





2019/7/4, OMEG15

Explosion mechanism of core-collapse supernovae and recent progress in nuclear physics



(National Astronomical Observatory of Japan)

4D2U

Supernovae teach us Nuclear physics

Supernova explosions provide densest and most extreme environments in Universe.

 ⇒ Good site to investigate nuclear physics: e.g. Nucleosynthesis
 Neutrino nucleon (nuclei) interactions
 Neutron star equation of state and nuclear forces
 Very rich physics can be investigated potentially.

But, simulations with our best knowledge, CANNOT reproduce the energetic explosion!

Q: What ingredients are missing?









Pioneering work => Fiducial work



An explosion found in 11.2M_s(WH02)

Explosions not found in 11.2 M_s and 27M_s(WH02)

Inconsistent at the era, but now it become consistent.

Phanke+2013, Tamborra+2014

Resolution (400+x88x176) Standard microphysics



Comparison of 2D and 3D



The dynamics is roughly consistent: e.g. 2D explode and 3D not. SASI is found. Explosion in 3D geometry is still difficult to achieve.

Hopeful Effects

Reaction Rate of $n + \nu \rightarrow n + \nu$ in dense region decreased by a nucleon correlation effect!



Previous Assumption on the reaction

$$n + \nu \rightarrow n + \nu$$

$$n + \nu \rightarrow n + \nu$$
Distribution function

$$R \propto 2 \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \mathbf{p}}{(2\pi\hbar c)^{3}} F_{n}$$

$$\sim n_{n}$$
Pauli blocking

$$R \propto 2 \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^{3} \mathbf{p}}{(2\pi\hbar c)^{3}} F_{n}(1 - F_{n})$$

$$\sim n_{n} \frac{3\mu_{n}}{2k_{B}T}$$

Previous studies assumed that nucleon is ideal Fermi gas. There is no interaction between nucleons.

11

Correlation Effect

 $n + \nu \rightarrow n + \nu$



First correction can be evaluated by the two body interactions (data of phase shift of the scattering).

Repulsive force of spin-spin interaction decreases the reaction rate.

In reality, interaction between nucleon cannot be ignored. The correction to the ideal case should be included.

12

Correlation Effect



Impact of the reaction



Kotake+ 2018 investigates the impact of the effect in 2D simulation. We found significant difference. How about 3D?



400 s20(WH07) 1D 2D 350 g_s=0.1,virial 3D 300 Togashi,TF Radius [km] 2D 3D 250 200 150 100 1D 50 Takiwaki+ in prep 0 100 200 300 400 500 0 Time after bounce [ms] Explodability: 1D << 3D (< 2D) (how easily the shock revives.)



Effect of EOS

EOS NAME	Uniform matter	Non uniform matter	
DD2, LD	Stiff	Multi nuclei, Liquid Drop	
Togashi, TF	Soft	Single nuclei, Thomas Fermi	
Togashi, LD	Soft	Multi nuclei, Liquid Drop	
$ \begin{array}{c} 400 \\ 350 \\ g_{s}=0. \\ 300 \\ \hline 250 \\ 200 \\ \end{array} $	VH07) [1,virial ogashi,TF DD2,	DD2,LD ashi,TF ashi,LD 2D shi, LD LD	
sni 150 100 - 50 - 0	Takiwaki	+ in prep	
0 100 200 300 400 500 Time after bounce [ms]			

Effect of EOS

EOS NAME	Uniform matter	Non uniform matter
DD2, LD	Stiff	Multi nuclei, Liquid Drop
Togashi, TF	Soft	Single nuclei, Thomas Fermi
Togashi, LD	Soft	Multi nuclei, Liquid Drop



The origin of difference come from the nuclei in the pre-bounce phase.

In Togashi, TF, cooling by the electron capture in heavy nuclei is surpressed.

- \Rightarrow Less cooling
- \Rightarrow Delay core bounce
- \Rightarrow Small mass accretion in the post bounce phase.

Summary

We performed 3D neutrino radiation hydrodynamic simulations and investigated the impact of the update of microphysical processes.

- My results are roughly consistent with the results of other group.
- With the effect of nucleon correlation, we found shock revivals in 3D.
- Treatment of sub-nuclear part in EoS, changes the bounce time and accretion rates.

Message:

 Some important effects of microphysics is still not sufficiently employed in the simulation and that could be gradients to make a strong explosion.