# MAGNETAR FORMATION FROM THE MERGER OF BNS





#### **Bruno Giacomazzo** University of Trento and INFN-TIFPA, Italy



# **BNS POST-MERGER EVOLUTION** Depending on mass and EOS several post-merger scenarios: ▲ high BNS mass 3H+torus NS-NS →SMNS+torus → BH+torus? low BNS mass S+torus

Magnetic fields play fundamental role in post-merger dynamics (jets from BH/NS+torus, NS collapse to BH, ...) All these scenarios may lead to SGRBs with different properties

# WHY DO WE NEED A MAGNETAR?



A stable or supramassive magnetar could be used to explain X-ray plateaus and extended emissions from SGRBs (e.g., Rowlinson et al 2013).

# TIME-REVERSAL SGRB MODEL (Ciolfi & Siegel 2014, Rezzolla & Kumar 2014)



## MAGNETAR FORMATION Giacomazzo & Perna 2013, ApJ Letters, 771, L26



Investigated merger of two 1.2 Mo NSs

Used Ideal Fluid, Gamma=2.75, k=30000 (Oechslin et al 2007)



### MAGNETAR FORMATION Giacomazzo & Perna 2013, ApJ Letters, 771, L26





Produced a stable ''ultraspinning'' NS surrounded by a magnetized disk of ~0.1  $\,M_\odot$ 

## MAGNETAR FORMATION Giacomazzo & Perna 2013, ApJ Letters, 771, L26

GWs publicly available for download at www.brunogiacomazzo.org/data.html



Magnetic field amplified of ~2 orders of magnitude. Difference in the GW signal are small and present only in the post-merger phase.

#### MAGNETIC FIELD AMPLIFICATION AT MERGER During the merger a shear interface forms and it develops a Kelvin-Helmholtz instability which produces a series of vortices.



## MAGNETIC FIELD AMPLIFICATION AT MERGER



Local very high-res simulations shows that magnetic fields could be strongly amplified (Zrake & MacFadyen 2013), but res unfeasible for global BNS sims!



Similar results (in Newtonian MHD) were obtained by Obergaulinger et al 2010

MAGNETIC FIELD AMPLIFICATION AT MERGER Giacomazzo, Zrake, Duffell, MacFadyen, Perna 2015, arXiv:1410.0013

We developed a sub-grid model to account for small scale effects:

$$\partial_t A_i = -E_i + S_{\text{subgrid}} A_i$$

 $S_{\text{subgrid}} \equiv c_1 \max\left(|\nabla \times v| - c_3, 0\right) \times \max\left(1 - c_4 \frac{\rho_{\text{atmo}}}{\rho}, 0\right) \times \max\left(1 - \frac{b^2}{c_2 \Delta w}, 0\right)$ 

where  $w\equiv 
ho+
ho\epsilon$  is the energy density and

$$\Delta w \equiv <\rho >_{Cons} + <\rho \epsilon >_{Cons} - <\rho >_{Vol} - <\rho \epsilon >_{Vol}$$

which is equal to the turbulent kinetic energy (Duffel and MacFadyen 2013).

This model has four parameters: two need to be fine tuned ( $c_3$  and  $c_4$ ) and two ( $c_1$  and  $c_2$ ) are based on local simulations (Zrake & MacFadyen 2013).

#### MAGNETIC FIELD AMPLIFICATION AT MERGER Giacomazzo, Zrake, Duffell, MacFadyen, Perna 2015, arXiv:1410.0013 We developed a sub-grid model to account for small scale effects:



 $S_{subgrid}$  is different from zero only in the central turbulent region. Magnetic field amplification is larger in the central vortices. MAGNETIC FIELD AMPLIFICATION AT MERGER Giacomazzo, Zrake, Duffell, MacFadyen, Perna 2015, arXiv:1410.0013 We implemented the sub-grid model in our GRMHD code Whisky and run a set of NS-NS simulations.



#### GWS FROM MAGNETARS Dall'Osso, **Giacomazzo**, Perna, Stella 2015, ApJ 798, 25



Strong toroidal field can deformWe used new twisted torus NSthe NS in a prolate shapeequilibrium configurations

#### GWS FROM MAGNETARS Dall'Osso, **Giacomazzo**, Perna, Stella 2015, ApJ 798, 25



# CONCLUSIONS

- Stable and Supramassive NSs may be formed after merger
- Magnetic fields can be strongly amplified via small scale turbulence (but still a lot of work to do to get an actual magnetar)
- GW and EM signals may be affected by magnetar formation
- GW detection from long-lived magnetar could also constrain EOS
- Note: magnetar scenario strongly dependent on max NS mass!

References:

Giacomazzo & Perna 2013, ApJ Letters, 771, L26 Dall'Osso, Giacomazzo, Perna, Stella 2015, ApJ 798, 25 Giacomazzo, Zrake, Duffell, MacFadyen, Perna 2015, arXiv:1410.0013