





#### **RICHARD IGNACE**

Department of Physics and Astronomy East Tennessee State University



# Stellar Winds



Massive star winds generally have broad lines of 1000s km/s

### X-ray Production in Massive Stars

#### • Colliding winds:

[NOT DISCUSSED HERE]

- collision of winds from binary stars
- or wind impact on companion star
- Embedded wind shocks
  - wind driving instabilities (stochastic structure)
- Co-rotating Interaction Regions [NOT DISCUSSED HERE]
  - no self-consistent modeling of this yet (organized structure)
- Magnetospheres:
  - magnetic confinement channels wind streams into head-on collisions ("self"-wind collision)
  - non-thermal emissions

### Chandra Large Program for Zeta Pup



- Fig from Nichols+ 2021 (about 800ks) rich emission line spectrum
- Detection of continuum emission at short wavelengths in with few lines (Huenemoerder+ 2020)
- Displays overall global spectral changes over ~20 years (Cohen+ 2020 and this meeting)

### Underlying physical paradigm: Snapshot of the time-dependent structure for typical spherically symmetric O star wind

expectation of distributed hot gas



### Line Profile Modeling: Optically thin Lines + Wind Photoabsorption

Geometry for a Constant Expansion Wind



resolved x-ray emission lines shapes can be blueward skewed

# Photoabsorption



photoabsorption a function of density and of energy

from Ignace+ 1999

from Leutenegger+ 2010

# Examples of Simple Profiles



*Optically thin lines* with spherical constant expansion



*Optically thick lines* also with constant expansion

from Ignace 2001 and Ignace & Gayley 2003

### Variation of Parameters (thin lines)





from Owocki & Cohen 2001

(beta is velocity law;  $R_0$  is inner radius; q is a filling factor power-law exponent)

# Trends in Line Profile Moments

- Smooth wind model
- Particular choice of wind velocity law
- Parametrized in terms of photo-absorptive optical depth, which is wavelength-dependent



THEORIST

**PLOTS** 

### Line Profile Moments: OBSERVER PLOTS



# Let's bounce through some heuristic cases

#### PROBING WOLF-RAYET WINDS: CHANDRA/HETG X-RAY SPECTRA OF WR 6

DAVID P. HUENEMOERDER<sup>1</sup>, K. G. GAYLEY<sup>2</sup>, W.-R. HAMANN<sup>3</sup>, R. IGNACE<sup>4</sup>, J. S. NICHOLS<sup>5</sup>, L. OSKINOVA<sup>3</sup>, A. M. T. POLLOCK<sup>6,7</sup>, N. S. SCHULZ<sup>1</sup>, AND T. SHENAR<sup>3</sup>



The value-added from profile modeling effort: X-rays consistent with emerging from terminal speed flow

# Porosity Effects



#### 100 porous 80 0.8 Relative Luminosity (%) Relative Change ( 8 5 5 9 60 smooth 0.2 0 -0.5 0.5 -0.5 0.5 -10 0 Velocity Shift Velocity Shift

#### from Sundqvist 2012

left to right: mean free path between clumps upper to lower: spherical versus flat clumps

# $\begin{array}{ccc} \underbrace{upshot}_{i} & of & porosity & is & to \\ & \underbrace{upshot}_{i} & of & porosity & is & to \\ & \underbrace{waste}_{i} & absorption & thru \\ & spatial & concentration & that \\ & allows & avenues & of & escape \end{array}$

#### from Ignace 2016

Figure 7: Left: An illustration of porosity effects on line profile shapes. The profiles are normalized to a peak value of unity. Red is for a smooth wind with  $\tau_0 = 1$ ; blue is  $\tau_0 = 0$ . In black from solid to long dash are profiles with  $h_{\infty} = 0.01, 0.1, 1.0$ , and 10, respectively, all with  $\tau_0 = 1$ . Right: Shown is the percent difference between normalized line profiles appearing in the left panel, with the red curve as the reference profile. Magenta (top) is the percent difference between the blue curve and the red one. The black curves are for winds with porosity corresponding to the lines in the left panel. Moving from small to large porosity lengths leads to a wind that is increasingly optically thin to photoabsorption for fixed  $\tau_0$ .

# Distribution Effects

Relative Luminosity

Relative Luminosity

### **Choices!**

#### Illustration of impacts from "recipe ingredients"

- All are peak normalized
- All lines assume v ~ r
- 4 curves for 4 absorbing optical depths
- upper for different absorbing distributions
- lower for different source distributions

#### Subtle differences

from Ignace 2016



Figure 8: Example emission line profile shapes using  $v(r) \propto r$ , with each profile normalized to peak emission. Each panel shows four model profiles for  $\tau_0 = 0$  (solid), 1 (dotted), 4 (short dash) and 14 (long dash). Upper left is for a constant photoabsorbing opacity; upper right is for one that varies with radius (see text). Lower panels are for constant absorption coefficient. Lower left is for  $r_X = 1.4R_*$ , and lower right is for a radius-dependent filling factor (see text).

# Rotational Effects: Wind Distortion



Using Owocki, Cranmer, & Gayley for distorted wind density and Maeder & Meynet global mass-loss dependence on rotation; <u>constant expansion case</u>

### Rotational Effects: Vlaw+Wind Absorption

- no rotational velocity; purely radial flow
- only rotationally distorted density distribution
- and rotationally modified terminal speed
- most prominent influence is directional escape of x-ray photons



#### Now using a beta=1 velocity law

# Rotational Effects:

Corotating Magnetosphere

- Uses Rigid Field Hydrodynamics (RFHD) model of Townsend+ 2007
- semi-qualitative approach for an aligned dipole
- note isovelocity zones are planes seen edge-on, with left-right symmetry
- no radial flow or photoabsorption; pure solid-body velocity field

NOTE: thin line with spherical shell in solid body rotation is also flat-top



Velocity Shift

# **3D Effect:** Clump Bowshocks

Cassinelli+ 2008



#### X-RAY EMISSION LINE PROFILES FROM WIND CLUMP BOW SHOCKS IN MASSIVE STARS



**Figure 2.** Inset (top center) shows the location of a clump at angle  $\vartheta$  around the star from the observer's axis. The plot shows example emission line profiles, all normalized to have unit area, for individual clumps located at the indicated orientations. In each case the clump is at the same radius, and so all profiles have the same apex temperature  $T_A$ . Solid curves are for clumps on the near side of the star; dashed are for ones on the far side.

**Figure 3.** Similar to Figure 2 but now profiles are for clumps only at  $\vartheta = 90^{\circ}$  and with different temperature intervals. The emissivity is taken to be constant within the temperature range of  $T_{10}$  up to  $T_A$ , with  $T_{10} = 0.1, 0.3, 1.0$ , and 3.0 MK from the most narrow line (blue) to the broadest one (black), respectively.

increasing number of clump bowshocks randomly distributed throughout the wind as 2<sup>n</sup>



red signifies gaussian instrumental smearing

**Figure 7.** Line profile shapes for an ensemble of clumps with  $\tau_* = 0.1$ . Panels are distinguished by the number of clumps  $\mathcal{N}_{cl}$  used in the model, with (a) 4, (b) 8, (c) 16, (d) 32, (e) 64, and (f) 128 clumps. Model line profiles are shown in black; overplotted are red curves that include the effects of instrumental smearing are included. Finite spectral resolution is approximated by convolving model lines with a Gaussian that has  $\sigma = 0.05V_{\infty}$ .

# Testing the reliability of X-rays as a tool for constraining mass-loss rates of hot stars Source

Sean J. Gunderson<sup>(b)</sup>,<sup>1</sup> Kenneth G. Gayley<sup>(b)</sup>,<sup>1</sup> Pragati Pradhan<sup>(b)</sup>,<sup>2</sup> David P. Huenemoerder<sup>(b)</sup> and Nathan A. Miller<sup>(b)</sup>

Line profile calculation depends on **TWO** main ingredients:

- source distribution (choices)
- escape distribution (choices)

Most line modeling proceeds on assumption of  $\rho^2$  emissivity; Gunderson+ have proposed prompt energy dump by wind shocks.

Gunderson+ 2023:

$$\frac{dL}{d\xi} = 4\pi \int j_{\nu} e^{-\tau} dV$$
$$\sim \int \frac{1}{\nu(r)} \frac{e^{-(r-R)/l_0}}{l_0} e^{-\tau} dr$$



### Multiplet Effects: Proximity Diagnostic from f/i ratios

He-like triplets normally yield density and temperature diagnostics; however, UV pumping from hot stars ends up yielding a *location* diagnostic (via the dilution factor).

He-like Triplet of OVII



#### r=resonance, i=intercombination, f=forbidden

### Example Application of He-like Triplets

OB stars like zeta Pup typically show a suppressed forbidden component owing to UV pumping effects

XMM/RGS data of WR6 shows normal ratios, indicating an absence of UV pumping and supporting line formation at (somewhat) large radii



### Modeling f-i-r Lines

Chandra has not been able to resolve the separate triplets for winds

$$\widetilde{R} = R_0 \frac{1}{1 + 2k_* W(r)}$$

R<sub>0</sub> is without UV pumping

$$\frac{dL}{dv_{obs}} = 4\pi \int j_v w_x e^{-\tau} \frac{dV}{v}$$
$$w_{fir} = \begin{cases} \frac{\widetilde{R}(r)}{1 + \widetilde{R}(r)} \\ \frac{1}{1 + \widetilde{R}(r)} \\ 1 \end{cases}$$

emission line calculation

Leutenegger+ 2006

# f-i-r Profile Shapes for hi-res

Level of pumping is distance dependent and imposes differential imprints on the 3 line component profiles

Hi-resolution could provide new ways of probing the velocity field of the hot plasma (here v ~ r assumed)

General rule for broadening of peak normalized profiles: *i-line narrowest and f-line broadest*  Note: peak normalized for comparison of shapes

Emission Measure style:  $\tau = 0, 1, 3$ 



red is i-line; black is r-line; blue is f-line

# Some f-i-r Profile Possibilities



f-line is broad because emission is weak!!! photon-starved diagnostic

### Polstar UV Spectropolarimetry Mission Concept



# Thank you!

# **QUESTIONS**?

# SUMMING UP

Large X-ray telescopes and their unprecedented spectral capability continue to make this an exciting time for the study of the driving and structure of massive star winds. Yet more can be achieved with future missions.

- X-rays probe shocks in massive star circumstellar environs
- Wind-shock paradigm for OB stars seems in decent shape (zeta Pup continuum and line shape modeling)
- X-rays from WR stars emerge from large radius (WR6 line shapes)
- Clumping continues to be of interest on many levels, from potential porosity effects for escape of X-rays, to clump bowshocks for detailed wind structure
- Some of the best-quality O star X-ray data come from reasonably fast rotators – time for new considerations of rotational effects?
- Source model approaches for shock X-rays appears ongoing
- f-i-r lines offer a variety of diagnostic potential (some not covered)
- Not covered: Line profiles probe bowshocks of colliding winds with orbital phase; connects observations to hydro simulations