1. INTRODUCTION

Supernova (SN) observations, especially of Type IIn (e.g., Filippenko 1997), indicate that some massive stars lose considerable amounts of mass $(\gtrsim 10^{-4} M_\odot)$ within a few months to years prior to their explosions (e.g., Dopita et al. 1984; Chugai & Danziger 1994; Chugai et al. 2004; Ofek et al. 2007, 2010, 2013b; Smith et al. 2007, 2008, 2009; Kiewe et al. 2012). Several theoretical mechanisms to eject large amounts of mass with super-Eddington luminosities have been suggested. Quataert & Shiode (2012) suggest that in some massive stars the super-Eddington fusion luminosities, shortly prior to core collapse, can drive convective motions, which in turn excite gravity waves that propagate toward the stellar surface. The dissipation of these waves can unbind up to several solar masses of the stellar envelope. In Ofek et al. (2013b), we argued that this mechanism can unbind a lower amount of mass $(\sim 10^{-2} M_\odot)$. Arnett & Meakin (2011) suggested that shell oxygen burning in massive stars produces large fluctuations in the turbulent kinetic energy, which in turn may produce bursts. Chevalier (2012) suggested that the mass loss is driven by a common-envelope phase due to the inspiral of a neutron star into a giant companion core, unbinding the companion envelope and setting up accretion onto the neutron star, which in turn collapses into a black hole and triggers an SN explosion. Soker & Kashi (2013) suggested that the SN 2009ip explosion was due to the merger of two stars, while some of the pre-explosion outbursts occurred near peri astron passages of the binary system. Another possible mechanism is the pulsational pair instability which in very massive stars can generate several explosions, expelling $\gtrsim 1 M_\odot$ each, followed by the collapse of the stellar core (Rakavy et al. 1967; Woosley et al. 2007; Waldman 2008).

Measuring the mass-loss rates from massive stars prior to their explosion can be used as a tool to study the latest stages of stellar evolution, and to discriminate between the different models suggested to generate large mass-loss events. Objects in which super-Eddington outbursts were directly observed prior to the SN explosion provide a way to constrain the time at which mass loss was taking place, and relate the optical luminosities with mass-loss rates and kinetic energy estimates. To date there are only three SNe in which precursor outbursts were seen prior to the SN explosion. These are the Type Ibn SN 2006jc (e.g., Foley et al. 2007; Pastorello et al. 2008), the Type IIn SN 2009ip (e.g., Mauerhan et al. 2013; Pastorello et al. 2013; Prieto et al. 2013), and the Type IIn SN 2010mc/PTF 10tel (Ofek et al. 2013b).

Here we present XMM-Newton and Swift X-ray observations of SN 2009ip. We use these observations as well as published and new visible-light and radio observations to set an order-of-magnitude estimate on the mass loss prior to the SN explosion.

SN 2009ip was a luminous blue variable (LBV) originally detected in the outburst on 2009 August 26.11 by the CHASE survey at a projected distance of 4.3 kpc from NGC 7259 (Maza et al. 2009). Three additional outbursts were subsequently discovered with the Catalina Real-Time Transient Survey on 2010 July 15, on 2010 September 29 (Drake et al. 2010), and then again on 2012 July 24 (Drake et al. 2012). Based on its multiple outbursts, Smith et al. (2010) and Foley et al. (2011) argued that it is an SN impostor (see recent reviews in Kochanek et al. 2012; Smith et al. 2011; van Dyk & Matheson 2012). On 2012 September, Smith & Mauerhan (2012), and later Mauerhan et al. (2013), reported the detection of broad P Cygni lines with velocities of up to 13,000 km s$^{-1}$, suggesting that the star had finally exploded as a Type IIn SN. Previous cases in which a
likely LBV progenitor has exploded as an SN include SN 2005gl (Gal-Yam et al. 2007; Gal-Yam & Leonard 2009) and SN 1961V (Kochanek et al. 2011; Smith et al. 2011). Prieto et al. (2013) reported that around 2012 September 24 the object’s I-band light curve started to rise rapidly at a rate of 2.3 mag day$^{-1}$. Shortly afterward, on early October, X-ray emission was detected from SN 2009ip with the Swift/X-Ray Telescope (XRT; Margutti & Soderberg 2012b).

Throughout the paper we assume that the source is located at a distance of 20.4 Mpc. In Section 2 we present our observations of SN 2009ip, while in Section 3 we review various methods for estimating the mass content of the SN circumstellar matter (CSM). Finally, in Section 4 we apply these methods to SN 2009ip and discuss our findings.

2. OBSERVATIONS

We observed SN 2009ip with XMM-Newton on 2012 November 1 in prime full-window imaging mode for an effective exposure time of 8 ks. Using data collected with the EPIC-pn detector, we accumulated the source spectrum from a circular region of 30$''$ centered on the optical position of SN 2009ip. We selected a circular background region from a source-free area on the same chip (i.e., CCD 7) with the same aperture size. The source is detected at a significance of about 3$\sigma$ with a background-subtracted count rate of $(4.6 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-3}$ counts s$^{-1}$, yielding a total of 37 net source counts in the 0.5–10 keV range. We generated the detector and ancillary response files using the latest calibration data.

The Swift-XRT (Gehrels et al. 2004) observed SN 2009ip on an almost daily basis since 2012 September 4 (triggered by Roming/Margutti). Some of these X-ray observations have been already reported in, e.g., Margutti et al. (2012) and Campana (2012). For each Swift-XRT image of the SN, we extracted the number of X-ray counts in the 0.2–10 keV band within an aperture of 9$''$ radius centered on the SN position. We note that this aperture contains $\approx$50% of the source flux (Moretti et al. 2004). The background count rates were estimated in annuls around the SN location, with an inner (outer) radius of 50$''$ (100$''$). The photometry of Swift-XRT observations, along with the source and background X-ray counts in the individual observations, is listed in Table 1. SN 2009ip is only marginally detected in individual images, but it is clearly visible in the co-added data. Figure 1 shows a binned light curve based on the Swift-XRT observations. The binned measurements are listed in Table 2.

For our XRT spectral analysis we selected all the XRT observations between MJD 56174 and 56228, taken in photon-counting mode and with an integration longer than 500 s. This resulted in a total effective exposure time of 149 ks. We extracted a stacked source spectrum from a circular region centered at the SN location with a radius of 20$''$. The stacked background spectrum was accumulated from a 20$''$ circular source-free region for all observations. We grouped the source spectrum with a minimum of 10 counts in each energy bin.

### Table 1

| MJD (days) | Exposure Time (ks) | Source (counts) | Background (counts) |
|------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| 55084.44   | 9.86              | 0               | 19                  |
| 56174.86   | 1.96              | 0               | 4                   |
| 56176.60   | 1.78              | 0               | 4                   |
| 56183.40   | 1.65              | 0               | 4                   |
| 56190.75   | 0.39              | 0               | 0                   |

Notes. MJD is the modified Julian day. Source is the number of counts in a 9$''$ radius aperture of the source position and in the 0.2–10 keV band. Background is the number of counts in the 0.2–10 keV band, in an annulus of inner (outer) radius of 50$''$ (100$''$) around the source. The ratio between the background annulus area and the aperture area is 92.59.

(This table is available in its entirety in a machine-readable form in the online journal. A portion is shown here for guidance regarding its form and content.)

### Table 2

| MJD (days) | Range (days) | CR (counts ks$^{-1}$) | UL$_{2\sigma}$ (counts ks$^{-1}$) | Exp. (ks) |
|------------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|----------|
| 55084.4    | 0.0          | ...                   | 0.61                             | 9.86     |
| 56178.0    | 3.2          | 12.7                  | ...                              | 1.03     | 5.79 |
| 56195.4    | 2.7          | 2.0                   | ...                              | 0.55     | 17.40 |
| 56201.6    | 3.9          | 2.9                   | 0.52$^{+0.20}_{-0.15}$           | ...      | 46.38 |
| 56207.3    | 1.9          | 2.9                   | 0.97$^{+0.29}_{-0.23}$           | ...      | 37.17 |
| 56214.5    | 2.3          | 4.3                   | 0.35$^{+0.17}_{-0.17}$           | ...      | 22.66 |
| 56222.8    | 2.5          | 5.9                   | 0.50$^{+0.30}_{-0.20}$           | ...      | 24.08 |
| 56233.9    | 3.5          | 10.5                  | 0.65$^{+0.28}_{-0.20}$           | ...      | 30.80 |
| 56253.3    | 6.4          | 5.2                   | 0.70$^{+0.48}_{-0.30}$           | ...      | 14.20 |
| 56279.7    | 19.4         | 14.7                  | ...                              | 0.18     | 52.57 |

Notes. Binned Swift-XRT light curve of SN 2009ip. (MJD) is the weighted mean modified Julian day of all the observations in a given bin, where the observations are weighted by their exposure times. Range is the time range around (MJD) in which the light curve (Table 1) was binned. CR is the count rate along with the lower and upper 1$\sigma$ errors. Note that the source count rates are corrected for extraction aperture losses. UL$_{2\sigma}$ is the 2$\sigma$ upper limit on the source count rate, which is given if the total source count within the binned exposure is $\leq 1$. Exp. is the exposure time.
The background-subtracted count rate of the source is \((4.1 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{-4} \) counts s\(^{-1}\), corresponding to 61 net source counts.

We used XSPEC\(^7\) V12.7.1 (Schäfer 1991) to simultaneously fit the XMM and Swift-XRT spectra. In all cases we set the Galactic extinction to \(N_{\text{HI}} = 1.2 \times 10^{20} \) cm\(^{-2}\) (Dickey & Lockman 1990), and we fitted four parameters: normalization of the XMM spectrum, normalization of the Swift-XRT spectrum, a parameter describing the spectrum (i.e., temperature or power-law index), and the hydrogen column density at the redshift of the SN (\(z = 0.00594\)) assuming solar metallicity. The best-fit parameters are listed in Table 3.

Figure 2 shows the \(\Delta \chi^2\) contours of these fits in the \(N_{\text{HI}}\) versus temperature \((kT)\) or power-law index space. From these fits we can set a 3\(\sigma\) upper limit on \(N_{\text{HI}}\) in the SN CSM of \(2 \times 10^{22}\) cm\(^{-2}\).

On 2012 September 22, two days before the fast rise in the light curve, we obtained a near-infrared (NIR) spectrum of SN 2009ip with the Folded-port InfraRed Echellette spectrograph (FIRE; Simcoe et al. 2008, 2010) on the 6.5 m Magellan Baade Telescope. We used the low-dispersion, high-throughput prism mode and completed an ABBA dither sequence. The data span 0.8–2.5 \(\mu\)m at a resolution ranging from 300 to 500. Immediately afterward, we obtained a spectrum of an A0V standard star for the purposes of flux calibration and removal of telluric absorption features, as described in Vacca et al. (2003). Data were reduced using the FIREHOSE pipeline developed by R. Simcoe, J. Bochanski, and M. Matejek. Smith et al. (2013) present a detailed analysis of the NIR spectrum.

On 2012 December 4, we obtained a visible-light spectrum of SN 2009ip using the Dual Imaging Spectrograph (DIS) mounted on the ARC 3.5 m telescope at Apache Point Observatory to obtain a spectrum, with 600 s integration, of SN 2009ip in the wavelength range from 3500 Å to 9000 Å and resolution of about 400. The visible-light spectrum was flux-calibrated using the standard star BD +28\(^{\circ}\)4211. Parts of the IR and visible-light spectra, centered on the Paschen \(\alpha\) and H\(\alpha\) lines, respectively, are shown in Figure 3. The full spectra are available from the WISEREP archive (Yaron & Gal-Yam 2012). We fitted a two-Gaussian model to the Paschen \(\alpha\) and H\(\alpha\) lines. We find that in the Paschen \(\alpha\) line the narrow (wide) component width corresponds to a velocity of \(<200\) (<2100) km s\(^{-1}\). In the H\(\alpha\) line, the narrow-line component width corresponds to a velocity of \(<300\) km s\(^{-1}\), while the difference between the emission line center and the bottom of the P Cygni absorption feature is about 8000 km s\(^{-1}\). The flux of the H\(\alpha\) narrow component is about \(3 \times 10^{-14}\) erg cm\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). Since we do not have access to photometric measurements of the SN obtained around the same time in which we got the visible-light spectrum, we estimate that the line flux measurement is good to about 30%. For future calibration, we note that, based on the current calibration, the Sloan Digital Sky Survey AB synthetic magnitudes of the visible-light spectrum are 17.17, 16.31, and 16.11 in the g, r, and i bands, respectively.

### 3. MASS-LOSS ESTIMATORS

Here we review several methods that we use to constrain the mass-loss rate from SN progenitors. In Section 4, we implement these methods for the case of SN 2009ip.

We use several observables, including the bound–free absorption limit derived from the X-ray spectrum, the X-ray luminosity, upper limit on the diffusion timescale as derived from the SN rise time, the \(\text{H}\alpha\) luminosity, the non-detection in radio bands, and the bolometric luminosity of the precursor observed prior to the SN explosion.

Our model assumes that the interaction of the SN blast wave with the CSM produces X-ray and radio emission at the radius of the shock. The visible-light photons may be produced below, or at, the shock radius. The \(\text{H}\alpha\) emission can be emitted either at the shock region, if it is due to collisional processes, or above the shock radius if it originates from optically thin CSM ionized by the SN radiation field. All the photon diffusion and attenuation are taking place above the shock.

Throughout the paper we assume that the CSM around the progenitor has a spherical wind-density profile of the form \(\rho = Kr^{-2}\), where \(r\) is the distance from the progenitor, \(K \equiv M/(4\pi v_w)\) is the mass-loading parameter, \(M\) is the mass-loss rate, and \(v_w\) is the wind/outburst velocity. Given the outbursts observed in SN 2009ip prior to its final explosion, it is likely that the CSM was not ejected as a continuous wind with a uniform velocity. However, the mass-loss rate estimators we use below are not very sensitive to this assumption. The reason for this is that, for a reasonable density distribution, the emission, or attenuation, is calculated by integrals which are dominated

---

\(^7\) http://heasarc.gsfc.nasa.gov/xanadu/xspec/

---

**Table 3**

| X-Ray Spectral Parameters |
|---------------------------|
| Model         | Parameter | \(N_{\text{HI}}\) (cm\(^{-2}\)) | \(\chi^2/\text{dof}\) |
|---------------|-----------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Mekal         | \(kT = 4.74^{+0.18}_{-0.20} \) keV | \((2.8^{+2.4}_{-1.6}) \times 10^{21}\) | 14.66/13 |
| Power law     | \(\Gamma = 1.79^{+0.60}_{-0.50}\) | \((3.2^{+3.7}_{-2.0}) \times 10^{21}\) | 14.98/13 |
| Blackbody     | \(kT = 0.72 \pm 0.10\) keV | … | 18.19/13 |

**Notes.** \(\Gamma\) is defined as the power-law index in a spectrum of the form \(n(E) \propto E^{-\Gamma}\), where \(n(E)\) is the number of photons per unit energy. \(\text{dof}\) is the number of degrees of freedom.
by the value at the shock radius. Here, the only exception is the mass-loss estimator based on the Hα line luminosity (see Section 3.2). Therefore, we argue that the use of the continuous wind-density profile provides an order-of-magnitude estimate for the mass-loss rate. In the following sections, we discuss our specific mass-loss rate estimators and their caveats.

### 3.1. Bound–Free Absorption

The particle density profile, in a continuous wind, is given by (e.g., Chevalier 1982)

\[
\rho \approx \frac{1}{4\pi m_p v_{w,r_0}^2} \frac{M}{(\mu_p)} \approx 6 \times 10^8 \frac{1}{(\mu_p)} M_{0.01} r_{w,500}^{-1} \mu m_1^{-2} \text{cm}^{-3},
\]

where \(M_{0.01}\) is the mass-loss rate in units of \(10^{-2} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}\), \(v_{w,500}\) is the wind/outburst speed in units of 500 km s\(^{-1}\), \(r_{15}\) is the radius in units of \(10^{15}\) cm, \(m_p\) is the proton mass, and \(\mu_p\) is the mean number of nucleons per particle (mean molecular weight). For our order-of-magnitude calculation, we adopt \(\mu_p = 0.6\). In a wind profile, the column density between radius \(r\) and infinity is

\[
N = \int_r^{\infty} n \, dr \approx 1 \times 10^{24} M_{0.01} v_{w,500}^{-1} r_{15}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}.
\]

Assuming that the gas in the pre-shocked wind is neutral and has solar abundance, the bound–free optical depth in the 0.03–10 keV region is roughly given by (e.g., Behar et al. 2011)\(^8\)

\[
\tau_{bf} = N \sigma(E) \approx 60 M_{0.01} v_{w,500}^{-1} r_{15}^{-1} E_1^{-2.5},
\]

where \(\sigma(E)\) is the bound–free cross section as a function of energy \(E\) and \(E_1\) is the energy in keV. This approximation is valid when the material is neutral. However, since above ~0.5 keV metals with a high ionization potential dominate the absorption, this formula is still valid, to an order of magnitude, above 0.5 keV when some of the inner electrons of the metals are bound (i.e., even if all the hydrogen is ionized). Chevalier & Irwin (2012) estimated that the metals will be completely ionized only above shock velocities of about \(10^4\) km s\(^{-1}\).

### 3.2. Hα Luminosity

Assuming that the SN radiation field can ionize all the hydrogen in the CSM, the mass of the hydrogen generating the Hα line is

\[
M_H \approx \frac{M_H L_{H\alpha}}{h v_{H\alpha} \alpha_H^e n_e},
\]

Here, \(h\) is the Planck constant, \(L_{H\alpha}\) is the Balmer Hα line luminosity, \(v_{H\alpha}\) is the line frequency (\(4.57 \times 10^{14}\) Hz for Hα), and \(\alpha_H^e\) is the case-B effective recombination coefficient at 10,000 K (\(\approx 8.7 \times 10^{-14}\) cm\(^3\) s\(^{-1}\) for Hα; Osterbrock & Ferland 2006). An important caveat is that this estimate assumes that the line is generated by recombination. Any Hα radiation generated in the shocked region due to collisional processes is not included here. In order to avoid this problem we take as the line luminosity only the luminosity of the narrow line component, which we assume is due to wind above the shock region. In a wind profile, the integrated mass from radius \(r\) to \(r_1\) is

\[
M = \int_r^{r_1} 4\pi r^2 K r^{-2} \, dr = 4\pi K (r_1 - r) \approx 4\pi K \beta r
\]

\[
\approx 0.006 \beta M_{0.01} v_{w,500}^{-1} r_{15}^{-1} M_\odot,
\]

where \(\beta \equiv (r_1 - r)/r\). We note that \(\beta\) cannot be arbitrarily large (otherwise the mass in the CSM will diverge), and here we will assume that it is of order unity.

---

\(^8\) This approximation deviates by a factor of two from a more accurate calculation (e.g., Morrison & McCammon 1983).
By substituting Equation (1) into Equation (4) (assuming \( n \approx n_e \)) and setting it equal to Equation (5), we can obtain a relation between the mass-loading parameter \( K \), the \( H\alpha \) luminosity, and the radius (Ofek et al. 2013b):

\[
L_{H\alpha} \approx \frac{4\pi \hbar \nu_{H\alpha} \alpha_{eff} \beta K^2}{\left< \mu_p \right> m_p^2 r} \approx 2 \times 10^{39} M_2^{3/2} v_{w,500}^{-2} \beta r_1^{-1} \text{erg s}^{-1}.
\]  

Equation (6)

The reason for the inequality is that it is possible that not all of the hydrogen is ionized or that the temperature of the gas is higher than \( 10^4 \) K (i.e., \( \alpha_{H\alpha} \) depends on temperature), and that \( \beta > 1 \). We note that if \( \beta < 1 \), then this inequality is incorrect. However, it is reasonable to assume that the width (i.e., \( r_1 - r \)) of the hydrogen envelope is of the same order of magnitude of \( r \), and therefore \( \beta \geq 1 \).

Another important caveat (which can be expressed in terms of \( \beta \)) is that unlike the X-ray and radio emission which originate at the shock region (radius \( r \)), the narrow component of the \( H\alpha \) may originate at radii \( r_{H\alpha} > r \) (i.e., above the shock region). In this case if \( L_{H\alpha} \propto M_2^{3/2} r_{H\alpha}^{-1} \), then \( M_{H\alpha}/M \approx (r_{H\alpha}/r)^{1/2} \). Therefore, if \( r_{H\alpha} \) is an order of magnitude, or more, larger than \( r \), the contribution of \( M_{H\alpha} \) to the bound–free column density (Equation (2)) and the diffusion timescale discussed in Section 3.4 will be small.

### 3.3. X-Ray Emission

The X-ray emission from an optically thin region is given by (e.g., Immler et al. 2008)

\[
L_X \approx \int_r^{\infty} 4\pi r^2 \Lambda(T) \rho^2 dr,
\]

where \( \Lambda(T) \) is the effective cooling function in the 0.2–10 keV range. Assuming an optically thin thermal plasma with a temperature \( T \) in the range \( 10^6 \)–\( 10^8 \) K (Raymond et al. 1976), we adopt a value of \( \Lambda(T) \approx 3 \times 10^{-25} \text{erg cm}^3 \text{s}^{-1} \). Substituting Equation (1) into Equation (7), we obtain (e.g., Ofek et al. 2013b)

\[
L_X \approx \frac{4\pi K^2}{\left< \mu_p \right> m_p^2 r} e^{-\left(t + t_{ff}\right)} \approx 3.8 \times 10^{41} M_2^{3/2} v_{w,500}^{-2} r_1^{-1} \text{erg s}^{-1}.
\]

Equation (8)

This expression includes an additional exponential term due to absorption in the wind, where \( t \) is the Thomson optical depth (see Ofek et al. 2010; Balberg & Loeb 2011), which is \( \sim 0.3 M_2 v_{w,500}^{-1} r_1^{-1} \). Although the Thomson optical depth is well known, when the optical depth is of the order of a few, Compton scattering is expected to reprocess more energetic photons into the 0.2–10 keV band (Chevalier & Irwin 2012; Svirski et al. 2012). Since the exact X-ray spectrum is not known (Katz et al. 2011; Svirski et al. 2012), a proper calculation of \( L_X \) when \( \tau \geq 1 \) is not straightforward. Assuming that the Comptonization of hard X-ray band into the soft X-ray band is smaller than the reduction of soft X-ray flux by the optical-depth factors, Equation (8) provides an order of magnitude lower limit on \( M \).

In Figure 1, the black solid line shows an order-of-magnitude estimate of the expected X-ray luminosity, assuming an optically thin wind-profile CSM with a mass-loss rate of \( 7 \times 10^{-4} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1} \) and \( v_w = 500 \text{ km s}^{-1} \) (Equations (8) and (12)). Some points are discrepant by factors of 2–3 in luminosity from this estimate. However, this is a simplistic model and since \( M \propto L_X^{1/2} \), our mass-loss rate estimate based on the X-ray luminosity is plausibly correct to within an order of magnitude.

We conclude that this formula can be trusted only for \( M \lesssim 10^{-2} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1} \). Above this mass-loss rate, \( \tau \) and \( \tau_{ff} \) are larger than unity.

### 3.4. Diffusion Timescale

Another observable that can be used to constrain the mass-loss rate is the rise time of the SN light curve. If a considerable amount of material is present between the SN and the observer, then photon diffusion will slow down the rise time of the SN light curve. Therefore, the maximum observed SN rise time can be used to put an upper limit on the amount of mass between the SN and the observer. The diffusion timescale in an infinite wind profile is given by (e.g., Ginzburg & Balberg 2012)

\[
\tau_{diff} \approx \frac{k K}{c} \left[ \ln \left( \frac{c}{v_{sh}} \right) - 1 \right]
\]

Equation (9)

\[
\approx 0.13 k_{0.34} M_2 v_{w,500}^{-1} \ln \left( 30 v_{sh,4}^{-1} \right) \text{ day}.
\]

Here, \( v_{sh,4} \) is the SN shock velocity in units of \( 10^4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \). In the case of SN 2009ip, the early fast rise of the SN light curve provides an upper limit on \( \tau_{diff} \) and, therefore, an upper limit on \( M \).

### 3.5. Free–Free Absorption

Typically, SN progenitors with mass-loss rates of \( \sim 10^{-6} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1} \) are easily detectable in radio frequencies in the nearby universe (e.g., Horesh et al. 2013; Krauss et al. 2012). The radio emission is the result of an interaction between the SN shock and the CSM that generates synchrotron radiation peaking at radio frequencies (e.g., Slysh 1990; Chevalier & Fransson 1994; Chevalier 1998). However, if the material is ionized or partially ionized, then the free–free optical depth may block this radiation. The free–free optical depth in a wind profile between radius \( r \) and the observer is given by (e.g., Ofek et al. 2013a)

\[
\tau_{ff} \approx 1.0 \times 10^{5} T_{4,4} v_{10}^{-1.35} v_{w,500}^{-2} M_2^{0.01} r_1^{-3},
\]

Equation (10)

where \( \nu_{10} \) is the frequency in units of 10 GHz. We note that the absence of Balmer lines in the spectrum likely means that at least some of the hydrogen is ionized and therefore free–free absorption is important.

Chandra & Soderberg (2012) and Hancock et al. (2012) reported on radio observations of SN 2009ip obtained on 2012 September 26 using the Jansky Very Large Array (JVLA’9) and the Australia Telescope Compact Array (ATCA). The JVLA observations did not detect the SN in the 22 GHz and 8.9 GHz bands down to a 3\sigma upper limit of 131 \( \mu Jy \) and 65 \( \mu Jy \), respectively. The ATCA observations put a 3\sigma limit of 66 \( \mu Jy \) in the 18 GHz band. Since our previous limits show that there is a significant amount of CSM interacting with the SN shock in this event, it is likely that strong synchrotron radiation is generated. The non-detection of such a radio source implies that \( \tau_{ff} > 1 \), providing, therefore, a lower limit on \( M \).

---

9 The Jansky Very Large Array is operated by the National Radio Astronomy Observatory (NRAO), a facility of the National Science Foundation operated under cooperative agreement by Associated Universities, Inc.
3.6. Precursor Fluence

Prior to the fast rise detected on 2012 September 24 (Prieto et al. 2013), the light curve of SN 2009ip presented a feature which can be interpreted as a 1 month-long outburst. If we assume that this outburst was a mass-loss event (rather than part of the SN explosion), and if we assume that the bolometric luminosity of the outburst is of the same order of magnitude as the kinetic energy released in the outburst, then by comparing the bolometric luminosity with the kinetic energy we can obtain a rough estimate of the mass released in the outburst. The outburst had a peak absolute V-band magnitude of about $-15$ and a duration of at least 30 days (see Prieto et al. 2013). Therefore, the total bolometric fluence of the outburst is $E_{\text{bol}} \gtrsim 8 \times 10^{47}$ erg. The reason for the lower limit is that we do not know the outburst light curve bolometric correction, and we only have a lower limit on its duration. Comparing $E_{\text{bol}}$ with the kinetic energy and dividing by the duration of the event, $t_{\text{dur}}$, we obtain a lower limit on the mass-loss rate

$$\dot{M} \gtrsim \frac{2E_{\text{bol}}}{v_{w,\text{2000}}^2 t_{\text{dur}}} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{-3} v_{w,\text{2000}}^2 E_{\text{bol,8e47}} t_{\text{dur,30}}^{-1} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where $v_{w,\text{2000}}$ is the wind/outburst velocity in units of 2000 km s$^{-1}$, $E_{\text{bol,8e47}}$ is the bolometric energy in units of $8 \times 10^{47}$ erg, and $t_{\text{dur,30}}$ is the outburst duration in units of 30 days.

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Constraints on Mass Loss

Along with the observations, Equations (2), (6), (8), (9), (10), and (11) provide order-of-magnitude lower and upper bounds on the mass-loss rate from the SN progenitor. It is important to note that the reason that these are only order-of-magnitude estimates is because some of the assumptions that go into these formulae are likely inaccurate: for example, the assumption that the wind is infinite, continuous, and can be described by a single velocity component or the assumption of spherical symmetry. Nevertheless, these relations provide order-of-magnitude, independent estimators for the SN progenitor mass-loss rate.

Some of the estimators require knowledge regarding the shock radius $r$. Following Chevalier (1982), we use the approximation\(^{11}\)

$$r \sim \int v(t)dt = (5/4)v_{e,j,s}(t_s - t_0)^{1/5} (t - t_0)^{4/5} \approx 3 \times 10^{15} \frac{v_{e,j,s}}{8000 \text{ km s}^{-1}} \left( \frac{t - t_0}{30 \text{ day}} \right)^{4/5} \text{ cm},$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

where $t$ is the time, $t_0$ is the SN explosion time, and $v_{e,j,s}$ is the SN ejecta velocity ($\approx 8000$ km s$^{-1}$) at $t_0$ ($t_s - t_0 = 71$ day). In Figure 4, we present the limits we derive on $M$, as a function of the wind/outburst velocity. Specifically, assuming $N \approx N_{\text{H}}$, our X-ray observations of SN 2009ip provide an upper limit of $N_{\text{H}} < 2 \times 10^{22}$ cm$^{-2}$. Therefore, Equation (2) constitutes an upper limit on $M$ (black dashed line). Using Equation (6), the Hα line luminosity of the narrow Hα component we measured on 2012 December 4, $L_{\text{H}\alpha} \approx 1.6 \times 10^{39}$ erg s$^{-1}$, and assuming $\beta = 1$, we can set a lower limit on $M$ (gray solid line). As discussed in Section 3, Equation (8), along with our measured X-ray luminosity of $1.1 \times 10^{39}$ erg s$^{-1}$, sets a lower limit on $M$ which is shown as the black solid line in Figure 4. Furthermore, the SN rise time of 2.3 mag day$^{-1}$ (Prieto et al. 2013) implies $t_{\text{diff}} \lesssim 0.3$ day. Along with Equation (9) these provide an upper limit on $M$ (gray dashed line). The estimate based on the bolometric fluence (Equation (11)) is shown as a vertical gray thick line. The non-detection in radio bands (Chandra & Soderberg 2012; Hancock et al. 2012) with Equation (10) sets a lower limit on $M$ (black dash-dotted line). On each line we also mark the $(t - t_0)$ used to calculate the line position. Here we assume that $t_0$ is on 2012 September 24.

Although there is no single $M$ value which is consistent with all the bounds in Figure 4, the closest values to all the bounds are in the range of about $10^{-3} \text{ to } 10^{-2} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$.

Kiewe et al. (2012) review the observed properties of 15 Type IIn SNe. They reported mass-loss rates, prior to explosion, in the range of $10^{-4}$ to $\sim 1 M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$, while their wind velocities are in the range of $\sim 30$–$1600$ km s$^{-1}$. The mass-loss rate and wind velocity of SN 2009ip are consistent with these values. Another SN which shows some similarities with SN 2009ip is SN 2010mc (PTF 10tel; Ofek et al. 2013b). This SN showed an outburst about one month prior to its explosion. We note that the high state of SN 2009ip just prior to its fast rise (Prieto et al. 2013) can be interpreted as a similar outburst.
Type IIn SNe are likely a non-homogeneous class of objects arising from multiple mechanisms. It is not clear what the best combination of parameters that will help us to relate a given Type IIn to a specific mechanism/progenitor is (e.g., LBV eruptions). However, better mass-loss rates and wind velocity measurements for larger samples of Type IIn SN progenitors, as well as additional cases of pre-explosion outbursts, can provide the missing link.

4.2. Interpretation

With the exception of the mass estimate based on the Hα luminosity, the mass-loss estimators in Figure 4 are consistent to an order of magnitude. Specifically, the mass-loss lower limit based on the Hα luminosity, and assuming β = 1, is over an order of magnitude above the upper limit which is derived from the bound–free absorption column-density limit. We note that in the case of another source in which a similar analysis was applied (SN 2010mc/PTF 10tel; Ofek et al. 2013b), the various estimators were consistent.

A possible explanation for the discrepancy here is that some of our basic assumptions are incorrect. Among these assumptions are uniformity of the CSM, spherical symmetry, r−2 density profile, solar metallicity, and ionized (but not fully ionized) CSM. Alternatively, as we discussed in Section 3.2, it is possible that the Hα emitting region is further out, above the shock region (e.g., β ≥ 1). Therefore, it is possible that the Hα line luminosity probes a completely different region of the CSM than the other methods discussed in Section 3.

Interestingly, we note that in Figure 4 the solution allowed by all the mass-loss rate estimators which depend on the integral of density along the line of sight (marked by non-solid lines in Figure 4) infers low mass-loss rates, while estimators which measure the total emission from an optically thin volume (marked by solid lines in Figure 4) give high values for the mass-loss rate. This behavior hints that another possible explanation for the discrepancy between the various lines in Figure 4 is that the CSM has an aspherical geometry.

There are two simple geometries that are roughly consistent with these results. The first simple explanation is that the CSM around the SN has a disk geometry, and we observe the system from above or below the disk. In this case there will be a relatively small amount of intervening material between the observer and the source, the small value of N_O and short t_off. Moreover, in this case the total emission (L_X and L_Hα) will be larger relative to the expectation based on the spherical geometry assumption and on the values of N_H and t_off. The second simple model is that the CSM has a bipolar hourglass-like structure. In this case we observe the system from the equatorial plane. We note that there are likely other possible geometrical solutions, which are more complicated.

We conclude that the best explanation for the discrepancy between the mass-loss estimators is that the Hα emission region is above the shock region (or effectively β ≥ 1), or alternatively that the CSM is aspherical. Unfortunately, our order-of-magnitude analysis does not provide a way to distinguish between the two scenarios.

If the Hα emission region is indeed located further out, relative to the shock, then an immediate conclusion is that an order-of-magnitude estimate to the mass-loss rate during the SN precursor is in the range of $\sim 10^{-3} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$ to $\sim 10^{-2} M_\odot \text{yr}^{-1}$.

In order to convert the mass-loss rate to an estimate of the total mass in the CSM, we need to integrate Equation (5) out to a specific radius. Here we choose to integrate the total mass out to a radius of $6 \times 10^{15}$ cm. The reason for this choice is that the relatively abrupt disappearance of the X-ray flux ∼70 days after the explosion may indicate that the CSM density is falling (faster than a wind profile) at a distance of $6 \times 10^{15}$ cm (see Equation (12)). Using Equation (5), we find that the total CSM mass out to this radius is

$$M_{\text{CSM}} \sim 4 \times 10^{-2} M_{0.01} v_{w,500}^2 r_{6E15} M_\odot.$$  

Here, $r_{6E15}$ is the radius in units of $6 \times 10^{15}$ cm.

4.3. Implications

Pastorello et al. (2013) and Mauerhan et al. (2013) suggested that the outbursts of SN 2009ip are due to pulsational pair instability. However, Woosley et al. (2007) predict that the mass loss in pair instability mass ejections would be at least a few solar masses. Unless the geometry is highly aspherical, this theoretically predicted mass loss is high relative to our estimate of the total mass in the CSM (i.e., $\sim 0.1 M_\odot$). Our mass-loss estimate is of the same order of magnitude as the one derived in Ofek et al. (2013b) in the context of the Quataert & Shiode (2012) mechanism. The estimators presented in Figure 4 are also in rough agreement with the shell mass of $\sim 0.15 M_\odot$, suggested by Soker & Kashi (2012), in the context of their binary–star merger scenario.

Interestingly, both Levesque et al. (2012) and Soker & Kashi (2012) suggested aspherical models for SN 2009ip (see also Mauerhan et al. 2013). Levesque et al. (2012) argued for a thin disk geometry, while Soker & Kashi (2012) suggested a bipolar hourglass-like geometry. However, Soker & Kashi (2012) suggested that we are observing the system along the polar direction. We note that if the discrepancy in Figure 4 is due to asymmetry in the CSM, rather than the radius at which the Hα line is generated, then the Soker & Kashi (2012) geometry is not consistent with our observations. However, we do not claim that our suggested geometries are the only possible solutions. Finally, we note that different mass-loss estimators have different functional dependencies on $r$. Therefore, additional observations (e.g., radio) can constrain the density profile of the CSM.
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