Supernova Remnants: An odyssey in space after stellar death Chania, Crete, Greece 2016-06-09

3D simulations of young supernova remnants with efficient particle acceleration: thermo-nuclear vs. core-collapse

> **Gilles Ferrand**, Samar Safi-Harb University of Manitoba gferrand@physics.umanitoba.ca



model

^{1.1} Diffusive shock acceleration: the coupled system



Numerical simulations: hydro + kinetic

slice of log(density)

From cosmology to supernova remnants (in both cases: comoving grid to factor out expansion)

1.2



Thermal + non-thermal emission



Two historical remnants

age: ~440 yr distance: 1.7-5 kpc size: 8' ~5-12 pc **Tycho's SNR** SN 1572 thermonuclear **Cas A SNR** (missed SN) core-collapse

age: ~330 yr distance: 3.3-3.7 kpc size: 5' ~5-7 pc



multi-wavelength composite: X-rays (Chandra 1-2 keV and 4-6 keV) optical (Calar Alto) infrared (Spitzer) multi-wavelength composite: X-rays (Chandra 0.5-2.5 keV and 4-6 keV) near IR (Hubble) infrared (Spitzer)

1.4

1.5 The two types of supernovae and their remnants

explosion	thermonuclear	core-collapse
SN type	Ia	II, Ib/c
energy	$10^{51} \text{ erg} = 10^{44} \text{ J}$	$10^{51} \text{ erg} = 10^{44} \text{ J}$
ejected mass	1.4 solar masses	a few solar masses
ejecta profile	steep power-law $\sim r^{-7}$	steeper power-law $_{\sim}r^{-9}$
ambient density profile	uniform ISM $\sim r^{0}$	stellar wind $_{\sim}r^{-2}$
3D morphology	usually simple	often complex
ambient magnetic field	uniform \approx few uG	(uncertain)
q = density, velocity, pressure	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 0.1 \\ 0.1 \\ 0.8 \\ r/r_{\rm FS} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ 0.1 \\ 0.01 \\ 0.8 \\ 0.9 \\ 1 \\ 1.1 \\ r/r_{\rm FS} \end{array}$

Wind properties: density profile

star type	mass loss rate \dot{M}_w	speed u_w
Sun	10 ^{−14} M☉/yr	300 km/s
Red Supergiant (RSG)	10^{−5} – 10 ^{−4} M⊙/yr	10 – 100 km/s
Wolf-Rayet (WR)	10 ⁻⁵ − 10 ⁻⁴ M⊙/yr	1000 – 3000 km/s

radial density profile (conservation of mass):

$$\rho(r) = \frac{\dot{M}_w}{4\pi r^2 v_w} \simeq 3 \, m_p \, \text{cm}^{-3} \, \left(\frac{\dot{M}_w}{10^{-5} \, \text{M}_\odot \, \text{yr}^{-1}}\right) \left(\frac{v_w}{10 \, \text{km.s}^{-1}}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{r}{1 \, \text{pc}}\right)^{-2}$$

position of the termination shock:

$$r_{\rm term}(t) \simeq 2 {\rm pc} \left(\frac{\dot{M}_{\rm w}}{10^{-5} \,{\rm M}_{\odot} \,{\rm yr}^{-1}} \right)^{\frac{3}{10}} \left(\frac{{\rm v}_{\rm w}}{10 \,{\rm km.s}^{-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{10}} \left(\frac{{\rm n}_{\rm ext}}{1 \,{\rm cm}^{-3}} \right)^{-\frac{3}{10}} \left(\frac{{\rm t}}{10^5 \,{\rm yr}} \right)^{\frac{2}{5}}$$

We consider here a single wind phase, and a SNR young enough that it's propagating inside the un-shocked stellar wind within the bubble

The structure of an expanding bubble

A supernova remnant

A wind-blown bubble





How does the SNR evolve inside a wind? (Dwarkadas 2005, 2007) hydro/thermo-dynamics & thermal emission

Results: density



thermo-nuclear supernova

type Ia in a uniform ISM n=7, s=0 (t = 500 yr)

core-collapse supernova

type II in the progenitor's wind n=9, s=2 (t = 300 yr) PRELIMINARY

Results: temperature of electrons



thermo-nuclear

type Ia in a uniform ISM n=7, s=0 (t = 500 yr)

core-collapse supernova

type II in the progenitor's wind n=9, s=2 (t = 300 yr)

Results: thermal X-rays

thermo-nuclear supernova

type Ia in a uniform ISM n=7, s=0 (t = 500 yr)

core-collapse supernova

type II in the progenitor's wind n=9, s=2 (t = 300 yr) PRELIMINARY



Abundances in the ejecta



Note: we use a spatially uniform distribution in our simulations, yet we obtain non-uniform thermal emission maps!

magnetic field & non-thermal emission

Wind properties: magnetization

Magnetic field needed to compute acceleration of particles at the shock, and to compute the synchrotron radiation from electrons

magnetization:
$$\sigma = \frac{\frac{B^2}{8\pi}}{0.5\rho v_w^2} = \frac{B^2 r^2}{\dot{M}_w v_w}$$

Chevalier & Luo 1994 Lee et al 2014

constant in a steady wind from conservation of magnetic flux

$$B(r) = \frac{\sqrt{\sigma \ \dot{M}_w \ v_w}}{r} \simeq 0.8\mu G \left(\frac{\sigma}{10^{-2}}\right)^{0.5} \left(\frac{\dot{M}_w}{10^{-5} \ M_\odot \ yr^{-1}}\right)^{0.5} \left(\frac{v_w}{10 \ km.s^{-1}}\right)^{0.5} \left(\frac{r}{1 \ pc}\right)^{-1}$$

Here adopts $\,\sigma=10^{-1}\,$ so that upstream of the SNR forward shock: $B_0=44\;\mu G\to 1\;\mu G$

2nd back-reaction loop: efficient amplification of the magnetic field $> \times 100$ by the energetic particles streaming in the shock precursor

than

Results: non-thermal (leptonic) X-rays



supernova type Ia in a

uniform ISM n=7, s=0 (t = 500 yr)

synchrotron

core-collapse supernova

type II in the progenitor's wind n=9, s=2 (t = 300 yr)PRELIMINARY

Results: (non-thermal) leptonic y-rays



^{3.4} Results: (non-thermal) hadronic γ-rays



thermo-nuclear supernova

> type Ia in a uniform ISM n=7, s=0 (t = 500 yr)

pion decay

core-collapse supernova

type II in the progenitor's wind n=9, s=2 (t = 300 yr) PRELIMINARY

3.5 Results: non-thermal broad-band emission



Conclusions

The impact of particle acceleration is dependent

- on the photon energy observed
- on the magnetic field evolution assumed
- In our current model for a CC SNR it appears to be
- similar for the particles emission
- less visible for the plasma emission

(but how about acceleration at the reverse shock?)

The broad-band emission from a SNR (thermal emission from the plasma + non-thermal emission from the accelerated particles) is the result of an integration over both space (projection) and time:

- history of the shock strength
- history of particle acceleration
- history of magnetic field amplification

(so how to match observations with a one-zone model??) Even more so when the SNR is evolving in a wind