Observational Signature on the Tidal Disruption of Dark Stars by Massive Black Hole

Thomas Hong Tsun, Wong¹; George M. Fuller¹ ¹ University of California San Diego

Introduction

Tidal Disruption Events (TDEs) are transients where a stellar object comes into close proximity of the galactic central massive black hole (BH), where the BH tidal force is sufficient to overcome the star's self-gravity.

Past work has only discussed on the disruption of various kinds of stars (main-sequence, giants, white dwarfs), but with the proliferation of literature in exploring the possibility of how the stellar structure could be drastically different when considering a large amount of Dark-matter (DM) admixture, we hope to extend the effort into TDEs.



Tidal force elongates the star into a long tidal debris stream that eventually orbits back and feed the BH. Only the mass with $\langle E \rangle \leq 0$ will eventually return to the BH, and the mass return rate \dot{M}_{return} sensitively depends on the stellar internal structure.



Scientific Question

How would the observed **TDE light curve differ** for: (i) Highly **DM-admixed** stellar object, (ii) Common **Baryonic** star?





Network for Neutrinos,

TIER CENTER

Setup

We consider a highly DM-admixed stellar object using two-fluid model assuming selfinteracting DM (SIDM). SIDM is able to dissipate their orbital energies and sink to the centre of the star, the enhanced gravitational contribution of the DM now creates an even deeper potential well that contracts the baryonic component.



The density profile of the diffuse baryonic envelope and the dense DM-admixed core is very similar to that of a *giant*. For a total disruption, the star has to reach $r < r_{\rm T}$ to disrupt even the dense core. We expect a signature bump in the light curve $\dot{M}_{return}(t)$ at the late phase evolution as the huge discontinuity at the core-envelope boundary would give an "unexpected" increase in mass compared to the smoothly varying density in the polytropic model. The luminous (baryonic) mass in the core is smaller than that of a giant, so the bump would not be as large in our case.

Key References

MacLeod, M. et al. 2012. ApJ. 757, 134. Guillochon, J. & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2013. ApJ. 767, 25. Lodato, G. et al. 2009. MNRAS. 392. Shiokawa, H. et al. 2015. ApJ. 804, 85.