

# KINETIC EQUATION MODEL FOR SELF-GRAVITATING SYSTEMS

A.E. ALLAHVERDYAN<sup>1,2)</sup> AND TH.M. NIEUWENHUIZEN<sup>3)</sup>

<sup>1)</sup> *CEA/Saclay, Service de Physique Theorique, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France,*

<sup>2)</sup> *Yerevan Physics Institute, Alikhanian Brothers St. 2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia*

<sup>3)</sup> *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Amsterdam,  
Valckenierstraat 65, 1018 XE Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

The kinetic theory of a self-gravitating system is considered in the Bhatnager-Gross-Krook approximation to the kinetic equation. This approach offers a unique and tractable setup for studying the central, collision-dominated region of the system, as well as its almost collisionless outer part. Stationary non-equilibrium states of the system are considered and several different self-similar solutions are identified.

## 1 Introduction

There is a long tradition of applications the kinetic theory to the gas of self-gravitating particles <sup>1-4</sup>. The first regular approach of that kind was developed by Chandrasekhar <sup>1</sup>, and appeared to be very useful in astrophysical applications. Indeed, the kinetic theory is certainly applicable for globular star clusters, which are rather well-isolated systems on the relevant time-scales, and contain sufficiently many (typically of order  $N \sim 10^5$ ) stars <sup>5</sup>. Therefore, the kinetic approach, which typically studies a closed, macroscopic system, has a definite range of validity here. It allows to identify correctly the collisional time-scale <sup>1-4</sup>, and predict the moderate and late stages of the evolution for globular clusters <sup>6</sup>.

The general method for constructing the collisional Fokker-Planck equation for statistical systems with  $1/r$  interaction was proposed in <sup>8</sup> (see also the text-book descriptions in <sup>1,2,3,4,7</sup>). This equation adopts a more general strategy for Boltzmann's kinetic equation to the considered long-range interacting system. After suitably dealing with the peculiarities of the long-range interaction, one ends up with the collisional Fokker-Planck equation. The main difficulty with this equation is that it is technically rather involved and resistant to reliable analytical treatments. Thus, one has to change the level of description and move to hydrodynamical models of the stellar dynamics (see e.g., <sup>3,4</sup> and refs. therein). Instead of the one-particle distribution function, which is the basic object of the kinetic theory, the hydrodynamical approach operates with a few coarse-grained hydrodynamic variables, but by its meaning it is applicable only to the dense central regions of the self-gravitating system, where collisions are certainly dominating.

In this contribution we present another approach to the kinetic theory of self-gravitating systems. This is an approach of kinetic models, where instead of going immediately to the hydrodynamical level of description, one is properly *modelling* the collisional part of the kinetic equation, trying to preserve its main qualitative characteristics, but to make the system analytically tractable. One of the most successful kinetic models was proposed by Bhatnager, Gross and Krook (BGK) <sup>9,10,11,12</sup>, and since that time appeared to be very useful in the kinetic theory.

The reason of its success is that the model offers a minimal way to incorporate the necessary conservation laws (those of particle number, momentum and energy) with a simple relaxation mechanism. For a self-gravitating statistical system this approach provides natural methods to consider simultaneously the collision-dominated (overdamped) regions of the system, and its almost collisionless outer domains (underdamping).

In the present contribution we will restrict ourselves to the presentation of the BGK-method as applied to self-gravitating systems (section II), and to straightforward analytical investigations which will recover within a single setup several known and also new results for the steady regime of behavior (section III). More detailed investigation of the situation, as well as the presentation of more elaborated BGK-type models, are planned for future.

## 2 Bhatnager-Gross-Krook kinetic equation

The statistical dynamics of  $N$  point particles with unit mass interacting through Newton's inverse-square law, will be considered in the classical kinetic approach. This basically involves two important assumptions: (i) The field acting on a given particle (test particle) can be represented as a mean, self-consistent field plus a contribution from two-particle collisions. (ii) As usual, a collision between a pair of particles is taken to be independent of the others, and local (namely, it leads to sudden changes in the corresponding momenta, whereas the coordinates can be considered as fixed).

The mean-field assumption is reasonable for a system having long-range forces, since they suppress fluctuations. On the other hand, the second assumption concerning the simple cumulative effect of independent collisions was subjected to a certain criticism (see e.g., <sup>7</sup>), because the long-range unshielded gravitational coupling involve many simultaneously interacting particles. Nevertheless, an impressive amount of observational and numerical material has been obtained, which advocates the use of the present approach at least on certain time-scales <sup>3,6</sup>.

According to our assumptions the contribution from the direct interaction between the particles is added on the right-hand side of the Liouville equation for the one-particle distribution function  $f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t)$  as the corresponding collision integral  $\mathcal{C}[f]$ :

$$\frac{df}{dt} \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + \vec{v} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{r}} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \vec{r}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{v}} = \mathcal{C}[f] \quad (1)$$

The mass of each particle is taken be unity,  $m = 1$ , and the potential  $\phi(\vec{r})$  can be viewed as an external despite its self-consistent closure with the Poisson equation:

$$\Delta \phi = 4\pi G \int d\vec{v} f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t) = 4\pi G n(\vec{r}) \quad (2)$$

As usual in kinetic theory, the distribution function  $f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t)$  is normalized on the total number of particles, namely

$$\int d\vec{v} f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t) = n(\vec{r}) \quad (3)$$

is the density of particles, and

$$\int d\vec{r} n(\vec{r}) = N \quad (4)$$

is the total number of particles.

Instead of deriving the collision integral of the kinetic equation from the underlying microscopic dynamics, Bhatnager, Gross and Krook proposed the following model for the collisional integral <sup>9</sup>:

$$\mathcal{C}_{BGK}[f] = -\nu(r)[f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t) - f_0(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t)], \quad (5)$$

where  $\nu(r) > 0$ , and  $f_0$  is the best local Maxwellian

$$f_0(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t) = \frac{n(\vec{r}, t)}{(2\pi T(\vec{r}, t))^{3/2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\vec{v} - \vec{u}(\vec{r}, t))^2}{2T(\vec{r}, t)}\right), \quad (6)$$

where  $n(\vec{r}, t)$ ,  $T(\vec{r}, t)$ ,  $\vec{u}(\vec{r}, t)$  are defined by the following conditions:

$$n(\vec{r}, t) = \int d\vec{v} f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t), \quad (7)$$

$$n(\vec{r}, t)\vec{u}(\vec{r}, t) = \int d\vec{v} \vec{v} f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t), \quad (8)$$

$$3n(\vec{r}, t)T(\vec{r}, t) = \int d\vec{v} (\vec{v} - \vec{u}(\vec{r}, t))^2 f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t). \quad (9)$$

Due to these conditions the collision integral (5) conserves probability, momentum and energy, and in the spatially homogeneous case  $T = T(\vec{r}, t)$  it enforces convergence of the distribution function  $f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t)$  to the corresponding Gibbs distribution. One should notice that BGK collision integral (5) is still non-linear due to these self-consistency relations. However, this non-linearity is based on the first three moments of  $f$  only, which means that BGK scheme will be friendly to moments equations and related procedures. Another attractive property of BGK model is that though being proposed *ad hoc*, it was later derived from the Boltzmann equation in both rarefied (low-density), and dense limits <sup>1112</sup>. In particular, relations with more formal approximation methods (e.g., those proposed by Chapman-Enskog or Grad) were established <sup>1012</sup>. Thus, there is a general expectation that this approximation will reasonably mimic the main properties of the original Boltzmann equation.

The general conditions of invariance and convergence do not specify  $\nu(r)$ , which has a meaning of the inverse characteristic relaxation time. It should not depend on  $\vec{v}$ , since else the conservation laws cannot be satisfied. Obviously, the concrete choice of  $\nu(\vec{r}, t)$  should be determined demanding that Eq. (5) is as close as possible to the original Boltzmann equation. A standard assumption is that  $\nu$  depends on the coordinate  $\vec{r}$  and time  $t$  through the  $\vec{r}$ -dependence of the first three moments,  $\nu = \nu(n, \vec{u}, T)$ , and a general procedure was proposed to derive its concrete form <sup>9</sup>. We will not go into details of that procedure, but we will show that already rather simple qualitative considerations determine its rough form, and then we will directly take for it the expression for the inverse characteristic time, which was obtained from the full Boltzmann equation in Refs. <sup>1,3</sup>. To determine  $\nu$  one notices

that in the rarefied case it is proportional to  $n$ , and then due to obvious dimensional reasons one has

$$\nu(\vec{r}, t) \propto \frac{n(\vec{r}, t)}{T(\vec{r}, t)^{3/2}}. \quad (10)$$

In this context one could wonder why only  $T$  and not  $\phi$  should enter  $\nu$ . Since  $\nu$  belongs to the collision integral, according to the common initial assumption the influence of the field is not taken into account there. Indeed, in the full Boltzmann equation binary collisions are considered in such a way that only microscopic two-particle interaction enters there, and not the mean-field. This is inevitable to find tractable schemes, and means that collisions occur on such time and length-scales, where the effect of the mean-field is not relevant.

More precisely, we notice the binary collision relaxation time obtained through the complete Boltzmann equation <sup>1,3,4,7</sup>

$$t_r = \frac{0.065 \langle v^2 \rangle^{3/2}}{nmG^2 \ln(0.4N)} \quad (11)$$

with the right hand side calculated at typical radius  $R$ , and where we momentarily recovered the dimensional units. Thus, we just take  $1/\nu$  equal to the local relaxation time, so

$$\nu(r) = \frac{1}{t_r(r)} = \frac{nmG^2 \ln(0.4N)}{0.065 \langle v^2 \rangle^{3/2}} \equiv \frac{15.4 \ln(0.4N) G^2 m^{5/2} n(r)}{T(r)^{3/2}} = \gamma \frac{n(r)}{T(r)^{3/2}}, \quad (12)$$

$$\gamma = 15.4 \ln(0.4N) G^2 m^{5/2} \quad (13)$$

is the inverse relaxation time at position  $r$  <sup>3</sup>. To estimate whether collisions are relevant compared with the motion in the mean-field, one has to compare  $t_{rel}$  with the dynamical time-scale  $t_d$ . For a cluster with mass  $M = Nm$  and typical radius  $R$  the dynamical time is

$$t_d = \frac{R}{\bar{v}} = \frac{R^{3/2}}{\sqrt{GM}} \quad (14)$$

The situation  $t_r(r) \ll t_d$  means that collisions dominate (overdamping), and  $t_r(r) \gg t_d$  indicates underdamping. This qualitative criterion will be applied to determine the transition from the outer weakly-damped part of the system (halo) to the inner strongly-damped part (core).

### 2.1 *H-theorem and convergence to equilibrium*

Let us now briefly show that if the conditions for equilibrium are satisfied, then the BGK-collisional term (5) indeed induces convergence toward the Gibbs distribution. To this end we will consider the time-behavior of the Boltzmann-Gibbs entropy:

$$S(t) = - \int d\vec{r} d\vec{v} f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t) \ln f(\vec{r}, \vec{v}, t), \quad (15)$$

$$\dot{S} = \int d\vec{r} d\vec{v} \nu(r) [f - f_0] \ln f + \int d\vec{r} d\vec{v} \left[ \bar{v} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{r}} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \vec{r}} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \vec{v}} \right] \ln f \quad (16)$$

Using the fact that  $\int d\vec{v} [f - f_0] \ln f_0 = 0$ , which is conservation of probability, momentum and energy, one can rewrite the first term in r.h.s. of Eq. (16) as

$$\int d\vec{r} \nu(r) d\vec{v} \left[ f \ln \frac{f}{f_0} + f_0 \ln \frac{f_0}{f} \right] \geq 0, \quad (17)$$

since

$$\int d\vec{v} f \ln \frac{f}{f_0} \geq 0 \quad (18)$$

for any distributions  $f, f_0$ . The second term in r.h.s. of Eq. (16) can be presented as an integral over the corresponding surface in the coordinate space

$$\oint d\vec{S} \int d\vec{v} \vec{v} f \ln f \quad (19)$$

If there are no global currents this integral is zero, and we obtain the H-theorem:

$$\dot{S} \geq 0 \quad (20)$$

Monotonically increasing at finite times  $S$  will saturate in the infinite-time limit:  $f = f_0$ . Substituting this expression in l.h.s of the kinetic equation we will get the Gibbs distribution

$$T = \text{const.}, \quad n(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-\beta\phi(\vec{r})} \quad (21)$$

If there are global currents in the system, then the actual distribution is not known a priori, and the full kinetic equation has to be solved.

## 2.2 Kinetic equation in spherical coordinates

Since we will consider non-equilibrium distribution functions, which are in a sense close to be isotropic, it is reasonable to employ spherical coordinates:

$$x = r \sin \theta \cos \varphi, \quad y = r \sin \theta \sin \varphi, \quad z = r \cos \theta, \quad (22)$$

In the local Cartesian base  $\{\vec{e}_r, \vec{e}_\theta, \vec{e}_\varphi\}$  (e.g.,  $\vec{e}_r$  is a unit vector, which points out from  $r$  to  $r + dr$ ) velocity will have components

$$\vec{v} = v_r \vec{e}_r + v_\theta \vec{e}_\theta + v_\varphi \vec{e}_\varphi, \quad (23)$$

where

$$v_x = v_r \sin \theta \cos \varphi + v_\theta \cos \theta \cos \varphi - v_\varphi \sin \varphi, \quad (24)$$

$$v_y = v_r \sin \theta \sin \varphi + v_\theta \cos \theta \sin \varphi + v_\varphi \cos \varphi, \quad (25)$$

$$v_z = v_r \cos \theta - v_\theta \sin \theta, \quad (26)$$

In the spherical coordinates the kinetic equation will read

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + v_r \frac{\partial f}{\partial r} + \frac{v_\theta}{r} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} + \frac{v_\varphi}{r \sin \theta} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \varphi} + \left[ \frac{v_\theta^2 + v_\varphi^2}{r} - \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial r} \right] \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_r} \\ + \frac{\cot \theta}{r} \left[ v_\varphi^2 \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_\theta} - v_\varphi v_\theta \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_\varphi} \right] - \frac{v_r}{r} \left[ v_\theta \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_\theta} + v_\varphi \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_\varphi} \right] = \mathcal{C}_{BGK}[f] \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

We will consider non-equilibrium states with radial symmetry. We will assume that  $\phi(r, \theta, \varphi) = \phi(r)$ , and the distribution function  $f$  is non-equilibrium exclusively through its radial properties:

$$f(r, \theta, \varphi, v_r, v_\theta, v_\varphi) = f(r, v_r) \frac{1}{2\pi T(r)} \exp \left[ -\frac{v_\theta^2 + v_\varphi^2}{2T(r)} \right], \quad (28)$$

namely there is no dependence on the angular coordinates, and the angular velocities have relaxed to equilibrium. In fact, Eq. (28) is the minimal Ansatz, which allows to study non-equilibrium states within the simplest spherical geometry.

For the collision term one has

$$\mathcal{C}_{BGK}[f] = -\nu(r) [f(r, v_r) - f_0(r, v_r)] \times \frac{1}{2\pi T(r)} \exp \left[ -\frac{v_\theta^2 + v_\varphi^2}{2T(r)} \right], \quad (29)$$

$$f_0(r, v) = \frac{n(r)}{[2\pi T(r)]^{1/2}} \exp \left( -\frac{(v-u)^2}{2T(r)} \right), \quad (30)$$

where the mean radial velocity  $u$  describes an average motion (current of particles) along the radial direction.

Let us now substitute Eq. (28) to Eq. (27), and integrate by  $v_\theta, v_\varphi$ . The result will read

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + v_r f' - \phi' \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_r} + \frac{2T(r)}{r} \left[ f(r) \frac{v_r}{T(r)} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_r} \right] = -\nu(r) [f(r, v_r) - f_0(r, v_r)] \quad (31)$$

where  $f' = \partial f(r, v_r) / \partial v_r$ ,  $\phi' = d\phi/dr$ .

### 2.3 Moments

Eq. (31) is still complicated integro-differential equation. To subtract the relevant information from it one considers the subtracted and non-subtracted moments

$$M_l(r) = \int dv_r (v_r - u)^l f(r, v_r), \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_l(r) = \int dv_r v_r^l f(r, v_r), \quad (33)$$

These two types of moments correspond to different experimental situations, since  $M_l(r)$  are measured in the comoving frame, whereas  $\mathcal{M}_l$  at the rest. We will use them in parallel choosing the one or the another as appears most convenient.

The corresponding equations read:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_l + l\dot{u}M_{l-1} + \frac{1}{r^2} [r^2(M_{l+1} + uM_l)]' + l \left( \phi' - \frac{2T}{r} \right) M_{l-1} + lu' [M_l + uM_{l-1}] \\ = -\nu(r) [M_l - \omega(l) nT^{l/2} (l-1)!], \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

where  $\omega(l)$  is zero for  $l$  odd, and equal to 1 for  $l$  even.

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathcal{M}}_l + \frac{1}{r^2}(r^2\mathcal{M}_{l+1})' + l\left(\phi' - \frac{2T}{r}\right)\mathcal{M}_{l-1} \\ = -\nu(r)[\mathcal{M}_l - n\sum_{p=0}^l u^{l-p}T^{p/2}\omega(p)(p-1)!], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Recall that, by construction, the low moments

$$M_0 = n(r), \quad M_1 = 0, \quad M_2 = n(r)T(r), \quad (36)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_0 = n(r), \quad \mathcal{M}_1 = n(r)u(r), \quad \mathcal{M}_2 = n(r)[T + u^2], \quad (37)$$

are the same for  $f_0(r, v_r)$  and  $f(r, v_r)$ . Since this fact expresses conservation of probability, momentum and energy, the equations (34, 35) with  $l = 0, 1, 2$  will be universal, namely they do not depend on the concrete form of the collision integral. Notice also that the third moments are connected as:

$$\mathcal{M}_3 = M_3 + nu^3 + 3unT. \quad (38)$$

Here  $\mathcal{M}_3$  is energy current, which consists of heat current  $M_3$ , transfer of kinetic energy  $nuu^2$ , and work done by pressure  $3unT = 3uP$ .

Let us write down the first members of Eq. (34)

$$l = 0: \quad r^2\dot{n}(r) + (r^2nu)' = 0, \quad (39)$$

$$l = 1: \quad n\dot{u} + (nT)' + n\phi' + nuu' = 0, \quad (40)$$

$$l = 2: \quad n\dot{T} + \frac{1}{r^2}(r^2M_3)' + 2u'nT + unT' = 0, \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} l = 3: \quad \dot{M}_3 + 3nT\dot{u} + \frac{1}{r^2}[r^2(M_4 + uM_3)]' + 3u'[M_3 + nuT] \\ + 3nT\left(\phi' - \frac{2T(r)}{r}\right) = -\nu(r)M_3, \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

$$\begin{aligned} l = 4: \quad \dot{M}_4 + 4M_3\dot{u} + \frac{1}{r^2}[r^2(M_5 + uM_4)]' + 4u'[M_4 + uM_3] \\ + 4M_3\left(\phi' - \frac{2T(r)}{r}\right) = -\nu(r)(M_4 - 3nT^2) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Eq. (39) expresses conservation of the mass inside the sphere  $r$ . When  $u = 0$  Eq. (40) expresses hydrostatic equilibrium; when  $u \neq 0$  it contains flow terms, that should be easy to understand. The equation for  $l = 2$  expresses the conservation of energy; for obtaining it we have also inserted Eq. (39).

Somewhat different, but of course, totally equivalent expressions will be obtained for the  $\mathcal{M}$ -moments.

Eqs. (39-43) are inherently attached to the Poisson equation:

$$\frac{1}{r^2}(r^2\phi')' = 4\pi Gn(r). \quad (44)$$

The density  $n(r)$  should satisfy to the condition of integrability,

$$4\pi \int_0^\infty dr n(r)r^2 = N. \quad (45)$$

Notice that equations with  $l \geq 2$  can be written in a form, which does not contain  $\phi'$  explicitly. In that respect their combination can be viewed as equations of state. For example, using Eq. (40), the for result for  $l = 3$  reads

$$\dot{M}_3 + \frac{1}{r^2}[r^2(M_4 + uM_3 - 3nT^2)]' + 3u'M_3 + 3nTT' = -\nu(r)M_3. \quad (46)$$

### 3 Steady state.

As was already indicated in the introduction, we will consider the stationary (steady) situation. This case, where all quantities are time-independent, is worth to study for its own sake, since there are clear observational evidences that typical globular clusters do have such a phase in their evolution<sup>5,6</sup>. On the other hand, it is a necessary step towards understanding of more general, time-dependent situation.

In the situation, where the known conditions for equilibrium are satisfied (e.g., absence of energy and/or probability currents), the self-gravitating system under study has the Gibbs distribution as its only steady state. This point was already illustrated by us when considering the H-theorem in section 2.1. In certain range of temperatures this distribution is physical (e.g., it is at least metastable), but it loses its stability for temperatures lower than a certain critical temperature<sup>7</sup>. This is the notorious phenomenon of gravo-thermal instability (collapse)<sup>3,4,7</sup>. However, there are situations, where one expects that the very reasons for the existence of the equilibrium can be invalid. The most typical situation of that kind appears with binary star formation and tightening processes in the central region of a star cluster<sup>3,4,5</sup>. These processes are accompanied with a release of energy, so that the rest of the system (namely its outer with respect to a relatively small part, where the binary-formation process occurs) can be considered as being subjected to sources of energy put in the central part. The existence of energy currents from the central part leads to a non-equilibrium steady state. Additionally, they can stabilize the behavior of the self-gravitating system preventing its collapse, since the mechanism of the gravothermal instability is connected with spontaneous energy currents towards the center<sup>3,4,5</sup>.

A somewhat more exotic example of a non-equilibrium steady state can be provided by the existence of a black hole in the central part of a star cluster<sup>3,4,5</sup>. Then one has a stationary current of consumed stars, which is directed towards the center, as well as a related current of energy.

Our setup with the moments equations is especially suitable for describing the above non-equilibrium states, since there are explicit expressions for the energy current,  $\mathcal{M}_3$  and the current of particles  $u$ .

#### 3.1 Ideal hydrodynamics

This scheme is determined by a condition  $M_3 = 0$  (no heat current). The nonequilibrium character is displayed only through the stationary current of particles  $u$ .

Eqs. (39-41) read

$$(r^2 n u)' = 0, \quad (nT)' + n\phi' + nuu' = 0, \quad 2u'nT + unT' = 0. \quad (47)$$



Recall that the usual gibbsian equilibrium is a particular case of this situation, which is realized for  $u = 0$ , and an additional assumption that  $T = \text{const}$ . In this case Eqs. (47, 47) are trivial, and Eq. (47) leads to the Gibbs distribution.

Let us first assume that  $u$  does not depend of  $r$ . Then Eq. (47) predicts that  $T = \text{const}$ . With Eq. (47) one gets

$$n = \frac{c}{u} \frac{1}{r^2}, \quad c = \text{const}, \quad (48)$$

Notice that similar to the isothermal case this distribution is non-integrable at infinity, and therefore predicts infinite mass. Being combined with the Poisson equation (44), Eq. (47) offers an exact solution:

$$\phi = 2T \ln r + \phi_0. \quad (49)$$

To study the case  $u \neq \text{const}$  one first notice that Eq. (47) can be exactly integrated

$$T = \frac{c_1}{u^2}, \quad c_1 = \text{const} \quad (50)$$

Eqs. (48, 50) combined with (47-47) lead to

$$c_1 u r^2 (u^{-3} r^{-2})' \phi' + u' u = 0, \quad u (r^2 \phi')' = 4\pi G c. \quad (51)$$

To study self-similar solutions, one makes an Ansatz  $u = u_0 r^\alpha$ , and gets from Eq. (51)

$$-c_1 u_0^{-2} (3\alpha + 2) r^{-2\alpha-1} + \phi' + \alpha u_0^2 r^{2\alpha-1} = 0 \quad (52)$$

Consulting with the Poisson equation one observes that for small distances the last term in Eq. (52) can be neglected, and as the result one has the following asymptotic solution at small distances  $\alpha = 1/2$  and

$$\phi' \simeq \frac{7c_1}{2u_0^2} r^{-2} + \frac{8\pi G c}{u_0} r^{-3/2}, \quad T \simeq \frac{c_1}{u_0^2} r^{-1}, \quad n \simeq \frac{c}{u_0} r^{-5/2}. \quad (53)$$

It is seen that the density is singular at the origin, but still integrable. The first term in  $\phi'$  indicates the presence of the central mass  $7c_1/(2u_0^2 G)$ . This implies the following choice:  $u_0 < 0$ ,  $c < 0$ , and then the obtained solution describes a stationary consumption regime of stars by the central mass. The energy current  $M_3 = nu^3 + 3nuT$  is also directed towards the center.

### 3.2 Overdamped situation

Starting since this moment, we will into the consideration an energy current, described by  $M_3$ . We make a self-consistent assumption that there is a range of distances close to the inner part (i.e., the core), where collisions dominate. In this overdamped regime  $\eta = (\text{dynamic time})/(\text{kinetic time})$  is large, and the large  $\nu(r)$  in the r.h.s. of Eqs. (42, 43) imposes the Gaussian behavior for the corresponding moments:

$$M_3 = \mathcal{O}(1/\eta), \quad M_4 - 3nT^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/\eta) \quad (54)$$

Using the last result as  $M_4 \simeq 3nT^2$  one gets from Eq. (42)

$$3n(r)T(r)T'(r) = -\nu(r)M_3(r) \quad (55)$$

as a constitutive equation for the overdamped case. Let us consider separately cases with  $u = 0$ , and  $u \neq 0$ .

*The case:  $u = 0$*

Then Eq. (41) reduces to

$$M_3 r^2 = \nu_3 = \text{const} \quad (56)$$

If  $\nu_3 > 0$  there is a solution

$$T = \left( \frac{2\gamma\nu_3}{21} \left( \frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r_0} \right) \right)^{2/7} \quad (57)$$

with some integration constant  $r_0$ . The condition  $\nu_3 > 0$  means a positive outward flow of energy. One thus gets for small  $r$

$$T \simeq T_0 r^{-2/7}, \quad T_0 = \left( \frac{2\gamma\nu_3}{21} \right)^{2/7}. \quad (58)$$

Taking this into account one easily gets from the Poisson equation and hydrostatic equilibrium

$$n(r) \simeq n_0 r^{-16/7}, \quad n_0 = \frac{1}{4\pi G} \frac{90}{49} T_0, \quad \frac{16}{7} = 2.2857143, \quad (59)$$

$$\phi'(r) \simeq \phi_0 r^{-9/7}, \quad \phi_0 = \frac{18}{7} T_0. \quad (60)$$

Notice that density is singular at the origin, but integrable. Thus, this solution can be intended to describe a stationary regime without a central mass (as follows from Eq. (60)), but with a stationary tightening of binaries at the very central region. In our setup this last process is reflected through a constant outward heat current.

The mass insider a sphere of radius  $r$  scales as  $M(r) \sim r^{5/7}$ . The inverse is  $r \sim M^{7/5}$ . These are so-called Lagrange radii. If one chooses a set of equidistant  $M$  values, e.g.  $M = i/20$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 20$ , then the radii will be closer to each other near the center than in the outer parts of the cluster. This happen one since  $16/7 > 2$ . If, on the other hand, the density would be finite at the center, then one would have  $r \sim M^{1/3}$ , implying large separations between Lagrange radii near  $M = 0$ .

*The case:  $u \neq 0$*

Here one can still use Eq. (55) for  $M_3$ , which now does not reduce to  $\text{const}/r^2$ . Having substituted this equation to Eq. (41), one obtains

$$l = 0: (r^2 un)' = 0, \quad l = 1: (nT)' + n\phi' + u'un = 0, \quad (61)$$

$$l = 2: -\frac{3}{\gamma} \frac{1}{r^2} [r^2 T^{5/2} T']' + unT' + 2u'nT = 0, \quad (62)$$

For small distances the self-consistent solution of these equations reads

$$n(r) \simeq n_0 r^{-12/5}, \quad T(r) \simeq T_0 r^{-2/5}, \quad u(r) \simeq u_0 r^{2/5}, \quad \phi'(r) \simeq \frac{14}{5} T_0 r^{-7/5} \quad (63)$$

where  $6T_0^{5/2} = 5\gamma u_0 n_0$ . Notice that there is no central mass (as follows from Eq. (63)). Moreover,  $u_0$  has to be positive and  $u(0) = 0$ . Therefore, the obtained solution can be suitable to describe evaporation phenomena.

### 3.3 Underdamped situation

There is yet another extremal situation realized at sufficiently large distances from the center, where the behavior of the system is almost collisionless (underdamping).

*The case with  $u = 0$*

In the underdamping regime one expects that all moments with  $k \geq 3$  will be equally important, therefore they have to behave in the nearly similar way. Looking for a self-consistent, long-distance solution of the hierarchy (39-43) one gets:

$$n(r) \simeq \frac{n_0}{r^{7/2}}, \quad T(r) \simeq \frac{T_0}{r}, \quad \nu(r) \simeq \gamma \frac{n_0 T_0^{-3/2}}{r^2}, \quad (64)$$

$$M_3 = \frac{\nu_3}{r^2}, \quad M_4 \simeq \frac{\nu_4}{r^2} + \gamma \frac{\nu_3 n_0 T_0^{-3/2}}{r^3}, \quad (65)$$

where  $\nu_4, n_0, T_0$  are constant. At this stage of our asymptotic analysis they will remain unfixed. For  $\phi'$  one has from the Poisson equation:

$$\phi'(r) = \frac{GM}{r^2} - \frac{8\pi G n_0}{r^{5/2}}, \quad (66)$$

where the first term is the standard asymptotic limit for a finite-mass cluster with  $M$  as the total mass. The second term follows from Eq. (64). The behavior of  $M_5$  is qualitatively the same as of  $M_4$  as seen from Eq. (43). Our expression for the density given by Eq. (64) coincides with that obtained in <sup>5</sup> for the halo of a globular cluster by means of qualitative physical considerations.

Having substituted Eqs. (64, 64) to hydrostatic equilibrium equation (40), one gets the correction terms to the density and temperature

$$n(r) = \frac{n_0}{r^{7/2}} \left[ 1 + \frac{n_1}{r^{1/2}} + \dots \right], \quad T(r) = \frac{T_0}{r} \left[ 1 + \frac{T_1}{r^{1/2}} + \dots \right], \quad (67)$$

$$5T_0(n_1 + T_1) = GM(n_1 + 8\pi G n_0) \quad (68)$$

with constant  $n_1, T_1$ .

*The case with  $u \neq 0$*

This case is capable to describe the evaporation phenomenon <sup>3,4</sup> as we indicated already in section 3.2. Having this in mind, we will look for a solution, which has the Maxwellian structure for very long distances, since there it is supposed to describe free escaped stars. In other words, for those scales only first two moments  $u = u_0 > 0$  and  $T = T_0 > 0$  are nonzero, and should be viewed as boundary conditions. Possible solutions of this kind should be then matched with the overdamped solutions having finite  $u$ . Notice that the equation (41) for energy can be written in a simplified form

$$\nu_3(r)' + \frac{J(r)}{u^2(r)} [u^2(r)T(r)]' = 0, \quad (69)$$

where  $M_3 = \nu_3(r) r^2$ , and where  $J = r^2 n u$  is the constant current of particles.

Searching again for a self-consistent solution, one gets

$$r^2 n(r) \simeq n_0 + \frac{n_{10} + n_{11} \ln r}{r} + \frac{n_{20} + n_{21} \ln r + n_{22} (\ln r)^2}{r^2}, \quad (70)$$

$$T(r) \simeq T_0 + \frac{T_{10} + T_{11} \ln r}{r} + \frac{T_{20} + T_{21} \ln r + T_{22} (\ln r)^2}{r^2}, \quad (71)$$

$$r\phi' \simeq \phi_0 + \frac{\phi_{10} + \phi_{11} \ln r}{r} + \frac{\phi_{20} + \phi_{21} \ln r + \phi_{22} (\ln r)^2}{r^2}, \quad (72)$$

$$u(r) \simeq u_0 + \frac{u_{10} + u_{11} \ln r}{r} + \frac{u_{20} + u_{21} \ln r + u_{22} (\ln r)^2}{r^2}, \quad (73)$$

$$\nu_3(r) \simeq \nu_{30} + \frac{\nu_{310} + \nu_{311} \ln r}{r} + \frac{\nu_{320} + \nu_{321} \ln r + \nu_{322} (\ln r)^2}{r^2}, \quad (74)$$

$$\nu(r) \simeq \gamma \frac{n_0 T_0^{-3/2}}{r^2}. \quad (75)$$

Higher-order terms can be presented analogously. Notice that density does not have to be integrable at infinity when considering stationary regimes of evaporation. Indeed, the only way to have a truly stationary evaporation regime is to have an infinite amount of stars, the most of them being located at infinity. The appearance of logarithms in the asymptotic expansions is mathematically connected with non-integrable character of the density.

It is seen as well that the leading-order behavior of  $\nu(r)$  is the same for both underdamped regimes (with and without evaporation).

At the present stage of our asymptotic analysis we able to obtain only certain relations between the coefficients of (70-75).

$$(r^2 \phi')' = 4\pi G r^2 n(r) \rightarrow \phi_0 = 4\pi G n_0, \quad n_{11} = u_{11} = 0, \quad \phi_{11} = 4\pi G n_{10}; \quad (76)$$

$$u n r^2 = J, \rightarrow J = u_0 n_0, \quad n_0 u_{10} + n_{10} u_0 = 0, \quad n_0 u_{11} + n_{11} u_0 = 0; \quad (77)$$

$$(nT)' + \phi' + \frac{n}{2}(u^2)' = 0, \rightarrow \phi_0 = 2T_0, \quad (78)$$

$$n_0 \phi_{10} - 2n_0 u_0 u_{10} = 3T_{10} n_0 - 3T_{11} n_0 + 2n_{10} T_0, \quad 3T_{11} = \phi_{11}; \quad (79)$$

$$\nu_3' + \frac{J}{u^2} [u^2 T]' = 0, \implies \quad (80)$$

$$J(T_{11} - T_{10}) - 2T_0 u_{10} + \nu_{311} + \nu_{310} = 0, \quad -JT_{11} = \nu_{311}.$$

The equations support an additional simplification  $T_{10} = \phi_{10} = 0$ , and consequently  $4\pi G n_0 = T_0 - 2u_0^2$ . This equation connects the energetic characteristics of the considered solution.

#### 4 Conclusion

This contribution was devoted to the kinetic theory of many-body self-gravitating systems in the framework of the model kinetic equation developed by Bhatnager, Gross and Krook <sup>9</sup>. The main advantage of using this kinetic model (as well as other, more refined kinetic models) is that it produces rather tractable schemes in

contrast to the full kinetic equations, which are typically quite difficult to investigate. On the other hand, model kinetic equations offer rather sensible results, which are usually at least in a qualitative agreement with those obtained from the full Boltzmann kinetic equation. The physical reason of this success is that a good amount of statistical phenomena are quite insensitive to the details of the collision integral. In order to explain them it is enough to use the simplest relaxation mechanism which only takes into account necessary conservation laws of energy, momentum and probability (number of particles) and the correct characteristic relaxation time.

The assumptions on the spherically symmetric character of the considered system and the assumed radial character of non-equilibrium led us to the kinetic equation (1), which was then studied by the method of moments. The straightforward analytic investigation allowed us to identify several self-similar regimes of a steady but non-equilibrium behavior. These solutions corresponds to the presence of the central black hole in the system (section 3.1), the influence of binary-formation and tightening processes to the system (section 3.2) and evaporation phenomena (section 3.3). In this way we reproduced certain known results<sup>5</sup> and also obtained a number of new regimes of behavior.

We believe that the model kinetic approach will be potentially quite powerful in application to many-body, self-gravitating systems. We plan in future to turn to the dynamical aspects of this approach, as well as construct more realistic (from the viewpoint of applications in astrophysics) kinetic models, that e.g account for the strong anisotropy of the velocity distribution in the outer part of the cluster.

## References

1. S. Chandrasekhar, *Principles of Stellar Dynamics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942.
2. L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Physical Kinetics*, Pergamon Press, 1980.
3. L. Spitzer, *Dynamical evolution of globular clusters*, Princeton University Press, 1987.
4. W. Saslaw, *Gravitational Physics of Stellar and Galactic Systems*, Cambridge University Press, 1985.
5. A.P. Lightman and S.L. Shapiro, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **50**, 437 (1978)
6. G. Meylan and D.C. Heggie, *Internal dynamics of globular clusters*, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.*, **8**, 1-143 (1997)
7. T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rep.*, **188**, 285, (1990).
8. M.N. Rosenbluth, W.M. MacDonald, D.L. Judd, *Phys. Rev.* **107**, 1, (1957).
9. P.L. Bhatnager, E.P. Gross and M. Krook, *Phys. Rev.*, **94** 511 (1954); M. Krook, *ibid.*, **99** 1896 (1955); E.P. Gross and M. Krook, *ibid.*, **102** 593 (1956).
10. E.P. Gross, E.A. Jackson and S. Ziering, *Ann. Phys.*, **1** 141 (1957)
11. E.P. Gross and E.A. Jackson, *Phys. Fluids*, **2** 432-441 (1959).
12. H. Grad, *Principles of the Kinetic Theory of Gases*, in *Handbuch der Physik*, ed. by S. Flugge, Springer-Verlag (1958)

## KINETIC EQUATION MODEL FOR SELF-GRAVITATING SYSTEMS

A.E. ALLAHVERDYAN<sup>1,2</sup> AND TH.M. NIEUWENHUIZEN<sup>3</sup>)

<sup>1)</sup> *CEA/Saclay, Service de Physique Theorique, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette Cedex, France,*

<sup>2)</sup> *Yerevan Physics Institute, Alikhanian Brothers St. 2, Yerevan 375036, Armenia*

<sup>3)</sup> *Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Amsterdam,  
Valckenierstraat 65, 1018 XE Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

The kinetic theory of a self-gravitating system is considered in the framework of Bhatnager-Gross-Krook model. This approach offers a unique and tractable setup for studying the central, collision-dominated region of the system, as well as its outer almost collisionless part. Stationary non-equilibrium states of the system are considered and several different self-similar solutions are identified.

*Introduction.* There is a long tradition of applications the kinetic theory to the gas of self-gravitating particles <sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>. The first regular approach of that kind was developed by Chandrasekhar <sup>1</sup>, and appeared to be very useful in astrophysical applications. Indeed, the kinetic theory is certainly applicable for globular clusters of stars, which are rather well-isolated systems on the relevant time-scales, and contain sufficiently many (typically of order  $N \sim 10^5$ ) stars <sup>4</sup>. In this contribution we present an approach, where one *models* the collisional part of the kinetic equation, trying to preserve its main qualitative characteristics, and to make the system analytically tractable. Our approach is based on one of the most successful models of the kinetic equation proposed by Bhatnager, Gross and Krook (BGK) in fifties <sup>6</sup>. Since that time it appeared to be very useful, and the reason of this success is that the model offers a minimal way to incorporate the necessary conservation laws (those of particle number, momentum and energy) with a simple relaxation mechanism. This approach provides natural methods to consider simultaneously the collision-dominated (overdamped) regions of the system, and its outer almost collisionless domains (underdamping). In the present contribution we will outline the approach, and present some of its results. More details will be found in <sup>8</sup>.

*Bhatnager-Gross-Krook kinetic equation.* The statistical dynamics of  $N$  point particles with unit mass interacting through Newton's inverse-square law, will be considered in the classical kinetic approach. There are two important assumptions: (i) The field acting on a given particle (test particle) can be represented as a mean, self-consistent field plus a contribution from two-particle collisions. (ii) As usual, a collision between a pair of particles is taken to be independent on the others, and local (namely, it leads to sudden changes in the corresponding momenta, whereas the coordinates can be considered as fixed). In the spirit of the BGK-model we propose the following kinetic equation for a spherical self-gravitating system:

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial t} + v_r f' - \phi' \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_r} + \frac{2T(r)}{r} \left[ \frac{v_r f}{T(r)} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial v_r} \right] = \nu(r) \left[ \frac{n(r) e^{-\frac{(v-u(r))^2}{2T(r)}}}{[2\pi T(r)]^{1/2}} - f(r, v_r) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $f(r, v_r)$  stands for the probability distribution of the radial coordinate  $r$  and the radial velocity  $v_r = \frac{d}{dt}r$ ,  $\phi$  is the self-consistent gravitational potential, and

where  $f' = \partial f(r, v_r)/\partial r$ ,  $\phi' = d\phi/dr$ ,  $n(r) = \int dv_r f(r, v_r)$  and

$$n(r)u(r) = \int dv_r v_r f(r, v_r), \quad n(r)T(r) = \int dv_r (v_r - u)^2 f(r, v_r), \quad (2)$$

are the local average radial velocity and the local temperature. Eq. (1) is inherently related to the Poisson equation:  $r^{-2}(r^2\phi')' = 4\pi Gn(r)$ . The r.h.s. of Eq. (1) is the model collision integral, which conserves probability, momentum and energy, and enforces relaxation to the corresponding local Maxwellian.  $\nu(r) = \gamma nT^{-3/2}$  (with  $\gamma \propto G^2 \ln N$  as the damping constant) is connected with the inverse characteristic relaxation time<sup>1,3,5</sup>. Eq. (1) is still a complicated integro-differential equation. To subtract the relevant information from it one considers the subtracted moments  $M_l(r) = \int dv_r (v_r - u)^l f(r, v_r)$ . The corresponding equations read:

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_l + l\dot{u}M_{l-1} + \frac{1}{r^2}[r^2(M_{l+1} + uM_l)]' + l\left(\phi' - \frac{2T}{r}\right)M_{l-1} + lu'[M_l + uM_{l-1}] \\ = \nu(r)[\omega(l)nT^{l/2}(l-1)!! - M_l], \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\omega(l)$  is zero for  $l$  odd, and equal to 1 for  $l$  even.

We will consider the stationary (steady) situation. This case, where all quantities are time-independent, is worth to study for its own sake, since there are clear observational evidences that typical globular clusters do have such a phase in their evolution<sup>4,7</sup>. On the other hand, it is a necessary step towards understanding of more general, time-dependent situation. If the known conditions for equilibrium are satisfied (e.g., absence of energy and/or probability currents), the self-gravitating system under study has the Gibbs distribution as its unique steady state. As a result of the gravothermal instability this distribution loses its stability for temperatures lower than certain critical temperature<sup>3,5</sup>. However, there are situations, where one expects that the very reasons for the existence of the gibbsian equilibrium can be invalid. The most typical situation of that kind appears with binary star formation and tightening processes in the central region of a star cluster<sup>3,4</sup>. These processes are accompanied with a release of energy, so that the rest of the system can be considered as being subjected to sources of energy put in the central part. The existence of energy currents from the central part leads to a non-equilibrium steady state, and can stabilize the behavior of the self-gravitating system preventing its collapse, since the mechanism of the gravothermal instability is connected with spontaneous energy currents towards the center<sup>3,4</sup>.

*Ideal hydrodynamics.* This scheme is determined by a condition  $M_3 = 0$  (no heat current), and the nonequilibrium character is displayed only through the stationary current of particles  $u$ . The following exact relations can be inferred from Eqs. (3) with  $l = 0, 1, 2$ :  $n = cu^{-1}r^{-2}$ ,  $T = c_1u^{-2}$ , where  $c$  and  $c_1$  are some constant numbers. If we assume that  $u$  does not depend on  $r$ , the Poisson equation offers an exact solution:  $\phi = 2T \ln r + \phi_0$ . This is an exact non-gibbsian ( $u \neq 0$ ) but isothermal solution having a non-integrable density at the origin.

The solution with  $u \neq \text{const}$  has the following form at the small distances:

$$u = u_0r^{1/2}, \quad \phi' \simeq \frac{7c_1}{2u_0^2}r^{-2}, \quad T \simeq \frac{c_1}{u_0^2}r^{-1}, \quad n \simeq \frac{c}{u_0}r^{-5/2}. \quad (4)$$

It is seen that the density is singular at the origin, but still integrable. The form of  $\phi'$  indicates the presence of the central mass  $7c_1/(2u_0^2G)$ . This implies the following choice:  $u_0 < 0$ ,  $c < 0$ , and then the obtained solution describes a stationary consumption regime of stars by the central mass. The energy current  $nu^3 + 3nuT$  is also directed towards the center. Altogether, this solution describes the situation with a central mass (“black hole”), but without other dissipative processes.

*Overdamped situation.* Starting since this moment, we take into account the heat current, described by  $M_3$ . We make a self-consistent assumption that there is a range of distances close to the inner part (i.e., the core), where collisions dominate. In this overdamped regime  $\eta = (\text{dynamic time})/(\text{kinetic time})$  is large, and the large  $\nu(r)$  in the r.h.s. of Eqs. (3) imposes the Gaussian behavior for the corresponding moments:  $M_3 = \mathcal{O}(1/\eta)$ ,  $M_4 - 3nT^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/\eta)$ . Using the last result as  $M_4 \simeq 3nT^2$  one gets from Eqs. (3) with  $l = 3$ :

$$3n(r)T(r)T'(r) = -\nu(r)M_3(r) \quad (5)$$

as a constitutive equation for the overdamped case. For  $u = 0$  Eq. (5) reduces to  $M_3r^2 = \nu_3 = \text{const}$ , and for  $\nu_3 > 0$  (a positive outward flow of energy), there is a solution which for small  $r$  reads

$$T \simeq T_0r^{-2/7}, \quad n(r) \simeq n_0r^{-16/7}, \quad \phi'(r) \simeq \phi_0r^{-9/7}, \quad (6)$$

where  $n_0 \propto T_0/(4\pi G)$ ,  $\phi_0 \propto T_0 \propto (\gamma\nu_3)^{2/7}$ . Notice that density is singular at the origin, but integrable. Thus, this solution can be intended to describe a stationary regime with tightening of binaries at the very central region. In our setup this last process is reflected through a constant outward heat current.

For  $u \neq 0$  can still use Eq. (5) for  $M_3$ , which now does not reduce to  $\text{const}/r^2$ . For small distances the self-consistent solution reads

$$n(r) \simeq \frac{n_0}{r^{12/5}}, \quad T(r) \simeq \frac{T_0}{r^{2/5}}, \quad u(r) \simeq u_0r^{2/5}, \quad \phi'(r) \simeq \frac{14T_0}{5r^{7/5}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $6T_0^{5/2} = 5\gamma u_0 n_0$ . Notice that there is no central mass (as follows from Eqs. (6, 7)). Moreover,  $u_0$  has to be positive and  $u(0) = 0$ . Therefore, the obtained solution can be suitable to describe evaporation phenomena.

*Underdamped situation.* There is yet another extremal situation realized at sufficiently long distances from the center, where the behavior of the system is close to be collisionless (underdamping). Here one expects that all moments with  $k \geq 3$  will be equally important, and they have to behave in the nearly similar way. Looking for a self-consistent, long-distance solution of the hierarchy (3) with  $u = 0$  (no evaporation) one gets:

$$n(r) \simeq \frac{n_0}{r^{7/2}}, \quad T(r) \simeq \frac{T_0}{r}, \quad \nu(r) \simeq \frac{\gamma n_0}{T_0^{3/2}r^2}, \quad M_3 = \frac{\nu_3}{r^2}, \quad M_4 \simeq \frac{\nu_4}{r^2}, \quad (8)$$

where  $\nu_4$ ,  $n_0$ ,  $T_0$  are constant. At this stage of our asymptotic analysis they will remain unfixed. For  $\phi'$  one has from the Poisson equation:  $\phi'(r) = GMr^{-2} - 8\pi Gn_0r^{-5/2}$ , where the first term is the standard asymptotic limit for a finite-mass cluster with  $M$  as the total mass. The behavior of  $M_5$  is qualitatively the same as of  $M_4$ . Our expression for the density given by Eq. (8) coincides with that obtained in <sup>4</sup> for the halo of a globular cluster by means of qualitative physical considerations.



Since the case with  $u \neq 0$  is capable to describe the evaporation phenomenon<sup>3</sup>, we will look for a solution which has the Maxwellian structure for very large distances, because there it describes free escaped stars. For those scales only first two moments  $u = u_0 > 0$  and  $T = T_0 > 0$  are nonzero, and should be viewed as boundary conditions. Searching for a self-consistent solution, one gets for large  $r$

$$\begin{aligned} r^2 n(r) &\simeq n_0 + \frac{3T_{11} \ln r}{4\pi Gr}, & T(r) &\simeq T_0 + \frac{T_{11} \ln r}{r}, \\ r\phi' &\simeq 2T_0 + \frac{3T_{11} \ln r}{r}, & u(r) &\simeq u_0 + \frac{u_{10} \ln r}{r}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The product  $r^2 M_3$  is a constant to leading order, indicating true energy loss, while  $\nu(r)$  behaves as in Eq. (8);  $T_{11}$  and  $u_{10}$  are certain constants<sup>8</sup>. Notice that density does not have to be integrable at infinity, since the only way to get a stationary evaporation regime is to have an infinite amount of stars, most of which are located at infinity.

*Conclusion.* This contribution was devoted to the kinetic theory of many-body self-gravitating systems in the framework of the Bhatnager-Gross-Krook model kinetic equation<sup>6</sup>. In contrast to the full kinetic equation, it produces tractable analytical schemes. On the other hand, kinetic models offer sensible results, which are usually at least in a qualitative agreement with those obtained from the full Boltzmann kinetic equation, since a good amount of statistical phenomena is quite insensitive to the details of the collision integral. We report several different self-similar regimes of behavior. Some of them are new, and in certain cases we confirm results obtained by more heuristic approaches<sup>4</sup>. More details of this investigation will be presented elsewhere<sup>8</sup>.

## References

1. S. Chandrasekhar, *Principles of Stellar Dynamics*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1942.
2. L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Physical Kinetics*, Pergamon Press, 1980.
3. L. Spitzer, *Dynamical evolution of globular clusters*, Princeton University Press, 1987.
4. A.P. Lightman and S.L. Shapiro, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **50**, 437 (1978)
5. T. Padmanabhan, *Phys. Rep.*, **188**, 285, (1990).
6. P.L. Bhatnager, E.P. Gross and M. Krook, *Phys. Rev.*, **94** 511 (1954)
7. G. Meylan and D.C. Heggie, *Internal dynamics of globular clusters*, *Astron. Astrophys. Rev.*, **8**, 1-143 (1997)
8. A.E. Allahverdyan and Th.M. Nieuwenhuizen, extended version published on the CD-rom, and in preparation.