

The Transition Region Structure of κ Ceti*

M. J. Fernández-Figueroa, E. de Castro, and M. Rego

Departamento de Astrofísica, Facultad de Físicas, Universidad Complutense, Ciudad Universitaria, Madrid 3, Spain

Received November 14, 1980; accepted January 12, 1981

Summary. Observations of κ Ceti (HD 20630), G5 V, obtained with the IUE satellite have been analysed to determine the structure of its outer atmosphere. This analysis is used to derive a model of transition region and to examine the terms of energy balance equation.

Key words: EUV spectra – stellar chromospheres – transition region

1. Introduction

The main sources of information about the outer stellar regions of intermediate and late type stars arise from far ultraviolet observations. The IUE satellite has provided a valuable opportunity to study the ultraviolet spectra of cool stars.

The star κ Ceti (HD 20630), G5 V, is one of the few dwarf stars for which indications of chromospheric activity have been observed in the visible range. Wilson and Bappu (1957) measured the Ca II emission in κ Ceti which was assigned an intensity 3 in a scale whose maximum value was 5. Later in the same star Zirin (1976) identified the He I line $\lambda 10830 \text{ \AA}$ in absorption. He obtained an equivalent width of 200 m\AA , this value placing κ Ceti among the 52 stars with an He I $\lambda 10830 \text{ \AA}$ equivalent width bigger than 100 m\AA out of a sample of about 125 G and K stars. According to Zirin the helium line is an indicator of the existence of a stellar corona rather than a chromosphere. Recently, Rego et al. (1979) have carried out a first analysis comparing the behaviour of the h and k magnesium emission lines in a sample of dwarf stars including κ Ceti. They observed that these lines were present with a remarkable intensity in κ Ceti.

In this paper we analyse the ultraviolet emission lines in κ Ceti in order to study the higher chromospheric, transition region and low corona structure as in solar analyses.

2. Observations

IUE low resolution ($\approx 6 \text{ \AA}$) observations of κ Ceti were obtained in the spectral range $\lambda 1150\text{--}2000 \text{ \AA}$ (SWP camera). The exposure

Send offprint requests to: M. J. Fernández-Figueroa

* Based on observations by the International Ultraviolet Explorer collected at the Villafranca Satellite Tracking Station of the European Space Agency

times used are 70 min on July 7, 1978 (SWP 1926) and 50 min on July 5, 1980 (SWP 9462).

The most prominent lines are those of C IV ($\lambda 1549$), Si II ($\lambda\lambda 1808$ and 1817), C II ($\lambda 1335$), O I ($\lambda 1304$), N V ($\lambda 1240$), and H Ly α . These lines are indicative of a chromosphere and a transition region similar to those seen in the sun.

The H Ly α and O I ($\lambda 1304$) emission lines were not considered since the former is strongly contaminated by geocoronal H Ly α emission and the latter may be due to a fluorescent mechanism by H Ly β .

We have used the C II ($\lambda 1334$, 1335), Si IV ($\lambda 1394$, 1402), C IV ($\lambda 1548$, 1550), N V ($\lambda 1240$), Si II ($\lambda\lambda 1309$, 1526 , 1534 , 1808 , 1817) lines which all appear to be optically thin. The observed line fluxes are listed in Table 1.

3. Line Fluxes

Methods previously used to analyse solar EUV line fluxes (Jordan et al., 1971) have been applied to stellar spectra. Observed line fluxes have been transformed into surface fluxes at the star, with the angular diameter $\phi' = 1''.08 \cdot 10^{-3}$ obtained by the relation of Barnes and Evans (1976), and hence the emission measures have been calculated. In Table 2 are listed the surface fluxes, the emission measures, $\int N_e^2 dh$, and the peak formation temperatures for the lines used. The atmospheric parameters and abundances

Table 1

λ (Å)	Elem.	F_{ob} (erg cm ⁻² s ⁻¹)
1240	N V	6.215 (-14)
1304	O I	7.057 (-14)
1309	Si II	1.330 (-14)
1335	C II	1.374 (-13)
1357	O I	2.723 (-13)
1394	Si IV	7.657 (-14)
1403	Si IV	7.044 (-14)
1482	S I	5.964 (-14)
1526	Si II	6.318 (-14)
1533	Si II	6.344 (-14)
1548	C IV	1.578 (-13)
1550	C IV	6.001 (-14)
1640	He II	6.001 (-14)
1657	C I	1.466 (-13)
1808	Si II	2.185 (-13)
1817	Si II	2.871 (-13)
1892	Si III	2.516 (-13)
1909	C III	3.022 (-13)

Table 2

λ (Å)	Elem.	F_{surf}	$\frac{N(\text{el})}{N(\text{H})} / N_e^2 dh$	g_m	$\log T_m$	f_{lu}	\bar{g}
1240	N V	9.8052 (3)	7.38 (22)	9.33 (-4)	5.2	0.234	0.78
1304	O I	1.1134 (4)	1.76 (28)	8.71 (-7)	4.1	0.031	0.03
1309	Si II	2.0970 (3)	4.00 (24)	1.07 (-5)	4.4	0.09	0.33
1335	C II	2.1683 (4)	1.66 (24)	9.55 (-5)	4.5	0.27	0.65
1394	Si IV	1.2081 (4)	1.35 (23)	3.09 (-4)	4.9	0.53	0.43
1403	Si IV	1.1113 (4)	2.50 (23)	3.09 (-4)	4.9	0.26	0.43
1526	Si II	9.8682 (3)	3.78 (25)	2.19 (-5)	4.3	0.076	0.20
1533	Si II	1.0009 (4)	3.85 (25)	2.19 (-5)	4.3	0.076	0.20
1548	C IV	2.4902 (4)	2.89 (23)	8.13 (-4)	5.0	0.194	0.60
1550	C IV	9.8540 (3)	2.30 (23)	8.13 (-4)	5.0	0.097	0.60
1657	C I	2.3136 (4)	8.80 (25)	6.61 (-5)	4.1	0.17	0.03
1808	Si II	3.4475 (4)	4.88 (24)	4.57 (-5)	4.3	0.004	0.33
1817	Si II	4.5292 (4)	6.26 (24)	4.68 (-5)	4.3	0.003	0.33

have been determined by Hearnshaw (1974) from optical data, $\log g = 4.44$ and $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = 0.08$. The colours $B - V = 0.68$ and $V - R = 0.57$ have been obtained from Johnson et al. (1966).

It is evident that the emission measures from the region of temperature $2 \cdot 10^4 - 1.6 \cdot 10^5$ K are between 9 and 2 times larger than the corresponding values for the quiet sun.

4. Model of the Transition Region

The distribution of the emission measures, $\int N_e^2 dh$, with temperature can be used to find a range of models of the outer atmosphere which would satisfy the observations. The method of analysis derived by Jordan (1965) and Evans et al. (1975) has been used. The emission measure is given by

$$\int_R N_e^2 dh = \frac{[P_e^2]_{\Delta T}}{T_e^2} \left[\frac{dh}{d \log T_e} \right]_{\Delta T} \times 0.32, \quad (1)$$

where T_e and $P_e = N_e T_e$ are the temperature and the electron pressure (cm^{-3} K).

The assumptions of hydrostatic equilibrium and a fully ionized gas with a mean molecular weight $\mu = 1.26$ give

$$\frac{d \log P_e}{d \log T_e} = -9.21 \cdot 10^{-5} \frac{1}{T_e} \frac{dh}{d \log T_e}. \quad (2)$$

When starting from a given pressure at a temperature, the temperature and pressure gradients can be found through the iteration of Eqs. (1) and (2).

The pressure at $T_e \simeq 1.6 \cdot 10^5$ K, which is the formation temperature of the Nv line, is not known. At the top of the solar chromosphere Ayres et al. (1974) find a total gas pressure of 0.15 dyn cm^{-2} . This value can be used to give an upper limit to the electron pressure at $T_e = 1.6 \cdot 10^5$ K of $\log P_e = 14.74$ ($P_e = 5.5 \cdot 10^{14} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ K). But Cook and Nicolas (1979) in their model of solar transition region with a constant pressure have used a total gas pressure of 0.25 dyn cm^{-2} . This value gives an upper limit to the electron pressure of $\log P_e = 14.96$ at the same temperature.

A lower limit to the electron pressure at $T_e = 1.6 \cdot 10^5$ K can be found by assuming that the Nv emission line is formed in an isothermal medium at this temperature. The scale height in such a medium would be $H = 1.04 \cdot 10^4$ km. Combining this value with emission measure for Nv leads to $N_e = 1.3 \cdot 10^9 \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $\log P_e = 14.31$ would be a lower limit.

Table 3. Models for κ Cet

Model a : $\log P_e = 14.74$, $\log T_e = 5.2$

$\log T$	$\log \frac{dh}{d \log T}$	$\log P_e$	$\log N_e$	$\int N_e^2 dh$	P_g	H (km)
5.2	8.67	14.74	9.54	1.78 (27)	1.09 (15)	1950
5.1	8.48	14.77	9.67	2.09 (27)	1.17 (15)	1648
5.0	8.33	14.79	9.79	2.57 (27)	1.23 (15)	1434
4.9	8.19	14.80	9.90	3.24 (27)	1.26 (15)	1279
4.8	8.10	14.82	10.02	4.57 (27)	1.32 (15)	1082
4.7	8.06	14.84	10.14	7.24 (27)	1.38 (15)	967
4.6	8.07	14.86	10.26	1.26 (28)	1.45 (15)	849
4.5	8.12	14.89	10.39	2.57 (28)	1.55 (15)	717
4.4	8.20	14.92	10.52	5.89 (28)	1.66 (15)	559
4.3	8.41	14.97	10.67	1.82 (29)	1.87 (15)	302
4.2	8.48	15.09	10.89	5.88 (29)	2.46 (15)	0

Model b : $\log P_e = 14.96$, $\log T_e = 5.2$

$\log T$	$\log \frac{dh}{d \log T}$	$\log P_e$	$\log N_e$	$\int N_e^2 dh$	P_g	H (km)
5.2	8.22	14.96	9.67	1.78 (27)	1.82 (15)	992
5.1	8.07	14.97	9.87	2.09 (27)	1.87 (15)	875
5.0	7.95	14.98	9.98	2.57 (27)	1.91 (15)	786
4.9	7.83	14.99	10.09	3.24 (27)	1.95 (15)	718
4.8	7.77	14.99	10.19	4.57 (27)	1.95 (15)	659
4.7	7.75	15.00	10.30	7.24 (27)	2.00 (15)	603
4.6	7.77	15.01	10.41	1.26 (28)	2.05 (15)	547
4.5	7.85	15.03	10.53	2.57 (28)	2.14 (15)	475
4.4	7.96	15.04	10.64	5.89 (28)	2.19 (15)	384
4.3	8.19	15.08	10.78	1.82 (29)	2.40 (15)	229
4.2	8.36	15.15	10.95	5.88 (29)	2.83 (15)	0

Model c : $\log P_e = 14.31$, $\log T_e = 5.2$

$\log T$	$\log \frac{dh}{d \log T}$	$\log P_e$	$\log N_e$	$\int N_e^2 dh$	P_g	H (km)
5.2	9.52	14.31	9.11	1.87 (27)	4.08 (14)	3676
5.1	9.01	14.50	9.40	2.09 (27)	6.32 (14)	2653
5.0	8.76	14.57	9.57	2.57 (27)	7.43 (14)	2078
4.9	8.55	14.63	9.73	3.24 (27)	8.53 (14)	1724
4.8	8.41	14.67	9.87	4.57 (27)	9.35 (14)	1467
4.7	8.34	14.71	10.01	7.24 (27)	1.02 (15)	1248
4.6	8.30	14.75	10.15	1.26 (28)	1.12 (15)	1048
4.5	8.32	14.79	10.29	2.57 (28)	1.23 (15)	849
4.4	8.36	14.84	10.44	5.89 (28)	1.38 (15)	619
4.3	8.48	14.93	10.63	1.82 (29)	1.70 (15)	316
4.2	8.50	15.08	10.88	5.88 (29)	2.40 (15)	0

Table 4

log T	F_c	ΔF_c	F_R	ΔF_R	ΔF_m
5.2	2.20 (4)	8.10 (3)	2.56 (5)	-4.50 (4)	3.69 (4)
5.1	1.39 (4)	5.74 (3)	3.01 (5)	-6.90 (4)	6.33 (4)
5.0	8.16 (3)	3.36 (3)	3.70 (5)	-9.70 (4)	9.36 (4)
4.9	4.81 (3)	2.35 (3)	4.67 (5)	-1.91 (5)	1.84 (5)
4.8	2.46 (3)	1.31 (3)	6.58 (5)	-3.82 (5)	3.80 (5)
4.7	1.15 (3)	3.58 (2)	2.04 (6)	-6.70 (5)	7.69 (5)
4.6	4.92 (2)	3.04 (2)	1.81 (6)	-1.89 (6)	1.89 (6)
4.5	1.83 (2)	1.19 (2)	3.70 (6)	-4.78 (6)	4.78 (6)
4.4	6.34 (1)	4.67 (1)	8.48 (6)	-1.83 (7)	1.83 (7)
4.3	1.67 (1)	1.17 (1)	2.68 (7)	-5.79 (7)	5.79 (7)
4.2	5.03		8.47 (7)		

The models derived for the upper limit (Models a and b) and for the lower limit (Model c) in electron pressure are tabulated in Table 3. In the three models derived the temperature gradient goes through a maximum in the region between $T_e = 1.6 \cdot 10^4$ and $T_e = 1.6 \cdot 10^5$ K. In the sun this gradient has a maximum in the same region.

Our best fit model has a pressure of $\log P_e = 14.96$ at $T_e = 1.6 \cdot 10^5$ K. This pressure is larger than that in the model of Ayres et al. (1974) but is the same than that in the model of Cook and Nicolas (1979) for the sun. We consider the last value better because κ Ceti is a dwarf of spectral type G5.

5. Energy Balance

By assuming (Evans et al., 1975) that over each region of atmosphere the energy dissipated is balanced by the sum of the radiation losses, thermal conduction and stellar wind losses then

$$\Delta F_m + \Delta F_r + \Delta F_c + \Delta F_w = 0 \quad (3)$$

and

$$\Delta F_r = 0.80 \int N_e^2 P_{\text{rad}} dh$$

$$F_c = \frac{1.8 \cdot 10^{-5}}{\ln \lambda} T^{5/2} \frac{dT}{dh} \simeq 10^{-6} T^{5/2} \frac{dT}{dh} \quad (\text{Spitzer, 1956})$$

where ΔF_w was neglected since any stellar wind from κ Ceti must be weak. In Eq.(3) we have assumed that P_{rad} is constant and takes a value of $1.8 \cdot 10^{-22} \text{ erg cm}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (McWhirter et al., 1975) over the whole temperature range of our models.

The convective flux, the radiation losses, and the mechanic energy for our best fit model are given in Table 4. It is clear that the effect of conduction is very much smaller than that of the radiative losses.

6. Conclusions

We have calculated three models from the emission measure distribution for the outer stellar atmosphere of κ Ceti, the best fit model has a pressure of $\log P_e = 14.96$ at $\log T_e = 5.2$ since the pressure-temperature distribution is more linear and the region height is about 800 km which is consistent with the assumptions made initially.

The energy balance for this model has shown that the transport of energy by conduction is negligible compared with radiation losses, which at all heights are larger than those from the sun.

References

- Ayres, T.R., Linsky, J.L., Shine, R.A.: 1974, *Astrophys. J.* **192**, 93
 Barnes, J.G., Evans, D.S.: 1976, *Monthly Notices Roy. Astron. Soc.* **174**, 489
 Brown, A., Jordan, C.: 1980, Proceeding of the Second European IUE Conference, Tübingen, Germany
 Cook, J.W., Nicolas, K.R.: 1979, *Astrophys. J.* **229**, 1163
 Evans, R.G., Jordan, C., Wilson, R.: 1975, *Monthly Notices Roy. Astron. Soc.* **172**, 585
 Hearnshaw, J.B.: 1974, *Astron. Astrophys.* **36**, 191
 Johnson, H.L., Mitchell, R.I., Iriarte, B., Wisniewski, W.Z.: 1966, *Comm. Lunar Planet Lab.* **4**, 99
 Jordan, C.: 1965, PhD Thesis, University of London
 Jordan, C., Wilson, R.: 1971, *Physics of the Solar Corona*, D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, p. 219–236
 McWhirter, R.W.P., Thonemann, P.C., Wilson, R.: 1975, *Astron. Astrophys.* **40**, 63
 Rego, M., Fernández-Figueroa, M.J.: 1979, *Astron. Astrophys.* **76**, 249
 Spitzer, L.: 1956, *Physics of Fully Ionised Gases*, New York Interscience Publishers
 Wilson, O.C., Bappu, M.K.V.: 1957, *Astrophys. J.* **125**, 661
 Zirin, H.: 1975, *Astrophys. J. Letters* **199**, L63
 Zirin, H.: 1976, *Astrophys. J.* **208**, 414