Modelling thermonuclear supernovae

Stuart Sim



Queen's University Belfast

Mattia Bulla, Mark Magee, Markus Kromer, Fritz Röpke, Ashley Ruiter, Ivo Seitenzahl, Wolfgang Hillebrandt

> Heidelberger Institut für Theoretische Studien





Stockholm University

> Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics





THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY

Supernovae in astrophysics

- Explosive death of star dramatic end point of stellar evolution
- Nuclear burning in SNe makes the heavy elements
- Inject energy, momentum and metals; can affect galaxy evolution
- Type Ia "Standardizable candles", probes of expansion history of the Universe
- Challenge our understanding of **physics**
 - Turbulence and hydrodynamics
 - Combustion and flame physics
 - Nuclear physics
 - Radiative transfer

SN1994D in NGC 4526 NASA/HST





- Thermonuclear supernovae
 - Reminder of basic picture for Type Ia supernovae

- Explosion models
 - Chandrasekhar mass explosions
 - Pure deflagrations and SNe lax (Magee)
 - Sub-Chandrasekhar mass models



Established picture for a thermonuclear supernova explosion



Supernovae la



Supernovae la





H and He not detected



Velocities measured from lines

$$v \sim 15,000 \, \text{km/s}$$

Supernovae la: diversity



Supernovae la



Thermonuclear Supernovae

Many unanswered questions remain:

- How did the system evolve to ignition?
 - Progenitor channel debate ("single vs double degenerate")
- What are the properties of the exploding star and how do these affect what we see?
 - Mass of WD, composition, immediate environment?
- Where does the flame ignite and how does it propagate (deflagration, detonation)?





SN Ia Flame Basics

- Instantaneously narrow region in which nuclear reactions are taking place
- Thermonuclear flame propagation modes
 - Deflagration (sub-sonic)
 - Detonation (supersonic)
- Flame generates energy (nuclear burning)
 - Eventually unbinds star





Synthetic explosions: testing models by comparing to data



Testing explosion scenarios

Explosion scenarios

Best known paradigm:

(Near-)Chandrasekhar-mass single-degenerate scenario

- WD in binary with H-rich star (main-sequence or giant)
- Mass-transfer
- Mass is retained (avoid net massloss in nova explosions)
- H burned to He then C/O
- WD grows in mass: central density and temperature rise



Explosion scenarios

Best known paradigm:

(Near-)Chandrasekhar-mass single-degenerate scenario

Explosion mechanism:

- WD heated by C burning during ~1000 yr
 "simmering" phase (Kuhlen et al. 06, Zingale et al. 06, 11)
- Thermonuclear runaway occurs
- Deflagration born (prompt detonation is no good for Ch mass)
- Proceeds as pure deflagration?





3D simulation: Kromer+ 13



Sequence of models: Fink+14. – roughly 1 order of magnitude in 56Ni mass. Bound remnant found in some cases, in agreement with Jordan+12.

Supernovae la: diversity

Multiple sub-classes of SNe Ia / related transients (figure from Taubenberger 2017)



Supernovae la: diversity



Pure deflagration: o2cx-like SNe?



Pure deflagration models:

Suggested connection to peculiar (faint) Ia's: Branch+04, Jha+06, Phillips+07

Now evidence that o2cx-like class ("SNe Iax"; Foley+09,13)

- is large and diverse
- range of ejecta mass ("failed" deflagrations)

Supernovae la: a progenitor?



First plausible detection of a la progenitor: (from McCully et al. 2014)



Spectra of 05hk from Phillips+07



Spectra of 05hk from Phillips+07 - pretty good match to model (Kromer+ 13)





Comparison extended to fainter example:

SN2015H Magee+2016





SN2015H Magee+2016



Deflagration models: summary

Strengths:

- Full star, multi-D deflagration simulations explosions occur
- Star not (always) full disrupted
- Synthetic spectra are fair matches to observed SN lax class
- Peak luminosities (and colours) match fairly well

Deflagration models: summary

Strengths:

- Full star, multi-D deflagration simulations explosions occur
- Star not (always) full disrupted
- Synthetic spectra are fair matches to observed SN lax class
- Peak luminosities (and colours) match fairly well

Open issues:

- Light curve timescales too fast in models: need more ejecta mass?
- Support for alternative models (e.g. PDD models; Stritzinger et al. 2015)
- Major challenge: late times
- Major challenge: very faint objects (08ha needs only ~3x10⁻³ M_{sun} of ⁵⁶Ni)

Deflagration model: late evolution





Comparison extended to fainter example:

Conclusion:

(Jordan et al. 2012; Kromer et al. 2013, Fink et al. 2014, Kromer et al. 2015, Magee et al. 2016)

Near-Chandrasekhar mass WD deflagrations may work well for the 2002cx-like SNe Ia

... still multiple loose ends ... what are the "normal" ones?!