Three Dimensional Radiation Hydrodynamics Simulations of Core Collapse Supernovae

Luke F. Roberts TAPIR, Caltech



Core Collapse Supernovae: Multimessenger events

From Filppenko '97

From Ott et al.

2



Core Collapse



 Core exceeds a Chandrasekhar mass supersonic collapse outside of homologous core bounce shock after ~2 x saturation density

Gravitational binding energy of compact remnant:

$$\frac{GM_{NS}^2}{R_{NS}} \sim 3 \times 10^{53} \, erg$$

Binding energy of stellar envelope:

 $\sim 10^{51} erg$

 No Explosions by the neutrino mechanism in spherical symmetry (e.g. Liebendorfer 'oo)



40

(10⁵² erg s 00 10 10

Core Collapse



 Core exceeds a Chandrasekhar mass supersonic collapse outside of homologous core bounce shock after ~2 x saturation density

Gravitational binding energy of compact remnant:

$$\frac{GM_{NS}^2}{R_{NS}} \sim 3 \times 10^{53} \, erg$$

Binding energy of stellar envelope:

$$\sim 10^{51} erg$$

 No Explosions by the neutrino mechanism in spherical symmetry (e.g. Liebendorfer 'oo)



40

10

(10⁵² erg s 00 10 10

- Hydrodynamic instabilities in the region behind the shock can provide increased post shock pressure and transport extra energy
- In axial symmetry, this enhances the efficiency of neutrino energy deposition and results in successful explosions (Mueller et al. '12, Bruenn et al. '13)
- Does the neutrino mechanism work in 3D? Lentz et al. '15 and Melson et al. '15 find it works for some progenitor stars using ray-by-ray transport
- How does this depend on input physics and numerics?



- Hydrodynamic instabilities in the region behind the shock can provide increased post shock pressure and transport extra energy
- In axial symmetry, this enhances the efficiency of neutrino energy deposition and results in successful explosions (Mueller et al. '12, Bruenn et al. '13)
- Does the neutrino mechanism work in 3D? Lentz et al. '15 and Melson et al. '15 find it works for some progenitor stars using ray-by-ray transport
- How does this depend on input physics and numerics?



- Hydrodynamic instabilities in the region behind the shock can provide increased post shock pressure and transport extra energy
- In axial symmetry, this enhances the efficiency of neutrino energy deposition and results in successful explosions (Mueller et al. '12, Bruenn et al. '13)
- Does the neutrino mechanism work in 3D? Lentz et al. '15 and Melson et al. '15 find it works for some progenitor stars using ray-by-ray transport
- How does this depend on input physics and numerics?



Two Moment Neutrino Transport

Boltzmann Equation:

 $\frac{\partial x^{\alpha}}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial f(x^{\mu}, p^{\mu})}{\partial x_{\alpha}} + \frac{\partial p^{i}}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial f(x^{\mu}, p^{\mu})}{\partial p_{i}}$

 $= \tilde{S}(x^{\mu}, p^{\mu})$

Take angular moments of the neutrino distribution function:

$$M_{(\nu)}^{A_{k}} = \int dV_{p} \frac{p^{\alpha_{1}} ... p^{\alpha_{k}}}{(-p_{\mu}u^{\mu})^{k-2}} f(p^{\beta}, x^{\beta}) \delta(\nu + p_{\delta}u^{\delta})$$

Two Moment Neutrino Transport



Get conservation equations for projections of the rest frame energy dependent stress tensor:

Two Moment Neutrino Transport



Get conservation equations for projections of the rest frame energy dependent stress tensor:

$$M^{\alpha\beta}_{(\nu)};\beta \quad \checkmark \quad \partial_{t}\tilde{E} + \partial_{j}\left(\alpha\tilde{F}^{j} - \beta^{j}\tilde{E}\right) + \partial_{\nu}\left(\nu\alpha n_{\alpha}\tilde{M}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}u_{\gamma;\beta}\right) = \alpha\left[\tilde{P}^{ij}K_{ij} - \tilde{F}^{j}\partial_{j}\ln\alpha - \tilde{S}^{\alpha}n_{\alpha}\right]$$
$$\partial_{t}\tilde{F}_{i} + \partial_{j}\left(\alpha\tilde{P}^{j}_{i} - \beta^{j}\tilde{F}_{i}\right) - \partial_{\nu}\left(\nu\alpha\gamma_{i\alpha}\tilde{M}^{\alpha\beta\gamma}u_{\gamma;\beta}\right) = \alpha\left[\frac{\tilde{F}_{k}\partial_{i}\beta^{k}}{\alpha} - \tilde{E}\partial_{i}\ln\alpha + \frac{\tilde{P}^{jk}}{2}\partial_{i}\gamma_{jk} + \tilde{S}^{\alpha}\gamma_{i\alpha}\right]$$

O X-Axis (N)

Amenable to finite volume techniques

Still need to specify neutrino stress tensor:

$$P_{(\nu)}^{\alpha\beta} = \frac{3\chi(\xi) - 1}{2} P_{(\nu),thin}^{\alpha\beta} + \frac{3(1 - \chi(\xi))}{2} P_{(\nu),thick}^{\alpha\beta}$$

Neutrino Interactions

Reaction	Details & References
$v + N \Leftrightarrow v + N$	Inelastic, non-interacting (Bruenn '85)
$v + e^- \Leftrightarrow v + e^-$	Ultra-relativistic, elastic (Yueh & Buchler '77, etc.)
$v + \overline{v} + N + N \Leftrightarrow N + N$	Non-relativistic, One-pion exchange, uncertain (Hannestad & Raffelt '98)
$v + \overline{v} \iff e^- + e^+$	Ultra-relativistic (Bruenn '85)
$v_e + n \iff e^- + p$	Inelastic, non-interacting, degeneracy (Bruenn '85)
$\overline{v}_e + p \iff e^+ + n$	Inelastic, non-interacting, degeneracy (Bruenn '85)



LR et al. in prep

Neutrino Heating Rate



Conclusions

- M1 provides a reasonably good method for radiative transfer in quasi-spherical situations
- Long term evolution of post-bounce CCSNe evolution without any imposed symmetries
- Shock runaway occurs in many models, but have not quantified predicted explosion energies
- Significant dependence on resolution and assumed symmetries
- More detailed analysis of post-shock flow required

