Lagrange and Liapunov stabilities of hierarchical triple systems



Hayashi, Trani & YS: arXiv:2207.12672 ApJ (2022), arXiv:2209.08487

Yasushi Suto Department of Physics and Research Center for the Early Universe the University of Tokyo The 10th KIAS workshop on Cosmology and Structure Formation @Korean Institute of Advanced Study, 9:50-10:10 October25, 2022

Ubiquity of hierarchical triples

Stellar systems

more than 70% of OBA-type stars and 50% of FGK-type stars a belong to binary/multiple systems (e.g., Alpha Centauri)

Planetary systems

Sun-earth-moon, planet around binary stars, multi-planets

Black-hole systems

- Possible pathway towards binary BHs
- Binaries (stars, BHs) around a supermassive BH in galaxies
- Triples of compact objects, e.g., pulsar-WD binary + tertiary WD (Ransom et al. 2014)

Triples are unstable in general ⇔ diversity



Stability criterion (Mardling & Aarseth 2001)

$$_{\rm MA} \equiv 2.8 \left(1 - 0.3 \frac{i_{\rm mut}}{\pi} \right) \left[\left(1 + \frac{m_3}{m_{12}} \right) \frac{(1 + e_{\rm out})}{\sqrt{1 - e_{\rm out}}} \right]^{2/2}$$

5

- Well-known and widely used, but its implication is often misinterpreted...
- What does it mean?
- Liapunov (chaoticity of local trajectory) vs. Lagrange (escape of a body from the system) stability

Liapunov vs. Lagrange (in)stability Liapunov instability Local divergence of trajectories of **bodies (chaoticity)** l_{mut} Lagrange instability m_{2} global escape of a body from the triple m_3 $P_{\rm in}$ Pout system (boundedness of an orbit)



Longer-term 3-body simulations in Newtonian dynamics (neglecting GR effects)



Hayashi, Trani & YS arXiv:2207.12672 ApJ (2022) arXiv:2209.08487 *i*_{mut}: 0°, 90°, 180° Coplanar: prograde, retrograde Orthogonal

 $q_{21} \equiv m_2/m_1 (\leq 1)$ Mass ratio (inner binary) $q_{23} \equiv m_2/m_3$ Mass ratio (tertiary)

Examples of orbital evolution of triples



Green: Lagrange stable up to t=10⁸ P_{in}

Magenta: Lagrange unstable around t=10⁶ P_{in}

Disruption timescales on a_{out}(1-e_{out})/a_{in} – e_{out} plane

$m_1 = m_2 = 5m_3$

Stability boundary by Mardling & Aarseth (2001)



 $T_{\rm d}/P_{\rm in}$ 10² 10³ 10⁴ 10⁵ 10⁶ 10⁷ 10⁸ 10⁹

Inclination dependence

 10^{1}

 10^{2}

 10^{3}

 10^{4}

 $T_{\rm d}/P_{\rm out}$

 10^{5}

 10^{6}

 10^{7}

T_d/P_{out} on $a_{out}(1-e_{out})/a_{in} - e_{out}$ plane

 $60 < i_{mut} < 150$ destabilized by the Kozai-Lidov oscillations $I_{mut} > 160$

significantly stabilized due to inefficient

energy transfer between inner and outer orbits

Very different from the stability boundary by Mardling & Aarseth (2001) ----



Chaotic nature of disruption timescale distribution



Tiny difference in the input value of P_{in} leads to one or two order-ofmagnitude difference of disruption timescales Initial phase difference of the three bodies also leads to one or two order-of-magnitude difference of disruption timescales



$T_d/P_{out} (r_{p,out}/a_{in}; i_{mut}, e_{out})$ with random initial phases

 Liapunov stability boundaries (Vynatheya+2022) are plotted in dashed lines for reference



Conclusions

- Lagrange vs. Liapunov stability for triple systems
 - Conventional criteria correspond to Liapunov stability
 - Lagrange stability is more relevant in considering the fate of astronomical triples, i.e., disruption timescale
- We derive triple disruption timescales as a function of orbital parameters (intrinsic variation by one or two orderof-magnitudes due to the chaotic dynamics of triples)
- Strong dependence on the mutual inclination
 - Strongly misaligned systems (60<i_{mut}<150) are destabilized due to the Kozai-Lidov oscillations over longer timescales
 - Coplanar retrograde triples are significantly stabilized