The Rates of Hypernovae and Gamma-Ray Bursts: Implications for their Progenitors

Ph.Podsiadlowski¹, P.A.Mazzal^{2;3;4}, K.Nomoto³, D.Lazzati⁵, E.Cappellaro⁶

ABSTRACT

A critical comparison of estimates for the rates of hypernovae (HNe) and gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) is presented. Within the substantial uncertainties, the estimates are shown to be quite comparable and give a Galactic rate of 10^{6} { 10^{5} yr¹ for both events. These rates are several orders of magnitude lower than the rate of core-collapse supernovae, suggesting that the evolution leading to a HN/GRB requires special circum stances, very likely due to binary interactions. Various possible binary channels are discussed, and it is shown that these are generally compatible with the inferred rates.

Subject headings: binaries: close | supernovae: general | stars: neutron | X-rays: stars

1. Introduction

W hile it has now been established form one than 5 years that gam m a-ray bursts (GRBs) are caused by some of the most energetic explosions in the Universe (van Paradijs, Kouveliotou, & W ijers 2000), no promising channel for their progenitors has been identied, a situation very much resembling that of the progenitors of Type Ia supernovae som e 20 years ago.

¹D epartm ent of A strophysics, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3RH, UK; podsi@astro.ox.ac.uk

² IN A F -O sservatorio A stronom ico di Trieste, 34131 Trieste, Italy; m azzali@ ts.astro.it

³Dept. of A stronom y and RESCEU, University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan; nom oto@ astron.sutokyo.ac.jp

⁴M P I fur A strophysik, 85748 G arching, G erm any

⁵Institute of A stronomy, University of C am bridge, M adingley Road, C am bridge CB3 OHA, UK; lazzati@ ast.cam ac.uk

⁶ IN A F-O sservatorio A stronom ico di Capodin onte, 80131 N apoli, Italy; cappellaro@ na astro.it

The m and, unlike the previous case, unambiguous association of a GRB (GRB 030329) with a hypernova, SN 2003dh (H jorth et al. 2003a; Stanek et al. 2003), a highly energetic Type Ic supernova (M azzali et al. 2003)⁷, has con m ed that at least som e long-duration GRBs are observationally connected with the explosion of m assive stars⁸.

All hypernovae known to date belong to the class of Type Ic supernovae (SN e Ic), of which they form a subset. These are SN e that show neither hydrogen nor signi cant am ounts of helium in their spectra. Their progenitors are believed to be either very massive single stars that lost their hydrogen and helium envelopes in a stellar wind or massive stars that lost their envelopes through the interaction with a companion (W heeler & Levreault 1985; U om oto 1986; Podsiadlow ski, Joss, & H su 1992; N om oto et al. 1994). Two out of the three nearby G R B s known to date are associated with hypernovae (G R B 980425/SN 1998bw at z = 0.008 and G R B 030329/SN 2003dh at z = 0.17). The third case, G R B 031203, is heavily extinguished by dust, so a SN association cannot be im ly ruled out (H prth et al. 2003b). This interesting coincidence raises the in portant question of the general connection between hypernovae and long-duration G R B s, and whether most, or perhaps even all G R B s are associated with/caused by hypernovae.

This paper addresses this question by providing a critical comparison of the rates of GRB s and hypernovae. A s is shown in x 2, the rates of GRB s and hypernovae are comparable within the uncertainties, and appear to be a small fraction of the global SN rate. This has important implications for the nature of their progenitors, which is discussed in detail in x 3 and x 4.

2. The R ates of G R B s and H ypernovae

2.1. The GRB rate

The rate of observed GRBs in a galaxy like our own is quite well established from the BATSE monitoring as R_{obs} 10⁷ yr¹ (e.g. Zhang & Meszaros 2003). However, since GRB reballs are highly beam ed, both geometrically and relativistically (with Lorentz

 $^{^{7}}$ The term Hypernovae has been used for SN e with energies signi cantly larger (by about a factor of 10 or m ore) than the canonical explosion energy of 1 foe 10^{51} ergs (N om oto et al. 2003).

⁸GRBs fall into two classes: short- and long-duration bursts. Presently, very little is known about the progenitors of short bursts from an observational point of view. It is quite possible that they are caused by a completely di erent physicalm echanism, e.g., the merger of two compact objects (van Paradijs et al. 2000). All inferences made in this paper exclusively apply to long bursts.

factors & 100), the true intrinsic rate must be substantially higher. It may be written as $R_{GRB} = R_{obs} \frac{4}{2}$, where is the solid angle within which an observer can detect the GRB. This factor depends on the jet opening angle, and is typically estimated as 50 { 500 (Frail et al. 2001; Panaitescu & Kum ar 2001). The rate is however uncertain, as R_{obs} and are estimated from two di erent samples, R_{obs} from the BATSE sample, and from the sample of GRBs with afferglow observations, and there is no robust evidence that the selection e ects are the same in the two sets. Additionally, the solid angle correction is based on the so-called uniform jet model, in which the opening angle is an intrinsic property of the jet. An alternative explanation of the observations calls for a structured jet, with a brighter core and dimmer wings. In this case the rate of GRBs would be smaller by a factor 3 { 10 (Rossi, Lazzati, & Rees 2002). Thus the range of plausible values for the GRB rate is 10⁶ to 10⁵ yr¹, of which about 2=3 are long-duration GRBs.

2.2. The H ypernova rate

To date, ve SN e Ic have been classi ed as hypernovae. They form quite a diverse group of objects, ranging from the very bright and energetic SN e 1998bw (Iw am oto et al. 1998) and 2003dh (M azzali et al. 2003), the m oderately bright but very energetic SN e 1997ef (M azzali et al. 2000) and 1997dq (M azzali et al., in preparation), and the norm ally bright but over-energetic SN 2002ap (M azzali et al. 2002). Based on spherically sym m etric explosion m odels, their explosion energies have been estim ated to range between 4 and 50 fbe, and the progenitor m asses from a lower limit of 20 { 25 M to 40 M and above. This covers the entire m ass range of single stars that are believed to becom e black holes (e.g. M aeder 1992; Fryer & K alogera 2001).

Interestingly, no hypernova is known to have the characteristics of a SN II, although such objects m ight in principle occur in the lower mass range (depending som ewhat on the m inimum initial mass for which a single star becomes a W olf-R ayet star). This may provide an important clue, linking the physical cause of the hypernova mechanism to the process causing the loss of the hydrogen and helium envelope. In this context, we note as a caveat that the inferred initial masses of hypernovae are based on the nal core structure expected from single-star evolution. If, the pre-hypernova evolution was a ected by binary evolution, as seem s possible or even likely (see x 3), this mapping must be modi ed ⁹.

⁹For example, Brown et al. (2001) showed that, if a star loses its envelope through a binary interaction soon after its main-sequence phase, its nalpre-supernova core structure is dram atically changed and even a 60 M starm ay produce a neutron star rather than a black hole (also see Podsiadlow skiet al. 2003).

As the lowest initial mass that is able to produce a hypernova appears to be 20M, this implies that not all SN e Ic are hypernovae. For example, N om oto et al. (1994) estimate that the progenitor of the normal SN Ic 1994I was 15M (again assuming a single-star mapping of the initial to the nalmass). SN e Ic may come from progenitors as low in mass as 8M if they are in a binary (Podsiadlow ski et al. 1992; N om oto et al. 1994).

The estim ated rate of all core-collapse supernovae is 7 10^{3} yr¹ for an average galaxy and 12 10^{2} yr¹ in our G alaxy (Cappellaro et al. 1999). The latter estim ate is som ew hat low er than recent estim ates for the G alactic pulsar birth rate of 4 10^{2} yr¹ based on the Parkes multi-beam survey (Vranesevic et al. 2003). In contrast, the observed rate of Type Ib and Ic supernovae in an average galaxy in the local Universe is only 10^{3} yr¹.

M ost lb/c supernovae actually appear to belong to the Ic sub-type and only a fraction of about 5% of observed SN e Ic are hypernovae. The brightness of hypernovae is highly diverse, ranging from norm all to about 10 times norm all. However, the average of the known cases is a factor of 3 { 5 brighter than a typical SN Ic. Therefore, we expect that hypernovae are easier to detect and hence intrinsically less common relative to norm al SN e Ic than the direct observational estimate. Being on average a factor 4 brighter in plies that in a magnitude-limited search they would be detectable in a volum e larger by a factor of $4^{3=2} = 8$. How ever, because m any of the current SN searches only target selected galaxies, they are also volum e limited. Thus, in a typical SN search the expected number of SN e grow sm ore or less linearly with SN m agnitude (C appellaro et al. 1993). Reducing the observed rate by the proper factor gives us an estimate of the true hypernova rate of 10^{5} yr¹.

3. The Progenitor Connection

The estim ates of the rates of GRBs and hypernovae in the previous section are the same to within the uncertainties (see Table 1), although the hypernova rate m ay be slightly higher. This suggests that m ost hypernovae also appear as GRBs at least from some view ing angle.

This is consistent with the fact that hypernovae are associated with at least two out of three nearby GRBs, one of which was typical while the other was weak. It is also consistent with the fact that only the most powerful hypernovae are seen in association with GRBs. Events that appear less powerful may simply be viewed o -axis, leading to an underestimation of the kinetic energy and to the non-detection of the GRB. SN 2002ap could be such a case, since there is ample evidence that the explosion was aspherical, like SN 1998bw (M azzali et al. 2002, M aeda et al. 2003). This may also imply that the beam ing correction cannot be too large.

The estimates allow for the possibility that some hypernovae do not produce GRBs, as in some popular models (MacFadyen & Woosley 1999) the relativistic jet may not always break through the envelope of the progenitor star. This may give rise to a Yailed GRB' with an orphan afferglow, as has been suggested for SN 2002ap (Totani2003), or to short-duration X-ray ashes (XRFs; Heise et al. 2001). Possible evidence for this comes from the reported detection of a SN-like \bum p" in the light curve of an X-ray ash (XRF030723, Fynbo et al. 2004).

SN-like bum ps have been detected in the light curves of GRB optical afferglows, but only for one such case (GRB 021211/SN 2002L, z 1) is a spectrum available: Della Valle et al. (2003) argue that it is similar to that of the standard SN Ic 1994I. However, the extracted SN U-band light curve (other bands not being available) appears signicantly brighter than the U-band light curve of SN 1994I, so a hypernova solution for SN 2002L cannot be mm ly nuled out. If a clear case of association of a norm al SN Ic and a GRB should be revealed, we may have to lower the mass limit of stellar collapses that trigger a GRB.

These estimates are also in broad agreement with those of Berger et al. (2003) and Soderberg, Frail, & W ieringa et al. (2003). Based on a comparison of the radio emission from hypernovae and SN e lb/c, these studies conclude that . 3% and . 6%, respectively, of SN e lb/c can be associated with GRBs. In contrast, Lamb et al. (2003) recently argued that, based on a universal jet m odel for XRFs and GRBs, the jet opening angle is as sm all as 0.5. This would imply an XRF/GRB rate comparable to the SN lb/c rate.

O ur rate estim ates suggest that GRBs and hypernovae constitute a sm all subset of corecollapse supernovae (also see, Paczynski 2001). Does this imply that only very massive stars become HNe/GRBs? In Table 1 we list the estimated rates for stars above various dierent masses, using a simple Salpeter-like mass function (f (M) dM / M^{2.5} dM) and assuming for simplicity that all stars above 8M produce a core-collapse supernova. C learly, even if the minimum initial mass for a HN/GRB was larger than 80M, they would be signicantly overproduced. On the other hand, the initial progenitor mass in some hypernovae appears to be as low as 20M (Mazzali et al. 2002; but see footnote 9).

In conclusion, it is extrem ely unlikely that the progenitors of hypernovae and GRBs are just very massive stars. Special circum stances are almost certainly needed. The most promising of these is rotation: a rapidly rotating core is the essential ingredient in the bollapsar' model for GRBs (W oosley 1993; Paczynski 1998; M acFadyen & W oosley 1999). The prototype hypernova, SN 1998bw, shows clear evidence from the line pro les that the explosion was highly asymmetric (M aeda et al. 2002).

The role of rotation

M assive stars are generally rapid rotators on the main sequence. However, there are many well-established mechanisms by which they can be their angular momentum during their evolution by both hydrodynam ical (e.g. winds) and magnetohydrodynam ical processes (Spruit & Phinney 1998; Spruit 2002). Therefore, it is not at all clear whether the cores of massive single stars will ever be rotating rapidly at the time of explosion. In this context, rapid rotation means su ciently rapid that the core cannot collapse directly to form a neutron star/black hole and conserve angular momentum. A simple criterion is that the speci c angular momentum, j, near the edge of the iron core (enclosing a mass M $_c$ 2M) is larger than the value at the last stable orbit around a black hole of that mass, i.e. $j \& {}^{\rm P} \ {\rm 6GM} \ {\rm c}={\rm c}' \ 2 \ 10^{16} \ {\rm ergss} \ {\rm M} \ {\rm c}={\rm 2M}$). Recent calculations taking into account magnetic torques (Heger et al. 2003) suggest that single massive stars fall short of this requirem ent by about one order of magnitude.

To have a su ciently rapidly rotating core at the time of explosion m ay require interactions with a binary companion that can spin up the progenitor or prevent its spin-down.

The role of binarity

B inary interactions can spin up a star by a variety of processes. T idal interactions can cause either component of a binary to rotate with the same frequency as the binary, spinning it up or down depending on the relative frequencies. For a star spinning synchronously with the binary orbit and lling a fraction r of its Roche bbe, the ratio of its rotation frequency, !, to its (K eplerian) breakup frequency, !_{crit}, just depends on the mass ratio according to !=!_{crit} = $(1 + q)^{1-2} h(q)^{3-2} r^{3-2}$; where $q = M_1 = M_2$ is the mass ratio (M_2) is the Roche-lobe lling object and M_1 the accreting star) and h(q) is the ratio of the Roche-lobe radius to the orbital separation (as, e.g., given by Eggleton 1983).

If we require that in a collapsar model only the inner-most core of 2M can collapse directly while the rest forms a disk, we can obtain a rough estimate for the maximum orbital period where tidal spin-up can provide enough angular momentum to the core by assuming that the whole star remains in solid body rotation until the end of helium burning. At this stage the core is likely to decouple and will probably retain most of its angular momentum in the nalrapid evolutionary phases. Taking the radius of the 2M core as 8 10^9 cm (typical for the core of a 30M star at the end of helium burning), one then immediately obtains a critical orbital period P_{crit} 5:6 hr (R = 8 10^9 cm)² (j=2 10^{16} ergss)¹. Izzard et al. (2003), using detailed binary population calculations, concluded that there are enough binaries where tidal boking could account for the observed rates¹⁰.

¹⁰N ote, how ever, that they assumed that it was su cient to prevent the whole star (rather than just the

The black-hole binary N ova Sco may provide indirect observational support for this channel. The companion in N ova Sco is polluted with heavy elements from the SN that form ed the black hole (Israelian et al. 1999). Podsiadlowski et al. (2002) concluded that the observed abundances are more consistent with a hypernova than with a norm al SN. The birthrate of such black-hole binaries is comparable to the HN/GRB rate (see, e.g., Lee, Brown, & W ijers 2002; Podsiadlowski, Rappaport, & Han 2003).

T idal locking is also likely to have spun up the W R companion (van Kerkwijk et al. 1992) in the close X -ray binary C yg X -3, which has an orbital period of 4.8 hr. Thus C yg X -3 is a potential H N /G R B progenitor, although the mass of the W R may be too small to lead to the form ation of a black hole. Nevertheless, the birthrate of system s like C yg X -3, one of the main channels to produce double-neutron-star binaries, is comparable to our estimate of the H N /G R B rate (D ewi & Pols 2003; Ivanova et al. 2003; K alogera et al. 2003)

The most dram atic type of binary interaction involves the complete merging of two stars or at least of their cores (Fryer & Woosley 1998; Zhang & Fryer 1999; Ivanova & Podsiadlow ski2003; Joss & Becker 2003; Nom oto et al. 2003). For example, Ivanova & Podsiadlow ski (2003) found that the core of the progenitor of SN 1987A was spun up dram atically in the merger, implying a rapidly rotating core at the time of the explosion. SN 1987A was not a hypernova, but there is some evidence that the explosion was jet-like (e.g., W ang et al. 2002; also see Joss & Becker 2003). Fryer & Woosley (1998) suggested that the merger rate of black holes and helium cores inside a common envelope is compatible with the GRB rate. N one of these merger suggestions for HN e/GRBs have yet been worked out in detail. If the merger is caused by the spiral-in inside a hydrogen-rich common envelope, one has to understand how the merger can proceed and still lead to the ejection of the envelope (which is required to provide the friction for the spiral in). Moreover, all hypernovae are SN e Ic, and thus the progenitors must have lost both their hydrogen and helium envelopes.

4. Discussion

The rates of hypernovae and GRB are quite com parable, suggesting that a large fraction (m ost?) of hypernovae also produce GRBs, at least in some direction. M oreover, the rates are signi cantly sm aller than the rates of core-collapse SNe (or even the fraction of SNe that produce black holes). Furtherm ore, at least at the present cosm ological epoch, special circum stances are required to produce HNe/GRBs. However, num erous fundam ental questions

core) from collapsing directly into a black hole, which signi cantly increases the critical orbital period and hence the estim ated rate for this channel.

rem ain unanswered, and no fully self-consistent evolutionary model for the progenitors exists at this time. As long as this is the case, it is not even clear whether or not the hypernova and the GRB occur concurrently. Does the hypernova occur instand trigger the GRB through the fallback of hypernova ejecta, as may be required in some models (Vietri & Stella 1998; Podsiadlow ski et al. 2002), or does the GRB occur and then trigger a SN-like event through the interaction of the relativistic jet with the envelope as in the collapsarm odel (Khokhlov et al. 1999; MacFadyen & Woosley 1999; Jason, Woosley, & Homan 2003)?

A lthough HNe/GRBs appear to be relatively rare events at the present epoch, this need not be the case for the rst generation of stars. Lower m etallicity m ay lead to lower angular m om entum loss from m assive stars, and the star-form ation environm ent m ay be very di erent. It is even conceivable that, at an early epoch of galaxy form ation, hypernovae could provide the m issing energy to eject half the baryons from galaxies (Silk 2003).

Finally, another important question concerns the relationship between hypernovae and the class of SN e Ib/c, of which they are a subgroup. P resumably, many normal SN e Ib/c are caused by the collapse of the core of a massive star that lost its H-rich envelope through binary interaction (W heeler & Levreault 1985; Podsiadlow skiet al. 1992; Nom oto et al. 1994) forming a neutron star. So perhaps one important distinction between a hypernova and an ordinary supernova is whether a black hole or a neutron star is formed in the afferm ath. However, not all black hole formation events can lead to a hypernova: if the minimum mass of a single star that leads to the formation of a black hole is as low as 20 { 25 M (M aeder 1992; Fryer & Kalogera 2001), this would overproduce hypernovae by a large factor (see Table 1).

A natural explanation for this dichotom y m ay lie in the fact that black holes can either form promptly on a dynam icaltim escale or on a much longer timescale by continued accretion through a disk phase or fallback. In particular, the disk accretion phase, which is the essential ingredient in collapsar models, requires a rapidly rotating core. In the case of prompt collapse, one would not necessarily expect a bright SN. This would imply the existence of a class of (very?) dim SN e lb/c for which there is, however, no observational evidence at present.

This work was in part supported by a European Research & Training Network (HPRN-CT-20002-00303) and a Royal Society visitor's grant to K N. The work of P P., P M., and K N. (the "Tokyo Think Tank") at the University of Tokyo has been supported by the 21st Century COE Program of MEXT, Japan.

REFERENCES

- Berger, E., Kulkami, S.R., Frail, D.A., & Soderberg, A.M. 2003, ApJ, 599, 408
- Brown, G.E., et al. 2001, NewA, 6, 457
- Cappellaro, E., Evans, R., & Turatto, M. 1999, A&A, 351, 459
- Della Valle, M., et al. 2003, A&A, 406, 33
- Dewi, J.D.M., & Pols, O.R. 2003, MNRAS, 344, 629
- Eggleton, P.P. 1983, ApJ, 268, 368
- Frail, D.A. et al. 2001, ApJ, 562, L55
- Fryer, C.L., & Kalogera, V. 2001, ApJ, 554, 548
- Fryer, C.L., & Woosley, S.E. 1998, ApJ, 502, L9
- Fynbo, J.P.U., et al. 2004, in preparation
- Heger, A., Woosley, S.E., Langer, N., & Spruit, H.C. 2003, in Maeder, A., & Eendens, Ph., eds, Stellar Rotation, IAU Symp. No. 215, in press (astro-ph/0301374)
- Heise, J., in't Zand, J., Kippen, R.M., & Woods, P.M. 2001, in Costa, E., Frontera, F., & Hjorth, J., eds, Gamma-Ray Bursts in the Afterglow Era (Springer, Berlin), p. 16
- H jorth, J. et al. 2003a, Nat, 423, 847
- H prth, J. et al. 2003b, GCN 2493
- Israelian, G., Rebolo, R., Basri, G., Casares, J., & Martin E.L. 1999, Nat, 401, 142
- Ivanova, N., Belczynski, K., Kalogera, V., Rasio, F.A., & Taam, R.E. 2003, ApJ, 592, 475
- Ivanova, N., & Podsiadlow ski2003, in Hillebrandt, W., & Leibundgut, B., eds, From Twilight to Highlight: the Physics of Supernovae (Springer, Berlin), p. 19
- Iwam oto, K., et al. 1998, Nat, 395, 672
- Jason, P., Woosley, S.E., & Homan, R.D. 2003, ApJ, 586, 1254
- Joss, P.C., & Becker, J.A. 2003, in Hillebrandt, W., & Leibundgut, B., eds, From Twilight to Highlight: the Physics of Supernovae (Springer, Berlin), p. 104

Kalogera, V., et al. 2003, ApJ, accepted (astro-ph/0312101)

- Khokhlov, A.M., et al. 1999, ApJ, 524, 107
- Lamb, D.Q., Donaghy, T.Q., & Graziani, C.2003, in 3-D Signatures in Stellar Explosions, in press (astro-ph/0309463)
- Lee, C.H., Brown, G.E., W ijers, R.A.M.J. 2002, ApJ, 575, L96
- MacFadyen, A.I., & Woosley, S.E. 1999, ApJ, 524, 262
- Maeda, K., Nakamura, T., Nomoto, K., Mazzali, P., Patat, F., & Hachisu, I. 2002, ApJ, 565, 405
- Maeda, K., Mazzali, P., Nomoto, K., Yoshii, Y., Tomita, H., & Kobayashi, Y. 2003, ApJ, 593, 931
- Maeder, A. 1992, A&A, 264, 105
- Mazzali, P.A., Iwamoto, K., & Nomoto, K. 2000, ApJ, 545, 407
- Mazzali, P.A., et al. 2002, ApJ, 572, L61
- Mazzali, P.A., et al. 2003, ApJ, 599, L95
- Nomoto, K., Maeda, K., Mazzali, P.A., Umeda, H., Deng, J., & Iwamoto, K. 2003, in Fryer, C.L., ed., Stellar Collapse (astro-ph/0308136)
- Nom oto, K., et al. 1994, Nature, 371, 227
- Paczynski, B. 1998, ApJ, 494, L45
- Paczynski, B. 2001, Acta Astronom ica, 51, 1
- Panaitescu, A., & Kumar, P. 2001, ApJ, 554, 667
- Podsiadlowski, Ph., Joss, P.C., & Hsu, J.J.L. 1992, ApJ, 391, 246
- Podsiadlowski, Ph., Langer, N., Poelarends, A.J.T., Rappaport, S., Heger, A., & Pfahl, E. 2003, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/0309588)
- Podsiadlowski, Ph., Nomoto, K., Maeda, K., Nakamura, T., Mazzali, P., Schmidt, B. 2002, ApJ, 567, 491
- Podsiadlowski, Ph., Rappaport, S., & Han, Z. 2003, MNRAS, 341, 385

- Rossi, E., Lazzati, D., & Rees, M. J. 2003, A IP Conf. Proc., Vol. 662, 335
- Sik, J.2003, MNRAS, 343, 249
- Soderberg, A.M., et al. 2003, ApJ, submitted (astro-ph/0311050)
- Spruit, H.C. 2002, A & A, 381, 923
- Spruit, H.C., & Phinney, E.S. 1998, Nature, 393, 139
- Stanek, K.Z., et al. 2003, ApJ, 591, L17
- Totani, T. 2003, ApJ, 598, 1151
- Uomoto, A. 1986, ApJ, 310, L35
- van Kerkwijk, M.H., et al. 1992, Nat, 355, 703
- van Paradijs, J., Kouveliotou, C., & Wijers, R.A.M.J., 2000, ARA&A, 38, 379
- Vietri, M., & Stella, L. 1998, ApJ, 507, 45
- Vranesevic, N. et al. 2003 (astro-ph/0310201)
- W ang, L., et al. 2002, ApJ, 579, 671
- W heeler, J.C., & Levreault, R. 1985, ApJ, 294, L17
- Woosley, S.E. 1993, ApJ, 405, 273
- Zhang, B., & Meszaros, P., 2003 (astro-ph/0311321)
- Zhang, W ., & Fryer, C.L. 1999, ApJ, 550, 357

This preprint was prepared with the AAS IAT_EX m acros v5.0.

Table 1. Rates in an average galaxy

Rate (yr ¹)		
Core-collapse supernovae	7	10 ³
Radio pulsars (Galactic)	4	10 ²
SNe 1b/c	1	10 ³
H ypemovae		10 ⁵
GRBs (for dierente ective beaming angles)		
= 1	6	10 4
= 5	3	10 ⁵
= 15	3	10 ⁶
M assive stars		
> 20M	2	10 ³
> 40 M	6	10 ⁴
> 80M	2	10 4