PUSHing Core-Collapse Supernovae to Explosions in Spherical Symmetry



Picture: courtesy NASA/JPL-Caltech

Kevin Ebinger

FAIRNESS

Arenzano

20.5.2019

In collaboration with:

S. Curtis,

C. Fröhlich,

M. Hempel,

A. Perego,

M. Liebendörfer &

F.-K. Thielemann

Outline

- Core-Collapse Supernovae
- CCSN Modeling: PUSH
- Explodability, Explosion & Remnant Properties

Core-Collapse Supernovae



Credit: NASA and the Night Sky Network

Core-Collapse Supernovae



Credit: NASA and the Night Sky Network

Core-Collapse Supernovae

Massive stars with masses $\mathrm{M} \gtrsim 8 - 10\mathrm{M}_{\odot}$:

- CCSNe, among the strongest explosions in the universe
- Source of heavy elements
- Driving force of cosmic cycle of matter



At the end of a massive star‘s life:

- Onion-shell structure
- Iron core approaches $\mathrm{M_{CH}(Y_e, s_e)}$
- Collapse → CCSNe

CCSNe: ν-driven Mechanism

Collapse releases gravitational binding energy:

$$\Delta \mathrm{E_B} \sim \frac{GM_{\mathrm{core}}^2}{R} = 3 \times 10^{53} \left(\frac{M_{\mathrm{core}}}{M_\odot}\right)^2 \left(\frac{R}{10\mathrm{km}}\right)^{-1} \mathrm{erg}$$

Explosion energy: $\sim 1\mathrm{B} = 10^{51}$ erg 1% of $\Delta \mathrm{E_B}$

- Core bounce → Prompt shock
- Prompt shock stagnation
- ν-driven mechanism:
  convection and multi-D instabilities
  (e.g. Bethe&Wilson85, Janka12)



CCSN Modeling

- Spherically symmetric (1D) models with detailed input physics generally fail to explode but **computationally affordable**
  (Liebendörfer+04, Thompson+03, Rampp&Janka02, Sumiyoshi+05)

- Multi-D: for the mechanism in general; convection and other instabilities play crucial role, enhancing neutrino heating, **computationally expensive**
  (Janka&Müller94, Blondin&Mezzacappa07, Nordhaus+10, Hanke+12, Couch+13, Dolence+13, ...)





Adapted from Herant, Colgate, Benz and Fryer (1997)

CCSN Modeling

Questions:

- Progenitor-remnant connection, explosion properties?
- Conditions for explosive nucleosynthesis?
- Explosion properties, remnant properties and yields as a function of M_{ZAMS} and Z?

Required:

- Progenitor models (mainly 1D)
- Properties of shock wave (e.g. E_{expl})
- Matter properties of innermost ejecta (Y_e)
- Explosion mechanism (energy injection), mass cut

CCSN Modeling

Ideal case:

- Self-consistent, detailed, long term, converging 3D models that match observables, for many progenitors

  But:

- Multi-D and detailed physics require large resources

Realistic strategy: efficient parametrized exploding models

- Models where a part of the problem is simplified

- Computationally efficient and physically reliable models

CCSN Modeling in 1D

Efficiently study broad range of CCSN progenitors in 1D:

- Induced explosion with different methods

Traditional Methods

(Piston/thermal bomb)

(Woosley&Weaver95, Chieffi & Limongi13, Thielemann+96, Umeda & Nomoto08)

Limitations:

- Physics of collapse, bounce, and onset of explosion
- Neutrinos, PNS
- Remnant mass / mass cut
- Explosion energy and nickel

Using Neutrinos:

- Light bulb models (L_ν) (e.g. Yamamoto+13)
- Enhanced ν reaction rates (e.g. Fröhlich+06, Fischer+10)
- Parametrized L_ν, excised core region

(Ugliano+12, Ertl+16, Sukhbold+16)

CCSN Modeling in 1D: PUSH

PUSH method introduced in ApJ 806, 275 (2015)

Perego, Hempel, Fröhlich, Ebinger, Eichler, Casanova, Liebendörfer, Thielemann

Updated PUSH method, explosion & remnant properties and nucleosynthesis yields in ApJ 870, 1 & 2 (2019)

Ebinger, Curtis, Fröhlich+ and Curtis, Ebinger, Fröhlich+

CCSN Modeling in 1D: PUSH

PUSH method introduced in ApJ 806, 275 (2015)

Perego, Hempel, Fröhlich, Ebinger, Eichler, Casanova, Liebendörfer, Thielemann

Updated PUSH method, explosion & remnant properties and nucleosynthesis yields in ApJ 870, 1 & 2 (2019)

Ebinger, Curtis, Fröhlich+ and Curtis, Ebinger, Fröhlich+

Aim:

- Parametrization of ν-driven mechanism: ν's determine explosion properties ($\mathrm{E_{expl}}$, $\mathrm{M_{rem}}$, nucleosynthesis yields)
- Preserve consistent $\mathrm{Y_e}$ evolution (no modification of $\nu_\mathrm{e}, \bar{\nu}_\mathrm{e}$ - transport)
- Nuclear EOS and proto-neutron star evolution included

CCSN Modeling in 1D: PUSH

Basic idea: Mimic in 1D simulations the increased heating efficiency of ν_e , $\bar{\nu}_e$ (due to convection and accretion) present in multi-D simulations by parametrizing the heating of $\nu_{\mu,\tau}$, $\bar{\nu}_{\mu,\tau}$

- General relativistic hydrodynamics (AGILE (Liebendörfer+02))
- EOS: nuclear EOS HS(DD2) (Hempel&Schaffner-Bielich+02,Typel+10)
- Neutrino transport: IDSA and advanced spectral leakage (Liebendörfer+09, Perego+16)
- Nucleosynthesis yields (Tracer, nuclear network) (for details see Curtis+19,KE+19)
- Progenitor models: 1D (Woosley+02, Woosley&Heger07)

CCSN Modeling in 1D: PUSH





- Uncertainties introduced by differences in the pre-explosion stellar evolution (e.g. WHW02, WH07)

PhD Ebinger 2017

CCSN Modeling in 1D: PUSH



PhD Ebinger 2017

CCSN Modeling in 1D: PUSH

A crucial property of CCSN progenitors is their **compactness**



- Introduced by O'Connor&Ott11

$$\xi_M \equiv \frac{M/M_\odot}{R(M)/1000\text{km}}$$

- Calibration of PUSH heating with dependence in compactness to fulfill constraints

Calibration of PUSH

- **Reproducing SN 1987A**
- Weaker SNe for lower ZAMS masses
- Possible BH formation

- SN1987A is used as constraint in the investigation of large progenitor samples

Quantity	SN 1987A (observed)	PUSH (s18.8)
$E_{\rm expl}$ (10^{51} erg)	1.1 ± 0.3	1.2
$M_{\rm prog}$ ($M_\odot$)	18-21	18.8
^{56}Ni ($M_\odot$)	(0.071 ± 0.003)	0.069
^{57}Ni ($M_\odot$)	(0.0041 ± 0.0018)	0.0027
^{58}Ni ($M_\odot$)	0.006	0.0066
^{44}Ti ($M_\odot$)	$(1.5 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-4}$	3.05×10^{-5}

Produced well in multi-D modeling of ejected high entropy blobs, e.g. Wongwathanarat+ (2017)

Seitenzahl+ 14, Fransson & Kozma 02, Blinnikov+ 00, Boggs+15, KE+19

Calibration of PUSH

- Reproducing SN 1987A
- **Weaker SNe for lower ZAMS masses**
- **Possible BH formation**

- For higher main-sequence masses:
  branching in Hypernovae and faint SNe
- HNe: very energetic explosions, driven by fast rotation and strong magnetic fields
- **ν-driven SNe** go into **faint branch** around ~25 $\mathrm{M}_\odot$
  → Calibration of PUSH to observational properties of CCSNe for lower mass progenitors and faint branch for higher masses

SN Landscape: Explodability and Properties





- Good agreement with the observational properties

- Compilation of observational data
  mostly based on Nomoto+13, Bruenn+16 and references therein

Ebinger+19

Explodability, Low Metallicity Stars



- Explodability, BH formation (also done for alternative calibration)
- CCSN explosion energies for low metallicity stars (WHW02)
- Lower explosion energies and more BH forming models

Global Properties of CCSN Simulations







- Trends with compactness
- Resulting properties of CCSNe for all progenitors across the ZAMS mass range
- Postprocessing: nucleosynthesis yields can be used for GCE

Ebinger+19

NS and BH Birthmass Distribution

- Predicted NS masses for ZAMS masses of stars
  → Birth mass distribution
- Initial mass function from Salpeter55 (for massive stars heavier than 10 $M_\odot$)





- Progenitor range limit at 10.8/12 solar masses. Lighter models would reduce the lower limit of the predicted NS mass distribution range
- Similar distribution for second calibration

Ebinger+19

NS and BH Birthmass Distribution

- Predicted BH mass distribution (both calibrations)





Broadly consistent with observationally determined BH mass distribution (7.8+-1.2 $M_\odot$, Özel+10), when we assume that the helium core mass sets the BH mass (Kochanek14)

NS and BH Birthmass Distribution

- Predicted BH mass distribution (both calibrations)





Progenitor series	Calibration	Black Hole fraction
WHW02	I	~5%
WHW02	II	~16%
WH07	I	~8%
WH07	II	~21%

Preliminary

Progenitor set	Metallicity	Black Hole fraction
z (WHW02)	$Z = 0$	~ 18 %
u (WHW02)	$Z = Z_\odot \times 10^{-4}$	~ 21 %

Conclusion and Outlook

- Calibration of PUSH: observational constraints (SN1987A)
  $\rightarrow$ Explodability, Supernova landscape, CCSN properties
- Good agreement with observational properties of CCSNe
- Influence of progenitor models
- Compare predicted neutron star and black hole masses to observations
- Explosion/Nucleosynthesis properties can be used in GCE calculations