

Supermassive Stars as Gamma-Ray Bursters

George M. Fuller and Xiangdong Shi

Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093

Received _____; accepted _____

arXiv:astro-ph/9711020v1 4 Nov 1997

ABSTRACT

We propose that the gravitational collapse of supermassive stars ($M \gtrsim 5 \times 10^4 M_\odot$) could be a cosmological source of γ -ray bursts. A supermassive star would be de-stabilized as a result of the Feynman-Chandrasekhar instability and likely would collapse to a black hole, possibly releasing a fair fraction of its gravitational binding energy as thermal neutrino pairs. We show that neutrino/antineutrino annihilation-induced heating of the tenuous outer layers of such an object could drive electron/positron “fireball” formation, relativistic expansion, and associated γ -ray emission. There are two major advantages of this model. (1) Supermassive star collapses are far more energetic than solar mass-scale catastrophic events such as neutron-star/neutron-star mergers; therefore, the conversion of gravitational energy to fireball kinetic energy in the supermassive star scenario need not be highly efficient, nor is it necessary to invoke directional beaming. Further, the cooling time of “afterglows” in the supermassive star collapse model is naturally long enough to accommodate observational constraints. (2) There is no need for galaxy hosts, since the formation/collapse of supermassive stars could be pregalactic. We explore other distinctive features of the supermassive star collapse model, including the possibility of the Rayleigh-Taylor instability leading to multiple jet-like e^\pm -fireballs and, hence, multiple shocks and a rich time structure in γ -ray emission.

Subject headings: gamma rays: bursts - cosmology: observations and theory

1. Introduction

In this letter we propose that the collapse of supermassive stars and the associated neutrino/antineutrino annihilation could give rise to high redshift (cosmological) γ -ray bursts. This model can meet current observational constraints and could alleviate a number of vexing problems associated with the energetics and the lack of host-galaxy detections of conventional compact object-based models. We define a supermassive star to be one which suffers the general relativistic Feynman-Chandrasekhar instability early in its evolution. This corresponds to objects with masses in the range $M \gtrsim 5 \times 10^4 M_\odot$.

Detections of the metal line absorption and OII emission features at a redshift $z = 0.835$ in the spectral observation of the afterglow of γ -ray burst GRB970508 (Metzger et al. 1997a,b) have established that at least some of the γ -ray burst sources lie at cosmological distances (redshift $z \gtrsim 1$). Observations show that the total energy in gamma rays associated with a γ -ray burst at cosmological distances is $10^{51} - 10^{52}$ erg when a 4π solid angle coverage is assumed (Fenimore et al. 1993; Wijers et al. 1997). This figure is right in the range of the *total* kinetic energy of the ejecta generated by the collapse of $\sim 1 M_\odot$ to $100 M_\odot$ stellar objects. Catastrophic collapse events, such as neutron-star/neutron-star mergers (Paczynski 1986; Goodman 1986; Eichler et al. 1989), neutron-star/black-hole mergers (Mochkovitch et al. 1993), failed supernovae (Woosley 1993), "hypernovae" (Paczynski 1997), collapse of Chandrasekhar-mass white dwarfs (Usov 1992), have been touted as natural candidates for cosmological γ -ray burst sources. Fireballs created in these collapse events could accelerate material to the ultra-relativistic regime, with Lorentz factors $\Gamma = E_e/m_e c^2 \sim 10^2$ (Paczynski 1986, Goodman 1986, Rees & Mészáros 1992, Mészáros & Rees 1992, Piran 1996). The kinetic energy in these fireballs could then be converted to gamma rays possibly via the cyclotron radiation and/or the inverse compton processes associated with the ultrarelativistic electrons. In these models, the energy loss of

the shock(s) propelled by the fireball would produce the afterglow associated with a γ -ray burst event (Waxman 1997).

There are, however, several potential problems for these stellar remnant-based models. One is an energetics problem. The total gravitational binding energy released when a $\sim 1 M_{\odot}$ configuration collapses to a black hole is $\sim 10^{54}$ erg. Calculations have shown that it is very difficult to power a γ -ray burst of energy $\sim 10^{52}$ erg (Wijers et al. 1997), or an afterglow that lasts for several months (Waxman 1997; Dar 1997) with such a collapse scenario, unless the γ -ray emission and the blast wave causing the afterglow are highly collimated. A second problem is the lack of an explanation for the non-detection of galaxies that host these stellar remnants (Schaefer 1992; Fenimore et al. 1993; Vrba, Hartmann & Jennings 1995; Schaefer et al. 1997; Band & Hartmann 1998). Even in the case of GRB970228, whose position overlaps with an extended faint source, the evidence for a host galaxy is not strong (Band 1997). It is not impossible that the host galaxies are intrinsically too dim to detect, but if these stellar remnants trace the star formation rate to some degree (which they should), the host galaxies should tend to have active star formation and so be bright. Perhaps, then, the host galaxies are too distant to detect. Unfortunately, this explanation would exacerbate the energetics/beaming problem of the stellar-remnant-based models. A possible solution to the no-host problem is to assume that most of the stellar remnants such as the neutron-star/neutron-star binaries were kicked out of their host galaxies at high velocities (e.g., pulsars in our own galaxy have a mean birth velocity of 450 ± 90 km/sec; see Lyne & Lorimer 1994). However, in this case it is then surprising that such kicks would not disrupt the binary systems. The lack of “interstellar medium” outside a galaxy also poses a problem for the deceleration of fireballs.

The supermassive star collapse model could alleviate both of the potential problems outlined above. Of course, as yet there is no direct evidence for supermassive stars ever

having been extant in the universe. However, it has been argued that their formation could be an inevitable result of the collapse of primordial hydrogen clouds at high redshifts in which cooling was not as efficient as in clouds contaminated with metals, or as a possible result of stellar mergers associated with relativistic star cluster collapse (Hoyle & Fowler 1963; Begelman & Rees 1978; Bond, Arnet, & Carr 1984; Fuller, Woosley, & Weaver 1986; McLaughlin & Fuller 1996). The typical baryonic Jean’s mass at high redshift can be $\sim 10^5 M_\odot$ to $10^6 M_\odot$ (Peebles & Dicke 1968; Tegmark et al. 1997), but we do not know whether the collapse of a cloud with this mass will result in fragmentation into many cloud-lets and so form stars of smaller masses. In any case, since we will argue that the supermassive star collapse model of γ -ray bursters has a number of very attractive features, a more thorough investigation of supermassive star formation/evolution issues is warranted.

The gravitational binding energy release of a supermassive star collapsing to a black hole end state is $10^{60} M_6^{\text{HC}} \text{ erg}$ (where M_6^{HC} is the homologous core mass of the star in units of $10^6 M_\odot$). A fair fraction of this gravitational energy is radiated as thermal neutrino/antineutrino pairs (Fuller, Woosley, & Weaver 1986; Fuller & Shi 1997a) whose annihilations into electron/positron pairs could create a fireball above the core (Goodman, Dar & Nussinov 1987, Mészáros & Rees 1992). Collapse of such gigantic configurations potentially could dump much more energy into electron/positron-dominated fireballs than could conventional collapse models utilizing a $\sim 1 M_\odot$ to $\sim 100 M_\odot$ scale.

Supermassive stars might form in pregalactic environments, and with their prodigious energy release they could produce γ -ray bursts with characteristics conforming to the observations even at redshifts $z > 1$. There is potentially no need for “host galaxies” with this model. There is no contradiction at this point between this conjecture and the detection of metal lines in the spectral observation of the GRB970508 afterglow (Metzger et al. 1997a,b). This is because (1) the metal lines may come from a foreground galaxy;

(2) supermassive stars themselves could generate hot rp -process nuclear burning products during the collapse, including iron, oxygen and magnesium (Wallace & Woosley 1981; Fuller, Woosley & Weaver 1986) and these could be ejected in rotationally-driven MHD/convective “jets;” and (3) supermassive stars may have other formation paths, such as those that result from the evolution of dense star clusters where lower mass stars could create metals (Begelman & Rees 1978).

2. Fireballs from Supermassive Star Collapse

Fuller, Woosley, and Weaver (1986) have discussed the evolution and general relativistic instability of supermassive objects. In that work it was shown that prodigious thermal neutrino pair emission will render the collapse of a nonrotating supermassive star non-homologous (see also Goldreich & Weber 1980). The initial hydrostatic entropy per baryon in these objects will be (in units of 100 Boltzmann’s constant per baryon) $S_{100}^{\text{init}} \approx 9.3M_6^{1/2}$, where M_6 is the initial mass of the star in units of $10^6 M_\odot$, and where we have assumed primordial composition.

Instability in these stars sets in at or before the onset of hydrogen burning. As such a star collapses, the entropy per baryon is slightly increased by nuclear burning, but then is reduced by neutrino pair emission. Though initially the whole star can collapse homologously, as the entropy is reduced only an inner “homologous core” can continue to collapse homologously. It is this homologous core that will plunge through a trapped surface as a unit to make a black hole.

The collapse to a black hole of a supermassive star with a homologous core mass M^{HC} (crudely) will have a characteristic (prompt) Newtonian gravitational binding energy release of about half the rest mass of the homologous core, $\sim E_s \approx 10^{60} M_6^{\text{HC}}$ erg. In fact this would

be true for any stellar configuration, but for those with a core mass in excess of about $4000 M_\odot$, neutrinos produced in the core will not be trapped and thermalized. Instead, they will freely stream out of the core. Most neutrino emission in supermassive stars will result from e^\pm -annihilation in the core. Furthermore, most of the gravitational binding energy removed by neutrinos will come out very near the point where the core becomes a black hole. Therefore, we can use the free fall time (or light crossing time) of the homologous core near the black hole formation point to get an estimate of the timescale over which most of the neutrinos are emitted. We employ a characteristic time scale of $t_s \approx 10 M_6^{\text{HC}}$ sec, and a characteristic radius (the Schwarzschild radius) of $r_s \approx 3 \times 10^{11} M_6^{\text{HC}}$ cm.

Clearly, neutrinos will suffer significant gravitational redshift which will degrade the total energy deposition above the star, though this will be compensated by increased $\nu\bar{\nu}$ -annihilation from gravitational bending of null trajectories (Cardall & Fuller 1997). We can subsume these uncertainties into a fraction f of the gravitational binding energy emitted through neutrinos by thermal processes in the core (Schinder et al. 1987, Itoh et al. 1989, Shi & Fuller 1997). This fraction f is about 0.1 in the simplest case of spherical collapse with no magnetic fields. It can be larger if rotation or magnetic fields prolong the duration of the collapse and keep the homologous core mass larger. Thermal neutrino emission will produce about 70% of the neutrinos in $\nu_e\bar{\nu}_e$. The average neutrino energy is about 5.5 times the local temperature (Schinder et al. 1987, Itoh et al. 1989, Shi & Fuller 1997). Near the black hole formation point, we can show that a characteristic *average* temperature (in 10^9 K) in the core is,

$$T_9^{\text{Schw}} \approx 3.72 \alpha_{\text{Schw}}^{1/3} \left(\frac{11/2}{g_s} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{M_6^{\text{init}}}{M_6^{\text{HC}}} \right)^{1/6} \left(M_6^{\text{HC}} \right)^{-1/2}, \quad (1)$$

where α_{Schw} is the ratio of the final entropy per baryon to the value of this quantity in the initial pre-collapse hydrostatic configuration, and $g_s \approx g_b + 7/8 g_f \approx 11/2$ is the statistical weight of relativistic particles in the core. (For example, if $\alpha_{\text{Schw}} = 1/2.5$ and $M_6^{\text{init}} = 1$,

then $M_6^{\text{HC}} = 0.1$ and $T_9^{\text{Schw}} \approx 13$.) Roughly then, at the black hole formation point, $T_9^{\text{Schw}} \approx 3.7(M_6^{\text{HC}})^{-1/2}$, and the average neutrino energy will be several MeV.

The copious $\nu\bar{\nu}$ emission during the collapse can create a fireball above the homologous core by $\nu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow e^+e^-$. The energy deposition rate per unit volume from the $\nu\bar{\nu}$ annihilation at a radius r above a spherical shell, or “neutrino sphere,” of neutrino emission (with a thermal energy spectrum) and having radius R_ν , can be shown to be (Goodman, Dar, & Nussinov 1987; Cooperstain, van den Horn, & Baron 1987; Woosley & Baron 1992)

$$\dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}(r) = \frac{KG_F^2\Phi(x)\hbar^2c}{12\pi^2R_\nu^4}L_\nu L_{\bar{\nu}}\left[\frac{\langle E_\nu^2 \rangle}{\langle E_\nu \rangle} + \frac{\langle E_{\bar{\nu}}^2 \rangle}{\langle E_{\bar{\nu}} \rangle}\right]. \quad (2)$$

Here G_F is the Fermi constant, L is the luminosity of the neutrinos/anti-neutrinos, and the brackets denote averages of neutrino energy or squared-energy over the appropriate neutrino or antineutrino energy spectra (see Shi & Fuller 1997). The phase space and spin factors are $K \approx 0.124$ (0.027) for $\nu = \nu_e (\nu_\mu, \nu_\tau)$, and the radial dependence of the energy deposition rate is,

$$\Phi(x) = (1-x)^4(x^2+4x+5), \quad \text{with } x = \sqrt{1-(R_\nu/r)^2}. \quad (3)$$

Note that when $r \gg R_\nu$, $\Phi(x) \approx (5/8)(R_\nu/r)^8$.

We can employ a modification of the above expressions to get a very crude estimate of the $\nu\bar{\nu}$ energy deposition in a fireball above the homologous core of a supermassive star. Of course, in our case neutrinos are not trapped and diffusing, but rather freely streaming from their production points deep in the core. The temperature distribution in the collapsing core (an index $n=3$ polytrope) will follow the Lane-Emden function and so be peaked at the center. Further, the e^\pm -annihilation into neutrino pairs will produce an energy emissivity which will be proportional to T^9 . Compensating this will be the $1/r^8$ dependence of the above $\nu\bar{\nu}$ energy deposition rate. We will then approximate the entire neutrino emissivity of the core as arising from the edge of the core (R_ν) and take the characteristic temperature to

be T_9^{Schw} . We will subsume the (possibly substantial) geometric factor for the true emission and annihilation rate and the potentially large general relativistic trajectory bending and redshift effects into f .

Most of the neutrinos will be emitted near the black hole formation point, so we will take $R_\nu \sim 3 \times 10^{11} \text{cm} M_6^{\text{HC}}$. Since 70% of the neutrinos are $\nu_e \bar{\nu}_e$, and the factor K is much larger for ν_e than for ν_μ and ν_τ , we need only consider the luminosity of $\nu_e \bar{\nu}_e$, which is

$$L_\nu = L_{\bar{\nu}_e} \sim 0.35 f E_s/t_s \sim 3 \times 10^{58} f \text{ erg s}^{-1} \quad (4)$$

From the thermal neutrino emissivity, which can be fit with a thermal distribution function (Shi & Fuller 1997), it can be shown that

$$\frac{\langle E_\nu^2 \rangle}{\langle E_\nu \rangle} = \frac{\langle E_{\bar{\nu}}^2 \rangle}{\langle E_{\bar{\nu}} \rangle} \approx 1.7 (M_6^{\text{HC}})^{-1/2} \text{ MeV} \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the neutrino energy deposition rate per unit volume will be roughly

$$\dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}(r) \sim 3 \times 10^{20} f^2 (M_6^{\text{HC}})^{-4.5} (r_s/r)^8 \text{ erg cm}^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1} \quad (6)$$

The total energy deposited into the fireball above a radius r is

$$E_{\text{f.b.}}(r) = \int_r^\infty 4\pi r^2 \dot{Q}_{\nu\bar{\nu}}(r) dr \sim 2 \times 10^{56} f^2 (M_6^{\text{HC}})^{-0.5} (r_s/r)^5 \text{ erg}, \quad (7)$$

which is tremendous. The fireball will undoubtedly lose some of this energy to thermal neutrino emission. But, once the e^\pm pair density is high enough for this, neutrino/electron scattering should deposit even more energy. If $f = 0.3$, the energy deposited in the fireball is $\sim 10^{52}$ erg at a radius $r \sim 5r_s \approx 1.5 \times 10^{12} M_6^{\text{HC}}$ cm. This is the total observed energy in a γ -ray burst assuming a 4π solid angle.

A successful model of a γ -ray burst must somehow accelerate material in the fireball to the ultra-relativistic regime with a Lorentz factor of $\Gamma \sim 100$ to 1000. Therefore, a fireball with total energy $\sim 10^{52}$ erg cannot load more than $10^{-5} M_\odot$ of baryon rest mass during the

acceleration phase. This suggests that the region at $r \sim 5r_s \approx 1.5 \times 10^{12} M_6^{\text{HC}}$ cm from the supermassive star should have extremely low baryon density. This may be satisfied if the *whole* star collapses homologously into a black hole. In turn, this could only be engineered if the star has substantial centrifugal support from rotation and/or if there is significant magnetic pressure. Substantial rotation would cause collapse into a flattened geometry with very little material in the polar directions. We might also worry that with sufficient centrifugal support, some or all supermassive stars might explode rather than collapse to black holes (see Fuller, Woosley, and Weaver 1986; Fricke 1973).

Another possibility may be relevant in the case where the homologous core does not represent the whole star and so there is material on top of the fireball. In this case, the $\nu\bar{\nu}$ -annihilation-heated “fireball layer” will have extremely high entropy, and this layer will reside underneath a layer of infalling material with much lower entropy. If the infall velocities are sub-sonic, then the material will be roughly hydrostatic, and we will have the classic prescription for Rayleigh-Taylor instability. Rayleigh-Taylor overturn could produce many jets and bubbles of the high entropy radiation-dominated plasma. These jets/bubbles could penetrate the infalling layer, and expand relativistically in a fireball once outside the star, thus elluding the problem of baryon loading. Furthermore, these jets/bubbles will be stochastically distributed in space and time, giving the possibility of overlapping relativistic shocks and a rich time structure to the resulting γ -ray burst event.

Once the material accelerated by the fireball(s) collides with the interstellar medium, the kinetic energy of fireball material can be converted into γ -rays (Rees & Mészáros 1992, Narayan, Paczyński & Piran 1992, Mészáros & Rees 1993, Rees & Mészáros 1994). Now, in the case of a supermassive star there may not be much “interstellar medium,” but there could be some mass (or clumps of mass) lost by the supermassive star prior to collapse due to its inherent radiation-driven mass loss process. If the shock(s) run into inhomogeneities

in this clumpy medium produced by the star, then the sharp variable features observed in some γ -ray burst events could be produced.

3. Gamma-Ray Burst Event Rate

The rate of supermassive star collapses should be able to match the observed rate of γ -ray burst events, about one per day, if a substantial fraction of the burst events are to come from this source. (However, we suspect that there may be many phenomena, both near and far, that can give flashes of γ -rays!) Assuming that supermassive stars all form and collapse at a redshift z , the rate of these collapses as observed at the present epoch is

$$4\pi r^2 a_z^3 \frac{dr}{dt_0} \frac{\rho_b F (1+z)^3}{M}, \quad (8)$$

where r is the Friedman-Robertson-Walker comoving coordinate distance of these supermassive stars (with earth at the origin), a_z is the scale factor of the universe at the epoch corresponding to a redshift z (with $a_0 = 1$), t_0 is the age of the universe, $\rho_b = 2 \times 10^{-29} \Omega_b h^2 \text{ g cm}^{-3} = 5 \times 10^{-31} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ (Tytler & Burles 1997) is the baryon density of the universe today, F is the fraction of baryons that formed supermassive stars and M is the mass of a typical supermassive star. Since $dr/dt_0 = c$, the speed of light, and r is of order $6000h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ so long as $z \gtrsim 1$, this rate is

$$0.03FM_6^{-1} \text{ sec}^{-1} \sim 3 \times 10^3 FM_6^{-1} / \text{day}. \quad (9)$$

Therefore, with $F \sim 0.03\%$, i.e., with 0.03% of all baryons having formed supermassive stars, we should observe (assuming a 100% detection efficiency) one collapse per day if the γ -rays they emitted have a 4π solid angle, matching the observed rate of γ -ray burst events. There are no available observational or theoretical (e.g., Big Bang Nucleosynthesis) constraints at the moment that could rule out a baryon collapse fraction as tiny as 0.03% . This fraction translates into an expectation that about 0.03% of the baryons in our universe

are in $\sim 10^{5-6}M_{\odot}$ blackholes at the present epoch. In fact, almost all galaxies that have been examined appropriately seem to have supermassive black holes in their centers (van den Marel et al. 1997). Perhaps our supermassive stars collapse to form the seeds of these objects.

4. Peak Flux Distribution and Time Dilation

If all γ -ray bursts are from $z \gtrsim 1$ (as we would expect if they are from supermassive star collapses), then the γ -ray burst peak flux distribution ($\log N$ - $\log P$) will be very different from models with a homogeneously distributed population of γ -ray bursters. The observed $\log N$ - $\log P$ distribution (Fenimore et al. 1993) is a power law with index = -1.5 which posses a break at the faint end. This would be consistent with homogeneously distributed cosmological sources with a cut-off at high redshifts, unless the peak flux of γ -ray bursts, P , can not be regarded as a standard candle. But since the $\log N$ - $\log P$ distribution is a convolution of the peak flux and spatial distribution, there is no guarantee that the observed power law requires a homogeneous distribution of sources. For our model, in which supermassive stars most likely concentrate at cosmological distances with $z \gtrsim 1$, we can always invoke variances in the peak flux of γ -ray bursts, and/or an evolution of supermassive star co-moving number densities, or invoke another population of γ -ray bursters, to fit the observed γ -ray burst peak flux distribution. All three assumptions are not unreasonable, given that so little is known about the physics of γ -ray bursters. It is worth noting that even in existing stellar remnant-based models, the sources tend to be more abundant at $z \gtrsim 1$, because the star formation rate was higher then (Lilly et al. 1996; Madau 1996). Therefore, similar assumptions are likely needed to fit the same observations with the supermassive star model.

Another consequence of supermassive stars preferentially residing at higher redshifts is

that their γ -ray bursts show a different time dilation factor than models in which sources are distributed uniformly between redshift 0 and high redshifts. For example, if most supermassive stars formed and collapsed between the epochs corresponding to redshifts of from 1 to 3, the time dilation spread is a factor of 2. This is consistent with statistical tests that show a factor of 2 (Norris et al. 1995) or less (Mitrofanov, Litvak & Ushakov 1997) time dilation effect. Stellar remnant-based models, on the other hand, tend to be distributed from a redshift of 0 to $\gtrsim 3$ (the epoch of substantial star formation activity, Madau 1996), yielding a factor of 4 in the time dilation distribution. Of course, the time dilation effect can be complicated by many other factors, not the least of which are the special relativistic effect of beamed γ -ray emission (Brainerd 1994), and correlation between the luminosity and duration of bursts (Band 1994). It is premature at the moment to use the time dilation effect alone to argue either for or against various available models.

5. Discussion

We have demonstrated that supermassive stars are viable candidates for γ -ray bursters. Supermassive star collapses exhibit the desirable features of being more energetic than collapses of solar mass objects, and requiring no host galaxies. Fireballs resulting from $\nu\bar{\nu} \rightarrow e^+e^-$ during supermassive star core collapses, can then expand and accelerate material to the ultra-relativistic regime with Lorentz factors $\gtrsim 100$. This could generate γ -ray bursts by means similar to those suggested in fireball models based on other candidate sources.

A natural question to ask is whether these supermassive stars leave other observational signatures. To take this line of questioning a step further, since these supermassive stars are so energetic, would they be too “easy” to detect? Before their collapse, these stars are as bright as a quasar, but their lifetime is only several thousand years (Fuller, Woosley & Weaver 1986), much too short for chance detection. Although the total gravitational energy

released in supermassive star collapse is several orders of magnitude larger than that from the collapse of a solar mass object, most of it is lost in forming blackholes, and through neutrino emission. Energy releases in the optical and other readily observable waveband may not be substantially larger than that produced in the collapse of solar mass objects and is probably less, unless the star explodes (it will not make a γ -ray burst in this case).

There are some interesting features of supermassive stars, however, that conceivably could leave telltale signs of their existence. These features include possibly enhanced local deuterium abundances (Fuller & Shi 1997b), a relic neutrino background (Shi & Fuller 1997), hot *rp*-process nuclear burning products (Wallace & Woosley 1981; Fuller, Woosley & Weaver 1986), relic blackholes, and possibly gravitational waves. Now that supermassive stars also show some attractive features as γ -ray burst candidates, it is therefore worthwhile to pursue detailed numerical models of rotating (perhaps magnetized) supermassive star collapses.

It is worth noting that by the same mechanism, very massive stars with $100M_{\odot} \ll M \lesssim 5 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ may well be viable candidates for γ -ray bursts, too. But their neutrino radiation is likely trapped in the core during the collapse, a situation which we have not investigated. It remains an interesting possibility to explore further.

This work is supported by NASA grant NAG5-3062 and NSF grant PHY95-03384 at UCSD.

REFERENCES

- Band, D.L. 1997, private communication
- Band, D.L., & Hartmann, D.H. 1998, ApJ, in press
- Begelman, M.C. & Rees, M.J. 1978, MNRAS, 185, 847
- Band, D. L. 1994, ApJ, 432, L23
- Brainerd, J. J. 1994, ApJ, 428, L1
- Bond, J.R., Arnett, W.D., & Carr, B.J. 1984, ApJ, 280, 825
- Cardall, C.Y., & Fuller, G.M. 1997, ApJ, 486, L111
- Eichler, D., Livio, M., Piran, T., and Schramm, D.N. 1989, Nature, 340, 126
- Fenimore, E. E. et al. 1993, Nature, 366, 40
- Fricke, K.J. 1973, ApJ, 183, 941
- Fuller, G.M., Woosley, S.E., & Weaver, T.A. 1986, ApJ, 307, 675
- Fuller, G.M. & Shi, X. 1997a, in preparation
- Fuller, G.M. & Shi, X. 1997b, ApJ, 487, L25
- Goldreich, P., & Weber, S.V. 1980, ApJ, 238, 991
- Goodman, J. 1986, ApJ, 308, L47
- Goodman, J., Dar, A., & Nussinov, S. 1987, ApJ, 314, L7
- Hoyle, F. & Fowler, W.A. 1963, MNRAS, 125, 169
- Itoh, N., Adachi, T., Nakagawa, M., Kohyama, Y., & Munakawa, H. 1989, ApJ, 339, 354

- Lilly, S. J., Le Fèvre, O., Hammer, F., and Crampton, D. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, L1
- Lyne, A., and Lorimer, D. R. 1994, *Nature*, 369, 127
- Madau, P. 1996, in *Star Formation Near and Far*, AIP conference proceeding (AIP, New York)
- McLaughlin, G.C. & Fuller, G.M. 1996, *ApJ*, 456, 71
- Mészáros, P., & Rees, M.J. 1992, *MNRAS*, 257, 29p
- Mészáros, P., & Rees, M.J. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 278
- Metzger, R.M., et al. 1997a, *Nature*, 387, 879
- Metzger, R.M., Cohen, J.G., Chaffee, M.H., & Blandford, R.D. 1997b, IAU circular No. 6676
- Mitrofanov, I. G., Litvak, M. L., and Ushakov, D. A. 1997, *ApJ*, in press
- Mochkovitch, R., Hernanz, M., Isern, J., and Martin, X. 1993, *Nature*, 361, 236
- Narayan, R., Paczyński, B. & Piran, T. 1992, *ApJ*, 395, L83
- Norris, J. P., et al. 1995, *ApJ*, 439, 542
- Paczyński, B. 1986, *ApJ*, 308, L43
- Paczyński, B. 1997, *ApJ*, submitted
- Peebles, P.J.E. & Dicke, R.H. 1968, *ApJ*, 154, 891
- Rees, M.J., & Mészáros, P. 1992, *MNRAS*, 258, 41p
- Rees, M.J., & Mészáros, P. 1994, *ApJ*, 430, L93

- Piran, T. 1996, in *Unsolved Problems in Astrophysics*, eds. J. N. Bahcall and J. P. Ostriker (Princeton: Prince University Press)
- Schaefer, B. E. 1992, in *Gamma-Ray Bursts: Observations, Analyses, and Theories*, eds. C. Ho, R. I. Epstein, & E. E. Fenimore, pp. 107 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Schaefer, B. E., Cline, T. L., Hurley, K. C. & Laros, J. C. 1997, *ApJ*, in press
- Schinder, P.J., et al. 1987, *ApJ*, 313, 531
- Shi, X. & Fuller, G.M. 1997, *ApJ*, submitted
- Tegmark, M., et al. 1997, *ApJ*, 474, 1
- Totani, T., Sato, K. & Yoshii, Y. 1996, *ApJ*, 460, 303
- Tytler, D., & Burles, S. 1997, in "Origin of Matter and Evolution of Galaxies", eds. T. Kajino, Y. Yoshii & S. Kubono (World Scientific Publ. Co.: Singapore), 37
- Usov, V. V. 1992, *Nature*, 357, 472
- van der Marel, R.P., de Zeeuw, P.T., Rix, H., & Quinlan, G.D. 1997, *Nature*, 385, 610
- Vrba, F. J., Hartmann, D. H., and Jennings, M.C. 1995, *ApJ*, 446, 115
- Wallace, R.K. & Woosley, S.E. 1981, *ApJS*, 45, 389
- Waxman, E. 1997, *ApJ*, in press
- Woosley, S. E. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 273
- Woosley, S. E. & Baron, E. 1992, *ApJ*, 391, 228