3D NLTE abundance of iron-peak and neutron-capture elements within GCE context

Nick Storm

Last year PhD student in Maria Bergemann's "Stellar spectroscopy and stellar populations" MPIA, Heidelberg, Germany

Collaborators: Maria Bergemann, Philipp Eitner, Richard Hoppe, Alex J. Kemp, Ashley J. Ruiter, Hans-Thomas Janka, Andre Sieverding, Selma E. de Mink, Ivo R. Seitenzahl and Evans K. Owusu

NIC XVIII

Girona, Spain

16 June 2025





Presentation based on our recently published work, see Storm et al. 2025

MNRAS **538**, 3284–3313 (2025) Advance Access publication 2025 March 22 https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staf472

Observational constraints on the origin of the elements. IX. 3D NLTE abundances of metals in the context of Galactic Chemical Evolution models and 4MOST

Nicholas Storm[®],^{1,2★} Maria Bergemann[®],¹ Philipp Eitner,^{1,2} Richard Hoppe[®],^{1,2} Alex J. Kemp[®],³ Ashley J. Ruiter,^{1,4,5,6} Hans-Thomas Janka[®],⁷ Andre Sieverding,⁷ Selma E. de Mink[®],⁷ Ivo R. Seitenzahl⁶ and Evans K. Owusu^{1,4,5,6}

¹Max-Planck-Institut für Astronomie, Königstuhl 17, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany
²Combined Faculty of Mathematics, Engineering and Natural Sciences, Heidelberg University, Grabengasse 1, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany
³Institute of Astronomy (IvS), KU Leuven, Celestijnenlaan 200D, B-3001 Leuven, Belgium
⁴School of Science, University of New South Wales Canberra, Australia Defence Force Academy, 2600, Australia Capital Territory, Australia
⁵ARC Centre of Excellence for All Sky Astrophysics in 3 Dimensions (ASTRO 3D), Canberra, ACT 2611, Australia
⁶Heidelberger Institut für Theoretische Studien, Schloss-Wolfsbrunnenweg 35, D-69118 Heidelberg, Germany
⁷Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics, Karl-Schwarzschild-Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany

Accepted 2025 March 19. Received 2025 March 12; in original form 2024 November 15

NI





NIC







 NI^3

















 Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models

 Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models



• Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models



Massive star supernovae, earlier in the galaxy

 Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models



Supernovae Type Ia of white dwarfs in binaries, later in the galaxy

- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding
- Neutron-capture elements
 - Slow (s-) and rapid (r-) processes
 - Sites with high neutron densities



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding
- Neutron-capture elements
 - Slow (s-) and rapid (r-) processes
 - Sites with high neutron densities

Magnetorotational SNe – Rare type of CCSN where magnetic and rotational effects play an important role



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding
- Neutron-capture elements
 - Slow (s-) and rapid (r-) processes
 - Sites with high neutron densities

NSM mergers – r-process site, later in galaxy?



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding
- Neutron-capture elements
 - Slow (s-) and rapid (r-) processes
 - Sites with high neutron densities

Low and intermediate mass stars, later in the galaxy



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding
- Neutron-capture elements
 - Slow (s-) and rapid (r-) processes
 - Sites with high neutron densities
- Differences to observations:
 - GCE problems?
 - Inaccurate observations?



- Standard Galactic Chemical Evolution (GCE) models
- [X/Fe] vs [Fe/H] -> Fe is important
 - Need to understand iron-peak production
 - NLTE: changes GCE model understanding
- Neutron-capture elements
 - Slow (s-) and rapid (r-) processes
 - Sites with high neutron densities
- Differences to observations:
 - GCE problems?
 - Inaccurate observations? ←



• Get 3D NLTE corrections for 1D LTE literature abundances

- Get 3D NLTE corrections for 1D LTE literature abundances
- Why 3D NLTE?
 - Stars are 3D objects (not 1D!)
 - Use 3D radiation-hydrodynamic model atmospheres
 - Validated and analysed in previous works, e.g. but not limited to Bergemann+19 & 21, Gallagher+20, Eitner+24, Storm+24, Guiglion+25





Eitner et al. 2024

NASA/SDO

- Using developed NLTE atomic models
 - Grotrian diagram
 - See also Magg+22, Gerber+23
 - Tested on wide range of stellar parameters
 - See e.g.
 - Mn: Bergemann+19, Eitner+23, Ni: Bergemann+21, Magg+22, Y, Eu: Storm+23,24



- Using developed NLTE atomic models
 - Grotrian diagram
 - See also Magg+22, Gerber+23
 - Tested on wide range of stellar parameters
 - See e.g.
 - Mn: Bergemann+19, Eitner+23, Ni: Bergemann+21, Magg+22, Y, Eu: Storm+23,24



Results

3D NLTE effect on the line strength

- Example of one nickel line fit
 - HD 84937 (teff = 6350, log = 4.1, [Fe/H] = -2.1)
 - 3D NLTE line is much weaker
 - Thus derived 3D NLTE abundance higher than 1D LTE



3D NLTE effect on the line strength

- Example of one nickel line fit
 - HD 84937 (teff = 6350, log = 4.1, [Fe/H] = -2.1)
 - 3D NLTE line is much weaker
 - Thus derived 3D NLTE abundance higher than 1D LTE



Difference between 3D NLTE and 1D LTE abundances



Effect on abundances

1D LTE literature abundances



1D LTE Now binned



1D LTE Now binned



3D NLTE: higher abundance



Comparison to GCE

- Our "baseline" GCE model
 - OMEGA+ (Cote+ 17, 18)
 - CCSN yields
 - Limongi & Chieffi 2018
- GCE trend is flat
- 3D NLTE
 - Increasing trend with lower [Fe/H]
- GCE does not reproduce



- Different explanation needed
 - Need CCSN simulations in 3D at low [Fe/H]?
 - Not explored very extensively in literature so far
 - 3D effects important for iron-peak yields in CCSN, see e.g. Wanajo+11



- Different explanation needed
 - Need CCSN simulations in 3D at low [Fe/H]?
 - Not explored very extensively in literature so far
 - 3D effects important for iron-peak yields in CCSN, see e.g. Wanajo+11
 - Or another production site?
 - ECSN?
 - Models predict higher Ni/Fe yields (Nomoto+87; Wanajo+18; Zha+22)
 - Need more bottom-heavy IMF in the early Galaxy?



- See also recent JWST observations of Crab Nebula (ECSN or low-mass CCSN remnant?)
 - [Ni/Fe] 3-5 larger than solar ones (Temim+24)





Conclusions

Conclusions

- 3D NLTE is necessary to provide robust chemical abundances, as the models are parameter-free
 - No mixing-length, no assumption of Saha-Boltzmann equilibrium, no Vmic
 - See e.g. Bergemann+19, Lind & Amarsi+24
- Iron-peak elements
 - GCE models of the disc (OMEGA+) based on state-of-the-art yields (Limongi & Chieffi 2018) do not explain the chemical evolution of Fe-group elements
 - CCSN-dominated regime is under-produced in the GCE tracks
 - ECSN have [Ni/Fe] >> 0, which could help? (Wanajo+18)
- More elements are also done: Mn, Co, Ni, Sr, Y, Ba, Eu (see Storm+2025)



Bonus slides

Iron-peak elements 3D NLTE



