

Constraints on an optical counterpart for the long-period radio transient GPM J1839–10

Ingrid Pelisoli¹,[★] A. J. Brown², N. Castro Segura¹, V. S. Dhillon^{3,4}, M. J. Dyer^{3,5}, J. A. Garbutt³, M. J. Green^{6,7}, D. Jarvis³, M. R. Kennedy⁸, P. Kerry³, S. P. Littlefair³, J. McCormac¹, J. Munday¹, S. G. Parsons³, E. Pike³, D. I. Sahman³ and A. Yates³

¹Department of Physics, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Road, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

²Hamburger Sternwarte, University of Hamburg, Gojenbergsweg 112, D-21029 Hamburg, Germany

³Astrophysics Research Cluster, School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S3 7RH, UK

⁴Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, E-38205 La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

⁵Research Software Engineering, University of Sheffield, Sheffield S1 4DP, UK

⁶Homer L. Dodge Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Oklahoma, 440 W. Brooks Street, Norman, OK 73019, USA

⁷JILA, University of Colorado and National Institute of Standards and Technology, 440 UCB, Boulder, CO 80309-0440, USA

⁸School of Physics, University College Cork, Cork T12 K8AF, Ireland

Accepted 2025 September 24. Received 2025 September 18; in original form 2025 September 8

ABSTRACT

Long-period radio transients (LPTs) are periodic radio sources showing pulsed emission on time-scales from minutes to hours. The underlying sources behind this emission are currently unclear. There are two leading candidates: neutron stars or white dwarfs. Neutron stars could emit at LPT time-scales as magnetars, binaries, or precessing sources. White dwarfs on the other hand have only been observed to emit in radio as binary systems with companions that provide charged particles through their wind. A key distinction is that an optical counterpart is much more likely in the white dwarf scenario. GPM J1839–10 is an LPT with a radio period of 21 min for which the white dwarf scenario has been favoured, but no optical counterpart is confirmed. Using HiPERCAM, a high-speed multicolour photometer that observes simultaneously in $u_s g_s r_s i_s z_s$ filters, we probe the existence of a white dwarf in GPM J1839–10. We do not directly detect a white dwarf, but cannot rule out its presence given the uncertain distance and reddening of GPM J1839–10. On the other hand, we find evidence in our data for periodic behaviour in harmonics of the radio period, as expected from the white dwarf scenario.

Key words: white dwarfs – pulsars: general.

1 INTRODUCTION

Long-period radio transients (LPTs) are a class of systems that show periodic pulsed radio emission with time-scales varying from minutes to hours. The first source of the class to be discovered was GCRT J1745–3009 (S. D. Hyman et al. 2005), which showed pulses with a width of 10 min repeating every 77 min. After more than 15 yrs without new LPTs being reported, there have recently been a number of discoveries (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2022, 2023; M. Caleb et al. 2024; F. A. Dong et al. 2025; N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2024; D. Li et al. 2024; S. Bloot et al. 2025; Y. W. J. Lee et al. 2025; I. Ruiter et al. 2025) fuelled by radio surveys with larger fields-of-view and better resolution, and by more comprehensive examination of the data considering longer time-scales.

Aside from their common characteristic of showing reoccurring radio pulses with periodicities in the range of minutes to hours, LPTs are a highly heterogeneous class. Pulses have been observed to disappear or decrease significantly in strength over time (e.g. S. D. Hyman et al. 2005; M. Caleb et al. 2024), or to remain active

for decades (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023). The duration and profile of the pulses are also highly variable, with some systems showing pulses with complex structure (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023) while others present a more smooth profile (I. Ruiter et al. 2025) and some vary between these states (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2022). These factors suggest that, rather than having a single common origin, LPTs are explained by different physical mechanisms with similar observational characteristics.

The properties of the emission shown by LPTs (intensity, periodicity, coherence, and polarization) are generally inconsistent with the stellar activity shown by M-dwarfs or brown dwarfs (e.g. S. D. Hyman et al. 2005). Instead, a compact object, either a neutron star or a white dwarf, is believed to be the underlying source of emission, though the exact mechanisms at play are unclear. Neutron stars can show pulsed radio emission due to pair-production conditions being met in their magnetic poles, leading to the occurrence of non-thermal emission from accelerated particles that varies periodically as the magnetic poles sweep across the line-of-sight. This, however, normally requires fast ($\lesssim 1$ min) spin periods (e.g. A. Szary et al. 2014). An alternative is that the emission is powered by the decay of a strong magnetic field rather than fast rotation in what is known as a magnetar (R. C. Duncan & C. Thompson 1992). X-ray emission

* E-mail: ingrid.pelisoli@warwick.ac.uk

is also expected from this mechanism, which is indeed detected from some LPTs (e.g. D. Li et al. 2024). Other models suggest that the observed long period could be the orbital period of a double neutron star binary (R. Turolla, A. Possenti & A. Treves 2005), or the precession period of the neutron star (W. W. Zhu & R. X. Xu 2006). White dwarfs, on the other hand, are not expected to meet pair production conditions at their typical rotation rates and magnetic fields, with field strengths $\gtrsim 10^9$ G required for efficient pair-production at the usual rotation rates (N. Rea et al. 2024), contrasting with observed white dwarf field strengths of $\lesssim 10^8$ G (e.g. F. Hardy, P. Dufour & S. Jordan 2023). Therefore, an external source of charged particles is required to fuel non-thermal emission, such as a binary companion (e.g. M. Lyutikov et al. 2020; Y. Qu & B. Zhang 2025).

Corroborating the binary model for radio emission from white dwarf sources, persistent radio emission from isolated white dwarfs has been found to be absent above a level of 1–3 mJy (I. Pelisoli et al. 2024b), a lower flux level than most LPTs. Although this study relied on the Very Large Array Sky Survey and could thus miss pulsed sources with low duty cycle, all the confirmed white dwarf systems found to show pulsed non-thermal emission are indeed in binary systems with red dwarf companions. This includes the three binary white dwarf pulsars (T. R. Marsh et al. 2016; I. Pelisoli et al. 2023; N. Castro Segura et al. 2025), whose pulsed emission is associated with the white dwarf spin, and two LPTs, ILT J1101+5521 (I. Ruiter et al. 2025) and GLEAM-X J0704–37 (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2024; A. C. Rodriguez 2025), where the radio periodicity matches the orbital period of the binary. These latter two detections demonstrate that at least some LPTs can be explained as white dwarf plus red dwarf systems, though there are cases where this possibility can be almost certainly excluded (J. D. Lyman et al. 2025).

Given their uncertain nature and emission mechanisms, LPTs are currently a puzzle in radio astronomy. With additional surveys such as the Square Kilometre Array Observatory and the Deep Synoptic Array 2000 on the horizon, understanding the properties of LPTs is a high priority. The main distinction between the neutron star and white dwarf mechanisms is that white dwarfs are expected to be stronger optical sources. Therefore, optical follow-up, and in particular deep-imaging, is a powerful tool for LPT characterization. In this work, we report optical observations of GPM J1839–10, discovered by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023). GPM J1839–10 was found to be active at least since 1988 and shows radio pulses with a period of 1318.1957(2) s (≈ 22 min). A possible infrared counterpart was reported as part of the discovery, though the source is not well resolved and its association with the radio source is unconfirmed. This infrared source has a magnitude of $K_s = 19.73 \pm 0.28$, consistent with a main sequence star of spectral type between mid-K and mid-M at the estimated distance of 5.7 ± 2.9 kpc. More recently, motivated by additional radio observations showing that the intervals of radio emission are spaced by 8.75 h, C. Horváth et al. (2025) suggested that the observed 22 min period is the beat period of a binary system, where the compact object has a rotation period of 1265.2197 ± 0.0002 s (≈ 21 min), and 8.75 h is the orbital period. The possibility that this could be a binary system with the previously detected infrared source being the companion to a white dwarf, in a similar scenario to the other LPTs confirmed to host white dwarf binaries, motivated this work.

2 OBSERVATIONS AND REDUCTION

GPM J1839–10 was observed with HiPERCAM (V. S. Dhillon et al. 2021) mounted on the 10.4 m Gran Telescopio Canarias during

Guaranteed Time Observations on the night starting 2024 August 03. Because of its dichroic beamsplitters, HiPERCAM obtains simultaneous data in five filters: u_s , g_s , r_s , i_s and z_s , which have similar bandpasses to the traditional *ugriz* filters of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey, but with improved efficiency. The exposure time was set to 15 sec for the r_s , i_s and z_s bands, 30 sec for g_s , and 45 sec for u_s , with negligible dead-time between exposures due to the frame transfer capabilities of the instrument. The maximum exposure time was defined to enable the detection of periods similar to the spin period of the binary white dwarf pulsar AR Sco (1.95 min; T. R. Marsh et al. 2016), taking into account that the origin of the observed 22-min radio periodicity was then unknown and not necessarily associated with the spin of a putative white dwarf. The target was observed for a total of two hours, starting on UTC time 2024-08-03T23:20:25 and finishing on 2024-08-04T01:19:20.69. Conditions were clear with a stable seeing around 0.6–0.7 arcsec.

The data were reduced using the HiPERCAM pipeline.¹ Frames were bias and flat-field corrected. Fringe correction was applied to the z_s observations. Before performing photometry, it was necessary to determine the expected position of GPM J1839–10, as its faintness precludes secure visual identification in the optical images. Therefore, we calculated astrometric solutions for the images in each passband using as reference an image created from averaging the first five observed frames, to minimize the impact of jittering. We identified ten relatively bright and isolated stars spread across the CCD and determined their pixel positions in each bandpass through a Gaussian fit. Their right ascension and declination were obtained from the values reported by *Gaia* data release 3 (DR3; Gaia Collaboration 2023), taking into account proper motions to obtain positions at the time of observing. An astrometric solution was then calculated using ASTROPY’s WCS package. Using this World Coordinate System (WCS) solution, we calculated the pixel positions of GPM J1839–10 in each bandpass using the radio coordinates reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023). Fig. 1 shows the obtained location of the target in each bandpass.

The derived pixel locations of GPM J1839–10 were used to perform photometry. A bright isolated star was used as reference to calculate centroiding corrections to the target’s aperture for each individual frame, to account for imperfect tracking and guiding. To minimize contamination caused by field crowding, we carried out point-spread function (PSF) photometry for all bands except u_s , for which a good PSF fit could not be obtained, likely due to the low number of bright stars. When doing PSF fitting, a Moffat profile was employed and its shape was determined for each individual frame by fitting ten relatively isolated stars near the location of GPM J1839–10. For the u_s frames we carried out aperture photometry with an aperture radius set to be 1.5 times the seeing (determined from a Gaussian fit to the reference stars in each frame). We calibrated the photometry using *cam_cal*,² which calculates a zero-point from observations of a standard star and atmospheric extinction corrections using reference stars in the same field as the target. No standard star was observed on the same night, so we used observations of the standard star G93-48 taken under photometric conditions five nights prior. Results within uncertainties were obtained when a star in the same field was used as standard instead, but no stars in the field have available u -band magnitude, therefore we opt for using the calibration based on G93-48.

¹<https://cygnus.astro.warwick.ac.uk/phsaap/hipercam/docs/html/>

²https://github.com/Alex-J-Brown/cam_cal




Figure 1. Zoom in on the field around the target for the co-added images for the full run in each passband (z_s , i_s , r_s , g_s , and u_s from left to right). The red circle shows the position of the target, with the size of the circle indicating the 1σ positional uncertainty taking into account both the uncertainty in the radio coordinates and the uncertainty in the astrometric fit of the image (which is not the same for the different filters). The exact coordinates vary slightly (< 1 arcsec) between filters as the WCS solution is fit independently; α and δ values shown are for the z_s band.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Light curve and magnitude limits

Fig. 2 shows the calibrated light curves for GPM J1839–10. There is significant flux in the z_s band, only marginal detection in the i_s band, and no clear detection in the u_s , g_s , and r_s bands. Based on these light curves, we estimated the fluxes and magnitudes reported in Table 1.

3.2 Period search

To search for periodic behaviour, we calculated the Fourier transform of the z_s light curve, where the target is detected. A 3σ peak-detection threshold was calculated via Monte Carlo, by shuffling the timestamps five thousand times to remove any underlying periodic signal and recalculating the Fourier transform. The maximum amplitude was recorded each time, and our detection threshold was set to the 99.7 percent quantile of the distribution of maxima. To account for non-sinusoidal signals, we also carried out phase-dispersion minimization. Flux uncertainties were taken into account with a Monte Carlo approach. We repeated the phase-dispersion minimization process five thousands times, each time sampling the fluxes assuming a normal distribution with standard deviation given by the flux errors. We recorded the frequency of minimum dispersion for each iteration. Results from both approaches are shown in Fig. 3. There is one peak above the detection threshold in the Fourier transform, and it is consistent with the third harmonic of GPM J1839–10’s reported radio periods. Marginal peaks consistent with other harmonics are also seen, in particular the first harmonic (with a significance of 2.6σ). These same peaks are prominent in the phase-dispersion minimization, though outranked by low-frequency noise.

We also folded the light curves to the period of 1318.1957(2) sec (presumably the beat), reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023), as well as the reported spin of 1265.2197 ± 0.0002 s from C. Horváth et al. (2025). The T_0 was set to an arbitrary value of 60 520 in all cases, as no ephemeris is published. To assess the significance of any observed behaviour, we fit the phase curves with a sine function and performed an F -test with the null hypothesis that the data are well described by simply the mean flux. The null hypothesis is rejected at a chosen 95 per cent confidence level when the data are folded on the beat period (p -value = 0.013). For the spin, the same is true if the data are fitted with the first harmonic rather than the fundamental period (p -value = 0.048). Phase-folded light curves are shown in Fig. 4. We also performed a different test in a Bayesian framework and

compared the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) of the constant and sine models. In both cases, we allowed for a fudge factor in the fit that would inflate the uncertainties, to simulate a situation where uncertainties are injected into the model. The BIC for the constant model is 607, whereas the BIC for the sine model is 615. Therefore, the BIC values are close enough that we cannot prefer a model over the other in this case.

4 DISCUSSION

The likely far distance of GPM J1839–10 (5.7 ± 2.9 kpc), combined with its location near the Galactic plane ($b \approx -2^\circ$), implies potentially very high reddening of up to $A_V \approx 6$ (E. F. Schlafly & D. P. Finkbeiner 2011). Therefore, the lack of detection in the bluer bands is not particularly constraining for a white dwarf scenario, as even fairly hot white dwarfs would lie below our detection limits under these conditions. Taking our derived upper limits and fluxes, as well as the K_s magnitude reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023), we calculated the maximum white dwarf temperature that would remain undetectable as a function of distance and A_V , considering a wide range of values given the very uncertain distance of GPM J1839–10.

We used models calculated by D. Koester (2010), available through the Spanish Virtual Observatory (SVO)³, which span effective temperatures between 6000 and 80 000 K. The log g has little impact on broad-band fluxes and was fixed at 8.0, near the mean value for white dwarfs (e.g S. O. Kepler et al. 2021). The radius was fixed at a representative value of $0.0135 R_\odot$ regardless of temperature (it varies by only $\approx \pm 5$ percent as a white dwarf cools down). A low-mass white dwarf could have a radius significantly larger (> 20 per cent) than our assumed value, but these are found to be remarkably rare in the class of interacting white dwarf plus red dwarf binaries (M. Zorotovic, M. R. Schreiber & B. T. Gänsicke 2011; A. F. Pala et al. 2020) to which GPM J1839–10 is likely related, therefore we consider our assumed radius to be a suitable upper limit to verify if our observations can exclude the presence of a white dwarf in GPM J1839–10.

As towards the infrared a red dwarf companion could contribute significantly or even dominate the flux, we also do separate calculations taking its contribution into account. For the red dwarf, we used NextGen solar metallicity models (F. Allard et al. 1997), also available from SVO⁴. We assumed log $g = 4.5$ and used two different temperatures, 3000 and 4000 K, to probe different regimes.

³<https://svo2.cab.inta-csic.es/theory/newov2/index.php?models=koester2>

⁴<https://svo2.cab.inta-csic.es/theory/newov2/index.php?models=NextGen>




Figure 2. Light curve in the u_s , g_s , r_s , i_s , and z_s bands from top to bottom. Symbols with errorbars are measurements where the flux value is significant at a 3σ level, downward arrows are values below a 3σ significance, and grey dots are used when the target was not detected above the background. GPM J1839–10 was only significantly detected in z_s .

Table 1. Derived fluxes and magnitudes of GPM J1839–10 in the five HiPERCAM filters. Limits represent the 3σ confidence level.

Band	Flux [μ Jy]	AB magnitude
z_s	3.0 ± 1.1	22.70 ± 0.53
i_s	<1.6	>23.4
r_s	<0.47	>24.5
g_s	<0.18	>25.5
u_s	<0.48	>24.7




Figure 3. The bottom panel shows the Fourier transform for the z_s light curve, with a 3σ detection threshold indicated by the dashed horizontal line. The top panel shows the distribution of periods obtained from phase-dispersion minimization. The dashed vertical grey lines in each plot correspond to the period reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023), as well as its first to third harmonics, and solid lines are the same for the spin period proposed by C. Horváth et al. (2025).




Figure 4. Folded light curves for the z_s observations of GPM J1839–10, with the data binned to 15 phase bins for clarity. The top panels show the data folded on the beat period, and the bottom panels show the same for the spin period. The dashed lines show the sinusoidal fits that are favoured over the mean by an F-test at a 95 percent confidence level.

The radius was fixed at a typical value of $0.2 R_{\odot}$. Extinction was applied using the PYTHON extinction module⁵ assuming the law of E. L. Fitzpatrick & D. Massa (2007) that uses $R_V = 3.1$.

Fig. 5 shows the results. A single white dwarf can only be fully excluded for distances closer than 100 pc. When the contribution of a companion is taken into account, we can rule out distances closer than 600 pc, as this would result in a detection considering our magnitude limits. Beyond these distances, limits highly depend on

⁵<https://extinction.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>




Figure 5. Maximum temperature of a white dwarf that would not be detected as a function of A_V and distance. The top panel shows limits for a white dwarf only, the middle panel assumes a companion with temperature 3000 K, and the bottom panel assumes 4000 K. The maximum allowed white dwarf temperature is indicated by the colourbar; black is used when any system would be detected.

the distance and reddening. For the range 2.8–8.6 kpc (1σ interval of the distance reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023), even an 80 000 K white dwarf would remain undetectable in all cases unless the A_V is much smaller than the total line of sight reddening of 6. These limits would become less restrictive if the white dwarf is smaller than the canonical size (i.e. if it is a massive white dwarf). Rerunning this experiment with a $0.005 R_\odot$ white dwarf, we find that a single massive white cannot be excluded, unless both the reddening and distance are much smaller than estimated. For the case of a binary the difference is less striking, and essentially only the maximum temperature of a white dwarf that would not be detected is affected: a massive white dwarf would remain undetected at close distances even for very high temperatures.

An example spectral energy distribution (SED) is shown in Fig. 6, for a distance of 2 kpc and $A_V = 2.2$, in which case the maximum white dwarf temperature allowed with a 3000 K companion is 11 500 K; temperatures above this value would result in a significant detection in the g_s band. That is the same temperature as the white dwarfs in the binary white dwarf pulsar systems AR Sco and J191213.72–441045.1 (P. Garnavich et al. 2021; I. Pelisoli et al. 2024a), whereas for ILT J1101+5521 and GLEAM-X J0704–37 the estimated temperatures are 4500–7500 K and 7320^{+800}_{-900} K, respectively (A. C. Rodriguez 2025; I. Ruiter et al. 2025). Temperatures in the range of the value found for these LPTs cannot be excluded




Figure 6. Example SED comparison used to place limits on the maximum effective temperature allowed for a white dwarf in GPMJ1839–10. Magnitudes obtained as part of this work are shown in black, with arrows used for limits, and the red star is the value reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023). The blue line, with increasing flux towards shorter wavelengths, is the white dwarf model and the red line, whose flux increases towards longer wavelengths, is the M-dwarf model. Both models have been reddened and rescaled assuming values as described in the text. The combined flux from both stars is shown by a magenta line. As there is an expected component of non-thermal emission, the observed magnitudes can be brighter than the sum of the stellar components (as is the case for the K_s measurement), but observed values or limits fainter than the model would indicate that a system with a white dwarf of that temperature can be excluded as it would lead to a (stronger) detection. For the case shown in this figure, a white dwarf temperature of 11 500 K is allowed for a 3000 K companion, 2 kpc distance and $A_V = 2.2$; higher temperatures would cause the expected g_s magnitude to be brighter than our 3σ limit.

in the binary scenario for distances larger than 4.0 kpc or A_V larger than 1.8, which is likely the case for GPMJ1839–10.

As our data do not rule out a white dwarf in GPMJ1839–10, the fact that our highest signal-to-noise ratio light curve (the z_s band) shows evidence for periodic behaviour, as found in Section 3.2, is encouraging for a white dwarf scenario. As discussed in the introduction, this would likely mean that the system is a binary where particles are fed into the white magnetosphere by a red dwarf companion (which is the proposed infrared counterpart, N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023). A period of ≈ 20 min would be too short to be the orbital period of such a binary, as the red dwarf would be overfilling its Roche lobe by a factor of ≈ 2 . The minimum period for such a binary is around 80 min (C. Knigge, I. Baraffe & J. Patterson 2011). Instead, the observed period would be associated with the rotation period of the white dwarf, as observed for the binary white dwarf pulsars and as proposed by C. Horváth et al. (2025) for GPMJ1839–10. A 21 min spin period is quite typical for a white dwarf that has accreted material from a companion (e.g. C. Hellier 1996), as is believed to be the case for binary white dwarf pulsars (M. R. Schreiber et al. 2021). AR Sco, whose current spin period is 1.95 min, is in a stage of fast spin-down ($P/\dot{P} = 5.6 \times 10^6$ yr; I. Pelisoli et al. 2022), implying that in the future it may show a spin similar to GPMJ1839–10, which could therefore be in a more advanced evolutionary stage than AR Sco. It is worth noting that there is an upper limit to GPMJ1839–10’s spin-down of $\dot{P} < 3.6 \times 10^{-13} \text{ s s}^{-1}$ (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023), which excludes a spin-down matching AR Sco’s ($6.62 \pm 0.11 \times 10^{-13} \text{ s s}^{-1}$; I. Pelisoli et al. 2022), but only by a small factor that could perhaps be explained by evolution.

One should of course be aware of the possibility of a chance alignment and take into consideration that the detected optical/infrared source might not be associated with the radio source. Using *sep* (E. Bertin & S. Arnouts 1996; K. Barbary 2016), we find that our 2.8×1.4 arcmin z_s HiPERCAM field contains around 2000

sources, resulting in a source density of 0.14 arcsec^{-2} . The positional uncertainty, taking into account the uncertainties on the radio coordinates and on the astrometric solution of the z_s image, is 0.4 arcsec . Therefore, given the source density, the chance of a source being within 1σ of the radio coordinates by chance is around 7 per cent. This is non-negligible, though the marginally sinusoidal behaviours shown by the z_s light curve when folded to the radio periods would be hard to explain in this case.

Although our findings are consistent with the white dwarf scenario, as we have no clear direct detection of a white dwarf in the system and there is a non-negligible probability of chance alignment with the source detected in (at least) z_s , we cannot fully rule out a neutron star scenario. The main explanation for LPTs when considering a neutron star origin are magnetars. However, no X-ray emission is detected at the position of GPM J1839–10, and implied limits are orders of magnitudes below those measured for magnetars (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023), making this possibility unlikely. The double neutron star scenario proposed by R. Turolla et al. (2005), where the radio is explained by a shock from the interaction between the wind of one pulsar with the magnetosphere of the companion, remains a possibility. The precessing pulsar model of W. W. Zhu & R. X. Xu (2006) is another possibility, although in this case the lack of a detected short spin period for the pulsar, despite there being observations with time resolution of a few tens of μs , is an argument against it.

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We carried out follow-up observations of the LPT GPM J1839–10 (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023; C. Horváth et al. 2025) using HiPERCAM to probe the existence of a white dwarf source at the position of the radio coordinates. We were motivated by the detection of an infrared counterpart (N. Hurley-Walker et al. 2023) and by the recent work of C. Horváth et al. (2025), who have argued that GPM J1839–10 can be explained by the same model as the binary white dwarf pulsars (T. R. Marsh et al. 2016; I. Pelisoli et al. 2023; N. Castro Segura et al. 2025). We confidently detect a source in the z_s band and derive limits for the other filters (Table 1).

The spin and beat periods reported by N. Hurley-Walker et al. (2023) and C. Horváth et al. (2025) are not above a 3σ detection threshold in our data, but some of their harmonics show peaks with a significance $>2.5\sigma$ and are also recovered by phase-dispersion minimization. Additionally, folding our z_s data to the reported periods results in a behaviour that is better explained by a sinusoidal than a constant. All of this points to the existence of periodic signals in our data, as expected if the radio source is a white dwarf system.

Based on the derived magnitudes and limits, we can only fully exclude a white dwarf plus red dwarf binary for distances closer than 600 pc, below the 1σ interval for GPM J1839–10 of $5.7 \pm 2.9 \text{ kpc}$. Binary white dwarfs with temperatures similar to what was found for other LPTs cannot be excluded, unless the system is closer than 4.0 kpc or has $A_V < 1.8$, which is unlikely the case for GPM J1839–10.

There is a non-negligible chance alignment probability of 7 per cent, therefore we cannot categorically associate the HiPERCAM source with GPM J1839–10. However, considering that the source seems to show periodic behaviour with the same period as GPM J1839–10, we consider that there is evidence for the scenario where GPM J1839–10 contains a white dwarf with a red dwarf companion, as proposed by C. Horváth et al. (2025). In this scenario,

the observed radio period of 22 min is the beat period, similar to what is observed for AR Sco. Continued monitoring and deeper imaging is required to unambiguously confirm this scenario. Direct detection of the orbital period and/or of the white dwarf would be the confirmation that GPM J1839–10 is another LPT containing a white dwarf plus red dwarf system. Additionally, improved distance or coordinate determination would allow us to place stricter constraints using the existing data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

IP acknowledges support from the Royal Society through a University Research Fellowship (URF\R1\231496). This project has received funding from the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement numbers 101002408 – MOS100PC). We thank Natasha Hurley-Walker, Nanda Rea, and Csánád Horváth for useful discussions on the nature and observed periods of GPM J1839–10.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All data analysed in this work can be made available upon reasonable request to the authors.

REFERENCES

- Allard F., Hauschildt P. H., Alexander D. R., Starrfield S., 1997, *ARA&A*, 35, 137
- Barbary K., 2016, *J. Open Source Softw.*, 1, 58
- Bertin E., Arnouts S., 1996, *A&AS*, 117, 393
- Bloot S. et al., 2025, *A&A*, 699, A341
- Caleb M. et al., 2024, *Nat. Astron.*, 8, 1159
- Castro Segura N. et al., 2025, preprint (arXiv:2506.20455)
- Dhillon V. S. et al., 2021, *MNRAS*, 507, 350
- Dong F. A. et al., 2025, *ApJL*, 990, L49
- Duncan R. C., Thompson C., 1992, *ApJ*, 392, L9
- Fitzpatrick E. L., Massa D., 2007, *ApJ*, 663, 320
- Gaia Collaboration, 2023, *A&A*, 674, A1
- Garnavich P., Littlefield C., Lyutikov M., Barkov M., 2021, *ApJ*, 908, 195
- Hardy F., Dufour P., Jordan S., 2023, *MNRAS*, 520, 6111
- Hellier C., 1996, in Evans A., Wood J. H., eds, *Astrophysics and Space Science Library*, Vol. 208, IAU Colloq. 158: Cataclysmic Variables and Related Objects. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 143
- Horváth C., Rea N., Hurley-Walker N., McSweeney S. J., Perley R. A., Lenc E., 2025, preprint (arXiv:2507.15352)
- Hurley-Walker N. et al., 2022, *Nature*, 601, 526
- Hurley-Walker N. et al., 2023, *Nature*, 619, 487
- Hurley-Walker N. et al., 2024, *ApJ*, 976, L21
- Hyman S. D., Lazio T. J. W., Kassim N. E., Ray P. S., Markwardt C. B., Yusef-Zadeh F., 2005, *Nature*, 434, 50
- Kepler S. O., Koester D., Pelisoli I., Romero A. D., Ourique G., 2021, *MNRAS*, 507, 4646
- Knigge C., Baraffe I., Patterson J., 2011, *ApJS*, 194, 28
- Koester D., 2010, *Mem. Soc. Astron. Italiana*, 81, 921
- Lee Y. W. J. et al., 2025, *Nat. Astron.*, 9, 393
- Li D. et al., 2024, preprint (arXiv:2411.15739)
- Lyman J. D., Dhillon V. S., Kamann S., Chrimes A. A., Levan A. J., Pelisoli I., Steeghs D. T. H., Wiersema K., 2025, *MNRAS*, 538, 925
- Lyutikov M., Barkov M., Route M., Balsara D., Garnavich P., Littlefield C., 2020, preprint (arXiv:2004.11474)
- Marsh T. R. et al., 2016, *Nature*, 537, 374
- Pala A. F. et al., 2020, *MNRAS*, 494, 3799
- Pelisoli I. et al., 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 5052
- Pelisoli I. et al., 2023, *Nat. Astron.*, 7, 931
- Pelisoli I. et al., 2024a, *MNRAS*, 527, 3826

- Pelisoli I. et al., 2024b, *MNRAS*, 531, 1805
 Qu Y., Zhang B., 2025, *ApJ*, 981, 34
 Rea N. et al., 2024, *ApJ*, 961, 214
 Rodriguez A. C., 2025, *A&A*, 695, L8
 de Ruiter I. et al., 2025, *Nat. Astron.*, 9, 672
 Schlafly E. F., Finkbeiner D. P., 2011, *ApJ*, 737, 103
 Schreiber M. R., Belloni D., Gänsicke B. T., Parsons S. G., Zorotovic M., 2021, *Nat. Astron.*, 5, 648

- Szary A., Zhang B., Melikidze G. I., Gil J., Xu R.-X., 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 59
 Turolla R., Possenti A., Treves A., 2005, *ApJ*, 628, L49
 Zhu W. W., Xu R. X., 2006, *MNRAS*, 365, L16
 Zorotovic M., Schreiber M. R., Gänsicke B. T., 2011, *A&A*, 536, A42

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