Structure and evolution of low mass W UM a type system s

Lifang Li[?], Zhanwen Han and Fenghui Zhang

N ational A stronom ical O bservatories/Yunnan O bservatory, Chinese A cadem y of Sciences, P.O. Box 110, Kunm ing, Yunnan P rovince 650011, P.R. China

A coepted yy mm dd.R eceived yy, mm, dd; in original form 2003 N ovember 5

ABSTRACT

The structure and evolution of low -m ass W UM a type contact binaries are discussed by employing Eggleton's stellar evolution code (Eggleton 1971, 1972, 1973). A ssum ing that these system s completely satisfy R oche geom etry, for contact binaries with every kind of m ass ratios (0.02 1.0), we calculate the relative radii ($R_{1:2}=A$, where $R_{1:2}$ are the radii of both stars, and A the orbital separation) of both components of contact binaries in dierent contact depth between inner and outer Roche lobes. We obtain a radius grid of contact binaries, and can ensure the surfaces of two components lying on an equipotential surface by interpolation using this radius grid when we follow the evolution of the contact binaries. Serious uncertainties concern mainly the transfer of energy in these systems, i.e., it is unclear that how and where the energy is transferred. W e assum e that the energy transfer takes place in the di erent regions of the com m on envelope to investigate the e ects of the region of energy transfer on the structure and evolution of contact binaries. We nd that the region of energy transfer has signi cant in uence on the structure and evolution of contact binaries, and conclude that the energy transferm ay occur in the outerm ost layers of the comm on convective envelope for W -type systems, and this transfer takes place in the deeper layers of the comm on envelope for A type system s. M eanwhile, if we assume that the energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers for our model with low total mass, and

nd that our model steadily evolves towards a system with a smaller mass ratio and a deeper envelope, suggesting that some A -type W UM a system s with low total mass could be considered as the later evolutionary stages of W -subtype system s, and that the surface tem perature of the secondary excesses that of the prim ary during the tim e when the prim ary expands rapidly, or the secondary contracts rapidly, suggesting that W -subtype system sm ay be caused by expansion of the prim ary, or by the contraction of the secondary.

Keywords: stars:binaries:close{stars:mass-loss{stars:rotation{stars:evolution

1 IN TRODUCTION

It is probable that m ore than 50 per cent of all stars are in binary orm ultiple system s. An unknown, but possibly large, percentage of these system s are su ciently close that som etim e during their lifetim e interacting as a result of R oche lobe over ow (RLOF). The W UM a-type contact binaries are the m ost com m on ones, com prising som e 95 per cent of eclipsing variables in the solar neighborhood (Shapley 1948) or one stars in every 1000{2000 in the sam e spectral range (Eggen 1967). A llow ing for selection e ects, W UM a stars m ay even contribute 1 per cent of all F and G dwarfs (van't Veer 1975a). A m ore recent discussion of contact binaries in the solar neighborhood is carried out by R ucinski (2002). H e considers the com plete sam ple of 32 EW , EB, and ellipsoidal (ELL) variables with V < 7.5, and gives the frequency as 1 per 500 stars with 0.5 < V < 5.5, including a serious estimate of the uncertainty.

W UM a stars are found both in young and in old galactic clusters (van't Veer 1975b). Am ong these clusters are: 1. NGC 2602, NGC 6383, NGC 7235 (. 10⁷ yr); 2. P leiades, Com a, Praesepe (. 5 10⁸ yr); 3. NGC 188, M 67 (& 5 10⁹ yr). For this reason it seem s we should be able to construct zero-age as well as evolved contact m odels. Further, there would be a natural explanation for the existence of W UM a stars in young as well as in old cluster if zero-age contact m odels could be shown to evolve on a nuclear tim escale. Structure and evolution of contact binaries are com plex and by no m eans well understood. A lthough theoretical investigation on early-type system s is alm ost absent, our discussion will be restricted to late-type system s. The observational properties (M ochnacki 1981; R ucinski 1993) that provide

[?] E-m ail: gssephd@ public.km .yn.cn or lifang_li@ hotm ail.com

the best clues to the nature of late-type W UM a system s are that the system s are of fairly low totalm ass, and are in shallow contact, that no equalm ass system s exist, that the m ass-lum inosity relation is unusual, and that m ost of the W -type system s are to be un unevolved or slightly evolved only, and som e of them are known to be unevolved.

Lucy (1968) had the key idea of a common convective envelope in which the entropy is constant and energy is transferred from the primary to the secondary in the common convective envelope. Thermal equilibrium turned out to be usually impossible. Lucy thermal equilibrium model (violating the period-colour relation) only in a limited mass region and for extrem ePopulation I composition (Z & 0.04). Moss & W helan (1970) and W helan (1972) encountered similar di culties. Indeed, thermal equilibrium was found to be in con ict with the equal entropy condition in zero age contact binaries (K ahler 1995).

R enouncing the restriction to therm alequilibrium, Lucy (1976); Flannery (1976), and Robertson & Eggleton (1977) obtained contact binary solution evolving in therm al cycles about a state of m arginal contact. The solutions are in agreem entwith the period-colour relation, but they have bad light curves because of a large tem perature di erence between the two components for a considerable part of the time in a cycle. Som e authors encountered the sam e di culty, the so-called light curve paradox, also for system s evolving without loss of contact. Hazlehurst (2001) pointed out that the present theory of cyclic contact binaries (therm al relaxation oscillation, TRO) is not in a position to resolve the light curve paradox. The di culty of explaining the EW -type light curves (i.e. light curve paradox) re ects a basic con ict between the treatment of the internal structure and the observed properties of the outerm ost layers.

Kahler (2002a,b) has discussed the structure equations of contact binaries, and assumed that the energy sources/sinks caused by the interaction of the components occurs only in the secondary's/prim ary's outer layers to obtain the models which are applied to the typical late-type system s.F irst he im posed the restriction that the fractional extent in m ass of the sources/sinks in the layers above the critical surface is the same in the both components, and found solutions evolving in them alcycles. And if the energy transfer is assumed to be su ciently e ective, loss of contact is avoided. O therw ise, the cycles consists of a long quiet phase in good contact and a short violent phase with rapid changes between contact, sem i-detached, and detached con-

gurations. And in both cases a large potential di erence between the surfaces of both components occurs during a part of the contact phase, that is to say, the system deviates hydrostatic equilibrium during this time. Meanwhile, the maximum contact degree is extremely small (2%) in both cases, suggesting that late-type contact binaries must be shallow contact. However, the contact degree of most of real W UM a system s which were observed to be in good therm al contact is about 10%, only a little of real latetype contact system s (ER Cep, AO Cam, Maceroni & van't Veer, 1996) is observed to be in good therm al contact with a smaller contact degree (2 per cent).

In a series of papers, Shu and his colleagues have extended the unequal entropy m odel by putting an equal entropy com m on envelope on top of interiors with the entropy di erence, S = 0, (Shu, Lubow & Anderson 1976, 1979, 1980; Lubow & Shu 1977, 1979). These models satisfy the light curve constraint but requires a temperature discontinuity region between the common envelope and the interior of the secondary component. This so-called D SC model has been strongly attacked by other investigators (Hazlehurst & Refsdal 1978; Papaloizou & Pringle 1979; Sm ith, Robertson & Sm ith 1980) since it was thought to be violating the second law of therm odynam ics.

The structure and evolution of W UM a stars still comprises many unsolved questions although many progresses have been achieved. The most di cult problem concerns the energy transfer between the components, i.e., it is not clear where and how the energy is transferred. The mechanism causing energy transfer is still a largely unsolved problem. In addition, we do not con rm that the transfer occurs in the base, or the outerm ost layers, or the whole of com m on envelope although it seem s probable that the transfer occurs in the com m on envelope, above the inner R oche critical surface, where the stars are in good contact.

In present paper, we have calculated a relative-radius grid of contact binaries with di erent m ass ratios and different contact degrees according to the R oche potential to ensure the surfaces of two components lying on the sam e equipotential by interpolation using this radius grid. In addition, we assume that the energy transfer occurs in the different regions of common envelope to investigate the e ect of region of energy transfer on the structure and evolution of contact binaries. As result of our investigation, we nd that the region of energy transfer has a signi cant in uence on the structure and evolution of the contact binaries, and that the energy transfer m ay take place in the outerm ost layers of the common envelope for W -type system s, and this probably takes place in the deeper layers of the common envelope for A -type system s.

2 STRUCTURE EQUATIONS AND BOUNDARY CONDITION

2.1 Dierential equations

Eggleton's stellar evolution code used in present work has considered the e ect of stellar rotation on stellar structure. Let ! be the angular velocity, m_i the m ass variable, g_i the e ective gravity in component i, $_{ex;i}$ the source (when positive) or sink (when negative) of energy per unit of m ass caused by the interaction of the components. Employing standard notation, the basic di erential equations are the follow ing

$$\frac{\mathfrak{g} \ln r_{i}}{\mathfrak{g} \mathfrak{m}_{i}} = \frac{1}{4 r_{i}^{3} \mathfrak{s}_{i}} \tag{1}$$

$$\frac{@\lnP_{i}}{@m_{i}} = \frac{1}{4 r_{i}^{2}P_{i}}g_{i}; \qquad (g_{i} = \frac{Gm_{i}}{r_{i}^{2}}(1 - \frac{2!^{2}r_{i}^{3}}{3Gm_{i}}))$$
(2)

$$\frac{@L_{i}}{@m_{i}} = T_{i} \frac{D s_{i}}{D t} + e_{x;i}$$
(3)

$$\frac{\varrho \ln T_{i}}{\varrho m_{i}} = \frac{\varrho \ln P_{i}}{\varrho m_{i}} r_{i}$$
(4)

where r_i (i = 1;2) is the temperature gradients of both components, and given by

$$r_{i} = \begin{array}{c} r_{a;i} & (r_{r;i} > r_{a;i}); \\ r_{r;i} & (r_{r;i} < r_{a;i}); \end{array}$$
(5)

where r $_{r;a}$ are the radiative and adiabatic tem perature gradients. The radiative tem perature gradient is given by

$$r_{r;i} = \frac{3}{16 \text{ acG}} \frac{{}_{i}L_{i}P_{i}}{m_{i}T_{i}^{4}} (1 - \frac{2!^{2}r_{i}^{3}}{3Gm_{i}})^{-1};$$
(6)

2.2 Contact condition

In hydrostatic equilibrium the surface of each star should coincide with the same equipotential surface which, in R oche approximation, requires

$$\frac{R_2}{R_1} = \left(\frac{M_2}{M_1}\right) ;$$
 (7)

where $R_{1,2}$ are the radii of both components, $M_{1,2}$ the m assess of both components, the index of m ass-radius relation of contact binaries. The value of varies not only with m ass ratio, but also with the depth of contact. It covers a range of 0.45 0.50 for the m arginal contact binaries, and will cover a larger range if the contact depth varies. But m ost of investigators takes = 0.46 approximately, which is very close to a value of a marginal contact binary with a m ass ratio of q 0.5. Since the m ass ratio of each contact binary varies during its evolution, some investigators use a boundary condition as the follow ing

$$\frac{R_1}{R_{crit1}} = \frac{R_2}{R_{crit2}};$$
(8)

where R_{1;2} are radii of two components, R_{crit1;2} the Roche critical radii. Eqs. (7) and (8) only approximately ensure the surfaces of both components lying on the same equipotential surface. In order to let the surfaces of the two stars lying on the same equipotential accurately, we calculate a radius grid of contact binaries which have di erent xed m ass ratios (0.02;0.04;0.06; ;1:0) and di erent contact degrees (0%;2:5%;5%; ;100%) for each xed m ass ratio using a dimensionless Roche potential

$$= \frac{1}{r_1} + \frac{q}{r_2} + \frac{1+q}{2} [(x - \frac{q}{1+q})^2 + y^2] - \frac{q^2}{2(1+q)}$$
(9)

where is the potential at an arbitrary point P, $r_{1,2}$ the distances of point P from the centers of gravity of the two stars, x and y the Cartesian coordinates of point P (the origin of the rectangular system of Cartesian coordinates at the center of gravity of m ass M 1, and the x-axis of which coincides with the line joining the centers of the two stars, the y-axis in the orbital plane), $r_{1,2}$, x, and y are in unit of orbital separation of the binary, $q = \frac{M_2}{M_1}$ the mass ratio.W e can accurately ensure the surfaces of two stars lying on the sam e equipotential by interpolation using our radius grid. Eggleton's stellar evolution code uses the most modern physics as reported by Pols et al. (1995), and it can calculate the evolution of a single star or a binary (not contact). For evolution of a single star, just choose an orbital period so large that there is no prospect of RLOF. For evolution of a detached binary, the evolution of each star is similar to that of a single star. For evolution of a sem i-detached binary, RLOF has been treated within the code, so that the mass above R oche lobe is transferred to its com panion, and the mass lost at a rate proportional to the cube of the fractional excess of the star's radius over its lobe's radius $\left(\frac{dm}{dt} = C \quad M \text{ ax } [0; (\frac{ln}{R} \frac{r}{crit})^3]$, where dm =dt gives the rate at which the m ass of the star changes, r the radius of the star, and R_{crit} the radius of its R oche lobe), it has been tested throughly and works very reliably. W ith C = 1000M /yr, RLOF proceeds steadily (H an et al. 2002).

W hen a close binary evolves into a contact one, them ass which is transferred is no longer the m ass above its R oche lobe. If the surface of star 2 is at a higher potential than star 1, so that an unbalanced pressure gradient will force m ass transferred from star 2 to star 1, then this boundary condition should be m odi ed as

$$\frac{dm_2}{dt} = C \quad m \, ax [0; (ln_{R_{20}}^{R_2})^3];$$
(10)

in which

$$R_{20} = <_{2}^{3} \frac{\frac{1}{8_{1}R_{1}^{3} + 8_{2}R_{2}^{3}}}{\frac{1}{8_{1}R_{1}^{3} + 8_{2}<_{2}^{3}}};$$
(11)

where $%_{1,2}$ are the surface densities of both components, R_1 the radius of star 1 (known), $<_2$ the radius of an equipotential surface in star2, whose potential is equal to the surface potential of star 1, and it is obtained by the interpolation according to our radius grid. R₂ the real radius of star 2 because of its evolution. (The mass which is transferred to star 1 is the mass above R_{20} rather than that above $<_2$, because the surface potential of star 1 will be higher than that of star 2 if the mass above $<_2$ is transferred to Star 1.) A ssum ing that the radii of the two stars 1 and 2 become $R_{\,10}\,$ and $R_{\,20}\,$ respectively after mass transfer, they should satisfy a very accurate condition $\left(\frac{R_{10}}{R_1} = \frac{R_{20}}{<_2}\right)$. M eanwhile, the mass gained by star 1 equals to that lost by star 2, i.e., $\left(\frac{4 R_{10}^3}{3} - \frac{4 R_1^3}{3}\right) \aleph_1 = \left(\frac{4 R_2^3}{3} - \frac{4 R_2^3}{3}\right) \aleph_2$. Then Eq. (11) can be easily derived from the two conditions mentioned above. Eq. (10) gives a mass loss rate from star 2 to star 1. If the m ass is lost by star 1, gained by star 2, the m ass loss rate can be derived in the sam e way.

For interacting binaries, we put the two stars 'side by side' in the computer, so that 22 di erential equations (11 equations should be solved for each stars), in 22 variables, have to be solved. The direct coupling between the sets of equations for the two components is via the boundary conditions and energy transfer discussed in sect. 3.

3 A MODEL FOR ENERGY TRANSFER

Struve (1948) rst recognized the unusual mass-lum inosity relationship of the secondary components of W U rsae M ajoris system s, suggesting that it m ight be causally related to a possible common envelope. O saki (1964) noted that von Zeipel's theorem would require the observed approximate constancy of radiative ux over the surface of a system with a radiative common envelope in order to maintain hydrostatic equilibrium. The fact that most W UM a system s appear to have convective envelopes, how ever, led Lucy (1968) to propose that the over-lum inosity of the secondaries is directly attributable to energy transfer between the two stars within a convective envelope.

It is not clear that where and how the energy is transferred from the primary (m ore massive star) to the secondary. It seems probable that the transfer occurs in the

4 Li, L. et al.

common envelope, above the inner Roche lobe, where the stars are in good contact, but we could not con m that the energy is transferred in the base or the outerm ost layers or the whole of the comm on convective envelope. M eanwhile, the mechanism causing energy transfer between the two components remains uncertain. Moses (1974, 1976) and M oses & Sm ith (1976) have argued that the large-scale circulation envisaged by Hazlehurst & Meyer-Hofmeister (1973) or Nariai (1976) is likely to be destroyed by both norm al, vertical convection and coriolis forces. They consider that a more appropriate picture would involve horizontally moving eddies, again driven by horizontal pressure gradients, which would travel only a short distant horizontally before of convection; it di ers fundam entally from the mechanism of Hazlehurst & Meyer-Hofmeister in that the eddies are not in therm al equilibrium with the surroundings, and will therefore dissipate on a therm altim e-scale even if no other process acts to break them up. On the contrary, Webbink (1977) argues that a large-scale circulation can be maintained, and has returned to the model of Hazlehurst & Meyer-Hofmeister. Therefore, the mechanism causing energy transfer is still largely an unsolved problem . Because of these uncertainties, m ost num erical m odels of contact binaries have been phenom enological, simply inserting an arti cial energy source L in the secondary, usually in the adiabatic part of the comm on envelope, and a corresponding energy sink in the primary, the value of L being chosen to satisfy the requirem ents that the system be both in contact and in equilibrium . As Robertson & Eggleton (1977), let L_1 and L_2 be the lum inosities (nuclear plus therm al lum inosities), and m_1 and m_2 the masses of the components. A though the W UM a-type system s are relatively m uch m ore common, 1 per 10 in the equivalent m agnitude range, we still assume that the elect of fully elicient energy exchange is to equalize the light-to-m ass ratio of the stars, since this seem s to obtain approxim ately am ong the observed system s. If L_0 is lost by the primary and gained by the secondary, we require that

$$\frac{L_1 \quad L_0}{m_1} = \frac{L_2 + L_0}{m_2};$$
(12)

since transfer is not fully e cient at all phases, an arbitrary factor f is introduced, which varies through the cycle and goes to zero with the depth of contact. Thus we take:

$$L = f \quad L_0; \quad (0 \ 6 \ f \ 6 \ 1):$$
 (13)

where f is the e cient factor of energy transfer. W e take

$$f = M in[1; (d^2 1)]$$
 (14)

in which

$$d = M \operatorname{ax}[1; M \operatorname{in}(\frac{r_1}{R_{\operatorname{crit1}}}; \frac{r_2}{R_{\operatorname{crit2}}})]$$
(15)

where $r_{1;2}$ are the radii of both stars, $R_{crit1;2}$ the Roche critical radii of both stars. The parameter is expected to be moderately large, so that heat transfer becomes fully e cient for stellar radii exceeding the Roche radii by some standard sm all am ount.

The lum inosity transferred by circulation currents from the prim ary to the secondary adopted by K ahler (2002b) is

$$L = \sum_{\substack{M_{2} \\ ex;2}} Z_{M_{1}} \\ L = \sum_{\substack{ex;2 \\ ex;1}} dm_{2} = \sum_{\substack{ex;1 \\ ex;1}} dm_{1};$$
(16)



Figure 1. Evolution of a close binary system into contact with logJ = 51:710. The prim ary, starting at the upper right, reached its Roche lobe almost immediately after leaving the zero-age main-sequence. A corretion on to the secondary, starting from the lower left, caused it to swelluntil it also lled its lobe. The resulting contact model, or a very similar model, is the initial model for most subsequent calculations. Further evolution in the gure assumes (unrealistically) that no heat transfer take place during contact. The system evolves to equal masses. The present model represents our result, the others obtained by Robertson & Eggleton (1977).



Figure 2. Evolution of a close binary system into contact with log J = 51:723.

4 EVOLUTION INTO CONTACT

4.1 The initialm odel

Our initial model consists of two zero-age main-sequence (ZAM S) stars of Population I (X = 0:70; Z = 0:02) with mass 1.2 and 0.6M as Robertson & Eggleton (1977). In order to nd the in uence of the adoption of our boundary condition and the most modern physical inputs reported by Pols et al. (1995) on the evolution of the binary. At rst, we do not consider the rotation of the stars and the energy transfer between the two components, and take an initial period of 0.3418 days, and orbital angular momentum, J, of 5:129 10^{51} erg s (logJ = 51.710) as Robertson & Eggleton (1977). Our result together with Robertson & Eggleton 's one is shown in Figure 1. It is seen in Figure 1 that the adoption of our boundary condition and the most modem physical inputs has a signi cant in uence on the evolution of the bi-

naries. Then we consider the rotation of both components of the binary, but the energy transfer between the two com ponents, and take a orbital period of 0.3732 days, and orbital angularmom entum, J, of $5283 \ 10^{51} \text{ erg} \text{ s} (\log J = 51.723)$. The initial separation is about 2.65R . The initial model is a detached binary, and the surface of the primary lies only a short way inside its Roche lobe which it lls after 2:8 10⁶ yr of nuclear evolution. Thereafter it losses mass to its companion at a rather slow rate which rises approxin ately 1:4 10 8 M =yr. At the beginning of the mass transfer, the mass loss rate is very slow, the radius of the secondary is smaller than that of a ZAMS star with the same mass because the secondary with a convective envelope gains m ass and its radius decreases. W hen the m ass loss rate rises to a higher value, the secondary is too late to adjust its structure therm ally after it gains mass from the primary and its radius increases so that the radius of the secondary is larger than that of a ZAM S starwith the same mass (See Figure 2).

The addition m ass on to the secondary causes it to expand and its e ective temperature and lum inosity to increase, and after a total of $3:5 \quad 10^7$ yr of evolution from the main sequence it has swollen to llits Roche lobe, so that the system evolve into a contact system . The contact binary form ed at this point has masses of 1.0 and 0.8M and a m ass ratio of 0.8. Since we do not consider the energy transfer between the two components, the two stars evolve steadily towards equal masses on a thermal timescale (see Figure 2). A though some of W UM a-type system s (at least V 348 Car, Hilditch & Bell, 1987) with closely equalmasses are consistent with this scenario, how everm ost of the realW UM a-type system s are not equalm ass ones. This can be regarded as su cient proof that the majority of contact binaries never approach the equal-m ass state, suggesting that the transfer of signi cant am ount of energy through the com m on envelope surrounding the components in direction from the prim ary to the secondary has the e ect of preventing mass transfer so that most of the real binaries do not evolve towards contact system swith equalm asses. Therefore, the following discussions only restrict to the possible consequence of energy transfer.

4.2 Contact Evolution W ith Energy Transfer

4.2.1 The regions of energy transfer

We consider now the evolution of the binary system from the initial contact model with energy transfer included in the manner described in sect. 3. Nuclear evolution is included in the models, although the in uence of the composition changes is negligible in the early stage. The di erential equations describing both the structure and the chem ical composition for both stars are solved simultaneously. The lum inosity increment L is applied to each components. As the uncertainty of the region of the energy transfer, we take

= 45, and assume that the energy transfer takes place in the di erent regions of the com m on envelope to investigate the e ect of the energy transfer region on the structure and evolution of the contact system s.At rst, we assume that the energy transfer takes place in the adiabatic part in the base of com m on convective envelope, and energy increment is ap-



Figure 3. The time dependence of the e ective temperature of the prim ary (solid line) and the secondary (dashed line) during the rst three cycles if energy transfer takes place in the base of common envelope.



Figure 4. The time dependence of the e ective tem perature of the prim ary (solid line) and the secondary (dashed line) during the rst three cycles if energy transfer takes place in the whole of common envelope.



F igure 5. The time dependence of the e ective tem perature of the prim ary (solid line) and the secondary (dashed line) during the rst three cycles if energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers of com m on envelope.

6 Li, L. et al.

plied in 10 meshpoints just above the Roche lobe, so that m ore stellar m aterial takes part in energy transfer, and the signi cant energy (0:5L) can be transferred between the two components. Then we assume that the energy transfer takes place in the whole of the comm on envelope surrounding the two components, and energy increment is applied in all meshpoints in the common envelope. Finally, we assume that the energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers in the common envelope of the two stars, and the lum inosity increment is applied in 10 m eshpoints near the surface of common envelope. The evolution of the surface e ective tem perature of both components are plotted in Figures 3, 4, and 5, respectively. As seen from Figs. 3 and 4, The same result is obtained when the energy transfer is assumed to take place in the base or the whole of the com m on envelope. In these cases, there is no possibility of the e ective tem perature of the secondary (less massive star) exceeding that of the prim ary at any time of a cycle even though energy transfer is fully e cient, and a large tem perature di erence between the two components occurs in a considerable time of a cycle when the energy transfer takes place in the base or the whole of the comm on envelope. This would usually be interpreted as im plying that these contact m odels represent the A -subtype W UM a system s only, but the W -subtype W UM a system s. It is seen in Figure 5 that the tem perature of the secondary can excess that of the primary for a considerable time of a cycle, and that a sm all tem perature di erence (T < 300K) between the two components occurs in a large part of the time of a cycle. In this case, the model represents the structure and evolution of a W -subtype W UM a system during a considerable tim e of a cycle when the energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers (10 m eshpoints) near the surface of the com m on envelope. Therefore, the region of the energy transfer has a signi cant in uence on the structure and evolution of the contact binaries. The same results are obtained if the energy transfer is assumed to take place in the base or in the whole of the com m on envelope, because most of energy is still transferred in the base of the common envelope due to a higher density of the base of the com m on envelope even if the energy transfer is assumed to take place in the whole of the common envelope. However, it is very dierent from the result based on the assumption that the energy transfer in the outerm ost layers. Therefore, we conclude that the energy transfer in W -type system s m ay take place in the outerm ost layers near the surface of common envelope, and energy transfer in A type systems probably takes place in the deeper layers of their common envelope. M oses (1976) has proposed a sm all-scale eddy m odel underlying the energy transfer which is similar to mixing-length theory, and concluded that the energy transfer in contact binaries must be characterized by a scale of a complicated eddy structure which is much shorter than the separation between the two stars, and that it appears possible to divide the envelope into a surface layer where convective m ixing determ ines the scale and a deeper layer where C oriolis e ects dom inate. M eanwhile, each A-type system has a radiative envelope, and the energy transfer is caused by the eddies due to Coriolis e ects, and should take place in the deeper layers (base) of the com m on envelope; H ow ever each W -type system has a convective envelope, the energy transfer is attributed to eddies due to convection, and should take place in the surface layers of the comm on envelope. Since the

surfaces of both stars are radiative rather than convective, it follows that convection is by no means essential to heat transport in contact envelopes, although it may well have an important in uence. In our model with low total mass, we assume the energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers of the common envelope. The therm all structure of the two components of the binary (log J = 51:723; = 45) during a phase of contact evolution and of sem idetached evolution is shown in Figure 6. In contact phase, energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers of the common envelope, and the outerm ost layers of the envelopes of both components are so sim ilar that the di erence is slight.

It is seen in Figure 6a that the lum inosity of the secondary's outer layers below the energy sources is very low, and in these layers the core lum inosity (includes therm aland nuclear lum inosities) has almost completely been exhausted by negative values of the $_{\rm g}$ -term s in the energy balance, i.e. by the expansion of the secondary (K ahler 2002b).

4.2.2 Cyclic evolution

W e consider now the evolutionary behavior of the binary, also beginning at the contact model with a mass ratio of about 0.8. The evolution of the binary, with energy transfer included and the lum inosity increment is applied in the outerm ost layers (10 m eshpoints) of the com m on envelope, is shown in Figures 7, 8 and 9 for = 45. The system undergoes therm alcycles on a therm altim escale. At the early stage, the evolution of the contact phase resemble the properties in the case of no energy transfer, since the e ciency of energy transfer is extremely low and equilibrium con guration remains at the equal-m ass state. However, the expansion of the secondary is hastened by the energy which is being deposited in its envelope, and the growth in the depth of the com m on envelope which these causes lead to the continued increase of energy transfer. The added mass onto the secondary stops when the signi cant energy is transferred from the primary to the secondary. This followed by a rapid rise in the rate of m ass transfer back to the prim ary, and the rate of m ass transfer rises rapidly to a higher value because of the rapid increase in the heat transfer, then decreases rapidly to stable value (see Figure 8c), however these could not prevent a further increase in the depth of contact and in the lum inosity transfer (see Figure 8d and Figure 9c) until the decrease in radius of the secondary caused by mass loss can not be compensated by its increase caused by lum inosity transfer. If this has occurred, the binary evolves rather slowly towards smaller mass ratios as each star attempts to obtain them al equilibrium. Throughout this phase the secondary contracts rapidly and the depth of contact decreases so that this phase will be rapidly term inated when full e cient energy transfer can no longer be maintained. This phase of good them al contact is characterized by a remarkable constancy of most of properties of both stars.

Once fulle ciency is lost, the secondary, no longer adequately supported, contracts very rapidly and the direction of m ass transfer reverses, the rate of m ass transfer rising to its highest value in the cycle. The secondary breaks contact with its Roche lobe, and continues to collapse towards a m ain-sequence equilibrium state, its temperature and lum inosity falling rapidly. The lum inosity of the prim ary also decreases during sem i-detached phase, since the Roche lobe



Figure 6. The therm al structure of the prim ary (solid line) and the secondary (dashed line) during a phase of sem idetached evolution (SD) and of contact evolution (C) with e cient energy transfer. In contact, lum inosity transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers of com m on envelope.

0

(b)

5

again contracts the star to prevent its free expansion towards therm alequilibrium, and the process of raising matter up through the star, for transfer to the secondary, requires signi cant quantities of energy, at the expense of the surface lum inosity. M eanwhile, the lum inosity produced by nuclear sources also falls because of the core of the prim ary is also expanding and cooling during sem idetached phase (R obertson 1977). Since the therm altim escales of the two components are not equal, the radius of the secondary will increase before the secondary collapses to be a main-sequence equilibrium state during sem i-detached phase, so that the system evolves into a contact binary again. Therefore, the two stars of the system are unlikely in therm all equilibrium at any time of a cycle.

15

10

 $\log P$

The radius-mass diagram is shown in Figure 7. It is seen in Figure 7 that the radius of the secondary is larger than that of a ZAM S star with the same mass, and the radius of the primary is smaller than that of a ZAMS starwith the same mass even though the system evolves in sem idetached phase. It suggests that the two components of the system are

not in therm al equilibrium at any time of a cycle. As seen from Figures 8 and 9, the system undergoes cyclic evolution on a therm altim escale, with a period of about 10^7 yr, and the system spends a large part of the time of a cycle in contact evolution (lasting about 70 percent of the time), only a sm all part of time in sem idetached evolution. M eanwhile, in a long phase (lasting a bout 60 percent of the time of a cycle), the system is in good therm al contact with a tem perature di erence between the two com ponents not larger than 300 K.Kahler (2002b) had given a model in which the tem perature di erence between two com ponents is less than 300K during 80 percent time of a cycle, but the maximum contact degree of his model is extremely low (about 2%) which is much lower than the mean contact degree of the realW -type system s of about 13% (Sm ith 1984), suggesting that hism odel could not evolve in high contact depth. How ever, our model can evolve in a maximum contact degree of about 7% (see Figure 8d) which is very close to the mean value of W -type system s. The evolution of the binary in any cycle does not com pletely repeat the evolutionary track of



Figure 7. The cyclic evolution in the mass-radius diagram of a binary (logJ = 51:723 and = 45) with alternating contact and sem i-detached phases. A steady cycle appears to be set up after two or three initial loops. Heat transfer is assumed to be fully e cient only when the depth of contact exceeds a certain fraction.

the previous cycle, although the evolution of the binary undergoes the therm alcycles. A s seen from the Figure 8a, the m ean m ass of the prim ary in any cycle is larger than that in the previous cycle, so that the m ean m ass ratio of the system becom es sm aller and sm aller along with the evolution of the binary. It indicates that the system will evolve to a typical W -type system with a mass ratio of about 0.5 although a contact system which originates from a initially detached or sem i-detached binary has a higher mass ratio of about 0.7 (M ochnacki1981). M eanwhile, the m axim um contact depth of the binary becom eshigher and higher because of the evolution of the system (see Figure 8d). The evolution of the lum inosities of the two stars are not synchronous, also are the radii of them, i.e., the lum inosity (radius) of the secondary does not rise to the maximum when the lum inosity (radius) of the prim ary reaches the minimum, and vice versa. It is caused by the di erent therm al tim escales of both com ponents. Because the therm altimescales of both components are unequal, the two stars unlikely reach the therm al equilibrium, but the two components of the system attempt to reach the therm al equilibrium , and the attem pt of the system to reach the nonexistent therm al equilibrium, coupled with Roche geometry, is the driver for the cycling behavior (Rahunen & Vilhu 1981). The evolution of the tem peratures and the orbital period of the two components of the system is shown in Figure 9b,d. It is seen in Figure 9 that the mean period in any cycle of the system becom es longer and longer as the evolution of the binary, and that the tem perature of the secondary excesses that of the primary in a large part of the time in any cycle.

4.2.3 The cycles in the period-colour diagram

As shown by Eggen (1961, 1967), the observed W UM a system s are located in a strip of the period-colour diagram, the two boundaries of the period-colour diagram are written by K ahler (2002b) as

 $1:5\log T_{e}$ $\log P = 5:975:::6:15;$



Figure 10. The cycles of the less massive component of the binary in the period-colour diagram .

where P is the period in days, which is limited by the solid lines in Figure 10. A ko shown is the cycles of the less massive component of our model ($\log J = 51:723$, = 45). As seen from the Figure 9, our model is in agreement with the period-colour relation. Our result is dierent from the results obtained by Flannery (1976) and Robertson & Eggleton (1977), and similar to that derived by K ahler (2002b). The dierence between our result and those derived by Flannery (1976) and Robertson & Eggleton (1977) is mainly caused by the elect of the stellar rotation considered by us.

5 DISCUSSION AND SUMMARY

The most uncertainties in the theoretical investigation of contact binaries concerns mainly the energy transfer, i.e., it is not clear that where and how this energy is transferred from the primary (m ore massive star) to the secondary. A though it seems probable that the transfer occurs in the comm on envelope, above the Roche lobe, where the two stars are in good contact. However, we can not con m that the energy transfer occurs in the base or the outerm ost region or the whole of the common envelope. Therefore, most of results of the previous investigators are based on the assum ption that the energy transfer between the components occurs in the adiabatic part of the comm on convective envelope (adiabatic transfer). The modi cation due to superadiabatic transfer for W -type system s is sm all (W helan 1972; Bierm ann & Thom as 1973). Extrem e superadiabatic transfer (Moss & Whelan 1973) gives more freedom, but Hazlehurst (1974) showed that this case must be excluded because the heat capacity of the secondary's subphotospheric layers is too sm all. In order to investigate the e ect of the region of energy transfer on the structure and evolution of contact binaries, we assume the energy transfer takes place in the di erent regions of the comm on envelope, and nd that the region of energy transfer has signi cant in uence on the evolution of the contact binaries. There is no possibility of the tem perature of the secondary exceeding that of the primary at any time of a cycle if the energy transfer occurs in the base or the whole of the common envelope, and the tem -



Figure 8. The evolution of som e quantities [such as the m asses, radii, lum inosities, m ass loss rates, and contact degrees ($F = \frac{1}{1}$)] of the prim ary (solid lines) and the secondary (dashed lines) of the binary as a function of Age, A steady cycle appears to be set up after two or three initial loops.

perature of the secondary can excess that of the prim ary if the energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers of the com m on envelope, suggesting that during contact phase of the cycle the m odels are reasonably good agreem ent with the observed properties of A -type W UM a system s when the energy transfer is assumed to take place in the base or the whole of comm on envelope, and the model is very consistent with the observed properties of W -type system s when the energy transfer is assumed to take place in the outermost layers of the comm on envelope. Therefore, we conclude that the energy transferm ay take place in the base of the com m on envelope for A-type systems, and the transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers for W -type system s. Since the surfaces of both components are radiative rather than convective, it follows that convection is by no means essential to heat transport in contact envelopes, although it m ay well have an important in uence.

The W UM a system s have been divided by B innendigk (1970) into A -type and W -type system s according as the primary minimum in the light curve is a transit, in which

the smaller star partially eclipses the larger, or an occultation, when the larger star is in front. The observations of W UM a stars have been reviewed by M ochnacki (1981). The main di erences between these subclasses are as the follow ings: the A -type system s have longer periods, are hotter, sm aller m ass ratio, and in better contact (i.e. the higher contact depth). M eanwhile, W lison (1978) has found that the A-type system s are likely evolved stars. For a low total m ass contact binary, we assumed that the energy transfer takes place in the outerm ost layers of the comm on envelope. Our model indicates that the mass ratio of the binary becom es sm aller and sm aller, and the contact depth becom es higher and higher as the evolution of the system, that is to say, the system steadily evolves towards a contact binary with a sm aller m ass ratio and a deeper com m on envelope. It suggests that som e A-type system s with low total m ass could be considered as later evolutionary stages of W subtypes, although W -type system s show greater activity in the form of period and light curve changes, which were originally thought to occur on a therm al tim escale (Rucinski



Figure 9. The evolution of the radii and tem peratures of the prim ary (solid line) and the secondary (dashed line), and also the orbital period (in days) and the transferred lum inosity of the system.

1974) but now their periods appear to consists of abrupt changes typically in a tim escale of a few m onths; A nd A -type system s possess m ore stable light curves and less rapidly varying periods. However, in this scenario the system evolution was towards smaller mass ratio, longer periods and deeper contact, and the better physical contact will lead to the gradual disappearance of the W -type peculiarities (hotter secondary, light curve perturbations, and frequent period changes). Therefore, som e of low totalm ass system s can be regarded as the later evolutionary stages of W -type system s.

In order to obtain a model of W -subtype W UM a system in which the tem perature of the less massive star is higher than that of the massive one, the investigators assumed that the energy transfer takes place in the superadiabatic part or even in extrem e superadiabatic region of the envelope of the secondary. How ever Hazlehurst (1974) suggested that the extrem e superadiabatic transfer must be excluded because the heat capacity of the secondary's subphotospheric layers

is too small. In our model, we do not assume that the energy occurs in the superadiabatic or extrem e superadiabatic part of the envelope of the secondary, but the surface tem perature of the secondary can excess that of the primary during the time when the radius of the primary increases rapidly, or the radius of the secondary (less massive com ponent) decreases rapidly (see qure 9a,b). The tem perature of the secondary exceeding that of the prim ary in our model can be attributed to exhaustion of a part of the nuclear lum inosity of the prim ary due to the expansion of the prim ary, or the release of the gravitation energy of the secondary because of its contraction. M eanwhile, it suggests that the two subtype W UM a system s are probably caused by the energy exchange between the gravitational (potential) energy and therm alone. W ang (1994) has showed that the two types of contact binaries are in two di erent TRO states: the less massive component of W -types are shrinking whereas the less m assive star of A -types are swelling. The contraction of the secondary in W -type system s releases some of its gravitational energy, therefore, it m akes the e ective tem perature of the secondary higher than the prim ary. However, In our m odel, the contraction of the secondary is one of the m echanism s which can m ake the tem perature of the secondary higher than the prim ary, but it only lasts a very short period, so the surface tem perature of the secondary higher than the prim ary is m ainly caused by the depletion of a part of the lum inosity of the prim ary due to its rapid expansion.

Our models for contact binary systems exhibit cyclic behavior about a state of marginal contact, with a period of 10^7 yr. In cyclic evolution, the two components of the system are unlikely in therm al equilibrium because of the di erence in their therm altim escales, but they attempt to reach the therm al equilibrium. The attempt of the system to reach an nonexistent therm al equilibrium, coupled with Roche geom etry, is driver for cycling behavior (Rahunen & V ilhu 1981). A larger tem perature di erence (T $_{\rm e}$ > 300K) between the two components occurs in a part of the time of a cycle (lasting about 30 35 percent time of a cycle). A lm ost all of the previous investigators thought that this requires there to be as many short-period binary with EB light curves as with EW light curves, and that them odels for contact binaries encounter a di culty, so called light curve paradox.Rucinski (2002) gives 13 EW s and 5 EBs (and 14 ELLs, which have too small an amplitude to be classi ed as EW s or EBs). It is reasonable to identify the EW s as contact binaries and the EBs as sem i-detached. The ratio of 5/13 is not much out of line with TRO theory, so we are not sure there is in fact any light curve paradox. However, the W UM a system s indeed undergo angular m om entum loss without doubt, and the most likely angular mom entum loss mechanism is magnetic braking (Huang 1966; Mestel 1968). The Einstein X -ray observations and IUE ultraviolet observations (Eaton 1983) showed that W UM a system s are strong sources, suggesting surface activity of the kind we observe on the Sun, and so the presence of the magnetic elds. The stellar wind would cause magnetic braking, and wewill discuss the evolution of W UM a system sincluded the

angular m om entum loss in our future work. M eanwhile, we do not consider the energy source at secondary's atm osphere provided by the accreting m atter from the prim ary at our present work. This energy source can hasten the expansion of the secondary, and shorten the time spent in the sem idetached evolution. W e refer to a forthcom ing work included this extra energy source for the secondary.

ACKNOW LEDGEM ENTS

W e acknow ledge the generous support provided by the Chinese National Science Foundation (G rant No. 10273020, 10303006 and 19925312), the Foundation of Chinese A cademy of Sciences (KJCX2-SW-T06), and from Yunnan Natural Science Foundation (G rant No. 2002A 0020Q). W e are gratefully acknow ledge stimulating discussions with P rof. R. Q. Huang and Dr. C. A. Tout. M eanwhile we are gratefully to P rof. Eggleton for his valuable suggestions which in prove the paper greatly.

REFERENCES

Bierm ann, P., Thom as, H.C., 1973, A&A, 23, 55 Binnendijk, L., 1970, V istas A stro., 12, 217 Eaton, J.A., 1983, ApJ, 268, 800 Eggen, O.J., 1961, R.G reenwhich Obs. Bull., 31 Eggen, 0. J., 1967, M e:R: astr: Soc:, 70, 111 Eggleton, P.P., 1971, MNRAS, 151, 351 Eggleton, P.P., 1972, MNRAS, 156, 361 Eggleton, P.P., 1973, MNRAS, 163, 279 Flannery B.P., 1976, ApJ, 205, 217 Han, Z., Podsiadlowski, Maxted, P.F.L., Marsh, T.R., Ivanova, N., 2002, M N R A S, 336, 449 Hazlehurst J., Meyer-Hofmeister E., 1973, A&A, 24, 379 Hazlehurst J., 1974, A&A, 36, 49 Hazlehurst J., Refsdal S., 1978, A & A Lett., 62, L9 Hazlehurst J., 2001, The Observatory, 121, 86 Hilditch R.W., BellS.A., 1987, MNRAS, 229, 529 Hilditch R.W., King D.J., Hill G., Poeckert R., 1984, MNRAS, 208, 135 Huang, S.S., 1966, Annls. A strophys., 29, 331 Kahler H., 1995, A & A, 294, 497 Kahler H., 2002a, A & A, 395, 889 Kahler H., 2002b, A & A, 395, 907 Lubow S.H., Shu F.H., 1977, ApJ, 216, 517 Lubow S.H., Shu F.H., 1979, ApJ, 229, 657 Lucy L.B., 1968, ApJ, 151, 1123 Lucy L.B., 1976, ApJ, 205, 208 Maceroni, C., van't Veer, F., 1996, A&A, 311, 531 M estel, L., 1968, M N R A S, 138, 359 MochnackiS.W , 1981, ApJ, 245, 650 Moses A.P., 1974, DP hil Thesis, University of Sussex Moses A.P., 1976, MNRAS, 176, 161 M oses A . P ., Sm ith R . C ., 1976, In Structure and Evolution of Close Binary Systems, IAU Symposium 73, 333, eds. Eggleton P. P., Mitton S., & W helan J. A. J., Reidel, D ordrecht MossD.L., W helan J.A.J., 1970, MNRAS, 149, 147 MossD.L., W helan J.A.J., 1973, MNRAS, 161, 239

- NariaiK ., 1976, PASJ, 28, 587
- O sakiY , 1964, PA SJ, 17, 97
- Papaloizou J., Pringle J.F., 1979, MNRAS, 189, 5
- PolsO.,ToutC.A.,Eggleton P.P.,HanZ.,1995,MNRAS, 274,964
- Rahunen, T., & Vilhu, O., 1981, In Binary and Multiple Stars as Tracers of Steller Evolution, Vol. 98, P289, eds. Kopal, Z., & Rahe, J.
- Robertson J.A., 1977, PhD. Thesis, University of Cambridge
- Robertson J.A., Eggleton P.P., 1977, MNRAS, 179, 359
- RucinskiS.M., 1974, Acta Astr., 24, 119
- Rucinski S. M., 1993, In Interacting binary stars, ed. J. E.Pringle, & R.A.W ade (Cambridge Univ.Press, Cambridge)
- Rucinski, S.M., 2002, PASP, 114, 1124
- Shapley H., 1948, In Harvard Centennial Symposium, Monogr Harv.Obs.No.7, p249
- Sm ith, R.C., 1984, QJRAS, 25, 405
- Sm ith D . H ., R obertson J. A ., Sm ith R . C ., 1980, M N R A S, 190, 177
- Shu F.H., Lubow S.H., Anderson L., 1976, ApJ, 209, 536
- Shu F.H., Lubow S.H., Anderson L., 1979, ApJ, 229, 223

12 Li, L. et al.

Shu F.H., Lubow S.H., Anderson L., 1980, ApJ, 239, 937
Struve O., 1948 Ann. Ap., 11, 117
Van't Veer F., 1975a, A&A, 40, 167
Van't Veer F., 1975b, A&A, 44, 437
W ang, J.M., 1994, ApJ, 434, 277
W ebbink R.F., 1977, ApJ, 215, 851
W helan J.A.J., 1972, M NRAS, 156, 115
W ilson R.E., 1978, ApJ, 224, 885

T his paper has been typeset from a $T_{\rm E}X$ / $\mathbbm E T_{\rm E}X$. Le prepared by the author.