Massive stars from various simulations: different, but why?

Dorottya Szécsi
Assistant professor at the Nicolaus Copernicus University, Toruń

Seminar at the ESO-Chile
11 August 2022

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that

many people use stellar evolutionary models in their research.

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that

many people use stellar evolutionary models in their research.

- …maybe even you?

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that

many people use stellar evolutionary models in their research.

- …maybe even you?
- *Massive* star models ("~~tracks~~"):
  - libraries / grids, e.g. Geneva models, Bonn models…

massive: > 8 $M_\odot$

It is a truth universally acknowledged, that

many people use stellar evolutionary models in their research.

- ...maybe even you?
- *Massive* star models ("~~tracks~~"):
  - libraries / grids, e.g. Geneva models, Bonn models...
- Really wide range of usage:
  - obstaining mass & age of observed stars
  - star-formation simulations, starcluster formation studies
  - chemical evolution of the Universe
  - binary population synthesis → gravitational-wave event rates

massive: > 8 $M_\odot$

What do *you* do?

just examples, there are more

Necessarily, the models are – most of the time – used as a black box.



Necessarily, the models are – most of the time – used as a black box.

Which is <u>fine</u>.



Necessarily, the models are – most of the time – used as a black box.

Which is fine.



However...

Let’s peek into to box!

Let’s peek into to box!

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)



Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS):

We compare 5 sets of stellar evolutionary models from 5 independent projects

– so that you don't have to ;)

<ins>*Also check out:*</ins> P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS):

We compare 5 sets of stellar evolutionary models from 5 independent projects

– so that you don’t have to ;)

- PARSEC (Padova code)
- MIST (MESA code)
- Geneva code
- BPASS
- BoOST project (Bonn code)

Also check out: P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS):

We compare 5 sets of stellar evolutionary models from 5 independent projects

– so that you don't have to ;)

- PARSEC (Padova code)
- MIST (MESA code)
- Geneva code
- BPASS
- BoOST project (Bonn code)

Only comparing:

models with the same mass and composition*
(single stars with no or slow rotational rate)

*namely, Solar

Also check out: P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)


P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)
Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)



P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)



P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

What about other predictions?

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

What about other predictions?





P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

O-okay, but… why??

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

Quick and dirty answer:

we don’t really understand massive star physics that well. (Yet.)

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

30 Doradus star-cluster in the Large Magellanic Cloud galaxy (VFTS survey, 2018)



30 Doradus star-cluster in the Large Magellanic Cloud galaxy (VFTS survey, 2018)



30 Doradus star-cluster in the Large Magellanic Cloud galaxy (VFTS survey, 2018)



They matter!

– ejecting matter in their extremely strong stellar winds & SN explosions
→ ***chem.evolution of the Universe…***

– forming BHs with ~40-100 M⊙
→ ***GW-emitting mergers…***

Again…
different, but why??

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

Again…
different, but why??

Long answer…

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

When the equilibrium* is compromized:

the Eddington limit

** between*
gravity & radiation pressure

Eddington limit

Radiative Force

$$g_{rad} = \int_0^\infty d\nu \frac{\kappa_\nu F_\nu}{c}$$



Gravitational Force

$$\frac{GM}{r^2}$$

$$\Gamma_e \equiv \frac{g_e}{g} = \frac{\kappa_e L / 4\pi r^2 c}{GM / r^2} = \frac{\kappa_e L}{4\pi GMc}$$

Credit: Stan Owocki

Other reasons for falling out of equilibrium:

- iron core

  → gravitational collapse & SN (due to bounce-back)
- pair-instability

  → grav. collapse & subsequent thermonuclear explosion (PISN) or pulsations (puls-PISN)
- end of a burning phase

  → restructuring, crossing the Herzsprung-gap...
- ...

of approaching the Eddington-limit

Consequences for the stellar interior

- density (and pressure) inversion *in the envelope*
- no efficient energy transport mechanism here (weak convection)
- → envelope "inflation"
- numerical difficulties...

density inversion:



CORE **ENVELOPE**

credit: Götz Gräfener

How do the codes deal with that?

- several “tricks” in the literature
  - various codes use various tricks & methods
  - *cf.* Agrawal (*PhD Thesis*), Agrawal & Szécsi+22 (MNRAS)
- PARSEC (‘Padova’) **artificially limiting the temp. gradient**
- MIST (MESA) **MLT++ formalism *(limiting the superadiabacity*)***
  =changing how convection is treated**
  **difference between the isothermal and adiabatic temperature gradient*
  ***a type of internal mixing*
- ‘Geneva’
- BPASS

  } **artificially enhanced mass loss at the right moment**
- BoOST (‘Bonn’) **inflated envelope & post-processing with ‘normal’ mass loss**



P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

Ionizing flux...

Table 2. Time averaged ionizing photon number flux [s^{-1}] in the Lyman continuum emitted by the stellar models during their lives *on average*, cf. Section 4.2. The last column provides the amount of Lyman radiation (number of photons [s^{-1}]) that a 10^7 $M_\odot$ population (e.g. a starburst galaxy or a young massive cluster in the Milky Way) containing these massive stars would emit.

M_{ini} [$M_\odot$]	24/25	40	80/85	120/125	pop.
PARSEC	3.7×10^{48}	1.3×10^{49}	5.5×10^{49}	1.0×10^{50}	1.08×10^{54}
MIST	3.3×10^{48}	1.5×10^{49}	5.1×10^{49}	1.1×10^{50}	1.06×10^{54}
Geneva	3.5×10^{48}	1.2×10^{49}	5.1×10^{49}	8.5×10^{49}	9.90×10^{53}
BPASS	3.6×10^{48}	1.3×10^{49}	4.5×10^{49}	7.7×10^{49}	9.34×10^{53}
BoOST	3.7×10^{48}	1.2×10^{49}	4.2×10^{49}	6.9×10^{49}	8.89×10^{53}

up to 18% difference!

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

Remnant mass...



Figure 2. Mass of stellar remnant as a function of the initial mass of the star (near-solar composition). Differences in the assumptions in massive star modelling can cause a variation of up to 20 $M_\odot$ in the remnant masses between simulations. Choosing to apply one of these simulations over the others in e.g. gravitational-wave event rate predictions can lead to strikingly different results.

Gravitational waves:
compact object mergers (e.g. black holes)



up to 20 $M_\odot$ difference!

P. Agrawal (2021, *PhD thesis*)

Agrawal & Szécsi et al. (2022, MNRAS)

What we learned today by peeking into the black box:





What we learned today by peeking into the black box:



- Eddington limit is a thing :)



What we learned today by peeking into the black box:



- Eddington limit is a thing :)
- stellar evolution above 40 $M_\odot$ has

not reached consensus



What we learned today by peeking into the black box:



- Eddington limit is a thing :)
- stellar evolution above 40 $M_\odot$ has

not reached consensus

not even at Solar composition!

we didn't even touch low-metallicities...



What we learned today by peeking into the black box:



- Eddington limit is a thing :)
- stellar evolution above 40 $M_\odot$ has

not reached consensus

- use stellar models with extra caution, & be flexible for updates



What we learned today by peeking into the black box:



- Eddington limit is a thing :)
- stellar evolution above $40\ M_\odot$ has

not reached consensus

- use stellar models with extra caution, & be flexible for updates

Thanks!