Draft version February 9, 2022
Typeset using LaTeX **twocolumn** style in AASTeX631

Waves!

Evan H. Anders,[1] Daniel Lecoanet,[1,2] Matteo Cantiello,[3,4] Benjamin P. Brown,[5] Keaton J. Burns,[6,7] Geoffrey M. Vasil,[8] Jeffrey S. Oishi,[9] and others?

[1] *CIERA, Northwestern University, Evanston IL 60201, USA*
[2] *Department of Engineering Sciences and Applied Mathematics, Northwestern University, Evanston IL 60208, USA*
[3] *Center for Computational Astrophysics, Flatiron Institute, New York, NY 10010, USA*
[4] *Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*
[5] *University of Colorado Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics and Department of Astrophysical and Planetary Sciences, Boulder, Colorado 80309, USA*
[6] *Massachusetts Institute of Technology Departments of Mathematics and Physics, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*
[7] *Center for Computational Astrophysics, Flatiron Institute, New York, New York 10010, USA*
[8] *School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney, Sydney, New South Wales 2006, Australia*
[9] *Bates College Department of Physics and Astronomy, Lewiston, Maine 04240, USA*

(Received July 28, 2021; Revised October 19, 2021; Accepted; Published)

Submitted to ApJ

ABSTRACT

Keywords: Stellar convection zones (301), Stellar physics (1621); Stellar evolutionary models (2046), others?

1. INTRODUCTION

Here's what Evan needs to do:

1. Get all of the damping layer simulations run.
2. Get a really long simulation run without a damping layer.
3. Do the transfer function derivation again.
4. Make figures and write out the story!

2. GRAIVITY WAVES IN THE TERMINOLOGY OF SOUND WAVES

3. SIMULATION DETAILS

4. RESULTS OF SIMULATIONS WITH DAMPING LAYERS

This is the "recording studio" section – it's useful to report the amplitude here because the theory doesn't give that.

Corresponding author: Evan H. Anders
evan.anders@northwestern.edu

We should run simulations as turbulent as possible here. Hopefully more turbulnce doesn't change the result. We will ignore the low-resolution laminar runs.

We report that we see powerlaw wave fluxes at all turbulence values, and no scaling with turbulence (hopefully).

5. SURFACE MANIFESTATION OF GRAVITY WAVES

This is the "Band plays in the bar" section – we can measure sound waves and resonances here.

We should run simulations for a long time here, at a resolution like 256^3.

6. TRANSFER FUNCTION: LINEAR THEORY DESCRIBES SURFACE MANIFESTATION

This is the section where we open Garage Band and put our bar filter on the recordings we took earlier. We see if the filter actually reproduces the resonances of the bar, etc.

Need to check through the transfer function derivation and theory here carefully. It may be useful to include Kyle here?

7. TRANSFER FUNCTION EXTRAPOLATION TO REAL STARS

This is where we say, based on the last section, the bar filter does a pretty good job of turning studio into bar. So, let's now see what happens if we use a stadium filter instead of a bar filter (whole star instead of sim). We obviously can't actually simulate a whole star, but our hope is that this gives us an idea of what gravity waves would look like on stars in gyre.

8. CONCLUSIONS & DISCUSSION

We thank Dominic Bowman, Jared Goldberg, Will Schultz, Falk Herwig, Kyle Augustson, (OTHERS?) for useful discussions which helped improve our understanding. EHA is funded as a CIERA Postdoctoral fellow and would like to thank CIERA and Northwestern University. This research was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. PHY-1748958, and we acknowledge the hospitality of KITP during the Probes of Transport in Stars Program. Computations were conducted with support from the NASA High End Computing (HEC) Program through the NASA Advanced Supercomputing (NAS) Division at Ames Research Center on Pleiades with allocation GID s2276.

APPENDIX

A. NUMERICAL METHODS

TODO: Describe nondimensionalization

We specifically solve these equations:

$$\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln\rho_0 = 0, \tag{A1}$$

$$\partial_t\boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\nabla}\varpi + s_1(\boldsymbol{\nabla}T_0) + \boldsymbol{u}\mathcal{D} - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\left(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} + \overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln\rho_0\right) = \boldsymbol{u}\times(\boldsymbol{\nabla}\times\boldsymbol{u}), \tag{A2}$$

$$\partial_t s_1 + \boldsymbol{u}\cdot(\boldsymbol{\nabla}s_0) - \boldsymbol{\nabla}s_1\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}\frac{1}{\mathrm{Pe}_{\mathrm{rad}}} - \frac{1}{\mathrm{Pe}_{\mathrm{rad}}}(\boldsymbol{\nabla}^2 s_1 + [\boldsymbol{\nabla}s_1]\cdot[\boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln\rho_0 + \boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln T_0]) = -\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}s_1 + \frac{1}{\mathrm{Re}}\frac{1}{T_0}\mathcal{V} + \mathcal{H}. \tag{A3}$$

The state variables are $\boldsymbol{u}$ the velocity, s_1 the fluctuations of specific entropy, and ϖ the dynamic reduced pressure. We define the stress tensor

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = 2\left(\overline{\boldsymbol{e}} - \frac{1}{3}\overline{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}\,\boldsymbol{\nabla}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\right), \tag{A4}$$

where $\overline{\boldsymbol{e}} \equiv 0.5[\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{u} + (\boldsymbol{\nabla}\boldsymbol{u})^T]$ is the strain rate tensor and $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}}$ is the identity matrix. The background stellar structure is that of a $40M_\odot$ MESA model (see appendices B & D). This provides radial profiles of $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln\rho_0$, $\boldsymbol{\nabla}\ln T_0$, $\boldsymbol{\nabla}T_0$, T_0, $\boldsymbol{\nabla}s_0$, $\mathrm{Pe}_{\mathrm{rad}}^{-1}$, and the effective heating $\mathcal{H}$. We refer the reader to appendix B for information on how these are calculated and what differences exist between MESA and Dedalus.

$\mathcal{D}$ is a radial profile of a damping coefficient. For the runs with damping presented in sec. 4, we set $\mathcal{D} = 0$ in the interior and $\mathcal{D} = f_b$ where f_b is the frequency associated with the peak of N^2 in our simulation domain.

TODO: be more precise about $\mathcal{D}$

TODO: Update this to be true for this paper.

We time-evolve equations A1-A3 using the Dedalus pseudospectral solver (Burns et al. 2020, git commit 1339061) using timestepper SBDF2 (Wang & Ruuth 2008) and safety factor 0.3. All variables are spectral expansions of Chebyshev coefficients in the vertical (z) direction ($n_z = 512$ between $z = [0, 2.25]$ plus $n_z = 64$ between $z = [2.25, 3]$) and as $(n_x,\ n_y) = (192,\ 192)$ Fourier coefficients in the horizontally periodic (x, y) directions. Our domain spans $x \in [0, L_x]$, $y \in [0, L_y]$, and $z \in [0, L_z]$ with $L_x = L_y = 4$ and $L_z = 3$. To avoid aliasing errors, we use the 3/2-dealiasing rule in all directions. To start our simulations, we add random noise temperature perturbations with a magnitude of 10^{-6} to the initial temperature profile.

Spectral methods with finite coefficient expansions cannot capture true discontinuities. To approximate discontinuous functions such as Eqns. **??** & **??**, we define a smooth Heaviside step function centered at $z = z_0$,

$$H(z; z_0, d_w) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 + \mathrm{erf}\left[\frac{z - z_0}{d_w}\right]\right). \tag{A5}$$

where erf is the error function and we set $d_w = 0.05$. The simulation in this work uses $\mathcal{P} = 3.2 \times 10^3$, $\mathrm{R}_0^{-1} = 10$, $\mathrm{Pr} = \tau = 0.5$, $\tau_0 = 1.5 \times 10^{-3}$, and $\kappa_{T,0} = \mathcal{P}^{-1}[(\partial T/\partial z)_{\mathrm{rad}}|_{z=0}]/(\partial T/\partial z)_{\mathrm{rad}}$

We produce figures ?? and ?? using matplotlib (Hunter 2007; Caswell et al. 2021). We produce figure ?? using plotly (Inc. 2015) and matplotlib. All of the Python scripts used to run the simulations in this paper and to create the figures in this paper are publicly available in a git repository (https://github.com/evanhanders/d3_stars) and in a Zenodo repository (?).

B. COMPARISON OF MESA AND DEDALUS MODELS

We read in a 40 $M_\odot$ ZAMS MESA stellar model (`LOGS/6.data` at github.com/matteocantiello/MESA_Models_Dedalus_Full_Sphere). From this model, we load the radial profiless of the mass m, radial coordinate r, density ρ, pressure P, temperature T, energy generation rate per unit mass ϵ, opacity κ, logarithmic temperature gradient $\nabla = d\ln T/d\ln P$, adiabatic temperature gradient $\nabla_{\rm ad}$, $\chi_\rho = (d\ln P/d\ln\rho)|_T$, $\chi_T = (d\ln P/d\ln T)|_\rho$, Brunt-Väisälä frequency N^2, specific heat at constant volume c_V and pressure c_P, convective luminosity $L_{\rm conv}$, and square sound speed c_s^2. From these quantities, we calculate the radiative diffusivity,

$$\chi_{\rm rad} = \frac{16\sigma_{\rm SB}T^3}{3\rho^2 c_P \kappa}, \tag{B6}$$

the gravitational acceleration $g = Gm/r^2$, the logarithmic pressure derivative $d\ln P/dr = -\rho g/P$, the logarithmic density gradient $(d\ln\rho/dr = d\ln P/dr)(\chi_T/\chi_\rho)(\nabla_{\rm ad} - \nabla) - g/c_s^2$, and the logarithmic temperature gradient $d\ln T/dr = (d\ln P/dr)\nabla$. The heating profile is found from the convective velocity $H = \hat{e}_r \cdot \boldsymbol{\nabla} L_{\rm conv}/(4\pi r^2)$. We nondimensionalize the length L on the radius of the core convection zone; the density, temperature, heating, and specific heat at constant pressure are nondimensionalized at their core values $\rho_c = \rho(r=0)$ and $T_c = T(r=0)$, $H_c = H(r=0)$, $c_{P,c} = c_P(r=0)$; the timescale is then set to be the core heating timescale $\tau_H = (H_c/L^2/\rho_c)^{-1/3}$ and the nondimensiona velocity is $u_H = L/\tau_H$.

Given this nondimensionalization and these MESA profiles, we compute the following nonconstant coefficients for our Dedalus model:

1. $\mathrm{Pe}^{-1} = \chi_{\rm rad}/(\mathrm{u_H L})$. When $\mathrm{Pe}^{-1} < \mathrm{Re}^{-1}$, a constant, we set $\mathrm{Pe}^{-1} = \mathrm{Re}^{-1}$.
2. $\nabla\mathrm{Pe}^{-1}$ is computed as the gradient of Pe^{-1}.
3. $\ln\rho$ is set to be $\ln(\rho/\rho_c)$.
4. $\ln T$ is set to be $\ln(T/T_c)$.
5. T is set to be T/T_c.
6. $\boldsymbol{\nabla} T$ is set to be $(T/T_c)\, L\, d\ln T/dr$.
7. $\mathcal{H} = (H/H_c)\,\rho_c T_C/(\rho T)$.
8. $\nabla s_0 = c_P N^2/g(L/s_c)$

TODO: write down what s_c is

Some fields with particularly sharp transitions (e.g., $\boldsymbol{\nabla} s_0$, $\mathcal{H}$) require additional smoothing. In Fig.
TODO: put fig in
, we show comparisons between the stratification felt by the Dedalus simulation and the original MESA model.

C. TRANSFORMS AND SPECTRA

All wave flux and poer spectra presented in this work are calculated from long time series of data of our state variables projected onto a 2D sphere. Given a 3D data cube of a variable $a(t,\phi,\theta)$, we transform the data into frequency space as

$$a(t,\phi,\theta) \xrightarrow[\text{SHT}]{} A(t,\ell,m) \xrightarrow[\text{FT}]{} \hat{A}(f,\ell,m). \tag{C7}$$

To perform the spherical harmonic transform (SHT), we load the real grid-space data into a Dedalus `field` object, then convert the field to coefficient space. Dedalus coefficient data must be divided by $\sqrt{2}$ at $\ell = 0$ data and 2 for $\ell > 0$. This returns two real values b_1 and b_2 for each $(\ell,\ m)$ pair, and $A(t,\ell,m) = b_1 + \hat{j} b_2$ (where $\hat{j} = \sqrt{-1}$). To perform the Fourier Transform (FT), we first measure the total number of temporal data points in the sample N and retrieve the Hanning window w of N points with `numpy.hanning`. We then use the `numpy.fft.fft` to transform the product of w and $A(t,\ell,m)$, and normalize the output by $\sqrt{8/3}/N$ to retrieve $\hat{A}(f,\ell,m)$. To obtain the frequencies, we use `numpy.fft.fftfreq` with N data points and provide it the time step between each output in our data series.

To calculate a power-like quantity (power spectrum, wave flux spectrum), we multiply one transformed field with the complex conjugate of another, e.g., $P_A(f) = \hat{A}^*\hat{A}$. To properly account for power in negative frequencies, we define $P_A(f) = P_A(f) + P_A(-f)$ for all $f \geq 0$.

To calculate the wave flux, we output $p = \varpi - 0.5|\boldsymbol{u}|^2$ and $u_r = \boldsymbol{u}\cdot\hat{e}_r$. We take transforms per the above recipe and calculate the wave flux $W(f) = R^2\rho(R)\hat{P}^*\hat{U}_r$, where R is the radial coordinate at which the shell is sampled.

D. MESA

The MESA EOS is a blend of the OPAL (Rogers & Nayfonov 2002), SCVH (Saumon et al. 1995), FreeEOS (Irwin 2004), HELM (Timmes & Swesty 2000), and PC (Potekhin & Chabrier 2010) EOSes.

Radiative opacities are primarily from OPAL (Iglesias & Rogers 1993, 1996), with low-temperature data from Ferguson et al. (2005) and the high-temperature, Compton-scattering dominated regime by Buchler & Yueh (1976). Electron conduction opacities are from Cassisi et al. (2007).

Nuclear reaction rates are from JINA REACLIB (Cyburt et al. 2010) plus additional tabulated weak reaction rates Fuller et al. (1985); Oda et al. (1994); Langanke & Martínez-Pinedo (2000). Screening is included via the prescription of Chugunov et al. (2007). Thermal neutrino loss rates are from Itoh et al. (1996).

E. DATA AVAILABILITY

The inlists and plotting scripts used in this work may be found at **Cite Github and Zenodo**.

REFERENCES

Buchler, J. R., & Yueh, W. R. 1976, ApJ, 210, 440, doi: 10.1086/154847

Burns, K. J., Vasil, G. M., Oishi, J. S., Lecoanet, D., & Brown, B. P. 2020, Physical Review Research, 2, 023068, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.023068

Cassisi, S., Potekhin, A. Y., Pietrinferni, A., Catelan, M., & Salaris, M. 2007, ApJ, 661, 1094, doi: 10.1086/516819

Caswell, T. A., Droettboom, M., Lee, A., et al. 2021, matplotlib/matplotlib: REL: v3.3.4, v3.3.4, Zenodo, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.4475376

Chugunov, A. I., Dewitt, H. E., & Yakovlev, D. G. 2007, PhRvD, 76, 025028, doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.76.025028

Cyburt, R. H., Amthor, A. M., Ferguson, R., et al. 2010, ApJS, 189, 240, doi: 10.1088/0067-0049/189/1/240

Ferguson, J. W., Alexander, D. R., Allard, F., et al. 2005, ApJ, 623, 585, doi: 10.1086/428642

Fuller, G. M., Fowler, W. A., & Newman, M. J. 1985, ApJ, 293, 1, doi: 10.1086/163208

Hunter, J. D. 2007, Computing in Science and Engineering, 9, 90, doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55

Iglesias, C. A., & Rogers, F. J. 1993, ApJ, 412, 752, doi: 10.1086/172958

—. 1996, ApJ, 464, 943, doi: 10.1086/177381

Inc., P. T. 2015, Collaborative data science, Montreal, QC: Plotly Technologies Inc. https://plot.ly

Irwin, A. W. 2004, The FreeEOS Code for Calculating the Equation of State for Stellar Interiors. http://freeeos.sourceforge.net/

Itoh, N., Hayashi, H., Nishikawa, A., & Kohyama, Y. 1996, ApJS, 102, 411, doi: 10.1086/192264

Langanke, K., & Martínez-Pinedo, G. 2000, Nuclear Physics A, 673, 481, doi: 10.1016/S0375-9474(00)00131-7

Oda, T., Hino, M., Muto, K., Takahara, M., & Sato, K. 1994, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables, 56, 231, doi: 10.1006/adnd.1994.1007

Potekhin, A. Y., & Chabrier, G. 2010, Contributions to Plasma Physics, 50, 82, doi: 10.1002/ctpp.201010017

Rogers, F. J., & Nayfonov, A. 2002, ApJ, 576, 1064, doi: 10.1086/341894

Saumon, D., Chabrier, G., & van Horn, H. M. 1995, ApJS, 99, 713, doi: 10.1086/192204

Timmes, F. X., & Swesty, F. D. 2000, ApJS, 126, 501, doi: 10.1086/313304

Wang, D., & Ruuth, S. J. 2008, Journal of Computational Mathematics, 26, 838. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43693484