

The Thermal Response of a Pulsar Glitch : The Non-spherical Symmetric Case

K.S. Cheng¹, Y.Li^{1,2} and W.M.Suen³

¹Department of Physics, University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

²High Energy Astrophysics Laboratory, IHEP, Beijing, China

³Department of Physics, Washington University, U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

We study the thermal evolution of a pulsar after a glitch in which the energy is released from a relative compact region. A set of relativistic thermal transport and energy balance equations is used to study the thermal evolution, without making the assumption of spherical symmetry. We use an exact cooling model to solve this set of differential equations. Our results differ significantly from those obtained under the assumption of spherical symmetry. Even for young pulsars with a hot core like the Vela pulsar, we find that a detectable hot spot can be observed after a glitch. The results suggest that the intensity variation and the relative phases of hard X-ray emissions in different epoches can provide important information on the equation of state.

Subject headings: dense matter - stars: evolution - star: interiors - stars: neutron
- stars: X-rays

1. Introduction

The studies of the thermal evolution of pulsars are believed to provide vital information on the internal properties of the neutron stars (for a review see e.g., Tsuruta 1992).

Theoretical cooling curves are often compared with the surface temperatures of pulsars with different ages. However, different pulsars clearly have different parameters, e.g. the rotation period (P) and the surface magnetic field (B), which may affect the cooling processes. Several proposed internal heating mechanisms, e.g. the fractional heating between the crustal superfluid and the crust (Alpar et al 1984a, Shibazaki and Lamb 1988), the crust cracking (Cheng et al 1992), the chemical heating (Reisenegger 1995) etc., all depend on the pulsar parameters, i.e. P and B . Furthermore, different pulsars have different internal properties, e.g. mass, equation of state, impurity content etc., which strongly affect the cooling curve. Hence ideally speaking, one would like to study the thermal evolution process of an individual pulsar. But realistically, the normal cooling process is an extremely slow process and cannot be followed observationally for an individual star.

The thermal evolution of a pulsar after a glitch is particularly interesting in that it fills in this gap. A large amount of energy could be suddenly released during the period jump (glitch). The energy will eventually be transported to the surface of the star, and released in the form of a transient thermal X-ray emission. Several authors (Van Riper et al 1991, Chong and Cheng 1994, Hirano et al 1997) have calculated the thermal evolutions of pulsars after glitches, but they all assumed that the energy is generated in a spherical shell inside the star. They found that the glitches cannot produce very significant observed results for young pulsars like the Vela pulsar (Van Riper et al 1991). However, the energy released in the glitch is likely to be deposited in a compact region in the inner crust, by either superfluid unpinning (e.g. Cheng et al 1988, Alpar and Pines 1995) or crust cracking (e.g. Ruderman 1991, Cheng et al 1992). The energy transport is clearly not spherical symmetric (although the background geometry is to a good approximation spherical). In this paper, we study the general case of the energy transport inside neutron stars after a glitch without the spherical symmetry assumption, and arrive at a conclusion substantially different from previous results. In section 2, we derive the general relativistic non-spherical symmetric transport and

energy balance equations. The necessary physics inputs and solution algorithms for solving this set of relativistic differential equations are described in section 3. Numerical results are presented in section 4, with a brief discussion in section 5.

2. General Relativistic Non-Spherical Symmetric Thermal Transport and Energy Balance Equations

The Newtonian thermal transport and energy balance equations are given respectively by

$$\nabla \cdot \mathbf{F} = -C_V \frac{dT}{dt} = -nT \frac{ds}{dt} - Q_\nu \quad (1)$$

and

$$\nabla T = -\frac{\mathbf{F}}{K} \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{F} is the energy flux, C_V is the specific heat capacity, T is the temperature, n is the particle number density, s is the specific entropy per particle, Q_ν is the neutrino emissivity per unit volume and K is the thermal conductivity.

To generalize the above equations to relativistic situation, we make the following assumptions. (1) The neutron star is rotating slowly enough that the metric tensor describing the background spacetime can be written as (Tolman 1934)

$$ds^2 = -e^{2\Phi(r)} dt^2 + e^{2\Lambda(r)} dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2) , \quad (3)$$

where $e^{\Lambda(r)} = (1 - 2Gm/rc^2)^{-1/2}$. (2) The diffusion limit is appropriate for the energy transport. (3) There are no other entropy-generating mechanism besides diffusion, and second order flux terms in the transport are negligible. (4) Fluid motion inside the star due to the thermal effects is negligible. These simplifying assumptions are clearly justified for the problem at hand. The energy transport is then governed by the following equations.

The energy-momentum tensor can be written as

$$T^{\mu\nu} = (\rho + P)U^\mu U^\nu + \rho g^{\mu\nu} + q^\mu U^\nu + U^\mu q^\nu \quad (4)$$

where U^μ is the 4-velocity of fluid flow, ρ is total energy density measured in the rest frame of fluid, and P is the pressure in rest frame of fluid. The heat flow is given by $q^\mu = -K(g^{\mu\nu} + U^\mu U^\nu)(T_{,\nu} + Ta_\nu)$ where $a_\nu = U^\mu U_{\nu;\mu}$ is the 4-acceleration, and $K = K(T)$ is the effective conductivity, e.g. $K \propto T^3(t, r, \theta, \varphi)$ for photon diffusion. Since we assume that there is no fluid motion the 4-velocity of the fluid is $U^\alpha = (e^{-\Phi}, 0, 0, 0)$ and $a^\alpha = (0, e^{-2\Lambda} \partial_r \Phi, 0, 0)$. The 4-heat flow is given by $q^\alpha = (0, -Ke^{-2\Lambda}(\partial_r T + T\partial_r \Phi), -\frac{K}{r^2} \partial_\theta T, -\frac{K}{r^2 \sin^2 \theta} \partial_\varphi T)$. The energy-momentum tensor components related to the energy transport equation are following: $T^{tt} = \rho U^t U^t = \rho e^{-2\Phi}$, $T^{tr} = f^r = q^r U^t = -Ke^{-\Phi-2\Lambda}(\partial_r T + T\partial_r \Phi)$, $T^{t\theta} = f^\theta = q^\theta U^t = -\frac{Ke^{-\Phi}}{r^2} \partial_\theta T$ and $T^{t\varphi} = f^\varphi = q^\varphi U^t = -\frac{Ke^{-\Phi}}{r^2 \sin^2 \theta} \partial_\varphi T$. To express the thermal transport equation in terms of local observables, we note that $T^{\hat{\alpha}\hat{\beta}} = \frac{\partial \zeta^{\hat{\alpha}}}{\partial x^\alpha} \frac{\partial \zeta^{\hat{\beta}}}{\partial x^\beta} T^{\alpha\beta}$ where $d\zeta^{\hat{\alpha}} = (e^\Phi dt, e^\Lambda dr, r d\theta, r \sin \theta d\varphi)$ are the unit one forms, and $dx^\alpha = (dt, dr, d\theta, d\varphi)$. The locally measured energy flux in spherical coordinate is

$$\mathbf{F} = (T^{\hat{t}\hat{r}}, T^{\hat{t}\hat{\theta}}, T^{\hat{t}\hat{\varphi}}) \quad (5)$$

where

$$T^{\hat{t}\hat{r}} = e^{(\Lambda+\Phi)} f^r = -Ke^{-\Phi-\Lambda} \partial_r (e^\Phi T), \quad (6)$$

$$T^{\hat{t}\hat{\theta}} = r e^\Phi f^\theta = -\frac{K}{r} \partial_\theta T \quad (7)$$

and

$$T^{\hat{t}\hat{\varphi}} = e^\Phi r \sin \theta f^\varphi = -\frac{K}{r \sin \theta} \partial_\varphi T. \quad (8)$$

Therefore, the relativistic thermal transport equation is given by

$$(e^\Phi T)_{;i} = -\frac{e^\Phi F_i}{K} \quad (9)$$

where $;i$ denotes spatial covariant derivative on the constant time slice of the metric given by Eq.(3), with $i = r, \theta, \varphi$. We can see that this equation (i) in the Newtonian limit reduces

to to Eq.(2) with Φ and Λ go to zero, and (ii) in the spherical symmetric case reduces to the equations of, e.g., Straumann (1984), with $\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta} = \frac{\partial}{\partial\varphi} = 0$.

The energy balance equation can be derived by the conservation of the energy-momentum tensor, namely $0 = T^{t\mu}_{;\mu} = T^{tt}_{;t} + \frac{2}{r}f^r + \frac{\cos\theta}{\sin\theta}f^\theta + \partial_r f^r + f^r \partial_r \Lambda + 3f^r \partial_r \Phi + \partial_\theta f^\theta + \partial_\varphi f^\varphi$ where $T^{tt}_{;t} = \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}e^{-2\Phi} = \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial\tau}e^{-\Phi}$. Here, $\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial\tau}$ is the rate of change of energy density measured in proper frame. $\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}$ depends on the processes under consideration, e.g., if only heat conduction is considered, one has $\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = C_V \frac{\partial T}{\partial t}$, with C_V being the heat capacity measured in the proper frame. We include neutrino emission, which leads to $\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} = C_V \frac{\partial T}{\partial t} + e^\Phi Q_\nu = \frac{e^{-\Phi-\Lambda}}{r^2} \partial_r (r^2 f^r e^{\Lambda+3\Phi}) + \frac{e^{2\Phi}}{\sin\theta} \partial_\theta (\sin\theta f^\theta) + e^{2\Phi} \partial_\varphi f^\varphi$. Using the relations between f^α and F^α in Eqs (6) to (8), we obtain

$$- (C_V \frac{dT}{dt} + e^\Phi Q_\nu) = \frac{e^{-(\Phi+\Lambda)}}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} (r^2 F^{\hat{r}} e^{2\Phi}) + \frac{e^\Phi}{r \sin\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (F^{\hat{\theta}} \sin\theta) + \frac{e^\Phi}{r \sin\theta} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi} F^{\hat{\varphi}} \quad (10)$$

It is very easy to see that the above equation again recovers the well-known spherical symmetric case, as well as the Newtonian limit.

3. Physics Inputs and Numerical Algorithms

Physics inputs include stellar model, thermal conductivity, heat capacity, neutrino emissivity, superfluidity, surface temperature treatment, and the position and amount of the energy released by a glitch. In our calculations, we divide a neutron star into two parts. The region from the neutron star center to where the mass density equals the nuclear density $\rho_N = 2.8 \times 10^{14} \text{g/cm}^3$ is defined as core, while the region from ρ_N to the boundary density $\rho_b = 10^9 \text{g/cm}^3$ is defined as crust. The core is treated as isothermal with a time-dependent temperature. In the crust region, the temperature after a glitch has both spatial and temporal variations; hence an 'exact' or 'evolutionary' treatment is necessary (Nomoto and Tsuruta 1987, Van Riper 1991). In our treatment, the energy flow and the spatial dependence of the

temperature throughout the crust is followed but the thermal effects on the stellar structures are neglected, i.e. the same hydrostatic stellar model is used throughout the evolution.

The stellar structure of a neutron star is determined by the equation of state (EOS). We consider three representative EOSs in this paper, with the total mass of the neutron star in all three models taken to be $1.4M_{\odot}$ (M_{\odot} is the solar mass). The first EOS is BPS (Baym, Pethick, and Sutherland 1971), which is often used as a soft EOS in neutron star cooling studies. BPS model results in high central density and little mass in crust, and hence a small radius. The second EOS used is PPS (Pandharipande, Pines, and Smith 1976), which is a stiff EOS with low central density, thick crust and large radius. The third EOS UT (Wiringa and Fiks 1988), is a representative intermediate stiff model. Its central density, crust thickness and radius are between those of BPS and PPS model.

In the crust region, we fitted the thermal conductivity data provided by Van Riper (1991), who followed the work of Itoh et al. (1984a,b,c,d), together with the quantum corrections of Mitake, Ichimaru, and Itoh (1984). The ions A and Z which required in the conductivity formulae are taken from Lattimer et al. (1985, hereafter LLPR). It is important to note that the conductivity decreases as the temperature increases.

For a star with a core temperature $\sim 10^8 K$, the important neutrino emission processes include electron bremsstrahlung (Flowers and Itoh 1976,1979), neutron-neutron, neutron-proton bremsstrahlung and the modified Urca process (e.g. Fridman and Maxwell 1979). The rapid cooling processes, e.g. pion condensation (e.g. Maxwell 1977) or direct Urca process (Prakash et al 1992) etc, will not be considered here.

The heat capacities in the crust region come from those of extreme relativistic degenerate electrons and those of nonrelativistic neutrons and ions. The capacities of electrons and neutrons are given by Glen and sutherland (1980). The capacity of ions is given by Van Riper (1991). The capacities of the core are mainly due to the relativistic electrons,

the superconducting protons and the superfluid neutrons (Maxwell 1979). The transition temperature of normal-superfluid neutrons is given by Takatsuka and Tamagaki (1971).

We use an empirical formula (Gudmundsson 1983) to relate the surface temperature T_s and the boundary temperature T_b at ρ_b

$$T_{b8} = 1.3(T_{s6}^4/g_{s14})^{0.455}, \quad (11)$$

where g_s is the surface gravity. Eichler and Cheng (1989) have shown that the thermal response time between the boundary and the surface is of order of seconds, which is even less than our numerical time step (greater than 10 s). The above relation is clearly valid in our computation.

In this paper, we study the thermal response of a glitch which releases heat in a small volume inside the star. Although the stellar structure may be spherical symmetric, the heat transport is *not* spherical symmetric as the heat is deposited off center. The pulsar glitch may be caused by the sudden transfer of angular momentum from the more rapidly rotating crustal superfluid to the solid crust region or the sudden fracture of the crustal lattice due to gravitational stress or magnetic stress. The two heating mechanisms have been studied by Alpar et al. (1984a,b) and Ruderman (1976,1991). The energy ΔE is most likely deposited within the density range 10^{12} to $2.4 \times 10^{14} g/cm^3$. ΔE is of order $10^{41} \sim 10^{43} ergs$ (Van Riper, Epstein, and Miller 1991). In this paper, we will focus on the case of the Vela pulsar, with $\Delta E = 10^{42} ergs$ released at $\sim 10^{12} g/cm^3$.

At time $t = 0$, the heat is deposited in a small volume at $r = r_g$ and $\theta = 0$. r_g is the radius where the density is $\rho_g = 10^{12} g/cm^3$ (cf. Fig.1). Without loss of generality, we choose the hot spot to be centered at $\theta = 0$, which gets rid of the φ dependence in the transport problem. The transport equations in the crust region are solved by explicit finite differencing, while the core is taken to be isothermal with a time dependent temperature T_{core} determined by the total heat inflow and the core heat capacity. In a typical run, the

spatial resolution is taken to be $N_r \times N_\theta = 100 \times 50$, with a variable time step determined by stability requirements. Numerical convergence of the results have been carefully checked. The temperature is cell-centered, while the flux is centered on the cell surface. The inner and outer boundary conditions for the flux are given explicitly by

$$F^r(1, j) = -K e^{-\Phi - \Lambda} \frac{e^{\Phi(1, j)} T(1, j) - e^{\Phi(\text{core})} T_{\text{core}}}{\Delta r} \quad 1 \leq j \leq N_\theta \quad (12)$$

at the inner boundary, and

$$F^r(N_r + 1, j) = \sigma T_s^4(N_r, j) \frac{r_s^2}{r_{ob}^2} \quad 1 \leq j \leq N_\theta \quad (13)$$

at the outer boundary. r_{ob} and r_s are respectively the radii of the outer boundary of the crust and the star. σ is Stefan-Boltzmann constant, $T_s(N_r, j)$ is the surface temperature of the j th angular cell at r_{ob} . The initial temperature distribution within the crust is that of the equilibrium state of the same star with the initial core temperature. The temperature evolution is given by standard finite differencing of Eq. (10). With a second order scheme no extra boundary condition is needed for Eq. (10) as the temperature is cell centered.

4. Results

We take the energy to be released at $3 \times 10^{11} \text{g/cm}^3 \leq \rho \leq 3 \times 10^{12} \text{g/cm}^3$ with a solid angle of $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ centered at $\theta = 0^\circ$. The initial temperature of the core is taken to be $T_c = 10^8 \text{K}$ and the released energy $\Delta E = 10^{42} \text{ergs}$, which is about the energy released by the Vela pulsar after a giant glitch. Figure 1 shows the surface temperature versus the polar angle at different times. The hot spot is gradually spreading away from $\theta = 0^\circ$ and takes about 275 days for the surface temperature to reach the maximum for a UT star. The temperature at maximum is about 5 times higher than the background temperature. However, the hottest region is concentrated in a solid angle of $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ centered at $\theta = 0^\circ$.

Figure 2 shows the evolution of the surface luminosity as function of time for three different EOSs, i.e. PPS, UT and BPS. The peak luminosity is higher, the time needed for reaching the peak is shorter and the relaxation time is also shorter for softer EOS in comparison with the stiff one. This is because the soft EOS has a much thinner crust. We can see that there are substantial differences among these EOSs.

Figure 3 compares the luminosity evolutions between the spherical symmetric case and non-spherical symmetric case. There are three major differences between these two cases. (1) The surface luminosity of the spherical symmetric case reaches the peak almost 5 times faster than that of the non-spherical symmetric case. This results from the fact that the non-spherical symmetric case has much higher temperature which decreases the conductivity a lot. (2) The peak of the total luminosity in the spherical case is lower than that of the non-spherical symmetric case. It is because in the non-spherical case more energy comes out through the surface instead of heating the core. (3) Most importantly, although the changes of the total luminosity for spherical case and non-spherical case are very small, the surface temperature of the non-spherical symmetric case at a $2^\circ \times 2^\circ$ cap area changes drastically (c.f. Fig.1 and Fig.3c of Chong and Cheng 1994, hereafter CC94) while the surface temperature changes very little in the spherical symmetric case. In other words, a hot spot should show up on the surface of neutron star 200 to 300 days after the glitch and lasts for about a few hundred days if the EOS is soft or intermediate stiff.

In calculating the evolution of total luminosity for different core temperatures, we find that the surface luminosity of the cooler model reaches its maximum earlier. This results from the fact that the conductivity is higher for lower temperature. The relative increase in the luminosity of the cooler star is higher than that of the hotter star. The net increase of the luminosity of the cooler star is a little higher than that of the hotter star. It is because the energy of the glitch spreads to stellar surface of the cooler star faster than that

of the hotter star. However, the total energy emitted during the thermal afterglow period is about the same in these two cases. We have also calculated the thermal evolution inside the neutron star at $\theta = 0^\circ$ (cf. Fig.1 of Cheng and Li 1997). In comparing with the spherical symmetric cases (e.g. Figure 2 of CC94), we find that the temperature of the heat pulse is much higher in this case because the energy is released in a much smaller volume. The heat pulse is propagating outward as well as inward, with a speed slower than that of Figure 2 of CC94 (where the core temperature is chosen to be $10^6 K$, and hence the conductivity is much larger).

5. Discussion

Based on a set of general relativistic thermal transport and energy balance equations, we studied the thermal evolution of a neutron star after a glitch. We find that if the energy is released in a compact region, a hot spot can appear on the stellar surface. For a UT star with an interior temperature $\sim 10^8 K$, although the surface luminosity only increases by $\sim 10\%$, the radiation is emitted from a small area with a temperature higher than the background temperature by a factor of ~ 5 . This results in a periodic hard X-ray pulse emission which should stand out clearly from the soft X-ray background. A soft EOS greatly enhances this effect and a stiff EOS reduces it: the thermal response to a glitch can provide important constraints on the EOS.

The time for reaching the peak luminosity is long, typically ~ 1 year for a UT star, this may make it difficult to relate the hard X-ray pulse to the glitch generating it. However, since the energy released by each glitch should be at a different place of the star, comparing the relative pulse phase difference and the intensity variation of the hard X-rays observed in different epochs can provide evidences for this phenomenon. Together with a detailed spectral analysis, the EOS could be deduced. A detailed report on this subject and a comparison

with observed data will be presented elsewhere.

Figure Captions

Figure 1.— The thermal profiles of the hot spot at the surface of neutron star of UT EOS labelled by the time in days after a heat input of $\Delta E = 10^{42} \text{ergs}$ induced by a glitch released at $3 \times 10^{11} \text{g/cm}^3 \leq \rho \leq 3 \times 10^{12} \text{g/cm}^3$ in non-spherical symmetric case as a function of polar angle. The core temperature is $T_c = 10^8 K$.

Figure 2.— The evolution curves of the total luminosity for PPS, UT and BPS stars denoted by solid, dashed and dot-dashed line respectively.

Figure 3.— The evolution curves of the total luminosity of UT star in spherical symmetric and non-spherical symmetric cases denoted by dashed and solid line respectively.

REFERENCES

- Alpar, M.A., Anderson, P.W., Pines, D., and Shaham, J., 1984a, ApJ, 276, 325
- Alpar, M.A., Anderson, P.W., Pines, D., and Shaham, J., 1984b, ApJ, 278, 791
- Alpar, M.A., and Pines, R., 1995, in *The Lives of the Neutron Star: Conference Proceedings*, eds. M.A. Alpar, Ukiziloglu, and J. Van Paradijs, Kluwer Academic Publisher: Dordrech.
- Baym, G., Pethick, C.J., and Sutherland, P.G., 1971, ApJ, 170, 299 (BPS)
- Cheng, K.S., Pines, D., Alpar, M.A., and Shaham, J., 1988, ApJ, 330, 835
- Cheng, K.S., Chau, W.Y., Zhang, J.L., and Chau, H.F., 1992, ApJ, 396, 135
- Cheng, K.S. and Li, Y., 1997, in *The Pacific Rim Conference on Stellar Astrophysics*, eds. K.L.Chan et. al., Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, in press.

- Chong, N., and Cheng, K.S., 1994, ApJ, 425, 210
- Eichler, D., and Cheng, A. F., 1989, ApJ, 336, 360
- Glen, G., and Sutherland, P. G., 1980, ApJ, 239, 671
- Gudmundsson, E.H., Pethick, C.J., and Epstein, R.I., 1983, ApJ, 272, 286
- Hirano, S., Shibazaki, N., Umeda, H., and Nomoto, K., 1997 ApJ, in press
- Itoh, N., Kohyama, Y., Matsumoto, N., and Seki, M., 1984a, ApJ, 279, 413
- Itoh, N., Kohyama, Y., Matsumoto, N., and Seki, M., 1984b, ApJ, 280, 787
- Itoh, N., Kohyama, Y., Matsumoto, N., and Seki, M., 1984c, ApJ, 285, 758
- Itoh, N., Matsumoto, N., Seki, M., and Kohyama, Y., 1984d, ApJ, 273, 774
- Lattimer, J.M., Pethick, C.J., Ravenhall, D.G., and Lamb, D.Q. 1985, Nucl. Phys. A., 432, 646 (LLPR)
- Maxwell, O.V., 1979, ApJ , 231, 201
- Mitake, S., Ichimaru, S., and Itoh, N., 1984, ApJ, 277, 375
- Nomoto, K., and Tsuruta, S., 1987, ApJ, 312, 711
- Pandharipande, V.R., Pines, D., and Smith, R.A. 1976, ApJ, 208, 550 (PPS)
- Reisenegger, A., 1995, ApJ, 442, 749
- Ruderman, M.A., 1991, ApJ, 366, 261
- Ruderman, M.A., 1976, ApJ, 203, 213
- Shibazaki, N. and Lamb, F. K., 1988, ApJ, 346, 808

- Straumann, N., 1984, in *General Relativity and Relativistic Astrophysics*, (Berlin: Springer)
- Takatsuka, T., and Tamagaki, R., 1971, Prog. Theor. Phys., 46, 114
- Tolman, R. C., 1934, in *Relativity, Thermodynamics, and cosmology*, (Clarendon Press, Oxford, England)
- Tsuruta, S., 1991, in *The Structure and Evolution of Neutron Star: Conference Proceedings*, eds. D. Pines, R. Tamagaki, and S. Tsuruta, (Addison-Wesley) 317
- Van Riper, K. A., 1991, ApJ, 75, 449
- Van Riper, K. A., Epstein, R. I., and Miller, G. S., 1991, ApJ, 381, L47
- Wiringa, R. B., and Fiks, V., 1988, Phys. Rev. C, 38, 1010 (UT).