCG–05-23-016 in the middle, and IC 4329a with highest mass and cut-off energy. In a number of other AGNs, a stringent lower limit on the cut-off energy was placed using the NuSTAR data, indicating a generally higher coronal temperature and lower optical depths, e.g., $E_{\text{cut}} > 190$ keV in 3C 382 (Ballantyne et al. 2014) and in Ark 120 (Matt et al. 2014), and $E_{\text{cut}} > 210$ keV in NGC 2110 (Marinucci et al. 2015). Using long-term averaged data from INTEGRAL, Malizia et al. (2014) constrained cut-off energies for 26 AGNs in the range between 50 and 200 keV, some of which have been or will be observed with NuSTAR. With more high-quality measurements in the near future, covering a wide range of physical properties, it will be possible to directly probe the physics of the AGN corona. In order to distinguish the fine differences due to the coronal geometry, longer observations of sources with a weaker reflection continuum will be needed.

The difference between the optical depth in the two geometries tested here is partially due to the different geometrical definition: whereas in the spherical case it is taken in the radial direction, in the case of slab geometry it is taken vertically, creating a natural offset by a factor of $\cos i$. For $\cos i = 0.45$ used here, the radial optical depth for the slab geometry becomes almost equal to the one of the spherical corona. The important result we point out in this paper is that the $E_{\text{cut}} < 200$ keV measurements with NuSTAR pressure the theoretical models toward the high-$\tau_c$ regime where their validity falls off. The approximations used in the compPS model hold only for low optical depth and the formal limits are $\tau_c < 1.5$ for the slab, and $\tau_c < 3$ for the sphere geometry (Poutanen & Svensson 1996). The limits of the simpler compTT model are even more stringent, although good agreement is found between the analytical model and Monte Carlo simulations in the $\tau_c \sim 1$ regime (Tith Successful). It is therefore not surprising that the best-fit optical depth in the two models differs somewhat. If the high optical depth derived from the currently available models can be interpreted directly, our results imply that the corona must be inhomogeneous. Spectral features and variability signatures of reflection from the inner accretion disk are clearly detectable in MCG–05-23-016 (Zoghbi et al. 2014) and therefore the corona, which covers the disk in either geometry, cannot be completely opaque. Homogeneity is one of the assumptions of the coronal models used here, hence pressing against their limits may be indicative of that assumption not being satisfied. Alternatively, our result may simply indicate a geometry different from the ones assumed in this work. In either case, we are drawn to the conclusion that new models are needed in order to better understand the physical implications of our result.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this paper we focus on modeling the hard X-ray spectrum of MCG–05-23-016 in order to constrain models of the AGN corona. We first robustly establish that a cut-off is present in the spectrum at 116$^{+6}_{-5}$ keV (statistical uncertainty; 90% confidence), despite the non-negligible reflection component contributing to curvature of the hard X-ray spectrum. The ability to disentangle a $\lesssim 200$ keV cut-off from the reflection continuum is essentially unique to NuSTAR. Modeling the spectrum with physical models, we find that both slab and spherical geometries of the corona provide equally good fits to the data, albeit for different physical parameters. Assuming a simple coronal model (compTT), we find the kinetic temperature of electrons in the corona and its optical depth, $kT_e$ and $\tau_c$, to be $29 \pm 2$ (25 $\pm$ 2) keV and 1.23 $\pm$ 0.08 (3.5 $\pm$ 0.2) for the slab (spherical) geometry. Similar results are found for a different, less approximate model (compPS). It is important to note that in all cases the data push the models toward high-$\tau_c$ values, where their validity drops off. The relative statistical uncertainty of $\lesssim 5\%$ (quoted here as a 90% confidence interval) has never been achieved before and we show that the new level of precision enabled by NuSTAR requires careful consideration of possible systematic uncertainties arising from simplifying assumptions. With further measurements at comparable precision for AGNs with a wide range of properties, and the extension of Comptonization models toward the high-opacity regime, it should be possible to construct a clearer physical picture of the AGN corona in the near future.
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