

The Structure of Cooling Fronts in Accretion Disks

Ethan T. Vishniac

Department of Astronomy, University of Texas, Austin TX 78712;
ethan@astro.as.utexas.edu

ABSTRACT

Recent work has shown that the speed of the cooling front in soft X-ray transients may be an important clue in understanding the nature of accretion disk viscosity. In a previous paper (Vishniac and Wheeler 1996) we derived the scaling law for the cooling front speed. Here we derive a similarity solution for the hot inner part of disks undergoing cooling. This solution is exact in the limit of a thin disk, power law opacities, and a minimum hot state column density which is an infinitesimal fraction of the maximum cold state density. For a disk of finite thickness the largest error is in the ratio of the mass flow across the cooling front to the mass flow at small radii. Comparison to the numerical simulations of Cannizzo et al. (1995) indicates that the errors in other parameters do not exceed $(c_{sF}/r_F\Omega_F)^q$, that is, the ratio of the sound speed at the disk midplane to its orbital velocity, evaluated at the cooling front, to the q th power. Here $q \approx 1/2$. Its precise value is determined by the relevant hot state opacity law and the functional form of the dimensionless viscosity.

1. Introduction

The most popular model for soft X-ray transients and dwarf novae is that both are due to fluctuations in the luminosity from accretion disks surrounding black holes and white dwarfs, respectively, and that the specific mechanism that starts an outburst is a thermal instability associated with the ionization of hydrogen (for a recent review see Cannizzo 1993a or Osaki 1996). In addition to their intrinsic interest, these systems may provide valuable clues to the nature of angular momentum transport in disks, simply by virtue of being non-stationary systems. In the thermal instability model these disks make the transition back to their quiescent states as their outer parts cool and a thermal transition front propagates inward. Mineshige, Yamasaki, and Ishizaka (1993) pointed out that this model will produce the observed exponential decay of soft X-ray luminosity for soft X-ray transients only if the radius of the hot phase decreases exponentially, i.e. if the cooling front speed is proportional to the radius of the uncooled part of the disk.

The speed of the cooling front affects the evolution of the hot phase of the disk and its value will depend on the local physics of the disk, including the dimensionless viscosity α . More specifically, Mineshige (1987) and Cannizzo, Shafer and Wheeler (1988) argued that the cooling front speed is approximately

$$\dot{r}_F \approx -\alpha_F c_{sF} \left(\frac{H}{r}\right) \left(\frac{r}{\delta r}\right), \quad (1)$$

where α_F is the dimensionless viscosity at the onset of rapid cooling, H is the disk thickness, δr is the width of the cooling region, c_s is the sound speed in the midplane of the disk, and the subscripts ‘F’ denote values at the onset of rapid cooling. Numerical simulations seemed to show that $\delta r \sim 0.1r$.

Recent high resolution work by Cannizzo, Chen and Livio (1995, hereafter CCL) has shown that this estimate for δr was a consequence of insufficient resolution in the simulations. They found δr was approximately equal to the geometric mean of the disk height and radius. Combining this with equation (1) they argued that an exponential decline implied a scaling law for α of the form

$$\alpha \approx 50 \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F \Omega_F}\right)^{3/2} \propto \left(\frac{H}{r}\right)^{3/2}. \quad (2)$$

More recently Cannizzo (1996) has shown that a similar result can be recovered from models of the dwarf nova SS Cygni.

In a previous paper (Vishniac & Wheeler 1996, hereafter VW) we showed that the cooling front speed was actually independent of the structure of the disk outside the radius where rapid cooling sets in, and that the cooling front speed scales as

$$\dot{r}_F \propto -\alpha_F c_{sF} \left(\frac{H}{r}\right)^q, \quad (3)$$

where q is determined by the functional form of α and the opacity law for the hot part of the disk. Assuming that the hot phase is thermally stable implies that q lies in the interval $[0, 1]$. For most reasonable opacity laws $q \approx 1/2$. This implies that the exponential luminosity decline of dwarf novae and soft X-ray transients is not just another test of the form of α , but one that specifically depends only on the physics of the hot state, thereby eliminating uncertainties regarding opacities in the cold state and the effects of comparing a largely ionized hot state to a largely neutral cold one. Finally, in VW we managed to show that the cooling front speed is surprisingly insensitive to the value of α right at the cooling front, but instead is a measure of its behavior over a broad annulus inward from the cooling front.

While it is important to see that the scaling law reported in CCL can be recovered from the simple physical argument presented in VW. It would be better still to see that the numerical coefficients found by CCL can be reproduced by an analytic solution built around this same argument. Furthermore, the numerical solution is not precisely self-similar and by itself the scaling law does not give us an understanding of when it might fail. In this paper we present a self-similar analytic solution of a cooling wave in a thin accretion disk and estimate the error involved in applying it to a disk of finite thickness. Section 2 contains a derivation of the thin disk similarity solution. Section 3 contains a summary of our results, a discussion of the error involved in applying this solution to realistic disks, and a discussion of the implications of this work for the physics of accretion disks.

2. Analysis

The usual sign that a system evolving in space and time has a stable self-similar solution is that the spatial distribution of some dynamically significant variable approaches a self-similar shape in an experiment or in a numerical simulation. In the case of a cooling wave in a disk the column density in the bulk of the hot phase has a simple power law shape with a constant exponent (CCL). However, near the cooling front itself, in the so-called ‘precursor’ region (cf. VW), the density drops quickly below an extrapolation of this power law. In VW we showed that the ratio of the column density at the edge of the precursor region, Σ_p , to the density at the cooling front itself, Σ_F , is given by

$$\frac{\Sigma_p}{\Sigma_F} \approx \left(\frac{r_F \Omega(r_F)}{c_{sF}} \right)^q. \quad (4)$$

The fact that this ratio varies with r_F , and therefore with time, suffices to show that the shape of the column density distribution is not time-invariant and that any self-similar solution to this problem can only be an approximation.

On the other hand, since this column density ratio goes to infinity as the disk becomes infinitely thin, this result suggests that it may be useful to approximate the column density at r_F as zero, while retaining a finite mass outflow determined by the actual conditions at the cooling front. We will see that this will allow us to recover an approximate similarity solution. This similarity solution is, in a sense, imaginary for the region where $\Sigma < \Sigma_F$, but we can estimate the errors this procedure introduces by examining the dynamical equations near the cooling front. To put it another way, in VW we divided the hot part of the disk into an interior region, in which the column density is well-approximated by power laws in radius and time, and a narrow precursor region in which the density drops precipitously as the cooling front approaches. Here we approximate the entire hot state with a similarity

solution, with a thin outer edge which is unrealistic. However, we can use this solution to calculate the evolution of the hot state, and use our knowledge of the precursor region to understand the errors in this solution.

One drawback to this approach is that it is not always appropriate to ignore the effect of the colder parts of the disk in calculating the cooling front speed and structure. More precisely, material ejected across the cooling front will quickly cool and slow down. Conservation of mass implies that the column density of cold material just outside the cooling front will be comparable to the column density of hot gas at the edge of the precursor region. Since there is a maximum column density for the cold state, this implies that there is an upper limit to Σ_p/Σ_F , which is a function of radius and which is comparable to $\Sigma_{c,max}/\Sigma_{h,min}$ at that radius. As a cooling wave approaches this limit its speed will drop and its structure will become dependent on the details of the cold state. We will ignore this limitation in what follows, but it has to be taken into account when the solution presented here implies Σ_p/Σ_F very large. We show at the end of this paper that for the systems considered so far this does not appear to be an important problem.

The basic equations for mass flow in a thin disk are

$$\partial_t \Sigma = -\frac{1}{2\pi r} \partial_r (\dot{M}), \quad (5)$$

$$V_r = \frac{2}{\Sigma \Omega r^2} \partial_r \left(r^3 \alpha \Sigma \frac{c_s^2}{\Omega} \partial_r \Omega \right), \quad (6)$$

and

$$\dot{M} = 2\pi r \Sigma V_r, \quad (7)$$

where Σ is the gas column density, V_r is the radial velocity, c_s is the sound speed, α is the dimensionless viscosity, and \dot{M} is the mass flow.

The thermal structure of an optically thick disk is determined by its opacity source. When the opacity law has a simple power law form, the midplane temperature can be written as

$$T = B_1 \Sigma^a \alpha^b \Omega^{(2/3)c}. \quad (8)$$

In the hot portions of the disk, for which the opacity can be approximated by a Kramers law opacity, $a = c = 3/7$ and $b = 1/7$. Rapid cooling sets in for temperatures below T_{min} , where

$$T_{min} \propto \alpha^{-1.1/7} \Omega^{-\frac{3}{70}}, \quad (9)$$

(cf. CCL, equation (4)). Consequently, T_{min} has a very weak dependence on radius. Equations (8) and (9) also imply that the hot phase has a minimum column density $\Sigma_{min} = \Sigma_F$. However, Σ_{min} has a strong dependence on radius.

In what follows we will assume that the dimensionless viscosity α has the form

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 \left(\frac{h}{r} \right)^n, \quad (10)$$

where $n \approx 3/2$ is required to get consistency with the nearly exponential decay of flux from soft X-ray transients following an outburst. This is not the only form for α that will produce an exponential luminosity decay. The luminosity evolution is primarily sensitive to the variation of α with radius and the same result can be obtained from $\alpha \propto r^{2/3}$ (Vishniac & Wheeler 1996) but equation (10) is the only functional form for α which is consistent with all available phenomenological constraints. A more troublesome question is whether or not α can be written as a purely local function or whether it depends in some manner on the global state of the disk.

We are looking for an asymptotic state in which the interior region of the disk maintains a self-similar mass distribution approximately characterized by a mass accretion rate $\dot{M}_0(t)$ which varies slowly with time. We can write this as

$$\dot{M}(r, t) = \dot{M}_0(t) F(y), \quad (11)$$

where

$$y \equiv \frac{r}{r_F}. \quad (12)$$

At small radii the disk will be very close to an equilibrium state with an approximately constant $\dot{M} = \dot{M}_0(t)$, so $F(0) = 1$. At large radii the mass flux will be positive, that is outward, towards the cooling front, so $F(1)$ will be negative. Using equations (8) and (10) we can define a constant C_0 such that

$$\alpha \Sigma c_s^2 = C_0 \Sigma^{1/q} r_F^{-s} y^{-s}, \quad (13)$$

where

$$\frac{1}{q} = 1 + \left(1 + \frac{n}{2} \right) \frac{a}{1 - \frac{n}{2}b}, \quad (14)$$

and

$$s = 1 - \left(1 + \frac{n}{2} \right) \frac{1 - c}{1 - \frac{n}{2}b}. \quad (15)$$

Our choice for the form of equation (11) is motivated by our previous work in VW in which we showed that the mass transfer rate everywhere between the cooling front and the inner edge of the disk will vary only by a factor of order unity, although it will change sign. This is fairly obvious for the precursor region, since the mass entering this narrow region as the cooling front advances has to be approximately balanced by the mass ejected across

the cooling front. The fact that the asymptotic state of the cooling front is one in which the front advances slowly enough to allow the interior region of the disk to evolve, implies that the velocity of the cooling front is directly tied to the accretion velocity in the outer parts of the interior solution. This in turn implies that the mass transfer rate inward in the interior solution is proportional to the mass transfer rate outward through the cooling front. It follows that a general description of the cooling disk is most easily obtained by referring the mass transfer rate at all radii to its value at the inner edge. (The mass transfer rate across the cooling front would be an equally good choice.)

Using these definitions in equation (6) we find that

$$\Sigma = \left(\frac{-r_F^s \Omega_F \dot{M}_0}{6\pi C_0} y^{s-2} \int_0^y F(\tilde{y}) \frac{d\tilde{y}}{\tilde{y}^{1/2}} \right)^q. \quad (16)$$

This expression can be substituted into equation (5) to obtain

$$q\Sigma \left(\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0 + \partial_t \ln r_F \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{F(y)y^{1/2}}{\int_0^y F(\tilde{y})\tilde{y}^{-1/2}d\tilde{y}} \right) \right) = \frac{-\dot{M}_0}{2\pi r_F^2} y^{-1} \partial_y F. \quad (17)$$

It is convenient to rewrite this as

$$-C_2 y \left(y^{s-2} \int_0^y F(\tilde{y}) \frac{d\tilde{y}}{\tilde{y}^{1/2}} \right)^q \left(1 + C_1 \left(1 - \frac{2y^{1/2}F(y)}{\int_0^y F(\tilde{y})\tilde{y}^{-1/2}d\tilde{y}} \right) \right) = \partial_y F, \quad (18)$$

where

$$C_1 \equiv \frac{\partial_t \ln r_F}{2\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0}, \quad (19)$$

and

$$C_2 \equiv -\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0 \left(\frac{2\pi q r_F^2}{-\dot{M}_0} \right) \left(\frac{-\dot{M}_0 \Omega_F r_F^s}{6\pi C_0} \right)^q. \quad (20)$$

Our assumption that the hot phase of the disk can be described by a self-similar solution is equivalent to requiring that C_1 and C_2 be constant, so that equation (18) is time-invariant. In fact, C_1 can be determined directly if we know the scaling of \dot{r}_F with r_F and use the requirement that the various time-varying factors in C_2 combine to give a constant product. We will return to this point later. The value of C_2 is determined by requiring that the solution to equation (18) satisfy the boundary conditions. In other words, it is an eigenvalue of equation (18).

What are the outer boundary conditions for the similarity solution? The condition that the column density vanishes at r_F implies, using equation (16), that

$$\int_0^1 F(\tilde{y}) \frac{d\tilde{y}}{\tilde{y}^{1/2}} = 0. \quad (21)$$

The mass flow at the outer edge of the disk, \dot{M}_F , is less precisely determined, since it depends on the gradient of Σ at the cooling front. However, given that the cooling front is defined by the onset of extremely rapid cooling, it follows that the radial scale for changes in Σ will be close to the disk height and we can write the radial velocity at the cooling front as

$$V_F = \Delta \alpha_F c_{sF}, \quad (22)$$

where Δ is a constant of order unity. Here we are interested in the mass flux at an imaginary point where $\Sigma = 0$, but we can approximate it with the value at $\Sigma = \Sigma_F$. In CCL's simulation they found $\Delta \approx 1/6$, but the exact number will depend to some extent on the uncertain turbulent radial transport of heat near the cooling front. In any case we have

$$\dot{M}_F = 2\pi r_F \Sigma_F \Delta \alpha_F c_{sF}. \quad (23)$$

This is not a constraint on $F(1)$, which is the ratio between this mass flux and the undetermined value of $\dot{M}_0(t)$. However, we can use this result to rewrite C_2 . Starting with the definition in equation (20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_2 &\equiv -\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0 \left(\frac{2\pi q r_F^2}{-\dot{M}_0} \right) \left(\frac{-\dot{M}_0 \Omega_F r_F^s}{6\pi C_0} \right)^q \\ &= -\partial_t \ln r_F \frac{1}{2C_1} \left(\frac{2\pi q r_F^2 \Sigma_F}{-\dot{M}_0} \right) \left(\frac{-\dot{M}_0 \Omega_F}{6\pi \alpha_F \Sigma_F c_{sF}^2} \right)^q \\ &= \frac{1}{2C_1} \left(\frac{2\pi q r_F \dot{r}_F \Sigma_F}{\dot{M}_0} \right) \left(\frac{-\Delta r_F \Omega_F}{3c_{sF} F(1)} \right)^q \\ &= \frac{q}{2C_1} \left(\frac{\dot{r}_F}{V_F} \right) F(1) \left(\frac{r_F \Omega_F}{c_{sF}} \right)^q \left(\frac{-\Delta}{3F(1)} \right)^q. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

We see from this that

$$\dot{r}_F = \frac{-6C_1 C_2}{q} \left(\frac{-\Delta}{3F(1)} \right)^{1-q} \alpha_F c_{sF} \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F \Omega_F} \right)^q, \quad (25)$$

in agreement with the scaling derived in VW.

In order to evaluate C_1 from its definition in equation (19) we use the fact that in the asymptotic state \dot{M}_F has a fixed ratio to \dot{M}_0 , so that

$$\dot{M}_0 = \frac{2\pi r_F \Delta \alpha_F c_{sF} \Sigma_F}{F(1)}. \quad (26)$$

Using equation (8) and our assumed form for α we find that

$$\Sigma_F \propto T_F^{(1-b(n/2))/a} r_F^{(c-b(n/2))/a}, \quad (27)$$

so that

$$\dot{M}_0 \propto r_F^{((1-b(n/2))/q+c-1)/a} T_F^{(1+bn)/2+(1-b(n/2))/a}. \quad (28)$$

Substituting this into the definition of C_1 we find that

$$C_1 = \frac{aq}{2 \left((1 - b\frac{n}{2}) + (c - 1)q + \epsilon q(a(1 + bn)/2 + (1 - bn/2)) \right)}, \quad (29)$$

where

$$T_F \propto r_F^\epsilon. \quad (30)$$

We can find the value of ϵ by using equation (9). It is

$$\epsilon = \frac{9 - 11n}{140 + 11n}, \quad (31)$$

which is typically a small number. We note that if $n = 3/2$ and we can assume a Kramers law opacity, then $\epsilon = -0.048$ and $C_1 = 0.2109$. This value of n is consistent with the observed approximately exponential luminosity decay, although any value near it would be as well.

If we integrate equation (18) for the case with $n = 3/2$ and Kramers opacities, and determine C_2 by requiring that f satisfy the boundary condition given by equation (21), then we find that

$$\dot{M}_F = -2.88\dot{M}_0, \quad (32)$$

$$\dot{r}_F = -0.94\alpha_F c_{sF} \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F \Omega_F} \right)^q, \quad (33)$$

and $\dot{M} = 0$ at $r = 0.36r_F$. The cooling front velocity goes as Δ^{1-q} . Here we have used $\Delta \approx 1/6$ (from CCL). CCL obtained $\dot{M}_F \sim 2\dot{M}_0$ and found a zero in \dot{M} at $r \approx 0.38r_F$. Assuming that the numerical solutions of CCL are more accurate than the similarity solution, the errors in the similarity solution are of order 5 to 10% for an example in which $(H/r)^q$ is slightly less than 0.1. The only exception is in the value of $F(1)$, which seems to be too large by as much as 40%. For illustration we show Σ , \dot{M} , and the surface temperature, T_s , as a function of r for the similarity solution in figure 1.

3. Error Evaluation and Conclusions

We have found a similarity solution that describes the progress of a cooling wave in an infinitely thin accretion disk whose hot state is governed by power law opacities. For a disk of finite thickness, the nonzero value of the critical column density for the onset of rapid cooling introduces an error at the outer edge of the similarity solution. The free parameters of this solution are almost entirely determined by the physics of accretion and the hot state opacity, the sole exception being the parameter Δ , which is determined by the structure

of the rapid cooling zone. In practice, this means that at present Δ is determined from numerical simulations. We can see, by comparison with the numerical simulations of CCL, that if we take a Kramers opacity and $n = 3/2$ we get a solution which is a fair description of the progress of a cooling wave in a disk surrounding a soft X-ray transient. Looking at our results in figure 1, we can see that the temperature profile of the hot phase is almost a perfect power law, with a sharp cutoff near the outer edge. Clearly, it will be difficult to observe the cutoff structure directly. However, this model predicts that the power law temperature profile of the inner region will be well above the critical temperature for the thermal instability at the cooling front. This should be a testable prediction of this model, although this effect will be more dramatic in the later stages of the luminosity decline. Conversely, a significantly broader temperature transition profile than the one seen here would be an indication of nonlocal effects in α .

In order to evaluate the size of the errors induced by using this solution, we need to examine the structure of the cooling wave near the cooling front. In this region the state variables will have a radial scale length much less than r , so the dynamical equations can be approximated by saving only radial derivatives of \dot{M} and Σ .

With this in mind we can write

$$\partial_t \Sigma(r) \approx -\dot{r}_F \partial_r \Sigma. \quad (34)$$

Invoking equation (5) we have

$$-\dot{r}_F \partial_r \Sigma = \frac{-1}{2\pi r} \partial_r \dot{M}. \quad (35)$$

We can integrate this from $\Sigma = 0$ to $\Sigma = \Sigma_F$ to obtain

$$\Delta \dot{M} \approx -\dot{r}_F 2\pi r_F \Sigma_F = \frac{-\dot{r}_F}{V_F} \dot{M}_F, \quad (36)$$

where $\Delta \dot{M}$ is the amount by which the mass outflow at the edge of the similarity solution, where $\Sigma = 0$, exceeds the mass outflow from the actual cooling front, where $\Sigma = \Sigma_F$. For the particular case examined by CCL we have

$$\Delta \dot{M} \approx 5.4 \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F \Omega_F} \right)^q \dot{M}_F, \quad (37)$$

which will be somewhat less than half for $(c_{sF}/r_F \Omega_F)$ between 10^{-2} and 10^{-3} .

Although this amounts to a large correction to \dot{M} , in agreement with the comparison between CCL and the prediction of the similarity solution, it does not imply that the behavior of \dot{M} with time is subject to a similarly large correction. Assuming a Kramers law

opacity and $n = 1.5$ we can look at the evolution of the mass flow through the point where $\Sigma = \Sigma_F$. We find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 t\partial_t \ln(\dot{M}_F - \Delta\dot{M}) &= t\partial_t \ln \left[\dot{M}_0 \left(1 - \frac{0.94}{\Delta} \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F\Omega_F} \right)^q \right) \right] \\
 &= t\partial_t \dot{M}_0 - \frac{0.94}{\Delta} t\partial_t \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r\Omega_F} \right)^q \\
 &= t\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0 \left[1 - \frac{1.88C_1}{\Delta} r_F \partial_{r_F} \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F\Omega_F} \right)^q \right] \\
 &= t\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0 \left(1 - 0.6 \left(\frac{c_{sF}}{r_F\Omega_F} \right)^q \right). \tag{38}
 \end{aligned}$$

In other words, we get only a small error when we treat the time evolution of the mass flow through the $\Sigma = \Sigma_F$ radius as though it were strictly proportional to the mass flow across the outer surface of the similarity solution. Since the realistic condition on the mass flux is that it is fixed at $\Sigma = \Sigma_F$, rather than at $\Sigma = 0$, the negative sign in the above equation actually implies that the realistic solution will give $t\partial_t \ln \dot{M}_0$ slightly more than the one predicted from the similarity solution. For the calculation of CCL the discrepancy should be of order a few percent, which is not significant.

Similarly we can estimate the error we make in equating the radius of the cooling front with the $\Sigma = 0$ surface by integrating equation (6) using equations (7) and (13). We obtain

$$\Delta r = r_F \frac{3}{\Delta} \frac{c_{sF}}{r_F\Omega_F}. \tag{39}$$

For the calculation of CCL this implies an error of a few percent.

CCL pointed out that comparing the observed e-folding time for the soft X-ray luminosity in X-ray transients to the results of their simulation gives a dimensionless viscosity of

$$\alpha \approx 50 \left(\frac{h}{r} \right)^{3/2}. \tag{40}$$

This coefficient of 50 is surprisingly large, since one would expect that almost any theory which gave the correct scaling law would involve a coefficient of order unity. This estimate of the coefficient is roughly inversely proportional to the minimum hot state temperature, which is fixed by the physics of the opacity in the hot state. The only other obvious way to get a different result is by using a different value of Δ , the ratio of the outflow velocity at the cooling front to $\alpha_F c_{sF}$. However, we see from equation (25) that this enters into the expression for the speed of the cooling front only as $\sim \Delta^{1/2}$. Even if we replace the value calculated by CCL, $\Delta \sim 1/6$, with $\Delta = 1$ the estimate of the coefficient in the expression for α only drops to ~ 20 .

One last point we need to consider is under what circumstances we can ignore the structure of the cold region in discussing the velocity and structure of the cooling front.

From the equation of continuity we see that the column density in the cold disk region, just outside the cooling front, will be of order $\sim \Sigma_F(V_F/ - \dot{r}_F)$. If this exceeds the maximum stable column density for the cold gas, then the solution described here is inapplicable, and the cold region will affect the velocity and structure of the cooling wave. The value of the maximum cold state column density is somewhat uncertain. Here we will use the results of Cannizzo (1993b). Assuming $n \approx 3/2$, we get

$$\frac{\Sigma_{c,max}}{\Sigma_F} = 6.2 \left(\frac{\alpha_F}{0.1} \right)^{-0.31} r_{10}^{-0.036}, \quad (41)$$

where r_{10} is the front radius in units of 10^{10} cm. We need this to be larger than $V_F/ - \dot{r}_F$ which is

$$\frac{V_F}{-\dot{r}_F} \approx \Delta \left(\frac{50}{\alpha_F} \right)^{q/n}. \quad (42)$$

We see from these expressions that this condition is generally satisfied, although not by a large factor, with very little dependence on α_F or r_{10} . Whether or not it will be satisfied for substantially different models for α or disk opacities depends on the specifics of the models.

In sum, the similarity solution described in this paper will give a good description of the progress of a cooling wave in a hot disk as long as four conditions are met. First, the outflow velocity across the cooling front needs to be substantially greater than the cooling front velocity. In practice, this means that the hot part of the disk needs to have a height to radius ratio of order 10^{-2} or less for the thermal instability associated with hydrogen ionization. If this condition is violated then the errors in the solution can become large. Other thermal instabilities will involve slightly different conditions, depending on the values of q and Δ . Second, the the opacity of the hot disk material, for a few e-foldings interior to the cooling front, has to be described by a power law. The explicit solution here assumed a Kramers law, but any power law approximation will yield a similar solution. Third, the α needs to be purely a function of local disk parameters. This last condition is significant, inasmuch as the only prediction for α which self-consistently allows for the effects of local magnetic instabilities and gives the correct scaling law is based on an explicitly non-local model (cf. Vishniac, Jin, & Diamond 1990, Vishniac & Diamond 1992). We plan an extension of this work to cover this model and to see if an observably different cooling front structure can be recovered from it. Fourth, neglecting the structure of the disk outside the radius where rapid cooling sets in is appropriate only when the ratio of V_F to \dot{r}_F is not so large as to imply an unphysically large column density in the cold gas. This does not seem to be an important limitation for the systems considered to date, but this conclusion is sensitive to the details of the cold disk structure.

I am happy to acknowledge helpful conversations with John Cannizzo and J. Craig

Wheeler. This work has been supported in part by NASA through grant NAG5-2773.

REFERENCES

- Cannizzo, J.K. 1993a, in *Accretion Disks in Compact Stellar Systems*, ed. J.C. Wheeler (Singapore: World Scientific), p. 6
- Cannizzo, J.K. 1993b, *ApJ*, 419, 318
- Cannizzo, J.K. 1996, *ApJ*, 473L, 51
- Cannizzo, J.K., Chen, W., & Livio, M. 1995, *ApJ*, 454, 880 (CCL)
- Cannizzo, J.K., Shafter, A.W., and Wheeler, J.C. 1988, *ApJ*, 333, 227
- Mineshige, S. 1987, *Astrophys. Sp. Sci.*, 130, 331
- Mineshige, S., Yamasaki, T., & Ishizaka, C. 1993, *PASJ*, 45, 707
- Osaki, Y. 1996, *PASP*, 108, 39
- Vishniac, E.T., Jin, L., & Diamond, P.H. 1990, *ApJ*, 365, 552
- Vishniac, E.T., & Diamond, P.H. 1992, *ApJ*, 398, 561
- Vishniac, E.T., & Wheeler, J.C. 1996, *ApJ*, 471, 921 (VW)




Fig. 1.— Surface temperature, column density, and mass flow as a function of radius for the cooling wave similarity solution using Kramers opacity and $n = 3/2$. The vertical axis is in arbitrary units, but \dot{M} is normalized to 1 at small radii.