Stellar Surfaces as Interface Physics: Boundary Conditions, Mode Coupling, and Effective Vacuum Response

Adam Sheldrick[1]

[1] *Independent Researcher*

(Dated: February 7, 2026)

Stellar surfaces span a wide range of physical regimes, from compressible fluids in normal stars to elastic and crystalline crusts in compact objects. Across helioseismology, neutron star seismology, magnetohydrodynamics, and quantum field theory in curved spacetime, these surfaces are treated as dynamically active interfaces that support normal modes, transmit stress, and exchange energy with their surroundings. By contrast, the exterior region is typically described as "vacuum," assumed to possess no intrinsic physical response. In this work, we synthesize results from these literatures to show that stellar surface phenomena already require an effective dynamical coupling across the surface–vacuum boundary, implicitly assigning medium-like response properties to the exterior. We formulate this coupling as an interface problem characterized by impedance, leakage, and relaxation times, independent of any specific ontology. We then discuss how this interface language naturally unifies helioseismic surface waves, magnetar quasi-periodic oscillations, and vacuum boundary effects, and outline discriminating observational tests. The analysis motivates, but does not require, interpretations in which the vacuum exhibits finite response properties.

I. INTRODUCTION

Stellar surfaces are among the most physically diverse interfaces studied in astrophysics. In normal stars, the photosphere behaves as a stratified, compressible fluid supporting surface gravity waves and turbulent convection. In neutron stars, the outer layers transition from superfluid interiors to elastic or crystalline crusts capable of sustaining shear stresses and starquakes. These surfaces are not treated as passive boundaries; rather, they are understood to actively support normal modes, dissipate energy, and couple dynamically to their surroundings.

Despite this, the exterior region is commonly described as "vacuum," often modeled as geometry and fields without intrinsic physical response. This creates a conceptual tension: surface dynamics are routinely observed to excite outward-propagating modes, exchange energy, and undergo relaxation, yet the medium into which this energy propagates is not assigned physical degrees of freedom beyond mathematical structure.

The purpose of this paper is not to revise general relativity or stellar structure theory, but to clarify what physical assumptions are already implicit in the treatment of stellar surface phenomena. We argue that, operationally, the surface–vacuum boundary is treated as a dynamical interface characterized by effective response properties. Making this explicit allows disparate observations to be unified under a common interface framework and provides a natural language for formulating observational tests.

II. STELLAR SURFACES AS PHYSICAL INTERFACES

A. Normal stars and helioseismic surfaces

In solar-type stars, the photosphere is treated as a stratified fluid boundary supporting a hierarchy of oscillation modes. Of particular importance are the fundamental (f) modes, which obey a surface-gravity-wave dispersion relation of the form

$$\omega^2 \simeq gk, \tag{1}$$

where g is the surface gravity and k the horizontal wavenumber. This dispersion relation is formally identical to that of deep-water surface waves, highlighting the interpretation of the photosphere as a true dynamical interface [1, 2].

Helioseismic inversions further require "surface term" corrections that account for imperfect modeling of near-surface physics. These corrections are systematic, frequency-dependent, and sensitive to surface structure, indicating that wave reflection, leakage, and damping at the boundary play an essential role in mode propagation [1].

B. Compact stars: elastic and crystalline boundaries

Neutron star surfaces represent an even more explicit realization of interface physics. Beneath the magnetosphere lies a solid crust composed of a nuclear lattice, possessing a nonzero shear modulus. Observations of magnetar giant flares reveal quasi-periodic oscillations (QPOs) commonly interpreted as torsional crustal modes or coupled crust–core oscillations [3–5].

The existence of discrete mode families, damping times, and mode coupling requires an exchange of energy between the crust, the core, and the exterior magnetosphere. Regardless of the detailed microphysics, these phenomena demonstrate that the stellar surface cannot be treated as an isolated boundary; it must be dynamically coupled to its surroundings.

III. VACUUM RESPONSE TO BOUNDARIES

Independent of stellar physics, quantum field theory provides clear examples in which the vacuum state depends on boundary conditions. The Casimir effect and its dynamical variants demonstrate that changing boundary geometries or motions modify vacuum mode structure, leading to measurable forces and radiation [6].

Similarly, in gravitational contexts, effective boundary descriptions such as the membrane paradigm assign conductivity, viscosity, and surface tension to horizons as calculational tools [7]. While these constructions are often presented as mathematical conveniences, they underscore that boundary dynamics are routinely modeled using response properties normally associated with physical media.

These results do not require adopting a specific ontology for the vacuum. They do, however, establish that "vacuum" behavior near boundaries is operationally responsive and sensitive to interface dynamics.

IV. AN INTERFACE FORMULATION

The observations reviewed above motivate a generic interface description applicable across stellar systems. In this formulation, the surface–vacuum boundary is characterized by effective parameters:

- An impedance governing reflection and transmission of modes,
- A leakage rate describing energy transfer across the boundary,
- A relaxation time associated with dissipation and equilibration.

These parameters need not imply a material vacuum; they summarize how exterior degrees of freedom respond to surface excitations. Importantly, analogous parameters already appear implicitly in helioseismic surface corrections, magnetar QPO damping models, and horizon boundary conditions [1, 3, 7].

Expressing surface phenomena in this language highlights structural similarities between systems traditionally treated as unrelated and provides a common basis for comparison.

V. OBSERVATIONAL TESTBEDS

A. Helioseismology

The Sun provides a controlled laboratory for interface physics. Frequency-dependent mode linewidths, surface-term residuals, and regional variations associated with magnetic activity offer opportunities to test whether an effective boundary-response description captures observed systematics more naturally than purely geometric corrections [2].

B. Magnetars

Magnetar QPOs offer a complementary high-energy testbed. The dependence of observed mode spectra and damping times on magnetospheric conditions and flare energetics directly probes the efficiency of energy transfer across the stellar surface [3, 4].

Systematic correlations between exterior state and mode behavior would favor an interface-based interpretation.

C. Compact object ringdown

Although beyond the scope of this paper, similar interface considerations may apply to the ringdown of compact objects, where observed quasi-normal modes encode information about boundary conditions and dissipation. Future high-precision measurements may further constrain allowable response behaviors.

VI. INTERPRETIVE OPTIONS

The interface formulation presented here is compatible with multiple interpretations. One may regard the effective response parameters as emergent properties of fields and geometry, or as indicative of deeper medium-like behavior. The analysis does not require choosing between these options; rather, it clarifies what physical behavior must be accounted for regardless of interpretation [6, 7].

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Stellar surfaces are demonstrably dynamical interfaces that support modes, dissipate energy, and couple to their surroundings. Across multiple subfields, successful modeling of these phenomena already relies on effective response properties at the surface–vacuum boundary. Making this interface structure explicit unifies helioseismology, neutron star seismology, and vacuum boundary effects under a common language and sharpens the formulation of observational tests.

Whether interpreted geometrically or as evidence for finite vacuum response, the interface perspective clarifies what is physically required by existing data and provides a disciplined framework for future investigation.

[1] J. Christensen-Dalsgaard, Helioseismology, Reviews of Modern Physics **74**, 1073 (2002).

[2] L. Gizon and A. C. Birch, Local helioseismology, Living Reviews in Solar Physics **2**, 10.12942/lrsp-2005-6 (2005).

[3] A. L. Watts, Magnetar oscillations, Astrophysics and Space Science **308**, 625 (2007).

[4] A. Colaiuda, H. R. Beyer, and K. D. Kokkotas, Coupled crust–core oscillations of magnetars, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **414**, 3014 (2011).

[5] H. Sotani, Oscillations of neutron stars with solid crusts, Universe **10**, 231 (2024).

[6] V. V. Dodonov, Fifty years of the dynamical casimir effect, Physics **2**, 67 (2020).

[7] K. S. Thorne, R. H. Price, and D. A. Macdonald, eds., *Black Holes: The Membrane Paradigm* (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1986).