

An Irradiation Effect in Nova DN Gem 1912 and the Significance of the Period Gap for Classical Novae

A. Retter^{1,2}, E.M. Leibowitz² and T. Naylor¹

¹*Dept. of Physics, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, U.K.; ar@astro.keele.ac.uk; timn@astro.keele.ac.uk*

²*School of Physics and Astronomy and the Wise Observatory, Raymond and Beverly Sackler Faculty of Exact Sciences, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv, 69978, Israel; elia@wise.tau.ac.il*

Accepted 1999 April 1. Received ???; in original form ???

ABSTRACT

Continuous CCD photometry of the classical nova DN Gem during 52 nights in the years 1992–98 reveals a modulation with a period 0.127844 d. The semi-amplitude is about 0.03 mag. The stability of the variation suggests that it is the orbital period of the binary system. This interpretation makes DN Gem the fourth nova inside the cataclysmic variable (CV) period gap, as defined by Diaz & Bruch (1997), and it bolsters the idea that there is no period gap for classical novae. However, the number of known nova periods is still too small to establish this idea statistically. We eliminate several possible mechanisms for the variation, and propose that the modulation is driven by an irradiation effect. We find that model light curves of an irradiated secondary star, fit the data well. The inclination angle of the system is restricted by this model to $10^\circ \lesssim i \lesssim 65^\circ$. We also refine a previous estimate of the distance to the binary system, and find $d=1.6\pm0.6$ kpc.

Key words:

accretion, accretion discs - novae, cataclysmic variables - radiative transfer - stars: individuals: DN Gem - stars: individuals: V1974 Cyg

1 INTRODUCTION - HISTORY OF OBSERVATIONS ON DN GEM

Nova DN Geminorum is an old classical nova, which erupted in 1912, and reached a peak magnitude of $m_V \approx 3.5$. The visual light curve of the nova a few months after the outburst was characterized by two maxima, and by strong oscillations. The nova was recognized as a fast one, with $t_{2V} \approx 16d$, and $t_{3V} \approx 37d$ (McLaughlin 1960).

The spectrum of the nova at quiescence shows a strong continuum, with weak emission lines (Humason 1938; Williams 1983). Warner (1986) deduced an inclination angle of about 50° from a comparison of the emission line widths of the nova with a few other classical novae, whose inclination angles are known from eclipses, assuming that the lines emanate from an accretion disc. Duerbeck, Lemke and Willerding (1979) deduced a distance of $d=450\pm70$ pc, $A_V = 0.27\pm0.13$ and $M_{V(max)} = -5.3\pm0.5$ from interstellar lines in the nova spectrum.

Robinson and Nather (1977) failed in their search for rapid oscillations in DN Gem and nine more classical novae. Retter and Leibowitz (1996), however, reported the detection of a sinusoidal variation with a period of

0.12785 ± 0.00005 d and a peak-to-trough amplitude of about 0.06 mag. In this work, we present the results of the photometry of Nova Geminorum, and discuss in detail the possible mechanisms that can generate the light modulation. Nova DN Gem 1912 is the fourth nova whose period is close to the upper edge of the period gap distribution of CVs. In Section 4.7 we discuss the implications of this fact.

2 OBSERVATIONS

We observed Nova DN Gem during 14 nights in the years 1992–93 through an R filter, in the I filter during 34 nights in 1995–97, and continuously switched between the I and B filters during four nights in 1998. Table 1 presents a summary of the observation schedule. The photometry was carried out with the 1-m telescope at the Wise Observatory, with the Tektronix 1K CCD camera. Our R , V and B filters are the standard Cousins filters. The I filter is pseudo-Johnson, i.e. its red end is determined by the CCD response. The typical exposures times were 3–4 m in the I and R bands and 7 m in the B band. We note that most of our observations in 1995–8 were obtained during bright phases of the moon.




Figure 1. All 1995-8 data points (*I* band) are presented. The empty circles display the mean of each night. There is a variation of the order of a few tens per cent between adjacent nights.

In addition, one snapshot through each of the *B*, *V*, *R* and *I* filters was taken during each of the nights of 1996 October, 4th and 1997 November, 27th, together with a series of exposures of nearby standard stars. Unfortunately, the photometric solutions were poor during both occasions. The magnitudes of Nova Gem 1912, measured during the latter night are: $m_B = 15.8$, $m_V = 16.0$, $m_R = 15.7$, $m_I = 15.4$. Error is about 0.2 mag globally.

Aperture photometric measurements were performed using the DAOPHOT program (Stetson 1987). Instrumental magnitudes of the nova, as well as of 3 to 20 reference stars, depending on each image quality were obtained from the frames. An internally consistent series of nova magnitudes was obtained by using the Wise Observatory reduction program DAOSTAT (Netzer et al. 1996).

We did not consider the points of 1997 March 27 in our analysis, because it seems that a wrong filter was accidentally used. Thus, the number of remaining frames obtained in each filter on our programme is: 2039 (I), 295 (R), 2 (V) and 57 (B).

3 DATA ANALYSIS

A variation at $P \approx 3$ hr and a full amplitude of about 5 - 10% can be seen by simple visual inspection of the light curve in a few of our best nights. In addition, the nightly mean varied by a few tenths mag from night to night with $\sigma \approx 0.09$ mag - more than three times larger than the mean error for a single data point. In Fig. 1 the observations in the *I* band during 1995-8 are plotted. The points represent the raw data, while the circles display nightly means.

The power spectrum of the 1995-8 data obtained through the *I* filter is shown in Fig. 2. The de-trending was carried out by subtracting the mean from each night. The highest peak in the graph corresponds to the periodicity of 0.127844 ± 0.000001 d. This period appears also in the power spectrum of each of the years 1992, 1993, 1995-6 winter and 1996-7 winter separately. The peak is many σ above the noise level. The fact that it is detected even in the light curves of most of our long-duration nights makes it also highly signif-

Table 1. The observations time table

UT Date	Time of Start (HJD)	Run Time (hours)	Points number	Filter/s
230192	2448645.198	6.8	37	R
240192	2448646.213	0.5	4	R
250192	2448647.186	9.3	53	R
230492	2448735.238	0.5	6	R
240492	2448736.233	1.6	17	R
250492	2448737.228	2.3	23	R
280193	2449016.490	1.3	14	R
110293	2449030.208	7.6	39	R
120293	2449031.204	0.4	3	R
130293	2449032.194	1.4	8	R
140293	2449033.196	7.8	39	R
020493	2449080.247	2.3	10	R
030493	2449081.233	3.6	19	R
090493	2449087.241	3.0	21	R
111295	2450063.442	0.3	8	I
121295	2450064.475	3.2	85	I
131295	2450065.492	2.7	46	I
020196	2450085.416	4.8	83	I
030196	2450086.507	3.6	57	I
090196	2450092.398	5.8	106	I
100196	2450093.423	2.5	25	I
130196	2450096.411	4.5	84	I
140196	2450097.522	2.8	53	I
300196	2450113.269	7.6	46	I
030296	2450117.192	9.3	124	I
050296	2450119.189	6.4	87	I
080396	2450151.234	2.7	36	I
090396	2450152.195	2.8	37	I
110396	2450154.189	0.6	9	I
290396	2450172.214	5.2	52	I
310396	2450174.209	5.3	76	I
041096	2450361.202	0.3	1,1,1,1	I,R,V,B
231196	2450411.493	3.2	54	I
151296	2450433.431	3.8	55	I
201296	2450438.375	4.9	70	I
221296	2450440.310	6.9	100	I
150197	2450464.251	1.6	24	I
170197	2450466.194	6.8	92	I
250297	2450505.274	3.5	50	I
260297	2450506.188	3.0	43	I
270297	2450507.199	7.5	94	I
280297	2450508.197	7.6	107	I
010397	2450509.295	3.3	7	I
260397	2450534.196	4.2	55	I
270397	2450535.216	4.3	36	?
290397	2450537.206	4.7	61	I
300397	2450538.202	5.6	78	I
210497	2450560.216	3.5	48	I
230497	2450562.259	1.7	21	I
271197	2450780.303	0.3	1,1,1,1	I,R,V,B
090198	2450823.253	8.3	47,45	I,B
100198	2450824.279	4.0	8	I
130198	2450827.509	0.6	3,3	I,B
140198	2450828.255	1.3	6,7	I,B

icant. The other peaks seen in the graph around the highest peak are identified as aliases. The group of peaks at the left hand side of the diagram corresponds to periodicities that are longer than the typical interval of observations in each night, and might reflect the noise added to our data by the presence of the moonlight. A consistent search for a second




Figure 2. The power spectrum of the 1995-8 points (*I* band). The highest peak at the frequency 7.82204 d^{-1} , marked as P, corresponds to the period 0.127844 d .

real periodicity in the light curve with the various techniques discussed by Retter, Leibowitz & Ofek (1997) was not fruitful.

In Fig. 3 we present the mean light curve of the 1995-8 observations. We omitted from the data the nights in which the duration of the observations was shorter than one full cycle. The light curve shows a symmetrical sinusoidal variation. The first harmonic fit to the data yields a semi amplitude of 0.028 ± 0.005 . The error corresponds to a 99% confidence level, and it was calculated by a sample of 1000 Bootstrap simulations (Efron & Tibshirani 1993).

The semi amplitude of the periodicity in the 1992-3 data is very similar to this value in the 1995-8 data - 0.031 ± 0.008 , and the shape of the mean light curve is a sinusoidal, too. It seems that there is no systematic difference in the amplitude of the variation in the two bands (*I* and *R*). However, the amplitude of the period in the *B* band, which is derived only from a single night (1998 January, 9th) is consistent with zero. Taking into account the interval length of the observations during this night (8.3 h), and the fact that the variation is clearly detected in the *I* band data of the same night, we believe that this result is significant.

The best fitted ephemeris of the periodicity is:

$$T_{min} = \text{HJD } 2450823.2866 + 0.127844 \text{ E.} \\ \pm 0.0005 \pm 0.000001$$

4 DISCUSSION

4.1 The distance problem

Duerbeck et al. (1979) found a distance of $d=450 \pm 70 \text{ pc.}$, $A_V = 0.27 \pm 0.13$ and $M_{V(max)} = -5.3 \pm 0.5$ (Section 1). The later value is very faint compared with typical values of novae (Warner 1986, 1995). Adopting these numbers and using the current visual magnitude of the nova ($m_V \approx 16$ - Section 2), we can use the distance modulus equation (Allen 1976):

$$m_V = M_V - 5 + 5 \log(d) + A_V \quad (1)$$




Figure 3. The *I* filter light curve of the nights in 1995-8, folded on to the 3.1-h period and binned into 20 equal bins.

and find $M_{V(1997)} = 7.4 \pm 0.6$ for DN Gem. This brightness is relatively faint for old novae (Warner 1986; Naylor & Somers 1997), and suggests a very low rate of mass transfer. Alternatively, the distance estimate might be wrong. In addition, when we use equation (7) of Retter & Leibowitz (1998), with a typical white dwarf mass of $1M_\odot$, we find that Duerbeck et al.'s values put Nova Geminorum well below the critical line for the thermal stability limit. This means, that as a probable non-magnetic CV (see arguments for this below), the system should have regular dwarf nova outbursts such as those observed in Nova V446 Her 1960 (Honeycutt, Robertson & Turner, 1995; Honeycutt et al. 1998). We, therefore, estimate the distance to the system in a different manner - by the $t_2 - M_V$ relation (Warner 1995). Using $t_{2V} \approx 16d$ (McLaughlin 1960), we obtain $d=1600 \pm 600 \text{ pc.}$ We adopt this value, which is much larger than the previous estimate, in this work. The corresponding absolute magnitude of DN Gem in outburst and in 1998 are $M_{V(max)} = -7.7 \pm 1.0$, and $M_{V(current)} = 4.5 \pm 1.0$. These values are almost identical with the estimates of Warner (1986) using the same method, but with a slightly different value of t_2 . They are typical of absolute magnitudes of novae.

4.2 Identification of the photometric period

We propose that the periodicity that prevails in the light curve of DN Gem through more than five years of photometric observations, $P \approx 3.1 \text{ h}$, is the orbital period of the underlying binary system. This suggestion is based mainly on the fact that this period was present in all yearly light curves, with no apparent change in its value, amplitude or shape. Typical orbital periods of nova systems range between $P_{orb}=1.5 - 9 \text{ h}$ with a peak around 4 h (Diaz & Bruch 1997), so the proposed orbital period of DN Gem fits in the observed orbital period distribution of novae. Naturally, radial velocity measurements are required in order to confirm this suggestion.

4.3 Classification of the system and identification of the variation - general remarks

There are a few mechanisms that can generate such variation in old novae. In many cases the various forms of accretion (i.e. accretion disc, accretion columns and bright spot) cause modulations in the light. Accretion plays an important role in the light curve of novae after only a few months to years after outbursts (Retter et al. 1997; Retter, Leibowitz & Kovo-Kariti 1998) and certainly many decades afterwards (Bode & Evans 1989). We observed fluctuations of up to 20-30% in the mean magnitude of adjacent nights presented in the light curve of DN Gem (Fig. 1). Such modulations in CVs are usually interpreted as fluctuations of the accretion source.

A major question is whether the white dwarf has a strong magnetic field (the accretion is maintained through accretion column/s) or whether the system is non-magnetic (the accretion stream forms an accretion disc around the white dwarf). We believe that based on the spectrum of DN Gem, which is characterized by a strong continuum and only weak absorption lines (Hummason 1938; Williams 1983), the first scenario can be eliminated, since AM Her systems have strong emission lines in their spectra (Warner 1995). The typical optical spectra, radiated from accretion discs, are characterized by a strong continuum, because the disc is usually optically thick in classical nova systems a few decades after their eruptions (Retter, Naylor & Leibowitz 1999).

In the next few sections we examine a few models for the nova and for the variation, and analyse them in the light of our data. One option - an eclipse of one of the light sources of the system (for example the accretion disc), can be immediately ruled out from an inspection of the shape of the mean light curve (Fig. 3), which is sinusoidal and does not resemble an eclipse.

4.4 An intermediate polar model?

Intermediate polars (for reviews see Patterson 1994; Hellier 1995, 1996, 1998) are a subclass of CVs. In intermediate polar systems the rotation of the primary white dwarf is not synchronized with the orbital motion of the binary system, unlike the AM Her systems. The spin periods found in intermediate polars are much shorter than their orbital periods (Patterson 1994; Hellier 1996), and range between 33 s in AE Aqr (Hellier 1996) to 1.44 h in Nova V1425 Aql 1995 (Retter, Leibowitz & Kovo-Kariti 1998). It is believed that in most intermediate polars the accretion is maintained most of the time through an accretion disc (Patterson 1994; Hellier 1996).

The power spectrum of Nova Geminorum (Fig. 2) is inconsistent with a significant second periodicity in addition to the main period (Section 3). Our relatively long (3-4 m) exposure times do not, however, allow us to eliminate the possibility of a very short spin period of the order of a few tens of seconds. Nevertheless, Robinson & Nather (1977) made a high speed photometric search in unfiltered light for very short periods in a sample of ten novae, including DN Gem. No such period was found in Nova Gem 1912 up to 0.0022 mag and to the Nyquist frequency (0.1 Hz). This fact suggests that unless the spin period of Nova Gem 1912

is shorter than all known intermediate polar periods, there is no short spin period in Nova Geminorum.

The intermediate polar model cannot be definitely ruled out. We could consider the observed 3.1 h period as the spin period itself, speculating that a possible longer period (the orbital period) has not been detected so far. If this suggestion were true, the spin period of this system would be the longest among all known intermediate polar systems. However, we believe that a better interpretation for the 3.1 h period is that it is the orbital period of the binary system (Section 4.2).

We conclude that it is very unlikely that an intermediate polar model fits the nova.

4.5 A permanent superhump system?

Permanent superhumps are quasi-periodic oscillations that appear in the light curve of relatively bright CV systems (Osaki 1996; Retter & Leibowitz 1998; Patterson 1999; Retter & Naylor in preparation), with short orbital periods ($P_{\text{orbital}}=17\text{--}225$ m). The superhump period is a few per cent longer than the orbital period (la Dous 1993). The precession of the accretion disc, which surrounds the white dwarf is believed to be the reason for the light variation (Osaki 1989, 1996).

As a bright, short orbital period CV, Nova Gem 1912 is a natural permanent superhump candidate. The fact that the power spectrum of the nova (Fig. 2) does not reveal two periodicities in the light curve does not rule out this hypothesis. First, we believe that we can reject the possibility that the periodicity we detect in Nova Geminorum is a superhump period, based on the stability of the observed period (Sections 3 and 4.2) and on the fact that the superhump variation is believed to be stronger in the blue bands (Warner 1995). Observationally, in one well-investigated object (Nova V1974 Cygni 1992), the amplitude of the permanent superhump variation was very similar in the *B*, *V* and *I* bands (Semeniuk et al. 1994, 1995; Olech et al. 1996; Skillman et al. 1997; Retter et al. 1997). This is unlike the variation in DN Gem, which is below our detection limit in the *B* band (Section 3).

Even if we interpret the detected periodicity as the orbital period of the binary system, the permanent superhump scenario could be applied to the nova. Permanent superhumps, unlike the strict meaning of their name, are not permanently present in the light curves of systems bearing this name. An example is again V1974 Cyg, a well established permanent superhump system (Skillman et al. 1997; Retter et al. 1997), which is probably the best observed of its kind. The superhump variations were detected in 1994, and since then have been present most of the time in the nova light curve. During a few weeks in 1995 July-August, the superhump modulation either decreased sharply in amplitude or completely disappeared from the light curve (Retter et al. in preparation). Other permanent superhump systems show similar behaviour (Patterson 1998). We should also keep in mind that, as already mentioned in Section 2, most of the observations presented in this work, were not obtained in ideal conditions, but are rather low quality data, because they were carried out during bright phases of the moon. The resulting high noise level in the power spectrum (Fig. 2) may, therefore, hide a possible permanent superhump pe-

riodicity of low amplitude, or the orbital period itself, if the observed periodicity is interpreted as a superhump period.

We try here to test the permanent superhump hypothesis. Based on the tidal-disc instability model (Osaki 1989, 1996), and assuming that the accretion disc is the dominant light source in the visual band, Retter & Leibowitz (1998) developed a way to check the thermal stability of CVs. Permanent superhumps are supposed to be developed in thermally stable discs, while SU UMa systems (performing regular superhumps in their light curves) are thermally unstable. In this method, the current mass transfer rate of the CV system is estimated by a few system parameters, and compared with the critical thermal instability value.

We use the parameters of DN Gem in the equations of Retter & Leibowitz. The current visual magnitude of DN Gem is $m_V \approx 16.0$ (Section 2), and the distance, $d = 1600 \pm 600$ pc (Section 4.1). We use the interstellar reddening, $A_V = 0.27 \pm 0.13$, which was determined by Duerbeck et al. (1979), although it should be somewhat higher as we believe that they underestimated the distance (Section 4.1). To our knowledge, there is no cited value in the literature for the white dwarf mass, however $M_{WD} \approx 1 M_\odot$ is a typical value for nova primaries, and a large change in this value doesn't alter our final conclusion. Inserting all these values into equation (8) of Retter & Leibowitz (1998), we get $\dot{M} \approx 4 \pm 3 \times 10^{17} \text{ g s}^{-1}$. The critical value of the mass transfer, which we get from equation (1) of Retter & Leibowitz, is about $2 \times 10^{17} \text{ g s}^{-1}$, so the system is very close to the thermal instability border-line. A definite conclusion cannot be made.

As a concluding remark for this section, we say, that unless a superhump periodicity is found in the light curve of Nova Gem 1912 in the future, in addition to the observed (orbital) period, this scenario cannot be applicable for the system and seems to be excluded by the observations.

4.6 Light from the companion

In this section we test the idea that the variation is generated by light from the red dwarf. We discuss two models.

4.6.1 An ellipsoidal variation?

The ellipsoidal variation is caused by the distorted shape of the secondary star in the binary system, due to the tidal forces exerted by the primary white dwarf. The result is a change in the surface area of the companion, seen by the observer at different phases of the cycle. Such light curves typically have two maxima at phases -0.25 and $+0.25$ relative to conjunction. We believe that there is only a small chance that such a model fits the observational features of DN Gem, because a typical ellipsoidal light curve has a double a-symmetrical structure. The mean light curve of Nova Gem 1912 is sinusoidal (Fig. 3). When the mean light curve is folded onto the double period (6.14 h), there is no difference between the two minima within the error limit. An ellipsoidal variation model may, thus, fit the nova only if the change in the light at the two different phases of the cycle mentioned above is coincidentally similar to each other.

A very strong argument againsts the ellipsoidal variation effect as an explanation for the observed periodicity, is

that the secondary star is very weak, and thus doesn't contribute significantly to the overall light curve of the nova. Using equation 2.102 of Warner (1995) with the alleged period of 6.14 h (twice the periodicity), we find that the visual absolute magnitude of the red dwarf is only about $M_V \approx 8.0$. This value, and the current absolute magnitude of DN Gem (Section 4.1) suggests that the secondary star contributes insignificantly to the light in the binary system - only about 4-10%. Using the code we apply for the irradiation effect in the next section, we find that the amplitude of the ellipsoidal modulation can be only about 20% of this value or less than 2% of the total flux. This value is inconsistent with the observed peak-to-trough amplitude of about 6% (Section 3).

Based on the above two arguments, we conclude that it is unlikely that the variation is an ellipsoidal effect.

4.6.2 An irradiation effect?

The observed variation in Nova Gem can be simply explained by light coming from the secondary star in the system, illuminated by the vicinity of the white dwarf, or from the various forms of accretion, i.e. an accretion disc, a bright spot, or an accretion column. The typical shape of such a modulation is sinusoidal, which fits the folded light curve of Nova Geminorum 1912 (Fig. 3).

We investigated the plausibility of the modulation originating from the irradiation of the secondary star using the model described in Somers, Mukai & Naylor (1996) and Ioannou et al. (1999). The model consists of a steady-state accretion disc, flared so as to be triangular in cross section, with a hot central source which irradiates a Roche-lobe filling secondary star. We chose the white-dwarf to be $1 M_\odot$, and the secondary star to be $0.34 M_\odot$, appropriate for a main-sequence star which would fill the Roche-lobe at a binary period of 3.07 h (Bode & Evans 1989). The chosen pole temperature was 3440°K . The semi-opening angle of the disc was 10° . The disc radius was set at 70% of the Roche Lobe of the white dwarf - $0.7R_{L1}$, close to the tidal radius. For a flat disc, we then searched a two-dimensional χ^2 space in irradiating luminosity and binary inclination. At each point in the grid, we set the mass transfer rate to match the observed *I*-band magnitude, assuming three distances of 1.0, 1.6, 2.2 kpc (Section 4.1). Unsurprisingly the resulting χ^2 space showed that low inclinations required high irradiating luminosities, while high inclinations - low luminosities. The resulting light curves are almost indistinguishable from sine waves, and hence are good fits to the data, until the inclination is greater than about 60° , when the mutual eclipses of disc and secondary star begin to affect the shape. Thus, we can rule out these higher inclinations.

The irradiating luminosity is not outrageous for a flat disc (at a luminosity of about $10L_\odot$), even at an inclination of only about 10° . This is similar to the accretion luminosity, and therefore could be supplied even without a hot white dwarf. For a flared disc, the flare shadows the secondary star, and so higher luminosities are required. In this case, $10L_\odot$ are required at 25° . Finally, we simulated light curves in the *B*-band for typical parameters which fit the *I*-band data. These have modulations of around 2 per cent, which are consistent with the one *B*-band light curve we have (Section 3).

In Fig. 4 we display an example of the constraints on




Figure 4. An example χ^2 space for a 2-d grid search of inclination and irradiating luminosity, for the *I*-band data. The contour in the (*i*, *L*) plane defines the 90% confidence region. See text for more details.

the inclination angle, deduced from our model. The overall shape of the χ^2 space varies little with reasonable changes to the chosen parameters, although the position of the contour depends on the parameters chosen. The distance used was 1.6 kpc, which fixed the mass transfer rate by the requirement to match the overall flux level. The χ^2 minimum was rescaled to give a reduced χ^2 of 1, and the contour shown is the 90% confidence region for three parameters of interest (inclination, irradiating luminosity and mass transfer rate). High inclination angles are prevented because of the absence of an eclipse in the mean light curve. Low inclination angles are favoured only for very high luminosities of the irradiated source. In this example we found $10^\circ \lesssim i \lesssim 60^\circ$, however taking into account the permitted range of the relevant input parameters, we adopt the constraints: $10^\circ \lesssim i \lesssim 65^\circ$. This result is consistent with a previous estimate of $i \approx 50^\circ$ (Warner 1986).

In summary, an irradiated secondary star seems a likely source of the modulation. It reproduces the orbital light curve well, for reasonable irradiating fluxes, which could be provided either by a hot white dwarf, or by accretion luminosity.

4.7 DN Gem as a nova inside the period gap

The observed orbital period distribution of CVs presents a deficiency of systems between about 2 h and 3 h, which is termed ‘the period gap’ (Warner 1995). Diaz & Bruch (1997) used the updated data of Ritter & Kolb (1998), and limited the gap to between 2.11 - 3.20 h. This interval encompasses the period of Nova Gem 1912. So far, the orbital periods of three other novae are inside the period gap - V Per 1891, QU Vul 1984 and V2214 Oph 1988 (Wood, Abbott & Shafter 1992; Baptista et al. 1993; Shafter et al. 1995; Diaz & Bruch 1997).

Our suggestion that the period observed in the light curve of DN Gem is its orbital period (Section 4.2), makes DN Gem the fourth case of classical nova in the gap, as defined by Diaz & Bruch (1997). The number of nova systems with orbital periods inside the period gap increases, then,

to more than 10 per cent of the overall distribution (see Diaz & Bruch 1997). It was suggested (Baptista et al. 1993) that the period gap in the orbital period distribution of CVs does not exist for novae. The detection of the period in DN Geminorum supports this claim, however we will show below that it cannot be backed up statistically. Since there is no period gap for systems whose primaries harbour strong magnetic fields - AM Her systems (Warner 1995), Baptista et al. also argued that magnetic systems are favoured among novae with orbital periods that lie inside the period gap. Our findings (Section 4.3) don’t support this idea.

Undoubtedly the period distribution of novae is different from that of all CVs, because there is a lack of nova systems below the period gap (Diaz & Bruch 1997; Ritter & Kolb 1998). We here subject to statistical test the idea of Baptista et al. (1993) that novae do not show a period gap at all. The small number of systems below the gap make it hard to be quantitative about the period gap in novae. We, therefore, ask the question “Is there a significant change in the number of systems per unit period interval at the upper end of the period gap, somewhere around 3 h?”. The answer to this question must be yes, if the gap exists, and so the question is interesting. Furthermore, it turns out to be a well posed question in the statistical sense.

To answer this question we performed a one sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (Press et al. 1992) of the cumulative distribution of novae between 2.11 h (the bottom of the gap) and 6 h (arbitrarily chosen), against a model distribution with a constant number of systems per unit log period. This gave a 17 per cent chance that the two distributions arise from the same parent population, *i.e.* the existing data are still consistent with a smooth change of population density with period around the upper edge of the period gap. In other words, the data are consistent with no gap.

Obviously, with just four systems in the gap the statistics are rather poor, so the next question we asked was if the data were consistent with a period gap. To ask this question, we performed a two sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the distribution of novae against all CVs (excluding novae) between 2.11 and 6 h. Again, the distributions are consistent, with a probability of 75 per cent of being from the same population. So the answer to the question “Is there a period gap for novae?” is as yet unsettled. There are simply too few systems to decide.

Since primary stars in novae show a variety of magnetic behaviour (Warner 1995), we should not, perhaps, expect that the distribution of classical novae will resemble that of AM Her systems, but rather be similar to that of all CVs.

In Fig. 5 we plot the discussed distribution. It is clear that the distribution of nova systems is not far removed from all CVs distribution, nor from a constant-period distribution.

5 SUMMARY

The observed sinusoidal variation in DN Gem with the period $P \approx 3.1$ h is interpreted as the orbital period of the nova binary system. This suggestion places Nova Gem near the upper edge of the period gap. Three other novae have orbital periods in the period gap, as well. However, the rather




Figure 5. The accumulative distribution of novae, CVs, and a theoretical model of constant distribution, versus the orbital period. The x-axis ranges are plotted from the lower end of the period gap until an arbitrary chosen period of 6 h. The distribution of nova systems is not significantly different from the other two distributions.

poor statistics prevents a verification of the claim that there is no such gap for classical novae.

All possible explanations for the variation, we can think of, seem not to fit the observational data, except for the irradiation effect. We used this model to constrain the inclination angle - $10^\circ \lesssim i \lesssim 65^\circ$.

6 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank John Dan and the Wise Observatory staff for their expert assistance with the observations. We acknowledge Ohad Shemmer for measuring for us standard stars for the nova, and Coel Hellier for a fruitful discussion. A.R. is supported by PPARC. Astronomy at the Wise Observatory is supported by grants from the Israeli Academy of Sciences.

REFERENCES

Allen C.W., 1976, *Astrophysical. Quantities*, Athlone Press
 Baptista R., Yablonski F.J., Cieslinski D., Steiner J.E., 1993, *Ap.J.*, 406, L67
 Bode, M.F., Evans, A. 1989, *Classical Novae*, Alden Press, Oxford
 Diaz M.P., Bruch A., 1997, *A&A.*, 322, 807
 la Dous C., 1993, in *Cataclysmic Variables & Related Objects*, Hack M., la Dous C. (ed.), Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, France
 Duerbeck H.W., Lemke B., Willerding E., 1979, *IBVS*, 1711
 Efron B., Tibshirani R.J., 1993, "An Introduction to the Bootstrap", Chapman & Hall
 Hellier C., 1995, in Buckley D.A.H., Warner B., eds, *Cape workshop on magnetic cataclysmic variables*, ASP Conf. Series, 85, 185
 Hellier C., 1996, in Evans N., Wood J.H., eds., *Proc. IAU Colloq.* 158, Kluwer, Dordrecht
 Hellier C., 1998, in *Proc. of the 1996 Cospar Assembly*, Adv. Space Res., 22, 973
 Honeycutt R.K., Robertson J.W., Turner G.W., 1995, *Ap.J.*, 446, 838

Honeycutt R.K., Robertson J.W., Turner G.W., Henden A.A., 1998, *Ap.J.*, 495, 933
 Hummason M.L., 1938, *Ap.J.*, 88, 228
 Ioannou Z., Naylor T., Welsh W.F., Catalan M.S., Worraker W.J., James N.D., 1999, *MNRAS*, accepted
 McLaughlin D.B., 1960, in Greenstein L. (ed.), *Stellar Atmospheres*, Vol. 4, 585
 Naylor T., Sommers M.W., 1997, in Wickramasinghe D.T., Bicknell G.V., Ferrario L., eds., *IAU Colloq. 163, ASP Conference Series*
 Netzer H. et al., 1996, *MNRAS*, 279, 429.
 Olech A., Semeniuk I., Kwast T., Pych W., DeYoung J.A., Schmidt R.E., Nalezyty M., 1996, *Acta Astron.*, 46, 311
 Osaki Y., 1989, *PASJ*, 41, 1005
 Osaki Y., 1996, *PASP*, 108, 39
 Patterson J., 1994, *PASP*, 106, 697
 Patterson J., 1998, private communication
 Patterson J., 1999, in "Disk Instabilities in Close Binary Systems", eds. Mineshige S., Wheeler C., Universal Academy Press, in press
 Press W.H., Teukolsky S.A., Vetterling W.T., Flannery B.P., 1992, 'Numerical Recipes', Cambridge University Press
 Retter A., Leibowitz E.M., 1996, *IAU Circ.*, 6431
 Retter A., Leibowitz E.M., 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, L37
 Retter A., Leibowitz E.M., Ofek E.O., 1997, *MNRAS*, 283, 745
 Retter A., Leibowitz E.M., Kovo-Kariti O., 1998, *MNRAS*, 293, 145
 Retter A., Naylor, T., Leibowitz E.M., 1999, in "Disk Instabilities in Close Binary Systems", eds. Mineshige S., Wheeler C., Universal Academy Press, in press
 Ritter H., Kolb U., 1998, *A&A Suppl.*, 129, 83
 Robinson E.L. Nather R.E., 1977, *PASP*, 89, 572
 Semeniuk I., Pych W., Olech A., Ruszkowski M., 1994, *Acta Astron.*, 44, 277
 Semeniuk I., DeYoung J.A., Pych W., Olech A., Ruszkowski M., Schmidt R.E., 1995, *Acta Astron.*, 45, 365
 Shafter A.W., Misselt K.A. Szkody P., Politano M., 1995, *Ap.J.*, 448, L33
 Skillman D.R., Harvey D., Patterson J., Vanmunster T., 1997, *PASP*, 109, 114
 Somers M.W., Mukai K., Naylor T., 1996, *MNRAS*, 278, 845
 Stetson P.B., 1987, *PASP*, 99, 191
 Warner B., 1986, *MNRAS*, 222, 11
 Warner B., 1995, *Cataclysmic Variables Stars*, Cambridge University Press
 Williams G., 1983, *Ap.J.S.*, 53, 523
 Wood J.H., Abbott T.M.C., Shafter A.W., 1992, *Ap.J.*, 393, 729