The characterization of the distant blazar GB6 J1239+0443 from flaring and low activity periods
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ABSTRACT

In 2008, AGILE and Fermi detected gamma-ray flaring activity from the unidentified EGRET source 3EG J1236+0457, recently associated with a flat spectrum radio quasar (GB6...
1 INTRODUCTION
Blazars are a subclass of active galactic nuclei (AGN), emitting from radio to TeV energies. They are subdivided in two main categories: flat spectrum radio quasars (FSRQs) and BL Lacertae (BL Lac) objects. FSRQs are characterized by a flat radio spectrum in the GHz range (with spectral index $\alpha \approx 0.5$, where the flux density is $S_\nu \propto \nu^{-\alpha}$), and strong and broad emission lines (with equivalent width $\gtrsim 5\AA$). BL Lac objects, on the other hand, have no or weak emission lines with equivalent width $<5\AA$.

Blazars continuum emission originates from a relativistic jet aligned with the line of sight. Their spectral energy distribution (SED) shows a double-humped shape (Urry & Padovani 1995), with a low-energy peak lying between infrared (IR) and X-rays, and a high-energy peak in the MeV–TeV band.

The low-energy region of blazar spectra is associated with the synchrotron emission coming from the jet relativistic electrons. The high-energy region can be modelled through inverse Compton emission (leptonic models), with seed photons coming from an external region (e.g. the accretion disc and the dusty torus), eventually reprocessed by the broad-line region (BLR), or the hot corona, or from the synchrotron process itself [synchrotron self-Compton (SSC)]. A detailed description of leptonic models can be found in Maraschi, Ghisellini & Celotti (1992), Marsher & Bloom (1992) and Sikora, Begelman & Rees (1994).

The high-energy region can also be modelled with hadronic scenarios (Mücke & Protheroe 2001; Mücke et al. 2003; Bottcher 2007), where the very high energy protons of the jet are radiatively important. The accelerated protons produce gamma-ray emission through proton synchrotron emission, the decay of neutral pions and synchrotron emission produced by secondaries.

The location of the so-called ‘blazar zone’, i.e. the spatial location of the blazar SED peaks and gamma-ray-emitting region, in blazars is still a matter of debate. Sikora et al. (2008) proposed that the blazar zone is located at $3–9\text{pc}$ from the central engine for the outburst of 3C 454.3 (a bright FSRQ) occurred in 2005. For the same flare, Ghisellini et al. (2007) indicated, instead, a dissipation region at $0.5–0.8\text{pc}$ from the central black hole (BH). From the combined study of time-dependent polarimetric radio images at 43 and 86 GHz, the optical polarimetry, and radio, optical, X-ray, gamma-ray light curves, Jorstad et al. (2010) proposed that the low- and high-energy emission are located near the 43-GHz core, at a distance of the order of tens of parsecs from the BH for 3C 454.3. A similar investigation, performed for the BL Lac objects OJ287 and AO 0235+164 (Agudo et al. 2011a,b), led to similar results.

Tavecchio & Mazin (2009) established that gamma-rays emitted inside the BLR are absorbed at $E > 20\text{GeV}(1 + z)$ due to the $\gamma\gamma$ interaction with the BLR photons (internal absorption). Poutanen & Stern (2010) refined this result and claimed internal absorption features at $E > 5\text{GeV}(1 + z)$ and at $E > 20\text{GeV}(1 + z)$ in the gamma-ray spectrum of 3C 279, 3C 454.3, PKS 1510–08 and a few other FSRQs.

Within the leptonic scenario, Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009) show that the contribution of external photon fields, including contributions from the BLR and dusty torus to the inverse Compton emission, can be parametrized as a function of the accretion disc luminosity and the dissipation distance of the emitting blob from the BH (Ghisellini & Tavecchio 2009). Ghisellini et al. (2010) modelled the SED of the gamma-ray loudest blazars as being emitted at 0.01–0.5 pc from the BH.

Using multiwavelength observations of the blazar GB6 J1239+0443, we will apply the models of Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009) to further investigate the location of the blazer zone. GB6 J1239+0443 was an unidentified gamma-ray source of the Virgo region (3EG J1236+0457), detected with low significance (Hartman et al. 1999; Casandjian & Grenier 2008) by the EGRET gamma-ray telescope (operating in the 30 MeV to 30 GeV energy range; see Esposito et al. 1999). In recent years, the gamma-ray source has shown two episodes of remarkable high-energy activity: at the beginning and at the end of 2008, when it was detected by the AGILE gamma-ray telescope (Pacciani et al. 2009) and the Fermi Large Area Telescope (Fermi–LAT; Tramacere et al. 2009), respectively; then named AGL J1238+0406 (Pittori et al. 2009) and 2FGL J1239.5+0443 (Nolan et al. 2012). The accurate source location determined by Fermi–LAT allowed for the association of the unidentified gamma-ray source with BZQ 1239+0443, an FSRQ included into the second edition of the Roma-BZCAT multifrequency catalogue of blazars (Massaro et al. 2010). The optical counterpart of this source is SDSS J123932.75+044305.3, located at $z = 1.762$, and the radio counterpart is named GB6 J1239+0443. In the
following sections, we refer to this object as GB6 J1239+0443, its radio source name.

Here we present the results of an analysis of multifrequency data simultaneous to the AGILE campaign on the Virgo field, and to the follow-up carried out after the Fermi–LAT detection and localization. By analysing the archival data, we estimate some fundamental physical properties of the source such as the accretion disc luminosity and the supermassive black hole (SMBH) mass. In this way, we can obtain a consistent picture of the source emission in the framework of leptonic models of blazars for periods of both low and high emission activity. In Sections 2 and 3, we will describe the multifrequency campaigns related to this source. In Section 4, we will report on the archival data. In Section 5, we will present our results consisting in the determination of the BH mass, the gamma-ray light curve and spectrum, and the SED modelling.

2 GAMMA-RAY OBSERVATIONS AND RELATED MULTIFREQUENCY CAMPAIGNS

The AGILE–GRID (Gamma Ray Imaging Detector, operating in the 30 MeV to 50 GeV energy range; see Tavani et al. 2009) performed two observing campaigns of the Virgo field. The first campaign included three observations from 2007 December 16 to 2008 January 8. There were three simultaneous observations (revolutions 633, 635, 637) with the wide-field instruments aboard the INTEGRAL mission (operating in optical, hard X-rays and soft gamma-rays; see Winkler et al. 2003). During this campaign, AGILE detected high gamma-ray activity from GB6 J1239+0443 (Pacciani et al. 2009). In the following sections, we will refer to this time period as period A and to the related multiwavelength campaign as campaign A.

AGILE also observed the Virgo field from 2009 June 4 to 15, but there were no simultaneous observations with wide-field instruments operating at other wavelengths. GB6 J1239+0443 was undetected during this observation.

The Fermi–LAT gamma-ray telescope (20 MeV to 300 GeV; see Atwood et al. 2009), operating in all-sky survey mode since 2008 August 4, detected high gamma-ray activity at the end of 2008 December (Tramacere et al. 2009) and triggered optical–ultraviolet (UV)/X-ray observations with the Swift satellite (Gehrels et al. 2004), starting from 2009 January 2 for a total exposure of 4.7 ks. Optical V-band photometry and polarization measurements were also made on ground with the KANATA telescope on 2009 January 2 and 3 (Ikejiri et al. 2009). In the following sections, we will refer to the observations collected during this period as period B, and to the related multiwavelength campaign as campaign B. A summary of the observations is provided in Table 1.

3 DATA ANALYSIS

3.1 AGILE–GRID data

Level-1 AGILE–GRID data for campaign A were analysed using the AGILE Standard Analysis Pipeline (BUILD20) and the AGILE Scientific Analysis Package, based on the likelihood method (Mattox et al. 1996). Albedo photons were rejected by applying a cut at 85° centred on the Earth. We selected well-reconstructed gammarays by applying the FM3.119 filter, calibrated in the 100 MeV to 3 GeV energy band (Cattaneo et al. 2011). All the events collected during the passage in the South Atlantic Anomaly were rejected. Counts, exposure and Galactic background gamma-ray maps were created with a bin size of 0.1 × 0.1 for E > 100 MeV. We detected a source (AGL J1238+0406 in the AGILE catalogue; see Pittori et al. 2009; Verrecchia et al. 2011) with a significance of ~6 (as measured by the \( \sqrt{T_S} \) parameter; see Mattox et al. 1996 for a reference to the Test Statistic or TS), located at \( \alpha_{2000} = 190.25, \delta_{2000} = 4.40 \), with an error radius of (33 ± 6) arcmin [statistical error at 95 per cent confidence level (CL) and systematic error, respectively], by integrating the GRID data for 4 days between 2008 January 4 13:35 and January 8 11:16 (within the campaign A). The source was positionally consistent with GB6 J1239+0443. A multisource maximum likelihood analysis was performed to extract the source flux and position taking into account nearby sources 3C 273, 3C 279 and 4C 04.42 (for which we obtained \( \sqrt{T_S} > 1 \) from a preliminary analysis of the observing campaign). For AGL J1238+0406 we obtained a flux of \((62 ± 9) \times 10^{-9} \) photons cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) (E > 100 MeV) and a photon index of 1.92 ± 0.14. The integration of the first week of observations with AGILE gave no detection at the position of GB6 J1239+0443, resulting in an upper limit of \(21 \times 10^{-8} \) photons cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\).

3.2 Fermi–LAT data

We analysed the Fermi–LAT data for campaign B with the standard Fermi Science Tools v9r23p1, following the prescriptions in the online documentation.\(^1\) We used the Pass 7 response functions...
(P7_V6). In particular, we selected events of event class 2, suitable for point-like sources, and we filtered out photons from the Earth’s limb with a cut at 100° in the zenith angle. We performed the unbinned likelihood analysis inside a region of radius 15° around GB6 J1239+0443 to derive the source flux. We took into account the diffusion backgrounds, which were modelled using gal_2yearp7v6_v0 for the Galactic diffuse emission and iso_p7v6source for the extragalactic isotropic emission models, and all the 51 point-like gamma-ray sources in the second Fermi–LAT catalogue (Nolan et al. 2012) within a slightly larger radius of 20° from GB6 J1239+0443 [we considered a larger radius due to the point spread function (PSF) width]. For each source we used the model specified in the second Fermi–LAT catalogue. For the sources within 10° from GB6 J1239+0443, we kept free all the spectral parameters in the fit. For the sources within an annulus of internal radius 10° and external radius 15° we kept free only the parameters related to the flux normalization, and all the other parameters were fixed to the values reported in the second Fermi–LAT catalogue. For the sources outside 15° from GB6 J1239+0443, we fixed all the spectral parameters to the values reported in the catalogue. This is a standard procedure for the analysis of Fermi–LAT data, implemented with the PYTHON routine make2FGLxml.py (contributed software by T. Johnson).

We proceeded with the analysis for energies only above 300 MeV, in order to process data with a smaller PSF and reduce background gamma-rays from 3C 273, a bright and soft gamma-ray source (Γ ~ 2.6) located at ~4° from GB6 J1239+0443, since the 68 per cent (95 per cent) containment radius for Fermi–LAT at normal incidence is 4.5 (10°) at 100 MeV. Our study showed that this choice had a negligible effect on the signal significance of GB6 J1239+0443.

We used the gfindsrc tool to locate the gamma-ray source. By integrating data for one month centred around the peak flux (2008 December 29 16:00 UT) in the band 300 MeV to 20 GeV, and by using photons converted in both the front and back sections of the Fermi–LAT, we obtained a detection of a source (2FGL J1239.5+0443 in the second Fermi–LAT catalogue; see Nolan et al. 2012) with √TS = 20 located at δ2000 = 189.897, δ2000 = 4.718 and an error radius of 9 arcmin. The source was positionally consistent with GB6 J1239+0443. We obtained a gamma-ray photon index of 2.15 ± 0.11.

From the analysis in the 300 MeV to 20 GeV range, we also obtained a detection with √TS ~ 18, a flux of (23 ± 3) × 10⁻⁸ photons cm⁻² s⁻¹ and a photon index of 2.21 ± 0.15, when keeping the integration time within only 4 days centred at 2008 December 29 16:00 UT (the peak flux). During this integration period, the source was detected up to the energy interval 10–20 GeV, for which we obtained a detection with √TS = 5.8. To compute the upper limits needed to build the source light curve and spectra, we used the UpperLimits PYTHON function provided with the Fermi Science Tools.

### 3.3 INTEGRAL/IBIS data

The INTEGRAL/IBIS (Imager on-Board INTEGRAL Satellite, operating in the 17–400 keV energy range; see Ubertini et al. 2003) data for campaign A were processed using the osa software version 2.0. We searched for the source starting from the images accumulated in the 20–40 keV band for revolutions 633, 635 and 637 (simultaneous with AGILE observation of the Virgo field, campaign A). IBIS did not detect the source. We derived a 3σ upper limit of 1.7 mCrab for each revolution (200 ks exposure).

### 3.4 Swift–XRT data

The Swift–X-ray Telescope (XRT, operating in the 0.2–10 keV range; see Burrows et al. 2005) data for campaign B were processed using the most recent available calibration files. We made use of swift software version 3.5, ftools version 6.8 and xspec version 12.5. The observations were obtained in photon counting mode, with a total integration of 4.7 ks. The mean source count rate was (2.58 ± 0.23) × 10⁻³ count s⁻¹. We extracted the spectrum using a photon binning ratio that ensured more than 20 photon counts per energy bin. We fitted the X-ray data with an absorbed power law, fixing the absorption to the galactic value of 1.85 × 10²⁰ cm⁻² (Dickey & Lockman 1990). We obtained a photon index of 1.42 ± 0.25 (90 per cent CL). The estimated flux in the range 2–10 keV was (8.8 ± 2.7) × 10⁻¹³ erg cm⁻² s⁻¹ (68 per cent CL).

### 3.5 Swift–UVOT data

Swift Ultraviolet/Optical Telescope (Swift–UVOT; see Roming et al. 2005) data from each observation sequence of period B were processed by the standard UVOT tool uvsotsource using the same version of the SWIFT software as for the XRT analysis. An extraction region of radius 5 arcsec centred on the source and a background region of radius 13 arcsec located at δ2000 = 12h39m29.s66, δ2000 = +04°42'34.2" [at least 27 arcsec far away from any object in the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database (NED)] were used. Magnitudes are expressed in the UVOT photometric system (Poole et al. 2008). We obtained m_U = 16.27 ± 0.03 for GB6 J1239+0443 (extinction corrected using the mean Galactic interstellar extinction curve from Fitzpatrick 1999).

### 3.6 CANATA optical data

The optical photometry was performed using TRISPEC (a simultaneous optical and near-IR imager, spectograph and polarimeter; see Watanabe et al. 2005) attached to the CANATA 1.5-m telescope at Higashi-Hiroshima Observatory on 2009 January 2 at 18:14 and January 3 at 19:41 UT (period B). The observations were performed in polarimetry mode with a narrow aperture mask of 1.5-arcmin width. The total exposure was 1476 s per night. The observations were pipeline reduced, including bias removal and flat-field corrections. We derived the V-band magnitude from differential photometry with a nearby reference star at σ2000 = 12h39m30.s11, δ2000 = +04°39'52.6" of which the V magnitude of 14.095 was deduced from the g’ and r’ data in the sixth release of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; Adelman-McCarthy et al. 2008).

### 3.7 INTEGRAL/OMC data

We analysed the Optical Monitoring Camera (OMC, equipped with a Johnson V filter; see Mas-Hesse et al. 2003) data collected during period A with the osa software version 8.0. Due to the differing mode of INTEGRAL observations, the field around the source was observed with OMC in the science windows 2, 50, 52 and 78 of revolution 633, in the science windows 49, 51 and 77 of revolution
In order to model accurately the SED (Sections 5.2 and 5.4), we used archival data of GB6 J1239+0443 from the SDSS. Photometry with the filters $u, g, r, i, z$ was performed on 2001 March 15. In particular, the SDSS archive reports $m_u = 20.62 \pm 0.06$ and $m_g = 20.47 \pm 0.03$ (corresponding to $m_U \sim 19.9$ and $m_V \sim 20.5$). An optical spectrum (370–920 nm) was obtained on 2002 May 13.

The near-IR photometry of the source was performed by using the data of the UKIRT Infrared Deep Sky Survey (UKIDSS) Large Area Survey (LAS) of 2007 January 18.

GALEX (an orbiting ultraviolet space telescope; see Martin et al. 2005) observed the source with NUV and FUV filters (with bandpass centred at 230 and 150 nm, respectively) between 2007 April 17 and May 13.

The source was observed by VLA at 43 GHz on 2001 November 5, resulting in a low flux (we reported the analysis of this observation in the previous section).

A weak detection at 22 GHz was obtained by the Metsahovi Observatory on 2002 May 11 (Terasranta et al. 2005), they reported a flux of $0.22 \pm 0.04$ Jy.

Following the Fermi–LAT detection of a gamma-ray flare, the source has been added to the MOJAVE sample, and was observed twice by the Very Long Baseline Array (VLBA) in 2009 at 2 cm: on 2009 January 30 (one month after the gamma-ray flare) and on 2009 December 10. The source was found in the Planck Legacy Archive v0.5, with detections at 30, 100, 143 and 217 GHz with observations on 2010 January 3, 6, 9 and 7, respectively. We also added the 147-GHz data for which the detection is flagged as extended. At last we included in the SED the detection in the ROSAT All Sky Survey. A summary of the archival observations is given in Table 2, while the archival radio and optical SED is plotted in Fig. 2.

### 5 RESULTS

#### 5.1 Disc luminosity and black hole mass determination from the archival optical/UV photometry

In spite of the large amount of data available for GB6 J1239+0443, the source has not been studied in detail before.

The optical SDSS spectrum was taken simultaneously with the 22-GHz Metsahovi radio observation (Terasranta et al. 2005). We note that the 22-GHz flux is a factor of 3–4 lower than the Planck data of 2010 (light blue data in the top panel of Fig. 2). From the

---

**Table 2. Summary of archival optical and radio observations of GB6 J1239+0443.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Project/Observatory</th>
<th>Measurement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001 Mar 15</td>
<td>SDSS</td>
<td>Optical photometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 Nov 5</td>
<td>VLA</td>
<td>43 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 May 11</td>
<td>Metsahovi</td>
<td>22 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002 May 13</td>
<td>SDSS</td>
<td>Optical spectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Jan 18</td>
<td>UKIDSS–LAS</td>
<td>Near-IR photometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Apr 17</td>
<td>GALEX</td>
<td>Near-UV photometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Jan 30</td>
<td>VLBA</td>
<td>15 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 Dec 10</td>
<td>VLBA</td>
<td>15 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Jan 3–9</td>
<td>Planck</td>
<td>30–217 GHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

5 The National Radio Astronomy Observatory is a facility of the National Science Foundation operated under cooperative agreement by Associated Universities, Inc.

6 MOJAVE (Monitoring Of Jets in Active galactic nuclei with VLBA Experiments) is a long-term programme to monitor radio brightness and polarization in jets of AGN.
making use of the Mg II line luminosity $\epsilon = 2$ and the GALEX data taken in 2010. Purple data represent the higher 50 per cent. We also note that the GALEX observations give a factor of $\sim 10$ lower flux with respect to the Swift/UVOT observation taken during the 2009 January flare. We cannot establish whether the UV emission detected by GALEX is due to the disc alone or whether there is also the contribution of the high-energy tail of synchrotron emission. In the latter, unfavoured, case, the UV data from GALEX result in at least an upper limit on the disc emission.

With these considerations, and assuming the disc emission is not variable on year time-scales, we attempted to model the SDSS and GALEX photometry with a Shakura–Sunyaev accretion disc (Shakura & Sunyaev 1973) around a non-rotating BH (dashed curve in the bottom panel of Fig. 2). We modelled the disc emission as proposed by Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009), with inner radius of 3 Schwarzschild radii ($R_S$) and outer radius of 500$R_S$. We fit the model to the SDSS+GALEX data keeping free the parameters of disc luminosity ($L_d$) and $R_S$. We obtained a disc luminosity of $\sim 8.9 \times 10^{45}$ erg s$^{-1}$ and $R_S \sim 2.4 \times 10^{12}$ cm, corresponding to a maximum emitting temperature of $\sim 5.4 \times 10^7$ K, a BH mass of $\sim 8 \times 10^9$ solar masses, an accretion rate of $\sim 9 \, M_{\odot}$ yr$^{-1}$ (assuming an accretion efficiency $\epsilon_{\text{acq}} = 0.1$) and then an Eddington ratio $R_{\text{Edd}} = L_d/L_{\text{Edd}} \sim 50$ per cent.

We note that one observation by SDSS and one observation by GALEX show a flux higher than the one expected according to our thermal emission model, but the filters used include quasar line emission from Mg II (the SDSS i filter) and Ly$\alpha$ (the GALEX NUV filter); see Fig. 2. We also fit a disc model assuming that the near-UV (GALEX) photometry is dominated by jet emission. In this case, the model assumes an accretion disc with only a minor contribution from jet emission and is fit to the SDSS data alone. In this scenario (dot–dashed curve in the bottom panel of Fig. 2), a model with a disc luminosity $> 5.4 \times 10^{45}$ erg s$^{-1}$ is required. We are aware that our model fits are not unique and that there are no simultaneous radio observations to strongly validate one fit over the other, but our preferred model reproduces the observed fluxes and is consistent with the scenario usually proposed for FSRQs (see e.g. Ghisellini et al. 2011, where hard optical/UV spectra are usually modelled as accretion-disc-dominated emission).

#### 5.2 Black hole mass determination from archival optical spectrum

The BH mass of GB6 J1239+0443 could be estimated better by using the single-epoch BH mass scaling relationship for C IV derived from Vestergaard & Peterson (2006) and applied on the archival optical spectrum for this FSRQ. Unfortunately, the SDSS spectrum has a rather low S/N ($\sim 3$ per pixel in the continuum near the C IV $\lambda$1549 emission line). Denney et al. (2009) show that line widths and thus single-epoch BH masses measured from low-S/N data have relatively larger systematic uncertainties than those.
measured from high-quality data. In addition, unrecognized absorption is a particular concern for low-quality C IV data (see Vestergaard & Peterson 2006; Assef et al. 2011; Denney et al. 2011). Nonetheless, this is the only optical spectrum during a low state currently available. Therefore, we use this spectrum to measure the line width and determine the mass. We employed two line width measurement methods and quote conservative uncertainties on the line width taking into account the low quality of the data. Our methods for measuring the C IV line width and uncertainties closely follow the prescription ‘A’ described by Assef et al. (2011), and we therefore refer the reader to this work for details. After subtracting the linearly fit continuum, based on the windows shown in Fig. 3, we measured the full width at half-maximum (FWHM) of C IV both directly from the data (FWHM = 2860 ± 910 km s⁻¹) and from a sixth-order Gauss–Hermite polynomial fit to the line profile, as shown in Fig. 3 (FWHM = 4710 ± 390 km s⁻¹). Denney et al. (2009) show that direct measurement of the FWHM from low-S/N data systematically underestimates the line width, while measurement from a fit referring to the same data can overestimate the same width. We adopt a conservative approach and take the mean of these two width measurements and assume the quadrature sum of the uncertainties. The adopted FWHM measurement becomes FWHM C IV = 3800 ± 1000 km s⁻¹. We then measure the mean continuum luminosity in the continuum window near rest-frame 1450 Å to be L{sub,450} = (3.47 ± 0.44) \times 10^{45} erg s⁻¹, after correcting for Galactic extinction. We then evaluate the mass using equation (7) from Vestergaard & Peterson (2006), which is also equation (6) from Assef et al. (2011). It is worth noting that the SDSS spectrum does not extend to rest-frame 1350 Å; however, Vestergaard & Peterson (2006) argue that the 1450-Å luminosity can be substituted without penalty for the 1350-Å luminosity, as we have done here. We estimate the BH mass of GB6 J1239+0443 to be 4.3^{+2.2}_{-1.2} \times 10^8 M_{\odot}.

Assef et al. (2011) find a correlation between the ratio of the C IV-to-Balmer mass estimates and the UV-to-optical luminosity ratio. Since this correlation is based on the ratio of the mass estimates, barring further investigation into the source of this correlation, it is unclear whether it is the C IV-based or Balmer-based mass estimates, or both, to be the source of the bias. Regardless of origin, Assef et al. found that, when this correlation is removed, and when they arbitrarily choose to correct the C IV-based masses, the corrected masses are highly consistent with the measured Balmer-line-based mass estimates (the scatter in the corrected C IV versus Balmer mass estimates is reduced by a factor of \geq 2 when compared to the uncorrected mass estimates; see Assef et al. 2011). Balmer-based mass estimates are generally more accepted in the literature because they are relatively better calibrated with direct mass measurements from reverberation mapping (see e.g. Collin et al. 2006; Vestergaard & Peterson 2006; Denney et al. 2009). At this point, however, it is impossible to state which of the two mass measures is actually more accurate. In particular, we must consider that host galaxy starlight can significantly contaminate the optical luminosity with which Balmer-based masses are estimated, yet there may be evidence of non-virial motions from C IV (see e.g. Richards et al. 2002). For GB6 J1239+0443, we fit a power-law continuum to the full wavelength extent of the SDSS spectrum and extrapolate to rest-frame 5100 Å to estimate the rest-frame optical luminosity to be \lambda L{sub,5100} = (2.64 ± 0.33) \times 10^{45} erg s⁻¹. Using equation (8) of Assef et al. (2011), with the coefficients based on their prescription A, we can then calculate a corrected C IV-based BH mass of 5.3^{+1.2}_{-1.1} \times 10^8 M_{\odot}.

The two mass estimates (based on the C IV broad-line width and on the thermal continuum) are in qualitative agreement.

### 5.3 Gamma-ray light curve

We created a gamma-ray light curve for the source from both the AGILE pointing and the Fermi survey, as shown in Fig. 4. The AGILE data were integrated with bin sizes of about 6.5, 6.5 and 4 d, due to gaps in the observation (see Table 1). The Fermi–LAT data were integrated with bin sizes of 1 and 7 d. The flux reported is in the 100 MeV to 3 GeV range for AGILE. As discussed in Section 3, the Fermi–LAT data were analysed between 300 MeV and 20 GeV in order to reduce the contamination from the nearby 3C 273 at lower energies. In Fig. 4, we also report the gamma-ray photon index in the 300 MeV to 20 GeV range as obtained by the Fermi–LAT data assuming a power-law spectrum.

To evaluate the flare duration, we made use of the procedure described by Abdo et al. (2010). From the light curve with time bin of 1 d, we obtained a duration [defined as (T_{rise} + T_{fall})/2] of 7 d and an asymmetry of −0.3 (see Abdo et al. 2010 for details, T_{rise} and T_{fall} are the rising and falling times, respectively). The light curve with a time bin of 7 d shows more than a single relative maximum; therefore, the fit with a simple curve is not feasible. A rough definition of the gamma-ray activity period could instead be the time span for which Fermi–LAT detects gamma-ray emission from the source. Assuming temporal bins of 7, 15 and 30 days, we found that Fermi–LAT detected gamma-rays from the source for at least 11 weeks.

### 5.4 The Fermi–LAT gamma-ray spectrum for the high activity period of campaign B

The gamma-ray spectrum obtained by Fermi–LAT data, integrated for one month centred around the peak flux (2008 December 29 16:00 UT), is reported in Fig. 5 together with the spectrum integrated for 4 days. The 30-day integrated spectrum has been fitted first with a power-law model. Because absorption is expected for a blazar zone originating near the central source (e.g. within the
Figure 4. The gamma-ray light curve for GB6 J1239+0443 obtained with AGILE during campaign A (diamond symbols and right vertical scale for the gamma-ray flux) and Fermi (left vertical scale for the gamma-ray flux). For the Fermi–LAT data, we report also the photon index evaluated in the 300 MeV to 20 GeV energy band. The upper panel reports Fermi–LAT data with a typical bin size of 1 d. The lower panel reports Fermi–LAT data with 7 d integration. AGILE data were integrated with bin sizes of about 6.5, 6.5 and 4 d, due to gaps in the observation (see Table 1). The orange bands represent the INTEGRAL campaign (campaign A); width is in scale. The green bands represent the Swift campaign (campaign B); width not in scale.

BLR), we also fit the spectrum with a power law combined with absorption. In particular, absorption at $E > 20 \text{ GeV} / (1+z)$ is expected (Tavecchio & Mazin 2009) due to the Lyman continuum, or at $E > 5 \text{ GeV} / (1+z)$ due to the He II recombination continuum (Poutanen & Stern 2010). We therefore fit the gamma-ray spectrum of GB6 J1239+0443 with a power law combined with the gamma–gamma absorption model as proposed by Poutanen & Stern (2010). Here, the absorption was fitted with two parameters: (1) the optical depth for the H I complex ($\tau_{\text{HI}}$) and (2) the optical depth for the He II complex ($\tau_{\text{HeII}}$). We fit the models to the data for gamma-ray energies below 20 GeV, because the extragalactic background light is expected to absorb gamma-rays of $E \gtrsim 20$ GeV, for sources at the redshift of GB6 J1239+0443 (Finke et al. 2010). The results of the fit are reported in Table 3. The fit with the gamma–gamma absorption components results in no absorption from the He II complex, and weak absorption from the H I complex. We performed the $F$-test on the two fits reported in Table 3 to test the hypothesis of the need of the absorption components. The $F$-test gives a value of 0.15, and an associated probability of $\sim 87$ per cent, hence the absorption component is not necessary to fit the spectrum, suggesting that in GB6 J1239+0443 the blazar zone is located in the outer low-ionization region of the BLR or outside it.

5.5 The spectral energy distribution for the high activity periods

We constructed two SEDs referring to the high gamma-ray activity observed by AGILE and Fermi (campaigns A and B, respectively, as reported in Table 1) with the data collected so far. The AGILE data are integrated for 4 d (the duration of the last observation during the campaign A, from 2008 January 4 13:35 to January 8 11:06 UT). The Fermi–LAT data for period B are integrated within 4 d around the flux peak (2008 December 29 16:00 UT) to achieve acceptable statistics. These SEDs are shown in Fig. 6, where we also included the archival data.

The SED modelling has been performed in the framework of leptonic models. We assume that the emitting region is a spherical blob of radius $R_{\text{blob}}$, with bulk Lorentz factor $\Gamma_{\text{bulk}}$, an electron population distribution proportional to $\left(1 + \gamma / \gamma_{\text{bulk}}\right)^{-s_1}$, and an electron population distribution proportional to $\left(1 + \gamma / \gamma_{\text{bulk}}\right)^{-s_2}$ (where $\gamma$ is the Lorentz factor of the electrons, ranging from $\gamma_{\text{min}}$ to $\gamma_{\text{max}}$).
and a randomly oriented magnetic field $B$ filling the dissipation region. The observer line of sight and the jet direction form an angle $\Theta_{\text{view}}$. We parametrize the external radiation fields as proposed by Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009), where the key elements are the accretion disc luminosity and the distance ($R_{\text{disc}}$) of the emitting blob from the central BH. We consider a jet aperture $R_{\text{jet}}/R_{\text{disc}} = 0.1$, according to Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009). In evaluating the power carried by protons, we assume one proton per emitting electron. We assumed that during the campaigns A and B, the accretion disc luminosity is the same as the one obtained from the SDSS data in 2001 (dashed curve in Fig. 6). We found in Section 5.4 that the Fermi–LAT gamma-ray spectrum (Fig. 6 green data, one-month integration) does not show absorption from the BLR. Therefore, we tried to find solutions for the blob dissipating beyond the BLR, without taking into account the gamma–gamma absorption from the BLR. We obtained two possible solutions for the modelling. Model parameters are reported in Table 4, where we use $R_{\text{BLR}}$ ($R_{\text{Torus}}$) to refer to the distance of the BLR region (of the dusty torus) from the BH, $f_{\text{BLR}}$ ($f_{\text{Torus}}$) to the fraction of the disc emission that is reprocessed by the BLR in lines (by the dusty torus), $\epsilon_{\text{acc}}$ to the accretion efficiency and $\gamma_{\text{cooling}}$ to the electron Lorentz factor for which the electron energy halves in the blob crossing time ($R_{\text{blob}}/c$).

The first solution (model 1, the top panel of Fig. 6) places the dissipation region ($R_{\text{disc}}$) just beyond the BLR ($R_{\text{disc}} \sim 0.2$ pc from the SMBH), where the photon field from the dusty torus is almost equal to the BLR seed photon field. At such a distance, the variability time-scale of a blob of radius $R_{\text{blob}} \sim 7 \times 10^{16}$ cm is of the order of $\sim 3$ d, qualitatively in agreement (within a factor of 2) with the 1-d binned gamma-ray light curve of the source. According to this modelling of the seed photon fields, the BLR photon contribution is expected to fade over time while the torus contribution remains constant. Both SSC and external Compton (EC) with seed photons from the torus contribute to the soft X-ray emission, the hard X-ray is dominated by EC emission with seed photons from the torus, and the GeV emission is dominated by EC with seed photons from the BLR. In the MeV to GeV range, the two EC contributions are almost equal. Further investigation of the variability is not possible, as no optical light curve is available from which to trace the electron population from the synchrotron emission. Moreover, the evolution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power law</th>
<th>Power law + double absorber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/d.o.f.</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photon index</td>
<td>2.14 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$/d.o.f.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photon index</td>
<td>2.13 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{\text{BLR}}$</td>
<td>$1.0^{+4.6}_{-1.0}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma_{\text{He}}$</td>
<td>$0^{+0.9}_{-0.9}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Gamma-ray spectral properties of GB6 J1239+0443, uncertainties at 68 per cent CL.
Table 4. Model parameters for the fits of the spectral energy density, in the two assumptions of a blob dissipating just beyond the BLR ($R_{\text{diss}} \sim 0.2$ pc) or far away from the SMBH ($R_{\text{diss}} \sim 7$ pc). In the last column, we report the model parameters for a blob dissipating far away from the SMBH ($R_{\text{diss}} \sim 5$ pc), but relaxing the condition $R_{\text{blob}} = (1/10)R_{\text{diss}}$ and assuming a blob radius of $\sim 10^{17}$ cm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_{\text{diss}}$ (pc)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blob radius (cm)</td>
<td>$6.7 \times 10^{16}$*</td>
<td>$2.1 \times 10^{18}$*</td>
<td>$1 \times 10^{17}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$m_{\text{BH}}$ ($M_\odot$)</td>
<td>$5.3 \times 10^8$</td>
<td>$8.8 \times 10^{45}$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{17}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_4$ (erg s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>$7.4 \times 10^{18}$</td>
<td>$0.1$</td>
<td>$0.3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{\text{diss}}$ (cm)</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{17}$</td>
<td>$3 \times 10^{17}$</td>
<td>$9.6 \times 10^{16}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{\text{BLR}}$</td>
<td>$3.0 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{\text{torus}}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-1}$</td>
<td>$1.1 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$7.6 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon_{\text{accr}}$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $R_{\text{blob}} = (1/10)R_{\text{diss}}$ in this model.
** We assume one proton per emitting electron.

of the gamma-ray photon index with time (reported in Fig. 4) is statistically poor.

The second solution to the SED modelling (model 2) has been found by assuming $R_{\text{diss}} \sim 7$ pc from the SMBH. Such a model requires that $R_{\text{blob}} = 2 \times 10^{18}$ cm, with a variability time-scale of the order of $10^4$ d. We do not find such a variability time-scale in the gamma-ray light curve, but we observe that the activity period for the source lasts at least 11 weeks. We can argue that the dissipating region in the jet has a radius of $2 \times 10^{18}$ cm. Gradients of the electron energy density in the distance from the BH, or disturbances in the medium (Bromberg & Levinson 2009), or to recollimation by the interaction with the external medium (Bromberg & Levinson 2009).

The optical observations of GB6 J1239+0443 revealed an optical to gamma-ray emission to EC with external photons from the torus.

6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We rarely have the opportunity to detect the disc emission in FSRQs, which are generally overwhelmed by synchrotron jet emission (see e.g. Pian et al. 1999). However, our study here suggests that we have detected accretion-disc-dominated emission in GB6 J1239+0443. Granted, we cannot fully exclude the possibility that the archival SDSS and GALEX observations we have reported could be interpreted as other emission mechanisms than thermal disc emission because we lack strictly simultaneous radio observations and extended radio light curves to corroborate the assumption of low jet emission. However, the assumption of disc emission remains, in our opinion, the most likely explanation for the observations.

The optical observations of GB6 J1239+0443 revealed an optical flux enhancement of a factor of 15–30 in six years, signifying a shift from accretion-disc- to synchrotron-jet-dominated emission. The optical spectrum obtained in the period of faint optical emission allowed the classification of the source as an FSRQ in BZCAT. We made an estimate of the SMBH mass of GB6 J1239+0443 and the accretion rate from a period of low jet activity. With these estimates, we were able to study the 2008 December flare. Modelling the
observed flat gamma-ray spectrum and SED also allowed for an investigation into the location of the blazar zone of the object.

As a final remark, it is worth stressing two major points. First, by definition, our estimate of \( R_{\text{diss}} \) is model dependent. The location of the dissipation region was estimated assuming the parametrization proposed by Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009) for the BLR and the torus contribution to seed photons for the EC. According to this parametrization, it was possible to derive \( R_{\text{diss}} \) from the luminosity ratio of synchrotron to EC emission. In fact, in the parametrization by Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009) for a dissipation region outside the BLR, the seed photons for EC fade with distance from the SMBH. We obtained two solutions. Referring to fig. 2 of Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009), the ratio \( U''_B/(U''_{\text{BLR}} + U''_{\text{IR}}) \) equals the ratio of the optical to gamma-ray luminosity at the two values of the \( R_{\text{diss}} \) (assuming knowledge of the magnetic energy density). For the flares of GB6 J1239+0443 reported in this article, one solution (model 2) places the blob at \( R_{\text{diss}} \sim 7 \) pc, with only the dusty torus as the origin of seed photons. The other solution (model 1, with \( R_{\text{diss}} \sim 0.2 \) pc) corresponds to just outside the BLR, where the contribution of seed photons from both the dusty torus and the BLR is relevant. The magnetic field is constrained in the SE modelling by the cut-off of synchrotron emission in the UV (due to the last and most energetic electrons), and by the corresponding cut-off of EC which we cannot derive directly from data (that give non-constraining upper limits at \( E > 20 \) GeV, see Fig. 6). Assuming the Thomson regime, and with only one external photon field contributing to the EC, the ratio \( f_{\text{cut-off}} \) between the synchrotron cut-off energy and the EC cut-off energy is proportional to \( \frac{b}{\Gamma_{\text{bulk}}(U''_0)} \), where \( \langle \nu_{\text{seed}} \rangle \) is the typical seed photon field energy. Hence if we have constraining data at the highest energy, and with a specific geometry in the model, we can constrain \( B/\Gamma_{\text{bulk}} \). However, the geometry in the model also constrains \( U''_{\text{BLR}} + U''_{\text{IR}} \), hence in the ideal case we can obtain \( B/\Gamma_{\text{bulk}} \) and \( R_{\text{diss}} \) from the SE modelling. The ratio of synchrotron to SSC luminosity further constrains the model parameters \( R_{\text{diss}}, \Gamma_{\text{bulk}}, B \), allowing one to remove the degeneracy between \( \Gamma_{\text{bulk}} \) and \( B \). In reality, we can obtain only upper limits of \( f_{\text{cut-off}} \) because the data at higher energies are non-constraining. Therefore, we have only upper limits on \( B/\Gamma_{\text{bulk}} \) for each model. As a consequence, the \( U''_{\text{BLR}} + U''_{\text{IR}} \) could be lower than in our parametrization [we have to maintain the ratio \( U''_B/(U''_{\text{BLR}} + U''_{\text{IR}}) \) at the desired value]. This implies that \( R_{\text{diss}} \) could be higher than our evaluations.

The second point is that the photon field intensity is proportional to the accretion disc luminosity, and the BLR and torus location is proportional to \( \sqrt{L_{\text{diss}}} \). In all our estimations, we assume that the disc luminosity is almost steady over time, e.g. in the low state observed during the Sloan survey in 2002, during the GALEX observation in 2007 and during the gamma-ray flares observed by AGILE at the beginning of 2008 and by Fermi–LAT at the end of 2008. This assumption could be false. In this case, we observe that the parametrization of \( U''_{\text{BLR}} \) and \( U''_B \) reported in equation (20) by Ghisellini & Tavecchio (2009) remains unchanged while varying \( L_{\text{diss}} \), provided that we scale the solution for \( R_{\text{diss}} \) with \( \sqrt{L_{\text{diss}}} \). Therefore, variations of the disc luminosity in time and/or systematic errors in the evaluation of disc luminosity from our SDSS+GALEX data (possibly biased by jet emission) only slightly affect our estimation of \( R_{\text{diss}} \).

The starting point of our modelling is that the emission region is far from the SMBH (at parsec scale) and we motivate this choice with the flat gamma-ray spectrum up to energies of 15 GeV. For a different approach and results for other blazars, we refer readers to the work of Tavecchio et al. (2010). They performed a detailed study of the localization of the emission region for bright blazars making use of the variability time-scale for objects showing a spectral cut-off at \((10-20)/(1+\alpha) \text{ GeV} \). They obtained that the variability time-scale and spectra are in agreement with a dissipation region inside the BLR.

We note that, contrary to the model we used, some authors (e.g. Giommi et al. 2011) model the SEDs of both FSRQs and BL Lac objects with pure synchrotron + SSC components only.

Model 1 (\( R_{\text{diss}} \sim 0.2 \) pc) gives a variability time-scale of the order of \( 3 \) d, in agreement with the flare duration estimated from the 1-d binned gamma-ray light curve. This model, however, does not properly reproduce the flat gamma-ray spectrum. In particular, in order to reproduce the observed flux at energies \( >10 \) GeV, it overestimates the spectrum for lower energies. In contrast, model 2 (\( R_{\text{diss}} \sim 7 \) pc) reproduces the flat gamma-ray spectrum, but it is not clear whether the predicted variability of the order of \( \sim 100 \) d can be associated with the duration of the gamma-ray activity period estimated from the 1-week/1-month binned gamma-ray light curves.

The third model has been built by relaxing the relation \( R_{\text{blob}} = 0.1 R_{\text{diss}} \) in order to preserve the variability time-scale estimated from the 1-d gamma-ray light curve (we follow the solution proposed by Tavecchio et al. 2011 for PKS 1222+216), and it still reproduces the gamma-ray spectrum. Interestingly, the size of the emitting region for PKS 1222+216 (\( R_{\text{blob}} \sim 5 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{pc} \)) and for GB6 J1239+0443 differs significantly.

For the third model, we obtain \( R_{\text{blob}} = 0.0067R_{\text{diss}} \), in agreement within a factor of 2 with the prediction of Bromberg & Levinson (2009), that gives \( R_{\text{blob}} = 10^{-2.5} R_{\text{diss}} \), for the case of efficient conversion of bulk luminosity in radiation in the strong focusing scenario. With the same assumptions, Bromberg & Levinson (2009) assume that the location of the emitting region is at \( R_{\text{diss}} \sim 2.5 \) \( (L_{\text{diss}}/10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1}) (R_{\text{BLR}}/0.1 \text{ pc})^{-1} \) pc from the SMBH, where \( L_{\text{jet}} \) is the jet power. If we invert this relation, and we make use of our result (\( R_{\text{diss}} \sim 4.8 \) pc), we obtain \( L_{\text{jet}} \sim 3.5 \times 10^{46} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \).

We must assume that the proton-to-emitting-electron ratio is of the order of 0.1 in order to reproduce such a power (in the evaluation of proton power reported in Table 4 we assumed one proton per emitting electron, instead). We note, however, that Nalewajko & Sikora (2009) evaluated that efficient radiative conversion could be assumed if the product of the bulk Lorentz factor by the opening angle is \( \gtrsim 3 \), and according to our third model this product is 2.
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