

Searching for Radio Signals from Two Magnetars and a High-magnetic-field Pulsar and the Serendipitous Discovery of a New Radio Pulsar PSR J1935+2200 (Postprint)

Authors: Lang Xie, J. L. Han, Z. L. Yang, W. C. Jing, D. J. Zhou, W. Q. Su, Yi Yan, Tao Wang, Nan-Nan Cai, P. F. Wang and Chen Wang

Date: 2025-02-25T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

Abstract

Magnetars are a class of slowly rotating, young neutron stars with extremely strong magnetic fields that can produce transient radio phenomena such as radio pulses and fast radio bursts (FRBs). We conducted radio observations of two magnetars, SGR J1935+2154 and 3XMM J185246.6+003317, and one high magnetic field pulsar, PSR J1846-0258, using the Five-hundred-meter Aperture Spherical radio Telescope (FAST). We performed single-pulse and periodicity searches but detected no radio signals from these objects. While observing the magnetar SGR 1935+2154, we serendipitously discovered a new radio pulsar, PSR J1935+2200, in piggyback data recorded from other FAST telescope beams. We carried out follow-up observations and obtained its timing solution based on these new observations and FAST archival data. PSR J1935+2200 is an isolated old pulsar with a spin period of 0.91 s, a spin period derivative of 9.19×10^{-15} s s⁻¹, and a characteristic age of 1.57 Myr. This pulsar is weak, with a flux density of 9.8 Jy at a frequency of 1.25 GHz. The discovery of a new pulsar from just 30 minutes of long-duration FAST observations suggests that there may be many more weak, old pulsars yet to be discovered in the Galactic disk.

Full Text

Preamble

Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 25:015018 (13pp), 2025 January

© 2025. National Astronomical Observatories, CAS and IOP Publishing Ltd. All

rights reserved. Printed in China.
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/ada2e9>
CSTR: 32081.14.RAA.ada2e9

Producing Type Ia Supernovae from Hybrid CONe White Dwarfs with Main-sequence Binary Companions at Low Metallicity of $Z = 0.0001$

Boyang Guo^{1,2,3,4}, Xiangcun Meng^{1,2}, Zhijia Tian³, Jingxiao Luo^{1,2,4}, and Zhengwei Liu^{1,2}

¹International Centre of Supernovae (ICESUN), Yunnan Key Laboratory, Kunming 650216, China

²Department of Astronomy, Key Laboratory of Astroparticle Physics of Yunnan Province, Yunnan University, Kunming 650500, China

³Department of Astronomy, Yunnan University, Kunming 650500, China

⁴University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

Received 2024 September 30; revised 2024 December 03; accepted 2024 December 16; published 2025 January 16

Abstract

The nature of progenitors of Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) and their explosion mechanism remains unclear. It has been suggested that SNe Ia may result from thermonuclear explosions of hybrid carbon–oxygen–neon white dwarfs (CONe WDs) when they grow in mass to approach the Chandrasekhar mass limit by accreting matter from a binary main-sequence (MS) companion. In this work, we combine the results of detailed binary evolution calculations with population synthesis models to investigate the rates and delay times of SNe Ia in the CONe WD + MS channel at a low metallicity environment of $Z = 0.0001$. For a constant star formation rate of 5 Me yr^{-1} , our calculations predict that the SN Ia rates in the CONe WD + MS channel at low metallicity of $Z = 0.0001$ are about $0.11\text{--}3.89 \times 10^{-4} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. In addition, delay times in this channel cover a wide range of $0.05\text{--}2.5 \text{ Gyr}$. We further compare our results to those given by a previous study for the CONe WD + MS channel with a higher metallicity of $Z = 0.02$ to explore the influence of metallicity on the results. We find that these two metallicity environments give only a slight difference in rates and delay times of SNe Ia from the CONe WD + MS channel, although SNe Ia produced at a low metallicity environment of $Z = 0.0001$ have relatively longer delay times.

Key words: methods: numerical –(stars:) binaries (including multiple): close –stars: evolution –(stars:) supernovae: general –(stars:) white dwarfs

1. Introduction

Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) are the cataclysmic explosions of intermediate-mass stars at the end of their lives. SNe Ia have typical B-band peak magnitudes of

around -19.5 mag, which are as bright as their host galaxies. Due to their high luminosities and homogeneity of their light curves, SNe Ia have been used as standard candles to measure cosmological parameters (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999). SNe Ia are also one of the main contributors to heavy elements such as intermediate-mass and iron-group elements in the Universe (e.g., Matteucci & Greggio 1986). Despite their importance, the progenitors of SNe Ia and their explosion mechanism remain a mystery (see Maoz et al. 2014; Livio & Mazzali 2018; Jha et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2023, for recent reviews).

It is widely accepted that SNe Ia may originate from thermonuclear explosions of carbon-oxygen white dwarfs (CO WDs) in binary systems (e.g., Hoyle & Fowler 1960; Nomoto 1982; Nomoto et al. 1984; Bloom et al. 2012). Depending on the nature of donor stars, different progenitor models have been proposed for SNe Ia, including the single-degenerate (SD) scenario (e.g., Whelan & Iben 1973; Nomoto et al. 1984; Han & Podsiadlowski 2004), the double-degenerate (DD) scenario (e.g., Iben & Tutukov 1984; Webbink & Iben 1987), the core-degenerate scenario (e.g., Livio & Riess 2003; Kashi & Soker 2011; Ilkov & Soker 2012; Soker et al. 2013, 2014; Soker 2018), the triple model (e.g., Katz & Dong 2012; Hamers et al. 2013; Toonen et al. 2018; Rajamuthukumar et al. 2023), and the single star model (e.g., Iben & Renzini 1983; Tout 2005; Antoniadis et al. 2020), etc. In this work, we focus only on the SD scenario.

In the SD scenario, the WD accretes material from its non-degenerate companion star to accumulate mass on its surface, triggering a thermonuclear explosion when the WD grows in mass to approach the Chandrasekhar-mass limit. The donor star in this scenario could be a main-sequence (MS) star, a sub-giant star, a red giant (RG) star, or a helium (He) star (e.g., Hachisu et al. 1999; Han & Podsiadlowski 2004; Meng et al. 2009; Ruiter et al. 2009; Wang et al. 2009; Meng & Yang 2010; Liu & Stancliffe 2018, 2020).

The SD scenario has advantages and disadvantages on both theoretical and observational sides, which have been comprehensively reviewed by Liu et al. (2023). We therefore only briefly summarize them here. The SD scenario seems likely to explain the homogeneity of peak luminosities of the so-called normal SNe Ia because the WDs in this scenario are expected to explode near the Chandrasekhar-mass limit. However, only a narrow range of mass-transfer rates can lead to stable mass accumulation onto the WD in the SD scenario. This leads to predicted SN Ia rates in this scenario that have difficulties explaining those inferred from observations (e.g., Paczynski 1976; Fujimoto 1982a, 1982b; Livio et al. 1989; Han & Podsiadlowski 2004; Nomoto et al. 2007; Shen & Bildsten 2007; Meng et al. 2009; Ruiter et al. 2009; Wang et al. 2009; Meng & Yang 2010; Wolf et al. 2013; Claeys et al. 2014; Piersanti et al. 2014; Liu & Stancliffe 2018; Liu et al. 2023).

On the observational side, there are certain observations that seem to suggest some SNe Ia may be produced from the SD scenario. For instance, McCully et al. (2014) reported that a blue luminous source was detected in the pre-explosion image of an SN Iax event, SN 2012Z. This blue luminous source has

been thought to be a He star companion of its progenitor system. Also, some studies reported that narrow absorption signatures of circumstellar material, thought to originate from mass-transfer from companion stars in the SD scenario, have been detected in some SNe Ia (e.g., Patat et al. 2007; Sternberg et al. 2011; Dilday et al. 2012; Silverman et al. 2013; but see also Soker et al. 2013). However, no promising surviving companion star predicted by the SD scenario has been firmly confirmed yet in nearby SN remnants (SNRs; Kerzendorf et al. 2009; Schaefer & Pagnotta 2012; Ruiz-Lapuente et al. 2018), although there are a few candidates such as Tycho G (Ruiz-Lapuente et al. 2004, 2019; Fuhrmann 2005; Ihara et al. 2007; González Hernández et al. 2009; Kerzendorf et al. 2009, 2013; Bedin et al. 2014; Ruiz-Lapuente 2023a), US 708 (Geier et al. 2015; Bauer et al. 2019; Liu et al. 2021), and MV-G272 (Ruiz-Lapuente et al. 2023). The features of swept-up H/He due to SN ejecta-companion interaction predicted by hydrodynamical models have not been firmly confirmed by observations yet (e.g., Marietta et al. 2000; Pakmor et al. 2008; Liu et al. 2012, 2013; Pan et al. 2012; Boehner et al. 2017; McCutcheon et al. 2022), although there are a few candidate objects that show H/He emission lines in their late-time spectra (Leonard 2007; Lundqvist et al. 2013, 2015; Shappee et al. 2013, 2018; Maguire et al. 2016; Graham et al. 2015, 2017; Dimitriadis et al. 2017, 2019; Hosseinzadeh et al. 2017, 2022; Sand et al. 2018, 2019, 2021; Holmbo et al. 2019; Jacobson-Galán et al. 2019; Tucker et al. 2019, 2020, 2022; Vallely et al. 2019; Prieto et al. 2020; Siebert et al. 2020; Elias-Rosa et al. 2021). In addition, the lack of X-ray emission in current observations also seems to challenge the SD scenario (e.g., Horesh et al. 2012; Margutti et al. 2014; Meng & Han 2016).

A series of previous studies on the SD scenario generally assumed that the accreting WD is a carbon-oxygen (CO) WD (e.g., Hoyle & Fowler 1960; Nomoto et al. 1984; Hachisu et al. 1999; Han & Podsiadlowski 2004; Meng et al. 2009; Ruiter et al. 2009; Claeys et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2014; Liu & Stancliffe 2018). Based on stellar evolution calculations, Denissenkov et al. (2013) found that a CO core that goes through an off-centered C-ignition in an asymptotic giant branch (AGB) star can stall its C-burning due to convective boundary mixing. As a result, the AGB star would eject its envelope after the core nuclear reaction, leaving a hybrid CO-neon (Ne) WD consisting of a CO core and an ONe mantle (Denissenkov et al. 2013). Furthermore, Chen et al. (2014) suggest that hybrid carbon-oxygen-neon white dwarfs (CONe WDs) could be as massive as 1.3 M_{\odot} at a low value of the C-burning rate (CBR) factor of 0.1. Such massive CONe WDs have been thought to likely accrete a small amount of mass from their companion stars to reach the Chandrasekhar-mass limit to trigger SN Ia explosions if they are in binary systems (Denissenkov et al. 2015). Therefore, some previous studies have proposed binary systems composed of a hybrid CONe WD and a non-degenerate companion star as a new sub-type of SD progenitor model for SNe Ia (e.g., García-Berro et al. 1997; Denissenkov et al. 2013, 2015; Chen et al. 2014; Meng & Podsiadlowski 2014; Wang et al. 2014; Kromer et al. 2015; Liu et al. 2015; Marquardt et al. 2015). Recently, Kromer et al. (2015) have shown that incomplete off-center pure deflagration explosions of near-Chandrasekhar-

mass hybrid CONe WDs (sometimes known as the “failed-detonation model” ; see also Jordan et al. 2012; Kromer et al. 2013; Fink et al. 2014; Lach et al. 2022) could provide reasonable agreement with the observational features of faint Type Iax SN 2008ha.

However, whether convective boundary mixing could be strong enough to stall the C-burning inside AGB stars remains open (see Leccoanet et al. 2016; Latanzio et al. 2017).

By performing binary population synthesis (BPS) calculations, Meng & Podsiadlowski (2014) and Wang et al. (2014) have respectively investigated the rates and delay times of SNe Ia produced from thermonuclear explosions of near-Chandrasekhar-mass hybrid CONe WDs with an MS donor (i.e., CONe WD + MS channel) and/or a He star donor (i.e., CONe WD + He star channel). Depending on different initial conditions and assumptions in their BPS calculations, both works have suggested SN Ia rates from near-Chandrasekhar-mass hybrid CONe WDs to be of the order of a few per cent of the Galactic SN Ia rates (Meng & Podsiadlowski 2014; Wang et al. 2014). In addition, because hybrid CONe WDs are expected to form through relatively massive zero-age MS stars (ZAMS; Chen et al. 2014), they found that this scenario could partly explain the short delay times of SNe Iax. However, these studies focused only on cases with solar-like metallicity (i.e., $Z = 0.02$).

It is unclear how different metallicities affect the SN Ia rates and delay times in the SD scenario with accreting hybrid CONe WDs. In particular, observations have detected SNe Ia with a high redshift of $z > 2$ (Rodney et al. 2014, 2015; Williams et al. 2020; Hayden et al. 2021; Pierel et al. 2024), which seems to indicate the production of SNe Ia in lower-metallicity environments. In this work, we investigate SNe Ia generated from the CONe WD + MS channel at low metallicity of $Z = 0.0001$ by combining the results of detailed binary evolution into population synthesis calculations. We aim to study the effect of different metallicities on the SN Ia rates and delay times in the CONe WD + MS channel. The paper is organized as follows: we describe the models and methods used in this work in Section 2. The results given by our detailed binary evolution and BPS calculations are presented in Section 3. Our discussions are shown in Section 4. Finally, we summarize our results in Section 5.

2.1. Binary Evolution Calculation

In this work we use the same method adopted by Han & Podsiadlowski (2004) to predict the rates and delay times of SNe Ia produced from the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel at a low metallicity environment, in which the results of detailed binary evolution calculations are combined with population synthesis models. We use the stellar evolution code Modules for Experiments in Stellar Astrophysics (MESA, version r22.05.1; Paxton et al. 2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, 2019) to trace the detailed evolution of binary systems in the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel. We start our binary evolution calculations when a CONe WD +

MS binary system is formed.

In our calculations, the detailed structures of MS companion stars are resolved consistently, and the CONe WD is treated as a point mass. The metallicity is set to be $Z = 0.0001$. This is the lowest metallicity that our codes are able to calculate. We therefore simply take $Z = 0.0001$ as an extreme case to investigate SN Ia rates and their delay times in metal-poor environments (see also Meng et al. 2009; Chen et al. 2019). We assume that hydrogen-rich (H-rich) material is transferred to the WD through Roche-lobe overflow (RLOF). If the WD grows in mass to reach the near-Chandrasekhar-mass limit (which is assumed to be 1.378 Me in this work), we assume that it would explode as an SN Ia (Nomoto et al. 1984).

We set the ratio of typical mixing length to the local pressure scaleheight, $\alpha = l/H_p$, to 2. In addition, the convective overshooting parameter, δ_{ov} , is set to 0.12 (Pols et al. 1997; Schroder et al. 1997), which means that the overshooting length is approximately equal to 0.25 pressure scaleheights (H_p). In this work, we focus on the hybrid CONe WD+MS channel for SNe Ia. In Chen et al. (2014), they suggest that a hybrid CONe WD forms when a massive AGB star stalls its CO core burning due to convective boundary mixing. They further showed that the formed CONe WDs have a range of masses of 1.02–1.30 Me for a range of CBR factors of 0.1–10.

Following the results of Chen et al. (2014), we therefore set a mass range of our initial CONe WDs to 1.0–1.3 Me in our detailed binary evolution calculations. It is important to note that the CBR during the C-burning process is quite uncertain. For instance, taking the possible resonance and hindrance effects (Jiang et al. 2007; Spillane et al. 2007) into account could cause the values of the CBR to change by a few orders of magnitude (Chen et al. 2014). Therefore, we treat the CBR as a free parameter in our calculations and set it to be the same values as used in Chen et al. (2014).

As the MS companion star evolves, it expands to fill its Roche lobe during either the MS phase or the Hertzsprung gap (HG) phase. As a result, the companion star starts to transfer H-rich material to the WD through RLOF. As described in Han & Podsiadlowski (2004), we also adopt the prescription of Hachisu et al. (1999) for the accumulation of transferred H-rich material onto the CONe WD (i.e., the mass growth of a CONe WD). If the mass-transfer rate (\dot{M}_2) is above the critical rate (\dot{M}_{cr}), we assume that the transferred H burns steadily on the surface of the WD and that the accreted H-rich material converts into He at a rate of \dot{M}_{cr} , and the unprocessed H-rich material will be lost from the binary system in an optically thick wind. Here, the critical mass-transfer rate is given as follows (see also Hachisu et al. 1999):

$$\dot{M}_{cr} = 5.3 \times 10^{-7} \frac{(1.7 - X)}{X^{0.4}} (M_{WD} - 0.4) M_{\odot} \text{yr}^{-1},$$

where $M_{\{WD\}}$ is the mass of the accreting WD (mass is in Me) and X is the

H mass fraction.

When $|\dot{M}_2|$ is lower than \dot{M}_{cr} , *different assumptions are adopted for the mass growth of the accreting WD: (i) when $|\dot{M}_2|$ is higher than $0.5\dot{M}_{\text{cr}}$, we assume that the transferred H-rich material will burn steadily on the WD surface or that weak H flashes occur, and all the transferred material would be retained onto the WD. (ii) When $|\dot{M}_2|$ is lower than $0.5\dot{M}_{\text{cr}}$, H-shell flashes are too strong to accumulate any transferred material.*

Therefore, the accumulation rate of the He-shell of the accreting WD can be described as follows:

$$\dot{M}_{\text{He}} = \eta_{\text{H}} |\dot{M}_2|,$$

where

$$\eta_{\text{H}} = \begin{cases} 1.0 & |\dot{M}_2| \geq \dot{M}_{\text{cr}} \\ \frac{|\dot{M}_2|}{\dot{M}_{\text{cr}}} & 0.5\dot{M}_{\text{cr}} \leq |\dot{M}_2| < \dot{M}_{\text{cr}} \\ 0.0 & |\dot{M}_2| < 0.5\dot{M}_{\text{cr}} \end{cases}$$

We further assume that the He ignites when the He layer reaches a certain mass and that He is converted into CO. He flashes may occur during He-shell burning and a portion of the shell mass is assumed to be blown away in our calculations. In this work, the mass accumulation efficiency for He-shell flashes is taken from Hachisu et al. (1999), which can be described as follows:

$$\eta_{\text{He}} = \begin{cases} -0.175 \log_{10}(|\dot{M}_2|) + 0.175 \log_{10}(\dot{M}_{\text{cr}}) + 1.05 & |\dot{M}_2| \geq 10^{-7.5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1} \\ 0.0 & |\dot{M}_2| < 10^{-7.5} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1} \end{cases}$$

Finally, we can calculate the mass growth rate (i.e., \dot{M}_{WD}) of an accreting CONe WD, which is

$$\dot{M}_{\text{WD}} = \eta_{\text{He}} \eta_{\text{H}} |\dot{M}_2|.$$

The mass lost from the binary system is assumed to take away the specific orbital angular momentum of the accreting WD. According to the results of Chen et al. (2014, see their Figure 5 [Figure 5: see original paper]), we consider cases with different CBR factors of 0.1, 1.0, and 10.0, and set the initial mass of CONe WD ($M_{\text{i,WD}}$) to range from 1.0 to 1.3 Me. For WDs with a mass range of 1.0–1.2 Me, we set the initial mass range of the donor star ($M_{\text{i,2}}$) to 1.0–3.6 Me, which is consistent with that in Meng & Podsiadlowski (2014). For cases with a WD mass of 1.3 Me, we range the donor mass $M_{\text{i,2}}$ from 1.0 Me to 4.0 Me. In addition, we set a range of initial orbital periods (P_{i}) to 0.25–20 days.

2.2. Binary Population Synthesis

In order to calculate the birth rates and delay times of SNe Ia produced from the CONe WD + MS channel, we perform a series of population synthesis calculations with the rapid binary evolution code developed by Hurley et al. (2000, 2002), i.e., the Binary Star Evolution (BSE) code. The BSE code can evolve a large number of binary systems rapidly from ZAMS to the formation of CONe WD + MS binary systems.

The basic assumptions and treatments for some fundamental processes in our population synthesis calculations are similar to those in Meng & Podsiadlowski (2014), which are briefly described as follows.

2.2.1. Formation of CONe WD + MS Systems

In Figure 5 of Chen et al. (2014), they have provided mass boundaries that allow formation of CO WDs, ONe WDs, and hybrid CONe WDs for different CBR factors. Usually, CO cores in AGB stars with significantly large masses will go through a C-burning process and evolve into an ONe core. However, according to Denissenkov et al. (2013), the C-burning process may stall due to convective boundary mixing and form a hybrid CONe core. Since the convective boundary mixing process is not considered in the BSE code, hybrid CONe WDs will be mis-evaluated as ONe WDs in our rapid binary evolution calculations. We therefore simply assume that a WD would be a hybrid CONe WD if its mass is lower than the upper-limit mass boundaries of hybrid CONe WDs given by Figure 5 of Chen et al. (2014, the upper panel) and appears to be an ONe WD in the binary population synthesis (see also Meng & Podsiadlowski 2014).

Based on the results of Chen et al. (2014), we performed BPS calculations for three different CBR factors of 0.1, 1, and 10. If a CONe WD + MS binary system is formed and its binary parameters at the onset of RLOF fall into the initial contours in the P_i - $M_{i,2}$ plane given by our detailed binary evolution calculation in Section 2.1, we assume that this system would eventually explode as an SN Ia.

2.2.2. Treatment for Common-envelope Evolution

Different binary systems start their first RLOF in different stages, which depend on the mass, mass ratios, and orbital periods. Whether or not a binary system can lead to dynamically unstable mass-transfer to form a CE mainly depends on the mass ratio of the system at the onset of RLOF. If the mass ratio is larger than the critical mass ratio, q_c , the dynamically unstable RLOF will happen to form a CE. Here, the critical ratio q_c varies with the evolutionary stages of the binary systems at the onset of RLOF (Hjellming & Webbink 1987; Webbink 1988; Han et al. 2002; Podsiadlowski et al. 2002; Chen & Han 2008). Based on the results of previous detailed binary evolution studies (e.g., Han et al. 2000; Chen & Han 2002, 2003), we set $q_c = 4.0$ when the primary star is either on the MS phase or on the HG phase. If the primary star is a naked He giant, we

set $q_c = 0.748$. If the primary star is on the first giant branch or AGB, we set q_c as follows:

$$q_c = \frac{M_{c1}}{M_P} + 0.15 \frac{M_P}{R_P} \frac{dR_P}{dM_P},$$

where M_P and M_{c1} are the mass and the core mass of the primary star, respectively; dR_P/dM_P is the mass-radius exponent of the primary star, which varies with composition.

Binary systems inside the CE are expected to release their orbital energies through frictional drag and then undergo an in-spiral. The released energy would be partly used to eject the CE. Once a binary system enters the CE phase, we assume that the CE could be ejected completely if

$$\alpha_{CE} \Delta E_{orb} \geq E_{bind},$$

where ΔE_{orb} is the orbital energy released during the spiral-in phase, E_{bind} is the binding energy of the CE, and α_{CE} is the CE ejection efficiency. Because the internal energy in the CE is not incorporated into the binding energy, α_{CE} may be greater than 1. The exact value of α_{CE} is still poorly constrained from both theoretical and observational sides (e.g., Zorotovic et al. 2010; Ivanova et al. 2013; Toonen & Nelemans 2013; Röpke & De Marco 2023; Scherbak & Fuller 2023; Ge et al. 2024). In this work, similar to various previous works (e.g., Meng et al. 2009; Meng & Podsiadlowski 2014, 2018; Liu & Stancliffe 2018; Wang et al. 2013, 2014, 2017), we simply set α_{CE} to be 0.5, 0.75, 1.0, and 3.0 to investigate the influence of different CE ejection efficiencies on the results.

E_{bind} is given by

$$E_{bind} = -\frac{GM_P(M_P - M_{c1})}{\lambda_{CE}R_P},$$

where G is the gravitational constant, M_P is the mass of the primary giant star, and M_{c1} is the mass of the removed envelope from the giant primary. Here R_P is the radius of the primary giant star at the onset of CE, while λ_{CE} is the binding energy factor, which is set to characterize the envelope central concentration of the giant primary. In this work, the binding energy factor is set to be $\lambda_{CE} = 0.5$.

2.2.3. Basic Assumptions

We use a Monte Carlo method to generate a large number of binary systems and follow their rapid evolution from the ZAMS phase to the formation of CONE WD + MS systems. The basic assumptions adopted in our rapid calculations are described as follows:

- (1) We assume that all stars are in binary systems. Also, all binary systems are assumed to have a circular orbit.
- (2) We use the initial mass function (IMF) given by Miller & Scalo (1979). The primary star is generated according to the formula of Eggleton et al. (1989):

$$M_P = 0.19 \frac{R}{(1-R)} \left[\left(\frac{1}{R} \right)^{1.55} + \left(\frac{1}{R} \right)^{0.25} \right],$$

where R is a random number uniformly distributed in the range $[0,1]$, M_P is the mass of the primary star, which is between 0.1 Me and 100 Me.

- (3) We assume that the mass ratios of the initial binary systems at the ZAMS phase, q , have a constant distribution (Mazeh et al. 1992; Goldberg & Mazeh 1994):

$$n(q') = 1, \quad 0 < q' \leq 1.$$

- (4) We assume that the distribution of binary separations is constant for wide binary systems (where a is separation), and falls off smoothly for close binary systems (Han et al. 1995):

$$an(a) = \begin{cases} \alpha_{\text{sep}} \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right)^m & a \leq a_0 \\ \alpha_{\text{sep}} & a_0 < a < a_1 \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha_{\text{sep}} = 0.07$, $a_0 = 10 \text{ Re}$, $a_1 = 5.75 \times 10^6 \text{ Re} = 0.13 \text{ pc}$, and $m = 1.2$. This distribution implies that the number of wide binary systems per logarithmic interval is equal and about 50% of binary systems have orbital periods less than 100 yr (Han et al. 1995).

- (5) Either a single starburst with 10^{11} Me or a constant star formation rate (SFR) of 5 Me yr^{-1} in the past 15 Gyr is assumed in our calculations.

3. Results

In this section, we present the main results from our detailed binary evolution and population synthesis calculations, including the initial parameter spaces (i.e., the orbital period-secondary mass plane) which eventually lead to SNe Ia in the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel, and the predicted birth rates and delay times of SNe Ia from this channel.

3.1. Initial Parameter Contours

We use the MESA code to perform detailed binary evolution calculations for about 1000 binary systems consisting of a CONe WD (which is treated as a

point mass) and an MS companion star using the method described in Section 2.1. The initial masses of CONe WDs and MS companions and orbital periods of these binary systems cover the ranges of 1.0–1.3 Me, 1.0–4.0 Me, and 0.25–20 days, respectively. Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper] presents the results from our detailed binary evolution calculations in the P_i - $M_{i,2}$ plane for different given initial WD masses. The filled circles and cross symbols in Figure 1 respectively correspond to models that are able and unable to successfully produce SN Ia explosions in our calculations.

The left boundaries of initial contours (solid lines) in Figure 1 are constrained by the requirement that the binary systems do not fill their Roche lobes before the MS phase. Binary systems outside the upper boundaries of the contours subsequently experience dynamically unstable mass-transfer and lead to CE objects. For binary systems outside the right boundaries, their mass-transfer rates are too high to lead to a long enough mass-transfer phase. This inhibits the WDs from accumulating mass to reach the Chandrasekhar limit. For binary systems below the lower boundaries of the contours, the MS donors are not massive enough to lead to sufficient mass-transfer rates to allow the WDs to accumulate mass to reach the Chandrasekhar limit.

As shown in Figure 1, the contours for the initial CONe WD mass of 1.3 Me extend to a significantly higher initial donor mass (the upper boundary) compared to those of other models, i.e., the enclosed region of this contour is much larger. This is because binary systems close to the upper boundaries may go through a short dynamically stable mass-transfer phase before dynamically unstable mass-transfer starts. This phase will only allow a small amount of mass accumulation (~ 0.1 Me) onto the CONe WD due to the short timescale. Thus, only a 1.3 Me CONe WD can accumulate enough mass to reach a mass of 1.378 Me to trigger an SN Ia explosion.

3.2. Results of Binary Population Synthesis

By using the method described in Section 2.2, we follow the rapid evolution of 10^8 binary systems from the ZAMS phase to the formation of CONe WD + MS systems. Once the formed CONe WD + MS systems fall into the initial contours given by detailed binary evolution calculations (i.e., Figure 1) at the moment of RLOF, we simply assume that the systems would eventually lead to successful SN Ia explosions. Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper] presents the predicted birth rates of SNe Ia from our BPS calculations for the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel by assuming a constant star formation rate (SFR) of ~ 5 Me yr^{-1} over the past 15 Gyr. As shown in Figure 2, the SN Ia rate in a galaxy with a constant SFR is affected not only by the assumed CE ejection efficiencies in our BPS calculations but also by the adopted CBR factors. Depending on different α_{CE} and CBR factors, we find that the SN Ia rate in a galaxy with a constant SFR in the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel at $Z = 0.0001$ is about $0.11\text{--}3.89 \times 10^{-4} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. In addition, Figure 2 shows that a lower α_{CE} tends to give a higher SN Ia rate. This is because the lower the α_{CE} values are,

the more orbital energy will be lost when the primordial binary systems eject the CE to form a CONe WD + MS system. As a result, the CONe WD + MS systems will have shorter initial orbital separations. This refers to a shorter initial Roche-lobe radius, thus making it easier to start the RLOF, leading to higher SN Ia rates.

Figure 3 [Figure 3: see original paper] presents the delay-time distributions (DTDs) of SNe Ia in the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel at $Z = 0.0001$ after a starburst of 10^{11} Me. We find that the delay times of SNe Ia in this channel cover a range of 0.05–2.5 Gyr. Two peaks are observed in the DTDs of SNe Ia, which is consistent with the result shown in Meng & Podsiadlowski (2014). The right peak, around 0.3 Gyr, is given by SNe Ia produced from the normal CONe WD + MS evolutionary channel. The left peak, around 0.06 Gyr, is from the so-called He-enriched MS (HEMS) evolutionary channel (see Meng et al. 2009; Liu & Stancliffe 2018, for a detailed description). In the HEMS channel, the primary star begins its first episode of RLOF mass-transfer during the HG phase or during the RG phase. The binary system then undergoes a CE phase due to dynamically unstable mass-transfer. After the CE ejection, the primary He star and a companion MS star remain in the system. As the primary He star continues to evolve and expand, the second episode of RLOF mass-transfer occurs. In this phase, He-rich material transfers onto the surface of the companion MS star and eventually forms a CONe WD + HEMS binary system (Liu & Stancliffe 2018). SNe Ia formed in the hybrid CONe WD + HEMS channel have relatively shorter delay times compared to those of the normal hybrid CONe WD + MS channel.

Figure 4 [Figure 4: see original paper] shows the mass distribution of the initial hybrid CONe WDs of the systems which successfully produce SNe Ia. The lower- and upper-limits for the initial CONe WD masses (which are about 1.02 Me and 1.30 Me) are respectively constrained by the upper-limits for CO WD and CONe WD masses given by Figure 5 of Chen et al. (2014). The difference in distribution between the CBR factor of 0.1 and 1 is relatively small, leading to the SN Ia rates of these two cases being quite similar (see Figures 2 and 3). For a CBR factor of 10, however, more CONe WD + MS systems that fulfill the condition for SN Ia production are formed, as well as the SN Ia rates shown in Figure 2.

4.1. Comparisons with Previous Works

In Figure 5, we compare the initial contours in the P_i - $M_{i,2}$ plane from our detailed binary evolution calculations ($Z = 0.0001$) to those given by the previous work of Meng & Podsiadlowski (2014) with $Z = 0.02$. It shows that our contours cover shorter orbital periods and lower MS companion masses than theirs. Similar trends are also shown in the binary systems from the CO WD + MS channel in Meng et al. (2009). In Figure 6 [Figure 6: see original paper], we further compare the predicted SNe Ia rates in a galaxy with a constant SFR and delay times of SNe Ia between the two metallicities. Here, only the results with

a CBR factor of 0.1 are presented. It shows that the SNe Ia rates in a galaxy with a constant SFR do not change significantly as the metallicity varies from $Z = 0.02$ to $Z = 0.0001$. However, Figure 6 shows that SNe Ia have relatively longer delay times in lower-metallicity environments. This is because progenitor systems in lower-metallicity environments have smaller initial secondary masses (see Figure 5), leading to longer evolutionary timescales until they fill their Roche lobe and thus longer delay times (see also Meng et al. 2009).

To compare our results with observations, following the previous work of Kistler et al. (2013), we simply calculate the galactic masses in a low metallicity galaxy with $Z = 0.0001$ by using the relation between stellar metallicities and galactic masses derived from Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) observations (Gallazzi et al. 2005). This gives a galactic mass of $\sim 2.5 \times 10^7$ Me for $Z = 0.0001$. We then use the observational relation between SNe Ia birth rates and stellar masses provided by Wiseman et al. (2021) to calculate the expected SN Ia rates at $Z = 0.0001$, which is $\sim 6.6 \times 10^{-5} \text{ yr}^{-1}$. These rates are relatively lower than those from our BPS calculations of $\sim 3.9 \times 10^{-4} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ by a factor of 6. However, it is important to note that BPS calculations have some uncertainties (e.g., Han et al. 2020, see also Section 4.2). Also, we directly use the relations given by Gallazzi et al. (2005) and Wiseman et al. (2021) for calculations under some assumptions such as that the effect of redshift could be neglected. This may lead to some uncertainties in the expected SN Ia rates at $Z = 0.0001$.

4.2. Uncertainties of Our Results

In this work, we simply assume that all stars are in binary systems. This means that our calculations only present upper limits of the SNe Ia birth rates. We also assume that all binary systems are in circular orbits. This assumption may lead to some uncertainties in the results. In previous work, Wang et al. (2013) investigated the effect of different initial eccentricities on their BPS results. They suggested that different initial eccentricities lead to a small difference in rates and delay times of SNe Ia from their BPS calculations compared with those with an assumption of a circular orbit. In addition, we simply use a constant SFR of ~ 5 Me for our calculations, which could lead to SN Ia rates in Figure 6 being under- or over-estimated. For comparison, we adopt a variable SFR given by Kubryk et al. (2015) to study its effect on SN Ia rates. As shown in Figure 6, with a variable SFR, SN Ia rates rise and reach a peak at delay times around 1 Gyr, then decline exponentially. This indicates that different SFRs need to be taken into account in BPS studies for SNe Ia.

We adopt the optically thick wind model (Hachisu et al. 1996, 1999; Kato & Hachisu 1999) for the treatment of the mass accumulation efficiency onto the WDs. However, the exact mass accumulation efficiency is still not well-constrained, which might bring some uncertainties to our results. Previous BPS studies have shown that adopting different mass accumulation efficiencies onto the WDs in BPS calculations could give a significant difference in the predicted SN Ia rates (e.g., Piersanti et al. 2014; Ruiter et al. 2014; Toonen et al. 2014).

We have tested the influence of different CE ejection efficiencies on the results by varying the values of $\alpha_{\{CE\}}$ from 0.5 to 3.0 in our BPS calculations. However, current constraints on the CE ejection efficiency are still quite weak. Meanwhile, a fixed binding energy factor value ($\lambda_{\{CE\}} = 0.5$) is used for all evolutionary phases in a single BPS calculation (see also Meng & Podsiadlowski 2014). Ivanova (2011) suggested that the value of $\lambda_{\{CE\}}$ is dependent on the relative mass distribution of the envelope of the donor stars, thus the exact $\lambda_{\{CE\}}$ value might vary with different evolutionary phases. In addition, other initial conditions and assumptions in BPS calculations such as the SFR and initial mass function are still quite uncertain (see Claeys et al. 2014, for a detailed description of theoretical uncertainties in BPS studies of SNe Ia). This may also lead to some uncertainties in our BPS results.

5. Summary

In this work, we have addressed the rates and delay times of SNe Ia produced from the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel at low metallicity of $Z = 0.0001$ by combining the results of detailed binary evolution calculation with MESA (Paxton et al. 2011, 2013, 2015, 2018, 2019) into the population synthesis models computed from BSE (Hurley et al. 2000, 2002). We adopt the ‘optically thick wind model’ for the treatment of the mass accumulation efficiency onto the accreting CONe WD. Compared with previous works for solar-like metallicity of $Z = 0.02$ (Meng & Podsiadlowski 2014), we attempt to explore how different metallicities affect the rates and delay times of SNe Ia in the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel. Our main results and conclusions can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Depending on different CE ejection efficiencies and CBR factors adopted in BPS calculations, we find that the SN Ia rates in a galaxy with a constant SFR of $\sim 5 M_{\odot}$ from the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel at low metallicity of $Z = 0.0001$ are $(0.11-3.89) \times 10^{-4} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.
- (2) The DTDs of SNe Ia from the hybrid CONe WD + MS channel at $Z = 0.0001$ cover a wide range of 0.05-2.5 Gyr, and most SNe Ia have delay times of ~ 0.3 Gyr.
- (3) Comparing with previous works of Meng & Podsiadlowski (2014) for $Z = 0.02$, we find that SN Ia rates and delay times given by our work are not significantly different from theirs, although SNe Ia produced at a low metallicity environment of $Z = 0.0001$ have relatively longer delay times.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Hai-Liang Chen, Zhenwei Li, Yunlang Guo, and Lifu Zhang for their fruitful discussions. This work is supported by the Strategic Priority Research Program of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (grant Nos. XDB1160303, XDB1160000), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC, Nos. 12288102, 12333008, 12090040/1, 11873016, 11973080, and

11803030), the National Key R&D Program of China (Nos. 2021YFA1600403, 2021YFA1600401, and 2021YFA1600400), the Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), the Yunnan Ten Thousand Talents Plan-Young & Elite Talents Project, and the CAS “Light of West China” Program, the International Centre of Supernovae, Yunnan Key Laboratory (No. 202302AN360001), the Yunnan Fundamental Research Projects (grant Nos. 202401BC070007, 202201BC070003, and 202001AW070007), and the “Yunnan Revitalization Talent Support Program” –Science & Technology Champion Project and Yunling Scholar Project (No. 202305AB350003).

References

- Antoniadis, J., Chanlaridis, S., Gräfenor, G., & Langer, N. 2020, *A&A*, 635, A72
- Bauer, E. B., White, C. J., & Bildsten, L. 2019, *ApJ*, 887, 68
- Bedin, L. R., Ruiz-Lapuente, P., González Hernández, J. I., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 439, 354
- Bloom, J. S., Kasen, D., Shen, K. J., et al. 2012, *ApJL*, 744, L17
- Boehner, P., Plewa, T., & Langer, N. 2017, *MNRAS*, 465, 2060
- Chen, H.-L., Woods, T. E., Yungelson, L. R., et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 1678
- Chen, M. C., Herwig, F., Denissenkov, P. A., & Paxton, B. 2014, *MNRAS*, 440, 1274
- Chen, X., & Han, Z. 2002, *MNRAS*, 335, 948
- Chen, X., & Han, Z. 2003, *MNRAS*, 341, 662
- Chen, X., & Han, Z. 2008, *MNRAS*, 387, 1416
- Claeys, J. S. W., Pols, O. R., Izzard, R. G., Vink, J., & Verbunt, F. W. M. 2014, *A&A*, 563, A83
- Denissenkov, P. A., Herwig, F., Truran, J. W., & Paxton, B. 2013, *ApJ*, 772, 37
- Denissenkov, P. A., Truran, J. W., Herwig, F., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 447, 2696
- Dilday, B., Howell, D. A., Cenko, S. B., et al. 2012, *Sci*, 337, 942
- Dimitriadis, G., Foley, R. J., Rest, A., et al. 2019, *ApJL*, 870, L1
- Dimitriadis, G., Sullivan, M., Kerzendorf, W., et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 468, 3798
- Eggleton, P. P., Fitchett, M. J., & Tout, C. A. 1989, *ApJ*, 347, 998
- Elias-Rosa, N., Chen, P., Benetti, S., et al. 2021, *A&A*, 652, A115
- Fink, M., Kromer, M., Seitenzahl, I. R., et al. 2014, *MNRAS*, 438, 1762
- Foley, R. J., Challis, P. J., Chornock, R., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 57
- Fuhrmann, K. 2005, *MNRAS*, 359, L35
- Fujimoto, M. Y. 1982a, *ApJ*, 257, 752
- Fujimoto, M. Y. 1982b, *ApJ*, 257, 767
- Gallazzi, A., Charlot, S., Brinchmann, J., White, S. D. M., & Tremonti, C. A. 2005, *MNRAS*, 362, 41
- García-Berro, E., Ritossa, C., & Iben, I. J. 1997, *ApJ*, 485, 765
- Ge, H., Tout, C. A., Webbink, R. F., et al. 2024, *ApJ*, 961, 202
- Geier, S., Fürst, F., Ziegerer, E., et al. 2015, *Sci*, 347, 1126
- Goldberg, D., & Mazeh, T. 1994, *A&A*, 282, 801
- González Hernández, J. I., Ruiz-Lapuente, P., Filippenko, A. V., et al. 2009,

- ApJ, 691, 1
- Graham, M. L., Kumar, S., Hosseinzadeh, G., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 472, 3437
- Graham, M. L., Nugent, P. E., Sullivan, M., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 454, 1948
- Hachisu, I., Kato, M., & Nomoto, K. 1996, ApJL, 470, L97
- Hachisu, I., Kato, M., Nomoto, K., & Umeda, H. 1999, ApJ, 519, 314
- Hamers, A. S., Pols, O. R., Claeys, J. S. W., & Nelemans, G. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 2262
- Han, Z., & Podsiadlowski, P. 2004, MNRAS, 350, 1301
- Han, Z., Podsiadlowski, P., & Eggleton, P. P. 1995, MNRAS, 272, 800
- Han, Z., Podsiadlowski, P., Maxted, P. F. L., Marsh, T. R., & Ivanova, N. 2002, MNRAS, 336, 449
- Han, Z., Tout, C. A., & Eggleton, P. P. 2000, MNRAS, 319, 215
- Han, Z.-W., Ge, H.-W., Chen, X.-F., & Chen, H.-L. 2020, RAA, 20, 161
- Hayden, B., Rubin, D., Boone, K., et al. 2021, ApJ, 912, 87
- Hjellming, M. S., & Webbink, R. F. 1987, ApJ, 318, 794
- Holmbo, S., Stritzinger, M. D., Shappee, B. J., et al. 2019, A&A, 627, A174
- Hoshino, A., Kulkarni, S. R., Fox, D. B., et al. 2012, ApJ, 746, 21
- Hosseinzadeh, G., Sand, D. J., Lundqvist, P., et al. 2022, ApJL, 933, L45
- Hosseinzadeh, G., Sand, D. J., Valenti, S., et al. 2017, ApJL, 845, L11
- Hoyle, F., & Fowler, W. A. 1960, ApJ, 132, 565
- Hurley, J. R., Pols, O. R., & Tout, C. A. 2000, MNRAS, 315, 543
- Hurley, J. R., Tout, C. A., & Pols, O. R. 2002, MNRAS, 329, 897
- Iben, I. J., & Renzini, A. 1983, ARA&A, 21, 271
- Iben, I. J., & Tutukov, A. V. 1984, ApJS, 54, 335
- Ihara, Y., Ozaki, J., Doi, M., et al. 2007, PASJ, 59, 811
- Ilkov, M., & Soker, N. 2012, MNRAS, 419, 1695
- Ivanova, N. 2011, in ASP Conf. Ser. 447, Evolution of Compact Binaries, ed. L. Schmidtobreick, M. R. Schreiber, & C. Tappert (San Francisco, CA: ASP), 91
- Ivanova, N., Justham, S., Chen, X., et al. 2013, A&ARv, 21, 59
- Jacobson-Galán, W. V., Foley, R. J., Schwab, J., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 487, 2538
- Jha, S. W., Maguire, K., & Sullivan, M. 2019, NatAs, 3, 706
- Jiang, C. L., Rehm, K. E., Back, B. B., & Janssens, R. V. F. 2007, PhRvC, 75, 015803
- Jordan, G. C. I., Graziani, C., Fisher, R. T., et al. 2012, ApJ, 759, 53
- Kashi, A., & Soker, N. 2011, MNRAS, 417, 1466
- Kato, M., & Hachisu, I. 1999, ApJL, 513, L41
- Katz, B., & Dong, S. 2012, arXiv:1211.4584
- Kerzendorf, W. E., Schmidt, B. P., Asplund, M., et al. 2009, ApJ, 701, 1665
- Kerzendorf, W. E., Yong, D., Schmidt, B. P., et al. 2013, ApJ, 774, 99
- Kistler, M. D., Stanek, K. Z., Kochanek, C. S., Prieto, J. L., & Thompson, T. A. 2013, ApJ, 770, 88
- Kromer, M., Fink, M., Stanishev, V., et al. 2013, MNRAS, 429, 2287
- Kromer, M., Ohlmann, S. T., Pakmor, R., et al. 2015, MNRAS, 450, 3045
- Kubryk, M., Prantzos, N., & Athanassoula, E. 2015, A&A, 580, A126
- Lach, F., Callan, F. P., Bubeck, D., et al. 2022, A&A, 658, A179
- Lattanzio, J. C., Tout, C. A., Neumerzhitskii, E. V., Karakas, A. I., & Lesaffre,

- P. 2017, *MmSAI*, 88, 248
- Lecoanet, D., Schwab, J., Quataert, E., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 832, 71
- Leonard, D. C. 2007, *ApJ*, 670, 1275
- Li, W., Filippenko, A. V., Chornock, R., et al. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 453
- Liu, Z., & Stancliffe, R. J. 2020, *A&A*, 641, A20
- Liu, Z.-W., Kromer, M., Fink, M., et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 778, 121
- Liu, Z. W., Pakmor, R., Röpke, F. K., et al. 2012, *A&A*, 548, A2
- Liu, Z.-W., Röpke, F. K., & Han, Z. 2023, *RAA*, 23, 082001
- Liu, Z.-W., Röpke, F. K., Zeng, Y., & Heger, A. 2021, *A&A*, 654, A103
- Liu, Z.-W., & Stancliffe, R. J. 2018, *MNRAS*, 475, 5257
- Liu, Z.-W., Stancliffe, R. J., Abate, C., & Wang, B. 2015, *ApJ*, 808, 138
- Livio, M., & Mazzali, P. 2018, *PhR*, 736, 1
- Livio, M., Prialnik, D., & Regev, O. 1989, *ApJ*, 341, 299
- Livio, M., & Riess, A. G. 2003, *ApJL*, 594, L93
- Lundqvist, P., Mattila, S., Sollerman, J., et al. 2013, *MNRAS*, 435, 329
- Lundqvist, P., Nyholm, A., Taddia, F., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 577, A39
- Maguire, K., Taubenberger, S., Sullivan, M., & Mazzali, P. A. 2016, *MNRAS*, 457, 3254
- Maoz, D., Mannucci, F., & Nelemans, G. 2014, *ARA&A*, 52, 107
- Margutti, R., Parrent, J., Kamble, A., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 790, 52
- Marietta, E., Burrows, A., & Fryxell, B. 2000, *ApJS*, 128, 615
- Marquardt, K. S., Sim, S. A., Ruitter, A. J., et al. 2015, *A&A*, 580, A118
- Matteucci, F., & Greggio, L. 1986, *A&A*, 154, 279
- Mazeh, T., Goldberg, D., Duquennoy, A., & Mayor, M. 1992, *ApJ*, 401, 265
- McCully, C., Jha, S. W., Foley, R. J., et al. 2014, *Natur*, 512, 54
- McCutcheon, C., Zeng, Y., Liu, Z. W., et al. 2022, *MNRAS*, 514, 4078
- Meng, X., Chen, X., & Han, Z. 2009, *MNRAS*, 395, 2103
- Meng, X., & Han, Z. 2016, *A&A*, 588, A88
- Meng, X., & Podsiadlowski, P. 2014, *ApJL*, 789, L45
- Meng, X., & Podsiadlowski, P. 2018, *ApJ*, 861, 127
- Meng, X., & Yang, W. 2010, *ApJ*, 710, 1310
- Miller, G. E., & Scalo, J. M. 1979, *ApJS*, 41, 513
- Nomoto, K. 1982, *ApJ*, 253, 798
- Nomoto, K., Saio, H., Kato, M., & Hachisu, I. 2007, *ApJ*, 663, 1269
- Nomoto, K., Thielemann, F. K., & Yokoi, K. 1984, *ApJ*, 286, 644
- Paczynski, B. 1976, *IAU Symp.* 73, Structure and Evolution of Close Binary Systems 73, ed. P. Eggleton, S. Mitton, & J. Whelan (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press), 75
- Pakmor, R., Röpke, F. K., Weiss, A., & Hillebrandt, W. 2008, *A&A*, 489, 943
- Pan, K.-C., Ricker, P. M., & Taam, R. E. 2012, *ApJ*, 750, 151
- Patat, F., Chandra, P., Chevalier, R., et al. 2007, *Sci*, 317, 924
- Paxton, B., Bildsten, L., Dotter, A., et al. 2011, *ApJS*, 192, 3
- Paxton, B., Cantiello, M., Arras, P., et al. 2013, *ApJS*, 208, 4
- Paxton, B., Marchant, P., Schwab, J., et al. 2015, *ApJS*, 220, 15
- Paxton, B., Schwab, J., Bauer, E. B., et al. 2018, *ApJS*, 234, 34
- Paxton, B., Smolec, R., Schwab, J., et al. 2019, *ApJS*, 243, 10

- Perlmutter, S., Aldering, G., Goldhaber, G., et al. 1999, ApJ, 517, 565
- Pierel, J. D. R., Engesser, M., Coulter, D. A., et al. 2024, ApJL, 971, L32
- Piersanti, L., Tornambé, A., & Yungelson, L. R. 2014, MNRAS, 445, 3239
- Podsiadlowski, P., Rappaport, S., & Pfahl, E. D. 2002, ApJ, 565, 1107
- Pols, O. R., Tout, C. A., Schroder, K.-P., Eggleton, P. P., & Manners, J. 1997, MNRAS, 289, 869
- Prieto, J. L., Chen, P., Dong, S., et al. 2020, ApJ, 889, 100
- Rajamuthukumar, A. S., Hamers, A. S., Neunteufel, P., Pakmor, R., & de Mink, S. E. 2023, ApJ, 950, 9
- Riess, A. G., Filippenko, A. V., Challis, P., et al. 1998, AJ, 116, 1009
- Rodney, S. A., Riess, A. G., Scolnic, D. M., et al. 2015, AJ, 150, 156
- Rodney, S. A., Riess, A. G., Strolger, L.-G., et al. 2014, AJ, 148, 13
- Röpke, F. K., & De Marco, O. 2023, LRCA, 9, 2
- Ruiter, A. J., Belczynski, K., & Fryer, C. 2009, ApJ, 699, 2026
- Ruiter, A. J., Belczynski, K., Sim, S. A., Seitenzahl, I. R., & Kwiatkowski, D. 2014, MNRAS, 440, L101
- Ruiz-Lapuente, P. 2023, FrASS, 10, 1112880
- Ruiz-Lapuente, P., Comeron, F., Méndez, J., et al. 2004, Natur, 431, 1069
- Ruiz-Lapuente, P., Damiani, F., Bedin, L., et al. 2018, ApJ, 862, 124
- Ruiz-Lapuente, P., González Hernández, J. I., Cartier, R., et al. 2023, ApJ, 947, 90
- Ruiz-Lapuente, P., González Hernández, J. I., Mor, R., et al. 2019, ApJ, 870, 135
- Sand, D. J., Amaro, R. C., Moe, M., et al. 2019, ApJL, 877, L4
- Sand, D. J., Graham, M. L., Botyánszki, J., et al. 2018, ApJ, 863, 24
- Sand, D. J., Sarbadhicary, S. K., Pellegrino, C., et al. 2021, ApJ, 922, 21
- Schaefer, B. E., & Pagnotta, A. 2012, Natur, 481, 164
- Scherbak, P., & Fuller, J. 2023, MNRAS, 518, 3966
- Schroder, K.-P., Pols, O. R., & Eggleton, P. P. 1997, MNRAS, 285, 696
- Shappee, B. J., Piro, A. L., Stanek, K. Z., et al. 2018, ApJ, 855, 6
- Shappee, B. J., Stanek, K. Z., Pogge, R. W., & Garnavich, P. M. 2013, ApJL, 762, L5
- Shen, K. J., & Bildsten, L. 2007, ApJ, 660, 1444
- Siebert, M. R., Dimitriadis, G., Polin, A., & Foley, R. J. 2020, ApJL, 900, L27
- Silverman, J. M., Nugent, P. E., Gal-Yam, A., et al. 2013, ApJS, 207, 3
- Soker, N. 2018, SCPMA, 61, 49502
- Soker, N., Garcia-Berro, E., & Althaus, L. G. 2014, MNRAS, 437, L66
- Soker, N., Kashi, A., Garcia-Berro, E., Torres, S., & Camacho, J. 2013, MNRAS, 431, 1541
- Spillane, T., Raiola, F., Rolfs, C., et al. 2007, PhRvL, 98, 122501
- Sternberg, A., Gal-Yam, A., Simon, J. D., et al. 2011, Sci, 333, 856
- Toonen, S., Claeys, J. S. W., Mennekens, N., & Ruiter, A. J. 2014, A&A, 562, A14
- Toonen, S., & Nelemans, G. 2013, A&A, 557, A87
- Toonen, S., Perets, H. B., & Hamers, A. S. 2018, A&A, 610, A22
- Tout, C. A. 2005, in ASP Conf. Ser. 330, The Astrophysics of Cataclysmic

- Variables and Related Objects, ed. J. M. Hameury & J. P. Lasota (San Francisco, CA: ASP), 279
- Tucker, M. A., Ashall, C., Shappee, B. J., et al. 2022, ApJL, 926, L25
- Tucker, M. A., Shappee, B. J., Valley, P. J., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 493, 1044
- Tucker, M. A., Shappee, B. J., & Wisniewski, J. P. 2019, ApJL, 872, L22
- Valley, P. J., Fausnaugh, M., Jha, S. W., et al. 2019, MNRAS, 487, 2372
- Wang, B., Chen, X., Meng, X., & Han, Z. 2009, ApJ, 701, 1540
- Wang, B., Justham, S., & Han, Z. 2013, A&A, 559, A94
- Wang, B., Meng, X., Liu, D. D., Liu, Z. W., & Han, Z. 2014, ApJL, 794, L28
- Wang, B., Podsiadlowski, P., & Han, Z. 2017, MNRAS, 472, 1593
- Webbink, R. F. 1988, in IAU Coll. 103: The Symbiotic Phenomenon, ed. J. Mikolajewska et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press), 311
- Webbink, R. F., & Iben, I. J. 1987, in IAU Coll. 95: Second Conference on Faint Blue Stars, ed. A. G. D. Philip, D. S. Hayes, & J. W. Liebert (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press), 445
- Whelan, J., & Iben, I. J. 1973, ApJ, 186, 1007
- Williams, S. C., Hook, I. M., Hayden, B., et al. 2020, MNRAS, 495, 3859
- Wiseman, P., Sullivan, M., Smith, M., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 506, 3330
- Wolf, W. M., Bildsten, L., Brooks, J., & Paxton, B. 2013, ApJ, 777, 136
- Zorotovic, M., Schreiber, M. R., Gänsicke, B. T., & Nebot Gómez-Morán, A. 2010, A&A, 520, A86

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv – Machine translation. Verify with original.