

Impact of the nuclear equation of state on the formation of twin stars

Nai-Bo Zhang^{1*} and Bao-An Li^{2†}

¹*School of Physics, Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, China and*

²*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Texas A&M University-Commerce, Commerce, TX 75429-3011, USA*

(Dated: June 12, 2024)

Twin stars—two stable neutron stars (NSs) with the same mass but different radii have long been proposed to appear as a consequence of a possible first-order phase transition in NS matter. Within a meta-model for the EOS of hybrid stars, we revisit the viability of twin stars and its dependence on numerous parameters characterizing the EOS of nuclear matter, quark matter, and the phase transition between them. While essentially no experimental constraint exists for the last two, parameters characterizing the EOS of neutron-rich nucleonic matter have been constrained within various ranges by terrestrial experiments and astrophysical observations. Within these ranges, the impact of nuclear EOS on the formation of twin stars is studied. It is found that the symmetry energy of neutron-rich nucleonic matter notably influences the formation of twin stars, particularly through its slope L and curvature K_{sym} . Conversely, the EOS of symmetric nuclear matter shows minimal influence on the formation of twin stars, partially owing to its relatively well-constrained parameters.

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutron star (NS) cores contain the densest visible matter in the universe. At such extreme densities, the NS matter containing only hadrons and leptons may become unstable, undergoing a phase transition to quark matter and thus enabling the formation of hybrid stars. However, to understand properties of supradense matter especially its phase transition, such as its critical hadron-quark transition baryon density ρ_t , energy density discontinuity $\Delta\varepsilon$, and the stiffness of quark matter measured in terms of its speed of sound squared c_s^2 , remains an outstanding challenge in nuclear astrophysics. In particular, four possible topologies of the mass-radius relation for hybrid stars were suggested in Ref. [1]. Their properties have been investigated using various EOS models in the literature. Nevertheless, many interesting issues regarding the impact of nuclear EOS on the formation of twin stars and their properties call for further investigations.

A possible mass-radius relation of hybrid stars is shown in Fig. 1 for introducing some terminologies and quantities characterizing twin stars. During a strong first-order phase transition from nuclear to quark matter, the sudden softening of the EOS results in the appearance of an extremum mass (the first extremum). As pressure increases, the mass initially decreases until reaching a minimum (the second extremum), after which it rises to a second maximum (the third extremum) mass. This non-monotonic mass-radius relationship, caused by the phase transition, can lead to the instability of NSs. The stability of solutions to the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equation can be assessed using the Bardeen, Thorne, and Meltzer stability criteria [2, 3]: At each extremum with increasing central pressure, one stable

(unstable) mode becomes unstable (stable) when the mass-radius curve rotates counter-clockwise (clockwise). Within the mass range ΔM between the first two extremums as shown in Fig. 1, two stable NSs with the same mass but different radii may coexist, forming twin stars [4–8]. Clearly, the ΔM quantifies the likelihood and mass-radius space to form twin stars. Observing the latter could help confirm the existence of a phase transition in supradense NS matter.




FIG. 1: A typical mass-radius relation for twin stars.

Recent astrophysical observations have stimulated more extensive explorations of twin star properties [9–24]. However, their existence remains inconclusive. For example, in our previous studies in either Bayesian inference [25] or forward-modeling [26] using a meta-model EOS for nuclear matter and the constant speed of sound (CSS) model for quark matter we found that twin stars cannot satisfy the observational constraints from NICER [27–30] and GW170817 [31] simultaneously. In particular, in the forward-modeling approach [26] when all nuclear matter parameters are fixed at their presently known most probable values based on previous analyses

*naibo Zhang@seu.edu.cn

†Bao-An.Li@Tamuc.edu

of many terrestrial nuclear experiments and recent NS observations, no evidence for the formation of twin stars was found. On the other hand, a more recent study [19] concluded that low-mass twin stars could satisfy current NS observations. In their work, they varied the slope L of nuclear symmetry energy and the skewness J_0 of symmetric nuclear matter (SNM) in relatively large ranges. Particularly, they varied J_0 from -600 to 1000 MeV, which is much wider than the constraints of $J_0 = -190 \pm 100$ MeV at 68% confidence level extracted from observations of NS [32–34] and $J_0 = -180_{-110}^{+100}$ MeV from analyzing nuclear collective flow in intermediate-high energy heavy-ion reactions [35]. Thus, it would be interesting to revisit the issue of forming possibly twin stars within the same meta-model EOSs as in our previous work [25, 26] but within the currently allowed whole space of EOS parameters instead of with their most probable values only. Indeed, we found that twin stars can exist in some EOS parameter space. Quantitatively, we examine the ΔM individually as a function of several key EOS parameters in their currently known uncertainty ranges.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: The meta-model EOSs describing nuclear matter and quark matter as well as the transition between them are introduced in Sec. II. Effects of the EOS parameters on the formation of twin stars are discussed in detail in Sec. III. Our findings are summarized in Sec. IV.

II. CONSTRUCTION OF EQUATIONS OF STATE FOR HYBRID STARS

In the present work, the EOS of nuclear matter ($npe\mu$) in NSs at β -equilibrium is described by a meta-model. The EOS of quark matter and its connection with nuclear matter in NSs is described by the CSS model. The latter is also a meta-model (in the sense that it is a model of models by varying its parameters). The two phases of NS matter are connected through a first-order phase transition with an energy density gap $\Delta\varepsilon$ and a transition density ρ_t . For the sake of completeness and clarity in subsequent discussions, we briefly recall the main features of these models. More details can be found in the literature as we shall point out in more detail.

A. An EOS for nuclear matter in neutron stars

In Ref. [36], we constructed a parameterized EOS of $npe\mu$ matter at β -equilibrium in NSs by parameterizing separately the EOS of SNM $E_0(\rho)$ and nuclear symmetry energy $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho)$ as:

$$E_0(\rho) = E_0(\rho_0) + \frac{K_0}{2} \left(\frac{\rho - \rho_0}{3\rho_0} \right)^2 + \frac{J_0}{6} \left(\frac{\rho - \rho_0}{3\rho_0} \right)^3, \quad (1)$$

$$E_{\text{sym}}(\rho) = E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0) + L \left(\frac{\rho - \rho_0}{3\rho_0} \right) + \frac{K_{\text{sym}}}{2} \left(\frac{\rho - \rho_0}{3\rho_0} \right)^2 + \frac{J_{\text{sym}}}{6} \left(\frac{\rho - \rho_0}{3\rho_0} \right)^3. \quad (2)$$

Details about this model can be found in our previous publications [25, 32–42]. We note here that the parameters in Eqs. (1) and (2) have dual meanings. On one hand, they can be seen as coefficients of Taylor expansions around the saturation density $\rho_0 \approx 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$ of SNM. They are extensively employed in various studies of NSs and nuclei, as well as their mergers and collisions. On the other hand, they serve purely as parameterizations when applied to extremely neutron-rich matter in NS with densities significantly larger than ρ_0 .

The binding energy $E_0(\rho_0)$ and incompressibility K_0 of SNM at the saturation density have been relatively well constrained to $E_0(\rho_0) = -15.9 \pm 0.4$ MeV and $K_0 = 240 \pm 20$ MeV [43, 44], while the magnitude $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ and slope L of symmetry energy at ρ_0 are constrained to $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0) = 31.7 \pm 3.2$ MeV and $L = 58.7 \pm 28.1$ MeV [45, 46], respectively. Regarding parameters characterizing the high-density behavior of nuclear matter, the curvature of the symmetry energy is around $K_{\text{sym}} = -100 \pm 100$ MeV [47–51], while the skewness of the SNM EOS is constrained to $J_0 = -190 \pm 100$ MeV [25, 33, 34, 38] based on terrestrial experiments and astrophysical observations. Few constraints on J_{sym} have been obtained so far, and it is only very roughly known to be around $-200 < J_{\text{sym}} < 800$ MeV [52–54].

Once the parameters in Eqs. (1) and (2) are given, the energy density for $npe\mu$ matter (also interchangeably called hadronic matter (HM)) at β -equilibrium in NSs can be calculated from

$$\varepsilon_{\text{HM}}(\rho, \delta) = \rho[E(\rho, \delta) + M_N] + \varepsilon_l(\rho, \delta), \quad (3)$$

where M_N represents the average nucleon mass of 938 MeV,

$$E(\rho, \delta) = E_0(\rho) + E_{\text{sym}}(\rho) \cdot \delta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4) \quad (4)$$

is the EOS of asymmetric nuclear matter (ANM), $\delta = (\rho_n + \rho_p)/\rho$ is the isospin asymmetry, and $\varepsilon_l(\rho, \delta)$ denotes the lepton energy density which can be calculated using the ideal Fermi gas model [55]. The baryon densities ρ_i of particle i can be obtained by solving the β -equilibrium condition $\mu_n - \mu_p = \mu_e = \mu_\mu \approx 4\delta E_{\text{sym}}(\rho)$ where $\mu_i = \partial\varepsilon(\rho, \delta)/\partial\rho_i$ and charge neutrality condition $\rho_p = \rho_e + \rho_\mu$. Then the energy density ε and pressure P both become barotropic, i.e. a function of density only. In particular, the pressure as a function of density only can be calculated from:

$$P(\rho) = \rho^2 \frac{d\varepsilon(\rho, \delta(\rho))/\rho}{d\rho}. \quad (5)$$

Based on the above equations, we can then obtain a unique EOS in the form of $P(\varepsilon)$ for the hadronic phase of NS matter once the parameters are fixed.

For the stated purposes of this work, to exclude the effects of varying the crust-core transition density on the properties of hybrid stars, we fix the crust-core transition density at 0.08 fm^{-3} and choose the NV EOS [56] for the inner crust and the BPS EoS [57] for the outer crust.

B. A meta-model for nuclear-quark phase transition and quark matter

To describe the possible quark matter in the cores of hybrid stars, we adopt the CSS model of Alford, Han, and Prakash assuming the phase transition from nuclear matter to quark matter is first-order [1, 58, 59]. In this model, the phase transition and the EOS of quark matter can be described by:

$$\varepsilon(\rho) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_{\text{HM}}(\rho) & \rho < \rho_t \\ \varepsilon_{\text{HM}}(\rho_t) + \Delta\varepsilon + c_s^{-2}(p - p_t) & \rho > \rho_t \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\text{HM}}(p)$ is the energy density of hadronic matter (HM) described in the previous subsection, p_t is the pressure at the transition density ρ_t , while $\Delta\varepsilon$ is the gap in energy density between the hadronic and quark phases. It has been shown in the literature that the CSS model can capture the characteristics of various microscopic quark matter models, such as Nambu–Jona-Lasinio models [59–62], perturbation theories [63, 64], or bag-model-like EOSs [65, 66]. It has been extensively employed in studying hybrid stars [1, 17, 25, 67–73].

Once the EOS of nuclear matter is determined, the properties of hybrid stars are solely dictated by the three CSS model parameters. By design, the stiffness of quark matter is controlled by the speed of sound squared c_s^2 . To support NSs at least as massive as about $2.0 M_\odot$, we limit c_s^2 to the range of $0.5 < c_s^2 < 1$. Similarly, a higher value of $\Delta\varepsilon$ leads to a smaller hybrid star mass, while a lower value of $\Delta\varepsilon$ complicates the formation of twin stars. We set $\Delta\varepsilon$ within the range of $150 < \Delta\varepsilon < 350 \text{ MeV}$. As for the transition density ρ_t , we select $1.5\rho_0 < \rho_t < 3.5\rho_0$ in this work. It is consistent with the relatively low transition densities found in Refs. [25, 73–75].

III. THE FORMATION OF TWIN STARS

In our previous study [26], by fixing the nuclear matter parameters to their most probable values mentioned above, we obtained constraints on the CSS parameters based on astrophysical observables. We found that the twin star is disfavored based on present observations. Going away from the most probable values for the nuclear EOS model parameters, in the following we present results of exploring the possible formation of twin stars in the whole EOS parameter space presently allowed, albeit some areas may have small probabilities to be reached according to some Bayesian analyses we and other have done. Because we have totally 9 EOS parameters, to

visualize our results and make the calculations manageable we examine the effects of each parameter individually within its currently known uncertainty ranges while keeping all other parameters at their presently known most probable values. This then limits us to see the effects of those poorly known parameters.

A. The effects of CSS parameters on twin stars

We first analyze the effects of the CSS parameters describing transition properties on the mass-radius phase diagram of hybrid stars. In Ref. [1], the plane of $p_t/\varepsilon_t \sim \Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon_t$ or $\rho_t/\rho_0 \sim \Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon_t$ is divided into four ranges. The occurrence of a twin star is possible in the quadrant characterized by relatively small ρ_t/ρ_0 and large $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon_t$, which varies for different EOSs of nuclear matter (see Ref. [67] for an example). These parameters are chosen to be comparable with the Seidov stability condition [76–78] for first-order phase transitions: $\Delta\varepsilon/\varepsilon_t \leq 1/2 + 3p_t/2\varepsilon_t$. The presence of a twin star is generally expected for small ρ_t and large $\Delta\varepsilon$.

Shown in Fig. 2 are the effects of varying respectively ρ_t (left panel), c_s^2 (middle panel), and $\Delta\varepsilon$ (right panel) on the mass-radius diagram of hybrid stars. The solid black line represents the mass-radius relation of a traditional NS without a phase transition when fixing the nuclear matter parameters to their most probable values ($J_{\text{sym}} = 800 \text{ MeV}$). The horizontal dotted line corresponds to $M = 2.0 M_\odot$. The shaded ranges depict the constraints from NICER on PSR J0030+0451 [27, 28] and PSR J0740+6620 [29, 30], as well as the mass-radius relation of HESS J1731-347 [79]. It is observed that the traditional NS can successfully satisfy the constraints imposed by NICER. Incorporating the phase transition visibly reduces the radii, making it more challenging to satisfy NICER’s constraints. Nevertheless, by adjusting the combinations of CSS parameters and nuclear matter parameters, it is possible to once again satisfy NICER’s constraints. As an example, the mass-radius diagram of a hybrid star ($c_s^2 = 1$, $\Delta\varepsilon = 300 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$, $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$, $K_{\text{sym}} = 0$, and $J_0 = -100 \text{ MeV}$) is shown in the left panel of Fig. 2. Compared with the dotted purple line of $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$, the change of nuclear matter parameters can once again satisfy NICER’s constraints. Given that the current study is primarily concerned with parameters influencing the formation of twin stars, we will not enforce the requirement that the theoretical mass-radius relationships should simultaneously describe properly the astrophysical observations in the following discussions.

As shown in the left panel, the condition $M_{\text{TOV}} \equiv M_{\text{max}} > 2 M_\odot$ is always satisfied as ρ_t increases from $1.5 \rho_0$ to $3.5 \rho_0$, while M_{TOV} correspondingly decreases from $2.2 M_\odot$ to $2 M_\odot$. The above relations arise from the stiff EOS of quark matter with $c_s^2 = 1$, which contributes to the increased maximum mass after a phase transition. The contribution from quark matter becomes more pronounced with decreasing ρ_t . As described in




FIG. 2: The effects of ρ_t (left panel), c_s^2 (middle panel), and $\Delta\epsilon$ (right panel) on the mass-radius relations of hybrid star. The solid black line represents the mass-radius relation of a traditional NS without a phase transition. The dash-dotted black line in the left panel represents the mass-radius relation of a hybrid star with $c_s^2 = 1$, $\Delta\epsilon = 300 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$, $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$, $K_{\text{sym}} = 0$, and $J_0 = -100 \text{ MeV}$. The horizontal dotted line corresponds to $M = 2.0 M_\odot$. The shaded ranges depict the constraints from NICER on PSR J0030+0451 [27, 28] and PSR J0740+6620 [29, 30], as well as the mass-radius relation of HESS J1731-347 [79].

the introduction, the mass range in which twin stars can coexist is measured by ΔM . Across all $M - R$ curves shown, the appearance of twin stars is evident within a narrow range of $\Delta M \leq 0.05 M_\odot$. As discussed below, the value of ρ_t emerges as a crucial determinant in the formation of twin stars.

The effects of c_s^2 on the mass-radius relations are depicted in the middle panel of Fig. 2. The squared speed of sound of nuclear matter at $2\rho_0$ is 0.52. Despite the fact that the EOS of the quark matter is stiffer compared to nuclear matter, a significant energy density discontinuity of $\Delta\epsilon = 300 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$ reduces the maximum mass from 2.09 to $1.63 M_\odot$ as c_s^2 decreases from 1 to 0.5. The effects of c_s^2 become noticeable as the mass-radius curves approach the maximum mass, suggesting that c_s^2 has limited impact on the formation of twin stars which normally form near the phase transition point. However, a larger c_s^2 would render the formation of twin stars more challenging, as stiffer EOSs with higher c_s^2 exhibit slightly greater mass at a fixed radius after a phase transition.

The most important role of CSS parameters in determining the formation of twin stars is displayed in the right panel of Fig. 2. The variation of $\Delta\epsilon$ from 150 to 350 $\text{MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$ not only reduces the maximum mass from 2.41 to $1.99 M_\odot$ but also gradually introduces the presence of twin stars when $\Delta\epsilon \geq 250 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$. The large maximum mass of $M_{\text{TOV}} = 2.41 M_\odot$ for $\Delta\epsilon = 150 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$ arises from the interplay of a stiff EOS of quark matter with $c_s^2 = 1$ and a small energy density discontinuity $\Delta\epsilon$. Given the apparent impact of $\Delta\epsilon$ on the formation of twin stars, we maintain $\Delta\epsilon = 300 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$ in the subsequent discussions when demonstrating the effects of nuclear EOS on twin stars.

B. The effects of SNM EOS on twin stars

As indicated in Eq. (1), the SNM EOS is determined by $E_0(\rho_0)$, K_0 , and J_0 . While the first two parameters are well-constrained by experiments, the uncertainty of J_0 remains relatively large, exerting a significant influence on the maximum mass of traditional NSs [42]. In previous studies, the J_0 is constrained to be approximately $-190 \pm 100 \text{ MeV}$ and we did not observe the formation of twin stars when nuclear matter parameters were fixed at their most probable values while varying the CSS parameters [26]. However, Refs. [17–19] opted for a wide range of J_0 values, spanning from an upper limit of 1000 MeV to a lower limit of -600 MeV . Consequently, it becomes imperative to meticulously examine the effects of J_0 on the formation of twin stars. Specifically, we need to ascertain whether twin stars can indeed form within $J_0 = -190 \pm 100 \text{ MeV}$.

The left panel of Fig. 3 illustrates the effects of J_0 on the mass-radius relations when $\rho_t = 2\rho_0, 3\rho_0$, and $c_s^2 = 0.6, 1$, respectively. Despite J_0 influencing the maximum mass of traditional NSs, we can see that the mass-radius curves are close to each other within the uncertainty of J_0 . A smaller J_0 results in a softer EOS and a smaller mass at the transition point for both $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$ and $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$. The influence of c_s^2 on the maximum mass is reproduced again. For $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$, the maximum masses converge for different J_0 values in hybrid stars. The uncertainty of J_0 introduces a maximum uncertainty of approximately 9% to the mass at a fixed radius for both $c_s^2 = 1$ and $c_s^2 = 0.6$. As ρ_t increases to $3\rho_0$, the effects of J_0 are slightly enhanced: the maximum uncertainty for the mass at a fixed radius does not converge and the deviation increases to about 15%, and the maximum mass exhibits uncertainties of 3% and 6% for $c_s^2 = 1$




FIG. 3: Left panel: The effects of J_0 on the mass-radius relations when $\rho_t = 2\rho_0, 3\rho_0$ and $c_s^2 = 0.6, 1$, respectively. The labeled black boxes mark the ranges where the corresponding phase transition happens. Right panel: The twin star mass range ΔM as a function of J_0 for different ρ_t and c_s^2 .




FIG. 4: Same as Fig. 3 but for the symmetry energy at saturation density $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$.

and $c_s^2 = 0.6$, respectively. The contribution of J_0 to the mass of traditional NSs is significantly mitigated by the relatively low transition density, given that the contribution from J_0 to the SNM EOS typically begins at around $2 - 3\rho_0$. However, larger uncertainties in J_0 might manifest notable effects on the mass-radius relations, thereby the formation of twin stars.

From the left panel of Fig. 3, it's also apparent that all curves exhibit the twin star phenomenon. To further elucidate the effects of J_0 on the formation of twin stars, the twin star mass range ΔM as a function of J_0 for different ρ_t and c_s^2 are depicted in the right panel of Fig. 3. The nearly horizontal lines indicate that J_0 exerts little influence on the formation of twin stars. Moreover, it's evident that increasing c_s^2 from 0.6 to 1 only marginally decreases the mass range of twin stars by less than $0.005 M_{\odot}$, rendering the formation of twin stars slightly more

challenging. Conversely, ρ_t exhibits pronounced effects by significantly reducing the mass range of twin stars and making their formation substantially more difficult.

It's worth noting that the effects of $E_0(\rho_0)$ and K_0 on twin star formation are not depicted here, given their relatively tight constraints compared to J_0 , and they have little impact on the formation of twin stars. Therefore, we can conclude that the EOS of SNM does not significantly influence the formation of twin stars.

C. The effects of symmetry energy on twin stars

It is well known that nuclear symmetry energy plays important roles in determining several properties of NSs, see e.g. Ref. [80] for comprehensive reviews. In particular, it is strongly correlated with the radii of canonical




FIG. 5: Same as Fig. 3 but for slope of symmetry energy L .




FIG. 6: Same as Fig. 3 but for curvature of symmetry energy K_{sym} .

NSs with masses around $1.4 M_{\odot}$, see, e.g., Refs.[81–83]. Peculiarly, its curvature K_{sym} is found to be even more important than L in determining the radius of canonical NSs [84]. As depicted in Fig. 2 or 3, twin stars typically appear around $1.4 M_{\odot}$, suggesting that the symmetry energy is likely to influence the formation of twin stars. The influence of L on the formation of twin stars is presented in Ref. [17, 19], indicating that greater values of L facilitate the formation of twin stars. However, the effects of other symmetry energy parameters are seldom discussed.

In the left panel of Fig. 4, the effects of $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ on the mass-radius relations are depicted for $\rho_t = 2\rho_0, 3\rho_0$, and $c_s^2 = 0.6, 1$, respectively. Given that $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ is tightly constrained to be 31.7 ± 3.2 MeV, all the mass-radius curves appear nearly identical when varying the CSS parameters. However, in comparison to J_0 , the smaller uncertainty of $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ results in a clearer decrease in ΔM with increasing $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ in the right panel of Fig. 4,

although the decrease remains subtle. More pronounced effects would be anticipated if $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ were less constrained.

As the slope of symmetry energy L has larger uncertainty compared to $E_{\text{sym}}(\rho_0)$ and it is sensitive to the radius of a canonical NS, L should affect the formation of twin star apparently. In the left panel of Fig. 5, its effects are illustrated. For $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$, the mass-radius curves exhibit distinct behavior, with mass (radius) increasing from $0.76 M_{\odot}$ (12.10 km) to $1.09 M_{\odot}$ (13.64 km) at the transition points as L varies from 30 to 90 MeV, respectively. Although each mass-radius curve maintains separation, they gradually converge as they approach maximum masses of 1.75 and $2.09 M_{\odot}$ for $c_s^2 = 0.6$ and 1, respectively. However, the effects of L are nearly imperceptible in the left panel of Fig. 5 for $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$, as all curves merge together and only exhibit slight separation around 11-12 km, where the twin star phenomenon appears. This is because L primarily influences the radius




FIG. 7: Same as Fig. 3 but for skewness of symmetry energy J_{sym} .

of canonical NSs but has little effect on the maximum mass (e.g., Fig. 3 in Ref. [37]). The contributions from K_{sym} and J_{sym} weaken the impact of L , and the δ^2 term in the Eq. (4) suppresses the contribution of the symmetry energy. Moreover, the relatively high transition density of $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$ results in nearly identical transition masses around $1.75 M_\odot$. The high transition density and energy density gap further attenuate the effects of L .

To better illustrate the effects of L on the formation of twin stars, the twin star mass range ΔM as a function of L is depicted in the right panel of Fig. 5. It's evident that the mass range ΔM increases with increasing L regardless of the choice of CSS parameters. Since the mass range ΔM of twin stars is typically smaller than $0.05 M_\odot$ when $\Delta\epsilon = 300 \text{ MeV}\cdot\text{fm}^{-3}$, the effects of L cannot be clearly discerned from the mass-radius alone. Instead, the ΔM vs. L relation should be examined. The twin star phenomenon would only disappear when $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$, $c_s^2 = 1$, and $L = 29 \text{ MeV}$ close to the lower limit of the uncertainty of L .

As a parameter affecting the EOS above about $2\rho_0$, the effects of K_{sym} on the mass-radius relations are depicted in the left panel of Fig. 6. Compared to the effects of L , the mass-radius relations before the phase transition are more crowded, but the transition mass differs for different K_{sym} values regardless of whether $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$ or $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$ is used. The trends of the mass-radius curves resemble the results shown in the left panel of Fig. 5 for $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$, but noticeable effects emerge after the phase transition for $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$. It is also demonstrated that the twin star phenomenon occurs for all the curves. To illustrate the effects of K_{sym} more clearly, the twin star mass range ΔM as a function of K_{sym} is presented in the right panel of Fig. 6. We can observe that K_{sym} exhibits almost the same impact as L within their current uncertainties.

The skewness J_{sym} of symmetry energy is crucial in determining the EOS of neutron-rich nucleonic matter at high densities above about $3\rho_0$. Its impact on the mass-

radius relations is depicted in the left panel of Fig. 7. Comparing this panel with those of L and K_{sym} in Figs. 5 and 6 reveals that while the effects of L , K_{sym} , and J_{sym} on the transition mass or radius decrease with $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$, they increase with $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$. A higher transition density enhances the influence of parameters associated with high-density properties of nuclear matter, whereas a lower transition density suppresses it.

The twin star mass range ΔM as a function of J_{sym} is illustrated in the right panel of Fig. 7. For $\rho_t = 2\rho_0$, the horizontal lines suggest that J_{sym} has little impact on the formation of twin stars. Similar trends are observed for $\rho_t = 3\rho_0$ when $J_{\text{sym}} \geq 0$. This is because J_{sym} significantly affects the radii of massive NSs but has only a slight effect on their masses (see, e.g., Fig. 2 in Ref. [42]). However, for $J_{\text{sym}} < 0$, the high-density symmetry energy becomes extremely soft, even decreasing with increasing density. Consequently, the isospin asymmetry δ at β -equilibrium increases due to the well-known isospin fraction phenomenon [85], accentuating the contribution of the symmetry energy to the EOS according to Eq. (4). More detailed discussions on the astrophysical impact of the super-soft symmetry energy at high-densities can be found in Ref. [86]. As a result, a softer high-density EOS is obtained, and the corresponding maximum mass is much smaller than $2 M_\odot$, potentially leading to its exclusion even without considering phase transitions. Thus, it can be concluded that J_{sym} does not affect the formation of twin stars.

IV. SUMMARY

In summary, within a meta-model for hybrid NS EOSs, we investigated the viability of twin stars and how the EOS parameters influence their formation, instead of how the current NS observations may constrain the properties of twin stars. We found that the existence of twin

stars remains inconclusive, as we first need to precisely determine numerous EOS parameters characterizing nuclear matter, quark matter, and the phase transition between them. The EOS of SNM exhibits minimal influence on the formation of twin stars. In contrast, the nuclear symmetry energy, particularly its slope L and curvature K_{sym} , significantly impacts the formation of twin stars. Moreover, the largest mass range for twin stars to coexist is found to be about $\Delta M \approx 0.05 M_{\odot}$, indicating that the formation of twin stars is infrequent based on our current knowledge about NS EOS. However, the mass range can be enhanced if we select larger $\Delta\varepsilon$ values.

The CSS model assumes that the phase transition from nuclear matter to quark matter is first-order, and the speed of sound of quark matter is constant. Since the latter has minimal impact compared to the other two CSS parameters, the conclusions in the present work would remain unchanged even if we choose another model with a density-dependent speed of sound for the quark matter phase. Finally, we also note that Ref. [87] proposed very recently that twin stars could be formed

without considering the first-order phase transition when the c_s^2 monotonically increases with energy density. The second stable branch on the mass-radius curve might emerge at super-high densities. Further studies within our framework are needed to clarify this point in comparison with what we have found above in this work.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Bao-Jun Cai, Xavier Grundler and Wen-Jie Xie for helpful discussions. BAL is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, under Award Number DE-SC0013702, the CUSTIPEN (China-U.S. Theory Institute for Physics with Exotic Nuclei) under the US Department of Energy Grant No. DE-SC0009971. NBZ is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12375120, the Zhishan Young Scholar of Southeast University under Grant No. 2242024RCB0013 and the Start-up Research Fund of Southeast University under Grant No. RF1028623060.

-
- [1] M. G. Alford, S. Han, and M. Prakash, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 083013 (2013).
 - [2] J. M. Bardeen, K. S. Thorne, and D. W. Meltzer, *Astrophys. J.* **145**, 505 (1966).
 - [3] B. K. Harrison, K. S. Thorne, M. Wakano, and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation theory and gravitational collapse*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press (1965).
 - [4] U.H. Gerlach, *Phys. Rev.* **172**, 1325 (1968).
 - [5] Kämpfer, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **14**, L471, (1981).
 - [6] Kämpfer, *Phys. Lett. B* **101**, 366 (1981).
 - [7] N. K. Glendenning and C. Kettner, *Astron. Astrophys.* **353**, L9–L12 (2000).
 - [8] K. Schertler, C. Greiner, J. Schaffner-Bielich, and M.H. Thoma, *Nucl. Phys. A* **677**, 463 (2000).
 - [9] M. G. Alford and S. Han, *Euro. Phys. J. A* **52**, 66 (2016).
 - [10] I. F. Ranea-Sandoval, S. Han, M. G. Orsaria, G. A. Contrera, F. Weber, and M. G. Alford, *Phys. Rev. C* **93**, 045812 (2016).
 - [11] G. Montana, L. Tolos, M. Hanauske, and L. Rezzolla, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 103009 (2019).
 - [12] P. Espino and V. Paschalidis, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 043014 (2022).
 - [13] Jan-Erik Christian and J. Schaffner-Bielich, *Astrophys. J.* **894**, L8 (2020).
 - [14] Jan-Erik Christian and J. Schaffner-Bielich, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 063042 (2021).
 - [15] Jan-Erik Christian and J. Schaffner-Bielich, *Astrophys. J.* **935**, 122 (2022).
 - [16] Lazaros Tsaloukidis, P. S. Koliogiannis, A. Kanakis-Pegios, and Ch. C. Moustakidis, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 023012 (2023).
 - [17] J. J. Li, A. Sedrakian, and M. Alford, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, L121302 (2021).
 - [18] J. J. Li, A. Sedrakian, and M. Alford, *Astrophysical J.* **944**, 206 (2023).
 - [19] J. J. Li, A. Sedrakian, and M. Alford, *Astrophys. J.* **967**, 116 (2024).
 - [20] T. Gorda, K. Hebeler, A. Kurkela, A. Schwenk, and A. Vuorinen, *Astrophys. J.* **955**, 100 (2023).
 - [21] H. Y. Sun and D. H. Wen, *Physical Review C* **108**, 025801 (2023).
 - [22] B. K. Pradhan, D. Chatterjee, and D. E. Alvarez-Castillo, *arXiv:2309.08775* (2023).
 - [23] S. Imajo, A. Miyake, R. Kurihara, M. Tokunaga, K. Kindo, S. Horiuchi, and F. Kagawa, *arXiv:2402.00391* (2024).
 - [24] J. P. Carlomagno, G. A. Contrera, A. G. Grunfeld, and D. Blaschke, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 043050 (2024).
 - [25] W. J. Xie and B. A. Li, *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, 035802 (2021).
 - [26] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 025803 (2023).
 - [27] M. C. Miller *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **887**, L24 (2019).
 - [28] T. E. Riley *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **887**, L21 (2021).
 - [29] M. C. Miller *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **918**, L28 (2021).
 - [30] T. E. Riley *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **918**, L27 (2021).
 - [31] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 161101 (2018).
 - [32] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *Euro. Phys. J. A* **55**, 39 (2019).
 - [33] W. J. Xie and B. A. Li, *Astrophys. J.* **883**, 174 (2019).
 - [34] W. J. Xie and B. A. Li, *Astrophys. J.* **899**, 4 (2020).
 - [35] W. J. Xie and B. A. Li, *J. Phys. G* **48**, 025110 (2021).
 - [36] N. B. Zhang, B. A. Li, and J. Xu, *Astrophys. J.* **859**, 90 (2018).
 - [37] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *J. Phys. G: Nucl. Part. Phys.* **46**, 014002 (2019).
 - [38] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *Astrophys. J.* **879**, 99 (2019).
 - [39] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *Astrophys. J.* **883**, 61 (2020).
 - [40] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *Astrophys. J.* **921**, 111 (2020).
 - [41] N. B. Zhang and B. A. Li, *Euro. Phys. J. A* **59**, 86 (2023).
 - [42] W. J. Xie, B. A. Li, and N. B. Zhang, *arXiv:2404.01989v1* (2024).
 - [43] U. Garg and G. Colò, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **101**, 55 (2018).

- [44] S. Shlomo, V. M. Kolomietz, and G. Colò, *Euro. Phys. J. A* **30**, 23 (2006).
- [45] B. A. Li and X. Han, *Phys. Lett. B* **727**, 276 (2013).
- [46] M. Oertel, M. Hempel, T. Klähn, and S. Typel, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **89**, 015007 (2017).
- [47] B. A. Li, B. J. Cai, W. J. Xie, and N. B. Zhang, *Universe* **7**, 182 (2021).
- [48] G. Grams, R. Somasundaram, J. Margueron, and E. Khan, *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 044305 (2022).
- [49] J. Margueron, R. H. Casali, and F. Gulminelli, *Phys. Rev. C* **97**, 025806 (2018).
- [50] C. Mondal, B. K. Agrawal, J. N. De, S. K. Samaddar, M. Centelles, and X. Viñas, *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 021302 (2017).
- [51] R. Somasundaram, C. Drischler, I. Tews, and J. Margueron, *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, 045803 (2021).
- [52] B. J. Cai and L. W. Chen, *Nucl. Sci. Tech.* **28**, 185 (2017).
- [53] N. B. Zhang, B. J. Cai, B. A. Li, W. G. Newton, and J. Xu, *Nucl. Sci. Tech.* **28**, 181 (2017).
- [54] I. Tews, J. M. Lattimer, A. Ohnishi, and E. E. Kolomeitsev, *Astrophys. J.* **848**, 105 (2017).
- [55] J. Oppenheimer and G. Volkoff, *Phys. Rev.* **55**, 374 (1939).
- [56] J. W. Negele and D. Vautherin, *Nucl. Phys. A* **207**, 298 (1973).
- [57] G. Baym, C. J. Pethick, and P. Sutherland, *Astrophys. J.* **170**, 299 (1971).
- [58] N. Chamel, A. Fantina, J. Pearson, and S. Goriely, *Astron. Astrophys.* **553**, A22 (2013).
- [59] J. Zdunik and P. Haensel, *Astron. Astrophys.* **551**, A61 (2013).
- [60] B. Agrawal, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 023009 (2010).
- [61] L. Bonanno and A. Sedrakian, *Astron. Astrophys.* **539**, A16 (2012).
- [62] R. Lastowiecki, D. Blaschke, H. Grigorian, and S. Typel, *Acta Phys. Pol. B Proc. Suppl.* **5**, 535 (2012).
- [63] A. Kurkela, P. Romatschke, A. Vuorinen, and B. Wu, *arXiv:1006.4062* (2010).
- [64] A. Kurkela, P. Romatschke, and A. Vuorinen, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 105021 (2010).
- [65] S. Traversi, P. Char, G. Pagliara, and A. Drago, *Astron. Astrophys.* **660**, A62 (2022).
- [66] S. Traversi and P. Char, *Astrophys. J.* **905**, 9 (2020).
- [67] M. G. Alford, G. F. Burgio, S. Han, G. Taranto, and D. Zappalà, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 083002 (2015).
- [68] A. Ayriyan, D. E. Alvarez-Castillo, D. Blaschke, H. Grigorian, and M. Sokolowski, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **46**, 854 (2015).
- [69] C. Drischler, S. Han, J. M. Lattimer, M. Prakash, S. Reddy, and T. Q. Zhao, *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, 045808 (2021).
- [70] K. Chatziioannou and S. Han, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 044019 (2020).
- [71] S. Han and M. Prakash, *Astrophys. J.* **899**, 164 (2020).
- [72] A. Li, G. C. Yong, and Y. X. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 043005 (2023).
- [73] Z. Q. Miao, A. Li, Z. Y. Zhu, and S. Han, *Astrophys. J.* **904**, 103 (2020).
- [74] A. Li, Z. Q. Miao, S. Han, and B. Zhang, *Astrophys. J.* **913**, 27 (2021).
- [75] R. Somasundaram and J. Margueron, *Europhysics Letters* **138**, 14002 (2022).
- [76] Z. F. Seidov, *Sov. Astron.* **15**, 347 (1971).
- [77] R. Schaeffer, L. Zdunik, and P. Haensel, *Astron. Astrophys.* **126**, 121 (1983).
- [78] L. Lindblom, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 024008 (1998).
- [79] V. Doroshenko, V. Suleimanov, G. Pühlhofer, and A. Santangelo, *Nature Astronomy* **6**, 1444 (2022).
- [80] Topical Issue on Nuclear Symmetry Energy, Eds. B.A. Li, A. Ramos, G. Verde and I. Vidana, *The European Physical Journal A* **50**, 9 (2014).
- [81] A. W. Steiner, M. Prakash, J. M. Lattimer and P. J. Ellis, *Phys. Rept.* **411**, 325 (2005).
- [82] B. A. Li and A. W. Steiner, *Phys. Lett. B* **642**, 436 (2006).
- [83] J. M. Lattimer and A. W. Steiner, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **50**, 40 (2014).
- [84] J. Richter, B. A. Li, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 055803 (2023).
- [85] B. A. Li, L. W. Chen, and C. M. Ko, *Phys. Rep.* **464**, 113 (2008).
- [86] B. A. Li, P. G. Krastev, D. H. Wen and N. B. Zhang, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **55**, 117 (2019).
- [87] R. Essick, *arXiv:2405.05395* (2024).