<u>SN2025gw: First IGWN Symposium on Core Collapse</u> <u>Supernova Gravitational Wave Theory and Detection</u>



# Understanding proto-neutron star oscillations in core-collapse supernova

A brief overview of asteroseismology

Alejandro Torres-Forné

Dimitra Tseneklidou, Noah Wolf, Tristan Bruel, Marie-Anne Bizouard, Patricio Maturana, Renate Meyer, Carla Fröhlich, Bernhard Müller, Martin Obergaunlinguer, Andrea Pasamonti, Pablo Cerdá-Durán and Toni Font

## **ANATOMY OF CCSN**



#### See Bernhard's Talk

### **GW EMISSION FROM PNS**



### **Highly stochastic**

Time evolving frequencies (g-modes, SASI)

# **INTRODUCTION TO ASTEROSEISMOLOGY**

- Simplified background: Reisenegger & Goldreich 1992, Ferrari et al 2003, 2004, Passamonti et al 2005, Krüger et al 2015, Camelio et al 2017
- Background based on simulations (f, p and w modes): Sotani et al 2018
- Background from simulations + Cowling approximation: TF et al 2018a
- Background from simulations + lapse perturbations: Morozova et al 2018
- Background from simulations + space-time perturbations (lapse and conformal factor): TF et al 2018b GREAT code: General Relativistic Eigenmode Analysis Tool. https://www.uv.es/cerdupa/codes/GREAT/
- Pseudo-Newtonian analysis: Westernacher-Schneider 2020
- Universal Relations: TF et al 2019, Sotani 2021 See Sotani's talk
- Inclusion of accretion: Tseneklidou et al 2025 See Dimitra's talk

## LINEAR PERTURBATION ANALYSIS

The system of equations:

 $\sigma$ : eigenfrequencies



### **INTRODUCTION TO ASTEROSEISMOLOGY**



### **INTRODUCTION TO ASTEROSEISMOLOGY**



Gravity (buoyancy) waves vs pressure waves

#### Transverse waves

### Longitudinal waves





- N<sup>2</sup> : Brunt-Väisälä frequency
  - $\mathcal{L}^2$  : Lamb frequency

Acoustic wave region:

 $\sigma^2 > N^2, \mathcal{L}^2$ 

Gravity wave region:

 $\sigma^2 < N^2, \mathcal{L}^2$ 





Torres-Forné et al. (2019)

## **AVOIDED CROSSINGS**

#### Coupled Oscillators:

$$egin{pmatrix} \omega_1^2(\lambda) & lpha\ lpha & \omega_2^2(\lambda) \end{pmatrix} egin{pmatrix} y_1\ y_2\end{pmatrix} = \omega^2 egin{pmatrix} y_1\ y_2\end{pmatrix}$$

$$\omega_{\pm}^{2}(\lambda) = \frac{\omega_{1}^{2}(\lambda) + \omega_{2}^{2}(\lambda)}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\left(\omega_{1}^{2}(\lambda) - \omega_{2}^{2}(\lambda)\right)^{2} + 4\alpha^{2}}$$

"At the avoided crossing the two modes exchange nature, while still maintaining the original labelling..."



Aerts, C., Christensen-Dalsgaard, J., & Kurtz, D. W. (2010).

### **AVOIDED CROSSINGS**



### **AVOIDED CROSSINGS**

#### See Daniel's talk



Murphy et al. Phys. Rev. D (2025) arXiv:2503.06406



# **P/G/F CLASSIFICATION**

#### See also Rodriguez et al. (2023)







Classifies modes by radial nodes Ambiguous fundamental mode limits early-time reliability. Uses eigenfunction phase to track modes and avoided crossings. Early-time mode mixing is complex. Track mode evolution including avoided crossings. Early-time mode mixing complicates interpretation.

# WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM ASTEROSEISMOLOGY?

# **MODE ORIGIN**



Dominant mode

Lives at the PNS surface and depends on bulk properties

#### Core g-mode

Comes from the core of the PNS. It is determined by the EoS

# **UNIVERSAL RELATIONS**



#### 26 1D simulations

2 codes (Alcar-Aenus and CoCoNuT)

6 EOS (LS220, Gshen-NL3, Hshen, SFHo, BHB-L, Hshen-L)

8 progenitors (11.2 – 75  $M_{\odot}$ )

g-modes scale with PNS surface gravity

No dependence on EOS

#### Torres-Forné et al 2019

### **UNIVERSAL RELATIONS**

Sotani & Takiwaki 2020

See Sotani's talk

#### Where the differences come from?

Different classification method

Difference between models introduce errors in the fits

Several combinations of M over R with different exponents produce similar fits



## **DOMINANT MODE - INFERENCE**



LVK network, source at 5 kpc

#### Injections:

- Simulations: 10 x 2D & 3D
- Code: Aenus-Alcar
- Progenitors: 11.2-40  $M_{\odot}$
- EOS: LS220, Gshen, SFHo

#### Noise:

 Detector network 2nd gen (HL, HLV, HLVK, HLVKA...) and 3<sup>rd</sup> gen (ET, CE)

X-pipeline)

Simulated noise

#### **Observational scenario**

- Neutrino trigger (time of bounce within ~10 ms)
- EM observation  $\rightarrow$  accurate sky localization

#### Spectrograms:

- Dominant polarization frame (similar to
- Time shifted data

### **DOMINANT MODE - INFERENCE**



LVK network, source at 5 kpc

### **DOMINANT MODE - INFERENCE**



Bruel et al 2023

# **AVOIDED CROSSING FREQUENCY VS EOS**

#### Wolfe et al (2023)

We analyze the gravitational wave eigen-frequencies of 1684  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{CCSN}}$ 

#### simulations.





- Dominant mode frequencies show similar trends across all equations of state.
- Dominant mode frequencies are tightly clustered at early times for all models using the same EOS.
- Spread in frequencies observed at later times correlates with the remnant mass and depends on the EOS.
- Dominant mode monotonically increases with time for most of its evolution.
- Early-time period identified with low f-mode frequencies and late-time period with higher frequencies.

# **AVOIDED CROSSING FREQUENCY VS EOS**

#### **Gaussian mixture**



TM1 & NL3 f<900 Hz. DD2 & BHB f  $\in$  [875, 950] Hz. SFHo & SFHx f  $\in$  [975, 1025] Hz.



# CONCLUSIONS

- A nearby supernova would give us a unique opportunity to learn about ...
  - ... explosion mechanism
  - … EOS at high densities and temperatures
  - ... rotation
- There is still a lot of work to do ...
  - ... eigenmode calculation: SASI, rotation ...
  - ... eigenmode classification
  - ... inference from other features (GW gap, secondary g-modes, SASI, bar-mode)
  - … phenomenological templates including rotation



# THANK YOU FOR YOU ATTENTION!