

**\*\*FULL TITLE\*\***  
*ASP Conference Series, Vol. \*\*VOLUME\*\*, \*\*YEAR OF PUBLICATION\*\**  
**\*\*NAMES OF EDITORS\*\***

## The Impact of Supernovae of Type Ia on Large Scales through the Secular Evolution of their Rate

L. Greggio

*INAF, Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo dell'Osservatorio 5,  
I-35122 Padova, Italia*

**Abstract.** A straightforward formalism to evaluate the impact of Type Ia Supernovae (SNIa) on large scale astrophysical issues is presented, together with analytical formulations for the SNIa rate following an instantaneous burst of Star Formation (SF), for the variety of SNIa progenitors. Some applications of the parametrized formalism are illustrated. The observations seem to favour the Double Degenerate (DD) systems as SNIa precursors.

### 1. Introduction

Type Ia supernovae are an important source of Iron and energy to the interstellar medium, and for this reason the evolution of their rate over cosmic times has profound implications on a variety of astrophysical issues, including the chemical evolution of galaxies, the Fe content of clusters of galaxies, the evolution of the gas flows in Ellipticals (Es). For example, the delayed release of Fe from SNIa with respect to the prompt release of  $\alpha$  elements from Type II supernovae implies that the shorter the formation timescale of a stellar system, the higher the  $\alpha$ /Fe abundance ratio recorded in its stars. Following this argument, short formation timescales have been inferred for E galaxies from the supersolar  $\alpha$  to Fe ratios traced by the Mg and Fe indices in their spectra (e.g. Matteucci 1994). As another example, the interplay between the rate of mass return from evolved stars in Es and the rate at which this matter is heated by SNIa explosions crucially determines the dynamical evolution of the gas in these galaxies (Renzini 1996), i.e. whether from inflow to outflow or from outflow to inflow.

Our ability to address these (and other) issues is hampered by the uncertainty which still affects the SNIa progenitors. Current models include Single Degenerate (SD) and Double Degenerate (DD) systems, both dealing with a close binary in which the primary component ( $m_1$ ) evolves into a CO white dwarf (WD). When the secondary ( $m_2$ ) evolves off the MS, Roche Lobe Overflow (RLO) occurs: in the SD model, the WD accretes and grows in mass; in the DD model, the envelope of the secondary is lost from the system, leaving a close double WD, which eventually merge due to the emission of gravitational radiation. In both cases, explosion may occur either when the accreting WD reaches the Chandrasekhar limit and C deflagrates (Ch), or when a He layer of  $\sim 0.15 M_\odot$  has accumulated on top of the CO WD so that He detonates (S-Ch) (Hillebrandt & Niemeyer 2000). The various models correspond to markedly different secular evolution of the SNIa rate, with great variance of the consequences on related issues.

To assess the impact of the SNIa rate on any astrophysical problem it is important to (i) adequately characterize the progenitor model and (ii) correctly couple this model to the SF history of the specific system. In this paper I will go through these steps, and show how the scenarios for the SNIa progenitors can be constrained by their impact on large scales. To do that I will use analytical relations for the SNIa rate for both SD and DDs derived in Greggio (2004), as a convenient parametrization of the progenitors' models.

## 2. The Model

An effective formulation of the SNIa rate for the modelling of stellar systems rests upon the definition of two key quantities: the distribution function of the delay times  $f_{\text{Ia}}(\tau)$ , where  $\tau$  is the time between the birth of a star and its death as a SNIa, and the number fraction of SNIa events out of one stellar generation,  $A_{\text{Ia}}$ . Denoting with  $\tau_{\text{i}}$  and  $\tau_{\text{x}}$  the minimum and maximum delay time, and if  $A_{\text{Ia}}$  is constant, the SNIa rate at epoch  $t$  in a system with a SF rate  $\psi$  is:

$$\dot{n}_{\text{Ia}}(t) = k_{\alpha} \cdot A_{\text{Ia}} \cdot \int_{\tau_{\text{i}}}^{\min(t, \tau_{\text{x}})} \psi(t - \tau) \cdot f_{\text{Ia}}(\tau) \, d\tau \quad (1)$$

where  $k_{\alpha}$  is the number of stars per unit mass in each stellar generation (e.g.  $k_{\alpha} = 2.83$  for Salpeter IMF between 0.1 and  $120 M_{\odot}$ ), considered constant in time.

Eq.(1) gives the dependence of the observed SNIa rate on the SF history: for systems with an almost constant  $\psi$ , like late type galaxies, at late epochs ( $t \simeq \tau_{\text{x}}$ ):

$$\dot{n}_{\text{Ia}}^{\text{L}}(t) \simeq \langle \psi \rangle \cdot k_{\alpha} \cdot A_{\text{Ia}} \quad (2)$$

since  $f_{\text{Ia}}(\tau)$  is normalized to one. Thus, the current SNIa rate in late type galaxies essentially gives information on the realization probability of the SNIa scenario, since it results from the contribution of systems with all possible delay times. By approximating  $\langle \psi \rangle$  with the ratio of the galaxy mass over its age, and assuming an  $M_{\star}/L_{\text{B}}$  ratio of the order of unity, Eq.(2) requires  $A_{\text{Ia}} \sim 10^{-3}$  to match the observed value of 0.2 SNU (Cappellaro, Evans, & Turatto 1999).

In early type galaxies, where most SF has occurred in an initial burst of relatively short duration  $\Delta t$ , the late epoch SNIa rate is:

$$\dot{n}_{\text{Ia}}^{\text{E}}(t) = M_{\star} \cdot k_{\alpha} \cdot A_{\text{Ia}} \cdot \langle f_{\text{Ia}} \rangle_{t-\Delta t, t} \quad (3)$$

i.e. it is proportional to the value of  $f_{\text{Ia}}$  at delay times close to the age of the galaxy, and to the total mass of stars *formed* in the burst ( $M_{\star}$ ).

If  $A_{\text{Ia}}$  and  $k_{\alpha}$  are the same in early and late type galaxies, the ratio between the current SNIa rates measured in SNU in the two galaxy types is:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{SNU}} = \frac{\dot{n}_{\text{Ia}, \text{SNU}}^{\text{E}}}{\dot{n}_{\text{Ia}, \text{SNU}}^{\text{L}}} \simeq \frac{(M_{\star}/L_{\text{B}})^{\text{E}}}{(M_{\star}/L_{\text{B}})^{\text{L}}} \times \frac{\langle f_{\text{Ia}} \rangle_{t-\Delta t, t}}{\langle f_{\text{Ia}} \rangle_{\tau_{\text{i}}, t}}. \quad (4)$$

Using Maraston (1998) solar metallicity models, at an age of 12 Gyr a system formed at a constant rate has  $M_*/L_B \simeq 2$ , while a single burst stellar population has  $M_*/L_B \simeq 13$ . Since  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{SNU}} \sim 1$  (Cappellaro et al. 1999), Eq. (4) implies:

$$\frac{\langle f_{\text{Ia}} \rangle_{t-\Delta t, t}}{\langle f_{\text{Ia}} \rangle_{\tau, t}} \sim 0.15 \quad (5)$$

showing that, on the average, the distribution of the delay times must be decreasing with  $\tau$ , i.e. *the majority of SNIa precursors are relatively short lived*.

The theoretical SNIa rate can be obtained with numerical simulations, which follow the evolution of a population of binary systems, under some prescriptions concerning the outcome of the mass transfer phases (e.g. Han 1998). Typically, the predicted  $A_{\text{Ia}}$  ranges within  $10^{-4}$  and  $10^{-3}$ , while  $f_{\text{Ia}}$  is characterized by an early steep rise, followed by a decline at later epochs. These results depend on a variety of input parameters, whose role is difficult to gauge, and therefore they are hardly suitable for a thorough exploration of the parameter space. On the other hand, the shape of the  $f_{\text{Ia}}(\tau)$  function can be characterized on the basis of general considerations founded on stellar evolution. Along this line, Greggio (2004) derives analytical relations for the  $f_{\text{Ia}}$  function for both the SD and the DD model, briefly described below.




Figure 1. The SD model:  $n(m_2)$  is derived from the distributions  $n(m_1) \propto m_1^{-\alpha}$  and  $n(q) \propto q^\gamma$  where  $q = m_2/m_1$ , and summing over the relevant combinations. The right panel shows the  $f_{\text{Ia}}^{\text{SD}}$  function on arbitrary units, as from Eq. (6).  $\tau$  is the MS lifetime of the mass  $m_2$ .  $\epsilon$  is the ratio between the accreted mass and the envelope mass of the donor. Curves are shown for  $\epsilon = 1$  and  $\epsilon = 0.5$  (labelled). For the Sub-Ch models, it is assumed that  $m_1 \geq 3$ .

In the SD model, the delay time is equal to the MS lifetime of the secondary, plus the duration of the accretion phase, which is negligible. Thus:

$$f_{\text{Ia}}^{\text{SD}}(\tau) \propto n(m_2) \cdot |\dot{m}_2|. \quad (6)$$

where  $|\dot{m}_2|$  is the rate of change of the mass whose MS lifetime is  $\tau$ , and  $n(m_2)$  is the distribution function of the secondary masses *in those systems which produce*




Figure 2. The DD model: dependence on  $\tau_{n,x}$  (left), and on the slope of the distribution of the gravitational delays (right). See text for more details.

*SNIa events.* Fig. 1 shows the two factors in Eq.(6) (left panel), and their product (right panel). The shape of the  $n(m_2)$  function reflects the limitations imposed on the components masses in order to give rise to a SNIa. It is assumed that  $m_1$  varies between 2 and  $8 M_\odot$ , since most CO WD come from this range. The lower boundary originates a relative lack of systems once  $m_2$  drops below  $2 M_\odot$ . The last steep decrease, instead, reflects the need of building a WD up to the Ch limit: as  $m_2$  decreases, so does its envelope, that is the donated mass. Then, at late epochs, only the most massive WD will end up as SNIa, which implies a lower limit of  $m_1 > 2M_\odot$ . Below  $m_2 = 2M_\odot$ ,  $n(m_2)$  is very sensitive to  $\alpha, \gamma, \epsilon$  (defined in the caption), which determine the volume in the parameter space of SNIa progenitors. The resulting  $f_{Ia}$  function is shown in the right panel: notice the dramatic drop at late epochs which stems from the requirement of building up to the Ch mass. S-Ch exploders (dot dashed line) do not show this drop, the only requirement being that the CO WD is more massive than  $0.7 M_\odot$ . If additional limitations are imposed on  $m_2$ , the  $f_{Ia}$  function is non zero only in the range of  $\tau$  equal to the MS lifetimes of the secondaries with appropriate mass. For example, if systems with  $m_2 < 2M_\odot$  evolve into a common envelope,  $f_{Ia}^{SD} = 0$  for  $\tau > 1$  Gyr. On the other hand, in order to explain the occurrence of SNIa in Es with the SD model, low mass secondaries must be allowed for.

In the DD model, the delay time is equal to the MS lifetime of the secondary ( $\tau_n$ ), plus the gravitational delay ( $\tau_{gw}$ ). Considering only CO DDs,  $m_2$  is (in most cases) heavier than  $2 M_\odot$ , which implies  $\tau_n \leq 1$  Gyr;  $\tau_{gw}$  instead can span a very wide range, being extremely sensitive to the separation  $A$  of the DD. For example, for a  $(0.7+0.7) M_\odot$  system,  $\tau_{gw}$  goes from 14 Myr to 18 Gyr when  $A$  increases from 0.5 to  $3 R_\odot$ . Since the separation of the progenitors of the CO DDs ranges from some tens to some hundreds  $R_\odot$ , a great degree of shrinkage must occur at the RLO phases in order to produce explosions within a Hubble time.  $f_{Ia}^{DD}$  can be derived as a modification of  $f_{Ia}^{SD}$ , with early explosions from systems with short  $\tau_n$  AND  $\tau_{gw}$ , and late explosions from systems with long  $\tau_{gw}$ . The distribution of  $\tau_{gw}$  will be very sensitive to the distribution of  $A$  within the

range of a few  $R_{\odot}$ . Motivated by literature results, Greggio (2004) considers two possibilities: (i) the WIDE DDs, in which the first RLO corresponds to a modest shrink of the system (as, e.g., in Nelemans et al. 2001); (ii) the CLOSE DDs, similar to the classical recipe (as, e.g., in Han 1998). The two channels imply different characterizations of the distribution of the gravitational delays. Fig. 2 shows the resulting  $f_{Ia}^{DD}$  functions for some choice of the major parameters:  $\tau_{n,x}$ , the MS lifetime of the least massive secondary still progenitor of a SNIa;  $\beta_a$  and  $\beta_g$  which are the exponents of the two power laws assumed to represent the distribution of  $A$  for the WIDE DDs, and of  $\tau_{gw}$  for the CLOSE DDs <sup>1</sup>.

The  $f_{Ia}^{DD}$  function shows an early rise, a wide maximum and a late epoch decline. The width of the maximum is  $\simeq \tau_{n,x}$ . Relative to the CLOSE DD, the WIDE DD scheme of evolution leads to flatter  $f_{Ia}^{DD}$  distributions, and the more systems with short  $\tau_{gw}$  (i.e. steeper  $\beta_a$  or  $\beta_g$ ), the steeper the early rise as well as the late epoch decline.

### 3. Constraining the SNIa Progenitors and Implications

In summary, stellar evolution arguments strongly support a distribution function of the delay times characterized by:

- an early maximum, soon after the most massive SNIa progenitor explodes;
- a relatively flat portion, up to a delay time equal to the MS lifetime of the least massive secondary in binaries which end up as SNIa;
- a decline phase, which for the SD Ch models becomes very steep at late epochs, due to the requirement of building up the Chandrasekhar mass.

In spite of the similar shape, the different models have very different astrophysical implications: this can be appreciated by looking at the left panel in Fig. 3, where the various models are plotted normalized at 12 Gyr, so that they all reproduce the currently observed SNIa rate in Ellipticals. Notice that  $f_{Ia}$  is proportional to the SNIa rate following an instantaneous burst of SF, not too far from what is expected in Es, whose stars are mostly old. The SD Ch model predicts a huge variation of the SNIa rate, which at early epochs would have been  $\sim 2000$  times greater than now. Similarly, the S-Ch model corresponds to a large excursion of the SNIa rate, but, after the maximum, the rate drops rather quickly. Finally, for the DD models the initial peak is less strong.

The various models are characterized by different values of the ratio in Eq.(5), and they correspond to vastly different total Fe production, as shown on the right panel of Fig.3. According to Renzini (2003), the Fe Mass-to-light ratio in Clusters of Galaxies, which are dominated by Es, is  $\sim 0.015$ : if 2/3 of this is provided by SNIa, then  $M_{Fe}^{Ia}/L_B \sim 0.01$ . This, admittedly rough, estimate is reported in Fig.3, together with the empirical value for the ratio in Eq.(5). It appears that, once normalized to reproduce the current rate in Es, SD models greatly overproduce Fe in galaxy Clusters *AND* overpredict the current SNIa rate in late type galaxies, where all the delay times are sampled. The data require a less dramatic secular evolution of the SNIa rate, similar to the behaviour of the DD models.

---

<sup>1</sup>If SNIa originate from DD systems with approximately the same mass,  $\beta_g \simeq -0.75 + 0.25\beta_a$




Figure 3. Normalized  $f_{Ia}(\tau)$  functions (left) and their global properties (right) for the various progenitors models. The total Fe production per unit luminosity of the parent galaxy is computed by adopting a current SNIa rate in Es of 0.2 SNU, and a release of  $0.7 M_{\odot}$  of Fe per SNIa. The numbers in parenthesis are respectively  $\tau_{n,x}$  and  $\beta_g$  (CLOSE, DD-C) or  $\beta_a$  (WIDE, DD-W). All the plotted models assume  $\alpha = 2.35, \gamma = 1$  to derive the distribution of the secondary masses in the primordial binaries.

The different models in Fig. 3 imply different timescales over which, following a burst of SF, 1/2 of the total SNIa explosions occur. Although the DD model is characterized by a less dramatic evolution of the SNIa rate, since most of the explosions take place within the first Gyr, supersolar  $\alpha$ /Fe ratios still imply SF timescales within 1-2 Gyr. Regarding the dynamical evolution of the gas in Es, detailed modelling is needed, since at late epochs the SNIa rate from DDs and the rate of mass return decline at a similar pace ( $\propto \tau^{-1.3}$ ).

In summary, taking advantage of an analytical formulation of the distribution of the delay times of SNIa progenitors, I have outlined a straightforward way to estimate their impact on the large scales. A more detailed elaboration of the issues considered here, as well as other applications, will be presented elsewhere.

## References

- Cappellaro, E., Evans, R., & Turatto M. 1999, A&A 351, 459  
 Greggio, L. 2004, A&A, submitted  
 Han, Z. 1998, MNRAS 296, 1019  
 Hillebrandt, W., & Niemeyer, J. C. 2000, ARA&A38, 191  
 Matteucci, M. F. 1994, A&A 288, 57  
 Maraston, C. 1998, MNRAS 300, 872  
 Nelemans, G., Yungelson, L. R., Portegies Zwart, S. F., & Verbunt, F. 2001, A&A 365, 491  
 Renzini, A. 1996, in IAU Symp. 171, New Light on Galaxy Evolution, ed. R. Bender & R. L. Davies (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 131  
 Renzini, A. 2003, in Clusters of Galaxies: Probes of Cosmological Structure and Galaxy Evolution, ed. J. S. Mulchaey, A. Dressler, & A. Oemler (CUP), 261