

# Effects of Input Nuclear Physics on Core Collapse Supernova Simulations




Brandon Barker<sup>1</sup>, Theo Cooper<sup>2</sup>, Mike Pajkos<sup>3</sup>, Jenn Ranta<sup>3</sup>, MacKenzie Warren<sup>3</sup>, Sean Couch<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Tennessee, <sup>2</sup>Johns Hopkins University, <sup>3</sup>Michigan State University



## Motivation

In the proto-neutron star (PNS) formed during a core collapse supernova (CCSN), densities can reach several times nuclear density. Due to **uncertainties in nuclear physics**, there are several different physical models for the equation of state (EOS) at the densities present in the CCSN environment. The **outcomes of CCSN simulations can depend sensitively on the EOS**. 1D CCSN simulations are key in predictions of the outcome of stellar evolution, neutron star mass distribution, nucleosynthesis, and ultimately, galactic evolution. However, uncertainties in nuclear physics causes changes in these results: **simulations using different EOS tables can lead to entirely different predictions**. We explore the **sensitivity of CCSNe to variations in input nuclear physics**. A quantitative understanding of how different EOS tables affect the outcome of core collapse is crucial to our ability to make predictions.




Explosion?

NS Mass Distribution?



Element Formation?

Nuclear Physics

## Methods



- 138 progenitor stars
- Masses ranging from 9 to 120 solar masses
- 9 open source EOS tables [1]
- 1242 1D simulations on MSU's HPCC computing resource
- We used a version of the FLASH code suitable for high fidelity supernova simulations which includes effects of turbulence
- Results compared across all progenitors and EOS's



## Conclusions

We found that the equation of state non-trivially affects the outcomes of the CCSN. These effects manifested in differences in observables such as neutrino luminosities and peak gravitational wave frequencies. Moreover, we found significant correlations between EOS parameters, particularly binding energy, and these observables. Further work is necessary to better understand the statistical differences in these quantities and how the nuclear physics affects other outcomes of the explosion.

## Future Work

- 1 • Run the simulations to further times and compare the results of the explosions
- 2 • Incorporate results from parameter study  
• Redo the comparisons with more accurate physics
- 3 • Perform analysis of the differences in neutrino signals  
• Explore effects on detected light curves

## References and Acknowledgements

- We acknowledge support from the MSU ACRES REU program, which is supported by the National Science Foundation through grant ACI-1560168.
- [1] Schneider, A., Roberts, L., and Ott, C. [arXiv:1707.01527](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.01527)
- [2] Kate Scholberg. Supernova neutrino detection. *Ann. Rev. Nuclear and Particle Science*, 62:81, 2012.