





### Polytrope & White dwarsf

 Completely degenerate electron gas : *n* changes from 1.5 to 3.0 as the density increases

In general, for a polytropic star,

Stellar radius: 
$$R = \frac{Z_n}{A} \propto A^{-1} \propto \rho_c^{\frac{1-n}{2n}}$$
  
Mass:  $M = 4 \pi \rho_c R^3 \left(-\frac{w'}{z}\right)_{z=z_n} \propto \rho_c^{\frac{3-n}{2n}}$   
 $\rightarrow R \propto M^{\frac{1-n}{3-n}}$   
When 1<*n*<3, *R* becomes smaller  
as *M* increases.

For the limit of  $n \rightarrow 3$  (relativistic limit),  $R \rightarrow 0$ .

Polytrope & White dwarfs  $K = c_1 A^{-2} G \rho_c^{\frac{n-1}{n}}$  (KH19.9),  $c_i$ : non dimensional constants &  $\rho_c \propto \overline{\rho} \propto MR^{-3} = M \left(\frac{A}{z_{\star}}\right)^3$  $\rightarrow A = c_2 \rho_c^{1/3} M^{-1/3}$  $\rightarrow K = c_3 M^{2/3} G \rho_c^{1 - \frac{1}{n-3}} = c_3 M^{2/3} G \rho_c^{\frac{1}{3-n}},$ also:  $P_c = K \rho_c^{1+\frac{1}{n}} = c_3 G M^{2/3} G \rho_c^{\frac{4}{3}}$  $P_c = 0.48 \ GM^{2/3}G\rho_c^{\frac{4}{3}} \qquad (n = \frac{3}{2}) \ (1.21)$  $= 0.36 \ GM^{2/3} G\rho_c^{\frac{4}{3}} \qquad (n=3) \ (1.22)$ 

## Polytrope & White dwarfs

For the limit of ultra - relativistic (or high density), EOS is  $P_c \propto \rho_c^{4/3}$ . Using this and (1.22) we find mass approaches to

$$M = 1.46 \left(\frac{Y_e}{0.5}\right)^2 M_{\Theta} \equiv M_{Ch},$$

the Chandrasekhar mass.

Or when  $M \to M_{Ch}$ , it becomes  $n \to 3$   $R \propto \lim_{n \to 3} M^{\frac{1-n}{3-n}} = \lim_{n \to 3} M_{Ch}^{\frac{1-n}{3-n}} \to 0$ , and  $\rho \to \infty$ .



# 近接連星系の進化

- 連星系の星の距離が非常に近いと2つの星の間でガスの移動が起きる。質量移動の時期とスピードは、連星系の大きさと2つの星の質量比で変わる。
- それぞれの星の重力圏の境界は臨界ロッシュ・ローブと呼ばれ、それらは一点 L<sub>1</sub>でつながっている。
- ・ 質量の大きい星ほど 進化が速いので、先に 大きい星が巨星に なって臨界ロッシュ・ ローブを超える。超えた 部分のガスは L<sub>1</sub>点 の近くを通り小さい 質量の星に流れ込む。



Figure 13.3: Gravitational potential contours for a binary system and the Lagrange points  $L_n$ . Dashed contours lie inside the Roche lobes (indicated in gray) and CM denotes the location of the center of mass. Adapted from reference [?].

A contour plot corresponding to the potential

$$\Phi_{\mathrm{R}}(\boldsymbol{r}) = -\frac{GM_1}{|\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}_1|} - \frac{GM_2}{|\boldsymbol{r}-\boldsymbol{r}_2|} - \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{\omega}\times\boldsymbol{r})^2,$$

#### Evolution of close binary systems

- When total mass and angular momentum is conserved, the distance between two stars is minimum when two stars have equal mass.
  - ➡ mass transfer rate is accelerated

# When two stars are very close :

Some patterns of CBS

(3)

- Principal star can fill its Roche lobe before the star become a red giant (2) (Case A), then
- transferred mass generates heat. If mass transfer rate is sufficiently large, the companion star also expand, and they may form a common envelope (3).
- After some time, when the evolved star mass becomes smaller the companion, the distance between two stars increases. Then two stars can be detached again. Mass transfer rate decreases and steady mass transfer can occur as (2).
- Depending on the separation and mass ratio, other type of evolution could be possible.



Case A: A primary star fills the Roche lobe during the main sequence. time scale: thermal (KH) time scale ~  $GM^2/(RL) = T_{th}$ example: M = 2Msun,  $T_{th=} 10^7$  yr,  $dM/dt \sim 10^{-7}$  Msun/yr M = 5Msun,  $T_{th=} 10^6$  yr,  $dM/dt \sim 10^{-5}$  Msun/yr Case B: A primary star fills the Roche lobe when it becomes a red giant.

#### time scale:

Convective envelope has large entropy, thus it can expand quickly when the outer most layer lose the mass with the dynamical time scale  $T_{dyn} \sim R/v_s \sim (R^3/GM)^{1/2}$ This is much faster than case A. For example, if R=100 Rsun,  $T_{dyn}$  is only 10 days.

Case C: A primary star fills the Roche lobe when it becomes an AGB star.

Time scale is fast as the Case C. Actual transfer rate depends on the masses of stars and separation distances.







#### Nova and Type Ia supernova

•SN Ia: In a binary system, when a WD gets accretion and reaches the M<sub>ch</sub>, C at center burns explosively. Then whole star is disrupted and becomes a SN Ia.

•After a nova, whether the WD mass increase or not ?: (Now we know 'No'.





→ too few SNe Ia from the SD model?

# Critical accretion rate

 $\dot{M}_{cr} = 5.3 \times 10^{-7} \frac{1.7 - X}{Y} (M_{WD} - 0.4)$  $\dot{M}_{He} = \eta_H \left| \dot{M}_2 \right|$  (He core growth rate) Mass accretion rate onto the star  $\eta_{H} = \dot{M}_{cr} / |\dot{M}_{2}|, \qquad |\dot{M}_{2}| > \dot{M}_{cr}$ = 1,  $\dot{M}_{cr} > |\dot{M}_2| > \frac{1}{8} \dot{M}_{cr}$  $\left|\dot{M}_{2}\right| < \frac{1}{2}\dot{M}_{cr}$ = 0, $\dot{M}_{WD} = \eta_{He} \dot{M}_{He} = \eta_{He} \eta_{H} \left| \dot{M}_{2} \right|$  (WD growth rate)  $\eta_{He}$ : Mass accumulation efficiency for helium-shell flashes (Kato & Hachisu 2004)









### **Neutrino emission**

• When stellar temperature exceeds 10<sup>9</sup> K, various neutrino emission processes occur.

- Pair annihilation neutrinos 
$$e^- + e^+ \rightarrow v + \overline{v}$$
  
 $\varepsilon_{\nu}^{(\text{pair})} = \begin{cases} \frac{4.9 \times 10^8}{\varrho} T_9^3 e^{-11.86T_9} , T_9 < 1 \\ \frac{4.45 \times 10^{15}}{\varrho} T_9^9 , T_9 > 3 \end{cases}$   
- Photo neutrinos  $\gamma + e^- \rightarrow e^- + v + \overline{v}$   
 $\varepsilon_{\nu}^{(\text{phot})} = \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2(\mu_e + \overline{\varrho})^{-1} , \varepsilon_1 = 1.103 \times 10^{13} e^{-1} T_9^9 e^{-5.93/T_9} , \varepsilon_2 = 0.976 \times 10^8 T_9^8 (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = 6.446 \times 10^{-6} \varrho T_9^{-1} (1 + 4.2T_9)^{-1} , \overline{\varrho} = h \omega_0 / kT$   
 $\omega_0^2 \frac{m_e}{4\pi e^2 n_e} = \begin{cases} 1 (1 + (\frac{h}{m_e c})^2 (3\pi^2 n_e)^{2/3}]^{-1/2} , \text{ degenerate } \gamma = h \omega_0 / kT$   
 $\varepsilon_{\nu}^{(\text{plasm})} = 3.356 \times 10^{19} \varrho^{-1} \lambda^6 (1 + 0.0158\gamma^2) T_9^3 , \gamma \ll 1$   
 $\varepsilon_{\nu}^{(\text{plasm})} = 5.252 \times 10^{20} \varrho^{-1} \lambda^{7.5} T_9^{1.5} e^{-\gamma} , \gamma \gg 1 ,$   
- Bremsstrahlung: deceleration of an electron  $\varepsilon_{\nu}^{(\text{brems})} \approx 0.76 \frac{Z^2}{A} T_8^6$ 





### Recent status of SN Ia model

(becoming more confusing lately)

- Long arguments about progenitor system
  - Merging of two WDs :

Double degenerate (DD) model

- Binary accretion (WD wind) model : Single degenerate (SD) model
- Next page for detail.
- Also arguments about explosion model
  - Detonation model (observationally ruled out)
  - Deflagration model (slower than sound velocity)
  - Delayed Detonation model

(Delayed Detonation – DDT model)

- DDT model fits observations better (partly because the model includes more parameters).
   However, current simulations can't confirm the transition to Detonation.
- Very recently another explosion model, called the violent merger model, was proposed (see below).
   In this model pure detonation explains SNe Ia.

### SD or DD

- Good for SD (or not good for DD)
  - There are some binary systems that seem to have a WD close to  $M_{\rm ch}$  and getting mass accretion from their companion.
  - There are a few SNe Ia that have Hydrogen feature. This may be an evidence for mass accretion before explosion. (However, most SNe Ia doesn't have any Hydrogen feature, so this may be against the SD model.
- Not good for SD (or not bad for DD)
  - Observed delay time (between the star formation and SN Ia explosion) distribution seem to be more consistent with the DD model: There appear to exist many SN with short delay time.
    - (but in SD, newer path has been proposed to explain the short delay time.
  - There appear to be no evidence for low metallicity inhibition, that's a prediction of the SD model.
    - More observations are required for the concrete conclusion.
  - So far, no evidence of the existence of a companion star, in the spectra of SNe and images in the supernova remnants.
    - Need more observations

### SD or DD

- Super-Chandra SNe Ia ?
  - Very bright, and with a reasonable estimate the total mass of the ejecta should exceed the Chandrasekharl limit.
  - Naively it means the evidence of DD because the sum of two WDs can exceed the limit.
  - However, it is not so simple (next paragraph
  - SD model can explain super Chandra progenitor if the progenitor WD is supported with vary rapid core rotation (though there are no observational evidence that such a massive WD can really exist.
- Theoretical aspects:
  - It was once considered that DD explosion doesn't occur, because after the merging one of a WD is broken and forms a massive accretion disk around the other WD. Then with the rapid mass accretion, C-burning ignites at the surface of the WD and then explosion is too weak to disrupts the star. Such a system is considered to form a neutron star without SNe Ia explosion.
  - However, recently another scenario was proposed for the DD model: Violent merger model.

### Violent merger model of DD Pakmor et al. 2010, 2012, 2013

- 2010: Sub-luminous type la supernovae from the mergers of equal-mass white dwarfs with mass 0.9 Msun
  - Nearly equal mass WDs merge violently
  - Hot spots appear in a high density region, and carbon detonation ignites here.
- Previously it was considered that detonation is not a burning mechanism for SNe Ia, because if it occurs at center, it burns entire star and inconsistent with observations showing some unburned materials.



Violent merger model of DD Pakmor et al. 2010, 2012, 2013

- 2012: Normal Type Ia supernovae from violent ٠ mergers of white dwarf binaries of mass 0.9 Msun and 1.1 Msun.
- 2013: Helium-ignited violent mergers as a ٠ unified model for normal and rapidly declining Type la Supernovae
- using a moving-mesh code that allows for the inclusion ٠ of thin helium (He) shells (0.01 M  $\odot$ ) on top of the WDs, at an unprecedented numerical resolution. The accretion of He onto the primary WD leads to the formation of a detonation in its He shell. This detonation propagates around the CO WD and sends a converging shock wave into its core, known to robustly trigger a second detonation, as in the well-known double-detonation scenario for He-accreting CO WDs. the required He-shell mass is significantly smaller, and hence its burning products are unlikely to affect the optical display of the explosion. We show that this scenario, which works for CO primary WDs with CO- as well as He-WD companions, has the potential to explain the different brightness distributions, delay times and relative rates of normal and fast declining SNe la.





# Summary

•Violent merger can explain all observed SNe Ia? -- not sure yet

•Can explain observed SN rate ?

•So far, VM can't explain super-chandra type. (DD rotation model can?

•Some are DD some are SD ??

 Uncertainty in numerical resolutions and assumptions.

# D6 model

the dynamically driven double-degenerate doubledetonation model

(近年流行っている Sub-Chandrasekhar Mass model)

例: Tanikawa + 2019, ApJ 885, 103

# la型超新星の理論の状況

- ・ 母天体モデルに関する長い論争、
   2つの白色矮星の合体モデル
  - 連星、降着モデル
- ・ 爆発モデルに関する論争
  - 爆燃波モデル(音速以下)
  - 遅延爆轟波モデル(途中から速以上)
     (Delayed Detonation DDT モデル)
  - DDTのほうが観測によく合うが、問題はシミュレー ションでDetonationへの遷移が簡単に起きない
  - いくつかスーパーチャンドラの示唆







