

Improving the inference of the stellar quantities using the extended I -Love- Q - δM relations

Eneko Aranguren¹, José A. Font^{2,3}, Nicolas Sanchis-Gual², Raül Vera¹

¹ Department of Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Bilbao, Spain

² Departament d'Astronomia i Astrofísica, Universitat de València, València, Spain

³ Observatori Astronòmic, Universitat de València, València, Spain

E-mail: eneko.aranguren@ehu.eus

Abstract. In relativistic Astrophysics the I -Love- Q relations refer to approximately EoS-independent relations involving the moment of inertia, Love number, and quadrupole moment through some quantities that are normalised by the mass M_0 of the background configuration of the perturbative scheme. Since M_0 is not an observable quantity, this normalisation hinders the direct applicability of the relations. A common remedy assumes that M_0 coincides with the actual mass of the star M_S ; however, this approximation is only adequate for very slow rotation (when the dimensionless spin parameter is $\chi_S < 0.1$). The more accurate alternative approach, based on the I -Love- Q - δM set of relations, circumvents this limitation by enabling the inference of M_0 . Here we review both approaches and provide numerical comparisons.

1 Introduction

Due to the complexity of solving the Einstein Field Equations for rotating compact bodies, which in general do not have exact and analytical solutions (except for infinitesimally thin disks of dust [1]), relativistic stellar configurations are usually studied using either full numerical integration (see e.g. [2] for the RNS code, or [3, 4] for the LORENE code), or semi-analytical approaches, often driven using perturbation theory in the framework of the so-called Hartle–Thorne model [5]. Within the latter approach, the general setup is split into an interior problem and a vacuum exterior, which are matched at the timelike boundary of the star imposing the identification of the first and second fundamental forms at either side at each order in the rotation parameter. The rigorous treatment provided in [6] has led to the first results on the existence and uniqueness of stationary and axially symmetric configurations to second order in perturbation theory [7, 8].

Perturbation theory is usually exploited up to second order for isolated rotating stars (see [9, 10, 11]), and up to first order for nonrotating stars embedded in a tidal field (see [12, 13, 14]), which is known as the electric-type tidal problem. In either scenario for a given equation of state (EoS) and central pressure P_c , the Tolman–Oppenheimer–Volkoff equations [15, 16] yield the mass $M_0(P_c)$ and radius $R_0(P_c)$ of the static and spherically symmetric background configuration. For a star rotating with angular velocity Ω_S , the first order problem provides the moment of inertia I_S , related to the angular momentum $J_S(P_c, \Omega_S)$ via $I_S(P_c) = J_S(P_c, \Omega_S)/\Omega_S$. The second order problem produces two quantities: the mass contribution $\delta M(P_c)$, so that the total mass of the star is given by [5]

$$M_S(P_c, \Omega_S) = M_0(P_c) + \Omega_S^2 \delta M(P_c), \quad (1)$$

and the quadrupole moment Q_S , which measures the deformation of the gravitational field at the exterior, and is related to the eccentricity of the star [5]. Regarding the tidal problem, the first order yields the

leading order Love number $k_2(P_c)$, which quantifies how the shape of a spherically symmetric compact star is affected by the presence of a companion star, and is related to the dimensionless tidal deformability via¹ $\lambda_S(P_c) = (2/3)(R_0/M_0)^5 k_2(P_c)$ (see [17, 18] for more context).

In [19], a set of approximately EoS-independent relations involving the moment of inertia $I_S(P_c)$, the Love number [via $\lambda_S(P_c)$], and the quadrupole moment $Q_S(P_c, \Omega_S)$, was found for cold neutron stars and quark stars. These relations depend on the dimensionless and rotation-independent quantities

$$\bar{I} := \frac{I_S}{M_0^3}, \quad \bar{Q} := \frac{Q_S M_0}{\Omega_S^2 I_S^2} = \frac{Q_S}{\chi_S^2 M_0^3}, \quad (2)$$

together with λ_S . Note that we have used the definition of the dimensionless spin parameter $\chi_S := I_S \Omega_S / M_0^2$. The reduced quantities (2) depend on the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff mass M_0 , which differs from the actual mass of the star via (1). The fact that M_0 is not an observable magnitude hinders the applicability of the relations, since one must obtain (or fix) the value of M_0 in order to translate from the reduced $\{\bar{I}, \bar{Q}\}$ to the actual $\{I_S, Q_S\}$.

In this regard, the approach usually followed in the literature (see for example, [20]) — which we call the standard approach — consists in fixing M_0 to the actual mass of the star, i.e.

$$M_0^{\text{std}} = M_S. \quad (3)$$

Reference [21] describes this as a “small caveat”, justified by the fact that stars observed so far rotate slowly ($\chi_S < 0.1$). However, recent detections of gravitational wave signals have found millisecond pulsars rotating at spins of $\chi_S \sim 0.4$ (see [22]). As argued in [23], this highlights the need to reassess the implications of the approximation $M_0 = M_S$.

The procedure of this approach works as follows. First, the I -Love and Q -Love relations are used to infer \bar{I} and \bar{Q} from λ_S , and then, with the values of M_S and χ_S at hand, I_S and Q_S are obtained from (2) via

$$I_S^{\text{std}} = M_S^3 \bar{I}, \quad Q_S^{\text{std}} = \chi_S^2 M_S^3 \bar{Q}. \quad (4)$$

The implementation of this approach requires that λ_S , M_S and χ_S be known. However, these quantities can be inferred from gravitational-wave observations of binary systems, since some related effective parameters get imprinted in the waveform during the inspiral [24, 25, 26, 27].

We stress that the universal relations hold as long as the quantities involved are normalised by M_0 (not M_S). Consequently, the standard approach results in deviations from universality, as was claimed already in [28]. The approximation $M_0 = M_S$ is only reasonable when Ω_S (or χ_S) is small [see Eq. (1)], which explains why the I -Love- Q relations are typically applied to slowly rotating stars — those rotating well below the Keplerian limit, which marks the upper bound for the applicability of the perturbative scheme.

Even if the universality is broken when taking $M_0 = M_S$, one may conjecture that there might still be one universal relation for each fixed value of some rotation magnitude. In [29, 30], this was indeed shown to be the case for the I - Q relation — the universality was recovered after expressing the relation in terms of some dimensionless frequency and spin. However, this I - Q relation is not directly applicable in observational astrophysics, since neither I nor Q can be extracted from gravitational wave data. As argued before, one needs to start from λ_S , so rotation-dependent I -Love and Q -Love relations are required, but neither of them has been established yet.

In [23] we introduced an approach that dodges the approximation (3) by enabling the inference of M_0 in the first place. This is known as the extended approach, as it is based on an extended set involving the quantity δM . We describe it in what follows.

2 Extended I -Love- Q - δM relations

In [31, 23] a new set of universal relations involving the normalised mass contribution

$$\overline{\delta M} := \frac{M_S - M_0}{\Omega_S^2 M_0^3 \bar{I}^2} = \frac{M_S - M_0}{\chi_S^2 M_0}, \quad (5)$$

¹We take $G = c = 1$ throughout.

was found. Given the value of λ_S , the δM -Love relation is used to extract $\overline{\delta M}$, from which the unique value of M_0 (denoted M_0^{ext}) is obtained through

$$M_0^{\text{ext}} = \frac{M_S}{\overline{\delta M} \chi_S^2 + 1}. \quad (6)$$

Once the value of M_0^{ext} has been inferred, the I -Love and Q -Love relations are then employed (just as in the standard approach) to obtain \overline{I} and \overline{Q} , and using the M_0^{ext} extracted in (6), the stellar quantities I_S and Q_S are computed as

$$I_S^{\text{ext}} = (M_0^{\text{ext}})^3 \overline{I}, \quad Q_S^{\text{ext}} = \chi_S^2 (M_0^{\text{ext}})^3 \overline{Q}. \quad (7)$$

3 Comparison: standard approach vs extended approach

Let us consider a polytropic EoS, where the energy density ρ and pressure P are related via $P = 100\rho^2$. We calculate the relative errors of M_0 , I_S and Q_S , defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{M_0}^{\text{std/ext}} = \frac{|M_0^{\text{std/ext}} - M_0^{\text{H}}|}{M_0^{\text{H}}}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{I_S}^{\text{std/ext}} = \frac{|I_S^{\text{std/ext}} - I_S^{\text{H}}|}{I_S^{\text{H}}}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{Q_S}^{\text{std/ext}} = \frac{|Q_S^{\text{std/ext}} - Q_S^{\text{H}}|}{Q_S^{\text{H}}} \quad (8)$$

for both the standard (std) and the extended (ext) approaches, considering different values of the central pressure P_c and spin parameter χ_S . The magnitudes M_0^{H} , I_S^{H} and Q_S^{H} correspond to the values of M_0 , I_S , Q_S as calculated using the perturbative approach, respectively. The results are shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: Relative errors of M_0 (left column), I_S (middle column) and Q_S (right column) as computed using perturbation theory, for the extended approach (upper row) and standard approach (lower row) as functions of P_c and for different values of χ_S . In order to compare the results from both approaches in a more visual way, a dashed line marks the highest error of the extended approach in every column.

4 Conclusions and comparison with previous results

Figure 1 shows that the extended approach yields more accurate results than its standard counterpart. The difference increases with χ_S (Ω_S), as the approximation $M_0 = M_S$ becomes less accurate [see Eq. (1)]. In addition, the relative errors of the extended approach exhibit a large variation, which may arise from the inherent noise of the universal relations themselves. In the standard approach, however, this effect appears to be overshadowed by the approximation $M_0 = M_S$, which introduces a larger source of error.

Let us note that the plots here differ from those in [23] [see Fig. 1 therein], since the present calculations are based on χ_S rather than Ω_S . To see the difference, compare (6), (7), (4) here with (12), (13)-(14), (15)-(16) in [23], respectively. Taking χ_S as the starting point, the value of M_0^{ext} depends solely on the δM -Love relation, while for the case of Ω_S , it depends on both δM -Love and I -Love (via \bar{I}). Moreover, the quantity \bar{I} also appears in $Q_S^{\text{std/ext}}$ when using Ω_S .

Acknowledgements

We thank the anonymous referee for their useful comments and suggestions. Work supported by the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación (grants PID2021-125485NB-C21, PID2021-123226NB-I00 funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and ERDF A way of making Europe), by the Generalitat Valenciana (grant CIPROM/2022/49), by the Basque Government (IT1628-22), and by the European Horizon Europe staff exchange (SE) programme HORIZON-MSCA-2021- SE-01 (NewFunFiCo-101086251). EA is supported by the Basque Government Grant No. PRE.2024.2.0078. NSG acknowledges support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation via the Ramón y Cajal programme (grant RYC2022-037424-I), funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and by “ESF Investing in your future”.

References

- [1] Neugebauer G and Meinel R 1993 *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **414** L97
- [2] Stergioulas N and Friedman J L 1995 *Astrophys. J.* **444** 306
- [3] Bonazzola S, Gourgoulhon E, Salgado M and Marck J A 1993 *Astron. Astrophys.* **278** 421–443
- [4] Bonazzola S, Gourgoulhon E and Marck J A 1998 *Phys. Rev. D* **58**(10) 104020
- [5] Hartle J B and Thorne K S 1968 *Astrophys. J.* **153** 807
- [6] Reina B and Vera R 2015 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **32** 155008
- [7] Mars M, Reina B and Vera R 2022 *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **26** 1873–1963
- [8] Mars M, Reina B and Vera R 2022 *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **26** 2719–2840
- [9] Aranguren E, Font J A, Sanchis-Gual N and Vera R 2023 *Phys. Rev. D* **107** 044034
- [10] Reina B 2016 *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **455** 4512–4517
- [11] Berti E, White F, Maniopoulou A and Bruni M 2005 *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **358** 923–938
- [12] Aranguren E, Font J A, Sanchis-Gual N and Vera R 2023 *Phys. Rev. D* **108** 104065
- [13] Hinderer T, Lackey B D, Lang R N and Read J S 2010 *Phys. Rev. D* **81** 123016
- [14] Diedrichs R F, Becker N, Jockel C, Christian J E, Sagunski L and Schaffner-Bielich J 2023 *Phys. Rev. D* **108**(6) 064009
- [15] Tolman R C 1939 *Phys. Rev.* **55**(4) 364–373
- [16] Oppenheimer J R and Volkoff G M 1939 *Phys. Rev.* **55**(4) 374–381
- [17] Flanagan E E and Hinderer T 2008 *Phys. Rev. D* **77**(2) 021502
- [18] Hinderer T 2008 *Astrophys. J.* **677** 1216
- [19] Yagi K and Yunes N 2014 *Science* **344** 1250349–1250349
- [20] Yagi K, Kyutoku K, Pappas G, Yunes N and Apostolatos T A 2014 *Phys. Rev. D* **89**(12) 124013
- [21] Yagi K and Yunes N 2013 *Phys. Rev. D* **88** 023009
- [22] Hessels J W T, Ransom S M, Stairs I H, Freire P C C, Kaspi V M and Camilo F 2006 *Science* **311** 1901–1904
- [23] Aranguren E, Font J A, Sanchis-Gual N and Vera R 2024 *Phys. Rev. D* **110**(8) 084027

- [24] Abbott B P *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) 2017 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**(16) 161101
- [25] Zhu X, Thrane E, Osłowski S, Levin Y and Lasky P D 2018 *Phys. Rev. D* **98**(4) 043002
- [26] Abbott B P *et al.* (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration and the Virgo Collaboration) 2018 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**(16) 161101
- [27] Abbott B P *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration) 2020 *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **892** L3
- [28] Doneva D D, Yazadjiev S S, Stergioulas N and Kokkotas K D 2013 *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **781** L6
- [29] Chakrabarti S, Delsate T, Gürlebeck N and Steinhoff J 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 201102
- [30] Pappas G and Apostolatos T A 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 121101
- [31] Reina B, Sanchis-Gual N, Vera R and Font J A 2017 *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. Lett.* **470** L54–L58