

A&A manuscript no.

(will be inserted by hand later)

Your thesaurus codes are:

(02.12.1; 08.01.3; 08.04.1; 08.05.1; 08.13.2)

ASTRONOMY
AND
ASTROPHYSICS
13.7.1996

O-Star Mass-Loss and Wind Momentum Rates in the Galaxy and the Magellanic Clouds

Observations and Theoretical Predictions*

J. Puls¹, R.-P. Kudritzki^{1,2}, A. Herrero³, A.W.A. Pauldrach¹, S.M. Haser¹, D.J. Lennon¹, R. Gabler¹, S.A. Voels⁴, J.M. Vilchez³, S. Wachter⁵, and A. Feldmeier¹

¹ Universitäts-Sternwarte München, Scheinerstr. 1, D-81679 München, Germany

² Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Karl-Schwarzschild-Str. 1, D-85740 Garching bei München, Germany

³ Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias (IAC), La Laguna, Tenerife, Spain

⁴ Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, MD 20771, USA

⁵ University of Washington, Department of Astronomy, FM-20, Seattle, WA 98195, USA

July 13, 1996

Abstract. A new, very fast approximate method is presented to determine mass-loss rates of O-stars from H_α line profiles. The method uses H and He II departure coefficients from unified model atmospheres parametrized in a simple way as function of wind velocity together with photospheric NLTE line profiles as the inner boundary condition for a numerically exact radiative transfer solution to derive a wind contaminated H_α -profile. The method is also applied to H_γ to determine stellar gravities corrected for wind emission.

A detailed analytical discussion of H_α line formation in O-star winds is given and it is demonstrated that former very simple approaches considering only optically thin wind emission lead to significant systematic errors. Scaling relations and generalized curves of growth are presented that connect mass-loss rate, terminal velocity, stellar parameters and H_α equivalent width.

The method is applied to samples of O-stars in the Galaxy, LMC and SMC and mass-loss rates are derived from H_α in combination with terminal velocities measured from IUE and HST spectra. The results reveal that a tight empirical relation exists between the radius modified stellar wind momentum rate $\dot{M}v_\infty R_*^{0.5}$ and the stellar luminosity. The variations of this relationship between the Galaxy, LMC and SMC are explained in terms of different abundances. Furthermore, for almost all

objects with dense winds (mostly supergiants), the commonly used velocity field exponent β could be *derived*, indicating a typical value of $\beta \approx 1$.

A comparison with the improved theory of radiation driven winds (as presented recently by Pauldrach et al. 1994) shows that the observed wind momentum-luminosity relationship can be understood qualitatively in terms of the theory. However, there exist significant systematic discrepancies as a function of effective temperature, luminosity class and wind performance number $\eta = \dot{M}v_\infty c/L$. We stress that these discrepancies would not have been detected with previous simplified H_α -approaches.

The deficiencies of the theory are discussed and suggestions for future improvements are made.

Key words: Line: formation – Stars: atmospheres – Stars: distances – Stars: early-type – Stars: mass-loss

Send offprint requests to: J. Puls (first address above)

* based upon observations made with the NASA/ESA Hubble Space Telescope, obtained at the Space Telescope Science Institute which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under NASA grant NAS 5-26555. Also based upon data obtained at the European Southern Observatory, La Silla, Chile and on observations made with the INT operated on the island of La Palma by the RGO in the Spanish Observatorio del Roque de los Muchachos of the Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias.

1. Introduction

Mass-loss is ubiquitous during the evolution of massive stars. It is the keystone to understanding the transition from the zero age main sequence to the Wolf-Rayet stage through phases of Of-stars, supergiants, Ofpe/WN-stars, Luminous Blue Variables etc. (for a recent rediscussion of the evolutionary scenario see Langer et al. 1994). Moreover, since the strength of mass-loss is obviously correlated with the stellar parameters, in particular the luminosity, this correlation can in principle be utilized to determine distances to massive luminous stars in other galaxies. Kudritzki et al. (1992), for instance, have used the theory of radiation driven winds to determine stellar masses, radii and

distances from the observed values of mass-loss rate and terminal velocity of the winds of massive stars. Consequently, the precise determination of mass-loss rates is extremely important.

In this connection it has become clear that for O-stars an accurate and also versatile method is to use the strength of the stellar wind emission in H_α (Klein & Castor 1978, Leitherer 1988/1988a). In this method, the observed equivalent width of H_α is corrected for “photospheric absorption” by subtracting the equivalent width of a synthetic H_α line formed in a hydrostatic model atmosphere (with appropriate T_{eff} and $\log g$) to yield the equivalent width of the stellar wind emission. This latter value is then analytically transformed into a mass-loss rate via the equation of continuity assuming optically thin line emission, a constant value of the departure coefficient b_3 of the third level of hydrogen plus a constant ratio of wind temperature T_e to effective temperature T_{eff} and a “ β -type” velocity law.

The advantage of this method is that its application is straightforward and easy and that it is certainly more accurate than the use of UV resonance lines, where the ionization correction is still a source of large uncertainty. Very recently, Lamers & Leitherer (1993, “L&L”) have used this method to redetermine the mass-loss rates of galactic O-stars. They have also tested the theory of radiation driven winds using the analytical approach by Kudritzki et al. (1989) and radiative line force parameters as published by Pauldrach et al. (1990). The result they found was a possible defect of the theory in not predicting enough stellar wind momentum with increasing “wind performance number” $\eta = \dot{M} v_\infty c / L$.

The disadvantage of the method is that it uses only the observed *equivalent width* and not the *line profile*, wasting important information, e.g. about the shape of the velocity field (the “ β ”-exponent). Moreover, in the context of the optically thin approximation, the consideration of *line emission* only and the neglect of *line absorption* is certainly incorrect, as we shall show below (see Sect. 2.2.1). In addition, H_α is never *completely* optically thin throughout the wind (in particular in cases of dense winds), and the simple subtraction of a photospheric equivalent width may be too simple, if precision is required. Finally the assumption of constant departure coefficients might introduce additional errors.

A more consistent and precise approach is the concept of “unified model atmospheres” as introduced by Gabler et al. (1989, 1990) and recently improved by Sellmaier et al. (1993) and Schaerer & Schmutz (1994). In this approach, hydrodynamical atmospheres with a smooth transition between the sub- and supersonic layers are used together with the correct multi-line NLTE radiative transfer in the comoving frame to calculate H_α profiles. However, the effort to calculate such atmospheric models is huge and, since a wide parameter space (T_{eff} , $\log g$, $N(\text{He})/N(\text{H})$, \dot{M} , R_*/R_\odot , v_∞ , shape of velocity field) has to be investigated per star, the investigation of a large sample of objects by this approach is difficult.

Therefore, we introduce in this paper a compromise which combines the advantages of the “unified model atmospheres” with the simplicity of the original “core-halo H_α concept” by Klein & Castor (1978) and Leitherer (1988). The

idea is very simple. We use unified model atmospheres to parametrize the run of hydrogen (b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5) and ionized helium (b_4, b_6, b_8, b_{10}) departure coefficients as function of depth in the supersonic atmosphere. This parametrization is then applied to solve the exact equation of transfer for the H_α/HeI , H_β/HeI and H_γ/HeI line profile blends in the expanding stellar wind assuming an incident hydrostatic NLTE line profile as the inner boundary condition. This procedure needs only a few seconds per profile on a work station and leads to results almost indistinguishable from unified model atmosphere calculations.

In Sect. 2, we introduce this method together with a detailed discussion of analytical solutions and resulting scaling relations. Moreover, we discuss the dependence on the HeI blend, on the β -exponent, on the electron temperature, on v_∞ and present a generalized curve of growth.

Then, in Sect. 3, we apply our new method to determine mass-loss rates and β -exponents from H_α for O-stars in the Galaxy and the Magellanic Clouds. We use terminal velocities determined from UV-resonance line fits obtained from IUE and HST spectra. The method is also used to correct for wind emission in H_γ for the determination of stellar gravities. We compare with the previous work and conclude that the use of *line profiles* (vs. their equivalent widths) and the relaxation of the optically thin approximation is a significant improvement.

In Sect. 4 we discuss the wind momentum-luminosity relation of O-stars. Solving analytically the hydrodynamic equations of radiation driven winds, we show that such a relation must exist if the basic concept of the theory is correct. This conclusion is nicely confirmed by the observations, which also indicate, as expected, a trend with metallicity. We then reinvestigate whether the theory in its improved form with additional metal line opacities (see Pauldrach et al. 1994) still has quantitative defects, as found previously by Lamers and Leitherer (1993).

2. H-alpha line formation

2.1. General assumptions and approximations

In the following subsection, we will describe our basic assumptions and approximations which are used to derive mass-loss rates from H_α .

2.1.1. Hydrodynamical structure.

In the present paper, the stellar wind is assumed to be *stationary*, *smooth* (i.e., no shocks and no clumps) and *spherically symmetric*.

Stationarity. The intention of this paper is to derive time averaged rates of mass-loss based on the *mean* atmospheric situation (i.e., average density, velocity and ionization/excitation stratification). We are confident that this concept is reasonable, since the observed degree of line profile variability (both optical and UV) is negligible on time-scales longer than the wind flow times. Of course, this statement is not true for the few cases of

observed dramatic changes in spectral appearance, as for LBVs such as R127 (Stahl et al. 1983)

Smooth flow. It is now generally accepted that the winds around hot stars have a time-dependent and inhomogeneous structure consisting of shocks, clumps and blobs. The observational evidence for this comes from the presence of black and broad troughs in saturated UV P Cygni profiles (Lucy 1982, Puls et al. 1993, 1995) and the X-ray emission of hot stars (e.g. Chlebowski et al. 1989 and references therein, Hillier et al. 1993, Cassinelli et al. 1994). Moreover, some direct evidence for clumping in the *outer* parts of Wolf-Rayet winds is provided by the observations and analyses of distinct blobs (e.g. Robert & Moffat 1990). In terms of theory, shocks and wind inhomogeneities are induced by the intrinsic instabilities of radiation driven winds (cf. Owocki 1992 and references therein; Feldmeier 1995).

Therefore, at first glance, the assumption of a stationary wind without clumping seems questionable, particularly as the H_α opacity/emissivity scales with the square of the density (the influence of this principal effect was firstly discussed by Abbott et al. 1981 and Lamers & Waters 1984). On the other hand, the wind emission contribution to H_α for O-stars comes from lower wind layers, typically between 1.0 and 1.5 stellar radii. Very recent hydrodynamical simulations for *self-excited* wind instabilities show that these layers are unaffected by shocks and that instabilities only occur further out in the wind (Owocki 1995). This agrees with the fact that the observed X-rays most probably also arise in the outer layers (see Hillier et al. 1993) and that the broad absorption troughs in saturated P Cygni profiles can also be interpreted as arising from small-scale structures in the *outer* wind (Owocki 1995).

Nevertheless, instabilities producing a small density contrast might still be present in the H_α forming region, *if* the wind is triggered by photospheric perturbations (sound waves, non-radial pulsations, “strange mode” oscillations). In such cases the location of the onset of structure formation depends crucially on the damping by the diffuse radiation force (Lucy 1984; Owocki & Rybicki 1985) which in present simulations is only approximated (Owocki 1991; Feldmeier 1995). However, almost all recent hydrodynamical simulations including photospheric perturbations show pronounced inhomogeneous structures only above 1.5 stellar radii. Therefore we conclude that the neglect of clumping does most probably not induce large systematic errors for *O-star* mass-loss determinations. (For WR-winds, the situation seems to be different, since the analysis of the mass spectrum of the observed blobs implies a factor three overestimate in the mass-loss derived from IR and radio observations, cf. Moffat & Robert 1994).

A second line of reasoning in favour of our assumption was given by L&L and Puls et al. (1993a). Briefly, they have argued that because of the same ρ^2 dependency of both the radio and the H_α emission and the fact that both rates agree for those objects with H_α and radio mass-loss rates, this would imply the same clumping factor in regions close to (H_α) and far away from the star (radio). As this is rather unlikely, since in the lower wind

the formation of structure just sets in, whereas in the outer part any structure should have stabilized, it is most probable that the degree of clumping in the lower wind part is small, if present at all, and will not affect the derived values of mass-loss rates.

Spherical symmetry. In the following, we will assume a spherically symmetric density stratification and velocity field. This assumption is well justified at least for objects with a small rotational velocity ($v \sin i \lesssim 100$ km/s) both because in this case the resulting polar variation of the *effective* gravity is weak and the observed intrinsic polarisation in those objects is small (e.g. Hayes 1975; Lupie et al. 1987). The only effect which has to be accounted for is the influence of the average centrifugal correction on the stellar mass (cf. also Herrero et al. 1992).

For stars with a large rotational rate, the effects of an explicitly two-dimensional density structure (cf. Bjorkmann & Cassinelli 1993) have still to be explored, so that the derived mass-loss rates are only order of magnitude results.

2.1.2. Core-halo structure, Stark broadening and rotation

Core-halo structure. In contrast to a consistent “unified atmosphere” approach (Gabler et al. 1989; Schaerer & Schmutz 1994), which avoids any artificial division between photosphere and wind, our treatment explicitly comprises only the line formation in the wind. However, the underlying photospheric profile (calculated by means of plane-parallel NLTE atmospheres (Giddings 1980; Butler & Giddings 1985; Husfeld et al. 1989) is taken into account consistently, i.e., as lower boundary in the transfer algorithm and not only as an additional constant to correct the equivalent width of the wind profile. The continuum at the frequencies of the Balmer lines is adopted to be optically thin in the wind, which is a good approximation for O-stars but fails for WR-stars. We will, however, use reliable photospheric continuum fluxes approximated by radiation temperatures taken from unified model atmospheres.

Stark broadening. In our above approach of line formation, the Stark broadening of H_α and the neighbouring HeII blend is accounted for in the photospheric “input” profiles, whereas the line profile in the wind is assumed to be only Doppler broadened. Since Stark broadening becomes effective for electron densities $\gtrsim 10^{13} \text{cm}^{-3}$, whereas the electron density in the sonic region of typical O-star winds is of the order of a few 10^{12}cm^{-3} , this approximation is acceptable as long as the *different pressure* at which the Stark wings are formed either in a hydrostatic or in an expanding atmosphere is accounted for. The procedure to fulfil this restriction is discussed in Sect. 3.1.2.

Rotation. In the present paper, we have neglected the influence of the *differential* rotation on the line formation process. The stellar rotation is here accounted for by a *final* convolution of the emergent profile with the rotational profile for the *photospheric* value of $v \sin i$. Although this approximation may fail for intermediate wind densities, it should give satisfying results

both for thin winds (where the line is formed very close to the photosphere) and thick winds (where the wings become almost independent on any normalized convolution). In a forthcoming paper (Petrenz & Puls, in prep.), we will discuss the influence of the differential rotation in detail. Test calculations (cf. also Schaerer & Schmutz 1994) indicate that the major effect arises for profiles with an equivalent width around zero (which together with a large $v \sin i$ are *not* present in our sample). In any case the equivalent width is almost completely preserved even under differential rotation, since this process does not modify the number of photons emitted in the wind.

2.2. Analytic treatment of the pure Hydrogen problem for constant departure coefficients

Having discussed now our basic assumptions and approximations, we are turning to the actual problem of H_α line formation in typical O-star winds¹. In order to understand the final results derived at the end of this section thoroughly – with special emphasis on the dependence of the equivalent width on the wind parameters – we will initially consider the pure Hydrogen problem, i.e., we neglect the He-blend. We will also assume constant departure coefficients for the hydrogen NLTE occupation numbers and constant electron temperatures, which is not too bad as we will see below. In addition, we will solve the radiative transfer in the Sobolev approximation. (All these simplifications will be dropped in Sects. 2.3 to 2.5 and more exact solutions will be presented there.)

In the Sobolev approximation and spherical symmetry, the optical depth τ of a resonance zone (with directional derivative $d\mu v/dz$ along impact parameter p) is given by

$$\tau = \frac{A}{r^4 v^2 \frac{d\mu v}{dz}} = \frac{A}{r^3 v^3 (1 + \mu^2 \sigma)} \quad (1)$$

where the radius r is calculated in units of R_* as well as p and z . v is the velocity in units of the terminal velocity v_∞ , μ is the cosine of the angle between the photon's path and the velocity vector and the curvature parameter σ measures the deviation from homogenous expansion (cf. Castor 1970):

$$\sigma = d \ln v / d \ln r - 1 \quad (2)$$

In the parameter A we have absorbed all constants of the H_α transition and the wind parameters, and A is given by

$$A = 49.30 T_e^{-1.5} \left[b_2 \exp\left(\frac{3.945}{T_e}\right) - b_3 \exp\left(\frac{1.753}{T_e}\right) \right] \times \frac{1 + I_{\text{He}} Y}{(1 + 4Y)^2} \frac{M^2}{R_*^3 v_\infty^3} \quad (3)$$

¹ The reader may note that an analogue investigation with respect to optically thin IR HeII line emission in optically thick WR-winds was performed by Hillier et al. (1983), however assuming a $\rho \sim r^{-2}$ dependence of the density which is valid in the line forming region under their consideration.

$b_{2,3}$ are here the *non-LTE* departure coefficients of the lower and upper level with respect to ionized hydrogen, $Y = n_{\text{He}}/n_{\text{H}}$ is the Helium abundance (by number) with respect to Hydrogen, I_{He} the number of free electrons provided per He atom (assumed to be 2 throughout this paper), T_e the electron temperature in 10^4 K, \dot{M} the mass-loss rate in $10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$, R_* the stellar radius in R_\odot and v_∞ the terminal velocity in 1000 km/s. For typical O-Star parameters, A lies in the range from 10^{-7} to 10^{-1} , so that in the largest part of the wind the transition is *optically thin* (cf. Eq. 1).

With the usual p-z geometry and taking into account that the receding part of the atmosphere can contribute only via non-core rays, the emergent residual line intensity R_x measured by an observer in units of the continuum is given by

$$R_x(x > 0) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 P_x e^{-\tau} p dp + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty \frac{S}{I_c} (1 - e^{-\tau}) p dp}{\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 p dp} \quad (4)$$

$$R_x(x < 0) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 P_x p dp + \frac{1}{2} \int_1^\infty \frac{S}{I_c} (1 - e^{-\tau}) p dp}{\frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 p dp}, \quad (5)$$

where we have assumed an optically thin continuum in the wind. x is here the frequency displacement with respect to rest wavelength measured in units of maximum Doppler shift $x = (\nu/\nu_0 - 1) c/v_\infty$, P_x the photospheric profile, $I_c = B_\nu(T_{\text{rad}})$ the continuum intensity at $x = 0$ (assumed to be non-varying over the profile, T_{rad} the corresponding radiation temperature) and S the *NLTE* source function of the transition. Both the source function and the Sobolev optical depth have to be evaluated at the location of the corresponding resonance zone defined by

$$\mu v(z, p) = x. \quad (6)$$

Integrating over frequency, the equivalent width W_λ (throughout this paper redefined to be *positive for net-emission*) can be expressed as the sum of three terms

$$W_\lambda = W_\lambda^{\text{em}} + W_\lambda^{\text{core}} + W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}}, \quad (7)$$

where the first term gives the contribution from the emission lobes of the wind

$$W_\lambda^{\text{em}} = 4 \frac{v_\infty \lambda_0}{c} \int_0^1 dx \int_1^\infty \frac{S}{I_c} (1 - e^{-\tau}) p dp, \quad (8)$$

the second term the contribution of the (absorbing and emitting) material in front of the stellar disk

$$W_\lambda^{\text{core}} = 2 \frac{v_\infty \lambda_0}{c} \times \left\{ \int_0^1 dx \int_0^1 \left[\frac{S}{I_c} + \left(P_x - \frac{S}{I_c} \right) e^{-\tau} \right] p dp - 1 \right\} \quad (9)$$

and $W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}}$ is the equivalent width of the *red* part of the photospheric profile, which is *not* processed by the wind.

The reader may note that for $S \equiv I_c$ and $P_x \equiv 1$ (i.e., no photospheric profile) the emission/absorption processes in front of the stellar core completely cancel each other resulting in $W_{\lambda}^{\text{core}} = 0$. Hence, in this case the total equivalent width depends exclusively on the emission in the lobes.

2.2.1. The optically thin approximation

Taking into account that τ is smaller than unity in a large part of the wind, Eqs. (8,9) may be expanded in τ to first order as

$$W_{\lambda} = W_{\lambda}^{\text{phot}} + 2 \frac{v_{\infty} \lambda_0}{c} \times \left\{ \int_0^1 dx \left[\int_0^{\infty} \frac{S}{I_c} \tau p dp + \int_1^{\infty} \frac{S}{I_c} \tau p dp - \int_0^1 P_x \tau p dp \right] \right\} \quad (10)$$

where the first term is the *total* equivalent width of the photospheric profile. $S/I_c \tau$ can be expressed as

$$S/I_c \tau = \bar{b}_3 \tau(b_{2,3} \equiv 1) \quad (11)$$

$$\bar{b}_3 = b_3 \frac{e^{h\nu_L/kT_{\text{rad}}} - 1}{e^{h\nu_L/kT_e} - 1}$$

where $\tau(b_{2,3} \equiv 1)$ is the optical depth for departure coefficients equal to unity (see Eqs. (1,3)). As we will show in the next sections, b_3 is not too different from unity and T_{rad} and T_e are quite similar. Also, P_x (for O-stars) is close to unity (except for a small range of frequencies near $x \approx 0$), which means that all three integrands of Eq. (10) are of the same order. Interestingly, the third term in the parenthesis - which accounts for absorption of photospheric radiation by wind material in front of the stellar disc - has been neglected by Leitherer (1988) and L&L, who considered the optically thin pure wind emission only and derived their formula for the equivalent width in a different way. In our case, if we neglect the third integral and recall that the integration over $\int dx \int \tau p dp$ along the resonance zones $dx = d\mu v$ can be transformed to (cf. Eq. 1)

$$\int_0^1 dx \int_{0,1}^{\infty} \tau(x, p) p dp = \int_{0,1}^{\infty} p dp \int_0^{\infty} \frac{A}{(r^4 v^2)(z, p)} dz. \quad (12)$$

and then switch to polar coordinates, we also recover Leitherer's (1988, Eq. 4) result

$$W_{\lambda} = 2 \frac{v_{\infty} \lambda_0}{c} \bar{b}_3 A(b_{2,3} \equiv 1) \int_1^{\infty} (1 + \mu_*(r)) \frac{dr}{r^2 v(r)^2} + W_{\lambda}^{\text{phot}}, \quad (13)$$

where $\mu_*(r) = (1 - 1/r^2)^{1/2}$ is the finite cone angle subtended by the stellar disk. By this equation the observed equivalent width

(corrected for the photospheric profile) $W_{\lambda}' = W_{\lambda}^{\text{obs}} + |W_{\lambda}^{\text{phot}}|$ is immediately related to the mass-loss rate by

$$\log(W_{\lambda}') = \log\left(\frac{\dot{M}^2}{R_*^3 v_{\infty}^2}\right) + \text{const}(T_e, \bar{b}_3, Y, \text{velocity field}). \quad (14)$$

To estimate the error introduced by the neglect of the third term in Eq. (10), we adopt $S/I_c \approx P_x$, which then yields

$$W_{\lambda} = 4 \frac{v_{\infty} \lambda_0}{c} \bar{b}_3 A(b_{2,3} \equiv 1) \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\mu_*(r) dr}{r^2 v(r)^2} + W_{\lambda}^{\text{phot}}. \quad (15)$$

The significant difference between Eqs. (13) and (15) is obvious. Using Eq. (15) instead of Eq. (13) leads to a different constant in the relation between observed equivalent width and mass-loss rate as given by Eq. (14).




Fig. 1. Difference in the determination of $\log \dot{M}$ as function of v_{min} for a fixed value of observed equivalent width W_{λ}' , if Eq. (13) is used instead of Eq. (15). $\beta = 1$ and $v_{\infty} = 2,000$ km/s were adopted.

Using a typical β velocity field

$$v(r) = \left(1 - \frac{b}{r}\right)^{\beta} \quad (16)$$

$$b = 1 - \left(\frac{v_{\text{min}}}{v_{\infty}}\right)^{1/\beta} \quad (17)$$

we can easily calculate the difference in $\log \dot{M}$ which results by applying either Eq. (13) or Eq. (15). An example is given in Fig. 1 indicating the error can be as large as a factor of 2.

However, Eq. (15) also represents a rather inaccurate approach. This is demonstrated in Fig. 2, where the results of a *correct* radiative transfer calculation (solution of the formal integral in (p,z) geometry) is compared with those obtained by Eq. (15) and (13). Figure 2 also contains the results using the formal integral obtained from the Sobolev approximation (Eqs. 4,5) showing that for $\log(A) \lesssim -4$ the H_{α} wind contribution comes mostly from the region around the sonic point, where this

approach inevitably fails (cf. e.g. Sellmaier et al. 1993). On the other hand, for $\log(A) > -4$ the SA results coincide perfectly with the exact calculation. Hence, the difference between Eqs. (13,15) and the exact solution is not caused by the fact that the SA is used. Obviously the true reason must be the assumption that H_α is optically thin throughout the full wind from $r = 1$ to $r \rightarrow \infty$.




Fig. 2. Logarithm of H_α stellar wind equivalent width as function of mass-loss parameter $\log A$ (Eq. 3). Open rectangles: solution of *correct* radiative transfer; solid line: Sobolev approximation; dashed: optically thin approximation (Eq. 15); dotted: optically thin approximation (Eq. 13).




Fig. 3. As Fig. 2. Solid: Sobolev approximation; dashed: Sobolev approximation, taking into account only resonance zones with $\tau \leq 1$; dotted: approximation by Eq. (21).

To investigate this in more detail we firstly disentangle the contribution of optically thick and thin layers to the equivalent width W'_λ . This is done in Fig. 3 where the full SA solution (Eqs. 4,5) is compared with a SA solution where only resonance zones with $\tau \leq 1$ are accounted for. We see that the difference is small and that about 80% of the equivalent width arises from optically thin layers. The reason why the optically thin approach of Eqs. (13, 15) overestimates W'_λ so badly must

therefore result from the fact that the optically thin assumption is applied also in optically *thick* regions, since then the expansion of $(1 - \exp(-\tau))$ by τ inevitably leads to a dramatic overestimation of the arising equivalent width. (Simply spoken, the resulting intensities from optically thick resonance zones are too large by a factor $\tau \gg 1$ if the optically thin approximation is inconsistently applied.) Hence, instead of starting the integration at $r = 1$ in Eq. (15) we have to introduce a lower boundary $r_0 > 1$ which terminates the optically thin emitting volume at $\tau_0 = 1$. r_0 can be found from Eq. (1) via

$$(r_0 v(r_0))^3 (1 + \mu^2 \sigma(r_0)) = A. \quad (18)$$

For the case of $\beta = 1$, which will be used in the following as a typical value, we obtain as a solution

$$r_0^r = b + (A/b)^{\frac{1}{2}}; \quad r_0^t = b + (A)^{\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (19)$$

where r_0^r , r_0^t are the values for a radial ($\mu = 1$, $p = 0$) and a tangential ($\mu = 0$, $p = r_0^t$, $z = 0$) ray, respectively. The reader may note that because of the change of sign in σ at $r = (1 + b)$ the $\tau_0 = 1$ surface is prolate (with respect to the observer) in the case of $A > 1$, oblate in the case $A < 1$ and a sphere for $A = 1$.

Since b is always very close to unity, r_0 is always larger than 1.01 for $\log A > -5$ and consequently $v(r_0)$ becomes much larger and independent of the minimum velocity v_{\min} . This means that we can replace b in Eq. (17) by $b = 1$ and then modify Eq. (15) by

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{\mu_*(r) dr}{r^2 v(r)^2} \rightarrow \int_{r(\tau_0=1)}^\infty \frac{\mu_*(r) dr}{(r-1)^2} = 2 \left(\left(\frac{2}{r(\tau_0=1) - 1} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \right) + \arccos \frac{1}{r(\tau_0=1)} - \frac{\pi}{2} \quad (20)$$

For small values of $h =: (r(\tau_0=1) - 1)$ this integral can be approximated by $\approx 2^{3/2} h^{-1/2}$, so that the equivalent width in the optically thin limit (and $\beta = 1$) is proportional to

$$W'_\lambda \sim \frac{v_\infty A}{h^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sim v_\infty A^{\frac{3}{2}} \dots v_\infty A^{\frac{5}{6}}$$

depending which value for $r(\tau_0=1)$ (cf. Eq. 19) is applied. Thus, it is now clear that the “exact” slope $d \log(W'_\lambda) / d \log(A) \approx 0.75 \dots 0.80$ of the results in Fig. 2, compared to the slope of unity in Eq. (13,14,15) which has been quoted as the standard value for optically thin emission in previous papers (Leitherer 1988; Panagia 1988; Scuderi et al. 1992), stems from the increasing size of the optically thick core which is also a function of A .

Performing finally some numerical calculations applying either r_0^r or r_0^t to Eq. (20), it turned out that the use of r_0^t (i.e., the largest possible value) gives sufficient accuracy compared to the results of Fig. 3. Hence, the optically thin contribution to the equivalent width of H_α ($\approx 80\%$ of the total emission) for a $\beta = 1$ velocity field can be approximated by

$$W_\lambda = 4 \frac{v_\infty \lambda_0}{c} \bar{b}_3 A (b_{2,3} \equiv 1) \times \left\{ 2 \left(2A^{-\frac{1}{3}} + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \arccos \frac{1}{1+A^{\frac{1}{3}}} - \frac{4+\pi}{2} \right\} + W_\lambda^{\text{phot}} \quad (21)$$

and is essentially independent of v_{\min} ! The high accuracy of this approximation is shown in Fig. 3. Recalling that for $A \gtrsim 10^{-4}$ the SA is correct, we have therefore explained why the exact solution results in an effective slope $d \log(W'_\lambda) / d \log(A) \approx 0.75$ for $-4 \lesssim \log A \lesssim -0.5$.




Fig. 4. Resonance zones (dashed-dotted) in p-z geometry for which the condition $\tau \geq \tau_0$ is fulfilled, for mass-loss parameter $A/\tau_0 = 0.1$. Each zone belongs to a different frequency $x \geq 0$. The point, where $\tau = \tau_0$ is reached the first time (from the observer's direction), is indicated by an asterisks. The envelope connecting these points is the solid curve. At $p = 0$ the point on the envelope belongs to a frequency $x_{\max} (= 0.243$ in our example), and at $p = 1$ the corresponding value is $x'_{\max} (= 0.202)$. At $z = 0$ the frequency is $x = 0$. We call this envelope $p_{\max}(x, A/\tau_0)$ the curve of *maximum impact parameter*. (The dependency on A/τ_0 will be suppressed in the following.) $\beta = 1$ and $v_{\min} = 0.01 v_\infty$ are adopted in this example.

Note: the intersection of the above envelope with the z-axis defines r_0^r , whereas its intersection with the p-axis defines r_0^l (cf. Eq. 19).

2.2.2. The optically thick limit

In this section, we want to discuss the case of a wind that is mostly optically thick in H_α . Although this does not occur in O-star winds, there are a number of reasons for also considering this case, apart from its intrinsic theoretical interest:

- As we have seen above, there is *always* a certain contribution from the optically thick core.
- While Panagia(1988) and Scuderi et al. (1992) discussed the optically thick limit, they used a different velocity structure. It is interesting to compare their results with the ones resulting from the physically more realistic β -velocity law.
- For B-type Super-/Hypergiants with large \dot{M} and small v_∞ (exemplary P Cygni) and WR-stars with large \dot{M} and small R_* (here of course with respect to the He-lines) the value of A can become larger than unity hence favouring a dominating contribution from optically thick processes, so that further investigations are extremely useful.

In the optically thick limit ($\exp(-\tau) \rightarrow 0$), the equivalent width of H_α is given by (cf. Eqs. 7,8,9)

$$W_\lambda = \frac{v_\infty \lambda_0}{c} \left\{ 4 \int_0^{x'_{\max}} dx \int_1^{p_{\max}(x)} \frac{S}{I_c}(z_0) p dp + 2 \int_0^{x_{\max}} dx \int_0^{p_x} \left(\frac{S}{I_c}(z_0) - 1 \right) p dp \right\} + W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}} \quad (22)$$

x_{\max} , x'_{\max} and $p_{\max}(x)$ are defined in Fig. 4, $p_x = \text{Min}(p_{\max}, 1)$ and z_0 is the location of the resonance zone as function of (x, p) between $p = 0$ and p_{\max} or p_x , respectively.

With the approximation $S \equiv I_c$, the solution of this problem

$$W_\lambda = 4 \frac{v_\infty \lambda_0}{c} \int_0^{x'_{\max}} dx \int_1^{p_{\max}(x)} p dp + W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}} = 2 \frac{v_\infty \lambda_0}{c} \int_0^{x'_{\max}} (p_{\max}^2(x) - 1) dx + W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}} \quad (23)$$

reduces to the calculation of x'_{\max} and $p_{\max}(x)$. In order to keep the problem analytically feasible, we will restrict ourselves again to the case $\beta = 1$ and $b = 1$, where the latter assumption is of no importance as for sufficiently large A the optically thick core is always large enough to ensure the solution to be independent on v_{\min} .

Under these conditions, we can calculate $p_{\max}(x)$. Combining Eq. (1) with the resonance condition Eq. (6), we obtain

$$h_0^3 + x^2(h_0 + 1)^2(1 - h_0) = A/\tau_0 \quad (24)$$

$$h_0 = r_0 - 1, \quad (25)$$

which yields the radius where a certain value of τ_0 is reached on the considered resonance zone. Assuming that we know the solution of this cubic equation $r_0(x)$ and hence $v(r_0(x))$, $p_{\max}(x)$ follows from

$$p_{\max}^2(x) = r_0^2(x) \left(1 - \left(\frac{x}{v(r_0(x))} \right)^2 \right) \quad (26)$$

Table 1. W''_λ as function of A in comparison to the optically thick approximation. Model parameters: LTE , $P_x \equiv 1$, $T_e = T_{\text{rad}}$, $v_\infty = 2,000$ km/s, $v_{\text{min}} = 5$ km/s, $\beta = 1$. For discussion see text.

log(A)	SA	SA ($\tau \geq 1$)	Eq.(32) ($\tau_0 = 1.$)	Eq.(32) ($\tau_0 = 0.228$)
-0.25	143	50	49	146
0.00	212	76	76	217
0.25	313	115	115	319
0.50	674	259	257	670
1.00	1431	567	545	1378

$$p_{\text{max}}^2(0) = r_0^t{}^2 \quad (27)$$

$$p_{\text{max}}^2(x_{\text{max}}) = 0 \quad (28)$$

$$x_{\text{max}} = v(r_0^r) \quad (29)$$

where r_0^r , r_0^t are defined in analogy to Eq. (19) with A replaced by A/τ_0 . As demonstrated by Tab. 2, an excellent approximation of Eq. (26) is

$$p_{\text{max}}^2(x) \approx r_0^t{}^2 \left(1 - \left(\frac{x}{x_{\text{max}}} \right)^2 \right), \quad (30)$$

which avoids the solution of the cubic equation (24). (Note that Eq. (30) is exact for $A/\tau_0 = 1$). The value of x'_{max} (to calculate W_λ in Eq. (23) we need p_{max} only in the range from 0 to x'_{max}) is then given by

$$p(x'_{\text{max}}) = 1 \rightarrow x'_{\text{max}} = x_{\text{max}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r_0^t{}^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow$$

$$x'_{\text{max}} = \frac{(r_0^t{}^2 - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{r_0^t r_0^r} (A/\tau_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (31)$$

Combining now Eq. (23) and (31) we obtain for the contribution of the optically thick core

$$W_\lambda = \frac{4 v_\infty \lambda_0}{3 c} \frac{(r_0^t{}^2 - 1)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{r_0^t r_0^r} (A/\tau_0)^{\frac{1}{2}} + W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}} \quad (32)$$

The accuracy of this approximation is investigated in Tab. 1, where we compare (for the same model as above) the resulting equivalent width $W''_\lambda = W_\lambda + |W_{\lambda, \text{phot}}^{\text{red}}|$ in dependence of A . Column 3 gives the values from the “exact” SA-calculation however taking only into account the contribution from optical depths $\tau \geq 1$, and column 4 the results from Eq. (32) with $\tau_0 = 1$. The results are essentially identical, and only for values $A \gtrsim 10$ the difference becomes significant as the approximation for p_{max}^2 begins to become less accurate. However, comparing with the *total* SA equivalent width given in column 2, it is obvious that the contribution of the region with $\tau \geq 1$ is roughly an (almost constant!) factor of 3 too small.

The reason for this discrepancy is the fact that for spherical geometry, an opacity proportional to ρ^2 and $v(r) \approx v_\infty$ the “effective” optical depth for contributing to the observed flux is significantly smaller than unity, namely

$$\tau_{\text{eff}} = 0.228. \quad (33)$$

This was found by Panagia & Felli (1975), Wright & Barlow (1975) and Lamers & Waters (1984) when treating the problem of thermal radio emission in stellar winds. Indeed, if using $\tau_0 = \tau_{\text{eff}}$ in Eq. (32) we achieve almost perfect agreement with the SA solution, as can be seen from the last column in Tab. 1.

Finally, we investigate the slope $d \log(W''_\lambda)/d \log(A)$ for large values of $A \gtrsim 1$. With the definitions for r_0^r , r_0^t and denoting $A_{\text{eff}} = A/\tau_{\text{eff}}$ Eq. (32) can be rewritten as

$$W''_\lambda(A) = \frac{4 v_\infty \lambda_0}{3 c} f(A_{\text{eff}}) A_{\text{eff}}^{\frac{2}{3}} \quad (34)$$

$$f(A_{\text{eff}}) = \frac{\left(2 + A_{\text{eff}}^{\frac{1}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} A_{\text{eff}}^{\frac{1}{3}}}{\left(1 + A_{\text{eff}}^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) \left(1 + A_{\text{eff}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \right)} \quad (35)$$

where the function $f(A_{\text{eff}})$ is an only mildly varying function in the range $A_{\text{eff}} = 0.1 \dots \infty$ (cf. Fig. 5) with

$$\begin{aligned} f(1) &= \frac{3^{\frac{3}{2}}}{4} = 1.30 \\ f(A_{\text{eff}})|_{\text{max}} &= 1.39 \quad \text{for } A_{\text{eff}} = 6.23 \\ f(A_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \infty) &\rightarrow 1 \\ \langle f \rangle &= 1.32 \quad \text{for } A_{\text{eff}} \in [1, 100] \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$




Fig. 5. $f(A_{\text{eff}})$ (cf. Eq. 35) for $\log A_{\text{eff}} = -1 \dots 4$.

In the optically thick limit, the equivalent width of H_α is therefore proportional to

$$W''_\lambda \sim v_\infty A^{\frac{2}{3}}. \quad (37)$$

Table 2. Exact (Eq. 24,26) and approximated values (Eq. 30) for p_{\max}^2 as function of x in the range from $x = x'_{\max} \dots 0$ for $A/\tau_0 = 0.1, 1.0, 10$ (calculated with $b = 0.99$).

$A/\tau_0 = 0.1$ $r_0^r = 1.31, r_0^l = 1.45$			$A/\tau_0 = 1.0$ $r_0^r = 1.99, r_0^l = 1.99$			$A/\tau_0 = 10.$ $r_0^r = 4.17, r_0^l = 3.14$		
x	$p_{\max}^2(\text{ex})$	$p_{\max}^2(\text{appr})$	x	$p_{\max}^2(\text{ex})$	$p_{\max}^2(\text{appr})$	x	$p_{\max}^2(\text{ex})$	$p_{\max}^2(\text{appr})$
.176	1.211	1.000	.436	1.000	1.000	.723	1.121	1.000
.159	1.403	1.212	.392	1.562	1.562	.651	2.910	2.689
.141	1.565	1.401	.348	2.066	2.066	.578	4.438	4.199
.124	1.701	1.568	.305	2.510	2.510	.506	5.750	5.533
.106	1.815	1.713	.261	2.894	2.894	.434	6.866	6.688
.088	1.909	1.836	.218	3.220	3.220	.361	7.798	7.666
.071	1.984	1.936	.174	3.486	3.486	.289	8.555	8.465
.053	2.042	2.014	.131	3.694	3.694	.217	9.139	9.088
.035	2.082	2.070	.087	3.842	3.843	.145	9.556	9.532
.018	2.107	2.103	.044	3.930	3.930	.072	9.805	9.799
.000	2.115	2.115	.000	3.960	3.960	.000	9.887	9.887

2.2.3. Resulting scaling relations – Comparison to previous results

Summarizing the results of the two preceding paragraphs, we find the following scaling relations for the equivalent width of H_α (assuming a $\beta = 1$ velocity field as the average representative for typical O-star winds with $\beta = 0.7 \dots 1.3$). We have for $10^{-4} \lesssim A \lesssim 10^{-1}$:

$$\log(W'_\lambda) \approx 3/4 \log(A) + \log(v_\infty) + \log(\bar{b}_3) + 2.09 \quad (38)$$

and for $A \gtrsim 1$:

$$\log(W''_\lambda) \approx 2/3 \log(A) + \log(v_\infty) + 2.014, \quad (39)$$

where v_∞ again is calculated in units of 1,000 km/s and S/I_e approximated by unity in the optically thick case. The equivalent width for A in the intermediate range $0.1 < A < 1$ has to be evaluated with the complete expression Eq. (21), taking into account that this gives only $\approx 80\%$ of the total value. Hence, for fixed v_∞ , the slope of $d \log(W'_\lambda) / d \log(A)$ should lie in the range between $3/4 \dots 2/3$. With respect to a variation in v_∞ , the above equations imply that the corrected equivalent width should either scale with

$$\log(W'_\lambda) \approx \frac{3}{4} \log \left(\frac{\dot{M}^2}{R_*^3 v_\infty^{5/3}} \right) + \text{const}(T_e, b_3, Y) \quad (40)$$

for $10^{-4} \lesssim A \lesssim 10^{-1}$ or with

$$\log(W''_\lambda) \approx \frac{2}{3} \log \left(\frac{\dot{M}^2}{R_*^3 v_\infty^{3/2}} \right) + \text{const}(T_e, Y) \quad (41)$$

for $A \gtrsim 1$. The precision of these predictions can be checked by comparison with our final results which include the influence of different β 's, consistent departure coefficients and the He II blend as discussed in Sects. 2.3 to 2.5.

Inverting the above scaling laws, the mass-loss rate derived by H_α is dependent on the following combination of stellar and wind parameters

$$\dot{M}(\text{thin}) \sim W'_\lambda{}^{\frac{2}{3}} R_*^{\frac{3}{2}} v_\infty^{\frac{5}{6}} \quad (42)$$

$$\dot{M}(\text{thick}) \sim W''_\lambda{}^{\frac{3}{4}} R_*^{\frac{3}{2}} v_\infty^{\frac{3}{4}}, \quad (43)$$

which has to be contrasted to the results by Leitherer (1988; optically thin limit) and Panagia (1988)/Scuderi et al. (1992) (optically thin *and* thick limit)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}(\text{thin}) &\sim W'_\lambda{}^{\frac{1}{2}} R_*^{\frac{3}{2}} v_\infty \\ \dot{M}(\text{thick}) &\sim W'_\lambda R_*^{\frac{3}{2}} v_\infty^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The obvious differences are due to the neglect of the increase in radius of the optically thick core in the optically thin limit and because of the different shape of the velocity field in Panagia's derivation.

Finally, it should be stressed that the influence of the assumed minimum velocity v_{\min} is clearly not so important as it would be if the purely optically thin approximation were used.

2.3. Approximate solution of the complete problem and comparison with unified model atmospheres

As the observable H_α feature actually consists of two components, H_α itself and the He II $_{4\leftrightarrow 6}$ blend (λ 6560.25 corresponding to $\Delta v = 120$ km/s), one has to investigate how far this blend is of importance for a *quantitative* mass-loss determination.

In view of the similar ionization energies ($E_{4,6}$ (He II) = 27450.1, 12219.9 cm $^{-1}$ compared to $E_{2,3}$ (H) = 27419.7, 12186.5 cm $^{-1}$) and gf -values ($gf_{He} = 5.7376$, $gf_H = 5.1256$) of the two transitions, the ratio of the resulting line opacities is roughly given by

$$\chi_{He} / \chi_H \approx Y b_4(\text{He II}) / b_2(\text{H}) \quad (44)$$

(cf. Eq. 3), which is (solar composition provided) of order 0.1 in the sonic region, but may reach ($b_4(\text{HeII}) \rightarrow \text{O}(10)$, see below) values of order unity in the outer wind part. Hence, in contrast to previous assumptions (cf. Leitherer 1988, Drew 1990), the He-blend can influence both the shape and the equivalent width of the combined profile significantly, especially in denser winds when the effective radius becomes large. This was firstly demonstrated by A. Gabler et al. (1990), who showed that for \dot{M} in the range of $1 \dots 10 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ the typical error in the equivalent width induced by neglecting this blend is of the order 1 to 2 Å below the correct value, i.e., a significant fraction of the total equivalent width. (Note, that L&L accounted for this blend, however only in an approximate way.)

Table 3. Model grid of unified atmospheres for O-type stars used to derive the radial stratification of Hydrogen/Helium departure coefficients and to check our approximate treatment of H_{α} line formation. $Y = 0.1$, \dot{M} in $10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$, v_{∞} in km/s, A (cf. Eq. 3) calculated with $T_e = 0.75T_{\text{eff}}$ and $b_{2,3} \equiv 1$. The last column gives the total equivalent width of the H_{α} complex in Å.

T_{eff}	$\log g$	R_*	\dot{M}	v_{∞}	$\log A$	W_{λ}
41000.	3.50	14.0	1.460	1055.	-2.17	0.71
41000.	3.50	14.0	1.740	1720.	-2.65	-0.27
41000.	3.70	14.0	.149	1716.	-4.78	-2.80
41000.	3.70	14.0	.622	1740.	-3.56	-2.39
41000.	3.70	14.0	1.010	2900.	-3.80	-2.36
41000.	3.70	14.0	1.664	2070.	-2.93	-0.92
41000.	3.70	14.0	2.590	1745.	-2.33	1.48
42000.	3.60	24.6	3.010	2650.	-3.51	-1.88
42500.	3.70	14.0	1.350	2100.	-3.19	-1.51
42500.	3.70	14.0	1.717	2100.	-2.98	-0.96
42500.	3.70	14.0	2.050	2105.	-2.83	-0.41
42500.	3.80	14.0	1.702	2066.	-2.97	-1.03
43500.	3.60	22.9	2.901	2650.	-3.50	-1.71
43500.	3.80	13.4	1.550	2160.	-3.08	-1.38
43500.	3.80	13.4	1.000	2160.	-3.46	-2.19
44000.	3.80	10.0	.093	1270.	-4.47	-2.88
44000.	3.80	10.0	.554	1276.	-2.92	-1.75
44000.	3.80	10.0	2.700	1265.	-1.54	8.00
45000.	4.00	12.3	.204	2043.	-4.71	-3.10
47500.	3.70	17.9	11.140	2250.	-1.93	6.70
47500.	3.70	17.9	13.150	2250.	-1.78	11.97
47500.	3.90	17.9	11.110	2260.	-1.93	7.73
47500.	4.00	8.2	1.015	2600.	-3.18	-1.56
47500.	4.00	8.2	1.990	2640.	-2.61	.88
47500.	4.00	8.2	2.920	2640.	-2.28	3.49
48000.	4.00	10.7	.304	2160.	-4.35	-2.91
50000.	3.90	19.0	11.220	1900.	-1.85	6.40
50000.	3.90	19.0	13.120	1910.	-1.72	8.35
50000.	4.20	14.4	.550	3200.	-4.79	-3.26
55000.	4.07	22.0	9.410	3205.	-3.01	-0.40

2.3.1. Radial stratification of departure coefficients

In order to obtain a simple expression for the departure coefficients without solving each time the complete *NLTE* wind problem, we proceed in the following way: From the analysis of the stratification of occupation numbers for a model grid of *unified atmospheres* of O-type stars (cf. Tab. 3), it turned out that the b_i 's can be simply parametrized as function of velocity. Thus for hydrogen ($i = 2,3,4,5$) we have

$$0. \leq v < 0.01 : b_2(r) = 1. + \left(\frac{b_2^{\text{in}} - 1.}{0.01} \right) v(r) \quad (45)$$

$$0. \leq v < 0.01 : b_i(r) = .9 + \left(\frac{b_i^{\text{in}} - .9}{0.01} \right) v(r), i \neq 2$$

$$0.01 \leq v < 0.1 : b_i(r) = b_i^{\text{in}} + \left(\frac{b_i^{\text{min}} - b_i^{\text{in}}}{0.09} \right) (v(r) - 0.01)$$

$$0.1 \leq v < 1.0 : b_i(r) = b_i^{\text{min}} + \left(\frac{b_i^{\infty} - b_i^{\text{min}}}{0.9} \right) (v(r) - 0.1)$$

and for helium ($i = 4,6,8,10$)

$$0. \leq v < 0.1 : b_4(r) = 1. + \left(\frac{b_4^{\text{in}} - 1.}{0.1} \right) v(r) \quad (46)$$

$$0. \leq v < 0.1 : b_i(r) = .9 + \left(\frac{b_i^{\text{in}} - .9}{0.1} \right) v(r), i \neq 4$$

$$0.1 \leq v < 0.55 : b_i(r) = b_i^{\text{in}} + \frac{1}{3} \left(\frac{b_i^{\text{in}} - b_i^{\infty}}{0.45} \right) (0.1 - v(r))$$

$$0.55 \leq v < 1.0 : b_i(r) = b_i^{\infty} + \frac{2}{3} \left(\frac{b_i^{\text{in}} - b_i^{\infty}}{0.45} \right) (1.0 - v(r)).$$

b_i^{in} and b_i^{∞} are here the departure coefficients at $v = 0.01$ for Hydrogen ($v = 0.1$ for HeII, respectively) and at the outer boundary, which have to be specified for all contributing levels (see Tab. 4,5). Note, that the boundary values of the HeII departure coefficients depend on the quantity $D = \dot{M}/(R_* v_{\infty})^{1.5} \sim A^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The special appearance of the value $b_i^{\text{min}} \neq b_i^{\infty}$ for the $i=2$ level of H (cf. Tab. 4) accounts for the fact that the corresponding departure coefficient exhibits a certain minimum at a typical velocity $v \approx 0.1$.

Table 4. Boundary values for Hydrogen departure coefficients b_i ($i = 2,3,4,5$) to be used for the parametrization Eq. (45) and $T_e = 0.75T_{\text{eff}}$.

i	b_i^{in}	b_i^{min}	b_i^{∞}
	$v = 0.01$	$v = 0.1$	$v = 1.0$
2	1.5	1.2	1.3
3	1.2	1.1	1.1
4	1.1	1.0	1.0
5	1.0	0.9	0.9

It must be stressed, that both Eqs. (45,46) in combination with the values given in Tab. 4,5 where derived by a *re-cal-*

Table 5. Boundary values for HeII departure coefficients b_i ($i = 4, 6, 8, 10$) in dependence of $D = \dot{M}/(R_* v_\infty)^{1.5}$ (\dot{M} in $10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$, R_* in R_\odot and v_∞ in km/s) to be used for the parametrization Eq. (46) and $T_e = 0.75T_{\text{eff}}$.

b_i^{in}	$\log D \leq -7.3$	$-7.3 < \log D \leq -6.3$	$\log D > -6.3$
$i = 4$	3.0	$-9.05 - 1.65 \log D$	1.35
6	3.5	$-12.56 - 2.2 \log D$	1.3
8	3.5	$-12.56 - 2.2 \log D$	1.3
10	2.2	$-6.56 - 1.2 \log D$	1.0
b_i^∞	$\log D \leq -6.9$	$-6.9 < \log D \leq -5.8$	$\log D > -5.8$
$i = 4$	20.6	$-76.0 - 14 \log D$	5.2
6	25.4	$-71.2 - 14 \log D$	10.
8	25.4	$-71.2 - 14 \log D$	10.
10	20.2	$-62.6 - 12 \log D$	7.0

bration of the original departure coefficients (valid for the specific temperature stratification of the unified atmospheres) to a constant electron temperature of $T_e = 0.75T_{\text{eff}}$, which is an average representative value in the line forming region of the models. The above approximation represents the typical run of the “exact” departure coefficients with an accuracy of 20 % and in so far incorporates the major effects arising from “unified atmospheres”, which comprise a correct treatment of line formation in the *transsonic* region and a consistent continuum (cf. also de Koter et al. 1993 and Schaerer & Schmutz 1994), contrasted to the results of a pure photospheric or pure wind calculation. Figs. 6,7 give an impression of the accuracy of our parametrization by comparing the approximated to the exact departure coefficients. The reader may note that the departure coefficients influence the determination of the mass-loss rate only by a power of 0.5, so that any errors and uncertainties have an only small effect.

2.3.2. Comparison with unified atmosphere profiles

With the above stratification of the departure coefficients, we are now able to calculate the emergent profile of the H_α complex. This is done by solving the formal integral for the two overlapping components in the observer’s frame, taking into account the finite and different thermal velocities of the hydrogen and helium ions. (This turns out to be of considerable importance especially for thin winds with a small effective radius.) For this calculation, we need the following input quantities (cf. Eqs. 3-5):

- the stellar radius R_* ,
- the parameters describing the velocity field, namely v_∞ , v_{min} and β ,
- the rotational speed $v \sin i$,
- the photospheric profile and the corresponding radiation temperature at the neighbouring continuum T_{rad} ,
- the helium abundance Y ,
- the boundary values of the departure coefficients for the $i = 2, 3$ (H) and $i=4, 6$ (HeII) level, cf. Tab.4,5 (calibrated to an electron temperature $T_e = 0.75T_{\text{eff}}$!)




Fig. 6. Relative error (compared with the results of unified model atmospheres) of approximated departure coefficients for the $i=2$ (fully-drawn) and $i=3$ (dashed) level of hydrogen and an atmospheric model with parameters $T_{\text{eff}} = 43,500\text{K}$, $\log g = 3.8$, $R_* = 13.4R_\odot$, $\dot{M} = 1.55 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ and $v_\infty = 2160\text{ km/s}$.




Fig. 7. As Fig. 6, but for the HeII($i=4,6$) levels.

– and the mass-loss rate \dot{M} .

In the application to observed stellar line profiles, the values of R_* , $v \sin i$, Y and the photospheric profile (dependent on T_{eff} and $\log g$) result from a *NLTE* analysis of the relevant star by means of hydrostatic, plane-parallel model atmospheres, modified to include the effects of winds on H_γ for the $\log g$ determination (cf. Sect. 3.1.2). The terminal velocity is determined from UV P-Cygni profiles (see Sect. 3.1.4), and \dot{M} and β are fit-parameters to be determined from the H_α profile itself.

The only quantities left to be specified are the values for v_{min} and T_{rad} , for which we will use

$$v_{\min} = 1 \text{ km/s}$$

$$T_{\text{rad}} = 0.77 T_{\text{eff}},$$

where the latter represents an average value resulting from our grid of unified atmospheres (Tab. 3).

The choice of the rather low minimum velocity (in comparison to the speed of sound) was triggered by the following arguments: Although the profiles are almost independent of this parameter for values of $\log A \gtrsim -4$, the “exact solution” depends on v_{\min} for the smallest wind densities. This behaviour follows from the fact that the “exact” solution takes into account the finite width of the profile. If the “effective” radius lies now in or even below the sonic region, the results *must* depend on the density stratification there and on the choice of the lower boundary, in particular for those cases, where the accumulated optical depth inside the corresponding resonance zones is not too large (cf. Sellmaier et al. 1993.)

By comparing our approximate treatment to the unified atmosphere profiles, it then turned out that the best agreement both in the resulting equivalent width and profile shape is obtained for the above value of $v_{\min} = 1 \text{ km/s}$.

Table 6. H_{α} equivalent width (in \AA) of our approximate treatment in comparison to the results of unified model atmospheres for the models of Tab. 4 with $T_{\text{eff}} = 41,000 \text{ K}$ and $47,500 \text{ K}$ ($Y = 0.1$, T_{eff} in kK, \dot{M} in $10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$).

T_{eff}	$\log g$	R_*	\dot{M}	e.w.(unif.)	e.w.(appr.)	β
41.0	3.5	14.0	1.460	0.71	0.73	.73
41.0	3.5	14.0	1.740	-0.27	-0.40	.77
41.0	3.7	14.0	.149	-2.80	-2.91	1.0
41.0	3.7	14.0	.622	-2.39	-2.54	.75
41.0	3.7	14.0	1.010	-2.36	-2.43	.80
41.0	3.7	14.0	1.664	-0.92	-1.07	.80
41.0	3.7	14.0	2.590	1.48	1.55	.80
47.5	3.7	17.9	11.140	6.70	7.09	.75
47.5	3.7	17.9	13.150	11.87	10.05	.75
47.5	3.9	17.9	11.110	7.73	7.35	.80
47.5	4.0	8.2	1.015	-1.56	-1.77	.85
47.5	4.0	8.2	1.990	0.88	0.61	.82
47.5	4.0	8.2	2.920	3.49	3.42	.80

In Tab. 6 and Fig. 8 we compare equivalent widths and line profiles calculated with the “exact” unified model atmospheres and the approximate approach. The good agreement is striking. In Fig. 8 we also indicate profiles arising from a mass-loss rate being 30 % larger and smaller than the actual one, which immediately show that in most cases (when the refilling of the photospheric profile becomes significant, i.e., $W_{\lambda}' \gtrsim 0.2 \text{ \AA}$) \dot{M} can be derived with a high precision.

To obtain the line profiles and equivalent widths of our approximate approach in Fig. 8 and Tab. 6 we had to adjust

the value of β for the velocity field. This was done iteratively by comparing with the line profile of the unified model until the best fit was achieved. The corresponding β -values are also given in Tab. 6. For all models, except the ones with the weakest wind, fit values between 0.75 and 0.85 were obtained, in every case in accordance with the hydrodynamical structure of the unified model to which the approximate profiles were fitted. The case with $\beta = 1$ is a model where the wind contributes to H_{α} only through its subsonic part. The somewhat larger value of β corresponds to the smaller wind acceleration in these layers.

We conclude that the method of deriving \dot{M} and β from H_{α} -profiles by our approximate method does indeed work.

2.4. The influence of different parameters on the equivalent width of H_{α}

In this section, we use our approximate approach to investigate the dependence of the H_{α} equivalent width on velocity field (β and v_{∞}) and temperature (T_{eff}). We will also study the influence of the He II blend.

From Sect. 2.2 it is obvious that the strength of the stellar wind contribution is basically a function of

$$Q = \frac{\dot{M}/(10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr})}{(R_*/(R_{\odot}))^{3/2}}. \quad (47)$$

We will therefore present “curves of growth” showing the relation between equivalent width $W_{\lambda}' = W_{\lambda}^{\text{obs}} + |W_{\lambda}^{\text{phot}}|$ and Q for the individual cases. Throughout this section, $\log g = 3.7$ will be adopted for the photospheric input profiles (this has almost no influence on the *wind contribution* W_{λ}') and a normal helium abundance $Y = 0.1$ will be assumed.

2.4.1. Influence of the He II blend

Fig. 9 illustrates the influence of the He II blend on the total equivalent width of H_{α} . Neglecting the blend leads to an almost parallel shift of the curve of growth resulting in an overestimate of \dot{M} by a factor of 1.3 to 1.7. We note that for $-3.5 \lesssim \log Q^2 \lesssim -1$ the slope of the relation closely follows the analytical prediction of the optically thin case *even when the He II blend is included*.

2.4.2. Influence of β

Fig. 10 shows the influence of the steepness of the velocity law on the resulting curve of growth. We selected $\beta = 0.7, 1.0$ and 1.3 , with $\beta = 0.7$ and 1.3 as limiting values found from the observations. Contrary to Fig. 9, here and in the following paragraphs we display the curve of growth as functional relation $\log(Q^2) = f(\log(W_{\lambda}'))$. In this way, the influence on \dot{M} when determined from the measured equivalent width can be seen immediately!

As was already discussed in Sect. 2.2, for large values of A (or Q) the curves converge since the optically thick core becomes so extended that almost only wind layers with $v \approx v_{\infty}$ contribute and β is no longer of importance.




Fig. 8. Comparison of approximate (dashed-dotted) to unified atmosphere H_{α} profiles (solid) for four exemplary models of Tab. 6. Also shown are the profiles for a mass-loss rate being 30 % larger and smaller. $V \sin i$ arbitrarily set to 100 km/s
 Upper left: $T_{\text{eff}} = 41.0$ kK, $\log g = 3.5$, $\dot{M} = 1.74 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$; upper right: $T_{\text{eff}} = 41.0$ kK, $\log g = 3.7$, $\dot{M} = 0.62 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$;
 lower left: $T_{\text{eff}} = 47.5$ kK, $\log g = 3.7$, $\dot{M} = 11.1 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$; lower right: $T_{\text{eff}} = 47.5$ kK, $\log g = 4.0$, $\dot{M} = 1.99 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$.
 The He blend is included in all calculations.




Fig. 9. Influence of the HeII blend on the equivalent width of H_α . Dashed: Hydrogen line only (“exact” treatment); fully drawn: H_α complex including He blend. For comparison, the lower line shows a slope of 0.75 to be expected from the scaling relation for the optically thin case (Sect. 2.2.1). $T_{\text{eff}} = 40,000$ K, $v_\infty = 2,000$ km/s and $\beta = 1$ were adopted. Note that the photospheric equivalent width is -2.96 \AA for pure hydrogen and -3.96 \AA when HeII is included.




Fig. 10. Influence of β on the equivalent width of H_α . Fully drawn: $\beta = 0.7$; dashed: $\beta = 1.0$; dotted: $\beta = 1.3$. $T_{\text{eff}} = 40,000$ K, $v_\infty = 2,000$ km/s were adopted, and the HeII blend is included.

On the other hand, for typical O-star values ($\log W'_\lambda < 1.0$), the influence of β is decisive and turns out to be the most crucial parameter in determining the mass-loss rates. Typical errors in \dot{M} by a factor of 1.5 larger and smaller are possible if the actual velocity law has an exponent of $\beta = 0.7$ or 1.3 instead of an assumed exponent of $\beta = 1$. For the lowest wind densities this error can even reach a factor of 2.8 for the steepest gradient. Fortunately, the influence of this parameter on the profile *shape* is in most cases so large that it can be determined in parallel with \dot{M} if a detailed profile fit is performed. For the smallest wind densities, however, when the contribution of the wind is marginal, one has to rely on theoretical predictions. Examples are given in Sect. 3.2, and we want to recapitulate here only the well known result that the larger the exponent (i.e., the flatter the velocity law in the inner wind part), the narrower but also higher is the central part of the resulting emission component.




Fig. 11. Influence of T_{eff} on the equivalent width of H_α . Triangles: $T_{\text{eff}} = 35$ kK; rectangles: $T_{\text{eff}} = 40$ kK; asterisks: $T_{\text{eff}} = 45$ kK. $\beta = 1$, $v_\infty = 2,000$ km/s were adopted, and the HeII blend is included. The photospheric equivalent widths are -3.13 , -3.29 and -3.24 \AA for the three values of T_{eff} .

2.4.3. Influence of effective temperature

Figure 11 shows the curves of growth for models with different T_{eff} . Evidently, all curves are almost parallel to each other. Exploiting the fact that the major part of the equivalent width stems from optically thin emission, the influence of the electron/radiation temperature on W'_λ is caused mostly by changes of $\bar{b}_3 A(b_3 \equiv 1)$, as discussed at the beginning of Sect. 2.2.1.

Hence, taking into account the almost identical dependence of $A(\text{H})$ (and $A(\text{He})$) on T_e for $b_i \equiv 1$, our models should yield the same value of W'_λ for *any* combination of parameters leading to identical values of $\bar{b}_i A(b_i \equiv 1)$. In addition, the dependence of




Fig. 12. As Fig. 11, but now with an ordinate scaled to $\log Q'^2$ according to Eq. (50) with $T_{\text{ref}} = 40$ kK.

$b_6(\text{He})$ on Q is small and the influence of the He I blend on the pure hydrogen case results only in a parallel-shift of the curve of growth for the entire Q -range of interest (cf. Fig. 9).

Thus, we should be able to scale (for constant v_∞ , β and Y) the different curves in Fig. 11 to some reference temperature, if we introduce a modified Q'^2 by

$$Q^2 \Rightarrow Q'^2 = Q^2 \cdot ct, \quad (48)$$

where the “temperature correction factor” ct to a given reference temperature T_{ref} follows from

$$ct(T_{\text{ref}}, T_{\text{eff}}) = \frac{\Delta \exp(T_{\text{eff}}) T_{\text{ref}}^{3/2}}{\Delta \exp(T_{\text{ref}}) T_{\text{eff}}^{3/2}} \quad (49)$$

$$\Delta \exp(T) = \exp\left(\frac{E_2 - E_3}{T_{\text{rad}}(T)} + \frac{E_3}{T_{\text{e}}(T)}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{E_3}{T_{\text{e}}(T)}\right).$$

$E_{2,3}$ are the energies of the involved levels. For a reference temperature $T_{\text{ref}} = 40,000$ K and $T_{\text{e}} = 0.75T_{\text{eff}}$, $T_{\text{rad}} = 0.77T_{\text{eff}}$, this results in

$$ct(T_{\text{ref}} = 40 \text{ kK}, T_{\text{eff}}) = 4.2989 \frac{\exp\left(\frac{5.184}{T_{\text{eff}}}\right) - \exp\left(\frac{2.337}{T_{\text{eff}}}\right)}{T_{\text{eff}}^{3/2}} \quad (50)$$

(T_{eff} in 10^4 K). Hence, the temperature correction for our above models with $T_{\text{eff}} = 35, 40$ and 45 kK is given by $\log ct = 0.206, 0.0$ and -0.175 , respectively. Applying these correction factors to the Q^2 values of Fig. 11 results in Fig. 12, where the *different* relations are now shifted to an almost *unique* curve of growth *independent of T_{eff} and the underlying photospheric profile*, if W'_λ is plotted as function of Q'^2 instead of Q^2 . The remaining differences (for small values of Q'^2) are related to the functional dependency of b_6 on Q , which especially in this part of the curve of growth is varying faster than for higher wind densities.




Fig. 13. Influence of v_∞ on the equivalent width on the H_α complex. Triangles: $v_\infty = 1,000$ km/s; rectangles: $v_\infty = 2,000$ km/s; asteriks: $v_\infty = 3,000$ km/s. $T_{\text{eff}} = 40,000$ K, $\beta = 1$ were adopted, and the He I blend is included.




Fig. 14. Same as Fig. 13, but now ordinate scaled to $Q^2/v_\infty^{5/3}$ (see text).

2.4.4. Influence of v_∞

The last substantial parameter which influences the equivalent width of H_α is the terminal velocity v_∞ . Fig. 13 shows the corresponding curves of growth. With respect to Eq. (40) and the fact that the departure coefficients are parametrized in terms of $v(r)/v_\infty$, these curves should become almost independent of v_∞ if the ordinate is scaled to $Q^2/v_\infty^{5/3}$. This is done in Fig. 14, where indeed now all three curves define an almost unique relation. The small differences in the lower and intermediate

range are primarily due to the different locations of the coupled resonance zones of the H and He line as function of *absolute* velocity. (Note that the line separation of both lines corresponds to 120 km/s.)

The above scaling relation $\log W'_\lambda \sim -5/3 \log v_\infty$ was already derived in Sect. 2.2, however only for the case $\beta = 1$. A priori, for different β 's other scaling laws are to be expected. However, the differences turn out to be moderate (cf. Fig. 15) and are non-negligible only in the case of very small values of W'_λ .

2.5. A generalized curve of growth for H_α

As demonstrated in Sect. 2.4 we can construct now a generalized curve of growth for H_α by introducing

$$\tilde{Q}^2 = Q'^2 / v_\infty^{\frac{5}{3}} \quad (51)$$

The relation $\log \tilde{Q}^2 = f(\log W'_\lambda)$ should then depend only on the velocity exponent β as parameter. This is indeed the case as can be seen from Fig. 15, which uses the grid of approximate calculations presented in Tab. 7 and the unified model atmosphere results of Tab. 3

For $W'_\lambda \gtrsim 1 \text{ \AA}$ the unified model results follow precisely the generalized curve of growth for $\beta \approx 0.7$ to 0.8. For $W'_\lambda \leq 1 \text{ \AA}$ the unified results imply $\beta \approx 1.0$, which was already found and discusses in Sect. 2.3.2.

The generalized curve of growth allows an immediate first estimate of the mass-loss rate provided that T_{eff} and $\log g$ are determined by the analysis of the photospheric lines, that the radius is known from the distance and that v_∞ could be measured from the UV wind lines. One then has simply to measure the equivalent width W_λ which then together with W'_λ ($T_{\text{eff}}, \log g$) yields W'_λ and finally \dot{M} via $\log \tilde{Q}^2$

$$\log \left(\frac{\dot{M}}{M_\odot/\text{yr}} \right) = -6 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\log \tilde{Q}^2 + \frac{5}{3} \log \left(\frac{v_\infty}{1000 \text{ km/s}} \right) \right) + \log ct(T_{\text{eff}}, T_{\text{ref}}) + \frac{3}{2} \log \left(\frac{R_*}{R_\odot} \right) \quad (52)$$

(The temperature correction factor $ct(T_{\text{eff}}, T_{\text{ref}})$ is given in the last column of Tab. 7.) If in a first approximation $\beta = 1$ is used, the accuracy of $\log \dot{M}$ should be better than 0.15 dex for $W'_\lambda \gtrsim 1 \text{ \AA}$. Using the information contained in the shape of the line profile in a next step, it should then be possible to determine β and, therefore, to obtain a more precise value of $\log \dot{M}$.

Finally, we note that the generalized curve of growth does also depend on the He abundance (i.e., $Y \neq 0.1$ in general), since the influence of the He blend is non-linear because of the different departure coefficients for H and He. As a first approximation, however, it is only necessary to account for the corresponding factor in Eq. (3) and to introduce an additional correction for \tilde{Q}^2 .

3. H-alpha mass-loss rates from Galactic and Magellanic Clouds O-stars

Having discussed in considerable detail the line formation process of H_α and its dependence on atmospheric parameters, we will use this knowledge to derive mass-loss rates for a sample of Galactic and Magellanic Cloud O-stars. Note that in addition to the use of an improved theoretical treatment of the H_α line formation, the present approach differs from previous work in a number of other aspects. Perhaps the most important of these is that mass-loss rates are derived from line profile fits as opposed to using only equivalent width data. Furthermore, the stellar parameters needed to specify the underlying photospheric H_α line profile were derived for each object from a NLTE model atmosphere analysis rather than simply assigning such parameters on the basis of spectral type and luminosity class. These latter considerations will be especially important for cases where the net emission of the line is small. In addition we consider only those stars for which an estimate of v_∞ is available from the UV, we make no assumptions concerning this quantity based upon spectral type (although for a few stars this criterion is not satisfied). Thus while the present sample of stars is not as extensive as that considered by Leither (1988, 1988a), for example, we expect that the data quality and method of analysis presented here lead to much superior results.

3.1. The O-star sample

It follows that the sample of stars was restricted to those objects for which the required information is present, i.e., that the star was observed in all strategic optical lines to derive the photospheric parameters ($\rightarrow T_{\text{eff}}, \log g, Y, v \sin i$), that the distance is well known from association or galaxy membership ($\rightarrow R_*$), and the star was also observed in the UV to derive v_∞ .

The core sample of galactic O-stars are those analyzed by Herrero et al. (1992) and Herrero (1994) for which IUE observations exist. These are supplemented by additional O3 stars in the Carina nebula plus some further well-observed stars such as ζ Pup and α Cam. The Magellanic Cloud star sample comprises of mainly those O-stars which were observed by the Hubble Space Telescope as part of a program aimed at investigating the physics of stellar winds of O-stars in different parent galaxies (see Kudritzki et al. 1992a). In total the sample consists of 24 Galactic, 6 LMC and 8 SMC O-stars, as listed in Tab. 8.

3.1.1. Observations and data reduction

The H_α observations of the galactic stars taken from Herrero et al. (1992) and Herrero (1994) were carried out with the 2.5 m Isaac Newton Telescope at the Observatory of El Roque de los Muchachos in La Palma in July and October 1989, and in August 1992. The Intermediate Dispersion Spectrograph (IDS) was used with the 1800 V grating with the 235 mm camera, which resulted in a resolution of 0.8 \AA FWHM while the measured S/N of the resulting data was typically around 300. The blue observations used for the derivation of the photospheric parameters were obtained on the same dates with an additional




Fig. 15. H_{α} fit diagram for $Y = 0.1$, three values of $\beta = 0.7, 1.0, 1.3$ (upper to lower family of curves) and three values of $v_{\infty} = 1,000, 2,000, 3,000$ km/s (fully drawn, dashed, dotted). The ordinate gives the logarithm of \tilde{Q}^2 (Eq. 51) with v_{∞} in 1,000 km/s. For the procedure to use this diagram, see text. Overplotted as rectangles are the unified model atmosphere results from Tab. 3.

run in September 1991. These data are described in the references given above, briefly however the spectral resolution was 0.6 \AA FWHM, the S/N ranging from 150 to 200. Additional red spectrograms of HD207198, HD209975 and α Cam were obtained with a similar instrumental setup as described above (see Lennon et al. 1993 for details) while data for the Carina stars, HD93128, HD93250, HD93129A and HD303308 were obtained in December 1992 using the ESO New Technology Telescope (NTT) and the EMMI spectrograph. This latter dataset consisted of spectrograms covering the wavelength ranges $3920 - 4380 \text{ \AA}$ and $6300 - 6800 \text{ \AA}$ at a resolution of 0.9 \AA and 1.1 \AA respectively, the S/N being in excess of 200. Finally, for the galactic star sample, the data for ζ Pup were taken from Bohannan et al. (1990) where further details of the

observational material and data reduction procedures may be found.

Blue spectra for O-stars in the Magellanic Clouds (excluding Mk42) were obtained using the ESO 3.6m telescope and Caspec echelle spectrograph during two observing runs in 1984 and 1985. The resolution of these data is approximately 0.5 \AA while S/N ratios range from 30 to 70, further details of these data may be found in Walborn et al. (1995). Red spectrograms with similar resolution and S/N for the LMC stars plus 4 SMC stars (NGC346#1, #3, #4 and AV232) were also obtained with the ESO 3.6m telescope and Caspec in November 1990 (excepting AV232 which was observed in October 1991). A blue spectrogram of Mk42 was also obtained at this time. Of the remaining SMC stars, H_{α} data were obtained for AV388, AV243 and AV238 using EFOSC in echelle mode on the ESO 3.6m

Table 7. a) Equivalent width W_λ of H_α (including He blend) as function of Q^2 (cf. Eq. 48), v_∞ and β for the standard parametrization of the departure coefficients and $Y = 0.1$. Photospheric model with $T_{\text{eff}} = 40,000$ K, $\log g = 3.70$ ($\rightarrow W_\lambda^{\text{phot}} = -3.29$ Å). b) Temperature correction factor $ct(T_{\text{eff}}, T_{\text{ref}}) = [ct(T_{\text{ref}}, T_{\text{eff}})]^{-1}$ (Eq. 50) to derive the actual value of Q^2 from Q^2 .

$\log Q^2$	$W_\lambda(\text{Å})$ $v_\infty = 1,000$ km/s			$W_\lambda(\text{Å})$ $v_\infty = 2,000$ km/s			$W_\lambda(\text{Å})$ $v_\infty = 3,000$ km/s			$T_{\text{ref}} =$ 40,000 K	
	$\beta = 0.7$	$\beta = 1.0$	$\beta = 1.3$	$\beta = 0.7$	$\beta = 1.0$	$\beta = 1.3$	$\beta = 0.7$	$\beta = 1.0$	$\beta = 1.3$	T_{eff} (kK)	$\log ct$
-5.5	-3.21	-3.04	-2.85	-3.25	-3.12	-2.96	-3.26	-3.15	-3.00	35.0	-.206
-5.0	-3.10	-2.83	-2.57	-3.20	-2.99	-2.78	-3.23	-3.04	-2.85	37.5	-.099
-4.5	-2.87	-2.47	-2.09	-3.10	-2.79	-2.53	-3.16	-2.89	-2.66	40.0	.000
-4.0	-2.35	-1.76	-1.18	-2.87	-2.47	-2.09	-3.02	-2.67	-2.37	42.5	.091
-3.5	-1.19	-0.24	0.69	-2.41	-1.82	-1.18	-2.74	-2.28	-1.80	45.0	.175
-3.0	1.60	3.23	4.75	-1.39	-0.39	0.66	-2.16	-1.43	-0.62	47.5	.253
-2.5	8.06	10.74	13.17	1.08	2.85	4.62	-0.81	0.46	1.85	50.0	.327
-2.0	24.27	28.41	32.08	7.14	10.32	13.34	2.51	4.88	7.32	52.5	.396
-1.5	62.42	68.26	73.49	21.97	27.44	32.41	10.91	15.40	19.69	55.0	.461
-1.0	149.33	156.71	163.55	59.69	68.19	75.80	31.76	39.62	46.79	57.5	.523

telescope in November 1988. Note that the EFOSC data have a resolution of approximately 3.0Å at H_α which is significantly lower than that of the rest of the sample. Finally, NGC346#6 was observed in the red during December 1993 using the EMMI spectrograph on the NTT at a resolution of 1.1Å and a S/N of 40.

The reduction of the visible region data was performed following the standard procedures of bias subtraction, flat field division, spectrum extraction, wavelength calibration and continuum rectification. Various packages were used for the reduction including IRAF², FIGARO (Shorridge, 1987), Midas and locally developed programs.

The IUE dataset for the galactic O-stars used in this work is identical to that used by Howarth & Prinja (1989) and has been extensively described there. These data were kindly sent to one of us (SMH) by the authors. The UV spectrum of Mk42 was obtained with the GHRS aboard the HST as described by Heap et al. (1991), where further details may be found. All the other Magellanic Cloud stars were observed with the Faint Object Spectrograph (FOS) aboard HST, and these observations plus the corresponding optical data are discussed more fully in Walborn et al. (1995). Note that spectral types are also taken from this paper.

3.1.2. Determination of T_{eff} , $\log g$, Y and $v \sin i$

The hydrogen and helium lines in the spectral range between 4000 and 5000 Å were used to determine T_{eff} , $\log g$ and Y . This standard technique has been described in detail many times (see, e.g., Kudritzki & Hummer, 1990; Herrero et al., 1992; Herrero, 1994). Plane-parallel and hydrostatic NLTE models were used for that purpose with the underlying assumption that the effects

of winds on the absorption lines in this spectral range are small. Of course, we admit that according to Gabler et al. (1989), Sellmaier et al. (1993) and Schaerer & Schmutz (1994) this assumption requires a careful reinvestigation. Consequently, detailed spectral analyses based on metal line blanketed unified models are presently under way in our group. However, for samples as large as the present one this represents a major effort. Therefore, at the present stage, we continue to work with the standard technique. Nevertheless, we do apply a correction that accounts for the most important effect arising from the application of unified model atmospheres, namely that concerning the determination of the surface gravities. Gabler et al. have shown that stellar winds, if they are strong, do not only affect H_α but also H_β and H_γ . Sellmaier et al. and Schaerer & Schmutz have added further evidence in this direction. As a result, gravities derived from Stark broadened wings of H_γ using hydrostatic NLTE models are systematically too low because of a) wind emission filling in the photospheric profile as for H_α and b) the density at optical depth unity is smaller in atmospheres with a wind than without one. We account for both effects in an approximate way.

Effect a) can be treated very easily by carrying out the same approximate line formation treatment for H_γ as for H_α (cf. the corresponding departure coefficients in Tab. 4.5). In this way, the stellar wind contribution to the photospheric profile is quite well accounted for and the profile fitting of H_γ is straightforward. Of course, now the determination of $\log g$ from H_γ has to be done iteratively together with the determination of \dot{M} from H_α . We start with H_γ and a purely hydrostatic model for a first estimate of $\log g$. Then we use the corresponding H_α profile as input for the \dot{M} -determination from H_α . With this \dot{M} -value we then account for wind emission in H_γ and derive a new $\log g$. The iteration of this process leads to the $\log g$ -values of the fourth column in Tab. 8.

The treatment of effect b) is more complicated. Fig. 16 shows the density stratifications for a hydrostatic and a unified

² The IRAF package is distributed by the National Optical Astronomy Observatories, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under contract with the National Science Foundation

Table 8. Galactic and MC O-star sample and used/deduced atmospheric parameters. T_{eff} in kK, R_* in R_{\odot} , $v \sin i$, v_{∞} in km/s, M_* in M_{\odot} , L in L_{\odot} , \dot{M} in $10^{-6}M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$. Bold face numbers for β denote derived values, others are assumed ones. r_4^{in} and r_6^{∞} give the ratio of He(i=4,6) departure coefficients to values of standard parametrization (Tab. 5) if different from unity.

¹⁾ fit-value for photospheric plus stellar wind profile in H_{γ} (see text).

²⁾ “true” value including “unified model atmosphere” and centrifugal correction (see text).

³⁾ other value applied for H_{α} profile fit (see text).

⁴⁾ v_{∞} estimated from spectral type.

⁵⁾ v_{∞} from $0.85v_*$ (Howarth & Prinja 1989), rather uncertain (see text).

⁶⁾ modified value for $r_4^{\infty} = 1.8$.

⁷⁾ modified value for $b_3(\text{H})$ (see text).

∴ (:) uncertain v_{∞} -determination, see text.

star	classif.	T_{eff}	$\log g^{1)}$	$\log g^{2)}$	R_*	Y	$v \sin i$	v_{∞}	$\log L$	M_*	\dot{M}	β	$r_4^{\text{in}}/r_6^{\infty}$
Galaxy													
HD 93128	O3 V ((f))	52.0	4.00	4.00	10.	0.10	100	3100 ⁴⁾	5.82	36.5	≤ 1.2	0.80	
HD 93250	O3 V ((f))	50.5	3.95	4.00	18.	0.10	100	3250	6.28	118.	4.9	0.80	
HD 93129A	O3 I f*	50.5	3.80	3.95	20.	0.10	130	3200	6.37	130.	22.0	0.85	1.15/ ⁶⁾
HD 303308	O3 V ((f))	48.0	4.05	4.10	12.	0.10	100	3100	5.84	66.	2.1	0.80	
ζ Pup	O4 I (f)	42.0	3.50	3.60	19.	0.12	220	2250	6.00	52.5	5.9	1.15	1.6/ ⁷⁾
HD 15558	O5 III (f)	48.0	3.80	3.85	21.8	0.08	120	2800	6.36	122.7	7.3	0.75	
HD 15629	O5 V ((f))	47.0	3.90	3.90	14.2	0.08	90	3000	5.95	58.5	0.75	1.00	
HD 193682	O5 III (f)	45.0	3.60	3.65	12.2	0.43	200	2800 ⁴⁾	5.74	24.3	1.3	0.80	
HD 14947	O5 I f ⁺	43.5	3.45	3.50	16.1	0.18	140	2350	5.93	30.	7.5	1.00	1.5/6
λ Cep	O6 I(n) fp	38.0	3.60	3.65	19.	0.10	100	2250	5.83	59.	5.3	0.90	1.4/ ⁷⁾
HD 190864	O6.5 III (f)	41.0	3.55	3.55	14.1	0.20	105	2500	5.71	25.7	1.5	0.80	1.3/
HD 217086	O7 V n	40.0	3.60	3.75	10.3	0.20	375 ³⁾	2550	5.39	21.8	≤ 0.2	1.00	
HD 192639	O7 Ib (f)	38.5	3.40	3.45	19.5	0.25	125	2150	5.88	39.	6.0	0.95	1.5/65
HD 193514	O7 Ib (f)	38.0	3.40	3.45	19.8	0.14	105	2200	5.87	40.3	4.2	0.75	1.4/3
HD 203064	O7.5 III:n ((f))	37.5	3.50	3.65	14.1	0.14	315 ³⁾	2550	5.55	32.4	1.2	0.80	
ξ Per	O7.5 III (n)((f))	36.0	3.30	3.40	25.5	0.22	250 ³⁾	2450	6.0	59.6	3.2	0.75	
HD 13268	ON8 V	35.0	3.30	3.50	11.7	0.25	320 ³⁾	2150	5.27	15.8	≤ 0.05	1.00	
HD 191423	O9 III : n*	34.0	3.40	3.70	13.	0.25	450 ³⁾	1150 ⁵⁾	5.31	31.	0.20	0.80	
HD 207198	O9 Ib-II	34.0	3.30	3.30	15.1	0.14	80	2150	5.44	16.6	1.6	0.75	1.95/4
HD 210809	O9 Iab	33.0	3.10	3.15	21.7	0.14	100	2100	5.7	24.3	4.0	0.93	1.7/55
ζ Oph	O9 III	32.5	3.70	3.85	12.9	0.19	400 ³⁾	1550:	5.22	43.	≤ 0.03	1.00	
HD 209975	O9.5 Ib	32.5	3.20	3.20	17.2	0.10	100	2050	5.47	17.	0.9	0.80	
HD 18409	O9.7 Ib	31.5	3.10	3.15	16.1	0.14	160 ³⁾	1750 ⁴⁾	5.36	13.4	0.5	0.80	
α Cam	O9.5 Ia	30.0	2.95	3.00	29.	0.20	80	1550	5.79	30.7	5.2	1.10	1.5/2 ⁷⁾
LMC													
Sk –67° 211	O3 III (f*)	60.0	4.10	4.15	17.8	0.10	100	3750	6.57	163.	10.	0.75	
Sk –68° 137	O3 III (f*)	60.0	4.05	4.10	12.4	0.10	100	3400	6.26	70.6	8.	0.75	
Melnick 42	O3 If/WN	50.5	3.80	3.90	26.	0.10	240	3000	6.60	196.	35.	0.55	
Sk –67° 166	O4 I f ⁺	47.5	3.60	3.65	19.5	0.10	80	1900	6.24	62.	13.0	0.67	1.15/5
Sk –67° 167	O4 Inf ⁺	47.5	3.60	3.65	17.9	0.10	120	2150	6.17	52.8	14.0	0.75	1.15/1
Sk –66° 100	O6 II (f)	43.5	3.70	3.75	13.2	0.13	80	2150	5.75	35.8	1.9	0.75	1.5/
SMC													
NGC 346#3	O3 III f*	55.0	3.90	3.90	12.3	0.10	100	2900	6.10	44.	2.3	0.80	
AV 388	O4 V	48.0	3.70	3.70	10.7	0.10	120	2100	5.74	21.	~ 0.17	1.00	
AV 243	O6 V	45.0	3.70	3.70	12.3	0.10	80	2050	5.75	27.7	≤ 0.1	1.00	
NGC 346#1	O4 III (n)(f)	42.0	3.60	3.65	23.3	0.10	200	2650(:)	6.18	88.5	4.8	0.80	
NGC 346#4	O5-6 V	42.0	3.80	3.85	14.2	0.10	250	1550:	5.75	52.	≤ 0.1	1.00	
NGC 346#6	O4 V ((f))	40.0	3.70	3.70	12.2	0.10	100	2250	5.54	27.2	≤ 0.3	1.00	
AV 232	O7 Iaf ⁺	37.5	3.20	3.30	29.3	0.20	80	1400	6.19	62.5	5.5	1.40	1.5/35 ⁷⁾
AV 238	O9 III	35.0	3.50	3.50	15.5	0.10	60 ³⁾	1200:	5.51	27.7	~ 0.13	1.00	

model with similar T_{eff} and $\log g$ as a function of atmospheric column density (proportional to Thomson optical depth)

$$m = R_* \int_r^\infty \rho dr. \quad (53)$$

The sonic point of the hydrodynamic unified model of Fig. 16 is located at $\log m = -3.9$, where $\log \rho$ shows the steep gradient. In the supersonic region ($\log m < -3.9$) the density in the unified model is much smaller whereas - naturally - it approaches the hydrostatic values in the subsonic region. The location of the sonic point depends, of course, on the mass-loss rate and moves inwards with increasing \dot{M} .




Fig. 16. Mass density ρ as function of logarithm of atmospheric column density m for a typical unified model (solid) and a hydrostatic model (dashed) with similar T_{eff} and $\log g$.

The wings of H_γ are normally formed in the subsonic region, but depending on \dot{M} the densities here can still be substantially lower than in the simple hydrostatic calculations, so that Stark broadening is less effective. Consequently, one would need a larger $\log g$ than in the purely hydrostatic case to fit the observed H_γ profile. In Appendix A we give a simple analytical estimate of this additional $\log g$ -correction, which we have applied to all the stars in our sample using the values of \dot{M} and β derived from H_α . In addition, we also apply the “centrifugal correction” of $\log g$, as it was introduced by Herrero et al. (1992) to account for centrifugal forces influencing the effective gravity (cf. also Sect. 2.1.1). These two corrections together lead to the “true” $\log g$ -values of column five in Tab. 8.

The projected rotational velocities ($v \sin i$) needed for the centrifugal correction were obtained from profile fits of weak lines unaffected by pressure broadening.

3.1.3. Stellar radii

Stellar radii were obtained from dereddened absolute magnitudes and model atmosphere fluxes using the procedure out-

lined by Kudritzki (1980; see also Herrero et al. 1992). We note that distances and therefore absolute magnitudes are uncertain for several of our galactic objects.

For the LMC and SMC distance moduli of 18.5^m and 19.1^m, respectively, were adopted, and apparent magnitudes from recent CCD photometry were used preferentially, where available.

3.1.4. Terminal velocities

The terminal velocities v_∞ have been determined by fits to the P-Cygni profiles of the UV resonance lines of Nv, SiIV, and CIV. To perform the fit we solve the exact equation for the formal integral together with the Sobolev approximation for the source function. As shown by Hamann (1981) and Lamers et al. (1987), this yields very accurate results almost indistinguishable from the exact comoving frame solution for the source function. As in Groenewegen & Lamers (1989) we allow for “microturbulence”, however, contrary to them we do not adopt a constant value but let v_{turb} increase from $v_{\text{turb}} = 0.02 \dots 0.03 v_\infty$ (corresponding to 50...60 km/s) at $r = R_*$ to $v_{\text{turb}}^{\text{max}}$ at $v = v_\infty$. A description of the method has been given by Haser et al. (1995).

For all objects of Tab. 8 that show steep blue absorption edges in at least two of the three above resonance lines, v_∞ can be fitted (together with $v_{\text{turb}}^{\text{max}}$) with an accuracy of ± 40 km/s. However, accounting for the inherent blue edge variability (see Henrichs 1991, Prinja et al. 1992) and the contamination of the edges by underlying photospheric lines, the v_∞ -values of Tab. 8 should generally be regarded as accurate to $\pm 5 \dots 10$ %. In a few cases of weak winds (the galactic O9 III star ζ Oph and some SMC O-stars), no strong lines with steep blue edges are present and v_∞ might be severely underestimated because of the change in ionization towards the outer wind. These cases are indicated by “:” in Tab. 8.

For the majority of our sample stars the analysis did not pose any serious problem. In the following we will comment only on those objects where the determination of v_∞ was somewhat more difficult. In the spectra of HD 93129A, HD 15558, and HD 15629 only the CIV lines could be used: The Nv profiles are corrupted either by a strong interstellar Ly_α absorption trough, leading to an invisible blue edge (HD 93129A), or the S/N is too poor (HD 15558, HD 15629) and the SiIV profiles are absent or too weak (HD 15558). Furthermore, the blue wings of the absorption troughs of HD 15558 and HD 93129A are very shallow, suggesting that CIV is being depopulated in the outermost parts of the winds. Hence, their derived terminal velocities are somewhat more uncertain by ~ 200 km/s (HD 15558) or even ~ 400 km/s (HD 93129A). In our subsequent analysis we used the lower limits for v_∞ . In fact a few of our targets were observed by the ORFEUS-mission and it turns out that for these stars this lower limit is consistent with the observed OVI $\lambda\lambda 1032/1038$ resonance lines (Taresch, private communication). In the case of ζ Oph only CIV was usable for an (uncertain) fit, with the Nv profile consisting almost exclusively of Discrete Absorption Components (DACs).

HD 191423 shows peculiar P-Cygni profiles similar to those of HD 93521 (see Howarth & Reid 1993). A fit with a spher-

ically symmetric flow model is not applicable here (see also below). v_∞ has been estimated then from the maximum edge velocity $v_\infty \approx 0.85v_*$ (cf. Howarth & Prinja 1989).

The terminal velocity for the SMC and LMC objects are taken from Haser et al. (1994). The observations for three more stars in NGC346 in the SMC have just recently been performed (NGC346#3, #4 and #6) and were analyzed in a similar fashion (Walborn et al. 1995).

For all MC stars (except Mk 42) the instrumental profile of the FOS of FWHM $\approx 1 \text{ \AA}$ (corresponding to 230 km/s at 1300 \AA) has been taken into account by convolving the model profile with a Gaussian, where one has to ensure that the steepest wings of the model profile are sufficiently resolved numerically prior to convolution. Due to the extraordinary data quality this does not significantly affect the accuracy of the derived values for v_∞ . Only for two stars in the SMC (NGC346#4 and AV 238) are the P-Cygni profiles so weak that only the C_{IV} line could be used for an (uncertain) fit.

NGC346#1 is a multiple system (Heydari-Malayeri & Hutsemékers 1991). The C_{IV} and N_V profiles show a considerable residual intensity in the absorption troughs although morphologically resembling saturated lines. If the residual intensity is artificially removed, the derived v_∞ decreases from 2650 km/s to a minimum value of 2250 km/s due to the increased effect of turbulence at the blue edges. Since the flux contribution of the companions is quantitatively unknown, we have retained the value of $v_\infty = 2650 \text{ km/s}$, which corresponds to the uncorrected flux level. This uncertainty is indicated by “(·)” in Tab. 8.

For three stars (HD 93128, HD 193628, HD 18409) no UV spectra are available, so v_∞ was estimated from its spectral type. The error is supposed not to exceed $\approx 400 \text{ km/s}$.

3.1.5. Radial Velocities v_{rad}

It turns out that a significant parameter affecting the results is the correction for the stellar radial velocity v_{rad} . One reason for this is that in the present approach the parameters β and/or especially $b_{4,6}$ are treated as fit parameters and therefore an erroneous radial velocity correction may be falsely compensated for by an inappropriate choice of these parameters. (Obviously, this problem will not arise in the curve of growth approach.) In fact for reliable results the radial velocity correction has to be known with a precision better than 20 km/s. The H $_{\alpha}$ line itself cannot be used to determine v_{rad} both for the reason we have just mentioned but also because all the hydrogen Balmer series lines have a He II line blended on the blue side and so the position of the line centroids depend upon the helium abundance. Clearly, lines other than H $_{\alpha}$ must be used to determine the radial velocity correction (and the helium abundance, see Sect. 3.1.2).

The determination of v_{rad} for O-stars with the required accuracy is complicated by a number of factors. At these temperatures only a small number of useful “photospheric” lines are present in the spectra. Furthermore, the wind itself may produce both an asymmetry and a shift of the observed line center for those remaining lines. (Note that also the so-called *photospheric* lines are actually formed in an expanding medium

with outflow velocities not too different from the above mentioned accuracy level (see Kudritzki 1992).) Furthermore, the projected rotational velocities of O-stars may be quite large, increasing the uncertainty associated with the measurement of line centers. The determination of the radial velocity correction in the critical H $_{\alpha}$ region is particularly problematical as we must rely entirely upon He I or He II lines or else resort to the adoption of values derived from blue spectral data (while recognizing that there may be systematic differences between red and blue).

For the hotter stars, those with strong He II lines and weak or absent He I, we used one or more members of the He II Pfund series lines at $\lambda\lambda 6683, 6527$ and 6406 , while for cooler stars (late O) we use the He I $\lambda 6678$ line. For a number of stars, particularly in the Magellanic Clouds, the S/N was not sufficient to permit the use of the He II lines (which are Stark broadened) and we adopted the radial velocities as derived from the blue spectrograms although in addition when possible we used nebular lines to correct for offsets between blue and red spectra. In general the uncertainty in the derived value of v_{rad} is of the order $\pm 20 \text{ km/s}$ although in some cases it is considerably better than this.

3.2. H-alpha mass-loss rates

With all required parameters now specified, we are able to deduce the stellar \dot{M} by a detailed fit to the H $_{\alpha}$ profile. We prefer the method of profile fits relative to the curve of growth method derived above for the following reasons:

- The profile fitting method, through its ability to optimize the values of β and the boundary values of the departure coefficients (should they deviate from the “standard parametrization”, see below) intrinsically allows a more accurate estimate of \dot{M} .
- Many of our galactic objects show an enriched He abundance (the so-called He discrepancy, cf. Herrero et al. 1992), which favours a distinct profile fit instead of calculating a variety of curve of growth diagrams to account correctly for this parameter.
- For a large number of our objects (the Carina and MC stars), the innermost part of the profile is heavily contaminated by nebula emission of the surrounding H II region, so that the specification of a measured equivalent width is difficult. In view of the fact that it is not the total equivalent width W_{λ} which is decisive, but rather the value of W'_{λ} (i.e., corrected for the photospheric equivalent width), this error may become intolerable for stars with a low wind density, where an only small portion of the profile is refilled by wind emission.
- By comparing theoretical profile shapes to the observed ones, it is also possible to extract the “problematic” cases easily, i.e., those ones, which in the framework of our assumptions cannot be modelled and may thus point to presently unsolved problems and/or different physical processes.

- Finally, these line fits can be performed interactively on a workstation with almost no perceptible time delay between input and output. Thus, the analysis of even a large sample of objects is not hampered by the fitting approach.

3.2.1. Fit procedure

The actual fit procedure works as follows (exceptions are discussed in the next section). As a first guess, following Sect. 2.3, we use a value of $\beta = 1.0$ for $W'_\lambda < 0.5 \text{ \AA}$, $\beta = 0.8$ for $0.5 \text{ \AA} \leq W'_\lambda < 1.3 \text{ \AA}$ and $\beta = 0.75$ for $W'_\lambda \geq 1.3 \text{ \AA}$. Using the b_i 's from Tab. 4,5 we first perform calculations with a guess for \dot{M} , this guess being modified iteratively to optimize the fit. In many cases this simple procedure gives a very good fit and a good determination of \dot{M} . For a number of objects (actually for almost all *supergiants*), we found that in order to model the blue wing we had to increase the He-opacity in the inner wind part – corresponding to an increase of b_4^{in} – and to reduce the emissivity outside, i.e., b_6^∞ had to be lowered. Fortunately, both quantities can be easily adjusted with sufficient accuracy because of the *asymmetric* reaction of the profile to their changes.

The second step of the fit procedure is to carefully adapt the mass loss rate and b_6^∞ to model the almost β -independent high-velocity wings (if present). As the shape of the central emission peak (if present) is primarily controlled by the velocity field (high and narrow emission for large, low and broad emission for small β), β is finally adjusted together with b_4^{in} (and partly \dot{M}) to fit the total profile. For those cases where the wind emission is smaller than the photospheric absorption, we adjust only b_4^{in} and \dot{M} while leaving β at its standard value dependent on W'_λ .

Table 8 (last three columns) lists the derived mass-loss rates, β 's and modified b_i 's, and Fig. 17 demonstrates the typical fit quality for our stellar sample. In the following, we give some general remarks and then discuss those objects where individual comments are appropriate.

3.2.2. General remarks: Departure coefficients, rotational velocities and derived β -values

When performing the individual profile fits, it was immediately clear that most of the supergiants exhibit a profile which cannot be fitted with our standard parametrization of the HeII departure coefficients. Most striking are those cases with a total equivalent width somewhat larger than zero, where the line shape resembles a P Cygni profile. Here, obviously, the absorption has to be attributed to the He blend, which can be simulated in our approach by increasing the He opacity in the lower wind part, typically by a factor of 1.5 (cf. the last column of Tab. 8). On the other hand, for a number of those objects we had additionally to lower the He emission in the outer wind part by decreasing the corresponding standard value of b_6^∞ (a typical factor here is 0.3). A possible reason for this discrepancy in comparison to the unified atmosphere results may be the neglect of the effects of (EUV) line blocking (cf. Pauldrach et al. 1994; Schmutz & Schaerer 1994) in our present calculations, which become

particularly important in dense winds. This problem will be thoroughly discussed in a forthcoming paper, where recent test calculations actually show that this effect yields a trend in the correct direction, i.e., changing the He occupation numbers, while keeping the hydrogen population almost unaffected.

As pointed out above, our parametrization of the hydrogen departure coefficients provided no difficulties when used for a line fit to *observed* profiles. The only cases where we had to perform a rather moderate change are ζ Pup, λ Cep, α Cam and AV 232. For those objects, which exhibit a strong decline from the emission maximum towards the (He-) absorption minimum, we were forced to lower the hydrogen emission in the inner wind part by decreasing the value of b_3^{in} from 1.2 to 1.1 for λ Cep, α Cam, AV232 and to 0.9 for ζ Pup. This corresponds to a reduction of the source function by a factor 0.88 for the first three objects and 0.65 for the latter one, respectively.

It is important to note here that the final values of \dot{M} are only weakly affected by these modifications of the departure coefficients, since the line opacity scales with \dot{M}^2 but only linearly with the b_i 's.

For those of our objects with a large rotational velocity (denoted by the superscript ³⁾ in Tab. 8), we had to modify $v \sin i$ to a smaller value in order to simulate the observed profiles. This may be explained by the fact that the wind emission is formed in a differentially rotating medium with an “effective” rotational speed smaller than the *photospheric* one given in Tab. 8. Actually, for those fast rotating objects one would have to perform a formal solution taking into account the differential rotation exactly. This will be done in a forthcoming paper, where we will show that – with respect to profile shape – the effects are largest for objects with an equivalent width of roughly zero and a “P Cygni” shape. However, as was mentioned in Sect. 2.1.2, the resulting equivalent width remains almost unaffected even if this process is included, so that our procedure of adapting $v \sin i$ should lead to no significant errors as long as the synthesized profile fits the observed one well.

As pointed out above, those objects with H_α in emission allow one to derive the β -value in parallel with the mass-loss rate (Tab. 8, β - values in bold face). For the galactic supergiants, an average value of $\beta = 1.0$ is found consistent with the UV line analysis. The only object which seems to show some contradictions is ζ Pup with $\beta = 1.15...1.20$, where UV line fits indicate a smaller value ($\approx 0.8...0.9$, cf. also Groenewegen & Lamers 1989). However, from the shape and strength of the emission peak a value of < 1.1 can be excluded.

In contrast, all three LMC objects for which a determination of β is possible show a value $\lesssim 0.75$, where Mk42 has the fastest acceleration in our sample with $\beta \approx 0.55$. Finally, the only SMC object with H_α in emission, AV 232, is an extreme supergiant with a rather low terminal velocity and a large $\beta = 1.40$.




Fig. 17. a) to f) Typical examples for detailed line fits, see text.




Fig. 17. g) to l) Typical examples for detailed line fits, see text.

3.2.3. Comments on individual objects

Galactic O-stars

HD 93128. For this star (Fig. 17a), we can only derive an upper limit of $1.2 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$, as the line center is heavily contaminated by nebula emission and lower \dot{M} 's have no effect onto the visible wings. The maximum possible value for HD 93128 is $1.5 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$.

HD 93250. As for HD 93128, only the wings can be fitted here. Fig. 17b shows the sensitivity to different values of \dot{M} , where the upper curve corresponds to $\dot{M} = 6.4 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ and the lower one to $3.4 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$. The best fit is obtained for $\dot{M} = 4.9 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$.

HD 93129A. From the shape of the emission peak, β can be restricted to 0.85. The best fit results in $\dot{M} = 22 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$. (The lower limit for this star is constrained by $21 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$.)

HD 303308. No comment necessary.

ζ *Pup* (*HD 66811*). Fig. 17c shows the influence of β on the emission peak. Whereas even a $\beta = 1.0$ cannot fit the observations, with $\beta = 1.15$ (and the modified departure coefficients, see above) we obtain an almost perfect fit. Also obvious is that the emission in the high velocity wings is unaffected by the actual value of β , so that the mass-loss rate can be determined in any case.

HD 15558. No comment necessary (Fig. 17d).

HD 15629. No comment necessary.

HD 193682. No comment necessary.

HD 14947. $\beta = 1.0$ from shape of emission peak (Fig. 17e).

λ *Cep* (*HD 210839*). With modified departure coefficients (both He and H, see above), we derive $\beta = 0.90$ and $\dot{M} = 5.3 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$.

HD 190864 illustrates a typical example of the error introduced by the uncertainty in β . With our standard value (in this case $\beta = 0.80$), the profile can be fitted with $\dot{M} = 1.5 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$, whereas $\beta = 1.0$ – with a worse fit quality – yields $\dot{M} = 1.1 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$. In view of the better fit quality, the spectral type, “normal” terminal velocity and the results from UV line fits ($\beta_{\text{UV}} \approx 0.7$; Haser 1995), the lower β seems to be more plausible.

HD 217086. In view of its almost vanishing wind-emission, we can derive only an upper limit of $\dot{M} \leq 0.2 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ for this extremely rapid rotator ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 375$ km/s), where the profile favours an “effective” rotational velocity of 290 km/s.

HD 192639 has a P Cygni type like profile, which is difficult to fit with respect to its absorption part and the *blue* emission wing. However, due to the large wind emission also in the high velocity wings, the resulting error in \dot{M} is only small. The inferred β is 0.95.

HD 193514. No comment necessary.

HD 203064. “Effective” rotational speed 190 km/s ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 315$ km/s).

ξ *Per* (*HD 24912*). Compared to the large rotational speed of ξ *Per* ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 250$ km/s), the observed profile appears much too narrow. Reducing the effective value of v_{rot} to 100 km/s, the fit quality becomes much better. ξ *Per* is known as a notorious variable object with a suspected variability also in the *lowest wind region* (cf. Henrichs et al. 1994). Additionally, both the He II 4686 line (cf. Herrero et al. 1992, Fig. 4) and the H $_{\alpha}$ complex show small emission peaks at the blue and red edge of the profile pointing to a disk like structure, so that the mass-loss rate derived here should be considered only to be an order of magnitude result.

HD 13268. As for HD 217086, also for this rapid rotator ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 320$ km/s, “effective” value 250 km/s) only an upper limit of $\dot{M} \leq 0.05 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$ can be given (Fig. 17f).

HD 191423. The largest uncertainty for this star ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 450$ km/s!, “effective” value 300 km/s) is due to its ill determined terminal velocity, which was here assumed as $v_{\infty} = 1150$ km/s (see Sect. 3.1.4). Due to the considerable wind emission, the resulting mass-loss rate can be regarded as significant and not only as an upper limit. Note, that also this profile points to a disk like structure because of the blue and red emission “bumps”, which can be also expected from the large ratio $v_{\text{rot}}/v_{\infty}$ in terms of the wind compressed disk model (cf. Bjorkman & Cassinelli 1993).

HD 207198. No comment necessary.

HD 210809. Same comment as for HD 192639, $\beta = 0.93$.

ζ *Oph* (*HD 149757*) ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 400$ km/s!, “effective value 300 km/s) is an extremely variable object and supposed non-radial pulsator (Vogt & Penrod 1983; Reid et al. 1993). From our H $_{\alpha}$ analysis, its mass loss rate can be restricted to $\dot{M} \leq 0.03 \cdot 10^{-6} M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$.

HD 209975. No comment necessary.

HD 18409 poses the same dilemma as ξ Per. To obtain a reasonable fit, the rotational speed ($v \sin i_{\text{phot}} = 160$ km/s) had to be lowered to an “effective” value of 80 km/s.

α Cam (HD 30614) This profile can be simulated by adapting both the H and HeII departure coefficients (see above) with $\beta = 1.1$ (Fig. 17g). One should note, however, that observations of this line by Ebbetts (1982; study of long term variability of O-star emission lines) showed a variability in the profile shape (also with respect to the position of the peak) up to a velocity of 600 km/s. Consequently, the apparent red shift of the emission peak (≈ 100 km/s with respect to rest wavelength) may be caused by a highly structured wind which is also indicated by the extremely broad (and black) UV SiIV absorption troughs of this star (cf. Puls et al. 1995).

LMC O-stars

Most of the LMC/SMC H_α profiles are contaminated by weak night sky emission and water vapour absorption. We account for this, when performing the profile fit.

Sk -67° 211. We obtain $\dot{M} = 10 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ with limits of $9.5 \dots 13 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ (Fig. 17h).

Sk -68° 137. The red emission favours a value of $\dot{M} = 8 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ with a lower limit of $7 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$.

Melnick 42 can be fitted very well with $\beta = 0.55$ and $\dot{M} = 35 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$. The influence of different values of β on the inner part of the profile is shown in Fig. 17i, where the upper curve corresponds to $\beta = 0.75$ and the lower one to the lowest possible value of $\beta = 0.5$ (“point star model”, cf. Castor, Abbott & Klein 1975).

Sk -67° 166. The emission peak can be simulated with $\beta = 0.67$, and the mass-loss rate results to $\dot{M} = 13.0 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ with only small errors.

Sk -67° 167. Spectroscopic twin of *Sk -67° 166* (also in the UV), deduced values $\beta = 0.75$ and $\dot{M} = 14.0 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$. The reader may note that this star, although of lower luminosity, shows a slightly larger mass-loss rate than its counterpart above, which results from the different combinations of R_* and v_∞ .

Sk -66° 100 (with modified HeII departure coefficients) can be almost perfectly fitted with $1.9 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ and a lower limit of $1.5 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$ (cf. Fig 17j).

SMC O-stars

NGC 346#3. No comment necessary (Fig. 17k).

AV 388 was observed with EFOSC and the spectrum corrected for the nebula emission (cf. Sect. 3.1.1). For this star and all the following ones observed with EFOSC we convolved the theoretical profile with the instrumental profile of 3 \AA (FWHM?) before comparing to the observed one. However, our simulation gives a dissatisfying fit quality, caused by the low quality spectrum. From the obtained equivalent width, the mass-loss rate can be roughly restricted to $\sim 0.2 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$.

AV 243 (EFOSC) gives an upper limit of $\dot{M} \leq 0.1 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$, however with a better fit quality than above.

NGC 346#1. No comment necessary.

NGC 346#4. Only upper limit of $0.1 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$. Note that this value scales with the very uncertain v_∞ .

NGC 346#6. Only upper limit of $0.3 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$.

AV 232 (Sk 80) shows, among all stars of our sample, the weakest velocity gradient with $\beta = 1.40$ (Fig 17l). With a high fit quality, \dot{M} results in $5.5 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$. Note, that for this star we had to reduce the hydrogen emissivity in the lower wind part.

AV 238 (EFOSC) provides an estimate of $\dot{M} \sim 0.13 \cdot 10^{-6} M_\odot/\text{yr}$. This value scales however with the uncertain v_∞ .

3.3. Comparison with other investigations

In Tab. 9 we compare our present results with the values used and derived by other authors for those stars which are in common. The majority of our galactic sample was also investigated by Leitherer (1988), where a subgroup of these stars has been reanalyzed by L&L. Only one of our galactic objects (HD 193514) is in common with the investigations by Scuderi et al. (1992). Finally, four of our LMC and three of our SMC stars have been also considered by Leitherer (1988a) but we note that there are serious discrepancies in his equivalent widths for the stars *AV 243*, *AV 388*, *Sk -67° 211* and *Sk -68° 137*. For the first two stars Leitherer’s values are approximately a factor of 2 smaller (in absorption) than the present values while for the last two stars he has a net emission in the H_α equivalent width compared with the net absorption found here. These differences are probably due to the lower S/N (approximately 20) and resolution (2.5 \AA) of Leitherer’s data coupled with an inadequate treatment of nebular emission. There is reasonably good agreement however for those stars which have a strong stellar emission component at H_α , namely the supergiants *AV 232*, *Sk -67° 166* and *Sk -67° 167*.

In order to facilitate the comparison, Tab. 10 gives the quantities $\log \hat{Q}^2$ (cf. Eq. 51, \dot{M} from the *equivalent width* of H_α) and $\log(Q/v_\infty)$ (\dot{M} from radio fluxes) which are independent of the stellar parameters used and reflect only the influence of the quantity which can be *actually* “measured”.


Table 9. a) Comparison of present results with assumed and deduced O-star parameters from other investigations. T_{eff} in kK, R_* in R_{\odot} , v_{∞} in km/s, M_* in M_{\odot} , L in L_{\odot} , \dot{M} in $10^{-6}M_{\odot}/\text{yr}$. (L&R = Leitherer & Robert 1991)

star	classif.	T_{eff}	$\log g$	R_*	v_{∞}	$\log L$	M_*	\dot{M}	author
Galaxy									
HD 93129A	O3 I f*	50.5	3.95	20.	3250.	6.37	130.	22.0	present paper
		47.5	3.75	25.	3900.	6.46	130.	25.7	Leitherer(1988)
		50.5	3.93	20.	3050.	6.35	125.	13.2	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
ζ Pup	O4 I(f)	42.0	3.60	19.	2250.	6.00	52.5	5.9	present paper
		44.8	3.75	17.	2650.	6.02	60.	6.6	Leitherer(1988)
					2500.			5.0	L&R(1991)
		42.4	3.80	16.	2200.	5.90	59.	3.55	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
						2.4	L&L, radio		
HD 15558	O5 III (f)	48.0	3.85	21.8	2800.	6.36	123.	7.3	present paper
		43.3	3.80	19.	3000.	6.06	85.	3.9	Leitherer(1988)
		42.3	3.70	19.	3350.	6.02	68.	2.45	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
HD 15629	O5 V ((f))	47.0	3.90	14.2	3000.	5.95	58.5	0.75	present paper
		45.0	3.90	14.	3250.	5.86	60.	1.86	Leitherer(1988)
		44.3	3.90	13.	2900.	5.74	51.	1.70	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
HD 193682	O5 III (f)	45.0	3.65	12.2	2800.	5.74	24.	1.3	present paper
		45.6	3.95	13.	3100.	5.82	55.	2.63	Leitherer(1988)
HD 14947	O5 I f ⁺	43.5	3.50	16.1	2350.	5.93	30.	7.5	present paper
		40.6	3.75	18.	2700.	5.90	70.	6.92	Leitherer(1988)
		40.3	3.70.	17.	2300.	5.86	52.	4.79	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
λ Cep	O6 I(n)fp	38.0	3.65	19.	2250.	5.83	59.	5.3	present paper
		39.5	3.65	19.	2500.	5.9	60.	4.07	Leitherer(1988)
		38.2	3.60	19.	2100.	5.86	52.	3.5	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
								2.1	L&L, radio
HD 190864	O6.5 III (f)	41.0	3.55	14.1	2500.	5.71	25.7	1.5	present paper
		37.8	3.75	15.	2950.	5.62	45.	1.41	Leitherer(1988)
		39.2	3.75	14.	2450.	5.62	41	1.32	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
HD 217086	O7 V n	40.0	3.75	10.3	2550.	5.39	22.	≤ 0.2	present paper
		37.6	3.83	11.	2300.	5.34	30.	0.62	Leitherer(1988)
HD 192639	O7 Ib (f)	38.5	3.45	19.5	2150.	5.88	39.	6.0	present paper
		35.9	3.53	20.	2950.	5.78	50.	3.9	Leitherer(1988)
HD 193514	O7 Ib (f)	38.0	3.45	19.8	2200.	5.87	40.	4.2	present paper
		35.9	3.53	20.	2950.	5.78	50.	2.82	Leitherer(1988)
		35.7		20.	2950.	5.77		3.6	Scuderi et al. (1992)
ξ Per	O7.5 III (n)((f))	36.0	3.40	25.5	2450.	6.0	60.	3.2	present paper
		36.0	3.80	12.	2500.	5.34	35.	0.87	Leitherer(1988)
		37.1	3.77	12.	2400.	5.38	31.	1.29	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
HD 13268	ON8 V	35.0	3.50	11.7	2150.	5.27	16.	≤ 0.05	present paper
		38.5	3.90	11.	2300.	5.38	35.	0.72	Leitherer(1988)
HD 191423	O9 III : n*	34.0	3.70	13.	1150.	5.31	31.	0.20	present paper
		30.0	3.60	13.	2550.	5.10	25.	0.22	Leitherer(1988)
HD 207198	O9 Ib-II	34.0	3.30	15.1	2150.	5.44	16.6	1.6	present paper
		33.0	3.55	15.	2650.	5.38	30.	0.74	Leitherer(1988)
ζ Oph	O9 III	32.5	3.85	12.9	1550.	5.22	43.	≤ 0.03	present paper
		35.9	4.0	8.	1500.	5.00	24.	0.039	L&L, radio
HD 209975	O9.5 Ib	32.5	3.20	17.2	2050.	5.47	17.	0.9	present paper
		28.7	3.30	18.	2300.	5.30	25.	0.42	Leitherer(1988)
α Cam	O9.5 Ia	30.0	3.00	29.	1550.	5.79	30.7	5.2	present paper
		28.7	3.15	30.	1750.	5.74	45.	2.19	Leitherer(1988)
		30.9	3.20	27.	1550.	5.78	43.	3.39	L&L, H $_{\alpha}$
						3.9	L&L, radio		

Table 9. b) As Tab. 9a), but for Magellanic Clouds stars.

star	classif.	T_{eff}	$\log g$	R_*	v_∞	$\log L$	M_*	\dot{M}	author
LMC									
Sk -67° 211	O3 III (f*)	60.0	4.15	17.8	3750.	6.57	163.	10.	present paper
		50.0	3.8	17.	3100.	6.22	70.	5.75	Leitherer(1988a)
Sk -68° 137	O3 III (f*)	60.0	4.10	12.4	3400.	6.26	70.6	8.	present paper
		50.0	3.8	16.2	3100.	6.18	65.	4.6	Leitherer(1988a)
Sk -67° 166	O4 I f ⁺	47.5	3.65	19.5	1900.	6.24	62.	13.0	present paper
		44.1	3.8	19.	2100.	6.10	75.	4.2	Leitherer(1988a)
Sk -67° 167	O4 Inf ⁺	47.5	3.65	17.9	2150.	6.17	52.8	14.0	present
		44.1	3.7	20.	2100	6.14	80.	4.5	Leitherer(1988a)
SMC									
AV 388	O4 V	48.0	3.70	10.7	2100.	5.74	21.	~ 0.17	present paper
		48.0	4.1	11.2	2600.	5.78	60	1.07	Leitherer(1988a)
AV 243	O6 V	45.0	3.70	12.3	2050.	5.75	23.	< 0.1	present paper
		39.5	3.7	13.2	2400.	5.58	35	0.51	Leitherer(1988a)
AV 232	O7 Iaf ⁺	37.5	3.30	29.3	1400.	6.19	62.5	5.5	present paper
		37.5	3.30	26.3	1600.	6.10	55.	6.2	Leitherer(1988a)

With respect to the results by Leitherer and L&L, both investigations do not differ too much (L&L on the average find slightly larger Q values), which is not astonishing since they used an almost identical procedure. Compared to our values, however, the differences are significant. Globally, we find larger values in the upper Q range and lower ones in the lower range. This is clearly demonstrated in Fig. 18.

**Fig. 18.** Comparison of our values for $\log \tilde{Q}^2$ (cf. Tab. 10) with the results by Leitherer (1988, 1988a; asteriks) and L&L (circles).

From this figure, it is obvious that the borderline between these two regimes (where both methods – i.e., ours and the one presented by Leitherer – give comparable results) lies roughly at $\log \tilde{Q}^2 \approx -4.25$.

The reason for this systematic discrepancy is readily understood in terms of the results presented in Sect. 2, in particular the generalized curves of growth of Fig. 15. If we compare such a curve with the simple optically thin approximation of Eq. (13), as it was used by L&L, we find that the latter tends to overestimate \dot{M} for low values of the net equivalent width (see Fig. 19, but also A. Gabler et al. (1990) and their Fig. 3). For large values of $\log W'_\lambda$, the mass-loss rate is underestimated.


**Fig. 19.** H_α curve of growth as in Fig. 15. Solid: $\beta = 0.7$ and $v_\infty = 2000$ km/s. Dashed: The L&L approach of Eq. (13) for $\beta = 0.7$, $v_\infty = 2000$ km/s and $v_{\text{min}}/v_\infty = 0.01$, as it has been applied in their paper.

Table 10. $\log \tilde{Q}^2$ and $\log(Q/v_\infty)$ derived from the results by Leitherer (1988, 1988a) and L&L in comparison with our values (see text). Reference temperature $T_{\text{ref}} = 40,000$ K (cf. Eq. 50, \dot{M} in $10^{-6}M_\odot/\text{yr}$, v_∞ in 1000 km/s and R_* in R_\odot).

star	classif.	$\log \tilde{Q}^2$			$\log(Q/v_\infty)$	
		present paper	Leitherer (1988(a))	L&L(H_α)	present paper	L&L(radio)
Galaxy						
HD 93129A	O3 I f*	-2.41	-2.61	-2.81		
ζ Pup	O4 I (f)	-2.95	-2.93	-3.17	-1.50	-1.77
HD 15558	O5 III (f)	-3.30	-3.57	-4.02		
HD 15629	O5 V ((f))	-4.74	-3.93	-3.80		
HD 193682	O5 III (f)	-3.95	-3.52			
HD 14947	O5 I f ⁺	-2.61	-2.83	-2.94	-1.33	<-0.97
λ Cep	O6 I(n)fp	-2.90	-3.26	-3.22	-1.55	-1.92
HD 190864	O6.5 III (f)	-3.80	-3.93	-3.82		
HD 217086	O7 V n	≤ -5.11	-4.04			
HD 192639	O7 Ib (f)	-2.81	-3.34			
HD 193514	O7 Ib (f)	-3.14	-3.62			
ξ Per	O7.5 III (n)((f))	-3.70	-3.86	-3.53		
HD 13268	O7	≤ -6.15	-3.95			
HD 191423	O9 III : n*	-4.59	-4.88			
HD 207198	O9 Ib-II	-3.43	-4.20			
ζ Oph	O9 III	≤ -6.37			≤ -3.38	-2.93
HD 209975	O9.5 Ib	-3.99	-4.59			
α Cam	O9.5 Ia	-2.82	-3.63	-3.14	-1.67	-1.74
LMC						
Sk -67° 211	O3 III (f*)	-3.29	-3.31			
Sk -68° 137	O3 III (f*)	-2.94	-3.44			
Sk -67° 166	O4 I f ⁺	-2.36	-3.27			
Sk -67° 167	O4 Inf ⁺	-2.27	-3.28			
SMC						
AV 388	O4 V	-5.43	-4.05			
AV 243	O6 III	≤ -5.96	-4.56			
AV 232	O7 Iaf ⁺	-3.06	-2.92			

The physical reasons behind this are firstly that the Sobolev approximation fails for very low values of \dot{M} , as the wind contribution to H_α then comes from regions around the sonic point. Secondly, for large values of \dot{M} the optically thin approximation *applied throughout the wind* fails and leads to a different scaling of wind emission with mass-loss rate, since a large part of the wind envelope is optically thick.

Another important test of the H_α -method is the comparison with mass-loss rates derived from radio fluxes. This test was carried out already by Leitherer (1988) and L&L, but needs to be repeated here because of the systematic differences between their and our H_α -method. Unfortunately, contrary to the L&L sample, only for a very few of our targets (four objects) have radio fluxes been published. Thus, to carry out this important test we proceed as follows. We use the measured H_α equivalent widths and stellar parameters from L&L for all those objects that have published radio fluxes. With these data we derive H_α mass-loss rates by means of our curve of growth method and

then compare with mass-loss rates obtained from radio fluxes. The details are given in Tab. 11, where for the results of column 3 we adopted our “standard values” of β (cf. Sect. 3.2.1). The values of column 4 are calculated with those β -values which could be actually measured by our profile fits (superscript ²), cf. Tab. 8), whereas for the supergiants in the L&L sample which are not present in ours we adopted $\beta = 1$ as an average value in accordance with our findings from Sect. 3.2.2 (superscript ³).

Fig. 20 compares the \dot{M} -values obtained with our method with the L&L-values based on their equivalent widths and stellar parameters. The same trend as in Fig. 18 is found. Fig. 21 then compares radio with H_α mass-loss rates. If we exclude for the moment HD 15570, then the L&L and our values show a similar degree of consistency. For the mean value of $\langle \log \dot{M}(H_\alpha) - \log \dot{M}(\text{radio}) \rangle$ we obtain 0.07 ± 0.21 for our values, contrasted to 0.02 ± 0.23 when the mass-loss rates given by L&L are used.

For HD 15570 our \dot{M} -value is significantly larger than the radio mass-loss rate. Note, however, that for this star only the




Fig. 20. Comparison of H_α mass-loss rates from L&L and our curve of growth method, using their stellar parameters and equivalent widths (column 2 and 3 of Tab. 11).




Fig. 21. Comparison of H_α vs. radio mass-loss rates. Circles: H_α mass loss rates from L&L; asterisks: H_α mass-loss rates from our curve of growth method (column 4 (or 3) of Tab. 11).

Table 11. Comparison of mass-loss rates from different methods for the sample of L&L. Stellar parameters from L&L (their Tab. 1), mass-loss in units M_\odot/yr (see text).

¹⁾ from L&L's equivalent width with “standard values” for β .

²⁾ from L&L's equivalent width with derived β -values (cf. Tab. 8).

³⁾ from L&L's equivalent width with $\beta = 1$ adopted.

HD/ star	$\log \dot{M}$ L&L (H_α)	$\log \dot{M}$ H_α ¹⁾	$\log \dot{M}$ H_α	$\log \dot{M}$ L&L (radio)
14947	-5.32	-5.07	-5.14 ²⁾	< -4.76
15558	-5.61	-5.32		
15570	-5.02	-4.74	-4.81 ³⁾	-5.33
15629	-5.77	-5.72		
ξ Per	-5.89	-5.81		
α Cam	-5.47	-5.34	-5.50 ²⁾	-5.41
δ Ori	-5.92	-5.95		-5.97
λ Ori	-6.20	-7.05		< -6.04
ι Ori	-5.99	-6.11		-6.50
ϵ Ori	-5.59	-5.48		-5.39
ζ Ori	-5.41	-5.33	-5.44 ³⁾	-5.60
46150	< -5.88	< -8.00		
46223	-5.85	-5.80		
15 Mon	-6.30	-6.88		
57061	-5.54	-5.51		-5.20
ζ Pup	-5.45	-5.20	-5.30 ²⁾	-5.62
93129A	-4.88	-4.72	-4.75 ²⁾	
μ Nor	-5.67	-5.73		< -5.36
151804	-5.00	-4.74	-4.80 ³⁾	-5.00
152408	-5.07	-4.79	-4.83 ³⁾	-4.87
152424	-5.42	-5.37	-5.44 ³⁾	-5.26
9 Sgr	-5.62	-5.68		
9 Sge	-5.38	-5.21	-5.29 ³⁾	
190429A	-5.16	-4.89	-4.96 ³⁾	
190864	-5.88	-5.75		
λ Cep	-5.28	-5.26	-5.35 ²⁾	-5.68

3.6 cm flux could be measured (for 2 cm and 6 cm only upper limits are given) and it was classified as a “probable” but *not* definite thermal emitter; note further, that this star is an O4 If⁺ supergiant, which from our experience most probable has a very flat velocity field, which would lower the mass-loss rate additionally if compared to the assumed $\beta = 0.75/1.0$ parameter. (For $\beta = 1.3$ we would obtain $\log \dot{M} \approx -4.95$ more consistent with the radio rate)

Summarizing the results of this section, we have shown that the assumption of an optically thin emission throughout the wind and the neglect of the finite profile width in Leitherer's method are mostly responsible for the differences in our results and those by L&L. In conclusion, we feel that our method of detailed modelling of the profile is superior to all other approaches since, especially for emission lines, the most decisive parameter – β – can be derived simultaneously and any correction for nebula emission lines can be carried out more easily.

4. Observed and theoretical wind momentum

In the following section, we want to investigate to what extent the observed stellar wind quantities are consistent with the predictions of radiative driven wind theory. In particular, we will reexamine the “momentum” problem pointed out by L&L for winds with a high density.

4.1. The “wind momentum-luminosity relation” – Theoretical prediction vs. observations

In order to examine how far the observed winds follow the *principal* predictions of radiative driven wind theory, one has to consider which crucial quantities can be checked with as little as possible contamination by uncertain parameters. With respect to an *individual* investigation of mass-loss rates and terminal velocities, this is a difficult task due to the *strong* dependence of both quantities on stellar mass which may be considered as erroneous, depending whether one prefers the “spectroscopic” or “evolutionary” masses (cf. Herrero et al. 1992 and L&L for the controversial discussion in this field). In this paper, we will therefore consider a different quantity, which we will prove to be only marginally dependent on the stellar mass and in this way provides an ideal tool to investigate the consistency of reality and theory.

First, we recall the individual scaling laws for radiation driven winds. If the radiative line force is given in terms of the usual “force-multiplier” parameters k , α , δ (Abbott 1982; Pauldrach, Puls & Kudritzki 1986), then, according to the complete analytical description by Kudritzki et al. (1989, especially their Eq. (47) or (61)), the mass-loss rate obeys the following scaling law

$$\dot{M}_{\text{theory}} \sim k^{\frac{1}{\alpha'}} L^{\frac{1}{\alpha'}} (M(1 - \Gamma)/D')^{1 - \frac{1}{\alpha'}} \left(\frac{g_{\text{eff}}}{R_*} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2\alpha'}}, \quad (54)$$

with $\alpha' = \alpha - \delta$, $\Gamma = L_E/L$ (L_E the Eddington luminosity), $D' = (1 + I_{\text{He}}Y)/(1 + 4Y)$ and g_{eff} the gravitational acceleration, corrected by $(1 - \Gamma)$.

For the terminal velocity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\infty}^{\text{theory}} &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} I(\alpha, \beta, \delta)^{\frac{1}{2}} v_{\text{esc}} \\ &\approx 2.24 \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} v_{\text{esc}} \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

with $v_{\text{esc}} = (g_{\text{eff}} R_*)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ the photospheric escape velocity and $I(\alpha, \beta, \delta)$ as defined by Eq. (46) in Kudritzki et al. (1989), where the latter approximation ($I \approx 5\alpha/(1 - \alpha)$) holds roughly for values of $\delta \lesssim 0.1$ (cf. Kudritzki et al. 1989, Figs. 4,6, Tab. 1 and Friend & Abbott 1986) and a typical velocity law with $\beta = 0.7 \dots 1.3$.

Hence, for typical values of $\alpha = 0.5 \dots 0.7$ and $\delta = 0.02 \dots 0.1$ the mass-loss rate should depend strongly on the “effective mass” via $(M(1 - \Gamma)/D')^{-1.5 \dots -0.5}$, whereas v_{∞} should scale with $(M(1 - \Gamma))^{0.5}$. For the wind momentum rate, however, we find a much weaker dependence on the effective mass,

$$\begin{aligned} (\dot{M} v_{\infty})_{\text{theory}} &\sim k^{\frac{1}{\alpha'}} L^{\frac{1}{\alpha'}} (M(1 - \Gamma))^{\frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{\alpha'}} \times \\ &\times R_*^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{g_{\text{eff}}}{R_*} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{2\alpha'}} D'^{\frac{1}{\alpha'} - 1} \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

since the combined exponent $(3/2 - 1/\alpha')$ is much closer to zero than the individual ones. Hence, from radiation driven wind theory we expect the following relation to hold

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\dot{M} v_{\infty} R_*^{\frac{1}{2}} D') &= x \log(k L D') + f(M, \Gamma, R_*, \alpha, \delta) \\ x &= 1/\alpha', \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where f is an only mildly varying function of stellar and force-multiplier parameters, namely

$$\begin{aligned} f &= \Delta \log(M(1 - \Gamma)) + (\delta/2\alpha') \log(g_{\text{eff}}/R_*) + h(\alpha, \delta) \\ \Delta &= \frac{3}{2} - \frac{1}{\alpha'}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

h is a function of α and δ only and the correction for g_{eff}/R_* in the latter expression for f is small because of $\delta/2\alpha' \ll 1$.

From Eq. (57) (and with $D' = \text{const}$) we would expect a strict correlation of $\log(\dot{M} v_{\infty} R_*^{0.5})$ with $\log L$, where the slope of this relation is predicted to yield an average value of $1/\alpha'$, at least if the flux-weighted number of driving lines (which is just the physical interpretation of k) is not too different for different spectral types.

Indeed, this so-called “wind momentum-luminosity relation” was *empirically* found by Kudritzki, Lennon & Puls (1995), who demonstrated the observational evidence of this correlation using a large sample of galactic O/B/A LC I-III stars, i.e., for stars *covering an extremely large range in spectral and luminosity type*. The significance of this relation for providing a tool for extragalactic distance measurements was emphasized in the above paper, while a thorough discussion (especially with respect to metallicity and wind density) will be given in a forthcoming publication.

In Figs. 22 we have plotted the observed wind momentum-luminosity relation for galactic O-stars (neglecting the D' -term which is only of minor influence). Fig. 22a contains our sample only (Tab. 8), whereas in Fig. 22b we have enlarged the data base with those objects of Tab. 11 which do not overlap with our sample. Both Figures show the same trend. Supergiants follow a very tight relation with a slope corresponding to $\alpha' = 0.56$. The objects of luminosity classes II, III and V show a somewhat less tight relation with 0.5 dex smaller “momentum” and an almost parallel slope ($\alpha' = 0.53$) until luminosities $\log L/L_{\odot} = 5.3$. Below this value the relation turns off and seems to become much steeper. We note that for these stars the winds have an extremely low density and optical thickness and that, therefore, their wind properties are affected by additional important effects part of which have already been identified (see, for instance, Springmann & Pauldrach 1992). Note also




Fig. 22. a) The observed wind momentum-luminosity-relation for galactic O-stars (Tab. 8). (Wind momentum rate $\dot{M}v_\infty$ in cgs-units, R_* in units of R_\odot .) Each object is plotted by a number giving its luminosity class. Two regression curves for luminosity class I (solid) and higher luminosity classes (dashed) are given. Note that for the latter the objects with $\log L/L_\odot < 5.3$ are excluded. Rapid rotators with $v \sin i \geq 200$ km/s are marked with a circle, and objects with only an upper limit for \dot{M} are indicated by an arrow.




Fig. 22. b) As Fig. 22a but including additionally the complementary objects of Tab. 11.

that most of these stars are rapid rotators ($v \sin i \geq 200$ km/s), as is the only luminosity class III object which lies *well* above the mean relation (HD 203064 with $v \sin i = 315$ km/s).

The shift between supergiants and other luminosity classes for $\log L/L_\odot \geq 5.3$ could have two explanations. Either the number of flux weighted driving lines (proportional to k) or the “effective” masses are smaller. In the latter case (since $\Delta = -0.31$ for a mean $\alpha' = 0.55$), this requires $M(1 - \Gamma)$ -values roughly a factor of twenty smaller. From Fig. 23 we conclude that the difference in the effective mass is not sufficient and that an additional influence of k is required. However, we note also

that the average mass correction for lower luminosities is much larger than for higher luminosities, so that at least a certain part of the differences in the wind momentum-luminosity-relation for lower luminosities and higher luminosity classes may be compensated.




Fig. 23. Logarithm of “effective mass” $M(1 - \Gamma)$ as function of luminosity for the objects of Fig. 22b. The regression curves with slope m are plotted as guide lines.




Fig. 24. a) The observed wind momentum-luminosity-relation for LMC O-stars (Tab. 8). For orientation, the regression curves for galactic O-stars (Fig. 22b) are also shown.

Figures 24 show the wind momentum-luminosity relations for the LMC and SMC O-stars of Tab. 8. Since the number of Magellanic Cloud objects studied so far is small, the comparison with the Galaxy is still marginal. We infer a small shift of approximately 0.20 dex and a parallel slope for the LMC supergiants. This can be explained by the dependence of the number




Fig. 24. b) As Fig. 24a but for SMC O-stars.

of driving lines or force-multiplier parameter k on metal abundance ϵ (Castor, Abbott & Klein 1975; Abbott 1982; Kudritzki et al. 1987) yielding

$$k(\epsilon) = k(\epsilon_{\odot}) \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_{\odot}} \right)^{1-\alpha'} \rightarrow \dot{M}(\epsilon) \sim \left(\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon_{\odot}} \right)^{\frac{1-\alpha'}{\alpha'}}. \quad (59)$$

With $\alpha' = 0.56$ (and $\delta = 0.07$) this would give an abundance difference of 0.3 dex between the Galaxy and the LMC in good agreement with the first results of the quantitative abundance analysis of the HST spectra presently under way in our group (see Kudritzki et al. 1992a).

For the SMC, the difference to the Galaxy is more striking. Adopting $\alpha' = 0.52$ (as most of our objects belong to luminosity classes III and V) and again $\delta = 0.07$, we find an average momentum shift of 0.66 dex corresponding to $\Delta \log \epsilon = -.83$ again in good agreement with our ongoing abundance work. However, the data points between $\log L/L_{\odot} = 5.5$ and 5.8 might also indicate a steeper slope (and therefore a smaller α') or a similar turnover of the relation as for galactic giants and main sequence stars. In the latter case it would be reasonable to expect this to occur at higher luminosities in the SMC because of smaller metallicity and consequently smaller wind density at a given luminosity.

That the value of α' is perhaps an increasing function of metallicity may be due to the possibility that the line-strength distribution function (cf. Kudritzki et al. 1988) is not perfectly linear in the $\log N(k_L < k_L^{\max})$ vs. $\log k_L$ relation (with N the number of lines and k_L the corresponding line strength), but has a steeper (negative) slope towards the high line-strength end of this relation. This trend can indeed be observed in the line strength distribution function given by Puls (1987, Fig. 4) and is also present in our latest simulations using the updated atomic data. (A detailed discussion and the reason for this behaviour will be given in a forthcoming paper.) Thus, for lower metallicities with a smaller range of contributing line-strengths, this steeper slope (proportional to $(\alpha - 1)$) would

have a larger influence on the average α , which then would tend to lower values.

In any case, to investigate the question which of the above two possibilities is actually present, we will need a significantly larger sample of stars.

4.2. A comparison with detailed radiation driven wind computations

To compare with the predictions of radiation driven wind theory we have calculated wind models for every object of Tab. 8. We have adopted solar metal abundances for all galactic objects. For the LMC and the SMC we have adopted 0.6 solar and 0.2 solar (Haser et al. 1994a; Haser 1995). For the additional galactic objects of Tab. 11 that were included in Fig. 22b we used the calculations for Tab. 8 plus an already existing grid of computations to interpolate force multiplier parameters k , α , δ as function of temperature and average wind density to the corresponding stellar parameters and calculated wind properties with the analytical approach by Kudritzki et al. (1989).

The underlying physics of the computations are described in detail by Pauldrach et al. (1994). These computations are clearly superior to older ones performed in our group (Pauldrach et al. 1990), the most important difference being a significantly larger number of lines included with much better atomic physics, and much better and more extended atomic models in the detailed NLTE approach.

In our discussion of the reliability of the theory we will concentrate on the wind momentum rate only. A discussion of \dot{M} and v_{∞} individually instead would be complicated by the fact that both systematic errors in wind theory and in the stellar parameters derived by spectroscopy would have to be disentangled, whereas the momentum should depend mainly on luminosity only (cf. the discussion in Sect. 4.1).

We will proceed in two steps. First we will investigate possible defects of the theory as function of luminosity and temperature. Secondly, we will re-investigate the differential behaviour of theory and observation as function of wind performance number $\eta = \dot{M} v_{\infty} c / L$ to check whether the important result by L&L that the theory fails as function of η is still valid.

4.2.1. Wind momentum and luminosity

Figure 25 shows the theoretical wind momentum rate as function of luminosity for all galactic objects of Fig. 22b. The comparison with the regression curves of the observed momentum reveals that, while the slope agrees with the observations, there is an obvious discrepancy for the supergiants as the theoretically predicted momentum is about 0.25 dex too small. This is somewhat better quantified in Fig. 26a, which gives the difference between observed and calculated logarithmic momentum for supergiants. We do *not* see any clear trend of the discrepancy with either luminosity or effective temperature.

For luminosity classes II, III and V there appears to be better statistical agreement between theory and observation, if we exclude objects with $\log L/L_{\odot} < 5.3$ for the reasons indicated




Fig. 25. Theoretical wind momentum as function of luminosity for all galactic objects of Fig. 22b. Asterisks: Luminosity class I, squares: II,III, V. The two regression curves from the observed data of Fig. 22b are also shown.




Fig. 26. b) As Fig. 26a, but for luminosity classes II, III, V.




Fig. 26. a) Difference between observed and calculated logarithmic momentum rate ($D = \dot{M} v_\infty$) of galactic O-supergiants as function of luminosity. Asterisks and squares correspond to effective temperatures below and above 40,000 K, respectively.

in Sect. 4.1. Additionally, we see also from Fig. 26b that there is no *obvious* systematic difference as function of temperature, if we divide our objects in two classes with T_{eff} below and above 40,000 K. We obtain -0.08 ± 0.32 and -0.23 ± 0.22 for the average (i.e. II to V) difference in logarithmic momentum, respectively. On the other hand, for luminosity class I objects the statistics yield $+0.29 \pm 0.24$ and $+0.17 \pm 0.17$, correspondingly.

We conclude that the theory very likely has systematic uncertainties of the order 0.25 dex, if the wind momentum is studied as function of luminosity, temperature and luminosity classes.

4.2.2. Wind momentum and performance number

After the important analysis by L&L it is imperative to check whether another systematic discrepancy between theory and observation is hidden in the data presented in Figs. 25 and 26. L&L detected a dependence on $\eta = \dot{M} v_\infty c / L$, the wind performance number which compares the stellar wind momentum flux with the photon momentum flux. Fig. 27 essentially repeats their results and demonstrates that there is a clear trend with η , if the L&L method is used to determine mass-loss rates from H_α and the “older” wind theory (essentially Pauldrach et al. 1990, but see L&L) is applied.




Fig. 27. Difference between observed logarithmic wind momentum rate determined using the method by L&L and predictions by the older theoretical approach (Pauldrach et al. 1990, force multiplier parameters as in L&L) as function of logarithmic wind performance number. Note that the result obtained in this plot is essentially identical with that by L&L, the only difference being that we have used our stellar parameters and v_∞ (Tab. 8) for their objects overlapping with our sample.

The first question is what happens to Fig. 27 if the improved wind theory (Pauldrach et al. 1994, see also Sect. 4.2.1) is applied and again the differences to observations using the L&L method are plotted. This is done in Fig. 28 and we see that, if we ignore the one object in the lower left (HD 15558, see also the discussion in Sect. 3.7), then the effect has almost disappeared and that observations and theory agree independent of η to an average of $+0.08 \pm 0.17$ in the logarithmic momentum difference.




Fig. 28. As Fig. 27 but now with new stellar wind calculations using the recent improvements of radiation driven wind theory as described by Pauldrach et al. (1994).

If we would, therefore, stay with the determination of mass-loss rates from H_α using the simple optically thin pure emission approach by L&L, then the straightforward conclusion would be that the improved wind theory is in excellent agreement with observation.

Unfortunately, we cannot maintain this conclusion as soon as we use the results of our improved H_α -diagnostics. The reason is that the simplified L&L approach leads to an underestimate at high \dot{M} and yields overestimates at small \dot{M} , as we have explained in the previous sections. In consequence, mass-loss rates will be higher at large η and smaller at small η , if the improved diagnostics are applied. This result, deplorable for the theory, is shown in Fig. 29, which again reveals a clear trend with η which however is now not identical for effective temperatures below and above 40,000 K. This trend remains significant, even if we do not include the objects with $\log L/L_\odot < 5.3$ that were already excluded in Sects. 4.1 and 4.2.1.

Thus, the improved H_α -diagnostics reveal another systematic defect of the present theory that would have been hidden if the simplified method had been applied.

4.2.3. Wind momentum in the Magellanic Clouds

Figures 30 compare the empirical wind momentum-luminosity-relations for SMC and LMC with model calculations for the




Fig. 29. Difference of observed logarithmic momentum rate determined by the improved method developed in this paper and predictions of the improved theory as described by Pauldrach et al. (1994). Targets and observed values are identical to those of Fig. 22b. Asterisks: $T_{\text{eff}} < 40,000$ K; squares: $T_{\text{eff}} \geq 40,000$ K. Objects with $\log L/L_\odot < 5.3$ are identified by an additional “1”.

individual objects. While the results for the LMC do not seem to indicate a severe discrepancy, we find some clearly discrepant cases at $\log L/L_\odot \approx 5.75$ in the SMC.




Fig. 30. a) Observed wind momentum rate in the LMC (squares) as function of luminosity compared to model computations (crosses).

The situation becomes much clearer as soon as we compare again the differences between observation and theory as function of observed η (Figs. 31). The trend in the LMC is comparable (although not very obvious) to the Galaxy, which in view of the only small difference in abundance is not surprising. In the SMC there is certainly a trend with η , where the two different regimes seem to be divided now at $T_{\text{eff}} \approx 45,000$ K.




Fig. 30. b) As Fig. 30a, but for the SMC.

The fact that we see the similar systematic failure of wind theory in the SMC and LMC assures that this is not an artefact caused by uncertain distances for the galactic O-stars. The problem is real, unfortunately.




Fig. 31. a) Difference of logarithmic wind momentum rate between observation and theory as function of observed wind performance number. Squares: Objects in the Galaxy with $T_{\text{eff}} \geq 40,000$ K; crosses: LMC objects (all well above 40,000 K).

5. Discussion

Together with the most important diagnostic results of this study we like to discuss two issues that we regard as important, namely the reliability of the H_{α} -method and the status of radiation driven wind theory.

We think that the method introduced in this paper is superior to previous ones using H_{α} , as it avoids systematic errors




Fig. 31. b) As Fig. 31a, but squares: galactic objects with $T_{\text{eff}} \geq 40,000$ K; asteriks: galactic objects with $T_{\text{eff}} < 40,000$ K; crosses: SMC (objects with $T_{\text{eff}} \geq 45,000$ K indicated by a bar. (For convenience, the indication of rapid rotators and upper limits of \dot{M} for galactic objects is suppressed.)

arising from the use of the Sobolev approximation or the assumption of purely optically thin emission and as it is still fast and effective compared with the complex calculations of unified atmospheres. On the other hand, we should not forget other possible sources for systematic errors. In our view, the most important ones are clumpiness (and variability) of the winds and deviations from spherical symmetry because of rotation. While a discussion of the present status of time dependent radiation-hydrodynamical calculations led us to the conclusion to neglect clumpiness, we still feel that this is an area that will require very careful observational and theoretical investigations in the future. The same is true with rotation. We feel that it is certainly time to reconsider the diagnostics of rapidly rotating O-stars in terms of two-dimensional disk-like structures following and extending the ideas by Bjorkman & Cassinelli (1993). So far, we have neglected these kinds of processes.

Another effect on the diagnostics that was also ignored by us is the influence of line blocking on the H_{α} occupation numbers. While the work by Schaerer & Schmutz (1994) and comparable calculations ongoing in our group indicate that the effects are small, a detailed and thorough investigation is certainly required.

Despite these uncertainties, we agree with Klein & Castor (1978), Leitherer (1988) and Lamers & Leitherer (1994), who have pioneered the systematic H_{α} -studies, that the investigation of H_{α} -profiles is the best way to determine mass-loss rates of a large sample of O-stars.

Two outstanding results of this study are the existence of the wind momentum-luminosity relation and the derivation of the wind velocity gradient. As for the latter, we have found that the velocity field exponent β is larger than usually adopted, which is important for any kind of further line profile and continuum

diagnostics. Unfortunately, our radiation driven wind models are not able to reproduce this value.

The tight wind momentum-luminosity-relation that we have found, in particular for supergiants, is another important result. In this connection we readily acknowledge that the investigation of this relation in terms of radiation driven wind scaling relations was triggered by the work of Lamers and Leitherer (1994). The fact that this relation can – at least qualitatively – be understood in terms of radiation driven winds is certainly a triumph of the theory. The fact that there are quantitative discrepancies is a challenge for the future.

Astronomically, the wind momentum-luminosity-relation has great potential for further astrophysical applications such as extragalactic distance determinations. The possibility to investigate the metallicity dependence of this relation by means of massive stars in the Magellanic Clouds will enable us to widen the applicability of the method enormously.

A shock for a stellar wind theoretist is our final result that, indeed, the theory shows a systematic defect as function of wind performance number η . Again, we need to express an acknowledgement to Lamers & Leitherer (1994), who were the first to investigate this idea. The fact that, after five years of continuous work to improve line lists, atomic physics and models and to include additional effects like shock induced EUV radiation etc. we find such a clear systematic discrepancy is disappointing. On the other hand, there is a clear indication of where the reason for this systematic failure might lie.

We are convinced that the reason is the inadequate treatment of line overlap or “multi-line effects”. Puls (1987) has already investigated this problem approximately for a wind of rather low η and found a reduction of wind momentum due to enhanced backscattering and blocking of photons between the sonic and critical points. We speculate that this effect might be enhanced towards even smaller η -values thus indicating that our procedure to account for pure photospheric blocking only might be intrinsically erroneous. For large η -values the effects of multiple photon momentum transfer combined with shifts in the ionization stratification as proposed by Lucy & Abbott (1993) and recently reanalyzed semi-analytically by Springmann (1994) might explain the failure of the theory in the other direction. In any case, there remains much work to be done in this field.

Acknowledgements. We gratefully acknowledge the following grants to A. Herrero (DAAD, “acciones integradas Hispano Alemanas” 1990-1992; Alexander von Humboldt Stiftung), A.W.A. Pauldrach, S.M. Haser and A. Feldmeier (DFG, Pa 477/1-2 in the “Gerhard-Hess-Programm”), D.J. Lennon and R. Gabler (BMFT 50 OR 93040) and S.A. Voels (DARA 50 OS 9002-ZA). We wish to thank Ian D. Howarth and Raman K. Prinja for kindly providing us with their sample of 203 IUE spectra of galactic O-stars. We are also indebted to Claus Leitherer for providing us with his H_α profiles for those stars in common with our dataset for comparison.

A. The different structure of unified and hydrostatic model atmospheres and an estimate of its influence on the $\log g$ determination

Figure 16 demonstrates the influence of stellar winds on the atmospheric density structure. If this difference is still significant at the H_γ continuum optical depth $\tau_c \approx 2/3$, then the use of a hydrostatic model to calculate the Stark broadened wings of H_γ will yield an *underestimate* of the stellar gravity. In this appendix we provide a simple first order estimate of the effect.

For approximating the density structure down to layers of the formation of the H_γ wings it is sufficient to adopt a constant kinetic temperature. For the hydrostatic case we then have

$$\rho_{\text{stat}}(g, m) = \frac{1}{v_{\text{sound}}^2} \int_0^m (g - g_{\text{rad}}) dm, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where v_{sound} is the isothermal sound speed, g_{rad} the radiative acceleration and m the column mass as defined in Eq. (53).

For estimating the density in the unified model we adopt the β -law (Eqs. 16,17) down to a velocity v_0 which via the equation of continuity yields

$$\rho_{\text{unif}} = \bar{\rho} \frac{1}{r^2(1 - b/r)^\beta}, \quad r \geq 1, v \geq v_0 \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\bar{\rho} = \frac{\dot{M}}{4\pi R_*^2 v_\infty}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

For velocities smaller than v_0 we then adopt a hydrostatic structure

$$\rho_{\text{unif}}(g, m) = \frac{1}{v_{\text{sound}}^2} \int_{m_0}^m (g - g_{\text{rad}}) dm + \rho_0 \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$\rho_0 = \rho_{\text{unif}}(r = 1) = \bar{\rho} \frac{v_\infty}{v_0} \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$m_0 = \bar{\rho} R_* h_1(b, \beta) \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$h_1 = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{b} \ln(1 - b), & \beta = 1 \\ \frac{1}{b} \frac{1}{1 - \beta} \left[1 - \left(\frac{v_0}{v_\infty} \right)^{\frac{1 - \beta}{\beta}} \right], & \beta \neq 1 \end{cases}$$

m_0 is the column mass at $r = 1$, $v = v_0$ obtained from (A2). Comparing with numerical results of unified models we found that (A2) and (A4) are good approximations of the density stratification.

To estimate the densities at $\tau_c = 2/3$ we need to determine m_c defined by

$$\frac{2}{3} = \int_0^{m_c} \frac{n_e \sigma_E + \kappa_{\text{true}}}{\rho} dm = a_1 m_c + a_2 \int_0^{m_c} \rho dm \quad (\text{A6})$$

where κ_{true} is the free-free and bound-free continuum absorption coefficient at H_γ . a_1 is given by

$$a_1 = \frac{\sigma_E}{m_p} \frac{1 + I_{\text{He}} Y}{1 + 4Y}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

If we approximate κ_{true} by its LTE-value and consider only hydrogen and helium opacity, we can express a_2 by

$$a_2 = \frac{f(T, Y)}{m_p^2} \frac{1 + I_{\text{He}} Y}{(1 + 4Y)^2}, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where the function f contains the temperature and Saha-Boltzmann-factor weighted contributions of hydrogen and helium free-free and bound-free cross-sections and can be easily calculated.

To perform the integrals in (A2) and (A4) we need an estimate of g_{rad} in the subsonic regions. The obvious approximation is

$$g_{\text{rad}} \approx g_{\text{Th}} = a_1 \frac{\sigma_B T_{\text{eff}}^4}{c} \quad (\text{A9})$$

with g_{Th} the acceleration by Thomson scattering. We note that around $\tau_c = 2/3$ this is generally a severe underestimate of g_{rad} because of the significant free-free and bound-free acceleration. However, for estimating the relative difference between the density of a unified and a hydrostatic model Eq. (A9) is still sufficient. We then obtain for the densities at $\tau_c = 2/3$

$$\rho_{2/3}^{\text{stat}} = \frac{g - g_{\text{Th}}}{v_{\text{sound}}^2} m_c^{\text{stat}} \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\rho_{2/3}^{\text{unif}} = \frac{g - g_{\text{Th}}}{v_{\text{sound}}^2} (m_c^{\text{unif}} - m_0) + \rho_0. \quad (\text{A11})$$

For (A11) we have assumed that \dot{M} is still small enough to ensure $m_c^{\text{unif}} > m_0$. For the column mass m_c at $\tau_c = 2/3$ we obtain the quadratic equations

$$\frac{2}{3} = a_1 m_c^{\text{stat}} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{a_2}{v_{\text{sound}}^2} (g - g_{\text{Th}}) (m_c^{\text{stat}})^2 \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\frac{2}{3} = \tau_0 + (a_1 + a_2 \rho_0) (m_c^{\text{unif}} - m_0) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{a_2}{v_{\text{sound}}^2} (g - g_{\text{Th}}) (m_c^{\text{unif}} - m_0)^2 \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\tau_0 = a_1 m_0 + a_2 \bar{\rho}^2 R_* h_2(b, \beta) \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$h_2 = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\beta^3} \left[\frac{1}{1-b} + 2 \ln(1-b) - (1-b) \right], & \beta = 1 \\ \frac{1}{\beta^3} \left[1 + \frac{(b-1)(1+b+b^2 - 2b\beta - 3b^2\beta + 2(b\beta)^2)}{(1-b)^2\beta} \right] \times \\ \times [(1-\beta)(3-2\beta)(1-2\beta)]^{-1}, & \beta \neq 1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A15})$$

The difference between $\rho_{2/3}^{\text{stat}}$ and $\rho_{2/3}^{\text{unif}}$ for given gravity, mass-loss rate and terminal velocity can be easily calculated from Eqs. (A10) to (A15). A comparison with calculated unified and hydrostatic models shows that this gives the right order of magnitude.

To estimate the influence of the density effect on the determination of spectroscopic gravities from H_γ , we assume that

we need different gravities g_{unif} and g_{stat} to fit the density $\rho_{2/3}^{\text{obs}}$ from H_γ . Thus, by requiring

$$\rho_{2/3}^{\text{unif}}(g_{\text{unif}}) = \rho_{2/3}^{\text{stat}}(g_{\text{stat}}) = \rho_{2/3}^{\text{obs}}$$

we obtain from Eqs. (A10, A11)

$$(g_{\text{unif}} - g_{\text{Th}}) = (g_{\text{stat}} - g_{\text{Th}}) \frac{m_c^{\text{stat}}}{m_c^{\text{unif}} - m_0} - \frac{\rho_0 v_{\text{sound}}^2}{m_c^{\text{unif}} - m_0}. \quad (\text{A16})$$

These corrections together with the centrifugal correction (Herrero et al. 1992) were applied to column 4 in Tab. 8 to obtain the values of column 5.

References

- Abbott D.C., 1982, ApJ 259, 282
 Abbott D.C., Biegging J.H., Churchwell E., 1981, ApJ 250, 645
 Bjorkman J.E., Cassinelli J.P., 1993, ApJ 409, 429
 Bohannan B., Voels S.A., Hummer D.G., Abbott D.C., 1990, ApJ 365, 729
 Butler K., Giddings J.R., 1985, Coll. Comp. Project No. 7 (CCP7), Newsletter 9, London, p. 7
 Cassinelli J.P., Cohen D.H., MacFarlane J.J., Sanders W.T., Welsh B.Y., 1994, ApJ 421, 705
 Castor J.I., 1970, MNRAS 149, 111
 Castor J.I., Abbott D.C., Klein R.I., 1975, ApJ 195, 157
 Chlebowski T., Hamden F.R., Sciortino S., 1989, ApJ 341, 427
 de Koter A., Schmutz W., Lamers H.J.G.L.M., 1993, A&A 277, 561
 Drew J.E., 1990, ApJ 357, 573
 Ebbets D., 1982, ApJS 48, 399
 Feldmeier A., 1995, A&A, in press
 Friend D.B., Abbott D.C., 1986, ApJ 311, 701
 Gabler A., Gabler R., Pauldrach A.W.A., Puls J., Kudritzki R.P., 1990, in: Garmany C.D. (ed.) Properties of Hot Luminous Stars, Boulder-Munich Workshop. PASPC 7, San Francisco, p. 218
 Gabler R., Gabler A., Kudritzki R.P., Puls J., Pauldrach A.W.A., 1989, A&A 226, 162
 Gabler R., Gabler A., Kudritzki R.P., Puls J., Pauldrach A.W.A., 1990, in: Garmany C.D. (ed.) Properties of Hot Luminous Stars, Boulder-Munich Workshop. PASPC 7, San Francisco, p. 64
 Giddings J.R., 1980, Ph.D. Thesis, University of London
 Groenewegen M.A.T., Lamers H.J.G.L.M., 1989, A&AS 79, 359
 Hamann W.-R., 1981, A&A 93, 353
 Haser S.M., 1995, PhD thesis, Universität München, in preparation
 Haser S.M., Lennon D.J., Kudritzki R.P., Puls J., Walborn N.R., Bianchi L., Hutchings J.B., 1994, Sp. Sci. Rev. 66, 179
 Haser S.M., Pauldrach A.W.A., Kudritzki R.P., Lennon D.J., Gabler R., Puls J., 1994a, AG Abstract Series 10, 199
 Haser S.M., Lennon D.J., Kudritzki R.P., Puls J., Pauldrach A.W.A., Bianchi L., Hutchings J.B., 1995, A&A, in press
 Hayes D.P., 1975, ApJ 197, L55
 Heap S.R., Altner B., Ebbets D., Hubeny L., Hutchings J.B., Kudritzki R.P., Voels S.A., Haser S., Pauldrach A., Puls J., Butler K., 1991, ApJ 377, L29
 Henrichs H.F., 1991, in: Baade D. (ed.) Rapid Variability of OB-Stars, ESO Conference Proc. 36. ESO, Garching, p. 199
 Henrichs H.F., Kaper L., Nichols J.S., 1994, A&A 285, 565
 Herrero A., 1994, in: Vanbeveren D., van Rensbergen W., de Loore C. (eds.) Evolution of Massive Stars. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 137

- Herrero A., Kudritzki R.P., Vilchez J.M., Kunze D., Butler K., Haser S.M., 1992, *A&A* 261, 209
- Heydari-Malayeri M., Hutsemékers D., 1991, *A&A* 243, 401
- Hillier D.J., Jones, T.J., Hyland, A.R., 1983, *ApJ* 271, 221
- Hillier D.J., Kudritzki R.P., Pauldrach A.W., Baade D., Cassinelli J.P., Puls J., Schmitt J.H.M.M., 1993, *A&A* 276, 117
- Howarth I.D., Prinja R.K., 1989, *ApJS* 69, 527
- Howarth I.D., Reid A.H.N., 1993, *A&A* 279, 148
- Husfeld D., Butler K., Heber U., Drilling J.S., 1989, *A&A* 222, 150
- Klein R.I., Castor J.I., 1978, *ApJ* 220, 902
- Kudritzki R.P., 1980, *A&A* 85, 174
- Kudritzki R.P., 1992, *A&A* 266, 395
- Kudritzki R.P., Hummer D.G., 1990, *ARAA* 28, 303
- Kudritzki R.P., Pauldrach A., Puls J., 1987, *A&A* 173, 293
- Kudritzki R.P., Pauldrach A., Puls J., 1988, in: Conti P.S., Underhill A.B. (eds.) *Monograph Series on Nonthermal Phenomena in Stellar Atmospheres – O Stars and Wolf-Rayet Stars*. NASA SP-497, Washington, D.C., p. 173
- Kudritzki R.P., Pauldrach A., Puls J., Abbott D.C., 1989, *A&A* 219, 205
- Kudritzki R.P., Hummer D.G., Pauldrach A.W.A., Puls J., Najarro F., Imhoff J., 1992, *A&A* 257, 655
- Kudritzki R.P., Lennon D.J., Becker S.R., Butler K., Gabler R., Haser S., Hummer D.G., Husfeld D., Pauldrach A.W.A., Puls J., Voels S., Walborn N.R., Heap S.R., Bohannon B., Conti P., Garmany C.D., Baade D., 1992a, in: Benvenuti P., Schreier E. (eds.) *Science with the Hubble Space Telescope*. ESO, Garching, p. 279
- Kudritzki R.P., Lennon D.J., Puls J., 1995, in: Walsh J.R., Danziger I.J. (eds.) *Science with the Very Large Telescope*. ESO, Garching, in press
- Lamers H.J.G.L.M., Leitherer C., 1993, *ApJ* 412, 771 (L&L)
- Lamers H.J.G.L.M., Waters L.B.F.M., 1984, *A&A* 138, 25
- Lamers H.J.G.L.M., Cerruti-Sola M., Perinotto M., 1987, *ApJ* 314, 726
- Langer N., Hamann W.-R., Lennon M., Najarro F., Pauldrach A.W.A., Puls J., 1994, *A&A* 290, 819
- Leitherer C., 1988, *ApJ* 326, 356
- Leitherer C., 1988a, *ApJ* 334, 626
- Leitherer C., Robert C., 1991, *ApJ* 377, 624
- Lennon D.J., Dufton P.L., Fitzsimmons A., 1993, *A&AS* 97, 559
- Lucy L.B., 1982, *ApJ* 255, 278
- Lucy L.B., 1984, *ApJ* 284, 351
- Lucy L.B., Abbott D.C., 1993, *ApJ* 405, 738
- Lupie O.L., Nordsieck K.H., 1987, *AJ* 92, 214
- Moffat A.F.J., Robert C., 1994, *ApJ* 421, 310
- Owocki S.P., 1991, in: Crivellari L., Hubeny I., Hummer D.G. (eds.) *Stellar Atmospheres, Beyond Classical Models*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 235
- Owocki S.P., 1992, in: Heber U., Jeffery S. (eds.) *The Atmospheres of Early-Type Stars*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, p. 393
- Owocki S.P., 1995, in: Moffat A.F.J., Fullerton A.W., Owocki S.P., St-Louis N. (eds.) *Instability and Variability of Hot Star Winds*. Kluwer, Dordrecht (in press)
- Owocki S.P., Rybicki G.B., 1985, *ApJ* 299, 265
- Panagia N., 1988, in: Pudritz R.E., Fich M. (eds.) *Galactic and Extragalactic Star Formation*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, p. 25
- Panagia N., Felli M., 1975, *A&A* 39, 1
- Pauldrach A., Puls J., Kudritzki R.P., 1986, *A&A* 164, 86
- Pauldrach A.W.A., Kudritzki R.P., Puls J., Butler K., 1990, *A&A* 228, 125
- Pauldrach A.W.A., Kudritzki R.P., Puls J., Butler K., Hunsinger J., 1994, *A&A* 283, 525
- Prinja R.K., Balona L.A., Bolton C.T., Crowe R.A., Fieldus M.S., Fullerton A.W., Gies D.R., Howarth I.D., McDavid D., Reid A.H.N., 1992, *ApJ* 390, 266
- Puls J., 1987, *A&A* 184, 227
- Puls J., Owocki S.P., Fullerton A.W., 1993, *A&A* 279, 457
- Puls J., Pauldrach A.W.A., Kudritzki R.P., Owocki S.P., Najarro F., 1993a, in: Klare G. (ed.) *Reviews in Modern Astronomy 6*. *Astronomische Gesellschaft, Hamburg*, p. 271
- Puls J., Feldmeier A., Springmann U., Owocki S.P., Fullerton A.W., 1995, in: Moffat A.F.J., Fullerton A.W., Owocki S.P., St-Louis N. (eds.) *Instability and Variability of Hot Star Winds*. Kluwer, Dordrecht (in press)
- Reid A.H.N., Bolton C.T., Crowe R.A., Fieldus M.S., Fullerton A.W., Gies D.R., Howarth I.D., McDavid D., Prinja R.K., Smith K.C., 1993, *ApJ* 417, 320
- Robert C., Moffat A.F.J., 1990, in: Garmany C.D. (ed.) *Properties of Hot Luminous Stars*, Boulder-Munich Workshop. PASPC 7, San Francisco, p. 271
- Schaerer D., Schmutz W., 1994, *A&A* 288, 231
- Scuderi S., Bonanno G., Di Benedetto R., Spadaro D., Panagia N., 1992, *ApJ* 392, 201
- Sellmaier F., Puls J., Kudritzki R.P., Gabler R., Gabler A., Voels S.A., 1993, *A&A* 273, 533
- Shorridge K., 1987, *Figaro User Manual*
- Springmann U., 1994, *A&A* 289, 505
- Springmann U.W.E., Pauldrach A.W.A., 1992, *A&A* 262, 515
- Stahl O., Wolf B., Klare G., Cassatella A., Krautter J., Persi P., Ferrari-Toniolo M., 1983, *A&A* 127, 49
- Vogt S.S., Penrod G.D., 1983, *ApJ* 275, 661
- Walborn N.R., Lennon D.J., Haser S.M., Kudritzki R.P., Voels S.A., 1995, *PASP*, in press
- Wright A.E., Barlow M.J., 1975, *MNRAS* 170, 41