VEGA status report and recent results

Karine PERRAUTC, Jean-Michel CLAUSSE, Vincent HOCDE, Frédéric MORAND, Denis MOURARD, Nicolas NARDETTO
and Mickael BONNEFOY, Isa Brandão, Margarida CUNHA, Pietr HARMANEC, Roxanne LIGI, Anna Romanovskaya, Tanya Ryabchikova, Denis SHULYAK
VEGA status report and recent results

VEGA in a nutshell

- **3T – 4T** visible combiner used with CLIMB for coherencing (+ self-coherencing in 4T)
- Spectrograph over \([480 \, \text{nm} ; 850 \, \text{nm}]\) with **2 cameras** and \(\mathcal{R} \sim (1700), 5000, 30000\)

Kinematics and environments

Accurate angular diameters

Mass-loss, winds, Be and supergiant environments, spectro-imaging

[see Elisson and Robert’s talks tomorrow]

[Mourard+2015]

[Ligi+2016]
Towards accurate fundamental parameters

**Science cases**

- Fundamental parameters of exoplanet host stars, benchmark stars, peculiar stars, ...
- Surface-brightness relations (early-type stars, small diameters)
- Hierarchic system properties
- Cepheid environments (δ Cep: Nardetto+2016, η Aql: in prep.)

![Graph showing VEGA performance](image)

Large impact of calibrator diameter
Towards fundamental parameters – The calibrator issue

- Need for accurate and precise angular diameters of the calibrators
- JSOC2 catalog: diameter determination through pseudo-magnitudes and spectral types

But:
- lack of statistics for early-type stars (fast rotators, ...)
- discrepancies between JSOC1 and JSOC2 catalogs for A-B spectral types

Ratio discrepancies as large as 15-20% for A-B stars
Towards fundamental parameters – The calibrator issue

During a 2-day workshop, we tried to bring back together all the diameter determinations: JSDCs, Surface-Brightness relations, SED fit (through the VOSA tool), ...

\[ \theta = \left( \frac{4F_{\text{bol}}}{\sigma T_{\text{eff}}^4} \right)^{1/2} \]
Towards fundamental parameters – The calibrator issue

Not so easy to bring back together all the angular diameter determinations

... and radii from GAIA DR2 to come!

Several tricky steps in VOSA:
- Selection of photometry data sets
- Extinction
- Models
- Effective temperature range (check with the PASTEL catalog but depends on ... spectral type!)

JSDC2 + SBR + « clean » VOSA method sound to be in good agreement whatever the spectral type
The Ap star program

**Scientific objectives:**
- Derive accurate fundamental parameters as independently as possible
- Compare to theoretical models (atmosphere, Bolometric Correction, excitation mechanism(s) of oscillations)
- Derive trends, i.e. for effective temperatures, with magnetic field strength ... for these peculiar stars

**Main difficulty:** $\theta < 1$ mas (visible OLBI)

### HD 188041 / UVES@VLTI

- observations
- depth dependent abundances
- homogeneous abundances

HD 188041 / UVES@VLTI

**Graph:**
- HRS abundances
- predicted SEDs
- predicted radii
The Ap star program

SED shape for Ap stars often different from that for normal stars

$R_{\text{mod}} = 2.24 \pm 0.12 \, R_{\odot}$
The Ap star program: towards general trends

\[ B < 1 \text{ kG} \]
\[ 3 \text{ kG} < B < 6 \text{ kG} \]
\[ 9 \text{ kG} < B < 15 \text{ kG} \]

Fit from Torres2010 (normal stars)
Calibration for Ap stars by Stépien+2008
Our fit
The GJ504 system

The faintest companion found with an AO instrument 43.5 au / 2.5'' from a G-type star
[Fe/H] = 0.22 ± 0.04
d = 17.56 ± 0.08 pc
Debated age : 100 Myr .... 5 Gyr

What interferometry brings:
- Angular diameter of the host star
- Accurate position in the HR diagram
- Age of the system

GJ504b
- Teff = 550 ± 50 K, log g = 3.5-4.0
- M = 1.3^{+0.6}_{-0.3} M_{Jup} / 23^{+10}_{-9} M_{Jup} (young/old ages)
→ Constraints on formation, atmosphere composition, ....

Part of the SHINE SPHERE survey

[see Roxanne’s talk]
β Lyr: the 2013 campaign

- Well-known object with direct imaging with MIRC-4T [Zhao+2010]
- Nice laboratory for studying the mass-transfer mechanisms (role of the hot spot) [Lomax2012]

Joint effort combining photometry, spectroscopy, interferometry observations, and a new modelling strategy:
- Paper I [Mourard, Harmanec et al., submitted] with photometry and interferometry in the continuum
- Paper II [in progress] with spectro-interferometry in Hydrogen and Helium lines + spectroscopy
β Lyr: the opaque disk modelling

From general idea... ... to a global and detailed modelling

- Adaptation of the SHELLSPEC code (Budaj 2004): global model fitting approach including light curves (from UV to FIR), $V^2$, CP, T3, (and, differential interferometric observables and line profiles soon).
- LTE radiative transfer code
- Models based on ‘opaque’ objects (donor, disk, and ‘hidden’ star) and including a hot spot (heated region of the disk by incoming flux)

- Accretion disk not in a vertical hydrostatic equilibrium (in agreement with the ongoing mass transfer)
- Hot spot detected in the continuum
- $i = 93.5 \pm 1.0^\circ$; $\Omega = 253.7 \pm 1.0^\circ$; $d = 319.7 \pm 2.7$ pc

© P. Harmanec, nov. 2015

[Mourard+, submitted]
2017 statistics

VEGA observations in 2017 (75 nights)

- Good conditions: 36.5
- Poor conditions: 14
- Closed: 2.5
- Technical issues: 22

2T/3T target measurements (w/o FRIEND)

- + FRIEND observations in March, May, June, and October

[see Marc-Antoine’s talk]
[see Denis’s talk]

[1 survey night]
VEGA observing software – MSIP & SPICA framework

J.M. Clausse, D. Mourard, F. Morand

The old way: heavy preparation scheme + Database management

The new way: simplified preparation and operation + more CHARA compliant

Fully operational and validated on the sky
Automatic data reduction pipeline (to be done)

' manual' transmission but automated way considered
Conclusion and perspectives

- Several long-term on-going programs to go towards statistical studies (Be, Ap stars, exoplanet host stars, benchmark, metal-poor stars, ...)
- NOAO programs
- Multi-instrument programs
- Niches for visible (spectro-)interferometry with CHARA, i.e.
  - search for envelop around Cepheids as observed around δ Cep. Similar findings around η Aql [Nardetto+, in prep]
  - accurate angular diameters of exoplanet host stars

- 2017: a very fruitful year for FRIEND, tests for SPICA also.

Many thanks to the whole CHARA group!
GJ504

Fig. 21. Gravitational instability model adapted to the case of GJ 504. Fragments are allowed to form if they respect the Toomre and cooling criteria. GJ 504b properties are reported. The pink curve corresponds to the posterior distribution of the companion semi-major axis found with our MCMC orbit fitting package (Section 7.1). The dashed lines correspond to the disk mass distribution for different hypothesis on the initial disk mass.

Fig. 22. Population synthesis at 20 Myr for core-accretion models including Type I and II migration and dynamical scattering between multiple planet embryos in the disk. We considered the case of a 1, 1.5, and 2 $M_\odot$ central stars. The colour shows the enrichment relative to the star.
Fig. 12. Comparison of the final $T_{\text{eff}}$ and bolometric luminosity of GJ 504b (dashed zone) to those of late-T and early-Y dwarfs. The bolometric luminosity values are taken from Dupuy & Kraus (2013) and Delorme et al. (2017a). The temperatures and luminosity of benchmark companions are taken from Tab. B. We added the $T_{\text{eff}}$ determined by Leggett et al. (2017), Line et al. (2017), and Schneider et al. (2015) using atmospheric models and report the $T_{\text{eff}}$/spectral type conversion scale of Filippazzo et al. (2015).

Fig. 13. Luminosity and $T_{\text{eff}}$ of GJ 504b compared to the COND03 ("hot-start") evolutionary tracks. The solid lines correspond to the 5, 10, 20, 100, 300, 600 Myr and 1, 2, 4, 6, and 10 Gyr isochrones (from top to bottom). The dashed lines correspond to the model predictions for masses of 1, 5, 10, 15, 20, 30, and 40 $M_{\text{Jup}}$ (from top to bottom).
**β Lyrae**

![Image](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**Fig. A.1.** $(u,v)$ coverage of all interferometric observations. Colours correspond to three different instruments: NPOI (blue), CHARA/MIRC (green), CHARA/VEGA (magenta).

**Fig. 8.** A similar comparison as in Figure 7, but for squared visibilities $|V|^2$, with a contribution $\chi^2 = 54137$. The $|V|^2$ values are plotted against projected baseline $B/\lambda$ (in cycles), and shifted vertically according to the dataset number. The are CHARA/MIRC data at the bottom, NPOI in the middle, and CHARA/VEGA at the top. Synthetic data are denoted by yellow crosses, observed data by blue error bars, and residua by red lines. Few outliers with large uncertainties, which do not contribute much to $\chi^2$ anyway, were purposely removed from the plot to prevent clutter. Even though there are some systematic differences for individual segments of data, overall trends seem to be correctly matched.
β Lyrae
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