

Effect of Electron Screening on the Collapsing Process of Core-Collapse Supernovae

Men-Quan Liu^{1,2*}, Ye-Fei Yuan^{1*} and Jie Zhang^{2,3*}

¹Key Laboratory for Research in Galaxies and Cosmology, University of Science and Technology of China, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hefei, 230026, China

²Institute of Theoretical physics, China West Normal University, Nanchong, 637002, China

³Institute of Structure and Function, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 400044, China

Accepted . Received ; in original form 2008 October 21

ABSTRACT

By using an average heavy nuclei model, the effects of the electron screening on electron capture (EC) in core-collapse supernovae are investigated. A one-dimension code based on the $W_{s15M_{\odot}}$ progenitor model is utilized to test the effects of electron screening during the collapsing process. The results show that, at high densities, the effects of EC on electron capture becomes significant. During the collapsing stage, the EC rate is decreased, the collapse timescale is prolonged and the leakage of the neutrino energy is increased. These effects lead to an appreciable decrease in the initial energy of the bounce shock wave. The effects of electron screening in the other progenitor models are also discussed.

Key words: nuclear reactions, nucleosynthesis, abundances - stars:evolution - supernovae:general.

1 INTRODUCTION

Supernovae explosion is one of the most violent events in our universe. Their explosion mechanism is an old problem, but has not been understood completely (see e.g. Woosley & Heger 2007; Martínez-Pinedo 2008 for reference). Generally, a massive star ($M \geq 10M_{\odot}$) proceeds through all burning stage from Hydrogen to Silicon, finally leading to an iron core in its center (Blanc & Greggio 2008). Electron capture (EC) causes the number density and the degenerate pressure of electron to decrease with a lot of neutrino energy loss, which lead to the accelerating collapse of the star till the central density reaches the maximum (two-three times the nuclear density). Later on, the infalling outer core collides with the stiff inner core, and then the bounce shock is produced in the vicinity of the boundary between the inner core and outer core. The initial temperature of shock wave is even higher than 10^{11} K. At such a high temperature, photon energy is much larger than the binding energy of nucleus, and the iron nuclei are photodisintegrated into protons, neutrons and electrons behind the shock wave (Janka 2007). Unfortunately with the current numerical simulations, a self-consistent treatment of one-dimension supernovae model does not yet lead to successful explosion due to

the energy insufficiency, while two-dimension models show some promise (Hix et al. 2003; Burrows et al. 2006).

It is well known that the weak interactions, especially the EC and beta decay, are essential to the evolution of supernovae. Many basic investigations at this aspect have been done by Bahcall (1962, 1964), Fuller, Flower, Newmann (1982a, 1982b), Aufderheide et al. (1994), Langanke, Martínez-Pinedo (1999; 2000) and so on in the last decades. Fuller et al. (1982b) have ever mentioned the screening correction but they did not make a detailed calculation. Later, Hix & Thielemann (1996) and Bravo & García-Senz (1999) considered the screening correction on the silicon burning and nuclear statistical equilibrium (NSE), and they found that screening effect is significant. Luo & Peng (1996) investigated the effect of screening on EC in the supernovae environment by using Fuller et al. (1982a, b) method (i.e. so called shell model brink hypothesis). Their results show screening can reduce the EC rate by 10 – 20 per cent at high density. More recently improved EC rate and screening potential were adopted in Liu, Zhang & Luo (2007). The screening affects the EC mainly in three aspects. (1) The screening changes the Coulomb in-wave function of the electron; however, it can be neglected because the screening potential is much less than the average energy of the electrons. (2) The screening reduces the energy of the electrons in the capture reaction. (3) The screening decreases the number of the high-energy electrons with energy greater than the threshold energy of EC. As a result, the reaction threshold

* E-mail: menquan@mail.ustc.edu.cn, liumq@cwnu.edu.cn (MQL); yfyuan@ustc.edu.cn (YFY); zhang_mail@tom.com (JZ)

energy increases. Compared with screening on EC, there are at least two differences for beta decay. (1) The electron energy of beta decay is decided by the energy difference between parent nucleus and daughter nucleus (including rest mass), but the electron energy in EC can be much larger than that of the capture threshold. (2) In the inner core, beta decay is prohibited due to the Pauli exclusion principle (inhibition degree has been given by Peterson & Bahcall 1963); at the outer core, beta decay gets permission, but the evolution of inner core is quicker than that of outer core at core collapsing stage (which is less than 0.5s). So we here neglect the screening effect on the beta decay. Langanke et al. have suggested the screening should be considered in the simulations (Langanke & Martínez-Pinedo 2003), but up to now the screening effect on the total explosion process has not been done. Early numerical simulations show that the onset of the SN explosion depends on the pre-supernovae model and the evolution mode that is especially sensitive to the physical parameters input, which is closely related to the electron fraction and the weak interaction rates (Heger, Woosley & Martínez-Pinedo 2001). Therefore, it is imperative to obtain the EC rates with high precision. As an actual physical input, screening should not be ignored since a series of important parameters, such as neutrino energy loss, collapsing timescale etc., is changed. In this paper, we investigate the detailed effects of electron screening on EC in core-collapse supernovae.

2 PRE-SUPERNOVAE MODEL AND COMPUTATIONAL APPROACH

We perform numerical simulations by using a modified version of the one-dimension code developed by Y.R. Wang, S.C. Zhang, W.Z. Wang, Z.H. Xie (WZWX 2003) in 1996. In this code the general relativistic hydrodynamic equations are adopted (May & White 1966); the hydrodynamics method is smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) referring to Benz (1991); equations of state are similar to Lattimer & Swesty (1991) and Cooperstein & Wambach (1984); the method of neutrino transport is provided by Suzuki (1994). The pre-supernovae model we choose is the $W_{s15}M_{\odot}$ model with an iron core of $1.38M_{\odot}$ (Woosley & Weaver 1995). The grid domain includes $1.6M_{\odot}$, which is divided into 96 mass layers. Since most of nuclei involved in supernovae environment are on the unstable and excited states, it is difficult to get a precise description of each energy level, especially for heavy nucleus whose excited states are almost continuous. For a simple consideration, we assumed that the matter consists of four typical particles including free protons, free neutrons, α -particles, and heavy nuclei, i.e. the so called ‘four-particle model’. Such four types of particles can well represent the whole property of pre-supernovae (Lattimer & Swesty 1991; Arcones Janka & Scheck 2008). Similar to the other authors, detailed numerical model indicates the shock is unable to rush out of the iron core because of too much energy loss in the iron photodisintegration. So here we mainly investigate the screening effect in the collapsing process of supernovae explosion.

Usually, the capture rates for the nucleus (Z, A) in thermal equilibrium at temperature T is given by a sum over the

initial parent states and the final daughter states (Pruet & Fuller 2003),

$$\lambda = \sum_i \frac{(2J_i + 1)e^{-E_i/k_B T}}{G(Z, A, T)} \sum_f \frac{\ln 2}{(ft)_{if}} f_{if}, \quad (1)$$

where J_i and E_i are the spin and excitation energy of the parent states, respectively, k_B is the Boltzmann constant and $G(Z, A, T)$ the nuclear partition function. The ft -values are related to GT and Fermi transition matrix elements. f_{if} is the phase space integral of electron. But for the ‘four-particle model’ we adopt, matter is composed of protons, free neutrons, α -particles, and heavy nuclei under NSE. Only proton and heavy nuclei can capture electrons, so the total EC rate $\lambda = \lambda_p + \lambda_H$, where λ_p and λ_H are the EC rates for proton and heavy nuclei, respectively. Considering the core of the pre-supernovae is composed of iron element, the dominant influence of electron screening is decided by the heavy nuclei. Precise calculation of the EC rate is usually based on the nuclear shell model, i.e formula (1), but the shortage of energy level quality at high temperature and diverse electron rates for so many different nucleus will bring complication and some uncertainty. Therefore, here the Fermi gas model is adopted to describe the average property of the heavy nuclei. The EC rate is defined by $\lambda = -(dn_e/dt)$, when the number density of electron decreases $\lambda > 0$; otherwise $\lambda \leq 0$. According to Bethe et al. (1979), the EC rate for average heavy nuclei is expressed

$$\lambda_H = 1.18 \times 10^{-44} \frac{3n_e}{\mu_e^3} \frac{3n_p}{(p_F^p)^2} \frac{c}{(m_e c^2)^2} m_p \iint \varepsilon_e^2 \varepsilon_p^2 f_e d\varepsilon_e d\varepsilon_p, \quad (2)$$

where $n_e = \rho N_A Y_e$, $n_p = x \chi_H \rho N_A$, $p_F^p = (2m_p \mu_p)^{1/2}$, ρ is the density, N_A is the Avogadro constant, μ_p is the chemical potential for proton, Y_e is the electron fraction, m_p the mass of proton. $x \equiv Z/A$, Z, A are the mass number and charge of average heavy nuclei, respectively. χ_H is the fraction of the average heavy nuclei, ε_e and ε_p is the energy of electron and proton, respectively. $f_e = \{1 + \exp[(\varepsilon_e - \mu_e - m_e c^2)/(k_B T)]\}^{-1}$ is the Fermi-Dirac distribution function for electrons. Because of the conservation of energy, $\varepsilon_e + \varepsilon_p = \varepsilon_n + \varepsilon_\nu$, equation (2) becomes

$$\lambda_H = 1.18 \times 10^{-44} \frac{3n_e}{\mu_e^3} \frac{3n_p}{(p_F^p)^2} m_p \frac{c}{(m_e c^2)^2} \times \int_{\mu_p - \Delta_p}^{\mu_p} \int_Q^{\infty} \varepsilon_e^2 (\varepsilon_e + \varepsilon_p - \varepsilon_n)^2 f_e d\varepsilon_e d\varepsilon_p, \quad (3)$$

where Q is the reaction threshold energy. $Q = |Q_{if}|$ if $Q_{if} < -0.511\text{MeV}$, otherwise $Q = 0.511\text{MeV}$. $Q_{if} = (M_p c^2 - M_d c^2 + E_i - E_f)$, M_p and M_d are the mass of parent and daughter nucleus, respectively. E_i and E_f the excited energy for parent and daughter nuclei, respectively. Note that here parent and daughter nuclei are proton and neutron in bound state of nucleus, so $Q_{if} = \mu_n + \Delta_n - \varepsilon_p$, which can also assurance the energy of neutrino is not less than zero. Proton energy $\varepsilon_p = \mu_p - \Delta_p$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_p = \mu_p - \varepsilon_p &= \mu_p - (\varepsilon_n + \varepsilon_\nu - \varepsilon_e) \\ &\approx \mu_p - (\mu_n + \Delta_n + \varepsilon_\nu - \mu_e) \\ &= \mu_e - \hat{\mu} - \Delta_n - \varepsilon_\nu = \Delta - \varepsilon_\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{\mu} = \mu_n - \mu_p$, $\Delta = \mu_e - \hat{\mu} - \Delta_n = 1.15 \rho_{10}^{-1/8} \sqrt{\mu_e / Y_e} (d\hat{\mu}/d\mu_e)^{1/4}$ is the maximum energy of

emitting neutrino, average energy of neutrino $\bar{\varepsilon}_v \approx (3/5)\Delta$, so $\Delta_p \approx (2/5)\Delta$. $\Delta_n = \min(3, \max(0, \Delta/2))$, where 3MeV is a refereed value given by Bethe et al. (1979). Some values at initial moment are listed in Table 1.

In the high density gas, screening electron cloudy is formed. Screening reduces the energy of the electron and enhances the threshold energy, so the EC rate will decrease. We adopt the method similar to Liu et al. (2007), i.e., we ignore the effect screening changes the Coulomb in-wave function of the electron, only consider the effect on the electron energy and threshold energy. So the capture rate in the strong screening is rewritten as

$$\lambda'_H = C \int_{\mu_p - \Delta_p}^{\mu_p} \int_{Q+D}^{\infty} (\varepsilon_e - v_s)^2 (\varepsilon_e - v_s + \varepsilon_p - \mu_n - \Delta_n)^2 f_e d\varepsilon_e d\varepsilon_p \quad (5)$$

$$C = 1.18 \times 10^{-44} \frac{3n_e}{\mu_e^3} \frac{3n_p}{k_f^2} \frac{c}{(m_e c^2)^2} m_p, \quad (6)$$

where D is the modification to the threshold energy, v_s is the screening potential (Fuller et al. 1982b, Itoh et al. 2002):

$$D = 2.94 \times 10^{-5} Z^{2/3} (\rho Y_e)^{1/3} (\text{MeV}) \quad (7)$$

$$v_s = 7.525 \times 10^{-3} Z \left(\frac{Z}{A} \rho_6 \right)^{1/3} J (\text{MeV}) \quad (8)$$

where ρ_6 is the density in the unit of 10^6 g cm^{-3} , $J = \sum_{i,j=0}^{10} a_{ij} s^i u^j$, $s = 0.5(\log r_s + 3)$, $u = 1/25(R - 25)$, $r_s = 1.388 \times 10^{-2} (A/Z\rho_6)^{1/3}$. a_{ij} can be found in Itoh et al. (2002), equation (8) is valid for $10^{-5} \leq r_s \leq 10^{-1}$ (i.e. $\rho \leq 10^{15} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$), which is usually fulfilled in the supernovae environment.

For the EC on proton, the most probable energy of interaction $E_0 \simeq E_F$. Because of $E_0 \gg E_p$ and $kT > E_p$, where E_p is the Coulomb energy for proton, strong screening is invalid and weak screening is valid (Salpeter & von Horn 1969). According the method of Kippenhahn & Weigert (1990), Bahcall, Chen, & Kamionkowski (1998) and Kippenhahn & Weigert (1990), weak screening factor is $\exp(x_0 \pi \eta)$ for $x_0 \ll 1$, where $x_0 = r_c/r_D \simeq (Z_1 Z_2 / 200 E_0) (\zeta \rho / T_7)^{1/2}$ (note that here E_0 is in KeV); r_c , r_D are the classical turning-point radius and Debye radius, respectively; $\zeta = \sqrt{\sum_i (X_i Z_i^2 / A_i + X_i Z_i / A_i)}$, X_i , Z_i , and A_i are the mass fraction, charge, and mass number, respectively; T_7 is temperature in unit of 10^7 K , $\eta = (m/2)^{1/2} [(Z_1 Z_2 e^2) / (\hbar E_0^{1/2})]$, where m is the reduced mass. With rough estimate for the core region of supernova, $T \sim 10^9 \text{ K}$, $\zeta \sim 10$, and $\rho = 10^9 \sim 10^{12} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$, weak screening correction is not more than 0.001. On the other hand, proton fraction is much smaller than heavy nuclei, so screening correction for free proton capture is not important comparing with that on heavy nuclei.

3 SIMULATION RESULTS

Because there are many output parameters in the simulation, in Table 1 we only tabulate some important parameters (only 10 layers are listed) at the initial moment of simulation (about 0.27s before bounce). One can see that the mass number and charge of average heavy nuclei, density, electron fraction, temperature in the pre-supernovae model and




Figure 1. Neutrino energy loss rates at 0.27s before bounce. Solid curve is neutrino energy loss rate without screening, while dashed curve is that with screening in the different layers.




Figure 2. The electron capture rate at different collapsing time. Solid curves are EC rates without screening, while dashed curves are that with screening in the different layers. The symbols 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 represent the time of -250.0, -200.0, -100.0, -50.0, -25.0, -5.0, -1.5, 0 and 6ms for the case of without screening ('-' means the time is before bounce, ms is the abbreviation for milliseconds). Squares denote the neutrino trapping positions at the corresponding time.

screening potentials at the different layers. Here, λ and λ' represent the EC rate without/with screening, respectively. It is shown in Table 1 that the mass number and charge of heavy nuclei decrease from the center to the outer layer. The screening potential is mainly dependent on the density, so both D and v_s decrease monotonically with densities. λ is not only a function of Z , A , Y_e , and T , but also a function of $\lambda_p, \lambda_H, \chi_p$ and χ_H , so it is not monotonic to the mass layers. With screening effect into consideration, it is easy to find that λ' is always smaller than λ .

The neutrino leakage and diffusion process are the key factors on the explosion energy, and the energy loss of neutrino exceeds 90 per cent of the total in the whole evolution process of the star. Neutrino energy loss rate is an important and complicated parameter to affect the explosion energy and evolution, which is related with the weak interaction rate, neutrino energy, and transport equation and so on. The change of EC rate must influence the neutrino energy loss rate. Fig. 1 shows the comparison of neutrino loss rate with/without screening at 0.27s before bounce. Solid curve

Table 1. Some important parameters at the initial moment 0.27s before bounce.

j	A	Z	ρ gcm^{-3}	Y_e	T K	D MeV	v_s MeV	μ_p MeV	μ_n MeV	Δ_p MeV	Δ_n MeV	λ $s^{-1}cm^{-3}$	λ' $s^{-1}cm^{-3}$
1	61.6	26.1	8.3E+09	0.42	8.1E+09	0.39	0.14	-12.54	-6.72	0.37	0.92	6.28E+30	5.41E+30
10	60.1	25.8	5.3E+09	0.43	7.9E+09	0.33	0.12	-12.04	-7.06	0.32	0.79	1.86E+30	1.65E+30
20	58.6	25.4	3.4E+09	0.43	7.7E+09	0.29	0.10	-11.47	-7.46	0.33	0.82	1.13E+30	1.02E+30
30	57.1	25.1	2.2E+09	0.44	7.5E+09	0.25	0.08	-10.83	-7.93	0.39	0.98	1.14E+30	1.05E+30
40	55.0	24.6	1.3E+09	0.45	7.3E+09	0.21	0.07	-9.95	-8.60	0.54	1.35	1.71E+30	1.59E+30
50	52.9	24.1	7.5E+08	0.46	6.8E+09	0.17	0.06	-9.18	-9.18	0.66	1.65	1.50E+30	1.40E+30
60	52.1	23.9	3.4E+08	0.46	7.1E+09	0.13	0.04	-9.19	-9.19	0.47	1.17	1.80E+29	1.73E+29
70	49.6	23.2	1.2E+08	0.47	6.1E+09	0.09	0.03	-9.13	-9.13	0.31	0.77	7.20E+27	6.90E+27
80	43.8	21.8	2.7E+07	0.50	4.7E+09	0.06	0.02	-8.89	-8.89	0.17	0.41	9.08E+25	8.77E+25
90	43.3	21.3	2.0E+06	0.50	2.9E+09	0.02	0.01	-8.80	-8.80	0.04	0.11	3.57E+22	3.48E+22

note. j denotes the layer number.




Figure 3. The explosion energy with/without screening versus collapsing time. The notes are the same as those in Fig.1.




Figure 4. The collapsing velocity versus radius at bounce. Shock is produced at sound speed position, and radius of PNS appears at the vicinity of maximal collapsing velocity at the bounce. The notes are the same as those in Fig.1.

denotes loss rate without screening, dotted curve denotes that with screening. We find neutrino energy loss rate decreases generally, at some region the modification is more than 5 per cent (It closely depends on EC rate), but for outer part of iron core, it has hardly changed.

Fig. 2 shows the evolution of EC rate with/without screening at different moment during the collapsing stage. One can find (i) the EC rate with screening is always smaller

than that without screening, which is caused by the decrease of the EC rate and the delay of collapse time-scale. At the initial stage (such as symbol 1), the difference is mainly caused by the different EC rates, and at the later stage (such as symbols 5,6,7), the difference comes from a different collapse history, while at bounce moment, for the case without screening (symbol 8), the EC rates are similar to that at moment 6ms later for the case with screening. (ii) In the inner part of the core, both the EC rates and the difference between the case with screening and the case without screening increase rapidly with time. The reason is that the densities increase quickly with the collapsing process. The higher the density, the larger the screening potential. However the screening effect is decided not only by the potential, but also by the Fermi energy of electrons. When the density is large enough, the Fermi energy becomes much larger than the potential energy. Correspondingly the screening effect will decrease. (iii) In the outer part of the core, the EC rates change comparatively slow. At the edge of iron core ($1.38M_{\odot}$), there is an inflexion because both the fraction of heavy nuclei and the densities break obviously. At the outer envelop, EC rate is almost stable since the time is just 0.3s. (iv) Note the squares symbols in Fig. 2, from left to right, they denote neutrino trapping critical position at -5.0, -1.5 and 0.0ms before bounce, respectively. We can find the high density region extents rapidly with time. Because of the inverse process of EC rate $[v_e + (A, Z) \rightleftharpoons e^- + (A, Z + 1)]$ enhances with density, above critical density ($\rho_{trapping}$ is about $3 \times 10^{12} gcm^{-3}$), an equilibrium of neutrino will be reached and the lepton fraction (including electron fraction and neutrino fraction) will keep as a constant. Surely, at such situation our method for screening modification is invalid to change of lepton fraction, but screening is still exist and keep effect in the reversible reaction.

We also compare the collapsing time and the radius of protoneutron star (PNS) with screening/without screening (as shown in Fig. 3 and 4). We find (i) the collapsing time is prolonged; $t=0.267s$ without screening while $t=0.272s$ with screening. The reason is that screening decreases the capture rate. This makes the electron number density and degenerate pressure to drop a little more slowly than the fiducial case. During the collapsing stage, the total pressure is dominated by the electron degenerate pressure, so that the decrease of total pressure also become more

slowly and the collapsing velocity decreases comparatively. (ii) The initial energy of shock wave decreases. The initial energy of shock wave at about 0.8ms after bounce is 1.06 foe ($1\text{foe}=1 \times 10^{51}\text{erg}$) without screening and 1.01foe with screening. Their difference is 0.05 foe, which is 5 per cent of the total. On the one hand, it could be that the calculation with screening results in a different radial profile of the star at bounce when compared with a calculation without screening. The different profile could result in differences in the propagation of the shock wave. Figure 4 shows that the velocity of the collapsing matter is different for radii above the shock position; on the other hand, it could be the total neutrino energy loss increase due to the time delay. The total neutrino energy loss $\dot{Q}_{vt} = \sum_i \sum_j \dot{Q}_v \Delta M_j \Delta t$, where t is the time, Δt is the time step, ΔM_j is the mass of the j th layer. Despite the screening effect decreases the capture rate and the neutrino energy loss rate, the total energy loss is also related to the collapsing time. (iii) Radius of PNS is hardly changed, but the radius of outer part of iron core increase slightly. It is favorable to the success of supernovae explosion.

4 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have considered screening effect on EC, the corresponding effects on the collapsing process, and on the initial shock wave energy of core-collapse supernovae. Our results show that the screening effect is appreciable. Since there are both advantages and disadvantages to the final explosion, more detailed simulation is needed by using more concrete equation of state and progenitor model (Hix et al. 2003). In order to investigate the exact effect of screening, the concrete nuclide and the other methods are needed. In recent years, many methods such as the large-scale shell model and the pn-random phase approach are widely investigated (Nabi & Sajjad 2008). Improved results are universally one order of magnitude smaller than Fuller et al. (1982a,b) results. If the improved EC rates are considered, the screening effect should increase comparatively. Furthermore, for two or three dimension numerical simulations of core-collapse supernovae, our method for electron screening is also valid. The explosion mechanism of the core-collapse supernovae has been investigated extensively in the last four decades and significant progress has been obtained, but some of the most fundamental questions are still unanswered. It is necessary to include the effect of screening in later detailed simulations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the referee for her/his valuable suggestions to improve our manuscript. We also thank Professor S.E. Woosley for providing us with his progenitor data. M-QL would like to thank WZWX for providing the original program to simulate the supernova explosion. This work is partially supported by National Basic Research Program of China (grant 2009CB824800), the National Natural Science Foundation (grant 10733010,10673010,10573016), and Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University. This

work is also supported by the Youth Fund of Sichuan Provincial Education Department (grant 2007ZB090) and the Science and Technological Foundation of China West Normal University (grants 07A004, 07A005)

REFERENCES

- Arcones A., Janka H-T., Scheck L., 2007, *A&A*, 467, 1227
 Aufderheide M. B., Fushiki I., Woosley S. E., Hartmann D. H., 1994, *ApJS*, 91, 389
 Bahcall J. N., 1962, *Phys.Rev*, 126, 1143
 Bahcall J. N., 1964, *ApJ*, 139, 318
 Bahcall J. N., Chen X., Kamionkowski M., 1998, *Phys. Rev. C*, 57, 2756
 Benz W., 1991, In de Loore C., ed. *Late Stages of Stellar Evolution and Computational Methods in Astrophysical Hydrodynamics*. Springer, Berlin, p.25
 Bethe H. A., Brown G. E., Applegate J., Lattimer J. M., 1979, *Nuclear Phys. A*, 324, 487
 Blanc G., Greggio L., 2008, *New Astronomy*, 13, 606
 Bravo E., García-Senz D., 1999, *MNRAS*, 307, 984
 Burrows A., Livne E., Dessart L., Ott C.D., Murphy J., 2006, *ApJ*, 640, 878
 Cooperstein J., Wambach J., 1984, *Nucl. Phys. A*, 420, 591
 Fuller G. M., Fowler W. A., Newman M. J., 1982a, *ApJ*, 252, 715
 Fuller G. M., Fowler W. A., Newman M. J., 1982b, *ApJS*, 48, 279
 Heger A., Woosley S. E., Martínez-Pinedo G., 2001, *ApJ*, 560, 325
 Hix W. R., Thielemann F.-K., 1996, *ApJ*, 460, 869
 Hix W. R., Messer O. E., Mezzacappa A., Liebendorfer M., Sampaio J., Langanke K., Dean D. J., Martínez-Pinedo G., 2003, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 91, 201102
 Itoh N., Tomizawa N., Tamamura M., Wanajo S., Nozawa S., 2002, *ApJ*, 579, 380
 Janka H-Th., 2007, *Phys. Rep.*, 442, 38
 Kippenhahn R., Weigert A., 1990, *Stellar Structure and Evolution*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin
 Langanke K., Martínez-Pinedo G., 1999, *Phys. Lett. B*, 453, 187
 Langanke K., Martínez-Pinedo G., 2000, *Nuclear Phys. A*, 673, 481
 Langanke K., Martínez-Pinedo G., 2003, *Rev. Modern Phys.*, 75, 819
 Lattimer J. M., Swesty F. D., 1991, *Nuclear Phys. A*, 535, 331
 Liu M.Q., Zhang J., Luo Z. Q., 2007, *A&A*, 463, 261
 Luo Z. Q., Peng Q. H., 1996, *Sci. China (Ser. A)*, 39, 776
 Peterson V. L., Bahcall J. N., 1963, *ApJ*, 138, 437
 Martínez-Pinedo G., 2008, *Nuclear Phys. A*, 805, 478
 May M. M., White R.H., 1966, *Phys. ReV.*, 141, 1
 Nabi J-Un., Sajjad M., 2008, *Phys Rev. C*, 77, 5802
 Pruet J., Fuller G. M., 2003, *ApJS*, 149, 189
 Salpeter E. E., Van Horn H. M., 1969, *ApJ*, 155, 183
 Suzuki H., 1994, in Fukugita M., Suzuki A., eds, *Physics & Astrophysics of Neutrinos*, Springer-Verlag, p.763
 Wang Y. R., Zhang S. C., Xie Z. H., Wang W. Z., 2003, *Supernova Mechanism and Numerical Simulation*. He Nan Scientific Press, Zhengzhou.
 Woosley S. E., Heger A., 2007, *Phy.Rep.*, 442, 269

6 *Men-Quan Liu, Ye-Fei Yuan, and Jie Zhang*

Woosley S. E., Weaver T. A., 1995, ApJS, 101, 181