Dynamical evolution of active detached binaries on $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram and contact binary formation

Z. Eker,^{1*} O. Demircan¹, S. Bilir² and Y. Karataş²

¹ Çanakkale University Observatory, 17100 Çanakkale, Turkey

²Istanbul University Science Faculty, Department of Astronomy and Space Sciences, 34119, University-Istanbul, Turkey

Accepted 2006 month day. Received year month day;

ABSTRACT

Orbital angular momentum (J_o) , systemic mass (M) and orbital period (P) distributions of chromospherically active binaries (CAB) and W Ursae Majoris (W UMa) systems were investigated. The diagrams of $\log J_o - \log P$, $\log M - \log P$ and $\log J_o - \log M$ were formed from 119 CAB and 102 W UMa stars. The $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram is found to be most meaningful in demonstrating dynamical evolution of binary star orbits. A slightly curved borderline (contact border) separating the detached and the contact systems was discovered on the $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram. Since orbital size (a) and period (P) of binaries are determined by their current J_o , M and mass ratio q, the rates of orbital angular momentum loss $(d \log J_o/dt)$ and mass loss $(d \log M/dt)$ are primary parameters to determine the direction and the speed of the dynamical evolution. A detached system becomes a contact system if its own dynamical evolution enables it to pass the contact border on the $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram. Evolution of q for a mass loosing detached system is unknown unless mass loss rate for each component is known. Assuming q is constant in the first approximation and using the mean decreasing rates of J_o and M from the kinematical ages of CAB stars, it has been predicted that 11, 23 and 39 cent of current CAB stars would transform to W UMa systems if their nuclear evolution permits them to live 2, 4 and 6 Gyrs respectively.

Key words: stars: mass-loss, stars: evolution, stars: binaries spectroscopic

$2 \quad Eker \ et \ al.$

1 INTRODUCTION

The angular momentum loss in close binaries is known to be replenished from the reservoir of orbital angular momentum (OAM) of the system by tidal locking. Since tidal locking operates as a mechanism to draw angular momentum from the orbit, the orbits of spin-orbit coupled binaries are then forced to shrink although actual angular momentum loss occurs at one or both components due to magnetically driven winds, also called magnetic braking (Schatzman 1959; Kraft 1967; Mestel 1968). Shrinking orbits, then, require orbital periods to be decreasing. Authors such, Huang (1966); Okamoto & Sato (1970); van't Veer (1979); Vilhu & Rahunen (1980); Rucinski (1982); Mestel (1984); Guinan & Bradstreet (1988); Maceroni & van't Veer (1991, 1996); Stepien (1995); Demircan (1999) all believed this mechanism is a main route to form W UMa systems from the binaries initially detached with comparable periods. Showing high level of chromospheric and magnetic activity, RS CVn like objects including binary BY Dra type systems, shortly called CAB, are primary candidates to be the progenitors of the contact systems.

Karataş et al. (2004) recently presented observational evidences of mass loss and orbital period decrease by comparing the total mass and period histograms between the kinematically young (age 0.95 Gyr) and older (age 3.86 Gyr) CAB sub samples. Secular orbital period decrease among CAB is indicated further by the fact that the shorter orbital period systems are older than the longer orbital period systems (see Table 5 of Karataş et al. 2004). Moreover, 5.47 Gyr kinematical age for the field W UMa stars determined by Bilir et al. (2005) appears consistent with the scenario. Consequently, the mean difference of 1.61-Gyr age between field W UMa and field CAB could be interpreted as a mean lifetime of contact stages. Not all contact systems have to be formed from detached progenitors. This is because Bilir et al. (2005) have found that about 20 per cent of contact binary sample have ages less than 0.6 Gyr. Such a young age, being much less than the mean life time (1.61–Gyr) of contact stages, does not permit pre-contact detached phases. A Pre-contact detached stage usually has a duration up to several Gyr, e.g. 3.86 Gyr is an average. Therefore, those young W UMa must have been formed directly in the beginning of the main sequence or during the pre-main sequence contraction phase. Apparently, both mechanisms with and without pre-contact phases actively operate.

Recently, Demircan et al. (2006) have determined a first order relative decreasing rates of OAM, systemic mass and orbital period for the detached CAB as $\dot{J}_o/J_o = -3.48 \times$ $10^{-10} yr^{-1}$, $\dot{M}/M = -1.30 \times 10^{-10} yr^{-1}$ and $\dot{P}/P = -3.96 \times 10^{-10} yr^{-1}$ by using kinematical ages of sub samples formed according to OAM ranges. Mass loss, OAM loss and orbital period decrease driving one another appear to be confirmed by observational data. Nevertheless, it has been known that an isotropic mass loss from the surface(s) of one/or both component(s), despite it means OAM loss, forces the orbit to be bigger and makes the orbital period larger (Pringle 1985). It has also been shown by Demircan et al. (2006) that not all rates of OAM loss would cause an orbit to shrink. Only if there is an amplification mechanism, such as magnetic loops forcing magnetized plasma to co-rotate, so mass loss at the Alfen radius carries away more angular momentum. If the amplification parameter, $\bar{A} = (dJ_o/dM)/(J_o/M)$, is bigger than 5/3, then the binary orbit would shrink and the orbital period would decrease. With the decreasing parameters given above, Demircan et al. (2006) found $\bar{A} = 2.68$ as a first order observational mean.

Although, shrinking orbits and decreasing orbital periods are confirmed observationally and mean decreasing rates are available to support dynamical evolution, the details of the actual process are still unknown. Therefore, in this study, we investigate orbital angular momentum (J_o) , systemic mass (M) and orbital period (P) distributions of CAB and W UMa systems together.

2 DATA

Table 1 contains 119 CAB stars from Karataş et al. (2004) with basic data (orbital and physical). Columns are organized as order number, name, spectral type, stage of evolution, total mass $(M = M_1 + M_2)$, mass ratio $(q = M_2/M_1 < 1)$, orbital period (P), primary radius (R_1) , secondary radius (R_2) , logarithm of OAM (J_o) and spin AM (J_{spin}) as a fraction of OAM. Rows are organized as first 53 stars are possible members of young moving groups (MG) and the rest 66 stars are field systems. Furthermore, rows are sorted in increasing orbital periods.

CAB stars in Table 1 had been classified into three stages of evolution G, SG and MS (column 4) according to their luminosity classes. One can see Karataş et al. (2004) for details. Simply, G group contains systems at least one component being a giant. SG group contains systems with at least one subgiant but no giants. MS marks the systems with both components are on the main sequence. Systems with unknown secondaries were classified according to primaries.

$4 \quad Eker \ et \ al.$

A mean kinematical age of 3.86 Gyr was assigned to field CAB stars by Karataş et al. (2004) from their galactic space velocity dispersions. The field CAB group contains younger and older stars as a mixture. But, the other CAB group (MG) contains only the young ones. One may see Karataş et al. (2004) for the details how MG systems were selected from the common CAB. The ages of MG groups are known as open cluster ages by the turn off point from the main–sequence. Consequently, a pre–determined age of a moving group can be assigned to binaries which were found to be possible members according to their space velocity vectors. Therefore, unlike the field stars with various ages, the MG stars are homogeneous with a single age corresponding to each MG. Among the five MG groups considered by Karataş et al. (2004), the Hyades super cluster is the oldest one with 0.6 Gyr age (see Table 3 of Karataş et al. 2004). Therefore, MG systems are considered to be younger than 0.6 Gyr. Kinematical criteria of MG were defined by Eggen (1958a,b, 1989, 1995) and summarized by Montes et al. (2001a,b).

Table 2 contains 102 W UMa stars from Bilir et al. (2005) with basic data (orbital and physical). Columns are organized the same as Table 1 with only one exception that column 4 contains the type rather than the evolutionary stage. There are two types of W UMa systems according to the light and the velocity curves (Binnendijk 1970). W-type systems are those such as W UMa itself, in which the hotter component (the star eclipsed at the primary minimum) is smaller and less massive. Rows are organized as first 26 with MG designations and the rest 76 stars are field systems. As in Table 1, rows are sorted in increasing orbital periods.

The spin AM (J_{spin}) of binaries is less well known than the orbital AM because the radii of gyration are uncertain. They are needed if one wants to study total AM. They are computed for this study just to compare them to OAM. An analytical approximation and coefficient from Claret & Gimenez (1990) for main-sequence stars were used in computing assuming synchronous rotations whenever the radii of both components are available. However, since their approximation is for the mass range between 0.60 and 25 M_{\odot} , for some CAB and W UMa stars with component masses less than 0.60 M_{\odot} , J_{spin} has not been computed. On the other hand, the computed J_{spin} for evolved stars has to be considered as upper limits because the moment of inertia is known to be decreasing by evolution. Those rough values of the total spin AM are displayed as fractions of OAM (as J_{spin}/J_o) in Table 1 and Table 2. It has been found that total spin AM of all systems (CAB and W UMa) usually less than one tenth of J_o . There are only nine systems, which are all contact systems (AW UMa, ϵ Cra, FG Hya, OU Ser, TZ Boo, TV Mus, V410 Aur, V776 Cas, XY Boo) with total Spin AM higher than one tenth but less a quarter of J_o . In average, W UMa systems have nearly 10 times more spin AM than those of CAB stars.

In this study, we consider orbital dynamics, e.g. OAM changes. If AM transfer occurs between the orbit and the spinning components due to tidal interactions, this study considers it as an instability in the orbit. Any AM transfered from the orbit to the component stars will be sensed by the orbit as an OAM loss and vice versa. For the rest of this study, J_o strictly mean OAM, one must not confuse it with the total AM which includes both orbital and spin AM existing in a binary.

3 ORBITAL DYNAMICS

The most basic definition of OAM (J_o) can be given as

$$J_o = \left(\frac{M_1 M_2}{M_1 + M_2}\right) a^2 \Omega = \left(\frac{q}{(1+q)^2}\right) M a^2 \Omega.$$

$$\tag{1}$$

where $I = \left(\frac{M_1 M_2}{M_1 + M_2}\right) a^2 = \left(\frac{q}{(1+q)^2}\right) M a^2$ is moment of inertia and $\Omega = 2\pi/P$ is angular speed for an orbital motion, thus $J_o = I\Omega$.

 J_o and M are two basic physical quantities which determine a unique period (P) and a unique size for the orbit as

$$P = \frac{(1+q)^6}{q^3} \frac{2\pi}{G^2} \frac{J_o^3}{M^5}, \qquad a = \frac{(1+q)^4}{Gq^2} \frac{J_o^2}{M^3},$$
(2)

where the mass ratio $(q = M_2/M_1 < 1)$ can be considered as an auxiliary parameter used in the definition of J_o . The size $a = a_1 + a_2$ represents the semi-major axis of a relative orbit of one star around the other. Stability of an orbit (dP = 0, da = 0) requires J_o and M to be constant $(dJ_o = 0, dM = 0)$ provided with no mass transfer (dq = 0). If there is no mass transfer, which must be true for detached binaries, it is obvious that OAM loss will cause an orbit to reduce its period and size. On the contrary, mass loss has an affect of increasing the period and the size. Logarithmic derivatives of (2) give all possible relative changes as

$$\frac{dP}{P} = -3\frac{1-q}{1+q}\frac{dq}{q} + 3\frac{dJ_o}{J_o} - 5\frac{dM}{M}, \qquad \frac{da}{a} = -2\frac{1-q}{1+q}\frac{dq}{q} + 2\frac{dJ_o}{J_o} - 3\frac{dM}{M}.$$
(3)

Because M has higher power than J_o , the affect of mass loss would dominate. For example,

$6 \quad Eker \ et \ al.$

in the case of same relative changes of OAM and mass (isotropic stellar winds, if dq = 0), $dJ_o/J_o = dM/M$ according to (1), then

$$\frac{dP}{P} = -2\frac{dJ_o}{J_o} = -2\frac{dM}{M}, \qquad \qquad \frac{da}{a} = -\frac{dJ_o}{J_o} = -\frac{dM}{M}.$$
(4)

which means mass loss and corresponding OAM loss will have a net effect on the orbit to increase both the period and the size. However, there could be additional causes to increase relative OAM loss, e.g. OAM loss of gravity waves, or stellar encounters in the galactic space, or a third body in an eccentric orbit around the binary system, or existence of an amplification mechanism such as in some tidally locked binaries, where tidal interactions transfer OAM to spinning components and transferred AM is lost at the Alfven radius. After considering all possibilities, one has to compare the grant total relative OAM loss to the relative mass loss which could be expressed by a parameter δ defined as

$$\delta = \left(\frac{dJ_o}{J_o}\right) / \left(\frac{dM}{M}\right),\tag{5}$$

which can be called dynamical parameter because dynamical respond of the orbit depends on the value of δ . It should be noted that δ is equal to the amplification parameter $A = (dJ_o/dM)/(J_o/M)$ as defined by Demircan et al. (2006). Inserting δ into (3),

$$\frac{dP}{P} = (3 - \frac{5}{\delta})\frac{dJ_o}{J_o} = (3\delta - 5)\frac{dM}{M}, \qquad \frac{da}{a} = (2 - \frac{3}{\delta})\frac{dJ_o}{J_o} = (2\delta - 3)\frac{dM}{M}.$$
(6)

Change in mass ratio could be negligible because of a comparable relative mass loss from the component stars. Even if $dq/q \neq 0$, the term (1-q)/(1+q) could be very small especially for high mass ratio $(q \sim 1)$ systems. Thus, ignoring it in the first approximation is acceptable.

Consequently, in eq. (6), $\delta > 5/3$ is required to decrease the period. But, $\delta > 3/2$ is sufficient to shrink an orbit. If $3/2 < \delta < 5/3$, orbital size decreases despite period is increasing. The size and the period of an orbit both increase if $\delta < 3/2$.

Using the mean decreasing rates of OAM and mass from Demircan et al. (2006), the mean value for the dynamical parameter $(\bar{\delta})$ for detached CAB systems can be estimated as

$$\bar{\delta} = \frac{\frac{dJ_o}{J_o}}{\frac{dM}{M}} = \frac{\frac{dJ_o}{J_o dt}}{\frac{dM}{M dt}} = \frac{-3.48 \times 10^{-10}}{-1.30 \times 10^{-10}} = 2.68 \tag{7}$$

in the solar neighborhood.

There may be alternative AM loss mechanisms among the detached CAB. Direct loss of OAM is always possible in the galactic space due to stellar encounters, although it would be negligible for short period systems (Stepien 1995; Ghez, Neugebauer & Matthews 1993). Close encounters are more likely in multiple systems during periastron passages of distant third companions, which can lead to a rapid AM loss from the smaller orbits (Kiseleva, Eggleton & Mikkila 1998; Eggleton & Kiseleva 2001). Therefore, we have preferred to use $\bar{\delta} = \bar{A} = 2.68$ of Demircan et al. (2006) as the mean dynamical parameter, which refers to all possible OAM loss mechanisms when describing the mean dynamical evolution on $\log J_o - \log P$, $\log M - \log P$, $\log J_o - \log M$ diagrams in the following sections.

4 DISCUSSIONS

4.1 The $\log J_o - \log P$ and $\log M - \log P$ diagrams

The orbital angular momenta (J_o) and the periods (P) of CAB (Table 1) and W UMa (Table 2) systems are all plotted on a $\log J_o - \log P$ diagram in Fig. 1. CAB stars containing G, SG and MS designations and A & W types of W UMa stars are indicated. With smaller orbital periods (P < 1 day) W UMa stars are concentrated at the lower left while CAB on the right display a wider band elongated towards the upper right. The constant total mass $(M = M_1 + M_2)$ lines are computed using

$$J_o = \frac{q}{(1+q)^2} \sqrt[3]{\frac{G^2}{2\pi} M^5 P},\tag{8}$$

where P is varied while a chosen M is fixed. To represent a typical CAB, q = 0.88 median value for the present sample were used.

The G systems with the biggest total masses prefer longer orbital periods and thus their OAMs are larger. The MS systems with smallest masses and shortest orbital periods have comparable OAMs with W UMa systems. Having moderate masses and orbital periods, the SG systems hold moderate OAMs. Unlike CAB with S, SG and MS designations, A and W type W UMa stars do not have distinct locations since they appear totally mixed.

A well defined smooth upper boundary of CAB stars appears as if tracing a path of dynamical evolution. OAM loss, mass loss and associated orbital period decrease would move a system form the upper right to the lower left parallel to the upper boundary. Finally some systems would enter in the region of contact binaries. With a similar idea and similar data set of less number of stars, Demircan (1999) has computed dJ_o/dP directly from the inclination of the upper boundary line and estimated dP/dM and dJ_o/dM from its cut positions by the constant total mass lines. Decreasing of the total masses on the upper

boundary had been interpreted as the mass loss which activates OAM loss. However, a logical reason why a system moves parallel to the upper boundary is not clear. The log $J_o - \log P$ diagram gives no clues on the time derivatives $(dJ_o/dt, dP/dt \text{ and } dM/dt)$ either.

It is easy to explain why lower right of CAB distribution on Fig. 1 is empty by selection effects. Being less bright, small-mass, long-period systems could be missed by observers or have not yet studied. Such an excuse, however, does not exist to explain absence of shortperiod but more massive CAB systems on the diagram (upper left of CAB distribution). Therefore, we are inclined to think such systems do not exist at all. Otherwise, they would have been noticed and observed as some of the CAB stars in our list.

In order to investigate why there exist such a well defined upper boundary, the $\log M - \log P$ and $\log J_o - \log P$ diagrams are compared in Fig. 2. Similar distribution characteristics are observable on both diagrams that the smooth upper boundary also exist on the $\log M - \log P$ diagram. First, the upper boundary of CAB sample on the $\log M - \log P$ diagram was eye estimated and digitized by computer. The estimated equation

$$\log M = 0.155 \log P + 0.399 \tag{9}$$

seems to mark upper mass limits for various orbital periods.

Next, from the P and M values of this line, we have computed the corresponding line on the log $J_o - \log P$ diagram using equation (8) with q = 0.88. Equally well, perhaps better fitting of the re-produced line on the log $J_o - \log P$ diagram clearly declares that the upper boundaries of these two diagrams are not independent and appears to be determined by mass upper limits for various orbital periods. Could it be that the mass upper limits imply initial Roche lobe structures with sizes primarily depend on the sizes of the preliminary orbits, where the mass within the lobes become limited according to the density of the star forming regions? or, is it only due to mass-period-activity relation? Why is the upper boundary not parallel to the constant total mass lines? (see Fig. 1). Special investigations other than this study seem to be needed.

If period decrease occurs because of OAM loss but no mass loss and transfer, a dynamical evolution would follow a path parallel to the constant total mass lines in Fig. 1, which would carry CAB stars into the empty region. Either this is not happening or systems moving into the region seize chromospheric activity. Therefore, the CAB upper boundary on $\log J_o - \log P$ diagram may indicate a dynamical evolution with a minimum mass loss. Nevertheless, mean decreases determined from the kinematical ages of CAB by Demircan et al. (2006), which are shown by the right sides of the triangles in both diagrams in Fig. 2, indicate that the direction of the mean dynamical evolution neither is parallel nor towards the empty region as it is shown by the arrows at the upper ends of the upper boundaries in both diagrams in Fig. 2.

Both diagrams in Fig. 2 have been plotted intentionally to indicate MG and field systems, in order see aging effect. Unlike the sub–groups with G, SG and MS designations, which prefers certain locations, kinematically young (ages < 0.6 Gyrs) MG systems appear randomly mixed among the kinematically old (3.86 Gyrs) field CAB. Random distribution of young and old systems in the CAB region confirms that an active binary can be born or may start its dynamical evolution anywhere on those diagrams. That is, a same location could be occupied equally likely by an old or a young system. Since there is no definite starting reference point (note: the direction and the speed may be known), it is not possible to trace the dynamical evolution of binary orbits on those plots in a similar manner as a single star nuclear evolution is traced on the H-R diagram.

Unlike, MG and field CAB, which has no preferred location on the $\log J_o - \log P$ and $\log M - \log P$ diagrams, the W UMa stars designated with MG and field in Fig. 2 seem to show distinct locations which will be discussed in the following.

4.2 $\log M - \log P$ and $\log J_o - \log P$ distributions of W UMa systems

W UMa systems do not display similar distribution characteristics as CAB systems. Downward curvature of the upper boundary at the left end of Fig. 1 (W UMa region) implies a decrease of OAM because of hiding considerable fraction of total AM as a spin AM since synchronous rotation rates increase towards the shorter periods. Displaying the W UMa region in a larger scale, Fig. 3 allows to compare mass and OAM distributions. Not only OAM distribution but also total mass distribution shows a similar trend. Therefore, the downward curvature of the upper boundary of W UMa region cannot be entirely due to transforming considerable OAM to spin AM. It is more likely to be related to mass content within the Roche lobes as the log $M - \log P$ diagram suggests. At smaller orbital periods, orbits are smaller. Smaller Roche lobes contain less mass. One should also not forget OAM is more sensitive to orbital sizes than the total masses and periods as displayed in equation (1).

The upper boundary of CAB region was extrapolated into the W UMa region and displayed as solid and dashed lines in Fig. 3. One can easily notice that there are considerable

number of contact systems over those lines especially at upper right. Those are the systems with excess mass not only with respect to the rest of the W UMa sample but also with respect to the mass-period distribution inferred from the CAB systems. With an excess mass for a given orbital period, it is easier to fill Roche lobes in the early stages of formation.

There are 18 systems above the solid line in Fig. 3a and half of them are with MG designations. Stars with MG designations have relatively larger masses and longer orbital periods with respect to the rest of the W UMa sample. Another interesting feature of W UMa distribution on Fig. 3a is that there is a square shaped empty region on the lower right corner that longer period systems (log P > -0.35) all have total masses bigger than 1.9 M_{\odot} (log M > 0.28).

Displaying an unusual distribution with respect to the rest of the W UMa sample, the 26 systems framed in a rectangle in Fig. 3 took our attention as young systems which were possibly born as contact binaries (with no pre-contact detached phases). We have restudied the galactic space velocities of those framed 26 systems, inspected their U-V diagrams, and computed their kinematical ages. Having the dispersions of 26.10, 19.16, 19.18 kms⁻¹ at U, V, W and 37.63 kms⁻¹ at the combined total space velocity vector $S = \sqrt{(U^2 + V^2 + W^2)}$, where U, V, W are galactic space velocity components with respect to LSR (Local Standard of Rest), an average age of 2.47 Gyr were found for them. It is also interesting that 15 out of 26 have positive V velocities bigger than Sun's V velocity in the LSR, which constitutes an additional strong argument favoring them to be young. Only two systems, ϵ Cra and V2388 Oph, appear kinematically different. If these two systems were excluded, the average kinematical age reduces to 2.00 Gyr.

Major contribution to the OAM loss at the contact stage comes from the gravitational wave radiation (Guinan & Bradstreet 1988), which is inversely proportional to the orbital period. Having the largest orbital periods with respect to the rest of the W UMa sample, the systems in the frame are expected to be less effected by gravity waves thus; their lifetime on the contact stage must be longer. According to Bilir et al. (2005), average lifetime of the contact stage is 1.61 Gyr, which is already slightly longer than the lifetime ($0.1 < t_{contact} <$ 1 Gyr) according to Guinan & Bradstreet (1988). Thus, the 2.00 Gyr age found for the systems in the rectangle strongly favors them as contact binaries which were born contact. Existence of a flat lower boundary for the framed systems could be a hint for this. The systems below the flat boundary (systems with masses less than $1.9M_{\odot}$), apparently do not had sufficient masses to be formed as contact systems. The systems below must have Dynamical evolution of active detached binaries and contact binary formation 11 been formed as detached systems and after their first Roche lobe overflow, their orbital periods decreased quickly due to mass transfer and they are now located among the other less massive contact systems.

In fact, the region is not really empty but scarcely populated by detached systems (see Fig. 1 and Fig. 2). We believe those are the detached systems still evolving dynamically from the detached stage to the contact stage by loosing mass and orbital angular momentum. Before reaching a state of full contact, a mass transfer from more massive primary to less massive secondary must occur first. Such a mass transfer is not commonly observed because it is a fast stage at which the system mass and angular momentum appears to be conserved while the period of the orbit decreases quickly. If it is not possible to reach a full contact configuration in this stage, a detached binary may lose a great deal of its chance to be a contact binary and may become a classical Algol because mass loosing primary becomes less massive, then it is recognized as the mass loosing secondary. Mass transfer from the secondary to primary is a rather slow process which forces orbital period and size to be bigger. Only if there is sufficient OAM loss, the orbital period may turn to decreasing.

W type W UMa systems dominate over A types towards the shorter periods (see Fig. 3). Therefore, according to the mass transfer evolution of an orbit as described above, W systems seems to be the first formed at the first mass transfer stage. Then, during the slow mass transfer stage after the mass ratio reversal, their orbital periods start to increase slowly and systems appear moving towards the longer periods into the region of A type systems. Existence of many W systems with increasing orbital periods Qian (2003) seems to confirm this scenario. A types being formed after W types have been suggested by Wilson (1978), Mochnacki (1981), and Awadalla & Hanna (2005).

Just recently, Gazeas & Niarchos (2006), who studied mass-period distribution of over 100 W UMa stars, have noticed A type systems usually have larger total masses. It is not very obvious but one can see Fig. 3b may also confirm this. According to Yakut & Eggleton (2005), near contact binaries can transform to A type W UMa stars without a need of mass loss. Gazeas & Niarchos (2006) propose A type systems may transform to W type systems with a simultaneous mass loss. The opposite were claimed unreasonable since it requires the total masses to increase (Gazeas & Niarchos 2006). However, it is clear in Fig. 3b that there are some A type systems with total masses less than the total masses of some W type systems. For a massive W system, there still could be chance to transform to a less

massive A type system. The two ways of forming A type systems cannot be ruled out only by comparing their mean masses.

Do both A type and W type contact systems have a common origin? Is the one type the progenitor of the other? Such questions are still not answered. Formation of W UMa systems will be considered in the following section again when dynamical evolution from detached to contact state becomes clearer.

4.3 The $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram

Because OAM (J_o) and mass (M) are basic physical quantities determining orbital size and period (a & P), and because OAM loss and mass loss are physical parameters controlling the magnitude and direction of dynamical evolution, the log $J_o - \log M$ diagram is a natural choice to study dynamical evolution of binary orbits. Once, the diagram (Fig. 4) is produced, a sharp separation between the detached and contact systems stroke to our attention. Goodness of the separation is out striking that despite crowding along the border, there are only two systems (OO Aql, δ Cap) on the wrong side, which could be due to a wrong identification of the state of being contact or just because of observational errors. Similar separation does not occur on the diagrams discussed before.

Marking several positions on the borderline between CAB and W UMa stars, the following quadratic equation was produced.

$$\log J_{lim} = 0.522 (\log M)^2 + 1.664 (\log M) + 51.315, \tag{10}$$

where M is in solar units and J_{lim} is in cgs. Physical significance of this line is that it marks the maximum OAM for a contact system to survive. It is like in single stars, spin AM has to be less than a certain value otherwise gravity cannot hold stellar mass together. If OAM of a contact system is more than J_{lim} , the contact configuration brakes.

Because W UMa systems all have circular orbits (CAB systems of small orbital periods too) and because OAM (eq. 1) is more sensitive to component separations than periods and masses, the line determined by (10) can be called "the contact border". This is also because if it were possible to increase (J_o) of a contact system, there will be a limiting value associated with a limiting separation of components. Any J_o bigger than J_{lim} , the distance between the components would be bigger than the limiting distance permitting a full contact.

CAB systems (RT Lac, AR Mon, ϵ UMi, RV Lib, BH CVn) eliminated from the list of Demircan et al. (2006), since they are filling or about to fill one of the Roche lobes that

mass transfer possibly occurring in them, are marked on Fig. 5. Since those systems are not close to the contact border and scattered randomly all over in the detached region, semi– contact configuration, like the other detached states, does not guarantee being close to the contact border.

If total AM rather than OAM were plotted on Fig. 4, the smoothness of the border would have been spoiled because as discussed by Rasio (1995) for low q contact binaries, the total spin AM of the primaries may be comparable with OAM, so points of low q systems would be lifted by up to 1/3 of its value. It would have been meaningless to search such a border on a diagram using total AM. Moreover, adding total spin AM to OAM would have introduced additional uncertainties since spin AM is less certain than OAM because radii of gyration are uncertain. So it is not a coincidence for us to notice the contact border on the log $J_o - \log P$ diagram.

Other diagrams (log $J_o - \log P$, log $M - \log P$) do not have such a well defined region and borderline for the contact binaries because according to equation (2) additional parameter (q) is needed to transform $J_{lim}(M)$ function into $P_{lim}(M)$ function as

$$P_{lim} = 0.0046 \frac{(1+q)^6}{q^3} M^{1.566 \log M - 0.008},\tag{11}$$

where P_{lim} is in units of days if M is in solar mass. It is also possible to express limiting separation of components as

$$a_{lim} = 0.1167 \frac{(1+q)^4}{q^2} M^{1.044 \log M + 0.328},\tag{12}$$

where a_{lim} is in the units of solar radius if M is in solar mass. Because limiting periods (or separations) strongly depends on (q), a unique transformation of the contact border into the other diagrams is not possible. As displayed in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, there are detached CAB systems with periods less than one day occupying the same region with W UMa stars on both $\log J_o - \log P$ and $\log M - \log P$ diagrams. With its own q, each system has its own $P_{lim}(M)$. Therefore, mixing CAB and W UMa stars is unavoidable on those diagrams.

Being able to confine detached and contact systems into separate regions, $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram is best for studying the dynamical evolution of binary orbits. The diagram clearly displays that there is a well defined possibility for a detached system to go into the region of contacts by losing OAM. This possibility, however, depends on systems position on the diagram as well as speed and direction of its dynamical evolution, which could be very different from one system to another. This diagram too, like other diagrams, gives no clue on individual dynamical evolutions since there is no information about initial positions.

$14 \quad Eker \ et \ al.$

Random mixing of young (MG) and old (field) systems also occurs in this diagram. That is, a same position could be belong to both a young and an old system.

Nevertheless, the contact border (eq. 10) could be helpful to determine contact binary candidates. The amount of mean losses (ΔJ and ΔM) corresponding to 2, 4 and 6 Gyr are subtracted from the J_o and M values of the border. That is, the contact border is shifted accordingly. Dotted lines in Fig. 5 represent shifted borders that the systems between a dotted line and the contact border are the ones, which have a definite chance to reach at the contact border within the time intervals indicated if their nuclear evolutions permit them to live as much. After counting, it becomes clear that 11, 23 and 39 per cent of the current sample of CAB could pass over the contact border within the next 2, 4 and 6 Gyr according to the mean dynamical evolution with $\overline{\delta} = 2.68$.

The dynamical evolution of contact binaries is more uncertain than detached CAB stars since a mean δ is not available for them. If there is a smooth transition from the detached to the contact region, W systems are first to form according to W and A type distributions on the log $J_o - \log M$ diagram (see Fig. 4) because W systems are usually closer to the border than A type systems. However, forming first W types and then A types is not reasonable according to Gazeas & Niarchos (2006) since this would need a mass gain. If A types are first to form, a smooth transition into the contact region also becomes unreasonable. This is because, forming W types later than A types appears also problematic since this require OAM gain (see Fig. 4). We encourage theoretical studies to investigate possibilities of jumping from the detached region into the contact region to form A type W UMa stars, which may occur during the first mass transfer stage, and then to produce W type W UMa stars. A to W or W to A transitions, if occuring, must be done within a lifetime of a contact binary which is known to be very short ($0.1 < t_{contact} < 1$ Gyr according to Guinan & Bradstreet (1988), 1.61 Gyr according to Bilir et al. (2005)).

4.4 Period and size evolution of orbits

It is possible to draw constant period lines on the $\log J_o - \log M$ diagram using (8). On the other hand,

$$J_o = \frac{q}{(1+q)^2} \sqrt{GM^3a} \tag{13}$$

can be used to compute constant orbital size lines similarly. From the statistics of present CAB and W UMa samples, the median values of q = 0.88 and q = 0.39 are found and used

to represent CAB and W UMa systems in computing constant period and size lines which are shown in Fig. 6. The constant orbital period and orbital size lines run almost parallel to the contact border and both P & a values decrease towards it. Further decrease into the region of contacts is also clear.

Constant period and constant size lines are sensitive to small q values. One can feel the sensitivity by comparing the lines of P = 1 day (or $a = 3R_{\odot}$) computed by q = 0.88 and q = 0.39, and P = 0.2 days (or $a = 1.2R_{\odot}$) computed with q = 0.39 and q = 0.1. Decreasing periods (or sizes) towards the lower right is deceptive as if evolution to contact stage is occurring from upper left to lower right which is impossible since such an evolution requires a mass gain. Mass loss, however, changes the direction from vertically down (OAM loss only) towards to the lower left (if OAM and mass both are lost). Because mass loss dominates over OAM loss (eq. 3), there are lower limits; one for orbital periods and one for the orbital sizes. Both limits are indicated by the dotted lines in the triangles and the corresponding numerical values ($\Delta \log J_o / \Delta \log M$) in Fig. 6. Any dynamical evolution with a δ smaller than those limits indicates an increase rather than a decrease on both P & a.

5 CONCLUSIONS

Total mass M and orbital angular momentum OAM (J_o) are two basic physical quantities which determine sizes and periods of binary orbits. OAM has several different analytical formulae established with different combinations of mass ratio q, semi-major axis a, orbital period P and systemic mass M. Because $M \& J_o$ are well known basic quantities and mass loss (dM) & OAM loss (dJ_o) are again free parameters, from which the speed and direction of dynamical evolution can be inferred, the log $J_o - \log M$ diagram is the best for studying the dynamical evolution of binary orbits.

There are limits in orbital dynamics. $d \log J_o/d \log M > 3/2$ is for decreasing orbital sizes. $d \log J_o/d \log M > 5/3$ is for decreasing orbital periods. if $d \log J_o/d \log M$ takes a value between 3/2 and 5/3, orbital sizes shrink despite corresponding orbital periods increase. According to mean dynamical evolution with $\bar{\delta} = d \log J_o/d \log M = 2.68$, as provided by Demircan et al. (2006), the orbital sizes and periods of detached CAB systems are decreasing.

A contact border, which separates W UMa stars from CAB, is discovered on the log $J_o - \log M$ diagram. So, One can predict OAM of a system on the contact border, called J_{lim} ,

16 $Eker \ et \ al.$

which is determined only by M. Any OAM less than J_{lim} implies a full contact for a binary. Similar to J_{lim} , the limiting period P_{lim} , and limiting orbital size a_{lim} are computable using empirical formulae (11) and (12). Unlike J_{lim} , which is independent of q, P_{lim} and a_{lim} have a strong dependence on q.

Rather than computing the time left for each detached system to reach at the contact border, limiting borders corresponding 2, 4, and 6 Gyrs were computed by subtracting mean decreases (ΔJ and ΔM) of mean dynamical evolution from J and M values of the contact border. The CAB systems located between the contact border and those borders are the ones which are expected to be contact binaries within the time scales indicated.

A detached system heading towards the contact region must go trough mass transfer stages before becoming a contact binary. At any mass transfer stage, even if it is conservative, OAM J_o is not conserved. For shrinking orbits, J_o must decrease according to eq. (1). For conservative cases, the OAM difference between the two different size orbits of same system are to be compensated by spin AM. That is, J_o still decreases while the total spin AM is increasing. If a detach system is sufficiently close to the contact border, during the first fast mass transfer stage, it has a changes to jump over into the region of contacts and to be one of them.

The traditional view of forming W UMa stars assumes that they only come from detached binaries of comparable periods. But, statistics available is convincing enough that there are very few such progenitors even to account for the low space density (0.2 per cent) of contact binaries in the solar neighbourhood (Rucinski 2002, 2006). Righteously Paczynski et al. (2006) says "at this time the contact systems seem to appear OUT OF NOWHERE" in order to emphasize the insufficiency of the traditional view. Paczynski et al. (2006), therefore, consider mechanical tree–body orbital evolution, which is a similar formation model of close binaries in globular clusters (Pooley et al. 2003), where the inner binary has relatively longer orbital period and has a better chance to evolve into a contact system after all Pribulla & Rucinski (2006) found that up to 50 per cent of W UMa binaries have companions.

The mean dynamical parameter $\bar{\delta}$ used in this study naturally contains affects of all mechanisms of OAM loss since its value is derived from stellar kinematics. Perhaps, it is not possible now to make a firm conclusion which mechanism is more efficient before a complete statistics and their analysis are available. Nevertheless, Bilir et al. (2005) provided observational evidence that near contact detached binaries of few days orbital period are not Dynamical evolution of active detached binaries and contact binary formation 17 the only source to form W UMa stars. They may also be born directly as contact systems. Moreover, it has also been found in this study that considerable fraction of current detached CAB sample (39 per cent within 6 Gyrs) to have a potential to jump over the contact border on the log $J_o - \log M$ diagram and become contact systems within a time scale of main-sequence life time. So, we encourage statistical studies to include these new findings after all contact binaries are rare with the local space density of just 0.2 per cent of the main sequence stars (Rucinski 2002, 2006).

6 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the partial support by Turkish Scientific and Technical Research Council (TÜBİTAK), Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University and Istanbul University. This study has been produced within the scopes of projects 104T508 of TÜBİTAK and BAP 2005/108 of Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University. We acknowledge anonymous referee who took our attentions to critical points.

REFERENCES

Awadalla N.S., Hanna M.A., 2005, JKAS, 38, 43 Bilir S., Karataş Y., Eker Z., Demircan O., 2005, MNRAS, 357, 497 Binnendijk L., 1970, VA, 12, 217 Claret A., Gimenez A., 1990, Ap&SS, 169, 215 Demircan O., 1999, Tr. J. Phys., 23, 425 Demircan O., Eker Z., Karataş Y., Bilir S., 2006, MNRAS, 366, 1511 Eggen O.J., 1958a, MNRAS, 118, 65 Eggen O.J., 1958b, MNRAS, 118, 154 Eggen O.J., 1989, PASP, 101, 366 Eggen O.J., 1995, AJ, 110, 2862 Eggleton P.P., Kiseleva L.G., 2001, ApJ, 562, 1012 Gazeas, K.D., Niarchos, P.G., 2006, MNRAS, 370L, 29 Ghez A.M., Neugebauer G., Matthews K., 1993, AJ, 106, 2005 Guinan E.F., Bradstreet D. H., 1988, in Dupree A.K., Lago M.T., eds, Formation and Evolution of Low Mass Stars, Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 345 Huang S.S., 1966, ARA&A, 4, 35

18 $Eker \ et \ al.$

- Karataş Y., Bilir S., Eker Z., Demircan O., 2004, MNRAS, 349, 1069
- Kiseleva L.G., Eggleton P.P., Mikkola S., 1998, MNRAS, 300, 292
- Kraft R.P., 1967, ApJ, 150, 551
- Maceroni C., van't Veer F., 1991, A&A, 246, 91
- Maceroni C., van't Veer F., 1996, A&A, 311, 523
- Mestel L., 1968, MNRAS, 138, 359
- Mestel L., 1984, in S.L. Baliunas and L. Hartmann, eds, the Third Cambridge Workshop Cool Stars, Stellar Systems, and the Sun, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 193, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, p. 49
- Mochnacki S., 1981, ApJ, 245, 650
- Montes D., Lopez-Santiago J., Galvez M.C., Fernandez-Figueroa M.J., De Castro E., Cornide M., 2001a, MNRAS, 328, 45
- Montes D., Fernandez-Figueroa M.J., De Castro E., Cornide M., Latorre A., 2001b, in J. Garcia Lopez, R. Rebolo, & M.R. Zapaterio, eds, ASP Conf. Ser. Vol. 223, 11th Cambridge Workshop on Cool Stars, Stellar Systems and the Sun, Astron. Soc. Pac., San Francisco, p. 1477
- Okamoto I., Sato K., 1970, PASJ, 22, 317
- Paczynski B., Szczygiel D., Pilecki B., Pojmanski G., 2006, MNRAS, 368, 1311
- Pooley D. et al., 2003, ApJL, 591, L131
- Pribulla T., Rucinski S.M., 2006, AJ, 131, 298
- Pringle J.E., 1985, in Pringle J.E., Wade R.A., eds, Interacting binary stars, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 1
- Qian, S., 2003, MNRAS, 342, 1260
- Rasio F.A., 1995, ApJ, 444L, 41
- Rucinski S.M., 1982, A&A, 112, 273
- Rucinski S.M., 2002, PASP, 114, 1124
- Rucinski S.M., 2006, 368, 1319
- Schatzman E., 1959, IAUS, 10, 129
- Stepien K., 1995, MNRAS, 274, 1019
- van't Veer F., 1979, A&A, 80, 287
- Vilhu O., Rahunen T., 1980, in Plavec M.J., Popper D.M., Ulrich D.R., eds, Proc. IAU
- Symp. 88, Close Binary stars, Reidel, Dordrecht, p. 491
- Wilson R.E., 1978, ApJ, 224, 885





Figure 1. Orbital AM and period distributions of CAB and W UMa stars are compared. Constant total mass lines (dashed) were computed using q=0.88, which is the median value for the present sample of CAB.

Yakut K., Eggleton P.P., 2005, ApJ, 629, 1055



Figure 2. Total mass-period (a) and OAM-Period (b) distributions are compared. CAB upper boundaries in both diagrams are not independent since it is possible to compute one from the other analytically. Young (MG) and old (field) CAB systems mix randomly. Mean dynamical evolution (arrow) and mean decreases (the right sides of triangles) are for 2 Gyrs.



Dynamical evolution of active detached binaries and contact binary formation 21

Figure 3. W UMa regions of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 are zoomed. Lines are CAB upper boundaries extended into W UMa region. Dashed is computed from solid using q = 0.39 (median value of W UMa sample). Young kinematical age (2 Gyr) and the empty region below imply systems in the rectangle may be formed directly as contact binaries (born in contact).



Figure 4. A well defined borderline sharply separates detached and contact systems. Crowded region above (framed) is zoomed below. Symbols are like Fig. 1.



Figure 5. Borders of equal times (dashed) to reach at the contact border (solid). Mean dynamical evolution (hypotenuse) and mean decreases (right sides) for 2 Gyrs.



Figure 6. Constant period and size lines indicating Period and size evolutions of orbits. Mean (hypotenuse) evolution and corresponding decreases (right sides of triangles). Evolution with $\delta = 5/3$ (dashed) keeps *P* constant but evolution with $\delta = 3/2$ (dashed) keeps *a* constant.

Table 1. Physical parameters of the CABs. First 53 are possible members of young MG (< 0.6 Gyr) and the rest are older (3.86 Gyr) field systems.

ID	Name	Spectrel Type	Stage of Evolution	M_{tot} (M_{\odot})	q	P (days)	R_1 (R_{\odot})	$egin{array}{c} R_2 \ (R_{\odot}) \end{array}$	$\log J_o$ (cgs)	J_{spin}/J_o
1	V471 Tau	K2V+WD	MS	1.50	0.974	0.521	0.83	0.01	51.690	0.017
2	RT And	F8V+K0V	MS	2.14	0.739	0.630	0.92	1.26	51.965	0.019
3	CG Cyg	G9+K2	MS	1.75	0.865	0.631	0.82	0.90	51.826	0.018
4	ER Vul	G0V+G5V	MS	2.15	0.957	0.698	1.08	1.11	51.992	0.014
5	YY Gem	dM1e+dM1e	MS	1.19	0.924	0.815	0.60	0.60	51.585	0.012
6	UV Psc	G5V+K2V	MS	1.75	0.765	0.861	0.83	1.11	51.869	0.013
7	V1430 Aql	G5V+K0111-1V	SG	1.84	0.957	0.873	1.11	0.86	51.913	0.012
8	V772 Her	(G0V+?)+K7V	MS	1.63	0.567	0.879	0.58	0.90	51.792	0.012
9	IL Com	F8V + F8V	MS	1.67	0.964	0.962	1.10	1.10	51.857	0.011
10	∂ Cap	F11V-111/K1V	SG	2.73	0.365	1.023	0.07	0.05	52.116	0.010
11	DH Leo	(K2V+K5V)+K5V	MS	1.44	0.675	1.072	0.67	0.97	51.748	0.010
12	GI 841A	dM3-5e	MS	0.50	0.917	1.122	0.34	0.36	51.008	0.008
13	IZ UrB	F6V + G0V	MS	2.19	0.975	1.140	1.10	1.14	52.077	0.008
14	BD+23 2297	KIV+KIV	MS	1.85	0.993	1.528	0.78	0.78	51.997	0.005
10	V824 Ara	G/IV/V + K0IV/V	SG	2.12	0.909	1.083	1.42	1.55	52.110	0.006
10	13 Cet V478 L	F8V+G4V	MS	0.68	0.545	2.080	0.20	0.08	51.279 E1 E4E	0.027
10 10	V410 Lyr FF And	dM1a dM1a	IVID MS	1.18	0.209	2.128	0.30	0.98	01.040 51.670	0.037
10	V810 U		C	0.70	0.970	2.110	1 00	1 97	50.025	0.004
19	VOI9 Her	$(r 2v + r \circ v) + G \delta v - III$	G MC	2.78 1.90	0.704	2.228	1.29	1.87	02.330 51.096	0.004
2U 21	NZ AIIO	UN2+UN2V	IVID MC	1.29	0.949	0.034 2.042	0.64	1 10	52.064	0.000
41 22	DD +39 4529	rov+rov CeV+F7V	IVID MC	1.83	0.364	0.243 2.204	0.64	1.10	51.011	0.002
42 22	v 835 Her	GOV + KIV	MS	1.43	0.700	3.304	0.60	0.90	51.911	0.002
23 24	CK Harr	G9+K4V	MB	1.37	0.957	3.330 2 FOO	1.10	0.80	01.903 50.956	0.002
24 25	GK Hya	F8+G8IV	SG	2.50	0.910	3.589	3.39	1.01	52.350	0.004
20	UX Com	KI(IV)+G2	SG	2.23	0.855	3.639	2.50	1.00	52.255	0.003
20	BU 163	(F9V/G0V) + ?	MS	2.22	0.947	3.963	1.00	1 00	52.200	0.004
27	RSCVN	F61V + G81V	SG	2.82	0.958	4.797	4.00	1.99	52.468	0.004
28	SS Cam	$F_5V-IV+K0IV-III$	G	3.58	0.954	4.820	0.40	2.20	52.641	0.005
29	RI Urb	G2IV	SG	2.83	0.991	5.117	3.00	2.60	52.480	0.003
30	V V Mon	$G_{5}V + G_{8}V$	SG	2.91	0.942	6.053	6.20	1.80	52.525	0.004
31	KW UMa	F8IV+K0IV	SG	3.06	0.951	1.328	4.24	2.31	52.588	0.002
32	LA Per	GOV-IV+KOIV	SG	2.55	0.931	8.035	3.05	1.64	52.470	0.001
33	AW Her	G21V + K21V	SG	2.54	0.906	8.810	3.20	2.40	52.479	0.001
34 97	V1285 Aqi	dM2e+dMe	MS	0.62	0.938	10.328	0.44	0.44	51.483	0.002
30 26	AE Lyn Vego Car	F9IV-V+G5IV	SG	3.25	0.979	11.000	2.64	3.14	52.693	0.001
30	V829 Cen	$G_{3V} + K_{11V}$	SG	1 50	0.979	11.722	0.80	0.80	51.440	0.000
20	V 808 Tau	K5V+K5V	MB	1.00	0.950	11.940	0.80	0.80	52.181	0.000
20	IL пуа V1270 А1	K1/2III/IV + G5V/IV	G	3.03	0.004	12.912			52.747	
59 40	V 1379 Aqi	K0111+SdB	G	3.05	0.129	20.034			52.342	
±0 4 1	ADS 11000C	CELLI AS FON	G	1.04	0.951	20.105	19.00	1 70	51.990	0.001
10		$K_{2} = 2 M + K_{2} M$	MC	4.10	0.404	44 261	12.00	1.70	52.962	0.001
±2 19	BD +04 487 KY Pog	E5 OV CON	NIS SC	2.00	0.921	44.301			52.334	
±3 4.4	RA Feg	C7111/CV	SG C	0.75	0.818	45.290			52.850	
15	$GT M_{22}$	$K_2 A \Pi \Pi \perp (A \Omega)$	G	4 50	0.000	61 976			52.173	
±0 16	DO Leo	C_{5IV} III $\pm \Lambda eV$	C	9.05 9.05	0.800	01.370 71.614	5.00	1 70	53 101	0.000
17	BD ±17 703	$G_{2V+G_{8V}}$	MS	1 00	0.879	75 683	1 00	1.00	52 614	0.000
±1 18	BM Cam	KUII	C	1 70	0.545	80.010	1.00	1.00	52.014	0.000
19	5 Cet	K2III	G	2 50	0 786	96 383			52.810	
50	o Aur	G1III+K0III	G	5.00	0.051	103 002	12.80	8 70	53 3/1	0.000
51	V1817 Cvg	K2III-II+A0V	G	7 73	0.600	108.892	12.00	0.70	53 623	0.000
52	n And	G8III/IV	G	4 93	0.000	115 611	11.00	11.00	53 333	0.000
53	SAO 23511	F95V+G0V	MS	1.85	0.682	122 180	0.75	1 00	52 616	0.000
,0	5110 20011	15.57 007	1415	1.00	0.002	122.100	0.10	1.00	02.010	0.000
4	XY UMa	G0V+K5V	MS	1.748	0.606	0.479	1.16	0.63	51.762	0.022
5	BI Cet	G6V/IV+G6V/IV	MS	1.840	0.916	0.515	0.90	0.90	51.836	0.024
66	SV Cam	F5V+K0V	MS	1.786	0.644	0.593	0.76	1.18	51.815	0.022
57	UV Leo	GOV+G2V	MS	2.214	0.970	0.600	1.19	1.08	51.992	0.019
8	BH Vir	F8V-IV+G2V	SG	2.021	0.981	0.817	1.11	1.25	51.971	0.014
59	WY Cnc	G0-8V+K2?	MS	1.601	0.495	0.830	0.58	0.93	51.752	0.014
50	CM Dra	M4V+M4V	MS	0.444	0.926	1.268	0.23	0.25	50.938	0.005
51	CC Eri	K7.5V+M3.5V	MS	0.876	0.537	1.563	0.41	0.64	51.419	0.011
52	V837 Tau	G2V+K5V	MS	1.670	0.673	1.932	0.74	1.00	51.941	0.004
;3	EI Eri	G51V	SG	1.060	0.379	1.945			51.531	
54	AR Lac	G2IV+K0IV	\mathbf{SG}	2.390	0.897	1.982	2.72	1.52	52.220	0.008
65	BK Psc	K5V+M4V	MS	1.040	0.552	2.168	0.45	0.72	51.594	0.010

 ${\bf Table} \ {\bf 1}-continued$

ID	Name	Spectrel Type	Stage of Evolution	M_{tot}	q	P (days)	R_1	$\binom{R_2}{(R_{\odot})}$	$\log J_o$	J_{spin}/J_o
		1900	Literation	((ddyb)	(100)	(100)	(085)	
66	BH CVn	F2IV+K2IV	SG	2.271	0.544	2.612	3.27	3.10	52.184	0.008
67	CF Tuc	G0V + K4IV	SG	2.266	0.880	2.799	4.60	1.50	52.231	0.007
68	V711 Tau	K1IV+G5IV	SG	2.531	0.821	2.838	3.80	1.76	52.310	0.008
69	PW Her	K01V+F8-G2	SG	2.652	0.768	2.884	3.80	1.40	52.343	0.007
70	AD Cap	$G_{5-81}V - V + G_{5}$	SG	1.624	0.526	2.958	1.00	1 50	51.955	0.002
71	TY Pyx	G5V + G5 - 8V	MS	2.416	0.987	3.199	1.86	1.58	52.298	0.003
72	V1396 Cyg	M2V + M4Ve	MS	0.658	0.696	3.273	0.45	0 55	51.346	0.000
73	HZ Aqr	K3Ve+K7Ve	MS	1.234	0.804	3.738	0.45 5 10	0.55	51.830	0.002
74	5Z FSC	KIIV + FOIV	SG	2.801	0.700	3.903	0.10	1.00	52.444	0.000
75	Z Her SAO 240652	COV + COV	MS	2.804	0.843	3.990	2.75	1.65	52.450	0.003
77	UZ Lib	G0V + G0V K0III + A82	C	2.180	0.998	4.230	21.00	1.00	51 830	0.019
78	BT Lac	G5V+G9IV	SG	2 082	0.303	5.070	4 81	4 41	52 171	0.013
70	AS Dra	G4V + G9V	MS	1.426	0.400	5.408	4.01	1.11	51 001	0.001
80	V1423 Agl	G5V+G5V	MS	2 040	1.000	5 433			52 252	
81	BY Dra	K6Ve + K7V	MS	0.934	0.891	5 970			51 699	
82	RS UMi	G0V+G-KV	MS	2.484	0.981	6.166			52.413	
83	KT Peg	G2V+K5V	MS	1.545	0.671	6.209	0.60	1.00	52.053	0.001
84	UX Ari	A2/3V + K1/2V	SG	2.050	0.864	6.442	5.78	1.11	52.278	0.002
85	II Peg	K2IV+M0/3V	SG	1.200	0.500	6.730			51.848	
86	LR Hya	K0/1V+K1/2V	MS	1.090	0.997	6.871	0.80	0.80	51.833	0.001
87	OU Gem	K2V+K5V	MS	1.180	0.831	6.998			51.889	
88	SS Boo	G0V+K0IV	SG	1.928	0.988	7.603	3.30	1.30	52.260	0.001
89	MM Her	G2IV+K1V	\mathbf{SG}	2.469	0.944	7.962	2.89	1.56	52.445	0.001
90	FF Aqr	G8III-IV+sdOB	G	3.100	0.240	9.205	6.00	0.15	52.427	0.006
91	RU Cnc	G8IV+F6-7	\mathbf{SG}	2.930	0.993	10.163	4.90	1.90	52.605	0.002
92	CQ Aur	G8IV+F5V	G	3.764	0.882	10.617	9.91	1.93	52.791	0.003
93	RV Lib	G8IV-K3IV	\mathbf{SG}	2.785	0.183	10.715			52.294	
94	EZ Peg	G5IV+K0IV	\mathbf{SG}	1.860	0.991	11.668			52.296	
95	42 Cap	G2IV+G2V	\mathbf{SG}	2.375	0.727	13.183			52.480	
96	AR Psc	K1IV+G7V	\mathbf{SG}	2.036	0.818	14.289	1.50	1.50	52.387	0.000
97	TZ Tri	K0III+F5	G	5.099	0.976	14.723			53.060	
98	V350 Lac	K2IV-III	G	1.800	0.818	17.742			52.329	
99	zeta And	K1III	G	3.480	0.289	17.783	13.40	0.70	52.653	0.006
100	UV CrB	K2III	G	1.320	0.362	18.664			52.008	
101	BL CVn	K1II+FIV	G	2.672	0.991	18.707	15.20	3.00	52.627	0.003
102	AR Mon	K2III+G8III	G	3.413	0.306	21.232	10.80	14.20	52.678	0.005
103	FG UMa	G9III	G	2.080	0.387	21.380			52.370	
104	IS Vir	K2III	G	2.160	0.440	23.659			52.436	
105	XX Tri	K0III	G	2.200	0.222	23.988			52.297	
106	AI Phe	F7V+K0IV	\mathbf{SG}	2.440	0.968	24.604	2.93	1.82	52.601	0.000
107	IM Peg	K2III-II	G	2.300	0.533	24.660			52.516	
108	CS Cet	(G8-K1)III/IV+F	G	2.780	0.878	27.353			52.709	
109	V792 Her	F3V+K0111	G	2.881	0.960	27.542	12.80	2.58	52.737	0.002
110	TW Lep	F61V + K2111	G	1.990	0.951	28.314			52.473	
111	V1762 Cyg	K2IV-III+G8V	G	2.810	0.892	28.576	6.20	0.90	52.723	0.001
112	V 965 Sco	F2IV+KIIII	G	3.418	0.990	30.974	14.00	5.50	52.878	0.001
113	KZ Eri	FUIV+G5-8111	G	3.323	0.963	39.265	6.94	2.84	52.892	0.000
114	v 4200 Ser	$K_{2-3V} + K_{2-3V}$	MS	1.700	0.998	46.774	0.80	0.80	52.432	0.000
115	EL Eri	G8III-IV	G	1.930	0.379	48.306	15.00	0.010	52.430	0.000
110	AY Cet	WD+G5IIIe	G	2.640	0.263	56.885	15.00	0.012	52.598	0.002
110	UK Dra	K1111+K1111 V4111	G	3.480	0.981	04.417	14.00	14.00	52.997 53.540	0.001
118	V 1197 UF1	A4111 C2111 F2V	G	1.011	0.789	142.889			52.049	
119	БD +44 801	G2111+F2V	G	2.780	0.853	903.829			03.223	

Table 2. Physical parameters of the W UMas. First 26 are possible members of young MG (< 0.6 Gyr) and the rest are older (5.47 Gyr) field systems.

ID	Star name	Spectrel Type	Type	M_{tot} (M_{\odot})	q	P (days)	$egin{array}{c} R_1 \ (R_{\bigodot}) \end{array}$	$egin{array}{c} R_2 \ (R_{\bigodot}) \end{array}$	$\log J_o$ (cgs)	J_{spin}/J_o
1	44 Boo	K2V	W	1.339	0.487	0.2678	0.795	0.601	51.457	0.055
2	GZ And	G5V	W	1.625	0.514	0.3050	1.032	1.032	51.624	0.056
3	TW Cet	G5V	W	1.964	0.530	0.3117	1.048	0.819	51.768	0.044
4	SW Lac	K0Vvar Doll	W	1.738	0.851	0.3207	0.997	0.925	51.724	0.047
5	AC Ree	F8V	W	1.592	0.437	0.3385	1.088	0.728	51.599	0.044
6 7	AC BOO	F8Vn	VV XXZ	1.968	0.403	0.3524	1.314	0.572	51.744	0.046
8	AH Cnc	G2V F5V	W	1.795	0.408	0.3582	1.058	0.711	51 701	0.041
9	AE Phe	F8V	w	1.995	0.461	0.3624	1.269	0.843	51.781	0.042
10	AM Leo	F5V	W	2.009	0.449	0.3658	1.260	0.983	51.783	0.041
11	YY CrB	F8V	А	1.777	0.243	0.3766	1.426	0.805	51.565	0.062
12	TX Cnc	F8V	W	1.212	0.535	0.3829	1.019	0.793	51.450	0.037
13	BI CVn	F2V	А	2.325	0.413	0.3842	1.200	1.130	51.881	0.037
14	SS Ari	G0V	W	1.749	0.302	0.4060	1.351	0.795	51.618	0.047
15	AH Vir	G8V	W	1.772	0.303	0.4075	1.401	0.871	51.629	0.048
16	QX And	F5V Fall	A	1.412	0.261	0.4118	1.632	0.804	51.430	0.078
17	UX Eri	F9V F9V	A	1.876	0.373	0.4453	1.362	0.678	51.728	0.038
18	NN VIT	FU/FIV	A	2.070	0.491	0.4807	1.717	1.240	52.044	0.037
20	DN Cam	Aov F2V	W	2.551	0.348 0.421	0.4077	1.462 1.775	1.265	52 036	0.038
20	V351 Peg	A8V	W	3.165	0.360	0.5933	1.875	1.192	52.030 52.141	0.037
22	UZ Leo	A9V	A	2.703	0.303	0.6180	2.024	0.851	51.995	0.043
23	BD + 145016	F0V	А	1.918	0.253	0.6369	2.076	1.181	51.707	0.052
24	V753 Mon	A8V	W	3.296	0.970	0.6770	1.738	1.592	52.298	0.019
25	FN Cam	A9V	А	2.934	0.222	0.6771			51.988	
26	II UMa	F5III	А	2.623	0.172	0.8250			51.861	
27	CC Com	K5V	W	1.050	0.522	0.2211	0.669	0.507	51.263	0.068
28	V523 Cas	K4V	W	0.950	0.501	0.2337	0.695	0.522	51.193	0.065
29	RW Com	K0V	W	1.230	0.337	0.2373	0.717	0.441	51.310	0.081
30	VZ Psc	K5V C0V	A	1.510	0.911	0.2613	0.776	0.746	51.594	0.060
31	VW Cep	G9V C4F	VV 337	1.144	0.275	0.2783	1.209	0.398	51.234	0.097
32	XY Leo	G4.5 KOV	W	1.400	0.575	0.2804	0.905	0.654	51 451	0.053
34	RW Dor	K1V	w	1.070	0.672	0.2854	0.823	0.636	51.342	0.041
35	BW Dra	F8V	W	1.141	0.281	0.2923	0.963	0.542	51.244	0.083
36	OU Ser	F9/G0V	А	1.194	0.173	0.2968	0.918	0.426	51.145	0.113
37	TZ Boo	G2V	Α	0.887	0.133	0.2972	1.050	0.318	50.846	0.167
38	FU Dra	F8V	W	1.461	0.251	0.3067	1.117	0.606	51.402	0.077
39	TY Boo	G5V	W	1.330	0.437	0.3171	1.072	0.761	51.459	0.054
40	YY Eri	G5v	W	2.160	0.403	0.3215	1.153	0.793	51.798	0.045
41	FG Hya	G2V	A	1.571	0.112	0.3278	1.371	0.670	51.216	0.144
42	AO Cam	GOV	W	1.680	0.413	0.3299	1.042	0.817	51.624	0.043
43	AB And W.UMa	GOV	VV 337	1.499	0.560	0.3319	1.041	0.755	51.589	0.042
44	EO Tau	G2V		1.760	0.479	0.3330	1.120	0.813	51.084 51.672	0.048
46	VW Boo	G5V	W	1.400	0.428	0.3422	1.105	0.100	51.504	0.040
47	V757 Cen	F9V	W	1.690	0.690	0.3432	1.054	0.880	51.701	0.044
48	V508 Oph	F9V	А	1.530	0.515	0.3448	1.049	0.811	51.598	0.048
49	V781 Tau	G0V	W	1.738	0.405	0.3449	1.155	0.776	51.651	0.042
50	ET Leo	G8V	W	1.120	0.342	0.3465			51.301	
51	BV Dra	F7V	W	1.398	0.402	0.3501	1.101	0.742	51.495	0.050
52	CK Boo	F8/7V	Α	1.986	0.111	0.3552	1.097	0.815	51.394	0.096
53	QW Gem	F8V	W	1.700	0.334	0.3581	1.242	0.924	51.602	0.050
54	BB Peg	F5V COV	W	1.946	0.360	0.3615	1.286	0.833	51.717	0.046
55 56	LS Del V410 Aur		VV A	1.407	0.375	0.3038	1.040	0.800	51.522	0.047
57	V410 Aur V752 Cen	G0/2V F7V	W	1.412	0.144	0.3003	1 280	0.005 0.754	51.239 51.604	0.121
58	V417 Agl	G2V	W	1.900	0.362	0.3702	1.200	0.825	51.004 51.705	0.045
59	XY Boo	F5V	A	1.081	0.158	0.3706	1.245	0.566	51.077	0.113
60	HV Aqr	F5V	Ā	1.564	0.145	0.3745			51.319	
61	U Peg	G2V	W	1.528	0.330	0.3748	1.207	0.735	51.529	0.051
62	RT Lmi	F7V	Α	1.774	0.367	0.3749	1.272	0.838	51.659	0.043
63	HX UMa	F4V	А	1.720	0.291	0.3792			51.588	
64	EE Cet	F2V	W	1.829	0.315	0.3799	1.350	0.820	51.651	0.046
65	AU Ser	K0V	Α	1.567	0.701	0.3865	1.051	0.950	51.665	0.039

 ${\bf Table} \ {\bf 2}-continued$

ID	Star name	Spectrel	Type	M_{tot}	q	P	R_1	R_2	$\log J_o$	J_{spin}/J_o
		Type		(M_{\odot})		(days)	(R_{\odot})	(R_{\odot})	(cgs)	
66	BH Cas	K4V	W	1.095	0.474	0.4059	1.114	0.751	51.367	0.037
67	HT Vir	F8V	Α	2.280	0.812	0.4077	1.262	1.252	51.953	0.034
68	EX Leo	F6V	Α	1.866	0.199	0.4086			51.557	
69	V839 Oph	F7V	Α	2.136	0.305	0.4090	1.462	0.989	51.766	0.047
70	V566 Oph	F4V	Α	1.826	0.243	0.4096	1.515	0.769	51.597	0.060
71	UV Lyn	F6V	W	1.844	0.367	0.4150	1.387	0.889	51.702	0.040
72	RZ Tau	A7V	А	2.516	0.540	0.4157	1.594	1.055	51.992	0.040
73	BL Eri	G0V	W	0.939	0.542	0.4169	1.021	0.777	51.279	0.031
74	V842 Her	F9V	W	1.713	0.260	0.4190			51.571	
75	Y Sex	F8	А	1.430	0.182	0.4198	1.240	0.620	51.341	0.073
76	V899 Her	F5V	А	2.875	0.566	0.4212	1.504	1.171	52.096	0.036
77	AK Her	F5V	А	1.610	0.229	0.4215	1.657	0.820	51.494	0.077
78	ER Ori	F7V	W	2.150	0.552	0.4234	1.388	1.130	51.883	0.035
79	EF Dra	F9V	А	2.102	0.160	0.4240	1.704	0.779	51.582	0.097
80	EF Boo	F5V	W	2.349	0.512	0.4295	1.090	1.460	51.939	0.027
81	AP Leo	F8V	А	1.916	0.297	0.4304	1.507	0.838	51.689	0.047
82	AW UMa	F2V	А	1.370	0.070	0.4387	1.692	0.560	50.988	0.233
83	V776 Cas	F2V	А	1.948	0.130	0.4404	1.710	0.710	51.465	0.113
84	TV Mus	F8V	А	1.473	0.119	0.4457	1.643	0.742	51.235	0.130
85	V502 Oph	G0V	W	1.778	0.335	0.4534	1.493	0.935	51.670	0.043
86	AA UMa	F9V	W	2.192	0.545	0.4680	1.356	1.101	51.910	0.029
87	DK Cyg	A8V	А	2.343	0.325	0.4707	1.789	0.987	51.868	0.051
88	V728 Her	F3V	W	1.949	0.178	0.4713	1.789	0.898	51.576	0.082
89	EL Aqr	F3V	А	1.880	0.203	0.4814	1.730	0.880	51.591	0.069
90	AH Aur	F7V	А	1.967	0.169	0.4943	1.856	0.897	51.573	0.085
91	OO Aql	G2V	А	1.920	0.846	0.5068	1.382	1.283	51.862	0.029
92	V401 Cyg	F0V	А	2.166	0.290	0.5827	1.950	1.170	51.816	0.046
93	ϵ Cra	F2V	А	1.940	0.128	0.5914	2.200	0.788	51.500	0.109
94	AQ Tuc	F2/5	А	2.620	0.358	0.5948	2.027	1.296	52.003	0.041
95	RR Cen	A9V	А	2.243	0.210	0.6057	2.188	0.974	51.762	0.066
96	V535 Ara	A8V	А	1.980	0.303	0.6293	1.847	1.121	51.772	0.038
97	AG Vir	A8V	А	2.120	0.317	0.6427			51.835	
98	S Ant	A9V	А	2.700	0.392	0.6483	2.070	1.360	52.056	0.035
99	V1073 Cvg	F2V	А	2.110	0.319	0.7859	2.154	1.318	51.862	0.034
100) V2388 Oph	F3V	А	1.954	0.186	0.8023	2.373	1.368	51.668	0.060
101	TY Pup	F3V	А	2.920	0.183	0.8192	1.787	1.082	51.957	0.035
102	2 V921 Her	A7IV	Δ	1 974	0.226	0.8774			51 744	