

Fluid dynamics of partially radiative blast waves

Ehud Cohen, Tsvi Piran and Re'em Sari

The Racah Institute of Physics, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem 91904, Israel

ABSTRACT

We derive a self similar solution for the propagation of an extreme relativistic (or Newtonian) radiative spherical blast wave into a surrounding cold medium. The solution is obtained under the assumption that the radiation process is fast, it takes place only in the vicinity of the shock and that it radiates away a fixed fraction of the energy generated by the shock. In the Newtonian regime these solutions generalize the Sedov-Taylor adiabatic solution and the pressure-driven fully radiative solution. In the extreme relativistic case these solutions generalize the Blandford-McKee adiabatic solution. They provide a new fully radiative extreme relativistic solution which is different from the Blandford-McKee fully radiative relativistic solution. This new solution develops a hot interior which causes it to cool faster than previous estimates. We find that the energy of the blast wave behaves as a power law of the location of the shock. The power law index depends on the fraction of the energy emitted by the shock. We obtain an analytic solution for the interior of the blast wave. These new solutions might be applicable to the study of GRB afterglow or SNRs.

Subject headings: Gamma rays:bursts — hydrodynamics — ISM: jets and outflows— relativity — shock waves — supernova remnants

1. Introduction

Many astrophysical phenomena (SNRs, γ -ray bursts - GRBs, AGN hot spots, etc.) are believed to involve radiative shock waves. These shocks accelerate particles which emit the observed radiation. In particular, it is widely accepted that the recently discovered GRBs afterglow results from an emission by relativistic shocks, created by the interaction between an initial ejecta and the interstellar medium. The recent observations of GRB afterglow have lead to numerous attempts to model this phenomena.

If the radiative mechanisms are slow compared to hydrodynamics time scale, the blast wave evolution is adiabatic. The propagation of such a blast wave is described by

a self similar solution: The Sedov-Taylor solution (Sedov 1969, Taylor 1950) describes the Newtonian regime and the Blandford & McKee (1976) solution describes the extreme relativistic regime.

We call the solution radiative if the radiative mechanisms are fast compared to the hydrodynamic time scale. A fully radiative solution is one in which all the energy generated by the shock is radiated away. Ostriker & McKee (1988) have shown that if a fully radiative blast wave emits its energy only in the vicinity of the shock, it can be described by one of two possible self-similar solutions: The pressure driven snow-plow (PDS) or the momentum conserving snow-plow (MCS) solution. In the PDS solution a thin shell “snow plows” through the external medium, driven by the pressure of its hot, roughly isobaric, interior. In the MCS solution the interior has been cooled and a thin shell slows down while conserving momentum. Blandford & McKee (1976) have found an extreme relativistic fully radiative solution. This solution describes a thin shell with a cold interior and it can be considered as the relativistic generalization of the Newtonian MCS solution. However, momentum is not conserved in this solution, as in the relativistic case one has to consider the momentum carried by the emitted radiation.

These solutions are either adiabatic or fully radiative. It is likely that in some cases not all the energy would be radiated away, even though the cooling is fast. Such is the situation if the shock distributes the internal energy between the electrons and protons and there is no coupling between the two afterwards. Since only the electrons cool, only a fraction of the internal energy will be radiated. It is likely that at least in the initial phases of a GRB afterglow this would be the case. We consider here this “partially radiative” scenario.

The goal of our paper is to find an analytic solution for the evolution of Newtonian and relativistic partially radiative blast waves. This, we believe, will eventually lead to a physical description of the evolution of GRB afterglows in their non-adiabatic stage, and of other astrophysical phenomena. We find a self similar solution under the assumption that the radiative mechanism is fast (compared to the hydrodynamics time scale). We parameterize the radiation by a dimensionless (the non dimensionality is essential for a self-similar solution) parameter, ϵ , which describes the fraction of the energy produced by the shock that is radiated away. We recover the extreme relativistic adiabatic Blandford-McKee solution and the Newtonian Sedov-Taylor solution in the corresponding limit when $\epsilon = 0$. In the Newtonian case when $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ we recover the PDS solution, but we do not reproduce the MCS solution. Similarly in the relativistic limit of $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ the solution approaches a new relativistic PDS solution which is different from the radiative Blandford-McKee solution.

We describe our model in Sec. 2. It is composed of an adiabatic shock followed by a narrow radiative region and a wide self-similar adiabatic regime. We proceed in Sec. 3.1 by

calculating the radiative shock conditions for Newtonian blast waves. We describe the self similar equations and their solution in Sec. 3.2. Using the same method we turn in Sec. 4 to the calculations of relativistic blast waves. Finally, in Sec. 5 we discuss the limiting solutions obtained by other authors and compare them with our solution.

2. The Model

We consider a spherical radiative blast wave, that appears when a large amount of energy is released within a small volume. This results in a strong shock wave that expands supersonically into the surrounding medium. We consider the regime where the influence of the initial mass is negligible and that the pressure of the surrounding medium is small compared to the energy density of the flow. These assumptions are necessary and sufficient to obtain a self similar solution, see e.g. Landau & Lifshitz, pg. 404. This solution corresponds in the adiabatic limit to the well known Newtonian Sedov-Taylor solution or to the relativistic Blandford-McKee solution.

We assume that the shocked, hot matter can radiate a fixed fraction of its internal energy generated by the shock. We show that the details of the radiation mechanism are not important, as long as the cooling time scale is short compared to the hydrodynamics time-scale. We also assume that the radiated energy is not re-absorbed in the system. Under these assumptions we can divide the system into three parts. An adiabatic shock, followed by a narrow radiative zone and a wide adiabatic flow.

The assumption of fast cooling allows us to treat the shock and the cooling layer as planar and stationary. This means that the velocity of the shock is constant during the time that a given fluid element crosses the radiative zone and cools. The physical conditions through this “radiative shock” can be found using the equations of energy, momentum and particle conservation. For simplicity we assume that the radiation does not alter the shock itself, which remains adiabatic, and that a radiative layer follows it. However, the shock jump conditions (Rankine-Hugoniot in the Newtonian case and Taub in the relativistic case) are derived from the same conservation equations. Thus, even though we divide the process into a shock and a radiative layer we effectively use the conservation equations between the unshocked matter and the shocked matter after it has been cooled. This is valid even if the radiation process changes the shock itself (i.e. in the case where the cooling length is comparable to the particles’ mean free path within the shock).

Fig. 1 describes the model. In the shock frame, cold matter enters the shock. The shock itself is not affected by radiation and can be described properly by the Newtonian

Rankine-Hugoniot or the relativistic Taub jump conditions. The downstream matter is hot and it moves sub-sonically relative to the shock front. This matter cools by radiation and it is compressed by the surrounding pressure. It stops radiating when it has emitted a fixed fraction of its energy. It continues adiabatically afterwards. The assumption of fast cooling enables us to treat the shock and the radiation layer as instantaneous and with zero width compared to the hydrodynamics scales. This translates to modified radiative jump conditions relating the unshocked material and the cooled material after the radiation zone. Using these conditions we find a self similar solution for the remaining adiabatic interior.

3. The Newtonian solution

3.1. Jump conditions of radiative shocks

We divide the radiative shock, as defined in Sec. 2, to two regions: The “adiabatic” shock, and the radiative zone. The conditions for the matter immediately after the shock are given by the Rankine-Hugoniot jump conditions. Assuming that the matter is adequately described by a polytropic equation of state with an adiabatic index $\hat{\gamma}$, the jump conditions in the shock frame are (see e.g. Landau & Lifshitz pg. 335) :

$$\rho_2 = \left(\frac{\hat{\gamma} + 1}{\hat{\gamma} - 1} \right) \rho_1, \quad u_2 = \left(\frac{\hat{\gamma} - 1}{\hat{\gamma} + 1} \right) U_{sh}, \quad p_2 = \frac{2}{\hat{\gamma} + 1} \rho_1 U_{sh}^2, \quad (1)$$

where ρ_1 is the density of the unshocked matter, U_{sh} is the velocity of the shock relative to the unshocked matter and p_2 , ρ_2 and u_2 are the pressure, density and velocity of the shocked matter, measured in the shock frame. These jump conditions hold if the shock is strong, i.e. the pressure of the unshocked gas is negligible ($p_1 \ll \rho_1 U_{sh}^2$).

In the radiative zone, the matter that was heated by the shock radiates and cools. In the mean time it is also compressed by the surrounding pressure. This compression causes the gas to slow down in order to conserve the matter flux. At some point the matter reaches some equilibrium and stops radiating.

To calculate the hydrodynamics of the blast wave interior, we need to know the pressure, velocity and density of matter at the end of the radiative layer. Since we assume the cooling is fast, the shock velocity is constant during the cooling of a fluid element of shocked matter. We look therefore for a steady solution for the conditions of the matter during the cooling process. We find the conditions at the end of the radiative layer as a function of energy lost through this process.

In a steady state we can use, in the shock frame, the equations of conservation of

matter:

$$\rho u = \text{constant}, \quad (2)$$

and of momentum:

$$(\rho u)u + p = \text{constant}, \quad (3)$$

where ρ , u and p are the fluid's density, velocity and pressure. These two conservation equations contain three unknowns, so that we can find the physical quantities as a function of one another. We solve equations 2 and 3 for ρ and p as function of u ,

$$\rho(u) = \frac{\rho_2 u_2}{u}, \quad p(u) = \rho_2 u_2 (u_2 - u) + p_2, \quad (4)$$

where ρ_2 , u_2 and p_2 , the density, the velocity and the pressure of the flow immediately after the shock, are given by Eq. 1.

We denote by $\tilde{\rho}$, \tilde{u} and \tilde{p} the density, the velocity and the pressure when the fluid has stopped radiating, and use the shock conditions (Eq. 1) as the boundary conditions for the radiative flow. We use the velocity at the end of the cooling layer to parameterize the fraction of energy lost, and find the pressure at that location by

$$\tilde{p}_2 = p_2 \left(1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma} - 1}{2} \delta\right) = \frac{2 + \delta(\hat{\gamma} - 1)}{\hat{\gamma} + 1} \rho_1 U_{sh}^2, \quad (5)$$

the velocity relative to the observer,

$$U_{sh} - \tilde{u}_2 = (U_{sh} - u_2) \left(1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma} - 1}{2} \delta\right) = \frac{2 + \delta(\hat{\gamma} - 1)}{\hat{\gamma} + 1} U_{sh}, \quad (6)$$

and the density is

$$\tilde{\rho}_2 = \frac{\rho_2}{1 - \delta} = \frac{\hat{\gamma} + 1}{(\hat{\gamma} - 1)(1 - \delta)} \rho_1, \quad (7)$$

where $\delta \equiv 1 - \tilde{u}_2/u_2$. Fig. 2 shows the trajectory of a fluid element during the shock and the following cooling process.

During the cooling process energy is radiated away. We write the energy flux as

$$\mathcal{J} = u(\rho u^2/2 + e + p), \quad (8)$$

where the energy per unit volume is denoted by e . We find that the fraction of energy flux lost in the radiative layer is:

$$\epsilon(\delta) = 1 - \frac{\mathcal{J}(\tilde{u}_2)}{\mathcal{J}(u_2)} = \frac{\delta}{1 + \hat{\gamma}} [2 + (\hat{\gamma} - 1)\delta]. \quad (9)$$

Note that we have not used the details of the cooling process to find the pressure and density as a function of the velocity. This is sufficient for our calculations, because all we need are the physical conditions at a location where the matter has stopped cooling. The velocity at this point is given by Eq. 9.¹

Using Eqs. 8 and 9 we calculate the overall energy loss rate:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -4\pi R_{sh}^2 \mathcal{J}_{sh} \epsilon = -2\pi \rho_1 U_{sh}^3 R_{sh}^2 \epsilon, \quad (10)$$

where $\mathcal{J}_{sh} = \rho_1 U_{sh}^3 / 2$ is the energy flux of the matter entering the shock in shock frame.

3.2. The self similar solution

After the matter has passed the radiation layer, it continues to flow adiabatically. The motion is described by matter, momentum and energy conservations equations in spherical coordinates:

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 \rho u) = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + u \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial p}{\partial r}, \quad (12)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} [e + \rho u^2 / 2] + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} [r^2 u (e + p + \rho u^2 / 2)] = 0. \quad (13)$$

We look for a self similar solution for these equations. Similarly to the non-radiative Sedov-Taylor solution we consider the case where $\rho_1 U_{sh}^2$, the momentum flux of the matter that enters the shock is much larger than the thermal pressure p_1 of the undisturbed medium.

In the Sedov-Taylor solution dimensional arguments lead to a self-similar dimensionless variable. In the radiative case the definition of the self similar variable is not straight forward, because the energy is not constant in time. We look for a self similar solution to the hydrodynamics equations with energy that varies with time as a power-law: $E = E_0 (t/t_0)^\lambda$. We define a dimensionless variable

$$\xi = r \left[\frac{\rho_1}{t^{2+\lambda} (E_0/t_0^\lambda)} \right]^{1/5}. \quad (14)$$

¹ The cooling profile is determined by the radiation mechanism. It is only the conditions at the end of the cooling process that are independent of this mechanism.

If this variable leads to a self similar solution, r and t will appear in the solution only through ξ , and the position of the shock corresponds to a fixed value of ξ , denoted ξ_0 . Thus:

$$R_{sh}(t) = \xi_0 \left[\frac{t^{2+\lambda}(E_0/t_0^\lambda)}{\rho_1} \right]^{1/5}, \quad U_{sh}(t) = \frac{dR_{sh}(t)}{dt} = \frac{2+\lambda}{5} \frac{R_{sh}}{t}. \quad (15)$$

We substitute R_{sh} and U_{sh} into Eq. 10 and obtain a cubic equation for λ (which has only one real solution):

$$\lambda = -2\pi \left(\frac{2+\lambda}{5} \right)^3 \xi_0^5 \epsilon. \quad (16)$$

Using the dimensionless similarity variable ξ , we look for a self similar solution of Eqs. 11,12,13 of the form:

$$\rho(r, t) = \rho_2 \alpha(\xi), \quad (17)$$

$$u(r, t) = (U_{sh} - u_2) \frac{r}{R_{sh}(t)} v(\xi), \quad (18)$$

$$p(r, t) = p_2 \left(\frac{r}{R_{sh}(t)} \right)^2 p(\xi). \quad (19)$$

The coefficients in these equations are chosen in order to match the standard definitions in the adiabatic case (see e.g. Shu 1992). Using Eqs. 5, 6, 7 we obtain the boundary conditions:

$$\alpha(\xi_0) = \frac{1}{1-\delta}, \quad v(\xi_0) = 1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma}-1}{2}\delta, \quad p(\xi_0) = 1 + \frac{\hat{\gamma}-1}{2}\delta. \quad (20)$$

To determine the dimensionless position of the shock front, ξ_0 , we require that the energy in the blast wave interior equals with the energy defined by the self similar variable:

$$E(t) = E_0 \left(\frac{t}{t_0} \right)^\lambda = \int_0^{R_{sh}(t)} \left(\frac{p(r)}{\hat{\gamma}-1} + \frac{\rho(r)u(r)^2}{2} \right) 4\pi r^2 dr. \quad (21)$$

Substitution of the self-similar functions into this equation yields a non-dimensional normalization equation:

$$\left(\frac{2+\lambda}{5} \right)^2 \frac{8\pi}{\hat{\gamma}^2-1} \int_0^{\xi_0} (p(\xi) + \alpha(\xi)v(\xi)^2) \xi^4 d\xi = 1. \quad (22)$$

Finally we substitute the self-similar functions $\alpha(\xi)$, $v(\xi)$ and $p(\xi)$ into the fluid equations 11-13, replacing the partial derivatives with the corresponding total derivatives:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial r} = \frac{\xi}{r} \frac{d}{d\xi}, \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t} = -\frac{2+\lambda}{5} \frac{\xi}{t} \frac{d}{d\xi}. \quad (23)$$

We obtain the coupled ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}}{2} \frac{d \log \alpha}{d \log \xi} = \left(\alpha v (1 + \hat{\gamma} - 2v) [(1 + 3\lambda)(1 + \hat{\gamma}) - 4(2 + \lambda)v] + \right. \quad (24)$$

$$\left. 2(\lambda - 3)(\hat{\gamma}^2 - 1)p \right) / (1 + \hat{\gamma} - 2v),$$

$$\mathcal{D} \frac{d \log v}{d \log \xi} = -\alpha(1 + \hat{\gamma} - 2v) [5(1 + \hat{\gamma}) - 2(2 + \lambda)v] + \quad (25)$$

$$2p(\hat{\gamma} - 1) [(\lambda - 3)(1 + \hat{\gamma}) + 3(2 + \lambda)\hat{\gamma}v],$$

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}}{2} \frac{d \log p}{d \log \xi} = 2(2 + \lambda)(\hat{\gamma} - 1)\hat{\gamma}p + \alpha(1 + \hat{\gamma}) \times \quad (26)$$

$$\left[(14 + 2\lambda + \hat{\gamma} + 3\lambda\hat{\gamma})v - 5(1 + \hat{\gamma}) - 4(2 + \lambda)v^2 \right],$$

where

$$\mathcal{D} = \left(2(1 - \hat{\gamma})\hat{\gamma}p + \alpha(1 + \hat{\gamma} - 2v)^2 \right) (2 + \lambda). \quad (27)$$

We solve these equations numerically, using the boundary conditions from Eq. 20, and obtain the relation between the cooling parameter ϵ and the power-law index λ (see Fig. 3). Self similar solutions for several cooling parameters are shown in Fig. 4.

For $\epsilon = 0$ our solution is adiabatic and we recover the classical Sedov-Taylor solution. For $\epsilon = 1$ the density diverges (Eq. 7) and the boundary conditions become singular. Thus, to obtain the fully radiative limit we must take the limit of $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$. We discuss this limit of the Newtonian and the relativistic solutions in section 5.1.

For intermediate values of ϵ we see (Fig. 4) that as the cooling parameter becomes larger, the matter concentrates in a small shell near the shock and the internal pressure decreases. Notice that similarly to the non-radiative Sedov-Taylor solution, the interior temperature $T \propto P/\rho$ diverges at the center of the blast wave and it monotonously decreases towards the shock. This behavior occurs because the material near the center passed through the front earlier, when the shock speed was larger (infinitely large in the formal extrapolation to $t \rightarrow 0$), and it cools slowly, adiabatically.

4. Extreme relativistic solution

The model described in Sec. 2 is adequate for relativistic blast waves as well as for Newtonian ones. We assume that each shocked particle emits a fraction of the internal energy it acquired in the shock. We also assume that the radiation time scale is short compared to the hydrodynamic time scale, thus allowing us to treat the blast wave as stationary when calculating the radiation process.

We start by calculating the conditions at the end of the “radiative shock” as a function of the fraction of energy emitted. Then we use these results as boundary conditions for the blast wave, assuming that the flow outside of the radiation layer is adiabatic. Following Blandford & McKee (1976) we derive a self similar solution for extreme relativistic blast wave, accurate to the leading order in Γ^{-2} . However, within the derivation the second order terms in the equations are also important.

4.1. Jump conditions of radiative shocks

We begin by calculating the jump conditions for a radiative extreme relativistic strong shock ($\Gamma \gg 1$) using the relativistic equation of state $\hat{\gamma} = 4/3$. The jump conditions are derived from the continuity of the energy, momentum and particle flux densities in the shock frame. (see e.g. Landau & Lifshitz pg. 511). Assuming that the unshocked matter is cold, $p_1 \ll \rho_1 \Gamma^2$, we have

$$e_2 = 2\Gamma^2 \rho_1, \quad (28)$$

$$\rho_2 = 2\sqrt{2}\rho_1\Gamma, \quad (29)$$

$$\gamma_2^2 = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma^2. \quad (30)$$

For generality we allow for any polytropic index, and relax our assumption of extreme relativistic flow when calculating the cooling profile. Later on, while tying together the shock and the cooling layer, we return to an extreme relativistic motion.

In a relativistic flow the thermal energy can be comparable to the rest mass energy, and we have to take into account the momentum of the radiation. We cannot calculate the profile from matter and momentum flux conservation alone as in the Newtonian case, and the independence of the cooling profile from the nature of the radiation mechanism is not obvious. We assume that the radiation is emitted isotropically in the fluid rest frame with a local cooling function $\mathcal{L}(e, \rho)$ (like in the Newtonian case this function does not appear in the final result), and calculate the cooling profile in the shock frame using matter conservation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \gamma^s \beta^s \rho = 0, \quad (31)$$

momentum conservation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} [\gamma^{s2} \beta^{s2} (\rho + \hat{\gamma}e) + (\hat{\gamma} - 1)e] = -2 \frac{\mathcal{L}(e, \rho)}{\beta^s} \gamma^{s2} \beta^s \quad (32)$$

and energy conservation:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} [\gamma^{s2} \beta^s (\rho + \hat{\gamma} e)] = -\frac{\mathcal{L}(e, \rho)}{\beta^s} \gamma^{s2} (1 + \beta^{s2}). \quad (33)$$

To solve these equations we rewrite Eq. 31 as

$$\rho = \frac{\rho_2 \gamma_2^s \beta_2^s}{\gamma^s \beta^s}. \quad (34)$$

The cooling function \mathcal{L} can be eliminated from Eqs. 32 and 33, which after a little algebra and the usage of Eq. 34 results in:

$$\frac{de}{d\beta^s} = -\frac{\beta_2^s \gamma_2^s \rho_2 \gamma^s}{\hat{\gamma} - 1 - \beta^{s2}}. \quad (35)$$

Integrating this differential equation we obtain

$$e = e_2 + \frac{\beta_2^s \gamma_2^s \rho_2}{2\sqrt{(2 - \hat{\gamma})(\hat{\gamma} - 1)}} \log [\Phi(\beta^s)/\Phi(\beta_2^s)], \quad (36)$$

where

$$\Phi(\beta) = \frac{(1 - \beta/\sqrt{\hat{\gamma} - 1})(1 + \beta\sqrt{\hat{\gamma} - 1} + \sqrt{2 - \hat{\gamma}/\gamma})}{(1 + \beta/\sqrt{\hat{\gamma} - 1})(1 - \beta\sqrt{\hat{\gamma} - 1} + \sqrt{2 - \hat{\gamma}/\gamma})}. \quad (37)$$

Fig. 5 depicts the flow of matter through the “radiative shock”. In the shock frame the dense shocked matter flows out of the shock with velocity $c/3$, slows and becomes even denser during the cooling process. In the extreme relativistic limit the pressure does not change during this process.

Combining the radiative flow solution with the strong shock jump conditions we obtain:

$$\tilde{e}_2 = 2\Gamma^2 \rho_1, \quad (38)$$

$$\tilde{\rho}_2 = 2\sqrt{2}\rho_1 \Gamma \frac{\sqrt{1 + \epsilon}}{1 - \epsilon}, \quad (39)$$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_2^2 = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma^2(1 + \epsilon). \quad (40)$$

Using Eqs. 38, 39 and 40 we find that ϵ is equal to the fraction of energy that each particle has lost in the unshocked fluid frame during the cooling process:

$$\epsilon = \frac{4\gamma_2 e_2/3\rho_2 - 4\tilde{\gamma}_2 \tilde{e}_2/3\tilde{\rho}_2}{4\gamma_2 e_2/3\rho_2}. \quad (41)$$

This definition of ϵ coincides with the definition of Sari (1997).

The energy loss rate of the whole blast wave in the unshocked matter rest frame is the difference between the work done on the cooling layer by the internal pressure \tilde{p}_2 , and the increase in internal and kinetic energy of shocked matter. For spherical radiative blast wave we obtain:

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = -4\pi R_{sh}^2 \left[\tilde{p}_2 \tilde{\beta}_2 - \left\{ (\tilde{e}_2 + \tilde{p}_2) \tilde{\gamma}_2^2 \tilde{\beta}_2 - \tilde{p}_2 \right\} \left\{ \beta(\Gamma) - \tilde{\beta}_2 \right\} \right] = -8\pi R_{sh}^2 \Gamma^2 \epsilon / 3. \quad (42)$$

This rate equals the rate in which energy is supplied to the unshocked matter ($4\pi R^2 p_2$), multiplied by ϵ . Blandford & McKee (1976) have obtained an equation for dE/dt in the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ (Eq. 84 there) which differs from our result due to a missing factor of $4/3$ in their Lorentz transformation of the energy density.²

It is important to note that there are many possible definitions of radiative efficiencies, which are frame dependent. For instance, the fraction of internal energy lost in the shock frame is:

$$\frac{e_2(4\gamma_2^{s2} - 1)/3\rho_2\gamma_2^s - \tilde{e}_2(4\tilde{\gamma}_2^{s2} - 1)/3\tilde{\rho}_2\tilde{\gamma}_2^s}{e_2(4\gamma_2^{s2} - 1)/3\rho_2\gamma_2^s} = \frac{\epsilon(37 + \epsilon(16 + 3\epsilon))}{7(1 + \epsilon)(3 + \epsilon)}. \quad (43)$$

This equals ϵ for $\epsilon = 0$ and $\epsilon = 1$, but it has a different form for intermediate values.

A physical example of a partially radiative shock wave leads to another definition of radiative efficiency. Consider a system in which the shock distribute the energy between electrons and protons according to:

$$e_2^{elec} = \epsilon_e e_2, \quad e_2^{prot} = (1 - \epsilon_e) e_2, \quad (44)$$

and there is no coupling between electrons and protons afterwards. Charge neutrality requires that the density of electrons and protons remains equal. The protons do not radiate. Therefore their flow is adiabatic. When the electrons have cooled down completely, the protons' energy satisfy:

$$\tilde{e}_2^{prot} \tilde{\rho}_2^{-\hat{\gamma}} = e_2^{prot} \rho_2^{-\hat{\gamma}}. \quad (45)$$

At this stage the cold electrons have no internal energy, $\tilde{e}_2^{elec} = 0$ and therefore $\tilde{e}_2 = \tilde{e}_2^{prot}$. Using Eq. 39 we obtain:

$$\epsilon_e = 1 - \left(\frac{1 - \epsilon}{\sqrt{1 + \epsilon}} \right)^{\hat{\gamma}}. \quad (46)$$

² Energy density transforms like $e' = (e+p)\gamma^2 - p$, which becomes $e' = (4/3)e\gamma^2$ in the extreme relativistic limit. In this calculation Blandford & McKee (1976) have used $e' = e\gamma^2$.

Again, ϵ_e equals ϵ for $\epsilon = 0$ and for $\epsilon = 1$ (see Fig. 9), but it has a different form. It is simple to understand this by recalling the behavior in the cooling layer. As a fluid element cools it *slows* in the shock frame and *accelerates* in the observer frame. The electrons accelerate the protons while cooling in order to maintain charge neutrality. This acceleration transfers energy from the electrons to the protons. Therefore, not all the electrons internal energy is radiated away.

4.2. Self similar solution for homogeneous medium

Inside the blast wave the flow is adiabatic and the equations of motion are obtained by setting the divergence of the energy momentum tensor to zero (see e.g. Landau & Lifshitz pg. 506). For spherically symmetric flow, the pressure, energy and velocity satisfy

$$\frac{\partial \gamma \rho}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r^2 \rho \gamma \beta = 0 \quad (47)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma^2 (e + \rho + p) \beta + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r^2 \gamma^2 (e + \rho + p) \beta^2 = 0 \quad (48)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma^2 (e + \rho + \beta^2 p) + \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} r^2 \gamma^2 (e + \rho + p) \beta = 0 \quad (49)$$

where (r, t) are in the unshocked matter frame and $r = 0$ is the center of the blast wave.

As in the Newtonian case we look for a solution in which the energy decreases as a power-law in time:

$$\Gamma^2 \propto t^{-m}, \quad m > 3. \quad (50)$$

Following Blandford & McKee (1976), we define a similarity variable

$$\chi = [1 + 2(m + 1)\Gamma^2(t)](1 - r/t). \quad (51)$$

We substitute the self similar variables and take the extreme relativistic limit ³ of Eqs. 47, 48 and 49. We have to expand Eqs. 48 and 49 to the second order in Γ^{-2} as these equations are identical in the leading order in Γ^{-2} .

³ While solving Eqs. 47 and 49 in the extreme relativistic limit we assume $\rho \ll e$. We check the validity of this limit by requiring that the flow continues to be extreme relativistic after the cooling layer, $\tilde{e}_2/\tilde{\rho}_2 \gg 1$. This results in a requirement $\Gamma \gg 1/(1 - \epsilon)$. It means that as the blast wave loses more energy, our solution breaks down, even though $\Gamma \gg 1$.

We write the pressure, velocity, and density of the shocked fluid as

$$p(r, t) = \frac{1}{3}\tilde{e}_2 f(\chi) = \frac{2}{3}\rho_1 \Gamma(t)^2 f(\chi), \quad (52)$$

$$\gamma(r, t)^2 = \tilde{\gamma}_2^2 g(\chi) = \frac{1}{2}\Gamma(t)^2 (1 + \epsilon) g(\chi), \quad (53)$$

$$\rho(r, t)\gamma(r, t) = \tilde{\gamma}_2 \tilde{\rho}_2 h(\chi) = 2\rho_1 \Gamma(t)^2 \frac{1 + \epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} h(\chi). \quad (54)$$

These expressions are valid for the interior of the blast wave, $\chi \geq 1$. The boundary conditions at $\chi = 1$ (Eqs. 38, 39 and 40) are satisfied by setting

$$f(1) = g(1) = h(1) = 1. \quad (55)$$

Substituting Eqs. 52, 53 and 54 in Eqs. 47, 48 and 49, and replacing the derivatives using

$$\frac{d\Gamma(t)}{dt} = -\frac{m}{2} \frac{\Gamma(t)}{t}, \quad (56)$$

$$t \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial t} = (m + 1)(2\Gamma^2 - \chi) + 1, \quad (57)$$

and

$$t \frac{\partial \chi}{\partial r} = -[1 + 2(m + 1)\Gamma^2] \quad (58)$$

all to the second order in (Γ^{-2}) , we obtain the following self similar equations:

$$\frac{A}{g} \frac{d \ln g}{d \chi} = (7m - 4) - (m + 2)(1 + \epsilon)g\chi \quad (59)$$

$$\frac{A}{g} \frac{d \ln f}{d \chi} = 8(m - 1) - (m - 4)(1 + \epsilon)g\chi \quad (60)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{A}{g} \frac{d \ln h}{d \chi} &= (2(9m - 8) - 2(5m - 6)(1 + \epsilon)g\chi + \\ &(m - 2)(1 + \epsilon)^2 g^2 \chi^2) / (2 - (1 + \epsilon)g\chi), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

where

$$A = \frac{(m + 1)(4 - 8(1 + \epsilon)g\chi + (1 + \epsilon)^2 g^2 \chi^2)}{(1 + \epsilon)}. \quad (62)$$

To solve these equations we need a relation between the amount of cooling, presented in the equations by the parameter ϵ and the evolution parameter m . The energy stored in the blast wave is given by:

$$E(t) = \int_0^{R(t)} \frac{4\pi}{3} r^2 e(4\gamma^2(r, t) - 1) dr = \frac{8\pi\rho_1}{3(m + 1)} \Gamma^2 t^3 (1 + \epsilon) \int_1^\infty f g d\chi, \quad (63)$$

to the leading order in Γ^{-2} . The time derivative of the energy satisfies

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = (3 - m) \frac{E}{t}. \quad (64)$$

Combining Eqs. 42, 63 and 64 we obtain a normalization equation which combines the hydrodynamic profile through f and g , the evolution parameter m , and the energy loss parameter:

$$1 - \frac{m - 3}{m + 1} \int_1^\infty f g d\chi = \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon}. \quad (65)$$

Surprisingly, there is an analytic solution to Eqs. 59, 60, 61 and 65 for arbitrary values of ϵ :

$$m = \frac{\epsilon^2 + 14\epsilon + 9}{3 - \epsilon} \quad (66)$$

$$g = \chi^{-1}, \quad f = \chi^{-\alpha_1}, \quad h = \chi^{-\alpha_2}, \quad (67)$$

$$\alpha_1 = 1 + \frac{5}{12 + \epsilon}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{\epsilon^2 + 14\epsilon - 21}{\epsilon^2 + 11\epsilon - 12} \quad (68)$$

and

$$E(t) = \frac{8\pi\rho_1}{3} \frac{3 - \epsilon}{17 + \epsilon} \Gamma^2 t^3. \quad (69)$$

The functions f, g, h are displayed in Fig. 6. In the limit of an adiabatic blast wave, $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, we recover the Blandford-McKee solutions. The matter is concentrated, in this solution, in a narrow shell of width R/Γ^2 . As ϵ increases, the matter tends to form even narrower, denser shell. Similarly to the Newtonian solution, the internal energy does not decrease as fast as the matter density in the interior of the blast wave. In fact, the width of the pressure profile is approximately independent of ϵ .

Our solutions are expressed in the un-shocked matter frame, which is the same as the observer frame. However, due to the relativistic motion of the emitting matter toward the observer, the time difference between the arrival of two photons to an observer at infinity is not equal to the delay between their emission. A photon released at time t from the radiation layer will reach the observer at a time

$$t_{obs} = t - R(t) = \frac{t}{2(m + 1)\Gamma^2} \propto t^{m+1}. \quad (70)$$

All the observables (luminosity, frequency, etc.) of blast waves should, of course, be given in the observer time. For instance, the bolometric luminosity is the derivative of the blast wave energy to the observer time. Using Eq. 64 we find

$$L \propto \frac{dE}{dt_{obs}} \sim t_{obs}^{\frac{m-3}{m+1}-1}. \quad (71)$$

An interesting case is a sudden release of all the blast wave energy. As the energy is released, the shell Lorentz factor also drops to unity. Due to the dependence of the observed time on Γ , this event, no matter how short it is, will be spread over a long time. Even if $m \rightarrow \infty$, the observed luminosity will not drop faster than $L \propto t_{obs}^{-2}$. (In our solutions this limit can not be reached because $m < 12$ for all ϵ). In Fig. 7 we show the relation between the energy drop rate and ϵ .

We check our solution for the blast wave interior using a spherical one dimensional numerical simulation. For simplicity, to avoid detailed modeling of the cooling process, we use our analytic solution for the “radiative shock”. At each time step we calculate the location we expect the shock to be, assuming that the evolution follows our self similar solution. We set the values of density, energy and velocity at that location using the modified shock conditions of Eqs. 38-40. As the initial conditions we use our self similar solution, and check if the calculated profiles follow it. We continue until the solution becomes non extreme relativistic. We find a good agreement between the numerical profiles and the self similar ones, see Fig. 8.

Blandford & McKee (1976) have also found a self similar solution for blast waves with injection of energy. This solution contains an additional internal shock wave. It is interesting to check whether it is possible to find another radiative solution by incorporating such a shock wave into our self similar solution. To check this, we write the velocity of a sphere with constant χ by inverting Eq. 51 to $r = r(\chi, t)$ and applying a partial time derivative. We obtain:

$$\Gamma_{\chi}^2 = \Gamma^2 / \chi. \quad (72)$$

The velocity difference between the fluid and this sphere is:

$$\Gamma_{diff} = \frac{3 + \epsilon}{2\sqrt{2(1 + \epsilon)}}, \quad (73)$$

which is constant over the whole profile. We find that for all possible values of ϵ , the Lorentz factor of the velocity difference $\Gamma_{diff} < \sqrt{3/2}$ (the local speed of sound), i.e. the flow is subsonic, while a shock requires supersonic flow. Therefore an additional shock wave cannot take place within this self similar solution.

4.3. External medium with a density gradient

These solutions, described in Sec. 4.2, can be generalized to the case where the external medium density has a power law profile. If the density gradient is $\rho_1 \propto r^{-k}$, we have

$$\rho_1 \propto \Gamma^{2k/m}, \quad E \propto \Gamma^{2+2k/m} R^3 \propto R^{-(m-(3-k))}. \quad (74)$$

The self similar are:

$$\frac{A}{g} \frac{d \ln g}{d \chi} = (7m + 3k - 4) - (m + 2)(1 + \epsilon)g\chi \quad (75)$$

$$\frac{A}{g} \frac{d \ln f}{d \chi} = 8(m - 1) + 4k - (m + k - 4)(1 + \epsilon)g\chi \quad (76)$$

$$\frac{A}{g} \frac{d \ln h}{d \chi} = \left(2(9m + 5k - 8) - 2(5m + 4k - 6)(1 + \epsilon)g\chi + \right. \quad (77)$$

$$\left. (m + k - 2)(1 + \epsilon)^2 g^2 \chi^2 \right) / (2 - (1 + \epsilon)g\chi), \quad (78)$$

where A is defined by Eq. 62. Equations 75-78 have an analytic solution:

$$g = \chi^{-1}, \quad f = \chi^{-\alpha_1}, \quad h = \chi^{-\alpha_2} \quad (79)$$

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{17 + \epsilon - 4k}{12 + \epsilon - 3k}, \quad \alpha_2 = \frac{21 - \epsilon(14 + \epsilon - 4k) - 6k}{(1 - \epsilon)(12 + \epsilon - 3k)} \quad (80)$$

for

$$m = \frac{(1 + \epsilon)^2 + 3(1 + \epsilon)(4 - k) - 4}{3 - \epsilon} > -1. \quad (81)$$

The energy contained in the blast wave is therefore given by:

$$E(t) = \frac{8\pi\rho_1}{3} \frac{3 - \epsilon}{17 + \epsilon - 4k} \Gamma^2 t^3, \quad (82)$$

where ρ_1 should be understood as the density of the external medium at the position of the shock.

As in the solution with homogeneous medium, it is interesting to check if another solution can be obtained by incorporating another shock into the self similar solution. However, Eq. 73 is valid also for the this solution, and no additional shock can be fitted into this self-similar solution.

5. Comparison to the limiting radiative cases

5.1. The fully radiative solution

The fully radiative solution deserves a special attention due to the singularity in the boundary conditions both in the Newtonian and in the extreme relativistic limits. To clarify the situation we re-derive following Ostriker & McKee (1988) the Newtonian fully radiative solutions. Then we discuss the validity of these solutions and compare them to our self

similar solution. Next we obtain a new fully radiative solution for the relativistic case and compare it to the Blandford-McKee fully radiative solution and to our self similar solutions.

In the Newtonian case we assume that all the matter is concentrated in a narrow shell, and look for a self similar solution. We define a dimensionless kinetic energy, and use Eq. 16 with $\epsilon = 1$ to find

$$\sigma = \frac{\rho_1 V U_{sh}^2}{E_0 (\frac{t}{t_0})^\lambda} = -\frac{2\lambda}{3} \left(\frac{5}{2 + \lambda} \right), \quad (83)$$

where $V = 4\pi R_{sh}^3/3$ is the volume swept by the blast wave. The pressure must be constant in the empty interior (otherwise it will lead to infinite acceleration). We find

$$\bar{P} = \frac{(\hat{\gamma} - 1)}{V} \left(E_0 \left(\frac{t}{t_0} \right)^\lambda - \frac{1}{2} \rho_1 V U_{sh}^2 \right) = \rho_1 U_{sh}^2 \left(\frac{1}{\sigma} - \frac{1}{2} \right) (\hat{\gamma} - 1). \quad (84)$$

The equation of motion for a narrow shell is:

$$\frac{d(\rho_1 V U_{sh})}{dt} = 4\pi R_{sh}^2 \bar{P}. \quad (85)$$

Substitution of Eqs. 83 and 84 in Eq. 85 yields a quadratic equation with two solutions:

$$\lambda = \begin{cases} -\frac{3}{4} & MCS \\ -\frac{6(\hat{\gamma}-1)}{2+3\hat{\gamma}} & PDS \end{cases} \quad (86)$$

The MCS solution incorporate an empty interior, with no pressure. In the PDS solution

$$\bar{P} V^{\hat{\gamma}} \propto \frac{R_{sh}^2}{t^2} R_{sh}^{3\hat{\gamma}} \propto t^{\left(\frac{2+\lambda}{5}\right)(2+3\hat{\gamma})-2} = const., \quad (87)$$

during the blast wave expansion corresponding to an adiabatic expansion in which new matter does not enter the blast wave interior. This behavior is consistent with our assumption that new matter accretes only on the expanding shell.

The existence of two possible solutions with the same boundary conditions is unusual. Therefore, one should recognize the physical conditions which leads to each of the self similar solutions. Cioffi et al. (1988) have found numerically that a supernova remnant (SNR) evolves initially according to the adiabatic Sedov-Taylor solution, becomes PDS when the energy loss near the shock becomes important, and finally becomes MCS when other processes cool the blast wave interior. Gaffet (1983) has investigated blast waves with power-law cooling functions, $\mathcal{L} \propto \rho T^{-c}$. He has found that $c > -2/3$ leads to the MCS solution, $c \rightarrow -2$ leads to the PDS solution and other values of c do not lead to self similar solutions. Since lower values of c correspond to less effective cooling in lower temperature (i.e., to a more adiabatic interior), no interior cooling results, asymptotically, in the PDS solution.

Approaching the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$, without taking into account interior cooling, results in the PDS solution. During the PDS expansion no matter enters the interior which expands adiabatically. Incorporating even an infinitesimal interior cooling will cool the interior down eventually, and the blast wave will asymptotically approach the MCS solution. Therefore, the limit of a fully radiative blast wave with adiabatic interior results in the MCS or PDS solution depending on the way we reach the limit of an adiabatic interior.. Our self similar solution reaches the PDS solution in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ limit. This is due to the adiabatic interior assumption, which, following the previous arguments, forbids a MCS solution.

Blandford & McKee (1976) have calculated the dynamics of a fully radiative relativistic blast wave with an impulsive supply of energy, treating the swept-up matter as lying in a thin, cold shell adjacent to the shock and assuming a cold interior (similarly to the Newtonian MCS solution). They have found that $\Gamma \propto R^{-3}$, which translates to an evolution of energy as seen by the observer:

$$E \propto t_{obs}^{-3/7}. \quad (88)$$

We proceed by deriving a PDS like relativistic solution. In the extreme relativistic limit we assume that $e \gg \rho$ in order to obtain self-similar solution. The motion of a matter shell is not self-similar, and we cannot follow the Newtonian derivation step by step. However, we know from Eq. 73 that in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 1$ limit the matter moves with same speed as shell of constant χ , i.e. new matter does not enter the blast wave interior, as in the Newtonian solution. We obtain the internal pressure, P , looking at the evolution of a shell with a constant χ and a constant width $d\chi$. Using Eq. 51 we find to the leading order in Γ^{-2} :

$$dR \propto d\chi \Gamma^{-2-2/m}, \quad R \propto \Gamma^{-2/m}, \quad (89)$$

where dR and R are the shells' width and its radius, in the unshocked matter frame. We use Eq. 52 to find that $P \propto \Gamma^2$, and obtain:

$$PV^{\hat{\gamma}} \propto \Gamma^{2-(6/m+1)\hat{\gamma}}, \quad (90)$$

including a Lorentz transformation of the shell width to the matter frame. Requiring that $PV^{\hat{\gamma}} = const.$ we obtain $m = 12$. Using Eq. 71 we finally find:

$$E \propto t_{obs}^{-9/13}, \quad (91)$$

As in the Newtonian case, our self similar relativistic solution approaches the PDS solution in the fully radiative limit. An analytic treatment of the validity of the MCS and PDS solution does not exist in the relativistic case. However, in view of the Newtonian solution we expect that interior cooling is needed in order to obtain the MCS solution.

5.2. Solutions for $\epsilon \ll 1$

Using the conditions at the shock, and our radiation model with parameter ϵ , we have found the energy loss rate for the Newtonian (Eq. 10) and for the extreme relativistic (Eq. 42) limits. Assuming that a self similar solution exists, we have found scaling laws for the conditions at the shock, (Eq. 15 or Eq. 50). Substituting the energy (calculated from the self similar profiles, Eqs 21 or 63) and combining the two, we have found equations which relates the energy decrease rate, the radiative parameter and the hydrodynamic profiles (Eqs. 16 or Eq. 65).

Self similarity requires that the energy is a power-law of time. The non-dimensional profiles are needed to determine the power-law index. In Sec. 3.2 and Sec. 4.2 of this paper, we have solved the self similar equations to obtain this index. However, as suggested by the relativistic calculations of Sari (1997), if $\epsilon \ll 1$ a simpler derivation exists. We assume that in this case the radiation does not alter the hydrodynamic profiles and use the adiabatic Sedov-Taylor or Blandford-McKee profiles to obtain the power-law index.

In the Newtonian case the hydrodynamic profiles enter Eq. 16 through the self similar location of the shock front. Assuming that the profiles do not depend on radiation, the shocks' location is constant, i.e. $\xi_0 = \xi_0(\epsilon = 0)$. Substituting this into Eq. 16 we find the energy decrease rate to the lowest order

$$\lambda = -\frac{16\pi[\xi_0(\epsilon = 0)]^5}{125}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (92)$$

For $\hat{\gamma} = 5/3$ we obtain $\lambda = -0.81\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2)$. The limiting curves appear in Fig. 3.

In the relativistic case the profiles enters Eq. 65 through $\int_1^\infty fgd\chi$. We use the adiabatic Blandford-McKee solution to obtain $\int_1^\infty fgd\chi = 12/17$, and find to the lowest order in ϵ

$$-\frac{d\log(E)}{d\log(t_{obs})} = \frac{1}{\int_1^\infty fgd\chi}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2) = \frac{17}{12}\epsilon + O(\epsilon^2). \quad (93)$$

This limit is shown in Fig. 7. This result differs from Sari (1997) due to a missing factor of 4/3 in his Lorentz transformation of the energy density (see footnote 2).

We conclude by noting that in the Newtonian and in the extreme relativistic limits, the change in the blast wave evolution causes the energy to decrease slower than what was calculated earlier using adiabatic estimates.

6. Conclusions

We have solved the hydrodynamical evolution of blast waves in which each shocked particle emits a fixed fraction of the energy it gains in the shock. We have divided the blast wave into three regions: the adiabatic shock, the radiative layer, and the adiabatic interior. The adiabatic shock and the radiation layer were combined to form a “radiative shock”, which set the boundary conditions for the adiabatic interior.

For fast cooling cases we have obtained a solution for a planar radiative layer with arbitrary shock velocities, independent of the cooling process. We have found that in the shock frame the fluid cools, slows down and its pressure *increases* during the cooling process.

We have obtained self similar solutions for adiabatic interior for the Newtonian and the extreme relativistic cases. We find that radiation can change the hydrodynamics considerably. Because of this change in the blast wave evolution the luminosity decays slower (in time) than what was estimated earlier assuming that the self similar profiles are independent of the radiated energy.

We have also found that as a blast wave becomes more radiative, its matter concentrates near the shock and forms a dense shell. However, the internal pressure does not drop to zero. In the fully radiative limit of Newtonian blast waves we have reached the pressure-driven solution. We have obtained a new extreme relativistic solution for fully radiative blast wave, which resembles the Newtonian PDS solution. Our self similar solutions reach this modified solution in the fully radiative limit. This solution does not correspond to the Blandford-McKee radiative solution.

The pressure must be continuous within the adiabatic interior and it cannot develop self a similar shock or a rarefaction wave (apart from the main strong shock with the ISM). Therefore, even in the Newtonian PDS limit with isobaric interior, the solution contains a self similar transition layer between the “radiative shock” conditions and the internal pressure.

The recently discovered X-ray, optical and radio emission following a GRB, so called “Afterglow” is widely believed to be the result of the deceleration of a relativistic material that collides with the surrounding matter. According to the common model, the shock wave produced by the collision accelerates electrons to relativistic velocities. These electrons, that carry a fixed fraction of the internal energy produced by the shock emit synchrotron radiation which is the observed afterglow. For reasonable parameters, the electron cooling is fast (at least in the early stages of the afterglow evolution), so that the electrons lose most of their energy. Since the density behind the shock is low, the coupling between

the electrons and the protons is negligible. Therefore, the protons energy is not radiated away. This leads to a partially radiative rather than a fully radiative shock, followed by an adiabatic flow. This is *exactly* the scenario that leads to the partially radiative blast waves derived in this paper. Our new self similar partially radiative blast wave can serve as the basic hydrodynamic solution from which spectra and light curves of the afterglow can be calculated. In particular we derive a new $\Gamma(R)$ relation (Eqs. 66, 50) between the Lorentz factor and the radius. This is the critical relation that determines most afterglow observations.

This research was supported by a US-Israel BSF grant 95-238 and by a NASA grant NAG5-3516. Re'em Sari thanks the Clore Foundations for support.

REFERENCES

- Blandford, R.D. & McKee C.F. (1976) *Phys. Fluids*, **19**, 1130
- Cioffi, D.F., McKee, C.F. & Bertschinger E. (1988) *ApJ*, **334**, 252
- Gaffet, B.,(1983) *ApJ*, **273**, 267
- Landau, L.D. & Lifshitz E.M. (1987), *Fluid Mechanics*, Pergamon press.
- Ostriker, J. P. & McKee C.F., (1988) *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **60**, 1
- Sari, R., (1997) *ApJ*, **489**, L37
- Sedov, L., (1969) *Similarity and Dimensional Methods in Mechanics*, Academic Press New York, Chap. IV.
- Shu, F.H., (1992) *Gas Dynamics*, University Science Books, pg. 235.
- Taylor, G. I., (1950) *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **201**, 159




Fig. 1.— Density as a function of distance from the center of the blast wave. The schematic drawing depicts the model used to obtain a self similar solution. It includes an adiabatic shock, a small radiative regime and an adiabatic self similar regime.




Fig. 2.— Pressure as a function of density for the shock and the cooling profile. The dotted arrow illustrates the adiabatic shock. The fluid then follows the appropriate line (Newtonian - thin; Extreme relativistic - thick) until it reaches the cooling parameter. Labels A and B describes the density and pressure of the shocked matter immediately after the shock (ρ_2 , p_2). Note that in the relativistic case the pressure is constant within the cooling layer. Label C describes the maximal pressure ($\rho_1 U_{sh}^2$), reached in the fully radiative Newtonian case at the end of the cooling layer.




Fig. 3.— The energy loss rate $-d\log(E)/d\log(t)$ as a function of ϵ for $\hat{\gamma} = 4/3$ (lower curve) and $\hat{\gamma} = 5/3$ (upper curve). The dashed-dotted lines are the linear approximation for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, assuming that the self similar profile does not depend on ϵ . The circles are the corresponding PDS solutions.




Fig. 4.— The normalized density (solid), velocity(dashed-dotted) and pressure (dashed) profiles of the self similar Newtonian solution, for $\epsilon = 0, 0.3, 0.7, 0.9$. The arrows show the direction of increasing ϵ .




Fig. 5.— The velocity in the shock frame as a function of the density for the extreme relativistic shock (dotted arrow) and for the cooling profile (solid line)




Fig. 6.— The normalized density (solid), the Lorenz factor (dashed-dotted) and the pressure (dashed) profiles of the self similar extreme relativistic solution, for $\epsilon = 0, 0.5, 0.8, 0.95$. The arrows shows the direction of increasing ϵ .




Fig. 7.— The observed energy loss rate, $-d \log(E)/d \log(t_{obs})$, as a function of ϵ , extreme relativistic case (solid line). The dashed line is the energy loss rate for the fully radiative, MCS like, Blandford-McKee solution. The dashed-dotted lines are the linear approximation for $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, assuming that the self similar profile does not depend on ϵ




Fig. 8.— Simulated (x-marks) and self similar (solid line) solutions for the *interior* of an adiabatic ($\epsilon = 0$) and a partially radiative ($\epsilon = 0.8$) blast waves. The initial conditions are $\Gamma = \sqrt{2} \cdot 500$, $R = 1$. Note the larger Lorentz factors and densities in the radiative solution.




Fig. 9.— Radiated energy as a fraction of the work done by the shock on the surrounding medium, vs. the fraction of internal energy the shock distributes to electrons. The calculation assume that electrons and protons are not coupled outside of the shock, and that only the electrons radiate.