

Joint electromagnetic and gravitational wave inference of binary neutron star merger GW170817 using forward-modeling ejecta predictions

Marko Ristić^{1,2,*}, Richard O’Shaughnessy³, Kate Wagner³, Christopher J. Fontes^{1,4}, Chris L. Fryer^{1,5}, Oleg Korobkin^{1,2}, Matthew R. Mumpower^{1,2} and Ryan T. Wollaeger^{1,5}

¹Center for Theoretical Astrophysics, *Los Alamos National Laboratory*, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA

²Theoretical Division, *Los Alamos National Laboratory*, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA

³Center for Computational Relativity and Gravitation, *Rochester Institute of Technology*, Rochester, New York 14623, USA

⁴Computational Physics Division, *Los Alamos National Laboratory*, Los Alamos, New Mexico 87545, USA

⁵Center for Nonlinear Studies, *Los Alamos National Laboratory*, Los Alamos, NM 87545 USA



(Received 7 April 2025; accepted 22 March 2026; published 4 May 2026)

We reassess the capacity for multimessenger inference of AT2017gfo/GW170817 using both kilonova and gravitational wave emission within the context of a recent simulation-based surrogate model for kilonova emission. Independent of the inclusion of gravitational wave observations, comparisons between observations that incorporate our kilonova model favor a narrow range of ejecta properties, even when allowing for a wide range of systematic uncertainties in our modeling approach. Conversely, we find that astrophysical conclusions about the neutron star itself, including its mass and radius, depend strongly on assumptions about how much material is ejected from the neutron star. Looking forward, our analysis highlights the importance of systematic uncertainty in general and the need for better modeling of neutron star merger mass ejection from first principles, and warns against uncontextualized applications of ejecta predictions using fits to numerical relativity simulations.

DOI: [10.1103/gffk-xjtg](https://doi.org/10.1103/gffk-xjtg)

I. INTRODUCTION

The detection of gravitational waves (GWs) emitted by the binary neutron star (BNS) merger GW170817 [1,2] and, subsequently, electromagnetic (EM) radiation from its associated optical/infrared counterpart AT2017gfo [3–19] introduced exciting prospects for studying the universe using multimessenger astronomy. The GWs emitted by BNS mergers carry information about the premerger binary, such as the masses, spins, and tidal deformabilities of the merging neutron stars. Likewise, the EM radiation from the optical/infrared counterpart, or “kilonova” [20,21], conveys details about the material that was ejected during and after the merger [22], tying directly to the fate of the merger remnant [23–25], the dense matter equation of state (EOS) [26,27], and rapid neutron capture process (*r*-process) nucleosynthesis [28–30].

Following the GW170817/AT2017gfo detection, recent studies have performed numerous numerical relativity simulations of BNS mergers [31–44]. Using these simulations, certain studies identified fitting formulas that connect BNS merger ejecta properties to the parameters of the binary that are easily extractable from the GW signal [45–47]. Mapping

these ejecta properties to those relevant to kilonova model ejecta is a crucial ingredient in enabling multimessenger inferences using both GW and EM information. These fits and ejecta mappings have been used in previous multimessenger analyses to place stronger constraints on unknown quantities like the EOS [46,48,49], particularly in the case of GW190425, a BNS/black-hole-neutron-star merger whose ejected mass had to be inferred using one of these fits due to the lack of an electromagnetic counterpart [50]. It is important to note that the BNS merger ejecta to kilonova ejecta mapping is highly nontrivial, and an accurate one-to-one mapping still eludes the field. Numerical relativity models of BNS mergers are still computationally expensive, with recent record-breaking simulations only going out to ~ 1.5 s post-merger [51]. The intrinsic variability in the BNS parameter space, in addition to kilonova timescales and length scales being many orders of magnitude larger than the longest numerical BNS models, necessitates extrapolation or projection in the mapping of BNS merger ejecta to kilonova model ejecta.

Previous work in the literature has identified that these fits to numerical relativity simulations exhibit variable validity in different regions of binary parameter space [52,53]. Moreover, the underlying simulations used to build these fits only cover a very limited range of possible BNS merger configurations. Nonetheless, as we will demonstrate in this work, large-scale multimessenger inference calculations must employ these fits far outside the regions in which they have been calibrated to recover reasonable binary parameters.

The need for using these fits outside of their safely calibrated region has not been emphasized in the many previous

*ISTI Fellow.

†Contact author: mristic@lanl.gov

Published by the American Physical Society under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license. Further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the published article’s title, journal citation, and DOI.

studies or frameworks that have employed them. Several (though not all) previous multimessenger inference studies [46,49,54,55] present joint EOS inference with systematically incomplete ejecta fit models, by marginalizing over the ejecta velocity *for all kilonova ejecta components*, leaving ejecta velocity inference as a free parameter, unconstrained by any modeling. In particular, these studies neglect to verify whether the velocities required by the kilonova models to reproduce observed light curves are even qualitatively consistent with the velocity expectations from the ejecta fits. Furthermore, these analyses were carried out by reweighting GW samples during joint inference, thus carrying a convenience prior that hides the effects that arise when performing simultaneous joint inference as explored in this study.

Motivated by a recently developed surrogate model for kilonova emission that provides the most constraining ejecta posteriors to date [56] (which do not necessarily encapsulate the full breadth of kilonova modeling systematics), in conjunction with previous studies examining the agreement between ejecta fits (e.g., Ref. [53]), in this study we examine how these ejecta fits inform multimessenger inference of the binary parameters. In this work, we assume a specific mapping between these ejecta types given its prior use in previous works and focus solely on the possible impact of the fitting formulas. We caution readers that our assumption of ejecta mapping is by no means complete or one-to-one, but is a convention readily assumed in the field. We emphasize that our kilonova model is also by no means complete in the sense that many systematic uncertainties are still omitted. Recent studies have identified multiple additional sources of systematic uncertainty along the merger-to-kilonova modeling chain [57–59]. Nevertheless, our surrogate model’s ability to tightly constrain ejecta parameters enables us to investigate the systematic uncertainties that propagate into Bayesian inference analyses that utilize these fits. Our approach contrasts previous studies that assume kilonova systematic uncertainties anywhere between 1 magnitude [54,60,61] and 5 magnitudes [62]; whereas the ejecta fit systematics have historically been washed out by the kilonova systematics, we take our surrogate model’s constrained posteriors for granted and directly examine the systematics associated *primarily* with the ejecta fits. Our intent with this study is to highlight the systematic uncertainties that are propagated when using these fits for more informed use in future studies.

The paper is structured as follows. Section II outlines our methodology, including details about the numerical relativity ejecta fits, our kilonova surrogate model and the simulations on which it is based, and our Bayesian inference approach. In Sec. III, we discuss the results of our analysis, specifically focusing on the cases where the fraction of the accretion disk unbound as ejecta is treated as a free versus fixed parameter. In Sec. IV, we discuss our results and the implications of our findings. Finally, we conclude the paper in Sec. V.

II. METHODOLOGY

At a high level, our methodology proceeds as follows: We generate iterative grids of samples across our binary parameter space over which the likelihood is evaluated. For the GW data,

we perform a coordinate transformation of our binary parameters to $\mathcal{M}_c$ (chirp mass), q (mass ratio), $\tilde{\Lambda}$ (effective tidal deformability), and χ_{eff} (effective spin) and calculate the GW likelihood through comparison to the GW170817 waveform. For the EM data, we calculate the ejecta properties from the binary parameter samples using the ejecta fits, create light curves corresponding to these ejecta properties, and calculate the EM likelihood through comparison to the AT2017gfo light curves. We continue generating iterative sample grids, informed by the prior iteration’s likelihood, until we reach convergence [$\mathcal{O}(1000)$ effective samples].

A. Kilonova simulations and surrogate model

We assume a two-component kilonova model consisting of lanthanide-rich, equatorial dynamical ejecta and lanthanide-poor, axial wind ejecta as described in Refs. [63,64] and motivated by numerical simulations [22,65]. Each component is assumed to be homologously expanding and parametrized by a mass and velocity such that (m_d, v_d) and (m_w, v_w) describe the dynamical and wind components’ masses and averaged velocities, respectively. The morphology for the dynamical component is an equatorially centered torus, while the wind component is represented by an axially centered peanut component; Fig. 1 of Ref. [63] displays the torus-peanut, or “TP,” schematic corresponding to the morphologies employed in this work; see Ref. [64] for a detailed definition.

The lanthanide-rich dynamical ejecta stems from r -process nucleosynthesis in the neutron-rich ejected material, characterized by a low electron fraction [$Y_e \equiv n_p/(n_p + n_n)$] of $Y_e = 0.04$, with elements reaching the third r -process peak ($A \sim 195$). Our dynamical ejecta explores the nucleosynthesis resulting from the full r process; however, recent studies have shown that the dynamical ejecta can be less neutron rich when considering neutrino interactions (see, e.g., Ref. [66]). The wind ejecta originates from higher $Y_e = 0.27$ that encapsulates elements between the first ($A \sim 80$) and second ($A \sim 130$) r -process peaks. The detailed breakdown of the elements in each component can be found in Table 2 of Ref. [63].

To generate the simulations on which the surrogate model discussed in this work is trained, we use SuperNu [67], a Monte Carlo code for simulation of time-dependent radiation transport with matter in local thermodynamic equilibrium. The simulated kilonova spectra $F_{\lambda, \text{sim}}$ assume the aforementioned two-component model. Both components are assumed to have fixed composition and morphology for the duration of each simulation. SuperNu uses radioactive power sources calculated from decaying the r -process composition from the WinNet nuclear reaction network [68–71]. These radioactive heating contributions are also weighted by thermalization efficiencies introduced in Ref. [72] (see Ref. [73] for a detailed description of the adopted nuclear heating). We use detailed opacity calculations via the tabulated, binned opacities generated with the Los Alamos suite of atomic physics codes [74–76]. In the database that we use, the tabulated, binned opacities are not calculated for all elements; therefore, we produce opacities for representative proxy elements by combining pure-element opacities of nuclei with similar atomic properties [75]. Specifics of the representative elements for our composition are given in Ref. [63].

The SuperNu outputs are observing-angle-dependent, simulated spectra $F_{\lambda, \text{sim}}$, postprocessed to a source distance of 10 pc, in units of $\text{erg s}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-2} \text{\AA}^{-1}$. The spectra are binned into 1024 equally log-spaced wavelength bins spanning $0.1 \mu\text{m} \leq \lambda \leq 12.8 \mu\text{m}$. For the purposes of this work, we consider the light curves for the Rubin Observatory *grizy* and 2MASS *JHK* broadband filters. As we only consider anisotropic simulations in this study, unless otherwise noted, we extract simulated light curves using 54 angular bins, uniformly spaced in $\cos \theta$ over the range $-1 \leq \cos \theta \leq 1$. The angle θ is taken between the line of sight and the symmetry axis ($z = 0$) as defined in Eq. (2) of Ref. [56], with further description of the treatment of observing angle found therein.

We interpolate over the library of SuperNu simulations described in Refs. [56,77] using the multilayer perceptron (MLP) described in Ref. [56]. In summary, the MLP was trained on ~ 250 light-curve simulations evaluated at 264 log-spaced times between 0.125 and 37.24 days for 54 viewing angles equally spaced in $\cos \theta$ for θ ranging from 0° to 180° . We do not perform any normalization of our inputs or outputs, with ejecta parameters ranging from $-3 \leq \log_{10} m/M_\odot \leq -1$ and $0.05 \leq v/c \leq 0.3$ and light curves ranging from -18 to 8 AB magnitudes. We train a separate MLP for each of our broadband filters, training each MLP for 1000 epochs with a batch size of 32 using the Adam optimizer. Our initial learning rate is 2×10^{-4} with a decay rate of 5% every 10 epochs.

B. Ejecta fits to numerical relativity simulations

We employ the forward model ejecta fits from Refs. [45–47], hereafter referred to as KruFo20, DiCo20, and Nedora21, respectively. These fits to numerical relativity simulations estimate the ejecta properties, namely, dynamical and wind ejecta mass and velocity, given binary properties (mass ratio q and neutron star radius $R_{1.4}$) as inputs. In summary, KruFo20 present fitting formulas based on 52 numerical relativity simulations of binary neutron star mergers compiled from Refs. [33], [34]. DiCo20 base their formulas on 73 numerical relativity simulations, using the two aforementioned sources in addition to simulations from Refs. [31,32]. Finally, Nedora21 employs the largest numerical relativity dataset to date for their fits, using 324 models from Refs. [32–44]. The implementation of these ejecta fits follows the approach outlined in Sec. IIF of Ref. [78], with the exception of the modifications described in this section. These fits neglect the effects of NS spin on the amount of ejected material, which can impact the amount of ejecta by factors of order unity for rapidly spinning NS ($\chi \gtrsim 0.1$); see, e.g., Refs. [32,79,80].

Each ejecta fit predicts the ejecta mass, total ejecta velocity, and accretion disk mass as a function of the binary mass ratio q and the neutron star radius $R_{1.4}$. We relate $R_{1.4}$ to $\tilde{\Lambda}$ as $R_{1.4} \simeq 13.4(\tilde{\Lambda}/800)^{1/6} \text{ km}$ per Eq. (18) in Ref. [81]. In none of the ejecta fit models is there a prescription for tying the disk mass to postmerger wind mass; instead, we map the fits' ejecta mass prediction to the dynamical ejecta, and assume some fraction f_{disk} of the disk mass is ejected as wind ejecta. In Fig. 1, we display naive contours corresponding to representative values of these ejecta parameters as a function of the binary parameters, fixing the binary source-frame chirp mass to the




FIG. 1. Solid, dashed, and dotted line contours corresponding to the KruFo20 dynamical ejecta mass m_{ej} , disk mass m_{disk} , and ejecta velocity v_{ej} , respectively. Contours were calculated as a function of mass asymmetry $\delta = (m_1 - m_2)/(m_1 + m_2)$ and neutron star radius $R_{1.4}$. Mass and velocity units are in $M_\odot$ and c , respectively.

observed value for GW170817. The solid, dashed, and dotted lines indicate $m_{\text{ej}}(\delta, R_{1.4})$, $m_{\text{disk}}(\delta, R_{1.4})$, and $v_{\text{ej}}(\delta, R_{1.4})$, respectively, where $\delta = (m_1 - m_2)/(m_1 + m_2) = (1 - q)/(1 + q)$ indicates the mass asymmetry in the binary. For reference, for GW170817-like systems as the one shown in Fig. 1, $\delta \sim 0.1 \Rightarrow q \sim 0.81$ while $\delta \sim 0.2 \Rightarrow q \sim 0.66$. The δ space explored in our study allows for a substantial fraction of extremely asymmetric configurations, which we will show are necessarily explored by the ejecta fits to reconcile EM and GW observations (assuming the constraints presented by our kilonova model) without the use of additional astrophysical priors. The solid dynamical ejecta contours constrain the mass ratio q while allowing for a broad range of radii. Conversely, the dashed disk mass contours constrain $R_{1.4}$ to favor low values for realistic disk masses ($m_{\text{disk}}/M_\odot < 0.45$, as in, e.g., Ref. [82]) with a slight constraint on δ . Critically, however, the dotted v_{ej} contours—shown at levels corresponding to our previously inferred estimate (0.10–0.20 c , [77,83]) for this quantity—exclude the conventional interpretation for GW170817, which consists of $\delta \simeq 0$ (comparable masses) and $R_{1.4} \simeq 12 \text{ km}$. Instead, the v_{ej} contours follow a trendline that permits either comparable mass but large radius or conventional radius but highly asymmetric masses, both scenarios that could produce sufficiently low dynamical ejecta velocities in binary neutron star mergers.

Because electromagnetic observations constrain these three ejecta properties independently (by way of kilonova models that introduce their own systematic uncertainties), only in exceptional circumstances can all three equations be solved simultaneously for a self-consistent pair of binary properties ($\delta, R_{1.4}$: we have more equations than unknowns). However, the ejecta parameters preferred by our previous analyses, notably and critically the ejecta velocity, are at or beyond the range of underlying simulation data used to train these analytic approximate fits. As a result, motivated by

previous work, we generously allow for independent systematic uncertainty in all three predictions for ejecta properties.

Rather than estimating the uncertainties on the ejected mass from each of our two components, we assign free parameters α_{dyn} and f_{disk} to quantify these systematic uncertainties during inference. The α_{dyn} parameter serves as a scale factor for the fits' dynamical ejecta mass prediction, while f_{disk} dictates what fraction of the accretion disk is expelled as wind ejecta. Given the behavior of the dotted v_{ej} contours in Fig. 1, we also introduce a systematic uncertainty parameter for the ejecta velocity, β_ϕ . To uniformly explore the systematic uncertainty in velocity space, we apply the reparametrization $\phi = \ln((c/v)^2 - 1)$. Our uncertainty is characterized by a uniformly distributed random variable β_ϕ added to ϕ .

The ejecta fits predict a total ejecta velocity v_{ej} by adding in quadrature the velocities describing the ejecta within and perpendicular to the orbital plane, without a direct one-to-one mapping to the standard kilonova dynamical and wind ejecta components [see Eqs. (5)–(9) in Ref. [60]]. In this study, to ensure maximal consistency with established methodology in the literature, we inherit previous conventions. As in Ref. [54], we set the dynamical ejecta velocity to that of the total ejecta velocity such that $v_d = v_{\text{ej}}$ and fix the wind velocity $v_w = 0.10c$ per the results of our previous analysis in Ref. [56]. The choice to fix v_w is similar to previous approaches, e.g., as in Ref. [78], where the wind velocity v_w was set to $0.08c$ as informed by Ref. [33]. We caution readers that in attributing $v_{\text{ej}} = v_d$ as a makeshift connection between binary and ejecta parameters, we stray away from the expected evolution of key quantities (e.g., matter density, temperature) as a function of their total expansion velocity.

The employed fits also have a lower limit on the accretion disk mass of $\log M_{\text{disk}} \geq -3$, but no defined upper limit. As certain combinations explored during sampling may yield ejecta parameters outside of the realm of validity of our surrogate model, we set an associated restriction on the wind mass such that $\log m_w \leq -1$. The same upper limit applies to the dynamical ejecta to ensure ejecta samples stay within the region of validity.

C. The likelihood of ejecta parameters for AT2017gfo given electromagnetic observations

The AT2017gfo data are originally presented in Refs. [3–17, 19, 84]. Each combination of ejecta parameters $\bar{x}_\theta$ is evaluated by the MLP to produce a light-curve prediction $\hat{y}$ for every one of the *grizyJHK* broadband filters. We calculate the residual between the MLP prediction $\hat{y}$ and the AT2017gfo observed data in time i for every band B by way of the reduced- χ^2 statistic

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i,B} \frac{(\hat{y}_{i,B} - d_{i,B})^2}{\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{\text{sys}}^2}. \quad (1)$$

In our χ^2 residual calculation, we include statistical uncertainties from the AT2017gfo data σ_i , as well as systematic uncertainties σ_{sys} that we use as a catch-all term to encompass all uncertainties, quantifiable or otherwise, associated with the neural network interpolation process and kilonova modeling uncertainties. Unlike in previous work [56], we set our

systematic modeling uncertainty σ_{sys} as a free parameter to allow for easier reconciliation of the GW and EM inferences. We adopt a purely Gaussian likelihood based on these residuals, i.e.,

$$\ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}} = -\frac{\chi^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \ln(2\pi)^N \sum_i (\sigma_i^2 + \sigma_{\text{sys}}^2), \quad (2)$$

where N is the total number of AT2017gfo observations.

D. The likelihood of source parameters for GW710817 given gravitational wave observations

Following previous studies that constrain properties of GW170817 and the equation of state from GW observations [85–88], we use the rapid parameter inference on gravitational wave sources via Iterative FiTting (RIFT) engine [89–91] to explore and evaluate the marginal likelihood $L(x)$ for a wide range of different compact binary source parameters x . Following the RIFT paradigm, the parameters x include all intrinsic (detector-frame) quantities needed to phenomenologically characterize the binary's inspiral: its two component masses, spins, and tidal deformabilities, assumed independent of any specific EOS model. We then use standard nonparametric interpolation techniques (here, random forests from *sklearn*) to interpolate the marginal likelihood to provide a continuous estimate $\hat{L}(x)$. Our GW likelihood takes the form

$$\ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{GW}} = \ln \hat{L}(\mathcal{M}_c, q, \chi_{\text{eff}}, \tilde{\Lambda}), \quad (3)$$

with input parameters derived from $x = (m_1, m_2, \chi_1, \chi_2, \Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$. To be more concrete, we will employ precisely the same analysis framework and settings as used in Ref. [92]. As a brief review to establish notation, gravitational wave observations of GW170817 constrain the binary masses m_i and tidal deformabilities Λ_i for each component i of the binary [1, 26, 85, 93]. The presence of matter impacts the binary's inspiral at leading order through each component's dimensionless tidal deformability parameter $\Lambda_i = (2/3)k_2(c^2 r_i / G m_i)^5$ [94], where k_2 is the $l = 2$ Love number, m_i is the neutron star mass, and r_i is the radius of a $1.4M_\odot$ neutron star. The leading-order contribution to the phase evolution of a GW inspiral is given by the weighted combination of Λ_i terms

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \frac{16}{13} \frac{(m_1 + 12m_2)m_1^4 \Lambda_1 + (m_2 + 12m_1)m_2^4 \Lambda_2}{(m_1 + m_2)^5}. \quad (4)$$

The impacts of tidal effects on outgoing radiation are included in many conventional approximate phenomenological estimates of outgoing radiation from merging compact binaries. In this work, we begin with precisely the marginal likelihood data accumulated in Ref. [92]. That investigation was performed with a contemporary state-of-the-art model, IMRPhenomPv2_NRTidalv2 [95, 96], which incorporates precession physics but omits higher-order modes. This GW analysis was performed with open GW data for GW170817 available from GWOSC [97], using the same power spectral densities provided with GWTC-1 [98, 99], over a frequency range from 23 to 1700 Hz, with known sky location and source luminosity distance derived from the electromagnetically identified host galaxy. For exploration purposes, most prior assumptions were customary (e.g., uniform in detector-frame




FIG. 2. In this figure, the colored dots represent the input marginal likelihood data assumed in our analysis. In black, red, and blue, we overplot posteriors corresponding to the 90% credible interval for the KruFo20, DiCo20, and Nedora21 GW + EM predictions, respectively. Here, $\mathcal{M}_c$ is in the detector frame.

component masses), noting that the previous investigation employed multiple spin priors and mass ratio priors to accumulate marginal likelihood information over a wide range of source parameters. Although this analysis included prior information about the alignment between the binary's angular momentum direction and the line of sight, inferred from late-time radio afterglow observation [100,101], this information should not significantly impact the GW intrinsic parameters (the binary component masses, spins, and tidal deformabilities).

Because the original marginal likelihood grid accumulated in Ref. [92] did not extend to cover all of the extreme BNS configurations needed for this study, we replicated and extended this analysis to ensure that marginal likelihood data were present whenever required for joint EM/GW analysis. For simplicity, we employ the same GW model throughout for all $\tilde{\Lambda}$, keeping in mind that this model was not calibrated over the full range of $\tilde{\Lambda}$ needed to carry out our investigation.

Figure 2 shows the raw marginal GW likelihood data employed in our analysis, before continuous interpolation over binary neutron star parameters. We show the GW likelihood as a function of the chirp mass $\mathcal{M}_c = (m_1 m_2)^{3/5} / (m_1 + m_2)^{1/5}$, mass ratio $q = m_2 / m_1$, effective spin $\chi_{\text{eff}} = (a_{1z} + q a_{2z}) / (1 + q)$, and effective tidal deformability $\tilde{\Lambda}$ as defined in Eq. (4). In this figure, the color indicates the marginal likelihood, scaling from higher (white) to lower (black) likelihood values, with gray points showing values below the $\ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{max}} - 15$ cutoff. This figure highlights the broad coverage of our underlying likelihood data, particularly the wide range of $\tilde{\Lambda}$. Our coverage includes carefully assessing the marginal likelihood of GW signals in many regions far outside the

customary GW posterior, which is concentrated in the white region. To put our broad exploration in context, drawing upon analyses to be discussed in detail in Sec. III A, in this figure we also show the results of three joint GW + EM inferences, using the DiCo20 (red), KruFo20 (black), and Nedora21 (blue) ejecta fits, respectively. As described later, all three analyses adopt conventional spin and mass ratio priors, consistent with previously published interpretations using comparable models, settings, and data [1,85]. Nonetheless, our joint GW + EM inferences favor more extreme binary and/or tidal parameters compared to previously reported posterior inferences using GW alone, including asymmetric mass ratio (all except DiCo20), large tidal deformability (KruFo20 and DiCo20), and sometimes even large spin (Nedora21). As these extreme configurations are not well represented in widely used fiducial posterior samples from the original analyses, previous follow-up GW + EM investigations that rely on simply reweighting these fiducial samples will not fully capture the features that we report below. In other words, our subsequent calculations demand the wide-ranging likelihood-based approach adopted here.

E. Bayesian inference

We use the RIFT framework [91] to adaptively perform Monte Carlo integration and generate samples using a joint likelihood $\ln \mathcal{L} = \ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{GW}} + \ln \mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}}$. In summing the separate GW and EM likelihoods, we assume their equal contribution to the joint likelihood and that our error model is well understood and lacking additional systematics (both modeling and data). While possible choices for composite likelihood weights have been discussed in the literature [102], in this work we stick to established conventions and leave the exploration of weighted composite likelihoods to a separate study. As previously, we employ an adaptive volume Monte Carlo integrator, following closely the approach outlined in Ref. [103]. The adaptive volume integrator allows for more efficient sampling given the higher-dimensional space explored in this work. As our inference is performed via adaptive Monte Carlo integration, the reliability of our posterior can be expressed in terms of a number of effective samples n_{eff} . Several different conventions exist for this number; see the Appendix of Ref. [91] for more detailed discussion. For this study, we terminate our analyses when $n_{\text{eff}} \simeq 10^3$, indicating sufficient convergence.

Table I shows the sampling parameters used during inference, along with their associated lower and upper limits and priors. The combination of the chirp mass $\mathcal{M}_c$ and mass asymmetry δ priors provides an equivalent locally uniform prior for the binary masses m_1 and m_2 . In addition to the masses, we also sample for the spins of the neutron stars s_{1z} and s_{2z} . We assume that both of the neutron stars have the same radius given a $1.4 M_\odot$ neutron star $R_{1.4}$, treating this radius as a proxy for the nuclear EOS. As described in Sec. II B, we introduce parameters α_{dyn} , f_{disk} , and β_ϕ that encapsulate the uncertainty in our dynamical ejecta mass, wind ejecta mass, and dynamical ejecta velocity, respectively. These parameters are sampled in addition to the light-curve systematics σ_{sys} , effectively allowing for three separate measures of systematic uncertainty in our analysis. Finally, we sample for

TABLE I. Sampling parameters along with their associated limits and priors. Parameters are dimensionless unless units in parentheses are specified in the parameter column. The priors in $\mathcal{M}_c$ and δ are equivalent to a locally uniform probability density in m_1, m_2 .

Parameter	Limits	Prior
$\mathcal{M}_c (M_\odot)$	[1.1853, 1.1880]	Jointly uniform m_1, m_2
δ	[0, 0.8]	Jointly uniform m_1, m_2
s_{1z}	[0, 0.05]	Uniform
s_{2z}	[0, 0.05]	Uniform
$R_{1.4}$ (km)	[8, 50]	Uniform
$\log \alpha_{\text{dyn}}$	[-5, 5]	Uniform
$\log f_{\text{disk}}$	[-5, 0]	Uniform
β_ϕ	[-2, 3]	Uniform
σ_{sys}	[0, 8]	Uniform
θ (deg)	[0, 90]	$\mathcal{N}(\mu = 20, \sigma = 5)$

the viewing angle θ as in prior work (e.g., Ref. [56]). All parameters in Table I are assumed to be dimensionless unless their names are followed by units in brackets.

III. RESULTS

For all the analyses in this section, we assume that the dynamical ejecta mass systematic uncertainty α_{dyn} and light-curve systematic uncertainty σ_{sys} are treated as free parameters. In Sec. III A, we treat f_{disk} and β_ϕ as free parameters to characterize the uncertainties associated with the wind ejecta mass (derived from the ejected disk mass) and ejecta velocity, respectively. In Sec. III B, we fix $\beta_\phi = 0$ to show the effect of ignoring ejecta velocity systematics during inference. Finally, in Sec. III C, we fix both $\beta_\phi = 0$ and $f_{\text{disk}} = 0.30$ to highlight how making assumptions about no ejecta velocity or disk ejection fraction systematics renders meaningful interpretation of our inference results intractable.

A. All systematics included ($\alpha_{\text{dyn}}, f_{\text{disk}}, \beta_\phi$ free)

The corner plots in Fig. 3 show 90% two-dimensional credible intervals and one-dimensional marginal posterior distributions for the underlying binary ($\mathcal{M}_c, \delta$), EOS ($R_{1.4}$), and ejecta systematic ($f_{\text{disk}}, \alpha_{\text{dyn}}, \beta_\phi$) model parameters. The dashed black, red, and blue lines correspond to inferences using only AT2017gfo data $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}}$ for the KruFo20, DiCo20,




FIG. 3. Binary parameter posterior distributions using EM (dashed) and GW + EM (solid) likelihoods using $\log f_{\text{disk}}$ priors of $[-0.9, -0.75]$, $[-1.4, -1.2]$, and $[-1.2, -1]$ for DiCo20, KruFo20, and Nedora21, respectively. The inclusion of the GW likelihood most noticeably affects the chirp mass $\mathcal{M}_c$ and mass asymmetry δ , while simultaneously providing tighter constraints on the neutron star radius $R_{1.4}$ and ejected disk fraction f_{disk} . Gray shaded regions represent $\delta > 0.3$ for which the secondary star's mass is subsolar ($< 1M_\odot$).




FIG. 4. Ejecta posterior distributions using EM (dashed) and GW + EM (solid) likelihoods with the disk mass ejection fraction left as a free parameter. The wind velocity is fixed to $v_w = 0.10c$ per the posteriors in Ref. [56]. There is little difference in the ejecta posteriors between the two approaches, modulo artifacts from varying sample counts, due to our kilonova model requiring parameters in a very narrow region to recreate the AT2017gfo light curves. Figure 3 highlights the differences in the binary parameters when including the GW likelihood.

and Nedora21 ejecta fits, respectively. The solid lines show the same analysis when incorporating both the AT2017gfo $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}}$ and GW170817 $\mathcal{L}_{\text{GW}}$ data. We do not plot the posteriors for s_{1z} , s_{2z} , and σ_{sys} as they are largely uninteresting in the context of understanding the ejecta fits and would have reduced the legibility of the figure. Following a preliminary analysis to identify the posterior support for each ejecta fit, we perform focused analyses targeting narrow regions of f_{disk} for each ejecta fit: $\log f_{\text{disk}}$ is uniform over $[-0.9, -0.75]$, $[-1.4, -1.2]$, and $[-1.2, -1]$ for DiCo20, KruFo20, and Nedora21, respectively.

We verify that our ejecta fit posteriors produce consistent kilonova ejecta properties in Fig. 4. We begin by examining the posteriors for the binary’s ejecta properties, primarily constrained by our EM likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{\text{EM}}$. Figure 4 shows the predicted ejected masses, bulk velocity (attributed to the dynamical ejecta), and the viewing angle derived from the inferences presented in Fig. 3. In this analysis, we adopt $v_w = 0.10c$, consistent with the viscosity-driven wind ejecta in numerical simulations and our previous analysis of AT2017gfo [56]. As in Fig. 3, the dashed curves represent inference using data from AT2017gfo alone and the solid curves consider both the AT2017gfo and GW170817 data. Due to considerable flexibility in ejecta mass model systematics (i.e., f_{disk} , α_{dyn} , β_{ϕ}), our model recovers once again a nearly indistinguishable distribution of ejecta parameters. Since our inference tries to fit AT2017gfo observations with our model,




FIG. 5. Light curves predicted by our kilonova surrogate model for the Nedora21 GW + EM ejecta posteriors presented in Fig. 4, with solid lines corresponding to the median posterior values and shaded bands representing 1σ uncertainty. This posterior includes the effect of marginalizing over unknown model systematic uncertainty σ_{sys} , as described in the text.

and since our ejecta model allows for systematic error, our inferences always find consistent solutions for the best-fitting ejecta, i.e., the ejecta parameters that consistently explain AT2017gfo within the context of our kilonova model family, subject to the limitations of those kilonova models. The much larger and more rapidly varying electromagnetic likelihood dominates our inference of these ejecta properties. In contrast, the GW information only slightly perturbs the overall conclusions obtained electromagnetically. The inclusion of an ejecta velocity systematic parameter does not affect the similarity of the ejecta posteriors. As in Ref. [56], our θ posteriors deviate appreciably from the prior, owing to our model reconciling the tension between the “blue” and “red” emission by sampling away from the θ prior (see their Fig. 10).

In Fig. 5, we plot the light curves associated with the Nedora21 GW + EM posteriors from Fig. 4, showing both the mean and posterior 68% credible interval. The width of these posterior intervals derives from and reflects the narrow posteriors shown in Fig. 4 (including suppressed parameters reflecting model systematic uncertainty). As in previous studies (e.g., Refs. [77,104]), we observe residual model systematics relative to the data, where the largest deviations between our models and the data occur in the bluer filters, namely, the g and r bands, starting at ~ 3 days. Though we explore possible reasons for this blue filter discrepancy in prior work (see Fig. 2 of Ref. [77]), we do not explicitly include this model fidelity issue in our formulation of σ_{sys} . We note that a better fit to late-time blue photometry would most likely invoke a slightly more massive, slower wind ejecta component; a slower wind would produce a longer-lived blue kilonova, with the increased mass accounting for the flux loss from slower-moving ejecta (assuming ejecta under local thermodynamic equilibrium (LTE), see Ref. [105] for non-LTE effects on late-time emission). Both in this work, where we treat σ_{sys} as a free parameter, and in our previous EM-only inferences, where we assume $\sigma_{\text{sys}} = 0.5$ [56,77,83], the deviations that would arise from variations in the posteriors are well encompassed by our systematics.

As expected, our analysis finds that the three ejecta models can only explain AT2017gfo using dramatically different progenitor binaries and EOS. Two of the three models prefer that the progenitor of AT2017gfo is a highly asymmetric binary ($\delta > 0.2 \Rightarrow q < 0.66$) with smaller NS radius $R_{1.4}$, with the DiCo20 models allowing equal-mass ($\delta = 0$) binaries with exceptionally large NS radius. Conversely, these inferences suggest that a surprisingly small fraction ($\sim 4\% - 20\%$) of the expected disk mass is ejected as a wind, in contrast to most previous work [106,107], but consistent with predictions from three-dimensional general relativistic magnetohydrodynamic (GRMHD) disk simulations with full transport neutrino radiation [108] (although past 1 s, these simulations have a larger fraction of ejected mass [109]; more late-time ($t > 1$ s) disk simulations are required for a conclusive comparison).

B. Allowing no uncertainty in ejecta velocity ($\alpha_{\text{dyn}}, f_{\text{disk}}$ free, $\beta_\phi = 0$)

We perform an additional suite of studies in which we assume no systematic uncertainty in the v_{ej} predicted by the ejecta fits. For these analyses, we continue to treat f_{disk} as a free parameter. Despite the assumption of no velocity systematic uncertainty made in this section, the ejecta posteriors remain unchanged, behaving as in Fig. 4. Thus, we still find that our kilonova model and subsequent EM likelihood provide the dominant constraint for the ejecta parameters.

However, without an additional parameter to encapsulate the ejecta systematics, we find several notable differences, largely dictated by the v_{ej} contours in Fig. 1. Specifically, we find that for all three ejecta fits, the GW + EM analyses all favor large radii in order to replicate the low dynamical ejecta velocities necessitated by the $v_{\text{ej}} = v_d$ posteriors in Fig. 4. Based on Fig. 1, a tight constraint on v_{ej} requires either asymmetric NS closer to more conventional radii ($\delta \simeq 0.4$ and $R_{1.4} \simeq 15$ km) or symmetric NS with extreme radii. Indeed, the union of all three $\delta - R_{1.4}$ posteriors in Fig. 6 closely mirrors the underlying v_{ej} contours. As a result, this constraint forces the posterior away from the peak GW likelihood, which favors lower NS radii and more symmetric binaries. In all three cases where we omit systematic error in velocity ($\beta_\phi = 0$), joint GW + EM inference mildly favors asymmetric binaries $\delta \simeq 0.1 - 0.2$ with large NS radius $R_{1.4} > 15$ km.

C. Allowing no uncertainty in ejecta velocity and disk mass ejection fraction (α_{dyn} free, $\beta_\phi = 0$, and $f_{\text{disk}} = 0.30$)

We also consider the case of a fixed disk mass ejection fraction, in which f_{disk} is not a free parameter, but restricted to the fixed value $f_{\text{disk}} = 30\%$. The purpose of this analysis is to evaluate the behavior of the ejecta fits in predicting light curves under the assumption of a generally applied ejected disk fraction. The top half of Fig. 7 displays the same ejecta parameters as in Fig. 4. While the dynamical mass m_d and viewing angle θ are somewhat consistent with prior results, the wind mass m_w and dynamical velocity v_d posteriors yield substantially different results. In the bottom half of Fig. 7, we plot the light curves corresponding to the Nedora21 GW + EM posteriors shown in the top part of Fig. 7. While the light curves corresponding to the median posterior values (solid




FIG. 6. Same as Figs. 2 and 3, but not allowing for systematic uncertainty in v_d (i.e., $\beta_\phi = 0$). Note the recreation of the v_{ej} contours from Fig. 1 in the $R_{1.4}$ vs δ plane.

lines) are clearly worse fits than those in Fig. 5, the more striking feature lies in the exceptionally large uncertainties across all broadband filters. More specifically, the uncertainty bounds are much broader than before, resulting from the broad dynamic range of the m_w posteriors. The difficulty in constraining m_w comes from f_{disk} being directly tied to the amount of ejected wind mass; as such, what the m_w posteriors in Fig. 7 are really showing us is the Monte Carlo integrator trying to reconcile the values of m_w that actually fit the data with the constricting value of $f_{\text{disk}} = 30\%$ that fixes the wind ejecta mass.




FIG. 7. Top: Ejecta posterior distributions using EM (dashed) and GW + EM (solid) likelihoods with an assumed disk mass ejection of $f_{\text{disk}} = 30\%$. In contrast to Fig. 4, m_w is less constrained (leading to the large uncertainties in the light curves below) and v_d is specific to the ejecta fit model. Bottom: Light curves associated with the Nedora21 GW + EM ejecta posteriors presented above, with solid lines corresponding to the median posterior values and shaded bands representing 1σ uncertainty. It is obvious that, at least for the purposes of parameter inference, assuming the same fixed disk fraction for all three ejecta fits yields poor fits to the data with a relatively high degree of uncertainty.

All of the samples generated by our analyses, including the GW likelihood data, can be found in Ref. [110].

IV. DISCUSSION

We perform multimessenger inference of GW170817/AT2017gfo using three different ejecta models and a single kilonova model represented by the neural network surrogate provided in Ref. [56]. This surrogate, when compared with observations, leads to strong constraints on our kilonova model's observable parameters, with posterior extent likely comparable to the information extractable from a perfect model. While many systematic uncertainties have still yet to

be incorporated into our analysis, many of which are well described in a recent study [59], our surrogate model is nevertheless sufficient to assess the prospects of, and challenges facing, multimessenger investigations. Thus, this surrogate provides us with an ideal opportunity to assess the consistency of and perform systematic uncertainty quantification of our methods to perform multimessenger inference, focusing on the remaining ingredients of that challenge. We find that the three ejecta fits we consider largely prefer asymmetric mass binaries (though one allows for symmetry), with all three ejecta fits encompassing effectively different regimes of the neutron star radius $R_{1.4}$.

Unsurprisingly, inference analyses using a joint EM and GW dataset are more constraining than using EM-only data. This behavior is most evident for the $\mathcal{M}_c$ and δ posteriors in Fig. 3, which highlight the impact of including the gravitational likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{\text{GW}}$. The $\mathcal{M}_c$ posteriors for each fit clearly converge on a preferred value when supplemented with GW information; likewise, the δ posteriors become narrower on both global (dynamic range of posterior values) and local (per-ejecta-fit posterior values) scales. With regard to the NS radius $R_{1.4}$ posteriors, the difference between EM and GW + EM analyses is less striking. More prevalent, however, are the different regions of the NS radius parameter space covered by the posteriors corresponding to each ejecta fit. Specifically, the GW + EM predictions for $R_{1.4}$ are roughly between 8 and 15 km, 10 and 20 km, and 10 and 40 km for the Nedora21, KruFo20, and DiCo20 forward models, respectively. These results strongly imply that, provided a constraining kilonova model, multimessenger inference about neutron star radius, and consequently, the dense matter equation of state, is entirely dependent on the chosen forward model and, more importantly, the chosen prescription for mapping BNS merger ejecta to kilonova model input ejecta.

Keeping in mind the individual contributions from the GW and EM information, the joint GW/EM inferences shown in Fig. 3 make sense. For almost all parameters, the addition of GW information only slightly perturbs the answers derived from EM information alone. This behavior is most evident in the bottom panel of Fig. 3, where narrower priors on f_{disk} directly affect the ejected wind mass and thus the EM likelihood, shifting the δ and $R_{1.4}$ posteriors to better agreement across ejecta fits.

As explained in Sec. II B, we introduce the α_{dyn} , f_{disk} , and β_ϕ free parameters to quantify the systematic uncertainty of the ejecta fit predictions, with σ_{sys} encompassing all other sources of systematic uncertainty in our light curves. As previously mentioned, we do not plot σ_{sys} in Fig. 3 because of its largely unconstrained and uninformative behavior. Conversely, Fig. 3 shows that f_{disk} is the most constrained of these parameters, while the α_{dyn} posteriors are generally broader and show minimal preference across individual ejecta fits. The velocity systematics β_ϕ lie somewhere in between, with the Nedora and KruFo GW + EM analyses preferring slower velocities ($\beta_\phi > 0$) and the KruFo EM and DiCo analyses preferring faster velocities ($\beta_\phi < 0$). For the velocity values allowed by the range of β_ϕ , we find that, compared to the recovered value of $v_{\text{ej}} = v_d = 0.14$ from Fig. 4, the KruFo20, DiCo20, and Nedora21 forward models recover relative uncertainties on the velocity of 30.7%, 138%, and 63%. For all

but the KruFo20 fit, these relative differences are substantially higher than the 33% originally reported in Ref. [60] from which the ejecta velocity fits originate.

Given the narrow peaks of the f_{disk} posteriors, we interpret the f_{disk} parameter as setting the scale for the wind ejecta mass, with the α_{dyn} , β_{ϕ} , and σ_{sys} parameters allowing our inference enough flexibility to fit the AT2017gfo light curves. Likewise, we expect the ejecta mass scale set by f_{disk} to be the dominant parameter determining the light curve behavior (see, e.g., Ref. [83]); however, recent studies have shown that velocity profiles can contribute significantly to variations in the light curves [111,112]. Our velocity systematics can have substantial effects on inference, corroborating the findings of these recent studies. These results motivate more detailed studies of versatile ejecta fits that, among other effects, specifically focus on a separate treatment of dynamical and secular ejecta velocities.

Within the context of no velocity systematics ($\beta_{\phi} = 0$), a closer look at the $R_{1,4}$ versus δ two-dimensional posterior in Fig. 6 indicates a cubic relationship between the two parameters. Specifically, as the mass asymmetry of the binary increases $\delta \rightarrow 0.5$, the radius of the individual stars decreases $R_{1,4} \rightarrow 0$, indicating that more asymmetric binaries prefer a softer (more compressible) EOS. This behavior is exactly the same as that observed in Fig. 1, where the ejecta velocity contours (dotted lines ranging from 0.1 to 0.2) dictated the $R_{1,4}$ versus δ relationship. The persistence of this restrictive behavior from the naive contours in Fig. 1 to our posteriors in Fig. 6 strongly suggests that future analyses of the NS radius and EOS must include *both* mass and velocity systematic parameters, lest they introduce significant biases on top of the ones already present in selecting an ejecta forward model.

Finally, in the case where the fraction of ejected disk material is fixed to $f_{\text{disk}} = 30\%$, we recover low-quality posteriors that clearly struggle to fit the data. Specifically, the wind mass m_w is unconstrained compared to the dynamical mass m_d , resulting in prohibitively large uncertainties in the light curves.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have examined multimessenger Bayesian inference of GW170817 and its kilonova AT2017gfo using forward-modeling ejecta predictions that are based on numerical relativity simulations of neutron star mergers. Using a fixed baseline kilonova model [56] and an established, yet imperfect mapping between BNS merger and kilonova ejecta, we assess the impact of systematic uncertainty in ejecta modeling, using three forward model ejecta fits presented in Refs. [45–47]. We find that these three forward models are in tension with one another and necessarily over-constrain ejecta inference (i.e., they make more predictions than they have parameters). Using concrete interpretation of GW170817/AT2017gfo, and after adding a generous budget for systematic uncertainty above and beyond stated confidence, we illustrate the impact of the tension in these three models on multimessenger interpretation: We find distinctly different conclusions about the underlying binary with each ejecta model, even allowing for systematics. We furthermore point out that adopting stronger assumptions about ejecta,

which omit one or more of our systematic uncertainty parameters, leads to even more extreme conclusions about AT2017gfo/GW170817. The posteriors we infer when omitting ejecta velocity systematics directly challenge the results from previous multimessenger analyses that marginalize over the ejecta velocity entirely [46,55].

Our study builds upon and extends the work in Ref. [56], which emphasized purely phenomenological kilonova inference with a fiducial $\sigma_{\text{sys}} = 0.5$ or a similar prior on σ_{sys} , without ejecta forward modeling. Except for when we strongly limit our assumptions about ejecta systematics, our inferences about the observed kilonova ejecta are identical. We highlight that key elements of these ejecta fits may be used well outside of their region of calibration (e.g., ejecta velocity) when used in conjunction with the surrogate kilonova model from our prior work in Ref. [56].

The primary observations highlighted by our analysis are as follows:

(1) Fits to numerical relativity simulations of neutron star mergers that predict mass ejection suffer from systematic uncertainties stemming from the parameter coverage and accuracy of the simulations used to derive them. Unfortunately, multimessenger inference requires confidence in the imperfect mapping between BNS merger and kilonova model ejecta, guiding these predictions well outside conventional configurations to properly assess extreme scenarios. At present, we are unable to confidently and consistently connect binary and ejecta parameters using GW170817/AT2017gfo’s rich observational datasets, thus also dooming future multimessenger inferences to a similar fate.

(2) Given a kilonova model that can provide tight constraints on ejecta parameters, multimessenger inference about binary parameters like the neutron star radius and, consequently, the dense matter equation of state are strongly dependent on the chosen forward model and its ejecta predictions that are primarily guided by the chosen prescription for mapping BNS merger ejecta to kilonova model input ejecta. The ejecta velocity in particular seems to have a strong impact, as ours and other contemporary inferences favor velocities at the low end of calibrated fits.

(3) Our study examines the inconsistencies between ejecta fits introduced by mapping binary parameters to ejecta mass *and* velocity, challenging the results from previous multimessenger studies that marginalize over ejecta velocity. Corroborating previous results (e.g., Refs. [111,112]), we find that a treatment of *both* mass and velocity systematic uncertainties is required for maximally unbiased inference of ejecta forward model predictions.

(4) Within the context of our model, we find that the fraction of the ejected disk lies around 4%–16% for a GW170817-like event, with said fraction also dependent on the chosen forward model. This agrees with predictions from subsecond GRMHD simulations with full neutrino transport, but is in tension with assumptions typically made in the literature (up to 40% of disk ejection).

(5) We emphasize that some of the outcomes and discussed pitfalls in this work are likely to also be related to the specific, established choice of mapping between BNS merger ejecta and kilonova model ejecta inputs. Although conventions exist in the literature, they are incomplete and not

one-to-one, and additional work establishing more physical mappings is necessary for accurate multimessenger inference.

Our results suggest that there are currently no broadly applicable prescriptions that accurately map binary parameters to ejecta predictions or correctly assume the ejected fraction of an arbitrary postmerger accretion disk. A large portion of the mapping incompatibility boils down to the difficulty in prescribing the ejecta from numerical relativity simulations to the standard assumption of two distinct, angle-separated kilonova ejecta components. The lack of such prescriptions strongly motivates future studies that examine the connection between numerical relativity simulations of neutron star mergers and their ejecta predictions. While future multimessenger observations of neutron star mergers will shed more light on the broader population of mergers, in the meantime, our conclusions suggest that significantly more additional numerical relativity studies are necessary to understand the connection between binary and ejecta parameters. Additionally, for kilonova models to be confidently used in multimessenger analyses such as the proof of concept presented in this article, more work is required to improve the fidelity of the radiative transfer simulations used to model these events. Likewise, in understanding these connections, we encourage future studies to carefully consider the contexts within which each of the ejecta forward models is applicable and assume appropriate levels of uncertainty in their analyses.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

R.O. and M.R. acknowledge support from NSF AST Grants No. 1909534 and No. 2206321. K.W. acknowledges support from NSF Grants No. AST-2319326 and No. PHY-2012057. R.O. also acknowledges support via NSF PHY Grants No. 2012057 and No. 2309172, and the Simons Foundation. The work by C.L.F., C.J.F., M.R., M.R.M., O.K., and R.T.W. was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy through the Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). This research was made possible in part by the Information Science & Technology Institute (ISTI) at LANL. This research used resources provided by LANL through the institutional computing program. Los Alamos National Laboratory is operated by Triad National Security, LLC, for the National Nuclear Security Administration of U.S. Department of Energy (Contract No. 89233218CNA000001). This document has been assigned LA-UR-25-22248.




FIG. 8. Ejecta contours as in Fig. 1, but for the DiCo20 forward model. The disk mass (dashed lines) is constrained by δ but unbounded in the $R_{1,4}$ dimension.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that support the findings of this article are openly available [110].

APPENDIX: INTERPRETING THE DiCo20 $\tilde{\Lambda}$ RESULTS

The DiCo20 $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and $R_{1,4}$ posteriors in Figs. 2 and 3 are appreciably different from those corresponding to the KruFo20 and Nedora21 ejecta fits, favoring much larger radii and $\tilde{\Lambda}$ than informed by the GW likelihood. We examine the DiCo20 ejecta contours in Fig. 8. The velocity prescription remains the same, while the disk mass and dynamical ejecta fits change. The dynamical ejecta contours behave similarly to the KruFo20 contours, with larger values of δ required to produce a higher quantity of dynamical ejecta. The disk mass contours (dashed lines) are the most different between the two fits. Whereas in the KruFo20 fits, disk mass was weakly dependent on δ and primarily set by $R_{1,4}$, the DiCo20 fits behave oppositely, with disk mass defined by δ and completely agnostic to $R_{1,4}$. This reversed dependency enables the DiCo20 posteriors to find solutions near $\delta = 0$ with low χ_{eff} , in line with the GW-informed likelihood; however, the lack of an $R_{1,4}$ constraint results in the uncharacteristically large $\tilde{\Lambda}$ values observed in Fig. 2.

- [1] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, F. Acernese, K. Ackley, C. Adams, T. Adams, P. Addesso, R. X. Adhikari, *et al.*, GW170817: Observation of gravitational waves from a binary neutron star inspiral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 161101 (2017).
- [2] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, F. Acernese, K. Ackley, C. Adams, T. Adams, P. Addesso, R. X. Adhikari, V. B. Adya, *et al.*, Multi-messenger observations of a binary neutron star merger, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848**, L12 (2017).
- [3] I. Andreoni, K. Ackley, J. Cooke, A. Acharyya, J. R. Allison, G. E. Anderson, M. C. B. Ashley, D. Baade, M. Bailes, K.

- Bannister, *et al.*, Follow up of GW170817 and its electromagnetic counterpart by Australian-led observing programmes, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Aust.* **34**, e069 (2017).
- [4] I. Arcavi, G. Hosseinzadeh, D. A. Howell, C. McCully, D. Poznanski, D. Kasen, J. Barnes, M. Zaltzman, S. Vasylyev, D. Maoz, and S. Valenti, Optical emission from a kilonova following a gravitational-wave-detected neutron-star merger, *Nature (London)* **551**, 64 (2017).
- [5] D. A. Coulter, R. J. Foley, C. D. Kilpatrick, M. R. Drout, A. L. Piro, B. J. Shappee, M. R. Siebert, J. D. Simon, N. Ulloa,

- D. Kasen, *et al.*, Swope supernova survey 2017a (SSS17a), the optical counterpart to a gravitational wave source, *Science* **358**, 1556 (2017).
- [6] P. S. Cowperthwaite, E. Berger, V. A. Villar, B. D. Metzger, M. Nicholl, R. Chornock, P. K. Blanchard, W. Fong, R. Margutti, M. Soares-Santos, *et al.*, The electromagnetic counterpart of the binary neutron star merger LIGO/Virgo GW170817. II. UV, optical, and near-infrared light curves and comparison to Kilonova models, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848**, L17 (2017).
- [7] M. C. Díaz, L. M. Macri, D. Garcia Lambas, C. Mendes de Oliveira, J. L. Nilo Castellón, T. Ribeiro, B. Sánchez, W. Schoenell, L. R. Abramo, S. Akas, *et al.*, Observations of the first electromagnetic counterpart to a gravitational-wave source by the TOROS Collaboration, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848**, L29 (2017).
- [8] M. R. Drout, A. L. Piro, B. J. Shappee, C. D. Kilpatrick, J. D. Simon, C. Contreras, D. A. Coulter, R. J. Foley, M. R. Siebert, N. Morrell, *et al.*, Light curves of the neutron star merger GW170817/SSS17a: Implications for *r*-process nucleosynthesis, *Science* **358**, 1570 (2017).
- [9] P. A. Evans, S. B. Cenko, J. A. Kennea, S. W. K. Emery, N. P. M. Kuin, O. Korobkin, R. T. Wollaeger, C. L. Fryer, K. K. Madsen, F. A. Harrison, *et al.*, *Swift* and *NuSTAR* observations of GW170817: Detection of a blue kilonova, *Science* **358**, 1565 (2017).
- [10] L. Hu, X. Wu, I. Andreoni, M. C. B. Ashley, J. Cooke, X. Cui, F. Du, Z. Dai, B. Gu, Y. Hu, *et al.*, Optical observations of LIGO source GW170817 by the Antarctic survey telescopes at Dome A, Antarctica, *Sci. Bull.* **62**, 1433 (2017).
- [11] M. M. Kasliwal, E. Nakar, L. P. Singer, D. L. Kaplan, D. O. Cook, A. Van Sistine, R. M. Lau, C. Fremling, O. Gottlieb, J. E. Jencson, *et al.*, Illuminating gravitational waves: A concordant picture of photons from a neutron star merger, *Science* **358**, 1559 (2017).
- [12] V. M. Lipunov, E. Gorbovskoy, V. G. Kornilov, N. Tyurina, P. Balanutsa, A. Kuznetsov, D. Vlasenko, D. Kuvshinov, I. Gorbunov, D. A. H. Buckley, *et al.*, MASTER optical detection of the First LIGO/Virgo neutron star binary merger GW170817, *Astrophysical J. Lett.* **850**, L1 (2017).
- [13] E. Pian, P. D'Avanzo, S. Benetti, M. Branchesi, E. Brocato, S. Campana, E. Cappellaro, S. Covino, V. D'Elia, J. P. U. Fynbo, *et al.*, Spectroscopic identification of *r*-process nucleosynthesis in a double neutron-star merger, *Nature (London)* **551**, 67 (2017).
- [14] S. J. Smartt, T. W. Chen, A. Jerkstrand, M. Coughlin, E. Kankare, S. A. Sim, M. Fraser, C. Innes, K. Maguire, K. C. Chambers, *et al.*, A kilonova as the electromagnetic counterpart to a gravitational-wave source, *Nature (London)* **551**, 75 (2017).
- [15] N. R. Tanvir, A. J. Levan, C. González-Fernández, O. Korobkin, I. Mandel, S. Rosswog, J. Hjorth, P. D'Avanzo, A. S. Fruchter, C. L. Fryer, *et al.*, The Emergence of a lanthanide-rich kilonova following the merger of two neutron stars, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848**, L27 (2017).
- [16] E. Troja, L. Piro, H. van Eerten, R. T. Wollaeger, M. Im, O. D. Fox, N. R. Butler, S. B. Cenko, T. Sakamoto, C. L. Fryer, *et al.*, The X-ray counterpart to the gravitational-wave event GW170817, *Nature (London)* **551**, 71 (2017).
- [17] Y. Utsumi, M. Tanaka, N. Tominaga, M. Yoshida, S. Barway, T. Nagayama, T. Zenko, K. Aoki, T. Fujiyoshi, H. Furusawa, *et al.*, J-GEM observations of an electromagnetic counterpart to the neutron star merger GW170817, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Jpn.* **69**, 101 (2017).
- [18] S. Valenti, D. J. Sand, S. Yang, E. Cappellaro, L. Tartaglia, A. Corsi, S. W. Jha, D. E. Reichart, J. Haislip, and V. Kouprianov, The discovery of the electromagnetic counterpart of GW170817: Kilonova AT 2017gfo/DLT17ck, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848**, L24 (2017).
- [19] A. S. Pozanenko, M. V. Barkov, P. Y. Minaev, A. A. Volnova, E. D. Mazaeva, A. S. Moskvitin, M. A. Krugov, V. A. Samodurov, V. M. Loznikov, and M. Lyutikov, GRB 170817A associated with GW170817: Multi-frequency observations and modeling of prompt gamma-ray emission, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **852**, L30 (2018).
- [20] L.-X. Li and B. Paczyński, Transient events from neutron star mergers, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **507**, L59 (1998).
- [21] B. D. Metzger, G. Martínez-Pinedo, S. Darbha, E. Quataert, A. Arcones, D. Kasen, R. Thomas, P. Nugent, I. V. Panov, and N. T. Zinner, Electromagnetic counterparts of compact object mergers powered by the radioactive decay of *r*-process nuclei, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **406**, 2650 (2010).
- [22] M. Shibata and K. Hotokezaka, Merger and mass ejection of neutron star binaries, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **69**, 41 (2019).
- [23] L. Piro, E. Troja, B. Zhang, G. Ryan, H. van Eerten, R. Ricci, M. H. Wieringa, A. Tiengo, N. R. Butler, S. B. Cenko, O. D. Fox, H. G. Khandrika, G. Novara, A. Rossi, and T. Sakamoto, A long-lived neutron star merger remnant in GW170817: Constraints and clues from x-ray observations, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **483**, 1912 (2019).
- [24] A. Murguía-Berthier, E. Ramirez-Ruiz, F. De Colle, A. Janiuk, S. Rosswog, and W. H. Lee, The fate of the merger remnant in GW170817 and its imprint on the jet structure, *Astrophys. J.* **908**, 152 (2021).
- [25] S. Curtis, P. Bosch, P. Mösta, D. Radice, S. Bernuzzi, A. Perego, R. Haas, and E. Schnetter, Magnetized Outflows from short-lived neutron star merger remnants can produce a blue kilonova, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **961**, L26 (2024).
- [26] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration and the Virgo Collaboration), GW170817: Measurements of neutron star radii and equation of state, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 161101 (2018).
- [27] M. Nicholl, B. Margalit, P. Schmidt, G. P. Smith, E. J. Ridley, and J. Nuttall, Tight multimessenger constraints on the neutron star equation of state from GW170817 and a forward model for kilonova light-curve synthesis, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **505**, 3016 (2021).
- [28] D. Kasen, B. Metzger, J. Barnes, E. Quataert, and E. Ramirez-Ruiz, Origin of the heavy elements in binary neutron-star mergers from a gravitational-wave event, *Nature (London)* **551**, 80 (2017).
- [29] F. K. Thielemann, M. Eichler, I. V. Panov, and B. Wehmeyer, Neutron star mergers and nucleosynthesis of heavy elements, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **67**, 253 (2017).
- [30] D. M. Siegel, GW170817—The first observed neutron star merger and its kilonova: Implications for the astrophysical site of the *r*-process, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **55**, 203 (2019).
- [31] K. Hotokezaka, K. Kyutoku, H. Okawa, M. Shibata, and K. Kiuchi, Binary neutron star mergers: Dependence on the nuclear equation of state, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 124008 (2011).

- [32] T. Dietrich, S. Bernuzzi, M. Ujevic, and W. Tichy, Gravitational waves and mass ejecta from binary neutron star mergers: Effect of the stars' rotation, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 044045 (2017).
- [33] D. Radice, A. Perego, K. Hotokezaka, S. A. Fromm, S. Bernuzzi, and L. F. Roberts, Binary neutron star mergers: Mass ejection, electromagnetic counterparts, and nucleosynthesis, *Astrophys. J.* **869**, 130 (2018).
- [34] K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, M. Shibata, and K. Taniguchi, Revisiting the lower bound on tidal deformability derived by AT 2017gfo, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **876**, L31 (2019).
- [35] A. Bauswein, S. Goriely, and H. T. Janka, Systematics of dynamical mass ejection, nucleosynthesis, and radioactively powered electromagnetic signals from neutron-star mergers, *Astrophys. J.* **773**, 78 (2013).
- [36] V. Nedora, S. Bernuzzi, D. Radice, B. Daszuta, A. Endrizzi, A. Perego, A. Prakash, M. Safarzadeh, F. Schianchi, and D. Logoteta, Numerical relativity simulations of the neutron star merger GW170817: Long-term remnant evolutions, winds, remnant disks, and nucleosynthesis, *Astrophys. J.* **906**, 98 (2021).
- [37] T. Vincent, F. Foucart, M. D. Duez, R. Haas, L. E. Kidder, H. P. Pfeiffer, and M. A. Scheel, Unequal mass binary neutron star simulations with neutrino transport: Ejecta and neutrino emission, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 044053 (2020).
- [38] Y. Sekiguchi, K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, M. Shibata, and K. Taniguchi, Dynamical mass ejection from the merger of asymmetric binary neutron stars: Radiation-hydrodynamics study in general relativity, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 124046 (2016).
- [39] K. Hotokezaka, K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, H. Okawa, Y.-i. Sekiguchi, M. Shibata, and K. Taniguchi, Mass ejection from the merger of binary neutron stars, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 024001 (2013).
- [40] L. Lehner, S. L. Liebling, C. Palenzuela, O. L. Caballero, E. O'Connor, M. Anderson, and D. Neilsen, Unequal mass binary neutron star mergers and multimessenger signals, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **33**, 184002 (2016).
- [41] A. Perego, S. Bernuzzi, and D. Radice, Thermodynamics conditions of matter in neutron star mergers, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **55**, 124 (2019).
- [42] V. Nedora, S. Bernuzzi, D. Radice, A. Perego, A. Endrizzi, and N. Ortiz, Spiral-wave wind for the blue kilonova, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **886**, L30 (2019).
- [43] S. Bernuzzi, M. Breschi, B. Daszuta, A. Endrizzi, D. Logoteta, V. Nedora, A. Perego, D. Radice, F. Schianchi, F. Zappa, I. Bombaci, and N. Ortiz, Accretion-induced prompt black hole formation in asymmetric neutron star mergers, dynamical ejecta, and kilonova signals, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **497**, 1488 (2020).
- [44] Y. Sekiguchi, K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, and M. Shibata, Dynamical mass ejection from binary neutron star mergers: Radiation-hydrodynamics study in general relativity, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 064059 (2015).
- [45] C. J. Krüger and F. Foucart, Estimates for disk and ejecta masses produced in compact binary mergers, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 103002 (2020).
- [46] T. Dietrich, M. W. Coughlin, P. T. H. Pang, M. Bulla, J. Heinzl, L. Issa, I. Tews, and S. Antier, Multimessenger constraints on the neutron-star equation of state and the Hubble constant, *Science* **370**, 1450 (2020).
- [47] V. Nedora, F. Schianchi, S. Bernuzzi, D. Radice, B. Daszuta, A. Endrizzi, A. Perego, A. Prakash, and F. Zappa, Mapping dynamical ejecta and disk masses from numerical relativity simulations of neutron star mergers, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **39**, 015008 (2022).
- [48] E. M. Holmbeck, R. O'Shaughnessy, V. Delfavero, and K. Belczynski, A nuclear equation of state inferred from stellar *r*-process abundances, *Astrophys. J.* **926**, 196 (2022).
- [49] P. T. H. Pang, T. Dietrich, M. W. Coughlin, M. Bulla, I. Tews, M. Almualla, T. Barna, R. W. Kiendrebeogo, N. Kunert, G. Mansingh, *et al.*, An updated nuclear-physics and multimessenger astrophysics framework for binary neutron star mergers, *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 8352 (2023).
- [50] G. Raaijmakers, S. Nissanke, F. Foucart, M. M. Kasliwal, M. Bulla, R. Fernández, A. Henkel, T. Hinderer, K. Hotokezaka, K. Lukošiušė, T. Venumadhav, S. Antier, M. W. Coughlin, T. Dietrich, and T. D. P. Edwards, The challenges ahead for multimessenger analyses of gravitational waves and kilonova: A case study on GW190425, *Astrophys. J.* **922**, 269 (2021).
- [51] K. Hayashi, K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, Y. Sekiguchi, and M. Shibata, Jet from binary neutron star merger with prompt black hole formation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **134**, 211407 (2025).
- [52] A. Camilletti, L. Chiesa, G. Ricigliano, A. Perego, L. C. Lippold, S. Padamata, S. Bernuzzi, D. Radice, D. Logoteta, and F. M. Guercilena, Numerical relativity simulations of the neutron star merger GW190425: Microphysics and mass ratio effects, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **516**, 4760 (2022).
- [53] A. Henkel, F. Foucart, G. Raaijmakers, and S. Nissanke, Study of the agreement between binary neutron star ejecta models derived from numerical relativity simulations, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 063028 (2023).
- [54] M. W. Coughlin, T. Dietrich, Z. Doctor, D. Kasen, S. Coughlin, A. Jerkstrand, G. Leloudas, O. McBrien, B. D. Metzger, R. O'Shaughnessy, and S. J. Smartt, Constraints on the neutron star equation of state from AT2017gfo using radiative transfer simulations, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **480**, 3871 (2018).
- [55] M. W. Coughlin, T. Dietrich, B. Margalit, and B. D. Metzger, Multimessenger Bayesian parameter inference of a binary neutron star merger, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **489**, L91 (2019).
- [56] Y. Peng, M. Ristić, A. Kedia, R. O'Shaughnessy, C. J. Fontes, C. L. Fryer, O. Korobkin, M. R. Mumpower, V. A. Villar, and R. T. Wollaeger, Kilonova light-curve interpolation with neural networks, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 033078 (2024).
- [57] C. L. Fryer, C. J. Fontes, O. Korobkin, M. Mumpower, R. Wollaeger, E. M. Holmbeck, and R. O'Shaughnessy, Uncertainties in kilonova modeling, in *The Sixteenth Marcel Grossmann Meeting. On Recent Developments in Theoretical and Experimental General Relativity, Astrophysics, and Relativistic Field Theories*, edited by R. Ruffino and G. Vereshchagin (World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2021), pp. 1391–1404.
- [58] M. R. Mumpower, T. M. Sprouse, J. M. Miller, K. A. Lund, J. C. Garcia, N. Vassh, G. C. McLaughlin, and R. Surman, Nuclear uncertainties associated with the nucleosynthesis in ejecta of a black hole accretion disk, *Astrophys. J.* **970**, 173 (2024).
- [59] D. Brethauer, D. Kasen, R. Margutti, and R. Chornock, Impact of systematic modeling uncertainties on kilonova property estimation, *Astrophys. J.* **975**, 213 (2024).

- [60] T. Dietrich and M. Ujevic, Modeling dynamical ejecta from binary neutron star mergers and implications for electromagnetic counterparts, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **34**, 105014 (2017).
- [61] M. Coughlin, T. Dietrich, K. Kawaguchi, S. Smartt, C. Stubbs, and M. Ujevic, Toward rapid transient identification and characterization of kilonovae, *Astrophys. J.* **849**, 12 (2017).
- [62] M. Breschi, R. Gamba, G. Carullo, D. Godzieba, S. Bernuzzi, A. Perego, and D. Radice, Bayesian inference of multimessenger astrophysical data: Joint and coherent inference of gravitational waves and kilonovae, *Astron. Astrophys.* **689**, A51 (2024).
- [63] R. T. Wollaeger, C. L. Fryer, E. A. Chase, C. J. Fontes, M. Ristić, A. L. Hungerford, O. Korobkin, R. O’Shaughnessy, and A. M. Herring, A broad grid of 2D kilonova emission models, *Astrophys. J.* **918**, 10 (2021).
- [64] O. Korobkin, R. T. Wollaeger, C. L. Fryer, A. L. Hungerford, S. Rosswog, C. J. Fontes, M. R. Mumpower, E. A. Chase, W. P. Even, J. Miller, G. W. Misch, and J. Lippuner, Axisymmetric radiative transfer models of kilonovae, *Astrophys. J.* **910**, 116 (2021).
- [65] O. Just, V. Vijayan, Z. Xiong, S. Goriely, T. Soultanis, A. Bauswein, J. Guilet, H. T. Janka, and G. Martínez-Pinedo, End-to-end Kilonova models of neutron star mergers with delayed black hole formation, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **951**, L12 (2023).
- [66] I. Kullmann, S. Goriely, O. Just, R. Ardevol-Pulpillo, A. Bauswein, and H. T. Janka, Dynamical ejecta of neutron star mergers with nucleonic weak processes I: Nucleosynthesis, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **510**, 2804 (2022).
- [67] R. T. Wollaeger and D. R. van Rossum, Radiation transport for explosive outflows: Opacity regrouping, *Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser.* **214**, 28 (2014).
- [68] C. Winteler, R. Käppeli, A. Perego, A. Arcones, N. Vasset, N. Nishimura, M. Liebendörfer, and F. K. Thielemann, Magnetototally driven supernovae as the origin of early galaxy r -process elements? *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **750**, L22 (2012).
- [69] O. Korobkin, S. Rosswog, A. Arcones, and C. Winteler, On the astrophysical robustness of the neutron star merger r -process, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **426**, 1940 (2012).
- [70] M. Reichert, C. Winteler, O. Korobkin, A. Arcones, J. Bliss, M. Eichler, U. Frischknecht, C. Fröhlich, R. Hirschi, M. Jacobi, J. Kuske, G. Martínez-Pinedo, D. Martin, D. Moclj, T. Rauscher, and F. K. Thielemann, The nuclear reaction network WinNet, *Astroph. J. S.* **268**, 66 (2023).
- [71] M. Reichert, C. Winteler, O. Korobkin, A. Arcones, J. Bliss, M. Eichler, U. Frischknecht, C. Fröhlich, R. Hirschi, M. Jacobi, J. Kuske, G. Martínez-Pinedo, D. Martin, D. Moclj, T. Rauscher, and F.-K. Thielemann, WinNet: v1.0.1, Zenodo (2023), <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8220550>.
- [72] J. Barnes, D. Kasen, M.-R. Wu, and G. Martínez-Pinedo, Radioactivity and thermalization in the ejecta of compact object mergers and their impact on kilonova light curves, *Astrophys. J.* **829**, 110 (2016).
- [73] R. T. Wollaeger, O. Korobkin, C. J. Fontes, S. K. Rosswog, W. P. Even, C. L. Fryer, J. Sollerman, A. L. Hungerford, D. R. van Rossum, and A. B. Wollaber, Impact of ejecta morphology and composition on the electromagnetic signatures of neutron star mergers, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **478**, 3298 (2018).
- [74] C. J. Fontes, H. L. Zhang, J. Abdallah Jr., R. E. H. Clark, D. P. Kilcrease, J. Colgan, R. T. Cunningham, P. Hakel, N. H. Magee, and M. E. Sherrill, The Los Alamos suite of relativistic atomic physics codes, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **48**, 144014 (2015).
- [75] C. J. Fontes, C. L. Fryer, A. L. Hungerford, R. T. Wollaeger, and O. Korobkin, A line-binned treatment of opacities for the spectra and light curves from neutron star mergers, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **493**, 4143 (2020).
- [76] Y. Ralchenko, K. Olsen, C. J. Fontes, C. L. Fryer, A. L. Hungerford, R. T. Wollaeger, and O. Korobkin, NIST-LANL Lanthanide Opacity Database (ver. 1.2) [Online] (2023), <https://nlte.nist.gov/OPAC>.
- [77] M. Ristić, E. Champion, R. O’Shaughnessy, R. Wollaeger, O. Korobkin, E. A. Chase, C. L. Fryer, A. L. Hungerford, and C. J. Fontes, Interpolating detailed simulations of kilonovae: Adaptive learning and parameter inference applications, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 013046 (2022).
- [78] A. Kedia, M. Ristić, R. O’Shaughnessy, A. B. Yelikar, R. T. Wollaeger, O. Korobkin, E. A. Chase, C. L. Fryer, and C. J. Fontes, Surrogate light curve models for kilonovae with comprehensive wind ejecta outflows and parameter estimation for AT2017gfo, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 013168 (2023).
- [79] R. Dudi, T. Dietrich, A. Rashti, B. Brügmann, J. Steinhoff, and W. Tichy, High-accuracy simulations of highly spinning binary neutron star systems, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 064050 (2022).
- [80] S. V. Chaurasia, T. Dietrich, M. Ujevic, K. Hendriks, R. Dudi, F. M. Fabbri, W. Tichy, and B. Brügmann, Gravitational waves and mass ejecta from binary neutron star mergers: Effect of the spin orientation, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 024087 (2020).
- [81] T. Zhao and J. M. Lattimer, Tidal deformabilities and neutron star mergers, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 063020 (2018).
- [82] S. Curtis, J. M. Miller, C. Fröhlich, T. Sprouse, N. Lloyd-Ronning, and M. Mumpower, Nucleosynthesis in outflows from black hole-neutron star merger disks with full GR(ν)RMHD, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **945**, L13 (2023).
- [83] M. Ristić, R. O’Shaughnessy, V. A. Villar, R. T. Wollaeger, O. Korobkin, C. L. Fryer, C. J. Fontes, and A. Kedia, Interpolated kilonova spectra models: Examining the effects of a phenomenological, blue component in the fitting of AT2017gfo spectra, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **5**, 043106 (2023).
- [84] B. J. Shappee, J. D. Simon, M. R. Drout, A. L. Piro, N. Morrell, J. L. Prieto, D. Kasen, T. W. S. Holoien, J. A. Kollmeier, D. D. Kelson, *et al.*, Early spectra of the gravitational wave source GW170817: Evolution of a neutron star merger, *Science* **358**, 1574 (2017).
- [85] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo Collaboration and LIGO Scientific Collaboration), Properties of the binary neutron star merger GW170817, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 011001 (2019).
- [86] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration and The Virgo Collaboration), Model comparison from LIGO-Virgo data on GW170817’s binary components and consequences for the merger remnant, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **37**, 045006 (2020).
- [87] A. Kedia, R. O’Shaughnessy, L. Wade, and A. Yelikar, Exploring hidden priors when interpreting gravitational wave and electromagnetic probes of the nuclear equation of state, [arXiv:2405.17326](https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.17326).
- [88] A. Vilkhia, A. Yelikar, R. O’Shaughnessy, and J. Read, Inference on neutron star parameters and the nuclear equation of state with RIFT, using prior EOS information, [arXiv:2407.15753](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15753).

- [89] J. Lange, R. O’Shaughnessy, and M. Rizzo, Rapid and accurate parameter inference for coalescing, precessing compact binaries, [arXiv:1805.10457](#).
- [90] D. Wysocki, R. O’Shaughnessy, J. Lange, and Y.-L. L. Fang, Accelerating parameter inference with graphics processing units, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 084026 (2019).
- [91] J. Wofford, A. B. Yelikar, H. Gallagher, E. Champion, D. Wysocki, V. Delfavero, J. Lange, C. Rose, V. Valsan, S. Morisaki, J. Read, C. Henshaw, and R. O’Shaughnessy, Improving performance for gravitational-wave parameter inference with an efficient and highly-parallelized algorithm, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 024040 (2023).
- [92] A. Kedia, R. O’Shaughnessy, L. Wade, and A. Yelikar, Exploring hidden priors when interpreting gravitational wave and electromagnetic probes of the nuclear equation of state, [arXiv:2405.17326](#).
- [93] T. Narikawa, N. Uchikata, K. Kawaguchi, K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, M. Shibata, and H. Tagoshi, Reanalysis of the binary neutron star mergers GW170817 and GW190425 using numerical-relativity calibrated waveform models, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 043039 (2020).
- [94] E. E. Flanagan and T. Hinderer, Constraining neutron star tidal Love numbers with gravitational wave detectors, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 021502 (2008).
- [95] T. Dietrich, S. Khan, R. Dudi, S. J. Kapadia, P. Kumar, A. Nagar, F. Ohme, F. Pannarale, A. Samajdar, S. Bernuzzi, G. Carullo, W. Del Pozzo, M. Haney, C. Markakis, M. Pürrer, G. Riemenschneider, Y. E. Setyawati, K. W. Tsang, and C. Van Den Broeck, Matter imprints in waveform models for neutron star binaries: Tidal and self-spin effects, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 024029 (2019).
- [96] T. Dietrich, A. Samajdar, S. Khan, N. K. Johnson-McDaniel, R. Dudi, and W. Tichy, Improving the NRTidal model for binary neutron star systems, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 044003 (2019).
- [97] J. M. Rich Abbott, T. D. Abbott, S. Abraham, F. Acernese, K. Ackley, C. Adams, R. X. Adhikari, V. B. Adya, C. Affeldt, M. Agathos, *et al.*, Open data from the first and second observing runs of Advanced LIGO and Advanced Virgo, *SoftwareX* **13**, 100658 (2021).
- [98] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific Collaboration and Virgo Collaboration), GWTC-1: A gravitational-wave transient catalog of compact binary mergers observed by LIGO and Virgo during the first and second observing runs, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031040 (2019).
- [99] L. S. Collaboration, Parameter estimation sample release for GWTC-1 (2018).
- [100] K. Hotokezaka, E. Nakar, O. Gottlieb, S. Nissanke, K. Masuda, G. Hallinan, K. P. Mooley, and A. T. Deller, A Hubble constant measurement from superluminal motion of the jet in GW170817, *Nat. Astron.* **3**, 940 (2019).
- [101] K. P. Mooley, E. Nakar, K. Hotokezaka, G. Hallinan, A. Corsi, D. A. Frail, A. Horesh, T. Murphy, E. Lenc, D. L. Kaplan, *et al.*, A mildly relativistic wide-angle outflow in the neutron-star merger event GW170817, *Nature (London)* **554**, 207 (2018).
- [102] W. Li, R. White, and D. Prangle, Optimal combination of composite likelihoods using approximate Bayesian computation with application to state-space models, [arXiv:2404.02313](#).
- [103] V. Tiwari, C. Hoy, S. Fairhurst, and D. MacLeod, Fast non-Markovian sampler for estimating gravitational-wave posteriors, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 023001 (2023).
- [104] K. Kawaguchi, S. Fujibayashi, M. Shibata, M. Tanaka, and S. Wanajo, A low-mass binary neutron star: Long-term ejecta evolution and kilonovae with weak blue emission, *Astrophys. J.* **913**, 100 (2021).
- [105] D. Brethauer, D. Kasen, R. Margutti, and R. Chornock, Non-thermal ionization of kilonova ejecta: Observable impacts, *Astrophys. J.* **996**, 64 (2026).
- [106] D. Radice, S. Bernuzzi, and A. Perego, The dynamics of binary neutron star mergers and GW170817, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **70**, 95 (2020).
- [107] S. Fujibayashi, M. Shibata, S. Wanajo, K. Kiuchi, K. Kyutoku, and Y. Sekiguchi, Mass ejection from disks surrounding a low-mass black hole: Viscous neutrino-radiation hydrodynamics simulation in full general relativity, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083029 (2020).
- [108] J. M. Miller, B. R. Ryan, J. C. Dolence, A. Burrows, C. J. Fontes, C. L. Fryer, O. Korobkin, J. Lippuner, M. R. Mumpower, and R. T. Wollaeger, Full transport model of GW170817-like disk produces a blue kilonova, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 023008 (2019).
- [109] T. M. Sprouse, K. A. Lund, J. M. Miller, G. C. McLaughlin, and M. R. Mumpower, Emergent nucleosynthesis from a 1.2 s long simulation of a black hole accretion disk, *Astrophys. J.* **962**, 79 (2024).
- [110] M. Ristić, Gwem data repo, Github repository (2025), https://github.com/markoris/GWEM_data_repo.
- [111] D. Tak, Z. L. Uhm, and J. H. Gillanders, Exploring the impact of the ejecta velocity profile on the evolution of kilonova: Diversity of the kilonova lightcurves, *Astrophys. J.* **958**, 121 (2023).
- [112] C. L. Fryer, A. L. Hungerford, R. T. Wollaeger, J. M. Miller, S. De, C. J. Fontes, O. Korobkin, A. Kedia, M. Ristić, and R. O’Shaughnessy, The effect of the velocity distribution on kilonova emission, *Astrophys. J.* **961**, 9 (2024).