

THE COMPACT CIRCUMSTELLAR MATERIAL OF SN 2024GGI: ANOTHER SUPERNOVA WITH A PRE-EXPLOSION EFFERVESCENT ZONE AND JET-DRIVEN EXPLOSION

NOAM SOKER

Department of Physics, Technion, Haifa, 3200003, Israel; soker@technion.ac.il

Version June 26, 2024

ABSTRACT

I examine recent theoretical studies and observations of the recent core-collapse supernova (CCSN) SN 2024ggi and find that the likely explanation for its dense, compact circumstellar material is an effervescent model, where parcels or streams of gas are uplifted by stellar convection and pulsation and fall back. The effervescent zone exists alongside the regular wind from the red supergiant (RSG) progenitor of SN 2024ggi. I find that an extended wind-acceleration zone encounters some difficulties in accounting for the required CSM mass. Recent modelling finds the explosion energy of SN 2024ggi to be $E_{\text{exp}} > 10^{51}$ erg, and up to $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{51}$ erg. I examine this explosion energy against a recent study of the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism and find that this mechanism has difficulties in accounting for the required energy. This suggests that the explosion was caused by the jittering jets explosion mechanism (JJEM), adding to other recent pieces of evidence supporting the JJEM, particularly point-symmetric CCSN remnants.

Subject headings: stars: massive – stars: mass-loss – supernovae: general; supernova: individual: SN 2024ggi

1. INTRODUCTION

Studies fit the type IIP core-collapse supernova (CCSN) SN 2024ggi lightcurve and spectroscopic properties with a compact pre-explosion circumstellar material (CSM; e.g., [Chen et al. 2024a,b](#); [Jacobson-Galán et al. 2024](#); [Pessi et al. 2024](#); [Shrestha et al. 2024](#); [Xiang et al. 2024](#); [Zhang et al. 2024](#)). By compact CSM, I refer to CSM with which the ejecta collides within days after the explosion, unlike SN 1987A, where a collision occurs years after the explosion. In principle, compact dense CSM of CCSN progenitors might result from an enhanced mass loss rate that starts years to weeks before explosion, possibly accompanied by a pre-explosion outburst (e.g., [Foley et al. 2007](#); [Pastorello et al. 2007](#); [Smith et al. 2010](#); [Margutti et al. 2014](#); [Ofek et al. 2014](#); [Svirski & Nakar 2014](#); [Tartaglia et al. 2016](#); [Yaron et al. 2017](#); [Wang, Wang, & Dai 2019](#); [Bruch et al. 2020](#); [Prentice et al. 2020](#); [Strotjohann et al. 2021](#); [Jacobson-Galán et al. 2022](#)), an extended long-lived dense zone above the stellar photosphere (e.g., [Dessart et al. 2017](#)), an extended accelerated zone of the wind (e.g., [Moriya et al. 2017, 2018](#)) or by a long-lived extended dense zone of uprising and falling gas parcels or streams above the stellar photosphere (e.g., [Soker 2021, 2023](#); [Fuller & Tsuna 2024](#); see further discussion by [Fuller & Tsuna 2024](#)). SN 2024ggi did not experience an outburst within years before the explosion (e.g., [Shrestha et al. 2024](#)).

The properties of the compact CSM of SN 2024ggi are not much different from those of SN 2023ixf (for SN 2023ixf, e.g., [Berger et al. 2023](#); [Bostroem et al. 2023](#); [Grefenstette et al. 2023](#); [Jacobson-Galan et al. 2023](#); [Kilpatrick et al. 2023](#); [Singh Teja et al. 2023](#); [Smith et al. 2023](#)), which also did not have any pre-explosion outburst

that could have formed the compact CSM (e.g., [Jencson et al. 2023](#); [Neustadt, Kochanek, & Rizzo Smith 2023](#); [Soraisam et al. 2023](#)). In [Soker \(2023\)](#), I argued that the best explanation for the compact pre-explosion CSM of SN 2023ixf is an effervescent Zone. In this study, I make a similar claim for the compact CSM of SN 2024ggi.

Most studies of SN 2024ggi mentioned above ignore the effervescent zone model and the similar model by [Fuller & Tsuna \(2024\)](#), which includes many more details; in both models, convective motion and pulsation uplift the bound material, but [Fuller & Tsuna \(2024\)](#) calculate the uplifting of material by shocks that the convection excites above the photosphere. In this study, I use the term effervescent zone model to include both the model studied by [Soker \(2023\)](#) and [Fuller & Tsuna \(2024\)](#). In some aspects, but not all, the hydrostatic model of [Dessart et al. 2017](#) can also be grouped with the effervescent zone model.

In section 2, I examine the proposed wind acceleration zone that [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) construct for the dense compact CSM of SN 2024ggi. I reiterate my claim that the effervescent zone should not be ignored. In section 3 I comment on the interesting finding by [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) that their best fit gives an explosion energy of $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{51}$ erg. This has implications for the likely explosion mechanism of SN 2024ggi that I emphasize. In my summary in section 4, I comment on the relation between the effervescent zone model and the explosion mechanism.

2. THE COMPACT CSM OF SN 2024GGI

A most recent study and analysis of the compact CSM of SN 2024ggi is that by [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#). They consider the wind acceleration model of [Moriya et al. \(2018\)](#)

for a compact CSM that extends to $R_{\text{CSM}} \simeq 6 \times 10^{14}$ cm, and that has a mass loss rate of $\dot{M}_{\text{CSM}} \simeq 0.001 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ for a wind terminal velocity of $v_w = 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The wind velocity is lower near the star as it is accelerated, such that the total wind mass within the radius of R_{CSM} is $M_{\text{CSM}} \simeq 0.4 M_{\odot}$. There are two challenges to this CSM model, as I discuss next.

The first challenge is to explain what accelerates the wind. The reason is that the momentum in the radiation is much smaller than that of the wind. Momentum balance limits the mass loss of the wind that radiation can accelerate. It is given by the equation $\dot{M}_{\text{wc}} v_w \simeq \eta_w L/c$, where v_w is the terminal wind speed, L the stellar luminosity, and η_w is the average number of times that a photon transfers its momentum to the wind in the outward radial direction,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{M}_{\text{wc}} &\simeq 4 \times 10^{-4} \eta_w \left(\frac{L}{2 \times 10^5 L_{\odot}} \right) \\ &\times \left(\frac{v_w}{10 \text{ km s}^{-1}} \right)^{-1} M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The mass loss rate of the wind-accelerated zone of [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) requires $\eta_w \simeq 2.5$. This requires several scattering of the photons, which is unclear how to achieve to distances of > 10 AU from the star. With the same model [Moriya & Singh \(2024\)](#) estimate the mass loss rate to build the CSM of SN 2023ixf to be $0.001 - 0.01 M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, which requires the highly-unlikely value of up to $\eta_w \simeq 25$.

The demand for $\eta_w \simeq 2.5$ at distances of tens of AU from the star is challenging for the wind-acceleration zone model. Note that the number η_w does not refer to the total scattering of photons but to the scattering in the radial direction, such that the photon deposits a radial outward momentum. A simple optically-thick medium does not increase η_w above 1. One needs scattering from different sides of the star, namely, that photons bounce from one side to another.

The terminal wind velocity that [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) and [Moriya & Singh \(2024\)](#) take in their model, $v_w = 10 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, is much lower than the escape velocity from red supergiant (RSGs) progenitors of SNe II. It is even more problematic as this is lower than the escape velocity at the outer boundary of the compact dense CSM

$$\begin{aligned} v_w = 10 \text{ km s}^{-1} &< v_{\text{esc}}(R_{\text{CSM}}) = 13.3 \\ &\times \left(\frac{M_{\text{RGB}}}{4 M_{\odot}} \right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{R_{\text{CSM}}}{6 \times 10^{14} \text{ cm}} \right)^{-1/2} \text{ km s}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The RSG mass is likely higher than the above scaling of $M_{\text{RGB}} = 4 M_{\odot}$. This implies that the acceleration zone must continue beyond $R_{\text{CSM}} = 6 \times 10^{14}$ cm.

The most important and robust parameter of the CSM that [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) and [Moriya & Singh \(2024\)](#) obtain in their modeling is the CSM mass. If the terminal wind velocity is taken to be higher, as should be for such RSG stars, by a factor of k_w , then the mass loss rate should also be k_w higher. This implies a wind radial momentum larger by a factor of k_w^2 , and so is the value of η_w . This would make the value of $\eta_w \gg 10$ unrealistically high.

This section concludes that the wind-accelerated zone model for a compact and dense CSM of SN 2023ixf and

SN 2024ggi encounters severe challenges. I consider this model unlikely to explain the CSM of SN 2024ggi and SN 2023ixf. However, the total CSM mass and the explosion energy that [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) and [Moriya & Singh \(2024\)](#) obtain in their modeling hold.

3. THE IMPLICATION OF $E_{\text{EXP}} \gtrsim 2 \times 10^{51}$ erg

With their accelerated-wind zone model for the CSM, [Chen et al. \(2024a\)](#) estimated the explosion energy of SN 2024ggi to be $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{51}$ erg, and [Moriya & Singh \(2024\)](#) estimate the explosion energy of SN 2023ixf to be $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 2 - 3 \times 10^{51}$ erg. Their fitting might apply to the effervescent zone model if it has a similar density profile. [Jacobson-Galán et al. \(2024\)](#) adopted an explosion energy of $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 1.2 \times 10^{51}$ erg for SN 2024ggi. Such explosion energies challenge the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism of CCSNe, which cannot account for explosion energies of $E_{\text{exp}} \gtrsim 2 \times 10^{51}$ erg, and even for $E_{\text{exp}} \gtrsim 10^{51}$ erg it has severe difficulties to account for (e.g., [Fryer et al. 2012](#); [Ertl et al. 2016](#); [Sukhbold et al. 2016](#); [Gogilashvili, Murphy, & Mabanta 2021](#)). To emphasize this limitation of the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism, I critically examine a most recent study by [Nakamura et al. \(2024\)](#), who write, ‘‘We find that neutrino-driven explosions occur for all models within 0.3 s after bounce.’’

[Nakamura et al. \(2024\)](#) conduct three-dimensional magnetohydrodynamical simulations of the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism for stellar models with different zero-age main sequence masses from $9 M_{\odot}$ to $24 M_{\odot}$. Their stellar models are from [Sukhbold et al. \(2016\)](#). The diagnostic explosion energy of their results is the sum of all numerical cells where the total energy is positive, and the materials have a positive radial velocity. The integrand is the sum of kinetic, gravitational, internal, and magnetic energy. In [Figure 1](#), I present their figure of the evolution of the diagnostic explosion energy, E_{Diag} with time.

The final explosion energy is the diagnostic energy minus the binding energy of the rest of the envelope and core (termed overburden), namely, $R_{\text{exp}} = E_{\text{Diag}} - \Delta E_{\text{OV}}$. Because [Nakamura et al. \(2024\)](#) do not give the binding energy of the rest of their stellar models (overburden), I take overburden energies from the simulations of [Mezzacappa et al. \(2015\)](#) who give this for 4 models at $t \simeq 1.2$ s when the shock radius is larger than those at the end of the simulations by [Nakamura et al. \(2024\)](#) each at $t = 0.3$ s. This implies that the binding energy (overburden) values should be larger even. Also, [Mezzacappa et al. \(2015\)](#) and [Nakamura et al. \(2024\)](#) do not use the same models. Therefore, the binding energy I give in the insets in [Figure 1](#) are approximate values. These values, nonetheless, clearly point to the very low final explosion energies (to distinguish from the diagnostic explosion energy) that [Nakamura et al. \(2024\)](#) obtain. Those models that explode have energies of $E_{\text{exp}} \lesssim 0.1 \times 10^{51}$ erg while some others seem to have negative energy, namely, they do not explode, e.g., the simulations for $M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 16, 18, 19, 20$ lead to no explosion.

For the purpose of the present study, relevant is the limit of $E_{\text{exp}} < 1.2 \times 10^{51}$ erg of most simulation results of the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism. In




FIG. 1.— A figure adapted from Nakamura et al. (2024). The different lines show the evolution of the diagnostic energy in their simulations of the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism of stellar models differ in their zero-age main sequence mass, as indicated on the inset on the left (foe stands for fifty-one erg, i.e., 10^{51} erg). The diagnostic energy includes only grid cells with positive energy that moves radially outwards. With three horizontal black lines, I emphasize cases where the diagnostic energy does not increase at the end of their simulation, or, for $M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 14M_{\odot}$, even decreases at the end. In the inset attached to the three cases with the largest diagnostic energies, I write the estimated binding energy of the stellar parts with negative energy, namely the binding energy ΔE_{OV} (overburden; based on Mezzacappa et al. 2015), as well as the expected final explosion energy $E_{\text{exp}} = E_{\text{Diag}} - \Delta E_{\text{OV}}$: $E_{\text{exp}}(14M_{\odot}) \simeq 0.1 \times 10^{51}$ erg and $E_{\text{exp}}(24M_{\odot}) \simeq 0.1 \times 10^{51}$ erg. For the cases of $M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 16, 18, 19, 20$, the overburden is larger than the diagnostic energy, and I expect no explosion (or one with very low energy of $\ll 0.1$ foe) according to the simulations by Nakamura et al. (2024). I mark this only for $E_{\text{exp}}(20M_{\odot}) < 0$. Using the overburden

their very long simulation to 7 seconds after bounce, Bolig et al. (2021) find the explosion energy of a model with $M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 19M_{\odot}$ to be $\simeq 10^{51}$ erg. Even the diagnostic explosion energies of Nakamura et al. (2024) do not reach these values. Mezzacappa et al. (2015) obtain higher explosion energies than Nakamura et al. (2024), but still of $E_{\text{exp}} < 10^{51}$ erg. Burrows, Wang, & Vartanyan (2024) obtain higher explosion energies, but still most models have $E_{\text{exp}} < 1.2 \times 10^{51}$ erg. Their results do not agree with those of Nakamura et al. (2024), e.g., Burrows, Wang, & Vartanyan (2024) obtain clear explosion with $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 10^{51}$ erg in models with negative value of E_{exp} in the simulations of Nakamura et al. (2024), e.g., $M_{\text{ZAMS}} = 16, 18, 19, 20$. Such qualitative disagreements between groups simulating the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism are a severe problem for this model.

The conclusion from the short discussion above is that the modelings of SN2024ggi and SN2023ixf suggest that the explosion mechanism of their progenitors was not the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism. Adding to this energetic consideration the challenge of the delayed

neutrino mechanism to explain the point-symmetric morphologies of some CCSN remnants identified in the last two years (e.g., Bear & Soker 2024; Soker 2024a,b,c), I conclude that the most likely explosion mechanism of the progenitors of SN 2024ggi and SN 2023ixf was the jittering jets explosion mechanism (JJEM). The JJEM can also account for the polarization of CCSNe and its correlation with the explosion energy (for the correlation, see Nagao et al. 2024b), as well as for bipolar CCSNe (e.g., Nagao et al. 2024a).

4. SUMMARY

The two recent relatively near CCSNe SN 2023ixf and SN 2024ggi allow good fitting to their light curves and spectra, suggesting a dense compact CSM in both cases. There are no indications of pre-explosion outbursts in either of these CCSNe. This limits the possibility of the compact CSM being modeled with a relatively long-lived CSM. Moriya & Singh (2024) and Chen et al. (2024a) suggest this CSM be the wind acceleration zone of SN 2023ixf and SN 2024ggi, respectively. In section 2 I concentrated on the recent model by Chen et al. (2024a)

and argued that the acceleration-wind zone model of the CSM requires an unlikely large number of photon scattering events in the radial direction, i.e., $\eta_w \gg 1$. Instead, I proposed the effervescent zone model for a pre-explosion dense compact CSM of SN 2024ggi, as I suggested for SN 2023ixf (Soker 2023), or the similar model of Fuller & Tsuna (2024). I encourage future studies of ejecta-CSM interaction of CCSNe, including SN 2023ixf and SN 2024ggi, not to ignore the effervescent zone model and similar ones (e.g., Soker 2023; Fuller & Tsuna 2024).

Moriya & Singh (2024) and Chen et al. (2024a) also find their best fitting to give explosion energy of $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 2 \times 10^{51}$ erg for both these CCSNe, and Jacobson-Galán et al. (2024) adopted an explosion energy of $E_{\text{exp}} \simeq 1.2 \times 10^{51}$ erg for SN 2024ggi. In section 3, I argued that these energies are a tough challenge to the delayed neutrino explosion mechanism. The energetic challenge adds to the extremely tough challenge of the delayed neutrino mechanism to explain point symmetric CCSN remnants, as was pointed out in 2023-2024 (e.g., Soker 2024b). I concluded in section 3 that the JJEM best explains the

explosion energy of SN 2024ggi.

The existence of a massive effervescent zone requires strong pulsation and envelope convection (e.g., Soker (2023), as was shown in detail by Fuller & Tsuna (2024) for a similar CSM model (I use effervescent to include both). The JJEM requires vigorous pre-explosion core convection (e.g., Papish & Soker 2011; Gilkis & Soker 2014, 2016; Shishkin & Soker 2021, 2022; Wang, Shishkin, & Soker 2024). The delayed neutrino explosion mechanism also requires pre-collapse convection to induce perturbations in the collapsing core that aid explosion (e.g., Couch et al. 2015; Müller 2020; Bollig et al. 2021; Yamada et al. 2024). I conclude that the correct modeling of convection, crucially in the inner core but also important in the envelope, is mandatory to explore the explosion and evolution of CCSNe.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Luc Dessart for his helpful comments. This research was supported by a grant from the Pazy Foundation.

REFERENCES

- Bear E., Soker N., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2403.07625](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.07625).
- Berger E., Keating G. K., Margutti R., Maeda K., Alexander K. D., Cendes Y., Eftekhari T., et al., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.09311](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.09311).
- Bollig R., Yadav N., Kresse D., Janka H.-T., Müller B., Heger A., 2021, *ApJ*, 915, 28.
- Bostroem K. A., Pearson J., Shrestha M., Sand D. J., Valenti S., Jha S. W., Andrews J. E., et al., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.10119](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10119).
- Bruch, R. J., Gal-Yam, A., Schulze, S., et al. 2020, [arXiv:2008.09986](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.09986)
- Burrows A., Wang T., Vartanyan D., 2024, *ApJL*, 964, L16.
- Chen T.-W., Yang S., Srivastav S., Moriya T. J., Smartt S. J., Rest S., Rest A., et al., 2024a, arXiv, [arXiv:2406.09270](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.09270).
- Chen X., Kumar B., Er X., Guo H., Yang Y.-P., Lin W., Fang Y., et al., 2024b, arXiv, [arXiv:2405.07964](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07964).
- Couch S. M., Chatzopoulos E., Arnett W. D., Timmes F. X., 2015, *ApJL*, 808, L21.
- Dessart, L., John Hillier, D., & Audit, E. 2017, *A&A*, 605, A83
- Ertl T., Janka H.-T., Woosley S. E., Sukhbold T., Ugliano M., 2016, *ApJ*, 818, 124.
- Foley, R. J., Smith, N., Ganeshalingam, M., Li, W., Chornock, R., & Filippenko, A. V. 2007, *ApJ*, 657, L105
- Fryer C. L., Belczynski K., Wiktorowicz G., Dominik M., Kalogera V., Holz D. E., 2012, *ApJ*, 749, 91.
- Fuller J., Tsuna D., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2405.21049](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.21049).
- Gilkis A., Soker N., 2014, *MNRAS*, 439, 4011.
- Gilkis A., Soker N., 2016, *ApJ*, 827, 40.
- Gogilashvili M., Murphy J. W., Mabanta Q., 2021, *MNRAS*, 500, 5393.
- Grefenstette B. W., Brightman M., Earnshaw H. P., Harrison F. A., Margutti R., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.04827](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.04827).
- Jacobson-Galán W. V., Davis K. W., Kilpatrick C. D., Dessart L., Margutti R., Chornock R., Foley R. J., et al., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2404.19006](https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.19006). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2404.19006
- Jacobson-Galán W. V., Dessart L., Jones D. O., Margutti R., Coppejan D. L., Dimitriadis G., Foley R. J., et al., 2022, *ApJ*, 924, 15.
- Jacobson-Galán W. V., Dessart L., Margutti R., Chornock R., Foley R. J., Kilpatrick C. D., Jones D. O., et al., 2023, *ApJL*, 954, L42.
- Jencson J. E., Pearson J., Beasor E. R., Lau R. M., Andrews J. E., Bostroem K. A., Dong Y., et al., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.08678](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.08678).
- Kilpatrick C. D., Foley R. J., Jacobson-Galán W. V., Piro A. L., Smartt S. J., Drout M. R., Gagliano A., et al., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.04722](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.04722).
- Margutti, R., Milisavljevic, D., Soderberg, A. M., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 780, 21
- Mezzacappa A., Bruenn S. W., Lentz E. J., Hix W. R., Harris J. A., Bronson Messer O. E., Endeve E., et al., 2015, arXiv, [arXiv:1501.01688](https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.01688).
- Moriya T. J., Förster F., Yoon S.-C., Gräfenner G., Blinnikov S. I., 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 2840.
- Moriya T. J., Singh A., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2406.00928](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.00928).
- Moriya, T. J., Yoon, S.-C., Gräfenner, G., & Blinnikov, S. I. 2017, *MNRAS*, 469, L108
- Müller B., 2020, *LRCA*, 6, 3.
- Nagao T., Maeda K., Mattila S., Kuncarayakti H., Kawabata M., Taguchi K., Nakaoka T., et al., 2024a, arXiv, [arXiv:2406.14057](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.14057).
- Nagao T., Patat F., Cikota A., Baade D., Mattila S., Kotak R., Kuncarayakti H., et al., 2024b, *A&A*, 681, A11.
- Nakamura K., Takiwaki T., Matsumoto J., Kotake K., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2405.08367](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08367).
- Neustadt J. M. M., Kochanek C. S., Rizzo Smith M., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.06162](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.06162).
- Ofek, E. O., Sullivan, M., Shaviv, N. J., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 789, 104
- Papish O., Soker N., 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 1697.
- Pastorello, A., Smartt, S. J., Mattila, S., et al. 2007, *Nature*, 447, 829
- Pessi T., Cartier R., Hueichapan E., de Brito Silva D., Prieto J. L., Muñoz R. R., Medina G. E., et al., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2405.02274](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.02274). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2405.02274
- Prentice, S. J., Maguire, K., Boian, I., et al. 2020, [arXiv:2009.10509](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.10509)
- Shishkin D., Soker N., 2021, *MNRAS*, 508, L43.
- Shishkin D., Soker N., 2022, *MNRAS*, 513, 4224.
- Shrestha M., Bostroem K. A., Sand D. J., Hosseinzadeh G., Andrews J. E., Dong Y., Hoang E., et al., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2405.18490](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.18490). doi:10.48550/arXiv.2405.18490
- Singh Teja R., Singh A., Dutta A., Basu J., Anupama G. C., Sahu D. K., Swain V., et al., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.10284](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10284)
- Smith, N., Miller, A., Li, W., et al. 2010, *AJ*, 139, 1451
- Smith N., Pearson J., Sand D. J., Ilyin I., Bostroem K. A., Hosseinzadeh G., Shrestha M., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.07964](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.07964).
- Soker N., 2021, *ApJ*, 906, 1.
- Soker N., 2023, *RAA*, 23, 081002.
- Soker N., 2024a, *NewA*, 107, 102154.
- Soker N., 2024b, *OJAp*, 7, 31.
- Soker N., 2024c, arXiv, [arXiv:2403.08544](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.08544).
- Soraisam M. D., Szalai T., Van Dyk S. D., Andrews J. E., Srinivasan S., Chun S.-H., Matheson T., et al., 2023, arXiv, [arXiv:2306.10783](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.10783)
- Strotjohann, N. L., Ofek, E. O., Gal-Yam, A., et al. 2021, [arXiv:2010.11196](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.11196)
- Sukhbold T., Ertl T., Woosley S. E., Brown J. M., Janka H.-T., 2016, *ApJ*, 821, 38.

Svirski, G., & Nakar, E. 2014, ApJ, 788, L14
Tartaglia, L., Pastorello, A., Sullivan, M., et al. 2016, MNRAS, 459, 1039
Wang N. Y. N., Shishkin D., Soker N., 2024, [arXiv:2401.06652](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.06652).
Wang S.-Q., Wang L.-J., Dai Z.-G., 2019, RAA, 19, 063.
Xiang D., Mo J., Wang X., Wang L., Zhang J., Lin H., Chen L., et al., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2405.07699](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.07699).
doi:10.48550/arXiv.2405.07699

Yamada S., Nagakura H., Akaho R., Harada A., Furusawa S., Iwakami W., Okawa H., et al., 2024, PJAB, 100, 190.
Yaron, O., Perley, D. A., Gal-Yam, A., et al. 2017, Nature Physics, 13, 510
Zhang J., Dessart L., Wang X., Zhai Q., Yang Y., Li L., Lin H., et al., 2024, arXiv, [arXiv:2406.07806](https://arxiv.org/abs/2406.07806).
doi:10.48550/arXiv.2406.07806

This paper was built using the Open Journal of Astrophysics L^AT_EX template. The OJA is a journal which

provides fast and easy peer review for new papers in the **astro-ph** section of the arXiv, making the reviewing process simpler for authors and referees alike. Learn more at <http://astro.theoj.org>.