

A COSMIC ABUNDANCE STANDARD:  
CHEMICAL HOMOGENEITY OF THE SOLAR NEIGHBOURHOOD & THE ISM DUST-PHASE COMPOSITION <sup>1</sup>NORBERT PRZYBILLA<sup>2</sup>, M. FERNANDA NIEVA<sup>2,3</sup> AND KEITH BUTLER<sup>4</sup>*Draft version December 1, 2018*

## ABSTRACT

A representative sample of unevolved early B-type stars in nearby OB associations and the field is analysed to high precision using NLTE techniques. The resulting chemical composition is found to be more metal-rich and much more homogeneous than indicated by previous work. A rms scatter of 10% in abundances is found for the sample, the same as reported for ISM gas-phase abundances. A cosmic abundance standard for the present-day solar neighbourhood is proposed, implying mass fractions for hydrogen, helium and metals of  $X=0.715$ ,  $Y=0.271$  and  $Z=0.014$ . Good agreement with solar photospheric abundances as reported from recent 3D radiative-hydrodynamical simulations of the solar atmosphere is obtained. As a first application we use the cosmic abundance standard as a proxy for the determination of the local ISM dust-phase composition, putting tight observational constraints on dust models.

*Subject headings:* stars: abundances — stars: early-type — stars: fundamental parameters — ISM: abundances — dust, extinction — solar neighbourhood

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Sun is unique among the stars because independent indicators allow its chemical composition to be constrained with a precision unmatched for any other star. This can be done by spectroscopic analysis of its photosphere and by measurement of solar wind and solar energetic particles. Solar nebula abundances can be determined from CI chondrites, which are unaltered since the formation of the system. The wealth of information established the Sun as the principal standard for the chemical composition of cosmic matter (e.g. Grevesse & Sauval 1998, GS98; Holweber 2001; Asplund et al 2005, AGS05). However, is a 4.6 Gyr old star indeed representative of the cosmic matter in its neighbourhood<sup>5</sup> at present?

Ideal indicators for pristine abundances are unevolved early B-stars of spectral types B0–B2. Slowly rotating stars are preferred as their photospheres should be essentially unaffected by mixing of CN-processed material (Maeder & Meynet 2000). The atmospheres of early B-stars are also unaffected by atomic diffusion that gives rise to peculiarities of metal abundances in many later-type stars (e.g. Smith 1996). A major practical advantage is also their relatively simple photospheric physics, which is represented well by classical model atmospheres, unaffected by complications such as stellar winds or convection.

As a consequence, early B-stars in the solar neighbourhood were subject of several NLTE studies in the past (e.g. Gies & Lambert 1992; Kilian 1992, 1994; Cunha & Lambert 1994; Daflon et al. 1999, 2001a,b, 2003; Lyubimkov et al. 2004, 2005). Overall, they found a wide range of abundances, by about a factor 10, and an average metallicity of only 2/3 solar (GS98). Hence, the impression arose that the solar neighbourhood is chemically highly heterogeneous, and the

Sun anomalously metal-rich compared to young stars.

Both findings are problematic in terms of Galactic chemical evolution. Dispersal of stellar nucleosynthesis products increases the metallicity over time (e.g. Chiappini et al. 2003) and hydrodynamic mixing tends to homogenize the interstellar medium (ISM) locally (Edmunds 1975). Characteristic timescales for homogenization are short, ranging from  $10^6$ – $10^8$  yrs on scales of 100–1000 pc (Roy & Kunth 1995).

In contrast to the young stars the interstellar gas shows a high degree of chemical homogeneity in the solar neighbourhood (Sofia 2004), with the rms scatter of mean abundances often being less than 10%. However, the ISM gas phase is not suitable as a tracer for cosmic abundances because of selective depletion of elements onto dust grains. Here we reinvestigate the conundrum of inhomogeneous stellar vs. homogeneous ISM gas-phase abundances in the solar neighbourhood, motivated by our previous finding of homogeneous B-star abundances for carbon (Nieva & Przybilla 2008, NP08).

## 2. SAMPLE ANALYSIS

Six bright and apparently slow-rotating early B stars in the solar neighbourhood – randomly distributed in OB associations and in the field, and covering a wide range of stellar parameters – were observed in early 2005 at ESO/La Silla, using FEROS on the 2.2 m telescope. Spectra with broad wavelength coverage and resolving power = 48 000 were obtained, at very high-S/N (up to 800 in the B-band).

The quantitative analysis of the sample stars was carried out following the hybrid NLTE approach discussed by Nieva & Przybilla (2007, NP07) and NP08. In brief, line-blanketed LTE model atmospheres were computed with ATLAS9 (Kurucz 1993) and NLTE line-formation calculations were performed using updated versions of DETAIL and SURFACE (Giddings 1981; Butler & Giddings 1985). State-of-the-art model atoms were adopted (see Table 1), which allow atmospheric parameters and elemental abundances to be obtained with high accuracy.

Multiple independent spectroscopic indicators were considered simultaneously for the determination of the atmospheric parameters, effective temperature  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and surface gravity  $\log g$ : all Stark-broadened Balmer lines and 4–6 ionization

Electronic address: przybilla@sternwarte.uni-erlangen.de

<sup>1</sup> Based on observations obtained at the European Southern Observatory, proposal 074.B-0455(A).

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Remeis-Observatory, Sternwartstr. 7, D-96049 Bamberg, Germany

<sup>3</sup> MPI for Astrophysics, Postfach 1317, D-85741 Garching, Germany

<sup>4</sup> University Observatory, Scheinerstr. 1, D-86179 Munich, Germany

<sup>5</sup> We consider the region at distances shorter than 1 kpc (and 500 pc in Galactocentric direction) as solar neighbourhood in order to minimize bias due to Galactic abundance gradients, see Fig. 1 for a schematic overview.

TABLE 1  
STELLAR PARAMETERS & ELEMENTAL ABUNDANCES

	HR 6165		HR 3055		HR 1861		HR 2928		HR 3468		HR 5285	
Sp. Type	B0.2 V		B0 III		B1 IV		B1 IV		B1.5 III		B2 V	
Association	Sco Cen		Field		Ori OB1b		Field		Field		Sco Cen	
$d$ (pc)	152 20		438 57		450 59		481 63		319 41		155 20	
$T_{\text{eff}}$ (K)	32000 300		31200 300		27000 300		26300 300		22900 300		20800 300	
$\log g$ (cgs)	4.30 0.05		3.95 0.05		4.12 0.05		4.15 0.05		3.60 0.05		4.22 0.05	
( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )	5 1		8 1		3 1		3 1		5 1		3 1	
$v \sin i$ ( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )	4 4		29 4		12 1		14 1		11 2		18 1	
( $\text{km s}^{-1}$ )	4 4		37 8				20 2		20 1			
"(He) <sup>a</sup>	10.99	0.05 (20)	10.94	0.05 (16)	10.99	0.05 (14)	10.99	0.05 (14)	10.99	0.05 (14)	10.99	0.05 (13)
"(C II) <sup>b</sup>	8.27	0.14 (13)	8.35	0.08 (10)	8.32	0.10 (19)	8.28	0.08 (18)	8.36	0.10 (17)	8.32	0.08 (20)
"(C III) <sup>b</sup>	8.31	0.11 (17)	8.30	0.05 (7)	8.36	0.03 (11)	8.27	0.02 (5)	8.47	0.04 (2)	8.42	0.06 (2)
"(C IV) <sup>b</sup>		8.34 (2)		8.45 (2)								
"(N II) <sup>c</sup>	8.16	0.12 (73)	7.77	0.08 (23)	7.75	0.09 (61)	8.00	0.12 (61)	7.92	0.10 (56)	7.76	0.08 (47)
"(O I) <sup>d</sup>					8.82	0.03 (3)	8.83	0.05 (5)	8.82	0.03 (7)	8.79	0.05 (7)
"(O II) <sup>e</sup>	8.77	0.08 (51)	8.79	0.10 (41)	8.74	0.11 (52)	8.74	0.09 (46)	8.80	0.09 (40)	8.71	0.05 (45)
"(Ne I) <sup>f</sup>	8.12	0.05 (2)			8.12	0.08 (9)	8.11	0.09 (9)	8.05	0.09 (10)	8.07	0.07 (14)
"(Ne II) <sup>f</sup>	8.14	0.07 (16)	8.07	0.07 (8)	8.08	0.09 (14)	8.03	0.12 (8)	8.06	0.03 (2)		
"(Mg II) <sup>g</sup>	7.62	0.03 (3)	7.60	0.01 (2)	7.58	0.10 (6)	7.56	0.03 (3)	7.51	0.10 (6)	7.50	0.05 (4)
"(Si II) <sup>h</sup>					7.47	0.17 (2)	7.56	0.08 (2)	7.51	0.10 (5)	7.22	0.13 (6)
"(Si III) <sup>h</sup>	7.50	0.08 (8)	7.48	0.08 (6)	7.46	0.11 (9)	7.52	0.11 (8)	7.53	0.17 (7)	7.29	0.05 (9)
"(Si IV) <sup>h</sup>	7.50	0.04 (10)	7.51	0.18 (5)	7.50	0.08 (3)	7.48	0.14 (2)	7.50	0.04 (2)		
"(Fe II) <sup>i</sup>											7.38 (1)	7.38 (1)
"(Fe III) <sup>j</sup>	7.38	0.12 (17)	7.49	0.12 (5)	7.44	0.09 (33)	7.48	0.10 (30)	7.42	0.12 (36)	7.40	0.09 (32)

"(El) =  $\log(\text{El}/\text{H}) + 12$ , with rms uncertainties and number of analysed lines in parentheses. NLTE model atoms: H: Przybilla & Butler (2004); <sup>a</sup> Przybilla (2005); <sup>b</sup> Nieva & Przybilla (2006, 2008); <sup>c</sup> Przybilla & Butler (2001); <sup>d</sup> Przybilla et al. (2000); <sup>e</sup> Becker & Butler (1988), updated; <sup>f</sup> Morel & Butler (2008), *gf*-values of Froese Fischer & Tachiev (2004) for Ne I; <sup>g</sup> Przybilla et al. (2001); <sup>h</sup> Becker & Butler (1990), extended & updated; <sup>i</sup> Becker (1998); <sup>j</sup> Morel et al. (2007)

equilibria, of He I/II, C II/III/IV, O I/II, Ne I/II, Si II/III/IV and Fe II/III. Also, the observed spectral energy distributions were reproduced (Nieva & Przybilla 2006). The resulting redundancy helps to avoid systematic errors. The microturbulent velocity was determined in the standard way by demanding that abundances be independent of line equivalent widths. Elemental abundances "(El), rotational velocity  $v \sin i$  and macroturbulence were determined from fits to individual line profiles. The results are summarized in Table 1. Stellar parameters and He and C abundances are identical with those derived by NP07/NP08, except for HR 5285, where consideration of additional ionization equilibria indicated small revisions, though agreement is obtained within the mutual uncertainties. Spectral types and spectroscopic distances are also given in Table 1. The positions of the stars in the  $T_{\text{eff}}\text{--}\log g$ -plane are indicated in Fig. 1, where a comparison with evolution tracks is made. An overview of the location of the stars in the solar vicinity is also given there.

The uncertainties in the atmospheric parameters were determined from the quality of the simultaneous fits to all diagnostic indicators. Statistical uncertainties for abundances were obtained from the individual line data (rms values). Systematic errors in the abundances due to uncertainties in atmospheric parameters, atomic data and the quality of the spectrum are 0.1 dex (NP08, Przybilla et al. 2006), i.e. about as large as the statistical errors.

Our analysis of the *individual* stars differs from previous studies in two main respects: I) practically all (unblended) lines of the ion spectra are analyzed instead of a few selected 'good' lines thus avoiding selection effects, and II) all parameter indicators (in particular all analyzed ionization equilibria) are closely matched simultaneously, which has never been achieved before. As a result, practically the *entire* observed stellar spectrum is reproduced closely by the spectral synthesis, see NP07, NP08, Przybilla et al. (2008) for examples. This is facilitated by the use of critically evaluated data in the model atom construction and a (time-consuming) itera-




FIG. 1.— Comparison with stellar evolution tracks (Meynet & Maeder 2003). Observed and predicted N/C ratios (by mass) are indicated. The inset shows the location of the sample stars as projected on the Galactic plane, with the solar neighbourhood (as considered here) schematically outlined. Open symbols denote positions of BA-SGs from the control sample (see text).

tive approach for a precise determination of the stellar parameters (NP08). Straightforward but less accurate  $T_{\text{eff}}$ -estimates using photometric calibrations as adopted in most previous work are avoided, as  $T_{\text{eff}}$ -uncertainties are often the most important sources of systematic error in the abundance derivation, next to ill-chosen atomic data (NP08).

### 3. CHEMICAL HOMOGENEITY OF THE SOLAR VICINITY

The status of previous NLTE abundance studies of early B-stars in the solar neighbourhood is illustrated in Fig. 2. A wide range of abundance values is found for most elements, typically spanning 1 dex (for comparison, such a range is bridged by the cumulative effect of 13 Gyrs of Galactochemical evolution, see e.g. Fig. 2 of Chiappini et al. 2003). Moreover, the abundance distributions peak in most cases at sub-solar values, in particular when referring to the solar composition of GS98. Exceptions are He, where most previous studies find values on average larger than solar, and Ne (about solar, GS98, from two very recent studies). Several of these older B-star studies were combined by Snow & Witt (1996)




FIG. 2.— Comparison of chemical abundance studies (NLTE) of B-type stars in the solar neighbourhood. Red bars: present work; full line and thick full line (for the same stars as in our work): Kilian (1992, 1994); dotted: Cunha & Lambert (1994), Cunha et al. (2006) for Ne; short-dashed: Gies & Lambert (1992), excluding bright giants and supergiants; long-dashed: Daflon et al. (1999, 2001a,b, 2003); dot-dashed: Morel & Butler (2008); triple-dot-dashed: Lyubimkov et al. (2004, 2005). Bin width is  $\sqrt{2}$  of the individual studies. Iron abundances were derived assuming LTE in all previous work. Solar abundances are also indicated ( $\odot$ , GS98 & AGS05: lower values). The panel for carbon is reproduced from NP08 for completeness. See the text for details.

and Sofia & Meyer (2001, SM01, see Table 2) to derive a reference composition, inevitably resulting in sub-solar average values and a large rms scatter. The former discrepancy has since been largely removed from a re-evaluation of solar abundances (AGS05). However, the status quo in terms of Galactochemical evolution can only be understood by invoking and fine-tuning extra processes such as infall/outflow of material and local retention of supernova products by large amounts.

On the other hand, our sample of early B-stars implies a high degree of homogeneity for elemental abundances in the solar neighbourhood, with a scatter of  $\sim 10\%$ , and absolute values of about solar (GS98 and/or AGS05, see Fig. 2 and Table 2)<sup>6</sup>. The only exception is N, which is most sensitive to mixing of the atmospheric layers with CN-processed material (e.g. Maeder & Meynet 2000). In this case the pristine N abundance may be indicated by the 3 objects with the lowest value, implying a pristine N/C ratio of  $0.31 \pm 0.05$  (by mass; error bar adjusted to reflect additional uncertainties).

Although our sample is small, we regard it as representative for the early B-star population in the solar neighbourhood. The stars sample the relevant portion of the H-burning phase of the objects in the HRD in terms of  $T_{\text{eff}}$  and  $\log g$  (see Fig. 1). They also sample one hemisphere of the solar neighbourhood (inset of Fig. 1), half of them located in OB associations and the other half in the field. All 6 stars were analyzed by Kilian (1992, 1994), which we regard one of the most accurate previous studies in terms of stellar parameter and abundance determination. Kilian's values for the 6 stars typically span the entire abundance range in her sample of 21 stars (see Fig. 2). We therefore also find a chance selection of stars with similar chemical composition for our sample unlikely. This is supported further by a control sample of 6 BA-type supergiants (BA-SGs, Fig. 1), for which mean values of  $\langle \text{O} \rangle = 8.80 \pm 0.02$  and  $\langle \text{Mg} \rangle = 7.55 \pm 0.07$  were derived using the same analysis methodology as applied here (Przybilla et al. 2006; Firnstein

2006). The wide abundance ranges found in previous work reflect the lower accuracy of the analyses, while shifts of the abundance distributions relative to each other reflect systematics, with different temperature scales being the most important among these.

The finding of chemical homogeneity for our sample is in excellent accordance with results from the analysis of the ISM gas-phase in the solar neighbourhood (Sofia 2004, and references therein) and with theory regarding the efficiency of hydrodynamic mixing in the ISM (Edmunds 1975; Roy & Kunth 1995). Excellent agreement is also obtained with elemental abundances in the Orion nebula (Esteban et al. 2004, E04, see Table 2), with the exception of C, which may be a consequence of the atomic data used in the Orion analysis (see NP08 for the stellar case) plus overestimated dust corrections.

In the following we briefly investigate the impact of this *cosmic abundance standard* on important topics of contemporary astrophysics.

#### 4. THE COSMIC ABUNDANCE STANDARD, SOLAR ABUNDANCES & THE DUST-PHASE COMPOSITION

In general, excellent agreement of our B-star abundances with solar values from recent 3D radiative-hydrodynamical simulations of the solar atmosphere (AGS05) is obtained. The oxygen value falls between GS98 and AGS05 values (see also Caffau et al. 2008) and neon is compatible with GS98. Assuming our O and Ne abundances to be also representative for the Sun, this could largely resolve the discrepancies between helioseismic constraints and the solar interior model based on abundances of AGS05 as reviewed by Basu & Antia (2008).

Our cosmic abundance standard also facilitates a precise determination of dust depletion in the local ISM for the primary constituents. The amount of material incorporated into dust grains is determined by the difference between our B-star abundances and the ISM gas-phase abundances, see Table 2. Accordingly, a composition poor in carbon but rich in oxygen and refractory elements is indicated.

Such studies were undertaken previously, using e.g. abundances of the Sun, of B stars and of young F & G stars (e.g.

<sup>6</sup> HR 5285 is excluded from the silicon mean abundance – asymmetric silicon line profiles (other species are unaffected) indicate non-radial pulsations which may be related to the silicon peculiarity.

TABLE 2  
CHEMICAL COMPOSITION OF DIFFERENT OBJECT CLASSES IN THE SOLAR NEIGHBOURHOOD AND OF THE SUN

Elem.	cosmic standard			Orion		Young		ISM		ISM		Sun <sup>e,f</sup>	
	B stars – this work			gas+dust <sup>b</sup>		B stars <sup>c</sup>		F&G stars <sup>c</sup>		gas		dust <sup>d</sup>	
He	10.98	0.02/	<sup>a</sup>	10.988	0.003							10.99	0.02
C	8.32	0.03/209	15	8.52	0.02	8.28	0.17	8.55	0.10	8.15	0.06 <sup>g</sup>	68	26
N	7.76	0.05/ 58	7	7.73	0.09	7.81	0.21			7.79	0.03		
O	8.76	0.03/575	41	8.73	0.03	8.54	0.16	8.65	0.15	8.59	0.01 <sup>i</sup>	186	42
Ne	8.08	0.03/120	9	8.05	0.07								
Mg	7.56	0.05/ 36	4			7.36	0.13	7.63	0.17	6.17	0.0234.8	4.4	7.58
Si	7.50	0.02/ 32	1			7.27	0.20	7.60	0.14	6.35	0.0529.6	2.2	7.55
Fe	7.44	0.04/ 28	3			7.45	0.26	7.45	0.12	5.41	0.0427.3	2.7	7.50

<sup>a</sup> in units of  $\log(\text{El}=\text{H}) + 12$  / atoms per  $10^6$  H nuclei – computed from average star abundances (mean values over all analyzed lines per element); <sup>b</sup> E04; <sup>c</sup> SM01; <sup>d</sup> difference between the cosmic standard and ISM gas-phase abundances, in units of atoms per  $10^6$  H nuclei; <sup>e,f</sup> GS98/AGS05, photospheric values; <sup>g</sup> Sofia (2004); <sup>h</sup> Meyer et al. (1997), corrected accordingly to Jensen et al. (2007); <sup>i</sup> Cartledge et al. (2004); <sup>j</sup> Cartledge et al. (2006)

Snow & Witt 1996, SM01, see Table 2) as proxies for the determination of the dust-phase composition, however with mixed success. In particular, B stars were rejected as reliable indicators as the derived abundances of material in dust at that time were too low to produce the observed interstellar extinction. Our study revives B stars as proxies of the ISM dust-phase composition, and even more so because of the extremely low abundance scatter compared to all other standards considered so far, except for the Sun.

The present results imply tight observational constraints on dust models in terms of carbon abundance. The observed properties of dust grains, as inferred from the interstellar extinction law, have to be produced by a rather small amount of carbon, posing a challenge to most dust models (see e.g. Snow & Witt 1995). We can carry out an important consistency check, following Cartledge et al. (2006): the O predicted to be incorporated in grains from the observed Mg, Si and Fe dust abundances and a rudimentary dust model agrees with the derived O dust abundance within the mutual (small) uncertainties. For the rudimentary dust model we assume silicates to be predominantly  $\text{MgSiO}_3$ , with only a small fraction of Fe bound in silicates and only a small fraction being of olivine-like composition. The remaining Mg and Fe fraction is considered to be in oxide form ( $\text{MgO}$ ,  $\text{FeO}$ ,  $\text{Fe}_2\text{O}_3$ ,

$\text{Fe}_3\text{O}_4$ ), see e.g. Draine (2003) for a discussion of observational evidence.

Finally, we combine our B-star abundances with data for S, Cl and Ar from the analysis of the Orion nebula (E04) and solar meteoritic values for other abundant refractory elements (with  $^{26}\text{Al}/^{27}\text{Al} \approx 5$ , AGS05) to derive mass fractions for hydrogen, helium and the metals. Values of  $X = 0.715$ ,  $Y = 0.271$ ,  $Z = 0.014$  and  $Z/X = 0.020$  characterize the present-day cosmic matter in the solar neighbourhood (to be compared to protosolar values  $X_0 = 0.7133$ ,  $Y_0 = 0.2735$  and  $Z_0 = 0.0132$ , Grevesse et al. 2007). These combined abundances are our recommended values for a wide range of applications requiring an accurate knowledge of the chemical composition at present (e.g. for opacity calculations), examples being models of star/planet formation or stellar evolution (in particular of short-lived massive stars), or for the empirical calibration of Galactochemical evolution models.

We express our deep gratitude to U. Heber for constant support of the project and useful comments on the manuscript, and thank M. Asplund for stimulating discussion. M.F.N. acknowledges support by DFG (grant HE 1356/45-1).

## REFERENCES

- Asplund, M., et al. 2005, ASP Conf. Ser., 336, 25 (AGS05)  
 Basu, S., & Antia, H. M. 2008, Phys. Rep., 457, 217  
 Becker, S. R. 1998, ASP Conf. Ser., 131, 137  
 Becker, S. R., & Butler, K. 1988, A&A, 201, 232  
 Becker, S. R., & Butler, K. 1990, A&A, 235, 326  
 Butler, K. & Giddings, J.R. 1985, in Newsletter of Analysis of Astronomical Spectra, No. 9 (Univ. London)  
 Caffau, E., Ludwig, H.-G., Steffen, M., et al. 2008, A&A, 488, 1031  
 Cartledge, S. I. B., Lauroesch, J. T., et al. 2004, ApJ, 613, 1037  
 Cartledge, S. I. B., Lauroesch, J. T., et al. 2006, ApJ, 641, 327  
 Chiappini, C., Romano, D., & Matteucci, F. 2003, MNRAS, 339, 63  
 Cunha, K., & Lambert, D. L. 1994, ApJ, 426, 170  
 Cunha, K., Hubeny, I., & Lanz, T. 2006, ApJ, 647, L143  
 Daflon, S., Cunha, K., & Becker, S. R. 1999, ApJ, 522, 950  
 Daflon, S., Cunha, K., Becker, S. R., & Smith, V. V. 2001a, ApJ, 552, 309  
 Daflon, S., Cunha, K., Butler, K., & Smith, V. V. 2001b, ApJ, 563, 325  
 Daflon, S., Cunha, K., Smith, V. V., & Butler, K. 2003, A&A, 399, 525  
 Draine, B. T. 2003, ARA&A, 41, 241  
 Edmunds, M. G. 1975, Ap&SS, 32, 483  
 Esteban, C., et al. 2004, MNRAS, 355, 229 (E04)  
 Farnstein, M. 2006, Diploma Thesis, Univ. Erlangen-Nuremberg  
 Froese Fischer, C., & Tachiev, G. 2004, At. Data Nucl. Data Tables, 87, 1  
 Giddings, J. R. 1981, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London  
 Gies, D. R., & Lambert, D. L. 1992, ApJ, 387, 673  
 Grevesse, N., & Sauval, A. J. 1998, Space Sci. Rev., 85, 161 (GS98)  
 Grevesse, N., Asplund, M., & Sauval, A. J. 2007, Space Sci. Rev., 130, 105  
 Holweger, H. 2001, AIP Conf. Proc., 598, 23  
 Jensen, A. G., Rachford, B. L., & Snow, T. P. 2007, ApJ, 654, 955  
 Kilian, J. 1992, A&A, 262, 17  
 Kilian, J. 1994, A&A, 282, 867  
 Kurucz, R. L. 1993, CD-ROM 13 (Cambridge: SAO)  
 Lyubimkov, L. S., Rostopchin, S. I., Lambert, D. L. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 745  
 Lyubimkov, L. S., Rostopchin, S. I., et al. 2005, MNRAS, 358, 193  
 Maeder, A., & Meynet, G. 2000, ARA&A, 38, 143  
 Meyer, D. M., Cardelli, J. A., & Sofia, U. J. 1997, ApJ, 490, L103  
 Meynet, G., & Maeder, A. 2003, A&A, 404, 975  
 Morel, T., & Butler, K. 2008, A&A, 487, 307  
 Morel, T., Butler, K., Aerts, C., et al. 2007, A&A, 457, 651  
 Nieva, M. F., & Przybilla, N. 2006, ApJ, 639, L39  
 Nieva, M. F., & Przybilla, N. 2007, A&A, 467, 295 (NP07)  
 Nieva, M. F., & Przybilla, N. 2008, A&A, 481, 199 (NP08)  
 Przybilla, N. 2005, A&A, 443, 293  
 Przybilla, N., & Butler, K. 2001, A&A, 379, 955  
 Przybilla, N., & Butler, K. 2004, ApJ, 609, 1181  
 Przybilla, N., Butler, K., Becker, S. R., et al. 2000, A&A, 359, 1085  
 Przybilla, N., Butler, K., Becker, S. R., Kudritzki, R. P. 2001, A&A, 369, 1009  
 Przybilla, N., Butler, K., Becker, S. R., Kudritzki, R. P. 2006, A&A, 445, 1099  
 Przybilla, N., Nieva, M. F., Heber, U., Butler, K. 2008, ApJ, 684, L103  
 Roy, J.-R., & Kunth, D. 1995, A&A, 294, 432  
 Smith, K. C. 1996, Ap&SS, 237, 77  
 Sofia, U. J. 2004, ASP Conf. Ser., 309, 393  
 Sofia, U. J., & Meyer, D. M. 2001, ApJ, 554, L221 (SM01)  
 Snow, T. P., & Witt, A. N. 1995, Science, 270, 1455  
 Snow, T. P., & Witt, A. N. 1996, ApJ, 468, L65