

# Neutrino Interactions in the Outflow from Gamma Ray Burst Accretion Disks

R. Surman<sup>1</sup> and G. C. McLaughlin<sup>2</sup>

## ABSTRACT

We examine the composition of matter as it flows away from gamma ray burst accretion disks, in order to determine what sort of nucleosynthesis may occur. Since there is a large flux of neutrinos leaving the surface of the disk, the electron fraction of the outflowing material will change due to charged current neutrino interactions. We calculate the electron fraction in the wind using detailed neutrino fluxes from every point on the disk and study a range of trajectories and outflow conditions for several different accretion disk models. We find that low electron fractions, conducive to making  $r$ -process elements, only appear in outflows from disks with high accretion rates that have a significant region both of trapped neutrinos and antineutrinos. Disks with lower accretion rates that have only a significant region of trapped neutrinos can have outflows with very high electron fractions, whereas the lowest accretion rate disks with little trapping have outflow electrons fractions of closer to one half.

*Subject headings:* gamma ray:bursts-nucleosynthesis-accretion disks

## 1. Introduction

Ever since the first gamma ray bursts were detected thirty years ago, their origin has been a subject of great interest. Many more observations have occurred in recent years which point to exotic supernova as their astrophysical source; for a review see Mészáros (2002). Although the hydrodynamic details of the evolution of these objects is still under development, see e.g. Woosley (1993); MacFadyen & Woosley (1999), it is likely that the burst will originate from a configuration where an accretion disk surrounds a black hole. Several models for these accretion disks have been examined (Popham, Woosley, & Fryer 1999; Narayan, Piran, & Kumar 2001; DiMatteo, Perna, & Narayan 2002). In addition

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, Union College, Schenectady, NY 12308

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8202

to the highly collimated ultrarelativistic jet that produces the observed gamma rays, there will also be outflow from the accretion disk which has been studied by MacFadyen (2003); MacFadyen & Woosley (1999). This material begins at relatively high temperature (a few MeV) and therefore will undergo a primary nucleosynthesis where free nucleons form heavy nuclei. Since this is a different environment than that which occurs in the relativistic jet, different nucleosynthesis products will be produced.

Any analysis of the nucleosynthesis must begin with the evolution of the electron fraction in the accretion disk. This was done in Pruet, Woosley, & Hoffman (2003) by considering only electron and positron capture and by Surman & McLaughlin (2004) by considering neutrino and antineutrino capture as well. The disk is hot enough that for high accretion rates the neutrinos and even the antineutrinos can become trapped, creating a neutrino torus around the black hole that is in some ways similar to the neutrinosphere at the surface of the protoneutron star in a normal supernova.

A preliminary analysis of the nucleosynthesis from the outflow of accretion disks was done in Pruet, Thompson, & Hoffman (2004) using a spherically symmetric neutrino driven wind model, and by Pruet, Surman, & McLaughlin (2004) using an outflow at fixed velocity and entropy. Maeda & Nomoto (2003) considered the nucleosynthesis that will occur from explosive burning in gamma ray bursts. Pruet, Thompson, & Hoffman (2004) concluded that iron peak elements will be produced in this outflow, while Pruet, Surman, & McLaughlin (2004) examined various rare isotopes that would point to GRB disk outflow as a unique nucleosynthesis event. Nucleosynthesis from accretion disks has also been discussed in Fujimoto et al. (2004).

In this paper we examine the nucleosynthesis in the gamma ray burst ejecta by studying the effect of the neutrino flux on the electron fraction of the material as it leaves the surface of the disk. We examine the conditions under which the electron fraction is quite low and the heaviest,  $r$ -process elements are likely to be produced. We also examine the conditions under which the lighter iron peak nuclei are likely to be formed.

## 2. Trajectories

Determining the trajectories followed by mass elements ejected from the gamma ray burst accretion disk is a complicated problem. The trajectories depend on the initial thermodynamic parameters of the material, and the manner in which energy is imparted to the gas. With different accretion disk parameters, such as the viscosity,  $\alpha$ , spin parameter  $a$  and size of the black hole, the results are likely to vary. Although disk winds have been studied

extensively in the context of other astrophysical objects such as AGNs and X-ray stars, a complete discussion of the outflow from gamma ray burst accretion disks has not yet been attempted.

In order to investigate the impact of neutrino interactions on the electron fraction and therefore the nucleosynthesis coming from gamma ray burst disk outflow, we approximate disk outflow trajectories by using a two component approach. At very large distance, we use spherical symmetry. Initially, however, the forces pushing the material off the accretion disk will be closer to vertical and we assume cylindrical symmetry. At short distances, therefore, the material moves approximately vertically, whereas at long distances, it moves radially away from the black hole.

The general hydrodynamic equations in steady state for matter conservation, momentum conservation and energy conservation are, e.g. Duncan, Shapiro, & Wasserman (1986):

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \mathbf{u}) \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{D\mathbf{u}}{Dt} = -\frac{1}{\rho}\nabla P - \nabla\phi \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{D\epsilon}{Dt} + P\frac{D(1/\rho)}{Dt} = \frac{1}{\rho}(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\text{ph}} + \nabla \cdot \mathbf{S}_{\nu}) \quad (3)$$

Here  $\rho$  is the density,  $P$  is pressure,  $\mathbf{u}$  is the velocity,  $\epsilon$  is the energy per unit mass and  $\mathbf{S}_{\text{ph}}$  and  $\mathbf{S}_{\nu}$  are the photon and neutrino fluxes respectively. The gravitational potential is represented by  $\phi$ , while the notation  $D/Dt$  represents a convective derivative.

As discussed above, we divide the outflow into two regions, and approximate the outflow in these regions as having a cylindrical or spherical symmetry. For the case of spherically radial flow, we rewrite the mass and the momentum equation, so we have:

$$\dot{M} = 4\pi r^2 \rho u_r \quad (4)$$

$$u \frac{\partial u}{\partial r} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial r} - \frac{GM}{r^2} \quad (5)$$

In these equations  $\dot{M}$  is the mass loss rate,  $G$  is the gravitational constant, and  $M$  is the mass enclosed within radius  $r$ . We also rewrite these equations for cylindrical geometry for vertical flow off the disk:

$$\dot{M} = -2\pi \left[ \int \rho u_r r_c dz + \int \rho u_z r_c dr_c \right] \quad (6)$$

$$u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r_c} + u_z \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial z} - \frac{u_\phi^2}{r_c} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial r_c} - GM r_c (z^2 + r_c^2)^{-3/2} \quad (7)$$

$$u_r \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r_c} + u_z \frac{\partial u_z}{\partial z} = -\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} - GM z (z^2 + r_c^2)^{-3/2} \quad (8)$$

In the above equations  $r_c$  is the radial cylindrical coordinate.

In principle one should solve Eqs. 6 - 8 (or Eqs. 4 - 5) together with with Eq. 3. However, because of the complex geometry, this involves a lengthy numerical calculation which is not practical until more accurate disk models become available. Still, we would like to understand the importance of neutrino interactions in the outflow and what sort of electron fractions can obtain in this environment. Therefore, in place of Eqs. 3 and Eq. 7 -8 (or Eq. 5), we use a parameterization for the velocity,

$$|u| = v_\infty \left(1 - \frac{R_0}{R}\right)^\beta \quad (9)$$

where  $R = (z^2 + r_c^2)^{0.5}$  for the first, vertical part of the trajectory and the starting position of the material is  $R_0$ . Once we switch to spherical flow  $R = r$ . We study the results as functions of the parameters  $\beta = 0.2$  to  $2.5$ ,  $v_\infty = 5 \times 10^3 \text{ km s}^{-1} - 5 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , and  $R_0 = 50 \text{ km}$  to  $600 \text{ km}$ . Although all trajectories with the same  $v_\infty$  asymptote to the same value at large distance, the ones with smaller  $\beta$  have a greater initial acceleration and arrive there more quickly.

Three velocity trajectories are shown in Fig. 1 as a function of distance from the black hole, all for the same  $\beta$  and final velocity  $v_\infty = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ , but for two different initial starting points.

We use the mass conservation equations (Eq. 8 or Eq. 5) in order to determine the density given the position and velocity. In the cylindrical case we assume the velocity is completely in the  $z$  direction, and therefore there is no expansion of the material in the radial direction along the disk.

In our calculations we assume a constant entropy, since any heating of the material should be done at the surface of the disk. We take the entropy as an input parameter in the range of  $s = 10$  to  $s = 40$ , from which we calculate the temperature at each step using the expression for the entropy in units of the Boltzmann constant

$$s = s_\gamma + s_{e^+e^-} + s_{nucleon} \quad (10)$$

where  $s_\gamma$  is the photon entropy,  $s_{e^+e^-}$  is the entropy of the electron-positron pairs, and  $s_{nucleon}$

is the entropy of the nucleons. The photon entropy is given by

$$s_\gamma = 0.019 \frac{T_{MeV}^3}{\rho_{10}} \quad (11)$$

where  $T_{MeV}$  is the temperature in units of MeV and  $\rho_{10}$  is the density in units of  $10^{10} \text{ g cm}^{-3}$ . The entropy of the electron positron pairs is

$$s_{e^+e^-} = 0.0022 \frac{T_{MeV}^3}{\rho_{10}} \left[ F\left(\frac{\mu_e}{T_{MeV}}\right) + F\left(-\frac{\mu_e}{T_{MeV}}\right) \right] \quad (12)$$

$$F\left(\frac{\mu_e}{T_{MeV}}\right) = \int_0^\infty dx \frac{x^4/(3y) + x^2y - (\mu_e/T_{MeV})x^2}{1 + \exp(y - \mu_e/T_{MeV})} \quad (13)$$

where  $y = (x^2 + (m_e/T_{MeV})^2)^{0.5}$ ,  $m_e$  is the mass of the electron and  $\mu_e$  is the chemical potential of the electrons, which is determined by the temperature, density and electron fraction of the material

$$\rho_{10} Y_e = 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \left[ F_{2m}\left(\frac{\mu_e}{T_{MeV}}\right) - F_{2m}\left(-\frac{\mu_e}{T_{MeV}}\right) \right] \quad (14)$$

where

$$F_{2m}\left(\frac{\mu_e}{T_{MeV}}\right) = \int_0^\infty \frac{x^2 dx}{1 + \exp(y - \mu_e/T_{MeV})}. \quad (15)$$

We take the complete expression for the electron and positron pairs since we are neither in the limit where they are fully relativistic or fully non-relativistic. The approximate expression for the entropy of the nucleons is

$$s_{nucleon} = 7.4 + \ln\left(\frac{T_{MeV}^{3/2}}{\rho_{10}}\right). \quad (16)$$

We begin the calculations when the material is at the surface of the disk. We start with disk conditions from the disk models of DiMatteo, Perna, & Narayan (2002) (hereafter DPN) for disks with accretion rates  $\dot{M} \geq 1 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$  and from Popham, Woosley, & Fryer (1999) for more slowly accreting disks. We take the disk surface to be at the density scale height

$$H = \left| \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{d\rho}{dz} \right|^{-1}. \quad (17)$$

We begin the outflow in the vertical direction so  $u_r$  is zero, and  $u_z = |u|$ . We take steps in vertical distance, at each point determining a velocity, a density, temperature and electron chemical potential. We turn from the vertical solution to the cylindrical one when the material has reached one, two or three vertical scale heights above the disk, although this is the least sensitive parameter in this model.

The results of this formulation for a relatively high accretion rate disk model and wind parameters,  $\beta = 0.8$  and  $r_c = 100$  km,  $s = 20$  (Model 1),  $r_c = 250$  km,  $s = 10$  (Model 2) and  $r_c = 250$  km,  $s = 20$  (Model 3) are shown in Figs. 2, 3 and 4. In Fig. 2, we plot two sample trajectories in position space. Since we have fixed the turnover point at two vertical scale heights, the final trajectories appear to lie almost on top of each other. As mentioned above, we found little impact on the results when examining different turnover points. In Fig. 3, we show the densities for these trajectories. In Fig. 4 the effect of a larger entropy can also be seen as a greater temperature at a given distance.

### 3. Neutrino Fluxes

Next we use the trajectories developed in the previous section to calculate the evolution of the electron fraction due to electron, positron, neutrino and antineutrino annihilation:

$$e^- + p \leftrightarrow \nu_e + n \quad (18)$$

$$e^+ + n \leftrightarrow \bar{\nu}_e + p \quad (19)$$

Since the electrons and positrons are in equilibrium with the baryons and photons and therefore their distribution can be described with the temperature,  $T$ , and electron chemical potential  $\mu_e$ , the forward rates in Eqs. 18 and 19 are easy to calculate. However, the neutrinos are not in equilibrium and their flux at each point on the trajectory must be calculated by summing over the neutrinos which originate at every part of the disk.

In Surman & McLaughlin (2004), we calculated the evolution of the electron fraction of a mass element as it spiraled from the outer edge of the disk toward the center. This was done by summing all contributions from the neutrino flux at all points on the disk, taking into account regions where the neutrinos become optically thick. These calculated electron fractions are the starting  $Y_e$ s for the material ejected from the disk. Furthermore, these neutrino fluxes are used to calculate the spectrum at every point above the disk through which the ejected material passes.

In Fig. 5 we show the results of using the reactions Eqs. 18 and 19 to determine the electron fraction for Models 1, 2, and 3. Dashed lines show the true electron fraction while the dot-dashed lines show the electron fraction calculated without neutrino capture interactions.

In the high entropy models ( $s = 20$ ) the large electron fractions are due to the increased importance of electron and positron capture at higher temperature. With higher temperatures the electrons and positrons essentially reset the electron fraction to a new equilibrium

value and the material “forgets” its original disk value and winds up consisting of nearly equal numbers of neutrons and protons. This is evident in the initial sharp increase in the electron fraction.

However, when the neutrino interactions have been included, the situation is quite different. Even at these high entropies, the neutrinos have a marked impact on the evolution of the electron fraction, bringing it down to  $Y_e < 0.3$ . The reverse rates in Eq. 18 and 19 overwhelm the forward rates. Furthermore, due to the higher energies of the electron antineutrinos, the antineutrino capture on protons is larger than neutrino capture on neutrons. As can be seen from the figure, the release point of the material determines the degree to which neutrino capture influences the final electron fractions.

For lower entropies we find less of an increase in the electron fraction when the neutrino capture reactions are turned off. The lower entropy means that the system is partially electron degenerate, and so even while the electron and positron captures are maintaining a weak equilibrium by themselves, the electron fraction is quite low. Note that the low entropy model corresponds to essentially no heating of the outflow material since the disk has an entropy of order 10.

## 4. Results

In this section we explore the qualitative effect of variables such as entropy and outflow timescale on the electron fraction and therefore on the nucleosynthesis. We also explore different disk models.

In the previous section we discussed the importance of entropy on the electron fraction. The outflowing material becomes less neutron rich if it is exposed to more positron capture, which happens when the entropy rises and the chemical potential decreases. Fig. 6 shows the electron fraction measured at  $T_9 = 10$  for several different entropies, for trajectories that start at  $r_0 = 250$  km and two different outflow parameters  $\beta$ . This figure shows that at the highest entropies  $s = 40$  and fast accelerations ( $\beta = 0.8$ ), where the neutrinos have the least influence, the electron fraction can become as high as 0.45, while for slow accelerations ( $\beta = 2.5$ ) the neutrinos insure that the electron fraction is very low ( $\sim 0.1$ ).

The effect of the time scale of the outflow through the parameter  $\beta$  is shown in Fig. 7. The material accelerates much more quickly at lower  $\beta$  providing less opportunity for the neutrinos to move the system toward weak equilibrium. In the case of the high entropy, the effect is most pronounced. The higher betas mean more time for the neutrinos to drive the electron fraction down. In the case of the lower entropy, as previously noted the electrons

and positrons already favor a low electron fraction, and so the electron fraction never gets very high.

So far we have considered disk models with accretion rates of  $\dot{M} = 10 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ , and spin parameter  $a = 0$ . This model is desirable because it produces many neutrinos which create a large energy deposition from neutrino-antineutrino annihilation. Such high accretion rates may be expected in the case of neutron star-neutron star mergers, but lower accretion rates are suggested for the collapsar model (MacFadyen & Woosley 1999). However, increasing the spin parameter or viscosity is similar to increasing the accretion rate as far as driving up the neutrino flux. So the high accretion rate model we have considered may mimic a lower accretion rate model with a large spin parameter.

When the accretion rate becomes lower an interesting effect occurs. At  $\dot{M} = 10 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ ,  $a = 0$  the neutrino surface is at 200 km but by  $\dot{M} = 1 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ ,  $a = 0$ , it has shrunk to 40 km. Similarly the antineutrino sphere shrinks from 140 km to around 32 km; see figures 3 and 4 in Surman & McLaughlin (2004). There are relatively few antineutrinos because the antineutrino surface is quite small, however the neutrino capture rates are still large and the net effect can be to drive  $Y_e$  to very high values. This can be seen in Fig. 8 which gives the electron fraction for a  $\dot{M} = 1 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$  model for various entropies both with neutrinos and without neutrinos. Note the difference in the slow acceleration ( $\beta = 2.5$ ) curves in Figs. 6 and 8.

This model is most sensitive to the outflow parameters because the neutrino capture rates, while still quite strong, are smaller than in the  $\dot{M} = 10 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$  model, by a factor of 2 - 3 for the neutrinos and an order of magnitude for the antineutrinos. Because of the extreme sensitivity to the neutrino parameters a neutrino diffusion calculation is needed to better determine the spectra and luminosity of the neutrinos and antineutrinos emitted at each part of the accretion disk.

In Fig. 9, electron fractions for models with lower accretion rate disks of  $\dot{M} = 0.1 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ ,  $a = 0.95$  are shown. In this model the material starts off with a low density and temperature relative to that of the higher accretion rate models. Although there is only a very small region where the neutrinos are trapped in this disk, and the antineutrinos are not trapped at all, the influence of neutrino capture is apparent. Even here, the electron fraction changes by as much as 30% in the upward direction depending on the model. Such changes will have an important impact on the nucleosynthesis in the iron peak region.

Since the parameterization discussed here is independent of the heating mechanism, these results can be used as a rough gauge of the electron fraction and therefore the nucleosynthesis for any type of wind model.



#### 4.1. Preliminary Nucleosynthesis Calculation

The nucleosynthesis that may be produced from configurations that give a low electron fraction is shown in figure 10. Here we show the results of an  $r$ -process calculation for  $s = 10$ ,  $\beta = 0.8$  and  $r_0 = 250$  km. For this choice of parameters, the outflow does result in  $r$ -process abundances. However, it can be seen from the figure that although the neutrinos initially helped to keep the electron fraction low, they actually cause the A=195 peak to disappear in an alpha effect (Fuller & Meyer 1995; McLaughlin, Fuller, & Wilson 1996).

The neutrino driven wind models for low accretion rate disks ( $\dot{M} = 0.1M_\odot/s$ ) were discussed in Pruet, Thompson, & Hoffman (2004). These fall at around  $\beta = 2.5$ ,  $v_\infty = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  in our parameterization and we estimate that the electron fraction may be increased by as much as 5% - 20% by the neutrinos. These conditions may lead to a large overproduction of elements such as  $^{42}\text{Ca}$  and  $^{45}\text{Sc}$ ,  $^{46}\text{Ti}$ ,  $^{49}\text{Ti}$ ,  $^{63}\text{Cu}$ ,  $^{64}\text{Zn}$  as discussed in Pruet, Surman, & McLaughlin (2004).

For winds that accelerate quickly from an accretion disk of around  $\dot{M} = 1M_\odot/s$  and  $a = 0$ , the electron fraction can become as high as 0.8. In this case the nucleosynthesis would be dominated by nickel, in addition to making nuclei on the proton rich side of the valley of beta stability, such as  $^{58}\text{Cu}$ ,  $^{59}\text{Zn}$ ,  $^{50}\text{Fe}$  and  $^{52}\text{Fe}$ .

### 5. Conclusions

We have presented a parameter study for outflow from gamma ray burst accretion disk and calculated the electron fractions produced in these outflows. We have considered the impact of charge changing neutrino interactions on the outflow, using our previously calculated neutrino fluxes from every point on the disk (Surman & McLaughlin 2004).

Complete hydrodynamic models for the outflow for various disk parameters will become available in the future and the parameter study presented here can then be used to determine which disk models and outflows are likely to produce different types of nucleosynthesis, such as  $r$ -process or iron peak nuclei. For example, we find that the conditions that are most conducive to making the  $r$ -process elements come from those disks with high accretion rates or spin parameters, e.g.  $\dot{M} = 10M_\odot/s$ ,  $a = 0$ , such that they produce a sizable region of trapped antineutrinos. Disk models with somewhat lower accretion rates and spin parameters, e.g.  $\dot{M} = 1M_\odot/s$ ,  $a = 0$  may still have a significant region of trapped neutrinos, but a smaller region of trapped antineutrinos. This causes the electron fractions to become very high, potentially as high as 0.8. Still lower accretion rate models, e.g.  $\dot{M} = 0.1M_\odot/s$ ,  $a = 0.95$  will have very small region of trapped neutrinos, which can raise the electron

fraction by 5% to 30%.

Several parameters determine the electron fraction in the outflow, the outflow timescale, the entropy and the release point on the disk. The effect of the high entropy is to raise the electron fraction through positron capture. A more slowly accelerating wind increases the importance of neutrino and antineutrino capture which can drive the electron fraction up or down. Releasing the material closer to the center of the disk has a similar effect.

In all cases there is interesting nucleosynthesis to explore. However, if the  $r$ -process is to come from gamma ray bursts, it is necessary for some of the outflow material to have a small electron fraction. This requires high accretion rate, high spin models, and small amounts of heating in the wind.

Future observations of emission lines from gamma ray bursts, when combined with studies such as this one may be an avenue toward understanding not only the nucleosynthesis originating from GRBs but also the conditions in the outflow and in the accretion disk itself.

We wish to thank A. ud-Doula and J. Pruet for useful discussions. G. C. M. acknowledges support from the US Department of Energy under grant DE-FG02-02ER41216, and R. S. acknowledges support from the Research Corporation under grant CC5994.

## REFERENCES

- DiMatteo, T., Perna, R., & Narayan, R. 2002 ApJ, 579, 706.
- Duncan, R. C., Shapiro, S. L., & Wasserman, I. 1986, ApJ, 309, 141.
- Fujimoto, S., Hashimoto, M., Arai, K., & Matsuba, R. 2004, astro-ph/0405510.
- Fuller, G. M. & Meyer, B. S. 1995 ApJ453, 792.
- MacFadyen, A. I. & Woosley, S. E. 1999, ApJ, 524, 262.
- MacFadyen, A. I. 2003, astro-ph/0301425.
- Maeda, K. & Nomoto, K. 2003, ApJ, 598, 1163.
- McLaughlin, G. C., Fuller, G. M., & Wilson, J. 1996 ApJ, 472, 400.
- Mészáros, P. 2002, ARA&A, 40, 137.
- Narayan, R., Piran, T., & Kumar, P. 2001, ApJ, 557, 949.

- Popham, R., Woosley, S. E., & Fryer, C. 1999, ApJ, 518, 356.
- Pruet, J., Surman, R., & McLaughlin, G. C. 2004, ApJ, 602, L101.
- Pruet, J., Woosley, S. E., & Hoffman, R. D. 2003, ApJ, 586, 1254.
- Pruet, J., Thompson, T., & Hoffman, R. D. 2004, ApJ, in press.
- Surman, R. & McLaughlin, G. C. 2004, ApJ, 603, 611.
- Woosley, S. E. 1993, ApJ, 405, 273.

Table 1. Disk and Wind Parameters for Three Sample Trajectories

| Model | Disk Model | $\dot{M}$                     | $a$ | $\alpha$ | $s$ | $\beta$ | $R_0$  | $v_\infty$                    |
|-------|------------|-------------------------------|-----|----------|-----|---------|--------|-------------------------------|
| 1     | DPN        | $10 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ | 0   | 0.1      | 20  | 0.8     | 100 km | $3 \times 10^4 \text{ km /s}$ |
| 2     | DPN        | $10 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ | 0   | 0.1      | 10  | 0.8     | 250 km | $3 \times 10^4 \text{ km /s}$ |
| 3     | DPN        | $10 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{s}$ | 0   | 0.1      | 20  | 0.8     | 250 km | $3 \times 10^4 \text{ km /s}$ |




Fig. 1.— Shows velocity plotted against radius for three different trajectories. The solid line shows Model 1 which starts at a distance on the disk from the center of  $r = 100$  km. The dashed line shows Model 2 and 3 which start at a distance of  $r = 250$  km from the center.




Fig. 2.— Shows vertical height as a function of radial coordinate,  $r_c$ , for the same three models as in Fig. 1. The dotted line shows the scale height of the disk.




Fig. 3.— Shows density as a function of distance from the center,  $R = (z^2 + r_c^2)^{0.5}$ , for the same three models as in Fig 1.




Fig. 4.— Shows temperature as a function of  $R$ , for Model 1 (solid line), Model 2 (short dashed line) and Model 3 (long dashed line).




Fig. 5.— Shows  $Y_e$  as a function of distance from the black hole for the same three models as in Fig. 1. The dotted and dot-dashed lines show the effect when neutrino capture interactions are turned off.






Fig. 6.— For disk models with  $\dot{M} = 10 \text{ M}_\odot \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $a = 0$ . Shows  $Y_e$  as a function of  $s$ , using a release point of  $r_0 = 250 \text{ km}$  and a final velocity of  $v_\infty = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The neutrinos have the maximum effect in a slowly accelerating outflow ( $\beta = 2.5$ ) and significantly decrease the electron fraction.




Fig. 7.— For disk models with  $\dot{M} = 10 M_{\odot} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $a = 0$ . Shows  $Y_e$  as a function of  $\beta$  at a release point of  $r_0 = 250 \text{ km}$  and a final velocity of  $v_{\infty} = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ .




Fig. 8.— For a disk model with an accretion rate of  $\dot{M} = 1.0 M_{\odot} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ,  $a = 0$ . Shows  $Y_e$  as a function of  $s$ , using a release point of  $r_0 = 170 \text{ km}$  and a final velocity  $v_{\infty} = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The neutrinos raise the electron fraction considerably in a slowly accelerating outflow ( $\beta = 2.5$ ).




Fig. 9.— For a disk model with an accretion rate of  $\dot{M} = 0.1 M_{\odot} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , spin parameter  $a = 0.95$ . Shows  $Y_e$  as a function of  $s$ , using a release point of  $r_0 = 100 \text{ km}$  and a final velocity  $v_{\infty} = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ . The neutrinos raise the electron fraction. For slowly accelerating outflows ( $\beta = 2.5$ ), the effect can be as large as 30%.




Fig. 10.— For a disk model with an accretion rate of  $\dot{M} = 10 M_{\odot} \text{ s}^{-1}$ , spin parameter  $a = 0$  and for a trajectory of  $s = 10$ ,  $\beta = 0.8$ ,  $v_{\infty} = 1 \times 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  and  $r_0 = 250 \text{ km}$ . The solid line gives the result with all neutrino interactions in the wind turned on, the dashed line has neutrino interactions in the disk, but not in the wind.