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...subsequent star formation episodes is sometimes questioned... stars, and those with modiﬁed chemistry as second-generation (SG) stars, and those with modiﬁed chemistry as second-generation (SG) stars, although the assumption that they are formed in a previous generation of more massive stars, as asymptotic giant branch (AGB) stars (Ventura & D’Antona 2005), fast-rotating massive stars (Decressin et al. 2007), interacting massive binary stars (De Mink et al. 2009), and/or supermassive stars (Denissenkov & Hartwick 2014). Objects with standard composition are commonly denoted as ﬁrst-generation (FG) stars, and those with modiﬁed chemistry as second-generation (SG) stars, although the assumption that they are formed in subsequent star formation episodes is sometimes questioned (see, e.g., Bastian et al. 2013).

In a few GCs the SG/FG star ratio measured along the red giant branch (RGB) is observed to differ from that measured along the AGB, with a substantial deﬁciency of SG stars within the AGB population, compared to the RGB (Norris et al. 1981; Gratton et al. 2010b; Campbell et al. 2012, 2013; Johnson et al. 2015; Lapenna et al. 2015; MacLean et al. 2016). In principle, this can be explained by taking into account that stars with evolving masses below 0.55M⊙ are expected to fail reaching the AGB phase (the so-called AGB-manqué stars; see, e.g., Greggio & Renzini 1990) and SG stars are indeed expected to have a lower mass along the HB than FG stars. In fact, since they are typically He-enhanced, they originate from RGB stars with a lower mass and end up, on average, with a lower mass along the HB, if the RGB mass loss is approximately the same for FG and SG sub-populations (see, e.g., Cassisi & Salaris 2013). One therefore expects that the AGB of GCs with a blue HB should lack at least part of the SG component, compared to what is seen along the RGB. This is consistent with the ﬁndings of Gratton et al. (2010b), who empirically showed that the number ratio between AGB and HB stars (the R2 parameter) correlates with the HB morphology, in the sense that clusters with the bluest HB morphology have lower R2 values.

NGC 6752 is a metal-intermediate GC with an extreme blue HB morphology and a low R2 value, and it is claimed to be the most extreme case of a GC lacking SG stars along the AGB. In fact, Campbell et al. (2013, hereafter C13) measured the Na abundance of 20 AGB stars in this cluster and from the derived [Na/Fe] distribution; they concluded that all objects belong to the FG population. In their interpretation, the SG stars fail to reach the AGB phase because their HB progenitors are all located at effective temperatures (Teff) hotter than the Grundahl Jump (at ∼11,500 K) and experience a very strong mass loss (a factor of 20 larger than that suffered along the RGB). An alternative solution has been proposed by Charbonnel et al. (2013), who argued that the lack of SG AGB stars can be explained within the fast-rotating massive stars scenario by...
assuming very high He abundances (up to $Y \sim 0.7$) for the SG objects, that therefore become AGB-mangue stars. On the other hand, by using detailed synthetic HB simulations, Cassisi et al. (2014) were able to reproduce the star distribution along the HB of NGC 6752 and its observed $R_2$ value assuming the initial He-abundance distribution derived from the cluster main sequence ($Y$' between $0.25$ and $0.27$; see Milone et al. 2013) without invoking any extreme HB mass loss or initial He enhancement. However, these simulations show that $\sim 50\%$ of the AGB population should be composed of SG stars, at odds with the claim by C13.

With the aim of solving this intriguing issue, here we present the chemical abundances of iron and several light elements that we recently determined from high-resolution spectra for the same sample of AGB stars discussed in C13.

2. OBSERVATIONS

The 20 AGB stars in NGC 6752 previously studied by C13 have been re-observed (program 095.D-0320(A), PI: Mucciarelli) with the UVES spectrograph (Dekker et al. 2000) mounted at the ESO-Very Large Telescope. We used the Dichroic1 mode adopting the gratings 390 Blue Arm CD#2 and 580 Red Arm CD#3 with the 1 arcsec slit ($R = 40,000$). Exposure times range from $\sim 10$ minutes for the brightest targets to $\sim 25$ minutes for the faintest ones to obtain pixel signal-to-noise ratios higher than 100. The data reduction was performed by using the dedicated ESO pipeline, including bias subtraction, flat fielding, wavelength calibration, spectral extraction, and order merging.

3. CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

The chemical analysis has been performed following the same procedure described in Lapenna et al. (2015). The stellar atmospheric parameters have been derived as follows:

1. $T_{\text{eff}}$ have been derived spectroscopically by requiring no trend between iron abundances and excitation potentials.
2. Surface gravities ($\log g$) have been obtained through the Stefan–Boltzmann relation, adopting the spectroscopic $T_{\text{eff}}$, the distance modulus ($m - M_0 = 13.13$ and color excess $E(B - V) = 0.04$ (Ferraro et al. 1999), and a mass of 0.61 $M_\odot$, according to the median value of the HB mass range estimated by Gratton et al. (2010a). Stellar luminosities have been calculated using the bolometric corrections by Alonso et al. (1999) and the V-band magnitudes from the ground-based photometric catalog reduced and calibrated following the procedures described in Stetson (2000, 2005).
3. Microturbulent velocities ($v_t$) have been obtained by requiring no trend between iron abundances and line strengths.

The derived values of $T_{\text{eff}}$ and $v_t$ agree well with those by C13, with average differences $\Delta T_{\text{eff}} = +31 \pm 8$ K and $\Delta v_t = -0.03 \pm 0.01$ km s$^{-1}$. For $\log g$ there is a systematic difference $\Delta \log g = +0.220 \pm 0.005$ dex, probably due to the different distance modulus and the larger stellar mass adopted by C13.

The abundances of Fe, Na, Mg, and Al have been derived using the classical method of the equivalent widths (EWs) with the package GALA (Mucciarelli et al. 2013b). EWs have been measured by means of the DAOSPEC package (Stetson & Pancino 2008), iteratively launched with the code 4DAO (Mucciarelli 2013). The line list was built using a synthetic reference spectrum calculated at the UVES resolution and selecting only transitions predicted to be unblended. We adopted the atomic data of the last release of the Kurucz/Castelli compilation for all species except for Fe II, which have been taken from Meléndez & Barbuy (2009). The adopted model atmospheres have been computed with the ATLAS9 code adopting a global metallicity of [M/H] = $-1.5$ dex. The abundances of Na have been corrected for NLTE effects according to Gratton et al. (1999) and consistently with the analysis of C13. For seven stars the Al lines at 6696–6698 Å are too weak to be detected and only upper limits can be obtained.

The abundances of C, N, and O have been measured through the spectral synthesis technique, using the forbidden oxygen line at 6300 Å, and the CH and CN molecular bands at 4300 and 3880 Å, respectively. To derive the abundance of N we have taken into account the abundance of carbon measured from the CH band, while for the O abundance we adopted the average C and N abundances thus obtained, together with the measured abundance of Ni. This was done to take into account the close blending of the O line at 6300 Å with a Ni transition. We also checked that the O transition is free from telluric contamination in 19 out of 20 AGB stars. For the star 1620 the contamination is severe and we did not derive the O abundance.

As reference solar abundances, we assumed those of Grevesse & Sauval (1998), except for C, N, and O, for which we assumed the values of Castelli et al. (2011).

The computation of the final abundance uncertainties adds in quadrature two terms. The first is the error arising from spectral feature measurements. For the abundances derived from EWs, this term is obtained for each star by dividing the line-to-line dispersion by the square root of the number of lines used. For the elements analyzed with spectral synthesis, the fitting procedure is repeated for a sample of 500 synthetic spectra where Poissonian noise has been injected to reproduce the noise conditions (see Mucciarelli et al. 2013a). The second term is the abundance error arising from atmospheric parameters. This has been computed by varying each parameter by its $1 \sigma$ uncertainty obtained in the analysis. Due to the quality of the spectra we found that the typical internal uncertainties for $T_{\text{eff}}$ are lower than $\sim 35$ K, while for $\log g$ and $v_t$ we found values lower than 0.1 dex and 0.05 km s$^{-1}$, respectively.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Iron Abundances

The derived iron abundance ratios are listed in Table 1 together with the stellar atmospheric parameters. We obtain average $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -1.80 \pm 0.01$ dex ($\sigma = 0.05$ dex) and

---

9 Cassisi et al. (2014) derived a slightly lower ($\sim 0.55$ $M_\odot$) median mass. The adoption of this value decreases $\log g$ by $-0.04$, with a negligible impact on the abundances, $\sim 0.02$ for [Fe/H] and smaller than 0.01 dex for the other species.

10 http://www.cosmic-lab.eu/gala/gala.php

11 http://www.cosmic-lab.eu/4dao/4dao.php

12 http://wwwuser.oats.inaf.it/castelli/linelist.html

13 http://wwwuser.oats.inaf.it/castelli/sources/atlas9codes.html
### Table 1
Atmospheric Parameters and Abundance Ratios of the Analyzed AGB Stars in NGC 6752

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>$T_{\text{eff}}$ (K)</th>
<th>log g (dex)</th>
<th>$v_\text{t}$ (km s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>[Fe i/H] (dex)</th>
<th>[Fe ii/H] (dex)</th>
<th>[C/Fe] (dex)</th>
<th>[N/Fe] (dex)</th>
<th>[O/Fe ii] (dex)</th>
<th>[Na/Fe] (dex)</th>
<th>[Mg/Fe] (dex)</th>
<th>[Al/Fe] (dex)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4554</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-1.77 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.61 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.29 ± 0.07</td>
<td>+1.20 ± 0.12</td>
<td>+0.41 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.29 ± 0.04</td>
<td>+0.37 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.52 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4351</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-1.79 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.60 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.25 ± 0.06</td>
<td>+0.68 ± 0.12</td>
<td>+0.54 ± 0.06</td>
<td>-0.00 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.44 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.20 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4413</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-1.76 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.56 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.17 ± 0.07</td>
<td>+0.76 ± 0.12</td>
<td>+0.53 ± 0.04</td>
<td>-0.03 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.43 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>4585</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.79 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.17 ± 0.07</td>
<td>+0.73 ± 0.12</td>
<td>+0.49 ± 0.05</td>
<td>-0.01 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.40 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.20 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>4752</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.81 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.61 ± 0.02</td>
<td>-0.19 ± 0.08</td>
<td>+0.99 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.44 ± 0.04</td>
<td>+0.14 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.41 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.40 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>4712</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.78 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.59 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.34 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.29 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.23 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.22 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.34 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>4724</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.81 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.34 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.29 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.21 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.25 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.34 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>4690</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.68 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.55 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.09 ± 07</td>
<td>+0.72 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.56 ± 0.05</td>
<td>-0.10 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.36 ± 0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>4722</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.77 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.19 ± 08</td>
<td>+0.99 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.44 ± 0.05</td>
<td>+0.17 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.42 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.36 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>4622</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-1.81 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.59 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.41 ± 07</td>
<td>+1.32 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.21 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.35 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.40 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.52 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>4724</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.84 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.59 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.10 ± 08</td>
<td>+0.68 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.48 ± 0.03</td>
<td>-0.05 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>4862</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.84 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.61 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.42 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.30 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.25 ± 0.05</td>
<td>+0.30 ± 0.04</td>
<td>+0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.54 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>4877</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>-1.82 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.46 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.40 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.16 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.32 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.53 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.80 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.18 ± 08</td>
<td>+0.91 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.39 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.05 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.43 ± 0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>4817</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-1.85 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.59 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.16 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.08 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.19 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.36 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.33 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>4798</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.86 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.34 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.15 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.28 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.30 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.01</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>4864</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-1.88 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.56 ± 0.02</td>
<td>-0.37 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.26 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.17 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.24 ± 0.04</td>
<td>+0.39 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.20 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>4884</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.89 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.33 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.14 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.22 ± 0.06</td>
<td>+0.25 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.40 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.15 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>4753</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-1.87 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.54 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.16 ± 08</td>
<td>+0.73 ± 0.13</td>
<td>+0.40 ± 0.07</td>
<td>+0.01 ± 0.03</td>
<td>+0.42 ± 0.01</td>
<td>&lt;0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620</td>
<td>4902</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-1.80 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-1.56 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.26 ± 08</td>
<td>+1.19 ± 0.14</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>+0.23 ± 0.01</td>
<td>+0.38 ± 0.02</td>
<td>+0.18 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Identification number (from C13), $T_{\text{eff}}$, log g, $v_\text{t}$, and abundance ratios for Fe i, Fe ii, C, N, O, Na, Mg, and Al.
[Fe II]/H = −1.58 ± 0.01 dex (σ = 0.02 dex). The average [Fe II]/H abundance is consistent with the values measured in RGB stars by Yong et al. (2003), Gratton et al. (2005), and Carretta et al. (2007, 2009a), while [Fe I]/H is 0.22 dex lower than the metallicity inferred from Fe II lines. Such a discrepancy between [Fe I]/H and [Fe II]/H among AGB stars is too large to be explained within internal uncertainties and has been observed previously in other GCs (Ivans et al. 2001; Lapenna et al. 2014, 2015; Mucciarelli et al. 2015a, 2015b). The same [Fe I]/H–[Fe II]/H discrepancy remains also if we adopt the atmospheric parameters quoted in C13. Note that C13 do not measure directly the Fe abundance, but assume the average RGB [Fe/H] by Carretta et al. (2007) for all the targets. With their atmospheric parameters we derive [Fe I]/H = −1.77 ± 0.01 dex (σ = 0.05 dex) and [Fe II]/H = −1.50 ± 0.01 dex (σ = 0.02 dex). Even if a complete explanation of this effect is still lacking, this iron discrepancy seems to be a general feature of AGB stars in GCs.

4.2. Light Elements

Significant inhomogeneities in the light element abundances of the studied AGB stars are immediately apparent already from the visual inspection of the acquired spectra. This can be appreciated in Figure 1, where the CH and CN molecular bands, and O, Na, Mg, and Al lines of star 44 and star 65 (having very similar atmospheric parameters; see Table 1) are compared. Apart from Mg, notable differences in the line strength are well visible for all the other elements. Moreover, the strength of the C and O features appears to anticorrelate with the strength of the N and Na lines. This clearly shows that the two stars are highly inhomogeneous in their light element content.

The abundance ratios obtained for the entire AGB sample are listed in Table 1. Following the approach discussed in Ivans et al. (2001) and Lapenna et al. (2015), the abundance ratios have been computed by adopting [Fe I]/H as the reference except for O, for which we used [Fe II]/H. This method provides the best agreement between the abundance ratios in AGB and RGB stars of the same cluster. However, because the origin of the Fe I–Fe II discrepancy is still unclear, we will discuss the abundances of AGB stars with respect to both hydrogen and iron to ensure that our results are independent of the adopted normalization of the abundance ratios. With the only exception of Mg, for which we find values confined within a narrow range, the abundances of all the other light elements show dispersions well exceeding the internal errors (see

![Figure 1](image-url)
This is true not only for the abundance ratios referred to iron, but it also holds for normalizations to hydrogen. In particular, the measured sodium abundances span a range of $\Delta [\text{Na}/\text{Fe}]_{D} = [\text{Na}/\text{H}]_{D} - 0.45$, for nitrogen we find $\Delta [\text{N}/\text{Fe}]_{D} = [\text{N}/\text{H}]_{D} - 0.8$, and for oxygen we obtain $\Delta [\text{O}/\text{Fe}]_{D} = [\text{O}/\text{H}]_{D} - 0.4$.

The detected inhomogeneities also appear to be mutually correlated. In fact, Figure 2 shows clear C–N and O–Na anticorrelations, and N–Na and Na–Al correlations, both if we consider the abundance ratios referred to Fe and if we normalize to H. In all cases, the statistical significance, as measured by the Spearman rank coefficients $|\rho|$, is very high (values of $|\rho|$ larger than 0.74 corresponds to non-correlation probabilities lower than $10^{-4}$). In these diagrams, star 44 and star 65 (see Figure 1) reside at two opposite ends, the former being C- and O-rich and N-, Na-, Al-poor, while star 65 shows a specular pattern. The existence of such well-defined correlations, by itself, indicates the presence of multiple sub-populations along the AGB of NGC 6752. By definition, in fact, a sample composed exclusively of FG stars (as suggested by C13) would display homogeneous abundances and produce no correlations. Indeed, the detected correlations are perfectly in agreement with those commonly ascribed to FG and SG sub-populations in GCs (see, e.g., Carretta et al. 2009a, 2009b).

5. DISCUSSION

Figure 3 shows the AGB population (solid blue circles) of NGC 6752 in the “standard” [Na/Fe]–[O/Fe] plane. For reference, we also plot the results obtained for the RGB population of NGC 6752 (empty red squares; from Yong et al. 2003) and several RGB samples in 19 GCs (gray dots; from Carretta et al. 2009b). The AGB population of NGC 6752 clearly outlines and follows the anti-correlation stream defined by the RGB samples, thus confirming the existence of SG AGB stars in NGC 6752. To better characterize the cluster sub-populations, in Figure 3 we also plot three ellipses corresponding to the values of [Na/Fe] and [O/Fe] that Milone et al. (2013), on the basis of their photometric study and the chemical abundances measured by Yong et al. (2003), associate to the FG, SG, and extreme-SG sub-samples in NGC 6752.

We also note that C13 adopted a constant iron abundance for the entire sample. This can be dangerous in the case of AGB stars that suffer from the still unclear problem affecting the measure of neutral elemental abundances (see Ivans et al. 2001; Lapenna et al. 2014, 2015; Mucciarelli et al. 2015a, 2015b).
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