

Double tidal disruption events or repeating partial tidal disruption events in AT 2020vdq

XUEGUANG ZHANG^{*1}

¹Guangxi Key Laboratory for Relativistic Astrophysics, School of Physical Science and Technology, GuangXi University, No. 100, Daxue Road, Nanning, 530004, P. R. China

Submitted to ApJ

ABSTRACT

AT 2020vdq has been known as a candidate of repeating partial tidal disruption events (pTDEs), due to its two flares with a time interval of ~ 1000 days. Here, a simplified method is proposed to test such repeating pTDEs scenario considering a main-sequence star tidally disrupted twice. For the two flares in AT 2020vdq if related to the repeating pTDEs scenario, theoretical TDE model determined stellar mass of the original star disrupted for the first flare should be not very different from the mass of the star (to trace the reminder of the original star) disrupted for the second flare, because a partial TDE with impact parameter β smaller than 1 can lead to most of (probable higher than 90%) the stellar mass also bound to the reminder of the original star. After considering theoretical TDE model applied to describe the two flares in AT 2020vdq, the model determined stellar masses are about $2M_{\odot}$ and $0.36M_{\odot}$ for the stars disrupted in the first flare and the second flare. The large mass difference cannot be reasonably expected by the repeating pTDEs with β around 0.6 in AT 2020vdq. The results in this manuscript indicate that the repeating pTDEs scenario is not preferred at current stage in AT 2020vdq, but the probable double TDEs for two individual stars tidally disrupted should be currently recommended.

Keywords: galaxies:active - galaxies:nuclei - galaxies:supermassive black holes - transients:tidal disruption events

1. INTRODUCTION

AT 2020vdq (RA=152.22273, DEC=42.71675, at $z = 0.045$) with a re-brightened flare about 1000 days after the first flare has been reported as a preferred candidate of repeating Partial Tidal Disruption Events (pTDEs) as recently discussed in Somalwar et al. (2025), after considering the re-disrupted reminder of the first disruption of a star. Such similar repeating pTDEs with re-brightened features (or repeating flares) have been reported in some known TDE candidates, such as the results in ASASSN-14ko in Payne et al. (2021, 2023), in eRASS1 J045650.3-203750 in Liu et al. (2023, 2024), in AT 2020dbl in Lin et al. (2024), in AT 2021aeuk in Bao et al. (2024); Sun et al. (2025), etc.

As discussed in Guillochon & Ramirez-Ruiz (2013); Goicovic et al. (2019); Law-Smith et al. (2020); Ryu et al. (2020); Sharma et al. (2024), when impact parameter β is smaller than the critical value around 2, a star around a central supermassive black hole (SMBH) should be not fully disrupted, but a reminder will be left out for the re-disruption leading to the expected re-brightened flares, similar as the

results expected by the repeating pTDEs. Furthermore, as more recent detailed discussions in Sharma et al. (2024) (see their Fig. 5), when the β is smaller than 1, the mass of the reminder is only a bit smaller than the stellar mass of the original star tidally disrupted. Therefore, under the repeating pTDEs scenario, especially with small β , once there was a second TDE (for the second flare) related to the reminder of the first TDE, a basic result can be expected that the stellar mass of the reminder should be not apparently smaller than the stellar mass of the disrupted star in the first TDE (for the first flare). This is the starting point of the manuscript.

Moreover, as discussed in Sharma et al. (2024), the reminder of a partially disrupted star can live on the main sequence for much longer than the original star they were disrupted from. Therefore, for the re-brightened flare related to the second TDE, theoretical TDE model can also be efficiently applied by a main-sequence star tidally disrupted by the central SMBH, especially if the time interval is long enough between the two flares. In other words, for two flares related to repeating pTDEs scenario, theoretical TDE model applied to describe them can lead to determined stellar masses of the original star and its reminder. More specially, if the time interval was long enough between the two flares, indicating few effects of the first flare on the following second flare,




Figure 1. Left panels show the best descriptions to the ZTF *gri*-band light curves with different β applied to the two flares. In left panels, panel (a1), (c1) and (e1) show the ZTF *gri*-band light curves (open circles plus error bars in blue) of AT 2020vdq in observer frame, and the corresponding best descriptions (solid red line) by the proposed TDEs model. Panel (b1), (d1) and (f1) show the corresponding residuals calculated by the light curves minus the best descriptions, with horizontal solid red line as residuals to be zero. Right panels show the best descriptions to the ZTF *gri*-band light curves with the same β applied to the two flares. In each right panel, symbols and line styles have the same meanings as those in the left panel.

the theoretical TDE model can be independently applied to determine the stellar masses related to the two flares. Then, the mass comparisons between the original star and the remainder could provide further clues to support or to be against the repeating pTDEs scenario, which is the main objective of the manuscript.

The manuscript is organized as follows. Section 2 gives our main results and necessary discussions on variability properties of AT 2020vdq through the long-term light curves from the Zwicky Transient Facility (ZTF) (Bellm et al. 2019; Dekany et al. 2020), due to its long enough time interval between the two flares in AT 2020vdq. Section 3 presents our main summary and conclusions. Throughout the manuscript, we have adopted the cosmological parameters of $H_0 = 70 \text{ km} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ and $\Omega_m = 0.3$.

2. MAIN RESULTS AND NECESSARY DISCUSSIONS

Detailed descriptions can be found in Somalwar et al. (2025) on the long-term variability properties of the repeating pTDEs candidate AT 2020vdq. In this manuscript, the ZTF *gri*-band light curves of AT 2020vdq are collected and shown in Fig. 1 in observer frame, with apparent first flare around MJD-58000 \sim 1100 and the second flare around MJD-58000 \sim 2100, leading to totally no mixed features between the two flares.

Theoretical TDE model applied to describe the two flares in AT 2020vdq can be simply done as follows. For the first flare described by a standard TDE case, a star with stellar mass $M_{*,1}$ (in units of M_\odot) and stellar radius $R_{*,1}$ (in units of R_\odot) was disrupted by the central SMBH with BH mass M_{BH6} (in units of $10^6 M_\odot$). For the second flare described by one another standard TDE case, one star (to trace the remainder of the disrupted star in the first TDE case) with stellar mass $M_{*,2}$ and stellar radius $R_{*,2}$ was disrupted by the same central SMBH, with the same energy transfer efficiency η and the same polytropic index γ as those applied in the first TDE case.

Similar as what have recently done in Zhang (2025a) to describe the plateau features in optical light curves of the changing-look active galactic nuclei Mrk1018, and also similar as what we have done to describe TDE expected long-term variabilities in Zhang (2023a,b, 2024a,b, 2025b), the procedure to describe the two flares in AT 2020vdq can be applied by the following three steps.

First, accepted the theoretical TDE model (the public codes of MOSFIT/TDEFIT) (Guillochon et al. 2014; Mockler et al. 2019) expected fallback material rate $\dot{M}_{fbt}(\beta, t)$, through the basic mass conservation assumption as described in Mockler et al. (2019), the corresponding physical viscous-delayed accretion rates $\dot{M}_a(t)$ can be determined. Then, for the two TDE cases, their physical accretion rates $\dot{M}_1(t)$ and

$\dot{M}_2(t)$ can be described as

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{M}_1(t) &= \dot{M}_a(M_{BH}, M_{*,1}, T_{vs,1}, \beta_1, t) \\ \dot{M}_2(t) &= \dot{M}_a(M_{BH}, M_{*,2}, T_{vs,2}, \beta_2, t)\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

with different viscous delay time $T_{vs,k}$ ($k = 1, 2$), different impact parameter β_k ($k = 1, 2$), different stellar masses $M_{*,k}$ ($k = 1, 2$) of the two disrupted main-sequence stars. Here, the more recent mass-radius relation in Eker et al. (2018) has been accepted for the main-sequence stars, leading the stellar radius $R_{*,k}$ ($k = 1, 2$) not to be a free model parameter in our procedure.

Second, accepted the blackbody photosphere model described in Mockler et al. (2019), the time dependent output spectrum in rest frame can be estimated as

$$F_\lambda(t) = F_{\lambda,1}(t) + F_{\lambda,2}(t) \quad (2)$$

with $F_{\lambda,1}(t)$ and $F_{\lambda,2}(t)$ as the time dependent output spectrum from the first flare and the second flare. And $F_{\lambda,k}(t)$ ($k = 1, 2$) can be described as

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\lambda,k}(t) &= \frac{2\pi G c^2}{\lambda^5} \frac{1}{\exp(hc/(k\lambda T_{BB,k}(t))) - 1} \left(\frac{R_{BB,k}(t)}{D}\right)^2 \\ R_{BB,k}(t) &= R_{0,k} \times a_p \left(\frac{\epsilon \dot{M}_k(t) c^2}{1.3 \times 10^{38} M_{BH}/M_\odot}\right)^{l_{p,k}} \\ T_{BB,k}(t) &= \left(\frac{\epsilon \dot{M}_k(t)^2}{c} 4\pi \sigma_{SB} R_{BB,k}^2\right)^{1/4} \\ a_{p,k} &= (GM_{BH} \times \left(\frac{t_{p,k}}{\pi}\right)^2)^{1/3}\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

with D as the distance to the earth determined by the redshift z , k as the Boltzmann constant, $T_{BB,k}(t)$ ($k = 1, 2$) and $R_{BB,k}(t)$ ($k = 1, 2$) as the time-dependent effective temperature and radius of the photosphere related to the corresponding TDE cases, respectively, and ϵ as the energy transfer efficiency smaller than 0.4, σ_{SB} as the Stefan-Boltzmann constant, and $t_{p,k}$ ($k = 1, 2$) as time information of the peak accretions of $\dot{M}_k(t)$ ($k = 1, 2$).

Third, based on the expected emission spectrum $F_\lambda(t)$ in observer frame convoluted with the transmission curves of ZTF *gri* filters, the TDE expected time-dependent ZTF *gri*-band magnitudes can be determined as $mag_T(g, r, i)(t)$. Meanwhile, the host galaxy contributions have been determined as $mag_H(g, r, i) = 19.04, 18.51, 18.28$ by the mean magnitudes of the *gri*-band light curves within MJD-58000 from 1500 to 1900, due to no variability during the time duration. Then, the observed time dependent magnitudes $mag_O(g, r, i)(t)$ (the ZTF *gri*-band light curves) can be described by

$$\begin{aligned}A &= -0.4 \times mag_O(g, r, i)(t) \\ B &= -0.4 \times mag_T(g, r, i)(t) \\ C &= -0.4 \times mag_H(g, r, i) \\ 10^A &= 10^B + 10^C\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

Based on the described procedure above, there are 12 free model parameters, the central SMBH mass M_{BH6} , the energy transfer efficiency η , the stellar mass $M_{*,1}$ of the original star for the first TDE, the impact parameter β_1 and the viscous delay time $T_{vs,1}$ and $R_{0,1}$ and $l_{p,1}$ for the first TDE case, the stellar mass $M_{*,2}$ of the second star (to trace the reminder of the original star) for the second TDE, the impact parameter β_2 and the viscous delay time $T_{vs,2}$ and $R_{0,2}$ and $l_{p,2}$ for the second TDE case.

Then, through the maximum likelihood method combining with the Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) technique (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013) applied with the prior uniform distributions of the model parameters as listed in Table 1 (which are similar as the prior distributions in Mockler et al. (2019)), the best fitting results can be determined and shown in the left panels of Fig. 1 to the ZTF *gri*-band light curves of AT 2020vdq, with determined $\chi^2/dof \sim 2389/1264 = 1.89$. The corresponding posterior distributions of the 12 model parameters are shown in Fig. 2, leading to the determined robust model parameters and the corresponding 1σ uncertainties listed in the fourth column of Table 1. Here, the starting values of the model parameters listed in the third column of Table 1 were determined through the Levenberg-Marquardt least-squares minimization technique (the known MPFIT package) (Markwardt 2009).

Based on the determined model parameters, for the first flare in AT 2020vdq, there was a main-sequence star (polytropic index $\gamma = 4/3$) with stellar mass about $2.02M_\odot$ and stellar radius about $2.17R_\odot$ (determined by the mass-radius relation) tidally disrupted by the central SMBH with BH mass $5.4 \times 10^5 M_\odot$, leading to the corresponding tidal disruption radius about $60.8R_G$ (R_G as the Schwarzschild radius of the central SMBH). Meanwhile, for the second flare in AT 2020vdq, there was a main-sequence star (polytropic index $\gamma = 4/3$, same as the one for the star disrupted for the first flare) with stellar mass about $0.36M_\odot$ and stellar radius about $0.30R_\odot$ tidally disrupted by the central SMBH with BH mass $5.4 \times 10^5 M_\odot$, leading to the corresponding tidal disruption radius about $15.1R_G$.

Before proceeding further, simple discussions can be given on the mass of the central SMBH in AT 2020vdq. As discussed in Yao et al. (2023), the BH mass has been estimated to be $3.9^{+3.7}_{-1.9} \times 10^5 M_\odot$ through the M-sigma relation (Kormendy & Ho 2013) applied with the measured stellar velocity dispersion of the host galaxy of AT 2020vdq. The BH mass determined by the M-sigma relation is consistent with the TDE model determined BH mass, providing further clues to support that the theoretical TDE model determined results are reasonable in AT 2020vdq. Meanwhile, for the listed determined model parameters in Table 1, comparing the values with those of the other reported optical TDEs, such as the

Table 1. Basic information of model parameters

par	range	value0	value1	value2
M_{BH6}	$[10^{-3}, 10^3]$	0.55	$0.543^{+0.009}_{-0.004}$	$0.198^{+0.007}_{-0.003}$
η	$[10^{-3}, 0.4]$	0.29	$0.286^{+0.002}_{-0.002}$	$0.257^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$
$M_{*,1}$	$[10^{-3}, 50]$	2.03	$2.021^{+0.012}_{-0.007}$	$1.501^{+0.011}_{-0.005}$
$M_{*,2}$	$[10^{-3}, 50]$	0.36	$0.359^{+0.004}_{-0.003}$	$0.580^{+0.005}_{-0.003}$
β_1	$[0.6, 4]$	0.60	$0.603^{+0.003}_{-0.001}$	$0.629^{+0.003}_{-0.002}$
β_2	$[0.6, 4]$	0.67	$0.667^{+0.001}_{-0.002}$	$= 0.629$
$T_{vs,1}$	$[10^{-3}, 3000]$	7.28	$7.332^{+0.086}_{-0.055}$	$17.470^{+0.017}_{-0.013}$
$T_{vs,2}$	$[10^{-3}, 3000]$	9.16	$9.168^{+0.132}_{-0.171}$	$10.076^{+0.014}_{-0.011}$
$R_{0,1}$	$[10^{-4}, 10^4]$	3.15	$3.162^{+0.029}_{-0.015}$	$0.763^{+0.009}_{-0.009}$
$R_{0,2}$	$[10^{-4}, 10^4]$	0.28	$0.281^{+0.002}_{-0.003}$	$0.604^{+0.010}_{-0.008}$
$l_{p,1}$	$[0, 4]$	0.92	$0.927^{+0.016}_{-0.009}$	$0.925^{+0.013}_{-0.011}$
$l_{p,2}$	$[0, 4]$	0.70	$0.696^{+0.007}_{-0.007}$	$0.007^{+0.017}_{-0.013}$

Note: The first column shows the name of the model parameter. Among the model parameters, the M_{BH6} is in units of $10^6 M_\odot$, the $M_{*,1}$ and $M_{*,2}$ are in units of M_\odot , the $T_{vs,1}$ and $T_{vs,2}$ are in units of days. The second column shows the limited range of the prior uniform distribution of the model parameter. The third column shows the starting value of the model parameter. The fourth column shows the MCMC determined accepted value of the model parameter and the corresponding 1σ uncertainties through the applications of TDE model with β as random parameters for the two flares. The final column shows the determined value of the model parameter and the corresponding 1σ uncertainties through applications of TDE model with the same β for the two flares.

ones listed in Mockler et al. (2019), the values for the model parameters of the two flares in AT 2020vdq are common.

Based on the fitting procedure to describe the flares in AT 2020vdq, the time dependent evolution of physical accretion rates $\dot{M}_i(t)$ ($i = 1, 2$) can be determined and shown in Fig. 3. We can estimate that the total accreted mass is about $1.3 \times 10^{-4} M_\odot$ (corresponding total energy about 6.5×10^{49} ergs) in the first flare through the determined $\dot{M}_1(t)$ and the energy transfer efficiency η . In other words, about 99.99% of the total stellar mass of the original star has been restored into the reminder in the first flare in AT 2020vdq. Considering the discussed results in Sharma et al. (2024), for a main-sequence star with stellar mass about $2M_\odot$ tidally disrupted with $\beta \sim 0.6$, the mass ratio of the reminder to the original star should be higher than 90% (almost near to 100%), simply consistent with the determined result in AT 2020vdq.

After considering the determined mass of the reminder of the disrupted original star in the first flare, it will be expected that the reminder with stellar mass about $2M_\odot$ ($2.02M_\odot - 1.3 \times 10^{-4} M_\odot$) should be tidally disrupted for the second flare in AT 2020vdq. Unfortunately, based on the determined model parameters, the stellar mass of the star is about $0.36M_\odot$ for




Figure 2. The posterior distributions of the model parameters. In each panel, the vertical solid red line marks the position of the accepted value of the model parameter, the horizontal solid red line marks the full width at half maximum which has been accepted to determine the lower and upper boundaries of the corresponding 1σ uncertainties of the model parameter.




Figure 3. Time dependent evolution of the physical accretion rates in AT 2020vdtq. Solid line in blue and in red show the corresponding results for the first TDE and the second TDE, respectively.

the second flare, which is about 5.6 times smaller than the expected mass of $2M_{\odot}$.

Besides the accreted mass in the first flare, some unbound materials should be not bound to the central SMBH nor bound to the reminder of the original star, leading to the unbound materials falling into the surrounding environments. If it was




Figure 4. The color between ZTF g-band and r-band, after subtractions of host galaxy contributions in AT 2020vdtq. Horizontal red lines show the color equal to zero and the corresponding 1RMS standard deviations.

the case to explain the determined mass difference above, there should be about $2M_{\odot} - 0.36M_{\odot} = 1.64M_{\odot}$ materials surrounding the central region, which probably lead to apparent obscuration. However, after removing the host galaxy contributions, checking the color between ZTF g-band and r-band, there are no clues for any obscuration on central flare, as

shown in Fig. 4. Therefore, even considering unbound materials, it is hard to explain the mass difference between the reminder expected by the first TDE case and the star expected by the second TDE case in AT 2020vdq.

Based on the discussed results above, rather than the repeating pTDEs scenario, the double TDEs (including two individual TDEs) scenario as discussed in Mandel & Levin (2015); Zhang (2025a) should be preferred in AT 2020vdq, after considering a binary star system tidally disrupted. A binary star system includes the primary star with stellar mass about $2.02M_{\odot}$ and the secondary star with stellar mass about $0.36M_{\odot}$. When the binary star system was wandering around the central SMBH in AT 2020vdq, followed the primary star partially tidally disrupted, then the secondary star was tidally disrupted.

Furthermore, for the second flare in AT 2020vdq, the total accreted mass is about $1.9 \times 10^{-4}M_{\odot}$ (corresponding total energy about 9.6×10^{49} ergs) through the shown $\dot{M}_2(t)$ (solid red line) in Fig. 3. Therefore, under the repeating pTDEs scenario, it will be necessary to check properties of the next flare in AT 2020vdq. If the next flare in AT 2020vdq can lead the mass of the partially disrupted star to be still around $0.36M_{\odot}$, the repeating pTDEs scenario should be strongly supported in AT 2020vdq. And the mass difference discussed in the manuscript should be governed by unclear mechanisms. Meanwhile, as discussed in the known repeating pTDEs candidate in ASASSN-14ko (Payne et al. 2021, 2023), if such similar repeating pTDEs could be efficient in AT 2020vdq, periodic flares could be expected in AT 2020vdq. Once the time interval about 1001 days between the peaks of the two flares could be simply accepted as the periodicity of expected periodic flares related to repeating pTDEs scenario in AT 2020vdq, the next flare in AT 2020vdq could be expected on February 11, 2026. In one word, to test the expected flare after several months and its related physical properties could provide direct evidence to support or to be against the repeating pTDEs scenario in AT 2020vdq.

Before ending the section, four additional points should be noted. First, as shown in Payne et al. (2021, 2023) for the repeating pTDEs candidate ASASSN-14ko, the repeating flares have almost similar variability profiles, such as the shown stacked phase-folded light curves in Figure 5 in Payne et al. (2021) and in Figure 3 in Payne et al. (2023). However, as shown in Fig. 1 for AT 2020vdq, the two flares have very different variability profiles, such as the very different peak intensities and very different time durations of the two flares, which could be accepted as indirect evidence to probably support that the repeating flares in AT 2020vdq should have some different physical origin for the repeating flares in the ASASSN-14ko. Further study on similarity of the variability profiles of repeating pTDEs is being prepared and should be reported in the near future.

Second, there are no discussions on detection rates for double TDEs or repeating pTDEs in this manuscript. In other words, we do not support or to be against the repeating pTDEs scenario by expected detection rates, but to check such repeating pTDEs scenario by stellar mass comparisons between the original star and the reminder through applications of two individual TDEs cases to describe the variability of the two flares, especially due to time interval between the two flares longer enough to apply two theoretical TDE cases in AT 2020vdq.

Third, considering repeating pTDEs expected totally similar β for the tidally star in the first flare and the second flare, besides the TDE model determined results above shown in the left panels of Fig. 1, procedure above with the same β for the two flares have been applied. The determined results are shown in the right panels of Fig. 1 with determined $\chi^2/dof \sim 3664/1265 = 2.90$, and the determined values and corresponding uncertainties of the model parameters are listed in the last column of Table 1. The very different masses, $1.50M_{\odot}$ and $0.58M_{\odot}$, between the tidally disrupted stars for the two flares (corresponding β to be 0.629 smaller than 1) can be re-confirmed, indicating the repeating pTDEs scenario probably not preferred at current stage. Meanwhile, similar as what we have recently done in Zhang (2022, 2023c, 2024c), through the F-test technique applied with the different χ^2 and dof for the procedures with different β , the results related to the procedure with different β for the two flares shown in the left panels of Fig. 1 are preferred with confidence level higher than 10σ . Therefore, there are not further discussions any more on the results related to the procedure with the same β applied to the two flares.

Fourth, we should note that the discussed results above are mainly through the physical process described by theoretical TDE model (MOSFIT/TDEFIT). Once the intrinsic physical process for the two flares in AT 2020vdq were very different from the process described by the MOSFIT/TDEFIT, the discussed results should not have deeply physical meanings. However, the best fitting results shown in Fig. 1 indicate that the physical process described by MOSFIT/TDEFIT can be accepted as a preferred process at current stage to describe the two flares in AT 2020vdq, unless there were stable evidence to rule out the MOSFIT/TDEFIT described procedure to describe the flares in AT 2020vdq. Furthermore, in the process above, distortions of the outer layers of the reminder are not considered. Here, effects of the distortions can be simply discussed as follows. The distortions can lead to probably steeper dependence $R_* \propto M_*^{1/\alpha}$ ($\alpha > 1$) (same stellar mass leading to larger stellar radius) of stellar radius on stellar mass than the common dependence $R_* \propto M_*^{-1}$ for main-sequence stars. Considering the dependence of accretion rate on stellar parameters $\dot{M} \propto M_*^2 R_*^{-3/2}$ as shown in equation (4) in Mockler et al. (2019), for common main-sequence stars,

the accretion rate can be simply estimated as $\dot{M}_0 \propto M_*^{-1/2}$. However, considering distortions of the outer layers of the reminder should lead to $\dot{M}_1 \propto M_*^{2-\frac{3}{2\alpha}}$ which is larger than \dot{M}_0 , indicating smaller stellar mass can lead to similar accretion rate. Therefore, considering distortions of the outer layers of the reminder should indicate smaller stellar mass of the reminder disrupted for the second flare in AT 2020vdq, leading to larger stellar mass difference between the original star and the reminder, to further confirm the mass difference.

3. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Our summary and main conclusions are as follows.

- A simple method is proposed in this manuscript to check the repeating pTDEs scenario for a main-sequence star tidally disrupted twice in the known AT 2020vdq of which light curves have re-brightened flares.
- Under the repeating pTDEs scenario, the determined stellar masses for the two flares in turn should be not very different, due to the very low mass loss of the original star disrupted in the first flare, especially for smaller impact parameter.
- considering the long enough time interval between the two flares in AT 2020vdq, the applications of two individual TDEs to describe the two flares, the stellar mass of the disrupted star in the first TDE case is about 5.5 times larger than the mass of the disrupted star in the second TDE case.
- Based on the determined model parameters, the total accreted stellar masses are around $10^{-3} \sim 10^{-4} M_\odot$ in the two TDE cases for the two flares in AT 2020vdq.

- The large mass difference cannot be reasonably expected by partially disrupted cases with impact parameter β around 0.6, even after considering probable unbound materials falling into surroundings.

- Therefore, at current stage, rather than the repeating pTDEs scenario for a main-sequence star tidally disrupted twice, the double TDEs with two stars in a binary star system tidally disrupted should be preferred in AT 2020vdq.

- If the repeating pTDEs scenario was intrinsically preferred in AT 2020vdq, the next flare should be expected on February 11, 2026. After only several months, there should be clear clues to support or to rule out the repeating pTDEs scenario in AT 2020vdq.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Zhang gratefully acknowledge the anonymous referee for giving us constructive comments and suggestions to greatly improve the paper. Zhang gratefully thanks the grant support from Guangxi University and the grant support from NSFC-12173020 and NSFC-12373014 and the support from Guangxi Talent Programme (Highland of Innovation Talents). The manuscript has made use of the data from the ZTF (<https://www.ztf.caltech.edu/>). The paper has made use of the code of TDEFIT/MOSFIT (<https://mosfit.readthedocs.io/>) and of the emcee (<https://emcee.readthedocs.io/>) and of the MPFIT (<https://pages.physics.wisc.edu/~craigm/idl/cmpfit.html>).

REFERENCES

- Bao, D. W., Guo, W. J., Zhang, Z. X.; et al. 2024, *ApJ*, 977, 279
- Bellm, E. C., Kulkarni, S. R., Barlow, T.; et al., 2019, *PASP*, 131, 068003
- Dekany, R., Smith, R. M., Riddle, R.; et al., 2020, *PASP*, 132, 038001
- Eker, Z., Bakis, V., Bilir, S.; et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 5491
- Foreman-Mackey, D., Hogg, D. W., Lang, D., Goodman, J., 2013, *PASP*, 125, 306
- Goicovic, F. G.; Springel, V.; Ohlmann, S. T.; Pakmor, R., 2019, *MNRAS*, 487, 981
- Guillochon, J.; Ramirez-Ruiz, E., 2013, *ApJ*, 767, 25
- Guillochon, J., Manukian, H., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., 2014, *ApJ*, 783, 23
- Kormendy, J., Ho, L. C. 2013, *ARA&A*, 51, 511
- Law-Smith, J. A. P.; Coulter, D. A.; Guillochon, J.; Mockler, B.; Ramirez-Ruiz, E., 2020, *ApJ*, 905, 141
- Lin, Z., Jiang, N., Wang, T.; et al. 2024, *ApJL*, 971, L26
- Liu, Z.; Malyali, A.; Krumpe, M.; et al. 2023, *A&A*, 669, A75
- Liu, Z.; Ryu, T.; Goodwin, A. J.; et al. 2024, *A&A*, 683, L13
- Mandel, I.; Levin, Y., 2015, *ApJL*, 805, L4
- Markwardt, C. B., 2009, *ASPC*, 411, 251
- Mockler, B.; Guillochon, J.; Ramirez-Ruiz, E., 2019, *ApJ*, 872, 151
- Payne, A. V.; Shappee, B. J.; Hinkle, J. T.; et al., 2021, *ApJ*, 910, 125
- Payne, A. V.; Auchettl, K.; Shappee, B. J.; et al. 2023, *ApJ*, 951, 134
- Ryu, T.; Krolik, J.; Piran, T.; Noble, S. C., 2020, *ApJ*, 904, 100
- Sharma, M.; Price, D. J.; Heger, A., 2024, *MNRAS*,
- Somalwar, J. J.; Ravi, V.; Yao, Y.; et al., 2025, *ApJ*, 985, 175
- Sun, J.; Guo, H.; Gu, M.; et al. 2025, *ApJ*, 982, 150
- Yao, Y.; Ravi, V.; Gezari, S.; et al. 2023, *ApJL*, 955, L6

Zhang, X. G., 2022, ApJ, 937, 105, arXiv:2209.02164

Zhang, X. G., 2023a, MNRAS, 526, 6015, arXiv:2310.07095

Zhang, X. G., 2023b, ApJ, 948, 68, arXiv:2303.02289

Zhang, X. G., 2023c, MNRAS, 526, 1588, arXiv:2309.08078

Zhang, X. G., 2024a, MNRAS Letters, 529, 169, arXiv:2402.04861

Zhang, X. G., 2024b, MNRAS Letters, 534, 23, arXiv:2407.20616

Zhang, X. G., 2024c, ApJ, 961, 82, arXiv:2311.05138

Zhang, X. G., 2025a, MNRAS Letters, 542, L149,
ArXiv:2507.14428

Zhang, X. G., 2025b, ApJ, 981, 90, ArXiv:2501.16585