

$$z = 1 + 1 \quad (4)$$

text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text.

Because of these characteristics, it is the most observed CV, not only in the optical, where measurements are available from the end of the 19th century to the present, but also in other wavelength regions.



Figure 1: Name of figure 1

Text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text.

Table 1: Name of table 1

column 1	column 2
column 1	column 2

Table 2: Comparison of the characteristic parameters of EI UMa – a well established IP (Reimer et al., 2008) – and SS Cyg (Giovannelli et al., 1983; Lombardi et al., 1987; Gaudenzi et al., 1990, 2002; Giovannelli & Martinez-Pais, 1991; Schreiber & Gänsicke, 2002).

EI UMa	SS Cyg
$P_{\text{orb}} = 6.434 \text{ h}$	$P_{\text{orb}} = 6.603 \text{ h}$
$P_{\text{opt}} = 745 \text{ s } (\sim P_{\text{XMM}})$	$P_{\text{opt}} = 745 \text{ s } (\sim P_{\text{XMM UV}})$
$0.81 M_{\odot} < M_{\text{WD}} < 1.2 M_{\odot}$	$M_{\text{WD}} = 0.97 M_{\odot}$
$R_{\text{WD}} = 7 \times 10^8 \text{ cm}$	$R_{\text{WD}} = 5 \times 10^8 \text{ cm}$
$M_{\text{R}} = 0.81 M_{\odot}$	$M_{\text{R}} = 0.56 M_{\odot}$
$R_{\text{R}} = 0.76 R_{\odot}$	$R_{\text{R}} = 0.68 R_{\odot}$
$L_{\text{X}} \sim 10 \times 10^{32} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$	$L_{\text{X}} \sim (6.6 - 9.8) \times 10^{32} \text{ erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$
$\dot{M} = 3.6 \times 10^{17} \text{ g s}^{-1}$	$\dot{M} \simeq (1 - 4) \times 10^{17} \text{ g s}^{-1}$
$M_{\text{V}} = 5.4$	$M_{\text{V}} = 5.9$
$f = R_{\text{d}}/a = 0.2 - 0.3$	$f = R_{\text{d}}/a = 0.2$
UBV Orbital modulations of continuum	UBV & UV Orbital modulations of continuum & emission lines EWs

Text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text.

2 The Intermediate Polar Nature of SS Cyg

In our opinion there are several incontestable arguments in favour of the IP nature of SS Cyg, namely:  
.....  
Text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text,  
text.

3 Discussion

Text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text.

4 Conclusions

Text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text.

5 Discussion and Conclusions

Text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text, text.



Figure 2: Big figure

## Acknowledgement

Thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks, thanks.

## References

- [1] Andronov, I.L., Chinarova, L.L., Han, W., Kim, Y., et al. : 2008, A&A 486, 855.
- [2] Bath, G.T., van Paradijs, J.: 1983, Nature 305, 33.
- [3] Bartolini, C., et al.: 1985, in *Multifrequency Behaviour of Galactic Accreting Sources*, F. Giovannelli (ed.), Edizioni Scientifiche SIDEREA, Roma, p. 50.
- [4] Bisikalo, D.V., et al.: 2008, Astron. Rep.52, No. 4, 318.
- [5] Braga, V.F. : 2009, Thesis in Physics, University La Sapienza, Roma.
- [6] Brinkworth, C.S., et al: 2007, in *15th European Workshop on White Dwarfs*, R. Napiwotzki & M. R. Burleigh (eds.), ASP Conf. Ser. 372, 333.
- [7] Dubus, G. et al.: 2004, MNRAS 349, 869.
- [8] Fabbiano, G., et al.: 1981, ApJ 243, 911.
- [9] Galis, R., et al.: 2011, this workshop.
- [10] Gaudenzi S., Giovannelli F., Lombardi R., Claudi R.: 1986, in *New Insights in Astrophysics. Eight Years of UV Astronomy with IUE*, ESA-SP 263, 455.
- [11] Gaudenzi S., Giovannelli F., Lombardi R., Claudi R.: 1990, AcA, 40, 105.
- [12] Gaudenzi S., et al.: 2002, in *Multifrequency Behaviour of High Energy Cosmic Sources*, F. Giovannelli, L. Sabau-Graziati (eds.), Mem. S.A.It., 73 N. 1, 213.
- [13] Gaudenzi S., et al.: 2011, A&A 525, 147.
- [14] Giovannelli, F.: 1981, SSR 30, 213.
- [15] Lombardi, R., Giovannelli, F., Gaudenzi, S.: 1987, Ap&SS 130, 275.
- [16] Long, K.S., et al.: 2005, ApJ 630, 511.
- [17] Marchev, D., Kjurkchieva, D., Ogłóza, W.: 1999, AcA 49, 585.
- [18] Martinez-Pais, I.G., Giovannelli, F., Rossi, C., Gaudenzi, S.: 1994, A&A 291, 455.

## DISCUSSION

**WHITE BUTTERFLY's Comment:** I have noted how pleasant has been my flight over the multicolor field of Cataclysmic Variables. Thank you.

**LINDA SCHMIDTOBREICK:** You have discussed several arguments in favour of SS Cyg being magnetic but all reflex indirect ones. What about direct measurements of optical polarization? Was done never an attempt?

**FRANCO GIOVANNELLI:** as far as I know, direct positive detections of optical polarization do not exist. Gnedin et al. (1995, Astr. Lett. 21, 118) performed UBVRI polarization measurements of SS Cyg. No appreciable intrinsic linear polarization was

detected. However, during a radio flare simultaneous with an optical outburst, upper limits of linear polarization ( $3.2 \pm 2.7\%$ ) and circular polarization ( $-3.2 \pm 2.7\%$ ) have been published (Körding et al.: 2008, *Science*, 320, 1318).

**SIMONE SCARINGI:** i) hard X-ray detection of SS Cyg is NOT a proof of magnetic nature; ii) Radio emission associated with jet is NOT a proof of magnetic nature; iii) failures of spectral fits to accretion disk is NOT a proof of magnetic nature. Is there a better magnetic model fit?

**FRANCO GIOVANNELLI:** As I clearly discussed, the proofs I gave for supporting the magnetic nature of SS Cyg are circumstantial. However, if we consider that the circumstantial proofs are numerous, it is very reasonable to support the magnetic nature of SS Cyg. Specifically: i) only accretion onto magnetic poles ( $B \approx 1$  MG) justify the hard X-ray emission in quiescence (Ricketts et al.: 1979, *MNRAS* 186, 233; Cordova et al.: 1980, *ApJ* 233, 163; Heise, et al.: 1978, *ApJL* 63, L1). A detailed analysis of simultaneous X-ray, UV, and optical data from SS Cyg needs the presence of a magnetic field of  $B \leq 1.9$  MG (Fabbiano et al.: 1981, *ApJ*, 243, 911). This conclusion is even more valid on the light of the INTEGRAL detection in a harder X-ray region. Moreover, the CVs detected by the INTEGRAL observatory are all IPs with the exception of SS Cyg (classified as dwarf Nova). Thus, if SS Cyg should be non magnetic, why INTEGRAL does not detect other dwarf novae?

iii) Accretion disk models do not fit the multifrequency data of SS Cyg, that are very similar to those of AM Her (e.g. Fabbiano et al., 1981). Models with the presence of a magnetic field for SS Cyg do not exist in the literature. But this is probably the obvious consequence of considering SS Cyg, by definition,

non magnetic. Some results could be available in the near future using the results of 3D MHD numerical simulations (Bisikalo & Zhilkin, these proceedings).

**IRINA VOLOSHINA:** You state that one of the arguments supporting the idea that SS Cyg is an IP is the detection of the 12-m period. However, I have obtained many photometric light curves of this system and none of them demonstrates the variability with the period that you report. Besides, I have not managed to find any confirmation of this period in papers published by other authors who performed photometric measurements of SS Cyg.

**FRANCO GIOVANNELLI:** It is true that the 12-m periodicity has not been reported by other authors. However, such periodicity has been found in the R band by Bartolini et al. (1985), and by Tramontana (2007), and in 10 ks XMM-OM UV observations by Braga (2009). On the contrary, this periodicity is not present in 10 ks XMM X-ray data analyzed by my group. However, the behaviour of SS Cyg fulfill most of the characteristics of an IP, such as orbital modulations of continuum and fluxes of emission lines, like discussed.

**DMITRY BISIKALO:** What are the recent estimates of the magnetic field values in SS Cyg?

**FRANCO GIOVANNELLI:** The variations in the mid-IR ( $11.7 \mu\text{m}$ ) emission from SS Cyg could be due to coherent emission during flares. This would probably requires very powerful magnetic field of  $\sim 10^7$  G (Dubus et al.: 2004, *MNRAS*, 349, 869). Our evaluation gives  $B = 1.6 \pm 0.7$  MG in agreement with the value ( $B \leq 1.9$  MG) deduced by Fabbiano et al. (1981).