

Local and Global Radiation Hydrodynamics Simulations of Massive Star Envelopes

Matteo Cantiello (CCA, Flatiron Institute & Princeton University) Collaborators: Yan-Fei Jiang (姜燕飞), Lars Bildsten, Eliot Quataert, Omer Blaes

FLATIRON INSTITUTE Division of Simons Foundation

Exciting times for Stellar Physics

 Transient surveys unraveling unpredicted variety of explosive stellar deaths (e.g. PTF/ZTF, ASAS-SN, Pan-STARRS and soon LSST).
 We do not understand SN progenitors



 We are entering the era of high precision stellar physics (Kepler, BRITE, K2, GAIA, TESS, PLATO). Theory is lagging behind

Dawn of GW-Astronomy

Massive Stars Evolution: The most uncertain physics

Stability and energy transport
Mass loss (See e.g. J. Vink & E. Beasor's Talk)
Rotation
Magnetic Fields

Binarity (Talks from Van Dyk, Hirai, Zapartas, Schneider...)



To Understand CCSNe, GRBs and LIGO GW sources we need to understand the structure, mass loss and binary interactions in massive stars

Stability and energy transport

Q: How is the energy transported in massive stars envelopes? (Impact on radii and stability)



Jiang, MC et al. 2015, 2017

Radii Important to understand SN light curves See e.g. Lars Bildsten's Talk

Massive Star Envelopes

- Massive stars can develop radiation dominated, loosely bound envelopes e.g Joss et al. 1973, Paxton et al. 2013
- In 1D models such envelopes are characterized by:
 - Superadiabatic Convection
 - Density Inversions (e.g. Grafener et al. 2012)
 - Gas Pressure Inversions
 - Envelope Inflation (e.g. Sanyal et al. 2015)
 - What about 3D?

Different regimes in Radiation Dominated Convection



Diff Rad Flux ····· Advection Flux ····· ("convection"...)

 $F_{\rm dif} \sim \frac{a_r T^4 c}{\tau}$ $F_{\rm adv} \sim c_s a_r T^4$

Critical optical depth

 $\tau_c = c/c_s$

Optical depth where radiation diffusion timescale = dynamical timescale

Stability and energy transport

1D Stellar Evolution (MESA) 3D Local Radiation MHD (ATHENA) 3D Global Radiation MHD (ATHENA++)





2.00

0.946

0.447

0.211

0.100



Jiang, MC et al. 2015, 2017

The Opacity: Iron Peak



Paxton, MC et al. 2015 Cantiello et al. 2009 Iglesias & Rogers 1996

Strong Metallicity Dependence

The Opacity: Iron Peak



3D Radiation Hydro Calculations:

Energy Transport & Stability



Initial Conditions Guided from MESA 1D models

Jiang, MC et al. 2015



Initial Conditions Guided from MESA 1D models

Jiang, MC et al. 2015







Variables/Units	StarTop
r_0/r_{\odot}	13.6
T_0/K	$1.57 imes 10^5$
$ ho_0/({ m g~cm^{-3}})$	5.52×10^{-9}
$g/({\rm cm \ s^{-2}})$	$1.17 imes 10^4$
$F_{r,i}/(\text{erg cm}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1})$	$3.06 imes10^{14}$
H_0/cm	$2.37 imes 10^{10}$
t_0/s	1.42×10^3
$ au_c \equiv c/c_{g,0}$	$6.54 imes10^3$
$ au_0$	166.5
$P_{r,0}/P_{0}$	13.22
$L_{x,y}/H_0$	1.17
L_z/H_0	4.60
$N_{x,y}$	128
N_z	512

Jiang, MC et al. 2015





Time=540

STARTOP Jiang, MC et al. 2015 The case with inefficient convection



The Porosity Factor



 $\mathscr{F} \equiv \frac{a_{\mathrm{r}}}{\widetilde{a}_{\mathrm{r}}} \ge 1$

Density weighted radiation acceleration

 $\frac{<\rho\kappa F_{\rm rad}>}{c<\rho>}$ $\widetilde{a}_{\mathrm{r}}$

See e.g. Owocki et al. 2004

STARTOP The case with inefficient convection



3D -> 1D

The Porosity Factor: Preliminary 1D implementation

- Use calibrated alpha MLT (using the advection flux calculated in ATHENA)
- Include Porosity Factor (Calibrated from ATHENA calculations)

Cantiello, Jiang et al. (in Prep)

$$\alpha_{\rm MLT} = 0.4 - 0.5$$

Larger in the presence of B-fields (0.6-1.0) Jiang, MC et al. 2017

$$\frac{dP_{\rm rad}}{dm} = -\frac{\kappa L}{c4\pi r^2} \frac{1}{\mathscr{F}}$$
$$< \kappa >_{\rm MLT} = \frac{\kappa}{\mathscr{F}}$$



3D Radiation Hydro Calculations:

Global Calculations and Mass Loss











${\bf StarMid4c}$



At lower temperatures / later evolutionary phases, things might get even more wild!







Jiang, MC et al. In Prep

Preliminary Results!

StarMid3



Summary

- 1. Density inversions observed in 1D codes unstable in 3D
- 2. Porosity of density fluctuations reduce the effective radiation acceleration, but density inversions can persist in a time-averaged sense
- 3. Realistic stellar structures require implementing the porosity factor and calibrating MLT to the values observed in the 3D calculations
- First 3D global radiation hydro calculations used to study the stability and mass loss of very luminous stars

What's Next?

- 1. Effects of magnetic fields (Jiang et al. 2017)
- 2. 3D->1D To improve predictions of massive star evolution
- 3. Continuum driven winds / Eruptions ?
- 4. Effects on line-driven winds (e.g. clumping)

