

ALL KNOWN TYPE IA SUPERNOVAE MODELS FAIL TO REPRODUCE THE OBSERVED $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ CORRELATION

Amir Sharon¹ and Doron Kushnir¹

¹*Dept. of Particle Phys. & Astrophys., Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot 76100, Israel*

ABSTRACT

Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) are likely the thermonuclear explosions of carbon-oxygen white-dwarf stars, but their progenitor systems remain elusive. A few theoretical scenarios for the progenitor systems have been suggested, which have been shown to agree with some observational properties of SNe Ia. However, several computational challenges prohibit a robust comparison to the observations. We focus on the observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation, where t_0 (the γ -rays' escape time from the ejecta) is positively correlated with $M_{\text{Ni}56}$ (the synthesized ^{56}Ni mass). Comparing to the $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation bypasses the need for radiation transfer calculations, as the value of t_0 can be directly inferred from the ejecta. We show that all known SNe Ia models fail to reproduce the observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ correlation.

Keywords: Type Ia supernova

Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) are likely the thermonuclear explosions of carbon-oxygen (CO) white-dwarf (WD) stars, but their progenitor systems remain elusive (see Maoz, Mannucci & Nelemans 2014, for a review). A few theoretical scenarios for the progenitor systems have been suggested, including a Chandrasekhar-mass (Ch) or sub-Chandrasekhar-mass (sCh) WD that ignites due to some external interaction, and direct collision of WDs. Although these models have been shown to agree with some observational properties of SNe Ia, a few computational challenges prohibit a robust comparison to observations, such as the calculation of the propagating burning wave (see, e.g., Röpke 2017; Kushnir & Katz 2020) and accurate radiation transfer calculations (see reviews, e.g. Hillebrandt & Niemeyer 2000; Noebauer & Sim 2019).

An observational property that can be calculated more robustly is the γ -ray escape time, t_0 (Stritzinger, et al. 2006; Scalzo, et al. 2014; Wygoda et al. 2019a), defined by (Jeffery 1999)

$$f_{\text{dep}}(t) = \frac{t_0^2}{t^2}, \quad f_{\text{dep}} \ll 1, \quad (1)$$

where t is the time since explosion and $f_{\text{dep}}(t)$ is the γ -ray deposition function, which describes the fraction of the generated γ -ray energy that is deposited in the ejecta. For a small enough γ -ray optical depth, each γ -ray photon has a small chance of colliding with matter, such that the deposition function is proportional to the column density, which scales as t^{-2} . The value of t_0 can be measured from a bolometric light curve to a few percent accuracy (Wygoda et al. 2019a; Sharon & Kushnir 2020) due to an integral relation derived by Katz, Kushnir & Dong (2013), independent of the supernova distance. Together with $M_{\text{Ni}56}$, the ^{56}Ni mass synthesized in the explosion, an observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation can be constructed (Wygoda et al. 2019a), see Figure 1. The accurate determination of t_0 by Sharon & Kushnir (2020) reveals a positive correlation between t_0 and $M_{\text{Ni}56}$. The methods used in previous works did not allow a robust determination of such a correlation, although there were some hints for its existence (Stritzinger, et al. 2006; Scalzo, et al. 2014; Wygoda et al. 2019a). The observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ correlation is similar to the Phillips relation (Phillips 1993), which relates the maximum flux to the width of the light curve in some band. However, unlike the Phillips relation, comparing to the $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation bypasses the need for radiation transfer calculations, as the value of t_0 can be directly inferred from the ejecta.




Figure 1. The $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation. Black-filled circles: the observed SNe Ia sample of Sharon & Kushnir (2020). Plotted are the median of the posterior distribution, together with the 68% confidence levels. Red line: sCh results of Kushnir, Wygoda, & Sharon (2020). Grey lines: sCh results of previous studies (Sim, et al. 2010; Moll, et al. 2014; Blondin, et al. 2017; Shen, et al. 2018; Bravo et al. 2019) are marked with circles, upward-pointing triangles, squares, filled circles and downward-pointing triangles, respectively. Green line: Ch results of Dessart, et al. (2014). Brown line: Ch results of Hoefflich, et al. (2017). Orange circles: The direct-collisions results of Kushnir et al. (2013).

Wygoda et al. (2019a) showed that Ch models predict an anti-correlation between t_0 and $M_{\text{Ni}56}$ and that they deviate by almost a factor of two from the $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation for low-luminosity SNe Ia (see Figure 1). The Ch models cannot be saved for the low-luminosity events, unless the ^{56}Ni is concentrated at very high velocities, which would be in direct conflict with the nebular spectra observations (Kushnir et al. 2013; Wygoda et al. 2019a). Kushnir, Wygoda, & Sharon (2020) used a new burning scheme (Kushnir & Katz 2020), which consistently resolves the propagating burning wave, to calculate $M_{\text{Ni}56}$ and t_0 of one-dimensional sCh models with an accuracy of a few percent (see Figure 1). As can be seen in the figure, the sCh model predicts an anti-correlation between t_0 and $M_{\text{Ni}56}$, with $t_0 \approx 30$ day for luminous ($M_{\text{Ni}56} \gtrsim 0.5 M_{\odot}$) SNe Ia, while the observed t_0 is in the range of 35 – 45 day. Various physical and numerical uncertainties are unlikely to resolve the tension with observations, but they can deteriorate the agreement with observations for low-luminosity SNe Ia. The tension with the observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation exists in all previous studies of the sCh model (see Figure 1). Kushnir, Wygoda, & Sharon (2020) argued that multi-dimensional modifications of the sCh model are unlikely to resolve the tension with observations. Also, the direct-collisions results of Kushnir et al. (2013) do not reproduce the observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ correlation, as they predict $t_0 \approx 40$ day for the entire $M_{\text{Ni}56}$ range (see Figure 1).

While all known models fail to reproduce the observed positive $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ correlation, there exists the possibility that two or more different progenitor scenarios conspire to produce a positive $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ correlation. For example, could it be that high-luminosity SNe are the result of Ch explosions while low-luminosity SNe are the result of sCh explosions? It is unlikely that the answer is positive. First, none of the models actually explains the region of $M_{\text{Ni}56} \approx 0.5 M_{\odot}$, where both should merge. Additionally, there is no apparent feature in any SNe Ia observation that hints at a change

of progenitor around $M_{\text{Ni}56} \approx 0.5 M_{\odot}$, and if anything, the scatter around the Phillips relation in that region is so small (Burns, et al. 2018) that an extreme fine-tuning between the two models would be required for such a scenario to occur. Moreover, even for the range of luminosities where the models seem to explain the $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation, the models fail to explain some other robust observations. sCh models seem to be in conflict with the double-peaked or highly shifted ^{56}Ni mass-weighted line-of-sight velocity distribution for a large fraction of low-luminosity events, as measured from nebular spectra observations (Dong et al. 2015, 2018; Vallely, et al. 2020). Ch models predict a large mass ratio of Ni/Fe, which seems to be in conflict with nebular spectra observations of luminous SNe Ia (Flörs, et al. 2020), where the derived ratio is consistent with the lower predictions of sCh.

While sCH calculations with the initial compositions suggested by evolutionary models of WDs are unable to explain the observed $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation, perhaps a different (heavier atoms) initial composition for high mass WDs would bring the predictions into better agreement with the observations (since the value of t_0 would increase with less available thermonuclear energy). Such a heavier initial composition is indeed expected for very massive, $M_{\text{WD}} \gtrsim 1.1 M_{\odot}$, WDs (see, e.g., Lauffer, Romero & Kepler 2018), however, the exact M_{WD} for the transition as well as the exact initial composition (for all WD masses) are quite uncertain. We intend to study in a subsequent work whether there are initial compositions that can reproduce the $t_0 - M_{\text{Ni}56}$ relation. Another possibility is that more accurate calculations of the direct-collision model would bring the predictions into better agreement with the observations, since the calculations of Kushnir et al. (2013) were with a resolution of few \times km and with a simplified 13-isotope reaction network, which are known to provide inaccurate results for low $M_{\text{Ni}56}$ values (Moll, et al. 2014; Kushnir, Wygoda, & Sharon 2020). We will report the results of more accurate calculations in a subsequent work.

REFERENCES

- Blondin S., Dessart L., Hillier D. J., Khokhlov A. M., 2017, MNRAS, 470, 157
- Bravo, E., Badenes, C., & Martínez-Rodríguez, H. 2019, MNRAS, 482, 4346
- Burns C. R., et al., 2018, ApJ, 869, 56
- Dessart L., Blondin S., Hillier D. J., Khokhlov A., 2014, MNRAS, 441, 532
- Dong, S., Katz, B., Kushnir, D., & Prieto, J. L. 2015, MNRAS, 454, L61
- Dong, S., Katz, B., Kollmeier, J. A., et al. 2018, MNRAS, 479, L70
- Flörs A., et al., 2020, MNRAS, 491, 2902
- Hillebrandt W., Niemeyer J. C., 2000, Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys., 38, 191
- Hoeflich P., et al., 2017, ApJ, 846, 58
- Jeffery D. J., 1999, arXiv, astro-ph/9907015
- Katz B., Kushnir D., Dong S., 2013, arXiv, arXiv:1301.6766
- Kushnir, D., Katz, B., Dong, S., Livne, E., & Fernández, R. 2013, ApJL, 778, L37
- Kushnir D., Katz B., 2020, MNRAS, 493, 5413
- Kushnir D., Wygoda N., Sharon A., 2020, arXiv, arXiv:2008.08592
- Lauffer G. R., Romero A. D., Kepler S. O., 2018, MNRAS, 480, 1547
- Maoz D., Mannucci F., Nelemans G., 2014, ARA&A, 52, 107
- Moll R., Raskin C., Kasen D., Woosley S. E., 2014, ApJ, 785, 105
- Noebauer, U. M., Sim, S. A., 2019, Living Rev. Comput. Astrophys., 5, 1
- Phillips M. M., 1993, ApJL, 413, L105
- Röpke F. K., 2017, hsn..book, 1185, hsn..book
- Scalzo R., et al., 2014, MNRAS, 440, 1498
- Sharon A., Kushnir D., 2020, MNRAS, 496, 4517
- Shen K. J., Kasen D., Miles B. J., Townsley D. M., 2018, ApJ, 854, 52
- Sim S. A., et al., 2010, ApJL, 714, L52
- Stritzinger M., Leibundgut B., Walch S., Contardo G., 2006, A&A, 450, 241
- Tanaka M. & Hotokezaka K., 2013, ApJ, 775, 113
- Vallely P. J., Tucker M. A., Shappee B. J., Brown J. S., Stanek K. Z., Kochanek C. S., 2020, MNRAS, 492, 3553
- Wygoda, N., Elbaz, Y., & Katz, B. 2019a, MNRAS, 484, 3941