Deciphering the Biography of Massive Stars: Compact Object Mergers as a Rosetta Stone

The direct observation of gravitational waves (GWs) is a landmark discoveries in modern physics. Over the past four years, GW observations of binary black hole (BBH) and binary neutron star (BNS) mergers have provided an astrophysical laboratory for tests of general relativity, the properties of extreme matter, independent measurements of cosmological parameters, and the connection between BNS mergers, short gamma-ray bursts (sGRBs), and kilonovae. However, we are only at the nascent stages of GW astrophysics. With the imminent onset of the design-sensitivity Advanced LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA network [1–3], which will observe $\gtrsim 100$s of compact binary coalescences (CBCs) over the next few years, we will assemble a population that will enable novel discovery and revolutionize compact object astrophysics. As a Hubble Fellow, I will develop the computational and statistical tools necessary to leverage this growing population for elucidating massive-star evolution.

Overview: Massive-Star Evolution in the Era of GW Astronomy

Over the next few years, the Advanced LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA network will achieve an order-of-magnitude increase in its observed population of CBCs [4]. This sample will be further bolstered by observations of electromagnetic (EM) transients that are attributed to CBCs, such as the ≈ 10 per year sGRBs detected by the *Neils Gehrels Swift Observatory* [5]. In anticipation of this growing population, two of the driving questions in astrophysics have become *where* and *how* did the progenitors of CBCs form and evolve?

The evolution of massive stars (particularly those in binary systems [6]) is poorly understood, yet vital across many realms of astrophysics, ranging from nucelosynthesis to transients to galaxy evolution and cosmology. As the endpoint of massive-star evolution, CBCs encode unique information about their progenitor systems, such as the types of galactic environments they were born in, the intricacies of stellar evolution that persisted throughout their lives, and the physics of the supernovae that marked their deaths. However, the detected population of CBCs likely results from disparate formation channels, each with their own inherent uncertainties. A key challenge over the coming years will be developing the tools and methodologies for properly leveraging the growing catalog of CBCs to disentangle formation scenarios and extract the underlying physics of their massive-star progenitors. Doing so will usher in a golden era in our understanding of how massive stars evolve, and the environments that facilitate compact binary formation.

As a Hubble Fellow, **I will combine the growing catalog of CBCs identified via GWs and/or EM emission with state-of-the-art computational tools** to answer multiple key questions in GW astrophysics and binary stellar evolution:

1. What are the dominant formation channels for BBHs, and how can we constrain their physics with GWs?
2. Which characteristics of a CBC are unique to a subset of formation channels, and how can the observation of one such signal inform merger rates?
3. How can the offsets of CBCs with respect to their host galaxies be used to understand the prior evolution of their stellar progenitors?

I. Constraining Astrophysical Models for BBH Formation

Ground-based GW observatories will detect more BBHs than any other type of CBC [4]. BBHs also have the most disparate array of proposed formation mechanisms. The two canonical BBH formation channels, isolated evolution of a binary [e.g., 9] and dynamically assembily in a dense stellar environment [e.g., 10], each have subchannels with their own predictions of BH masses, spins, and redshift evolution. Another layer of complexity comes from the poorly-constrained physical prescriptions that strongly affect the outcome of these models, such as mass transfer stability, common envelope evolution, the onset and outcome of pulsational pair-instabilities, and BH natal spins.

Meaningful astrophysical statements have already been made using only the 10 events from the first and second observing runs of Advanced LIGO/Virgo. Using phenomenological representations of the true, underlying BBH population, we have tentative evidence for an upper mass gap ($> 99\%$

of BBHs have component masses $\lesssim 45\,M_\odot$) and that BHs with high spins aligned with the orbital angular momentum are strongly disfavored [11]. Recent studies [e.g., 12, 13] have investigated how GW detections can be exploited to infer uncertain physical processes that affect BH populations. However, a robust and self-consistent investigation accounting for the impact of such parameter choices across a combination of state-of-the-art BBH formation models has yet to be accomplished.

In [14], I found that with $\mathcal{O}(100)$ BBH observations we can determine *the relative contribution* of the two canonical formation channels to the total BBH population *as well as certain physical processes* inherent to these channels (see Figure 1). Though idealized model comparisons such as this are enlightening, the most robust and unbiased constraints will come from considering all BBH formation channels and a wide range of prescriptions for uncertain physical processes, which can affect BBH populations in highly degenerate ways. During my fellowship, I will expand upon my previous work by **performing hierarchical inference on a full suite of state-of-the-art astrophysical simulations that encompass the numerous formation scenarios and physical prescriptions for BBH systems.** To accomplish this, I will start by modeling a grid of BBH populations formed through isolated binary evolution and dynamical assembly in globular clusters using population simulations that I helped develop and have significant experience working with (COSMIC [15] and CMC [16], respectively), properly accounting for selection effects and redshift evolution. I will then incorporate BBH population predictions from other formation channels (in particular, *chemically-homogeneous evolution* [17] and *hierarchical triples from the galactic field and galactic center* [18]), ensuring self-consistency across channels to allow for side-by-side investigations.

For each channel, I will analyze the effect of three uncertainties in binary evolution that strongly affect the resultant population properties and rates: (i) the strength of BH natal kicks; (ii) the efficiency of common envelope evolution; and (iii) the natal spins of BHs at birth. After creating a grid of simulations, I will use machine-learning techniques (e.g., Gaussian processes) to interpolate the out-


Figure 1: The growing population of GW observations provide an unprecedented opportunity for constraining massive-star evolution and BBH formation scenarios. *Bottom panel:* distributions of BBH total mass, accounting for selection effects, for two astrophysical models: isolated binary evolution (dashed histogram) and dynamical assembly in globular clusters (solid histogram). Colors show how these populations change due to variations in the prescription for BH natal kicks. Total masses of BBHs from GWTC-1 [7] are over-plotted for reference. *Top panel:* demonstration of hierarchical inference in a Universe where 40% of BBHs come from clusters, 60% come from isolated binary evolution, BHs are kicked via the *fallback* mechanism [8]; posterior distributions on the population-level parameters show strong preference for the correct branching fraction and kick prescription with $\mathcal{O}(100)$ BBH observations. As a Hubble Fellow, I will expand this inference to include more BBH populations (triples, chemically homogeneous evolution, galactic nuclei) and additional physical prescriptions that effect these populations (common envelope efficiency, black hole natal spins).

put distributions of BBH parameters, thereby cutting computational costs by not needing to perform a simulation at each unique point in parameter space [see e.g., 19]. **Using the catalog of GWs from LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA, I will then perform Bayesian hierarchical inference to jointly measure branching fractions and physical processes of stellar evolution across full range of progenitor channels**. My experience in BBH population modeling, GW data analysis, Bayesian inference, and integrated data science makes me perfectly suited for this substantial endeavor.

As part of my fellowship, I will package this tool and accompanying database of population models, making them publicly available so the consistency and compatibility of any BBH formation channel can be easily assessed. This will allow such methodologies to be extensible to include other predicted formation scenarios, and be adaptable to model selection endeavors using mock populations in the context of future GW detectors, such as *LISA*, *Cosmic Explorer*, and *Einstein Telescope*.

II. QUANTIFYING THE SELECTION FUNCTION FOR ECCENTRIC MERGERS

Hierarchical inference will be more powerful with the observation of BBH systems with parameters that are unique to particular formation channels. Globular clusters, for example, are predicted to produce a significant number ($\approx 1\,\mathrm{Gpc}^{-3}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ at $z < 1$ [23]) of systems with measureable eccentricities in the LIGO band [22–25, see Figure 2], whereas BBHs that inspiral in isolation will have negligible orbital eccentricity by the time they enter the LIGO sensitive band. Therefore, the detection and measurement of an eccentric BBH will be indispensable for pinning down the globular cluster merger rate, and therefore also limit viable merger rates in isolated binary evolution (and physical processes that affect merger rates).


Figure 2: Dense stellar environments facilitate rapid-inspiral BBH mergers that retain appreciable eccentricity in the LIGO sensitive band. Solid (dashed) histograms show the eccentricity in the LIGO [20] (LISA [21]), with the minimum measurable eccentricity marked with a solid (dashed) black line. Colors differentiate the three main subchannels of BBH mergers from globular clusters. Mergers that occur during strong, chaotic gravitational encounters (*GW captures*) have eccentricities measurable by LIGO. Adapted from [22].

Though binaries with lower eccentricities will be easier to detect using the circular waveform templates in matched-filter searches, binaries with larger eccentricities will be easier to distinguish from their circular counterparts [26]. Development of eccentric waveforms and measurability of eccentricity has been an active topic of research. Though none of the BBH mergers in the current catalog have clear signs of eccentricity [27], recent work has found that GW159014-like systems with eccentricities of $e \gtrsim 0.05$ when entering the LIGO band [20] can be distinguished from analogous circular signals. Modeling of globular clusters shows that this is the case for $\approx 5\%$ of cluster BBH mergers (see Figure 2). Quantifying the selection biases impinging the detection of eccentric binaries, on the other hand, has yet to be addressed thoroughly. Understanding this selection function is vitally important for determining the rate of cluster BBH mergers, in the case of both *detections* and *non-detections* of eccentric mergers. To this end, **I will perform a targeted injection study, where eccentric GW waveforms tuned to the properties of globular cluster binaries are placed in LIGO/Virgo noise realizations, and recovered using quasi-circular templates.** This will provide a selection function for eccentric BBHs, essential for understanding the astrophysical implications of detecting (or not detecting) an eccentric BBH.

III. EXPOSING PROGENITORS OF NEUTRON STAR MERGERS VIA HOST ASSOCIATIONS

Host associations of GW mergers can also act to unveil the lives of their massive-star progenitors, as well as provide an important probe into the demographics of galaxies that host CBCs. In [28], I showed that host associations and projected spatial offsets encode information about about the

progenitors of BNS mergers, such as the natal kicks and mass loss in supernovae (see Figure 3). The third focus of my work will be to **investigate the kinematic evolution and progenitor systems of CBCs via their host galaxy associations.** Such kinematic modeling techniques will apply to both the expanding catalog of sGRBs with known host association, and CBCs with EM counterparts detected by the current GW network or LISA.


Figure 3: The location of CBCs with respect to their host galaxies provides insights into the mechanisms that led to their formation. The kinematic evolution of a BNS tracer that matches the offset of GRB 070809 is shown. The motion of the system through its host is significantly altered due to the supernova explosion(s) that formed the BNS, and therefore the merger location contains insights into the supernova mechanism itself. As a Hubble Fellow, I will pair such modeling with cosmological simulations to understand the progenitors and host properties of CBCs identified via GW and/or EM emission. Adapted from [28].

Rather than relying on semi-analytic prescriptions to approximate the evolution of host galaxies, I will use the `Illustris` cosmological simulation suite [29] to identify analogs of CBC host galaxies, and follow the kinematic evolution of CBC progenitors through cosmic time, accounting for the full star-formation history and galactic growth. By comparing observed locations and environments of mergers to these computational models, I will constrain aspects of CBC massive-star progenitors, such as delay times, supernova natal kicks, and metallicity dependencies.

I will expand upon my previous work to include *all* ≈ 30 that have galactic host associations characterized by *Hubble Space Telescope* (*HST*) photometry (see [30]). Based on the size, mass, redshift, and star formation rate of the hosts, I will find the best-matching galaxies in the `Illustris` simulations and directly integrate the kinematic evolution of CBC "tracers" in the time-dependent galactic potential from birth until merger, accounting for supernova kicks and orbital decay from GWs. Investigating these CBC progenitors will provide complementary constraints to those achieved from the sample of BNSs in the Milky Way, and will unveil the selection biases that influence our ability to realize the true, underlying population properties of CBCs and their progenitors.

Though the BNS detection rate of LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA at design sensitivity is $\sim 10\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ [4], the detection rate of optical counterparts is much less certain. However, with the onset of dedicated counterpart surveys, it is plausible that at least one BNS or NSBH merger with an optical counterpart will be identified in the next few years. At a distance of $\lesssim 200\,\mathrm{Mpc}$ from us, such systems will be prime targets for detailed galactic characterization, especially with the impending launch of *JWST*. **I will use these detailed galactic characterizations to identify local-universe analogs in the `Illustris` simulation suite, and collaborate with `Apreo` experts to perform zoom-in simulations of these galaxies embedded with compact binary tracers.** I will pilot this type of analysis with `Illustris` analogs of NGC 4993, the host galaxy of GW170817/GRB170817A. By exploring the kinematic evolution and offsets of these tracers, I will place novel constraints on the stellar progenitors of GW sources and explore the evolutionary history of galaxies that harbor CBCs, such as star formation history, galactic growth, and galaxy mergers.

∘ ∘ ∘

The next few years will be a golden era for CBC discovery. My research will take crucial steps towards realizing the full potential of the growing GW population and unveil unprecedented information about the progenitors of CBCs through state-of-the-art astrophysical modeling.

RELEVANCE TO NASA SCIENCE AND MISSIONS

By combining observations of compact binary mergers with numerical simulations and statistical models, my work will (i) elucidate the formation processes of BHs and NSs and (ii) disentangle the astrophysical scenarios and environments that lead to GW merger events, both goals of the Physics

of the Cosmos (PCOS) program. My work modeling BNS systems in their host galaxies leverages the growing catalog of high-energy transients identified by PCOS missions such as *Fermi* and *Swift*, and relies on the detailed photometric and spectroscopic followup of their hosts using missions such as *HST*, and soon *JWST*. These missions, as well as future survey facilities such as *WFIRST*, are essential for identifying counterparts to GW events and allowing for multi-messenger constraints of their progenitors. In addition, numerical evolution of BNS progenitors representative host galaxies will help understand the distribution and dispersion of r-process for an array of galaxy types across cosmic time, a key goal of the Cosmic Origins program.

ROLE OF HOST AND HOST INSTITUTION

The Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics (CfA) is the ideal institution for conducting my proposed research. The Institute for Theory and Computation (ITC) at CfA has leading experts in the broad range of fields that complements my planned research: binary stellar evolution, dynamics, transient observation, and galaxy evolution. My primary faculty contact, Selma de Mink, is an expert in massive-star evolution and the formation of LIGO sources. My work will also greatly benefit from Avi Loeb (dynamics), Edo Berger (sGRB observations and host characterization), and Lars Hernquist (galaxy evolution), all of whom are experts in crucial components to my proposed research. The ITC has access to the `Cannon` computing cluster, which boasts $\gtrsim 10^5$ cores, as well as a dedicated cluster with 1152 cores, which will be essential for my computationally-intensive research. In addition, I will retain my affiliation in the LIGO Scientific Collaboration through the neighboring MIT LIGO Lab, contributing 20% of my time working on LIGO data analysis and GW populations with Salvatore Vitale.

FELLOWSHIP TIMELINE

Year 1 (2020-2021): (i) run suite of BBH population simulations, develop model interpolation; (ii) publish population analysis for all localized sGRBs using semi-analytic galactic models; (iii) publish eccentric merger selection effects study

Year 2 (2021-2022): (i) identify sGRB host analogs from cosmological simulations, perform kinematic evolution of tracers; (ii) publish model selection study (inference on BH natal spins, kicks, and common envelope efficiency); (iii) perform zoom-in galactic simulations and kinematic evolution for NGC 4993/GW170817

Year 3 (2022-2023): (i) create database to host BBH population models and API that allows hierarchical inference to be performed using new population models and the current catalog of GWs; (ii) publish results on sGRB/BNS population based on cosmological simulations, compare with properties inferred for Galactic BNS; (iii) perform zoom-in galactic simulations and kinematic evolution for new multimessenger events

REFERENCES

[1] Aasi, J. et al. 2015,*CQG*, 32, 074001
[2] Acernese, F. et al. 2015, *CQG*, 32, 024001
[3] Aso, Y. et al. 2013, *PRD*, 88, 1
[4] Abbott et al. 2018, *Living Rev. Relativ.*, 21, 57
[5] Gehrels, N. 2004, *ESA SP*, 777
[6] Sana, H. et al. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 817
[7] Abbott, B. P. et al. 2019, *PRX*, 9, 31040
[8] Janka, H. T. 2013, *MNRAS*, 434, 1355
[9] Belczynski, K. et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 789, 120
[10] Rodriguez, C. L. et al. 2015, *PRL*, 115, 051101
[11] Abbott, B. P. et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 882, L24
[12] Stevenson, S. et al. 2015, *ApJ*, 810, 58
[13] Rodriguez, C. L. et al. 2019, *PRD*, 100, 43027
[14] Zevin, M. et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 846, 82
[15] Breivik, K. et al. 2019, arXiv:
[16] Chatterjee, S. et al. 2010, *ApJ*, 719, 915
[17] Marchant, P. et al. 2016, *A&A*, 588, A50

[18] Fragione, G. et al. 2019, *MNRAS*, 488, 2825
[19] Taylor, S. R., & Gerosa, D. 2018, *PRD*, 98, 83017
[20] Lower, M. E. et al. 2018, *PRD*, 98, 083028
[21] Nishizawa, A. et al. 2017, *MNRAS*, 465, 4375
[22] Zevin, M. et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 871, 15
[23] Rodriguez, C. L. et al. 2018, *PRL*, 120, 151101
[24] Samsing, J. et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 71
[25] D'Orazio, D. J., & Samsing, J. 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 4775
[26] Brown, D. A., & Zimmerman, P. J. 2010, *PRD*, 81, 024007
[27] Romero-Shaw, I. M. et al. 2019, arXiv:1909.05466
[28] Zevin, M. et al. 2019, arXiv:1910.03598
[29] Nelson, D. et al. 2015, *Astronomy and Computing*, 13, 12
[30] Fong, W. et al. 2013, *ApJ*, 769, 18

References

[1] Aasi, J., Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., et al. 2015, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 32, 074001

[2] Acernese, F., Agathos, M., Agatsuma, K., et al. 2015, Classical and Quantum Gravity, 32, 024001

[3] Aso, Y., Michimura, Y., Somiya, K., et al. 2013, Physical Review D, 88, 1

[4] Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2018, Living Reviews in Relativity, 21, 57

[5] Gehrels, N. 2004, European Space Agency, (Special Publication) ESA SP, 777

[6] Sana, H., James, G., & Gosset, E. 2011, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 416, 817

[7] Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2019, Physical Review X, 9, 31040

[8] Janka, H. T. 2013, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 434, 1355

[9] Belczynski, K., Buonanno, A., Cantiello, M., et al. 2014, The Astrophysical Journal, 789, 120

[10] Rodriguez, C. L., Morscher, M., Pattabiraman, B., et al. 2015, Physical Review Letters, 115, 051101

[11] Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2019, The Astrophysical Journal, 882, L24

[12] Stevenson, S., Ohme, F., & Fairhurst, S. 2015, Astrophysical Journal, 810, 58

[13] Rodriguez, C. L., Zevin, M., Amaro-Seoane, P., et al. 2019, Physical Review D, 100, 43027

[14] Zevin, M., Pankow, C., Rodriguez, C. L., et al. 2017, The Astrophysical Journal, 846, 82

[15] Breivik, K., Coughlin, S., Zevin, M., et al. 2019

[16] Chatterjee, S., Fregeau, J. M., Umbreit, S., & Rasio, F. A. 2010, Astrophysical Journal, 719, 915

[17] Marchant, P., Langer, N., Podsiadlowski, P., Tauris, T., & Moriya, T. 2016, Astronomy & Astrophysics, 50, 1

[18] Fragione, G., Leigh, N. W. C., & Perna, R. 2019, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 488, 2825

[19] Taylor, S. R., & Gerosa, D. 2018, Physical Review D, 98, 83017

[20] Lower, M. E., Thrane, E., Lasky, P. D., & Smith, R. 2018, Physical Review D, 98, 083028

[21] Nishizawa, A., Sesana, A., Berti, E., & Klein, A. 2017, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 465, 4375

[22] Zevin, M., Samsing, J., Rodriguez, C., Haster, C.-J., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2019, The Astrophysical Journal, 871, 15

[23] Rodriguez, C. L., Amaro-Seoane, P., Chatterjee, S., & Rasio, F. A. 2018, Physical Review Letters, 120, 151101

[24] Samsing, J., MacLeod, M., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2014, The Astrophysical Journal, 784, 71

[25] D'Orazio, D. J., & Samsing, J. 2018, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, 481, 4775

[26] Brown, D. A., & Zimmerman, P. J. 2010, Physical Review D - Particles, Fields, Gravitation and Cosmology, 81, 024007

[27] Romero-Shaw, I. M., Lasky, P. D., & Thrane, E. 2019, arXiv:1909.05466

[28] Zevin, M., Kelley, L. Z., Nugent, A., et al. 2019, arXiv:1910.03598

[29] Nelson, D., Pillepich, A., Genel, S., et al. 2015, Astronomy and Computing, 13, 12

[30] Fong, W., Berger, E., Chornock, R., et al. 2013, The Astrophysical Journal, 769, 18