

MODE-SNR-PWN 2016

Relativistic Star Models with Hot Matter

Miguel Marques Micaela Oertel Jerome Novak

LUTh, Observatoire de Paris, France

How do Massive Stars Die?

• The final fate of star evolution



How do Massive Stars Die?

• Which supernovae?



Core-Collapse

• The gravitational collapse of the iron core



Core-Collapse

• The consequences of the core-collapse



Core Collapse

• The neutrino driven mechanism

Explosion mechanisms

- The neutrino heating
- Hydrodynamical instabilities (Sasi, convection)
- Magnetorotational instabilities



Neutron star mergers



Finite Temperature in Compact Stars Astrophysics

- Core-Collapse Supernovae
 - T ~ 50 100 MeV
- Neutron Star Mergers
 - T ~ 80 MeV
- Proto-Neutron Stars

- T ~ 50 MeV

10 MeV \approx 1.16 x 10¹¹ K



60

40

T [MeV]

20

Finite Temperature in Compact Stars Astrophysics

Core-Collapse Supernovae

- Temperature effects included since many years in dynamical simulations

• Neutron Star Mergers

- Kaplan et al (2014), Bauswein et al (2012), Abdikamalov et al (2013), Sekiguchi et al (2011) ...

• Proto-Neutron Stars

- Martinon et al (2014), Villain et al (2004), Pons et al (1999), Goussard et al (1998, 1997) ...

Finite Temperature in Compact Stars

• Finding a general solution for the equilibrium equations of stationary axisymetric spacetimes with finite temperature is difficult. Typical strategies are:

- Effective barotropic EoS Goussard et al (97,98), ...
 - $p = p(n_b, T(n_b), Y_e(n_b, T(n_b)))$
- Using perturbative approximation methods for the metric

Martinon et al (2014), ...

Our model for hot stars

• General relativistic, stationary axisymmetric solutions of rotating stars

• Perfect fluid

Energy-momentum tensor – $T^{\mu\nu}=(p+\varepsilon)u^{\mu}u^{\nu}+p\,g^{\mu\nu}$

• Temperature (or entropy) dependent EoS

 $p := p(n_b, s_b)$ $\varepsilon := \varepsilon(n_b, s_b)$

Spacetime Solution

Stationary axisymmetric spacetimes

Two killing vector fields: $\partial_t, \ \partial_\phi$

• Dirac Gauge

We use a conformal metric, defined as:

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{ij} := \Psi^{-4} \gamma_{ij}$$

Bonazzola et al, (2004) Lin and Novak, (2006)

$$\mathcal{D}_j h^{ij} = 0, \qquad \qquad h^{ij} := \tilde{\gamma}^{ij} - f^{ij}$$

• Maximal slicing condition K = 0

Spacetime Solution

• Metric calculations in Dirac gauge

Bonazzola et al, (2004) Lin and Novak, (2006)

 $\Delta_1 N = \sigma 1$ $\Delta_2 \beta_i = \sigma 2$ $\Delta_3 \Psi = \sigma 3$ $\Delta_4 h_{ij} = \sigma 4$

• Equilibrium equations

$$(\delta^{\mu}_{\nu} + u^{\mu}u_{\nu})\nabla_{\mu}T^{\mu\nu} = 0$$

Defining the pseudo-log enthalpy field as

$$H = \ln\left(\frac{\varepsilon + p}{m_b n_b}\right),\,$$

With the help of the $1^{\mbox{\scriptsize st}}$ law of thermodynamics, the equilibrium equations can be written as

$$\partial_i (H + \nu - \ln \Gamma) = T e^{-H} \partial_i s_b - F \partial_i \Omega, \quad i = r, \theta$$

• Equilibrium equations (for rigid rotation)

$$\partial_i (H + \nu - \ln \Gamma) = T e^{-H} \partial_i s_b, \qquad i = r, \theta$$

No first integral in general! First integral for the barotropic EoS $H(n_b)$.

• Equilibrium equations (for rigid rotation)

$$\partial_i (H + \nu - \ln \Gamma) = T e^{-H} \partial_i s_b, \qquad i = r, \theta$$

Instead of solving an analytical first integral, we propose the following scheme

$$H = -\nu + \ln \Gamma + \int_0^{r_s} T e^{-H} \partial_r s_b \, dr' \bullet$$
$$\Delta_{\theta\phi} s_b = \left(\partial^{\theta} + \frac{1}{\tan \theta}\right) \left[\frac{\partial_{\theta}(T e^{-H})}{\partial_r (T e^{-H})} \partial_r s_b\right]$$

Where the monopolar part of the s_b has to be specified, whereas the higher multipoles are determined by the equilibrium solver

• Equilibrium equations

$$\partial_i (H + \nu - \ln \Gamma) = T e^{-H} \partial_i s_b - F \partial_i \Omega, \quad i = r, \theta$$

Assuming that we have a rotation law such that $F := F(\Omega)$

$$H = -\nu + \ln \Gamma + \int_0^{r_s} \left(Te^{-H} \partial_r s_b - F(\Omega) \partial_r \Omega \right) dr' \cdot$$
$$\Delta_{\theta \phi} s_b = \left(\partial^{\theta} + \frac{1}{\tan \theta} \right) \left[\frac{\partial_{\theta} (Te^{-H})}{\partial_r (Te^{-H})} \partial_r s_b \right]$$

Results

To test the code, we use the relativistic ideal gas EoS:

$$\begin{aligned} p(H,s_b) &= k \, n_b(H,s_b)^{\gamma} e^{(\gamma-1)s_b} \\ \varepsilon(H,s_b) &= \frac{k}{\gamma-1} n_b(H,s_b)^{\gamma} e^{(\gamma-1)s_b} + m_b n_b(H,s_b) \end{aligned}$$

$$T(H) = m_b \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma k_b} \left(e^H - 1 \right)$$

$$n_b(H, s_b) = \left(m_b \frac{\gamma - 1}{\gamma k} \left(e^H - 1\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma - 1}} e^{-s_b}$$

with $\gamma = 2$ and $k = 0.025 \rho_{nuc} c^2 / n_{nuc}$

Results

• We will consider two (ad hoc) non-constant entropy per baryon radial profiles

non cte 1 →
$$s_b = 0.5 + \frac{r^2}{5}$$

non cte 2 → $s_b = 2 \times e^{-\frac{r^2}{2^3}}$



Results (rigid rotation)

Enthalpy

cte sb profile

 $M_g = 4.73 \, M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 47.37 \, Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.58$ $f_{rot} = 382.84 \, Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 162.89 \, MeV$

GRV2 = -7.43 e - 7GRV3 = 1.32 e - 6



non-cte sb profile 1

 $M_g = 2.26 M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 22.65 Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.64$ $f_{rot} = 721.85 Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 162.89 MeV$

Enthalpy



Results

(rigid rotation) GRV2 = -9.45 e - 4GRV3 = 9.35 e - 4





non-cte sb profile 1

 $M_g = 2.18 M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 20.26 Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.75$ $f_{rot} = 650 Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 162.89 MeV$ Results

(rigid rotation) GRV2 = -3.34 e - 6 GRV3 = 2.38 e - 5

Enthalpy







non-cte sb profile 2

 $M_g = 4.40 \, M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 37.65 \, Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.57$ $f_{rot} = 490 \, Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 162.89 \, MeV$

Enthalpy











non-cte sb profile 2 $M_g = 3.79 M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 28.72 Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.76$ $f_{rot} = 395 Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 162.89 MeV$



(rigid rotation) GRV2 = 2.35 e - 5 GRV3 = -4.69 e - 5











Results (differential rotation)

• We will consider a simple linear rotation law, of the form

Baumgarte et al (2000)

$$F(\Omega) = \left(\frac{R_{eq}}{a}\right)^2 \left(\Omega_c - \Omega\right)$$

Results (differential rotation)

Enthalpy

cte sb profile $M_g = 7.18 \, M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 47.50 \, Km$ $R_p / R_{eq} = 0.35$ $f_c = 1000 \, Hz$ a = 0.75 $H_{c} = 0.3$ $T_c = 162.89 \, MeV$ GRV2 = -1.67 e - 5

GRV3 = 2.14 e - 5



non-cte sb profile 1 $M_g = 2.31 M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 20.23 Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.69$ $f_{rot} = 1000 Hz$ a = 0.60

 $H_c=0.3$

Enthalpy



Results

(differential rotation)

$$GRV2 = -5.23 e - 06$$

 $GRV3 = 4.14 e - 06$





non-cte sb profile 2 $M_g = 4.43 M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 32 Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.76$ $f_c = 1000 Hz$ a = 1 $H_c = 0.3$

Enthalpy



Results

(differential rotation)

GRV2 = 2.04 e - 3GRV3 = 1.15 e - 3





Results

• A more realistic EoS:

Banik et al, (2014)

- density dependent relativistic mean field model (parameter set DD2 – Typel et al, (2013))
- Λ hyperons and its interactions via Φ mesons included
- β -equilibrium

Results (rigid rotation)

Enthalpy

cte sb profile

 $M_g = 2.11 \, M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 20.30 \, Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.58$ $f_{rot} = 913.63 \, Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 47.35 \, MeV$

GRV2 = 2.31 e - 4GRV3 = -1.96 e - 4





Results (rigid rotation) GRV2 = GRV3 =

GRV2 = 1.36 e - 3GRV3 = -7.99 e - 4







non-cte sb profile 2 $M_g = 1.91 M_{\odot}$ $R_{eq} = 15.71 Km$ $R_p/R_{eq} = 0.85$ $f_{rot} = 650 Hz$ $H_c = 0.3$ $T_c = 47.27 MeV$

Enthalpy



Results (rigid rotation)

GRV2 = -7.18 e - 5GRV3 = 2.01 e - 4





Results



Conclusions and future perspectives

- We propose a numerical scheme to consistently make use of not necessarily barotropic EoS capable of modeling appropriately the finite temperature effects on a stationary axisymmetric star, using general entropy profiles
- Having in mind the use of realistic EoS's out of β-equilibrium, we intend to extend the code for EoS's with electron fraction as a third parameter
- We plan to use this for developing quasistationary models of proto-neutron stars

Thank You!