

On the Universality of the Companion Mass Ratio Distribution (Research Note)

M. Reggiani¹ and M. R. Meyer¹

Institute of Astronomy, ETH Zurich, CH-8093 Zurich, Switzerland

Preprint online version: June 6, 2019

ABSTRACT

Aims. We present new results regarding the companion mass ratio distribution (CMRD) of stars, as a follow up of the work reported in Reggiani & Meyer (2011).

Methods. We use a maximum likelihood estimation method to re-derive the field CMRD power law avoiding dependence on the arbitrary binning. We also consider two new surveys of multiples in the field for solar-type stars (Raghavan et al. 2010) and M dwarfs (Janson et al. 2012) to test the universality of the CMRD.

Results. We do not find significant differences in the CMRD for M dwarfs and solar-type stars compared to previous results over the common mass ratio and separation range. The new best fit power law of the CMRD in the field, combining Raghavan et al. (2010) and Janson et al. (2012) data, is $dN/dq \propto q^\beta$, with $\beta = 0.25 \pm 0.29$.

Key words. binaries: general - stars: formation - stars: low-mass - stars: solar-type

1. Introduction

A large fraction of stars, both in the field (Raghavan et al. 2010; Janson et al. 2012) and in star forming regions (Patience et al. 2002), are formed in multiple systems. Therefore the understanding of multiple star formation is necessary to investigate star formation in general (Goodwin et al. 2007; Duchêne & Kraus 2013). As binary properties reflect the main characteristics of binary formation, they may help us to determine which are the most common mechanisms for the formation of multiple stars. In a binary system of stars with masses M_1 and M_2 ($M_1 > M_2$), the mass ratio is conventionally defined as $q = M_2/M_1$. Similar to the initial mass function (IMF) for single objects, the companion mass ratio distribution (CMRD) is the distribution of q values as a function of primary mass. Tidal capture models predict that for each primary star the mass of the secondary is chosen randomly from the single star mass function and the CMRD reflects the IMF (McDonald & Clarke 1993; Kroupa et al. 2003). In the case of fragmentation scenarios subsequent continued accretion onto both objects from a common reservoir tends to equalize the masses, resulting in a q distribution peaked towards unity (Bate 2000). Capture is unlikely to be the most relevant binary formation mechanism, however it may still occur during the dissolution phase of star clusters, causing differences in the shape of the CMRD as a function of orbital separation (Moeckel & Bate 2010; Moeckel & Clarke 2011). Motivated by the fact that every theoretical model predicts a different shape of the mass ratio distribution and dependency of the CMRD on the primary mass, we used Monte-Carlo simulations to compare the CMRD for different samples and to study the relationship between the IMF and the CMRD (Reggiani & Meyer (2011), hereafter, RM11). This research note represents a follow up to RM11, in which we will present a re-analysis of the "universal" CMRD by adopting a different statistical approach (Section 2) and some new results on the CMRD on the basis of recent datasets (Section 3).

2. The Universal Companion Mass Ratio Distribution

The CMRD appears to be universal over a wide range of q values and primary masses (e.g. Metchev & Hillenbrand 2009). According to RM11 the CMRD follows a single slope power law $dN/dq \propto q^\beta$ over the separation range 1-2400 AU and primary mass range 0.25-6.5 M_\odot , and there is no evidence for variation of the CMRD with orbital separation.

In previous work we combined together samples of M dwarfs (Fischer & Marcy 1992), G stars (Metchev & Hillenbrand 2009) in the field and intermediate mass stars in ScoOB2 (Kouwenhoven et al. 2005) adopting a χ^2 fit of the combined binned distribution to derive the power law slope, obtaining $\beta = -0.50 \pm 0.29$ (Reggiani & Meyer 2011). The choice of the statistical method was motivated by the need of comparing our results with previous studies of the CMRD (e.g. Kouwenhoven et al. 2005; Metchev & Hillenbrand 2009). However, the χ^2 fit of a binned distribution can lead to a biased estimate, in particular for small samples. A more robust analysis, instead, is achieved through a maximum likelihood estimation method (Feigelson & Babu 2011). This approach gives a new best fit power law $dN/dq \propto q^\beta$, with $\beta = -0.18 \pm 0.33$ to the data described in RM11. Although the two values are consistent with each other within the errors, the new estimate is flatter than previously thought.

3. Updates to the CMRD in the field

Recently, two new studies of the CMRD for solar type (Raghavan et al. 2010) and M dwarf primaries (Janson et al. 2012) in the field have been carried out. Since they represent the most complete samples to date for sun-like stars and M dwarfs, respectively, we applied the same statistical analysis that is presented in RM11 to follow up this preliminary work.

In the first study (Raghavan et al. 2010), roughly 200 binaries with primary masses between $0.5\text{--}3 M_{\odot}$ are considered to determine the CMRD over a large range of separations ($10^{-1}\text{--}10^5$ AU) and mass ratios (0.02-1). The CMRD that they derived appears to be more peaked towards unity than previously observed and the period distribution is unimodal and roughly log-normal with a peak at around 50 AU. Following the methodology described in RM11, we used the KS test to compare the newly observed CMRD with the CMRD by Metchev & Hillenbrand (2009), over the common range of mass ratios (0.02-1) and separations (28-1590 AU). The KS test returns a probability of $\sim 30\%$, therefore we cannot reject the hypothesis that the data were drawn from the same parent population. However, if we compare the two samples, over the common range of mass ratios, regardless of separation, the probability is only $\sim 1\%$, pointing towards a change of the CMRD with orbital radius, as Raghavan et al. (2010) covers a wider range than Metchev & Hillenbrand (2009). We tested therefore the possibility of a variation of the CMRD with angular separation. In order to do that we considered break points in the angular separation distribution between 10^{-1} and 10^5 AU and for each of them we used the KS test to determine the probability of the CMRD inside the break point being consistent with the CMRD outside. Since for any possible choice of break point we find probabilities greater than 1%, we conclude that we do not have strong evidence for a dependence of the CMRD on angular separation. As we do not expect to see random pairing from cluster dissolution models inside 10^4 AU (Kouwenhoven et al. 2010) and these widest binaries are relatively rare, we will need larger samples in the future to test these models.

The second study (Janson et al. 2012) consists of 85 systems with primary masses between $0.15\text{--}0.5 M_{\odot}$, separations in the range 3-227 AU and mass ratios between 0.1 and 1. For M dwarfs, the CMRD appears to be flat and the period distribution is narrower and peaks at smaller values than for solar type primaries, indicating a continuous transition from higher- to lower-mass stars (Burgasser et al. 2007). In this case as well, we tested the newly observed CMRD with the CMRD from Fischer & Marcy (1992) over the common range of mass ratios and separations. With a probability of $\sim 56\%$ the KS test does not allow us to reject the hypothesis that the newer data were drawn from the same parent sample. Finally, we used the same procedure that we adopted for sun-like stars, but in the range 3-227 AU, to explore the dependence of the observed CMRD on separation. Also for this sample we do not see evidence of this dependence.

Moreover, we compared the CMRD for solar-type primaries from Raghavan et al. (2010) with the new sample of M-dwarf primary binaries (Janson et al. 2012). The KS test returns a probability of 30% that the two distributions are consistent with each other (Figure 1). Motivated by this result and the CMRD being independent of angular separation, we combined together the two CMRDs over the common range of mass ratios. We used again a maximum likelihood method to fit the distribution and we found a power law $dN/dq \propto q^{\beta}$, with $\beta=0.25\pm 0.29$. While this slope β is formally consistent with the one derived in Section 2 (within the errors), the change in sign is notable. It is also worth mentioning that this fit is consistent with the mass ratio distribution with power-law exponent $\beta=-0.10\pm 0.58$ presented in a recent study of O-type spectroscopic binaries (Sana et al. 2012), whereas the observed CMRD for brown dwarfs ($\beta \sim 1.5$) points toward a different formation mechanisms for these objects (Goodwin 2013).




Fig. 1. Comparison between the observed CMRDs for solar type primaries and M dwarf primaries in the field. The open histogram represents the CMRD from Raghavan et al. (2010), whereas the hashed histogram represents the distribution from Janson et al. (2012). The KS test returns a probability of 30% that the two distributions are drawn from the same parent sample.

4. Summary

In this research note we have presented some updates to the study of RM11. First, we adopted a maximum likelihood estimation method to re-derive the field CMRD power law, based on the combination of samples (Fischer & Marcy 1992; Metchev & Hillenbrand 2009; Kouwenhoven et al. 2005) described in RM11, to show how the dependence on the bin size can bias the result.

Secondly, we analyzed recent binarity studies from the field (Raghavan et al. 2010; Janson et al. 2012) adopting the same methodology as in RM11. The new results from Raghavan et al. (2010) appear to be consistent with Metchev & Hillenbrand (2009) over the common range of mass ratios and angular separations. The recent updates on the M-dwarf CMRD (Janson et al. 2012) are also consistent with past results. The KS test does not allow us to reject the hypothesis that the CMRDs from Raghavan et al. (2010) and Janson et al. (2012) are drawn from the same parent sample. In both studies we do not uncover evidence for a CMRD dependence on separation. For those reasons we combined the two distributions and we obtained a new maximum likelihood fit to the field CMRD $dN/dq \propto q^{\beta}$, with $\beta=0.25\pm 0.29$.

Since the CMRD appears to be independent of separation and dynamical evolution (see also Parker and Reggiani and Parker et al. - submitted), it represents a measurable parameter of binary stars to focus on when investigating binary formation mechanisms. However we need larger samples to look for subtle variations of the CMRD with separation. In the future we would like to study the CMRD in other star forming regions (e.g. ONC) and test its dependence on separation for wide systems.

Acknowledgements. We thank the referee, Simon Goodwin, for his review. We are also grateful to Carolina Bergfors, Stanimir Metchev, Deepak Raghavan, Eric Feigelson and Richard Parker for the insightful discussions and sharing their data electronically.

References

Bate, M. R. 2000, MNRAS, 314, 33

- Burgasser, A. J., Reid, I. N., Siegler, N., et al. 2007, *Protostars and Planets V*, 427
- Duchêne, G., & Kraus, A. 2013, arXiv:1303.3028
- Feigelson, E. D. & Babu, G. J. 2011, *Modern Statistical Methods for Astronomy with R Applications*, Cambridge Univ. Press
- Fischer, D. A., & Marcy, G. W. 1992, *ApJ*, 396, 178
- Goodwin, S. P. 2013, *MNRAS*, 430, L6
- Goodwin, S. P., Kroupa, P., Goodman, A., & Burkert, A. 2007, *Protostars and Planets V*, 133
- Kouwenhoven, M. B. N., Brown, A. G. A., Zinnecker, H., Kaper, L., & Portegies Zwart, S. F. 2005, *A&A*, 430, 137
- Kouwenhoven, M. B. N., Goodwin, S. P., Parker, R. J., et al. 2010, *MNRAS*, 404, 1835
- Kroupa, P., Bouvier, J., Duchêne, G., & Moraux, E. 2003, *MNRAS*, 346, 354
- Janson, M., Hormuth, F., Bergfors, C., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 754, 44
- McDonald, J. M., & Clarke, C. J. 1993, *MNRAS*, 262, 800
- Metchev, S. A., & Hillenbrand, L. A. 2009, *ApJS*, 181, 62
- Moeckel, N., & Bate, M. R. 2010, *MNRAS*, 404, 721
- Moeckel, N., & Clarke, C. J. 2011, *MNRAS*, 415, 1179
- Patience, J., Ghez, A. M., Reid, I. N., & Matthews, K. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 1570
- Raghavan, D., McAlister, H. A., Henry, T. J., et al. 2010, *ApJS*, 190, 1
- Reggiani, M. M., & Meyer, M. R. 2011, *ApJ*, 738, 60
- Sana, H., de Mink, S. E., de Koter, A., et al. 2012, *Science*, 337, 444