
**SN 2017ens**

*Published in:* Astrophysical Journal Letters

*DOI:* 10.3847/2041-8213/aaeb2e

*Published:* 10/11/2018

*Document Version*
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record


This material is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.
We present observations of supernova (SN) 2017ens, discovered by the ATLAS survey and identified as a hot blue object through the GREAT program. The redshift $z = 0.1086$ implies a peak brightness of $M_V = -21.1$ mag, placing the object within the regime of superluminous supernovae. We observe a dramatic spectral evolution, from initially being blue and featureless, to later developing features similar to those of the broad-lined Type Ic supernovae: individual Rayet stars. This may suggest that the progenitor passed through a luminous blue variable phase, or that the wind is instead from a binary companion red supergiant star. At late times we see emission persisting at high luminosity — wide Hα emission — possibly indicative of additional mass loss at high velocities that could have been ejected by a pulsational pair instability.
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1. Introduction

Type Ic supernovae (SNe) arise from the core collapse of a massive star that has lost its hydrogen and helium layers prior to exploding, through either strong stellar winds or interaction with a binary companion (e.g., Filippenko 1997; Gal-Yam 2017). Their light curves are powered by the radioactive decay of $^{56}$Ni that is produced in the SN explosion. Related to these events, and with luminosities up to 100 times higher, are the Type I superluminous SNe (SLSNe; see Gal-Yam 2012; Inserra et al. 2018a; Moriya et al. 2018b for reviews of observations and models). SLSNe exhibit spectral similarities to SNe Ic (Pastorello et al. 2010), but their luminosities are such that they cannot be powered solely by radioactive decay (Quimby et al. 2011). The nature of the additional energy source remains unknown, with suggestions ranging from a central engine (Kasen & Bildsten 2010; Woosley 2010) to interaction with a massive H and He-free circumstellar medium (CSM; Chevalier & Irwin 2011).

Some SNe Ib/Ic have been observed to develop relatively narrow (~500–1000 km s$^{-1}$) emission lines of hydrogen in their spectra; examples include SNe Ib 2014C and 2004dk (Milisavljevic et al. 2015; Mauerhan et al. 2018), and SNe Ic 2001em and 2017dio (Gal-Yam 2017; Kuncarayakti et al. 2018). This has been interpreted as evidence that for at least some H-poor SNe, the fast ejecta are colliding with H-rich material relatively far from the star. This late-time interaction has also been observed in some SLSNe Ic which show H$\alpha$ emission at +70 to +250 day after their peak brightness (Yan et al. 2015, 2017).

In this Letter we report on the discovery of an unusual SN with our Gamma-Ray Burst Optical/Near-Infrared Detector (GROND)/extended-Public ESO Spectroscopic Survey for Transient Objects (ePESSTO)/Asteroid Terrestrial-impact Last Alert System (ATLAS) (GREAT; Greiner et al. 2008; Smartt et al. 2015; Tonry et al. 2018) survey. We introduce this program here, which is designed to rapidly identify hot blue transients, with the specific goal of finding very young SLSNe in faint galaxies (Chen et al. 2017c). SN 2017ens (ATLAS17-gqa) was discovered by the ATLAS survey on 2017 June 5 (UT dates are used herein), located at (J2000) $\alpha = 12^h$04$^m$09$^s$, $\delta = -01^\circ$S$55^\prime$S$52^\prime$T. Prompted by the high blackbody temperature of 21,000 $\pm$ 3000 K that we measured with our GREAT data on 2017 June 8 (Chen et al. 2017a), we began an intensive spectroscopic and photometric follow-up campaign (Section 2).

The adopted redshift of SN 2017ens, $z = 0.1086$ (Section 3.3), implies an absolute magnitude of $M_r = -21.1$ at peak, and thus a luminosity consistent with a SLSN (Gal-Yam 2012). In Section 3 we present the spectral evolution of SN 2017ens, which began to show $\sim$2000 km s$^{-1}$ wide H$\alpha$ and H$\beta$ emission after +163 day (phases are corrected for time dilation and are relative to the GROND r-band maximum on MJD = 57,924.011). We compare the spectral properties of SN 2017ens to those of other SLSNe and broad-lined SNe Ic (SNe Ic-1), and also present the detections of rarely seen coronal lines. The bolometric light curve and modeling results are described in Section 4. Finally, in Section 5 we discuss plausible scenarios that may explain the spectral evolution and luminosity of SN 2017ens. We adopt a cosmology of $H_0 = 72$ km s$^{-1}$ Mpc$^{-1}$, $\Omega_M = 0.73$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.27$. The foreground reddening toward SN 2017ens is $A_V = 0.058$ mag (Schlafly & Finkbeiner 2011), and we assume that host-galaxy extinction is negligible because no Na D absorption is visible in the SN spectrum.

2. Observations

Our photometric coverage of SN 2017ens spans the ultraviolet (UV) with the Ultraviolet and Optical Telescope (UVOT) on the Neil Gehrels Swift Observatory, optical wavelengths with GROND, ATLAS, LCO 1 m,34 and Lulin-SLT,35 and near-infrared (NIR) bands with GROND. We use standard procedures to reduce the data (Poole et al. 2008 for UVOT; Krühler et al. 2008 for GROND). Ground-based optical photometry is calibrated against the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS). For ATLAS magnitudes we apply passband corrections using spectra (prescription from Inserra et al. 2018b); for Super Light Telescope (SLT) data we use the conversion of R. Lupton.36 The NIR magnitudes are calibrated against Two Micron All Sky Survey (2MASS) field stars. All data are reported in the AB system, and errors include the statistical and systematic uncertainties. We do not have host-galaxy templates, but we estimate a <15% contribution from host light (r > 23 mag measured in pre-explosion Panoramic Survey Telescope and Rapid Response System (PanSTARRS) images) to our SN photometry after +150 day. Our photometric results are given in a machine-readable table and shown in Figure 1 (top panel).

We obtained a series of spectra of SN 2017ens, following the SN evolution from +4 day to +265 day (log of observations in Table 1). Spectra are reduced in the standard fashion (ALFOSC GUI pipeline37 for ALFOSC) or using custom-built pipelines Py WiFeS (Childress et al. 2014) for WiFeS, LPipe38 for LRIS, Krühler et al. (2015) for X-Shooter, and Smartt et al. (2015) for EFOSC2. Finally, we correct the spectral-flux calibration against r-band photometry. The resulting calibration error estimated by comparing to g-band photometry is generally <0.10 mag, with the exception of the WiFeS (0.15 mag) and Keck (0.25 mag) spectra. (Those data were taken at very high airmass, making flux calibration difficult.) All spectra will be available through WISeREP (Yaron & Gal-Yam 2012).

3. Analysis and Results

3.1. Light Curves and Comparison

The discovery epoch of SN 2017ens with $M_r \approx -19.8$ mag is at MJD = 57,909.3. ATLAS monitored the field daily for 23 day before discovery. From a deep image taken 3 day before discovery ($M_r \approx -18.7$ mag), we constrain the explosion date of SN 2017ens to MJD = 57,907.8 $\pm$ 1.5; thus, the rest-frame rise time is $\sim$15 day.

Figure 1 (middle panel) shows the absolute g-band light curve, which we compare to SLSNe, SNe IIn, and SNe Ic-BL selected based on the photometric properties and spectral evolution (see Section 3.2) of SN 2017ens. At peak, SN 2017ens is $\sim$10 times more luminous than the SNe Ic-BL 1998bw (Patat et al. 2001), 2003jd (Valenti et al. 2008), and SN Ic 2017dio (Kuncarayakti et al. 2018), which shows narrow H and He emission in its spectra. The early-phase light-curve evolution of SN 2017ens is

---

34 http://lco.global/observatory/sites/
35 http://www.lulin.nctu.edu.tw/ssl67cm/slt_introduction.htm
36 http://classic.sdss.org/dr4/algorithms/sdssUBVRITransform.html
37 http://sngroup.oapd.inaf.it/exceptui.html
38 http://www.astro.caltech.edu/~dperley/programs/lpipe.html
undulations in its light curves, as are often observed in slowly evolving SLSNe as well as SLSNe that exhibit late-time Hα such as iPTF13ehe (Yan et al. 2015) and iPTF15esb (Yan et al. 2017). At late times, the light curves of SN 2017ens remain approximately constant, indicating that strong interaction dominates, as in SN IIn 2010jl before +300 day (Fransson et al. 2014).

### 3.2. Spectroscopic Evolution and Comparison

We show the spectral evolution of SN 2017ens in Figure 2. Around maximum light the spectra are blue and featureless. In the first spectrum taken at +4 day after peak, we detect narrow Hα and Hβ emission lines (barely resolved width of ∼100 km s⁻¹). Fitting the dereddened spectra with a blackbody gives a temperature of $T_{BB} \geq 10,300$ K, consistent with our estimate from the GROND analysis ($\geq 11,500$ K). At ~1 month after peak, some broad features emerge, similar to those seen in SNe Ic-BL after peak brightness (e.g., Patat et al. 2001). Apart from narrow Hα and Hβ, we detect a narrow HeI λ5876 emission line. The commonly observed [O II], [O III], and [N II] host-galaxy emission lines are absent, suggesting that the observed Balmer lines originate from the transient itself, not the underlying host (Perley et al. 2017). We also check the WiFeS datacubes and see no [O III] emission at the SN position.

At late times (>160 day) after the SN emerged from solar conjunction, our data reveal dramatic evolution, with the spectra more resembling those of SNe IIn. The spectra are still blue, but now dominated by prominent, ~2000 km s⁻¹ wide Balmer emission lines, indicative of a much stronger interaction with H-rich CSM. The luminosity and the velocity of the ~2000 km s⁻¹ Hα line does not vary significantly between +163 and +264 day, staying at $3 \times 10^{40}$ erg s⁻¹.

The spectral evolution of SN 2017ens is unique, sharing features with several distinct SN subclasses (Figure 3, top panel). In the earliest phases, the blue and featureless spectra share a similarity with young core-collapse SN spectra. We do not see the O II absorption features commonly associated with SLSNe. However, we may have missed them in SN 2017ens. For example, SLSN 2010gx (Pastorello et al. 2010) displayed O II absorption before it peaked and then became blue and featureless.

As the spectra evolve, SN 2017ens is not well matched to other SLSNe such as LSQ14mo (Chen et al. 2017b) and iPTF15esb (Yan et al. 2017). Rather, it appears to be more similar to SNe Ic-BL. The classification tool GELATO (Harutyunyan et al. 2008) applied to the SN 2017ens +27 day spectrum returns the closest similarity with SN 1998bw at +22 day (Patat et al. 2001) and SN 2003jd at −0.3 day (Modjaz et al. 2014). These two SNe Ic-BL still provide a good match to SN 2017ens when we remove the continua assuming a blackbody (Figure 3, middle panel). SN 2017ens has a somewhat bluer continuum, perhaps due to CSM interaction, as was the case for SN 2017dio at +6 day (Kuncarayakti et al. 2018). The origin of the broad feature around 6530 Å is uncertain; it could be attributed to a blend of Si and Fe/Co lines, Hα associated with interaction, or the C II λ6580 line sometimes seen in SLSNe (e.g., SN 2018bsz; Anderson et al. 2018).

During the late-time strongly interacting phase, the overall spectral features of SN 2017ens are well matched with those of SN 2017dio at +83 day. Both SNe exhibit a blue pseudocontinuum (below ∼5000 Å) that is more significant than in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UT Date</th>
<th>MJD</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Telescope</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Grating/Grism /Arm</th>
<th>Exp. Time</th>
<th>Slit</th>
<th>Resolution</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Jun 24</td>
<td>57928.392</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>ANU 2.3 m</td>
<td>WiFeS(^a)</td>
<td>B3000/R3000</td>
<td>1200/1200</td>
<td>IFU</td>
<td>1.6/2.5</td>
<td>3500–5700/5400–9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Jun 26</td>
<td>57930.356</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>NOT</td>
<td>ALFOSC</td>
<td>Gr#4</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3300–9700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Jul 20</td>
<td>57954.264</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>Keck I</td>
<td>LRIS</td>
<td>B600/R400</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5/6</td>
<td>3200–10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Jul 26</td>
<td>57960.356</td>
<td>32.78</td>
<td>ANU 2.3 m</td>
<td>WiFeS(^a)</td>
<td>B3000/R3000</td>
<td>1200/1200</td>
<td>IFU</td>
<td>1.6/2.5</td>
<td>3500–5700/5400–9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Dec 17</td>
<td>58104.325</td>
<td>162.65</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#13</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3700–9200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 Dec 27</td>
<td>58114.301</td>
<td>171.65</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#11/Gr#16</td>
<td>2700/2700</td>
<td>1.0/1.0</td>
<td>13.8/13.4</td>
<td>3400–7400/6000–9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Jan 14</td>
<td>58132.275</td>
<td>187.86</td>
<td>VLT</td>
<td>X-Shooter</td>
<td>UVB/VIS/NIR</td>
<td>3600/3400/3680</td>
<td>0.9/0.9/1.0</td>
<td>1/1.1/3.3</td>
<td>3000–5560/5450–10,200/10,000–20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Jan 14</td>
<td>58132.312</td>
<td>187.90</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#11</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3400–7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Jan 15</td>
<td>58133.263</td>
<td>188.75</td>
<td>VLT</td>
<td>X-Shooter</td>
<td>UVB/VIS/NIR</td>
<td>7200/6800/7360</td>
<td>0.9/0.9/1.0</td>
<td>1/1.1/3.3</td>
<td>3000–5560/5450–10,200/10,000–20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Jan 15</td>
<td>58133.273</td>
<td>188.76</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#16</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6000–9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Jan 16</td>
<td>58134.268</td>
<td>189.66</td>
<td>VLT</td>
<td>X-Shooter</td>
<td>UVB/VIS/NIR</td>
<td>3600/3400/3680</td>
<td>0.9/0.9/1.0</td>
<td>1/1.1/3.3</td>
<td>3000–5560/5450–10,200/10,000–20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Jan 19</td>
<td>58137.305</td>
<td>192.40</td>
<td>VLT</td>
<td>X-Shooter</td>
<td>UVB/VIS/NIR</td>
<td>3600/3400/3680</td>
<td>0.9/0.9/1.0</td>
<td>1/1.1/3.3</td>
<td>3000–5560/5450–10,200/10,000–20,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Feb 14</td>
<td>58163.277</td>
<td>215.83</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#11</td>
<td>8100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3400–7400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Feb 18</td>
<td>58167.245</td>
<td>219.41</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#16</td>
<td>5400</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>6000–9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 Apr 9</td>
<td>58217.065</td>
<td>264.35</td>
<td>NTT</td>
<td>EFOSC2</td>
<td>Gr#13</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>3650–9200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) WiFeS is an integral field unit (IFU) with 25 slitlets that are 1" wide and 38" long. Resolution is measured from the night-sky lines.
with the same color as in the main panel.

Figure 2. Spectroscopic evolution of SN 2017ens. The right panels show the velocity of the Hα, Hβ, and He I λ5876 lines at selected epochs. Each phase is shown with the same color as in the main panel.

iPTF13eeh at +251 day (Yan et al. 2015); it is likely produced by Fe II lines (Smith et al. 2009).

3.3. Nebular and Coronal Lines

The VLT/X-Shooter spectra around +190 day (Figure 4) provide higher resolution and wider wavelength coverage than our other spectra, enabling us to detect many narrow emission lines. Interestingly, we find that the flux ratio of the nebular [O III] λ4959, 5007 and auroral [O III] λ4363 lines is 0.45, consistent with coronal lines that may arise from X-ray photoionization (Fransson et al. 2002) of dense gas (see Filippenko & Halpern 1984, their Figure 11). Therefore, we conclude that the [O III] λ4363 line comes from the SN, and we use it to constrain the redshift of SN 2017ens to $z = 0.1086$, consistent with the average of the [O II] λ3727 and [O III] λλ4959, 5007 lines.

These narrow coronal lines have been seen in only a handful of SNe IIn and the transitional object SN 2011hw (Pastorello et al. 2015). The ratio [O III] λ4363/[O III] λλ4959, 5007 for SN 2017ens is similar to that seen in SN 2005ip at +173 day (Smith et al. 2009), SN 2006ij at +1542d (Stritzinger et al. 2012), and SN 2010jl at +461 day and +573 day (Fransson et al. 2014). Other coronal lines detected in SN 2017ens are similar to those seen in SN 2010jl (Figure 3, bottom panel): [Fe X] λ6374.5 is strong, as are [Fe XI] λ7891.8, [Ne V] λλ3345.8, 3425.9, [Ca V] λ6086.8, and [Ar X] λ5533.2. The presence of these lines is indicative of a highly ionized and dense CSM, although we do not detect the highest-ionization coronal lines such as [Fe XIV] λ5302.9 and [Ar XIV] λ4412.3, which were seen in SN 2005ip.

The flux ratio of the [O III] λ4363 to λ5007 lines is a function of the CSM density and temperature. Following Fransson et al. (2014), their Figure 26, we use our measured flux ratio, log(λ4363/λ5007) = −0.22, to constrain the CSM electron density to lie between $10^6$ and $10^8$ cm$^{-3}$ for $T_e = 50,000$ to 10,000 K. This density range is consistent with that observed for SN 2010jl.

From our mid-resolution X-Shooter data, we resolve narrow P-Cygni profiles on top of the ~2000 km s$^{-1}$ wide Balmer and Paschen lines. We measure the blueshifted wavelength from the absorption component of the Hγ, Hβ, and Hα P-Cygni profiles, which suggests that the unshocked CSM has a low velocity of ~50 km s$^{-1}$. A similar velocity of ~60 km s$^{-1}$ is obtained from the P-Cygni profile of the He I λ10,830 line. Moreover, we measure the FWHM intensity of the wide components, such as Hα (2500 ± 700 km s$^{-1}$), Hβ (2300 ± 400 km s$^{-1}$), Paγ (2000 ± 200 km s$^{-1}$), and He I λ10,830 (2200 ± 200 km s$^{-1}$). We also detect narrow absorption lines from the Balmer series (no clear emission), spanning He to H33 (3659 Å).

In addition, we see emission from the H II region close to the host-galaxy center (see Figure 4, marked B), as part of a faint galaxy (SDSS J120409.47–015552.4) with $g = 21.92 ± 0.24$ mag ($M_g ≈ −16.5$ mag). These lines have a slightly different redshift ($z = 0.1084$) than SN 2017ens. In particular, the (noisy) detection of the weak auroral [O III] λ4363 line indicates a low host-galaxy metallicity of ~0.04–0.4 Z$_\odot$ using the direct $T_e$-based method.
we instead use the empirical N2 metallicity diagnostic (Pettini & Pagel 2004), we measure $Z = 0.3 \pm 0.2 Z_{\odot}$.

### 4. Bolometric Light Curve and Model Fitting

Using all of our available UV-through-NIR photometry, we built a pseudobolometric light curve for SN 2017ens using the prescription from Inserra et al. (2018b). The results are very similar to those derived when using a blackbody fit, as expected as our photometry covers a large wavelength range.

From a polynomial fit to the bolometric data we obtain $L_{\text{bol}} = (5.86 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{43}$ erg s$^{-1}$ at peak and an integrated energy of $(3.53 \pm 1.42) \times 10^{50}$ erg.

To fit our bolometric light curve, we used a two-component model consisting of a central heating and an interaction component. First, the centrally heated component uses the standard Arnett method (Arnett 1982; Inserra et al. 2013). We tested three
possible central power sources: the nuclear decay of $^{56}\text{Ni}$, the spindown of a magnetar (Kasen & Bildsten 2010), and fallback accretion (Dexter & Kasen 2013; Moriya et al. 2018a). The $^{56}\text{Ni}$ decay and the magnetar spindown light curves are obtained as by Inserna et al. (2013), but the magnetar model takes the gamma-ray opacity from the magnetar into account as by Chen et al. (2015). The fallback accretion power is obtained by assuming a central energy input of $L_{\text{fallback}}(t/1\, \text{s})^{-5/3}$, where $L_{\text{fallback},1}$ is a constant (Dexter & Kasen 2013). Second, for the interaction component, we adopted a steady-wind CSM, and the input luminosity from this component goes as $L_{\text{int}}(t/1\, \text{s})^{-3/5}$ where the outer SN density structure is proportional to $r^{-7}$ (Moriya et al. 2013). The inner SN density structure is assumed to be constant.

We first used the interaction component to fit the bolometric light curve 150 day after explosion, assuming that interaction is the dominant light source at this time. We then derived the contribution required from a central power source at early times to provide a good light-curve match. Given that the spectra of SN 2017ens and SN 1998bw are similar (Figure 3), we used the relation $(E_\gamma/10^{51}\, \text{erg})/(M_\text{ej}/M_\odot) \approx 3$ found for SN 1998bw (Nakamura et al. 2001) to break the degeneracy between $E_\gamma$ and $M_\text{ej}$.

Figure 1 (bottom panel) shows the results of our fits. In all cases, the CSM interaction model that we used has $L_{\text{int},1} = 7.7 \times 10^{46}\, \text{erg}\, \text{s}^{-1}$. The inner edge of the CSM is set at 1.2 $\times 10^{15}\, \text{cm}$ to match the early light-curve rise in the model, but this constraint is not strong. We find that all three centrally heated models provide reasonable fits to the bolometric light curve. They all have $E_\text{ej} = 1.5 \times 10^{52}\, \text{erg}$ and an ejecta mass of $5\, M_\odot$. However, the $^{56}\text{Ni}$-powered light curve requires a very high $^{56}\text{Ni}$ mass of $3.5\, M_\odot$. This is close to the ejecta mass, and we therefore find the $^{56}\text{Ni}$-powered model to be unlikely. Alternatively, a magnetar central engine with an initial spin of 3.8 ms and a magnetic field of $8 \times 10^{13}\, \text{G}$, and fallback accretion with $L_{\text{fallback},1} = 6 \times 10^{53}\, \text{erg}\, \text{s}^{-1}$, provide good qualitative fits to the light curve. It is of course possible that the entire light curve is driven by different degrees of interaction. The contribution of the interaction component at early times (0–70 day after explosion) is $\sim 20\%$, while it is $\geq 90\%$ at late times (200 day).

Assuming the above best-fit results and a kinetic energy to radiation conversion efficiency at the shock of 0.1 (Moriya et al. 2013), we estimate the mass-loss rate of the progenitor to be $5 \times 10^{-4}\, M_\odot\, \text{yr}^{-1}$, with a constant wind velocity of $50\, \text{km}\, \text{s}^{-1}$. The CSM density estimate is similar to those of SNe IIn showing similar coronal lines (Taddia et al. 2013).

5. Discussion

One important clue to interpreting the possible powering mechanisms behind SN 2017ens is that we measured the H-rich material to have a velocity of $\sim 50$–$60\, \text{km}\, \text{s}^{-1}$ from the blueshifted absorption of the narrow P-Cygni profiles. This wind velocity is far slower than those present in Wolf–Rayet star winds. If this wind is from the progenitor, it could come from a massive H-rich progenitor (such as a luminous blue variable) that explosively ejected its H envelope shortly before the SN explosion. Alternatively, this wind could come from a pulsational pair-instability SN with a slow and long-term stable wind (Woosley 2017).

It is also possible that SN 2017ens exploded as a SN Ic-BL inside a patchy, H-rich CSM from a binary companion; the expanding ejecta interact with the bulk of the CSM at later times, as has been suggested for SN 2017dio (Kuncarayakti et al. 2018). Alternatively, as proposed for ASASSN-15no (Benetti et al. 2018), a dense inner CSM may have hidden the SN features at early times, before they become briefly visible as the CSM was swept up by the ejecta. At late times they could have again been masked by an increasingly strong interaction component. A special CSM geometry (e.g., doughnut shape) is also probable, and we see the SN Ic-BL along a certain viewing angle.

In the case of a binary companion, the wind of $\sim 50$–$60\, \text{km}\, \text{s}^{-1}$ and mass-loss rate of $5 \times 10^{-4}\, M_\odot\, \text{yr}^{-1}$ are consistent with a red supergiant (Goldman et al. 2017), albeit at the more extreme end, which can be explained by the companion having gained mass from the SN progenitor during an earlier accretion phase. If so, this may suggest that the progenitor of SN 2017ens lost its H and He layers through interaction with a binary companion.

We must also consider the apparent $\sim 2000\, \text{km}\, \text{s}^{-1}$ material, given its high luminosity. If this is associated with mass loss from the progenitor, and the line width is not from electron scattering as seen in many SNe IIn, then the material is moving much faster than the winds of H-rich stars (or the CSM of SNe IIn). It is difficult to imagine how this could be produced by anything other than a sudden ejection of the H envelope, shortly before the SN explosion. In fact, the luminosity of the $\sim 2000\, \text{km}\, \text{s}^{-1}$ wide component of Hα is comparable to that seen in SN 1995N (Fransson et al. 2002) ($\sim 2.3 \times 10^{46}\, \text{erg}\, \text{s}^{-1}$), and it may be too large to be coming solely from swept-up material. A pulsational pair-instability explosion is at least qualitatively consistent with an outburst that can unbind the H envelope shortly before an SN explosion. This scenario is also consistent with the measured low-metallicity environment.

The unique spectroscopic evolution of SN 2017ens together with its high luminosity poses challenges to all currently known SN scenarios. While detailed modeling can help elucidate the nature of this transient, ongoing surveys for SLSNe such as GREAT will find more such peculiar transients. With a larger sample and high-cadence follow-up spectroscopy, we will be able to further understand the nature of SN 2017ens-like objects and the role of interaction in SLSNe.
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