

The broad-band properties of the intermediate synchrotron peaked BL Lac S2 0109+22 from radio to VHE gamma-rays

MAGIC Collaboration, S. Ansoldi,^{1,2} L. A. Antonelli,³ C. Arcaro,⁴ D. Baack,⁵ A. Babić,⁶ B. Banerjee,⁷ P. Bangale,⁸ U. Barres de Almeida,^{8,9} J. A. Barrio,¹⁰ J. Becerra González,¹¹ W. Bednarek,¹² E. Bernardini,^{13,14} R. Ch. Berse,⁵ A. Berti,^{1,15} J. Besenrieder,⁸ W. Bhattacharyya,¹³ C. Bigongiari,³ A. Biland,¹⁶ O. Blanch,¹⁷ G. Bonnoli,¹⁸ R. Carosi,¹⁹ G. Ceribella,⁸ A. Chatterjee,⁷ S. M. Colak,¹⁷ P. Colin,⁸ E. Colombo,¹¹ J. L. Contreras,¹⁰ J. Cortina,¹⁷ S. Covino,³ P. Cumani,¹⁷ V. D’Elia,³ P. Da Vela,¹⁸ F. Dazzi,³ A. De Angelis,⁴ B. De Lotto,¹ M. Delfino,^{17,20} J. Delgado,^{17,20} F. Di Pierro,⁴ A. Domínguez,¹⁰ D. Dominis Prester,⁶ D. Dorner,²¹ M. Doro,⁴ S. Einecke,⁵ D. Elsaesser,⁵ V. Fallah Ramazani,^{22★} A. Fattorini,⁵ A. Fernández-Barral,⁴ G. Ferrara,³ D. Fidalgo,¹⁰ L. Foffano,⁴ M. V. Fonseca,¹⁰ L. Font,²³ C. Fruck,⁸ S. Gallozzi,³ R. J. García López,¹¹ M. Garczarczyk,¹³ M. Gaug,²³ P. Giammaria,³ N. Godinović,⁶ D. Guberman,¹⁷ D. Hadasch,² A. Hahn,⁸ T. Hassan,¹⁷ M. Hayashida,² J. Herrera,¹¹ J. Hoang,¹⁰ D. Hrupec,⁶ S. Inoue,² K. Ishio,⁸ Y. Iwamura,² Y. Konno,² H. Kubo,² J. Kushida,² A. Lamastra,³ D. Lelas,⁶ F. Leone,³ E. Lindfors,^{22★} S. Lombardi,³ F. Longo,^{1,15} M. López,¹⁰ C. Maggio,²³ P. Majumdar,⁷ M. Makariev,²⁴ G. Maneva,²⁴ M. Manganaro,¹¹ K. Mannheim,²¹ L. Maraschi,³ M. Mariotti,⁴ M. Martínez,¹⁷ S. Masuda,² D. Mazin,^{2,8} K. Mielke,⁵ M. Mineev,²⁴ J. M. Miranda,¹⁸ R. Mirzoyan,⁸ A. Moralejo,¹⁷ V. Moreno,²³ E. Moretti,¹⁷ V. Neustroev,²² A. Niedzwiecki,¹² M. Nievas Rosillo,¹⁰ C. Nigro,¹³ K. Nilsson,²² D. Ninci,¹⁷ K. Nishijima,² K. Noda,² L. Nogués,¹⁷ S. Paiano,⁴ J. Palacio,¹⁷ D. Paneque,⁸ R. Paoletti,¹⁸ J. M. Paredes,²⁵ G. Pedalletti,¹³ P. Peñil,¹⁰ M. Peresano,¹ M. Persic,^{1,26} K. Pfrang,⁵ P. G. Prada Moroni,¹⁹ E. Prandini,⁴ I. Puljak,⁶ J. R. Garcia,⁸ W. Rhode,⁵ M. Ribó,²⁵ J. Rico,¹⁷ C. Righi,³ A. Rugliancich,¹⁸ L. Saha,¹⁰ T. Saito,² K. Satalecka,¹³ T. Schweizer,⁸ J. Sitarek,¹² I. Šnidarić,⁶ D. Sobczynska,¹² A. Stamerra,³ M. Strzys,⁸ T. Surić,⁶ F. Tavecchio,³ P. Temnikov,²⁴ T. Terzić,⁶ M. Teshima,^{2,8} N. Torres-Albà,²⁵ S. Tsujimoto,² G. Vanzo,¹¹ M. Vazquez Acosta,¹¹ I. Vovk,⁸ J. E. Ward,¹⁷ M. Will,⁸ D. Zarić,⁶ S. Ciprini (Fermi-LAT Collaboration),^{27,28} R. Desiante (Fermi-LAT Collaboration),¹ S. Barcewicz,²⁹ T. Hovatta,^{29★} J. Jormanainen,²⁹ L. Takalo,²⁹ R. Reinthal,²⁹ N. Mankuzhiyil,³⁰ F. Wierda,²⁹ A. Lähteenmäki,^{31,32,33} J. Tammi,³¹ M. Tornikoski,³¹ R. J. C. Vera,^{31,32} S. Kiehlmann,³⁴ W. Max-Moerbeck³⁵ and A. C. S. Readhead³⁴

Affiliations are listed at the end of the paper

Accepted 2018 June 30. Received 2018 June 26; in original form 2018 April 19

* E-mails: vafara@utu.fi (VFR); talvikki.hovatta@utu.fi (TH); elilin@utu.fi (EL)

ABSTRACT

The Major Atmospheric Gamma-ray Imaging Cherenkov (MAGIC) telescopes observed S2 0109+22 in 2015 July during its flaring activity in high-energy gamma-rays observed by *Fermi*-Large Area Telescope. We analyse the MAGIC data to characterize the very high energy (VHE) gamma-ray emission of S2 0109+22, which belongs to the subclass of intermediate synchrotron peak (ISP) BL Lacertae (BL Lac) objects. We study the multifrequency emission in order to investigate the source classification. Finally, we compare the source long-term behaviour to other VHE gamma-ray emitting (TeV) blazars. We performed a temporal and spectral analysis of the data centred around the MAGIC interval of observation (MJD 57225–57231). Long-term radio and optical data have also been investigated using the discrete correlation function. The redshift of the source is estimated through optical host-galaxy imaging and also using the amount of VHE gamma-ray absorption. The quasi-simultaneous multifrequency spectral energy distribution (SED) is modelled with the conventional one-zone synchrotron self-Compton (SSC) model. MAGIC observations resulted in the detection of the source at a significance level of 5.3σ . The VHE gamma-ray emission of S2 0109+22 is variable on a daily time scale. VHE gamma-ray luminosity of the source is lower than the average of TeV BL Lacs. The optical polarization and long-term optical/radio behaviour of the source are different from the general population of TeV blazars. All these findings agree with the classification of the source as an ISP BL Lac object. We estimate the source redshift as $z = 0.36 \pm 0.07$. The SSC parameters describing the SED are rather typical for blazars.

Key words: galaxies: active – BL Lacertae objects: individual: S2 0109+22 – galaxies: jets – gamma-rays: galaxies.

1 INTRODUCTION

BL Lacertae (BL Lac) objects dominate the extragalactic very high energy (VHE; $E > 100$ GeV) gamma-ray sky. A relativistic jet shoots from the region of the central supermassive black hole, hosted at the centre of BL Lac objects, in the line of sight of the observer. Jets are typically characterized by featureless spectra in the optical band, highly polarized radiation in radio and optical, and variable radiation at all frequencies. The jet emission is non-thermal and described as a continuous spectral energy distribution (SED), spanning from radio to VHE gamma-ray frequencies, and featuring two wide peaks. Synchrotron emission by highly relativistic electrons spiralling in the magnetic field of the jet is used to explain the lower frequency peak. Different scenarios within various models are used to explain the high-frequency peak: external Compton (Melia & Konigl 1989; Dermer & Schlickeiser 1994; Sikora, Begelman & Rees 1994) and synchrotron self-Compton (SSC; Coppi 1992; Maraschi, Ghisellini & Celotti 1992) as leptonic models, proton synchrotron emission (Mannheim 1996; Aharonian 2000; Mücke & Protheroe 2001) and photopion production (Aliu et al. 2014) as hadronic models. Traditionally, in view of their relative simplicity and agreement with the data, single-zone SSC models have been used to describe BL Lac SEDs (e.g. Abdo et al. 2011a,b). However, there is growing evidence that these models do not reproduce all the observed features of BL Lac objects (e.g. Aleksić et al. 2014), and, in some cases, more complicated models should be considered. BL Lac objects are classified according to the peak frequency of their lower energy peak, ν_{syn} (Giommi & Padovani 1994): low synchrotron peaked (LSP; $\nu_{\text{syn}} < 10^{14}$ Hz), intermediate synchrotron peaked (ISP; $10^{14} \leq \nu_{\text{syn}} < 10^{15}$ Hz), and high synchrotron peaked (HSP; $\nu_{\text{syn}} \geq 10^{15}$ Hz) (Abdo et al. 2010b).

S2 0109+22 (also known as GC 0109+224), at coordinates (J2000) RA = $01^{\text{h}}12^{\text{m}}05^{\text{s}}.8$ and Dec. = $+22^{\circ}44'39''$, was first detected as a compact radio source in the 5 GHz Survey of the National Radio Astronomy Observatory (NRAO) 43-m dish of Green Bank,

West Virginia (Davis 1971; Pauliny-Toth et al. 1972). In 1976, it was optically identified as a stellar object of magnitude 15.5 on the Palomar Sky Survey plates, Owen & Mufson (1977) also measured a strong millimetre emission (1.53 Jy at 90 GHz)¹ and defined it as a BL Lac object. Since then it was continuously monitored in radio and optical (Ciprini et al. 2003; Hovatta et al. 2008, 2014). Ciprini et al. (2003, 2004) performed extensive studies on the radio and optical behaviour and the broad-band SED of this source. It remarkably shows high polarization variability, from 7 to 30 per cent (Takalo 1991; Wills, Wills & Breger 2011). It is classified as an ISP BL Lac object (Laurent-Muehleisen et al. 1999; Dennett-Thorpe & Marchã 2000; Bondi et al. 2001; Ciprini et al. 2004; Ackermann et al. 2011) using different approaches and data sets to calculate the location of its synchrotron peak.

Since the launch of the *Fermi* satellite in 2008, the source has been listed in most of the *Fermi*-Large Area Telescope (LAT) catalogues, i.e. 1FGL (Abdo et al. 2010a), 2FGL (Nolan et al. 2012), 1FHL (Ackermann et al. 2013), and 3FGL (Acero et al. 2015). However, the source is not listed in the catalogue of sources detected >50 GeV by the *Fermi*-LAT (2FHL; Ackermann et al. 2016). The source is variable in the high-energy (HE; 100 MeV $< E < 100$ GeV) gamma-ray band with the variability index equal to 489 and the maximum monthly flux value of $F_{(0.1-100 \text{ GeV})} = (2.14 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-7}$ photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ that is reported in 2011 February (3FGL; Acero et al. 2015). Healey et al. (2008) reported a redshift value for the source of $z = 0.265$, which was disfavoured by Paiano et al. (2016) using a high signal-to-noise ratio optical spectrum from Gran Telescopio Canarias. Based on this spectrum, $z > 0.35$ was measured, assuming the source is hosted by a massive elliptical galaxy typical for this class of sources. VHE gamma-ray observations of this source carried out with Major Atmospheric

¹The 11-m telescope (National Radio Astronomy Observatory) observed the source in 1976.

Gamma-Ray Imaging Cherenkov (MAGIC) between 2015 July 22 and 28 (MJD 57225–57231), were triggered when the reported HE gamma-ray daily flux, July 20 (MJD 57223), was about two times higher than the average flux reported in the 3FGL catalogue (Luigi Pacciani, private communication). The MAGIC observations led to the first detection of this source in VHE gamma-rays (Mirzoyan 2015).

In this paper, we present the multifrequency observations and data analysis in Section 2. A long-term behaviour study, the comparison with other VHE gamma-ray emitting (TeV) blazars, and estimations of the source distance are presented in Section 3. Finally, Section 4 summarizes our results.

2 OBSERVATIONS AND DATA ANALYSIS

In this section, we introduce the instruments and their respective data analysis procedures.

2.1 Very high energy gamma-rays (MAGIC)

MAGIC is a system of two Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Telescopes (17 m diameter) located in the Canary Island of La Palma (28°7′N, 17°9′W), at the elevation of 2200 m above sea level (Aleksić et al. 2016b). The use of the stereoscopic technique combined with large mirror size makes MAGIC one of the most sensitive instruments for VHE gamma-ray astronomy. The corresponding trigger threshold is $\gtrsim 50$ GeV (Aleksić et al. 2016b). S2 0109+22 is visible from the MAGIC site at zenith angle below 40° between mid-July and February.

Triggered by increased activity in HE gamma-rays, MAGIC observed S2 0109+22 for 9.63 h in 2015 July within a multiwavelength blazar monitoring program. The observations were performed during 7 consecutive nights from July 22 to July 28 (MJD 57225–57231) with zenith angle range between 11° and 39°. The data have been analysed using the MAGIC Standard Analysis Software (MARS; Moralejo et al. 2009; Aleksić et al. 2016a; Ahnen et al. 2017a). Parts of the data were affected by clouds, therefore we applied atmospheric transmission correction based on the information obtained with the MAGIC elastic LIDAR (Fruck & Gaug 2015).

2.2 High-energy gamma-rays (Fermi-LAT)

The LAT is the primary instrument onboard the *Fermi Gamma-ray Space Telescope*. Based on the pair-conversion technique, it is designed to investigate the gamma-ray sky in the energy band from 30 MeV to >300 GeV (Atwood et al. 2009). In its standard operation mode it surveys the sky, covering it fully every 3 h.

The data analysed in this paper were selected from a region of interest around S2 0109+22 with a radius of 15°, in a period lasting around 3 weeks (MJD 57220–57240) roughly centred on the MAGIC detection peak on MJD 57228 (2015 July 25). The data reduction of the events of the Pass8 source class was performed with the SCIENCETOOLS software package version v10r0p5² in the energy range 0.1–300 GeV. To reduce the Earth limb contamination a zenith angle cut of 90° was applied to the data. The unbinned likelihood fit of the data was performed using the suggested Galactic diffuse-emission model and isotropic component (Acero et al. 2016) recommended for Pass8 source event class.³

²<https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/software/>

³<https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/access/lat/BackgroundModels.html>

The normalizations of both diffuse components in the source model were allowed to freely vary during the spectral fitting. The source model also includes the sources of the *Fermi*-LAT third source catalogue (3FGL; Acero et al. 2015) within 25° of the source of interest. Spectral indices and fluxes are left to freely vary for sources within 5°; fluxes are also left to freely vary for sources flagged as ‘variable’ in the 3FGL catalogue that lie from 5° to 10°. The spectral parameters of the sources from 10° to 25° were instead fixed to their catalogue value.

To construct the light curve (LC) with 1-d time bins, only the source of interest (normalization and spectral index) and the diffuse models (normalization) were left free to vary, while the remaining 3FGL sources were fixed to the values obtained for the 3-week analysis of the region. An upper limit is shown when the detection significance was $<3\sigma$.⁴ The SED was obtained analysing data collected between the 2015 July 22 and 2015 July 28 (MJD 57225–57231), corresponding to the MAGIC observing period.

2.3 X-ray and UV (*Swift*)

Since 2006, *Neil Gehrels Swift observatory* (*Swift*) has pointed to the source 15 times in photon counting mode. 10 of the raw images by the X-ray Telescope (XRT; Burrows et al. 2004) onboard the *Swift* satellite are qualified for analysis.⁵ The multi-epoch (8) event list for the period from 2015 July 21 (MJD 57224.95) to 2015 August 1 (MJD 57235.86) with a total exposure time of ~ 6.15 h were downloaded from the publicly available SWIFTXRLOG (*Swift*-XRT Instrument Log).⁶ These observations have an average integration time of 2.8 ks each. They were processed using the procedure described by Fallah Ramazani, Lindfors & Nilsson (2017), assuming fixed equivalent Galactic hydrogen column density $n_{\text{H}} = 4.24 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$ reported by Kalberla et al. (2005). Additionally, *Swift* observed this source two more times in 2006. We analysed those two additional event lists to get a broader view of the source’s X-ray properties.

The Ultraviolet/Optical Telescope (UVOT, [4.9–16.6] $\times 10^5$ GHz), onboard the *Swift* satellite (Poole et al. 2008), observed the source 15 times during the MAGIC campaign, out of which eight were simultaneous to the XRT data taking.⁷ An iterative data calibration procedure (Raiteri et al. 2010) was used to calculate the Galactic extinction,⁸ the effective frequency, and the flux conversion factor for each filter.

2.4 Optical

2.4.1 Light curve (KVA, KAIT, and Catalina)

S2 0109+22 was added to the Tuorla blazar monitoring program⁹ when HE activity was reported in 2015 July. The monitoring observations were performed in optical *R* band using a 35-cm Celestron telescope coupled to the Kunglinga Vetenskapsakademi (KVA) telescope located at La Palma. Data analysis was performed using a semi-automatic pipeline for differential photometry assuming the

⁴The detection significance for a given source is approximately equal to the square root of the test statistic, for a given source.

⁵https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/analysis/threads/gen_thread_atfilter.html

⁶<https://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/W3Browse/swift/swiftxrlog.html>

⁷The difference between the number of data points measured by UVOT and XRT is due to the usage of XRT window timing mode, multiple UVOT snapshots during XRT exposure, and bad quality of XRT raw images.

⁸Calculated based on the value obtained from Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011).

⁹<http://users.utu.fi/kani/1m>

comparison star magnitudes in Ciprini et al. (2003). The magnitudes were corrected for Galactic extinction using values from Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011).

In order to study the long-term optical behaviour of S2 0109+22, its optical LC is retrieved from the publicly available online data base of 76-cm Katzman Automatic Imaging Telescope (KAIT) at Lick Observatory.¹⁰ The LC from KAIT is produced through a pipeline that utilizes aperture photometry and performs brightness calibrations using USNO B1.0 catalogue stars in the source field. The long-term optical LC is extended back to 2005 by including available online data from the Catalina Real-Time Transient Survey (Drake et al. 2009). KAIT and Catalina data are obtained from unfiltered observations, whose effective colour is close to the *R* band (Li et al. 2003).

2.4.2 Host galaxy imaging (NOT)

To investigate the host galaxy of S2 0109+22, we obtained a deep *I*-band image at the Nordic Optical Telescope (NOT) on 2015 November 11. In total, 26 exposures, each 150 s long, were obtained using the Andalucia Faint Object Spectrograph and Camera (ALFOSC)¹¹ instrument. After subtracting the bias, flat-fielding, and fringe map correction, the images were registered using stars in the field and summed. The resulting image has a total exposure time of 3900 s with full width at half-maximum (FWHM) ≈ 1.14 arcsec. The comparison stars in Ciprini et al. (2003) were used to calibrate the field.

2.4.3 Polarization (NOT)

Polarization observations were carried out using the ALFOSC instrument in the standard linear polarization set-up ($\lambda/2$ retarder followed by calcite) in optical *R* band. Weekly observations were performed from 2015 November to 2017 September within three observing seasons. In order to determine the zero-point of the position angle, polarization standards were observed on a monthly basis. The instrumental polarization was measured observing zero-polarization standard stars, and was found to be negligible. Most of the observations were conducted under good sky condition (seeing ~ 1 arcsec).

Using aperture (radius of 1.5 arcsec) photometry, the sky-subtracted target counts were measured for ordinary and extraordinary beams. By using the intensity ratios of two beams and standard formulae in Landi Degl'Innocenti, Bagnulo & Fossati (2007), we calculated normalized Stokes parameters, polarization fraction, and position angle for each observation. Systematic uncertainties are included in our error estimation.

2.5 Radio (OVRO and Metsähovi)

S2 0109+22 was observed at 15 GHz as part of a high-cadence gamma-ray blazar monitoring program using the Owens Valley Radio Observatory (OVRO) 40-m telescope (Richards et al. 2011). The observations are calibrated by using a temperature-stable diode noise source to remove receiver gain drifts, and the flux density scale is derived from observations of 3C 286 assuming the value of 3.44 Jy at 15.0 GHz (Baars et al. 1977). The systematic uncertainty of about 5 per cent in the flux density scale is not included in the error

¹⁰<http://herculesii.astro.berkeley.edu/kait/agn>

¹¹<http://www.not.iac.es/instruments/alfosc>




Figure 1. θ^2 distribution of the S2 0109+22 events, signal (blue) and background (shaded grey), for the 1.4 h of MAGIC observations during the flare night (top) and for all other observations 8.2 h (bottom). The vertical dashed line indicates the defined signal region.

bars. Complete details of the reduction and calibration procedure are found in Richards et al. (2011).

The Metsähovi Radio Telescope, operating at 37 GHz, has been observing the source for two decades. We selected radio data obtained after mid-2005 for the long-term study of the source. The instrument and data reduction procedures are described by Teräsraanta et al. (1998).

3 RESULTS

3.1 Very high energy gamma-rays

The VHE gamma-ray signal from the source is estimated after applying energy-dependent selection cuts to the signal. Residual background of the observation is measured around a control region (Ahnen et al. 2017a). The distribution of the events is shown in Fig. 1. In total, there was an excess of (365.8 ± 69.1) events in the signal region $\theta^2 < 0.02 \text{ deg}^2$, where θ^2 is the squared angular distance between the reconstructed source position of the events and the nominal position of the expected source. The data taken during MJD 57228 (2015 July 25) contribute ≥ 61 per cent of excess events of the whole sample of data. The source was detected at a significance level of 7.24 σ during MJD 57228 (Fig. 1).

The LC of the VHE gamma-ray integral flux above 100 GeV ($F_{>100\text{GeV}}$) is shown in Fig. 2 with the details presented in Table 1. The constant flux hypothesis is disfavoured with $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 14.5/4$ ($P_{\text{value}} = 0.005$). The peak flux, detected on MJD 57228 (hereafter flare night), is twice the average flux over the whole period of




Figure 2. Multiwavelength light curve (LC) of S2 0109+22 during 2015 July. (a) Daily VHE gamma-ray flux above 100 GeV from MAGIC. (b) HE gamma-ray flux (0.1–300 GeV) from *Fermi*-LAT in daily binning. The blue line shows the average HE gamma-ray flux reported by Acero et al. (2015, 3FGL). (c) X-ray (red) and HE gamma-ray spectral index. (d) X-ray flux between 2–10 keV (blue) and 0.3–10 keV (red) by *Swift*-XRT. The solid lines show the level of the X-ray flux observed in 2006. (e) UV flux obtained using different filters from *Swift*-UVOT. (f) Optical *R*-band (Cousin) flux from Tuorla blazar monitoring program. The blue line shows the average optical flux since 2015 July. (g) Radio flux density at 15 GHz (blue) from OVRO and 37 GHz (red) from Metsähovi. The vertical dashed line indicates the beginning of the flare night (MJD 57228). Arrows represent flux upper limits (95 percent C.L.). X-rays, UV, and optical fluxes are corrected for Galactic absorption/extinction.

observation, $F_{>100\text{ GeV, ave}} = (4.7 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-11}$ photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. Real correlation analysis for such a short period around the flare night is beyond the reach with the available data sample shown in Fig. 2. However, there seems to be an increased flux in X-rays, optical, and UV bands around the flare night, which suggests that emission in these bands could originate from a single region.

We compare the integral flux ($F_{>200\text{ GeV}}$) of S2 0109+22 to that of other TeV BL Lac objects (21 sources) with variable flux in VHE gamma-rays presented in the most recent population study by Fallah Ramazani et al. (2017), who studied a time-independent correlation between several lower energy bands and VHE gamma-ray luminosity, and predicted the VHE gamma-ray flux for 182 non-TeV BL Lac objects. The comparison is shown in Fig. 3. Both the lowest and the largest observed flux of S2 0109+22 during the MAGIC campaign are among the faintest of the population. High- and low-state VHE gamma-ray predicted energy flux (>200 GeV) in Fallah Ramazani et al. (2017) are $(4.5 \pm 1.9) \times 10^{-12}$ and $(9.8 \pm 2.1) \times 10^{-14}$ erg $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, respectively. The largest observed flux over the same energy range, $F_{>200\text{ GeV}}^{\text{high obs}} = (4.6 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-12}$ erg $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, is in good agreement with the predicted flux. The lowest observed flux of this source is $F_{>200\text{ GeV}}^{\text{low obs}} = (1.5 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-12}$ erg $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$. The observed VHE gamma-ray flux of the source is fainter than the sample of variable TeV BL Lacs.

Fig. 4 shows the spectrum of S2 0109+22 in the VHE gamma-rays. We assume a simple power-law model:

$$\frac{dN}{dE} = F_0 \left(\frac{E}{E_{\text{dec}}} \right)^{-\Gamma}, \quad (1)$$

where E_{dec} and F_0 are the decorrelation energy and differential flux at E_{dec} , and Γ is the spectral photon index. The spectral parameters are obtained via forward-folding using Poissonian maximum likelihood procedure described by Ahnen et al. (2017b). In order to calculate the intrinsic spectral parameters, the same estimation procedure is used by assuming $z = 0.35$ (see Section 3.5) and Extragalactic Background Light (EBL) absorption model described by Domínguez et al. (2011). The spectral parameters are summarized in Table 2 for the flare night and the average spectrum. The fitted model statistics are calculated in the energy range of 65–370 and 65–250 GeV for average and flare night spectra, where MAGIC detected the source.

3.2 High-energy gamma-rays

We have found that there is no significant HE gamma-ray spectral and flux variability on a daily basis during the investigated period (MJD 57220–57240). These results are shown in Fig. 2 (panels b and c). The HE gamma-ray constant fit flux is $F_{(0.1-300\text{ GeV})} = (1.4 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{-7}$ photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$, which is ~ 2 times higher than the average flux reported in the 3FGL catalogue (Acero et al. 2015) for this source.

To model the HE gamma-ray spectrum of S2 0109+22, a power-law function that uses integrated flux as a free parameter¹² is used:



$$\frac{dN}{dE} = \frac{N(\Gamma + 1)E^\Gamma}{E_{\text{max}}^{\Gamma+1} - E_{\text{min}}^{\Gamma+1}}, \quad (2)$$

where Γ is the photon index, $E_{\text{min}} = 100$ MeV, $E_{\text{max}} = 300$ GeV, and N is the integral flux between E_{min} and E_{max} .

¹²https://fermi.gsfc.nasa.gov/ssc/data/analysis/scitools/source_models.html#PowerLaw2

Table 1. The VHE gamma-ray flux of S2 0109+22.

MJD	Integration time (s)	$F_{>100\text{GeV}} \times 10^{-11}$ (photons $\text{cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	Notes
57225.15	4462	3.0 ± 1.3	
57226.15	4175	4.2 ± 1.3	
57227.15	4609	3.6 ± 1.3	
57228.15	5049	9.3 ± 1.4	Highest observed flux
57229.15	5249	3.8 ± 1.2	
57230.15	4234	2.0	95% C.L. upper limit
57231.15	5580	2.3	95% C.L. upper limit

**Figure 3.** Different states of the observed and predicted VHE gamma-ray flux (>200 GeV) of S2 0109+22 compared to the distribution of the variable TeV BL Lac sample reported in Fallah Ramazani et al. (2017). This sample contains BL Lac objects with at least two flux measurements in VHE gamma-rays.**Figure 4.** The observed (filled symbols) and intrinsic spectrum (open symbols) of the source obtained from MAGIC data for the flare night (MJD 57228, circles) and for all observations (MJD 57225–57231, squares) together with the HE gamma-ray spectrum obtained from *Fermi*-LAT data (MJD 57225–57232, triangles). The VHE gamma-ray spectra are corrected for the EBL absorption effect using the Domínguez et al. (2011) model.

We analysed the source in the period MJD 57225–57232, modelling its spectrum with a simple power law. The likelihood fit obtained a test statistic (TS) = 111. The resulting power-law index of the fitted model is $\Gamma = 1.81 \pm 0.14$. The spectral index of the investigated period is within the error bars of the one reported in 3FGL. In Fig. 4, we show the flux values in six logarithmically spaced bins from 100 MeV to 300 GeV. Upper limits are shown when the detection significances are lower than 3σ .

3.3 X-rays

The results of our X-ray analysis are shown in Fig. 2 with the details available in Table 3. The X-ray flux peaks 3 nights before the VHE gamma-ray peak. The X-ray spectrum is usually soft (photon index, $\Gamma_X \geq 2.4$). The constant flux hypothesis is rejected with $>10\sigma$ level of confidence. However, only a hint of brighter–harder trend with 2σ level of confidence is present in our data sample. The trend between X-ray spectral index and flux ($F_{0.3-10\text{keV}}$) can be described by a linear model (Fig. 5) with the test statistics of $\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 2.97/5$, corresponding to Pearson correlation coefficient of 0.76. Moreover, we tried to fit a log-parabola model to the data obtained on MJD 57228. It reveals that the power-law model with an index $\Gamma_X = 2.58 \pm 0.05$ ($\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 48.2/50$) can describe the spectrum better. The X-ray flux ($F_{0.3-10\text{keV}}$) on the flare night was >6 times higher than the flux from 2006 observations.

3.4 Long-term behaviour

Recently two studies of optical and radio behaviour of TeV blazars have been published. Lindfors et al. (2016) studied the long-term optical and radio behaviour of 32 VHE gamma-ray blazars using data from the OVRO and Tuorla blazar monitoring programs. They found correlated flares in half of the sources, and correlated long-term trends in 13 sources. Hovatta et al. (2016) performed a first statistical study of the optical polarization variability of TeV blazars, and found that they are not different from the control sample of non-TeV blazars. S2 0109+22 was not part of those studies. In order to compare its optical and radio behaviour with the sample of VHE gamma-ray blazars, we have performed the same analysis of the long-term optical and radio data and optical polarization data as done in Lindfors et al. (2016) and Hovatta et al. (2016).


Moreover, the long-term correlation studies between radio/optical and gamma-ray bands were already performed by Max-Moerbeck et al. (2014) and Cohen et al. (2014) using similar radio and optical data sets as those presented in this analysis. Therefore, we only attempt to study the long-term radio–optical cross-correlation behaviour of the source together with its optical polarization behaviour.

Table 2. The VHE gamma-ray spectrum parameters of S2 0109+22.

Data set	$F_0 \times 10^{-10}$ ($\text{TeV cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	Γ	E_{dec} (GeV)	$\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.}$	Fit probability (%)
25 Jul 2015 (observed)	11.7 ± 1.3	3.69 ± 0.20	119.43	0.56/3	91
25 Jul 2015 (intrinsic)	15.6 ± 1.9	3.07 ± 0.30	119.43	4.92/5	43
All data (observed)	2.5 ± 0.3	3.45 ± 0.22	137.13	1.43/2	49
All data (intrinsic)	4.2 ± 0.5	2.92 ± 0.32	130.95	9.05/7	25

Table 3. The X-ray properties of S2 0109+22.

MJD	Exposure time (s)	$F(2-10 \text{ keV})$ $\times 10^{-12}$ ($\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$)	$F(0.3-10 \text{ keV})$	Γ_X	$\chi^2_{\text{reduced}}/\text{d.o.f.}$	Observation ID
53762.93 ± 0.07	1993	0.32 ± 0.14	1.25 ± 0.34	2.69 ± 0.23	1.24/2	00035001001
53887.45 ± 0.44	17998	1.01 ± 0.07	2.05 ± 0.17	2.06 ± 0.05	1.17/49	00035001003
57224.99 ± 0.04	3951	1.40 ± 0.13	5.26 ± 0.44	2.66 ± 0.06	1.05/31	00040849003
57225.99 ± 0.04	3961	5.34 ± 0.32	15.88 ± 0.90	2.46 ± 0.04	1.20/73	00040849004
57226.47 ± 0.44	3316	2.29 ± 0.21	8.26 ± 0.60	2.63 ± 0.06	1.32/39	00040849005
57228.45 ± 0.04	2939	3.80 ± 0.29	12.90 ± 0.75	2.58 ± 0.05	0.96/50	00040849006
57229.39 ± 0.31	2968	1.10 ± 0.16	4.01 ± 0.43	2.63 ± 0.09	0.68/16	00040849007
57230.36 ± 0.34	2038	0.39 ± 0.11	1.41 ± 0.31	2.64 ± 0.18	0.17/3	00040849008
57231.59 ± 0.04	1516	0.83 ± 0.44	1.81 ± 0.99	2.14 ± 0.32	0.05/1	00040849010
57235.87 ± 0.01	1411	2.94 ± 0.44	8.92 ± 1.21	2.48 ± 0.10	0.88/14	00040849011


Figure 5. X-ray spectral index versus flux during the MAGIC campaign. The blue line shows the best-fitting linear model.

3.4.1 Radio–optical cross-correlation analysis

Fig. 6 illustrates the long-term optical and radio data of S2 0109+22. The coverage is of 12 yr in the optical band (R band and open filters) and at 37 GHz, and 10 yr at 15 GHz.

Following Lindfors et al. (2016), we calculated the cross-correlation function between the optical and 15 GHz LCs using the Discrete Correlation Function (DCF; Edelson & Krolik 1988) with local normalization (LCCF; Welsh 1999). We use temporal binning of 10 d and require that each LCCF bin has at least 10 elements. Following Max-Moerbeck et al. (2014), the significance of the correlation is estimated using simulated LC. In the simulations, we used a power spectral density index of -1.8 for the radio LC (Max-Moerbeck et al., in preparation), which is slightly smaller than the values between -1.4 and -1.7 reported in Ciprini et al. (2004) for the (8–37 GHz) radio LCs. For the optical, we used a power spectral

density index of -1.5 (Nilsson et al., in preparation). While there are several peaks (features) in the LCCF, shown in Fig. 7, none of them reach the 2σ significance level. We also calculated the cross-correlation functions between the optical – 37 and 37–15 GHz. The only significant correlation is between 37 and 15 GHz, with significance $>3\sigma$. The peak is rather broad from -40 to $+30$ d (Fig. 7) and is consistent with zero lag. Typically, for evolving synchrotron self-absorbed components (e.g. Stevens et al. 1994; Fuhrmann et al. 2014), one would expect the higher frequency to lead the lower frequency variations, which is consistent with our finding. However, as stated the peak is rather wide and also consistent with zero time lag. These results may indicate compositality.

The optical–radio correlations of this source have been previously studied by Hanski, Takalo & Valtaoja (2002) and Ciprini et al. (2004). Both works found several weak peaks in the correlations with lags 190, 400 d (Hanski et al. 2002), and 190, 789, and 879 d (Ciprini et al. 2004). In Fig. 7, there is a single ‘feature’ covering all these lags, peaking at ~ 500 d. This feature is not significant and in general the results of our calculation agree with those by Hanski et al. (2002) and Ciprini et al. (2004).

We also searched for common long-term trends from the optical and radio data by fitting linear trends to these LCs. No long-term trends were found at these wavelengths.

We then compared the results of the correlation and trend analyses to the results obtained for other TeV blazars in Lindfors et al. (2016). The sources in which neither connection between flaring behaviour nor long-term behaviour were found were a minority in that sample and were either very weak sources or bright sources with clear outbursts like S2 0109+22. These other bright sources in the Lindfors et al. (2016) sample were S5 0716+714, ON 325, and WCom and it was suggested that as there were several 2σ peaks in their correlation function, there might be several time-scales involved, blurring the correlation. However, for S2 0109+22 we do not find any correlation peaks above 2σ . This result may indicate that a major fraction of the optical flux in this source is not originating from the same emission region as the radio, or that the radio–optical correlation is more complex than can be probed by the simple cross-correlation function used in this paper.




Figure 6. Long-term radio and optical LC of S2 0109+22. Top: radio flux density at 15 GHz (OVRO). Middle: radio flux density at 37 GHz (Metsähovi). Bottom: optical flux density in *R* band (KVA) and with open filter (KAIT and Catalina). The vertical dashed line indicates the flare night (MJD 57228).

3.4.2 Optical polarization

The optical emission in active galaxies is dominated by synchrotron emission of their jet, which is intrinsically highly polarized. In an optically thin jet with uniform magnetic field, the polarization fraction can be up to 70 per cent (e.g. Pacholczyk 1970). The more typically observed levels of fractional polarization reach a few tens of per cent at maximum (e.g. Angel & Stockman 1980; Angelakis et al. 2016), which have been taken as evidence for disordered magnetic fields. The linearly polarized emission is described using the Stokes parameters I (for total intensity), and Q and U (for linear polarization). Using the Stokes parameters, the polarization fraction and the electric vector position angle (EVPA) can be defined as $m = (\sqrt{Q^2 + U^2})/I$ and $\text{EVPA} = 1/2 \tan^{-1}(U/Q)$. The polarization fraction and EVPA for S2 0109+22 are shown in Fig. 8.

We estimate the long-term polarization variability of S2 0109+22 by using the methods described in Hovatta et al. (2016) where the optical polarization of a sample of TeV and non-TeV-detected BL Lac objects was studied. We calculate the intrinsic mean polarization fraction and its modulation index (standard deviation of the polarization fraction over the mean) by assuming that the polarization fraction follows a Beta distribution, which is confined to values between 0 and 1, similarly as the polarization fraction. A single polarization observation is assumed to follow a Ricean distribution, so that our probability density function is obtained by convolving the Beta and Ricean distributions as follows:

$$\text{PDF}(p; \alpha, \beta) = \frac{p^{\alpha-1} (1-p)^{\beta-1}}{B(\alpha, \beta)}, \quad (3)$$

where p is the polarization fraction and α and β determine the shape of the Beta distribution $B(\alpha, \beta)$. If the parameters α , β of this distribution are known, the mean polarization fraction and the

intrinsic modulation index are then given by

$$p_{\text{int}} = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta} \quad (4)$$

and

$$m_{\text{int}} = \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}}}{p_{\text{int}}} = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\alpha\beta}{(\alpha+\beta)^2(\alpha+\beta+1)}}}{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}}, \quad (5)$$

where Var is the variance of the distribution. Details of the method are described in appendix A of Blinov et al. (2016). The intrinsic mean polarization fraction of S2 0109+22 is $0.090^{+0.010}_{-0.008}$, which is higher than the sample mean values of 0.054 ± 0.008 and 0.079 ± 0.009 obtained for the TeV and non-TeV BL Lac objects in Hovatta et al. (2016). Similarly, the intrinsic modulation index of the polarization fraction $0.54^{+0.08}_{-0.06}$ is higher than the sample mean values for the TeV (0.29 ± 0.03) and non-TeV (0.38 ± 0.04) sources.

The polarization angle variability can be quantified by calculating the derivative of the polarization angle variations. First we account for the $n\pi$ ambiguity of the polarization angle by requiring that each subsequent point is within 90° from the previous observation. We obtain a median derivative of 2.4 d^{-1} , which translates to 3.3 d^{-1} in the source frame when multiplied by $(1+z)$ ($z = 0.35$, see Section 3.5). Comparing this to the histograms in fig. 4 of Hovatta et al. (2016) shows how S2 0109+22 varies more rapidly in polarization angle than the average TeV (mean $1.11 \pm 0.29 \text{ d}^{-1}$) and non-TeV (mean $1.66 \pm 0.45 \text{ d}^{-1}$) sources. This is also seen when we examine the polarization variations in the $Q/I-U/I$ plane (see the inset in Fig. 8 for the $Q/I-U/I$ plot). As described in Hovatta et al. (2016), a tightly clustered distribution of the points in the $Q/I-U/I$ plane is an indication of a preferred polarization angle. For S2 0109+22 the weighted average of the Q/I and U/I values places the mass centre at a distance of 0.039 from the origin, which is smaller than the




Figure 7. Top: the results of the DCF study between optical (R band) and radio (15 GHz). Bottom: the results of the DCF study between radio bands (15 and 37 GHz); we show 1σ , 2σ , and 3σ significance limits (green, blue, and red lines, respectively). Positive significant lags show that the flare at 15 GHz is leading the other bands.

mean value of 0.050 ± 0.008 for the TeV sources in Hovatta et al. (2016). However, the spread in the points, quantified as the distance of each point from the mass centre, is 0.077, which is much higher than the mean values (0.021 ± 0.003 for TeV and 0.041 ± 0.005 for non-TeV sources) in Hovatta et al. (2016). In fact, there is only one non-TeV source with a value higher than we obtain for S2 0109+22.

These results are in good agreement with previous studies (e.g. Takalo 1991) and indicate that the optical polarization of S2 0109+22 is more variable both in fractional polarization and position angle than other high-energy BL Lac objects, and that there does not seem to be a preferred polarization angle in the source, at least over our monitoring period. This is not unexpected based on the analysis of Hovatta et al. (2016) that showed that the polarization variability depends more on the position of the synchrotron peak rather than the detection of TeV emission (see also Covino et al. 2015). As shown in Fig. 9, in the ISP-type S2 0109+22 the optical emission probes the peak of the synchrotron component, where the variability is expected to be higher (see also Angelakis et al. 2016). Comparing the obtained intrinsic mean polarization fraction to the values presented by Angelakis et al. (2016), this source seems to be a rather typical ISP-type object. The maximum polarization fraction is over 15 percent, which is high, but not uncommon for ISP




Figure 8. Top panel: degree of polarization in the optical (R band) obtained with the Nordic Optical Telescope. Bottom panel: same for the polarization angle. The inset shows the source polarization measurements in $Q/I-U/I$ plane. The black square in the $Q/I-U/I$ plane is the mass centre of weighted average of the Q/I and U/I values.




Figure 9. Quasi-simultaneous broad-band SED of S2 0109+22 during the MAGIC observations. Archival non-simultaneous data are also shown (grey symbols). See the text for detailed information on the period of observation by different instruments.

sources, as shown in Hovatta et al. (2016) where about 30 per cent of the ISP objects reach fractional polarization values as high as or higher than 15 per cent. This indicates that the magnetic field order must be fairly high in the emission region.

3.5 Redshift estimation

The lack of emission lines in the optical spectrum of BL Lacs objects makes the determination of the redshift of these sources particularly challenging. An estimation on the distance can be obtained from basic assumption on the host galaxy luminosity (e.g. Nilsson et al. 2003). Alternatively, an upper limit on the distance can instead be

estimated by studying the deformation induced by the EBL on the VHE gamma-ray spectrum.

3.5.1 Host galaxy

We use the deep *I*-band image (see Section 2.4.2) to search for the host galaxy emission. Two-dimensional surface brightness models were fitted to the light distribution of S2 0109+22 in order to study its host galaxy. Prior to the fitting, the background level was measured and subtracted, removing also a small tilt in the background. Two models were considered: (1) a point source (jet) model and (2) a point source+elliptical galaxy model. Both models had three free parameters: point source *x*-*y* position plus flux in the first model, and point source flux, host galaxy flux, and host galaxy effective radius in the second model. The first model was used to fix the position of the nucleus, i.e. the second model was fit using the position from the first model to fix the point source and the host galaxy into the same position. Moreover, the ellipticity of the host galaxy was fixed to $\epsilon = 0$ and the Sersic index to $n = 4$. Both models were convolved with the point spread function (PSF), determined from two nearby stars, located at 61 and 84 arcsec away from, and with similar peak intensity to S2 0109+22. The fit was performed using pixels within 10.5 arcsec of the centre of S2 0109+22.

We used a Metropolis sampler (e.g. Martino & Elvira 2017) to map a posteriori distribution in three-dimensional parameter space. We employed 10 independent walkers, each completing 30 000 iteration steps and with flat priors. The walkers were initially distributed randomly over a fairly wide range of values, but they all quickly converged towards the same area in the parameter space corresponding to the maximum likelihood. The calculation of likelihood assumed that the pixel values had an uncertainty consisting of four components, each normally distributed: (1) photon noise; (2) readout noise; (3) error in background determination; and (4) error in the PSF model. The background uncertainty was determined by measuring the background around the source in 10 rectangular regions. For the PSF error, we subtracted the PSF from a star close to S2 0109+22 and examined the residuals. The residuals were the strongest near the centre of the star, where they amounted to 2 per cent of the local signal.

Fig. 10 shows the marginalized posterior distributions of the two host galaxy parameters: the host galaxy flux and effective radius. The parameters are correlated and in addition both correlate strongly with the point source flux. The best-fitting (mode of the posteriors) parameters of model no. 2 correspond to active galactic nuclei (AGN) flux = (6.651 ± 0.003) mJy, host galaxy flux (0.149 ± 0.003) mJy, and effective radius (1.40 ± 0.04) arcsec. The host galaxy flux in the *I*-band optical is $I = 18.05$ mag.

If we make the assumption that the host galaxy is a passively evolving early-type galaxy with absolute magnitude $M_R = -22.8$ (Sbarufatti, Treves & Falomo 2005) with $R - I = 0.7$ and using $A_I = 0.057$ for the Galactic absorption (Schlafly & Finkbeiner 2011), then we obtain $z = 0.36 \pm 0.07$. This value and its error are a result of 1000 trials where we first drew M_R from a Gaussian distribution with average -22.8 ± 0.5 and then determined the redshift compatible with the observed *I*-band magnitude taking into account the evolution, *K*-correction, and Galactic absorption.

3.5.2 Redshift upper limit based on absorption of VHE gamma-rays

The absorption of VHE gamma-rays through interaction with the EBL increases with source distance and photon energy. Basic as-




Figure 10. Marginalized posterior distributions of the host galaxy flux and effective radius (bottom-right). The likelihood distribution of effective radius (bottom-left) and host galaxy flux (top-right). The colour is proportional to the probability.

sumptions on the intrinsic spectrum can be used to infer a limit on the distance of the blazar (e.g. Mazin & Goebel 2007; Prandini et al. 2010). In order to determine an upper limit for the source distance, we assumed that the intrinsic spectrum is described by a power law or a concave function (i.e. hardness does not increase with energy). The archival data (Fig. 9) indicate that the spectrum of the source in the HE gamma-ray band is variable. Considering that the source is not located at $z > 1$, we assume the hardest possible spectrum for this redshift as an intrinsic power-law index. As a conservative approach we assume a fixed photon-index limit of 1.5 following Aharonian et al. (2006) and Meyer et al. (2012). We obtain a 95 per cent confidence level limit to the S2 0109+22 redshift of $z \leq 0.60$. The value is obtained by means of a maximum likelihood fit to the observed event rates versus the reconstructed energy, modelling the intrinsic spectrum with a power-law function, using the EBL model of Domínguez et al. (2011), and performing a scan in redshift. The limit is obtained, following Rolke & López (2001), from the resulting profile likelihood versus redshift, with the intrinsic source parameters, and the background rates versus reconstructed energy, treated as nuisance parameters. A more conservative limit can be estimated by varying the simulated total light throughput of the instrument by ± 15 per cent. This yields a 95 per cent upper limit on the redshift of $z \leq 0.67$. To estimate the uncertainties caused by EBL model selection, we test eight different EBL models (i.e. Franceschini, Rodighiero & Vaccari 2008; Finke, Razzaque & Dermer 2010; Kneiske & Dole 2010; Gilmore et al. 2012; Helgason & Kashlinsky 2012; Inoue et al. 2013; Stecker, Scully & Malkan 2016). The results show that the uncertainties due to EBL model selection are negligible compared with the instrumental uncertainties. Finally, in order to verify the assumed intrinsic photon index (1.5), we compare the results with the ones obtained by assuming the photon index in Section 3.2 ($\Gamma = 1.81 \pm 0.14$). The comparison shows that results are consistent with each other.

The estimated redshift ($z = 0.36 \pm 0.07$) and the calculated redshift 95 per cent upper limit ($z \leq 0.67$) in this paper are consistent with the value reported by Paiano et al. (2016, $z > 0.35$). Therefore, we used $z = 0.35$, based on the accuracy of the technique and other uncertainties, to calculate the intrinsic properties of the source.

3.6 Spectral energy distribution

In this section, we first present the physical modelling of the SED based on the quasi-simultaneous data described in previous sections. Then, we use a mathematical approach in order to calculate the location of SED peaks in other epochs using archival data (as well as the quasi-simultaneous data near the flare night).

3.6.1 Broad-band SED

In Fig. 9, we plot the broad-band SED of S2 0109+22 using the multifrequency data described in previous sections. For the SED modelling, the HE and VHE gamma-ray spectra are constructed from MAGIC and *Fermi*-LAT data obtained on MJD 57225–57231. The VHE gamma-ray data are corrected for the EBL absorption effect using the Domínguez et al. (2011) model. The VHE gamma-ray spectrum is dominated by the signal from the flare night. However, for the night of the flare, we do not have enough strictly simultaneous data to produce a robust model. As discussed in Section 3.1, the low significance of the signal outside the flare night did not allow us to construct a low-state SED. For X-ray, UV, and optical, we selected the data points that are near the flare night to avoid averaging a variable source with different distribution of observation times during the MAGIC campaign. The *Swift*-UVOT and *Swift*-XRT data are used to reproduce the UV and X-ray spectra of the source on MJD 57228.41. The optical data point, obtained by the KVA telescope on MJD 57228.22, is corrected for Galactic extinction. The host galaxy contribution to the optical flux is neglected (see Section 3.5.1). The radio data points were collected on MJD 57227.41 and 57227.08 in 15 and 37 GHz, respectively, but are not used for SED modelling (see below).

The quasi-simultaneous SED was modelled using a one-zone synchrotron self-Compton model (Maraschi & Tavecchio 2003). It assumes a spherical, relativistically moving emission region characterized by its radius R , magnetic field B , and Doppler factor δ . It contains an electron population following a broken power-law distribution with index p_1 for $\gamma_{\min} < \gamma < \gamma_{\text{break}}$ and p_2 for $\gamma_{\text{break}} < \gamma < \gamma_{\max}$. The normalization of this electron distribution at $\gamma = 1$ is K . We use the redshift of $z = 0.35$ for the source (see Section 3.5).

The goodness of the fitted model is judged by a χ^2 -test ($\chi^2/\text{d.o.f.} = 22.4/16$) assuming fixed $\gamma_{\min} = 1.0 \times 10^3$ because there is no instrument available to probe the energy range where the influence of γ_{\min} would be significant. Therefore, the curve represents only one possible set of SED parameters. The other parameters used for the model are $R = 5.5 \times 10^{16}$ cm, $B = 0.054$ G, $\delta = 21.7$, $\gamma_{\text{break}} = 1.2 \times 10^4$, $\gamma_{\max} = 4.5 \times 10^5$, $p_1 = 1.94$, $p_2 = 3.68$, and $K = 3.1 \times 10^3 \text{ cm}^{-3}$. The assumed emission region size is compatible with a daily variability time-scale. There is no evidence of a shorter variability time-scale in the multiwavelength data during the MAGIC campaign. The parameters are rather typical for TeV BL Lac objects (see e.g. Tavecchio et al. 2010).

The one-zone model does not reproduce the spectrum at the lowest frequencies, since the emission is self-absorbed below the millimetre band. It is generally assumed that this emission is produced in the outer regions of the jet. This is in agreement with the results in Section 3.4.1, where no connection between the long-term behaviour of the optical and radio bands was found for this source. Moreover, the locations of the SED peaks are roughly estimated to be $\log \nu_{\text{sync}} \simeq 15.4$ and $\log \nu_{\text{IC}} \simeq 23.3$.

3.6.2 SED peaks

In order to determine the peak frequencies of the SED components, we fitted simultaneously two log-parabolic spectra (e.g. Massaro et al. 2004), one for the synchrotron peak and another for the inverse Compton (IC), to the SED of the source. We try to calculate the location of the SED peaks for two different states. First, we extracted the archival data from the ASI Space Science Data Center.¹³ Since the archival data are non-simultaneous and ν_{peak} is known to change with the activity state in blazars (e.g. Anderhub et al. 2009), we can expect the fitted ν_{peak} to depend on the frequencies covered and on the number of observing epochs. To roughly estimate how much this could affect ν_{peak} we constructed four different samples from the archival data, one representing a high state, another for a low state, and two ‘mixed’ states. The archival data indicate that the source is an ISP BL Lac object based on the classifications in Abdo et al. (2010b) with $\log \nu_{\text{sync}} = 14.4 \pm 0.1$ and $\log \nu_{\text{IC}} = 22.8 \pm 0.2$, which is consistent with the source classification reported by Laurent-Muehleisen et al. (1999), Dennett-Thorpe & Marchã (2000), Bondi et al. (2001), and Ciprini et al. (2004).

In the second step we used the quasi-simultaneous data described in Section 3.6.1. The locations of the peaks are $\log \nu_{\text{sync}} = 15.1 \pm 0.5$ and $\log \nu_{\text{IC}} = 23.1 \pm 0.2$, which are consistent with the results obtained from the physical modelling described in Section 3.6.1. Table 4 shows the summary of the SED peaks using different approaches and data sets. Based on the broad-band SED modelled for this data set, the X-ray emission is purely synchrotron, which is normal for HSP BL Lac objects (e.g. Acciari et al. 2010). The historical X-ray observations of 2006 (Table 3) show a hard X-ray spectral index ($\Gamma_{\text{X}} = 2.06 \pm 0.05$) that is in good agreement with the broad-band SED reported by Ciprini et al. (2004) and the normal case for LSP and ISP BL Lac objects (e.g. Pratim Basumallick & Gupta 2017). Therefore, there is a hint of a transition from ISP to HSP during the MAGIC observation period. The transition is not only in the peak but the whole SED is appearing as a typical X-ray bright HSP SED (e.g. PKS 2155 – 304; H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. 2012, and references therein).

4 SUMMARY

S2 0109+22 was discovered for the first time in the HE gamma-ray band by the *Fermi*-LAT during the first 3 months of sky survey operation in 2008 (Abdo et al. 2009). Previous Energetic Gamma-Ray Experiment Telescope (EGRET) upper limits are reported in Ciprini et al. (2004).

In this paper, we reported the first VHE gamma-ray detection of S2 0109+22 by MAGIC in 2015 July. The MAGIC observation was triggered by the source high state in HE gamma-rays. During the MAGIC observation campaign, the HE gamma-ray LC does not show variability on a daily time-scale, while the constant fit to VHE gamma-ray flux was rejected with 3σ level of confidence.

We performed a long-term and a short-term multifrequency study of the source, from radio to VHE gamma-rays, and compare the source to other TeV blazars. The summary of the main outcomes is as follows.

- (i) Compared to the sample of 21 known variable TeV BL Lac objects (Fig. 3), the observed VHE gamma-ray flux from S2 0109+22 is relatively low. The predicted low-state VHE gamma-ray flux by Fallah Ramazani et al. (2017) is below the sensitivity of the current

¹³<http://www.asdc.asi.it/>

Table 4. Location of SED peaks calculated based on different approaches and states described in Section 3.6.

Data set	Method	State	$\log \nu_{\text{synch}}$	$\log \nu_{\text{IC}}$
Archival	Mathematical	Low	14.4	22.9
		High	14.6	22.9
		Mixed 1	14.3	22.7
		Mixed 2	14.5	23.1
Quasi-simultaneous	Mathematical	–	15.1	23.1
Quasi-simultaneous	Physical modelling	–	15.4	23.3

generation of imaging atmospheric Cherenkov telescopes (IACTs). Moreover, the source was not detected after its flaring activity by MAGIC. Therefore, this source will be a good candidate to be monitored by the future Cherenkov Telescope Array (CTA) in order to characterize its VHE gamma-ray temporal behaviour and its connection to lower energy bands.

(ii) The brighter–harder trend is clear in the X-ray band (Table 3 and Fig. 5). Similar behaviour was observed for many TeV BL Lac objects (Pandey, Gupta & Wiita 2017). However, such a trend is not present in the VHE gamma-ray (Table 2 and Fig. 4) and HE gamma-ray (Figs 2 b and c) bands, but this could be due to large error bars in these bands. The absence of such a correlation in HE and VHE gamma-ray bands for non-HSP BL Lac objects is widely discussed in the context of the ‘blazar sequence’ (see Ackermann et al. 2015, and references therein).

(iii) In the long-term optical and radio LC (Fig. 6), there was no correlation peak between 15 GHz and optical flux. This fact suggests that, unlike for many other TeV blazars, the optical and radio emission do not originate from the same region or that the correlation is too complex to be probed by the method found in Lindfors et al. (2016).

(iv) The optical fractional polarization and polarization angle of S2 0109+22 are more variable than found for typical high-energy BL Lac objects (e.g. Hovatta et al. 2016).

(v) We used two methods to estimate the redshift of the source. The result of the photometric host-galaxy method is $z = 0.36 \pm 0.07$, whereas the 95 per cent upper limit estimation based on the absorption of VHE gamma-ray emission, assuming the EBL model described in Domínguez et al. (2011), gives $z \leq 0.67$. The estimated redshifts are in agreement with the one derived by Paiano et al. (2016).

(vi) When comparing the quasi-simultaneous SED presented in this paper with archival data obtained from the ASI Space Science Data Center, there is a hint of ISP to HSP transition. This has been previously suggested for PKS 0301 – 243 (H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al. 2013) and IES 1011+496 in 2008 (Ahnen et al. 2016).

(vii) The broad-band SED of S2 0109+22 (Section 3.6.1) reveals that the parameters of a single-zone SSC model are rather typical for TeV BL Lac objects. Comparing the SED parameters with the ones reported in Ciprini et al. (2004) reveals that the magnetic field strength is an order of magnitude weaker. Weaker magnetic field energy density ($U_B = B^2/8\pi$) increases the radiation to magnetic energy ratio ($U_{\text{rad}}/U_B = L_{\text{IC}}/L_{\text{sync}}$). Therefore, SSC luminosity component increases to the level above the sensitivity of VHE gamma-ray instruments.

The long-term radio to optical and optical polarization behaviour of the source agree with the classification of the source as an ISP BL Lac object, which are still a minority in the class of TeV blazars. However, there is a hint of type transition as discussed in Section 3.6.2 based on the multi-epoch comparison of the SED peak

locations and X-ray behaviour of the source. In order to precisely characterize the source-type transition behaviour, more simultaneous multiwavelength observations during different flux states are needed. Such observations can be performed when CTA enables us to detect VHE gamma-ray emission also during the low state of the source. Moreover, considering the increased SSC luminosity, high polarization degree in the optical and high X-ray luminosity of the source make this source an ideal candidate for physical modelling when the X-ray and soft-gamma-ray (MeV) polarization observations become available by instruments such as *Imaging X-ray Polarimetry Explorer (IXPE)*; Weisskopf et al. 2016), *e-ASTROGAM* (De Angelis et al. 2017), and All-sky Medium Energy Gamma-ray Observatory (AMEGO; McEnery 2017).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Part of this work is based on archival data, software, or online services provided by the Space Science Data Center – ASI.

We would like to thank the Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias for the excellent working conditions at the Observatorio del Roque de los Muchachos in La Palma. The financial support of the German BMBF and MPG, the Italian INFN and INAF, the Swiss National Fund SNF, the ERDF under the Spanish MINECO (FPA2015-69818-P, FPA2012-36668, FPA2015-68378-P, FPA2015-69210-C6-2-R, FPA2015-69210-C6-4-R, FPA2015-69210-C6-6-R, AYA2015-71042-P, AYA2016-76012-C3-1-P, ESP2015-71662-C2-2-P, and CSD2009-00064), and the Japanese JSPS and MEXT is gratefully acknowledged. This work was also supported by the Spanish Centro de Excelencia ‘Severo Ochoa’ SEV-2012-0234 and SEV-2015-0548, and Unidad de Excelencia ‘María de Maeztu’ MDM-2014-0369, by the Croatian Science Foundation (HrZZ) Project IP-2016-06-9782 and the University of Rijeka Project 13.12.1.3.02, by the DFG Collaborative Research Centers SFB823/C4 and SFB876/C3, the Polish National Research Centre grant UMO-2016/22/M/ST9/00382, and by the Brazilian MCTIC, CNPq, and FAPERJ.

The *Fermi*-LAT Collaboration acknowledges generous ongoing support from a number of agencies and institutes that have supported both the development and the operation of the LAT and scientific data analysis. These include the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Energy in the United States, the Commissariat à l’Energie Atomique and the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique/Institut National de Physique Nucléaire et de Physique des Particules in France, the Agenzia Spaziale Italiana and the Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare in Italy, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT), High Energy Accelerator Research Organization (KEK), and Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency (JAXA) in Japan, and the K. A. Wallenberg Foundation, the Swedish Research Council, and the Swedish National Space Board in Sweden. Additional support for

science analysis during the operations phase is gratefully acknowledged from the Istituto Nazionale di Astrofisica in Italy and the Centre National d'Études Spatiales in France. This work performed in part under DOE Contract DEAC02-76SF00515.

The OVRO 40-m monitoring program is supported in part by NASA grants NNX08AW31G, NNX11A043G, and NNX14AQ89G, and NSF grants AST-0808050 and AST-1109911.

REFERENCES

- Abdo A. A. et al., 2009, *ApJ*, 700, 597
 Abdo A. A. et al., 2010a, *ApJS*, 188, 405
 Abdo A. A. et al., 2010b, *ApJ*, 716, 30
 Abdo A. A. et al., 2011a, *ApJ*, 727, 129
 Abdo A. A. et al., 2011b, *ApJ*, 736, 131
 Acciari V. A. et al., 2010, *ApJ*, 708, L100
 Acero F. et al., 2015, *ApJS*, 218, 23
 Acero F. et al., 2016, *ApJS*, 223, 26
 Ackermann M. et al., 2011, *ApJ*, 743, 171
 Ackermann M. et al., 2013, *ApJS*, 209, 34
 Ackermann M. et al., 2015, *ApJ*, 810, 14
 Ackermann M. et al., 2016, *ApJS*, 222, 5
 Aharonian F. A., 2000, *New Astron.*, 5, 377
 Aharonian F. et al., 2006, *Nature*, 440, 1018
 Ahnen M. L. et al., 2016, *MNRAS*, 459, 2286
 Ahnen M. L. et al., 2017a, *MNRAS*, 468, 1534
 Ahnen M. L. et al., 2017b, *MNRAS*, 472, 2956
 Aleksić J. et al., 2014, *A&A*, 567, A135
 Aleksić J. et al., 2016a, *Astropart. Phys.*, 72, 61
 Aleksić J. et al., 2016b, *Astropart. Phys.*, 72, 76
 Aliu E. et al., 2014, *ApJ*, 797, 89
 Anderhub H. et al., 2009, *ApJ*, 705, 1624
 Angel J. R. P., Stockman H. S., 1980, *ARA&A*, 18, 321
 Angelakis E. et al., 2016, *MNRAS*, 463, 3365
 Atwood W. B. et al., 2009, *ApJ*, 697, 1071
 Baars J. W. M., Genzel R., Pauliny-Toth I. I. K., Witzel A., 1977, *A&A*, 61, 99
 Blinov D. et al., 2016, *MNRAS*, 457, 2252
 Bondi M., Marchã M. J. M., Dallacasa D., Stanghellini C., 2001, *MNRAS*, 325, 1109
 Burrows D. N. et al., 2004, in Flanagan K. A., Siegmund O. H. W., eds, *Proc. SPIE*, Vol. 5165, X-Ray and Gamma-Ray Instrumentation for Astronomy XIII. SPIE, Bellingham, p. 201
 Ciprini S., Tosti G., Raiteri C. M., Villata M., Ibrahimov M. A., Nucciarelli G., Lanteri L., 2003, *A&A*, 400, 487
 Ciprini S., Tosti G., Terãsranta H., Aller H. D., 2004, *MNRAS*, 348, 1379
 Cohen D. P., Romani R. W., Filippenko A. V., Cenko S. B., Lott B., Zheng W., Li W., 2014, *ApJ*, 797, 137
 Coppi P. S., 1992, *MNRAS*, 258, 657
 Covino S. et al., 2015, *A&A*, 578, A68
 Davis M. M., 1971, *AJ*, 76, 980
 De Angelis A. et al., 2017, *Exp. Astron.*, 44, 25
 Dennett-Thorpe J., Marchã M. J., 2000, *A&A*, 361, 480
 Dermer C. D., Schlickeiser R., 1994, *ApJS*, 90, 945
 Domínguez A. et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, 410, 2556
 Drake A. J. et al., 2009, *ApJ*, 696, 870
 Edelson R. A., Krolik J. H., 1988, *ApJ*, 333, 646
 Fallah Ramazani V., Lindfors E., Nilsson K., 2017, *A&A*, 608, A68
 Finke J. D., Razzaque S., Dermer C. D., 2010, *ApJ*, 712, 238
 Franceschini A., Rodighiero G., Vaccari M., 2008, *A&A*, 487, 837
 Fruck C., Gaug M., 2015, *European Phys. J. Web Conf.*, 89, 02003
 Fuhrmann L. et al., 2014, *MNRAS*, 441, 1899
 Gilmore R. C., Somerville R. S., Primack J. R., Domínguez A., 2012, *MNRAS*, 422, 3189
 Giommi P., Padovani P., 1994, *MNRAS*, 268, L51
 Hanski M. T., Takalo L. O., Valtaoja E., 2002, *A&A*, 394, 17
 Healey S. E. et al., 2008, *ApJS*, 175, 97
 Helgason K., Kashlinsky A., 2012, *ApJ*, 758, L13
 H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al., 2012, *A&A*, 539, A149
 H.E.S.S. Collaboration et al., 2013, *A&A*, 559, A136
 Hovatta T., Nieppola E., Tornikoski M., Valtaoja E., Aller M. F., Aller H. D., 2008, *A&A*, 485, 51
 Hovatta T. et al., 2014, *AJ*, 147, 143
 Hovatta T. et al., 2016, *A&A*, 596, A78
 Inoue Y., Inoue S., Kobayashi M. A. R., Makiya R., Niino Y., Totani T., 2013, *ApJ*, 768, 197
 Kalberla P. M. W., Burton W. B., Hartmann D., Arnal E. M., Bajaja E., Morras R., Pöppel W. G. L., 2005, *A&A*, 440, 775
 Kneiske T. M., Dole H., 2010, *A&A*, 515, A19
 Landi Degl'Innocenti E., Bagnulo S., Fossati L., 2007, in Sterken C., ed., *ASP Conf. Ser. Vol. 364, The Future of Photometric, Spectrophotometric and Polarimetric Standardization*. Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco, p. 495
 Laurent-Muehleisen S. A., Kollgaard R. I., Feigelson E. D., Brinkmann W., Siebert J., 1999, *ApJ*, 525, 127
 Li W., Filippenko A. V., Chornock R., Jha S., 2003, *PASP*, 115, 844
 Lindfors E. J. et al., 2016, *A&A*, 593, A98
 McEnery J. E., 2017, Am. Astron. Soc., HEAD Meeting, #16, 103.13
 Mannheim K., 1996, *Space Sci. Rev.*, 75, 331
 Maraschi L., Tavecchio F., 2003, *ApJ*, 593, 667
 Maraschi L., Ghisellini G., Celotti A., 1992, *ApJ*, 397, L5
 Martino L., Elvira V., 2017, preprint ([arXiv:1704.04629](https://arxiv.org/abs/1704.04629))
 Massaro E., Perri M., Giommi P., Nesci R., 2004, *A&A*, 413, 489
 Max-Moerbeck W., Richards J. L., Hovatta T., Pavlidou V., Pearson T. J., Readhead A. C. S., 2014, *MNRAS*, 445, 437
 Mazin D., Goebel F., 2007, *ApJ*, 655, L13
 Melia F., Konigl A., 1989, *ApJ*, 340, 162
 Meyer M., Raue M., Mazin D., Horns D., 2012, *A&A*, 542, A59
 Mirzoyan R., 2015, *Astron. Telegram*, 7844
 Moralejo A. et al., 2009, preprint ([arXiv:0907.0943](https://arxiv.org/abs/0907.0943))
 Mücke A., Protheroe R. J., 2001, *Astropart. Phys.*, 15, 121
 Nilsson K., Pursimo T., Heidt J., Takalo L. O., Sillanpää A., Brinkmann W., 2003, *A&A*, 400, 95
 Nolan P. L. et al., 2012, *ApJS*, 199, 31
 Owen F. N., Mufson S. L., 1977, *AJ*, 82, 776
 Pacholczyk A. G., 1970, *Radio Astrophysics: Nonthermal Processes in Galactic and Extragalactic Sources*. Freeman & Co., San Francisco
 Paiano S., Landoni M., Falomo R., Scarpa R., Treves A., 2016, *MNRAS*, 458, 2836
 Pandey A., Gupta A. C., Wiita P. J., 2017, *ApJ*, 841, 123
 Pauliny-Toth I. I. K., Kellermann K. I., Davis M. M., Fomalont E. B., Shaffer D. B., 1972, *AJ*, 77, 265
 Poole T. S. et al., 2008, *MNRAS*, 383, 627
 Prandini E., Bonnoli G., Maraschi L., Mariotti M., Tavecchio F., 2010, *MNRAS*, 405, L76
 Pratim Basumallick P., Gupta N., 2017, *ApJ*, 844, 58
 Raiteri C. M. et al., 2010, *A&A*, 524, A43
 Richards J. L. et al., 2011, *ApJS*, 194, 29
 Rolke W. A., López A. M., 2001, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A*, 458, 745
 Sbarufatti B., Treves A., Falomo R., 2005, *ApJ*, 635, 173
 Schlafly E. F., Finkbeiner D. P., 2011, *ApJ*, 737, 103
 Sikora M., Begelman M. C., Rees M. J., 1994, *ApJ*, 421, 153
 Stecker F. W., Scully S. T., Malkan M. A., 2016, *ApJ*, 827, 6
 Stevens J. A., Litchfield S. J., Robson E. I., Hughes D. H., Gear W. K., Terãsranta H., Valtaoja E., Tornikoski M., 1994, *ApJ*, 437, 91
 Takalo L. O., 1991, *A&AS*, 90, 161
 Tavecchio F., Ghisellini G., Ghirlanda G., Foschini L., Maraschi L., 2010, *MNRAS*, 401, 1570
 Terãsranta H. et al., 1998, *A&AS*, 132, 305
 Weisskopf M. C. et al., 2016, *Proc. SPIE*, 9905, 990517
 Welsh W. F., 1999, *PASP*, 111, 1347
 Wills B. J., Wills D., Breger M., 2011, *ApJS*, 194, 19

- ¹ *Università di Udine, and INFN Trieste, I-33100 Udine, Italy*
- ² *Japanese MAGIC Consortium: ICRR, The University of Tokyo, 277-8582 Chiba, Japan; Department of Physics, Kyoto University, 606-8502 Kyoto, Japan; Tokai University, 259-1292 Kanagawa, Japan; RIKEN, 351-0198 Saitama, Japan*
- ³ *National Institute for Astrophysics (INAF), I-00136 Rome, Italy*
- ⁴ *Università di Padova and INFN, I-35131 Padova, Italy*
- ⁵ *Technische Universität Dortmund, D-44221 Dortmund, Germany*
- ⁶ *Croatian MAGIC Consortium: University of Rijeka, 51000 Rijeka; University of Split – FESB, 21000 Split; University of Zagreb – FER, 10000 Zagreb; University of Osijek, 31000 Osijek; and Rudjer Boskovic Institute, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia*
- ⁷ *Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, HBNI, I/AF Bidhannagar, Salt Lake, Sector-1, Kolkata 700064, India*
- ⁸ *Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, D-80805 München, Germany*
- ⁹ *now at Centro Brasileiro de Pesquisas Físicas (CBPF), 22290-180 URCA, Rio de Janeiro (RJ), Brazil*
- ¹⁰ *Unidad de Partículas y Cosmología (UPARCOS), Universidad Complutense, E-28040 Madrid, Spain*
- ¹¹ *Inst. de Astrofísica de Canarias, E-38200 La Laguna; and Universidad de La Laguna, Dpto. Astrofísica, E-38206 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain*
- ¹² *Department of Astrophysics, University of Łódź, PL-90236 Łódź, Poland*
- ¹³ *Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron (DESY), D-15738 Zeuthen, Germany*
- ¹⁴ *Institut für Physik, Humboldt University of Berlin, D-12489 Berlin, Germany*
- ¹⁵ *also at Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Trieste, I-34127 Trieste, Italy*
- ¹⁶ *ETH Zurich, CH-8093 Zurich, Switzerland*
- ¹⁷ *Institiut de Física d'Altes Energies (IFAE), The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology (BIST), E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*
- ¹⁸ *Università di Siena and INFN Pisa, I-53100 Siena, Italy*
- ¹⁹ *Università di Pisa, and INFN Pisa, I-56126 Pisa, Italy*
- ²⁰ *also at Port d'Informació Científica (PIC), E-08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain*
- ²¹ *Universität Würzburg, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*
- ²² *Finnish MAGIC Consortium: Tuorla Observatory (Department of Physics and Astronomy) and Finnish Centre of Astronomy with ESO (FINCA), University of Turku, FIN-20014 Turku, Finland; Astronomy Division, University of Oulu, FIN-90014 Oulu, Finland*
- ²³ *Departament de Física, and CERES-IEEC, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, E-08193 Bellaterra, Spain*
- ²⁴ *Institute for Nuclear Research and Nuclear Energy, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, BG-1784 Sofia, Bulgaria*
- ²⁵ *Universitat de Barcelona, ICC, IEEC-UB, E-08028 Barcelona, Spain*
- ²⁶ *INAF-Trieste and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Bologna, 40126 Bologna, Italy*
- ²⁷ *Agenzia Spaziale Italiana (ASI), Space Science Data Center, I-00133 Roma, Italy*
- ²⁸ *Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Sezione di Perugia, I-06123 Perugia, Italy*
- ²⁹ *Tuorla Observatory, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Turku, FIN-20014 Turku, Finland*
- ³⁰ *Astrophysical Sciences Division, BARC, Mumbai-400085, India.*
- ³¹ *Metsähovi Radio Observatory, Aalto University, Metsähovintie 114, FI-02540 Kylmäla, Finland*
- ³² *Department of Electronics and Nanoengineering, Aalto University, PO Box 15500, FI-00076 Aalto, Finland*
- ³³ *Tartu Observatory, Observatooriumi 1, 61602 Tõravere, Estonia*
- ³⁴ *Owens Valley Radio Observatory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA*
- ³⁵ *Departamento de Astronomía, Universidad de Chile, Camino El Observatorio 1515, Las Condes, Santiago, Chile*

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.