



Thermal radiative losses in high-mass microquasars jets

Arthur CHARLET

CRAL - LUPM

June 2021

R. Walder, A. Marcowith, D. Folini, M. Dieckmann, J. Favre







Arthur CHARLET (CRAL - LUPM)

HMMQ jets



Cygnus X-1 @1.4 GHz (Gallo *et al.* 2005) Structure spans ${\sim}15$ ly

Context:

binary star systems jet ($\beta \sim 0.1-0.9$) into stellar wind emission from radio to gamma

Aims:

large scales ($\sim 10^{14}$ cm) long times (quasi stationary state) role of cooling and system parameters

Methods:

3D relativistic hydrodynamics thermal radiative losses AMR

Challenge:

months long simulation times

Cygnus X-1 vs Cygnus X-3

Parameters choice:

Cygnus X-1: Orosz *et al.* 2011, Yoon & Heinz 2015 Cygnus X-3: Zdziarski *et al.* 2013, Dubus *et al.* 2010

	Cyg X-1	Cyg X-3	unit
star type	O9-B	WN 4-6	
M_{co}	15	\lesssim 5	M_{\odot}
d_{orb}	$3\cdot 10^{12}$	$2.7\cdot10^{11}$	cm
Ň	$3 \cdot 10^{-6}$	10^{-5}	<i>M</i> ⊙/yr
Vw	1000	1500	km/s
L_j	$5 \cdot 10^{36}$	10 ³⁸	$erg s^{-1}$
β_j	0.33	0.75	

Cygnus X-3:

- \rightarrow more compact system, stronger wind
- \rightarrow hotter star, stronger B field
- \rightarrow denser, faster, more energetic jet
 - \Rightarrow stronger losses expected



Methods

Code and physics

Simulations with A-MaZe toolkit (Walder & Folini 2000, 2003):

- finite volume method
- forward Euler scheme
- 2nd order Lax-Friedrich
- min-mod limiter

Relativistic hydrodynamics:

$$\partial_t D + \partial_i (Dv^i) = 0$$

$$\frac{\partial_t S^j + \partial_i (S^j v^i + pc^2 \delta^{ij}) = 0}{\partial_t \tau + \partial_i S^i = -P_{loss}}$$
(2)

 ρ_j , v_j , T_j at injection x=0 reflecting conditions outflow elsewhere

coarse grid: $250 \times 200 \times 200$ cells $\sim 7 \times 5 \times 5$ AU (1) $dx = dy = dz = 4 \cdot 10^{11}$ cm

²⁾ fixed grid centered on jet for performance 3) 5 levels up to $\times 64$ refinement where jet is launched

Relativistic solver with recovery of primitive variables

First simulations including relativistic hydrodynamics *and* large scales First implementation of radiative loss effects in jet dynamics

Arthur CHARLET (CRAL - LUPM)

Methods

Radiative losses

free-free + relativistic correction (Rybicki & Lightman
1979):

$$P_{\rm ff} \propto \rho^2 T^{1/2} g_{\rm ff}(T) (1 + \frac{T}{10^{10} \text{ K}}) \tag{4}$$

 g_{ff} frequency-averaged Gaunt factor $g_{ff} = 1.2$ in CygX1 runs $g_{ff}(T)$, van Hoof *et al.* 2015 for CygX3

synchrotron and inverse Compton derived from Maxwell-Jüttner for e^- :

$$P_{syn, IC} \propto \gamma \rho T \frac{K_3}{K_2} \left(T^{-1} \right) U_{B, rad}$$
(5)

line recombination, Cook et al. 89:

$$P_{line} \propto \rho^2 \Lambda(T) T^{\beta(T)}, \ T < 10^{7.7} \ {
m K}$$
 (6)



 ${\cal P}_{\rm rad}(\,{\cal T})$ for typical CygX3 cocoon values, $\rho=10^{-14}~{\rm g~cm^{-3}},~\gamma=1$

Fiducial runs



Arthur CHARLET (CRAL - LUPM)

Parametric study



 \rightarrow beam temperature matters for stability



Arthur CHARLET (CRAL - LUPM)

Rad. losses in HMMQ jets

June 2021 7/11

Cooled vs adiabatic



Cygnus X-1: $t_{cool} > t_{dyn}$, barely any effects Cygnus X-3: $t_{cool} < t_{dyn}$ \rightarrow focus on Cygnus X-3 case



Cooled vs adiabatic (2)





 \rightarrow faster KHI growth

Arthur CHARLET (CRAL - LUPM)

Cooled vs adiabatic (3)



 \rightarrow expansion becomes self-similar

outer cocoon:

 \rightarrow smaller in cooled jet but same law inner cocoon:

 \rightarrow slightly stronger slope for non-cooled jet beam:

 \rightarrow strong difference in behaviour

Conclusions and prospects

Conclusions

- First large scale relativistic study of cooling in HMMQ jet outbreaks
- ▶ Weak to no effects on Cygnus X-1, structural and dynamical modifications for Cygnus X-3
- > Parameter dependence of quantities (e.g. temperature pdf, self-similarity power laws...)

(paper to be submitted : A. Charlet et al. 2021)

Prospects

- Study steady-state structure
- Compute synthetic thermal and non-thermal emission spectra