

Leveraging Differentiable Programming in the Inverse Problem of Neutron Stars

Thibau Wouters, Peter T. H. Pang, Rahul Somasundaram, Ingo Tews, Tim Dietrich, and Chris Van Den Broeck

t.r.i.wouters@uu.nl



Extreme Matter 17/03/2025




Utrecht
University



Introduction

Inverse problem of neutron stars: infer the equation of state (EOS) of dense nuclear matter from observations of neutron stars (NSs): masses, radii, tidal deformabilities, ...

Bottleneck: solving Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equations



Inverting neutron stars with differentiable programming

Our solution: **differentiable programming** with JAX [1]

- GPU accelerators – no emulators required!
- Automatic differentiation to compute gradients of code

We efficiently invert neutron stars with

- 1 **Bayesian inference**: using NS data to constrain EOS parameters
- 2 **Gradient-based optimizers**: efficient inversion of $R(M)$ or $\Lambda(M)$

Available open source: JESTER ([🔗otsunhopang/jester](https://github.com/otsunhopang/jester))

Methods – Equation of state parametrization (1)

- At **low density**, we use the metamodel [2, 3]: Taylor expansion of energy per nucleon E/A in¹ $x = (n - n_{\text{sat}})/3n_{\text{sat}}$
- **Nuclear empirical parameters** (NEPs): coefficients of the expansion


$$E/A(n, \delta) = e_{\text{sat}}(n) + e_{\text{sym}}(n)\delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4), \quad \delta = (n_n - n_p)/n$$

$$\begin{aligned} e_{\text{sat}}(n) &= E_{\text{sat}} + \frac{1}{2}K_{\text{sat}}x^2 + \frac{1}{3!}Q_{\text{sat}}x^3 + \frac{1}{4!}Z_{\text{sat}}x^4 + \mathcal{O}(x^5) \\ e_{\text{sym}}(n) &= E_{\text{sym}} + L_{\text{sym}}x + \frac{1}{2}K_{\text{sym}}x^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{3!}Q_{\text{sym}}x^3 + \frac{1}{4!}Z_{\text{sym}}x^4 + \mathcal{O}(x^5) \end{aligned}$$

¹ $n_{\text{sat}} \equiv 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$

Methods – Equation of state parametrization (2)

- Metamodel description breaks down at $n_{\text{break}} \sim [1, 2] n_{\text{sat}}$
- **Higher density:** parametrize the EOS with $c_s^2(n)$ grid points and linear interpolation [4]




Contents

- ① Bayesian inference
- ② Gradient-based optimization

Results – Bayesian inference

- EOS constraints: nuclear theory (χ_{EFT}), NS observations (heavy PSRs, NICER, GW170817)
- Extend Koehn *et al.* [5]: directly sample θ_{EOS}
- ~ 0.24 ms per TOV solver call, ~ 1 h for MCMC run (H100 GPU)
- Scales well with number of parameters (more $c_s^2(n)$ grid points)


Constraint	$R_{1.4}$ [km]	
	Koehn+	This work
χ_{EFT}	$12.11^{+1.69}_{-3.39}$	$12.59^{+2.24}_{-3.51}$
Radio timing	$13.70^{+1.41}_{-2.17}$	$13.71^{+1.19}_{-1.88}$
PSR J0030+0451	$13.17^{+1.65}_{-2.24}$	$13.48^{+1.42}_{-2.15}$
PSR J0740+6620	$13.39^{+1.57}_{-1.72}$	$13.79^{+1.26}_{-1.73}$
GW170817 [†]	$11.98^{+1.08}_{-1.09}$	$12.40^{+1.33}_{-1.49}$
All	$12.26^{+0.80}_{-0.91}$	$12.62^{+1.04}_{-1.11}$



Results – Measuring n_{break}

χ_{EFT} predicts metamodel to break down at a density $n_{\text{break}} \sim 1 - 2 n_{\text{sat}}$
Can we determine this with NSs?

- Wide, agnostic prior on n_{break} : $U(1, 4) n_{\text{sat}}$
- Only consider heavy PSRs, NICER, GW170817



Contents


① Bayesian inference

② Gradient-based optimization

Methods – Gradient-based optimization

- Given $\hat{\Lambda}_i$: “true” tidal deformabilities at masses M_i to invert
- Loss function $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{EOS}})$: relative error in tidal deformability Λ
- Gradient descent: $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(i+1)} \leftarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(i)} - \gamma \nabla L(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(i)})$ with Adam
 - Automatic differentiation!


$$L(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{EOS}}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left| \frac{\Lambda_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{EOS}}) - \hat{\Lambda}_i}{\hat{\Lambda}_i} \right|$$



Results – Recovery of nuclear empirical parameters

What do NSs tell us about nuclear empirical parameters (NEPs)?

- “True” EOS: only NEPs – no $c_s^2(n)$ grid points
- Recover with increasingly more NEPs being varied
- If more NEPs are varied, L_{sym} is no longer constrained
- Recovered EOSs deviate < 100 meters, < 10 in Λ from the true EOS – observationally indistinguishable



Conclusion

- We have developed JESTER, a differentiable programming framework for the inverse problem of NSs
- We demonstrate accurate and scalable Bayesian inference on NS data
- Gradient-based optimizers can efficiently invert a complete NS family
- New tool to gain insights into how NSs probe the EOS

Available open source: JESTER (github.com/sunhopang/jester)

References I

- [1] Roy Frostig, Matthew James Johnson, and Chris Leary. “Compiling machine learning programs via high-level tracing”. In: *Systems for Machine Learning 4.9* (2018). Available at: <https://github.com/google/jax>.
- [2] Jérôme Margueron, Rudiney Hoffmann Casali, and Francesca Gulminelli. “Equation of state for dense nucleonic matter from metamodeling. I. Foundational aspects”. In: *Phys. Rev. C* 97.2 (2018), p. 025805. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.97.025805](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.97.025805). arXiv: [1708.06894](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06894) [nucl-th].
- [3] Jérôme Margueron, Rudiney Hoffmann Casali, and Francesca Gulminelli. “Equation of state for dense nucleonic matter from metamodeling. II. Predictions for neutron star properties”. In: *Phys. Rev. C* 97.2 (2018), p. 025806. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.97.025806](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.97.025806). arXiv: [1708.06895](https://arxiv.org/abs/1708.06895) [nucl-th].
- [4] Rahul Somasundaram, Ingo Tews, and Jérôme Margueron. “Investigating signatures of phase transitions in neutron-star cores”. In: *Phys. Rev. C* 107.2 (2023), p. 025801. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevC.107.025801](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevC.107.025801). arXiv: [2112.08157](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.08157) [nucl-th].
- [5] Hauke Koehn et al. “From existing and new nuclear and astrophysical constraints to stringent limits on the equation of state of neutron-rich dense matter”. In: (Feb. 2024). arXiv: [2402.04172](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.04172) [astro-ph.HE].

More validation results

Constraint	$M_{\text{TOV}} [M_{\odot}]$		$p(3n_{\text{sat}}) [\text{MeV fm}^{-3}]$		$n_{\text{TOV}} [n_{\text{sat}}]$	
	Koehn+	This work	Koehn+	This work	Koehn+	This work
χ_{EFT}	$2.05^{+1.08}_{-1.16}$	$2.03^{+1.03}_{-0.97}$	69^{+186}_{-53}	72^{+165}_{-65}	$6.51^{+10.7}_{-3.11}$	$6.53^{+9.26}_{-4.09}$
Radio timing	$2.35^{+0.73}_{-0.29}$	$2.20^{+0.39}_{-0.26}$	111^{+140}_{-49}	97^{+65}_{-49}	$5.51^{+1.89}_{-1.66}$	$5.68^{+1.63}_{-1.74}$
PSR J0030+0451	$2.16^{+0.83}_{-0.71}$	$2.19^{+0.78}_{-0.76}$	89^{+143}_{-46}	94^{+135}_{-62}	$5.62^{+4.44}_{-1.91}$	$5.60^{+3.65}_{-2.59}$
PSR J0740+6620	$2.34^{+0.65}_{-0.32}$	$2.38^{+0.70}_{-0.42}$	107^{+125}_{-40}	118^{+150}_{-59}	$5.34^{+1.63}_{-1.61}$	$5.16^{+1.72}_{-2.04}$
GW170817	$2.21^{+0.45}_{-0.18}$	$2.17^{+0.39}_{-0.23}$	80^{+81}_{-32}	80^{+70}_{-48}	$6.25^{+1.40}_{-1.70}$	$6.35^{+1.65}_{-1.88}$
All	$2.25^{+0.42}_{-0.22}$	$2.24^{+0.36}_{-0.23}$	90^{+71}_{-31}	93^{+66}_{-37}	$5.92^{+1.35}_{-1.38}$	$5.91^{+1.36}_{-1.45}$