

Kinematic Insights Into Luminous Blue Variables and B[e] Supergiants

JULIAN A. DEMAN¹ AND M. S. OEY¹

¹*Department of Astronomy, 323 West Hall, University of Michigan
1085 S. University Avenue
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1107, USA*

(Accepted September 27, 2024)

Submitted to AAS

ABSTRACT

Recent work suggests that many luminous blue variables (LBVs) and B[e] supergiants (sgB[e]) are isolated, implying that they may be products of massive binaries, kicked by partner supernovae (SNe). However, the evidence is somewhat complex and controversial. To test this scenario, we measure the proper-motion velocities for these objects in the LMC and SMC, using Gaia Data Release 3. Our LMC results show that the kinematics, luminosities, and IR properties point to LBVs and sgB[e] stars being distinct classes. We find that Class 1 LBVs, which have dusty nebulae, and sgB[e] stars both show velocity distributions comparable to that of SMC field OBe stars, which are known to have experienced SN kicks. The sgB[e] stars are faster, plausibly due to their lower average masses. However, Class 2 LBVs, which are luminous objects without dusty nebulae, show no signs of acceleration, therefore suggesting that they are single stars, pre-SN binaries, or perhaps binary mergers. The candidate LBV Class 3 stars, which are dominated by hot dust, are all confirmed sgB[e] stars; their luminosities and velocities show that they simply represent the most luminous and massive of the sgB[e] class. There are very few SMC objects, but the sgB[e] stars are faster than their LMC counterparts, which may be consistent with expectations that lower-metallicity binaries are tighter, causing faster ejections. We also examine the distinct class of dust-free, weak-lined sgB[e] stars, finding that the SMC objects have the fastest velocities of the entire sample.

Keywords: Luminous blue variable stars — B(e) stars — Massive stars — Stellar evolution — Close binary stars — Runaway stars — Circumstellar matter — Stellar dynamics — Field stars

1. INTRODUCTION

Luminous blue variables (LBVs) are an enigmatic class of hot, evolved, massive stars with a range of unusual properties that distinguish them from other supergiants and evolved massive stars. These include variability in photometric brightness and color, accompanied by spectral changes which can be quite varied in character. S Doradus variability, named after the eponymous LMC LBV, refers to variation in effective temperature and luminosity over timescales of several years to decades, while “giant eruptions” refer to very large increases in brightness up to several magnitudes over a period of

months (Humphreys & Davidson 1994; de Koter et al. 1996; Weis & Bomans 2020). LBVs are recognized by their S Dor variability, which is their defining parameter as a distinct group; but due to the infrequency of their enhanced mass loss state, they are hard to identify. In their quiescent state their spectra can at least temporarily resemble those of other hot, massive stars such as Of/WN stars (Weis & Bomans 2020).

LBV spectra are also often similar to those of B[e] supergiants (sgB[e]) (Weis & Bomans 2020), another class of hot, evolved stars with emission lines and in particular, forbidden emission lines, in their spectra, indicating cooling and expanding circumstellar material (Kraus 2019), with observations giving credence to the existence of surrounding dusty disks. There may be a

link between these two groups of stars due to their similar properties and an overlap in their luminosities (e.g., Kraus 2019). The relationship between LBVs and sgB[e] stars is unclear, but evidence is growing that they are distinct classes, based on their dust properties, luminosity range, distribution on the H-R diagram, and other factors (e.g., Kraus 2019; Humphreys et al. 2017a).

Questions about the evolutionary status of LBVs and sgB[e] stars, and their relationship, have been debated for decades. Traditional, single-star models of massive star evolution treat the LBV as a transitional state between main sequence O-type stars and stripped-envelope Wolf-Rayet (WR) stars, with the LBV corresponding to a phase when the stellar envelope is ejected, perhaps due to internal instabilities (e.g., Humphreys & Davidson 1994; Langer et al. 1994; Maeder & Conti 1994). This is referred to as the Conti scenario (Conti 1975, 1979). This is a primary scenario for how WR stars can form from massive, young O-type stars, since a temporary LBV phase can permit a period of elevated mass-loss that is estimated to be enough to remove the envelope of the star, and as winds from O-type stars are recognized to be much weaker than originally thought due to clumping in hot star winds, with mass-loss rates consequently lowered (e.g., Bouret et al. 2005; Smith & Owocki 2006).

However, Smith & Tombleson (2015) find that LBVs and sgB[e] stars are isolated and tend to avoid massive star clusters, using O stars as a proxy for the location of clusters. More than half of the LBVs in their sample are not in clusters or OB associations, and a number of them are hundreds of parsecs from the nearest O-type star. They make the critical observation that LBVs appear to be even more isolated from O-type stars than are WR stars, therefore implying that LBVs cannot represent an intermediate evolutionary phase between these classes. They also find that isolation of sgB[e] stars from the nearest O-type stars is even greater than for LBVs, being comparable to that of red supergiants (RSGs). This leads Smith & Tombleson to suggest that sgB[e] stars are lower-mass analogs of LBVs, and that both LBVs and sgB[e] stars instead form in binaries, and are kicked after a supernova event.

Humphreys et al. (2016) contest the findings by Smith & Tombleson (2015), revising their LBV sample and dividing it into “classical LBVs” with masses $> 50 M_{\odot}$, and “less luminous LBVs” with masses between 25 and $40 M_{\odot}$. They demonstrate that only classical LBVs should be associated with O-type stars, and find that the classical LBVs have a spatial distribution similar to that of late O-type stars and WR stars, while the less luminous LBVs have a distribution similar to RSGs. They

conclude that there is therefore no evidence that classical LBVs are kicked from binaries.

There has been continued controversy regarding the spatial distribution of LBVs, centered on both methodology and the LBV sample (Smith 2016; Aghakhanloo et al. 2017; Aadland et al. 2018; Smith 2019). On the other hand, there is more agreement that sgB[e] stars are deep field objects (Smith & Tombleson 2015; Humphreys et al. 2017a), therefore supporting a binary origin scenario for this stellar class.

The stellar kinematics offer a way to clarify the observational results regarding the spatial distribution of LBVs and sgB[e] stars. Aghakhanloo et al. (2022) examine the radial velocities of LBVs in the LMC, and find that over 33% of LBVs have radial velocities exceeding 25 km/s. In this work, we further examine whether LBVs and sgB[e] stars are ejected from clusters by measuring their peculiar proper motion velocities using data from the Gaia mission (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2022).

2. SAMPLES AND TECHNIQUES

The LMC and SMC offer a unique opportunity to study the proper motions of complete samples of these stars. The most comprehensive catalog of LBVs to date is the census for these galaxies by Agliozzo et al. (2021), which is updated from that of Richardson & Mehner (2018). This compilation includes 9 LBVs in the LMC and 2 in the SMC; thus, the LBVs are statistically a rare class. Agliozzo et al. (2021) also list candidate LBV (LBVc) stars, which are spectroscopically similar to LBVs. Their magnitudes, colors, and masses overlap with those of LBVs, but they lack strong variable activity. Thus, LBVc stars may be dormant LBVs (e.g., Smith & Tombleson 2015; Solovyeva et al. 2020). One such star that was previously considered a candidate LBV, HD 269582, was subsequently confirmed as a true LBV by Walborn et al. (2017). There are 9 LBVc stars known in the LMC. Agliozzo et al. (2021) list two stars as LBVc in the SMC, but these are identified as sgB[e] stars by Kraus (2019), and we adopt the latter’s classifications to define our sgB[e] sample.

SgB[e] stars are also rare, although not quite as rare as LBV/LBVc stars. The most comprehensive catalog of sgB[e] stars was compiled by Kraus (2019). This census identifies 13 confirmed sgB[e] stars and two candidate sgB[e] stars (hereafter sgB[e]c stars) in the LMC; and 5 confirmed sgB[e] stars and 1 sgB[e]c in the SMC. For both LMC and SMC, there are additionally a few related objects that are sometimes identified as sgB[e] stars, but which may be fundamentally different classes of objects, including the dust-poor, weak-lined sgB[e] stars (hereafter sgB[e]-WL) found by Graus et al. (2012).

Two more potential sgB[e] and LBVc stars were not included in the Kraus catalog: the star AzV 261 in the SMC (Kalari et al. 2018), and [BE74] 328 in the LMC (Jones et al. 2015), which we classify as sgB[e]c stars in this work, since they are not mentioned by either Kraus (2019) or Agliozzo et al. (2021). This leaves two sgB[e]c stars in each galaxy.

The LMC LBVc star HD 269227 was not included in our sample due to a lack of reliable Gaia data; it has a positive parallax and very large Gaia “renormalized unit weight error” (RUWE), indicating poor data quality. Thus, we have a total of 9 LBVs, 9 LBVc stars, 13 sgB[e] stars, 2 sgB[e]c stars, and 2 sgB[e]-WL stars for our LMC sample; and 2 LBVs, 0 LBVc stars, 5 sgB[e] stars, 2 sgB[e]c stars, and 3 sgB[e]-WL stars for our SMC sample.

These designations include identifying R81, R99, and HD 5980 as candidate objects; their status as LBVs has been substantially questioned by Humphreys et al. (e.g., 2016). Both R81 and R99 appear in several other texts concerning LBVs, including Smith & Tomblason (2015) and Aghakhanloo et al. (2022) without any concern for their status as LBVs. As such, we will continue to follow the classification given by Agliozzo et al. (2021). However, we caution that these stars may be fundamentally different objects and they are individually identified in some of our analysis below. Our adopted samples of LBV, LBVc, sgB[e], and sgB[e]c stars are given in Table 1 for the LMC and Table 2 for the SMC.

We measure the residual proper motion velocities of our sample target stars using Gaia DR3 data (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2022), following the general method described by Oey et al. (2018) and Phillips et al. (2024). For each target star, the local field velocity is obtained from the stars in the Gaia DR3 catalog within a 3′ radius that have $G < 18$, excluding stars with incomplete basic data. We examine the RA and decl. velocities independently, discarding stars whose velocity or velocity error have values $> 3\sigma$ from the median for each component. The target star peculiar velocity is then calculated as the difference from the local systemic RA and decl. proper motion velocities.

Tables 3 and 4 give the target star and local systemic velocities in the LMC and SMC, respectively. In these tables, columns 1 and 2 give the object name and stellar class, respectively, and column 3 lists the number of field stars used to determine the residual peculiar velocity. Columns 4 and 5 give the target star R.A. and decl. velocity components of the Gaia proper motions, and columns 6 and 7 give the R.A. and decl. velocity components of the field systemic velocity, respectively, for each target; column 8 lists the target star’s transverse

peculiar velocity v_{\perp} . Column 9 provides the stellar luminosity from the literature, which is a rough proxy for the stellar mass. The quoted errors for the target stars are the Gaia measurement errors, and those for the local field are the standard error of the median. The total velocity errors are calculated by combining these errors in quadrature. Tables 5 summarizes the characteristic v_{\perp} for the different stellar classes in the LMC and SMC, including values calculated by weighting by the inverse of the measurement errors. The table also lists the median of the errors on the v_{\perp} measurements for each class.

Since the earlier paper by Phillips et al. (2024) used slightly different definitions of field star samples, we also compared with residual velocities obtained by selecting the local field stars within radii of 3′ versus 5′, $G < 17$ versus $G < 18$, and using the Gaia DR3 catalog for field star selection versus the catalogs of Zaritsky et al. (2002) and Zaritsky et al. (2004). Additionally, we compared the results using the outlier rejection method from Phillips et al. (2024) and our 3σ rejection method. None of these variations generate significantly different results within the errors.

Given the much smaller samples of LBV and sgB[e] stars in the SMC, most of our findings focus on results for the LMC. However, the SMC stars hint at possible significant differences, as discussed below.

3. LBV VELOCITY DISTRIBUTIONS

Focusing first on the LBV stars, Figure 1 compares the velocity distributions of LBV and LBVc stars in the LMC. The two distributions look similar, and a two-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test carried out with the Scipy package gives a p -value of 0.99, consistent with the possibility that LBVc stars are quiescent LBVs. We caution that our sample sizes are small, with 9 stars in each of the two groups, hence the results cannot be regarded as conclusive. But based on their kinematics, the LBV and LBVc stars do not show significant differences, and we therefore combine them into a single, larger sample for the purposes of this study. This does not mean that significant differences may not exist between them. In this section, we examine some subsets of this combined sample, and we also provide data for individual stars in Tables 3 and 4 so that studies can be done using different subsets and classifications for this group.

Table 1. LMC Target Stars

Object	Alternate Identifiers	Type ^a	Class ^a
HD 269006	R 71	LBV	1b
HD 269216	SK −69 75	LBV	1b
S Doradus	HD 35343	LBV	1a
HD 269582	SK −69 142a	LBV	2
HD 269662	R 110	LBV	1b
HD 269700	R 116	LBV	2
HD 269858	R 127	LBV	1a
R 143	CPD −69 463	LBV	1b
HD 269321	R 85	LBV	...
HD 268939	R 74	LBVc	2
LHA 120-S 18	SK −68 42	LBVc	1a
HD 269050	R 78	LBVc	1b
HD 269128	R 81	LBVc	1a
HD 269445	R 99	LBVc	2
HD 269687	LHA 120-S 119	LBVc	1a
HD 37836	R 123	LBVc	2
SK −69 279	[BE74] 619	LBVc	1a
LHA 120-S 61	AL 418	LBVc	1a
HD 268835	R 66	sgB[e]	3
HD 34664	MWC 105	sgB[e]	3
HD 37974	R 126	sgB[e]	3
HD 38489	SK −69 259	sgB[e]	3
LHA 120-S 12	SK −67 23	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 35	SK −66 97	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 59	[BE74] 475	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 89	HD 269217	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 93	SK −68 66	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 111	HD 269599	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 137	[BE74] 621	sgB[e]	...
LHA 120-S 165	[BE74] 587	sgB[e]	...
ARDB 54	...	sgB[e]	...
VFTS 822	...	sgB[e]c	...
[BE74] 328	SK −69 169	sgB[e]c ^b	...
VFTS 698	AL 377	sgB[e]-WL	...
[L72] LH 85-10	[BE74] 388	sgB[e]-WL ^c	...

^aAll LBVs and LBVc types and Classes are from [Agliozzo et al. \(2021\)](#), and all sgB[e] stars and sgB[e]c are from [Kraus \(2019\)](#), with the exception of [BE74] 328. Class types for sgB[e]-WL stars are from [Graus et al. \(2012\)](#), with the exception of [L72] LH 85-10.

^bFrom [Jones et al. \(2015\)](#)

^cThis work

Table 2. SMC Target Stars

Object	Alternate Identifiers	Type ^a	Class ^a
HD 5980	R 14	LBV	2
HD 6884	R 40	LBV	1b
LHA 115-S 6	R 4	sgB[e]	3
LHA 115-S 18	AzV 154	sgB[e]	3
LHA 115-S 23	AzV 172	sgB[e]	...
LHA 115-S 65	R 50	sgB[e]	...
[MA93] 1116	...	sgB[e]	...
LHA 115-S 38	[MA93] 1405	sgB[e]c	...
AzV 261	[MA93] 1235	sgB[e]c ^b	...
LHA 115-S 29	[MA93] 1149	sgB[e]-WL	...
LHA 115-S 46	[MA93] 1552	sgB[e]-WL	...
LHA 115-S 62	R 48	sgB[e]-WL	...

^aAll LBVs and their Classes are from [Agliozzo et al. \(2021\)](#), and all sgB[e] stars and sgB[e]c stars are from [Kraus \(2019\)](#), with the exception of AzV 261. Class types for sgB[e]-WL stars are from [Graus et al. \(2012\)](#).

^bFrom [Kalari et al. \(2018\)](#)




Figure 1. Histogram comparing velocities of LBVs and LBVc stars in the LMC.

In what follows, our sample of LBVs thus includes the LBVc stars.

Massive star kinematics are often linked to binary interaction history (e.g., [Renzo et al. 2019](#); [Dorigo Jones et al. 2020](#)), which also often plays a role in whether and

Table 3. LMC Proper Motion Measurements

Object	Type	Number of field stars	v_α (Target)	v_δ (Target)	v_α (Field)	v_δ (Field)	v_\perp	Luminosity ^a
			km s ⁻¹	km s ⁻¹	km s ⁻¹	km s ⁻¹	km s ⁻¹	log(L/L_\odot)
HD 269006	LBV	71	428.4 ±4.6	-28.1 ±6.0	479.1 ±4.1	-6.09 ±5.1	55.2 ±10.0	5.78
HD 269216	LBV	558	411.9 ±4.0	122.1 ±4.3	413.8 ±1.6	116.3 ±3.2	22.8 ±7.5	5.44
S Doradus	LBV	733	420.4 ±4.2	88.0 ±5.3	421.5 ±2.4	68.4 ±1.2	19.7 ±7.2	6.3
HD 269582	LBV	552	395.8 ±5.9	152.9 ±5.5	394.0 ±2.0	96.3 ±5.0	56.6 ±9.7	5.68
HD 269662	LBV	333	401.1 ±5.9	119.3 ±6.4	397.6 ±2.4	114.9 ±2.8	5.6 ±9.4	5.36
HD 269700	LBV	167	381.1 ±5.2	117.1 ±6.2	385.1 ±2.7	125.8 ±0.3	9.6 ±8.5	5.92
HD 269858	LBV	558	411.9 ±4.0	122.1 ±4.3	413.8 ±1.6	116.3 ±3.2	6.1 ±6.9	6
R 143	LBV	417	412.4 ±4.4	141.0 ±4.3	396.1 ±2.3	145.0 ±3.5	16.7 ±7.5	5.32
HD 269321	LBV	666	420.4 ±5.2	96.0 ±5.2	428.9 ±2.5	68.8 ±1.1	28.5 ±7.9	5.67
HD 268939	LBVc	197	389.0 ±4.3	1.1 ±4.3	396.2 ±2.4	-5.7 ±0.2	9.9 ±6.5	5.4
LHA 120-S 18	LBVc	195	419.4 ±5.8	20.0 ±6.2	420.2 ±2.7	16.7 ±0.1	3.4 ±8.9	5.58
HD 269050	LBVc	357	437.6 ±6.0	37.8 ±6.9	433.6 ±2.2	26.0 ±3.1	12.5 ±10.0	5.78
HD 269128	LBVc	472	449.4 ±5.2	44.0 ±5.8	423.7 ±2.3	34.3 ±3.3	27.4 ±8.8	6
HD 269445	LBVc	144	391.4 ±4.0	67.1 ±4.1	389.5 ±2.8	69.8 ±2.5	3.3 ±6.9	6.26
HD 269687	LBVc	312	435.4 ±7.7	88.2 ±7.7	395.5 ±2.8	121.3 ±1.1	51.8 ±11.3	5.78
HD 37836	LBVc	424	415.4 ±4.1	117.8 ±4.3	419.4 ±2.1	124.7 ±3.9	7.9 ±7.4	6.5
Sk -69 279	LBVc	314	428.7 ±5.5	184.6 ±6.6	420.2 ±2.0	151.3 ±0.9	34.3 ±8.9	5.6
LHA 120-S 61	LBVc	132	448.9 ±6.9	163.3 ±6.9	366.0 ±2.7	151.1 ±0.9	83.8 ±10.1	5.8
HD 268835	sgB[e]	200	444.4 ±4.3	-15.8 ±5.3	462.6 ±2.8	-19.0 ±0.5	18.5 ±7.4	5.47
HD 34664	sgB[e]	133	395.4 ±5.5	41.0 ±5.5	384.2 ±2.9	24.7 ±3.6	19.8 ±9.1	5.56
HD 37974	sgB[e]	480	409.8 ±3.7	126.6 ±3.8	408.0 ±1.8	120.8 ±3.3	6.1 ±6.5	6.15
HD 38489	sgB[e]	434	426.2 ±5.4	144.8 ±6.0	412.9 ±1.9	142.8 ±2.0	13.5 ±8.5	6.13
LHA 120-S 12	sgB[e]	153	432.7 ±4.0	0.4 ±4.4	422.7 ±2.6	-23.2 ±1.9	25.7 ±6.7	5.41 ^b
LHA 120-S 35	sgB[e]	193	353.4 ±4.8	138.5 ±5.5	367.9 ±2.0	107.2 ±2.3	34.5 ±7.9	5.21 ^b
LHA 120-S 59	sgB[e]	107	333.8 ±4.5	175.8 ±4.3	371.3 ±3.3	154.3 ±0.3	43.3 ±7.1	4.01 ^b
LHA 120-S 89	sgB[e]	582	469.4 ±3.8	57.9 ±3.9	448.2 ±2.5	55.2 ±0.8	21.4 ±6.0	5.44 ^b
LHA 120-S 93	sgB[e]	161	419.2 ±4.6	78.4 ±5.1	416.5 ±3.2	49.3 ±2.0	29.3 ±7.8	4.61 ^b
LHA 120-S 111	sgB[e]	592	386.3 ±4.4	133.1 ±4.7	398.8 ±1.8	102.0 ±3.5	33.5 ±7.5	6.06 ^b
LHA 120-S 137	sgB[e]	301	428.7 ±3.9	120.2 ±4.7	426.3 ±2.3	147.6 ±1.5	27.5 ±6.7	4.24 ^b
LHA 120-S 165	sgB[e]	172	523.9 ±4.9	88.5 ±5.0	491.5 ±3.0	92.8 ±5.3	32.7 ±9.3	5.0 ^c
ARDB 54	sgB[e]	189	472.0 ±3.2	-30.4 ±4.0	460.7 ±2.4	-19.8 ±0.5	15.5 ±5.7	4.4 ^b
VFTS 822	sgB[e]c	126	367.2 ±7.7	176.2 ±7.9	407.9 ±3.9	147.1 ±0.3	50.0 ±11.7	4.04 ^d
[BE74] 328	sgB[e]c	402	396.6 ±6.0	113.7 ±6.6	395.1 ±2.1	112.6 ±1.2	1.8 ±9.2	3.79 ^e
VFTS 698	sgB[e]-WL	481	409.5 ±6.6	162.7 ±6.6	395.5 ±2.4	148.3 ±4.6	20.1 ±10.7	5.6 ^f
[L72] LH 85-10	sgB[e]-WL	318	370.4 ±5.5	147.2 ±5.4	381.4 ±1.9	134.6 ±3.1	16.7 ±8.6	5.46 ^g

^aFrom Agliozzo et al. (2021) unless otherwise noted.^bFrom Kraus (2019).^cFrom Oksala et al. (2012).^dFrom Kalari et al. (2014).^eFrom Jones et al. (2015).^fFrom Dunstall et al. (2012).^gCalculated from bolometric magnitude of Massey et al. (2000).

Table 4. SMC Proper Motion Measurements

Object	Type	Number of field stars	v_α (Target) km s ⁻¹	v_δ (Target) km s ⁻¹	v_α (Field) km s ⁻¹	v_δ (Field) km s ⁻¹	v_\perp km s ⁻¹	Luminosity log(L/L_\odot)
HD 5980	LBV	410	265.0 ±10.2	-392.8 ±9.1	216.9 ±2.7	-365.6 ±2.1	55.3 ±14.1	6.5 ^a
HD 6884	LBV	229	255.2 ±3.8	-369.7 ±3.9	248.6 ±3.4	-360.1 ±1.2	11.6 ±6.5	5.65 ^a
LHA 115-S 6	sgB[e]	435	224.3 ±5.9	-393.7 ±4.8	188.5 ±2.3	-371.4 ±2.0	42.4 ±8.2	5.02 ^b
LHA 115-S 18	sgB[e]	394	221.9 ±6.2	-393.6 ±5.6	199.5 ±2.8	-365.5 ±0.6	35.9 ±8.8	5.60 ^b
LHA 115-S 23	sgB[e]	233	200.7 ±4.2	-362.9 ±4.0	209.4 ±3.3	-364.0 ±0.9	8.8 ±6.8	4.31 ^b
LHA 115-S 65	sgB[e]	86	370.1 ±5.7	-360.6 ±5.5	340.5 ±10.1	-342.1 ±3.4	35.0 ±13.3	5.65 ^b
[MA93] 1116	sgB[e]	431	234.3 ±18.4	-347.7 ±15.8	213.1 ±2.6	-366.4 ±2.4	28.3 ±24.5	4.4 ^c
LHA 115-S 38	sgB[e]c	265	217.0 ±4.8	-377.9 ±4.5	232.9 ±2.9	-365.7 ±3.4	20.0 ±8.0	4.10 ^b
AzV 261	sgB[e]c	225	229.5 ±5.5	-370.1 ±4.9	224.9 ±3.0	-364.0 ±2.2	7.7 ±8.3	4.9 ^d
LHA 115-S 29	sgB[e]-WL	188	271.6 ±5.8	-383.4 ±4.7	223.0 ±3.5	-360.5 ±0.7	53.7 ±8.3	4.79 ^e
LHA 115-S 46	sgB[e]-WL	110	268.9 ±5.4	-331.5 ±6.6	252.7 ±4.2	-363.7 ±1.9	36.0 ±9.7	4.61 ^e
LHA 115-S 62	sgB[e]-WL	114	264.9 ±5.4	-322.3 ±4.8	307.0 ±8.8	-354.1 ±1.0	52.8 ±11.4	4.36 ^e

^aFrom [Agliozzo et al. \(2021\)](#).

^bFrom [Kraus \(2019\)](#).

^cFrom [Wisniewski et al. \(2007\)](#).

^dFrom [Kalari et al. \(2018\)](#).

^eFrom [Graus et al. \(2012\)](#).

Table 5. Characteristic Transverse Peculiar Velocities by Stellar Class

Class	N	Median km s ⁻¹	Median Error ^a km s ⁻¹	Weighted Median km s ⁻¹	Weighted Mean km s ⁻¹	Standard Deviation km s ⁻¹
LMC - All	35	20.1	7.9	19.8	23.4	18.3
LMC - LBV	9	19.7	7.9	19.7	23.2	19.4
LMC - LBVc	9	12.5	8.9	9.9	23.1	27.1
LMC - LBV + LBVc ^b	18	18.2	8.7	16.8	23.2	22.9
LMC - Class 1a	7	27.4	8.9	27.4	29.4	28.1
LMC - Class 1b	5	16.8	9.4	16.8	22.1	19.3
LMC - Class 1	12	21.3	8.9	19.7	26.4	24.3
LMC - Class 2	5	9.6	7.4	9.6	15.3	22.0
LMC - Class 3	4	16.0	8.0	13.5	13.9	6.2
LMC - sgB[e] non-Class 3	11	29.3	7.5	27.5	27.8	13.0
LMC - sgB[e] ^c	15	25.7	7.5	25.7	24.9	13.1
LMC - sgB[e]-WL	2	18.4	9.6	16.7	18.2	2.4
SMC - All	12	35.4	8.6	35.0	29.9	17.3
SMC - LBV ^b	2	33.4	10.3	11.6	25.4	30.8
SMC - Class 1	1	11.6	6.5	11.6	11.6	...
SMC - Class 2 ^d	1	55.9	14.1	55.9	55.9	...
SMC - Class 3	2	39.0	8.5	42.2	39.1	4.5
SMC - sgB[e] non-Class 3	5	20.0	8.3	8.8	16.7	12.0
SMC - sgB[e] ^c	7	28.3	8.3	20.0	23.8	13.6
SMC - sgB[e]-WL	3	52.8	9.7	52.8	47.6	9.9
SMC - Field OBe ^e	160	25.5	14.5	24.0	29.9	21.6

^aMedian of measurement errors on v_{\perp} ^bExcluding Class 3.^cIncluding sgB[e]c and excluding sgB[e]-WL.^dThis object is HD 5980.^eFrom Phillips et al. (2024)

when a star ejects material. Agliozzo et al. (2021) classified LBVs and LBVc stars according to infrared environment and circumstellar emission. Class 1 corresponds to sources with dusty nebulae peaking in the mid- to far-infrared, suggesting previous substantial stellar mass ejection. The Class 2 sources lack dusty nebulae, and are dominated by free-free emission from 1 to 24 μm ; they are thus less likely to have experienced mass ejection of the type or scale of Class 1 objects. Agliozzo et al. (2021) further divided Class 1 into Class 1a objects which have free-free excess above the stellar photosphere, and Class 1b objects without free-free excess. Humphreys et al. (2017b) suggest that the definition of LBVs should include a lack of warm dust emission in the IR, which thus includes the Class 2 objects. As shown below, *the Class 2 objects indeed appear to be a distinct*

physical class. About half of the Class 1 objects would be considered by Humphreys et al. (2016) to belong to the “less luminous” LBV-like objects; in Section 3.2, we show results for confirmed LBVs classified according to this scheme.

Agliozzo et al. (2021) also specify Class 3 as sources dominated by a hotter, dusty component at wavelengths $> 2 \mu\text{m}$; however, these objects are all known to be identified as sgB[e] stars and are catalogued as such by Kraus (2019, ; Table 1). In Section 4.1 below, we show that the properties of Class 3 stars are consistent with their being luminous sgB[e] stars, and we therefore exclude them from our LBV sample. Data for the characteristic transverse velocities of Classes 1, 2, and 3 are included in Table 5.




Figure 2. Total velocity distribution of LBV and LBVc stars in the LMC, showing the contributions of objects in Classes 1a, 1b, and 2 indicated by stacked orange, yellow, and cyan bars respectively.

As seen in Table 1, the majority of LBV stars (12) belong to Class 1, and 5 belong to Class 2. Figure 2 shows the contributions of Classes 1a, 1b, and 2 to the total velocity distribution of the LBV stars. We see that Classes 1a and 1b have similar distributions although Class 1a tends to have faster velocities than Class 1b, with weighted median values of 27 km s^{-1} vs 17 km s^{-1} , and weighted means of 29 km s^{-1} vs 22 km s^{-1} , respectively (Table 5). However, the distributions are similar and dominated by small-number statistics. Class 1a is notably more luminous than Class 1b, as can be seen in Table 3 and Figure 3; both groups show high velocities, consistent with a population dominated by ejections from the parent clusters.

On the other hand, Class 2 appears to be a distinct population, having velocities $< 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, with the exception of HD 269582, whose velocity is 56.6 km s^{-1} . The weighted median velocity for Class 2 is 9.6 km s^{-1} , which is half the median value of 20 km s^{-1} for all of Class 1 (Table 5), and with the removal of HD 269582, the weighted median reduces further to 7.9 km s^{-1} . Class 2 stars also tend to be more luminous than either Class 1a or Class 1b (Table 6 and Figure 3). The low measured peculiar velocities are consistent with their not being accelerated by any ejection mechanism, although they might also be merger products, which generally have much lower velocities.

3.1. LBVs as possible binary products




Figure 3. Luminosity vs v_{\perp} for Classes 1a, 1b, and 2, color-coded as shown. Circles and triangles correspond to LMC and SMC objects, respectively. The star R85 does not have an IR class and thus appears as a black circle. The SMC LBVc star HD 5980, which may not be a true LBV, is indicated with the open triangle, while the two open circles correspond to the stars R81 and R99, which also have questionable LBV status (Humphreys et al. 2016). The four stars considered to be “classical” LBVs appear with black dots superposed on their symbols (see Section 3.2).


The peculiar velocities of Class 1 LBVs are high on average, compared to the local fields. This is consistent with the high radial velocities found by Aghakhanloo et al. (2022), and supports the premise of Smith & Tombleson (2015) that the majority of LBVs have been ejected from their birth clusters.

We can compare with the classical OBe stars, which are reasonably established to represent a population of ejected objects. These are believed to largely represent survivors of post-interaction binary mass transfer, accelerated by supernova kicks and/or orbital unbinding (e.g., Dallas et al. 2022; Phillips et al. 2024). Table 5 includes velocity statistics for the field SMC OBe stars from Phillips et al. (2024) that can be compared with the LMC LBV and sgB[e] populations. The peculiar velocities for these two samples are both measured using the same general algorithm that compares the target star’s motion relative to the background field, as described earlier. Figure 4 shows the normalized velocity distributions of the field SMC OBe stars and our LMC LBV sample.

We caution that the OBe star sample consists of field objects from the RIOTS4 survey (Lamb et al. 2016; Phillips et al. 2024), which are all at least 28 pc from any OB or OBe star, while the LBV sample does not have this restriction and includes all available LBVs in the LMC as described above. However, Smith & Tombleson (2015) find that LBVs have median distances from the

Table 6. Characteristic Luminosities by Stellar Class

Class	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation
		$\log(L/L_{\odot})$	$\log(L/L_{\odot})$	$\log(L/L_{\odot})$
LMC - Class 1a	7	5.93	5.80	0.25
LMC - Class 1b	5	5.58	5.44	0.23
LMC - Class 1	12	5.81	5.79	0.32
LMC - Class 2	5	6.12	5.92	0.44
LMC - Class 3	4	5.93	5.85	0.36
LMC - sgB[e] non-Class 3	11	5.41	4.51	0.76
LMC - sgB[e]	15	5.62	5.25	0.81
LMC - sgB[e]-WL	2	5.54	5.54	0.17
SMC - LBV ^a	2	6.26	6.08	0.59
SMC - Class 1	1	5.66	5.66	...
SMC - Class 2	1	6.50	6.50	...
SMC - Class 3	2	5.30	5.31	0.41
SMC - sgB[e] non-Class 3	5	5.07	4.40	0.62
SMC - All sgB[e] ^b	7	5.26	4.90	0.62
SMC - sgB[e]-WL	3	4.62	4.61	0.22

^aExcluding Class 3.^bExcluding sgB[e]-WL stars.**Figure 4.** Normalized comparison of LMC LBV stars with the SMC field OBe star sample. The stacked contributions of Classes 1 and 2 are color-coded as shown.

nearest O stars on the order of 40 – 50 pc, which may be compared to the above values for OBe field stars.

If LBVs are largely post-SN ejected objects, then we can expect their velocity distribution to be similar to that of the classical OBe stars. The parameters for SN acceleration would likely differ between these two

groups, so the velocity distributions are not expected to be identical, but there should be broad similarities, especially in shape. Figure 4 shows the distributions for the LMC LBVs and the SMC field OBe stars. As seen above, the strong peak at the lowest velocities is due to the Class 2 objects, which seem largely unaccelerated. When comparing only Class 1 LBVs with the OBe distribution, the two samples show substantial similarity, with the K-S test p -value at 0.59. However, the Class 1 LBV distribution appears offset to lower velocities than the SMC OBe stars, and the characteristic velocities for Class 1 LBVs tend to be somewhat smaller than for the SMC OBe stars (Table 5). This may be due to the omission of non-field SMC OBe stars; and/or, the effect could be real, since we expect LBVs to have much higher average masses than OBe stars. Other physical or observational reasons could also be important.

Thus, we find that Class 1 LBVs have kinematics that are consistent with objects that have been ejected as runaways and walkaways from post-SN binaries, as suggested by Smith & Tombleson (2015) and Aghakhanloo et al. (2017). Our peculiar velocities are consistent with the results of Aghakhanloo et al. (2022), who find that over 33% of LMC LBVs have radial velocities exceeding 25 km/s. In contrast, the Class 2 objects, which are those lacking dusty nebulae, appear to be unaccelerated,

having a completely different velocity distribution from the Class 1 objects, as noted above (Figure 2). In agreement with the findings of Humphreys et al. (2016) and Aadland et al. (2018), Class 2 objects therefore likely have a different origin, consistent with single-star evolution models. Alternatively, they could be pre-SN binaries, or the product of binary mergers, which would experience very weak acceleration.

3.2. “Classical” and “Less luminous” LBVs

Humphreys et al. (2016) suggest that “classical” LBVs are not accelerated by binary SN explosions, thus it is also of interest to examine the stellar kinematics when using their LBV classification scheme for “classical” and “less luminous” objects. These authors identify S Dor, R127, and R143 as the only confirmed “classical” LBVs in the LMC, and they are known to be cluster members (Smith & Tombleson 2015). The “classical” group is distinguished from “less luminous” LBVs primarily by luminosity, and we caution that R143 has since been determined to have much lower luminosity than believed earlier, due to an apparent misidentification in the literature (Table 3; Agliozzo et al. 2019). We therefore drop this star as a “classical” object. We instead include two stars that meet the Humphreys et al. (2016) luminosity criterion and are considered confirmed LBVs in Table 3; since these were identified as only candidates by Humphreys et al., they did not include them in the “classical” group. These stars are R116 and HD 269582, which both belong to Class 2; while S Dor and R127 both belong to Class 1a. The remainder of the confirmed objects in Table 3 are the “less luminous” LBVs.

Figure 5 shows the velocity distributions for these subsamples. We see that the “less luminous” LBVs have higher velocities than the “classical” objects. Taking luminosity as a proxy for mass, this is consistent with the scenario where the most massive stars have the slowest velocities. In the SN acceleration scenario, this effect is expected due to the slower acceleration expected for more massive stars. However, this does not preclude other scenarios to explain the “classical” LBVs, including single-star evolution.

Figure 3 indicates the “classical” objects with black dots on their symbols. We see that the Class 1 “classical” LBVs have among the lowest transverse velocities for Class 1 objects. As noted earlier, the definition of Class 2 objects, which have no dusty nebula and no dust emission, appears to be most closely related to the LBVs defined as “classical” objects (Humphreys et al. 2017b). And, we find that the peculiar velocities of the “classical” LBVs are indeed slower, thus similar to the




Figure 5. Velocity distributions for the “classical” and “less luminous” confirmed LBVs, as identified in Section 3.2. LBVc stars are not included.

Class 2 objects. However, Figure 3 shows that the velocity distribution for “classical” LBVs is not as clearly limited to values $< 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, as seems to be the case for the Class 2 stars. Thus the kinematics do not clarify whether there is a fundamental distinction between the “classical” LBVs and the “less luminous” objects.

4. SGB[E] VELOCITY DISTRIBUTION

4.1. Class 3 “LBV candidate” stars

Turning now to sgB[e] stars, we first review the status of the Class 3 objects from Agliozzo et al. (2021). These objects have IR SEDs dominated by hot dust, and all of them are also identified as sgB[e] stars in the literature; such dust is a defining feature of classical sgB[e] stars. We note that Agliozzo et al. (2021) based their sample on that of Richardson & Mehner (2018), who focused only on identifying all possible candidate LBV stars without attempting to distinguish them from sgB[e] stars. The Class 3 group shows observational commonalities between LBV and sgB[e] stars. In particular, Table 6 shows that their luminosities are comparable to Class 1 and 2 LBVs, whereas non-Class 3 sgB[e] stars have median luminosities that are an order of magnitude fainter.

Comparing the kinematics of Class 3 stars to the Class 1 and 2 LBV groups, there are some notable differences, as seen in Figure 6. Class 3 stars all have relatively low velocities, $< 20 \text{ km/s}$. Table 5 shows that the weighted median of Class 3 stars is significantly lower than that for the Class 1 objects. The Class 3 velocities are more similar to those of the Class 2 stars, which are also all




Figure 6. Comparison of velocity distributions for Classes 1, 2, and 3 in the LMC.

slow, except for the single outlier. However, the Class 2 objects are even slower, and consistent with having unaccelerated velocities, whereas the Class 3 kinematics are dominated by objects in the $10 - 20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ range, and thus consistent with origins as slow ejections, known as walkaway stars.

Figure 7 compares the Class 3 velocity distribution to that of other sgB[e] stars. The Class 3 stars are confined to slow velocities, and none are faster than 20 km s^{-1} . In contrast, the other sgB[e] stars have high velocities, peaking at $20-30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, with a tail up to 60 km s^{-1} . The aggregate differences between these groups are also apparent in Table 5. Figure 8 shows that Class 3 objects are slower and more luminous than the non-Class 3 sgB[e] stars, with little overlap in their parameter space. We also see that the non-Class 3 sgB[e] stars have a wide range of luminosities and velocities, but their average velocities are higher than all LBV classes (Table 5).

Figures 7 and 8 show that the luminosities and velocities of the LMC Class 3 objects form a continuous distribution with those of the remaining sgB[e] stars. Since all classical sgB[e] stars also have strong dust emission, the Class 3 stars appear to correspond to the most luminous and massive extreme of the of the sgB[e] population. This is consistent with their status as confirmed sgB[e] stars in the catalog of Kraus (2019). We therefore consider them to be distinct from LBVs. We retain them all in our sgB[e] sample, and consider LBVs to include only Classes 1 and 2.

4.2. sgB[e] stars vs LBVs




Figure 7. Comparison of velocity distributions for Class 3 and the remaining sgB[e] stars in the LMC.




Figure 8. Luminosity vs velocity for Class 3 stars, non-Class 3 classical sgB[e] stars, and sgB[e]-WL stars, color coded as shown. Circles and triangles indicate LMC and SMC objects, respectively.

Figure 9 shows the velocity distribution for this combined LMC sgB[e] sample, showing that it is a fast population. Since we found above that the Class 2 LBVs are largely unaccelerated, we compare the the sgB[e] stars to only the Class 1 LBVs in Figure 9. We see that the two distributions are qualitatively similar, which is consistent with the K-S test p -value of 0.72. The weighted median for Class 1 LBVs is 20 km s^{-1} , while the that for sgB[e] stars is 26 km s^{-1} .

These results suggest that Class 1 LBVs and sgB[e] stars may have similar kinematic origins. Class 1 LBVs are on average much more luminous, and therefore more massive, than sgB[e] stars (Figure 10 and Table 6),




Figure 9. Velocity distributions of Class 1 LBVs and sgB[e] stars in the LMC.

which is qualitatively consistent with the difference in their mean velocities if both types of objects are accelerated by SN ejections. However, the substantial overlap in parameter space between the Class 1 LBVs and the combined sgB[e] classes (Figure 10) suggests that there are likely fundamental differences between these two populations as suggested by, e.g., Humphreys et al. (2017a), rather than that sgB[e] stars are simply lower-mass analogs to LBV stars as suggested by other authors (e.g., Smith & Tombleson 2015).

We see that the Class 1 LBV population does include a few high-velocity outliers. It may be that these LBVs are accelerated by dynamical ejections. Possibly they could result from two-step ejections combining both the dynamical and SN mechanisms. It is interesting that such high-velocity objects are not apparent among the sgB[e] stars, but additional data is needed to determine whether this difference is significant.

4.3. *sgB[e] stars as possible binary products*

Figure 11 compares the normalized velocity distributions of the LMC sgB[e] stars and the SMC field OBe stars. The sgB[e] stars are known to be even more isolated than LBV stars, with essentially all of them being field objects (Smith & Tombleson 2015; Humphreys et al. 2017a; Kraus 2019). The distributions of sgB[e] and field OBe stars have strong similarities, including similar weighted medians (26 km s^{-1} and 24 km s^{-1} , respectively; Table 5). This supports the scenario that sgB[e] stars are also accelerated by SN ejections, particularly since the OBe population excludes non-field stars.

There is significant evidence that sgB[e] stars are binary systems and that the B[e] phenomenon in these




Figure 10. Luminosity vs velocity for LMC LBV Classes 1 and 2, and sgB[e] Class 3 and non-Class 3 objects, color-coded as shown.

objects originates from a circumbinary disk (see, e.g., review by de Wit et al. 2014, and references therein). In a scenario where the sgB[e] stars are ejected by SNe in binary systems, any bound binary companions must be neutron stars or black holes. Interestingly, detection of the inferred binary companions of sgB[e] stars is often elusive, especially in the LMC and SMC. In particular, only one of our sample sgB[e] stars, HD 38489 (Bartlett & Clark 2015), is a known binary (Kraus 2019). If we also consider SMC sgB[e] stars, LHA 115-S6 (R4; Zickgraf et al. 1996; Massey et al. 2014) and LHA 115-S18 (Clark et al. 2013) are additional binaries, although LHA 115-S6 is also a candidate merger system (Pasquali et al. 2000). The other two objects, HD 38489 and LHA 115-S18, are identified as binaries by their X-ray emission, attributed to colliding winds (Clark et al. 2013). These data are ambiguous enough that there may be a possibility that most sgB[e] stars in our sample might have neutron star or black hole companions.

Around 15% of post-SN massive binaries remain bound in models by Renzo et al. (2019), and their predicted characteristic velocities for these systems are around 20 km s^{-1} for neutron stars and 10 km s^{-1} for black holes. The latter value depends strongly on the treatment of fall-back from the explosion and could be higher. We can compare these predictions with the observed sgB[e] velocity distribution in Figure 9, keeping in mind that this shows 2-d projected velocities, which are on average smaller than the 3-d space velocities by a factor of 0.82. The observed velocities are consistent with a possible scenario that most sgB[e] stars in the LMC and SMC are post-SN bound systems.

5. SMC POPULATIONS




Figure 11. Normalized velocity distributions of LMC sgB[e] stars and SMC field OBe stars, with Class 3 and non-Class 3 stars stacked and color-coded as shown.

We now consider the SMC populations. Table 5 shows characteristic velocity data for the different object classes. Given the small numbers of LBVs and sgB[e] stars in this galaxy, interpretations of their data are inconclusive; however, observed variations could be suggestive of effects due to the SMC’s lower metallicity.

5.1. LBV stars

There are two LBV stars identified in the SMC. According to Agliozzo et al. (2021), HD 6884 belongs to Class 1b, and HD 5980 to Class 2. HD 6884 has a low velocity ($11.6 \pm 6.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}$), which is not necessarily unusual for Class 1 LBVs, as shown in Figures 3 and 6. On the other hand, HD 5980 is a complicated and unusual multiple system, which includes a Wolf-Rayet star, and its photometric variability is attributed to both hydrostatic instability and binary interactions (Koenigsberger et al. 2014; Hillier et al. 2019). Therefore, this object may not be a true LBV (Humphreys et al. 2016). We find that it is traveling at high speed ($55.3 \pm 14.1 \text{ km s}^{-1}$), which is unusual for Class 2 objects in the LMC, although as seen in Figures 3 and 6, one other Class 2 LBV does have a similar velocity. Without more stars in the SMC sample, it is hard to evaluate whether there are significant differences from the LMC trends.

5.2. sgB[e] stars

There are 7 sgB[e] stars in the SMC sample, including the 2 sgB[e]c stars. The sample also includes 2 Class 3 stars identified by Agliozzo et al. (2021), LHA 115-S 6 and LHA 115-S 18. Similar to the LMC Class 3 objects, both are established in the sgB[e] census of Kraus




Figure 12. Luminosity vs velocity for all stars in the SMC. LBVc stars are shown with open circles; the Class 2 object is HD 5980, whose LBV status is especially questionable.

(2019). We see that these SMC Class 3 stars are faster than the other sgB[e] stars (Tables 4 and 5), a trend opposite to what is seen in the LMC (Figure 8). However, as discussed above in Section 4.3, both of these stars are likely non-compact binaries, which therefore can only be accelerated by the dynamical process. Dynamical ejections, including runaway binaries, typically attain higher velocities than SN ejections, as has been observed in the SMC (Phillips et al. 2024; Oey et al. 2018), including at values shown by the Class 3 objects. These Class 3 stars still have higher luminosities than the other sgB[e] stars, consistent with what we found above (Section 4.1) for the LMC sgB[e] stars, although the two SMC Class 3 stars have somewhat lower luminosities than their LMC counterparts. The high velocities of the SMC objects suggest that dynamical processes may play a role in their kinematics.

Figure 13 compares the velocities of the 7 sgB[e] stars of the SMC with the field OBe stars. This now has the advantage of comparing populations within the same galaxy. The velocity distribution of the sgB[e] stars appears to be flatter than for the OBe stars, but the data are noisy and the KS-test p -value is 0.82, showing that the difference is not statistically significant. In any case, we see that the data are certainly consistent with most SMC sgB[e] stars also being accelerated and ejected from their parent clusters. If the contrasting velocity distributions are confirmed, the SMC sgB[e] objects may experience stronger SN kicks or a greater contribution from dynamical ejection processes.

6. WEAK-LINED SGB[E] STARS

As mentioned earlier, there is a distinct subset of dust-poor sgB[e] stars identified by Graus et al. (2012), which we refer to as weak-lined sgB[e] (hereafter sgB[e]-WL)




Figure 13. Normalized velocity distributions for the sgB[e] and field OBe stars in the SMC.

stars, due to their much weaker forbidden emission lines compared to other sgB[e] stars. Graus et al. (2012) find that while sgB[e]-WL stars have no mid-IR dust emission, they do show free-free emission, which is also seen in the Class 2 LBVs and OBe stars. This indicates that the circumstellar emission is dominated by ionized gas. These objects are different enough from standard sgB[e] stars that Kraus (2019) considers them to be “erroneous classifications”, although historically the B[e] classification is based only on the presence of optical forbidden emission features, as discussed by Graus et al. (2012) (see, e.g., Conti 1976; Lamers et al. 1998).

Graus et al. (2012) identify SMC stars LHA 115-S 29, LHA 15-S 46, and LHA 115-S 62 as members of this group, along with the LMC star VFTS 698. We now also include the LMC star [L72] LH 85-10 as a member of this class, based on its IR SED, which is dominated by free-free emission instead of dust (Bonanos et al. 2009). Due to the very small sample size of sgB[e]-WL stars, it is again difficult to make any conclusive interpretations of their kinematics.

Figure 14 shows the velocity distributions of the sgB[e]-WL stars for both galaxies compared to the SMC field OBe stars. The SMC sgB[e]-WL stars have very high velocities, exceeding those of any other group (Table 5), whereas the two LMC sgB[e]-WL stars are slower. However, all of these objects again show accelerated proper motion velocities.

In the SMC, their kinematics reinforce previous conclusions that the sgB[e]-WL stars have little in common with the other groups, including other sgB[e] stars, and should be treated as a distinct phenomenon. We see




Figure 14. Velocity distributions for the sgB[e]-WL stars and the SMC field OBe stars. Blue and green correspond to LMC and SMC objects, respectively.

that their velocities are by far the fastest of any group (Figure 8 and Table 5). Their luminosities imply somewhat lower masses, which promote faster SN ejection velocities, but the observed velocities, having a weighted median of 53 km s^{-1} , imply very strong kick velocities and/or a significant contribution from dynamical processes for all 3 objects.

The LMC objects do not share these distinctive kinematics, and the two sgB[e]-WL stars have velocities similar to those of normal sgB[e] stars and Class 1 LBVs (Figure 8 and Table 5). If the LMC objects are indeed true analogs of their SMC counterparts, their slower velocities may in part be linked to their higher luminosities, and presumably, higher masses. The lower SMC metallicity may also play an important role, since under these conditions, massive interacting binaries experience less orbital widening and are therefore tighter, leading to faster ejections (Renzo et al. 2019). However, we again caution that the small number statistics make any interpretation difficult.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The origin of LBV and sgB[e] stars has been debated for decades, with traditional single-star models depicting LBVs as a transitional class that occurs after early O stars lose their outer layers to evolve into WR stars. The sgB[e] stars have often been considered to be closely related to LBVs. On the other hand, origins linked to binary interactions have also long been considered. Since binary interactions usually lead to post-SN acceleration, the stellar kinematics provide crucial insight on these models. In this paper, we carry out this test by measur-

ing the peculiar proper motions for the LBVs and sgB[e] stars in the LMC and SMC.

We focus primarily on the LMC, where we find that the velocities of LBVs and LBVc stars are statistically indistinguishable, suggesting that they are indeed a single general group. We consider the IR classes of [Agliozzo et al. \(2021\)](#), where Class 1 objects have dusty nebulae, pointing to likely previous mass ejection; these objects have velocity distributions that are comparable to those another group of massive stars known to be kicked from binaries, the SMC field OBe stars. This suggests that Class 1 LBVs are also kicked by supernovae in binary systems in both the LMC and SMC, consistent with the widely dispersed spatial distribution reported by [Smith & Tombleson \(2015\)](#).

On the other hand, the Class 2 LBV stars, which lack dusty nebulae, generally show no evidence of acceleration. They are also more luminous than the Class 1 stars, and therefore more massive and harder to accelerate via the supernova mechanism. However, the kinematics suggest that it is more likely that they are a fundamentally different class of objects with a different origin or evolutionary state, perhaps being pre-SN binaries or merger products. While the criteria for identifying “classical” LBVs differ significantly from those that identify Class 2 LBVs, these classifications may be physically related; the kinematics of Class 2 objects are consistent with the findings by [Humphreys et al. \(2016\)](#) that “classical” LBVs remain in clusters, which is also consistent with their being products of single-star evolution.

The overall velocity distribution of sgB[e] stars is also similar to that of the SMC field OBe stars, with higher average velocities than the LBV Class 1 stars. This may be attributed to the lower masses of the sgB[e] stars. Thus, the kinematics of sgB[e] stars are also consistent with binary supernova origins. The sgB[e] sample includes the Class 3 stars of [Agliozzo et al. \(2021\)](#), which they consider to be LBVc stars, but all are identified as sgB[e] stars in the census of [Kraus \(2019\)](#). The Class 3 stars are defined by their dusty spectra, which is also a defining property of classical sgB[e] stars. We find that the Class 3 stars and the remaining LMC sgB[e] stars form a continuous distribution in luminosity and velocity, fully consistent with the Class 3 objects simply corresponding to the most luminous and massive extreme of the sgB[e] population, and we therefore treat them as such.

Although sgB[e] stars extend to much lower luminosities and higher velocities than Class 1 LBVs, there is substantial overlap between them in this parameter space, implying that the two types of objects are dis-

tinct, and that sgB[e] stars are not simply lower luminosity LBVs. This is also supported by the clear difference in dust properties (e.g., [Kraus 2019](#)).

We also obtain the peculiar velocities of SMC LBVs and sgB[e] stars. Not much can be inferred for the LBV stars, since there are only two objects, one of which is unusual. The SMC sgB[e] stars, even the most luminous ones, tend to have substantially higher velocities than the LMC counterparts. This may be consistent with the expectation that lower-metallicity binaries are tighter, leading to faster ejection velocities ([Renzo et al. 2019](#)). There may also be greater contribution from dynamical ejections, especially for the most massive objects.

We also examine the weak-lined sgB[e] stars ([Graus et al. 2012](#)), which are distinct from classical sgB[e] stars in that they show only free-free emission and no dust in the IR. All of these objects also show accelerated velocities. The SMC objects are again much faster than their LMC counterparts, and they have the fastest velocities of any group studied here. This could be due to the same metallicity effect mentioned above. Another possible contributing factor might be that the SMC objects may be overluminous, lower-mass objects.

Thus, the kinematics of the Class 1 LBVs, sgB[e] stars, and sgB[e]-WL stars all show accelerated velocities, implying that these objects generally are ejected from their parent clusters. The velocity distributions of the Class 1 LBVs and sgB[e] stars are similar in form to that of the SMC field OBe stars, which are expected to be products of binary mass transfer. Thus it is likely that the LBVs with dusty nebulae and sgB[e] stars have similar origins. However, a significant contribution from dynamical ejections cannot be ruled out, since the timescale for this process is on the order of the stellar lifetimes (e.g., [Brinkmann et al. 2017](#)). On the other hand, the Class 2 LBVs, which are luminous objects with no dusty nebulae, generally show no evidence of acceleration and may form according to single-star evolution models, or they could be pre-SN binaries or binary merger products (e.g., [Aghakhanloo et al. 2017](#)).

We gratefully thank all who discussed this work with us, including Mojgan Aghakhanloo, Johnny Dorigo Jones, Grant Phillips, Mathieu Renzo, and Irene Vargas-Salazar. We also thank the referee for comments and suggestions that substantially improved this paper.

Facilities: Gaia, SIMBAD, VizieR

Software: Astropy ([Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013](#)), Scipy ([Virtanen et al. 2020](#))

REFERENCES

- Aadland, E., Massey, P., Neugent, K. F., & Drout, M. R. 2018, *AJ*, 156, 294, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aaeb96](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aaeb96)
- Aghakhanloo, M., Murphy, J. W., Smith, N., & Hložek, R. 2017, *MNRAS*, 472, 591, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx2050](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx2050)
- Aghakhanloo, M., Smith, N., Andrews, J., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 516, 2142, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2265](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2265)
- Aglizzo, C., Mehner, A., Phillips, N. M., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 626, A126, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201935239](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201935239)
- Aglizzo, C., Phillips, N., Mehner, A., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 655, A98, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202141279](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202141279)
- Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 558, A33, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201322068](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201322068)
- Bartlett, E. S., & Clark, J. S. 2015, in *SALT Science Conference 2015 (SSC2015)*, ed. D. Buckley & A. Schroeder, 55, doi: [10.22323/1.250.0055](https://doi.org/10.22323/1.250.0055)
- Bonanos, A. Z., Massa, D. L., Sewilo, M., et al. 2009, *AJ*, 138, 1003, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/138/4/1003](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/138/4/1003)
- Bouret, J. C., Lanz, T., & Hillier, D. J. 2005, *A&A*, 438, 301, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361:20042531](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361:20042531)
- Brinkmann, N., Banerjee, S., Motwani, B., & Kroupa, P. 2017, *A&A*, 600, A49, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201629312](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201629312)
- Clark, J. S., Bartlett, E. S., Coe, M. J., et al. 2013, *A&A*, 560, A10, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201321216](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201321216)
- Conti, P. S. 1975, *Memoires of the Societe Royale des Sciences de Liege*, 9, 193
- Conti, P. S. 1976, in *Be and Shell Stars*, ed. A. Slettebak, IAU Symposium 70, 447
- Conti, P. S. 1979, in *Mass Loss and Evolution of O-Type Stars*, ed. P. S. Conti & C. W. H. De Loore, Vol. 83, 431–443
- Dallas, M. M., Oey, M. S., & Castro, N. 2022, *ApJ*, 936, 112, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac8988](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac8988)
- de Koter, A., Lamers, H. J. G. L. M., & Schmutz, W. 1996, *A&A*, 306, 501
- de Wit, W. J., Oudmaijer, R. D., & Vink, J. S. 2014, *Advances in Astronomy*, 2014, 270848, doi: [10.1155/2014/270848](https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/270848)
- Dorigo Jones, J., Oey, M. S., Paggeot, K., Castro, N., & Moe, M. 2020, *ApJ*, 903, 43, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abbc6b](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abbc6b)
- Dunstall, P. R., Fraser, M., Clark, J. S., et al. 2012, *A&A*, 542, A50, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201218872](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201218872)
- Gaia Collaboration, Bailer-Jones, C. A. L., Teyssier, D., et al. 2022, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2206.05681, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2206.05681](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.05681)
- Graus, A. S., Lamb, J. B., & Oey, M. S. 2012, *ApJ*, 759, 10, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/759/1/10](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/759/1/10)
- Hillier, D. J., Koenigsberger, G., Nazé, Y., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 486, 725, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz808](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz808)
- Humphreys, R. M., & Davidson, K. 1994, *PASP*, 106, 1025, doi: [10.1086/133478](https://doi.org/10.1086/133478)
- Humphreys, R. M., Davidson, K., Hahn, D., Martin, J. C., & Weis, K. 2017a, *ApJ*, 844, 40, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa7cef](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa7cef)
- Humphreys, R. M., Gordon, M. S., Martin, J. C., Weis, K., & Hahn, D. 2017b, *ApJ*, 836, 64, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa582e](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa582e)
- Humphreys, R. M., Weis, K., Davidson, K., & Gordon, M. S. 2016, *ApJ*, 825, 64, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/825/1/64](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/825/1/64)
- Jones, O. C., Meixner, M., Sargent, B. A., et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 811, 145, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/811/2/145](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/811/2/145)
- Kalari, V. M., Vink, J. S., Dufton, P. L., & Fraser, M. 2018, *A&A*, 618, A17, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833484](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833484)
- Kalari, V. M., Vink, J. S., Dufton, P. L., et al. 2014, *A&A*, 564, L7, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201323289](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201323289)
- Koenigsberger, G., Morrell, N., Hillier, D. J., et al. 2014, *AJ*, 148, 62, doi: [10.1088/0004-6256/148/4/62](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-6256/148/4/62)
- Kraus, M. 2019, *Galaxies*, 7, 83, doi: [10.3390/galaxies7040083](https://doi.org/10.3390/galaxies7040083)
- Lamb, J. B., Oey, M. S., Segura-Cox, D. M., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 817, 113, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/817/2/113](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/817/2/113)
- Lamers, H. J. G. L. M., Zickgraf, F.-J., de Winter, D., Houziaux, L., & Zorec, J. 1998, *A&A*, 340, 117
- Langer, N., Hamann, W. R., Lennon, M., et al. 1994, *A&A*, 290, 819
- Maeder, A., & Conti, P. S. 1994, *ARA&A*, 32, 227, doi: [10.1146/annurev.astro.32.1.227](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.astro.32.1.227)
- Massey, P., Neugent, K. F., Morrell, N., & Hillier, D. J. 2014, *ApJ*, 788, 83, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/788/1/83](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/788/1/83)
- Massey, P., Waterhouse, E., & DeGioia-Eastwood, K. 2000, *AJ*, 119, 2214, doi: [10.1086/301345](https://doi.org/10.1086/301345)
- Oey, M. S., Dorigo Jones, J., Castro, N., et al. 2018, *ApJL*, 867, L8, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aae892](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aae892)
- Oksala, M. E., Kraus, M., Arias, M. L., et al. 2012, *MNRAS*, 426, L56, doi: [10.1111/j.1745-3933.2012.01323.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-3933.2012.01323.x)
- Pasquali, A., Nota, A., Langer, N., Schulte-Ladbeck, R. E., & Clampin, M. 2000, *AJ*, 119, 1352, doi: [10.1086/301257](https://doi.org/10.1086/301257)
- Phillips, G. D., Oey, M. S., Cuevas, M., Castro, N., & Kothari, R. 2024, *ApJ*, 966, 243, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad3909](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad3909)
- Renzo, M., Zapartas, E., de Mink, S. E., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 624, A66, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201833297](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201833297)
- Richardson, N. D., & Mehner, A. 2018, *Research Notes of the American Astronomical Society*, 2, 121, doi: [10.3847/2515-5172/aad1f3](https://doi.org/10.3847/2515-5172/aad1f3)

- Smith, N. 2016, MNRAS, 461, 3353,
doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw1533](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1533)
- . 2019, MNRAS, 489, 4378, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stz2277](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stz2277)
- Smith, N., & Owocki, S. P. 2006, ApJL, 645, L45,
doi: [10.1086/506523](https://doi.org/10.1086/506523)
- Smith, N., & Tombleson, R. 2015, MNRAS, 447, 598,
doi: [10.1093/mnras/stu2430](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stu2430)
- Solovyeva, Y., Vinokurov, A., Sarkisyan, A., et al. 2020,
MNRAS, 497, 4834, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa2117](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa2117)
- Virtanen, P., Gommers, R., Oliphant, T. E., et al. 2020,
Nature Methods, 17, 261,
doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-019-0686-2>
- Walborn, N. R., Gamen, R. C., Morrell, N. I., et al. 2017,
AJ, 154, 15, doi: [10.3847/1538-3881/aa6195](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-3881/aa6195)
- Weis, K., & Bomans, D. J. 2020, Galaxies, 8, 20,
doi: [10.3390/galaxies8010020](https://doi.org/10.3390/galaxies8010020)
- Wisniewski, J. P., Bjorkman, K. S., Bjorkman, J. E., &
Clampin, M. 2007, ApJ, 670, 1331, doi: [10.1086/522330](https://doi.org/10.1086/522330)
- Zaritsky, D., Harris, J., Thompson, I. B., & Grebel, E. K.
2004, AJ, 128, 1606, doi: [10.1086/423910](https://doi.org/10.1086/423910)
- Zaritsky, D., Harris, J., Thompson, I. B., Grebel, E. K., &
Massey, P. 2002, AJ, 123, 855, doi: [10.1086/338437](https://doi.org/10.1086/338437)
- Zickgraf, F. J., Kovacs, J., Wolf, B., et al. 1996, A&A, 309,
505