Nucleosynthesis in Neutrino-Driven Winds: II. Implications for Heavy Element Synthesis

R. D. Hoffman and S. E. Woosley

Board of Studies in Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA

95064

and

Y.-Z. Qian

Physics Department, 161-33, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125

Received _____

accepted _

ABSTRACT

During the first 20 seconds of its life, the enormous neutrino luminosity of a neutron star drives appreciable mass loss from its surface. This neutrino-driven wind has been previously identified as a likely site for the r-process. Qian & Woosley (1996) have derived, both analytically and numerically, the physical conditions relevant for heavy element synthesis in the wind. These conditions include the entropy (S), the electron fraction (Y_e) , the dynamic time scale, and the mass loss rate. Here we explore the implications of these conditions for nucleosynthesis. We find that the standard wind models derived in that paper are inadequate to make the r-process, though they do produce some rare species above the iron group. We further determine the general restrictions on the entropy, the electron fraction, and the dynamic time scale that are required to make the r-process. In particular, we derive from nuclear reaction network calculations the conditions required to give a sufficient neutron-to-seed ratio for production of the platinum peak. These conditions range from $Y_e\approx 0.2$ and $S \lesssim 100$ per baryon for reasonable dynamic time scales of \sim 0.001–0.1 s, to $Y_e \approx$ 0.4–0.495 and $S \gtrsim 400$ per baryon for a dynamic time scale of ~ 0.1 s. These conditions are also derived analytically to illustrate the physics determining the neutron-to-seed ratio.

Subject headings: elementary particles — nuclear reactions, nucleosynthesis, abundances — supernovae: general

1. Introduction

The origin in nature of the neutron-rich isotopes heavier than the iron group remains uncertain, but rapid progress in both theory and observation has been made in recent years. For example, analysis of the metal deficient star CS 22892-052 ([Fe/H] ≈ -3.1) by Sneden et al. (1996) shows striking evidence that the solar abundance pattern for the *r*-process isotopes exists even at very early times in our Galaxy, and suggests an origin for these nuclei quite distinct from the *s*-process. The fact that the *r*-process abundance pattern in this very metal deficient star is so strikingly solar across the entire range $56 \leq Z \leq 76$ also suggests that this pattern is generic and reflects the conditions constantly obtained in a unique astrophysical environment responsible for the *r*-process. However, we note that the current observational data for Z < 56 are not so conclusive.

On the theoretical front, many recent calculations (e.g., Woosley & Hoffman 1992; Howard et al. 1993; Takahashi, Witti, & Janka 1994; Woosley et al. 1994) have shown that a promising site for r-process nucleosynthesis is the neutrino-driven wind blowing from a nascent neutron star following a core-collapse-driven supernova. This r-process site has some attractive features. First of all, the r-process would be primary, in accordance with the observation of Sneden et al. 1996 (see also Cowan et al. 1996; Mathews & Cowan 1990; Cowan, Thielemann, & Truran 1991). Furthermore, the total mass loss in the wind approximately accounts for the amount of r-process material ejected per supernova, $\sim 10^{-5} M_{\odot}$, as expected from the supernova rate and total r-process yields of the Galaxy. Finally, the conditions in the wind are determined by the properties of the neutron star and the characteristics of its neutrino emission. Therefore, the r-process nucleosynthesis might be approximately constant from event to event, reflecting the near constancy of the neutron star mass and cooling history, if possible complications due to fallback could be ignored.

However, problems have emerged in the theoretical model. The successful r-process

calculations, with the possible exception of Woosley et al. (1994), all utilize parametric modifications to the key parameters, especially an artificial increase in the entropy. The high entropies of Wilson's supernova model reported in Woosley et al. (1994) have not been replicated elsewhere. This discrepancy has been emphasized by the analytic calculations of Qian & Woosley (1996, hereafter Paper I). In general, the deficiency in entropy is only a factor of two, but the gap is proving difficult to bridge. Paper I also suggested that other relevant parameters of the problem, especially a short dynamic time scale or large neutron excess, might compensate for the low entropy, or that there may emerge other sources of entropy hitherto neglected. But, for the time being, a potentially beautiful solution to a classic problem — the origin of the r-process — falters by a factor of two.

We will not resolve this quandary in the present paper. What we shall do however, is: a) show that the standard models of the neutrino-driven wind derived in Paper I give interesting nucleosynthesis above the iron group, but with the electron fractions obtained in Woosley et al. (1994), do not give the classical r-process; and b) determine, both analytically and numerically, the conditions that *are* required in this sort of model to produce the r-process, in particular the platinum peak.

2. Nucleosynthesis In Neutrino-Driven Winds

An *r*-process might occur for various combinations of entropy, electron fraction, and dynamic time scale. Different authors, using numerical supernova models, have arrived at qualitatively different values for these key parameters in the neutrino-driven wind. In order to obtain a better understanding of the physical conditions, both analytic and numerical studies of the wind were carried out in Paper I. The primary goal of that paper was to examine the dependencies of the physical parameters in the wind on the neutron star mass (M) and radius (R), and the emergent neutrino luminosity (L_{ν}) and energy spectra. The analytic study was in the same spirit as that of Duncan, Shapiro, & Wasserman (1986), but was more extensive and directed towards nucleosynthetic issues. The analytic results of Paper I were given by equations (48a), (48b), and (49) for the entropy (S), equations (58a) and (58b) for the mass outflow rate (\dot{M}), equation (61) for the dynamic time scale ($\tau_{\rm dyn}$), and equation (77) for the electron fraction (Y_e).

Physically, the first three parameters $(S, \dot{M}, \text{ and } \tau_{\text{dyn}})$ are determined by the sum of heating produced by all neutrinos, whereas the evolution of Y_e mostly reflects the difference between the ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ fluxes through the inter-conversion of free nucleons by ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures. As discussed in Paper I, the first three parameters are not sensitive to the exact values of Y_e , and their determination can be essentially decoupled from the evolution of Y_e in the wind. The analytic results for these three parameters were tested by a series of numerical calculations using the one-dimensional implicit hydrodynamic code KEPLER. A total of nine models were studied. The neutron star mass and radius, and neutrino luminosity at the inner boundary of these models were varied to observe the corresponding effects on these three parameters. A comparison between analytic and numerical results was summarized in Table 1 of Paper I.

From these numerical models, we have extracted the velocity (v), density (ρ) , and temperature (T) of a mass element as functions of its position (r) in a steady-state wind. Using dt = dr/v(r), we can obtain the evolution of r, ρ , and T with time t for the mass element. Starting at $T_9 \approx 10$ (T_9 is the temperature in units of 10^9 K), when nuclear statistical equilibrium (NSE) is assured, we then follow the time evolution of the nuclear composition in this mass element with a reaction network (Woosley & Hoffman 1992), until the composition freezes out at $T_9 \approx 1$. To good accuracy, the mass element is initially composed of free nucleons, in proportions specified by the initial electron fraction $Y_{e,i}$. The initial electron fraction is essentially determined by the equilibrium between ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free neutrons and protons, respectively (Qian et al. 1993; see also Paper I). If we denote the rates for ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons as $\lambda_{\nu_e n}$ and $\lambda_{\bar{\nu}_e p}$, respectively, the initial electron fraction is given by

$$Y_{e,i} = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda_{\bar{\nu}_e p} / \lambda_{\nu_e n}}.$$
(1)

In turn, the rate $\lambda_{\nu_e n}$ ($\lambda_{\bar{\nu}_e p}$) is determined by the ν_e ($\bar{\nu}_e$) luminosity and energy spectrum.

In realistic supernova models, the neutrino luminosity and energy spectra evolve with time. The individual wind models of Paper I represent the steady-state configurations reached at different neutrino luminosities over time scales much shorter than the evolution time scales of the neutrino luminosity and energy spectra. Because the time evolution of the neutrino energy spectra is much less pronounced than that of the neutrino luminosity, two generic sets of neutrino mean energies were assumed for these models. From the analytic results of Paper I, we can see that the mass loss rate, the dynamic time scale, and especially the entropy would not change significantly if a more precise prescription of the neutrino energy spectra were used. However, because the electron fraction is sensitive to the difference between the ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ fluxes, and the nature of heavy element nucleosynthesis is extremely sensitive to Y_e , in this paper we calculate the ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ reaction rates according to the time evolution of neutrino luminosity and energy spectra in Wilson's 20 ${\rm M}_{\odot}$ supernova model used in Woosley et al. (1994). Specifically, we take from Wilson's supernova model the neutrino energy spectra corresponding to the same neutrino luminosity as in the wind model. Starting with the initial value in equation (1), we then follow the evolution of Y_e in the reaction network, taking into account ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons and heavy nuclei (McLaughlin & Fuller 1995), electron and positron captures on free nucleons and heavy nuclei, and nuclear β -decays.

The results of the nucleosynthesis calculations are presented in Tables 1–3. The entropy, the initial electron fraction, and the dynamic time scale are given for each wind

model. The dynamic time scale roughly corresponds to the time over which the temperature changes by one *e*-fold (Paper I). In order to check the influence of the neutrino flux on the nucleosynthesis, we have carried out five different calculations. All runs included electron and positron captures on free nucleons and nuclei, as well as nuclear β -decays. The individual runs differ in the inclusion of various neutrino reactions. Respectively, they cover the cases including (1) no neutrino reactions (column 2), (2) ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons only (column 3), (3) ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons, and neutral-current neutrino spallation on α -particles (column 4), (4) ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons and nuclei (column 5), and (5) ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons and nuclei, as well as neutral-current neutrino spallation on α -particles (column 6). For all runs, we give the electron fraction ($Y_{e,f}$), the average mass number of nuclei excluding free nucleons and α -particles (\bar{A}), and the neutron and α -particle mass fractions ($X_{n,f}$ and $X_{\alpha,f}$) at the freeze-out of the charged-particle reactions ($T_9 \approx 2.5$).

In Figures 1–9, detailed nucleosynthesis results from the runs that included ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons (column 3 in Tables 1-3) are given in terms of the production factor, defined as the final mass fraction (after all weak decays) of a given stable nucleus divided by its solar abundance (Anders & Grevesse 1989). These results are also representative of the nucleosynthesis obtained in the other runs. In these figures, the most abundant isotope in the solar abundance distribution for a given element is plotted as an asterisk. Isotopes of a given element are connected by solid lines. A diamond around a data point indicates that the isotope is produced chiefly as a (neutron-rich) radioactive progenitor. The dotted horizontal lines represent an approximate "normalization band," bounded from above by the largest production factor in the calculation and from below by a production factor four times smaller. Nuclei that fall within this band will be the dominant species produced. In Figures 1–9, no re-normalization has been attempted. Models 10A–F produced interesting nucleosynthesis representative of the α -process (Woosley & Hoffman 1992; Witti, Janka, & Takahashi 1994). The most abundant nuclei produced have mass numbers 90 $\leq A \leq$ 110. Model 10A ($Y_e \approx 0.47$, $S \sim 70$ per baryon) shows the production of the N = 50 closed-neutron-shell nuclei which were grossly overproduced in previous studies. Models 10B and C, with progressively lower neutrino luminosity and lower values of Y_e , made heavier nuclei. Production of Sn, Sb, and Te was not accurately calculated, as the radioactive progenitors for these species were isotopes of Ru, the last element in our reaction network. Models 30A–C produced nuclei near the iron group. Model 30A exhibits interesting nucleosynthesis for $Y_e > 0.5$, while Model 30C shows the production of ⁶⁴Zn (made as itself), the dominant isotope of this element. This nucleus was not accounted for in the surveys of Galactic chemical evolution and nucleosynthesis in massive stars (Timmes, Woosley, & Weaver 1995; Woosley & Weaver 1995), and appears to be made predominantly under conditions similar to those obtained in the neutrino-driven wind (Hoffman et al. 1996).

From Tables 1–3, it is also clear that inclusion of the neutrino reactions made a difference. The ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons have the largest effect. The electron fraction increases appreciably due to these capture reactions when free nucleons are being assembled into α -particles. This so-called " α -effect" (Fuller & Meyer 1995; McLaughlin, Fuller, & Wilson 1996) is evident when we compare the case including no neutrino reactions (column 2) with the cases including various neutrino reactions (columns 3–6). The inclusion of neutral-current neutrino spallation on α -particles and ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on heavy nuclei did not have a major effect on the nucleosynthesis, at least before the freeze-out of the charged-particle reactions. For the relatively low entropies studied here, the neutrino spallation on α -particles did not have any appreciable influence on the final α -particle mass fraction. This is to be contrasted with the dramatic effect of these spallation reactions on the *r*-process in Wilson's high-entropy supernova model (Meyer 1995). The ν_e captures on

heavy nuclei may have important consequences for the ensuing neutron-capture phase of the *r*-process (Nadyozhin & Panov 1993). Regardless of these issues, it is clear that none of these wind models produced an *r*-process. The neutrons had been consumed by the time the charged-particle reactions froze out ($T_9 \approx 2.5$), and the nuclear flow did not even reach the $A \sim 130$ *r*-process peak.

Another important issue concerns the overall ejection of the synthesized material in the wind into the interstellar medium. As the following simple argument will show, the magnitudes of the production factors may preclude the ejection of such material in all nine wind models. From the time evolution of neutrino luminosity in Wilson's supernova model, we find that, for example, the neutrino luminosity decreases from twice to half the value in Model 30B over a time of $\tau_{\nu} \sim 1$ s. With a mass loss rate of $\dot{M} \approx 1.1 \times 10^{-2} M_{\odot} \text{ s}^{-1}$ and the largest production factor of $(X_w/X_{\odot})_{\text{max}} \approx 2.7 \times 10^4$ in Model 30B (Figure 8), the corresponding normalized production factor is $\sim (\dot{M}\tau_{\nu}/20 M_{\odot})(X_w/X_{\odot})_{\text{max}} \sim 15$, if the total amount of ejecta from the supernova is 20 M_{\odot} . Models 30A and C give normalized production factors of up to ~ 30 . For Models 10A–F, the normalized production factors for the nuclei produced in the largest amount are typically of order 100. However, Woosley & Weaver (1993) find that the normalized production factor should not be much above 10 in order for supernovae to produce the observed solar abundance of oxygen. Therefore, these wind models cannot represent in detail what commonly occurs in supernovae.

It is quite possible that appropriate modifications of these standard wind models can lead to the physical conditions for acceptable nucleosynthesis. Paper I studied the effects of an additional energy source on the entropy and dynamic time scale in the wind. Model 10F of Paper I was recalculated with an additional energy input of 5×10^{47} erg s⁻¹ distributed uniformly in volume between 15 and 25 km. At these radii, the mass loss rate has been more or less determined. The additional energy input represents a moderate perturbation to the total amount of heating provided by neutrinos $(1.2 \times 10^{48} \text{ erg s}^{-1})$. As a result, the entropy increased from 140 to 192 per baryon, and the dynamic time scale decreased from 0.11 to 0.022 s, while the mass loss rate slightly increased from 2.8×10^{-6} to $3.7 \times 10^{-6} M_{\odot}$ s⁻¹.

The effect on the nucleosynthesis was dramatic as shown in Table 4. The neutron-toseed ratio (cf. eq. [3]), less than 10 in all of the unmodified models, rose to ~ 166. With an average mass number of $\bar{A} \sim 90$ for the seed nuclei, uranium could be produced if all the neutrons were to be subsequently captured. The $A \sim 195 r$ -process peak probably could have been produced with less additional energy input, and hence a lower entropy and a longer dynamic time scale, than assumed in Paper I. We conclude that lower values of Y_e than those calculated by Wilson in Woosley et al. (1994), or additional energy input like that considered in Paper I, are necessary to produce an r-process in a spherically symmetric wind model.

3. The Requisite Conditions For The *r*-Process

From our studies of nucleosynthesis in the neutrino-driven wind in the previous section, we learn that the standard wind models of Paper I fail to make an r-process. On the other hand, we also see that reasonable modifications of these models can significantly change the physical conditions in the wind, and therefore give rise to a possible r-process. In order to better understand the deficiencies of the standard wind models, and furthermore, to motivate and direct physically plausible modifications of these models, we now survey the important physical parameters required for a strong r-process. (See also Takahashi, Witti, & Janka 1994; Takahashi 1996; Freiburghaus et al. 1996; and Meyer & Brown 1996).

We consider the following generic model for the r-process. Neutron-rich material

initially composed of free nucleons at high temperatures ($T_9 \approx 9$) adiabatically expands and cools. After nearly all the protons are assembled into α -particles at $T_9 \approx 5$, an α -process occurs to burn the α -particles into heavy nuclei. The α -process stops when charged-particle reactions freeze out at $T_9 \approx 2.5$. The heavy nuclei produced at the end of the α -process then become the seed nuclei for the subsequent rapid neutron capture process, or the r-process. We do not intend to account for the full detail of the r-process, such as the final abundance distribution, which becomes meaningful only in the context of a consistent astrophysical model. What we are most interested in is the physical conditions favorable for the production of the most abundant r-process nuclei, such as those in the platinum peak of the solar r-process abundance distribution. For this purpose, we can think of the r-process as the transformation of seed nuclei into r-process nuclei through simple addition of the available neutrons. In this sense, the possibility of producing r-process nuclei around a certain mass number depends only on the relative abundances of seed nuclei and neutrons at the end of the α -process.

In general, the composition resulting from the α -process satisfies

$$X_{n,f} + X_{\alpha,f} + X_s \approx 1,\tag{2}$$

where $X_{n,f}$ and $X_{\alpha,f}$ are the final mass fractions of neutrons and α -particles, respectively, and X_s is the total mass fraction of seed nuclei. If we represent the seed nuclei with a mean proton number \overline{Z} and a mean mass number \overline{A} , we can define a neutron-to-seed ratio at the end of the α -process as

$$\frac{n}{s} \approx \frac{X_{n,f}}{X_s} \bar{A}.$$
(3)

In terms of this ratio, our simplified condition for making r-process nuclei with mass number A becomes

$$\frac{n}{s} + \bar{A} \approx A. \tag{4}$$

We are particularly interested in the production of the platinum peak, and will describe the numerical calculations for $A \approx 200$ in the following.

To follow the nucleosynthesis in the adiabatically cooling material with a nuclear reaction network, we need the initial composition and the time evolution of temperature and density. The initial composition at $T_9 \approx 9$ can be simply specified by the initial electron fraction $Y_{e,i}$, with the initial mass fractions of neutrons and protons given by $X_{n,i} \approx 1 - Y_{e,i}$ and $X_{p,i} \approx Y_{e,i}$, respectively. Because temperature and density are related through the constant entropy for the adiabatically cooling material, we only need to specify the temperature as a function of time. For simplicity, we introduce a dynamic time scale (τ_{dyn}) over which the temperature changes by one *e*-fold, i.e.,

$$T_9(t) \approx T_9(0) \exp(-t/\tau_{\rm dyn}). \tag{5}$$

With this time evolution of the temperature, the duration of the adiabatic expansion from $T_9 \approx 9$ to 2.5 is

$$t_{\rm exp} \approx 1.28 \tau_{\rm dyn}.$$
 (6)

Hereafter, we will refer to t_{exp} as the expansion time. We further assume that the entropy is dominated by contributions from radiation and relativistic electron-positron pairs, and is given by

$$S \approx 3.33 \frac{T_9^3}{\rho_5},$$
 (7)

where ρ_5 is the density in units of 10^5 g cm⁻³, and S is in units of Boltzmann constant per baryon. For convenience, we frequently refer to entropy without its unit throughout this paper.

Now it is straightforward to determine the combinations of initial electron fraction, entropy, and expansion time, for which an α -process can lead to a sufficient neutron-to-seed ratio for production of r-process nuclei with $A \approx 200$. We choose a range of expansion times $(0.005 \le t_{\exp} \le 0.25 \text{ s})$. For each t_{\exp} , we survey a broad range of initial electron fractions $(Y_{e,i} = 0.20, 0.25, 0.30, 0.35, 0.40, 0.45, 0.46, 0.47, 0.48, 0.49, \text{ and } 0.495)$. With a particular set of t_{\exp} and $Y_{e,i}$, we seek through iteration the appropriate entropy which enables the α -process to produce a final composition satisfying equation (4) for $A \approx 200$. In our calculations, we take into account the effects of electron and positron captures and nuclear β -decays on the evolution of the electron fraction.

The results are given in Table 5 and Figure 10. For each successful run, the composition at the end of the α -process are given in terms of the final neutron and α -particle mass fractions and the mean proton and mass numbers for seed nuclei. The mean proton and mass numbers were calculated from $\overline{Z} = \sum Y(Z_s, A_s)Z_s / \sum Y(Z_s, A_s)$ and $\overline{A} = \sum Y(Z_s, A_s)A_s / \sum Y(Z_s, A_s)$, respectively, with $Y(Z_s, A_s)$ the number fraction of the seed nucleus with proton number Z_s and mass number A_s . The final electron fraction and the neutron-to-seed ratio are also given in Table 5. The combinations of initial electron fraction and entropy in the successful runs for three specific expansion times are shown as filled circles connected by solid lines in Figure 10. At a given t_{exp} , values of $Y_{e,i}$ and S to the left of the solid line will not give a sufficient neutron-to-seed ratio for production of the platinum peak. In addition, the following features of this figure are worth mentioning:

(1) Depending on the expansion time, there exist many possible combinations of initial electron fraction and entropy that can produce nuclei with $A \sim 195$. The "high entropy" scenario ($S \gtrsim 350$ and $0.495 \gtrsim Y_{e,i} \gtrsim 0.40$) corresponds to longer expansion times ($t_{exp} \gtrsim 0.1$ s). The results for $t_{exp} = 0.25$ s are consistent with the conditions seen at late times in Wilson's supernova model (Woosley et al. 1994), and those employed in the successful *r*-process calculations of Woosley et al. (1994) and Takahashi, Witti, & Janka (1994), although the later required an artificial increase in the entropy (by a factor of five) to produce nuclei with $A \sim 195$. (2) Alternatively, there is a "low entropy" scenario ($S \leq 200$ and $Y_{e,i} \leq 0.4$) that requires shorter expansion times ($t_{\exp} \leq 0.025$ s). For the most extreme case shown ($t_{\exp} = 0.005$ s), the platinum peak can be made for any $Y_{e,i} \leq 0.495$ if $S \sim 150$. Such an expansion would correspond to very high velocities which might be more appropriate to a jet than to a quasi-steady-state wind as considered in Paper I. However, these rapid expansions may not continue after the α -process in order to allow enough time for the neutron capture phase of the *r*-process. The slowing down of the expansion could be facilitated by a massive overlying mantle in the case of a Type II supernova.

(3) For smaller values of $Y_{e,i}$, the required entropy decreases regardless of the expansion time. This merely reflects the very neutron-rich nature of the initial composition. The results of Paper I suggest that values of Y_e below 0.3 might be very difficult to achieve in the neutrino-driven wind. Material with $Y_e < 0.3$ would need to be ejected without any significant interaction with neutrinos.

(4) For a fixed expansion time, the required value of entropy actually decreases as $Y_{e,i}$ increases from ~ 0.48 to ~ 0.495. Lower entropy translates to higher density (cf. eq. [7]), and would normally produce more seed nuclei. However, in these cases of high $Y_{e,i}$, the electron fraction has even more leverage on the seed production. As $Y_{e,i}$ increases towards 0.5, the neutron abundance decreases to vanishingly small values when the α -process begins at $T_9 \approx 5$. This in turn diminishes the efficiency of burning α -particles through the main reaction path bridging the unstable mass gaps at A = 5 and 8, i.e., ${}^{4}\text{He}(\alpha n, \gamma){}^{9}\text{Be}(\alpha, n){}^{12}\text{C}$. Table 5 shows that these high $Y_{e,i}$ values give extreme α -rich freeze-outs with final α -particle mass fractions approaching unity and comparable mass fractions for neutrons and heavy seed nuclei.

In deriving the above results, we have made two major assumptions: (1) the entropy is proportional to T^3/ρ with the proportionality constant calculated for a mixture of radiation and relativistic electron-positron pairs, and (2) weak interactions other than electron and positron captures and nuclear β -decays can be neglected in the nuclear reaction network. We will discuss how our results are affected if we drop either assumption in turn.

Due to its logarithmic dependence on the temperature and density, the entropy of non-relativistic particles roughly stays constant over the temperature range in our calculations (9 $\gtrsim T_9 \gtrsim 2.5$). For a total entropy of $S \gtrsim 20$, the change in density essentially maintains a constant entropy of relativistic particles as the material adiabatically cools. At high temperatures $(9 \ge T_9 \ge 5)$, the relativistic particles include photons and electron-positron pairs, and the corresponding entropy is given by equation (7). However, as the temperature cools below $T_9 \sim 5$, electron-positron pairs begin to annihilate. The situation is much like the Big Bang. Eventually, at $T_9 \sim 1$, the only relativistic particles in the material are photons, with the corresponding entropy given by $S \approx 1.21 T_9^3 / \rho_5$. In general, we can write the entropy in relativistic particles as $S \approx C(T_9)T_9^3/\rho_5$. Because $C(T_9)$ decreases noticeably from $T_9 \approx 5$ to 2.5 when the α -process is taking place in our calculations, we have overestimated the density by using $C(T_9) \approx 3.33$ throughout the adiabatic expansion of the material. Consequently, we have overestimated the seed production and underestimated the neutron-to-seed ratio at the end of the α -process. This is especially true for the cases of high entropies where more time is available to produce seed nuclei.

With an accurate expression for the entropy, the condition in equation (4) is satisfied at slightly lower entropies than those given in Table 5 for the same initial electron fraction and expansion time. In fact, we have repeated our calculations for $Y_{e,i} = 0.30, 0.40, 0.45, 0.47$, and 0.49, using an exact adiabatic equation of state to compute the density corresponding to a specific temperature. This equation of state takes into account the contributions to the entropy from radiation, electron-positron pairs, and ions. The results are shown as filled squares in Figure 10 for three of the expansion times explored in the initial numerical survey. As expected, our previous results using equation (7) overestimated the entropy required to produce the platinum peak. When we use the exact adiabatic equation of state, the required entropy is lower by ~ 10% for the longest expansion time $t_{exp} = 0.25$ s, whereas for the shortest expansion time $t_{exp} = 0.005$ s, the results are essentially unchanged.

If the *r*-process occurs in an environment with intense neutrino flux, perhaps we should also include various neutrino interactions in the nuclear reaction network. In fact, we could have specified a less "generic" model by considering an *r*-process site similar to the neutrino-driven wind. In this case, the adiabatically expanding material is also moving away from the neutrino source. We can define a constant dynamic time scale as $\tau_{\rm dyn} \approx r/v$, with *r* the distance from the neutrino source and *v* the expansion velocity. The time evolution of temperature in equation (5) follows on assuming $T \propto r^{-1}$. We can then introduce an additional parameter, e.g., the initial neutrino flux $\Phi_{\nu,i}$ at $T_9 \approx 9$, in our calculations. As the material adiabatically expands, the neutrino flux it receives decreases as $r^{-2} \propto \exp(-2t/\tau_{\rm dyn})$. In principle, using the above prescription, we can repeat our calculations for a range of $\Phi_{\nu,i}$ with various neutrino interactions included in the nuclear reaction network.

From our discussions in §2, we have seen that for relatively low entropies of $S \leq 200$, the major role of the neutrino flux in determining the neutron-to-seed ratio is to increase the electron fraction by ν_e and $\bar{\nu}_e$ captures on free nucleons through the α -effect. In addition, Meyer (1995) has shown that for high entropies of $S \sim 400$, neutral-current neutrino spallations on α -particles during the α -process can increase the production of seed nuclei. In both cases, inclusion of neutrino interactions tends to reduce the neutron-to-seed ratio at the end of the α -process, although the effects of these neutrino interactions are less important for shorter expansion times. Therefore, we can interpret the entropies in Table 5 and Figure 10 as the minimum values required to produce the platinum peak for given sets of initial electron fraction and expansion time. With this interpretation, we can avoid repeating our calculations and complicating our results with an additional parameter $\Phi_{\nu,i}$. Of course, in a consistent astrophysical model for the *r*-process where intense neutrino flux exists, the exact conditions for production of, e.g., the platinum peak, have to be determined with full consideration of various neutrino interactions.

4. Analytic Treatment Of The α -Process

In order to provide some physical insight into what determines the neutron-to-seed ratio, and extend our results in the previous section to production of r-process nuclei in general, we present an analytic treatment of the α -process in this section based on our generic r-process model. If we ignore possible neutrino interactions, the electron fraction at the beginning of the α -process $(T_9 \approx 5)$ is about the same as the initial electron fraction $Y_{e,i}$ at $T_9 \approx 9$. At $T_9 \approx 5$, the material is essentially composed of free neutrons and α -particles for $Y_{e,i} < 0.5$, with almost all the protons already assembled into the α -particles. The mass fractions of α -particles and neutrons at the beginning of the α -process are then approximately given by

$$X_{\alpha,0} \approx 2Y_{e,i},$$
 (8a)

$$X_{n,0} \approx 1 - 2Y_{e,i},\tag{8b}$$

respectively.

The composition at the end of the α -process ($T_9 \approx 2.5$) satisfies

$$\frac{1}{2}X_{\alpha,f} + \frac{\bar{Z}}{\bar{A}}X_s \approx Y_{e,f},\tag{9}$$

where $Y_{e,f}$ is the final electron fraction at $T_9 \approx 2.5$. Using equation (9) together with equations (2)–(4), we find that the final mass fractions of α -particles and neutrons have to be

$$X_{\alpha,f} \approx \frac{Y_{e,f} - \bar{Z}/A}{1/2 - \bar{Z}/A},\tag{10a}$$

$$X_{n,f} \approx \frac{1 - \bar{A}/A}{1 - 2\bar{Z}/A} (1 - 2Y_{e,f}),$$
 (10b)

respectively, in order to produce r-process nuclei with mass number A. Comparing equations (8a) and (8b) with equations (10a) and (10b), we see that the fractional change in the neutron mass fraction during the α -process is less than that in the α -particle mass fraction for $Y_{e,f} \approx Y_{e,i} < \bar{Z}/\bar{A}$. Obviously, because neutrons carry no charge and the mean charge per nucleon for α -particles exceeds \bar{Z}/\bar{A} for the heavy seed nuclei, the final composition favors the presence of neutrons for $Y_{e,f} < \bar{Z}/\bar{A}$. Accordingly, we will present the analytic treatment of the α -process for two different cases: $Y_{e,i} < \bar{Z}/\bar{A}$ and $Y_{e,i} > \bar{Z}/\bar{A}$. In both cases, we will assume $Y_{e,f} \approx Y_{e,i}$.

As the temperature declines from $T_9 \approx 5$ to 2.5, α -particles and neutrons are partially assembled into heavy seed nuclei. We can describe the α -process in terms of the time evolution of the α -particle and neutron abundances. During the α -process, the burning of α -particles mainly proceeds via the reaction sequence ${}^{4}\text{He}(\alpha n, \gamma){}^{9}\text{Be}(\alpha, n){}^{12}\text{C}$. The production of seed nuclei occurs through the efficient α -capture reactions starting with ${}^{9}\text{Be}(\alpha, n){}^{12}\text{C}$. Consequently, the rates of change in the α -particle and neutron number fractions can be approximately written as

$$\frac{dY_{\alpha}}{dt} \approx -FY_{\alpha}Y_{9}\rho N_{A}\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}, \qquad (11a)$$

$$\frac{dY_n}{dt} \approx -GY_{\alpha}Y_9\rho N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}, \qquad (11b)$$

respectively, where Y_9 is the number fraction of ⁹Be, and $N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}$ is the reaction rate for ⁹Be $(\alpha, n)^{12}$ C in units of cm³ s⁻¹ g⁻¹. In equations (11a) and (11b), F and G are the numbers of α -particles and neutrons that make up a typical heavy seed nucleus. For a seed distribution with mean proton number \bar{Z} and mean mass number \bar{A} , we have $F \approx \bar{Z}/2$ and $G \approx \bar{A} - 2\bar{Z}$.

Due to its low Q-value of only 1.573 MeV, the reaction ${}^{4}\text{He}(\alpha n, \gamma){}^{9}\text{Be}$ is tightly balanced by its reverse reaction essentially over the entire temperature range $5 \gtrsim T_{9} \gtrsim 2.5$. According to statistical equilibrium, the number fraction of ${}^{9}\text{Be}$ during the α -process is given by

$$Y_9 \approx 8.66 \times 10^{-11} Y_{\alpha}^2 Y_n \rho_5^2 T_9^{-3} \exp(18.26/T_9).$$
(12)

Because the density ρ is related to the temperature T_9 through the constant entropy S, and $N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}$ depends on T_9 only, equations (11a) and (11b) can be expressed in a more convenient form if we regard Y_{α} and Y_n as functions of temperature. Using equation (5), we have

$$\frac{dY_{\alpha}}{dT_9} \approx FY_{\alpha}^3 Y_n g(T_9) \tau_{\rm dyn}, \qquad (13a)$$

$$\frac{dY_n}{dT_9} \approx GY^3_{\alpha} Y_n g(T_9) \tau_{\rm dyn}, \qquad (13b)$$

where $g(T_9)$ has the unit of s⁻¹, and is given by

$$g(T_9) \approx 8.66 \times 10^{-6} \rho_5^3 T_9^{-4} \exp(18.26/T_9) N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}.$$
 (14)

Now we can solve equations (13a) and (13b) for the two different cases mentioned previously. For $Y_{e,i} < \overline{Z}/\overline{A}$, the final composition favors the presence of neutrons. So we can approximately take $Y_n \approx Y_{n,0} = X_{n,0}$ during the α -process. In this case, it is straightforward to solve equation (13a) and obtain

$$Y_{\alpha,f}^{-2} - Y_{\alpha,0}^{-2} \approx 2FY_{n,0}\tau_{\rm dyn} \int_{2.5}^{5} g(T_9)dT_9.$$
⁽¹⁵⁾

Likewise, for $Y_{e,i} > \overline{Z}/\overline{A}$, we can approximately take $Y_{\alpha} \approx Y_{\alpha,0} = X_{\alpha,0}/4$ during the α -process, and solve equation (13b) to obtain

$$Y_{n,f} \approx Y_{n,0} \exp\left[-GY_{\alpha,0}^3 \tau_{\rm dyn} \int_{2.5}^5 g(T_9) dT_9\right].$$
 (16)

Equations (15) and (16) implicitly constrain the combinations of $Y_{e,i}$, S, and τ_{dyn} , for which the α -process can give a sufficient neutron-to-seed ratio for production of r-process nuclei with mass number A.

To proceed further, we approximate the constant entropy during the adiabatic expansion as $S \approx C(T_9)T_9^3/\rho_5$, with $C(T_9)$ decreasing from 3.33 at $T_9 \gtrsim 5$ to 1.21 at $T_9 \lesssim 1$. So equation (14) can be rewritten as

$$g(T_9) \approx 8.66 \times 10^{-6} S^{-3} C(T_9)^3 T_9^5 \exp(18.26/T_9) N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}.$$
 (17)

We plot $g(T_9)S^3$ as a function of T_9 in Figure 11, assuming $C(T_9) \approx 3.33$ and using the fitting formula for $N_A \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\alpha n}$ given by Wrean, Brune, & Kavanagh (1994). As we can see from this figure, $g(T_9)$ decreases monotonically with temperature over $2.5 \leq T_9 \leq 5$. At $T_9 \approx 4$, $g(T_9)$ has already fallen below half its value at $T_9 \approx 5$. Clearly, the main contribution to the integral $\int_{2.5}^5 g(T_9) dT_9$ comes from $4 \leq T_9 \leq 5$. This remains true even when the exact form of $C(T_9)$ is used. For our analytic estimates, we can approximately evaluate the integral with $C(T_9) \approx 3.33$, and obtain

$$\int_{2.5}^{5} g(T_9) dT_9 \approx 6.4 \times 10^8 S^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}.$$
(18)

Using equation (18) and assuming $Y_{e,f} \approx Y_{e,i}$, we can rearrange equations (15) and (16) as

$$S \approx \left\{ \frac{4 \times 10^{7} \bar{Z} (1 - 2Y_{e,i})}{\left[\frac{1/2 - \bar{Z}/A}{Y_{e,i} - \bar{Z}/A}\right]^{2} - \left[\frac{1}{2Y_{e,i}}\right]^{2}} \left(\frac{\tau_{\rm dyn}}{\rm s}\right) \right\}^{1/3}, \text{ for } Y_{e,i} < \frac{\bar{Z}}{\bar{A}},$$
(19a)

$$S \approx Y_{e,i} \left\{ \frac{8 \times 10^7 (\bar{A} - 2\bar{Z})}{\ln \left[\frac{1 - 2\bar{Z}/A}{1 - A/A}\right]} \left(\frac{\tau_{\rm dyn}}{\rm s}\right) \right\}^{1/3}, \text{ for } Y_{e,i} > \frac{\bar{Z}}{\bar{A}},$$
(19b)

where we have also used equations (8a), (8b), (10a) and (10b).

To compare our analytic results in equations (19a) and (19b) with the numerical results for $A \approx 200$ in §3, we take $\bar{Z} \approx 34$ and $\bar{A} \approx 90$ from the numerical survey, and obtain

$$S \approx 10^{3} \left\{ \frac{1 - 2Y_{e,i}}{\left[\frac{0.33}{(Y_{e,i} - 0.17)}\right]^{2} - \left[\frac{1}{2Y_{e,i}}\right]^{2}} \left(\frac{t_{\exp}}{s}\right) \right\}^{1/3}, \text{ for } Y_{e,i} < 0.38,$$
(20a)

$$S \approx 2 \times 10^3 Y_{e,i} \left(\frac{t_{\exp}}{s}\right)^{1/3}$$
, for $Y_{e,i} > 0.38$, (20b)

where we have replaced τ_{dyn} with $t_{exp} \approx 1.28 \tau_{dyn}$. These analytic results are shown as open circles connected by dotted lines in Figure 10. The general agreement between our analytic results and the numerical survey using equation (7) (filled circles connected by solid lines) is quite good. Because Y_{α} and Y_n can decrease during the α -process and effective burning of α -particles may start at $T_9 < 5$, we always tend to overestimate the entropy by holding either Y_{α} or Y_n constant and doing the integral in equation (18) over the entire temperature range $2.5 \leq T_9 \leq 5$ in our analytic treatment. The largest discrepancies occur at $Y_e \geq 0.47$ where we overestimate the entropy by $\sim (15-50)\%$. Using the specific values of \overline{Z} and \overline{A} found in the numerical survey would slightly improve the agreement. Further improvement could be obtained by solving equations (11a) and (11b) together instead of approximately solving each for a specific case. However, these improvements would add little to our understanding of the physics determining the neutron-to-seed ratio. We also notice that the same level of agreement with the numerical survey using an exact equation of state (filled squares) can be achieved if we use $C(T_9) \approx 3$ instead of 3.33 to account for the annihilation of electron-positron pairs into photons at $T_9 < 5$.

From our analytic treatment of the α -process, we can clearly see the individual roles of the initial electron fraction, entropy, and dynamic time scale in determining the neutron-to-seed ratio. In addition to specifying the overall availability of neutrons (cf. eq. [8b]), the initial electron fraction serves to direct the path of nuclear flow during the α -process. As our analytic treatment indicates, the comparison of $Y_{e,i}$ with the ratio $\overline{Z}/\overline{A}$ for the typical seed distribution reflects whether α -particles or neutrons are mainly consumed during the α -process. The influence of entropy is manifested through the density dependences of the equilibrium abundance of ⁹Be (cf. eq. [12]) and the rate for burning α -particles (cf. eq. [11a]). Physically, a high entropy means many photons per baryon in radiation-dominated conditions. A significant fraction of these photons can be on the high-energy tail of the Bose-Einstein distribution, and therefore can maintain a low ⁹Be abundance through the photo-disintegration reactions. In turn, this limits the overall efficiency of burning α -particles, and hence the production of seed nuclei. The dynamic time scale, or the expansion time, specifies the duration of the α -process (cf. eq. [6]). Obviously, the expansion time also acts to limit the production of seed nuclei. In general, a lower initial electron fraction, a higher entropy, and a shorter expansion time all give a larger neutron-to-seed ratio. It is most interesting to notice that for a given $Y_{e,i}$, the composition resulting from the α -process essentially only depends on the combination S^3/t_{exp} (cf. eqs. [20a] and [20b]). Consequently, the same neutron-to-seed ratio can be achieved for the same initial electron fraction with an expansion time 8 times shorter if the entropy is reduced by a factor of 2.

5. Conclusions

For reasonable assumptions regarding neutrino luminosity, neutron star mass and radius, and the time history for Y_e , the nucleosynthesis resulting from the analytic model developed in Paper I for the neutrino-driven wind does not resemble the solar *r*-process, although a number of interesting species in the mass range $90 \le A \le 120$ are produced. This failure may be a consequence of important (but unknown) physics neglected in Paper I, or our results may reflect the true nucleosynthesis from typical core-collapse-driven supernovae (however, see the discussion concerning the ejection of the wind material in §3). Extra (but, so far, artificial) energy input to the wind beyond the injection radius (where \dot{M} is determined) does give a successful *r*-process. Possible sources of this energy were discussed in Paper I.

A numerical survey has delineated the necessary combinations of key parameters

— Y_e , entropy, and expansion time — needed to produce the third *r*-process peak (i.e., the platinum peak). High entropy is not a unique requirement. A shorter expansion time also serves to limit the number of heavy seed nuclei produced and thus increase the neutron-to-seed ratio. A lower Y_e also leads to a larger neutron-to-seed ratio. The sensitivity of the neutron-to-seed ratio to Y_e diminishes as one proceeds to shorter expansion times, as does the sensitivity to the entropy. Specific values of Y_e , entropy, and expansion time to produce the third *r*-process peak are given in Table 5 and Figure 10.

Approximate analytic formulae (eqs. [20a] and [20b]) were derived that give the requisite entropy needed to produce the heavy r-process nuclei as functions of Y_e and expansion time. These equations can be used to gauge whether other unstudied supernova models or other astrophysical environments are appropriate sites for making r-process nuclei.

Given that the standard wind models, without artificial modification, produce a set of abundances distinct from the r-process, one must be concerned about the observational consequences. One possibility already mentioned is that important physics has still been omitted from the simple wind model — e.g., neutrino flavor mixing, added energy input from shocks, rotation, or magnetic fields, convection, etc. — and that the conditions required for the r-process may still ultimately be achieved in common core-collapse-driven supernovae. Perhaps material having a much lower Y_e than calculated by Wilson in Woosley et al. (1994) is ejected (Burrows, Hayes, & Fryxell 1995). Another possibility which must be seriously considered however, is that the r-process has more than one important site and neutron exposure.

Sneden et al. (1996) and Cowan et al. (1996) have observed elements attributed to the third *r*-process peak in the metal poor halo giant stars HD 126238 ([Fe/H] = -1.7) and CS 22892-052 ([Fe/H] = -3.1). In HD 126238, the scaled solar abundances of both Os and Pt have been clearly observed. Both elements are made almost exclusively by the r-process and fit the solar r-process abundance pattern. Similar results hold for the more metal poor star CS 22892-052, although Pt was not observed and the detection of Os is less certain. Coupled with previous data, the fit to the solar r-process pattern for all elements between Ba and Os is striking, suggesting that, for this range of nuclei, the solar r-process abundance distribution appears to be made in its entirety in the progenitor(s) of these metal poor stars. This result argues for a primary production scenario. Due to the star's very low metallicity, especially so for CS 22892-052, the observed r-process abundance pattern probably arose from only a few supernovae.

Interestingly, the abundance pattern for CS 22892-052 shows that elements in the first neutron capture peak (Sr, Y, and Zr) are below their scaled solar r-process fractions relative to Pt, Os, and Th, yet well above the the iron group. Thus locally the r-process abundances seem solar, but globally they are not. Sneden et al. (1996) suggest that the bulk of the solar abundance of Sr, Y, and Zr is due to the s-process, but these nuclei are also easily produced in the neutrino-driven wind (Figure 1 here; Woosley & Hoffman 1992; Witti, Janka, & Takahashi 1994; Woosley et al. 1994). This is consistent with the existence of two sources for the r-process, one responsible for production of the r-isotopes for Z < 56, including those in the N = 50 peak, and the other for the heavier elements, possibly operating in another site or a higher entropy version of the same site.

A very different type of r-process would arise also for much shorter expansion times, as might occur in accretion induced collapse where the wind is not slowed down by a massive overlying mantle (Woosley & Baron 1992; Woosley & Hoffman 1992). A high entropy r-process with short expansion time could occur through ejection by relativistic jets in coalescing neutron stars (Ruffert et al. 1996). With short expansion times, the duration of the neutron capture phase of the r-process may require special consideration. If the material undergoing nucleosynthesis cannot be slowed down during the neutron capture phase, the *r*-process may have to be accelerated by ν_e captures on heavy nuclei (Nadyozhin & Panov 1993). Ultimately, observational signatures of these very distinct physical processes may be needed to resolve the nature and site(s) of the *r*-process.

We would like to thank George Fuller and Gail McLaughlin for very helpful discussions concerning the evolution of Y_e in the neutrino-driven wind and also for providing the neutrino capture rates used in this work. We also gratefully acknowledge the Institute for Nuclear Theory at the University of Washington and the Max-Planck Institute for Astrophysik for their generous hospitality during completion of this paper. This work was supported by NSF grant No. AST 94-17161 at UCSC. Woosley was also supported by an Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung in Germany. Y.-Z. Qian was supported by the D. W. Morrisroe Fellowship at Caltech.

REFERENCES

- Anders, E., & Grevesse, N. 1989, Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta, 53, 197
- Burrows, A., Hayes, J., & Fryxell, B. A. 1995, ApJ, 450, 830
- Cowan, J. J., Thielemann, F.-K., & Truran, J. W. 1991, Phys. Rep., 208, 267
- Cowan, J. J., Sneden, C., Truran, J. W., & Burris, D. L. 1996, ApJ, in press.
- Duncan, R. C., Shapiro, S. L., & Wasserman, I. 1986, ApJ, 309, 141
- Freiburghaus, Ch., Kolbe, E., Rauscher, T., Thielemann, F.-K., Kratz, K.-L., & Pfeiffer,
 B. 1996, in *Fourth International Symposium on Nuclear Astrophysics* University of Notre Dame, USA
- Fuller, G. M., & Meyer, B. S. 1995, ApJ, 453, 792
- Hoffman, R. D., Woosley, S. E., Fuller, G. M., & Meyer, B. S. 1996, ApJ, 460, 478
- Howard, W. M., Goriely, S., Rayet, M., & Arnould, M. 1993, ApJ, 417, 713
- McLaughlin, G. C., & Fuller, G. M. 1995, ApJ, 455, 202
- McLaughlin, G. C., Fuller, G. M., & Wilson, J. R. 1996, ApJ, in press.
- Mathews, G. J., & Cowan, J. J. 1990, Nature, 345, 491
- Meyer, B. S. 1995, ApJ, 449, L55
- Meyer, B. S. & Brown, J. 1996, in *Fourth International Symposium on Nuclear Astrophysics* University of Notre Dame, USA
- Nadyozhin, D. K. & Panov, I. V. 1993, in Proc. Int. Symp. on Weak and Electromagnetic Interactions in Nuclei (WEIN-92), Ts. D. Vylov, ed. (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993) p. 479

- Qian, Y.-Z., Fuller, G. M., Mathwes, G. J., Mayle, R. W., Wilson, J. R., & Woosley, S. E. 1993, Phys. Rev. Lett., 71, 1965
- Qian, Y.-Z., & Woosley, S. E. 1996, (Paper I) ApJ, in press.
- Ruffert, M., Janka, H.-Th., Takahashi, K., & Schäfer, G. 1996, A&A, submitted.
- Sneden, C., McWilliam, A., Preston, G. W., Cowan, J. J., Burris, D. L., and Amorsky, B. J. 1996, ApJ, in press.
- Takahashi, K., Witti, J., & Janka, H.-Th. 1994, A&A, 286, 857
- Takahashi, K. 1996, in Proceedings of the 8th Annual Ringburg Conference on Supernovae and Nucleosynthesis.
- Timmes, F. X., Woosley, S. E., & Weaver, T. A. 1995, ApJS, 98, 617
- Witti, J., Janka, H.-Th., & Takahashi, K. 1994, A&A, 286, 841
- Woosley, S. E., & Baron, E. 1992, ApJ, 391, 228
- Woosley, S. E., & Hoffman, R. D. 1992, ApJ, 395, 202
- Woosley, S. E., & Weaver, T. A. 1993, in Supernovae: Les Houches Summer School Vol 54, eds. S. Bludman, R. Mochkovitch, & J. Zinn-Justin, (Amsterdam: North Holland)
- Woosley, S. E., & Weaver, T. A. 1995, ApJS, 101, 181
- Woosley, S. E., Wilson, J. R., Mathews, G. J., Hoffman, R. D., & Meyer, B. S. 1994, ApJ, 433, 229
- Wrean, P. R., Brune, C. R. & Kavanagh, R. W. 1994, Phys. Rev. C, 49, 1205

This manuscript was prepared with the AAS IATEX macros v4.0.

Fig. 1.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 10A: M = 1.4 M_{\odot}, R = 10 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 1.8 \times 10^{52}$ erg s⁻¹. Nuclei with N = 50 closed neutron-shell dominate the nucleosynthesis.

Fig. 2.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 10B: M = 1.4 M_{\odot}, R = 10 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 6.0 \times 10^{51} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

Fig. 3.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 10C: M = 1.4 M_{\odot}, R = 10 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 3.6 \times 10^{51} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

Fig. 4.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 10D: M = 2.0 M_{\odot}, R = 10 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 1.8 \times 10^{52} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

Fig. 5.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 10E: M = 2.0 M_{\odot}, R = 10 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 6.0 \times 10^{51} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

Fig. 6.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 10F: M = 2.0 M_{\odot}, R = 10 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 3.6 \times 10^{51} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. Fig. 7.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 30A: $M = 1.4 M_{\odot}$, R = 30 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 1.8 \times 10^{53} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. These conditions lead to the production of species in the iron group.

Fig. 8.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 30B: M = 1.4 M_{\odot}, R = 30 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 6.0 \times 10^{52} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$.

Fig. 9.— Nucleosynthesis in KEPLER wind model 30C: M = 1.4 M_{\odot}, R = 30 km, $L_{\nu tot} = 3.6 \times 10^{52}$ erg s⁻¹. The production of ⁶⁴Zn (made as itself), a unique signature of the neutrino-driven wind, suggests that such winds have likely occurred in nature.

Fig. 10.— The combinations of Y_e , entropy, and expansion time required for the production of the $A \sim 195 \ r$ -process peak nuclei. Circles connected by lines are for various fixed expansion times. Shown are the values derived in the numerical study using equation (7) (filled circles) and those from the analytic approximation (eqs. [20a] and [20b], open circles). The filled squares represent results from the numerical survey that used an exact adiabatic equation of state.

Fig. 11.— The temperature dependent function $g(T_9)$ (eq. [17]). The main contribution to the integral of $g(T_9)$ comes from $T_9 > 4$.

	no- ν	$ u(\mathrm{np^a})$	$ u(\mathrm{np},\!\alpha^\mathrm{b})$	$ u(\mathrm{np},^{A}Z^{\mathrm{c}})$	$ u(\mathrm{np}, \alpha, {}^{A}Z)$				
Model 10A: $S \sim 74, Y_{e,i} = 0.465, \tau_{\rm dyn} = 0.024 \text{ s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.465	.470	.470	.470	.470				
Ā	85.1	81.0	80.7	80.3	80.7				
X_{α}	.456	.501	.506	.508	.504				
X_n	$4.4(-12)^{d}$	3.0(-12)	3.4(-12)	3.3(-12)					
Model 10B: $S \sim 87, Y_{e,i} = 0.372, \tau_{\rm dyn} = 0.066 \ {\rm s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.373 .393		.395	.396	.394				
\bar{A}	98.5	96.8	96.6	96.6	96.8				
X_{α}	.167	.200	.204	.205	.201				
X_n	4.73(-2)	1.42(-2)	1.17(-2)	1.07(-2)	1.28(-2)				
Model 10C: $S \sim 94, Y_{e,i} = 0.354, \tau_{dyn} = 0.11 \text{ s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.355	.386	.390	.391	.387				
\bar{A}	99.8	97.7	97.3	97.3	97.7				
X_{α}	.135	.173	.178	.180	.174				
X_n	7.75(-2)	2.10(-2)	1.57(-2)	1.42(-2)	1.91(-2)				

Table 1. Nucleosynthesis in Wind Models 10A-C

 $^{\mathrm{a}}\nu_{e}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{e}$ captures on nucleons (np)

^bneutral-current neutrino spallations on α -particles (α)

 ${}^{\mathrm{c}}\nu_e$ captures on heavy nuclei $({}^{A}Z)$

 $^{\mathrm{d}}x(y) \equiv x \times 10^{y}$

	no- ν	$ u(\mathrm{np^a})$	$ u(\mathrm{np},\!\alpha^\mathrm{b})$	$ u(\mathrm{np},^{A}Z^{\mathrm{c}})$	$ u(\mathrm{np}, \alpha, {}^{A}Z)$				
Model 10D: $S \sim 109, Y_{e,i} = 0.465, \tau_{\rm dyn} = 0.024$ s									
$Y_{e,f}$	$Y_{e,f}$.465 .470 .471 .471								
Ā	90.0	89.0	89.0	88.9	88.9				
X_{α}	.642	.679	.682	.683	.683				
X_n	$1.78(-5)^{d}$	1.92(-6)	1.74(-6)	1.22(-6)					
Model 10E: $S \sim 129, Y_{e,i} = 0.372, \tau_{\rm dyn} = 0.066 \ {\rm s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.372	.396	.398	.399	.399				
Ā	98.0	97.2	97.1	97.2	97.2				
X_{α}	.302	.345	.348 .348		.348				
X_n	9.54(-2)	5.10(-2)	4.80(-2)	4.66(-2)	4.66(-2)				
Model 10F: $S \sim 140, Y_{e,i} = 0.354, \tau_{dyn} = 0.11 \text{ s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.355	.390	.393	.393	.393				
\bar{A}	99.1	98.1	97.9	98.0	98.0				
X_{α}	.262	.315	.320	.321	.321				
X_n	1.26(-2)	5.69(-2)	5.16(-2)	4.99(-2)	4.99(-2)				

Table 2. Nucleosynthesis in Wind Models 10D-F

 $^{\mathrm{a}}\nu_{e}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{e}$ captures on nucleons (np)

^bneutral-current neutrino spallations on α -particles (α)

 ${}^{\mathrm{c}}\nu_e$ captures on heavy nuclei $({}^{A}Z)$

 $^{\mathrm{d}}x(y) \equiv x \times 10^{y}$

	no- ν	$ u(np^a)$	$\nu(np, \alpha^b)$	$ u(\mathrm{np},^{A}Z^{\mathrm{c}})$	$ u(\mathrm{np}, \alpha, {}^{A}Z)$				
Model 30A: $S \sim 24, Y_{e,i} = 0.510, \tau_{dyn} = 0.032$ s									
$Y_{e,f}$.510	.508	.508						
\bar{A}	56.1	56.1	56.1	56.1	56.1				
X_{α}	.271	.271	.271	.272	.272				
X_n	$3.(-18)^{d}$	1.(-15)	1.(-15)	1.(-15) 1.(-15) 1					
Model 30 B: $S \sim 26, Y_{e,i} = 0.488, \tau_{\rm dyn} = 0.075 \ {\rm s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.488	.489	.489	.490	.489				
\bar{A}	58.1	58.0	57.9	57.9	58.0				
X_{α}	.220	.223	.224	.225	.223				
X_n	3.(-15)	2.(-15)	2.(-15)	3.(-15)	3.(-15)				
Model 30C: $S \sim 28, Y_{e,i} = 0.481, \tau_{dyn} = 0.12 \text{ s}$									
$Y_{e,f}$.481	.483	.484	.484	.483				
\bar{A}	59.6	59.1	59.0	58.9	59.1				
X_{α}	.181	.190	.194	.194	.191				
X_n	7.(-15)	7.(-15)	7.(-15)	9.(-15)	1.(-14)				

Table 3. Nucleosynthesis in Wind Models 30A-C

 $^{\mathrm{a}}\nu_{e}$ and $\bar{\nu}_{e}$ captures on nucleons (np)

^bneutral-current neutrino spallations on α -particles (α)

 ${}^{\mathrm{c}}\nu_e$ captures on heavy nuclei $({}^{A}Z)$

 $^{\mathrm{d}}x(y) \equiv x \times 10^{y}$

	no- ν	$ u(\mathrm{np^a})$	$ u(\mathrm{np},\!\alpha^\mathrm{b})$	$\nu(\mathrm{np},^{A}Z^{\mathrm{c}})$	$ u(\mathrm{np}, \alpha, {}^{A}Z)$
	Modif	fied Model 10F:	$S \sim 192, Y_{e,i} = 0$.354, $\tau_{\rm dyn} = 0.022$ s	S
		2.02	2.02		
$Y_{e,f}$.354	.363	.363	.363	.363
Ā	89.7	91.0	91.0	91.0	91.0
X_{α}	.615	.629	.629	.629	.629
X_n	.258	.240	.240	.240	.240

Table 4. Nucleosynthesis in Modified Wind Model 10F with Extra Energy Input

 ${}^{\rm a}\nu_e$ and $\bar\nu_e$ captures on nucleons (np)

^bneutral-current neutrino spallations on α -particles (α)

 ${}^{\mathrm{c}}\nu_e$ captures on heavy nuclei (^AZ)

 \bar{Z} \bar{A} $t_{\rm exp}(s)$ $Y_{e,f}$ S $X_{\alpha,f}$ $X_{n,f}$ n/s0.0050.200 280.0740.46235.8101.81010.250580.2390.396 34.7 97.01050.30081 0.3910.320 33.993.8 1040.3501030.5450.24233.391.31040.4001240.6960.16332.989.4 1030.4500.8520.08332.487.2 145111 0.4601470.8820.06732.286.6 1120.4701440.9100.05032.085.8 1080.4801310.9420.03332.287.9 1160.4900.9700.01634.797.11071170.4951120.00741.1116.00.983850.0250.201500.0810.466 36.1101.81050.251950.2320.39335.297.9 1030.3011360.3930.320 34.494.7 1060.3500.24492.11101750.55133.7 0.4002100.7000.16433.390.010932.90.4502450.8520.08388.2 111 0.4602500.8820.06632.8 87.8 1120.4702550.9120.05032.7 87.3 1150.4802490.941 0.03332.586.5 1100.49022399.71000.9700.01535.80.4952100.9840.00741.7117.282 0.050.065102.6980.202 550.45736.4

Table 5. Results from the Numerical Survey Using $S \approx 3.33 T_9^3 / \rho_5$

- 34 -

Table 5—Continued

t (g)	V	Q	V	V	Ź	Ā	<i>m</i> /a
$\iota_{\exp}(s)$	$I_{e,f}$	D	$\Lambda_{\alpha,f}$	$\Lambda_{n,f}$	Z	Л	11/5
	0.252	120	0.236	0.393	35.4	98.3	104
	0.301	170	0.394	0.320	34.6	95.1	106
	0.351	217	0.550	0.243	34.0	92.6	108
	0.401	263	0.702	0.164	33.5	90.4	110
	0.451	310	0.852	0.082	33.2	88.8	111
	0.461	315	0.883	0.066	33.0	88.2	114
	0.471	320	0.912	0.049	33.0	87.9	113
	0.481	323	0.942	0.033	32.9	87.4	113
	0.490	295	0.970	0.015	35.4	97.6	101
	0.495	278	0.984	0.006	41.9	117.7	83
0.1	0.204	70	0.067	0.453	36.6	103.2	97
	0.253	145	0.228	0.386	35.7	99.2	99
	0.302	210	0.392	0.316	34.9	95.8	103
	0.352	268	0.548	0.240	34.2	93.2	106
	0.402	325	0.702	0.162	33.7	90.9	108
	0.451	385	0.853	0.081	33.4	89.2	109
	0.461	390	0.883	0.064	33.3	88.8	108
	0.471	400	0.913	0.048	33.2	88.4	110
	0.481	410	0.944	0.032	33.1	87.9	113
	0.491	392	0.973	0.015	32.5	85.9	108
	0.496	369	0.986	0.006	42.5	118.8	78
0.25	0.210	105	0.082	0.443	37.1	104.5	97
	0.258	200	0.239	0.378	36.2	100.2	99

$t_{\rm exp}(s)$	$Y_{e,f}$	S	$X_{\alpha,f}$	$X_{n,f}$	\bar{Z}	Ā	n/s
	0.000	00 F	0.401	0.000			100
	0.306	285	0.401	0.309	35.3	96.8	103
	0.355	360	0.555	0.234	34.6	94.1	104
	0.404	435	0.707	0.157	34.1	91.6	106
	0.453	520	0.859	0.078	33.7	89.7	110
	0.463	530	0.887	0.061	33.7	89.6	105
	0.473	544	0.919	0.045	33.5	88.9	111
	0.483	565	0.949	0.029	33.4	88.4	115
	0.493	567	0.978	0.012	33.1	86.7	107
	0.498	532	0.990	0.004	43.7	121.8	80

Table 5—Continued



°X/X















°X/X



°X/X



