

Impact of nuclear masses on r -process nucleosynthesis: bulk properties versus shell effects

Samuel A. Giuliani ^{1,*} Gabriel Martínez-Pinedo ^{2,3,4,†} Andreas Bauswein ^{2,4,‡} and Vimal Vijayan ^{2,§}

¹*Departamento de Física Teórica and CIAFF, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid 28049, Spain*

²*GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, Planckstraße 1, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany*

³*Institut für Kernphysik (Theoriezentrum), Technische Universität Darmstadt, Schlossgartenstraße 2, D-64289 Darmstadt, Germany*

⁴*Helmholtz Forschungsakademie Hessen für FAIR (HFHF),*

GSI Helmholtzzentrum für Schwerionenforschung, Planckstraße 1, D-64291 Darmstadt, Germany

(Dated: December 5, 2024)

Decomposing theoretical nuclear mass predictions into a liquid-drop parametrization and local shell effects shows that r -process abundances are virtually insensitive to large variations of the masses which originate from nuclear bulk properties of the model, such as the symmetry energy. Therefore, experimental and theoretical studies of masses devoted to r -process applications, such as the nucleosynthesis in the ejecta of neutron star mergers, should focus on the physical origin of local changes in mass trends without necessarily providing highly accurate mass determinations of individual nuclei.

Introduction – The cosmic origin of heavy elements is a major challenge in modern science [1]. Roughly half of the elements heavier than iron are produced in a nucleosynthesis process known as rapid neutron-capture process, or r process [2, 3]. It occurs in an astrophysical environment with extreme neutron fluxes, where exotic neutron-rich nuclei are produced by subsequent neutron captures and β decays. As such, a fundamental understanding of the r process requires a multidisciplinary effort involving the modeling of astrophysical environments, astronomical observations as well as the knowledge of nuclear and atomic properties of the synthesized nuclei (see [4–6] for recent reviews).

When it comes to the modeling of r -process abundances, the two major sources of uncertainty are the astrophysical conditions at which the r process operates and the nuclear properties of the involved nuclei. In the last years, increasing efforts have been made in order to understand which astrophysical scenarios could provide suitable conditions for the production of heavy elements and identify observational constraints. Numerical simulations suggest three main candidates: compact binary mergers, such as binary neutron star mergers (NSM) [7] and NS-black hole mergers [8]; magneto-rotational core-collapse supernova [9]; and accretion disk outflows from collapsars [10]. So far, the only direct evidence of the production of heavy elements has been obtained for NSM, through the observation of the AT2017gfo kilonova light curve [11, 12], the electromagnetic counterpart associated to the gravitational wave event GW170817 [13].

From the nuclear physics side, the main challenge resides in the fact that the nuclei produced during the r process are extremely neutron rich and short-lived. As such, measuring the relevant reaction rates in current experimental facilities is often not possible, and one must rely on theoretical modeling that results in large differences in predictions as the neutron drip-line is approached. Uncertainties in the nuclear physics input and astrophysical conditions produce degeneracies in the predicted abundances, hindering the identification of the astrophysical conditions and relevant nuclear properties by confronting r -process models and observations. Among the nuclear properties that are required for modeling the r process, nuclear

masses are the most basic quantity, as they determine the energy threshold of all reactions and decays. As a consequence, several experimental campaigns in radioactive ion-beam facilities have been devoted to the measurement of masses of neutron rich nuclei, and more experiments are currently ongoing and envisaged in order to extend the reach further into the r -process region [4–6, 14]. At the same time, more refined global nuclear models capable to predict nuclear masses across the entire nuclear chart have been developed, some of them capable to reproduce experimental data with a root-mean-square (rms) error smaller than 700 keV [15–19]. In the last years, these global calculations of nuclear masses have been supplemented with machine learning techniques, with the aim to alleviate the computational burden and/or effectively reduce model discrepancies with experimental data [20–25].

Despite all the progress made, discrepancies among models in the predicted masses tend to increase with neutron excess. Because of the fundamental role that nuclear masses play for the r process, it has always been assumed that absolute differences have *per se* a major impact on r -process abundances. Therefore, experimental efforts have been dedicated to constrain the value of nuclear masses with the highest possible precision [4]. From a theory side, several studies explored the impact of different mass models on predicted r -process abundances [26–34]. However, when comparing different theoretical predictions (among themselves or against experimental data), there has been so far no attempt to determine which features in the evolution of nuclear masses with neutron and proton number, the so-called mass surface, are important and which ones are negligible for the determination of the r -process abundances.

In this letter, we show that variations in the predicted masses that are related to differences in their bulk or global properties, e.g. symmetry energy, remarkably, do not affect the r -process abundances. Instead, the nucleosynthesis outcome is highly sensitive to shell effects that induce local changes in neutron separation and neutron shell gap energies. We decompose the predicted masses in two contributions: one that represents the bulk properties and changes smoothly with proton and neutron number, and a second part that accounts for local

Model	a_{vol}	a_{sur}	a_{cur}	a_{sym}	a_{ssym}	$a_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}$	a_{Coul}	a_{pai}
DZ31	-14.96	13.16	7.96	27.91	-27.97	-3.22	0.67	-9.05
DZ31*								
FRDM	-14.56	11.21	10.39	26.16	-23.10	-1.28	0.66	-9.86
FRDM*								
AME20	-15.63	19.17	-4.74	26.48	-20.56	-5.21	0.68	-6.78

TABLE I. LDM parameters (in MeV) of Eq. (1) corresponding to the mass models employed in this work. The last row corresponds to the LDM parameter obtained from the AME2020 experimental masses [40].

variations on top of the smooth global behavior. The first part is described using a liquid drop model parametrization obtained from a fit to a specific mass model, while the second represents the difference. We consider two mass models which have been widely used in r -process nucleosynthesis studies: the Finite-Range Droplet Model (FRDM) [35] and the Duflo-Zuker mass formula (DZ31) [15]. We construct two new additional mass tables, each one retaining the smooth energy part of one model and the shell corrections predicted by the other. By performing nuclear network calculations for a large set of trajectories corresponding to the dynamical ejecta of a neutron star merger (see Ref. [36] for details), we demonstrate the insensitivity of predicted abundances to large variations of the nuclear masses provided that they originate from the smooth part of the underlying nuclear mass model.

Nuclear masses – We assume that the binding energy of a nucleus can be decomposed into an average contribution, which depends smoothly on the number of protons (Z) and neutrons (N), and a quantum shell-correction arising from local changes in single-particle levels [37]. The homogeneous, bulk part of the energy can be efficiently parametrized using a leptodermous expansion such as the liquid drop model (LDM) [38]:

$$\frac{E^{\text{LDM}}}{A} = a_{\text{vol}} + a_{\text{sur}}A^{-1/3} + a_{\text{cur}}A^{-2/3} + a_{\text{sym}}I^2 + a_{\text{ssym}}A^{-1/3}I^2 + a_{\text{sym}}^{(2)}I^4 + a_{\text{Coul}}Z^2A^{-4/3} + a_{\text{pai}}\delta, \quad (1)$$

being $A = N + Z$, and $I = (N - Z)/A$ the so-called neutron excess. The pairing term δ takes the value $A^{-3/2}$ for even-even nuclei, $-A^{-3/2}$ for odd-odd nuclei, and zero for odd-mass nuclei. A detailed discussion of the physical meaning of the different terms entering in Eq. (1) can be found, for instance, in Refs. [38, 39]. Starting from a mass table (either DZ31 or FRDM), we fit the a_i coefficients of Eq. (1) to parametrize the smooth behavior of mass surfaces. The residuals between nuclear masses and the smooth contribution constitute the shell effects of the original mass model. By combining the homogeneous contribution obtained from the DZ31 (FRDM) mass table with the shell effects of FRDM (DZ31), we create a new mass table denoted DZ31* (FRDM*). Table I summarizes the LDM parameters of the mass tables employed in this work.

Evidently, the four mass tables predict rather different nu-




FIG. 1. Panel (a): Comparison of theoretical and experimental masses for neodymium ($Z = 60$) isotopes as a function of neutron number. The bulk LDM AME2020 contribution is subtracted from all the masses. Panel (b): Comparison of two-neutron separation energies. Panel (c): comparison of two-neutron shell-gap energies as a function of charge number for $N = 124$ isotones. In all the panels, black circles represent AME2020 experimental data.

clear masses, particularly in the region far from stability where the original models DZ31 and FRDM have not been fitted. This is shown in Fig. 1(a), where nuclear masses along the neodymium isotopic chain are plotted as function of mass number A . By subtracting the homogeneous contribution given by the AME2020 LDM parametrization (obtained from the fit of Eq. (1) to the AME2020 experimental masses [40], see last row in Table I), it becomes visible that the model pairs DZ31/FRDM* and FRDM/DZ31* predict different values of nuclear masses, while share the same local shell effects. Due to this, despite the large discrepancies in the binding energies, we observe that the neutron separation energies S_{2n} predicted by the different models show a rather similar behavior, as depicted in Fig. 1(b) (for displaying purposes, we plot S_{2n} rather than S_n). The modified mass tables result in a slight change in the S_{2n} slope, mostly due to changes in the symmetry energy term a_{sym} , which governs the evolution of masses with neutron excess. We recall that neutron-capture rates depend exponentially on the neutron separation energy, suggesting

that the impact of variations in nuclear masses can be easily overestimated, as local changes in S_{2n} are more relevant for shaping the r -process abundances. Such local changes can be quantified by means of the (two-)neutron shell-gap energies, which are given by the difference between two-neutron separation energies $\Delta_{2n}(N, Z) = S_{2n}(N, Z) - S_{2n}(N + 2, Z)$. This quantity is extremely sensitive to variations in single-particle levels between neighboring nuclei, providing a proxy for local changes in the binding energies due to nucleonic (shell) effects [41–43]. For instance, local maxima in Δ_{2n} are associated with the presence of spherical and deformed shell gaps, while negative values usually indicate a nuclear shape transition (see Ref. [44] for a recent detailed discussion on Δ_{2n} and its evolution across the nuclear chart). The Δ_{2n} values along the isotonic chain $N = 124$ predicted by the four models are plotted in Fig. 1(c). As one can see, this quantity is insensitive to changes in the bulk properties of nuclear masses characterized by the LDM parametrization, as its evolution is actually driven by the emergence and disappearance of shell-effects with neutron excess.

r-process abundances – Nucleosynthesis calculations are performed using a large nuclear reaction network, including all nuclei up to $Z = 110$ from the valley of stability to the neutron dripline. We derived neutron capture rates consistently for each mass model by means of the Hauser-Feshbach statistical theory, employing the TALYS 1.95 nuclear reaction code [45]. Experimental masses are employed whenever available. Photodissociation rates are obtained from neutron-capture rates using detailed balance. We adopted the FRDM β -decay rates, which have been renormalized for each mass table according to their predicted Q -values. In order to isolate the impact of masses on predicted abundances, in all the calculations we employed the neutron-induced fission rates based on the FRDM+TF model [46], and the fission yields derived using the code ABLA [47].

We compute the r -process abundances predicted from the four mass tables of Table I for a set of 2015 trajectories simulating the dynamical ejecta produced in neutron star mergers [36] (see [48] for code details). We use this specific r -process scenario because it covers a broad range of astrophysical conditions, in particular regarding the proton-to-nucleon ratio (see Fig. 2 of Ref. [36]). By this, we show that our result is fully general and does not depend on considering a specific trajectory. We also expect our conclusions to be valid for any r -process scenario. Figure 2 shows the total integrated elemental and mass abundances predicted at two different phases of the evolution: when the average timescale for neutron captures becomes equal to the average timescale for β decay ($\tau_{(n,\gamma)} = \tau_{\beta}$), and at 1 Gyr. The abundances obtained with the four models at 1 Gyr (when most of the material has decayed to stability) present the main characteristics of a strong r -process pattern: we observe the presence of the second and third peaks, as well as the production of transuranic elements U and Th. When comparing the different models, we notice that already at the freeze-out the abundances predicted by masses with the same shell effects but different bulk properties, are virtually




FIG. 2. Mass-integrated abundances as a function of atomic number (top panels) and mass number A (bottom panels) predicted by different mass models at $\tau_{(n,\gamma)} = \tau_{\beta}$ (left panels) and at 1 Gyr (right panels). Black circles are r -process abundances in the solar system.

identical: only minor differences in the strength of odd-even staggering are observed in mass abundances, which are subsequently washed out by β -delayed neutron emissions and late neutron captures. We observe no connection between the bulk properties of masses (as determined by LDM parameters) and the abundance distribution. In other words, models with the same LDM coefficients a_i result in very different abundances patterns.

In order to better understand the fundamental connection between variations in nuclear masses and abundances, we study the case of neodymium isotopes ($Z = 60$) around neutron number $N = 124$, which dominate the abundances at freeze-out in the region $A = 184$ (indicated with a gray vertical band in Fig. 2). Figure 2(c) shows that the abundances predicted by FRDM/DZ31* strikingly differ from DZ31/FRDM*. In particular, FRDM and DZ31* show a deeper trough right before the third r -process peak compared to DZ31 and FRDM*. This behavior of abundance distributions cannot be explained by the differences in the predicted masses around the region $Z/N = 60/124$. As one can notice in Fig. 1(a), the DZ31* predictions at $A = 184$ (gray band) are closer to DZ31, while those predicted by FRDM* around this mass number are more in agreement with FRDM predictions. Instead, one has to look at the predicted S_{2n} shown in Fig. 2(b). Despite the absolute difference in predicted masses, which are a consequence of variations in the bulk part of the binding energy, FRDM and DZ31* (as well as DZ31 and FRDM*) show the same S_{2n} trend and, in turn, a strikingly similar r -process path. In particular, FRDM and DZ31* predict a local increase in S_{2n} around $Z/N = 60/124$, resulting in a negative Δ_{2n} . This change in the slope of S_{2n} reduces the probability of neutron captures for nuclei in this region, producing in turn a deeper trough in the

abundance distribution around $A \sim 184$ [26]. More generally, this result shows that features of the r -process abundances are not connected to global variations in nuclear masses, but rather the result of local changes in binding energies as a consequence of configuration changes in single particle levels.

To further assess the impact produced by global and local changes of mass surfaces, we study the variation of elemental abundances with increasing deviations between nuclear masses. To do so, we introduce a new term in the LDM formula (1):

$$a_{\text{Nsym}}[N - N_{\text{max}}^{\text{exp}}(Z)]H(N - N_{\text{max}}^{\text{exp}}(Z))I^2, \quad (2)$$

with $H(x)$ being the Heaviside step function and $N_{\text{max}}^{\text{exp}}(Z)$ the maximum N value for each isotopic chain Z with a measured mass in the AME2020 dataset [40]. By varying the a_{Nsym} term, we produce mass tables that diverge at different rates with increasing isospin asymmetry. Figure 3 shows the nuclear masses along the neodymium isotopic chain for five different values of a_{Nsym} applied to the FRDM LDM parametrization. One can notice that the smallest absolute values of a_{Nsym} roughly match the absolute differences between FRDM and DZ31 masses, while $a_{\text{Nsym}} = \pm 0.01$ and 0.05 MeV produce mass tables that largely differ from the original FRDM predictions. Despite inducing changes in S_{2n} of the order of 1.5 MeV for nuclei in the r -process region, the elemental and isotopic abundances obtained from the different FRDM models at 1 Gyr are virtually identical, as shown in Fig. 3. Noticeable differences only appear for $a_{\text{Nsym}} = 0.05$ MeV in the $Z = 77 - 81$ region. These differences are produced by the strong decrease of the two-neutron separation energies around the $N = 126$ shell closure, with S_{2n} dropping below zero for nuclei with $Z \lesssim 68$, which shifts the third peak towards heavier atomic numbers. As shown in Fig. 3, the impact of variations in masses is also visible in the final-integrated abundances as a function of mass number A , with a shift in the position of troughs and peaks for $a_{\text{Nsym}} = 0.05$ MeV. However, it is important to notice that variations in the abundances between the FRDM models are generally smaller than the variations observed between DZ31 and any FRDM-based model, regardless of the level of agreement between the absolute masses predicted by the different models. This result provides further evidence that the main drivers of r -process abundances are the local changes in S_{2n} , rather than the global changes of mass surfaces, suggesting that sensitivity studies focused on individual masses could overemphasize their impact on r -process abundances.

Conclusions – In summary, we have shown that variations in predicted nuclear masses do not necessarily correlate with changes in the r -process abundance distributions. We employ the LDM to decompose the mass surface in a smooth contribution and local shell-effects for the two mass models considered: FRDM and DZ31. By performing detailed nuclear network calculations simulating the occurrence of r process in neutron star mergers, we find that large changes in the bulk properties that result in very different theoretical nuclear masses, have little impact on the predicted elemental and mass




FIG. 3. Panels (a) and (b): FRDM masses and two-neutron separation energies (in MeV) for different values of a_{Nsym} along the neodymium isotopic chain as a function of neutron number. The red solid line represent the DZ31 predictions. Black circles represent the AME2020 experimental data. The bulk LDM AME2020 contribution is subtracted from all the masses. Panels (c) and (d): Mass-integrated abundances at 1 Gyr for the mass models of the top panel. Black circles are r -process abundances in the solar system.

abundances. The abundance distribution is instead driven by local changes in the (two-)neutron separation energies arising from nucleon shell effects, which can be identified by means of neutron shell gap energies. Our results suggest that theoretical approaches, like ab-initio calculations, that currently do not provide accurate values of the masses but that may capture the local trends may still provide valuable information for r -process studies. Similarly, experimental measurements devoted to nuclear masses for r -process nucleosynthesis should aim to measure mass trends rather than obtaining precise mass measurements of individual nuclei. Furthermore, fitting protocols of nuclear interactions and training processes of machine-learning algorithms devoted to large-scale calculations of neutron-rich nuclei should include experimental information of (two-)neutron separation and shell gap energies. This work demonstrates that the rms error between theoretical and experimental masses may not necessarily determine which nuclear mass models are the best suited for r -process studies. A similar conclusion was reached in Ref. [49] comparing the predictive power of different mass models to masses which were not experimentally known at the time of the model calibration.

We thank M.-R. Wu, F.-K. Thielemann, W. Nazarewicz, and K. Langanke for helpful discussion and comments. SG acknowledges support by the Spanish Agencia Estatal de Investigación (AEI) of the Ministry of Science and Innovation (MCIN) under grant agreements No. PID2021-127890NB-I00 and No. RYC2021-031880-I funded by MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033 and the “European Union NextGenerationEU/PRTR”. This work benefited from support by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of Nuclear Physics, under Award Number DE-SC0023128 (CeNAM). GMP acknowledge support by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (ERC Advanced Grant KILONOVA No. 885281), the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through GMP and AB acknowledge support by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) through Project - ID 279384907 - SFB 1245 (subprojects B01, B06, B07), and the State of Hesse within the Cluster Project ELEMENTS. AB and VV acknowledge support by the European Union (ERC, HEAVYMETAL, 101071865).

* samuel.giuliani@uam.es

† g.martinez@gsi.de

‡ a.bauswein@gsi.de

§ v.vijayan@gsi.de

- [1] National Research Council, *Connecting Quarks with the Cosmos: Eleven Science Questions for the New Century* (The National Academies Press, Washington, DC, 2003).
- [2] E. M. Burbidge, G. R. Burbidge, W. A. Fowler, and F. Hoyle, Synthesis of the Elements in Stars, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29**, 547

(1957).

- [3] A. G. W. Cameron, Nuclear Reactions in Stars and Nucleogenesis, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pacific* **69**, 201 (1957).
- [4] C. J. Horowitz *et al.*, r -process nucleosynthesis: connecting rare-isotope beam facilities with the cosmos, *J. Phys. G Nucl. Part. Phys.* **46**, 083001 (2019).
- [5] T. Kajino, W. Aoki, A. Balantekin, R. Diehl, M. Famiano, and G. Mathews, Current status of r -process nucleosynthesis, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **107**, 109 (2019).
- [6] J. J. Cowan, C. Sneden, J. E. Lawler, A. Aprahamian, M. Wiescher, K. Langanke, G. Martínez-Pinedo, and F.-K. Thielemann, Origin of the heaviest elements: The rapid neutron-capture process, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93**, 015002 (2021).
- [7] E. Symbalisty and D. N. Schramm, Neutron star collisions and the r -process, *Astrophys. Lett.* **22**, 143 (1982).
- [8] J. M. Lattimer and D. N. Schramm, Black-hole-neutron-star collisions, *Astrophys. J.* **192**, L145 (1974).
- [9] E. M. D. Symbalisty, D. N. Schramm, and J. R. Wilson, An expanding vortex site for the r -process in rotating stellar collapse, *Astrophys. J.* **291**, L11 (1985).
- [10] A. I. MacFadyen and S. E. Woosley, Collapsars: Gamma-Ray Bursts and Explosions in “Failed Supernovae”, *Astrophys. J.* **524**, 262 (1999).
- [11] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, Multi-messenger Observations of a Binary Neutron Star Merger, *Astrophys. J.* **848**, L12 (2017).
- [12] V. A. Villar *et al.*, The Combined Ultraviolet, Optical, and Near-infrared Light Curves of the Kilonova Associated with the Binary Neutron Star Merger GW170817: Unified Data Set, Analytic Models, and Physical Implications, *Astrophys. J.* **851**, L21 (2017).
- [13] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, GW170817: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Neutron Star Inspiral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 161101 (2017).
- [14] B. A. Brown *et al.*, Motivations for Early High-Profile FRIB Experiments, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2410.06144](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.06144) (2024).
- [15] J. Duflo and A. Zuker, Microscopic mass formulas, *Phys. Rev. C* **52**, R23 (1995).
- [16] S. Goriely, N. Chamel, and J. M. Pearson, Further explorations of Skyrme-Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov mass formulas. XII. Stiffness and stability of neutron-star matter, *Phys. Rev. C* **82**, 035804 (2010).
- [17] M. Liu, N. Wang, Y. Deng, and X. Wu, Further improvements on a global nuclear mass model, *Phys. Rev. C* **84**, 014333 (2011).
- [18] P. Möller, A. J. Sierk, T. Ichikawa, and H. Sagawa, Nuclear ground-state masses and deformations: FRDM(2012), *At. Data Nucl. Data Tables* **109**, 1 (2016).
- [19] G. Grams, N. N. Shchepochin, A. Sanchez-Fernandez, W. Ryssens, N. Chamel, and S. Goriely, Skyrme-Hartree-Fock-Bogoliubov mass models on a 3D mesh: IV. Improved description of the isospin dependence of pairing, *arXiv e-prints*, [arXiv:2411.08007](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.08007) (2024).
- [20] R. Utama and J. Piekarewicz, Refining mass formulas for astrophysical applications: A Bayesian neural network approach, *Phys. Rev. C* **96**, 044308 (2017).
- [21] Z. Niu and H. Liang, Nuclear mass predictions based on Bayesian neural network approach with pairing and shell effects, *Phys. Lett. B* **778**, 48 (2018).
- [22] L. Neufcourt, Y. Cao, S. A. Giuliani, W. Nazarewicz, E. Olsen, and O. B. Tarasov, Quantified limits of the nuclear landscape, *Phys. Rev. C* **101**, 044307 (2020).
- [23] R.-D. Lasserri, D. Regnier, J.-P. Ebran, and A. Penon, Taming Nuclear Complexity with a Committee of Multilayer Neural Networks, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 162502 (2020).
- [24] M. Mumpower, M. Li, T. M. Sprouse, B. S. Meyer, A. E. Lovell,

- and A. T. Mohan, Bayesian averaging for ground state masses of atomic nuclei in a Machine Learning approach, *Frontiers in Physics* **11**, 1198572 (2023).
- [25] Y. Saito, I. Dillmann, R. Krücken, M. R. Mumpower, and R. Surman, Uncertainty quantification of mass models using ensemble Bayesian model averaging, *Phys. Rev. C* **109**, 054301 (2024).
- [26] A. Arcones and G. Martínez-Pinedo, Dynamical r-process studies within the neutrino-driven wind scenario and its sensitivity to the nuclear physics input, *Phys. Rev. C* **83**, 045809 (2011).
- [27] A. Arcones and G. F. Bertsch, Nuclear Correlations and the r Process, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 151101 (2012).
- [28] J. D. J. Mendoza-Temis, M.-R. Wu, K. Langanke, G. Martínez-Pinedo, A. Bauswein, and H.-T. Janka, Nuclear robustness of the r process in neutron-star mergers, *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 055805 (2015).
- [29] M. R. Mumpower, R. Surman, D.-L. Fang, M. Beard, P. Möller, T. Kawano, and A. Aprahamian, Impact of individual nuclear masses on r-process abundances, *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 035807 (2015).
- [30] D. Martin, A. Arcones, W. Nazarewicz, and E. Olsen, Impact of Nuclear Mass Uncertainties on the r-Process, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 121101 (2016).
- [31] T. M. Sprouse, R. Navarro Perez, R. Surman, M. R. Mumpower, G. C. McLaughlin, and N. Schunck, Propagation of statistical uncertainties of Skyrme mass models to simulations of r-process nucleosynthesis, *Phys. Rev. C* **101**, 055803 (2020).
- [32] N. Vassh, G. C. McLaughlin, M. R. Mumpower, and R. Surman, Markov Chain Monte Carlo predictions of neutron-rich lanthanide properties as a probe of r-process dynamics, *Astrophys. J.* **907**, 98 (2021).
- [33] Y.-L. Zhu, K. A. Lund, J. Barnes, T. M. Sprouse, N. Vassh, G. C. McLaughlin, M. R. Mumpower, and R. Surman, Modeling Kilonova Light Curves: Dependence on Nuclear Inputs, *Astrophys. J.* **906**, 94 (2021).
- [34] I. K. B. Kullmann, S. Goriely, O. Just, A. Bauswein, and H.-T. Janka, Impact of systematic nuclear uncertainties on composition and decay heat of dynamical and disc ejecta in compact binary mergers, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **523**, 2551 (2023).
- [35] P. Möller, J. R. Nix, W. D. Myers, and W. J. Swiatecki, Nuclear Ground-State Masses and Deformations, *At. Data Nucl. Data Tables* **59**, 185 (1995).
- [36] C. E. Collins, A. Bauswein, S. A. Sim, V. Vijayan, G. Martínez-Pinedo, O. Just, L. J. Shingles, and M. Kromer, 3D radiative transfer kilonova modelling for binary neutron star merger simulations, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **521**, 1858 (2023).
- [37] V. M. Strutinsky, Shell effects in nuclear masses and deformation energies, *Nucl. Phys. A* **95**, 420 (1967).
- [38] W. D. Myers and W. J. Swiatecki, The Macroscopic Approach to Nuclear Masses and Deformations, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **32**, 309 (1982).
- [39] P.-G. Reinhard, M. Bender, W. Nazarewicz, and T. Vertse, From finite nuclei to the nuclear liquid drop: Leptodermous expansion based on self-consistent mean-field theory, *Phys. Rev. C* **73**, 014309 (2006).
- [40] M. Wang, W. J. Huang, F. Kondev, G. Audi, and S. Naimi, The AME 2020 atomic mass evaluation (II). Tables, graphs and references, *Chinese Phys. C* **45**, 030003 (2021).
- [41] W. Satuła, J. Dobaczewski, and W. Nazarewicz, Odd-Even Staggering of Nuclear Masses: Pairing or Shape Effect?, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3599 (1998).
- [42] J. Dobaczewski, P. Magierski, W. Nazarewicz, W. Satuła, and Z. Szymański, Odd-even staggering of binding energies as a consequence of pairing and mean-field effects, *Phys. Rev. C* **63**, 024308 (2001).
- [43] R. Bengtsson, J.-y. Zhang, J.-y. Zhang, and S. Åberg, On the analogy between backbending in gauge space and in ordinary space, *Phys. Lett. B* **105**, 5 (1981).
- [44] L. Buskirk, K. Godbey, W. Nazarewicz, and W. Satuła, Nucleonic shells and nuclear masses, *Phys. Rev. C* **109**, 044311 (2024).
- [45] A. J. Koning, S. Hilaire, and M. C. Duijvestijn, TALYS-1.0, in *ND2007 - Int. Conf. Nucl. Data Sci. Technol.* (EDP Sciences, Les Ulis, France, 2008) pp. 211–214.
- [46] I. V. Panov, I. Y. Korneev, T. Rauscher, G. Martínez-Pinedo, A. Kelić-Heil, N. T. Zinner, and F.-K. Thielemann, Neutron-induced astrophysical reaction rates for translead nuclei, *Astron. Astrophys.* **513**, A61 (2010).
- [47] A. Kelic, M. Valentina Ricciardi, and K.-H. Schmidt, ABLA07 - towards a complete description of the decay channels of a nuclear system from spontaneous fission to multifragmentation, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:0906.4193 (2009).
- [48] R. Ardevol-Pulpillo, H. T. Janka, O. Just, and A. Bauswein, Improved leakage-equilibration-absorption scheme (ILEAS) for neutrino physics in compact object mergers, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **485**, 4754 (2019).
- [49] A. Sobczewski and Y. A. Litvinov, Predictive power of nuclear-mass models, *Phys. Rev. C* **90**, 017302 (2014).