

METALLICITY DEPENDENCE OF BLACK HOLE MAIN SEQUENCE BINARIES DETECTABLE WITH GAIA

TOMOYA KINUGAWA¹, AND MASAKI S. YAMAGUCHI²
Draft version November 18, 2021

ABSTRACT

LIGO has detected gravitational waves from massive binary black hole mergers. In order to explain the origin of such massive stellar-mass black holes, extreme metal poor stars including first stars have been invoked. However, black holes do not carry information of the metallicity. In order to check the metallicity dependence of the black hole formation, we focus on galactic black hole-main sequence binaries (BH-MSs). Using a binary population synthesis method, we find that *Gaia* can detect $\sim 200 - 400$ BH-MSs whose metallicity is Z_{\odot} and $\sim 70 - 400$ BH-MSs whose metallicity is $0.1Z_{\odot}$. With the spectroscopic observation on 4-m class telescopes, we can check the metallicity of BH-MSs. The metallicity dependence of the black hole formation might be checked by the astrometry and spectroscopic observations.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are some observations of low metallicity main sequence stars at the present day?. Black hole-main sequence binaries (BH-MSs) which are low metal stars also be able to survive at the present day. The astrometry observatory *Gaia* is a powerful tool for search BH-MSs. Some researchers expected the *Gaia* can detect $10^2 - 10^5$ BH-MSs (Mashian & Loeb 2017; Breivik et al. 2017; Yamaguchi et al. 2018; Yalinewich et al. 2018). Such BH-MSs might be mixed with the low metallicity BH-MSs. With the spectroscopic observation on 4-m class telescopes, we can check the metallicity of BH-MSs. The main sequence star has the information of the metallicity which then allows us to infer the metallicity of the progenitor of the black hole primary. This is very useful to check the metallicity dependence of black hole formation.

LIGO has detected gravitational waves from binary black holes mergers (Abbott et al. 2016a,b,c). Some black holes of the gravitational wave sources are $\sim 30 M_{\odot}$. On the other hand, the masses of black hole candidates of X-ray binaries are typically $\sim 10 M_{\odot}$ (Özel et al. 2010). Thus, the origin of massive black holes might be different from general black holes. In order to explain the origin of such massive stellar black holes, extreme metal poor stars including first stars have been invoked (Kinugawa et al. 2014; Kinugawa et al. 2016; Belczynski et al. 2016; Hartwig et al. 2016; Inayoshi et al. 2017; Miyamoto et al. 2017). However, since black holes do not carry information of the metallicity, it might be difficult to determine the population of black hole progenitors until we detect binary black hole mergers at high redshift (Nakamura et al. 2016). In order to check the metallicity dependence of the black hole formation, the comparison of the theoretical expectation and the results of *Gaia* and the spectroscopic observation will be important.

In this paper, we calculate the binary evolution using the population synthesis method to estimate the BH-MS detection rate. Especially, we calculate two metallicity

cases such as Z_{\odot} , and $0.1Z_{\odot}$ and consider the metallicity dependence of the BH-MSs. We also check the difference of the properties between the galactic BH-MSs and the observable BH-MSs.

2. METHOD

We use the Monte Carlo method called as the population synthesis to calculate BH-MS rates. Our binary population synthesis code is based on the BSE code (Hurley et al. 2002). We rewrite the wind mass loss rate (Kinugawa & Asano 2017) and the common envelope parts (Kinugawa et al. 2014) of the BSE code.

In the part of the wind mass loss, the Wolf Rayet (WR) stellar wind mass loss and the mass loss rate of the luminous blue variable (LBV) stars are updated as

$$\dot{M}_{\text{WR}} = 10^{-13} \left(\frac{L}{L_{\odot}} \right)^{1.5} \left(\frac{Z}{Z_{\odot}} \right)^{0.86} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

and

$$\dot{M}_{\text{LBV}} = 1.5 \times 10^{-4} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where L , and Z are the luminosity, and the metallicity, respectively (Belczynski et al. 2010a).

When the stellar radius become large and the stellar surface is captured by the gravitational force of the companion, a mass transfer occurs. If the separation rapidly shrinks or the stellar radius rapidly expands during the mass transfer, the mass transfer becomes dynamical unstable. In this case, the companion plunges into the envelope of the donor giant star. This phase is called as the common envelope phase. In this phase, the orbit shrinks and the donor envelope evaporates. After this phase, there is a merged star or a binary which consists of the companion and the core of the donor giant star. For the common envelope phase:

$$\alpha \left(\frac{GM_{c,1}M_2}{2a_f} - \frac{GM_1M_2}{2a_i} \right) = \frac{GM_1M_{\text{env},1}}{\lambda R_1}, \quad (3)$$

where M_1 , $M_{c,1}$, $M_{\text{env},1}$, M_2 , a_i , and a_f are the mass of the donor giant star, the mass of the donor giant's core, the mass of the donor giant's envelope, the mass of the companion star, the initial separation, and the separation after the common envelope phase, respectively

¹ Department of Astronomy, Faculty of Science, The University of Tokyo, 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-8654 Japan
² Department of Physics, Faculty of Science and Engineering, Konan University, 8-9-1 Okamoto, Kobe, Hyogo, 658-0072, Japan

(Webbink 1984). We use $\alpha\lambda = 1$. After the CE phase, if the separation a_f is less than the sum of the giant's core radius and the companion stellar radius or the donor giant is a Hertzsprung gap phase, the binary will merge (Belczynski et al. 2007).

At the end of star evolution, we need to calculate the black hole mass. In order to calculate the BH mass, we use the equation (1) of Belczynski et al. (2002).

To calculate a binary evolution, we need initial binary parameters such as primary mass M_1 , mass ratio $q = M_2/M_1$, separation a , and eccentricity e . We use initial distributions as $f(M_1) \propto M_1^{-2.35}$ ($5 M_\odot < M_1 < 100 M_\odot$), $f(q) = \text{const.}$ ($0.1 M_\odot/M_1 < q < 1$), $f(a) \propto 1/a$ ($a_{\min} < a < 10^6 R_\odot$), and $f(e) \propto e$ ($0 < e < 1$), where a_{\min} is a minimum separation at either star is just filling its Roche lobe.

We calculate 10^5 binaries for two metallicity models such as $Z = Z_\odot$ and $Z = 0.1Z_\odot$. We choose BH-MSs whose periods P are 50 days $< P < 5$ yrs, because the cadence of *Gaia*. We consider two star formation model to check the BH-MSs. First, we use the star formation rate as constant ($SFR \sim 2.5 M_\odot/\text{yr}$) for 10 Gyrs (Misiriotis et al. 2006), and assume the fraction of solar metallicity stars and subsolar metallicity stars as $Z_\odot : 0.1Z_\odot = 1 : 1$ (Panter et al. 2008; Belczynski et al. 2012). We call this model as Mix model. Second, in order to roughly reflect the chemical evolution of galaxy (Prantzos 2008), we use two star formation rates $SFR_{Z_\odot} = 2.5 M_\odot/\text{yr}$ ($t = 3.6\text{--}13.6$ Gyr), $SFR_{0.1Z_\odot} = 25 M_\odot/\text{yr}$ ($t = 2.6\text{--}3.6$ Gyr) for $Z = Z_\odot$ and $Z = 0.1Z_\odot$, respectively. We call this model as ChemiEvo model. We use the binary fraction $f_B = \frac{N_{\text{binary}}}{N_{\text{single}} + N_{\text{binary}}} = 0.5$, where N_{single} and N_{binary} are the number of single stars and the number of binaries, respectively.

3. RESULT

The number of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy N_G for each metallicity is

$$N_G = \frac{1}{N_{\text{total}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{BHMS}}} \frac{f_B}{1 + f_B} \cdot \frac{SFR}{2} \cdot t_{\text{life},i} \cdot f_{\text{IMF}}, \quad (4)$$

where N_{BHMS} , $t_{\text{life},i}$, and f_{IMF} ($= \int_5^{100} M^{-2.35} dM / \int_{0.1}^{100} M^{-2.35} dM$) are the number of BH-MSs whose periods are 50 days $< P < 5$ yrs for $N_{\text{total}} = 10^5$ binaries, the life time of the BH-MS, and the IMF normalization factor, respectively.

Figure 1 and 3 show the mass distribution of black holes which are the components of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy for the Mix model and the ChemiEvo model, respectively. Figure 2 and 4 show the mass distribution of main sequence stars which are the components of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy for the Mix model and the ChemiEvo model, respectively. Mass distributions of main-sequence companions do not show dependence on the metallicity in the Mix model. However, in the ChemiEvo model, there is no massive main-sequence star due to the short lifetime. On the other hand, the black hole mass distributions show that the maximum mass for $Z = 10\%Z_\odot$ is clearly more massive than that for $Z = Z_\odot$ for each model.

In order to calculate the number of BH-MSs detected by *Gaia*, we assume the spatial distribution of BH-MS

in the entire galaxy as

$$\rho_{\text{BHMS}} = \rho_0 \exp\left(-\frac{z}{h_z} - \frac{r - r_0}{h_r}\right) \quad (5)$$

where ρ_0 , z , r , r_0 ($= 8.5$ kpc), h_z ($= 250$ pc), and h_r ($= 3.5$ kpc) are the normalization factor of the spatial distribution, the distance perpendicular to the galactic plane, the distance from the galactic center, the distance from the galactic center to the sun, the scale length for the exponential stellar distribution perpendicular to the galactic plane, and the scale length for the exponential stellar distribution parallel to the galactic plane, respectively. The normalization factor of the spatial distribution is calculated by

$$\rho_0^{-1} = \int_0^\infty dr \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{z}{h_z} - \frac{r - r_0}{h_r}\right). \quad (6)$$

We use the spherical coordinate centered at the earth, (D, b, l) , as

$$r = [r_0^2 + D^2 \cos^2 b - 2Dr_0 \cos b \cos l]^{1/2}, \quad (7)$$

$$z = D \sin b, \quad (8)$$

where D , b , and l is the distance from, respectively, the earth, the galactic latitude, and the galactic longitude. The number of BH-MSs detected by *Gaia* N_D is calculated by

$$N_D = N_G \times \int_0^{2\pi} dl \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos b db \int_0^{D_{\max}(M)} D^2 dD \rho_0 \quad (9)$$

where $D_{\max}(M)$ is the maximum detectable distance of the BH-MS whose main sequence mass is M .

Here, we derive $D_{\max}(M)$ including the signal-to-noise ratio of distance and the precision of astrometric measurement with *Gaia*. Generally, the absolute magnitude in the V -band M_V can be represented with the apparent magnitude in V -band m_V and D : $M_V = M_V(m_V, D)$ (e.g., see Eq. (26) in Yamaguchi et al. 2018), where we assume the interstellar extinction $A_V = D/1\text{kpc}$. In addition, the main sequence mass M can be assumed to be a function of M_V : $M(M_V)$ (e.g., Eq. 27 in Yamaguchi et al. 2018). Thus, the main sequence mass is represented as $M(m_V, D)$. When we impose the condition that the signal to noise ratio exceeds 10 for the reliable distance measurement, we obtain the condition equation $D/1\text{kpc} < 10^2/\sigma_\pi(\text{G})$, where σ_π is the precision of parallax measurement in G -band in unit of micro-arcsecond (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2016). By equating the G -band magnitude with V -band magnitude, which is justified in Yamaguchi et al. (2018), we obtain $D_{\max} = 10^2 \sigma_\pi(m_v)$. We derive the function $D_{\max}(M)$ by solving this equation and $M(m_V, D_{\max})$ as simultaneous equations.

Table 1 shows the numbers of BH-MSs N_{BHMS} whose periods are 50 days $< P < 5$ yrs for 10^5 binaries, the numbers of such BH-MSs in the entire galaxy N_G , and the number of BH-MSs detected by *Gaia* N_D for each metallicity case. The numbers of binaries with $Z = 0.1Z_\odot$ are about twice larger than the those with $Z = Z_\odot$ in the Mix model. There are two reasons. First, since the mass loss is not so effective in the low metallicity case, they can evolve to more massive compact object. Second, the low metallicity binaries are more hard

TABLE 1
THE NUMBERS OF BH-MSs N_{BHMS} WHOSE PERIODS ARE 50 DAYS $< P < 5$ yrs FOR 10^5 BINARIES, THE NUMBERS OF SUCH BH-MSs IN THE ENTIRE GALAXY N_{G} , AND THE NUMBER OF BH-MSs DETECTED BY *Gaia* N_{D} FOR EACH METALLICITY CASE.

metallicity	Z_{\odot}	$0.1Z_{\odot}$
N_{BHMS}	1322 (1322)	2841 (18)
N_{G}	4057 (8114)	7898 (7496)
N_{D}	225 (449)	397 (72)




FIG. 1.— The mass distribution of black holes which are the components of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy for the Mix model.




FIG. 2.— The mass distribution of main sequence stars which are the components of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy for the Mix model.




FIG. 3.— The mass distribution of black holes which are the components of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy for the ChemiEvo model.




FIG. 4.— The mass distribution of main sequence stars which are the components of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy for the ChemiEvo model.

to merge within a common envelope phase than the high metallicity binaries, because the Hertzsprung gap phase of the low metallicity stars is shorter than that of the high metallicity (Belczynski et al. 2010b). On the other hand, the number of binaries detectable by *Gaia* with $Z = 0.1Z_{\odot}$ are about six times less than that of $Z = Z_{\odot}$ in the ChemiEvo model. This reason is that the BH-MSs which consist of massive MS companions are already died due to a short lifetime.

Figure 5 and 7 show mass distributions of black holes in BH-MSs detected by *Gaia* for the Mix model and the ChemiEvo model. Figure 6 and 8 show mass distributions of main sequence stars in BH-MSs detected by *Gaia* for the Mix model and ChemiEvo model. As with Fig. 1 and Fig. 3, black hole mass distributions detected by *Gaia* depend on the metallicity. The mass distribution of black holes detected by *Gaia* is almost the same in shape as that for the entire galaxy. On the other hand, in the case of the main-sequence companion, the number

of low mass main-sequence companion is clearly smaller than that of main sequence stars of BH-MSs in the entire galaxy. This is because the low mass components are hard to be detected by *Gaia* due to their faintness.

4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We find that *Gaia* can identify ~ 600 galactic BH-MSs. This number is almost the same as the BH-MS detection number of Yamaguchi et al. (2018), which is a few times larger than that of Yalınwıch et al. (2018). We consider the BH-MS detection fraction by *Gaia* for two metallicity cases. Figure 5, 7 show that the BH mass distributions obviously depend on the metallicity. If the BH-MS whose BH mass is more massive than $\sim 18 M_{\odot}$ is detected by *Gaia*, it might be Pop II origin.

The metallicity of each binary can be measured with a follow-up spectroscopic observation. A main-sequence star in Pop II binaries should show a low metallicity and its typical brightness is expected to be $V \lesssim 20$ mag, as the limiting magnitude of *Gaia* is 20 magnitude in G-band.




FIG. 5.— The mass distribution of black holes which are the components of BH-MSs to be detected by *Gaia* for the Mix model.




FIG. 6.— The mass distribution of main sequence stars which are the components of BH-MSs to be detected by *Gaia* for the Mix model.




FIG. 7.— The mass distribution of black holes which are the components of BH-MSs to be detected by *Gaia* for the ChemiEvo model.




FIG. 8.— The mass distribution of main sequence stars which are the components of BH-MSs to be detected by *Gaia* for the ChemiEvo model.

Thus, this low metallicity can be measured with spectroscopic observations using 4m-class telescopes, such as AAT (Anglo-Australian Telescope) at NSW, Mayall telescope at Kitt Peak, and Kyoto university 3.8m telescope at Okayama.

If the metallicity of black hole progenitor is revealed by the *Gaia* astrometry and follow-up observations, we can know the metallicity dependence of the black hole mass distribution. Although the gravitational wave observations have revealed the existence of the massive stellar

black hole and will describe the black hole mass distribution, they cannot reveal the metallicity of the progenitor. *Gaia* can be the powerful tool for the research of the black hole progenitor study.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Shri Kulkarni and Michiko Fujii for useful comments and discussion. This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grant numbers JP18J00558(TK), JP17H06363 and JP18K13576(MSY).

REFERENCES

- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2016a, Physical Review Letters, 116, 061102
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2016b, ApJL, 818, L22
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2016c, Physical Review X, 6, 041015
- Abt, H. A. 1983, ARA&A, 21, 343
- Belczynski, K., Kalogera, V., & Bulik, T. 2002, ApJ, 572, 407
- Belczynski, K., Taam, R. E., Kalogera, V., Rasio, F. A., & Bulik, T. 2007, ApJ, 662, 504
- Belczynski, K., Bulik, T., Fryer, C. L., et al. 2010a, ApJ, 714, 1217
- Belczynski, K., Dominik, M., Bulik, T., et al. 2010b, ApJ, 715, L138
- Belczynski, K., Dominik, M., Repetto, S., Holz, D. E., & Fryer, C. L. 2012, arXiv:1208.0358
- Belczynski, K., Holz, D. E., Bulik, T., & O’Shaughnessy, R. 2016, Nature, 534, 512
- Breivik, K., Chatterjee, S., & Larson, S. L. 2017, ApJL, 850, L13
- Gaia Collaboration, Prusti, T., de Bruijne, J. H. J., et al. 2016, A&A, 595, A
- Hartwig, T., Volonteri, M., Bromm, V., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 460, L74
- Heggie, D. C. 1975, MNRAS, 173, 729
- Hurley, J. R., Pols, O. R., & Tout, C. A. 2000, MNRAS, 315, 543
- Hurley, J. R., Tout, C. A., & Pols, O. R. 2002, MNRAS, 329, 897
- Ishiyama, T., Enoki, M., Kobayashi, M. A. R., et al. 2015, PASJ, 67, 61
- Ivanova, N., Justham, S., Chen, X., et al. 2013, A&ARv, 21, 59
- Kinugawa, T., Inayoshi, K., Hotokezaka, K., Nakauchi, D., & Nakamura, T. 2014, MNRAS, 442, 2963
- Kinugawa, T., Miyamoto, A., Kanda, N., & Nakamura, T. 2016, MNRAS, 456, 1093
- Inayoshi, K., Hirai, R., Kinugawa, T., & Hotokezaka, K. 2017, MNRAS, 468, 5020
- Kinugawa, T., & Asano, K. 2017, ApJL, 849, L29
- Mashian, N., & Loeb, A. 2017, MNRAS, 470, 2611
- Misiriotis A., Xilouris E. M., Papamastorakis J., Boumris P., Goudis C. D., 2006, A&A, 459, 113
- Miyamoto, A., Kinugawa, T., Nakamura, T., & Kanda, N. 2017, Phys. Rev. D, 96, 064025

- Nakamura, T., Ando, M., Kinugawa, T., et al. 2016, Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics, 2016, 093E01
- Özel, F., Psaltis, D., Narayan, R., & McClintock, J. E. 2010, ApJ, 725, 1918
- Panter, B., Jimenez, R., Heavens, A. F., & Charlot, S. 2008, MNRAS, 391, 1117
- Prantzos N., 2008, EAS, 311, EAS....32
- Webbink, R. F. 1984, ApJ, 277, 355
- Yalinewich, A., Beniamini, P., Hotokezaka, K., & Zhu, W. 2018, MNRAS, 481, 930
- Yamaguchi, M. S., Kawanaka, N., Bulik, T., & Piran, T. 2018, ApJ, 861, 21