The Perils of Pdot

Andrew King^{1,2,3} & Jean–Pierre Lasota^{4,5}

¹ School of Physics & Astronomy, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH UK

² Astronomical Institute Anton Pannekoek, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, NL-1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands

³ Leiden Observatory, Leiden University, Niels Bohrweg 2, NL-2333 CA Leiden, The Netherlands

⁴ Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, CNRS et Sorbonne Université, UMR 7095, 98bis Bd Arago, 75014 Paris, France

⁵ Nicolaus Copernicus Astronomical Center, Polish Academy of Sciences, ul. Bartycka 18, 00-716 Warsaw, Poland

7 June 2024

ABSTRACT

Schaefer (2024) has recently published observations of binary period derivatives \dot{P} for 52 cataclysmic variables, and concluded that these strongly conflict with all proposed evolutionary pictures for these systems. We point out once again that using measurements of \dot{P} is likely in practice to produce misleading evolutionary constraints in almost every case. The one identified exception to this is probably the recently–born X–ray binary SN 2022jli, because of its extremely high mass transfer rate.

Schaefer (2024) has recently published observations of the rate \dot{P} of binary period change \dot{P} in 52 cataclysmic variable systems (CVs). The measured values of \dot{P} do not conform to those expected in the standard picture of CV orbital evolution under long-term angular momentum loss via gravitational radiation and magnetic braking. This relates the long-term value of \dot{P} to that of the mass transfer rate $-\dot{M}_2$ from the donor star (see e.g. King, 1988 for a review).

Schaefer (2024) concludes that the reported observations invalidate this evolutionary picture. But a very long line of papers – most recently King & Lasota (2021) in another context – have reiterated the fundamental point that stars do not have sharp edges, so cannot follow the predicted evolutionary relations on arbitrarily short timescales. The predicted relations between \dot{P} and $-\dot{M}_2$ hold only when averaged over timescales significantly longer than the timescale t_H on which the angular momentum losses move the Roche lobe one density scaleheight H through the donor star. In almost every case, this requires observations over unfeasibly long timescales.

Standard formulae show that the scaleheight for a CV donor star of radius R_2 is given by

$$\frac{H}{R_2} \sim \frac{R_2 k T_{\text{eff}}}{G M_2 \mu m_H} \sim 3 \times 10^{-4},\tag{1}$$

where the star's effective temperature $T_{\rm eff}\sim 3000-5000$ K. Then

$$t_H \sim \frac{H}{\dot{R}_2} \sim \frac{H}{R_2} \frac{M_2}{|\dot{M}_2|} \sim 3 \times 10^5 \,\mathrm{yr}$$
 (2)

for a CV evolving on a timescale $\sim M_2/|\dot{M}_2| \sim 10^9$ yr (e.g. under magnetic braking), or ~ 10 times longer for evolution under gravitational radiation. In a monitoring programme

lasting ~ 30 yr, the Roche lobe will typically have moved by 2 metres, compared with the density scaleheight ~ 200 km.

Since only observations on timescales $> t_H$ can constrain the long-term evolution of CVs, we conclude that those reported by Schaefer (2024) do not pose problems for the currently-accepted evolutionary picture. The observed period changes must be dominated by short-term phenomena, so it is unsurprising that they frequently show alternating or unexpected signs for example.

The form of Eq. (2) shows that the tempting idea that one might measure a mean mass transfer rate in a binary system by the much easier method of measuring \dot{P} is unlikely to work very often in practice. Evidently this requires a much higher mass transfer rate $-\dot{M}_2$ than in CVs. To our knowledge the only case where this appears to occur is in the newly-born X-ray binary system SN 2022jli (Chen et al. 2024; Moore et al. 2023). Here the very recent supernova explosion producing the compact accretor has violently disturbed the binary geometry and forced the companion to overflow its Roche lobe very significantly, producing a mass transfer rate $\gtrsim 10^{-5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (King & Lasota 2024). This gives $t_H \sim 1 \text{ yr}$, and probably accounts for the observed luminosity decay on a timescale ~ 250 days.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Jim Pringle for discussions.

REFERENCES

Chen P., Gal-Yam A., Sollerman J., Schulze S., Post R. S., Liu C., Ofek E. O., et al., 2024, Natur, 625, 253
King, A.R., Lasota, J.P., 2021, arXiv211203779K
King, A.R., Lasota, J.P., 2024, A&A, 682, L22
King A. R., 1988, QJRAS, 29, 1

2 Andrew King & Jean-Pierre Lasota

Moore T., Smartt S. J., Nicholl M., Srivastav S., Stevance H. F., Jess D. B., Grant S. D. T., et al., 2023, ApJL, 956, L31

Schaefer, B.E., 2024, ApJ 966, 155