

On the origin of GW190425

Isobel M. Romero-Shaw^{1,2}, Nicholas Farrow^{1,2}, Simon Stevenson^{3,2},
Eric Thrane^{1,2}, Xing-Jiang Zhu^{1,2}★

¹*School of Physics and Astronomy, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia*

²*OzGrav: The ARC Centre of Excellence for Gravitational Wave Discovery, Australia*

³*Centre for Astrophysics and Supercomputing, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, VIC 3122, Australia*

18 February 2022

ABSTRACT

The LIGO/Virgo collaborations recently announced the detection of a binary neutron star merger, GW190425. The mass of GW190425 is significantly larger than the masses of Galactic double neutron stars known through radio astronomy. We hypothesize that GW190425 formed differently than Galactic double neutron stars, via unstable “case BB” mass transfer. According to this hypothesis, the progenitor of GW190425 was a binary consisting of a neutron star and a $\sim 4\text{--}5\,M_{\odot}$ helium star, which underwent common-envelope evolution. Following the supernova of the helium star, an eccentric double neutron star was formed, which merged in $\lesssim 10$ Myr. The helium star progenitor may explain the unusually large mass of GW190425, while the short time to merger may explain why similar systems are not observed in radio. To test this hypothesis, we measure the eccentricity of GW190425 using publicly available LIGO/Virgo data. We constrain the eccentricity at 10 Hz to be $e \leq 0.007$ with 90% confidence. This provides no evidence for or against the unstable mass transfer scenario, because the binary is likely to have circularized to $e \lesssim 10^{-4}$ by the time it was detected. Future detectors will help to reveal the formation channel of mergers similar to GW190425 using eccentricity measurements.

Key words: gravitational waves – stars: neutron – binaries: general – pulsars: general

1 INTRODUCTION

Gravitational waves produced by a binary neutron star (BNS) merger have been detected for the second time (Abbott et al. 2017b, 2019a, 2020) by Advanced LIGO (Abbott et al. 2018) and Virgo (Acernese et al. 2015). The binary GW190425 is remarkable because it is significantly more massive than Galactic BNS (Abbott et al. 2020). Of the 17 Galactic BNS with reported mass measurements (see Farrow et al. 2019, and references therein), the most massive has total mass $M = 2.886 \pm 0.001 M_{\odot}$ (Lazarus et al. 2016; Ferdman 2017). For GW190425, $M = 3.4^{+0.3}_{-0.1} M_{\odot}$, which is inconsistent with the observed Galactic population (Abbott et al. 2020). This invites speculation about its formation channel.

BNS may form through isolated binary evolution (Smarr & Blandford 1976; Srinivasan 1989; Portegies Zwart & Yungelson 1998; Canal et al. 1990; Kalogera et al. 2007; Postnov & Yungelson 2014; Beniamini & Piran 2016; Vigna-Gómez et al. 2018; Kruckow et al. 2018; Giacobbo & Mapelli 2018, 2019, 2020; Mapelli & Giacobbo 2018) or through dynamical interactions (Phinney & Sigurdsson 1991; Sigurdsson & Phinney 1995; Kuranov & Postnov 2006; Ivanova et al. 2008; Kiel et al. 2010; Benacquista & Downing 2013; East & Pretorius 2012; Palmese et al. 2017; Andrews & Mandel

2019). The dominant formation channel for Galactic BNS is thought to be isolated evolution: a stellar binary in the field experiences successive supernovae, and the stellar remnant of each component is a neutron star (Tauris et al. 2017; Vigna-Gómez et al. 2018). While many neutron stars *not* in BNS are known to have masses consistent with the components of GW190425 (Özel & Freire 2016; Alsing et al. 2018), the high mass of this system is not easily explained by standard isolated evolution, since the large supernova kicks associated with massive NS formation are expected to disrupt binaries; see Michaely et al. (2016), and references therein.

In the dynamical formation case, BNS form through interactions inside dense stellar environments, such as globular clusters. A NS, which may have a stellar companion, sinks to the cluster core through dynamical friction. This can only occur once the number of black holes in the core has been depleted, either due to merger-induced kicks or because they gain velocity through dynamical interactions (e.g., Breen & Hoggie 2013). In the core, the NS preferentially swaps any existing stellar companion for another NS, forming a BNS with a short merger time (Zevin et al. 2019). While the dynamical hypothesis provides an explanation for the large mass of GW190425, it is difficult to reconcile the implied merger rate with that predicted by N -body simulations (Grindlay et al. 2006; Bae et al. 2014; Belczynski et al. 2018; Ye et al. 2020); see also Papenfort et al. (2018), and references therein. Current es-

★ E-mail: zhuxingjiang@gmail.com




Figure 1. Illustration of unstable case BB mass transfer leading to a BNS merger. Credit: Carl Knox.

timates sit at around $0.003\text{--}6\text{ Gpc}^{-3}\text{yr}^{-1}$ (Tsang 2013), which, for advanced LIGO’s BNS range of $\sim 100\text{ Mpc}$ (Abbott et al. 2018), translates to a predicted rate of $1.25 \times 10^{-5}\text{--}2.5 \times 10^{-2}\text{ yr}^{-1}$. For a different perspective see Andrews & Mandel (2019), who highlight that tight and highly-eccentric Galactic-field BNS may form dynamically, provided that their host clusters have sufficiently high central densities.

We argue that massive BNS like GW190425 may evolve in isolation if they undergo a process known as unstable “case BB” mass transfer (MT) (Delgado & Thomas 1981; Tutukov & Yungelson 1993a,b; Portegies Zwart & Verbunt 1996; Portegies Zwart & Yungelson 1998; Belczynski et al. 2002a,b; Dewi et al. 2002; Ivanova et al. 2003; Zevin et al. 2019). We illustrate this process in Fig. 1. The He star companion of a NS (panel A) fills its Roche lobe after the end of its He core burning phase (panel B), initiating common-envelope evolution (panel C). The He envelope is ejected, leaving behind a NS–CO core binary (panel D) that is tight enough to survive the supernova of the He star (panel E). The resulting BNS inspirals due to emission of gravitational waves (panel F) and eventually merges, leaving behind a NS or black hole remnant (panel G). Unstable case BB MT may produce heavy BNS with unequal masses (Ivanova et al. 2003; Müller et al. 2016). The supernova kick can also leave the binary with significant eccentricity (Brandt & Podsiadlowski 1995), which can act as an identifier for this formation channel. During standard isolated evolution, gravitational radiation gradually circularizes binaries before they get close to merger (Peters 1964; Hinder et al. 2008). On the other hand, as we show in Sec. 2 of this work, binaries formed through unstable case

BB MT have eccentricities $10^{-6} \lesssim e \lesssim 10^{-3}$ when they enter the LIGO/Virgo band.

GW190425 was detected by a search algorithm that assumes quasi-circular binary orbits. Its properties, presented in Abbott et al. (2020), were inferred by matched-filtering data against quasi-circular waveform models. Burst searches may flag eccentric signals, but cannot measure their eccentricity (e.g., Abbott et al. 2019b). Recently, Nitz et al. (2020) performed a matched-filtering search for eccentric BNS signals using inspiral-only eccentric waveform models. Computationally efficient, inspiral-merger-ringdown models of eccentric waveforms are not yet available, although development is ongoing (e.g., Huerta et al. 2018; Tiwari et al. 2019). Computationally inefficient models (e.g., Cao & Han 2017) take too long to generate to be used for straightforward Bayesian inference, which relies on $O(100)$ waveform computations per iteration of its sampling algorithm. We can, however, use such models to efficiently obtain eccentricity measurements by post-processing the posterior probabilities for quasi-circular waveform models, as demonstrated in Romero-Shaw et al. (2019); see also Lower et al. (2018).

In this Letter, we take steps towards identifying the formation channel of GW190425 using orbital eccentricity measurements. We simulate BNS evolving through unstable case BB MT and compare the resulting eccentricity distribution to the posterior probability on eccentricity for GW190425. The remainder of this work is structured as follows. In Sec. 2, we describe unstable case BB MT and outline our method for simulating the expected eccentricity distribution at 10 Hz from this channel. We present upper limits on the orbital eccentricity of GW190425 when its gravitational radiation has a frequency of 10 Hz in Sec. 3, comparing the posterior probability distribution to the eccentricity distribution expected from supernova kicks. We discuss the implications of our results for the formation pathway of GW190425 in Sec. 4.

2 THE ISOLATED EVOLUTION OF GW190425

2.1 Unstable mass transfer in the isolated binary evolution channel

The immediate progenitor of an isolated BNS is a binary comprising a NS and a helium (He) star with orbital period $\sim 0.1\text{--}2$ days, which has evolved thus far via common-envelope (CE) evolution (Belczynski et al. 2002b; Dewi et al. 2002; Ivanova et al. 2003, 2013; Zevin et al. 2019). The He star then expands, filling its Roche lobe, and transferring mass onto the NS. If the mass transfer process is unstable, it can lead to a second CE (2CE) phase (Ivanova et al. 2003; Dewi & Pols 2003). The surviving post-2CE system consists of the carbon-oxygen (CO) core of the He star and the original NS. The latter has accreted only a small amount of mass ($\sim 0.05\text{--}0.1M_{\odot}$) (MacLeod & Ramirez-Ruiz 2015) during the 2CE phase. The binary can be tight enough that its orbital period is < 1 hr, making it likely to survive the subsequent supernova explosion of the CO core.

This asymmetric supernova explosion gives the compact object a kick. In population synthesis studies, kick velocities are often assumed to follow Maxwellian distributions. Core collapse supernovae are thought to produce large kicks, with one-dimensional standard deviation $\sigma \approx 265\text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Hobbs et al. 2005), while ultra-stripped supernovae and electron-capture supernovae are thought to produce small kicks, $\sigma \approx 30\text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Vigna-Gómez et al. 2018; Giacobbo & Mapelli 2019, 2020).

The relationship between the final He star mass (CO core mass)




Figure 2. Posterior distribution on $\log_{10}(e)$ for GW190425, alongside eccentricities acquired during unstable case BB MT from kicks with velocities drawn from Maxwellian distributions. We indicate our measured 90% confidence upper limit on the eccentricity of GW190425 at 10 Hz with a dashed bar at $e = 0.007$, and our estimate of the third-generation detector network upper limit with a dot-dashed bar at $e = 0.0003$. Space-based detector LISA will be able to resolve BNS eccentricities within the entire unstable case BB MT range; see Sec. 4, with reference to Lau et al. (2020). Our simulated eccentricity distributions agree with the subpopulation of ultra-compact BNS studied by Kowalska et al. (2011).

and the NS remnant mass is uncertain, but Müller et al. (2016) predict that a $\sim 4\text{--}5 M_{\odot}$ He star (with a $\sim 3 M_{\odot}$ CO core) corresponds to a $\sim 2 M_{\odot}$ NS (see also Tauris et al. 2015). It is assumed that there is an instantaneous mass loss of $\sim 1 M_{\odot}$ during supernova. If the pre-2CE binary consists of a $\sim 1.4 M_{\odot}$ NS and a $\sim 4\text{--}5 M_{\odot}$ He star, then the post-2CE, post-supernova binary is a $\sim (1.4 + 2.0) M_{\odot}$ BNS which merges in < 10 Myr. BNS with this lifespan are far less likely to be detected in radio pulsar surveys than their longer-lived counterparts, and BNS with orbital periods < 1 hr are effectively invisible in current pulsar searches. For example, the acceleration search of Cameron et al. (2018), which found the most accelerated pulsar observed to date, was sensitive to binary pulsars with orbital periods down to 1.5 hr. We discuss selection effects further in Appendix A.

2.2 Eccentricity distribution

Following Equations 2.1 to 2.8 from Brandt & Podsiadlowski (1995), we calculate eccentricities introduced by supernova kicks in this formation scenario. We simulate binaries with first-born NS of mass $1.4 M_{\odot}$ and CO core of mass $3.0 M_{\odot}$, which lead to a second-born NS of mass $2.0 M_{\odot}$, and draw orbital periods at time of supernova from a log-uniform distribution between 0.1 hr and 1 hr (see Fig. 8 from Vigna-Gómez et al. 2018). Supernova kick velocities are drawn from Maxwellian velocity distributions, with $\sigma = 265 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for large kicks and $\sigma = 30 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ for small kicks. We simulate isotropically-distributed kicks, and discard NS that receive kicks sufficient to disrupt the binary. Each binary’s eccentricity is evolved according to Peters (1964) until its gravitational-wave frequency reaches $f_{\text{gw}} = 10$ Hz.

We present the distributions of \log_{10} eccentricities obtained in this scenario in Fig. 2. Higher-velocity kicks tend to cause slightly higher eccentricities. Measured at 10 Hz, supernovae with large kicks lead to a $\log_{10}(e)$ distribution with a mean of -4.30 , while the $\log_{10}(e)$ distribution arising from smaller kicks has a mean of -4.46 .

The 90% confidence interval on $\log_{10}(e)$ spans $-4.94 \leq \log_{10}(e) \leq -3.98$ for small kick velocities, and $-4.89 \leq \log_{10}(e) \leq -3.79$ for large kick velocities.

3 ECCENTRICITY OF GW190425

To compare GW190425 to the model described in Sec. 2, we measure its eccentricity when it enters the frequency band of LIGO/Virgo. Romero-Shaw et al. (2019) demonstrated the calculation of Bayesian posterior probability distributions for the eccentricity of binaries detected in gravitational waves; see Payne et al. (2019) for detailed formulation of the reweighting procedure that underlies such post-processing techniques. Following the same method, we use circular waveform model IMRPhenomD (Khan et al. 2016) to compute “proposal” posterior probability distributions for the binary parameters, and eccentric waveform model SEOBNRE (Cao & Han 2017) to reweight to our “target” distribution.

We use the Bayesian inference library BILBY (Ashton et al. 2019) to fit the data to the proposal model. Our prior on chirp mass \mathcal{M} is uniform between 1.42 and $2.60 M_{\odot}$, and our prior on mass ratio q is uniform between 0.125 and 1 . Our prior on source luminosity distance d_L is uniform in co-moving volume between 1 and 500 Mpc. For dimensionless aligned component spins χ_1 and χ_2 , we use priors that are uniform between -1 and 0.6 due to limitations of the SEOBNRE waveform model. For the remaining sampled parameters – right ascension, declination, source inclination angle, polarisation angle and reference phase – we use standard priors.

To reduce the time spent evaluating computationally-expensive SEOBNRE waveforms, we make initial measurements at a reference frequency of 20 Hz. To obtain orbital eccentricity measurements at 10 Hz, we follow Peters (1964) to evolve the system backwards in time. We use a log-uniform prior on eccentricity, with a resolution of 30 bins per sample. At 20 Hz, our prior is in the range $-6 \leq \log_{10}(e) \leq -1$, translating to $-5.68 \leq \log_{10}(e) \leq -0.71$ at 10 Hz.

We constrain the eccentricity of GW190425 to be $e \leq 0.007$ at 10 Hz with 90% confidence. Our reweighting efficiency is 0.386, giving us 7718 effective samples; see Romero-Shaw et al. (2019) for a discussion of efficiency. See Appendix B for posteriors on the intrinsic source parameters, which are consistent with results from Abbott et al. (2020).

We compare the eccentricity posterior for GW190425 to the eccentricity distribution expected from supernova kicks during unstable case BB MT in Fig. 2. The posterior probability distribution for the eccentricity of GW190425 is consistent with our log-uniform prior for eccentricities $e \leq 7 \times 10^{-3}$ at 10 Hz, implying that we are unable to resolve differences between eccentricities lower than this with existing instruments. While the eccentricity of GW190425 is consistent with eccentricities induced during unstable case BB MT, we cannot distinguish this channel from other mechanisms using eccentricity measurements obtained with advanced LIGO/Virgo.

4 DISCUSSION

We constrain the eccentricity of GW190425 to $e \leq 0.007$ at 10 Hz. GW190425 may have formed through unstable case BB MT, but with present-day detectors, we are unable to distinguish the small residual eccentricity expected from this channel at 10 Hz. Proposed third-generation observatories such as Cosmic Explorer (CE; Abbott et al. 2017a) and the Einstein Telescope (ET; Punturo et al.

2010) will detect GW190425-like binaries with higher signal-to-noise ratios, and at lower frequencies. Following the calculation outlined in Lower et al. (2018), we find that a network of $2\times$ CE can measure the eccentricity of a GW190425-like BNS if $e \geq 0.0003$ at 10 Hz, and will be able to observe the upper tail of the distribution expected from high-velocity kicks. The space-based gravitational-wave detector LISA (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2017) will be sensitive down to 10^{-4} Hz, enabling sub-categories of both isolated and dynamical mergers to be distinguished (Breivik et al. 2016; Nishizawa et al. 2017; D’Orazio & Samsing 2018; Samsing & D’Orazio 2018; Lau et al. 2020). From Lau et al. (2020), the resolvable eccentricity of LISA at ~ 1 mHz is $e \gtrsim 0.001$, which translates to $e \gtrsim 10^{-7}$ at 10 Hz. Hence, the predicted eccentricity distribution from unstable case BB MT will be resolvable with LISA.

The inferred merger rate for GW190425-like systems is high compared to lighter BNS (Abbott et al. 2020). Since GW190425 is only the second BNS merger to be observed in gravitational waves, roughly half of all BNS mergers may form by the same means. This could imply that unstable case BB MT is a common pathway to BNS formation. Any proposed formation channel for this merger must also explain the relatively high formation rate of similar BNS.

Measurements of NS spins, which are imprinted on gravitational-wave signals through the effective spin parameter χ_{eff} , can provide additional clues to the formation channel of BNS. The χ_{eff} of Galactic-field BNS, thought to have formed via standard isolated evolution, are predicted to range from 0.00 to 0.02 at merger (Zhu et al. 2018). Although we have not devoted much discussion to the dynamical formation hypothesis for GW190425 because it is theoretically disfavoured, it remains possible that GW190425-like BNS can form dynamically in, for example, globular clusters. Such BNS can have a wider range of spins than their isolated counterparts (see East et al. 2015, and references therein). A binary with measurably negative χ_{eff} would be difficult to explain through anything other than dynamical formation. The χ_{eff} of BNS formed through unstable case BB MT depends critically on the amount of angular momentum transferred onto the first-born NS during two CE stages, since the second-born NS is expected to spin down to effectively zero spin in a timescale comparable to the merger time ($\lesssim 10$ Myr). De et al. (2019) suggest that black holes tend to preserve their natal masses and spins during CE evolution. If this holds up for BNS, it might imply that all BNS formed through unstable case BB MT are expected to have low dimensionless component spins of $\chi < 0.05$ at merger. While we are unable to measure NS spins in GW190425 (and in GW170817), it may be possible to do so for future discoveries, allowing stronger constraints to be placed on system origins.

We note that, in systems with misaligned component spins, the signature of spin-induced precession in the signal can mimic the signature of eccentricity, leading to non-negligible eccentricity measurements for precessing quasi-circular binaries (Romero-Shaw, Lasky & Thrane, in preparation). We see no evidence of significant eccentricity in the signal of GW190425, so any degeneracy between precession and eccentricity does not influence our conclusion. Regardless, the in-plane spin of BNS is believed to be small (e.g., Ferdman et al. 2013), so this degeneracy is more important for binary black hole signals.

5 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Mike Lau for his insight into the eccentricity sensitivity of LISA, and Marcus Lower for letting us use his code to esti-

mate the BNS eccentricity sensitivity of third-generation detectors. This work is supported by Australian Research Council grants CE170100004 and FT150100281. This research has made use of data, software and/or web tools obtained from the Gravitational Wave Open Science Center (<https://www.gw-openscience.org>), a service of LIGO Laboratory, the LIGO Scientific Collaboration and the Virgo Collaboration.

Note added.— While preparing this manuscript, we became aware of a pre-print claiming that the merger rate implied by GW190425 is inconsistent with population synthesis results for fast-merging BNS (Safarzadeh et al. 2020). Similar discrepancies have arisen for GW170817, but studies show that predicted merger rates are consistent with observations when various model uncertainties, e.g., NS natal kicks, CE evolution, metallicity-specific star formation rate (Chruslinska et al. 2018; Giacobbo & Mapelli 2018; Belczynski et al. 2018; Chruslinska et al. 2019; Neijssel et al. 2019; Tang et al. 2020), are included. We therefore believe that we cannot rule out the formation of GW190425 through unstable case BB MT based solely on the inferred BNS merger rate.

REFERENCES

- Abbott B. P., et al., 2017a, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **34**, 044001
- Abbott B., et al., 2017b, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **119**, 161101
- Abbott B. P., et al., 2018, *Living Rev. Rel.*, **21**, 3
- Abbott B., et al., 2019a, *Phys. Rev. X*, **9**, 031040
- Abbott B. P., et al., 2019b, *Phys. Rev. D*, **100**, 064064
- Abbott B. P., et al., 2020, *ApJ*, **892**, L3
- Acernese F., et al., 2015, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, **32**, 024001
- Alsing J., Silva H. O., Berti E., 2018, *MNRAS*, **478**, 1377
- Amaro-Seoane P., et al., 2017, arXiv e-prints, [p. arXiv:1702.00786](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.00786)
- Andrews J. J., Mandel I., 2019, *ApJ*, **880**, L8
- Ashton G., et al., 2019, *ApJS*, **241**, 27
- Bae Y.-B., Kim C., Lee H. M., 2014, *MNRAS*, **440**, 2714
- Belczynski K., Bulik T., Kalogera V., 2002a, *ApJ*, **571**, L147
- Belczynski K., Kalogera V., Bulik T., 2002b, *ApJ*, **572**, 407
- Belczynski K., et al., 2018, *A&A*, **615**, A91
- Benacquista M. J., Downing J. M. B., 2013, *Living Rev. Rel.*, **16**, 4
- Beniamini P., Piran T., 2016, *MNRAS*, **456**, 4089
- Brandt N., Podsiadlowski P., 1995, *MNRAS*, **274**, 461
- Breen P. G., Heggie D. C., 2013, *MNRAS*, **436**, 584
- Breivik K., Rodriguez C. L., Larson S. L., Kalogera V., Rasio F. A., 2016, *ApJ*, **830**, L18
- Cameron A. D., et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, **475**, L57
- Canal R., Isern J., Labay J., 1990, *ARA&A*, **28**, 183
- Cao Z., Han W.-B., 2017, *Phys. Rev. D*, **96**, 044028
- Chruslinska M., Belczynski K., Klencki J., Benacquista M., 2018, *MNRAS*, **474**, 2937
- Chruslinska M., Nelemans G., Belczynski K., 2019, *MNRAS*, **482**, 5012
- D’Orazio D. J., Samsing J., 2018, *MNRAS*, **481**, 4775
- De S., MacLeod M., Everson R. W., Antoni A., Mandel I., Ramirez-Ruiz E., 2019, arXiv e-prints, [p. arXiv:1910.13333](https://arxiv.org/abs/1910.13333)
- Delgado A. J., Thomas H. C., 1981, *A&A*, **96**, 142
- Dewi J. D. M., Pols O. R., 2003, *MNRAS*, **344**, 629
- Dewi J. D. M., Pols O. R., Savonije G. J., van den Heuvel E. P. J., 2002, *MNRAS*, **331**, 1027
- East W. E., Pretorius F., 2012, *ApJ*, **760**, L4
- East W. E., Paschalidis V., Pretorius F., 2015, *ApJ*, **807**, L3
- Farrow N., Zhu X.-J., Thrane E., 2019, *ApJ*, **876**, 18
- Ferdman R. D., 2017, *Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union*, **13**, 146
- Ferdman R. D., et al., 2013, *ApJ*, **767**, 85
- Giacobbo N., Mapelli M., 2018, *MNRAS*, **480**, 2011
- Giacobbo N., Mapelli M., 2019, *MNRAS*, **482**, 2234
- Giacobbo N., Mapelli M., 2020, *ApJ*, **891**, 141

Grindlay J., Portegies Zwart S., McMillan S., 2006, *Nature Phys.*, 2, 116

Hinder I., Vaishnav B., Herrmann F., Shoemaker D. M., Laguna P., 2008, *Phys. Rev. D*, 77, 081502

Hobbs G., Lorimer D. R., Lyne A. G., Kramer M., 2005, *MNRAS*, 360, 974

Huerta E. A., et al., 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 97, 024031

Ivanova N., Belczynski K., Kalogera V., Rasio F. A., Taam R. E., 2003, *ApJ*, 592, 475

Ivanova N., Heinke C. O., Rasio F. A., 2008, *IAU Symp.*, 246, 316

Ivanova N., et al., 2013, *A&ARv*, 21, 59

Kalogera V., Belczynski K., Kim C., O’Shaughnessy R. W., Willems B., 2007, *Phys. Rept.*, 442, 75

Khan S., Husa S., Hannam M., Ohme F., Pürrer M., Forteza X. J., Bohé A., 2016, *Phys. Rev. D*, 93, 044007

Kiel P., Fregeau J., Umbreit S., Chatterjee S., Rasio F., 2010, *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1314, 367

Kowalska I., Bulik T., Belczynski K., Dominik M., Gondek-Rosinska D., 2011, *A&A*, 527, A70

Kruckow M. U., Tauris T. M., Langer N., Kramer M., Izzard R. G., 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 1908

Kuranov A. G., Postnov K. A., 2006, *Astronomy Letters*, 32, 393

Lau M. Y. M., Mandel I., Vigna-Gómez A., Neijssel C. J., Stevenson S., Sesana A., 2020, *MNRAS*, 492, 3061

Lazarus P., et al., 2016, *ApJ*, 831, 150

Lower M. E., Thrane E., Lasky P. D., Smith R., 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 98, 083028

MacLeod M., Ramirez-Ruiz E., 2015, *ApJ*, 798, L19

Mapelli M., Giacobbo N., 2018, *MNRAS*, 479, 4391

Michaely E., Ginzburg D., Perets H. B., 2016, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1610.00593

Müller B., Heger A., Liptai D., Cameron J. B., 2016, *MNRAS*, 460, 742

Neijssel C. J., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 3740

Nishizawa A., Sesana A., Berti E., Klein A., 2017, *MNRAS*, 465, 4375

Nitz A. H., Lenon A., Brown D. A., 2020, *ApJ*, 890, 1

Özel F., Freire P., 2016, *ARA&A*, 54, 401

Palmese A., et al., 2017, *ApJ*, 849, L34

Papenfort L. J., Gold R., Rezzolla L., 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 98, 104028

Payne E., Talbot C., Thrane E., 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, 100, 123017

Peters P. C., 1964, *Phys. Rev.*, 136, B1224

Phinney E. S., Sigurdsson S., 1991, *Nature*, 349, 220

Portegies Zwart S. F., Verbunt F., 1996, *A&A*, 309, 179

Portegies Zwart S. F., Yungelson L. R., 1998, *A&A*, 332, 173

Postnov K. A., Yungelson L. R., 2014, *Living Rev. Rel.*, 17, 3

Punturo M., et al., 2010, *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 27, 194002

Romero-Shaw I. M., Lasky P. D., Thrane E., 2019, *MNRAS*, 490, 5210

Safarzadeh M., Ramirez-Ruiz E., Berger E., 2020, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2001.04502

Samsing J., D’Orazio D. J., 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 5445

Sigurdsson S., Phinney E. S., 1995, *ApJS*, 99, 609

Smarr L. L., Blandford R., 1976, *ApJ*, 207, 574

Srinivasan G., 1989, *Astronomy and Astrophysics Review*, 1, 209

Tang P. N., Eldridge J. J., Stanway E. R., Bray J. C., 2020, *MNRAS*, 493, L6

Tauris T. M., Langer N., Podsiadlowski P., 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 2123

Tauris T. M., et al., 2017, *ApJ*, 846, 170

Tiwari S., Gopakumar A., Haney M., Hemantakumar P., 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, 99, 124008

Tsang D., 2013, *ApJ*, 777, 103

Tutukov A. V., Yungelson L. R., 1993a, *Astronomy Reports*, 37, 411

Tutukov A. V., Yungelson L. R., 1993b, *MNRAS*, 260, 675

Vigna-Gómez A., et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 4009

Ye C. S., Fong W.-f., Kremer K., Rodriguez C. L., Chatterjee S., Fragione G., Rasio F. A., 2020, *ApJ*, 888, L10

Zevin M., Kremer K., Siegel D., Coughlin S., Tsang B., Berry C., Kalogera V., 2019, *ApJ*, 886, 4

Zhu X., Thrane E., Osłowski S., Levin Y., Lasky P. D., 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 98, 043002




Figure B1. Recovered posterior probability distributions for GW190425 for intrinsic parameters: chirp mass M , mass ratio q , effective spin χ_{eff} , and log eccentricity $\log_{10}(e)$. We plot the proposal posteriors in turquoise and the reweighted posteriors in gray.

APPENDIX A: SELECTION EFFECTS

There are several selection effects that could cause discrepancy between the mass distribution of Galactic BNS observed in radio and that of extra-galactic BNS mergers detected in gravitational waves. First, more massive binary mergers are detectable at further distances with gravitational waves. Assuming a uniform-in-comoving-volume source distribution, the *observed* chirp mass distribution differs from the *true* distribution by a factor of $M^{5/2}$. Second, more massive BNS merge faster, making them less likely to be discovered in pulsar surveys. However, the binary lifetime scales more strongly with its initial orbital period and eccentricity. As long as the binary chirp mass does not correlate *strongly* with initial orbital period or eccentricity¹, the mass distribution of BNS observed in radio is a good representation of the birth distribution. Third, the binary total masses (M) of Galactic BNS are known from measurements of the advance of periastron, which is proportional to $M^{2/3}$. This leads to a slight preference within the observed Galactic BNS sample towards higher total masses as well as shorter orbital periods, which make periastron advance and orbital decay rates easier to measure. The fact that GW190425 is significantly more massive than all 17 known Galactic BNS may suggest an invisible Milky Way BNS population that is formed in ultra-tight, possibly highly eccentric orbits, as produced via unstable case BB MT.

APPENDIX B: RECOVERED POSTERIOR PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTIONS FOR GW190425

We present the posterior probability distributions obtained for a selection of intrinsic parameters for GW190425 in Fig. B.

¹ Noting the mild correlation between the mass of second-born NS and orbital eccentricity for Galactic BNS (e.g., Fig. 17 of Tauris et al. 2017).