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ABSTRACT

One of the main goals of the CoRoT experiment is to determine the internal rotation of stars. A seismic measure of rotation requires the detection and an accurate measurement of rotational splittings. Our ability to achieve this goal with CoRoT observations depends on the properties of the target star (in short: spectral type and distance) and will be discussed.

1. INTRODUCTION

Seismology can be a powerful tool to provide information about stellar rotation through the precise knowledge of the frequency splittings. The question is however whether these splittings will be detected with CoRoT; if they are, how many of them; which precision will have the measurements and what information will they provide, for which star? These issues are addressed in this work which has been presented at the second CoRoT Brasil meeting (2005).

The oscillation eigenmodes of a stellar non rotating model can be represented with a single spherical harmonics $Y_{\ell,m}$; the associated eigenfrequencies $\nu_{\ell,m}$ are $2\ell + 1$ degenerate as they do not depend on the azimuthal number $m$; $n$ is the radial order of the mode.

Stellar rotation breaks the spherical symmetry of a star and thereby lifts the degeneracy: a mode with given $n, \ell$ gives rise to a multiplet of $2\ell + 1$ components with associated eigenfrequencies $\nu_{n,\ell,m}$.

If the rotation rate, $\Omega$, is not too large ($\Omega^2/(GM/R^3) < 0.01 - 0.1$ with $M$ and $R$ the mass and radius of the star, $G$ the gravitational constant), the rotation can be treated as a perturbation. The first order correction to the eigenfrequency comes from the Coriolis force; it can be written under the form $\Delta \nu_{n,\ell,m} = \nu_{n,\ell,m} - \nu_{n,\ell} = m \Delta \nu_{n,\ell}$ and is a measurable quantity.

The rotational splittings, $\Delta \nu_{n,\ell}$, are related to the rotation rate (or rotational angular velocity in rad/s) inside the star as:

$$\Delta \nu_{n,\ell} = \int \frac{\Omega(r,\theta)}{2\pi} K_{n,\ell}(r,\theta)d\theta dr$$

where $r$ is the radius inside the star, $K_{n,\ell}$ is the rotational kernel which depends on the eigenfunction associated with the $(n, \ell)$ nonrotating mode. From the knowledge of the splittings (determined observationally), it is then theoretically possible to invert the above relation and deduce the rotation profile $\Omega(r,\theta)$.

We consider here only the depth dependence of the rotation profile and therefore look for information on $\Omega(r)$ which satisfies (see for instance, Christensen-Dalsgaard, 2003):

$$\Delta \nu_{n,\ell} = \int_0^R \frac{\Omega(r)}{2\pi} K_{n,\ell}(r)dr$$

where

$$K_{n,\ell} = \frac{1}{I} (\xi_r^2 + \Lambda \xi_t^2 - 2\xi_r \xi_t - \xi_t^2) \rho r^2 dr$$

and

$$I = \int_0^R (\xi_r^2 + \Lambda \xi_t^2) \rho r^2 dr$$

where $\rho$ is the stellar density, $\xi_r$ and $\xi_t$ are the radial and horizontal displacement eigenfunctions (Unno et al., ...).

If rotation is uniform inside the star, the splittings reduce to

$$\Delta \nu_{n,\ell} = \nu_{\text{rotsurf}} (1 - C_{n,\ell})$$

in the observed frame with the Ledoux constant given by:

$$C_{n,\ell} = \frac{1}{I} \int_0^R (2\xi_r \xi_t + \xi_t^2) \rho r^2 dr$$

and $\nu_{\text{rotsurf}} = \Omega_s/(2\pi)$ with $\Omega_s$ the surface rotation rate.
Figure 1. Top: Schematic rotation profile as it would be obtained assuming local conservation of angular momentum (blue) and uniform rotation (red) both normalized to the surface rotation rate $\Omega_s$. Bottom: $\Delta \nu_{n,\ell}/(\nu_{\text{rot,surf}}(1-C_{n\ell}))$ for $\ell = 1$ modes in function of the corresponding frequency $\nu_{n,\ell}$. The rotational splittings $\Delta \nu_{n,\ell}$ are computed using Eq.5 with the rotational profile displayed on the left for $\ell = 1,2$ modes (solid and dotted blue curves resp.) and computed assuming uniform rotation (Eq.4) (red curves).

For nonuniform rotation, we consider

$$\Delta \nu_{n,\ell} = \nu_{\text{rot,surf}} \int_0^R \frac{\Omega(r)}{\Omega_s} K_{n,\ell}(r) dr \quad (5)$$

For a uniform rotation and a given star, the splittings are the same apart from the Ledoux constant $C_{n\ell}$ (Eq.1). On the other hand, the signature of a varying rotation rate $\Omega(r)$, with depth on the splittings is a variation of the splitting value with the mode frequency since different modes probe different depths. Fig.1 illustrates this behavior for a 1.25 $M_\odot$ stellar model with a stellar radius of 1.31 $R_\odot$ and effective temperature $T_{\text{eff}} = 6420K$. The horizontal curve represents the case of uniform rotation $\Omega(r) = \Omega_{\text{surf}}$. The varying curves correspond to splittings which vary with the modes because the assumed rotation profile varies with depth as shown on Fig.1(left).

It is this property which enables to probe the internal rotation profile of an oscillating star.

When addressing the aforementioned issues, one must first distinguish two different cases:

- **Opacity driven oscillations** concern $\delta$ Scuti, $\beta$ Cephei, $\gamma$ Dor stars which are intermediate mass (1.5 to $\sim 7 \ M_\odot$) stars on the main sequence. For such stars, modes are self excited by the $\kappa$ mechanism which generates oscillations with large amplitudes.
These oscillations are coherent hence their width is given by the observing time $\sim 1/T_{\text{obs}}$.

These stars are rather fast rotators and there should be no problem in detecting their splittings. The problem with these stars lies elsewhere: it will not be easy to say which mode is associated with which detected frequency, the so-called mode identification problem. As this is out of scope here, these stars will not be discussed any further (see for instance Goupil et al 2004, Suarez et al 2006, Reese et al 2006).

- **Stochastically excited, damped oscillations**: also named solar like oscillations. These $p$-modes are excited by turbulent convection in the upper convective regions of the star. This concerns main sequence stars with relatively low mass to have an enough extended outer convective region. For a long time, the Sun was the only star which showed this type of oscillation. These oscillations are damped, that is the kappa mechanism is not operating efficiently to cause these modes to be unstable. Left to themselves, these modes would rapidly die (over $\sim 5$ days). However turbulent convection in the outer layer transfers acoustic energy into these oscillations which then are stochastically excited. Amplitudes of such oscillations are much smaller (a few ppm) than in the previous case and only recently they have been firmly detected in other stars. We know now several solar like oscillating stars: Procyon (Martic et al. 1999, Barban et al. 1999), α Cen (Bouchy et al. ), HD49933 (Mosser et al 2005), η Boo (see references section). These stars are rather low mass, slow rotator stars. If the rotation is too slow, their rotational splittings can happen to be smaller than the width of the modes, $\Gamma$, and therefore would not be detectable. Hence some constraints on the ratio of the width over the splitting must be considered in order to expect detection of splittings.

Because these modes are stochastically excited by turbulent convection and have a finite life time ($\tau = 2\pi/\Gamma$), their average profile in a power spectrum is lorentzian and is given by (Fig.2(left)):

$$P(\nu) = \frac{H (\Gamma/2)^2}{(\nu - \nu_0)^2 + (\Gamma/2)^2} + \text{noise}$$

(6)

where the height $H$ is related to the intrinsic amplitude of the mode $A$ (see Baudin et al, this volume; Baudin et al., 2005) Fig.2(right) shows two illustrative cases: two $\ell = 1$ modes which are split by rotation, hence two triplets of modes with $m = -1, 0, 1$ (from spherical harmonics). We assume the same expression Eq.4 for all the multiplet components with $A$ given by the amplitude of the $m = 0$ modified by visibility effect. Here we take an inclination angle $i = 30^\circ$. We consider one solar like oscillation mode of low frequency which is rather narrow and a second mode with higher frequency which therefore is wider. In the first case, the splitting is larger than the width of each component, the triplet can be resolved and the splitting detected. This is no longer true in the second case.
2. WHAT CAN WE EXPECT AS DETECTION AND MEASUREMENT ACCURACY OF ROTATIONAL SPLITTING?

The second step, once the splittings have been detected, is to measure them accurately enough to obtain useful information about stellar rotation and this requires a high signal to noise ratio as seen next.

In order to estimate the number of detected splittings as well as their measurement accuracy in function of the considered star, we use simple simulations as detailed below. Note that Gizon & Solanki (2003,2004) have carried out Montecarlo simulations and reach similar conclusions.

2.1. Detection criteria

As mentioned above, the first step is to establish a detection criterion.

Criterion 1: Here we assume that a \( m \neq 0 \) component can be detected if its signal to noise ratio, \( \text{SNR} \), satisfies:

\[
\text{SNR} > 9
\]  

(7)
as measured in the power spectrum (hence a SNR detection level of 3 in amplitude).

Criterion 2: The splittings must be large enough compared to the widths of the adjacent components of a multiplet. For a \( \ell = 1 \) multiplet for instance, one imposes:

\[
\Delta \nu > \frac{(\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_1)}{2} \sim \Gamma_0
\]

where \( \Gamma_0, \Gamma_1 \) are the widths of the \( m = 0, m = \pm 1 \) respectively. More generally, we assume as an additional detection criterion that a splitting is detected if it is larger than the width of the \( m = 0 \) mode:

\[
\Delta \nu > \Gamma
\]  

(8)

2.2. Expected signal to noise ratio and measurement uncertainties

In criterion 1, Eq.7, the signal to noise ratio \( \text{SNR} = SNR(A_1, m_\nu) \) depends on the amplitudes of the \( m \neq 0 \) components, \( A_1 \), and on the noise level which itself in practice depends on the apparent magnitude of the star \( m_\nu \).

The amplitudes of the \( m \neq 0 \) components \( A_1 \) can be related to the \( m = 0 \) one, \( A_0 \); the ratio \( A_1 / A_0 \) is assumed to depend only on visibility effects (although not necessarily true) which depend on the inclination angle \( i \). Amplitudes \( A_0 \) and widths \( \Gamma_0 \) of the excited modes are in turn dependent on the mass and age of the star.

![Figure 4. Top: Amplitudes in intensity, \( A_0 \), for \( m = 0 \) modes in function of frequency for the selected models of Fig.3: red:1.2 \( M_\odot \) TAMS; dark blue: 1.3 \( M_\odot \); yellow: 1.4 \( M_\odot \) TAMS; light blue: 1.5 \( M_\odot \); green: 1.6 \( M_\odot \) TAMS; black: 1.3 \( M_\odot \) ZAMS (\( \pi^3 \) Ori); bottom: Amplitudes \( A_1 \) of \( m \neq 0 \) components of \( \ell = 1, 2 \) modes for the 1.4\( M_\odot \) TAMS model with \( i = 60^\circ \).]

The signal to ratio also depends whether the mode is resolved or not (see Lochard et al., 2005). This is also true for the splitting measurement precision as detailed next.

2.2.1. Resolved modes

A resolved mode has its width, \( \Gamma \), which is larger than the frequency bin, \( \text{bin} = 1/T_{\text{obs}} \) with \( T_{\text{obs}} \) = the observation time interval.

CoRoT specifications estimate the noise level \( B^2 \) in a power spectrum for a target star with an apparent magnitude \( m_0 = 5.7 \) mag at \((0.61)^2 \text{ppm}^2\) for a width \( \Gamma_{nt} = 1 \mu Hz \). More generally, we expect for a star with an apparent magnitude \( m_\nu \) and a mode line width \( \Gamma_{nt} \).

\[
B^2 = \left(\frac{0.61}{2.3}\right)^2 \cdot 10^{\frac{m_\nu - m_0}{2.5}} \text{ppm}^2
\]

(Note that this takes into account the white noise level for CoRoT but does not include other perturbations such as stellar activity for instance but also orbital noises and long term instrument response.)

Hence the signal to noise for a star with apparent magnitude \( m_\nu \), and a given \( (nt) \) mode, with a width
\( \Gamma_{n\ell} \) and an oscillation amplitude \( A_1 \) is obtained as:

\[
SNR = \left( \frac{A_1}{0.61} \right)^2 \frac{2.3}{\pi \Gamma_{n\ell}} \times 10^{-\frac{(m_v - m_0)}{2.5}} (9)
\]

**Splitting uncertainty** When the splitting is detected (i.e. satisfying Eq.7 and Eq.8), the precision of its measurements (\( \sigma \) in \( \mu \text{Hz} \)) is calculated according (Libbrecht, 1992):

\[
\sigma^2 = \frac{\Gamma_{n\ell}}{4\pi T_{\text{obs}}} \sqrt{\beta + 1} \left( \frac{\beta + 1 + \sqrt{\beta}}{\beta} \right)^3 (10)
\]

with \( \beta = \frac{1}{SNR} \)

The SNR drops rapidly with the apparent magnitude of the star and for a given star with its distance. For instance, a 100pc star has \( SNR = 0.01 SNR_{(10pc)} \) and for a 500pc star, \( SNR = 4 \times 10^{-4} SNR_{(10pc)} \). This considerably reduces the number of detected splittings and increases their measurement uncertainties. This is illustrated in Fig.6 below.

### 2.2.2. Nonresolved modes

A **nonresolved** mode has a width which is smaller than 1 bin i.e. longlife time mode: \( \Gamma_{n\ell} < \text{bin} = 1/T_{\text{obs}} \), then \( SNR \) varies with the magnitude \( m_v \) as:

\[
SNR = 0.5 \left( \frac{A_1}{0.61} \right)^2 T_{\text{obs}}(\text{in days}) \times 10^{-\frac{(m_v - m_0)}{2.5}} (11)
\]

**Splitting uncertainty** When the splitting is detected (i.e. satisfying Eq.7 and Eq.8), the precision of its measurement is given by

\[
\sigma = 1/T_{\text{obs}} = 0.08 \mu \text{Hz} \quad (12)
\]

for \( T_{\text{obs}} = 150 \text{ days} \).

### 2.3. Simulations

For a given stellar model, i.e. given \( T_{\text{eff}}, L/L_\odot \), we compute the number of detected splittings, \( N_s \), i.e which satisfy the detection criteria Eq.7 and Eq.8.

As input we need the apparent magnitude hence the luminosity (hence the mass) and the distance; we need the splitting values (hence \( \nu_{\text{rotsurf}} \), hence the rotational velocity and the stellar radius), the inclination angle \( i \) and the observing time interval \( T_{\text{obs}} \).

We consider TAMS models with masses ranging from 1.2 to 1.6 \( M_\odot \) and one younger MS 1.25 \( M_\odot \) star representative of \( \pi^3 \text{ Ori} \). The selected models are computed with CESAM code (Morel, 1997) and their evolutionary tracks in a HR diagram are shown in Fig.3.

To proceed, we obtain the necessary input ingredients, \( m_v, \nu_{n\ell}, \Gamma_{n\ell}, \Delta \nu_{n\ell}, SNR \) as follows:
• The luminosity is converted in absolute magnitude with $M_{bol} = 4.64 - 2.5 \log_{10}(L/L_\odot)$, then assuming the star is at a distance $d$ (in pc), one derives the apparent magnitude (neglect the bolometric correction) as $m_v = M_{bol} + 5 \log_{10} d - 5$.

• Adiabatic frequencies $\nu_{\ell m}$ with $\ell = 1, 2$ are computed in the frequency interval $[\sim 100, \sim 3200] \mu$ Hz with the adiabatic oscillation code ADIPLS (Christensen-Dalsgaard et al., 1996)

• we take the corresponding damping rates $\Gamma_{n,\ell}$ (displayed in Fig.5) from Houdek’s Tables (Houdek et al., 1999)

• We compute the excitation rates as in Samadi, Goupil (2001) and Samadi et al. (2003), details can be found in Baudin et al., this volume. The excitation rates are combined with the damping rates $\Gamma_{n,\ell}$ to provide the intensity amplitudes of $m = 0$ modes, $A_0$. These are shown in Fig.4. We compute the amplitudes of $m \neq 0$ components, $A_1$ as $A_1 = A_0 Q_{\ell m}(i)$ where $Q_{\ell m}(i)$ are the visibility coefficients for $\ell, m$ modes for various inclination angle $i$. We consider four values for $i = 10^\circ, 30^\circ, 60^\circ, 80^\circ$ (see Table 1). As we have neglected the effect of limb darkening in the visibility coefficients, these vanish for $\ell = 3$ and we limit the study to splittings of $\ell = 1, 2$ modes.

The signal to ratio, $SNR(A_1)$ are then computed using Eq.9 and Eq.11.

• The splittings $\Delta \nu_{n,\ell}$ are given by Eq.4 as we assume a uniform rotation for sake of simplicity (see section 4.2 for a discussion about a nonuniform rotation) . We consider several values of the rotational velocity $v$.

Criteria 1 (Eq.9) and 2 (Eq.11) are then applied. The results are summarised in Fig.5 which shows that the number of splittings with $SNR > 9$, $N_s$ increases with the mass and age of the star. We also see that the modes rapidly become too wide with increasing frequency to be detectable according to criterion 2. Furthermore, as it can be expected, for a given star, $N_s$ increases with the rotational velocity $v$ as the splittings then get larger and criterion 2 easier to be satisfied. We note also that except at very low frequency, most modes are resolved.

### 2.4. Influence of inclination angle, mass, age, surface rotational velocity, distance

Fig.7 represents the number of detected splittings as well as their measurement uncertainties in function of their $m = 0$ frequency for several values of the surface velocity and inclination angle. This representation is given for a 1.3 ZAMS model, a 1.3 TAMS model and a 1.5 ZAMS model. The detected splittings are represented with different colours depending on the inclination angle. The nondetected splittings are shown in black symbols at the bottom of the panels.

We find that the number of detected splittings (i.e. satisfying both criteria), $N_s$, increases age , surface rotational velocity and inclination angle. This can be easily understood with the dependence of $SNR$ and $v$ upon these quantities as discussed in the previous section. $N_s$ also increases with the mass for masses up to 1.4 $M_\odot$. Above this mass, the theoretical widths of the modes become quite large and the number of detected splitting can decrease. This must be taken with caution as theoretical computation of mode line widths remains very dubious.

The measurement uncertainties also follow quite closely the behavior of the mode line widths. When
the modes are detected, their measurement precision lies in the range $\sigma \sim 0.1 - 0.3 \mu Hz$

For sake of simplicity, we have sofar investigated $1.2 M_\odot - 1.6 M_\odot$ stars located at 10 pc. We now consider more realistic cases where these stars are further away, hence with significantly higher apparent magnitudes. This causes the signal to noise ratio to decrease hence the number of detected splittings to decrease. The number of detected splittings as computed from our simulations is plotted in Fig.6 as a function of the apparent magnitude of the star. Splittings are no longer detected for a 1.5 $M_\odot$ star with apparent magnitude above 8.5 and for a 1.3 $M_\odot$ above 7.5.

3. COMPARISON WITH RESULTS FROM A HARE AND HOUND EXERCISE ABOUT HD49333

HD 49333 is a 1.25 $M_\odot$ star with an effective temperature $T_{\text{eff}} \sim 6700 K$. As it was considered as a possible CoRoT target, it was chosen as a proxy star for a Hare and Hound exercise by the CoRoT HH team (see Appourchaux et al in the same volume). Since then, it was observed from ground with Harps and was shown to undergo solar like oscillation (Mosser et al, 2005). Many splittings were indeed detected. As expected, the error bars on the splitting measurements were found to increase with the frequency. Characteristics of this star corresponds approximately to the $\pi$ Ori model studied here with a rotational velocity of 10 km/s in Fig.7. HH results confirm the present estimation in this case that only a few splittings can be detected with uncertainties below 0.5 $\mu Hz$.

4. WHAT PIECES OF INFORMATION UPON ROTATION CAN WE EXPECT FROM THESE SEISMIC MEASUREMENTS?

We can consider 3 levels:

- **Level 1** Only a few splittings with enough precision are detected. Then a readily straightforward average of the splittings yields the surface rotation period.

- **Level 2** Enough splittings with enough precision are detected so that a forward method can provide some information on the r-profile of the rotation rate inside the star.

- **Level 3** Enough splittings with enough precision with appropriate nature are detected so that an inversion technique can provide some information upon the r-profile of the rotation rate deep inside the star. This third level will be obtained only for specific stars with masses above 1.4–1.5 $M_\odot$ and evolved enough (middle of the main sequence) with an apparent magnitude below 7.

Figure 7. Top panel: $\pi^3$ Ori: a 1.25 $M_\odot$ ZAMS model. From top to bottom: splittings calculated with a non uniform rotation; uncertainties $\sigma$ for detected splittings assuming a surface velocity of $v = 10$ km/s; $v = 20$ km/s; $v = 30$ km/s; middle panel same for a 1.3 $M_\odot$ TAMS model. bottom panel Same for a 1.50 $M_\odot$ TAMS model. Colours corresponds to different inclination angles as in Fig.6 (distance =10pc, $T = 150$ days).
4.1. Level 1

At level 1, stars with apparent magnitude above 8 are too faint to allow the detection of enough precisely measured splittings for a forward technique to be used. However an average rotation period can be determined as the average over the detected splittings as

\[ P_{\text{rot}}^{1} = \frac{\Delta \nu_{n\ell}}{1 - C_{n\ell}} = \frac{1}{N_{s}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{s}} \frac{\Delta \nu_{j}}{1 - C_{j}} \]  

(13)

Note that the average rotation period, \( P_{\text{rot}} \), which is determined by seismic measurements is an average of the rotation period over a depth where the modes propagate which extends downward the surface; hence it can differ from the surface rotational period \( P_{\text{surf}} \) which would be obtained with spot techniques for instance.

Our simulations show that the difference \( |P_{\text{rot}} - P_{\text{surf}}| \) amounts to about a few hours where we have assumed a surface rotational period of about a few days; this is slightly larger than the measurement uncertainty on \( P_{\text{rot}} \).

4.2. Level 2

Fig.7 shows that the splittings which are expected to be detected are not equal but vary with the frequency, which indicates that the rotation is not uniform. Let crudely represent the rotation profile in Fig.2 as:

\[ \Omega(r) = \Omega_{c} \quad \text{for} \quad r \leq r_{c} \quad ; \quad \Omega(r) = \Omega_{s} \quad \text{for} \quad r > r_{c} \]  

(14)

We then easily find from Eq.5:

\[ \frac{\Delta \nu_{n\ell}}{\nu_{\text{rot, surf}}} = \left( \frac{\Omega_{c}}{\Omega_{s}} - 1 \right) \int_{0}^{r_{c}} K_{n\ell}(r) \, dr + \left( 1 - C_{n\ell} \right) \]  

(15)

As an example, let consider the splitting, \( \Delta \nu_{1} \) of the highest frequency in the detected splitting set and \( \Delta \nu_{2} \) the splitting of the lowest frequency one for a given \( \ell \). Then one obtains:

\[ \left( \frac{\Omega_{c}}{\Omega_{s}} - 1 \right) = \frac{1 - C_{1} - (1 - C_{2})/K_{2} \Delta \nu_{1}/\Delta \nu_{2}}{K_{2} \Delta \nu_{1}/\Delta \nu_{2} - K_{1}} \]  

(16)

where \( K_{j} = \int_{0}^{r_{c}} K_{n_{j}\ell}(r) \, dr \) (\( j=1,2 \)) with \( r_{c} \) the radius of the convective core. This crude modelling can tell us whether the core rotates faster than the surface.

For instance, in the case of \( \ell = 1 \) modes for the \( \pi^{3} \) Ori model and a rotational surface velocity \( v = 20 \) or 30 km/s (Fig.10left), one has \( \nu_{1} = 1.08 mHz; \nu_{2} = 2.5 mHz; \Delta \nu_{1}/\Delta \nu_{2} = 1.06 \) and \( K_{1} = 0.054, K_{2} = 0.0245, 1 - C_{1} = 0.994 \sim 1, 1 - C_{2} = 0.983 \sim 1 \). This yields \( \Omega_{c}/\Omega_{s} \sim 1.95 \) (to be compared with the true value 2.56). Hence with a modelling as crude as Eq.16, one can already conclude that the core rotates faster than the surface by a ratio larger than \( \sim 1.95 - 2 \)

More sophisticated profiles of course can be implemented into Eq.5 and the results compared to the observed splittings for further constraints upon rotation.

As the mass and age of the model increase, the lowest frequency detected splittings reach those which are associated with mixed modes (large values of the splittings) which makes possible a successful inversion process as illustrated next.

4.3. Level 3

The inversion of the splittings requires a larger variety of modes than the previous levels. It is known that one cannot retrieve localized information about the internal rotation profile with only low degree (\( l \leq 3 \)) pure \( p \) modes. However for a star with appropriate mass and age, it is expected to detect enough splittings to perform an inversion of the data and obtain the rotation rate in the deep parts of the star. Indeed, stars with a convective core and evolved enough can present modes that probe the deep inside of the star, down to the edge of the core. Such modes, called mixed modes, have dual characteristics as they share their energy both in the inner and outer layers of the star. Lochard et al. (2005) showed that the detection of only a few mixed modes would be enough to perform an inversion of the splittings and recover localized information on the rotation rate at several radii close to the core, leading to an estimate of the expected gradient. Figure 8 shows the reconstructed profiles from the values obtained at these radii.

This study gave constraints to select such appropriate stars from their mass, evolution stage and surface rotation rate. Among the stars CoRoT will observe, 5 answer the selection criterions. Their characteristics are presented in Tab. 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HD</th>
<th>M/M⊙</th>
<th>m_Hz</th>
<th>V sin i (km/s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>170987</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170579</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171802</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181420</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171834</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. List of potential targets in the CoRoT fields that would suit for radial rotational profile inversion. All stars are \( F \) spectral type.
Figure 8. Input and fitted rotational profiles. The full line curve stands for the initial rotational profile. The dotted curves fit the retrieved points by inversion at several radii. The middle one fits the central values, the two others fit the extreme values of the error bars. From Lochard et al 2005.

5. CONCLUSION

The largest numbers of detected splittings with sufficiently accurate measurements are obtained for relatively massive ($1.4 - 1.6 M_\odot$), brightest, cool stars with relatively high $v \sin i$ (high $v$ or high $i$). This means to our present knowledge of the CoRoT field:

- about 5 targets will be suitable for an inversion process (Lochard et al. 2005) which are presented in Tab. 2 (Lochard, 2005, PhD) (level 3 above).
- one must expect about a few tenths of target stars which are suitable for forward techniques (level 2 above)
- likely quite some more which will provide an average rotation rate (level 1) (independently of activity and spot techniques)

Hence on one hand a pessimistic view says that probing rotation for solar like stars is going to be difficult as instrumental noise and stellar activity have not been included as additional perturbators here.

On the other side, an optimistic view recalls that a ratio of $\Omega_{\text{core}}/\Omega_{\text{surf}} \sim 2$ as assumed here is probably very conservative that is likely underestimated. In that case, chances to detected more splittings with a better accuracy increase.

Finally we stress that the expectations given here are strongly dependent on the assumed input ingredients and particularly the theoretical damping rates which fortunately will be made observationally available with CoRoT.
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