

Energy dependence of Quasi-periodic oscillations in accreting X-ray pulsars

Hemanth Manikantan,^{1,2,*} Biswajit Paul,¹ Rahul Sharma¹, Pragati Pradhan³ and Vikram Rana¹

¹*Astronomy & Astrophysics Department, Raman Research Institute, CV Raman Avenue, Sadashivanagar, Bangalore 560080, India*

²*INAF Istituto di Astrofisica e Planetologia Spaziali, Via del Fosso del Cavaliere 100, 00133 Roma, Italy*

³*Department of Physics, Embry Riddle Aeronautical University, Prescott Campus, 3700 Willow Creek Road, Prescott, AZ 86301, USA*

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

We present the results from an investigation of the energy dependence of Quasi-Periodic Oscillations (QPOs) exhibited by accreting X-ray pulsars using data from archival *XMM-Newton*, *NuSTAR*, *RXTE*, and *NICER* observations. In a search for the presence of QPOs in 99 *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations, we detected QPOs in eleven observations of five sources, viz., 4U 1626–67 (48 mHz), IGR J19294+1816 (30 mHz), V 0332+53 (2, 18 and 40 mHz), Cen X–3 (30 mHz), and XTE J1858+034 (180 mHz). A positive correlation of the QPO rms amplitude with energy is exhibited by 4U 1626–67, IGR J19294+1816, Cen X–3 and XTE J1858+034, while no energy dependence is observed in V 0332+53. We also analysed the energy spectrum to decouple thermal (soft-excess) from non-thermal emission and determine if the soft-excess has different QPO properties. We found no evidence for different QPO characteristics of the soft excess. The *NuSTAR* observations of V 0332+53 during the Type-I outburst in 2016 show the presence of twin QPOs at 2.5 mHz and 18 mHz, while the *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations during the Type-II outburst in 2015 show a QPO at 40 mHz. We review the observed QPO properties in the context of QPOs found in other types of accreting sources and the models usually used to explain the QPOs in accreting X-ray pulsars.

Key words: pulsars: general – accretion discs – X-rays: binaries – methods: data analysis – X-rays: individual: 4U 1626–67, IGR J19294+1816, V 0332+53, Cen X–3, XTE J1858+034

1 INTRODUCTION

Accreting X-ray pulsars (XRP) are strongly magnetized rotating neutron stars, having surface magnetic fields of the order of 10^{12} Gauss, that accretes matter from a binary stellar companion either via Roche lobe overflow or from its strong stellar wind. Quasi-periodic oscillations (QPOs), exhibited as a concentration of Fourier power at frequencies of a few ten mHz in the power spectral density (PSD), are a transient phenomenon in XRPs. These mHz QPO have been reported in about twenty XRPs (See the list of sources in James et al. 2010 and Raman et al. 2021) in both transient and persistent sources.

The strong magnetic field of the neutron star impedes the formation of an accretion disk inside the magnetospheric radius (r_M) at about a few 1000 km from the neutron star. Therefore, the radius of the inner accretion disk is expected to be of the order of r_M . QPOs are usually exhibited by XRPs at frequencies of a few ten mHz, and since the Keplerian orbital frequency of matter around a canonical $1.4 M_\odot$ neutron star at $r_M \sim 5000$ km is $\frac{1}{2\pi} \sqrt{\frac{GM_{NS}}{r_M^3}} \sim 200$ mHz, the QPOs are qualitatively associated with phenomena related to the inner accretion disk. The QPO is XRP are usually observed from a few keV up to ~ 40 keV (Qu et al. 2005; Raichur & Paul 2008; Nepoli & Reig 2010; Devasia et al. 2011; Raman et al. 2021; Sharma

et al. 2023a), but 1A 0535+262 is an exception where QPO is only present in hard X-rays above ~ 25 keV (Finger et al. 1996; Ma et al. 2022). The accretion disk is considered to be always present in persistent sources. On the contrary, transient sources are believed to have phases of formation of a temporary accretion disk around the neutron star during their luminous phases.

The two most commonly used models to explain QPOs in XRPs are the Magnetospheric beat-frequency model (BFM; Alpar & Shaham 1985) and the Keplerian frequency model (KFM; Klis 1997). BFM models the QPO as a modulation in the mass accretion rate on to the NS poles at the beat frequency between the spin frequency of NS (ν_{NS}) and the orbital frequency of the inner accretion disk. Matter is channelled onto the neutron star from inhomogeneity in the inner accretion disk along the spinning magnetic field lines. According to BFM, $\nu_{QPO} = \nu_k - \nu_{NS}$, where ν_k is the Keplerian orbital frequency of the inner accretion disk and ν_{NS} is the spin period of the neutron star. KFM models the QPO as an effect due to the blobs of matter in the inner accretion disk intercepting the emission from the neutron star, because of which the observer perceives a modulation in the X-ray flux. According to KFM, $\nu_{QPO} = \nu_k$. KFM places a constraint on the observed QPO frequency based on the neutron star spin frequency $\nu_{NS} < \nu_{QPO}$, based on the argument of centrifugal inhibition of accreted matter beyond this limit. BFM, on the other hand, provides constraints on the minimum X-ray flux to be maintained by accretion based on the centrifugal inhibition limit (Finger 1998). Assuming the radius of the inner accretion disk also scales

*E-mail: hemanth.manikantan@inaf.it

by the accretion rate $\dot{M}^{-\frac{2}{3}}$ (and hence the X-ray luminosity), the Keplerian frequency of the inner accretion disk, and thereby the QPO frequency, is expected to increase with luminosity in both KFM and BFM (Finger 1998).

QPOs exhibit variability as a function of photon energy, which puts constraints on the applicable models that explain the origin of QPO. So far no general characteristic trend has been recognised in XRP with respect to the QPO rms amplitude as a function of energy. Correlation (IGR J19294+1816; Raman et al. 2021, KS 1947+300; James et al. 2010, XTE J1858+034; Mukherjee et al. 2006, LMC X-4; Sharma et al. 2023a), anti-correlation (A 1118-615; Nespoli & Reig 2010, V 0332+53; Qu et al. 2005, Cen X-3 Liu et al. 2022, GX 304-1; Devasia et al. 2011) and no correlation (Cen X-3; Raichur & Paul 2008) have all been reported. Most of the studies mentioned above were performed using *RXTE/PCA* data, which was sensitive to photons in the 2–30 keV energy band. There are also cases where unusual dependency is seen, for instance, the detection of QPO at 80 keV and the convex-shaped relation between QPO rms and photon energy in 1A 0535+262 peaking at around 60 keV from the *In-sight/HXMT* data which offers 1–250 keV spectral coverage (Ma et al. 2022).

We performed a comprehensive search for QPOs in the archival *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations of XRPs. Additional data from *RXTE/PCA* and *NICER* were analysed for 4U 1626–67. In observations where QPO was detected, we constructed the variation of QPO rms as a function of photon energy and analysed the energy spectrum.

The paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 describes the instruments utilized, data reduction and the methods employed for timing and spectral analyses. The results of the timing and spectral analysis for each source are provided in Section 3. The discussion of findings and interpretation of the results is given in Section 4. The log of all observations utilised in this work and fits on individual power spectral densities are given in Appendices A and B.

2 OBSERVATIONS AND DATA REDUCTION

2.1 Instruments and Data reduction

XMM-Newton: The PN-type European Photon Imaging Camera (EPIC-PN) onboard the *X-ray Multi-Mirror Mission (XMM-Newton)* is an array of twelve pn-CCDs coupled to focussing optics, sensitive to photons in 0.15–15 keV (Strüder et al. 2001). EPIC-PN has an effective area of around 1000 cm² at 1.5 keV. We followed the standard data reduction steps from *XMM-Newton* data analysis threads¹. First, the event list for the EPIC-PN instrument was generated from the Observation Data Files (ODF) with the tool *epproc*, using the calibration files generated with the tool *cifbuild*. The generated event time stamps were then corrected for the motion of the earth around the barycenter of the solar system using the tool *barycen* and subsequently filtered for time intervals of high background particle flaring. We also checked the observations for pile-up, following the steps mentioned in SAS Thread *epatplot*². If found, the piled-up data were removed by excluding the central core of the PSF in imaging mode

observations using an annular source region, and by removing the boresight columns in Timing mode observations³.

The source and background light curves and spectra were extracted from the resulting events file with the tool *evselect*. A circular source and annular background region were used for imaging mode observations, while rectangular strips were used for timing mode observations.

NuSTAR: *NuSTAR* operating in 3–79 keV, consists of two CdZnTe detectors paired to separate hard X-ray focussing optics and have a total effective area of about 1000 cm² at 10 keV (Harrison et al. 2013). The two detectors are called Focal Plane Modules (FPM) A and B. We followed the standard data reduction steps from The *NuSTAR* Data Analysis Software Guide⁴, using the *NuSTAR* Data Analysis Software package *NuSTARDAS* v2.1.1. The filtered and calibrated events files were generated with the tool *nupipeline* using the *NuSTAR* calibration database (CALDB) version 20210315. Using *nuproducts*, the source and background light curves were generated from circular regions of FPMA and FPMB modules. The light curves from FPMA and FPMB were summed together using task *1cmath*.

RXTE/PCA: The Proportional Counter Array (PCA) on the *Rossi X-ray Timing Explorer (RXTE)* consists of five collimated large-area Xenon filled proportional counter units with a total effective area of ~ 6500 cm², sensitive to photons in 2–60 keV (Jahoda et al. 2006). PCA light curves in different energy bands were extracted from the GoodXenon Event mode data files using the tool *seextract* using the photon energy to channel conversion table given here⁵. We have used only one *RXTE/PCA* observation (of 4U 1626–67, OID P10101) in this work.

NICER: The *Neutron star Interior Composition Explorer (NICER)* is an X-ray observatory installed on the International Space Station (ISS). The X-ray Timing Instrument (XTI) onboard *NICER* comprises 56 X-ray concentrator (XRC) optics coupled to SDD detectors (Gendreau et al. 2016). The XTI operates in the 0.2–10 keV energy range and has an effective area of ~ 1900 cm² at 1.5 keV. XTI lightcurves in different energy bands were extracted using the tool *nicer13-1c* and the spectra were extracted using the tool *nicer13-spect* after screening the data from the noisy detectors (DET_ID 14 and 34). The background lightcurves and spectra were generated using the Space Weather background model. The lightcurves were corrected for the solar-system barycenter using the tool *barycorr*. We have only used the *NICER* observations of 4U 1626–67 (Table 1) in this work.

2.2 Method of analysis

For each observation listed in Table B1, the background subtracted light curves were generated with a bin size of 1 s. Setting the bin size to 1 s enables the construction of PSD up to 500 mHz, facilitating the ability to check for mHz QPOs. The PSD of each light curve was generated using the *XRONOS* tool *powspec*⁶. The light curves were divided into segments of length 4096 s (1024 s for *NICER*) and the power spectra obtained from the lightcurve segments were averaged

¹ <https://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/xmm-newton/sas-threads>

² <https://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/XMM-Newton/sas-thread-epatplot>

³ http://xmm-tools.cosmos.esa.int/external/xmm_user_support/documentation/sas_usg/USG/epicpileuptiming.html

⁴ https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/nustar/analysis/nustar_swguide.pdf

⁵ https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/docs/xte/e-c_table.html

⁶ <https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/lheasoft/ftools/fhelp/powspec.txt>

to improve the signal-to-noise ratio of PSD (van der Klis 1989). The resulting PSD was normalised so that it has units of $(\text{rms}/\text{mean})^2 \text{ Hz}^{-1}$ so that integrating the PSD over frequency gives the fractional rms squared variability. An expected flat noise level of $\sim 2/\text{mean}$ was also subtracted from the PSD (van der Klis 1989, Belloni & Hasinger 1990). Normalisation of PDS and subtraction of the expected noise level was achieved by setting $\text{norm} = -2$ in `powspec`. The fractional rms amplitude from QPO in *NICER* observations were estimated from non-background-corrected lightcurves, and hence the estimated QPO fractional rms were corrected for background by scaling it with a factor of $\sqrt{(S+B)/S}$ (Belloni & Hasinger 1990), where S and B are the source and background count rates, respectively.

QPOs appeared as a relatively wide asymmetric bump in the PSD (See Appendix.A) and were identified through visual inspection. Apart from QPOs some of the PSDs also showed sharp narrow features (See, for example, Figs. A1, A2, A4 and A8) corresponding to the spin period of the pulsar and its harmonics. PSD to a factor of four frequency range on either side of the QPO vicinity ($0.25\nu_{\text{QPO}}-4\nu_{\text{QPO}}$) or a factor of 8 for the low Q -factor cases (V 0332+53 and Cen X-3) was fitted with the combination of a `powerlaw` or `lorentzian` (for the continuum), and a `lorentzian` (for the QPO). The sharp spikes in PSD corresponding to the pulsar spin period and its harmonics were removed before performing the fit. The centre (ν_{QPO}), width ($\text{width}_{\text{QPO}}$) of `lorentzian` and the integrated fractional rms-squared power under the `lorentzian` ($P_{\text{rms}} \pm \Delta P_{\text{rms}}$) was then estimated. Fractional rms amplitude variability of the QPO was estimated as $\sqrt{P_{\text{rms}}} \pm (\Delta P_{\text{rms}}/2\sqrt{P_{\text{rms}}})$. To assess the variation of QPO fractional rms in different energy ranges, the procedure was repeated on PSDs derived from light curves in different energy bands. The errors assigned to the QPO fractional rms values are their 68% (1σ) confidence intervals and all other parameters are their 90% (2.7σ) confidence intervals, unless otherwise stated. The fractional rms amplitude for the high-frequency (200 mHz) QPO in XTE J1858+034 was assessed after constructing the PSD from lightcurve with 0.5 s bin size so that the Nyquist frequency is 1 Hz.

We analysed energy-resolved lightcurves for a total of 99 observations of 29 X-ray pulsars and QPOs were identified in eleven of them (Table 1). The very fact that QPOs were not detected in all the observations of a particular source, and in sources which have previous reports of QPO, indicates the transient nature of QPOs in XRP.

In the observations with a QPO detection, we also performed the spectral analysis. We used the package `XSPEC v12.13.1` (Arnaud et al. 1999) for performing the spectral analysis. Unless stated otherwise, we have binned the spectrum to a minimum of 25 counts per bin.

3 SOURCES AND RESULTS

3.1 4U 1626–67

4U 1626–67 is a persistent Low mass Ultra-compact X-ray binary in which a 130 mHz spinning strongly magnetized ($\sim 3 \times 10^{12}$ G) neutron star (Coburn et al. 2002, and references therein) is accreting Oxygen and Neon rich matter from a companion by Roche lobe overflow, that is assessed from the presence of Oxygen/Neon emission complex at 1 keV in its energy spectrum (Schulz et al. 2001). The X-ray spectrum of the persistent accreting pulsar 4U 1626–67 has been extensively studied, and it usually exhibits a soft blackbody

component along with the power-law (Camero-Arranz et al. 2012). A QPO at 48 mHz is well established in the source at multiple wavelengths, in the Optical band with 3% rms amplitude (Chakrabarty 1998), UV band with 3% rms amplitude in the near-UV to 15% in the far-UV (Chakrabarty et al. 2001) and X-ray band with 15% rms (Shinoda et al. 1990, Kaur et al. 2008). The 48 mHz QPO is observed in 4U 1626–67 when the pulsar is spinning down, and lower frequency QPOs (36 and 40 mHz) are observed when the source is spinning up (See Jain et al. 2010, and references therein).

The 48 mHz QPO is present in two *XMM-Newton* observations (Fig. A1) (Beri et al. 2014). To extend the study of QPO variability to higher energy bands, we also selected an *RXTE/PCA* observation having ~ 147 ks on-source exposure in which 48 mHz QPO was reported by Kaur et al. (2008). The band-limited noise between 12 to 192 mHz in the PDS of both the *XMM-Newton*/PN observations were fitted with a `powerlaw` and the QPO at 48 mHz was fitted with a `Lorentzian` (Fig. A1). The band-limited noise between 12 to 192 mHz in the *RXTE/PCA* observation was fitted with a `powerlaw`, a broad low frequency `Gaussian` at ~ 12 mHz, a narrow `Lorentzian` at ~ 80 mHz for the QPO-pulsar-sideband (Kommers et al. 1998), and the QPO at 48 mHz was fitted with a `Lorentzian` (Fig. A2). We determined the energy-resolved variation of QPO in the 0.5–60 keV energy band (Fig. 1). The fractional rms amplitude of QPO exhibits a steadily rising trend in 3–60 keV, increasing from about 15% to 28%. However, it deviates from this trend below 3 keV, where the QPO rms is high at around 20% in 1–3 keV and 18% in 0.5–1 keV. To study the QPO characteristics below 3 keV in finer energy segments, we analysed the combined PSD from multiple *NICER* observations (Table 1) of 4U 1626–67 having the 48 mHz QPO. The band-limited noise between 12 to 192 mHz in the PDS of *NICER* observation was fitted with a `powerlaw` and the QPO at 48 mHz was fitted with a `Lorentzian` (Fig. A3). We estimated the fractional rms amplitude of the QPO in five energy bands; 0.5–0.9 (14%), 0.9–1.3 (17%), 1.3–1.9 (20%), and 1.9–3.5 keV (19%) (Fig. 2). A detailed discussion on the energy dependence of QPO rms below 3 keV, especially from *NICER* observations, is given in Section 4.4.

We analysed the 0.5–10 keV spectra from both *XMM-Newton* observations and the 0.5–8 keV spectra from all the *NICER* observations. We adopted the spectral model from Beri et al. (2018). A `powerlaw` could fit the continuum, and the strong Neon emission complex at ~ 1 keV was fitted with a `Gaussian` profile. The spectra also showed the presence of soft excess, which was modeled with a black body component of $kT_{\text{BB}} \sim 0.3$ keV. The finally used spectral model is `tbabs*(powerlaw+tbody+gaussian)` (Figs. 1, 2). The best fitting spectral model parameters for all the observations are given in Table. 2.

3.2 IGR J19294+1816

IGR J19294+1816 is a transient High mass X-ray binary in which a spinning ($\nu_{\text{spin}} \sim 83$ mHz) strongly magnetized ($\sim 4 \times 10^{12}$ G) neutron star (Tsygankov et al. 2019a) accretes matter from a Be-type companion star (Rodes-Roca et al. 2018) in a 117 d orbit (Rodríguez et al. 2009). QPO was reported in the *AstroSat*/LAXPC observation at 32 mHz during the luminosity decline phase of a Type-I outburst of the source during the periastron passage in 2019 (Domček et al. 2019; Raman et al. 2021).

We detected QPO in an *XMM-Newton* observation at 30 mHz (Fig. A4) during the rising phase of the same 2019 outburst. The band-limited noise in PDS between 8 mHz and 128 mHz was fitted with a `powerlaw` and the QPO at 30 mHz was fitted with a `Lorentzian` (Fig. A4). The fractional rms amplitude of QPO shows

Table 1. Observations catalogue for timing and spectral analysis, of sources with QPO detection.

| Source | Observatory/Instrument | Obs. ID | Observing mode | Start date (Duration in ks) | Avg. count rate [†] (cts s ⁻¹) | Piled-up | Avg. count rate [‡] (cts s ⁻¹) |
|-----------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|---|
| 4U 1626–67 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0111070201 | PrimeSmallWindow | 24-08-2001 (16) | 33.20 ± 0.06 | - | - |
| | | 0152620101 | PrimeSmallWindow | 20-08-2003 (84) | 27.63 ± 0.02 | XRL [§] | - |
| | <i>RXTE</i> /PCA | P10101 | Good Xenon | 10-02-1996 (395) | 306.90 ± 0.05 [¶] | - | - |
| | | NICER/XTI | 62038001XX [§] | N/A | 28-04-2023 (40) [§] | 22.12 ± 0.04 [§] | - |
| IGR J19294+1816 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0841190101 | PrimeFullWindow | 13-10-2019 (67) | 20.57 ± 0.03 | PU | 2.74 ± 0.09 |
| V 0332+53 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0763470301 | FastTiming | 10-09-2015 (32) | 423.68 ± 0.19 | PU | 194.7 ± 0.1 |
| | | 0763470401 | FastTiming | 16-09-2015 (31) | 280.12 ± 0.12 | PU | 162.0 ± 0.1 |
| | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPM | 80102002004 | N/A | 10-09-2015 (15) | 209.40 ± 0.10 | - | - |
| | | 80102002006 | N/A | 16-09-2015 (17) | 136.60 ± 0.10 | - | - |
| | | 90202031002 | N/A | 30-07-2016 (44) | 24.52 ± 0.02 | - | - |
| | | 90202031004 | N/A | 31-07-2016 (44) | 19.64 ± 0.02 | - | - |
| Cen X–3 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0400550201 | FastTiming | 12-06-2006 (80) | 452.10 ± 0.07 | No | - |
| XTE J1858+034 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPM | 90501348002 | N/A | 03-11-2019 (90) | 17.27 ± 0.02 | - | - |

[†] Before pile-up correction.

[‡] After pile-up correction.

[§] This *XMM-Newton* observation is affected by X-ray loading.

[¶] Across all five PCUs of *RXTE* that were ON during this observation.

^{||} In FPMA module.

[§] XX=03, 04, 06, 11, 12, 15–17, 22, 32, 33, 35–42, 45–47, 49. The start date of OID 6203800103 and total on-source exposure across all the observations (out of a total elapsed time duration of 5933 ks) are given. The average count rate in 0.5–10 keV of the combined lightcurve from the observations is given.

Table 2. The results of spectral fit performed on two observations of 4U 1626–67 having QPO. All observations were fitted with the composite spectral model `tbabs*(powerlaw+tbody+gaussian)`. The best fit model parameter values and their errors are given. The errors quoted on all parameters are their 90% confidence ranges.

| Obs. ID | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | | <i>NICER</i> |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| | 0111070201 | 0152620101 | 62038001XX ^ℓ |
| nH [†] | 0.05 ± 0.01 | 0.07 ± 0.01 | 0.07 ± 0.03 |
| PhoIndex (Γ) | 0.81 ± 0.02 | 0.80 ± 0.01 | 0.65 ± 0.11 |
| N _{PL} [‡] | (8.1 ± 0.2) × 10 ⁻³ | (6.8 ± 0.1) × 10 ⁻³ | (5.1 ± 0.6) × 10 ⁻³ |
| kT _{tbody} (keV) | 0.27 ± 0.01 | 0.24 ± 0.01 | 0.23 ± 0.02 |
| N _{tbody} [§] | (1.2 ± 0.1) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (1.10 ± 0.04) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (7.8 ± 2.3) × 10 ⁻⁵ |
| E _{Gauss} | 1.00 ± 0.01 | 1.01 ± 0.01 | 1.00 ± 0.02 |
| σ _{Gauss} | 0.04 ± 0.01 | 0.02 ^{+0.01} _{-0.02} | 0.01* |
| N _{Gauss} [¶] | (3.9 ± 0.5) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (2.1 ± 0.2) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (1.2 ± 0.3) × 10 ⁻⁴ |
| Flux _{2–20 keV} (10 ⁻¹⁰ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²) | 2.90 ± 0.01 | 2.31 ± 0.01 | 1.70 ± 0.17 to 6.05 ± 0.17 |
| χ ² (dof) | 1823 (1642) | 2153 (1896) | 74(94) to 122(95) |
| χ ² _{red} | 1.11 | 1.14 | 0.79 to 1.29 |

* Frozen.

[†] in units of 10²² atoms cm⁻².

[‡] Normalization in units of photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² keV⁻¹ at 1 keV.

[§] Normalization in units of 10³⁷ ergs s⁻¹ kpc⁻².

[¶] Total photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² in the gaussian line.

^ℓ XX = 03, 04, 06, 11, 12, 15–17, 22, 32, 33, 35–42, 45–47, and 49. The quoted best-fitting parameter values are the error-weighted mean and standard error of the parameter estimates from individual observations. The ranges of variation of flux and fit-statistic are given. The best fitting model on observations XX=38 and 45 having relatively short exposure duration did not require a blackbody component.

an increasing trend in the 0.5–10 keV range and the trend continues till 30 keV (Fig. 3), as evident from the results of Raman et al. (2021).

We tried to fit different continuum models to the 0.5–10 keV *XMM-Newton*/PN spectrum and found that `powerlaw*highcut` and `powerlaw*FDcut` gave good fits to the continuum with acceptable values for all the spectral parameters. Residuals left by the iron fluorescence line could be modelled with a Gaussian emission profile. Since the width of the Gaussian was not constrained by the fit, we fixed it to 10 eV (the spectral resolution of EPIC-PN at 6.4 keV is 150 eV). The finally used spectral model is `tbabs*(powerlaw*highcut+gaussian)` (Fig. 3). The best fitting spectral model parameters are given in Table. 3.

3.3 V 0332+53

V 0332+53 is a transient High mass X-ray binary in which a 227 mHz pulsar accretes matter from a Be-type companion star in a 34 d eccentric ($e \sim 0.3$) orbit (Stella et al. 1985). QPO was discovered in the source during a Type-II outburst in 1989 from *Ginga*/LAC observations by Takeshima et al. (1994) at 51 mHz with about 5% rms in the 2.3–37.2 keV energy band. The 51 mHz QPO and another 220 mHz QPO (centred at the NS spin frequency) were found in later observations during the 2004/2005 Type-II outburst decay phase with *RXTE*/PCA (Qu et al. 2005), and *INTEGRAL*/JEM-X and IBIS (Mowlavi et al. 2006) observations. Qu et al. (2005) also observed that the QPO central frequency does not vary with flux and that the QPO rms stays constant as a function of photon energy till 10 keV and drops beyond 10 keV.

Two quasi-simultaneous observations from *XMM-Newton* and




Figure 1. Top: The energy dependent variation of QPO fractional rms amplitude in 4U 1626–67 from *XMM-Newton*/PN (red, black) and *RXTE*/PCA (blue) observations. Bottom: The 0.5–10 keV unfolded spectrum and residuals to the best-fit model $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} + \text{gaussian} + \text{bbody})$ on the *XMM-Newton* Obs. ID 0111070201. Soft excess was modelled with a black body component of $kT \sim 0.3$ keV.

Table 3. The results of spectral fit performed on one observation of IGR J19294+1816 having QPO. The best fit model parameter values and their errors are given. The errors quoted on all the parameters are their 90% confidence ranges.

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| Obs. ID | 0841190101 |
| $n\text{H}^\dagger$ | 3.62 ± 0.17 |
| PhoIndex (Γ) | 0.41 ± 0.07 |
| N_{PL}^\ddagger | 0.010 ± 0.001 |
| cutoffE (keV) | 4.96 ± 0.30 |
| foldE (keV) | 7.03 ± 0.50 |
| $E_{\text{Gauss,Fe}}$ | 6.39 ± 0.01 |
| $\sigma_{\text{Gauss,Fe}}$ | 0.01* |
| $N_{\text{Gauss,Fe}}^\S$ | $(2.9 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-4}$ |
| Flux _{2–20 keV} (10^{-10} erg s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$) | 4.04 ± 0.02 |
| χ^2 (dof) | 679 (669) |
| χ^2_{red} | 1.02 |

* Frozen.

† in units of 10^{22} atoms cm $^{-2}$.

‡ Normalization in units of photons s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$ keV $^{-1}$ at 1 keV.

§ Total photons s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$ in the gaussian line.




Figure 2. The top panel shows QPO fractional rms amplitude in 4U 1626–67 in different energy bands from combined PDS of all the *NICER* observations. The middle panel shows the *NICER* photon energy spectrum and the best fit composite spectral model $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} + \text{bbody} + \text{gaussian})$ and the contribution from individual components, especially the soft excess and the Neon line at 1 keV, on selected five observations. The vertical dashed lines indicate the energy range 1.3–1.9 keV, where the QPO rms peaks (See Section 4.4). The bottom panel shows residuals to the best fit spectral model.

NuSTAR during the 2015 Type-II outburst show the presence of a QPO at about 40 mHz (Figs. A5, A6), and two observations from *NuSTAR* during a Type-I outburst in 2016 show twin QPOs at 2.5 mHz and 18 mHz (Fig. A7). The *XMM-Newton*/PN and *NuSTAR* PSDs of the 2015 observations in the 0.005–0.24 Hz range were fitted with a wide Lorentzian for the band-limited noise and another narrow Lorentzian at 40 mHz for the QPO (Figs. A5, A6). The *NuSTAR* PSDs of 2016 observations in the 0.005–0.12 Hz range were fitted with $\text{powerlaw} * \text{highcut}$ for the broadband noise and two Lorentzian profiles at ~ 2.5 mHz and ~ 18 mHz for the twin QPOs (Fig. A7). The rms amplitude of 40 mHz QPO in the 2015 observations, and the 2.5 mHz and 18 mHz QPO in the 2016 observations does not exhibit any secular trend in energy (Fig. 4). The quality factor of the 2.5 mHz QPO is higher than the 18 mHz and 40 mHz QPOs. The *NuSTAR* PSDs of both the 2016 observations also show the presence of a faint QPO-like structure at about 100 mHz (Fig. A7). We would like to point out that an additional sixth *NuSTAR* observation also exists during the rising phase, before the peak of the 2015 outburst. However, the PDS of this *NuSTAR* observation has a complex shape with four QPO-like features at 2, 9, 57 and 225 mHz frequencies. However, the analysis and interpretation of that observation are beyond the scope of this work.

We analysed the spectra from the two *XMM-Newton* and four *NuSTAR* observations. The *XMM-Newton*/PN spectra were rebinned with the HEASOFT tool FTGROUPPHA such that each spectral bin has a minimum number of counts equivalent to a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of ≥ 50 per bin. We tried to fit different continuum models to the 1–10 keV *XMM-Newton*/PN spectra of both observations and found that absorbed powerlaw , compTT and NPEX models could fit the continuum well. Residuals were left at around 6.7 keV, and 2.2 keV in both observations and we used two Gaussians centred at 6.7 keV and 2.2 keV to model them. The width of the 2.2 keV line was not constrained by the fit in both observations and




Figure 3. Top: The energy dependent variation of QPO fractional rms amplitude in IGR J19294+1816 from *XMM-Newton* (this work; black) and *Astrosat/LAXPC* (red; Raman et al. 2021). Bottom: The 0.5–10 keV unfolded *XMM-Newton/PN* spectrum and residuals to the best fit model $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} * \text{highcut} + \text{gaussian})$.

therefore we froze it to 10 eV. We finally used the NPEX model as other continuum models left residuals around the iron fluorescence region. Soft-excess-like residuals were visible at the lowest energies only in OIG 0763470301 and we used a *bbody* with $kT \sim 0.1$ keV to model it. The finally used model for the two *XMM-Newton* observations are $\text{tbabs} * (\text{NPEX} + \text{gaussian}_1 + \text{gaussian}_2 + \text{bbody})$, and $\text{tbabs} * (\text{NPEX} + \text{gaussian}_1 + \text{gaussian}_2)$.

The *NuSTAR/FPM* spectra were re-binned with the same tool as per the optimal binning scheme developed by Kaastra & Bleeker (2016). We found that the continuum of the 3–55 keV *NuSTAR* spectra could be well-modelled with an absorbed *powerlaw* with a high energy cutoff (*highcut*, *newhcut*) or *compTT*. We used the simplest high energy cutoff model *highcut*. An additional *gabs* centred at the cutoff energy was included to flatten the kink at E_{cut} (*mplcut*; Coburn et al. 2002). The absorption column density could not be constrained by the fit, so we froze it to the Galactic value of 0.7×10^{22} atoms cm^{-2} . Significant residuals were left at ~ 30 keV (the fundamental CRSF; Vybornov, V. et al. 2018) and they could be modelled with a *gabs* or a *cyclabs* model, and we adopted *cyclabs* owing to its better fit-statistic. However, to flatten the residuals completely in 2015 observations, we added one more narrow *gabs* at ~ 30 keV. This could be due

to poor modelling of the underlying continuum or a complex CRSF profile (Doroshenko et al. 2017). Residuals were also left at ~ 55 keV due to the harmonic CRSF (Vybornov, V. et al. 2018), which could be eliminated by the harmonic CRSF parameters of the *cyclabs*. Residuals were left at 6.4 keV (iron fluorescence), and we fitted it with a *Gaussian*. Soft-excess-like residuals were visible and we modelled it with a *bbody* of $kT \sim 0.3$ keV in 2015 observations and $kT \sim 1.0$ keV in 2016 observations. The final used model for the 2015 and 2016 *NuSTAR* observations are $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} * \text{mplcut} * \text{cyclabs} * \text{gabs} + \text{bbody} + \text{gaussian})$, and $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} * \text{mplcut} * \text{cyclabs} + \text{bbody} + \text{gaussian})$, respectively. The best fitting spectral model parameters are given in Table 4.

3.4 Cen X-3

Cen X-3 is a persistent 208 mHz X-ray pulsar accreting matter from a massive O-type 20 M_{\odot} supergiant companion star in a compact, nearly circular 2.2 d orbit (Suchy et al. 2008, and references therein). The accretion is expected to be partly from stellar wind and partly from the accretion disk due to the overall spin-up trend of the pulsar (Peterson 1978). Cen X-3 shows QPO at different frequencies ranging from 30 mHz (this work) to 90 mHz (Raichur & Paul 2008). Raichur & Paul (2008) and Liu et al. (2022) have shown that the QPO frequency or rms showed no dependence on the X-ray luminosity. Even though Raichur & Paul (2008) reported that the 40 mHz QPO rms does not show any energy dependence in the 1996–1998 *RXTE* observations, recently Liu et al. (2022) showed that the 40 mHz QPO rms decreases from 13% at 2 keV to about 9% at 17 keV in the 2020 *Insight-HXMT* observations. They further argued that the QPO frequency and rms have an orbital dependence and that the QPO photons show an overall soft lag.

We detected the presence of a QPO at around 30 mHz in one *XMM-Newton* observation that was conducted in the out-of-eclipse orbital phase. The PDS in 7.5–120 mHz range was modelled with the combination of a *powerlaw* for the band-limited noise and a Lorentzian at 30 mHz for the QPO (Fig. A8). The QPO rms shows a weak increasing trend with photon energy, increasing from about 5% in 0.5–3 keV to about 6% in 3–10 keV (Fig. 5).

The *XMM-Newton/PN* spectrum was re-binned such that each bin has counts equivalent to a minimum SNR of 50. We adopted the spectral model of the source used in Aftab et al. (2019). The spectrum was modelled with an absorbed *powerlaw* for the continuum, a *bbody* with $kT \sim 0.1$ keV, and eleven *Gaussian* emission lines. The iron line emission region is complex, and it was modelled with a combination of two narrow *Gaussians* at 6.44 keV and 6.65 keV, and a broad *Gaussian* at 6.65 keV. The complex iron region is possibly due to three distinct iron lines at 6.4, 6.7 and 7 keV (Naik & Paul 2012). The finally used best fitting spectral model is $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} + \text{bbody} + 11 \times \text{Gaussians})$ (Fig. 5). The best fitting spectral model parameters are given in Table 5.

3.5 XTE J1858+034

XTE J1858+034 is a transient X-ray pulsar spinning at 4.5 mHz. The binary is thought to be a Be-type HMXB due to its transient nature (Takeshima et al. 1998) and nature of the optical companion (Reig et al. 2005). However, a recent study by Tsygankov et al. (2021) proposed that the system could be a Symbiotic binary hosting a K/M type stellar companion. QPO was first reported in the source from an *RXTE/PCA* observation by Paul & Rao (1998) at 110 mHz.

Table 4. The results of spectral fit performed on four observations of V 0332+53 having a QPO. The best fit model parameter values and their errors are given. The errors quoted on all the parameters are their 90% confidence ranges.

| Obs. ID | XMM-Newton/PN | | NuSTAR [†] | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| | 0763470401 | 0763470301 | 80102002004 | 80102002006 | 90202031002 | 90202031004 |
| Continuum | tbabs*NPEX | tbabs*NPEX | tbabs*powerlaw*mplcut | tbabs*powerlaw*mplcut | tbabs*powerlaw*mplcut | tbabs*powerlaw*mplcut |
| Energy range | 1–10 keV | 1–10 keV | 3–55 keV | 3–55 keV | 3–55 keV | 3–55 keV |
| nH [‡] | 2.19 ± 0.07 | 2.17 ± 0.06 | 2.07 ^{+1.04} _{-0.90} | 0.43 ^{-0.94} _{-0.44} | 0.7* | 0.7* |
| PhoIndex (Γ) | 1.06 ± 0.05 | 1.04 ± 0.05 | 0.53 ± 0.02 | 0.49 ± 0.02 | 0.57 ^{+0.03} _{-0.04} | 0.57 ^{+0.04} _{-0.02} |
| N _{CPL/PL-1} [‡] | 0.15 ± 0.01 | 0.18 ± 0.01 | 0.18 ± 0.01 | 0.106 ^{+0.006} _{-0.003} | 0.011 ± 0.001 | 0.008 ± 0.001 |
| E _{cut} | 3.41 ± 0.03 | 3.27 ± 0.03 | 10.90 ^{+0.18} _{-0.21} | 11.95 ^{+0.18} _{-0.21} | 15.17 ^{+0.84} _{-0.39} | 16.31 ^{+0.39} _{-0.36} |
| E _{fold} | — | — | 17.23 ^{+1.65} _{-1.32} | 16.79 ^{+0.96} _{-0.97} | 26.21 ^{+4.30} _{-9.24} | 16.58 ^{+4.34} _{-2.88} |
| N _{CPL/PL-2} [‡] | (2.93 ± 0.08) × 10 ⁻³ | (4.00 ± 0.10) × 10 ⁻³ | — | — | — | — |
| E _{Gauss,Fe} | 6.64 ± 0.02 | 6.66 ± 0.02 | 6.44 ± 0.02 | 6.46 ± 0.03 | 6.3 ± 0.10 | 6.37 ± 0.07 |
| σ _{Gauss,Fe} | 0.25 ± 0.02 | 0.35 ^{+0.03} _{-0.02} | 0.34 ± 0.04 | 0.38 ± 0.04 | 0.36 ^{+0.17} _{-0.15} | 0.15 ^{+0.13} _{-0.15} |
| N _{Gauss,Fe} [¶] | (1.35 ± 0.08) × 10 ⁻³ | (2.34 ± 0.15) × 10 ⁻³ | 0.005 ± 0.001 | (3.77 ± 0.44) × 10 ⁻³ | (2.25) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (1.23 ^{+0.04} _{-0.37}) × 10 ⁻⁴ |
| E _{Gauss,2} | 2.25 ± 0.01 | 2.25 ± 0.01 | — | — | — | — |
| σ _{Gauss,2} | 0.01* | 0.01* | — | — | — | — |
| N _{Gauss,2} [¶] | (2.65 ± 0.52) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (3.53 ± 0.60) × 10 ⁻⁴ | — | — | — | — |
| kT _{bbody} (keV) | — | 0.089 ± 0.003 | 0.33 ^{+0.04} _{-0.06} | 0.34 ± 0.10 | 0.88 ^{+0.09} _{-0.07} | 0.97 ^{+0.08} _{-0.09} |
| N _{bbody} [§] | — | 0.10 ± 0.02 | 0.03 ^{+0.05} _{-0.01} | 0.01 ^{+0.05} _{-0.01} | (3.38 ^{+0.69} _{-0.57}) × 10 ⁻⁴ | (3.17 ^{+0.68} _{-0.58}) × 10 ⁻⁴ |
| Flux _{2–20 keV} (10 ⁻¹⁰ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²) | 29.05 ± 0.02 | 35.01 ± 0.03 | 124.80 ± 0.08 | 83.07 ± 0.07 | 7.51 ± 0.02 | 6.08 ± 0.01 |
| const | — | — | 0.980 ± 0.001 | 0.978 ± 0.0002 | 1.025 ± 0.004 | 1.04 ± 0.01 |
| χ ² (dof) | 1502.83 (1256) | 1600.27 (1417) | 538.75 (401) | 537.59 (377) | 418.66 (331) | 364.12 (323) |
| χ ² _{red} | 1.20 | 1.13 | 1.34 | 1.43 | 1.27 | 1.13 |

* Frozen.

† in units of 10²² atoms cm⁻².

‡ Normalization in units of photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² keV⁻¹ at 1 keV.

¶ Total photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² in the gaussian line.

§ Normalization in units of 10³⁷ ergs s⁻¹ kpc⁻².

† A CRSF at 29 keV and its harmonic is modelled with `cyclabs` and `gabs` models, the parameters of which are not given in this table.

In subsequent outbursts, [Mukherjee et al. \(2006\)](#) found the centroid frequency of the QPO being variable from 140 to 185 mHz and that rms amplitude of QPO has a strong correlation with photon energy. QPO was again reported in the *NuSTAR* observation at 196 mHz by [Mandal & Pal \(2021\)](#) during an outburst of the source in 2019.

We generated the energy-dependent variation of fractional rms amplitude of the QPO detected at 196 mHz (Fig. A9), the same one reported by [Mandal & Pal \(2021\)](#). The QPO is detected only till 25 keV. The *NuSTAR* PDS in 5 – 1000 mHz was fitted with the combination of a `powerlaw` for the band-limited noise and a `Lorentzian` for the QPO (Fig. A4). The QPO rms increases from about 5% in 3–8 keV to about 11% in 15–25 keV (Fig. 6).

We adopted the spectral model of the source used by [Malacaria et al. \(2021\)](#). The 5–55 keV *NuSTAR* spectrum could be fitted with a `compTT` continuum, modified by the CRSF at 50 keV with a `gabs`, and an iron emission line at 6.4 keV with a `gaussian` (Fig. 6). The best fitting spectral model parameters are given in Table. 6.




Figure 4. Top: The top and bottom panels show the energy dependence of the ~ 40 mHz, and ~ 2.5 , ~ 18 mHz QPOs in V 0332+53. Middle: The 1–10 keV unfolded spectrum and residuals to the best fit spectral model $\text{tbabs} * (\text{NPEX} + \text{gaussian} + \text{bbody})$ on the *XMM-Newton* observation OID 0763470401. Bottom: The 3–55 keV unfolded spectrum and residuals to the best fit spectral model $\text{tbabs} * (\text{powerlaw} * \text{mplcut} + \text{gaussian} + \text{bbody})$ on the *NuSTAR* observation OID 90202031002.




Figure 5. Top: The energy dependence of QPO rms in Cen X-3 from *XMM-Newton*. Bottom: The 0.8–10 keV unfolded *XMM-Newton*/PN spectrum and residuals to the best fit model $\text{tbabs} * (\text{cutoffpl} + \text{bbody} + (10)\text{gaussians})$.

Table 5. The results of spectral fit performed on the *XMM-Newton* observation of Cen X-3 having a QPO. The best fit model parameter values and their errors are given. The errors quoted on all the parameters are their 90% confidence ranges.

| Obs. ID | 040550201 |
|--|---|
| Continuum -- | |
| nH ₁ | 2.43 ± 0.03 |
| PhoIndex (Γ) | 1.175 ± 0.004 |
| N _{PL} [‡] | 0.444 ± 0.003 |
| kT _{bbody} | 0.096 ± 0.001 |
| N _{bbody} [§] | 0.64 ^{+0.09} _{-0.08} |
| Iron emission lines complex -- | |
| E _{Gauss,1} | 6.44 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| σ _{Gauss,1} | 0.01* |
| N _{Gauss,1} [¶] | 9.74 ^{+0.62} _{-0.64} × 10 ⁻⁴ |
| E _{Gauss,2} | 6.65 ± 0.01 |
| σ _{Gauss,2} | 0.22 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| N _{Gauss,2} [¶] | (4.16 ± 0.02) × 10 ⁻³ |
| E _{Gauss,3} | 6.65 ± 0.01 |
| σ _{Gauss,3} | 1.21 ^{+0.10} _{-0.08} |
| N _{Gauss,3} [¶] | 0.009 ± 0.001 |
| Other emission lines -- | |
| E _{Gauss,4} | 1.018 ± 0.004 |
| σ _{Gauss,4} | 0.019 ± 0.002 |
| N _{Gauss,4} [¶] | 0.22 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| E _{Gauss,5} | 1.39 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| σ _{Gauss,5} | 0.16 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| N _{Gauss,5} [¶] | 0.019 ± 0.003 |
| E _{Gauss,6} | 1.89 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| σ _{Gauss,6} | 0.10 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| N _{Gauss,6} [¶] | 3.43 ^{+0.80} _{-0.61} × 10 ⁻³ |
| E _{Gauss,7} | 2.254 ± 0.003 |
| σ _{Gauss,7} | 0.1* |
| N _{Gauss,7} [¶] | 1.38 ^{+0.15} _{-0.13} × 10 ⁻³ |
| E _{Gauss,8} | 2.68 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| σ _{Gauss,8} | 0.10 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| N _{Gauss,8} [¶] | 1.68 ^{+0.25} _{-0.19} × 10 ⁻³ |
| E _{Gauss,9} | 3.29 ^{+0.02} _{-0.02} |
| σ _{Gauss,9} | 0.18 ^{+0.02} _{-0.02} |
| N _{Gauss,9} [¶] | 0.16 ^{+0.01} _{-0.01} |
| E _{Gauss,10} | 3.90 ^{+0.03} _{-0.04} |
| σ _{Gauss,10} | 0.30 ^{+0.05} _{-0.04} |
| N _{Gauss,10} [¶] | (2.20 ± 0.03) × 10 ⁻³ |
| Flux _{2-20 keV} (10 ⁻¹⁰ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²) | 67.12 ± 0.02 |
| χ ² (dof) | 2496.02/1813 |
| χ ² _{red} | 1.38 |

[‡] Normalization in units of photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² keV⁻¹ at 1 keV.

[§] Normalization in units of 10³⁷ ergs s⁻¹ kpc⁻².

[¶] Total photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² in the gaussian line.




Figure 6. Top: XTE J1858+034 QPO rms energy dependence from *NuSTAR* (black) and *RXTE/PCA* (red; Mukherjee et al. 2006). Bottom: The 3–60 keV unfolded spectrum and residuals to the best fit spectral model (*tbabs* * (*compTT* * *gabs* + *gaussian*)) on the *NuSTAR* observation with OID 90501348002.

Table 6. The results of spectral fit performed on the *NuSTAR* observation of XTE J1858+034 having QPO. The best fit model parameter values and their errors are given. The errors quoted on all the parameters are their 90% confidence ranges.

| Obs. ID | 90501348002 |
|--|----------------------------|
| nH [†] | 8.49 ± 2.29 |
| kT ₀ | 0.98 ± 0.05 |
| kT _e | 5.80 ± 0.15 |
| τ | 6.60 ± 0.30 |
| N _{norm} | 0.020 ± 0.001 |
| E _{CRSF} | 51.09 ± 2.06 |
| σ _{CRSF} | 10.74 ± 1.81 |
| τ _{CRSF} | 0.25 ± 0.06 |
| E _{Gauss,Fe} | 6.48 ± 0.03 |
| σ _{Gauss,Fe} | 0.25 ± 0.05 |
| N _{Gauss,Fe} [‡] | (5 ± 1) × 10 ⁻⁴ |
| Flux _{2-20 keV} (10 ⁻¹⁰ erg s ⁻¹ cm ⁻²) | 10.35 ± 0.02 |
| const. | 1.018 ± 0.003 |
| χ ² (dof) | 411.50/337 |
| χ ² _{red} | 1.22 |

[†] in units of 10²² atoms cm⁻².

[‡] Total photons s⁻¹ cm⁻² in the gaussian line.

Table 7: Summary of the QPO fits. The continuum is fitted with either a combination of *powerlaw*, *lorentzian* and the QPO is fitted with a *lorentzian*. The centre and width of the *lorentzian* are considered the centroid and width of the QPO respectively. Errors assigned to the centroid and width of the QPO are their 90% confidence intervals, while error assigned to the rms powers are their 68% confidence intervals.

| Source | Obs. ID | Energy range (keV) | Avg. count rate ¹ (cts s ⁻¹) | ν_{QPO} (mHz) | width _{QPO} (mHz) | Power _{rms} (%) | Q-factor |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|---|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|
| 4U 1626–67 | 0111070201 | 0.5–1.0 | 5.53 ± 0.03 | 48 ± 1 | 12 ± 3 | 18.34 ± 1.06 | 4.0 |
| | | 1.0–3.0 | 13.35 ± 0.04 | 49 ± 1 | 13 ± 3 | 20.74 ± 0.96 | 3.8 |
| | | 3.0–5.7 | 6.19 ± 0.03 | 49 ± 2 | 14 ± 7 | 15.69 ± 1.41 | 3.5 |
| | | 5.7–10.0 | 4.08 ± 0.02 | 49 ± 1 | 11 ± 4 | 18.54 ± 1.44 | 4.5 |
| | 0152620101 | 0.5–1.0 | 4.63 ± 0.01 | 48 ± 1 | 11 ± 2 | 17.65 ± 0.51 | 4.3 |
| | | 1.0–3.0 | 10.96 ± 0.02 | 48 ± 1 | 11 ± 1 | 20.61 ± 0.48 | 4.2 |
| | | 3.0–5.7 | 5.24 ± 0.01 | 47 ± 1 | 11 ± 2 | 17.11 ± 0.60 | 4.3 |
| | | 5.7–10.0 | 3.53 ± 0.10 | 48 ± 1 | 10 ± 2 | 16.86 ± 0.73 | 4.5 |
| | P10101 | 2.02–6.70 | 61.23 ± 0.02 | 48.2 ± 0.3 | 11 ± 1 | 16.83 ± 0.44 | 4.4 |
| | | 6.7–8.5 | 31.75 ± 0.02 | 48.3 ± 0.3 | 10 ± 1 | 16.65 ± 0.39 | 4.8 |
| | | 8.5–11.1 | 35.33 ± 0.02 | 48.4 ± 0.3 | 11 ± 1 | 17.45 ± 0.35 | 4.4 |
| | | 11.1–13.0 | 19.40 ± 0.01 | 48.2 ± 0.3 | 10 ± 1 | 18.23 ± 0.41 | 4.8 |
| 13.0–15.4 | | 16.31 ± 0.01 | 48.3 ± 0.3 | 11 ± 1 | 19.83 ± 0.36 | 4.4 | |
| 15.4–20.2 | | 19.67 ± 0.01 | 48.4 ± 0.3 | 11 ± 1 | 21.45 ± 0.35 | 4.4 | |
| 20.2–60.0 | | 11.38 ± 0.02 | 48.7 ± 0.5 | 9 ± 1 | 28.32 ± 0.98 | 5.4 | |
| 62038001 | 0.5–0.9 | 5.89 ± 0.03 | 47 ± 1 | 12 ± 3 | 13.59 ± 0.69 | 3.9 | |
| | 0.9–1.3 | 5.74 ± 0.03 | 47 ± 1 | 12 ± 3 | 17.26 ± 0.69 | 3.6 | |
| | 1.3–1.9 | 5.91 ± 0.03 | 48 ± 1 | 15 ± 3 | 19.59 ± 0.83 | 3.2 | |
| | 1.9–3.5 | 6.44 ± 0.03 | 49 ± 2 | 17 ± 5 | 19.10 ± 1.10 | 2.9 | |
| IGR J19294+1816 | 0841190101 | 0.5–3 | 4.38 ± 0.02 | 29 ± 1 | 8 ± 5 | 8.07 ± 1.27 | 7.8 |
| | | 3.0–5.7 | 8.95 ± 0.02 | 31 ± 1 | 9 ± 3 | 9.84 ± 0.83 | 3.6 |
| | | 5.7–10.0 | 7.70 ± 0.03 | 31 ± 1 | 10 ± 5 | 11.00 ± 1.03 | 3.0 |
| V 0332+53 | 0763470301 | 0.5–3 | 123.77 ± 0.11 | 38 ± 3 | 38 ± 8 | 9.62 ± 0.74 | 1.0 |
| | | 3.0–5.7 | 153.56 ± 0.18 | 39 ± 2 | 33 ± 7 | 10.67 ± 0.76 | 1.2 |
| | | 5.7–10.0 | 147.28 ± 0.12 | 38 ± 2 | 38 ± 7 | 10.74 ± 0.72 | 1.8 |
| | 80102002004 | 3.0–6.0 | 123.09 ± 0.13 | 40 ± 1 | 37 ± 8 | 9.67 ± 0.50 | 1.1 |
| | | 6.0–8.5 | 139.10 ± 0.13 | 38 ± 2 | 24 ± 5 | 8.81 ± 0.69 | 1.6 |
| | | 8.5–11.5 | 147.92 ± 0.13 | 39 ± 2 | 32 ± 8 | 9.57 ± 0.77 | 1.2 |
| | | 11.5–60.0 | 163.67 ± 0.14 | 40 ± 2 | 36 ± 10 | 9.39 ± 0.85 | 1.1 |
| | 0763470401 | 0.5–3 | 84.54 ± 0.07 | 41 ± 1 | 22 ± 6 | 11.38 ± 0.66 | 1.9 |
| | | 3.0–5.7 | 100.66 ± 0.13 | 42 ± 1 | 21 ± 5 | 12.16 ± 0.73 | 2.0 |
| | | 5.7–10.0 | 95.23 ± 0.07 | 42 ± 1 | 22 ± 5 | 12.94 ± 0.90 | 2.0 |
| | 80102002006 | 3.0–6.0 | 79.40 ± 0.08 | 41 ± 1 | 21 ± 4 | 11.71 ± 0.49 | 2.0 |
| | | 6.0–8.5 | 89.54 ± 0.09 | 41 ± 1 | 20 ± 4 | 12.24 ± 0.54 | 2.1 |
| | | 8.5–11.5 | 99.43 ± 0.09 | 41 ± 1 | 19 ± 3 | 12.20 ± 0.55 | 2.1 |
| | | 11.5–60.0 | 112.81 ± 0.09 | 41 ± 1 | 20 ± 3 | 11.65 ± 0.49 | 2.1 |
| | 90202031002 | 3–8 | 14.69 ± 0.03 | 17.1 ± 0.4 | 2.7 ± 1.2 | 9.33 ± 1.16 | 6.3 |
| | | 8–10 | 6.00 ± 0.02 | 18.3 ± 0.7 | 3.3 ± 1.2 | 9.80 ± 1.37 | 5.5 |
| | | 10–15 | 9.15 ± 0.03 | 17.4 ± 0.3 | 2.0 ± 0.9 | 10.52 ± 1.11 | 8.7 |
| | | 15–60 | 6.29 ± 0.02 | 18.0 ± 0.5 | 2.8 ± 1.1 | 9.86 ± 1.25 | 6.4 |
| 90202031004 | 3–8 | 14.69 ± 0.03 | 2.48 ± 0.05 | 0.27 ± 0.13 | 10.91 ± 1.38 | 9.2 | |
| | 8–10 | 6.00 ± 0.02 | 2.51 ± 0.05 | 0.11 ± 0.11 | 9.61 ± 1.43 | ≥11.4 | |
| | 10–15 | 9.15 ± 0.03 | 2.49 ± 0.05 | 0.23 ± 0.11 | 11.95 ± 1.43 | 10.8 | |
| | 15–60 | 6.29 ± 0.02 | 2.49 ± 0.05 | 0.29 ± 0.13 | 11.92 ± 1.44 | 8.6 | |
| 90202031004 | 3–8 | 12.05 ± 0.03 | 17.8 ± 0.9 | 4.4 ± 1.9 | 12.56 ± 1.26 | 4.1 | |
| | 8–10 | 4.88 ± 0.02 | 17.5 ± 0.8 | 4.9 ± 1.8 | 15.20 ± 1.30 | 3.6 | |
| | 10–15 | 7.46 ± 0.02 | 17.8 ± 0.8 | 5.5 ± 2.4 | 14.56 ± 1.38 | 3.2 | |

¹ Across all PCUs (*RXTE*) or FPMs (*NuSTAR*).

Table 7 Continued: Summary of QPO fits

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| | | 15-60 | 5.14 ± 0.02 | 18.6 ± 1.2 | 4.7 ± 2.2 | 12.77 ± 1.52 | 4.0 |
| | | 3-8 | 12.05 ± 0.03 | 2.33 ± 0.08 | 0.36 ± 0.26 | 12.55 ± 1.33 | 6.5 |
| | | 8-10 | 4.88 ± 0.02 | 2.33 ± 0.08 | 0.40 ± 0.27 | 13.64 ± 1.41 | 5.8 |
| | | 10-15 | 7.46 ± 0.02 | 2.35 ± 0.05 | 0.18 ± 0.15 | 12.36 ± 1.26 | $\gtrsim 10.2$ |
| | | 15-60 | 5.14 ± 0.02 | 2.30 ± 0.12 | 0.40 ± 0.36 | 11.73 ± 1.49 | 5.8 |
| Cen X-3 | 040550201 | 0.5-3 | 187.88 ± 0.06 | 30 ± 1 | 26 ± 4 | 4.74 ± 0.16 | 1.2 |
| | | 3.0 – 5.7 | 186.94 ± 0.06 | 31 ± 1 | 23 ± 4 | 5.98 ± 0.19 | 1.4 |
| | | 5.7 – 10.0 | 118.63 ± 10.05 | 30 ± 1 | 23 ± 3 | 6.12 ± 0.20 | 1.3 |
| XTE J1858+034 | 90501348002 | 3-8 | 23.03 ± 0.03 | 178 ± 9 | 70 ± 30 | 5.20 ± 0.69 | 2.5 |
| | | 8-10 | 9.08 ± 0.02 | 185 ± 8 | 37 ± 22 | 6.02 ± 0.87 | 5.0 |
| | | 10-15 | 12.45 ± 0.02 | 183 ± 7 | 56 ± 20 | 7.07 ± 0.69 | 3.3 |
| | | 15-25 | 3.69 ± 0.01 | 186 ± 7 | 84 ± 27 | 11.73 ± 1.03 | 2.2 |

4 DISCUSSIONS

Our search for QPOs in the archival *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations resulted in the detection of QPO in eleven observations of five sources viz., 4U 1626–67 (*XMM-Newton*) (Fig. A1), IGR J19294+1816 (*XMM-Newton*) (Fig. A4), V 0332+53 (*XMM-Newton*, *NuSTAR*) (Figs. A5, A6, A7), Cen X–3 (*XMM-Newton*) (Fig. A8) and XTE J1858+034 (*NuSTAR*) (Fig. A9). A summary of the QPO parameters in different energy bands of each observation is given in Table 7. The highest QPO rms is observed in the 48 mHz QPO in 4U 1626–67 ($\gtrsim 15\%$), followed by V 0332+53 ($\gtrsim 10\%$). The QPO rms is $< 10\%$ in all the other cases. In Cen X–3 and XTE J1858+034, the QPO rms is low at $\lesssim 6\%$ below 10 keV. We discuss the observed QPO characteristics in various contexts below.

4.1 Transient nature of QPOs

The transient nature of QPOs in XRPs is evident from detection and non-detection in different observations of the same source (Tables 1 and B1). Some observations could however be made regarding the appearance/disappearance of QPOs in certain observations of a source analysed in this work.

In the four observations of 4U 1626–67 analysed in this work, QPO has been detected in three observations and not detected in one observation. 4U 1626–67 was in the spin-down torque-state of the pulsar between 1990 and 2008, and since 2023 (Sharma et al. 2023b). The three observations (Table 1) having the 48 mHz QPO were taken when the pulsar was in the spin-down state. The source was observed in the spin-up torque state of the pulsar in the observation without QPO (*XMM-Newton* OID 0764860101 in 2015). The appearance of the 48 mHz QPO only during the spin-down state of the pulsar has been previously reported by Jain et al. (2010) and Sharma et al. (2023b). 4U 1626–67 is the only XRP where the QPO is persistently present during a specific torque state of the pulsar.

Among the three observations of IGR J19294+1816, QPO was only detected in one observation. The *XMM-Newton* observation in which the QPO at ~ 30 mHz is present, was taken at the luminosity rising phase during a Type-I outburst of Be-XRP in October 2019. Raman et al. (2021) has reported the presence of QPO at around the same frequency during the luminosity decline phase of the same outburst with *Astrosat*/LAXPC. QPO was not observed in the two *NuSTAR* observations, of which OID 90401306002 was done when the source was in a low-luminosity state in March 2018 and OID 90401306004 was taken immediately following a Type-I outburst in the same month (Tsygankov et al. 2019b).

In the three observations of Cen X–3, a QPO at 30 mHz is present in only one observation (Table 1) and it covers the out-of-eclipse orbital phase of the source (Aftab et al. 2019), and not present in the two eclipse-egress orbital phase observations (*XMM-Newton* OID 0111010101 that covers orbital phase 0.00 – 0.37; Sanjurjo-Ferrín et al. 2021, and *NuSTAR* OID 30101055002 that covers orbital phase 0.20 – 0.41; Tamba et al. 2023). 30 mHz is the lowest QPO frequency reported in Cen X–3. Raichur & Paul (2008) had found QPO frequency clustering around 40 mHz and 90 mHz from *RXTE*/PCA observations during 1996–1998. Liu et al. (2022) observed that the QPO frequency varies as a function of the orbital phase from about 33 mHz in the eclipse egress phase (0.1 – 0.3) to about 40 mHz in the pre-ingress phase (0.8) from *Insight-HXMT* observations in 2022.

Among the nine observations of V 0332+53, QPO is present in six observations. Seven out of the nine observations were taken during a Type-II outburst of the source in 2015. This includes two *XMM-Newton* and five *NuSTAR* observations. Two quasi-simultaneous

NuSTAR and *XMM-Newton* observations taken mid-way during the decline of Type-II outburst (Doroshenko et al. 2017; Vybornov, V. et al. 2018) have the presence of QPO at 40 mHz. However, two other *NuSTAR* observations taken towards the end of the decline of the 2015 outburst (Doroshenko et al. 2017; Vybornov, V. et al. 2018) does not show QPO. The two *NuSTAR* observations during a Type-I outburst in 2016 have the presence twin-QPOs at ~ 2.5 and ~ 18 mHz (See discussion in Section 4.3). The *XMM-Newton* observation taken during the quiescent state of the source in 2008 (Elshamouty et al. 2016; Tsygankov et al. 2017) does not have a QPO.

QPOs in Be-XRPs are generally associated with the formation of accretion disks during the outbursts (Reig & Nespoli 2013). In the two Be-XRPs analysed in this work (IGR J19294+1816 and V 0332+53), QPOs were detected in all the observations during high luminosity phases of the Type-II outbursts and were detected in some Type-I outbursts while not in some other Type-I outbursts. However, no QPOs were detected in the observations that were carried out during their low-luminosity states.

4.2 Energy-dependence of QPOs

The energy spectra of all five sources had a smooth continuum shape absorbed by ISM at low energies, with atomic emission lines mainly of iron. Cen X–3, which has a companion that releases strong stellar wind had the presence of multiple emission lines. CRSF was present in all of them having *NuSTAR* observations. A soft excess was present in 4U 1626–67, Cen X–3, and V 0332+53 (Section 4.4).

The overall shape of the broadband noise in PDS does not vary with energy in all the sources (Appendix A). However, the strengths of QPO and the pulsations vary with energy. We do not notice any strong trends in the QPO parameters (centre, width, Q -factor) except the fractional rms amplitude, as a function of energy in any of the sources (Table 7). There is also no secular trend in the QPO rms vs energy exhibited by all the sources. A correlation of fractional rms amplitude with energy is seen in 4U 1626–67 in 5 – 60 keV, IGR J19294+1816 in 0.5 – 30 keV, Cen X–3 in 0.5 – 10 keV, and XTE J1858+034 in 2 – 30 keV. No variation of fractional rms amplitude with energy is visible in V 0332+53. However, differences are noticed in the energy dependence of fractional rms between different observations (having the same QPO frequency) of the same source.

In XTE J1858+034, the fractional rms amplitude of the QPO during the November 2019 outburst (*this work*) is overall higher than during the outburst in May 2004 with *RXTE* observations (Mukherjee et al. 2006). The X-ray flux is similar ($\sim 10^{-9}$ ergs s^{-1} cm^{-2}) for the two observations. The authors also observed that the QPO frequency changes from 150 to 180 mHz while the X-ray flux varies from $2.5 - 5.5 \times 10^{-9}$ ergs s^{-1} cm^{-2} . The highest 180 mHz QPO frequency was observed at a flux of about 4×10^{-9} ergs s^{-1} cm^{-2} . In the *NuSTAR* observation we analysed, the QPO frequency is slightly higher than 180 mHz and the flux is about 1.4×10^{-9} ergs s^{-1} cm^{-2} . Even though a correlation of rms amplitude with energy is seen in both the outbursts, the trend is seen to deviate above 10 keV, where it saturates for the 2004 observations while the correlation continues in the 2019 observation. The absence of QPO above 30 keV is in agreement with Mukherjee et al. (2006).

In Cen X–3, the rms amplitude of 30 mHz QPO shows a correlation with energy as opposed to no correlation of the 40 mHz QPO in Raichur & Paul (2008) and a clear anti-correlation of the 30–40 mHz QPO seen in Liu et al. (2022). While Raichur & Paul (2008) reported the presence of QPO till 35 keV, Liu et al. (2022) observed no QPO above 20 keV.

The overall energy dependence of the rms amplitude of the 30

mHz QPO in IGR J19294+1816 during the onset of Type-I outburst in 2019 from this work is in agreement with [Raman et al. \(2021\)](#) during the decline of the same outburst.

Neither the twin-QPOs at 2.5 and 18 mHz in 2016 (0.5–60 keV) nor the QPO at 40 mHz in 2015 (3–60 keV) detected in V 0332+53 exhibit any energy dependence. This is different from the previous reports of [Qu et al. \(2005\)](#) where the rms of the twin QPOs at 50 mHz and 220 mHz detected during the 2015 Type-II outburst drops beyond 10 keV.

The 48 mHz QPO in 4U 1626–67 preserves the value of fractional rms amplitude and the correlation of QPO rms with energy across several observations spanning over two decades. During this time, the source has also exhibited multiple torque-state switches ([Sharma et al. 2023b](#)). A peculiarity of 4U 1626–67 is that it is the only Roche lobe overflow (RLO) LMXB in the list (Table 1), in which the accretion only proceeds via an accretion disk. Even though accretion in the compact HMXB Cen X–3 is also partially driven by RLO, there is also a significant contribution expected from the strong stellar wind. Cen X–3 in the long-term has shown a variety of QPO frequencies varying from 30 mHz to 90 mHz and the energy trend of these QPOs are also different ([Raichur & Paul 2008](#); [Liu et al. 2022](#), and this work). It is also worth noting that the 48 mHz QPO in 4U 1626–67 has exhibited the highest rms amongst the list ($\gtrsim 15\%$), while Cen X–3 has the lowest ($\lesssim 6\%$).

4.3 Twin QPOs in V 0332+53

The QPOs we detected in V 0332+53 at 2.5 mHz, 18 mHz (2016 Type-I outburst) and 40 mHz (2015 Type-II outburst decay) in the *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations have different frequencies compared to the ones reported earlier (50 mHz and 220 mHz). We also noticed that the PSDs of the observations during 2015 outburst have a different overall shape when compared to the PSDs during the 2016 Type-I outburst (*this work*) and the previously reported PSDs during two different Type-II outbursts from *Ginga* ([Takeshima et al. 1994](#)) and *RXTE* ([Qu et al. 2005](#); [Caballero-García, M. D. et al. 2016](#)). This variable nature of the PSD directly indicates that the factors contributing towards aperiodic variability in the source vary over time.

The 2015 *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations show a QPO at 40 mHz (Figs. A5, A6) while the 2016 *NuSTAR* observations show twin QPOs at 2.5 mHz and 18 mHz (Fig. A7). Twin QPOs have been reported in V 0332+53 ([Qu et al. 2005](#)) and in GX 304-1 ([Devasia et al. 2011](#)). However, the twin QPOs in V 0332+53 reported before have centroid frequencies of 50 mHz and 220 mHz, where 220 mHz is the spin period of the NS. [Qu et al. \(2005\)](#) proposed that inhomogeneous accretion flow at the polar caps results in coupling between the spin-variability and noise-variability in the PDS, which could lead to the appearance of QPO at NS spin frequency. In GX 304–1, the second QPO was a harmonic of the first, which is not the case here.

Spectra from all the observations could be modelled with a soft-black body component and a power-law-based comptonization component (Table 4). The 2015 observations were performed when the source was ≥ 5 time brighter than during the 2016 observations. The higher QPO frequency during a high X-ray flux state favours the inner accretion disk origin of QPO, which might move closer to the neutron star, resulting in an enhanced Keplerian orbital frequency. Following the relations $r \propto \dot{M}^{-2/7}$ and Keplerian relation of $v \propto r^{-3/2}$, we get $v \propto \dot{M}^{3/7}$. Under this argument, an increase in QPO frequency to a factor of ~ 2 (from 18 mHz to 40 mHz) requires \dot{M} (L_X) to scale up to a factor of ~ 5 , which close to the measured

X-ray flux from the spectral analysis. However, a similar argument for an increase in QPO frequency from 2.5 mHz to 40 mHz would require a factor of ≥ 600 increase in \dot{M} . Thus, the 40 mHz QPO observed during the 2015 outburst and 18 mHz QPO observed during the 2016 outburst are likely of similar origin, while the 2.5 mHz QPO is likely of a different origin. The Q -factor of 18 mHz QPO present at low flux is also about a factor of $\gtrsim 2$ higher than that of the 40 mHz QPO present at a high flux (Table 7). A similar increment in the Q -factor with decreasing flux has also been observed for the 220 mHz QPO by [Qu et al. \(2005\)](#).

A careful consideration of the estimate of Alfvén radius from [Lamb et al. \(1989\)](#) in Section 4.5 however shows that the 40 mHz QPO could be explained with BFM, and a shift in QPO frequency to 18 mHz is unlikely to be due to change in luminosity. Moreover, this interpretation of the 18 mHz and 40 mHz having a common origin contrasts with the observation of [Qu et al. \(2005\)](#), where it was shown that the QPO centroid frequency does not evolve with source flux.

4.4 Association of QPO with the soft excess

XRPCs sufficiently away from the galactic plane are known to exhibit soft excess in their energy spectrum and is usually associated with the X-ray emission from the NS reprocessed by the inner accretion disk ([Paul et al. 2002](#), [Hickox et al. 2004](#)). It is usually modelled with a low temperature ($kT \sim 100 - 200$ eV) blackbody component. The idea that both soft excess and QPOs in XRPCs are considered to originate from the inner accretion disk motivated us to look for patterns in the QPO strength in the soft-excess energy band. *XMM-Newton*/PN is the most suitable detector for such a study, as it has low energy coverage till 0.5 keV to detect the soft excess and a relatively good effective area for high significance detection of QPO. However, sources that exhibit both QPO in the light curve and soft excess in the spectrum were needed to perform such a study.

Out of the five sources in which we detected *XMM-Newton* observations, only 4U 1626–67 satisfies this criterion. Despite soft-excess being also detected in V 0332+53 and Cen X–3, the blackbody dominant spectral band is outside the sensitive instrument energy band to perform QPO rms estimation. We modelled the soft excess in 4U 1626–67 with a blackbody component of $kT_{\text{BB}} \sim 0.3$ keV. The black body contribution is expected to peak around 0.8 keV ($\sim 2.8 kT_{\text{BB}}$). Incidentally, QPO also shows high rms values of about 20% in the 0.5–3 keV spectral band in 4U 1626–67 (Fig. 1). An alternate interpretation is that the QPO rms is consistently high in the 0.5–10 keV with an abrupt drop in 3–5.7 keV, which seems unlikely when looking at it together with QPO rms from other wavelengths (See Section 3.1) and the *RXTE*/PCA observation (Fig. A2).

However, apart from the soft excess, 1–3 keV also contains the Ne emission complex (See Fig. 2), the origin of which is believed to be the O/Ne rich accretion disk of 4U 1626–67 ([Schulz et al. 2001](#)). To check if the QPO rms show any anomaly in the energy range corresponding to the Neon emission complex, we calculated the QPO rms in 0.5–0.9 keV, 0.9–1.1 keV and 1.1–3 keV energy bands, and there seems to be no significant rise in the QPO rms peculiar to the Neon spectral range in the two *XMM-Newton* observations (Fig. 7). The QPO rms as a function of energy from combined multiple *NICER* observations also show that the QPO rms is maximum in 1.3–1.9 keV, i.e., neither at the soft-excess energy band nor at the Neon line energy band (Fig. 2). Therefore, we found no evidence to associate the origins of soft-excess and QPO.




Figure 7. QPO rms in three different energy ranges of two *XMM-Newton* observations of 4U 1626–67. The QPO rms shows a rise throughout the 0.9–3.0 keV band in both observations.

4.5 Applicability of KFM and BFM

The KFM treats QPO as the NS emission modulated by the inhomogeneous matter orbiting at Keplerian orbit in the inner accretion disk. KFM imposes the condition $v_{\text{NS}} < v_{\text{QPO}}$, and based on this the applicability of KFM is invalid on four of the five QPOs we detected (See Table 8). It could be applicable in XTE J1858+034, which gives the inner accretion disk orbital frequency as 196 mHz. But considering that soft X-rays are vulnerable to absorption from cold matter compared to hard X-rays, the QPO rms is expected to peak at lower energies, i.e., exhibiting anti-correlation with energy. However, a strong positive correlation is exhibited by XTE J1858+034 between QPO rms and photon energy in both the *NuSTAR* (this work) and *RXTE/PCA* (Mukherjee et al. 2006), with the QPO rms reaching about 10% in 15–25 keV in the *NuSTAR* observation.

KFM is therefore not apt to explain the QPOs we observed. From the observed QPO frequency and the pulsar spin frequency, we estimated the orbital frequency of the inner accretion disk in each case (Table 8). Both KFM and BFM also predict the QPO centroid frequency to vary with the X-ray luminosity, which is not generally observed in XRPs (Finger 1998; Raichur & Paul 2008). Exceptions are A 0535+262 (Finger et al. 1996; Finger 1998; Ma et al. 2022) and XTE J1858+034 (Mukherjee et al. 2006), where, a positive correlation of the QPO frequency with X-ray flux was observed. We found such a variation in V 0332+53, where the QPO centroid frequency is almost doubled when the X-ray flux increased ~ 5 times (See the discussion in Section 4.3).

The inner accretion disk is expected to terminate at the Alfvén radius (r_{M}), and r_{M} (Lamb et al. 1989; Becker et al. 2012) is given by

$$r_{\text{M}} = 2.73 \times 10^7 \text{cm} \left(\frac{\Lambda}{0.1} \right) \left(\frac{M_{\star}}{1.4M_{\odot}} \right)^{1/7} \left(\frac{R_{\star}}{10 \text{ km}} \right)^{10/7} \times \left(\frac{B_{\star}}{10^{12} \text{ G}} \right)^{4/7} \left(\frac{L_{\text{x}}}{10^{37} \text{ ergs s}^{-1}} \right)^{-2/7} \quad (1)$$

Λ is a constant, and $\Lambda = 1$ for spherical accretion, and $\Lambda \approx 0.22\alpha^{18/69}$ for disk accretion, where α is the alpha-disk parameter. $\Lambda = 0.1$ is a fair approximation for typical values of α between 0.01–0.1 (Becker et al. 2012). M_{\star} is the mass of the NS, R_{\star} is the

radius of NS, B_{\star} is the magnetic field at the surface of the NS, and L_{x} is the X-ray luminosity of the source. We checked the difference in r_{M} predicted by equation 1 from the inner accretion radius (r_{BFM}) predicted by BFM, given by

$$r_{\text{BFM}} = \left(\frac{GM_{\text{NS}}}{4\pi^2(v_{\text{QPO}} + v_{\text{NS}})^2} \right)^{1/3} \quad (2)$$

The results are summarized in Table 8. The BFM predicted inner accretion radius and the Alfvén radius are within a factor of 1.1 in IGR J19294+1816, XTE J1858+034, and the 40 mHz QPO in V 0332+53. However, they are off by a factor of 1.5 or less in the 2.5 mHz and 18 mHz QPOs in V 0332+53, and by a factor of 1.5 or more in 4U 1626–67 and Cen X–3. BFM could therefore explain the QPOs only in IGR J19294+1816, V 0332+53 (40 mHz), and XTE J1858+034. The estimate of Alfvén radius from equation 1 is also, however, bound to have uncertainties from various variables.

Beyond KFM and BFM, we also acknowledge the existence of other QPO models, for instance, the magnetically driven disk precession model (Shirakawa & Lai 2002). However, this model does not predict the energy dependence of QPO rms.

4.6 QPOs in other accretion-powered X-ray sources

Besides XRPs, black hole binaries (BHBs) and low magnetic field (10^8 – 10^9 G) neutron stars in Low mass X-ray binaries (NSBs) are two other classes of accretion-powered X-ray binaries containing primary compact stellar objects with a mass of the order of M_{\odot} , that exhibits QPOs which has been well studied. The QPOs exhibited by BHBs are broadly classified into two types based on their centroid frequency, namely the low-frequency QPOs (LFQPOs) (0.1–30 Hz) and the high-frequency QPOs (HFQPOs) (> 30 Hz). HFQPOs in BHBs like the QPOs exhibited by XRP are also a transient phenomena (Belloni et al. 2012). NSBs exhibit QPOs at kHz frequencies, known as kHz QPOs (they sometimes appear in pairs, and are then known as twin kHz QPOs). Due to the centroid frequency being close to the Keplerian frequency of their inner accretion disks, the kHz QPOs in NSBs and HFQPOs in BHBs are generally associated with the accretion disk (Remillard & McClintock 2006). Moreover, BHBs and NSBs usually exhibit different spectral states like high-soft state (high luminosity and soft spectrum), low-hard state and intermediate state. The kHz QPOs in NSBs and HFQPOs in BHBs are usually observed during the soft states (Motta et al. 2017), which are generally associated with the accretion disk. Considering their connection with the accretion disk, the mHz QPOs in XRPs, kHz QPOs in NSBs and HFQPOs in BHBs could be discussed in the same context.

The twin kHz QPOs in NSBs are usually explained by two models; the sonic point beat-frequency model (Miller et al. 1998) and the relativistic precession model (Stella & Vietri 1998). The relativistic precession model interprets the HF kHz QPO from the inner accretion disk and LF kHz QPO as relativistic precession modes at that orbit. The sonic point beat-frequency model interprets the high-frequency kHz QPO to be related to the clumps in the innermost accretion disk and the LF kHz QPO as the beat frequency between neutron star spin and the HF kHz QPO. The sonic point model is a combination of the KFM and BFM employed in XRPs. If the sonic point model is employed to explain the twin QPOs (2 and 18 mHz) observed in two *NuSTAR* observations of V 0332+53, the model predicts a spin frequency of NS around 20 mHz, while the true value stands at 220 mHz.

In general, QPOs in XRPs (*this work*), HFQPOs (Morgan et al.

Table 8. Characteristics of the observed QPOs and applicability of Keplerian and Beat frequency models.

| Source | Type | ν_{QPO} in mHz | E-relation | ν_{orb} (inner acc. disk) in mHz | | Unabsorbed Flux _{2–20keV} in 10^{-10} ergs s $^{-1}$ cm $^{-2}$ | inner acc. disk radius in km | | | References [†] |
|-----------------|------------|---------------------------|------------|---|------------------|---|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|---|
| | | | | KFM [†] | BFM [§] | | r_{KFM} | r_{BFM} | r_{M} | |
| 4U 1626–67 | Persistent | 48 | +ve | N.A | 178 | 2.8 | – | 5305 | 1055 | Staubert et al. (2019) |
| IGR J19294+1816 | Transient | 30 | +ve | N.A | 113 | 4.0 | – | 7182 | 6616 | Staubert et al. (2019) |
| V 0332+53 | Transient | 2.5 | nil | N.A | 230 | 6.1–7.5 | – | 4478 | 5386–5713 | Staubert et al. (2019) |
| | | 18 | nil | N.A | 245 | 6.1–7.5 | – | 4287 | 5386–5713 | Staubert et al. (2019) |
| | | 40 | nil | N.A | 267 | 29.1–124.8 | – | 4049 | 2411–3656 | Staubert et al. (2019) |
| Cen X–3 | Persistent | 30 | +ve | N.A | 238 | 67.1 | – | 4371 | 2775 | Staubert et al. (2019) |
| XTE J1858+034 | Transient | 185 | +ve | 185 | 190 | 10.4 | 5170 | 5088 | 5363 | Malacaria et al. (2021) |

[†] $\nu_{\text{orb}} = \nu_{\text{QPO}}$. KFM is not applicable if $\nu_{\text{QPO}} < \nu_{\text{NS}}$ (denoted by N.A).

[§] $\nu_{\text{orb}} = \nu_{\text{QPO}} + \nu_{\text{NS}}$.

[†] References for distance to the source, and magnetic field strength.

1997, van der Klis 2000) and kHz QPOs (Strohmayer et al. 1996, Zhang et al. 1996, Berger et al. 1996, Wijnands et al. 1997) exhibit a positive correlation of QPO rms with photon energy. A key aspect that sets the QPOs in XRP apart is their QPO rms that regularly goes over 10% up to 30% (this work) when compared to < 20% in kHz QPOs (Zhang et al. 1996, Wijnands et al. 1997) and even lower values for the rarely detected transient HFQPOs (Belloni et al. 2012).

5 CONCLUSIONS

We analysed 99 *XMM-Newton* and *NuSTAR* observations of 29 accreting X-ray pulsars and searched for the presence of mHz Quasi-periodic oscillations in them. We detected QPOs in six *XMM-Newton* observations and three *NuSTAR* observations and estimated the variation of QPO properties with photon energy. The Magnetospheric beat frequency model (BFM) is favourable over the Keplerian frequency model (KFM) in IGR J19294+1816, V 0332+53 (40 mHz) and XTE J1858+034. Twin QPOs were detected in the *NuSTAR* observation of V 0332+53.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research has made use of data and/or software provided by the High Energy Astrophysics Science Archive Research Center (HEASARC), which is a service of the Astrophysics Science Division at NASA/GSFC. This publication makes use of the observations obtained with *XMM-Newton*, an ESA science mission with instruments and contributions directly funded by ESA Member States and NASA. This research has made use of the *NuSTAR* Data Analysis Software (*NuSTARDAS*) jointly developed by the ASI Science Data Center (Italy) and the California Institute of Technology (USA). HM thank Ketan Rikame and Kinjal Roy for the lightcurves of Her X–1 and Cen X–3, respectively. We thank the anonymous reviewer for the useful suggestions that helped us improve the manuscript.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All the data underlying this research work is publicly available in NASA’s HEASARC Data archive.

REFERENCES

Aftab N., Paul B., Kretschmar P., 2019, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 243, 29
 Alpar M. A., Shaham J., 1985, *Nature*, 316, 239

Arnaud K., Dorman B., Gordon C., 1999, *Astrophysics Source Code Library*, pp ascl-9910
 Becker P., et al., 2012, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 544, A123
 Belloni T., Hasinger G., 1990, *A&A*, 230, 103
 Belloni T. M., Sanna A., Méndez M., 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, 1701
 Berger M., et al., 1996, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 469, L13
 Beri A., Jain C., Paul B., Raichur H., 2014, *MNRAS*, 439, 1940
 Beri A., Paul B., Dewangan G. C., 2018, *MNRAS*, 475, 999
 Caballero-García, M. D. et al., 2016, *A&A*, 589, A9
 Camero-Arranz A., Pottschmidt K., Finger M., Ikhsanov N., Wilson-Hodge C., Marcu D., 2012, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 546, A40
 Chakrabarty D., 1998, *ApJ*, 492, 342
 Chakrabarty D., Homer L., Charles P. A., O’Donoghue D., 2001, *ApJ*, 562, 985
 Coburn W., Heindl W. A., Rothschild R. E., Gruber D. E., Kreykenbohm I., Wilms J., Kretschmar P., Staubert R., 2002, *ApJ*, 580, 394
 Devasia J., James M., Paul B., Indulekha K., 2011, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 417, 348
 Domcek V., et al., 2019, *The astronomer’s telegram*, 13215, 1
 Doroshenko V., Tsygankov S. S., Mushtukov A. A., Lutovinov A. A., Santangelo A., Suleimanov V. F., Poutanen J., 2017, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 466, 2143
 Elshamouty K. G., Heinke C. O., Chouinard R., 2016, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 463, 78
 Finger M. H., 1998, *Advances in Space Research*, 22, 1007
 Finger M., Wilson R., Harmon B., 1996, *Astrophysical Journal* v. 459, p. 288, 459, 288
 Gendreau K. C., et al., 2016, in *Space telescopes and instrumentation 2016: Ultraviolet to gamma ray*, pp 420–435
 Harrison F. A., et al., 2013, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 770, 103
 Hickox R. C., Narayan R., Kallman T. R., 2004, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 614, 881
 Jahoda K., Markwardt C. B., Radeva Y., Rots A. H., Stark M. J., Swank J. H., Strohmayer T. E., Zhang W., 2006, *ApJS*, 163, 401
 Jain C., Paul B., Dutta A., 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 403, 920
 James M., Paul B., Devasia J., Indulekha K., 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 407, 285
 Kaastra J., Bleeker J., 2016, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 587, A151
 Kaur R., Paul B., Kumar B., Sagar R., 2008, *ApJ*, 676, 1184
 Klis M. v. d., 1997, in *Astronomical Time Series*. Springer, pp 121–132
 Kommers J. M., Chakrabarty D., Lewin W. H., 1998, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 497, L33
 Lamb F., Pethick C., Pines D., 1989, *Accretion: A Collection Of Influential Papers*, 5, 160
 Liu Q., et al., 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 5579
 Ma R., et al., 2022, *MNRAS*, 517, 1988
 Malacaria C., et al., 2021, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 909, 153
 Mandal M., Pal S., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2101.09250
 Miller M. C., Lamb F. K., Psaltis D., 1998, *ApJ*, 508, 791
 Morgan E. H., Remillard R. A., Greiner J., 1997, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 482, 993
 Motta S. E., Rouco Escorial A., Kuulkers E., Muñoz-Darias T., Sanna A.,

2017, *MNRAS*, **468**, 2311
 Mowlavi N., et al., 2006, *A&A*, **451**, 187
 Mukherjee U., Bapna S., Raichur H., Paul B., Jaaffrey S., 2006, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy*, **27**, 25
 Naik S., Paul B., 2012, arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0949
 Nespoli E., Reig P., 2010, arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.0564
 Paul B., Rao A. R., 1998, *A&A*, **337**, 815
 Paul B., Nagase F., Endo T., Dotani T., Yokogawa J., Nishiuchi M., 2002, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **579**, 411
 Petterson J. A., 1978, *ApJ*, **224**, 625
 Qu J. L., Zhang S., Song L. M., Falanga M., 2005, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, **629**, L33
 Raichur H., Paul B., 2008, *ApJ*, **685**, 1109
 Raman G., Paul B., Bhattacharya D., 2021, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **508**, 5578
 Reig P., Nespoli E., 2013, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **551**, A1
 Reig P., Negueruela I., Papamastorakis G., Manousakis A., Kougentakis T., 2005, *A&A*, **440**, 637
 Remillard R. A., McClintock J. E., 2006, *ARA&A*, **44**, 49
 Rodes-Roca J. J., Bernabeu G., Magazzù A., Torrejón J. M., Solano E., 2018, *MNRAS*, **476**, 2110
 Rodriguez J., Tomsick J. A., Bodaghee A., Zurita Heras J. A., Chaty S., Paizis A., Corbel S., 2009, *A&A*, **508**, 889
 Sanjurjo-Ferrín G., Torrejón J. M., Postnov K., Oskinova L., Rodes-Roca J. J., Bernabeu G., 2021, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **501**, 5892
 Schulz N. S., Chakrabarty D., Marshall H. L., Canizares C. R., Lee J. C., Houck J., 2001, *ApJ*, **563**, 941
 Sharma R., Jain C., Rikame K., Paul B., 2023a, *MNRAS*, **519**, 1764
 Sharma R., Jain C., Paul B., 2023b, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters*, **526**, L35
 Shinoda K., Kii T., Mitsuda K., Nagase F., Tanaka Y., Makishima K., Shibazaki N., 1990, *PASJ*, **42**, L27
 Shirakawa A., Lai D., 2002, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **565**, 1134
 Staubert R., et al., 2019, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **622**, A61
 Stella L., Vietri M., 1998, *ApJ*, **492**, L59
 Stella L., White N. E., Davelaar J., Parmar A. N., Blissett R. J., van der Klis M., 1985, *ApJ*, **288**, L45
 Strohmayer T. E., Zhang W., Swank J. H., Smale A., Titarchuk L., Day C., Lee U., 1996, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **469**, L9
 Strüder L., et al., 2001, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **365**, L18
 Suchy S., et al., 2008, *ApJ*, **675**, 1487
 Takeshima T., Dotani T., Mitsuda K., Nagase F., 1994, *ApJ*, **436**, 871
 Takeshima T., Corbet R. H. D., Marshall F. E., Swank J., Chakrabarty D., 1998, *IAU Circ.*, **6826**, 1
 Tamba T., Odaka H., Tanimoto A., Suzuki H., Takashima S., Bamba A., 2023, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **944**, 9
 Tsygankov S. S., Wijnands R., Lutovinov A. A., Degenaar N., Poutanen J., 2017, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **470**, 126
 Tsygankov S. S., Doroshenko V., Mushtukov A. A., Lutovinov A. A., Poutanen J., 2019b, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, **621**, A134
 Tsygankov S. S., Doroshenko V., Mushtukov A. A., Lutovinov A. A., Poutanen J., 2019a, *A&A*, **621**, A134
 Tsygankov S. S., et al., 2021, *ApJ*, **909**, 154
 Vybornov V., Doroshenko V., Staubert, R. Santangelo, A. 2018, *A&A*, **610**, A88
 Wijnands R., et al., 1997, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **490**, L157
 Zhang W., Lapidus I., White N. E., Titarchuk L., 1996, *The Astrophysical Journal*, **469**, L17
 van der Klis M., 1989, in Ögelman H., van den Heuvel E. P. J., eds, *NATO Advanced Study Institute (ASI) Series C Vol. 262, Timing Neutron Stars*. p. 27
 van der Klis M., 2000, *ARA&A*, **38**, 717




Figure A1. The *XMM-Newton*/PN PSD of 4U 1626–67 in different energy bands (0.5–1 keV in black, 1–3 keV in red, 3–5.7 keV in magenta, 5.7–10.0 keV in blue) of OID 0152620101 (Top) and OID 111070201 (Bottom). QPO at 40 mHz is fitted with lorentzian profile.

Figure A2. The *RXTE*/PCA PSD of 4U 1626–67 in different energy bands (2.02–6.70 keV in black, 6.7–8.5 keV in red, 8.5–11.1 keV in green, 11.1–13.0 keV in blue, 13.0–15.4 keV in orange, 15.4–20.2 keV in magenta and 20.2–60.0 keV in purple). The QPO at 48 mHz is fitted with a Lorentzian profile.




Figure A3. The *NICER* PSD of 4U 1626–67 in different energy bands (0.5 – 0.9 keV in black, 0.9 – 1.3 keV in red, 1.3 – 1.9 keV in magenta, 1.9 – 3.5 keV in blue). The QPO at 48 mHz is fitted with a Lorentzian profile.




Figure A4. The *XMM-Newton*/PN PSD of IGR J19296+1816 in different energy bands (0.5–3 keV in black, 3–5.7 keV in red, 5.7–10 keV in blue). The QPO at 30 mHz is fitted with a Lorentzian profile.

APPENDIX A: QPO FITS

APPENDIX B: OBSERVATIONS





Figure A5. The *XMM-Newton*/PN PSD of V 0332+53 in different energy bands (0.5–3 keV in black, 3–5.7 keV in red, 5.7–10 keV in blue) of OID 0763470301 (Top) and OID 0763470401 (Bottom). QPO at 40 mHz is fitted with a Lorentzian profile.




Figure A6. The *NuSTAR* PSD of V 0332+53 in different energy bands (3–6 keV in black, 6–8.5 keV in red, 8.5–11.5 keV in magenta, and 11.5–60 keV in blue) of OID 80102002004 (Top) and OID 80102002006 (Bottom). QPO at 40 mHz is fitted with a Lorentzian profile.




Figure A7. The *NuSTAR* PSD of V 0332+53 in different energy bands (3–8 keV in black, 8–10 keV in red, 10–15 keV in magenta, 15–25 keV in blue). Twin QPOs at 2.5 mHz and 18 mHz were fitted with two Lorentzian profiles.




Figure A8. The *XMM-Newton*/PN PSD of Cen X–3 in three different energy bands (0.5–3 keV in black, 3–5.7 keV in red, 5.7–10 keV in blue). QPO at 30 mHz is fitted with Lorentzian profile.




Figure A9. The *NuSTAR* PSD of XTE J1858+034 in four different energy bands (3–8 keV in black, 8–10 keV in red, 10–15 keV in magenta, 15–25 keV in blue). QPO at ~ 185 mHz was fitted with a Lorentzian profile.

Table B1: Observations log

| Sl no. | Source | Observatory/Instrument | Obs. ID | Observation mode | Observation duration (ks) |
|--------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 1 | 1A 0535+262 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0674180101 | PrimeFullWindow | 58 |
| 2 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80001016002 | - | 43 |
| 3 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80001016004 | - | 56 |
| 4 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90401370001 | - | 118 |
| 5 | 2S 1553–542 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90101002002 | - | 50 |
| 6 | 4U 0115+63 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90102016002 | - | 38 |
| 7 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90102016004 | - | 41 |
| 8 | 4U 1538–522 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0152780201 | PrimeFullWindow | 79 |
| 9 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30201028002 | - | 85 |
| 10 | 4U 1626–67 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0111070201 | PrimeSmallWindow | 16 |
| 11 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0152620101 | PrimeSmallWindow | 84 |
| 12 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0764860101 | FastTiming | 54 |
| 13 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30101029002 | - | 114 |
| 14 | | <i>RXTE</i> /PCA | P10101 | Good Xenon | 395 |
| 15 | 4U 1700–37 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0600950101 | PrimeFullWindow | 50 |
| 16 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30101027002 | - | 74 |
| 17 | 4U 1901+03 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90501305001 | - | 44 |
| 18 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90501324002 | - | 102 |
| 19 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90502307002 | - | 38 |
| 20 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90502307004 | - | 55 |
| 21 | 4U 1907+09 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0555410101 | FastTiming | 21 |
| 22 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30401018002 | - | 154 |
| 23 | 4U 2206+54 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0650640101 | PrimeLargeWindow | 75 |
| 24 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30201015002 | - | 108 |
| 25 | Cen X–3 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0111010101 | PrimeSmallWindow | 67 |
| 26 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0400550201 | FastTiming | 80 |
| 27 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30101055002 | - | 39 |
| 28 | Cep X–4 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80002016002 | - | 79 |
| 29 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80002016004 | - | 76 |
| 30 | EXO 2030+375 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0745240201 | FastTiming | 31 |
| 31 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90201029002 | - | 117 |
| 32 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90701336002 | - | 50 |
| 33 | GRO J1008–57 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80001001002 | - | 32 |
| 34 | GRO J1744–28 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0506291201 | FastTiming | 38 |
| 35 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0729560401 | FastTiming | 82 |
| 36 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80002017002 | - | 67 |
| 37 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80202027002 | - | 56 |
| 38 | GX 301–2 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0555200301 | FastTiming | 59 |
| 39 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0555200401 | FastTiming | 47 |
| 40 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30001041002 | - | 51 |
| 41 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30101042002 | - | 53 |
| 42 | GX 304–1 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90401326002 | - | 108 |
| 43 | IGR J16393–4643 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0206380201 | PrimeLargeWindow | 9 |
| 44 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0604520201 | PrimeSmallWindow | 19 |
| 45 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30001008002 | - | 96 |
| 46 | IGR J17329–2731 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0795711701 | FastTiming | 37 |
| 47 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90301012002 | - | 38 |
| 48 | IGR J17544–2619 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0679810401 | PrimeSmallWindow | 15 |
| 49 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0679810501 | PrimeSmallWindow | 15 |
| 50 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0744600101 | PrimeFullWindow | 135 |
| 51 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30002003003 | - | 50 |
| 52 | IGR J18027–2016 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0206380601 | PrimeLargeWindow | 10 |
| 53 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0745060401 | PrimeFullWindow | 43 |
| 54 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0745060501 | PrimeFullWindow | 16 |
| 55 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0745060601 | PrimeFullWindow | 17 |
| 56 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0745060701 | PrimeFullWindow | 14 |
| 57 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0745060801 | PrimeFullWindow | 17 |
| 58 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30101049002 | - | 85 |

Table B1 Continued: Observations log

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------|------------------|-----|
| 59 | IGR J19294+1816 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0841190101 | PrimeFullWindow | 67 |
| 60 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90401306002 | - | 79 |
| 61 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90401306004 | - | 79 |
| 62 | KS1947+300 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0727961201 | FastTiming | 12 |
| 63 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80002015002 | - | 38 |
| 64 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80002015004 | - | 42 |
| 65 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80002015006 | - | 56 |
| 66 | RX J0520.5–6932 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0701990101 | PrimeFullWindow | 20 |
| 67 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0729560201 | FastTiming | 2 |
| 68 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0729560301 | FastTiming | 10 |
| 69 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80001002002 | - | 54 |
| 70 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80001002004 | - | 66 |
| 71 | SMC X–1 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0784570201 | FastTiming | 19 |
| 72 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0784570301 | FastTiming | 19 |
| 73 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0784570401 | FastTiming | 21 |
| 74 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0784570501 | FastTiming | 19 |
| 75 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0893400101 | PrimeSmallWindow | 21 |
| 76 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0893400301 | PrimeSmallWindow | 22 |
| 77 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30202004002 | - | 42 |
| 78 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30202004004 | - | 42 |
| 79 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30202004006 | - | 38 |
| 80 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30202004008 | - | 43 |
| 81 | SMC X–2 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0770580701 | FastTiming | 8 |
| 82 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90101017002 | - | 48 |
| 83 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90102014002 | - | 48 |
| 84 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90102014004 | - | 50 |
| 85 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0770580901 | PrimeSmallWindow | 31 |
| 86 | V 0332+53 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0506190101 | PrimeFullWindow | 36 |
| 87 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0763470301 | FastTiming | 32 |
| 88 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0763470401 | FastTiming | 31 |
| 89 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80102002004 | - | 41 |
| 90 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80102002006 | - | 38 |
| 91 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80102002008 | - | 38 |
| 92 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 80102002010 | - | 44 |
| 93 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90202031002 | - | 44 |
| 94 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90202031004 | - | 44 |
| 95 | X Persei | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0151380101 | PrimeFullWindow | 30 |
| 96 | | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0600980101 | PrimeFullWindow | 124 |
| 97 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 30401033002 | - | 12 |
| 98 | XTE J1829–098 | <i>XMM-Newton</i> /PN | 0135746701 | PrimeFullWindow | 1 |
| 99 | | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90401332002 | - | 55 |
| 100 | XTE J1858+034 | <i>NuSTAR</i> /FPMA,B | 90501348002 | - | 90 |

This paper has been typeset from a \LaTeX file prepared by the author.