Extreme Matter meets Extreme Gravity: Observational Implications of Ultra-Heavy Neutron Stars with Cross-Overs and Phase Transitions

Veronica Dexheimer

in collaboration with H. Tan, T. Dore,

J. Noronha-Hostler, and N. Yunes



Current state of QCD phase diagram

A complete picture requires putting together astrophysics observations and laboratory measurements, in addition to lattice QCD, ye pQCD, ...
A complete picture requires putting together astrophysics observations isospin-symmetric matter neutron-star matter QUARK PHASE

 Since 2015 (2017), we can also see the universe through gravitational waves



What have we learned <u>about dense matter</u> from GW170817

- Realistic waveform deviation from point-particle one: tidal deformability, measured in the end of inspiral
- New vector-isovector channel that can be added to any model

$$L_{\omega\rho} = \underbrace{g_{\omega\rho}g_{\omega}^2g_{\rho}^2}_{\omega\rho}\omega_{\mu}\omega^{\mu}\rho_{\mu}\rho^{\mu}$$



improves overall agreement with observation! e-Print: 1810.06109

What have we learned <u>about dense matter</u> from GW190814

- Merger of $23.2^{+1.1}_{-1.0}$ M_{Sun} black hole and a $2.59^{+0.08}_{-0.09}$ M_{sun} object
- New vector interactions increase masses to > $_2$ M_{sun}
- Rotation close to the Kepler frequency reproduces \sim $_{2.5}$ M_{sun} stars with hyperons and quarks



• Exotic degrees of freedom are not excluded! e-Print: 2007.08493 4

Using magnetic fields instead of rotation

- Maximum fields allowed by axi-symmetric GR codes ~10¹⁸ G not enough to change significantly equation of state
- But decrease in hyperon fraction could increase stellar masses enough to explain GW190814
- Stellar radius becomes much larger
- Still, exotic degrees of freedom are not excluded when using density dependent couplings



e-Print: 2104.05950

Does it depend on a particular model?

• Model-independent parametric approaches can generate even more massive stars, such as the companion of V723 Mon with M \ge 2.91 \pm 0.08 M_{Sun} with central densities not larger \lesssim 4 n_{sat}



- Considering GW190814 as involving a neutron star, we generate central densities $\lesssim 6~n_{sat}$ (otherwise the limit is $\sim 8~n_{sat}$)

Size and position of <u>bumps</u>

• Reproducing M > 2.5 M_{Sun} stars requires a steep rise in c_s^2 at $n_B < 3 n_{sat}$, consistent with a bump or a plateau that could be associated with vector interactions (see Pisarski 2021)



7

 Radius measurements with smaller error could help pinpointing the position of bump

More complicated structures

• Plateau heights are harder to determine observationally



• Extra bumps could be motivated by hyperons and other

crossover transitions but only slightly modify max. masses



First-order phase transitions

• Still reproduce M > 2.5 M_{Sun} stars



- More "extended" phase transitions switch from generating connecting branches, to kinks, to twin solutions
- But disconnected twins are only found with thin bumps and do not reach 2.5 M_{sun}, regardless of the slant after the transition or the height of the plateau
- Neither of these configurations violates I-Love-Q relations (variation below 1.5%)

Discussion

- Neutron-star mergers create unique ideal conditions to achieve deconfinement
- Comparisons between HI collisions and astrophysics must be performed with care (Y_Q, Y_s, leptons, chem. eqil, ...)



- Now, in addition to observe light, we can also understand the universe through gravitational waves so, maybe, there will be a clear signature for a quark deconfinement phase transition from astrophysics!
- Post-merger part of neutron-star mergers could tell us about deconfinement ... but not yet observed
- For now, we can learn from dense stellar masses, radii, and tidal deformability



The Mass Distribution of Neutron Stars in Gravitational-Wave Binaries

Philippe $Landry^1$ and Jocelyn S. $Read^1$



Figure 1. Measured masses and inferred mass distribution for NSs in GW binaries. Top: Marginal onedimensional mass likelihoods P(d|m) for the NSs in the BNS mergers GW170817 and GW190425, the NSBH mergers GW200105 and GW200115, and the candidate NSBH merger GW190814.