

Are white dwarf magnetic fields in close binaries generated during common-envelope evolution?

Diogo Belloni^{1,2*} and Matthias R. Schreiber^{2,3†}

¹*National Institute for Space Research, Av. dos Astronautas, 1758, 12227-010, São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil*

²*Instituto de Física y Astronomía, Universidad de Valparaíso, Av. Gran Bretaña 1111 Valparaíso, Chile*

³*Millennium Nucleus for Planet Formation, Universidad de Valparaíso, Valparaíso 2360102, Chile*

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

Understanding the origin of the magnetic fields in white dwarfs (WDs) has been a puzzle for decades. A scenario that has gained considerable attention in the past years assumes that such magnetic fields are generated through a dynamo process during common-envelope evolution. We performed binary population models using an up-to-date version of the BSE code to confront the predictions of this model with observational results. We found that the hypothesis in which the WD magnetic field is generated during common-envelope evolution cannot explain the observed distribution of WD magnetic fields in polars and pre-polars. The model also fails in explaining the dominance of low-temperature WDs in pre-polars. Finally, the model predicts that nearly all cataclysmic variables and $\sim 80 - 90$ per cent of close detached WD+M-dwarf binaries should be magnetic, which is in dramatic disagreement with the observations. Therefore, either the common-envelope dynamo scenario should be substantially revised or an alternative process is generating the strong WD magnetic fields in close WD binaries.

Key words: novae, cataclysmic variables – methods: numerical – stars: evolution – stars: magnetic field – white dwarfs.

1 INTRODUCTION

White dwarfs (WDs) in cataclysmic variables (CVs) are more frequently magnetic and have, on average, stronger magnetic fields than single WDs (e.g. Ferrario et al. 2015). Understanding this difference may provide insight about magnetic field generation with implications beyond WD research. In recent years, several hypothesis have been put forward to explain magnetic field generation in WDs.

In the fossil field scenario (e.g. Angel et al. 1981), it is assumed that the magnetic flux is conserved during the WD formation and that strongly magnetic Ap and Bp stars are the progenitors of magnetic WDs. However, Kawka et al. (2007) showed that the magnetic Ap and Bp stars cannot be the only progenitors of magnetic WDs as their birth rate is simply too small. In an alternative scenario, strong magnetic field generation occurs in the corona present in the outer layers of the remnant of coalescing double WDs. (García-Berro et al. 2012). This scenario, however, can only explain the large field strength of massive magnetic single WDs but is not applicable to CVs. More recently, Isern et al. (2017) argued that when the WD temperature is low enough and its interior crystallizes, a dynamo similar to those operating in main-sequence stars

and planets can generate a magnetic field. While this mechanism may work in both single WDs and WDs in CVs, the field strengths predicted by Isern et al. (2017) are much smaller than those derived from observations of strongly magnetic WDs in CVs.

A hypothesis that gained significant attention during the last years and that has recently been claimed to fully explain the magnetic fields observed in WDs has been put forward by Tout et al. (2008). According to this scenario the high magnetic fields in WDs are generated by a dynamo created during the common-envelope (CE) evolution. Based on this CE dynamo hypothesis, Briggs et al. (2018b) investigated the origin of WD magnetic fields in CVs and claimed that this scenario can explain the observed characteristics of magnetic CVs which, if true, would provide considerable support for the CE dynamo hypothesis.

However, the results and conclusions presented by Briggs et al. (2018b) should be taken with a grain of salt, since there are several caveats in the investigation. First, these authors used the old version of the BSE code (Hurley et al. 2000, 2002). This version is unable to reproduce observed properties of CVs (such as the mass transfer rate, orbital period and WD mass distributions) and its predictions dramatically disagree with standard theories of mass transfer and angular momentum loss in CVs (see Belloni et al. 2018, for details). Second, Briggs et al. (2018b) only compared the observed and predicted WD magnetic field distributions of magnetic CVs, while other equally important predictions such as the WD mass

* diogo.belloni@inpe.br (DB)

† matthias.schreiber@uv.cl (MRS)

and orbital period distributions of magnetic and non-magnetic CVs, and their detached progenitors, are not confronted with the corresponding observational properties. Third, [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#) did not provide information if contributions from internal or recombination energy during CE evolution have been taken into account nor did they describe the criteria they used to evaluate the stability of mass transfer. Both, the energy budget during CE evolution as well as the stability criteria for mass transfer significantly contribute to shaping predicted properties of post-common-envelope binaries (PCEBs) and CVs (e.g. [Zorotovic et al. 2014](#); [Camacho et al. 2014](#); [Schreiber et al. 2016](#)). Fourth, [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#) did not take into account the influence of the WD magnetic field on angular momentum loss due to magnetic braking, which has been predicted to be significant for strong fields (e.g. [Li et al. 1994](#); [Webbink & Wickramasinghe 2002](#); [Belloni et al. 2019a](#)). Because of these limitations, the question whether dynamo processes generated during CE evolution can indeed explain occurrence rates and field strength of magnetic WDs in CVs remains unanswered.

In this letter, we test the CE dynamo hypothesis based on binary population models of magnetic CVs performed with the updated version of the BSE code which includes state-of-the-art prescriptions for the CE evolution and mass transfer stability. We furthermore take into account the impact of the WD magnetic field on magnetic braking (see [Belloni et al. 2019a](#), for details) and compare the model predictions with the main observed properties of magnetic CVs and their progenitors, i.e. (i) the WD magnetic field distribution of magnetic CVs ([Ferrario et al. 2015](#)); (ii) the WD magnetic field, the WD effective temperature and orbital period distributions of pre-polars ([Schwope et al. 2009](#); [Parsons et al. 2013](#), and references therein); and (iii) the relative numbers of magnetic WDs among detached WD+M-dwarf PCEBs ([Liebert et al. 2015](#)) and CVs ([Pala et al. 2019](#)). Our model results clearly show that, in its current form, the model of magnetic field generation during CE evolution dramatically fails when compared with the observations.

2 BINARY POPULATION MODEL

In order to test the origin of WD magnetic fields during CE evolution, we carried out binary population synthesis with the BSE code ([Hurley et al. 2002](#)), which has recently been modified and calibrated ¹ to carry out population synthesis of non-magnetic ([Belloni et al. 2018](#)) and magnetic CVs ([Belloni et al. 2019a](#)).

The binary population simulations presented here are similar to those shown in [Belloni et al. \(2019a\)](#). In brief, we first generated an initial population of 2×10^7 binaries using the following initial distributions. The primary mass was obtained from the canonical [Kroupa \(2001\)](#) initial mass function (i.e. with two stellar segments) in the range $[1, 8] M_{\odot}$; the secondary was generated assuming a uniform mass ratio distribution, where $M_2 \leq M_1$, and requesting that $M_2 \geq 0.07$; the semi-major axis was assumed to follow a log-uniform distribution in the range $[10^{-0.5}, 10^{4.5}] R_{\odot}$ and the eccentricity to follow a thermal distribution in the range $[0, 1]$. We then evolved these systems and selected those that start dynamically unstable mass transfer when the primary was on the first giant branch or the asymptotic giant branch. The critical mass ratio q_c adopted here assumes conservative mass transfer and is based on the condensed polytropic models by [Hjellming & Webbink \(1987\)](#), i.e. $q_c = 0.362 + [3(1 - M_c/M_g)]^{-1}$, where M_c is the giant core

mass and M_g is the giant mass. Dynamically unstable mass transfer gives rise to CE evolution, which we modelled using eqs. 69–77 of [Hurley et al. \(2002\)](#), taking into account the upgrades described in appendix A of [Claeys et al. \(2014\)](#) related to the binding energy parameter. We considered three relatively small values for the CE efficiency α (0.1, 0.25 and 0.4), assumed that no recombination energy contributes to the CE ejection and computed the binding energy parameter of each system based on the properties of the giant star. These assumptions have been shown to be reasonable in simulations of CVs and PCEBs (e.g. [Zorotovic et al. 2010](#); [Toonen & Nelemans 2013](#); [Camacho et al. 2014](#); [Cojocaru et al. 2017](#); [Belloni et al. 2019b](#)).

For those binaries that survived CE evolution, we assumed standard angular momentum loss prescriptions ([Knigge et al. 2011](#)). For the second phase of mass transfer, i.e. for the CV stage, we adopted the recently suggested empirical model for consequential angular momentum loss (eCAML; [Schreiber et al. 2016](#)). Observational evidence for this new model for CV evolution is growing. It is not only a good candidate to solve some long-standing problems related to CV evolution models, like the predicted large fraction of low-mass WDs in CVs, the predicted excess of short-period systems, and the overestimated space density ([Schreiber et al. 2016](#); [Belloni et al. 2018](#)). The eCAML idea also explains the existence of single low-mass WDs ([Zorotovic & Schreiber 2017](#)), the properties of detached CVs crossing the orbital period gap ([Zorotovic et al. 2016](#)) and the characteristics of CVs in globular clusters ([Belloni et al. 2019b](#)). We furthermore assume that the WD expels the accreted mass in repeated nova eruptions and, therefore, treat its mass as constant during CV evolution.

Concerning the influence of the WD magnetic field on CV evolution, we adopted the reduced magnetic braking model proposed by [Li, Wu & Wickramasinghe \(1994\)](#) and developed further by [Webbink & Wickramasinghe \(2002\)](#), which can reasonably well explain the observed properties of polars ([Belloni et al. 2019a](#)) if the WD magnetic field strength distribution is assumed to be the observed one. In order to test the scenario of magnetic field generation during CE evolution, we changed our code and, instead of using the observed distribution, we determined the WD magnetic field strength B_{WD} in each PCEB using the formula provided by [Briggs et al. \(2018a\)](#), i.e.

$$B_{\text{WD}} = 1.35 \times 10^{10} \left(\frac{\Omega}{\Omega_{\text{crit}}} \right) \text{ G} , \quad (1)$$

where Ω is the orbital angular velocity just after the CE evolution given by

$$\Omega = \frac{2\pi}{P_{\text{orb}}} \text{ yr}^{-1} , \quad (2)$$

with P_{orb} being the orbital period just after the CE evolution and Ω_{crit} the break-up angular velocity of the WD given by

$$\Omega_{\text{crit}} = \sqrt{\frac{GM_{\text{WD}}}{R_{\text{WD}}^3}} = 2\pi \sqrt{\left(\frac{M_{\text{WD}}}{M_{\odot}} \right) \left(\frac{R_{\text{WD}}}{\text{AU}} \right)^{-3}} \text{ yr}^{-1} , \quad (3)$$

where M_{WD} and R_{WD} are the WD mass and radius, respectively. We additionally assume that B_{WD} is constant during PCEB and CV evolution.

When comparing our model predictions to observed populations we considered only CVs with donor masses greater

¹ <http://www.ifa.uv.cl/bse>




Figure 1. Distribution of predicted PCEBs and observed pre-polars in the plane orbital period (P_{orb}) versus WD magnetic field (B_{WD}). We show the model for the CE efficiency $\alpha = 0.25$. Colours indicate the secondary Roche-lobe overfilling factor for simulated PCEBs. Observed measurements are from Schwope et al. (2009, and references therein) and Parsons et al. (2013). Notice that, with the exception of two systems, predicted values for B_{WD} are not strong enough to explain observed values among pre-polars, provided their orbital periods.

than $0.05 M_{\odot}$ and PCEBs having secondary masses smaller than $0.6 M_{\odot}$. In other words, we neglect period bouncers and concentrate on systems with M-dwarf companions in PCEBs. The reason for both these limits are potential strong observational biases in the observed samples. Period bouncers are hard to find because of their extremely low mass transfer rates. PCEBs with secondary stars earlier than spectral type M are often overlooked as the optical emission is entirely dominated by the main-sequence companion which makes it difficult to detect the WD component. Finally, we define a limit of $B_{\text{WD}} = 1 \text{ MG}$ to separate magnetic and non-magnetic systems (either PCEBs or CVs). This strict limit is somewhat arbitrary but roughly reflects the minimum field strengths that have been measured for WDs in PCEBs and CVs.

3 COMPARISON BETWEEN PREDICTED AND OBSERVED PROPERTIES

If the model proposed by Briggs et al. (2018b) was correct, the resulting predictions for magnetic WDs in all WD binaries should resemble their observed properties. The ideal systems to carry out this comparison between model predictions and observations are the large populations of CVs and detached WD+M-dwarf PCEBs. We start our comparison between model predictions and observations with the latter.

3.1 Post-Common-Envelope Binaries

Observations clearly show that the number of magnetic systems among PCEBs is small. The population of observed PCEBs is dominated by systems with negligible B_{WD} (Liebert et al. 2015, and references therein). Only ten PCEBs with strongly magnetic WDs, so called *pre-polars*, have been identified so far (Schwope et al. 2009; Parsons et al. 2013, and references therein). Given that the *Sloan Digital Sky Survey* (SDSS) alone has discovered




Figure 2. Cumulative distribution function of the WD effective temperature in PCEBs whose secondaries fill at least ~ 95 per cent of their Roche lobe. We show the case for the CE efficiency $\alpha = 0.25$ and separate the population according to the strength of B_{WD} , in units of MG. Notice that ≈ 50 per cent of systems with $10 \text{ MG} < B_{\text{WD}} < 50 \text{ MG}$ have WD effective temperature $\gtrsim 10\,000 \text{ K}$. In addition, nearly all WDs having $B_{\text{WD}} > 50 \text{ MG}$ are hotter than $10\,000 \text{ K}$.

several hundred PCEBs (Schreiber et al. 2010), we can safely state that the observed fraction of magnetic PCEBs is well below ten per cent. All the magnetic WDs in PCEBs are relatively cool ($T \lesssim 10^4 \text{ K}$) and they seem to be rather close to Roche-lobe filling as the WDs accrete from the wind of their M-dwarf secondaries via a magnetic siphon. The resulting mass transfer rates are very low ($\sim 10^{-14} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$). None of the magnetic WDs in detached systems is a He-core WD (Rebassa-Mansergas et al. 2011).

Our binary population models predict that the overwhelming majority of PCEBs have orbital periods shorter than ~ 5 days and in general small M_{WD} ($\sim 0.45 - 0.55 M_{\odot}$). Both these predictions are in good agreement with observations of PCEBs (e.g. Schreiber et al. 2010; Zorotovic et al. 2010, 2011; Nebot Gómez-Morán et al. 2011). However, if combined with Eq. 1, these otherwise reasonable predictions produce an extremely high fraction of magnetic PCEBs. According to Eq. 1, about 80–90 per cent of all PCEBs are magnetic. In addition, using Eq. 1, the model predicts that nearly all systems with He-core WDs are magnetic, with B_{WD} ranging from ~ 1 to $\sim 100 \text{ MG}$. The predicted general large fraction of magnetic systems and also the large fraction of magnetic He-core WDs in PCEBs are in dramatic disagreement with the observations.

The fraction of predicted magnetic WDs and its dependence on M_{WD} are not the only predictions of Eq. 1 that can be confronted with observations. In Fig. 1, we show B_{WD} as a function of orbital period for the simulated PCEBs (assuming a CE efficiency of 0.25) and the observed pre-polars. Apparently, with the exception of two pre-polars, the predicted B_{WD} are significantly below the observed values, which cluster around $60 - 70 \text{ MG}$. Thus, despite predicting a far too large fraction of magnetic systems among PCEBs, Eq. 1 can not explain the field strength of most (eight out of ten) pre-polars.

The comparison with the predictions based on Eq. 1 with observations continues to reveal disagreement when considering the low WD effective temperatures of the observed pre-polars.

As nine pre-polars have secondaries that are very close to filling their Roche-lobes, in order to properly compare with observations, we selected simulated PCEBs in which the secondary is filling at least ~ 95 per cent of their Roche lobe, i.e. $R_2 \geq 0.95 R_{2,RL}$. For each system, provided M_{WD} and age, we determined its effective temperature by interpolating grids of hydrogen-rich atmospheres. For He-core WDs ($M_{WD} \lesssim 0.5 M_{\odot}$), we used the cooling tracks provided by [Panei et al. \(2007\)](#); for CO-core WDs ($0.5 \lesssim M_{WD} \lesssim 1.05$), we used the cooling sequences of [Renedo et al. \(2010\)](#) and; for ONe-core WDs ($M_{WD} \gtrsim 1.05 M_{\odot}$), we used the evolutionary sequences of [Althaus et al. \(2007\)](#).

In Fig. 2 we show the resulting WD effective temperature distributions, separated according to the strength of B_{WD} . Nearly all systems with B_{WD} stronger than ~ 50 MG contain WDs hotter than $\sim 10\,000$ K. This is again in dramatic contradiction to the observations, as the WDs in eight pre-polars have fields stronger than 50 MG and are colder than 10 000 K. Only the WD temperature in the two pre-polars with fields weaker than ~ 50 MG can be explained by the model as roughly half of the simulated systems with fields between 10 and 50 MG have WDs cooler than 10 000 K. This disagreement is again a direct consequence of Eq. 1. In order to have B_{WD} stronger than ~ 50 MG, the orbital periods after CE evolution need to be very short. This implies that such systems will be closest to the CV phase after emerging from the CE evolution, and will consequently be the youngest and host the hottest WDs, when the secondary is getting close to filling its Roche-lobe.

It furthermore appears difficult to explain the identified discrepancy as an observational bias because current surveys, such as the SDSS, efficiently detect WD+M-dwarf binaries with WD effective temperatures from $\sim 7\,500$ to $\sim 57\,000$ K (e.g. [Zorotovic et al. 2011](#)). If CE evolution was responsible for the magnetic field generation, one would expect large numbers of hot WDs with strong B_{WD} . These hot magnetic WDs would clearly be detectable as being magnetic in surveys such as SDSS. The M-dwarf companions do not significantly affect the WD spectrum for WD temperatures exceeding $\sim 25\,000$ K and magnetic single WDs with such temperatures have been identified ([Ferrario et al. 2015](#)). Therefore, the fact that not a single PCEB with a hot WD is known further illustrates that, in its current form, the idea of generating B_{WD} during CE evolution is in sensational disagreement with the observations.

3.2 Cataclysmic Variables

One of the easiest and therefore most precise measurement available for CV populations is the fraction of magnetic systems. A recent detailed study of CVs within 150 pc provided a measured value for the fraction of magnetic CVs of $\lesssim 33$ per cent ([Pala et al. 2019](#), and references therein). Our binary population model, however, predicts a much large fraction of at least 94 per cent of all CVs being magnetic. This large predicted fraction and the resulting huge discrepancy between theory and observations is a simple result of combining Eq. 1 with realistic binary population models of CVs.

The second observable we can compare with model predictions, is the B_{WD} strength. The observed distribution of magnetic CVs contains 77 polars and intermediate polars with measured B_{WD} ([Ferrario et al. 2015](#), their tables 2 and 3), peaks at $\log_{10}(B_{WD}/\text{MG}) \sim 1.42$, and has a standard deviation of ~ 0.35 . In Fig. 3, we compare this distribution with the model predictions. The predicted distributions, according to Eq. 1, drastically disagree with observations, regardless of the CE efficiency α . In particular, predicted B_{WD} are always weaker than 60 MG,




Figure 3. Predicted and observed WD magnetic field strength (B_{WD}) distributions of magnetic CVs. Observed measurements are from [Ferrario et al. \(2015\)](#) and best-fitting Gaussian to the observed distribution is also shown. Note that predicted values of B_{WD} drastically disagree with those derived from observations, irrespective of the CE efficiency α .

which is clearly below the values measured for high field polars. Were the observed B_{WD} be as low as predicted by Eq. 1, intermediate polars would clearly dominate over polars, which is not what observations show. Among the predicted magnetic CVs only $\sim 25 - 30$ per cent are polars ($B_{WD} \gtrsim 10$ MG) while observations clearly show that polars are more common than intermediate polars by a factor of $\sim 2 - 4$ ([Pretorius et al. 2013](#); [Pala et al. 2019](#)).

While the observed B_{WD} distribution is likely somewhat biased and not necessarily representative of the intrinsic population in the Galaxy, it is clear from Fig. 3 that Eq. 1 does not provide B_{WD} strong enough to explain the large fraction of observed systems with $B_{WD} \gtrsim 60$ MG. Therefore, it seems highly unlikely that the B_{WD} distribution of the intrinsic Galactic population of magnetic CVs, especially polars, can be explained with the hypothesis of magnetic field formation during CE evolution in the way proposed by [Briggs et al. \(2018a\)](#).

3.3 Why did [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#) claim agreement between theory and observation?

While [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#) claimed to find agreement between model predictions and observations when generating WD magnetic fields during CE evolution, we found here dramatic differences between model predictions and observations.

The first reason for the different results obtained by [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#) and in this work lies in us addressing the full properties of the few known pre-polars. While [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#) speculated that the initial rapid cooling of WDs could explain the low WD effective temperatures in these systems, we compared here the WD effective temperatures, orbital periods, and B_{WD} of the observed pre-polars with our model predictions. This comparison confirmed that the absence of pre-polars with hot WDs contradicts the idea of B_{WD} being generated during CE evolution.

The second reason is connected with the fraction of magnetic systems among the predicted populations. While this fraction was not computed by [Briggs et al. \(2018b\)](#), we found that Eq. 1 predicts

unrealistically high fractions of both magnetic detached WD+M-dwarf PCEBs and CVs.

The third reason is that Briggs et al. (2018b) compared distributions that are not comparable. They compared their predicted B_{WD} distribution of zero-age CVs (PCEBs that just start the second mass transfer) with the observed B_{WD} distribution of polars (their fig. 8 and 9), and the corresponding simulated M_{WD} distribution with the observed M_{WD} distribution of PCEBs (their fig. 10 and 11). This approach would only be reasonable if both the field strength and WD masses of PCEBs and CVs were at least similar, which is not the case. Zorotovic et al. (2011) showed that the M_{WD} distributions of observed samples of PCEBs and CVs are very different and this difference cannot be explained as an observational bias. In other words, while the predicted B_{WD} of the simulated zero-age CV population in Briggs et al. (2018b) seemed to agree with the observed B_{WD} distribution of CVs, the underlying M_{WD} distributions were fundamentally different. Interestingly, Briggs et al. (2018b) were clearly aware of this problem as they perfectly summarise recent developments in the field in their section 5.

In contrast to Briggs et al. (2018b), we used here a model that includes the evolution of magnetic CVs (Belloni et al. 2019a) and recent revisions that bring into agreement predicted and observed orbital period distributions, M_{WD} distributions, and space densities (Schreiber et al. 2016). We were therefore able to compare the predictions of PCEBs with the observations of PCEBs and the predictions of CVs with observations of CVs. This comparison clearly showed that the predictions of the model explaining B_{WD} generation in close binaries through CE evolution do not agree with the observations.

4 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Explaining the origin of magnetic fields in WDs has been a challenge for decades. Despite there is a handful of scenarios proposed, none of them has been sufficiently verified and there are not enough evidences supporting them. One scenario that has gained some attention in the past years is the model in which the WD magnetic field is generated via a dynamo process during common-envelope evolution. In this letter, we examined whether such a scenario could explain the observed fraction of magnetic CVs, the observed distribution of WD magnetic fields in polars and pre-polars, the incidence of cool WDs amongst pre-polars and the paucity of detached WD+M-dwarf post-common-envelope binaries harbouring magnetic WDs. By performing binary population synthesis with a state-of-the-art version of the BSE code, we found that this scenario is unable to explain the above-mentioned characteristics of magnetic CVs and their progenitors. Therefore, either such a scenario should be severely modified or there should exist a more promising scenario in which properties of magnetic CVs and their progenitors are properly accounted for.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank MCTIC/FINEP (CT-INFRA grant 0112052700) and the Embrace Space Weather Program for the computing facilities at the National Institute for Space Research, Brazil. DB was supported by the grants #2017/14289-3 and #2018/23562-8, São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP). MRS acknowledges financial support from FONDECYT grant number 1181404.

REFERENCES

- Althaus L. G., García-Berro E., Isern J., Córscico A. H., Rohrmann R. D., 2007, *A&A*, **465**, 249
- Angel J. R. P., Borra E. F., Landstreet J. D., 1981, *ApJS*, **45**, 457
- Belloni D., Schreiber M. R., Zorotovic M., Izkiewicz K., Hurley J. R., Giersz M., Lagos F., 2018, *MNRAS*, **478**, 5639
- Belloni D., Schreiber M. R., Pala A. F., Gänsicke B. T., Zorotovic M., Rodrigues C. V., 2019a, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1910.06333
- Belloni D., Giersz M., Rivera Sandoval L. E., Askar A., Ciecielag P., 2019b, *MNRAS*, **483**, 315
- Briggs G. P., Ferrario L., Tout C. A., Wickramasinghe D. T., 2018a, *MNRAS*, **478**, 899
- Briggs G. P., Ferrario L., Tout C. A., Wickramasinghe D. T., 2018b, *MNRAS*, **481**, 3604
- Camacho J., Torres S., García-Berro E., Zorotovic M., Schreiber M. R., Rebassa-Mansergas A., Nebot Gómez-Morán A., Gänsicke B. T., 2014, *A&A*, **566**, A86
- Claeys J. S. W., Pols O. R., Izzard R. G., Vink J., Verbunt F. W. M., 2014, *A&A*, **563**, A83
- Cojocaru R., Rebassa-Mansergas A., Torres S., García-Berro E., 2017, *MNRAS*, **470**, 1442
- Ferrario L., de Martino D., Gänsicke B. T., 2015, *Space Sci. Rev.*, **191**, 111
- García-Berro E., et al., 2012, *ApJ*, **749**, 25
- Hjellming M. S., Webbink R. F., 1987, *ApJ*, **318**, 794
- Hurley J. R., Pols O. R., Tout C. A., 2000, *MNRAS*, **315**, 543
- Hurley J. R., Tout C. A., Pols O. R., 2002, *MNRAS*, **329**, 897
- Isern J., García-Berro E., Külebi B., Lorén-Aguilar P., 2017, *ApJ*, **836**, L28
- Kawka A., Vennes S., Schmidt G. D., Wickramasinghe D. T., Koch R., 2007, *ApJ*, **654**, 499
- Knigge C., Baraffe I., Patterson J., 2011, *ApJS*, **194**, 28
- Kroupa P., 2001, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, **322**, 231
- Li J. K., Wu K. W., Wickramasinghe D. T., 1994, *MNRAS*, **268**, 61
- Liebert J., Ferrario L., Wickramasinghe D. T., Smith P. S., 2015, *ApJ*, **804**, 93
- Nebot Gómez-Morán A., et al., 2011, *A&A*, **536**, A43
- Pala A. F., et al., 2019, submitted to *MNRAS*, p. arXiv:1907.13152
- Panei J. A., Althaus L. G., Chen X., Han Z., 2007, *MNRAS*, **382**, 779
- Parsons S. G., Marsh T. R., Gänsicke B. T., Schreiber M. R., Bours M. C. P., Dhillon V. S., Littlefair S. P., 2013, *MNRAS*, **436**, 241
- Pretorius M. L., Knigge C., Schwöpe A. D., 2013, *MNRAS*, **432**, 570
- Rebassa-Mansergas A., Nebot Gómez-Morán A., Schreiber M. R., Girven J., Gänsicke B. T., 2011, *MNRAS*, **413**, 1121
- Renedo I., Althaus L. G., Miller Bertolami M. M., Romero A. D., Córscico A. H., Rohrmann R. D., García-Berro E., 2010, *ApJ*, **717**, 183
- Schreiber M. R., et al., 2010, *A&A*, **513**, L7
- Schreiber M. R., Zorotovic M., Wijnen T. P. G., 2016, *MNRAS*, **455**, L16
- Schwöpe A. D., Nebot Gomez-Moran A., Schreiber M. R., Gänsicke B. T., 2009, *A&A*, **500**, 867
- Toonen S., Nelemans G., 2013, *A&A*, **557**, A87
- Tout C. A., Wickramasinghe D. T., Liebert J., Ferrario L., Pringle J. E., 2008, *MNRAS*, **387**, 897
- Webbink R. F., Wickramasinghe D. T., 2002, *MNRAS*, **335**, 1
- Zorotovic M., Schreiber M. R., 2017, *MNRAS*, **466**, L63
- Zorotovic M., Schreiber M. R., Gänsicke B. T., Nebot Gómez-Morán A., 2010, *A&A*, **520**, A86
- Zorotovic M., Schreiber M. R., Gänsicke B. T., 2011, *A&A*, **536**, A42
- Zorotovic M., Schreiber M. R., García-Berro E., Camacho J., Torres S., Rebassa-Mansergas A., Gänsicke B. T., 2014, *A&A*, **568**, A68
- Zorotovic M., et al., 2016, *MNRAS*, **457**, 3867

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.