# Modeling the circumstellar interaction in the gamma-ray binary LS I +61 303

Atsuo T. Okazaki (Hokkai-Gakuen University, Japan)

In collaboration with Itumeleng Monageng (U. Cape Town, South Africa), Yuki Moritani (IPMU, Japan), and Vanessa McBride (U. Cape Town, South Africa)

### **Talk Outline**

- 1. Gamma-ray binaries
- 2. Be stars
- 3. Gamma-ray binary LS I +61 303 and superorbital activity
- 4. Long-term variation in Be-disk geometry in LS I +61 303
- 5. Dynamic modeling of LS I +61 303
- 6. Concluding remarks

#### **1. VHE gamma-ray binaries**

#### **Ground-based VHE gamma-ray astronomy**

# Imaging Atmospheric Cherenkov Telescopes (H.E.S.S., VERITAS, and MAGIC)





### VHE (TeV) gamma-ray sources



# (VHE) gamma-ray binaries

- Binaries with spectral energy distribution (SED) dominated by gamma-ray emission
- Only 6 systems, all of which consist of an OB star and a compact object
  - > 3 systems with a Be (B-type emission) star
  - > 3 systems with an O star
- Nature of compact object established only for one system (PSR B1259-63 with a non-accreting pulsar)
- Two competing scenarios for other systems:
   Pulsar wind scenario vs. Microquasar scenario

# High energy emission in PW scenario

Collision shocks between a relativistic pulsar wind and a stellar wind (and/or a Be disk)



# High energy emission in MQ (accretion/ejection) scenario

Accretion Relativistic jet Leptonic model: IC by relativistic electrons ) gamma-rays Hadronic model: pp interactions in neutral pions gamma-rays

System	Scenario	Optical star	P <sub>orb</sub> (d)	е
PSR B1259-63	PW	Be	1237	0.87
LS I +61 303	?	Be	26.5	0.54
HESS J0632+057	?	Be	315	0.83
LS 5039	?	Ο	3.9	0.35
1FGL J1018.6- 5856	?	0	16.6	low
CXOUJ053600.0- 673507	?	0	10.3	?

#### 2. Be stars

### Be star: schematic diagram



#### Viscous decretion disk model for Be stars (Lee, Saio & Osaki 1991)

Observations support an idea that Be disks are formed by the effect of viscosity

Ejection of gas from the stellar equatorial region, at the Keplerian rotation velocity

- Outward drift by viscosity

Formation of a geometrically thin, Keplerian disk, where radial flow is very subsonic

## **Emission line profiles**

#### Line profiles depend on:

- viewing angle,
- disk size
- disk density
- disk eccentricity
- whether disk is planar or warped



#### (Rivinius+ 2013)

#### Gamma-ray binaries with Be stars

 Gas pressure in Be disk >> ram pressure of Be wind
 High-energy emission arises via the interaction between Be disk and compact object



Density distribution on orbital plane of PSR B1259-63 (Porb=1237d, e=0.87). Disk misaligned by 45 deg. (Takata+ 2012)

## 3. Gamma-ray binary LS I +61 303 and superorbital activity

#### **Observed features**

- Be star + compact object of unknown nature (P<sub>orb</sub>=26.5 d, e=0.54)
- TeV emission detected only around apastron previously, while it peaks before periastron recently
- HE (>100MeV) gamma-ray flux peaked after periastron before Mar. 2009, while it is ~const. after Mar. 2009
- radio maps is jets vs. PW shocks
- Weak X-rays (<10<sup>34</sup> erg/s) Arg Radiatively inefficient accretion flow vs. no accretion

#### Superorbital modulation in LS I +61 303

- Radio and X-ray flares modulates on a superorbital 1667 d (>> P<sub>orb</sub>) timescale
- Optical brightness and disk emission also modulates on same timescale

## **Superorbital modulation in X-ray flare phase**



(Chernyakova+ 2012)

# Superorbital modulation in radio flare phase



(Chernyakova+ 2012)

140

# Superorbital modulation in gamma-rays?



# Orbital modulation in optical light curve (left) and EW(Halpha) (right) modulates in superorbital timescale



#### Superorbital modulation in LS I +61 303

- Radio and X-ray flares modulates on a superorbital 1667 d (>> P<sub>orb</sub>) timescale
- Optical brightness and disk emission also modulates on same timescale

What causes the superorbital modulation? What is/are regularly changing? Disk size? Disk eccentricity? Other disk quantities?

# 4. Long-term variation in Be-disk geometry in LS I +61 303

#### Particle model for the Halpha emitting region



### **Basic equations**

orbit: 
$$r_{\rm p} = \frac{a_{\rm p} \left(1 - e_{\rm p}^2\right)}{1 + e_{\rm p} \cos f}$$
 true anomaly  
 $\Rightarrow$  radial velocity: argument of pericenter  
 $v_{\rm rad} = \sqrt{\frac{GM_1}{a_{\rm p}(1 - e_{\rm p}^2)}} \sin i \left[\cos(\omega + f) + e_{\rm p} \cos \omega\right]$   
 $\Rightarrow$  Blue- and red- peak velocities of a line profile:  
 $v_{\rm blue, red} = \sqrt{\frac{GM_1}{a_{\rm p}(1 - e_{\rm p}^2)}} (\mp 1 + e_{\rm p} \cos \omega) \sin i$ 

$$\Rightarrow \quad \text{eccentricity:} \ e_{\rm p} = \frac{v_{\rm red} + v_{\rm blue}}{v_{\rm red} - v_{\rm blue}} \sec \omega$$

# Variations in observed peak velocities in 2007-2015



Blue: mid-dispersion spectra Red: high-dispersion spectra

#### Eccentricity vs. argument of pericenter



#### Disk size ~ constant



#### Fit with e=const disk (precessing disk) is poor



#### **Disk eccentricity varies at ~superorbital period!**



This suggests that the Be-disk eccentricity and pericenter argument vary simultaneously.

#### 5. Dynamic modeling of LS I +61 303

What is/are responsible for the long-term change in the disk eccentricity and argument of pericenter?

- Variation in the argument of disk pericenter
   Tidal precession?
- Variation in the disk eccentricity
  - Kozai-Lidov mechanism (exchange between inclination and eccentricity) for a highly misaligned disk?

# Ideally, simulations with PW should be done to study both the PW and tidal effects on Be disk

But, running sims with PW for >100  $P_{orb}$  is impractical



PACIFIC 2016 (Moorea, 14 September 2016)

## SPH simulation of the tidal interaction between the compact object and the Be disk in LS I +61 303



#### Disk eccentricity varies, but no precession occurs



## **6.** Concluding remarks

## Superorbital modulation in LS I +61 303 is a ~30 years old puzzle, but now

- A simple model to analyze the Be-disk geometry shows that the superorbital modulation in LS I +61 303 is likely due to the variation in the disk eccentricity coupled with the disk precession.
- Unfortunately, however, 3D SPH simulations failed to confirm this conclusion.
- This failure may be the lack of resolution of the simulations. Simulations with much more particles are needed.
- Including the effect of PW is also a next step.