# G ravitational W aves from Stellar Collapse: Correlations to Explosion A sym m etries

Chris L.Fryer

Theoretical A strophysics, Los A lam os National Laboratories, Los A lam os, NM 87544

> Daniel E. Holz Center for Cosm ological Physics University of Chicago Chicago, IL 60637

Scott A.Hughes Department of Physics Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA 02139-4307

#### ABSTRACT

The collapse of massive stars not only produces observable outbursts across the entire electrom agnetic spectrum but, for G alactic (or near-G alactic) supernovae, detectable signals for ground-based neutrino and gravitational wave detectors. G ravitational waves and neutrinos provide the only means to study the actual engine behind the optical outbursts: the collapsed stellar core. W hile the neutrinos are most sensitive to details of the equation of state, gravitational waves provide a means to study the mass asymmetries in this central core. We present gravitational wave signals from a series of 3-dim ensional core-collapse simulations with asymmetries derived from initial perturbations caused by pre-collapse convection, core rotation, and low-m ode convection in the explosion engine itself. A Galactic supernovae will allow us to di erentiate these di erent sources of asymmetry. Combining this signal with other observations of the supernova, from neutrinos to gam ma-rays to the com pact rem nant, dram atically increases the predictive power of the gravitational wave signal. We conclude with a discussion of the gravitational wave signal arising from collapsars, the leading engine for long-duration gam m a-ray bursts.

Subject headings: black hole physics | stars: black holes | stars: supernovae | stars: neutron

## 1. Introduction

The mechanism behind core-collapse supernovae (SN e) remains one of the longest outstanding problems in astrophysics. W hether or not simulations of stellar collapse produce explosions depends sensitively on the numerical in plementations of the neutrino transport and the equation of state physics (Herant et al. 1994; Burrows, Hayes, Fryxell 1995; Janka & Muller 1996; Mezzacappa et al. 1998; Fryer & Warren 2002; Buras et al. 2003). 10% di erences in this physics can make the di erence between the success or failure of an explosion. But it may be that the sensitivity of the current simulations occurs only because theorists are missing essential aspects of physics in the core. For exam ple, rotation in the core (Fryer & Heger 1998; Akiyam a et al. 2003; Kotake, Yam ada, & Sato 2003a; Fryer & Warren 2004), asymmetric collapse (Burrows & Hayes 1996; Fryer 2004a), one-sided convection due to oscillations (B londin, Mezzacappa & DeMarino 2003), or the merger ofm odes (Scheck et al. 2003) may help or hinder the explosion.

The reason we know so little about the core and the resultant supernova explosion is because we have very few ways of directly observing the engine behind these explosions. The collapsed core is enshrouded by the outer layers of the star and it is not until the supernova shock reaches the edge of the star and becomes optically thin to photons that we can nally see the supernova. Then begins the laborious task of working back from the optical display to study the workings of the inner core. A lthough these observations (see A kiyam a et al. 2003 and references therein), and observations of the neutron star rem nant (see Lai, Chemo, & Cordes 2001; Brisken et al. 2003 for reviews), have shown that the supernova explosion is alm ost certainly asymmetric, the level of asymmetry in the engine is very di cult to determ ine from these indirect methods. Gravitational waves and neutrinos provide the only means to directly probe the supernova engine.

Neutrinos have only been detected in SN 1987A (H irata et al. 1987; B ionta et al. 1987), and gravitational waves (GW s) have yet to be conclusively detected in supernovae. Unfortunately, the signals of both are su ciently weak to lim it their detection to G alactic or near-G alactic supernovae (N eutrinos: B urrows, K lein & G andhi 1998; GW s: Fryer, H olz & H ughes: FH H 2002; D im m elm eier, Font & M uller 2002; K otake, Y am ada & Sato 2003b; Fryer & W arren 2004; M uller et al. 2004). A lthough predictions for the GW signal from stellar collapse have been m uch higher in the past (see FH H 2002; N ew 2003 for reviews), these predictions were based on stellar cores rotating m uch faster than even the fastest rotating supernova progenitors produced today (H eger, Langer & W oosley 2000). M odem progenitors of stellar collapse are only m arginally, if at all, unstable to bar instabilities, and strong bar m odes (the source of strong gravitational wave signals) do not occur in collapse calculations using these progenitors (Fryer & W arren 2004). Even if bars did form,

they form at low densities, and at most produce a marginally detectable signal at 10 M pc (Ram pp, Muller & Ru ert 1998; FHH 2002). GW observations, like neutrinos, are limited to Galactic or near-Galactic supernovae.

Even though the rate of such nearby SN e are low  $(0.02 \text{ year}^1)$ , the insight gained from these supernovae will provide essential inform ation into stellar collapse. In this paper, we will focus on 3 phases of gravitational waves:

- Stellar B ounce The signal produced during the bounce caused when the stellar core reaches nuclear densities and its runaway free-fall is abruptly halted. For initial progenitors with asymmetries or rotation, the quadrupole moment in the progenitors will vary wildly during bounce, producing a strong signal.
- II) C onvection The signal produced during the convective phase of the supernova engine. Even if the initial conditions are sym metric, the convection modes may merge to form low -mode convection with a signi cant time-variable quadrupole moment.
- III) N eutrinos The signal produced by asymmetries in the neutrino emission. A symmetries in the collapse or in the convection will lead to asymmetries in the neutrino emission. These asymmetries lead to a time-variable quadrupole moment.

The GW signal can not only be used to distinguish these phases, but also the asymmetry that causes the signal in each phase.

In this paper, we will use the results from recent 3-dimensional collapse simulations (Fryer & W arren 2002, 2004; Fryer 2004a) to study the diment characteristics of these signals, focusing especially on what these signals can tell us about stellar collapse and supernova explosions. But a lot of uncertainty remains in such simulations and we use comparisons with other work and analytic estimates to gauge the uncertainties in these calculations. The models, and the numerical methods used to calculate the GW signal, are discussed in x2. x3 shows the results of these simulations, along with comparisons to other work and analytic estimates. To make GW s a powerful probe of the inner core, we must study a bigger picture and correlate the GW signal with other supernova observables: neutrino signal, nucleosynthetic yields and other explosion asymmetry characteristics in the observations (x4). We conclude with a discussion of the observability of gam marray bursts under the collapsar model and a review of the key observations and the constraints they can place on the supernova engine.

## 2. Computations

The gravitational wave signals presented here are derived from the 3-dimensional corecollapse calculations by Fryer & W arren (2002,2004) and Fryer (2004a). This core-collapse code couples smooth particle hydrodynamics (SPH) with a 3- avor ( $_{e}$ ;  $_{e}$ ; ; ) ux-limited di usion neutrino transport scheme (W arren, Rockefeller, & Fryer 2004). Beyond a trapping radius (corresponding to an optical depth, = 0:03), the neutrinos are assumed to escape the star completely. The neutrinos leaking from the \boundary particles" at this radius dom inate the observed neutrino ux. Unless otherwise specified, the gravity is Newtonian, using the træ-based algorithm described in W arren & Salm on (1995). These models begin with initial stars that are both rotating and non-rotating, with density distributions that are either initially symmetric, or perturbed by global asymmetries (Table 1).

The advantage of such a code is that we can model the collapse of the entire star in 3-dimensions for a series of initial conditions with existing computational resources (a typical simulation takes roughly 100,000 processor hours on both the Space Simulator and A SC IQ machines). Because the full 3-dimensional star is modeled, no approximations need be taken to calculate the mass quadrupole moments and its derivatives. And since this code is Lagrangian (particle based), the resolution follows the proto-neutron star and this code is ideally suited to model asymmetries that accelerate this central core.

However, bear in m ind that the neutrinos are modeled with a single-energy ux-limited transport algorithm. Comparison of such a transport algorithm with more sophisticated transport algorithms in 1 and 2-dimensions have found that the such calculations can drastically change the fate of the collapsing star (Buras et al. 2003). Note also that these models assume Newtonian rather than General Relativistic gravity, which not only a ects the bounce of and convective motions in the core, but also forces us to calculate the gravitational wave signal using a post-process technique. All of our results must be tempered by these uncertainties.

However, as we shall see in x3, the gravitational wave signal is so weak that the back-reaction of the gravitational wave em ission is unlikely to e ect the dynam ics in the core. The remaining uncertainties are less easy to quantify, but by comparing to more detailed 2-dimensional work (Muller et al. 2004), we can estimate the level of uncertainty in our results (x3).

W e calculate the gravitational wave signal from baryonic mass motions using the

formulism of Centrella & M dM illan (1993):

$$c^{8}=G^{2} < (rh_{+})^{2} > = \frac{4}{15} (I_{xx} I_{zz})^{2} + \frac{4}{15} (I_{yy} I_{zz})^{2} + \frac{1}{10} (I_{xx} I_{yy})^{2} + \frac{14}{15} (I_{xy})^{2} + \frac{4}{15} (I_{xz})^{2} + \frac{4}{15} (I_{yz})^{2}; \qquad (1)$$

$$c^{8}=G^{2} < (rh_{})^{2} > = \frac{1}{6} (I_{xx}_{x} - I_{yy})^{2} + \frac{2}{3} (I_{xy})^{2} + \frac{4}{3} (I_{xz})^{2} + \frac{4}{3} (I_{yz})^{2};$$
 (2)

where r is the distance to the source. The angle brackets in these equations denote averaging over all source orientations, so that for example

$$h(rh_{+})^{2}i = \frac{1}{4}^{2} d r^{2}h_{+} (;)^{2}:$$
 (3)

The quantities  $I_{ij}$  are the second time derivatives of the trace-free quadrupole moment of the source. The diagonal elements are given by, for example,

$$I_{xx} = \frac{2}{3} \sum_{p=1}^{X^{N}} m_{p} (2x_{p}x_{p} - y_{p}y_{p} - z_{p}z_{p} + 2\underline{x}_{p}^{2} - \underline{y}_{p}^{2} - \underline{z}_{p}^{2}); \qquad (4)$$

where  $m_p$  is the mass of an SPH particle, and  $(x_p; y_p; z_p)$  is its coordinate location. The other diagonal elements can be obtained using Eq. (4) plus cyclic permutation of the coordinate labels:  $I_{xx}$  !  $I_{yy}$  via x ! y, y ! z, z ! x;  $I_{xx}$  !  $I_{zz}$  via x ! z, y ! x, z ! y. The o -diagonal elements are given by, for example

$$I_{xy} = \prod_{p=1}^{X^{N}} m_{p} (x_{p} x_{p} + y_{p} y_{p} + 2 \underline{x}_{p} \underline{y}_{p});$$
(5)

the remaining o -diagonal elements can be found via symmetry  $(I_{ji} = I_{ij})$  plus cyclic permutation. This approach provides only averaged square amplitudes, instead of the speci c amplitude of the gravitational wave signal. This paper is concerned with general qualitative features of the wave signals, rather then detailed predictions. In this vein, the averaged square amplitudes are a cleaner and more elective description.

For the trends we a studying here, this form ulism is su cient and provides a cleaner signal.

For gravitational waves from neutrinos, we use the form ulae derived by M uller & Janka (1997):

$$(h_{xx}^{TT})_{pole} = \frac{2G}{Z^{4}r} \int_{1}^{Z t_{R=c}} dt^{0} d$$

$$(h_{xx}^{TT})_{equator} = \frac{2G}{c^{4}r} \int_{1}^{T} dt^{0} dt^{0} dt^{0} (1 + \sin^{0}\cos^{0}) \\ \frac{\cos^{2} \int_{0}^{0} \sin^{2} \int_{0}^{0} \sin^{2} \int_{0}^{0} dL (\int_{0}^{0} t^{0}) dt^{0}}{\cos^{2} \int_{0}^{0} + \sin^{2} \int_{0}^{0} \sin^{2} \int_{0}^{0} dL (\int_{0}^{0} t^{0}) dt^{0} dt^{0$$

where G is the gravitational constant, c is the speed of light and r is the distance of the object.  $(h_{xx}^{TT})_{pole}$  denotes the emergent strain for an observer situated along the source coordinate fram e's z-axis (or pole) and  $(h_{xx}^{TT})_{equator}$  is the comparable strain for an observer situated perpindicular to this z-axis (or equator). For our simulations, the rotation axis or asymmetry axis is the z-axis and the polar view corresponds to the axis of symmetry for the initial perturbations.

In SPH calculations, these expressions reduce to:

$$(h_{xx}^{TT})_{pole} = \frac{2G}{c^4 R}$$
  $t$   $(1 z=r) (2x^2=r^2 1) L ;$  (8)

$$(h_{xx}^{TT})_{equator} = \frac{2G}{c^4 R} X t \sum_{p=1}^{X} (1 p_{1} z^2 = r^2 (x; y) = r) \frac{z^2 = r^2}{z^2 = r^2 + p_{1} z^2 = r^2} (x; y)^2 = r^2 L :$$
(9)

where t is the tim estep, the sum m ation is over all particles emitting neutrinos that escape this star (prim arily, the boundary particles). We assume that the neutrino emission at these boundaries is along the radial direction of the particle, so L is set to E = t where E is the neutrino energy emitted by that particle. If the neutrinos are more isotropic, this will weaken the gravitational wave signal, but not by more than a factor of 2. The correspond to observers along the positive/negative directions of each axis: for instance, in the polar equation, this corresponds to the positive/negative z-axis. In the equatorial region, the x,y axis is determined by the choice of x or y position for the (x,y) coordinate in the equation.

## 3. Results from 3-dimensional Simulations

A massive starends its life when its iron core becomes som assive that that the therm al and electron degeneracy pressure of the star can no longer support the core and it implodes. This implosion continues until the core reaches nuclear densities, where nuclear forces and neutron degeneracy pressure halt the collapse. The \bounce" of the core does not produce an explosion. The bounce shock stalls when neutrino cooling and photodisintegration saps the shock of its energy. If there are asymmetries in the star, this collapse and bounce phase produces rapidly varying quadrupole moments and gravitational waves.

The stalled shock leaves behind a convectively unstable region between the protoneutron star and the accretion shock of the infalling star. Neutrinos leaking out of the proto-neutron star heat this region, driving further convection. W hen the pressure from this convection overcom es the pressure of the infalling star, a supernova explosion is launched. The mass motions in this convection also produce rapidly varying quadrupole moments.

If stellar asym m etries or convective m otions are su ciently asym m etric, the neutrino em ission w ill also be asym m etric. These neutrino asym m etries can produce a signi cant gravitational wave signal. As we shall see, these signals can dom inate the GW signal in som e cases.

Let's take a closer look at each of these phases in turn, using core-collapse simulations as a guide.

## 3.1. Gravitational W aves from C ore B ounce

R otation: A though massive stars are observed to rotate at nearly break-up velocities while on the main-sequence, the angular velocity (of the envelope at least) decreases dram atically (just from angular momentum conservation) when these stars expand into giants. If they cores are not coupled to their expanding envelopes, they will spin up as the core contracts. If they are coupled, the contracting core will impart its angular momentum to the envelope and slow down as this envelope expands. The extent of this coupling depends sensitively on uncertain magnetohydrodynamic physics and current supernova models (Heger, Langer, & W oosley 2000; Heger, W oosley, & Spruit 2004) predict a range of answers (see Fryer & W arren 2004 for a review). If these cores collapse with signi cant angular velocity, centrifugal support will deform the collapse, making strong asymmetries and, ultim ately, a strong gravitational wave signal. GW observations provide an ideal m eans to probe this asymmetry.

Figure 1 shows the gravitational wave signals for a range of rotating stellar collapses. M odel R otl is the the fastest spinning core produced by Heger, Langer & W oosley (2000). The signal in Fig. 1 assumes the collapse occurs 10 kpc away. At 10 kpc (within the G alaxy), this bounce signal from m odels R otl and R ot2 (peaking at 2  $10^{21}$  at 1 kH z) is well above the expected noise level of advanced L IG O, suggesting it should not be di cult to observe. The strong signal dies away very quickly and is strongest right at core bounce. But the strength of this signal depends sensitively on the rotation. The slower rotating

cores do not produce gravitational wave signals (R ot3) that are significantly stronger than those produced by asymmetries (R ot4 and R ot5)<sup>1</sup> in a non-rotating core.

A sym m etries from Explosive Burning: Rotation is not the only way to produce asym m etries in the star just prior to collapse. Explosive burning in the oxygen and silicon shells produces strong convection in these shells, causing density perturbations in these shells (Bazan & A mett 1998). If this convection has many down ows and up ows (high mode convection), these density perturbations would be random ly distributed across the oxygen and silicon layers of the star, sim ilar to the 5–10% perturbations introduced using the sm ooth particle hydrodynam ics technique. The signal from our non-rotating star (Figs. 1,2) is caused by these perturbations.

But what if the convection is dom inated by low modes with the density perturbations taking on a more global scale? Burrows & Hayes (1996) argued that global perturbations from oxygen and silicon burning would lead to asymmetries in the bounce and could be the source of neutron star kicks. Lai & Goldreich (2000) argued that this convection would drive oscillatory modes in the iron core that would grow during collapse and drive large asymmetries in the bounce. Fryer (2004a) min icked these global perturbations by decreasing the density to the oxygen and silicon layers (or in the entire star) in a cone an the positive z axis.

Fig. 3 shows the gravitational wave signals from these globabally asymmetric explosions. The bounce signal from these global asymmetries is much dimensioned the rotating stars. The peak signal does not occur at bounce, but 10-20 m s later. The signal from baryonic mass motions is dominated by the asymmetries caused by the oscillations in the core as ejecta and neutrino asymmetries kick the neutron star.

M odels A sym 1, A sym 2 correspond to the large asym metry cases for \Shell O nly", or W ith O scillations" simulations in Fryer (2004a). M odels A sym 3, A sym 4 are 30% perturbations in the oxygen/silicon burning shells. A sym 3 and A sym 4 di er in that the momentum imparted by the last scattering of neutrinos is included in A sym 3 and not in A sym 4<sup>2</sup>. Note that there is very little di erence between the GW signal of these two models. N either model produces sizable kicks ( $v_{kick} < 30$ km s<sup>1</sup>) in the neutron star or strong oscillations in the core. M odels A sym 1 and A sym 2 produce much stronger oscillations and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Our SPH initial conditions introduce 5-10% asymmetries. A lthough these are numerical artifacts, they do not dier signicantly from the asymmetries expected from explosive burning prior to collapse.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>The ux limited-di usion scheme used by Fryer (2004a) includes the e ects of neutrino pressure and momentum. Below = 0.03, we make a light-bulb approximation. At the boundary, the neutrino momentum must be included. The prescription for this is described in Fryer (2004a).

slightly stronger GW signals. The largest signal occurs when oscillatory modes are driven in the iron core prior to collapse (A sym 1). However, as we shall see in x3.3, the neutrino GW signal for these models is much stronger than that of mass motions, and that will dom inate the signal at late times.

Fig. 4 com pares the gravitational wave signals from the extrem e cases of rotating (Rot1) and globally asymmetric (A sym 1) simulations along with a non-rotating model (SPH1 - equivalent to high mode perturbations). For mass motions, the rotating model has the strongest signal which peaks at bounce. The globally asymmetric model can also produce a signal which should detectable by LIGO, peaking at 10-20m s after bounce. If the rotation or asymmetries are not extreme, the gravitational wave signal will not be easily detectable. However, even a non-detection will tell us much about the core, as it will rule out these large (or larger) asymmetries in the initial core.

## 3.2. G ravitational W aves from C onvection

W ith accurate equations of state, when the bounce shock stalls, it leaves behind an unstable entropy pro le above the proto-neutron star. The region bounded by the proto-neutron star on the inside and the accretion shock where the rest of the material falls down onto the stalled bounce shock quickly becomes convective. This convection is further driven by heating from neutrinos leaking out of the proto-neutron star. Convection allows the energy deposited from neutrinos to convert into kinetic energy of rising matter. W hen this matter is able to push o the infalling star, an explosion is launched (see Fryer 1999 for a review).

Herant et al. (1994) found that the energy in this convection was primarily carried in just a few up ows and Herant (1995) argued that if the convection were dom inated by a single up ow, they could explain the high space velocities of pulsars (see x4.3). Indeed, the convective modes merge with time (Fig. 5). In our 3-dimensional models, the explosion occurs so quickly that there are still 3-6 up ows when the explosion is launched. Hence, the convective modes do not produce a strong signal for our models (Figs. 1-4). Indeed, the only simulations that produced strong signals from baryonic mass motions were the globally asymmetric collapse simulations with strongly oscillating neutron stars.

However, Scheck et al. (2003) have found that for su ciently delayed explosions (which may well be more typical in supernovae), the convective up ows can merge until there is only 1 single up ow. This can produce a gravitational wave signal that rivals even the bounce signal for some rotating stars (Muller et al. 2004). To get a better understanding of

this signal, we can approximate the mass motions by assuming that the convective motions have merged, leading to a single down ow, but that the down ow occurs in spurts (large blobs accreting). Such an assumption is not too unreasonable, as mass builds up at the accretion shock until its weight carries it down, punching its way through the up owing material. To estimate the maximum signal from convection, we assume the mass of the accreting blob is 0.1 M and it accelerates at free-fall from the edge of the accretion region to half way between the accretion shock and the proto-neutron star surface (at 50 km), at which point they begin to decelerate and stop at the proto-neutron star surface (we chose a deceleration that was symmetric in magnitude about the half radius). The signal produced by this \convection" varies as the blob falls. Figure 6 plots the maximum of that signal as a function of the accretion shock radius. A s the convection region expands, the signal will decrease, but it could take 500m s for the shock to move from 100 km to 500 km. Note that this signal is an upper lim it to the possible signal from convection and is an order of magnitude higher than that predicted by M uller et al. (2004). It is also nearly an order of magnitude greater than the rotating simulations presented here.

## 3.3. Gravitational W aves from Neutrino A sym m etries

All of these asymmetries in the bounce and convection lead to asymmetries in the neutrino emission. These asymmetries produce a gravitational wave signal that grows with time. In most cases, the asymmetry in the neutrinos is not large enough to dominate the GW signal (e.g. Muller et al. 2004), but neutrino asymmetries can dominate the gravitational wave signal in the case of asymmetric collapse (e.g. Burrows & Hayes; Fryer 2004a).

Figs. 7 and 8 show the gravitational wave signal from models A sym 1 and A sym 2 respectively. The signal continues to grow with time and, for these two simulations, exceeds the bounce or convective signals by over an order of magnitude! Unfortunately, these signals were not calculated for any models prior to Fryer (2004a), so we can not present gravitational wave signals for earlier models. But the neutrino asymmetry in the rotating and spherical models are more than 2 orders of magnitude less than the asymmetries of these simulations, so neutrinos asymmetries may not play a dominant role in most supernovae. Indeed, Muller et al. (2004) found that the GW signal from asymmetric neutrino emission was slightly lower than that produced by baryonic mass motions.

Figures 7 and 8 show the GW signal from neutrinos along 6 lines of site (positive and negative x, y, and z axes). The magnitude of the signal is strongest along the positive z axis (the positive z axis is where the initial density perturbation was placed). Reviewing

all axes gives a handle on how observation location will e ect the signal. These extrem e asym m etries will easily produce signals detectable in a G alactic supernova. In addition, the tim e evolution of this signal is signi cantly di erent that it can easily be distinguished from signals by m ass m otions. Unfortunately, unlike the signal from m ass m otions, the signal for neutrinos peaks at low er frequencies (F ig. 9) and, in advanced L IG O sensitivity band, the neutrino asym m etry G W signal is only slightly stronger than m ass m otions for these stellar im plosions.

D etecting a G alactic supernova in gravitational waves and following the time evolution of the GW signal can easily tell us much about the behavior of the inner core of a star during collapse. We can distinguish between rotating and asymmetric collapse and between low-mode and high-mode convection. We can also estimate the level of neutrino asymmetry. G ravitational waves provide an ideal window into the mass motions in, and just above, the proto-neutron star core.

## 4. Comparing with other Observables

Especially with Galactic supernovae, we have a number of additional observations which can be used to help learn about supernovae ranging from direct observations of the core with neutrinos to indirect methods such as supernova asymmetries, nucleosynthetic yields, and studies of the compact remnant from these explosions. Combined with these constraints, gravitational waves can tell us much about the supernova engine.

# 4.1. Neutrinos

Neutrino detections provide the only other means beyond GW s to study the supernova engine directly. SuperK am iokande will detect over 5000 neutrinos from a supernova 10 kpc away (Burrows, Klein, & Gandhi 1998). The bulk of these detections will be electron anti-neutrinos, but both SuperK am iokande and the Sudbury Neutrino O bærvatory will detect a few hundred electron and neutrinos. This signal will be su cient to produce reasonable neutrino light-curves that can be used to make detailed com parisons with the neutrino em ission predicted by models.

How do the mass motions a ect the neutrino observations? The actual net asym metries in the neutrino emission tend to be small (a percent or less - see Janka & Monchmeyer 1989a,1989b), but Kotake et al. (2003a) have found that rotation can lead to a neutrino energy that varies by as much as a factor of 2 for di erent angular lines-of-sight. Figure 10 shows the electron neutrino lum inosity and energy for a range of models (from spherical to rotating to asymmetric collapse). For our models, the electron neutrino lum inosity does not change much even though the actual progenitors for these objects does vary in some cases. The electron neutrino energies vary by < 30%. However, bear in m ind that these calculations rely upon a single-energy ux-limited di usion scheme and we should take these quantitative results with a grain of salt.

The , , and electron anti-neutrinos vary much more than the electron neutrinos (Figs. 11-12). Even so, it would be very di cult to distinguish asymmetries in the core with neutrinos. But neutrinos do give us an ideal probe into the equation of state in the core (e.g. Pons et al. 2000). The details of the equation of state will also a ect the gravitational waves to a lesser extent (D immelmeier et al. 2002) and we can use neutrino observations to distinguish equation of state e ects from mass motions. C om bining the neutrino and the gravitational wave signal, we can study both the mass asymmetries in the collapse and the behavior of matter at nuclear densities. Q uantitative analyses will require much more detailed core-collapse models.

The detection of both gravitational waves and neutrinos also has implications for calculating the neutrino mass. The delay between the emission of neutrinos ( $t_e$ ) and their arrivalat a detector ( $t_d$ ) is (e.g. A mett & Rosner 1987):

$$t_d = t_e (d=c) (1 + 0.5m^2 = E^2)$$
 (10)

where d is the distance from the supernova to the observer, c is the speed of light and m ;E are the mass and energy of the neutrino respectively. If we know that our GW signal peaks at bounce (as is the case for our rotating supernovae), the time between the peak em ission of the gravitational and neutrino signals should not dier by more than 5m s and can easily be determined to this accuracy. By dierencing the delay in the neutrinos by the delay in the gravitational wave signal ( $t_d = t_e$ ) ( $t_d = t_e$ )<sub>GW</sub>, we could then determine the neutrino m ass from a 10 kpc supernova to better than 1eV (see also, A maud et al. 2002). It will be more di cult to use this technique if the neutrino signal is determined by convective modes or neutrino asymmetries, where the timing is less accurate.

## 4.2. Observations of Explosion A sym m etries

The same asymmetric mass motions that produce gravitational waves may also produce asymmetries in the supernova explosion. For example, rotation causes the strongest convection to occur along the rotation axis and this bipolar convection will drive asymmetric explosions (Fryer & Heger 2000; Kotake et al. 2003a; Fryer & Warren 2004). The merger

of convective modes will also produce wildly asymmetric supernovae (Scheck et al. 2003). Burrows & Hayes (1996) also argued that asymmetric collapse would produce asymmetries in the explosion, but 3-dimensional calculations have found that these asymmetries are mild (Fryer 2004a).

For G alactic supernovae, there are m any observational diagnostics that can help, albeit indirectly, determ ine the level of asymmetry in the core. Supernova 1987A provides a number of examples of how powerful these diagnostics can be for nearby supernovae and m odern telescopes. One of the suprises SN 1987A provided for astronomers was that somehow the nickel in the core was mixed well into the star, causing the gamma-ray lum inosity powered by the  $^{56}$ N i produced in this explosion to peak 150 d earlier than expected by theorists (P into & W oosley 1988). Spherical explosions can not explain this easily (K ifonidis et al. 2003), but m ild ( 2 times stronger along the rotation axis over the equator) asymmetries would easily explain this m ixing (F ig. 13: H ungerford, Fryer, & W arren 2003, Fryer 2004b). Because of these asymmetries, the nickel is also ejected preferentially along the asymmetry axis (F ig. 14) and this asymmetric distribution leads to a gamma-ray line pro le that, in principal, can determ ine the angle and level of the asymmetry (with some uncertainty due to the degeneracy of these two e ects: H ungerford et al. 2003). Supernova 1987A was too distant to easily m ake these distinctions, but a G alactic supernova with m odern telescopes would provide strong constraints.

A sym metries also e ect the nucleosynthetic yields, optical line proles, and polarization of supernovae. Varying the shock velocity changes the yields from explosive nuclear burning. N agataki et al. (1998) found that mild asym metries (on the same level as those required to explain the gam ma-ray lines) were required to best t the nucleosynthetic yields of SN 1987A. Interpretations of the polarization signal have argued that most supernovae must be jet-like with explosions 100 times stronger along the rotation axis over the equatorial plane (A kiyam a et al. 2003). However, this interpretation requires several layers of detailed radiation transport calculations. This result is in contrast to more direct measurements from both radio studies of supernovae (Berger et al. 2003) and speci c studies of SN 1987A (e.g. the mixing and nucleosynthetic yield results described above) which argue for mild asym metries. It is likely that the interpretation of the polarization measurement is overestimating the asym metry and such large asym metries are probably limited to a small fraction of all supernovae. But this descrepancy highlights the limitations of such indirect measurements of asym metries.

W hat indirect observations from current supernovae can tell us at this point is that asym m etries exist. The situation will change with a Galactic supernova. A Galactic supernova will provide enough gam m a-ray photons (which have few transport uncertainties) to constrain not only the level of asymmetry, but the axis of asymmetry. Such information can be used to help us understand the GW signal and use gravitational waves to constrain the mass motions.

## 4.3. C om pact R em nants

A symmetric mass motions also a ect the velocity and spin of the neutron star remnant. produced in the supernova explosion. Spinning, magnetized neutron stars are observed as pulsars. For the fastest spinning collapse progenitors (the ones that produce sizable GW signals), the angular momentum is so high in the core that, if no angular momentum were bst in the supernova explosion, the resultant core would be spinning at sub-millisecond periods. During the collapse and subsequent supernova explosion of the core, the high angular momentum in the core is ejected, but the new ly-born neutron star will have periods in the 1-3m s range, with total rotational energies in excess of  $10^{51}$  ergs (Fryer & W arren 2004). If such a pulsar had moderate to high (above  $10^{11}$  G) magnetic elds, its em ission would easily be observable in the Galaxy (even if not directed toward us!). Indeed, the pulsar emission may alter the supernova explosion energy (see Fryer & Warren 2004). A detailed, strong GW signal (or the lack of a signal) could give constraints on this em ission. Sim ilarly, pulsar observations can help interpret the GW signal. Since the pulsar spin depends primarily on the rotation of the core, it is most sensitive to this source of gravitational waves. A number of limitations may confuse such results: e.g. the neutron star could lose angular m om entum due to GW driven m odes after the explosion, som e collapsing stars produce fast-spinning neutron stars but only weak GW signals.

The evidence that neutron stars receive a sizable \kick" ( 500 km s<sup>1</sup>) at birth continues to grow (see Lai, Chemo, & Cordes (2001); Brisken et al. (2003) for recent review s). These kicks are either produced by ejecta asymmetries (e.g. Herant 1995; Burrows & Hayes 1996; Scheck et al. 2003) or neutrino asymmetries (Lai & Arras 1999; Fryer 2004a). It is likely that the velocity of the neutron star remnant of a Galactic supernova will be measured. The velocity of the neutron star does not depend so much on the rotation, but may depend on the level of asymmetry in the collapse (Burrows & Hayes 1996; Fryer 2004a) or the merger of convective modes (Herant 1995; Scheck et al. 2003). Because these two GW mechanisms have such distinct signatures, GW observations of a Galactic supernova (com bined with a neutron star velocity measurement) will be able to determ ine which, if either, of these mechanisms produce neutron star kicks.

## 5. Conclusions

A number of asymmetries in the stellar collapse can produce a gravitational wave signal in a Galactic supernova that should be detectable by advanced LIGO. These asymmetries are caused by rotation in the star, asymmetries induced by explosive nuclear burning just prior to collapse, or low mode convection in the supernova engine. Each has a distinctive gravitational wave signal which can be used to study the mass motions in the supernova engine.

But the real power of GW s arises when combined and corroborated with other observations. The correlation between GW and these observations is sum marized in Tables 2 and 3. Fast rotating progenitors can produce a strong signal at bounce, mild asymmetries in the ejecta and fast-spinning neutron star remnants. The timing of the GW signal is within 5m s (maybe even closer) of the neutrino signal and such an event could be used to constrain the neutrino mass. A symmetries in the collapsing star caused by explosive burning can produce strong signals at late times through asymmetric neutrino emission and mild velocities on the neutron star, but the explosion is roughly symmetric. Low mode convection will produce a gravitational wave signal during the convective engine phase, asymmetric explosions and possibly strong neutron star kicks. The GW signal will help determ ine the mechanism behind the SN and our understanding of these additional phenomena.

Supernovae are not the only explosions produced by stellar collapse. The favored m echanism for long-duration gam m a-ray bursts, the collapsar m odel (W oosley 1993; M acFadyen & W oosley 1999), invokes the collapse of a m assive star. C ollapsars are m assive stars that do not produce strong supernova explosions, but instead collapse to form black holes. If the star is rotating fast enough, the high angular m om entum stellar m aterial w ill form an accretion disk around the black hole. Energy liberated from the disk drives a strong explosion (even stronger than supernovae) in a jet along the rotation axis.

Because rotation is required to produce a collapsar explosion, the collapsing stars will necessarily be fast rotators. Thus they will have a strong bounce GW signal. However, this signal is unlikely to be much stronger than our fast rotating collapse models (too much rotation will also prevent the collapsar engine from working -M acFadyen & W oosley 1999). It is likely that collapsars arise from extrem ely massive stars (Heger et al. 2003), but, because the cores of massive stars are essentially all the same, this does not alter the GW signal signi cantly from our extrem e rotating case (D upuis, Fryer, & Heger 2004).

The bounce of collapsar driven gam m a ray bursts will only be detectable when they occur in the galaxy. The accretion onto the black hole will cause ringing, but this signal

too will only be detectable in a G alactic gam ma-ray burst. Finally, for the low-m ass disks produced in collapsars (Popham, Fryer, & W oosley 1998; M acFadyen & W oosley 1999), no disk instabilities will form and the accretion phase of collapsars are unlikely to produce strong GW signals. The narrow ly collimated, low-baryon jet produced in collapsars will produce a signal akin to neutrino driven signals. However, for a bipolar jet, there will be no signal along the jet axis. Perpendicular to the jet axis, the signal (using equation 8) can be as high as 5  $10^{24}$  for a  $10^{51}$  erg jet, on parw ith the signal from the disk, but still only detectable within the G alaxy and only if the jet is not directed toward us (so not associated with G R B s, but m aybe with hypernovae). W hat this all boils down to is that collapsar driven gam ma-ray bursts, like supernovae, will not be detectable beyond the G alaxy. G iven their low rate ( $10^5$  year<sup>1</sup> in the G alaxy), collapsars will not be a strong G W source. However, other gam ma-ray burst models will produce strong G W signals (e.g. neutron star m ergers) and G W s can easily distinguish these two burst engines.

It is a pleasure to thank L.S.F inn whose questions set up the direction of this paper. This work under the auspices of the University of Arizona and the U.S.Dept. of Energy, and supported by its contract W -7405-ENG-36 to Los A lam os National Laboratory as well as DOE SciDAC grant number DE-FC02-01ER 41176, NSF grant PHY-0244424 and NSF G rant PHY-0114422 to the CfCP. The simulations used in this work were run on LANL's ASCIQ machine and the Space Simulator.

M odel Nam e	Reference Name	InitialRot. (rads <sup>1</sup> )	Initial A sym m etry	N um ber of Particles	
R ot 1	SN 15A -hrª	4	sym m etric	5 10 <sup>6</sup>	
R ot2	SN 15B <sup>a</sup>	10	sym m etric	5 10 <sup>5</sup>	
R ot3	SN 15C <sup>a</sup>	0.25	sym m etric	10 <sup>6</sup>	
R ot4	SN 15B -nr <sup>a</sup>	0	sym m etric	10 <sup>6</sup>	
R ot5	SN 15A -nr <sup>a</sup>	0	sym m etric	10 <sup>6</sup>	
Sph1	M odelC <sup>b</sup>	0	sym m etric	3 10 <sup>6</sup>	
Sph2	M odelB <sup>b</sup>	0	sym m etric	10 <sup>6</sup>	
Sph3	M odelA <sup>b</sup>	0	sym m etric	3 10 <sup>5</sup>	
Asym 1	Shell O n ly <sup>c</sup>	0	40% in O "Si <sup>d</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>	
A sym 2	W ith O scillations <sup>c</sup>	0	25% in Fe,O ,Si <sup>d</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>	
A sym 3	Shell0nly <sup>e</sup>	0	30% in O "Si <sup>d</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>	
A sym 4	Shell O n ly <sup>e</sup>	0	30% in O <b>,</b> Si <sup>d;f</sup>	10 <sup>6</sup>	

Table 1. Collapse Models

<sup>a</sup>Fryer & Warren (2004)

<sup>b</sup>Fryer & Warren (2002)

<sup>c</sup>Fryer (2004a)

 $^{d}$ T his refers to the density decrease in a 30 cone along the positive z axis either in just the O, Si layers (ShellOnly) or the entire star (W ith O scillations).

<sup>e</sup>Simulations rst presented here, but using the same conditions as in Fryer (2004a).

<sup>f</sup>Backreaction from momentum carried away by neutrinos not included.

Table 2. Collapse Results

M odel	Peak GW Signal	f(H z)	Pulsar	NSVelocity	A sym m etry
N am e	(10 <sup>21</sup> at 10 kpc)	at Peak <sup>a</sup>	Period	kms <sup>1</sup>	v <sub>pole</sub> /v <sub>eq</sub>
R ot1 R ot2 R ot3 R ot4 R ot5 Sph1 Sph2 Sph3	2.3 1.9 0.5 0.4 0.5 0.1 0.1 0.1	1000 1000 1000 200 200 100 100	> 0:66m s > 0:35m s > 17m s > 1s > 1s > 1s > 1s > 1s > 1s > 1s	< 30 < 30 < 30 < 30 < 30 < 30 < 30 < 30	2 1:5 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1 < 1:1
A sym 1	0.9	1000 <sup>b</sup>	> 1s	200	12
A sym 2	0.4	1000 <sup>b</sup>	> 1s	< 100	12
A sym 3	02	1000 <sup>b</sup>	> 1s	< 30	< 1:1
A sym 4	03	1000 <sup>b</sup>	> 1s	< 30	< 1:1

<sup>a</sup>Because most of the signals are dominated by a single burst, this frequency is just  $t_{burst}^{1}$  where  $t_{burst}$  is the burst duration.

 $^{\rm b}$ T his is the frequency of the baryonic m as motions. Neutrino asymmetries dominate the signal below this frequency, peaking below 10 Hz.

Table 3. GW sources in Core-Collapse

Initial	G ravitationalW aves			Correlation		
A sym m etry	Source	PeakGW Signal <sup>a</sup>	T T <sub>GW</sub>	$\operatorname{Expl.Asym}$ .	m s Pulsar	NSK ick
None	C onvection <sup>b</sup>	10 22	50-500m s	Υ?	Ν	Υ?
R otation	Bounce <sup>b</sup>	2 <b>:</b> 5 10 <sup>22</sup>	0ms	Y	Y	Ν
D ensity <sup>c</sup>	Neutrinos	> 4 10 <sup>22</sup>	50m s-1s	Ν	Ν	Υ?

<sup>a</sup>at 10 kpc

<sup>b</sup>Baryonic mass motions drive signal.

<sup>c</sup>D ensity Perturbation caused by explosive shell burning prior to collapse.

# { 20 {

#### REFERENCES

- Akiyama, S., Wheeler, J.C., Meier, D.L., & Lichtenstadt, I. 2003, ApJ, 584, 954
- Amett, D.& Rosner, J.L. 1987, PRL, 58, 1906
- A maud, N., Barsuglia, M., Bizouard, M.A., Cavalier, F., Davier, M., Hello, P., Pradier, T. 2002, PRD, 65, 3010
- Bazan, G., & Amett, D. 1998, ApJ, 496, 316
- Berger, E., Kulkami, S.R., Frail, D.A., Soderberg, A.M., submitted to ApJ
- Bionta, R.M., Blewitt, G., Bratton, C.B., Caspere, D., Ciocio, A. 1987, PRL, 58, 1494
- Blondin, J.M., Mezzacappa, A., DeMarino, C. 2003, ApJ, 584, 971
- Brisken, W.F., Fruchter, A.S., Goss, W.M., Hemstein, R.S., & Thorsett, S.E. 2003, accepted by ApJ
- Buras, R., Rampp, M., Janka, H.-Th., Kifonidis, K. 2003, PRL, 90, 241101
- Burrows, A., Klein, D., Gandhi, R. 1992, PRD, 45, 3361
- Burrows, A., Hayes, J., & Fryxell, B.A. 1995, ApJ, 450, 830
- Burrows, A. & Hayes, J. 1996, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 352
- Centrella, J.M., & M dM illan, S.L.W. 1993, ApJ, 416, 719
- D im m elm eier, H ., Font, J.A ., M uller, E . 2002, A & A , 393, 523
- Dupuis, R., Fryer, C.L., & Heger, A. 2004, in preparation
- Fryer, C.L. 1999, ApJ, 522, 413
- Fryer, C L. & Heger, A., 2000, ApJ, 541, 1033
- Fryer, C.L., Holz, D.E., Hughes, S.A. 2002, 565, 430: FHH
- Fryer, C.L., & Warren, M.S. 2002, ApJ, 574, L65
- Fryer, C.L., & Warren, M.S. 2004, ApJ, 601, 391
- Fryer, C.L. 2004a, ApJ, 601, L175
- Fryer, C.L. 2004b, New AR, 48, 13

- Gustafson, E., Shoemaker, D., Strain, K., Weiss, R. 1999, LSC White Paper on Detector Research and Development, LIGO Document T990080-00-D
- Heger, A., Langer, N., Woosley, S.E. 2000, ApJ, 528, 368
- Heger, A., Fryer, C.L., Woosley, S.E., Langer, N., Hartmann, D. 2003, ApJ, 591, 288
- Heger, A., Woosley, S.E., Spruit, H. 2004, in preparation
- Herant, M., Benz, W., Hix, W. R., Fryer, C.L. & Colgate, S.A. 1994, ApJ, 435, 339
- Herant, M. 1995, Space Science Reviews, 74, 335
- Hirata, K., Kajita, T., Koshiba, M., Nakahata, M., Oyama, Y. 1987, PRL, 58, 1490
- Hungerford, A.L., Fryer, C.L., Warren, M.S. 2003, ApJ, 594, 390
- Janka, H.-Th., & Monchmeyer, R. (1998a), A & A, 209, L5.
- Janka, H.-Th., & Monchmeyer, R. (1998b), A & A, 226, 69
- Janka, H.-Th., & Muller, E. 1996, A&A, 306, 167
- Kotake, K., Yamada, S., Sato, K. 2003a, ApJ, 595, 304
- Kotake, K., Yam ada, S., Sato, K. 2003b, PRD, 68, 4023
- K ifonidis, K., P lewa, T., Janka, H.-Th., M uller, E. 2003, A & A, 408, 621
- Lai, D. & Arras, P. 1999, ApJ, 519, 745
- Lai, D., Chemo, D.F., & Cordes, J.M. 2001, ApJ, 549, 1111
- Lai, D. & Goldreich, P. 2000, ApJ 535, 402
- MacFadyen, A. I., Woosley, S.E. 1999, ApJ, 524, 262
- Mezzacappa, A., Calder, A.C., Bruenn, S.W., Blondin, J.M., Guidry, M.W., Strayer, M. R., Umar, A.S. 1998, Apj, 493, 848
- Muller, E., & Janka, H.-Th. 1997, A&A, 317, 140
- Muller, E., Rampp, M., Buras, R., Janka, H.-Th. 2003, accepted by ApJ
- Nagataki, S., Hashim oto, M., Sato, K., Yam ada, S., Mochizuki, Y. 1998, ApJ, 492, L45
- New, K.C.B. 2003, Living Reviews in Relativity, IN-2003-2

- Pinto, P.A. & Woosley, S.E. 1988, Nature, 333, 534
- Pons, J., Reddy, S., Ellis, P.J., Prakash, M., Lattimer, J.M. 2000, PRC, 62, 5803
- Popham, R., Woosley, S.E., Fryer, C.L. 1999, ApJ, 518, 356
- Rampp, M., Muller, E., & Ru ert, M. 1998, ApJ, 332, 969
- Scheck, L., Plewa, T., Janka, H.-T., Kifonidis, K., & Muller, E. 2003, submitted to Phys. Rev. Letters.
- Warren, M.S., & Salmon, J.K. 1995, Computer Physics Communications, 87, 266
- Warren, M.S., Rockefeller, G., & Fryer, C.L. 2003, in preparation
- Woosley, S.E. 1993, ApJ, 405, 273

This preprint was prepared with the AAS  ${\rm I\!A} T_E X$  m acros v4.0.



10<sup>22</sup>h at 10 kpc

2

0

0

Fig. 1. The angle averaged wave am plitudes ( $h_{+}^2 > {}^{1=2}$ : solid line,  $h_x^2 > {}^{1=2}$ : dotted line) for the mass motions from 4 rotating supernova models. Rot2 is the fastest rotating model. R ot3 is what would be predicted for a magnetically braked core. R ot4 shows the signal from the sam e star as R ot2, but where the rotation was set to zero just before collapse. See Table 1 for more details. Note that the gravitational wave signal is a factor of 5 higher in the rapidly versus slow ly rotating models. A fast-rotating supernova in the Galaxy should be detectable by advanced LIG0.

0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08

Time Since Bounce (s)

2

0

0

0.02 0.04 0.06 0.08

Time Since Bounce (s)



Fig. 2. The angle averaged wave am plitudes (<  $h_{+}^{2} > {}^{1=2}$ : solid line,<  $h_{x}^{2} > {}^{1=2}$ : dotted line) for the mass motions from 4 non-rotating supernova models. Sph1-Sph3 are 3 di erent models with 3 levels of resolution (0.3,1.0,3.0 m illion particles). In these simulations, gravity was assumed to be spherically symmetric. Rot5 is a rotating progenitor (corresponding to Rot1: see Fig. 1) where the velocity angular was set to zero just before collapse, but with the collapse followed under full gravity. The di erence in signals arises both from full versus spherically symmetric gravity and from the di erent progenitors.



Fig. 3. The angle averaged wave amplitudes (<  $h_+^2 > {}^{1=2}$ : solid line, <  $h_x^2 > {}^{1=2}$ : dotted line) for the mass motions from 4 supernovae with global perturbations prior to collapse. A sym 1 corresponds to a 25% global perturbation throughout the entire core (assuming oscillatory modes in the neutron star). A sym 2 corresponds to a 40% global perturbation in the burning shells only. A sym 3 and A sym 4 correspond to 30% pertubations in the burning shells, sith and without momentum being carried away by neutrinos.



Fig. 4. The angle averaged wave amplitudes (<  $h_+^2 > {}^{1=2}$ : solid line,<  $h_x^2 > {}^{1=2}$ : dotted line) for the mass motions from 3 representative models of rotating, non-rotating, and asymmetric collapse. The fast-rotator produces the strongest signal which occurs at bounce. The asymmetric collapse simulation produces a reasonably strong signal, but not necessarily at bounce, and the weak signal from the non-rotating case also does not peak at bounce.







Fig. 6. Maximum gravitational wave signal from convection as a function of the radial extent of the convective region. As the convective region expands, the maximum signal decreases. Note that this estimate is an upper limit, and calculations predict signals that are 1{2 orders of magnitude weaker than this value.



Fig. 7. Gravitational wave signal for the simulation with a 25% core oscillation pertubation as a function of time and observer location. The signals observed of the perturbation axis are nearly all identical and are bracketed by the positive and negative z axis observations.



Fig. 8. Gravitational wave signal for the simulation with a 40% burning shell pertubation as a function of time and observer location. As with Fig. 7, the signals observed of the perturbation axis are nearly bracketed by the positive and negative z axis observations.



Fig. 9. Spectral energy distribution (calculated by taking the Fourier transform of the data from g. 7) of the GW radiation from the neutrino asymmetries for model A sym 1 (25% perturbations throughout the star). The advanced LIGO noise curve is plotted for comparison (Gustafson et al. 1999). The neutrino signal for more reasonable asymmetries is likely to be an order of magnitude lower.



Fig. 10. Electron neutrino lum inosity and energy as a function of time since bounce. The lum inosities (and energies to the 30% level) are all very similar. Based upon these simulations, it would be dicult to distinguish the mass motions from observations of just the the electron neutrinos.



Fig. 11. Anti-electron neutrino lum inosity and energy as a function of time since bounce. The di erences in the lum inosities and energies are greater for these neutrinos than those of the electron neutrinos (Fig. 10), but the uncertainties (due to the lower uxes) are higher for these models. Neutrino observations may be able to constrain the mass motions with more detailed 3-dimensional neutrino estimates.



Fig. 12. ; neutrino lum inosity and energy as a function of time since bounce. A swith the anti-electron neutrinos, the di erences in the lum inosities and energies are greater for these neutrinos than those of the electron neutrinos (Fig. 10), but the uncertainties (due to the lower uxes) are higher for these models. Anti-electron neutrino observations are easier to observe, and their observations will probably place stronger constraints on the m ass m otions and equation of state. etailed 3-dim ensional neutrino estim ates.



Fig. 13. Am ount of mixing of the inner 0.1M (left) and the inner 0.5M (right) of supernova ejecta for a symmetric explosion with decay energy added in (solid line), a polar explosion with a jet 2 times stronger along the poles than along the equator (dotted lines), and an equatorial explosion with the explosion 4 times stronger in the equator than along the poles (dashed line). See Hungerford et al. (2003) for details.



Fig. 14 Two contours of the nickel distribution for an asymmetric evolution. The inner