

# Two step ejection of massive stars and the issue of their formation in isolation

Jan Pflamm-Altenburg<sup>\*</sup> and Pavel Kroupa<sup>\*</sup>

*Argelander-Institut für Astronomie (AIfA), University of Bonn, Auf dem Hügel 71, D-53121 Bonn, Germany*

Accepted 2010 January 18

## ABSTRACT

In this paper we investigate the combined effect of massive binary ejection from star clusters and a second acceleration of a massive star during a subsequent supernova explosion. We call this the *two-step-ejection* scenario. The main results are: i) Massive field stars produced via the two-step-ejection process can not in the vast majority of cases be traced back to their parent star clusters. These stars can be mistakenly considered as massive stars formed in isolation. ii) The expected O star fraction produced via the two-step-ejection process is of the order of 1–4 per cent, in quantitative agreement with the observed fraction of candidates for isolated-O-star formation. iii) Stars ejected via the two-step-ejection process can get a higher final velocity (up to 1.5–2 times higher) than the pre-supernova velocity of the massive-star binary.

**Key words:** (stars:) binaries: general, stars: formation, stars: kinematics, (stars:) supernovae: general

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Considering pure number counts massive stars are by far only a tiny minority in the stellar population of galaxies. But they mainly drive galactic evolution due to their dominating chemical and energetic feedback. Although the importance of massive stars for galactic astrophysics has been accepted, the physical circumstances of their formation are still not resolved, i.e. where, why, and how they form.

It is currently strongly debated whether the formation of massive stars is entirely restricted to the interior of massive star clusters or if they can form in isolation in the galactic field.

Indeed, on the basis of a statistical analysis of a sample of galactic O stars de Wit et al. (2005) conclude that 4±2 per cent of all O-type stars can be considered as formed outside a cluster environment. They further show that this fraction of isolated O stars is expected if the slope of the cluster mass function (CMF) is  $\beta = 1.7$ . This assumed CMF slope in the low mass star cluster regime is in disagreement with the slope of  $\beta = 2$  observed in the solar neighborhood (Lada & Lada 2003).

The definition of an isolated O star in the IMF-Monte-Carlo simulations of de Wit et al. (2005) is restricted to stellar ensembles which contain only one O star. Parker & Goodwin (2007) strengthened the definition of an isolated O star being an O star without B-star com-

panions but allowed the O star to be surrounded by a cluster with a mass of  $<100 M_{\odot}$ . Using this definition Parker & Goodwin (2007) conclude that an observed CMF slope of  $\beta = 2$  can quantitatively explain the statistical analysis by de Wit et al. (2005)

The analysis by de Wit et al. (2004, 2005) identifies a small number of O-stars which are deemed to be truly isolated in the sense of not being traceable to an origin in a cluster or OB association. However, Gvaramadze & Bomans (2008) reported the existence of a bow shock associated with the O-star HD165319, which is marked in de Wit et al. (2005) as a very likely candidate for an O-star formed in isolation.

In general, two main processes exist for the production of high-velocity O- and B-stars: i) close encounters between binaries and single stars or binaries and binaries can result in the ejection of massive stars (e.g. Poveda et al. 1967; Hoffer 1983; Mikkola 1983, 1984; Leonard 1991). The ejection velocity is of the order of the orbital velocity of the binary (Heggie 1980). Thus tighter binaries can produce larger ejection velocities. ii) The supernova explosion of one component of the binary leads to a recoil of the other component (e.g. Zwicky 1957; Blaauw 1961; Iben & Tutukov 1997; Tauris & Takens 1998; Portegies Zwart 2000; Hoogerwerf et al. 2001). The supernova ejection scenario only requires the existence of massive binaries, whereas ejection rates in the dynamical ejection scenario depend on the close encounter frequency. This frequency will be increased if massive stars

<sup>\*</sup> email: jpflamm@astro.uni-bonn.de, pavel@astro.uni-bonn.de

form in compact few-body groups (Clarke & Pringle 1992; Pflamm-Altenburg & Kroupa 2006).


Various studies on the individual ejection processes exist. To our knowledge only one investigation exists combining both processes (Gvaramadze, Gualandris & Portegies Zwart 2008), where the hypothesis is explored that a hyperfast pulsar can be the remnant of a symmetric supernova explosion of a massive O star dynamically ejected from a young massive star cluster. In this contribution we investigate for the first time the combination of the dynamical and supernova ejection process, in which a massive binary is dynamically ejected from a star cluster with subsequent supernova explosion of one binary component with recoil of the other binary component. We refer to this composite ejection scenario as the *two-step-ejection process* of massive stars.

We start our investigation in Section 2 with the calculation of the velocity spectrum of stars which are released with the same velocity during a supernova from binaries with identical ejection velocities. We then derive the probability that stars released by a supernova from ejected binaries can be traced back to their parent star cluster (Section 3), and discuss the maximum possible velocity which stars can get in the two-step-ejection process in Section 5.

## 2 COMPOUND VELOCITY SPECTRUM

Due to dynamical interactions during close encounters of stars, binaries can be ejected from star clusters with the ejection velocity,  $v_e$ . If one component of the binary explodes in a supernova the gravitational force acting on the other component decreases rapidly if the expanding supernova shell has passed the orbit of the stellar companion releasing it with nearly its orbital velocity into the galactic field. Depending on the configuration of the pre-supernova binary and the supernova details (e.g. eccentricity, supernova mass loss, asymmetry of the supernova) the supernova remnant may still be bound to its companion. Portegies Zwart (2000) calculated that between 20 and 40 per cent of the supernova runaways have neutron star companions, but less than 1 per cent are detectable as pulsars. Independent if the supernova remnant (neutron star or black hole) still remains bound to the other massive star or not we speak of binary disintegration throughout this paper. The post-supernova massive-star runaway is released with a release velocity,  $v_r$ , with respect to the centre-of-mass of the pre-supernova binary.

The vectorial sum of both velocities, the ejection and release velocity, is the new velocity of the released star. We call this velocity the compound velocity,  $v_c$ . For fixed ejection velocity,  $v_e$ , and release velocity,  $v_r$ , the compound velocity,  $v_c$ , is distributed, because the direction of the release of the star from the disintegrating binary during the supernova is randomly distributed in space. The corresponding spectrum of the compound velocity,  $f_c(v_c)$ , defines the number of stars,  $dN(v_c)$ , which have a compound velocity,  $v_c$ , after they have been released from ejected binaries.



**Figure 1.** Illustration of the compound velocity. A binary is ejected with the velocity  $v_e$ . One component is then released with the velocity  $v_r$  resulting in the compound velocity,  $v_c$ , given by the vectorial sum.

### 2.1 Calculating $f_c(v_c)$

We start the calculation of the resulting compound velocity spectrum with the definition of the compound velocity through vectorial addition,

$$\mathbf{v}_c = \mathbf{v}_e + \mathbf{v}_r . \quad (1)$$

The relation between the absolute values of the velocities follows from the cosine theorem (Fig. 1),

$$v_c^2 = v_e^2 + v_r^2 - 2v_e v_r \cos \theta . \quad (2)$$

Differentiation leads to the relation

$$\frac{dv_c}{d\theta} = \frac{v_e v_r}{v_c} \sin \theta \quad (3)$$

between the compound velocity and the release angle  $\theta$ .

The orientations of the binaries are randomly distributed in space. Thus, the released stars are  $4\pi$  distributed with respect to the centre-of-mass system of the binary. If a set of binaries release  $N$  stars isotropically the number of stars  $dN(\theta)$  released in a small angle  $d\theta$  is given by the ratio of the area of the small circular stripe,  $dA(\theta)$ , with the angle  $\theta$  and the unit sphere,  $4\pi$  (Fig. 1) ,

$$\frac{dN(\theta)}{N} = \frac{dA(\theta)}{4\pi} , \quad (4)$$

where the area of the small circular stripe is

$$dA(\theta) = 2\pi \sin(\theta) d\theta . \quad (5)$$

By combining these equations the number fraction of stars having the compound velocity  $v_c$  is


$$\frac{dN(v_c)}{dv_c} = \frac{N}{2v_e v_r} v_c . \quad (6)$$

As the angle  $\theta$  varies from 0 to  $2\pi$ , the allowed range of the compound velocity can be obtained from the cosine theorem above and is

$$|v_e - v_r| \leq v_c \leq v_e + v_r . \quad (7)$$

The distribution function,  $f_c(v_c)$ , of the compound velocity is normalised by

$$1 = \int f_c(v_c) dv_c , \quad (8)$$



**Figure 2.** The form of the compound velocity spectrum  $f_c$  (eq. 9).

and is for a constant ejection velocity,  $v_e$ , and constant release velocity,  $v_r$ ,

$$f_c(v_c) = \frac{1}{2v_e v_r} v_c \Theta(v_c - |v_e - v_r|) \Theta(v_e + v_r - v_c), \quad (9)$$

where the  $\Theta$ -mapping is defined by

$$\Theta(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & ; x \geq 0 \\ 0 & ; x < 0 \end{cases}. \quad (10)$$

The form of the compound spectrum can be seen in Fig. 2. Compound velocities at the high speed end are preferred. But the distribution function,  $f_c(v_c)$ , flattens with increasing ejection or release velocity. The distribution is symmetric in  $v_r$  and  $v_e$ . Note that in eq. 8 an additional factor  $4\pi v_c^2$ , as for example in the Maxwellian distribution calculated from a three-dimensional Gaussian distribution function, is not required, because  $f_c(v_c)$  refers already to an absolute velocity value and is not calculated from spatial integration over a three-dimensional distribution function.

If the velocities of the ejected binaries and of the released stars are distributed according to uncorrelated distribution functions,  $f_e(v_e)$  and  $f_r(v_r)$ , then the resulting distribution of compound velocities is calculated by integration over both distributions,

$$f_c(v_c) = \frac{v_c}{2} \int \int \frac{f_e(v_e) f_r(v_r)}{v_e v_r} \Theta(v_c - |v_e - v_r|) \Theta(v_e + v_r - v_c) dv_e dv_r. \quad (11)$$

## 2.2 Properties of $f_c(v_c)$

In the following we derive some properties of the compound velocity spectrum.

i) The simplest case we can consider is that if one of the velocities,  $v_e$  or  $v_r$ , is zero. If for example  $v_r$  converges against zero then the velocity spectrum converges against the delta-distribution

$$f_c(v_c) = \lim_{v_r \rightarrow 0} f_{v_r}(v_c) = \delta(v_c - v_e). \quad (12)$$

Because  $f_c(v_c)$  is symmetric in  $v_r$  and  $v_e$ , the same result follows for  $v_e \rightarrow 0$ . The compound velocity is identical to the ejection or release velocity.

ii) The released stars are not necessarily faster than the previous binaries. They can also be decelerated. The fraction of stars ( $\mu_{>v_e}$ ) which are accelerated, i.e. having a compound velocity greater than the ejection velocity is given by the integral

$$\mu_{>v_e} = \int_{v_e}^{v_e+v_r} f_c(v_c) dv_c. \quad (13)$$

The evaluation of the integral leads to

$$\mu_{>v_e} = \frac{1}{4v_e v_r} (v_r^2 + 2v_e v_r - \Theta(|v_e - v_r| - v_e) (v_r^2 - 2v_e v_r)). \quad (14)$$

The fraction of accelerated stars in dependence of the ejection and release velocity can be seen in Fig. 3. Two cases can be distinguished:

$$|v_e - v_r| \geq v_e : \mu_{>v_e} = 1, \quad (15)$$

and

$$|v_e - v_r| < v_e : \mu_{>v_e} = \frac{v_r}{4v_e} + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (16)$$

The number fraction of accelerated stars is always larger than 50 per cent and all stars are accelerated for  $v_r > 2v_e$ .

For the case that  $v_e = v_r$ , which will be important for Section 5, i.e. the ejection velocity is comparable to the orbital velocity of the ejected binary, the fraction of accelerated stars is 75 per cent.

iii) We now calculate the resulting mean compound velocity,  $\bar{v}_c$ , by the integral

$$\bar{v}_c = \int_{|v_e - v_r|}^{v_e + v_r} v_c f_c(v_c) dv_c = \frac{1}{6v_e v_r} v_c^3 \Big|_{|v_e - v_r|}^{v_e + v_r} \quad (17)$$

We define

$$v_{\min} = \min\{v_e, v_r\}, \quad v_{\max} = \max\{v_e, v_r\} \quad (18)$$

and write

$$v_e + v_r = v_{\min} + v_{\max} \quad (19)$$

and

$$|v_e - v_r| = v_{\max} - v_{\min}. \quad (20)$$

and finally the mean compound velocity can be written as

$$\bar{v}_c = \frac{1}{3} \frac{v_{\min}^2 + 3v_{\max}^2}{v_{\max}}. \quad (21)$$

It follows that the mean compound velocity is always greater than or equal to the ejection and release velocity:


$$\bar{v}_c \geq \frac{1}{3} \frac{3v_{\max}^2}{v_{\max}} = v_{\max}. \quad (22)$$

For the case that  $v_e = v_r$ , which will be important for section 5, i.e. the ejection velocity is comparable to the orbital velocity of the ejected binary, the mean compound velocity is


$$\bar{v}_c = \frac{4}{3} v_e \quad (23)$$

## 3 BACK-TRACING PROBABILITY

If single stars or binaries are ejected from star clusters it is theoretically possible to calculate their orbits backward,



**Figure 3.** The fraction of accelerated stars in dependence of the ejection and release velocity for different release velocities in  $\text{km s}^{-1}$ .



**Figure 4.** Illustration of the back-tracing-probability. See text for details.

if the force field, through which the objects have moved in time, is given. In such a case the star cluster, where the stars have their origin, can be identified.

If the binary disintegrates due to a supernova, the released component suffers a strong deflection of its previous binary orbit, and the cluster, from where it is expelled, can only be identified if the angle between the deflected and previous orbit is not too large (Fig. 4).

A binary is ejected from a star cluster and moves along path 1. After the binary has moved the distance  $\xi$  from the centre of the cluster,  $O$ , it disintegrates at the position  $P$  and one component of the binary is released. The star cluster, from which the star has been ejected, is identified, if the extrapolated path of the released star intersects a sphere with the identification radius,  $R_i$ , round the star cluster. If the released star moves along path 2, the star cluster is identified (extrapolated long dashed line). If the star moves along path 3, the parent star cluster can not be identified (extrapolated short dashed line). Only stars which have new orbits within the gray shaded region between the dotted lines can be traced back to their parent star cluster.

**Table 1.** Back-trace probability

$R_i/\xi$	1	1/2	1/5	1/10	1/15	1/50
$P$ [%o]	500	67	10	2.5	1	0.1

$R_i$  is the radius of the identification sphere around the star cluster from which the binary has been ejected.  $\xi$  is the distance between the location of the disintegration of the binary and the centre of the identification sphere which coincides with the centre of the star cluster.  $P$  is the back-tracing probability in %o.

At the location of binary disintegration (point  $P$ ) the identification sphere appears under the angle  $2\alpha$ , i.e. a solid angle of  $2\pi(1 - \cos \alpha)$ . Because the directions of the released stars are randomly distributed over the full solid angle of  $4\pi$ , the probability that the star cluster can be identified is given by the ratio of the solid angle of the identification sphere and the full solid angle,

$$P = \frac{1 - \cos \alpha}{2} . \quad (24)$$

The cosine can be expressed by the identification radius,  $R_i$ , and the disintegration distance,  $\xi$ ,

$$\cos \alpha = \sqrt{1 - \sin^2 \alpha} = \sqrt{1 - \frac{R_i^2}{\xi^2}} . \quad (25)$$

Then the identification probability is

$$P = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1 - R_i^2/\xi^2} \right) . \quad (26)$$

The resulting probabilities for different ratios of the identification radius and disintegration distance are listed in Table 1.

#### 4 OBSERVED STATISTICS OF RUNAWAYS AND APPARENTLY ISOLATED O STARS

Massive stars and massive binaries can only be ejected dynamically from star clusters during the early stage of their life. If they form within compact few-body configurations or trapezia systems (Clarke & Pringle 1992), then the decay time scale of these few-body systems ( $<1$  Myr, Pflamm-Altenburg & Kroupa 2006) implies only early ejections of massive stars. If massive stars and binaries are formed distributed over the star cluster, then ejections can only occur as long as the stellar densities are high. Due to gas expulsion young embedded star clusters become super-virial and start to expand and the stellar density decreases rapidly (Kroupa, Aarseth & Hurley 2001). The time scale of decrease of the stellar density is comparable to the gas expulsion time scale, of the order of  $\approx 1$  Myr. Thus the time of flight of ejected binaries is comparable to their maximum-lifetime.

Taking a lower velocity cut-off for O-star runaways of  $30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  as considered in Gies & Bolton (1986) and a mean life-time of 5 Myr of O-stars implies a disintegration distance  $\xi = 150$  pc. For a large identification radius of  $R_i = 10$  pc of the star cluster, the back-tracing probability is 1 %o (Table 1). Lowering the cut-off velocity of the runaway-star definition to  $10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  results in a back-tracing probability of 1 per cent. Thus, ejected massive binaries which are listed in runaway O-star surveys will produce O stars

which can not be traced back to their parent star cluster. But one might expect that in this case the massive star can be traced back to a supernova shell. However, as single supernova shells disappear on a time scale of 0.5–1 Myr (Chevalier 1974) it might be possible to identify the parent supernova of the released star only in very rare cases.

The observationally derived runaway fraction among O stars varies widely in the literature, (see for example Table 13 in Gies & Bolton 1986 or Table 5 in Stone 1991). Gies & Bolton (1986) identified 15 stars out of a sample of 36 runaway candidates with confirmed peculiar radial velocities  $\geq 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . Comparing with their stated total number of about 90 O stars within their sample space, a runaway fraction of  $15/90 = 16$  per cent results. They further conclude that the true runaway fraction of O stars depends on the adopted velocity cut-off and may lie in the range of 10–25 per cent. Gies & Bolton (1986) also found the binary fraction among runaway O stars in their sample to be about 10 per cent. As explained above, O stars released in a supernova in an ejected massive binary result in field O stars which can not be traced back to their parent star clusters. Thus, on the basis of the O-star runaway fraction and binary fraction of O-runaway data published by Gies & Bolton (1986) 1–2.5 per cent of O stars can not be traced back to the star cluster where they have form. These O stars will appear to have formed in isolation, although they were born in an ordinary star cluster.

The different O-star runaway fractions in the literature have been unified by Stone (1991) by considering true space frequencies: The radial velocity spectrum of O stars is decomposed into two different Gaussian velocity distributions, which correspond to two different Maxwellian space velocity distributions. The high velocity component has a number fraction of  $f_H = 46$  per cent and a velocity distribution of  $\sigma_H = 28.2 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . By transforming individual O star runaway studies, which are based on individual runaway definitions, to true space frequencies based on bimodality in the velocity distribution of O stars, Stone (1991) achieves good agreement between the different individual studies.

From the runaway fraction of 46 per cent derived by Stone (1991) it follows that a fraction of 4.6 per cent of O stars will apparently form in isolation, if the runaway binary fraction of 10 per cent by Gies & Bolton (1986) is used.

Thus, the two-step-ejection process predicts a fraction of O stars which have formed apparently in isolation in the range of 1–4.6 per cent. de Wit et al. (2004, 2005) conclude, based on the actually observed positions and velocities of O stars, that  $4 \pm 2$  per cent of O stars can be considered as candidates of massive stars formed in isolation, because such stars can not be traced back to a young star cluster. Consequently, the process of two-step ejection can quantitatively account for the proposed fraction of massive candidates formed in isolation.

## 5 MAXIMUM POSSIBLE VELOCITY

The maximum possible velocity in the two-step-ejection process is  $v_{\text{max}} = v_r + v_e$ , i.e. if the star is released in the moving direction of the previous binary. Binaries can be ejected from star clusters due to dynamical interactions. Two common situations are the scattering of two binaries (B+B) and the

scattering of one binary and one single star (B+S). B+B-events lead commonly to two single runaway stars and one tight binary. But also high velocity binaries can be produced in roughly 10 per cent of all cases (Mikkola 1983).

In the B+S event high velocity binaries must be produced due to local conservation of linear momentum. The ejection velocity of the single star is typically of the order of the orbital velocity of the binary (Heggie 1980),  $v_o$ . In the case of equal masses the ejection velocity of the binary,  $v_e$ , is half of the ejection velocity of the single star,  $v_e = \frac{1}{2} v_o$ . When the ejected binary disintegrates due to a supernova explosion then the maximum possible velocity of the released star is  $v_{\text{max}} = \frac{3}{2} v_o$ .

If on the other hand, the companion of the massive star is a low-mass star then the ejection velocity of the binary is equal to the ejection velocity of the single star, thus we have  $v_e = v_o$ . The maximum possible velocity of the released (less-massive companion) star after binary disintegration is of the order  $v_{\text{max}} = 2 v_o$ . It might be expected that in the case of binaries consisting of a high-mass and a low-mass star encountered by a high-mass star the low-mass star will be ejected and an equal-mass binary will form. To what amount binaries with a large mass ratio will not suffer an exchange has to be quantified numerically in further studies.

## 6 CONCLUSION

Various theoretical and numerical studies exist on individual ejection processes of massive stars, namely the dynamical ejection scenario and the supernova ejection scenario, but the combined effect of both scenarios for the distribution of massive stars in a galaxy has not been considered yet. In this paper we investigate for the first time the implications of the combination of the dynamical and the supernova ejection scenario for the O-star population of the Galactic field. We call this combined effect the *two-step-ejection* process of massive stars. The main results are as follows:

i) The compound velocity,  $v_c$ , which is the vectorial sum of the ejection velocity,  $v_e$ , of the binary from the star cluster and the release velocity,  $v_r$ , with which a star is released during a supernova, can be larger or smaller than the previous ejection velocity. Stars can be both, accelerated and decelerated.

ii) The mean compound velocity is always greater than each of the initial velocities,  $v_e$  and  $v_r$  (eq. 22).

iii) It is very unlikely that the parent star cluster of a massive field star produced by the two-step-ejection scenario can be identified. The expected number fraction of such massive field stars which are formed apparently in isolation can account quantitatively for the number of candidates for isolated massive star formation derived in de Wit et al. (2005).

iv) Massive stars which are ejected via the two-step scenario can get higher maximum space velocities (up to 1.5 times higher for equal-mass binary components or 2 times higher for significantly unequal-mass companion masses) than can be obtained by each process (dynamical or supernova ejection) individually.

**REFERENCES**

- Blaauw A., 1961, *Bull. Astron. Inst. Nederlands*, 15, 265
- Chevalier R. A., 1974, *ApJ*, 188, 501
- Clarke C. J., Pringle J. E., 1992, *MNRAS*, 255, 423
- de Wit W. J., Testi L., Palla F., Vanzi L., Zinnecker H., 2004, *A&A*, 425, 937
- de Wit W. J., Testi L., Palla F., Zinnecker H., 2005, *A&A*, 437, 247
- Gies D. R., Bolton C. T., 1986, *ApJS*, 61, 419
- Gvaramadze V. V., Bomans D. J., 2008, *A&A*, 490, 1071
- Gvaramadze V. V., Gualandris A., Portegies Zwart S., 2008, *MNRAS*, 385, 929
- Heggie D. C., 1980, in D. Hanes & B. Madore ed., *Globular Clusters Dynamical theory of binaries in clusters*. pp 281–+
- Hoffer J. B., 1983, *AJ*, 88, 1420
- Hoogerwerf R., de Bruijne J. H. J., de Zeeuw P. T., 2001, *A&A*, 365, 49
- Iben I. J., Tutukov A. V., 1997, *ApJ*, 491, 303
- Kroupa P., Aarseth S., Hurley J., 2001, *MNRAS*, 321, 699
- Lada C. J., Lada E. A., 2003, *ARAA*, 41, 57
- Leonard P. J. T., 1991, *AJ*, 101, 562
- Mikkola S., 1983, *MNRAS*, 203, 1107
- Mikkola S., 1984, *MNRAS*, 207, 115
- Parker R. J., Goodwin S. P., 2007, *MNRAS*, 380, 1271
- Pflamm-Altenburg J., Kroupa P., 2006, *MNRAS*, 373, 295
- Portegies Zwart S. F., 2000, *ApJ*, 544, 437
- Poveda A., Ruiz J., Allen C., 1967, *Boletin de los Observatorios Tonantzintla y Tacubaya*, 4, 86
- Stone R. C., 1991, *AJ*, 102, 333
- Tauris T. M., Takens R. J., 1998, *A&A*, 330, 1047
- Zwicky F., 1957, *Morphological astronomy*. Berlin: Springer, 1957