

Constraining bosonic asymmetric dark matter with neutron star mass-radius measurements

Nathan Rutherford,^{1,*} Geert Raaijmakers,^{2,†} Chanda Prescod-Weinstein,^{1,‡} and Anna Watts^{3,§}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824*

²*GRAPPA, Anton Pannekoek Institute for Astronomy and Institute of High-Energy Physics,
University of Amsterdam, Science Park 904, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

³*Anton Pannekoek Institute for Astronomy, University of Amsterdam,
Science Park 904, 1090GE Amsterdam, the Netherlands*

Neutron stars can capture asymmetric dark matter (ADM), which affects the neutron star’s measurable properties and makes compact objects prime targets to search for ADM. In this work, we use Bayesian inference to explore potential neutron star mass-radius measurements, from current and future X-ray telescopes, to constrain the bosonic ADM parameters for the case where bosonic ADM has accumulated in the neutron star interior. We find that the high bosonic ADM particle mass (m_χ) and low effective self-interaction strength (g_χ/m_ϕ) regime is disfavored due to the observationally and theoretically motivated constraint that neutron stars must have at least a mass of $1 M_\odot$. However, within the remaining parameter space, m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ are individually unconstrained. On the other hand, the ADM mass-fraction, i.e., the fraction of ADM mass inside the neutron star, can be constrained by such neutron star measurements. The inclusion of bosonic ADM in neutron star cores also relaxes the constraints on the baryonic equation of state and suggests that ADM should be taken into account when interpreting constraints from mass-radius measurements.

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutron stars have been of great interest to astronomers because of the rich phenomena they produce, allowing us to probe, for example, strong gravity, cosmology, and heavy element enrichment. For instance, neutron stars can be a source of continuous gravitational waves, which can provide insight into their interiors. Signals from their mergers can also be used in determining the Hubble constant [1, 2]. Neutron stars have additionally been of great interest to nuclear physicists because the microphysical behavior of ultradense neutron-rich matter is poorly understood. Neutron stars may contain exotic states of matter, such as hyperons or deconfined quarks [3–5]. The effects of the hypothetical components that comprise neutron star interiors are parameterized by the equation of state (EoS), which has traditionally been understood to only reflect baryonic components. The EoS both theoretically captures information about neutron star interiors and can be deduced from measurable properties of neutron stars. Thus, understanding the potential impact of any given component is both theoretically and observationally important.

Recent work has shown dark matter, too, can have a significant impact on currently measurable properties of neutron stars, namely the masses, radii, and tidal deformabilities, with implications for the EoS. Dark matter cores in neutron stars have been shown to reduce the radii, masses, and tidal deformabilities of the stars [6–10]. If dark matter forms a halo around neutron stars,

the tidal deformabilities and the total masses of the stars have been shown to increase [7–11]. Thus, if dark matter is present in neutron stars, it must be accounted for in estimates of the measurable properties of neutron stars [6–19]. There have been efforts to constrain the dark matter particle mass, self-interaction strength, and mass-fraction using neutron star and gravitational wave (GW) measurements [9, 12, 14, 17, 20], and these rely on assumptions about the EoS. These efforts include placing mass-fraction constraints on sub-GeV bosonic dark matter particles [9], demonstrating that a stiffer baryonic matter EoS with dark matter can evade constraints that the baryonic matter EoS alone cannot achieve [14, 17], and calculating Bayesian parameter estimations of the dark matter parameter space [12, 20].

To quantify the effects of dark matter on neutron stars, we calculate the percent change in mass and radius between a baryonic neutron star with and without a dark matter core using our algorithm described in Sec. IV. For example, if a $2.3 M_\odot$ purely baryonic neutron star with radius of 10.7 km is compared to a baryonic neutron star with an identical central baryonic energy density and a dark matter core of 7% mass-fraction, the radius of the dark matter admixed neutron star is reduced at the 3.5% level while the gravitational mass is decreased at the 6.8% level. The dark matter core increases the compactness of the neutron star within the dark matter core radius, which reduces the neutron star’s gravitational mass [6, 8, 17]. This demonstrates that the presence of dark matter can have an observable impact on neutron stars, suggesting a need to account for this possibility in data analyses.

Searching for observable effects of the impact of dark matter on the neutron star interior requires measurements of the mass and radius of the neutron star. These measurements can be used to characterize the mass-

* Corresponding author: nathan.rutherford@unh.edu

† g.raaijmakers@uva.nl

‡ chanda.prescod-weinstein@unh.edu

§ A.L.Watts@uva.nl

radius relation, which is the relation of all possible, stable neutron star masses and radii that can correspond to a specific EoS. Calculating the mass-radius relation makes it possible to obtain hypothetical EoSs of the neutron star [21]. Mass and radius measurement techniques have been advanced by NICER (the Neutron Star Interior Composition Explorer), an X-ray telescope on the International Space Station [22]. NICER uses Pulse Profile Modeling [PPM, see 23, and references therein], a technique that exploits relativistic effects on X-rays emitted from the hot magnetic polar caps of millisecond pulsars, i.e., neutron stars that emit beams of radiation from their magnetic poles and have a rotational period less than ten milliseconds. A pulse profile is a rotationally phase-resolved X-ray count spectrum. PPM involves a Bayesian inference of this data for a generative relativistic ray-tracing model of the thermal emission from hotspots on a neutron star's surface. This analysis delivers the posterior probability distributions of the various model parameters, such as a neutron star's mass and radius and a map of the hot emitting regions, which form as magnetospheric particles slam into the stellar surface [23]. To date, NICER has delivered PPM mass and radius inferences for two neutron stars: PSR J0030+0451 [24, 25] and PSR J0740+6620 [26, 27]. These mass-radius measurements have been incorporated into numerous EoS studies, both from the NICER team [25, 27–30] and other groups [see for example 31–36].

NICER anticipates delivering improved mass-radius constraints for the sources already analysed, in addition to results for at least three more neutron stars, in the near future. In the longer-term, plans are being developed for large area X-ray spectral-timing missions that will be able to carry out PPM for a larger population of neutron stars. These include the NASA probe-class mission concept STROBE-X (the Spectroscopic Time-Resolving Observatory for Broadband Energy X-rays, [37]) and the Chinese-European mission concept eXTP (the enhanced X-ray Timing and Polarimetry mission, [38]).

Although NICER, STROBE-X, and eXTP will perform PPM on compact objects, current PPM techniques do not account for a possible dark matter component in neutron stars. Dark matter admixed neutron stars exhibit two possible spatial regimes: a dark matter core inside the neutron star, and a dark matter halo extending through and beyond the baryonic surface of the neutron star. A dark matter core is defined when the dark matter radius, R_χ , is less than the baryonic radius, R_B . Dark matter halos are defined when the dark matter radius is greater than the baryonic radius, i.e. $R_\chi > R_B$. Capturing the impact of dark matter on neutron star structure alters how PPM is executed, and will certainly necessitate modification of the ray-tracing models currently being used by the NICER collaboration. For example, the existence of any halo will modify the exterior space-time. In addition, dark matter could modify the universal relations that are relied on to model the oblateness of the star (another factor affecting the space-time) [12, 39–41].

Two studies, [12, 20], have used PPM measurements from NICER, or GW measurements from LIGO/VIRGO, in the context of dark matter admixed neutron stars. In [20], the authors performed a Bayesian analysis on a fermionic dark matter model using a fixed baryonic matter EoS. Their inference is based on the posterior mass measurement of PSR J0348+0432 from [42] and the tidal deformability constraints from GW170817 in [43]. The Bayesian analysis of [20] showed the fermionic dark matter EoS parameters are independent of each other and well constrained. In [12], the Bayesian analysis takes into account the fermionic model described in [11] with a fixed baryonic matter EoS and is restricted to dark matter cores and diffuse dark matter halos. The data points used for the analysis were the mass and radius measurements of two NICER pulsars PSR J0740+6620, and PSR J0030+0451. For the halos, [12] found that the fermionic particle mass is constrained to be less than 1.5 GeV. For cores, they found that the observational data favors a particle mass around 0.6 GeV. However, [12] did not determine constraints on the ADM self-interaction strength and mass-fraction. To constrain dark matter in and around neutron stars, both studies used Bayesian parameter estimation with PPM or GW measurements and a fixed baryonic EoS.

Here we take a different approach since the interior of neutron stars is not well understood. The most conservative approach to a Bayesian analysis of neutron stars is by allowing all parameters in the EoS model to vary. In this work, we use the mass-radius measurements of simulated neutron stars to infer the optimal combination of baryonic matter EoS and admixed dark matter in neutron star cores. We assume the *bosonic* asymmetric dark matter (ADM) model described in [11]. One major objective is to demonstrate the possibility of constraining the properties of bosonic ADM, e.g., the possible particle mass, mass-fraction of the total accumulated ADM mass inside the neutron stars, and the effective interaction strength of ADM. Knowing the possible constraints on bosonic ADM will allow us to better understand the composition of neutron stars. The other objective is to characterize the effects on the derived uncertainties of the baryonic matter EoS when including ADM inside neutron stars. We study two possible scenarios of future mass-radius measurements, the first being the *Future* scenario and the other the *Future-X* scenario. The *Future* case is modeled after a potential end of mission scenario for NICER and takes into account six simulated mass-radius measurements. The *Future-X* scenario is modeled using six possible STROBE-X sources. These are modeled at lower uncertainties than the *Future* case since the STROBE-X mission is expected to provide tighter measurements than NICER [37, 44]. This work shows that the baryonic EoS uncertainties are relaxed if the possibility of ADM cores in neutron stars is accounted for. Additionally, this work finds that the possible future NICER and STROBE-X mass-radius measurements can constrain the most likely ADM mass-fractions and the ratio of the bosonic ADM

particle mass and effective self-repulsion strength. We do not find that NICER or STROBE-X can constrain the bosonic ADM particle mass or effective self-repulsion strength using mass-radius measurements.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss the background on ADM. In Sec. III, we motivate the two-fluid TOV equations and define the baryonic matter and ADM EoSs. In Sec. IV, we introduce the baryonic matter and ADM equation of states and their numerical implementation in the two-fluid TOV equations. In Sec. V, we describe our inference methods, the constraints on the ADM EoS parameter space, selection of simulated sources, and how we conducted the Bayesian parameter estimation for both the *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios. Lastly, in Sec. VI, we discuss our results. Throughout this work, we use the metric signature $diag(-, +, +, +)$.

II. BACKGROUND: ASYMMETRIC DARK MATTER

Broadly, the ADM model is motivated by the observation that the mass density of dark matter in the Universe is only approximately five times greater than that of baryonic matter [45]. The similarity in the observed density of dark matter to that of baryonic matter suggests a strong connection in the cosmic history between them. This connection suggests that, like the baryon asymmetry, at some time in the early universe there was a tiny excess of dark matter particles over anti-dark matter particles and the dark matter particles today constitute the excess after all of the anti-dark matter particles were annihilated [45, 46]. This “dark asymmetry” would allow for both significant repulsive self-interactions and small attractive interactions with baryonic matter.

The [11] ADM model is a MeV-GeV mass-scale bosonic dark matter particle with a repulsive self-interaction. Two identical particles self-interact when they scatter off one another through the exchange of a gauge boson, i.e., a force carrier. This exchange causes the particles to attract or repel each other. In the [11] ADM model, the repulsive self-interaction arises from the exchange of an eV-MeV mass-scale vector gauge boson which also carries the Standard Model baryon number. The vector gauge boson carries the Standard Model baryon number to create the “dark asymmetry” mentioned previously.

The action of [11], in units of $\hbar = c = 1$, is expressed as

$$S = \int d^4x -\sqrt{-g} \left(D_\mu^* \chi^* D^\mu \chi + m_\chi^2 \chi^* \chi + \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi_\mu \phi^\mu + \frac{1}{4} Z_{\mu\nu} Z^{\mu\nu} - g_B \phi_\mu J_B^\mu \right), \quad (1)$$

where g is the determinant of the metric, χ is the charged bosonic ADM field, χ^* is the anti-ADM field, m_χ is the mass of the bosonic ADM field, ϕ_μ is the vector boson

field of the ADM mediator, m_ϕ is the mass of the vector boson field, $Z_{\mu\nu} = \partial_{[\mu} \phi_{\nu]} = \partial_\mu \phi_\nu - \partial_\nu \phi_\mu$ is the field strength tensor of ϕ_μ , g_B is the interaction strength of ϕ_μ with the Standard Model baryon number current¹ J_B^μ , $D_\mu = \partial_\mu + i g_\chi \phi_\mu$, and g_χ is the interaction strength of χ with the ϕ_μ vector field. This model considers only the necessary interactions of the bosonic ADM model: the repulsive self-interactions of ADM, the minimal interaction of ADM to gravity, and the interaction of ADM with baryons.

We make a few approximations that simplify deriving the equations of motion. [48] shows that g_B is constrained from measurements of supernova SN1987A to be

$$g_B \leq 10^{-10}. \quad (2)$$

This constraint was determined by requiring the energy radiated due to the possible production of ϕ_μ , from nucleon-nucleon Bremsstrahlung reactions in proto-neutron stars, be consistent with the neutrino data of SN1987A. This constraint means we can assume that $g_B \ll g_\chi$ because the [11] model requires $g_\chi \geq 10^{-6}$ for the ϕ_μ masses considered. Making this assumption allows us to ignore the interactions between ADM and baryonic matter, and we can neglect the $g_B \phi_\mu J_B^\mu$ term in the action. We also assume the local spacetime is flat. This is reasonable because the gradient of the metric is small compared to the length scales of neutron stars [9].

With these approximations, the equations of motion are

$$\left[D_\mu D^\mu - m_\chi^2 \right] \chi = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\left[D_\mu^* D^{*\mu} - m_\chi^2 \right] \chi^* = 0 \quad (4)$$

$$\partial_\mu Z^{\mu\nu} + i g_\chi \left[\chi^* D^\mu \chi - (D^{*\mu} \chi^*) \chi \right] - m_\phi^2 \phi^\mu = 0. \quad (5)$$

From the equations of motion one can employ the mean-field approximation to arrive at the ADM EoS which will be described in more detail in Sec. IV.

The energy of χ and χ^* in a hot dense background, such as the background from proto-neutron stars, can also be obtained using the equations of motion. The conditions of the background from a proto-neutron star can produce neutron Bremsstrahlung reactions of ADM [6, 11]. The neutron Bremsstrahlung converts the kinetic energy of two neutrons scattering to the gauge boson ϕ_μ , i.e., $NN \rightarrow NN\phi_\mu$, where NN is the pair scattering neutrons. Since ϕ_μ interacts strongly with ADM and weakly with the Standard Model baryon number current, the Bremsstrahlung process causes the rate of the reaction $NN \rightarrow NN\chi\chi^*$ to proceed at a comparable pace. In order to expel the anti-ADM, one must assume that ADM is attracted to baryons and anti-ADM is repulsed.

¹ See [47] for a detailed discussion of the Standard Model baryon number current.

It is due to the asymmetry in the energies of ADM and anti-ADM, i.e., $\Delta E = E_{\bar{\chi}} - E_{\chi}$, that expels the anti-ADM and leaves the ADM inside the proto-neutron star. Neutron Bremsstrahlung is enhanced for young neutron stars because they provide a sufficiently hot and dense background. Newly-born neutron stars have a temperature of approximately $5.8 \times 10^{11} K$ which can lead to $\approx 0.02 M_{NS}$ ADM accumulation in the interior, where M_{NS} is the mass of the neutron star [6].

Another mechanism whereby ADM can accumulate in neutron stars is the conversion of the neutron to scalar ADM. The conversion of neutrons to scalar ADM, $N \rightarrow \chi$, can occur because neutrons in compact objects can reach Fermi momenta large enough to allow for the conversion reaction [6]. For neutron stars with an age ~ 10 Gyr, this process allows for ADM to reach masses of $\approx 0.05 M_{NS}$ [6]. An additional possibility is the collapse of a star to a neutron star from an ADM minihalo that has been accumulated from the local dark matter density [49]. Other possible scenarios, such as absorption of dark matter stars by baryonic matter and supernovae of supermassive stars which can form an ADM core inside neutron stars, have been explored in [6] and [50], respectively.

III. TWO-FLUID TOV EQUATIONS

Typically, neutron star interiors are modeled using a hypothetical baryonic matter equation of state and solving the Tolman-Oppenheimer-Volkoff (TOV) equations for the pressure, mass, and radius given a central density [51, 52]. The mass-radius relation can be calculated from the TOV equations by varying the central density [21]. The structure of a neutron star with an ADM component is modeled using the two-fluid TOV equations [53], which allows for baryonic matter and dark matter to be treated as two separate fluids, and can be solved for the mass, radius, and pressure profiles for both fluids using an appropriate equation of state. The two-fluid TOV is an appropriate treatment for studying ADM in neutron stars because the dominant inter-fluid interaction between baryonic matter and ADM is gravitational. In the two-fluid TOV equations, the pressures and masses of both the baryonic matter and ADM fluids are simultaneously solved numerically until either one of the fluid pressures goes to zero. Then the integration is broken and restarted using the single-fluid TOV equations for the remaining fluid. Here we follow the derivation in [54] and derive the TOV equations from Einstein's field equations.

First, consider a general static, spherically symmetric metric

$$ds^2 = -c^2 e^{2\alpha(r)} dt^2 + \left[\frac{c^2 r}{rc^2 - 2GM(r)} \right] dr^2 + r^2 d\Omega^2, \quad (6)$$

where $M(r)$ is the mass of the stellar interior as a function of radius, r . If we model the neutron star as a perfect

fluid, then the energy-momentum tensor takes the form

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag} \left(e^{2\alpha(r)} \frac{\epsilon}{c^2}, \left[\frac{c^2 r}{rc^2 - 2GM(r)} \right] p, r^2 p, r^2 \sin^2(\theta) p \right), \quad (7)$$

where $p = p(r)$ is the pressure, $\epsilon = \epsilon(r)$ is the energy density, and $d\Omega^2 = d^2\theta^2 + \sin^2(\theta)d\phi^2$. Then from the conservation of energy-momentum ($\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu} = 0$), we obtain the TOV equations

$$\frac{dM(r)}{dr} = 4\pi r^2 \frac{\epsilon(r)}{c^2} \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{dp}{dr} = -(\epsilon(r) + p(r)) \frac{d\alpha(r)}{dr} \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{d\alpha(r)}{dr} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{Gc^2 M(r) + 4\pi r^3 Gp(r)}{r [rc^2 - 2GM(r)]}, \quad (10)$$

Since we are modeling neutron stars mixed with dark matter, we adopt the two fluid formalism and let

$$p(r) = p_B(r) + p_\chi(r) \quad (11)$$

$$\epsilon(r) = \epsilon_B(r) + \epsilon_\chi(r), \quad (12)$$

where ϵ_B and ϵ_χ are the baryonic matter and ADM energy densities respectively, and p_B and p_χ are the pressures of baryonic matter and ADM respectively. This choice yields the two-fluid TOV equations:

$$\frac{d\alpha(r)}{dr} = \frac{1}{c^2} \frac{Gc^2 M(r) + 4\pi r^3 Gp(r)}{r [rc^2 - 2GM(r)]} \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{dp_B}{dr} = -(\epsilon_B + p_B) \frac{d\alpha(r)}{dr} \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{dp_\chi}{dr} = -(\epsilon_\chi + p_\chi) \frac{d\alpha(r)}{dr} \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{dM_B(r)}{dr} = 4\pi r^2 \frac{\epsilon_B(r)}{c^2} \quad (16)$$

$$\frac{dM_\chi(r)}{dr} = 4\pi r^2 \frac{\epsilon_\chi(r)}{c^2}, \quad (17)$$

where $M_\chi(r)$ is the total gravitational mass of ADM, M_B is the total gravitational mass of baryonic matter, and $M(r) = M_B(r) + M_\chi(r)$.

When studying ADM admixed neutron stars, it is helpful to define the ADM mass-fraction, F_χ , which gives the relative amount of gravitational mass of ADM compared to the total gravitational mass of the admixed neutron star. The mass-fraction is defined as

$$F_\chi = \frac{M_\chi(R_\chi)}{M_\chi(R_\chi) + M_B(R_B)}, \quad (18)$$

where $M_\chi(R_\chi)$ is the total accumulated ADM gravitational mass evaluated at the ADM core radius and $M_B(R_B)$ is the baryonic matter gravitational mass evaluated at the baryonic radius. The mass-fraction is important to the analysis of ADM in neutron stars because the ADM core distribution is dependent on F_χ , as well as the ADM particle mass (m_χ) and the effective self-interaction strength (g_χ/m_ϕ) [9, 12].

IV. CALCULATING THE BARYONIC AND ADM EQUATIONS OF STATE

We expect the neutron star core to potentially have two components: baryonic and ADM. This necessitates accounting for two EoSs. Traditionally, the baryonic matter EoS is represented by one or more of the many tabulated EoSs [6, 7, 11, 14, 55, 56] or the $\sigma - \omega$ model for the nuclear EoS [13, 17]. We use the general parameterized piece-wise polytropic models of [28–30] with three polytropes divided by varying transition densities [see 57]. Since neutron stars have central densities above the nuclear saturation density $n_0 = 0.16 \text{ fm}^{-3}$, uncertainties in the EoS become significant due to the higher order effects of nucleon interactions at high densities. These uncertainties in the EoS can be captured by calculating the nucleon interactions within chiral effective field theory [57, 58]. For the EoS model, we employ a polytropic fit to these calculations between $0.5n_0$ and $1.1n_0$, which we connect at lower densities to the Baym-Pethick-Sutherland (BPS) crust EoS [59]. At higher densities, the formalism of the chiral effective field theory breaks down and we connect to the piece-wise polytropic parameterization.

The second component that we need to solve the two-fluid TOV equation is the bosonic ADM EoS of the [11] ADM model. A derivation of the bosonic ADM EoS calculation is detailed in Appendix A, which finds

$$\epsilon_\chi(r) = m_\chi c^2 n_\chi + \frac{g_\chi^2}{2m_\phi^2} \frac{\hbar^3}{c} n_\chi^2 \quad (19)$$

$$p_\chi(r) = -\epsilon_\chi + \tilde{\mu}_\chi n_\chi = \frac{g_\chi^2}{2m_\phi^2} \frac{\hbar^3}{c} n_\chi^2 \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{\mu}_\chi(r) = \frac{\partial \epsilon_\chi}{\partial n_\chi}, \quad (21)$$

where n_χ is the number density distribution of ADM and $\tilde{\mu}_\chi$ is the ADM chemical potential in the local Lorentz frame. We note that the overall placement of the constants $\hbar$ and c in the last term of Eq. (19) appear to be different from the same term in [12]. However, we implement g_χ/m_ϕ with units of c^2/MeV , which results in an identical placement of the constants.

We use a numerical algorithm to compute the mass-radius relation of constant F_χ (see Eq. (18)) using the two-fluid TOV equation and the EoS of both baryonic matter and ADM. As discussed in Sec. III, the mass-radius relation of a purely baryonic neutron star is found by varying its central energy density. However, in dark matter admixed neutron stars, the central energy densities of both ADM and baryonic matter can be varied to obtain a mass-radius relation. To maintain a constant F_χ along the mass-radius relation, the central energy densities of ADM and baryonic matter need to be varied simultaneously. For each variation in baryonic central energy density, there is an ADM central energy density that will result in the desired constant mass-fraction, $F_{\chi, \text{desired}}$. To find the ADM central energy density that results in $F_{\chi, \text{desired}}$, we iteratively compute the

difference between $F_{\chi, \text{desired}}$ and “test” mass-fractions using the *Scipy.optimize.brent* python root-finding algorithm. The *Scipy.optimize.brent* algorithm works by using Brent’s method [see 60] to test ADM central energy densities until it finds a “test” mass-fraction that results in a difference of zero. The ADM central energy density that corresponds to this mass-fraction is saved. We repeat this process until each baryonic central energy density has a corresponding ADM central energy density which yields $F_{\chi, \text{desired}}$.

The mass-radius relation of constant F_χ is formed by solving the two-fluid TOV equations for the mass and radius corresponding to each baryonic and ADM central energy densities. The two-fluid TOV equations can be integrated radially outward starting from a small radius, e.g., $r \sim 10^{-21} \text{ km}$, with the enclosed masses of each fluid initialized to zero. Numerical integration must start at some small radius because Eq. (13) is proportional to $1/r$ and $r = 0$ would produce an infinity. The integration continues radially until one of the fluid pressures reaches zero, marking the radius of the fluid. The integration then restarts using the single-fluid TOV equations for the remaining fluid until its pressure also reaches zero. We then can compute the total mass and radius of the admixed neutron star, which will be used to form the mass-radius relation.

To ensure we produce neutron stars with only ADM cores, which form when $p_\chi(R_\chi) < p_B(R_\chi)$, we set the radius of any admixed star that does not satisfy the inequality to zero, i.e., $R_{NS} = 0 \text{ km}$. Admixed neutron stars that do not satisfy the inequality $p_\chi(R_\chi) < p_B(R_\chi)$ are ADM halo configurations, which we plan to appropriately account for in future work. An example of the mass-radius relation algorithm is shown in Fig. 1.

V. FUTURE AND FUTURE-X SCENARIOS

We will now show how we can constrain underlying physics using PPM-derived mass-radius measurements. We explain our inference framework, constraints on the ADM parameter space, simulated source selection, and finally, how we conducted the Bayesian analysis for two realistic hypothetical simulated scenarios. For both the *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios, we perform a Bayesian parameter estimation using a fixed baryonic matter EoS and with a varying baryonic matter EoS.

A. Inference Framework

In order to infer the ADM parameters m_χ , g_χ/m_ϕ , and F_χ , we employ nested sampling, following the framework outlined in [28–30, 61]. Letting θ be a vector containing all EoS parameters, and ϵ_c a vector containing the central baryonic and dark matter energy densities of observed stars, we can use Bayes’ theorem to write the posterior distribution on θ and ϵ_c as




FIG. 1: The mass-radius relations of the ground truth models described in Sec. V D. The first model assumes an ADM component to be present in neutron stars (dashed-dotted orange), while the second model does not have ADM in neutron stars (solid blue). The two relations are overlaid with the 68% credible interval mass measurements of NICER sources PSR J0740+6620, PSR J1614-2230, and PSR J0437-4517.

$$p(\theta, \epsilon_c | \mathbf{d}) \propto p(\theta) p(\epsilon_c | \theta) p(\mathbf{d} | \theta, \epsilon_c) \propto p(\theta) p(\epsilon_c | \theta) p(\mathbf{d} | \mathbf{M}(\theta, \epsilon_c), \mathbf{R}(\theta, \epsilon_c)), \quad (22)$$

where $\mathbf{d}$ is the vector containing the masses and radii of the sources from each scenario, $\mathbf{M}(\theta, \epsilon_c)$ is the mass of a produced admixed neutron star, and $\mathbf{R}(\theta, \epsilon_c)$ is the radius of the admixed neutron star. Eq. (22) shows that the posterior distribution of the baryonic and ADM parameters is directly proportional to the product of the priors $p(\theta) p(\epsilon_c | \theta)$ and likelihood evaluation of the sources given the admixed neutron star mass and radii produced by the baryonic and ADM parameters. If we furthermore equate the likelihood function $p(\mathbf{d} | \mathbf{M}(\theta, \epsilon_c), \mathbf{R}(\theta, \epsilon_c))$ to the PPM-derived mass-radius posteriors, and assume each of these posteriors is independent of the other, we can write

$$p(\theta, \epsilon_c | \mathbf{d}) \propto p(\theta) p(\epsilon_c | \theta) \prod_i p(M_i, R_i | d_{PPM,i}), \quad (23)$$

where $d_{PPM,i}$ is an element in the $\mathbf{d}$ vector and i runs over the number of stars for which PPM delivers the mass and radius.

The inference methods of [28–30, 61] sample over the central energy density. We instead sample over the mass-fraction as defined in Eq. (18), i.e., we introduce $F_\chi =$

$F_\chi(\theta, \epsilon_{c,B}, \epsilon_{c,ADM})$ and write Eq. (23) as

$$p(\theta, \epsilon_{c,B}, F_\chi | \mathbf{d}) \propto p(\theta) p(\epsilon_{c,B} | \theta) p(F_\chi | \theta, \epsilon_c) \prod_i p(M_i, R_i | d_{PPM,i}), \quad (24)$$

where $\epsilon_{c,B}$ and $\epsilon_{c,ADM}$ are the central energy densities of baryonic matter and ADM, respectively. We sample over the mass-fraction because our mass-radius algorithm is structured such that the dark matter energy density is dependent on the mass-fraction.

B. Bosonic ADM EoS constraints

Here we define the prior space of each bosonic ADM parameter we wish to study, namely m_χ , g_χ/m_ϕ , and F_χ . These independent parameters fully characterize our bosonic dark matter model, providing a parameter space to explore.

To capture the bosonic ADM particle mass prior space, we consider the physical constraints on the parameter space placed by [62], [63], and [64]. [62] showed that in order to safely avoid the ADM particles from escaping the neutron star,

$$m_\chi \geq 10^{-2} \text{ MeV}. \quad (25)$$

This provides a lower bound on the ADM particle mass prior space. The upper bound on the ADM particle mass can be found by considering observations from old neutron stars and the formation of a black holes in neutron stars from bosonic ADM core collapse [63, 64]. According to [63], the upper bound on the ADM particle mass is $\approx 10^5 - 10^7$ GeV depending on the self-interaction of the ADM particles. So, we adopt a conservative upper bound on m_χ to be

$$m_\chi \leq 10^8 \text{ MeV}. \quad (26)$$

Although the bosonic ADM particle mass prior space is physically constrained, the repulsive self-interaction strength is not. To ensure the self-repulsion prior space has a finite size, we adopt a range that captures the interaction strengths used in [11]

$$10^{-2} \leq \frac{g_\chi}{m_\phi/\text{MeV}} \leq 10^3. \quad (27)$$

The repulsive self-interaction strength is critical for our bosonic dark matter model because, in the absence of any self-repulsion, the dark matter would quickly form a black hole and destroy the neutron star [11, 50, 64, 65].

The final ADM parameter of our bosonic ADM model is the mass-fraction, which is constrained by prior work to be $F_\chi \leq 5\%$ [9]. This result was found by computing $F_\chi(m_\chi)$ at a fixed self-interaction strength for a singular baryonic EoS. The results of the function were compared to the $1.4M_\odot$ neutron star tidal deformability constraint

of GW170817 from [43] and the requirement that a mass-radius relation must have a maximum mass of at least $2M_\odot$. Since we vary the baryonic EoS, we adopt the upper bound of

$$F_\chi \leq 20\%, \quad (28)$$

to account for the changes in the mass-fraction constraint from [9]. Based on the constraints mentioned above, we set the priors of the ADM parameter space to be

$$\log_{10}(m_\chi/\text{MeV}) \in [-2, 8] \quad (29)$$

$$\log_{10}\left(\frac{g_\chi}{m_\phi/\text{MeV}}\right) \in [-2, 3] \quad (30)$$

$$F_\chi \in [0, 20] \%. \quad (31)$$

C. Source Selection

Here we introduce the sources used in our Bayesian analysis for the *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios, respectively. For the *Future* scenario, three of the six sources are assumed to have an a priori known mass obtained from radio pulsar timing, corresponding to the NICER targets PSR J0740+6620 [66], PSR J1614–2230 [67], and PSR J0437–4715 [68]. For each of these known sources we assume a 5% uncertainty in radius. Note that the current uncertainty on the radius of PSR J0740+6620 reported by NICER is closer to the $\sim 10\%$ level, so achieving 5% is very much a stretch goal even given NICER's extended mission lifetime to 2025. For the other three sources masses were chosen between $1.2 - 2.1 M_\odot$, and we assume a 10% uncertainty in mass and radius, close to what NICER has already delivered for the one source (PSR J0030+0451) where no independent mass measurement is available.

For the *Future-X* case we again assume six sources, but this time with a 2% mass and radius uncertainty and selected in the range of $1.2 - 2.2 M_\odot$. This scenario improves on what is possible with NICER and is something we anticipate being achievable with a large-area X-ray telescope operating for several years [37, 38, 69]. For STROBE-X, we expect to be able to make mass-radius measurements for ≈ 15 sources using PPM at the $\pm 5\%$ uncertainty level [37]. However, with longer observations, we expect STROBE-X to provide approximately six mass-radius measurements at the two percent uncertainty level which will likely provide the strongest EoS constraints.

D. Best Case *Future/Future-X*: Varying Baryonic EoS

In both varying and fixed baryonic EoS cases, we calculate the radii of our sources from two ground truth models. The first ground truth model, which we call the




FIG. 2: (a) Uncertainty ellipses from the 1 sigma level of a 2-D Gaussian for each of the synthetic *Future* sources calculated from both ground truth models. (b) Same as in (a), but for the 6 *Future-X* sources. For both panels, the corresponding ground models are overlaid on the appropriate ellipses.

“ADM core” model, is described by the PP model in Sec. IV with an ADM core defined by the ADM parameters

$$m_\chi = 15 \text{ GeV} \quad (32)$$

$$\frac{g_\chi}{m_\phi/\text{MeV}} = 0.1 \quad (33)$$

$$F_\chi = 7\%. \quad (34)$$




FIG. 3: (Left panel) *Future* prior corner plot of the ADM parameters; (Right panel) The *Future-X* prior corner plots of the ADM parameters. For each panel, the ADM particle mass, effective self-interaction strength, and mass-fraction are plotted against each other, where the dark shaded regions represent a higher prior probability and lighter shaded regions represent a lower prior probability. The solid lines represent contours of constant probability. When the combination of parameters is a parameter plotted against itself, we have a 1-D prior histogram. In both panels, we see large regions of no shading in all 2-D prior density plots.

The second ground truth model, the “No ADM” model, is the PP model mentioned in Sec. IV with no ADM component. The mass-radius relation of both ground truth models is shown in Fig. 1. The uncertainty ellipses of each of the *Future* and *Future-X* sources are displayed in Fig. 2. Notably, in [61], the data points were scattered around the ground truth model, but not centered on the ground truth like our source ellipses are. This is more realistic. However, given that selecting a scatter model also introduces some arbitrariness – for example the masses at which the scatter is smallest matters – we have chosen not to do this at this stage. Effectively, this makes our current study a ‘best case’ scenario.

The most conservative approach to a Bayesian analysis of neutron stars varies all parameters in the EoS model. Therefore, the most likely EoS, and by extension mass-radius relation, of baryonic matter and ADM can be inferred. In Fig. 3, we show the prior distributions of the ADM parameters for the *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios. Both panels in Fig. 3 have similar regions in which there is no shading, e.g., the upper left region in the $\log_{10}(g_x/(m_\phi/\text{MeV}))$ vs. $\log_{10}(m_\chi/\text{MeV})$ plots. This region is cut out because that part of the bosonic ADM parameter space is composed of halo configurations.

In Fig. 4, we show the posterior distributions for both

the *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios. The posterior of Fig. 4 shows that the ratio of $\log_{10}(g_x/(m_\phi/\text{MeV}))$ and $\log_{10}(m_\chi/\text{MeV})$ is constrained to a stripe that runs diagonally across the parameter space. Fig. 4 also shows that the high m_χ and low g_x/m_ϕ regime – which we characterize by the region in which $m_\chi \gtrsim 10^6$ MeV and $g_x/m_\phi \lesssim 10^{-1} \text{MeV}^{-1}$ – is effectively disfavored for both *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios.

In order to accumulate any appreciable ADM mass in this regime, the ADM central energy density needs to be much larger than the baryonic matter central energy density. For example, to have $F_\chi = 0.05\%$ we need $\epsilon_\chi(r=0) \sim 10^8 \epsilon_B(r=0)$ for a baryonic matter EoS with a maximum mass of $\approx 2.3 M_\odot$. The resulting mass and radius of an ADM admixed neutron star from this example has a similar radius to the baryonic matter neutron star, but the mass is significantly smaller. In this example, the maximum mass of the neutron star produced from baryonic matter EoS is reduced to $0.119 M_\odot$. Therefore, this regime is disfavored because it does not satisfy the imposed constraint that the produced neutron stars must have a mass of at least $1 M_\odot$. The $1 M_\odot$ constraint is motivated by the theoretical description of a neutron star early in its evolution [see, e.g., 70].

According to the 1-D posterior histograms of m_χ and g_x/m_ϕ , we find that both parameters do not have a sig-




FIG. 4: (Left two panels) *Future* scenario with varying baryonic matter EoS posterior corner plot; (Top Left) The “ADM core” ground truth model; (Bottom Left) The “No ADM” ground truth model. (Right two panels) *Future-X* scenario with varying baryonic matter EoS corner plot; (Top Right) The “ADM core” ground truth model; (Bottom Right) The “No ADM” ground truth model. For the top 2 panels, the solid orange lines represent the ground truth values of ADM values for the “ADM core” model. For all quadrants, the dashed blue lines represent the 1-D priors shown in Fig. 3 for the *Future* and *Future-X* cases, respectively. The solid black lines represent the posteriors of each case. In all panels, the ratio of $\log_{10}(g_x/(m_\phi/\text{MeV}))$ and $\log_{10}(m_\chi/\text{MeV})$ is constrained; however, the 1-D posterior of F_χ appears to be independent of this.




FIG. 5: (Left two panels) *Future* EoS plots with varying baryonic matter EoS; (Right two panels) *Future-X* EoS plot with varying baryonic matter EoS. Note the ground truth models used in each respective panels follows the same flow as in Fig. 4. For all panels, the dashed black line represents the 95% prior distribution, the light and dark green band represents the 68% and 95% confidence region of the posterior distribution when only varying the baryonic matter EoS, with both ground truth models. As a comparison, the dashed-dotted orange line is the 95% confidence region when we additionally allow for ADM in the star, i.e., we also sample the ADM EoS parameters. In all panels, we see that including ADM in neutron stars widens the constraints on the baryonic EoS.

nificant peak. From this observation, we conclude that m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ are individually unconstrained quantities in the remaining parameter space. Fig. 4 shows, in both the “ADM core” and the “No ADM” models, low mass fraction F_χ being favored with the highest posterior density covering the range of $F_\chi \in [0, 4]\%$. We also find F_χ is the only parameter that is well constrained in both the

Future and *Future-X* scenarios.

In Fig. 5 we study our Bayesian inferences in the energy density-pressure plane. This has the advantage of highlighting constraints on the ADM and baryonic matter EoSs that aren’t readily observable in the posterior corner plots. In all quadrants, we consider the EoS posteriors that only vary the baryonic EoS (‘Neglecting ADM’)




FIG. 6: (Left two panels) *Future* scenario with fixed baryonic matter EoS posterior corner plot; (Right two panels) *Future-X* scenario with fixed baryonic matter EoS posterior corner plot. Where the priors, posteriors, and ground truth models for each respective panels follows the same flow as in Fig. 4. The F_χ 1-D posteriors of all quadrants are tighter than the posteriors of F_χ in Fig. 4 and have significant peaks around their respective ground truth models.

and the EoS posteriors that additionally vary the ADM EoS ('Including ADM'). The 'Including ADM' posteriors correspond to the posteriors shown in Fig. 4. For both the *Future* and *Future-X* scenarios, Fig. 5 shows

that the 95% confidence interval of the 'Including ADM' (orange dashed-dotted band) band is noticeably wider than the 95% confidence interval of 'Neglecting ADM' (light green band). In the *Future scenario*, we calcu-

late that the ‘including ADM’ 95% confidence interval is 20.67% and 27.66% wider than the ‘Neglecting ADM’ 95% confidence interval for the “ADM core” and “No ADM” models, respectively, at $\log_{10}(\epsilon \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}) = 14.71$. For *Future-X*, we calculate that the ‘including ADM’ 95% confidence interval is 7.48% and 28.16% wider than the ‘Neglecting ADM’ 95% confidence interval for the “ADM core” and “No ADM” models, respectively, at $\log_{10}(\epsilon \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}) = 14.71$. Including ADM broadens the 95% confidence interval because ADM cores decrease the radii of neutron stars, so the baryonic matter EoS is allowed to be more stiff and still be consistent with mass-radius measurements. A stiffer baryonic EoS implies the posterior constraints from all presently observed NICER pulsars, and the future sources of both NICER and STROBE-X, can be relaxed if the possibility of ADM is considered. Finally, this figure also demonstrates *Future-X*’s ability to more tightly constrain the neutron star EoS due to the tighter confidence bands in both posteriors.

E. *Future/Future-X*: Fixed Baryonic EoS

We now consider a fixed baryonic matter EoS. Performing a Bayesian analysis on the dark matter parameter space with a fixed baryonic matter EoS is similar to previous analyses [12, 20]. However, it is hard to envisage a situation where we would be able to constrain the baryonic matter EoS using neutron stars observationally independent of the role of any ADM contribution, since ADM will also affect gravitational wave observations. This is a scenario that may be of interest to those developing theoretical models and it may be important when connecting to EoSs derived from laboratory/heavy ion collision measurements, which may be less affected by ADM [see, e.g., 71–73]. Here we also explore what *Future-X* might be able to deliver in comparison to a *Future* scenario. For the prior distribution of the bosonic ADM parameters, we use the priors shown in Fig. 3 because the same ADM parameters were sampled over as in the varying baryonic matter case.

Fig. 6 shows the posterior distributions of the ADM parameters. Here we notice, similar to the varying baryonic matter EoS state case, that the high particle mass and low interaction strength regime is disfavored from the requirement that the calculated neutron stars must have a mass above $1 M_\odot$. However, the mass-fraction 1-D posterior in this figure contrasts significantly to the varying baryonic EoS case. The F_χ 1-D posterior is more Gaussian-like in shape than its 1-D posterior in Fig. 4 because fixing the baryonic EoS reduces the number of parameters sampled over from 10 to 3. Therefore, any degeneracies between the baryonic EoS parameters and the ADM mass-fraction are eliminated, which results in the mass-fraction 1-D posterior to be more Gaussian-like. The Gaussian-like shape of the 1-D F_χ posteriors of both *Future* and *Future-X* shows that if the baryonic EoS is fixed, i.e., better understood than it is now, tighter con-

straints on F_χ can be imposed.

For *Future-X*, Fig. 6 shows both of the 1-D F_χ posteriors are centered around the F_χ ground truth value. Fig. 6 also shows that the 1-D F_χ posterior distributions of the “ADM core” and “No ADM” models have 4σ deviations of $\approx \pm 9\%$ and $\approx \pm 7\%$, respectively. The *Future* scenario also displays that both 1-D F_χ posteriors are centered around the ground truth value, but “ADM core” and “No ADM” models have 4σ deviations of $\approx \pm 15\%$ and $\approx \pm 13\%$, respectively. These results show that *Future-X* can provide tighter 1-D F_χ posteriors than *Future*, highlighting *Future-X*’s ability to place better constraints on the ADM mass-fraction than *Future*.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we adapted the Bayesian analysis of [28] to include a bosonic ADM core component in neutron stars. We have considered the bosonic ADM model of [11], which describes bosonic ADM particles with self-repulsion. We performed Bayesian inferences of the bosonic ADM particle mass m_χ , effective self-repulsion strength g_χ/m_ϕ , and mass-fraction F_χ , which uses synthetic mass-radius posteriors for two different instrumentation scenarios, namely the *Future* (“NICER”) and *Future-X* (“STROBE-X”) scenarios. Interestingly, the synthetic sources used for *Future-X* suggest that if two neutron stars with the same mass but different radii were measured at the 2% uncertainty level, one could conclude that one neutron star has ADM while the other does not, since both neutron stars share the same baryonic matter EoS. A scenario like this would hint at variation in the amount of ADM in neutron stars.

In the cases where the baryonic matter EoS is varied, we find the high ADM particle mass ($m_\chi \gtrsim 10^6 \text{ MeV}$) and low effective self-interaction strength ($g_\chi/m_\phi \lesssim 0.1 \text{ MeV}^{-1}$) regime is disfavored due to the observational and theoretical constraint that neutron stars must have a mass above $1 M_\odot$. Although the 2-D posteriors show the ratio of m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ is constrained, we find the individual quantities are not well constrained. For the mass-fraction, we find, in both ground truth models, the highest posterior density is within the interval $[0, 4]\%$. These results show that, regardless of the baryonic EoS, *Future* and *Future-X* will be able to constraint the ratio of m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ and the most likely bosonic ADM mass-fractions.

In the energy density-pressure plane, we find the statistical uncertainty in the inference of the neutron star EoS is widened when the possibility of an ADM core is taken into account. For example, at $\log_{10}(\epsilon \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}) = 14.71$, the *Future* baryonic EoS uncertainty increased by 20.67% and 27.66% for both ground truth models when including ADM, while *Future-X* showed a 7.48% and 28.16% increase. This shows that the current uncertainties of the baryonic EoS are being underestimated because the possibility of dark matter in neutron stars is being ig-

nored. We recommend that projections of future data sets – and data analysis pipelines – should account for the possibility that neutron stars contain ADM cores.

The ADM mass-fraction posteriors differ significantly from the mass-fraction posteriors of the varying baryonic EoS case when the baryonic matter EoS is fixed. Both *Future* and *Future-X* show that the 1-D F_χ posteriors have Gaussian-like shapes and are centered around the ground truth value. We find the 1-D F_χ posteriors of *Future* have 4σ deviations of $\approx \pm 15\%$ and $\approx \pm 13\%$ for the “ADM core” and “No ADM” ground truth models, respectively. For the *Future-X* 1-D F_χ posteriors, we find the “ADM core” model has a 4σ deviation of $\approx \pm 9\%$ and the “No ADM” model has a 4σ deviation of $\approx \pm 7\%$. This highlights that *Future-X* will be able to provide stronger constraints on the bosonic ADM mass-fraction than *Future*. Our results show that, if the baryonic EoS is known, F_χ can be tightly constrained, but no new constraints on the bosonic ADM particle mass and effective self-interaction strength can be inferred. This work demonstrates the possible future ability of the NASA missions, NICER and STROBE-X, to constrain the ratio of m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ and F_χ , but not the individual quantities of m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ in the [11] bosonic ADM model.

These results are physically reasonable because the bosonic ADM particle mass and effective self-interaction significantly impact the distribution of the ADM core. This is most evident in the 1-D posteriors of Fig. 4 and 6 since neither show significant peaks. Therefore, neither individual parameter has a significant effect on the mass and radius of the admixed neutron star, which our Bayesian analysis is done in reference to. Within the uncertainties considered, m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ have indistinguishable effects on the mass-radius and they primarily effect the distribution of ADM in the neutron star. Although individually m_χ and g_χ/m_ϕ are unconstrained, their ratio is constrained because it determines the number of ADM particles that can be contained in the ADM radius, which affects the central energy density needed to reach a given F_χ . This is demonstrated by the solid white triangulated regions in 2-D posteriors of $\log_{10}(g_\chi/(m_\phi/\text{MeV}))$ vs. $\log_{10}(m_\chi/\text{MeV})$ in Fig. 4 and 6. The low mass and high effective self-interaction strength regime has a low posterior density evaluation because it produces ADM halos for any ADM central energy density. This is different from the high mass and low effective self-interaction strength regime, which has a low posterior evaluation because it produces very small ADM cores with central energy densities of $\mathcal{O}(10^{22} \text{ g/cm}^3)$ and neutron stars below the $1 M_\odot$ constraint. It is surprising that the ratio of the parameters is constrained even though the individual parameters are unconstrained. Lastly, it is physically consistent that the bosonic ADM mass-fraction is the most constrained parameter in this analysis because it is directly related to the total mass of ADM, which effects the mass and radius of the admixed neutron star.

We have also shown the value of performing full in-

ference runs on the ADM parameter space, rather than drawing conclusions only from the effects that each ADM parameter has on the mass-radius relation. Degeneracies between the parameters can confound the effects of the ADM parameters, which would make it difficult to draw meaningful conclusions on any of the parameters if an inference was not done. Our inference method shows a degeneracy, but also displays an ability to provide constraints on ADM parameters which may otherwise not be found.

Future work will account for ADM halos by appropriately modifying the ray-tracing models used by the NICER collaboration and how PPM is conducted. As Miao et al. [12] has shown, this can help us fully understand the effects ADM halos have on neutron mass-radius measurements and the potential halos have in providing new insights on the constraints of the ADM parameter space. Future work will also include a scatter of the data sources around the ground truth model. Although we did not include scatter in our sources due the added arbitrariness, Greif et al. [61] shows that including scatter around the ground truth models can help us study real mass-radius data in the most general way. The combination of full inferences with scatter and ADM halos will allow for general and accurate statements about the constraints on the ADM parameter space. More broadly, our work adds to the growing literature which shows how to use these inference methods to constrain dark matter models that interact with neutron star interiors.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge Ann Nelson for her foundational contributions to this work and helpful conversations with CPW about the purpose of model-building. We thank Djuna Croon, Rebecca Leane, and Nathan Musoke for helpful discussions. We also thank Sharon Morsink, Slavko Bogdanov, Paul Ray, and Tom Maccarone for offering feedback on the manuscript. A.L.W. acknowledges support from ERC Consolidator grant No. 865768 AEONS. CPW acknowledges all the administrative and facilities staff at the University of New Hampshire. The contributions of CPW and NR were supported by NASA grant No. 80NSSC22K0092.

Appendix A: Derivation of the Bosonic ADM Equation of State

The Lagrangian of the model described in Sec. II which yields the EoS in Eq. (19) and Eq. (20) can be written down, in units of $\hbar = c = 1$, as

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi = -\sqrt{-g} \left(D_\mu^* \chi^* D^\mu \chi + m_\chi^2 \chi^* \chi + \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi_\mu \phi^\mu + \frac{1}{4} Z_{\mu\nu} Z^{\mu\nu} - g_B \phi_\mu J_B^\mu \right), \quad (\text{A1})$$

Before we begin the derivation, we make a few approximations to for ease of calculations. As discussed in

Sec. II, we approximate g_B to be $g_B \ll g_\chi$. Therefore, we may neglect the g_B in the Lagrangian. Next, we approximate the local spacetime to be flat. To convince ourselves that this is a good approximation, we follow the reasoning in [9].

Consider the gradient of the g_{tt} component of the metric. Since we are working in a spherically symmetric spacetime, then one can write the gradient as

$$\frac{\partial g_{tt}}{\partial r} = \frac{-2g_{tt}}{P + \epsilon} \frac{dP}{dr}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where P is the pressure and ϵ is the energy density. Consider the stellar surface, which is where the spacetime is most curved, then $g_{tt} = 1 - \frac{2M}{R}$ and $P = 0$, where M is the mass of the star and R is its radius. This tells us that $\frac{\partial g_{tt}}{\partial r} = \frac{2M}{R} < \frac{1}{R}$ in the limit where $g_{tt} = 0$. Therefore, for a star of radius 10 km , a typical radius of a neutron star, and we consider a spherical layer of thickness $\delta r = 10^{-3} \text{ km}$ we have that

$$\frac{\partial g_{tt}}{\partial r} \delta r < \frac{\delta r}{R} = 10^{-4}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Therefore the gradient of the metric is small compared to the spatial scales of a neutron star, so we can approximate our spacetime as being flat. The final form of the Lagrangian is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_\chi = -D_\mu^* \chi^* D^\mu \chi - m_\chi^2 \chi^* \chi - \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi_\mu \phi^\mu - \frac{1}{4} Z_{\mu\nu} Z^{\mu\nu}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

By variations of the action, we obtain the equations of motions Eqs 3, 4, and 5 in Sec. II. In the mean-field approximation, we assume separability and make the stationary scalar field ansatz of

$$\chi(r, t) = (Ae^{ikr} + Be^{-ikr})e^{-i\omega t}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

where A and B are real constants, k is the wave-number, and ω is the eigen frequency of the spherically symmetric bound state of the scalar field. Since we are treating the vector field as a classical field, then $\phi_\mu = (\phi_0, 0)$, where ϕ_0 is a constant. Plugging in the expressions for the fields

χ and ϕ_μ into the equations of motion and letting $k = 0$, we find

$$\omega = g_\chi \phi_0 \pm m_\chi. \quad (\text{A6})$$

Since m_χ could be larger than $g_\chi \phi_0$ and we demand that $\omega > 0$ then, we will take the “+” solution. Since $\phi_\mu = (\phi_0, 0)$ the equation of motion of ϕ_μ gives us a relation between ϕ_0 and $\chi^* \chi$ to be

$$m_\phi^2 \phi_0 = 2g_\chi m_\chi \chi^* \chi. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Next we calculate the conserved current, J^μ , since $J_0 = n_\chi$ where n_χ is ADM number density.

$$J^\mu = i \left(\chi^* \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\chi}{\partial \partial_\mu \chi^*} - \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_\chi}{\partial \partial_\mu \chi} \right) \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$= -i(\chi^* \partial^\mu \chi - (\partial^\mu \chi^*) \chi) + 2g_\chi \phi_\mu \chi^* \chi. \quad (\text{A9})$$

Writing out the $J_0 = g_{0\nu} J^\nu$ element using equation for ω yields that

$$n_\chi = 2\omega \chi^* \chi - 2g_\chi \phi_0 \chi^* \chi = 2m_\chi \chi^* \chi \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\Rightarrow \phi_0 = \frac{g_\chi}{m_\phi^2} n_\chi. \quad (\text{A11})$$

To write down the stress-energy tensor one needs to vary the action with respect to the metric [54]. In the mean-field approximation, we find the stress-energy tensor to be

$$T_{\mu\nu} = D_0^* \chi^* D_0 \chi - g_{\mu\nu} m_\chi^2 \chi^* \chi + \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi_0^2. \quad (\text{A12})$$

The ADM energy density, ϵ_χ , is determined from T_{00} component, and the ADM pressure, p_χ , is determined by T_{ii} . Writing out the respective components of the stress-energy tensor, the ADM EoS, with $\hbar$ and c restored, is

$$\epsilon_\chi = m_\chi c^2 n_\chi + \frac{1}{2} \frac{g_\chi^2}{m_\phi^2} \frac{\hbar^3}{c} n_\chi^2 \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$p_\chi = \frac{1}{2} \frac{g_\chi^2}{m_\phi^2} \frac{\hbar^3}{c} n_\chi^2. \quad (\text{A14})$$

This is Eq. (19) and Eq. (20).

-
- [1] Magdalena Sieniawska and Michał Bejger. Continuous Gravitational Waves from Neutron Stars: Current Status and Prospects. *Universe*, 5(11):217, October 2019. doi: 10.3390/universe5110217.
- [2] Hsin-Yu Chen, Maya Fishbach, and Daniel E. Holz. A two per cent Hubble constant measurement from standard sirens within five years. *Nature (London)*, 562(7728):545–547, October 2018. doi:10.1038/s41586-018-0606-0.
- [3] M. Oertel, M. Hempel, T. Klähn, and S. Typel. Equations of state for supernovae and compact stars.

- Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 89:015007, Mar 2017. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.89.015007. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.89.015007>.
- [4] G.F. Burgio, H.-J. Schulze, I. Vidaña, and J.-B. Wei. Neutron stars and the nuclear equation of state. *Progress in Particle and Nuclear Physics*, 120:103879, 2021. ISSN 0146-6410. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pnpnp.2021.103879>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0146641021000338>.
- [5] Ming-Zhe Han, Yong-Jia Huang, Shao-Peng Tang, and

- Yi-Zhong Fan. Plausible presence of quark matter in neutron stars with masses above $0.97M_{\text{TOV}}$. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2207.13613, July 2022.
- [6] John Ellis, Gert Hütsi, Kristjan Kannike, Luca Marzola, Martti Raidal, and Ville Vaskonen. Dark matter effects on neutron star properties. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(12):123007, June 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.123007.
- [7] Ben Kain. Dark matter admixed neutron stars. *Phys. Rev. D*, 103(4):043009, February 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.043009.
- [8] O. Ivanytskyi, V. Sagun, and I. Lopes. Neutron stars: New constraints on asymmetric dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 102(6):063028, September 2020. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.102.063028.
- [9] Davood Raffei Karkevandi, Soroush Shakeri, Violetta Sagun, and Oleksii Ivanytskyi. Bosonic dark matter in neutron stars and its effect on gravitational wave signal. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(2):023001, January 2022. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.023001.
- [10] V. Sagun, E. Giangrandi, O. Ivanytskyi, I. Lopes, and K. A. Bugaev. Constraints on the fermionic dark matter from observations of neutron stars. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2111.13289, November 2021.
- [11] Ann E. Nelson, Sanjay Reddy, and Dake Zhou. Dark halos around neutron stars and gravitational waves. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2019(7):012, July 2019. doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2019/07/012.
- [12] Zhiqiang Miao, Yaofeng Zhu, Ang Li, and Feng Huang. Structure and pulse profiles of dark matter admixed neutron stars. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2204.05560, April 2022. Accepted to ApJ.
- [13] H. C. Das, Ankit Kumar, Bharat Kumar, S. K. Biswal, Takashi Nakatsukasa, Ang Li, and S. K. Patra. Effects of dark matter on the nuclear and neutron star matter. *Monthly Notices of the RAS*, 495(4):4893–4903, July 2020. doi:10.1093/mnras/staa1435.
- [14] H. C. Das, Ankit Kumar, and S. K. Patra. Dark matter admixed neutron star as a possible compact component in the GW190814 merger event. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(6):063028, September 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063028.
- [15] H. C. Das, Ankit Kumar, and S. K. Patra. Dark matter admixed neutron star as a possible compact component in the GW190814 merger event. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(6):063028, September 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063028.
- [16] H. C. Das, Ankit Kumar, Bharat Kumar, and Suresh Kumar Patra. Dark Matter Effects on the Compact Star Properties. *Galaxies*, 10(1):14, January 2022. doi:10.3390/galaxies10010014.
- [17] Arpan Das, Tuhin Malik, and Alekha C. Nayak. Confronting nuclear equation of state in the presence of dark matter using GW170817 observation in relativistic mean field theory approach. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99(4):043016, February 2019. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.043016.
- [18] Michael Collier, Djuna Croon, and Rebecca K. Leane. Tidal Love Numbers of Novel and Admixed Celestial Objects. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2205.15337, May 2022.
- [19] Kwing-Lam Leung, Ming-chung Chu, and Lap-Ming Lin. Tidal deformability of dark matter admixed neutron stars. *Phys. Rev. D*, 105(12):123010, June 2022. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.123010.
- [20] Arpan Das, Tuhin Malik, and Alekha C. Nayak. Dark matter admixed neutron star properties in the light of gravitational wave observations: a two fluid approach. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2011.01318, November 2020.
- [21] Lee Lindblom. Determining the Nuclear Equation of State from Neutron-Star Masses and Radii. *Astrophys. J.*, 398:569, October 1992. doi:10.1086/171882.
- [22] Keith Gendreau and Zaven Arzoumanian. Searching for a pulse. *Nature Astronomy*, 1:895–895, December 2017. doi:10.1038/s41550-017-0301-3.
- [23] Anna L. Watts. Constraining the neutron star equation of state using pulse profile modeling. In *Xiamen-CUSTIPEN Workshop on the Equation of State of Dense Neutron-Rich Matter in the Era of Gravitational Wave Astronomy*, volume 2127 of *American Institute of Physics Conference Series*, page 020008, July 2019. doi:10.1063/1.5117798.
- [24] T. E. Riley, A. L. Watts, S. Bogdanov, P. S. Ray, R. M. Ludlam, S. Guillot, Z. Arzoumanian, C. L. Baker, A. V. Bilous, D. Chakrabarty, K. C. Gendreau, A. K. Harding, W. C. G. Ho, J. M. Lattimer, S. M. Morsink, and T. E. Strohmayer. A NICER View of PSR J0030+0451: Millisecond Pulsar Parameter Estimation. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 887(1):L21, December 2019. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab481c.
- [25] M. C. Miller, F. K. Lamb, A. J. Dittmann, S. Bogdanov, Z. Arzoumanian, K. C. Gendreau, S. Guillot, A. K. Harding, W. C. G. Ho, J. M. Lattimer, R. M. Ludlam, S. Mahmoodifar, S. M. Morsink, P. S. Ray, T. E. Strohmayer, K. S. Wood, T. Enoto, R. Foster, T. Okajima, G. Prigozhin, and Y. Soong. PSR J0030+0451 Mass and Radius from NICER Data and Implications for the Properties of Neutron Star Matter. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 887(1):L24, December 2019. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab50c5.
- [26] Thomas E. Riley, Anna L. Watts, Paul S. Ray, Slavko Bogdanov, Sebastien Guillot, Sharon M. Morsink, Anna V. Bilous, Zaven Arzoumanian, Devarshi Choudhury, Julia S. Deneva, Keith C. Gendreau, Alice K. Harding, Wynn C. G. Ho, James M. Lattimer, Michael Loewenstein, Renee M. Ludlam, Craig B. Markwardt, Takashi Okajima, Chanda Prescod-Weinstein, Ronald A. Remillard, Michael T. Wolff, Emmanuel Fonseca, H. Thankful Cromartie, Matthew Kerr, Timothy T. Pennucci, Aditya Parthasarathy, Scott Ransom, Ingrid Stairs, Lucas Guillemot, and Ismael Cognard. A NICER View of the Massive Pulsar PSR J0740+6620 Informed by Radio Timing and XMM-Newton Spectroscopy. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 918(2):L27, September 2021. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac0a81.
- [27] M. C. Miller, F. K. Lamb, A. J. Dittmann, S. Bogdanov, Z. Arzoumanian, K. C. Gendreau, S. Guillot, W. C. G. Ho, J. M. Lattimer, M. Loewenstein, S. M. Morsink, P. S. Ray, M. T. Wolff, C. L. Baker, T. Cazeau, S. Manthripragada, C. B. Markwardt, T. Okajima, S. Pollard, I. Cognard, H. T. Cromartie, E. Fonseca, L. Guillemot, M. Kerr, A. Parthasarathy, T. T. Pennucci, S. Ransom, and I. Stairs. The Radius of PSR J0740+6620 from NICER and XMM-Newton Data. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 918(2):L28, September 2021. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac089b.
- [28] G. Raaijmakers, T. E. Riley, A. L. Watts, S. K. Greif, S. M. Morsink, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk, T. Hinderer, S. Nisanke, S. Guillot, Z. Arzoumanian, S. Bogdanov, D. Chakrabarty, K. C. Gendreau, W. C. G. Ho, J. M. Lattimer, R. M. Ludlam, and M. T. Wolff. A Nicer View

- of PSR J0030+0451: Implications for the Dense Matter Equation of State. *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 887(1): L22, December 2019. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab451a.
- [29] G. Raaijmakers, S. K. Greif, T. E. Riley, T. Hinderer, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk, A. L. Watts, S. Nisanke, S. Guillot, J. M. Lattimer, and R. M. Ludlam. Constraining the Dense Matter Equation of State with Joint Analysis of NICER and LIGO/Virgo Measurements. *Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 893(1):L21, April 2020. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ab822f.
- [30] G. Raaijmakers, S. K. Greif, K. Hebeler, T. Hinderer, S. Nisanke, A. Schwenk, T. E. Riley, A. L. Watts, J. M. Lattimer, and W. C. G. Ho. Constraints on the dense matter equation of state and neutron star properties from NICER’s mass-radius estimate of PSR J0740+6620 and multimessenger observations. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2105.06981, May 2021.
- [31] Jia Jie Li, Armen Sedrakian, and Mark Alford. Relativistic hybrid stars in light of the NICER PSR J 0740 +6620 radius measurement. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(12):L121302, December 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.L121302.
- [32] Isaac Legred, Katerina Chatziioannou, Reed Essick, Sophia Han, and Philippe Landry. Impact of the PSR J 0740 +6620 radius constraint on the properties of high-density matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(6):063003, September 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063003.
- [33] Peter T. H. Pang, Ingo Tews, Michael W. Coughlin, Mattia Bulla, Chris Van Den Broeck, and Tim Dietrich. Nuclear Physics Multimessenger Astrophysics Constraints on the Neutron Star Equation of State: Adding NICER’s PSR J0740+6620 Measurement. *Astrophys. J.*, 922(1): 14, November 2021. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac19ab.
- [34] Shao-Peng Tang, Jin-Liang Jiang, Ming-Zhe Han, Yi-Zhong Fan, and Da-Ming Wei. Constraints on the phase transition and nuclear symmetry parameters from PSR J 0740 +6620 and multimessenger data of other neutron stars. *Phys. Rev. D*, 104(6):063032, September 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.063032.
- [35] Eemeli Annala, Tyler Gorda, Evangelia Katerini, Aleks Kurkela, Joonas Nättilä, Vasileios Paschalidis, and Aleks Vuorinen. Multimessenger Constraints for Ultradense Matter. *Physical Review X*, 12(1):011058, January 2022. doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.12.011058.
- [36] Bhaskar Biswas. Bayesian Model Selection of Neutron Star Equations of State Using Multi-messenger Observations. *Astrophys. J.*, 926(1):75, February 2022. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/ac447b.
- [37] Paul S. Ray, Zaven Arzumanyan, David Ballantyne, Enrico Bozzo, Soren Brandt, Laura Brenneman, Deepto Chakrabarty, Marc Christophersen, Alessandro DeRosa, Marco Feroci, Keith Gendreau, Adam Goldstein, Dieter Hartmann, Margarita Hernanz, Peter Jenke, Erin Kara, Tom Maccarone, Michael McDonald, Michael Nowak, Bernard Philips, Ron Remillard, Abigail Stevens, John Tomsick, Anna Watts, Colleen Wilson-Hodge, Kent Wood, Silvia Zane, Marco Ajello, Will Alston, Diego Altamirano, Vallia Antoniou, Kavitha Arur, Dominic Ashton, Katie Auchettl, Tom Ayres, Matteo Bachetti, Mislav Balokovic, Matthew Baring, Altan Baykal, Mitch Begelman, Narayana Bhat, Slavko Bogdanov, Michael Briggs, Esra Bulbul, Petrus Bult, Eric Burns, Ed Cackett, Riccardo Campana, Amir Caspi, Yuri Cavecchi, Jerome Chenevez, Mike Cherry, Robin Corbet, Michael Corcoran, Alessandra Corsi, Nathalie Degenaar, Jeremy Drake, Steve Eikenberry, Teruaki Enoto, Chris Fragile, Felix Fuerst, Poshak Gandhi, Javier Garcia, Adam Goldstein, Anthony Gonzalez, Brian Grefenstette, Victoria Grinberg, Bruce Grossan, Sebastien Guillot, Tolga Guver, Daryl Haggard, Craig Heinke, Sebastian Heinz, Paul Hemphill, Jeroen Homan, Michelle Hui, Daniela Huppenkothen, Adam Ingram, Jimmy Irwin, Gaurava Jaisawal, Amruta Jaodand, Emrah Kalemci, David Kaplan, Laurens Keek, Jamie Kennea, Matthew Kerr, Michiel van der Klis, Daniel Kocevski, Mike Koss, Adam Kowalski, Dong Lai, Fred Lamb, Silas Laycock, Joseph Lazio, Davide Lazzati, Dana Longcope, Michael Loewenstein, Dipankair Maitra, Walid Majid, W. Peter Maksym, Christian Malacaria, Raffaella Margutti, Adrian Martindale, Ian McHardy, Manuel Meyer, Matt Middleton, Jon Miller, Cole Miller, Sara Motta, Joey Neilsen, Tommy Nelson, Scott Noble, Paul O’Brien, Julian Osborne, Rachel Osten, Feryal Ozel, Nipuni Palliyaguru, Dheeraj Pasham, Alessandro Patruno, Vero Pelassa, Maria Petropoulou, Maura Pilia, Martin Pohl, David Pooley, Chanda Prescod-Weinstein, Dimitrios Psaltis, Geert Raaijmakers, Chris Reynolds, Thomas E. Riley, Greg Salvesen, Andrea Santangelo, Simone Scaringi, Stephane Schanne, Jeremy Schnittman, David Smith, Krista Lynne Smith, Bradford Snios, Andrew Steiner, Jack Steiner, Luigi Stella, Tod Strohmayer, Ming Sun, Thomas Tauris, Corbin Taylor, Aaron Tohuvavohu, Andrea Vacchi, Georgios Vasilopoulos, Alexandra Velechina, Jonelle Walsh, Nevin Weinberg, Dan Wilkins, Richard Willingale, Joern Wilms, Lisa Winter, Michael Wolff, Jean in ’t Zand, Andreas Zezas, Bing Zhang, and Abdu Zoghbi. STROBE-X: X-ray Timing and Spectroscopy on Dynamical Timescales from Microseconds to Years. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:1903.03035, Mar 2019.
- [38] Anna L. Watts, WenFei Yu, Juri Poutanen, Shu Zhang, Sudip Bhattacharyya, Slavko Bogdanov, Long Ji, Alessandro Patruno, Thomas E. Riley, Pavel Bakala, Altan Baykal, Federico Bernardini, Ignazio Bombaci, Edward Brown, Yuri Cavecchi, Deepto Chakrabarty, Jérôme Chenevez, Nathalie Degenaar, Melania Del Santo, Tiziana Di Salvo, Victor Doroshenko, Maurizio Falanga, Robert D. Ferdman, Marco Feroci, Angelo F. Gambino, MingYu Ge, Svenja K. Greif, Sebastien Guillot, Can Gungor, Dieter H. Hartmann, Kai Hebeler, Alexander Heger, Jeroen Homan, Rosario Iaria, Jean in’t. Zand, Oleg Kargaltsev, Aleks Kurkela, XiaoYu Lai, Ang Li, XiangDong Li, ZhaoSheng Li, Manuel Linares, FangJun Lu, Simin Mahmoodifar, Mariano Méndez, M. Coleman Miller, Sharon Morsink, Joonas Nättilä, Andrea Possenti, Chanda Prescod-Weinstein, JinLu Qu, Alessandro Riggio, Tuomo Salmi, Andrea Sanna, Andrea Santangelo, Hendrik Schatz, Achim Schwenk, LiMing Song, Eva Šrámková, Benjamin Stappers, Holger Stiele, Tod Strohmayer, Ingo Tews, Laura Tolos, Gabriel Török, David Tsang, Martin Urbanec, Andrea Vacchi, RenXin Xu, YuPeng Xu, Silvia Zane, GuoBao Zhang, ShuangNan Zhang, WenDa Zhang, ShiJie Zheng, and Xia Zhou. Dense matter with eXTP. *Science China Physics, Mechanics, and Astronomy*, 62(2):29503, February 2019. doi:10.1007/s11433-017-9188-4.
- [39] Sharon M. Morsink, Denis A. Leahy, Coire Cadeau, and John Braga. The Oblate Schwarzschild Approximation for Light Curves of Rapidly Rotating Neutron Stars. *Astrophys. J.*, 663(2):1244–1251, July 2007. doi:

- 10.1086/518648.
- [40] Mohammad AlGendy and Sharon M. Morsink. Universality of the Acceleration due to Gravity on the Surface of a Rapidly Rotating Neutron Star. *Astrophys. J.*, 791(2):78, August 2014. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/791/2/78.
 - [41] Fabrizio Di Giovanni, Nicolas Sanchis-Gual, Pablo Cerdá-Durán, and José A. Font. Can fermion-boson stars reconcile multimessenger observations of compact stars? *Phys. Rev. D*, 105:063005, Mar 2022. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.105.063005. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.105.063005>.
 - [42] John Antoniadis, Paulo C. C. Freire, Norbert Wex, Thomas M. Tauris, Ryan S. Lynch, Marten H. van Kerkwijk, Michael Kramer, Cees Bassa, Vik S. Dhillon, Thomas Driebe, Jason W. T. Hessels, Victoria M. Kaspi, Vladislav I. Kondratiev, Norbert Langer, Thomas R. Marsh, Maura A. McLaughlin, Timothy T. Pennucci, Scott M. Ransom, Ingrid H. Stairs, Joeri van Leeuwen, Joris P. W. Verbiest, and David G. Whelan. A Massive Pulsar in a Compact Relativistic Binary. *Science*, 340(6131):448, April 2013. doi:10.1126/science.1233232.
 - [43] B. P. Abbott, R. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, F. Acernese, Ackley, et al. GW170817: Measurements of Neutron Star Radii and Equation of State. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 121(16):161101, October 2018. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.161101.
 - [44] P. S. Ray, Z. Arzoumanian, S. Brandt, E. Burns, D. Chakrabarty, M. Feroci, K. C. Gendreau, O. Gevin, M. Hernanz, P. Jenke, S. Kenyon, J. L. Gálvez, T. J. Maccarone, T. Okajima, R. A. Remillard, S. Schanne, C. Tenzer, A. Vacchi, C. A. Wilson-Hodge, B. Winter, S. Zane, D. R. Ballantyne, E. Bozzo, L. W. Brenneman, E. Cackett, A. De Rosa, A. Goldstein, D. H. Hartmann, M. McDonald, A. L. Stevens, J. A. Tomsick, A. L. Watts, K. S. Wood, and A. Zoghbi. STROBE-X: a probe-class mission for x-ray spectroscopy and timing on timescales from microseconds to years. In *Space Telescopes and Instrumentation 2018: Ultraviolet to Gamma Ray*, volume 10699 of *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series*, page 1069919, July 2018. doi:10.1117/12.2312257.
 - [45] Kalliopi Petraki and Raymond R. Volkas. Review of Asymmetric Dark Matter. *International Journal of Modern Physics A*, 28(19):1330028, July 2013. doi:10.1142/S0217751X13300287.
 - [46] Kathryn M. Zurek. Asymmetric Dark Matter: Theories, signatures, and constraints. *Physics Reports*, 537(3):91–121, April 2014. doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2013.12.001.
 - [47] Steven D. Bass. Electroweak baryon number non-conservation and “topological condensates” in the early Universe. *arXiv e-prints*, art. hep-ph/0407245, July 2004.
 - [48] Ermal Rrapaj and Sanjay Reddy. Nucleon-nucleon bremsstrahlung of dark gauge bosons and revised supernova constraints. *Phys. Rev. C*, 94(4):045805, October 2016. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.94.045805.
 - [49] Maksym Deliyergiyev, Antonino Del Popolo, Laura Tolos, Morgan Le Delliou, Xiguo Lee, and Fiorella Burgio. Dark compact objects: An extensive overview. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99:063015, Mar 2019. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.063015. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.99.063015>.
 - [50] Chris Kouvaris and Peter Tinyakov. Can neutron stars constrain dark matter? *Phys. Rev. D*, 82(6):063531, September 2010. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.063531.
 - [51] J. R. Oppenheimer and G. M. Volkoff. On Massive Neutron Cores. *Physical Review*, 55(4):374–381, February 1939. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.55.374.
 - [52] Richard C. Tolman. Static Solutions of Einstein’s Field Equations for Spheres of Fluid. *Physical Review*, 55(4):364–373, February 1939. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.55.364.
 - [53] Fredrik Sandin and Paolo Ciarcelluti. Effects of mirror dark matter on neutron stars. *Astroparticle Physics*, 32(5):278–284, December 2009. doi:10.1016/j.astropartphys.2009.09.005.
 - [54] Sean M. Carroll. *Spacetime and geometry. An introduction to general relativity*. 2004. pgs 195,231-233.
 - [55] Wasif Husain and Anthony W. Thomas. Possible nature of Dark Matter. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2104.01540, April 2021.
 - [56] Nicole F. Bell, Giorgio Busoni, Sandra Robles, and Michael Virgato. Improved treatment of dark matter capture in neutron stars. *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2020(9):028, September 2020. doi:10.1088/1475-7516/2020/09/028.
 - [57] K. Hebeler, J. M. Lattimer, C. J. Pethick, and A. Schwenk. Equation of State and Neutron Star Properties Constrained by Nuclear Physics and Observation. *Astrophys. J.*, 773(1):11, August 2013. doi:10.1088/0004-637X/773/1/11.
 - [58] K. Hebeler and A. Schwenk. Chiral three-nucleon forces and neutron matter. *Phys. Rev. C*, 82(1):014314, July 2010. doi:10.1103/PhysRevC.82.014314.
 - [59] Gordon Baym, Christopher Pethick, and Peter Sutherland. The Ground State of Matter at High Densities: Equation of State and Stellar Models. *Astrophys. J.*, 170:299, December 1971. doi:10.1086/151216.
 - [60] J. C. P. Bus and T. J. Dekker. Two efficient algorithms with guaranteed convergence for finding a zero of a function. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.*, 1(4):330–345, dec 1975. ISSN 0098-3500. doi:10.1145/355656.355659. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/355656.355659>.
 - [61] S. K. Greif, G. Raaijmakers, K. Hebeler, A. Schwenk, and A. L. Watts. Equation of state sensitivities when inferring neutron star and dense matter properties. *Monthly Notices of the RAS*, 485(4):5363–5376, June 2019. doi:10.1093/mnras/stz654.
 - [62] Chris Kouvaris and Peter Tinyakov. Excluding Light Asymmetric Bosonic Dark Matter. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 107(9):091301, August 2011. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.091301.
 - [63] Joseph Bramante, Keita Fukushima, and Jason Kumar. Constraints on bosonic dark matter from observation of old neutron stars. *Phys. Rev. D*, 87(5):055012, March 2013. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.055012.
 - [64] Nicole F. Bell, Andrew Melatos, and Kalliopi Petraki. Realistic neutron star constraints on bosonic asymmetric dark matter. *Phys. Rev. D*, 87(12):123507, June 2013. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.123507.
 - [65] Chris Kouvaris and Niklas Grønlund Nielsen. Asymmetric dark matter stars. *Phys. Rev. D*, 92(6):063526, September 2015. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.063526.
 - [66] E. Fonseca, H. T. Cromartie, T. T. Pennucci, P. S. Ray, A. Yu. Kirichenko, S. M. Ransom, P. B. Demorest, I. H. Stairs, Z. Arzoumanian, L. Guillemot, A. Parthasarathy, M. Kerr, I. Cognard, P. T. Baker, H. Blumer, P. R. Brook, M. DeCesar, T. Dolch, F. A. Dong, E. C. Ferrara, W. Fiore, N. Garver-Daniels, D. C. Good, R. Jennings, M. L. Jones, V. M. Kaspi, M. T. Lam, D. R. Lorimer,

- J. Luo, A. McEwen, J. W. McKee, M. A. McLaughlin, N. McMann, B. W. Meyers, A. Naidu, C. Ng, D. J. Nice, N. Pol, H. A. Radovan, B. Shapiro-Albert, C. M. Tan, S. P. Tendulkar, J. K. Swiggum, H. M. Wahl, and W. W. Zhu. Refined Mass and Geometric Measurements of the High-mass PSR J0740+6620. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 915(1):L12, July 2021. doi:10.3847/2041-8213/ac03b8.
- [67] Z. Arzoumanian, P. T. Baker, A. Brazier, S. Burke-Spolaor, S. J. Chamberlin, S. Chatterjee, B. Christy, J. M. Cordes, N. J. Cornish, F. Crawford, H. Thankful Cromartie, K. Crowter, M. DeCesar, P. B. Demorest, T. Dolch, J. A. Ellis, R. D. Ferdman, E. Ferrara, W. M. Folkner, E. Fonseca, N. Garver-Daniels, P. A. Gentile, R. Haas, J. S. Hazboun, E. A. Huerta, K. Islo, G. Jones, M. L. Jones, D. L. Kaplan, V. M. Kaspi, M. T. Lam, T. J. W. Lazio, L. Levin, A. N. Lommen, D. R. Lorimer, J. Luo, R. S. Lynch, D. R. Madison, M. A. McLaughlin, S. T. McWilliams, C. M. F. Mingarelli, C. Ng, D. J. Nice, R. S. Park, T. T. Pennucci, N. S. Pol, S. M. Ransom, P. S. Ray, A. Rasskazov, X. Siemens, J. Simon, R. Spiewak, I. H. Stairs, D. R. Stinebring, K. Stovall, J. Swiggum, S. R. Taylor, M. Valisneri, R. van Haasteren, S. Vigeland, W. W. Zhu, and NANOGrav Collaboration. The NANOGrav 11 Year Data Set: Pulsar-timing Constraints on the Stochastic Gravitational-wave Background. *Astrophys. J.*, 859(1):47, May 2018. doi:10.3847/1538-4357/aabd3b.
- [68] D. J. Reardon, G. Hobbs, W. Coles, Y. Levin, M. J. Keith, M. Bailes, N. D. R. Bhat, S. Burke-Spolaor, S. Dai, M. Kerr, P. D. Lasky, R. N. Manchester, S. Osłowski, V. Ravi, R. M. Shannon, W. van Straten, L. Toomey, J. Wang, L. Wen, X. P. You, and X. J. Zhu. Timing analysis for 20 millisecond pulsars in the Parkes Pulsar Timing Array. *Monthly Notices of the RAS*, 455(2):1751–1769, January 2016. doi:10.1093/mnras/stv2395.
- [69] Anna L. Watts, Nils Andersson, Deepto Chakrabarty, Marco Feroci, Kai Hebeler, Gianluca Israel, Frederick K. Lamb, M. Coleman Miller, Sharon Morsink, Feryal Özel, Alessandro Patruno, Juri Poutanen, Dimitrios Psaltis, Achim Schwenk, Andrew W. Steiner, Luigi Stella, Laura Tolos, and Michiel van der Klis. Colloquium: Measuring the neutron star equation of state using x-ray timing. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 88(2):021001, April 2016. doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.88.021001.
- [70] K. Strobbe, Ch. Schaab, and M. K. Weigel. Properties of non-rotating and rapidly rotating protoneutron stars. *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 350:497–512, October 1999.
- [71] D. Adhikari, H. Albataineh, D. Androic, K. A. Aniol, D. S. Armstrong, T. Averett, C. Ayerbe Gayoso, S. K. Barcus, V. Bellini, R. S. Beminiwattha, J. F. Benesch, H. Bhatt, D. Bhatta Pathak, D. Bhetuwal, B. Blaikie, J. Boyd, Q. Campagna, A. Camsonne, G. D. Cates, Y. Chen, C. Clarke, J. C. Cornejo, S. Covrig Dusa, M. M. Dalton, P. Datta, A. Deshpande, D. Dutta, C. Feldman, E. Fuchey, C. Gal, D. Gaskell, T. Gautam, M. Gericke, C. Ghosh, I. Halilovic, J.-O. Hansen, O. Hassan, F. Hauenstein, W. Henry, C. J. Horowitz, C. Jantzi, S. Jian, S. Johnston, D. C. Jones, S. Kakkar, S. Katugampola, C. Keppel, P. M. King, D. E. King, K. S. Kumar, T. Kutz, N. Lashley-Colthirst, G. Leverick, H. Liu, N. Liyanage, J. Mammei, R. Mammei, M. McCaughan, D. McNulty, D. Meekins, C. Metts, R. Michaels, M. Mihovilovic, M. M. Mondal, J. Napolitano, A. Narayan, D. Nikolaev, V. Owen, C. Palatchi, J. Pan, B. Pandey, S. Park, K. D. Paschke, M. Petrusky, M. L. Pitt, S. Premathilake, B. Quinn, R. Radloff, S. Rahman, M. N. H. Rashad, A. Rathnayake, B. T. Reed, P. E. Reimer, R. Richards, S. Riordan, Y. R. Roblin, S. Seeds, A. Shahinyan, P. Souder, M. Thiel, Y. Tian, G. M. Urciuoli, E. W. Wertz, B. Wojtsekhowski, B. Yale, T. Ye, A. Yoon, W. Xiong, A. Zec, W. Zhang, J. Zhang, and X. Zheng. Precision determination of the neutral weak form factor of ^{48}Ca . *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 129:042501, Jul 2022. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.042501. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.042501>.
- [72] D. Adhikari, H. Albataineh, D. Androic, K. Aniol, D. S. Armstrong, T. Averett, C. Ayerbe Gayoso, S. Barcus, V. Bellini, R. S. Beminiwattha, J. F. Benesch, H. Bhatt, D. Bhatta Pathak, D. Bhetuwal, B. Blaikie, Q. Campagna, A. Camsonne, G. D. Cates, Y. Chen, C. Clarke, J. C. Cornejo, S. Covrig Dusa, P. Datta, A. Deshpande, D. Dutta, C. Feldman, E. Fuchey, C. Gal, D. Gaskell, T. Gautam, M. Gericke, C. Ghosh, I. Halilovic, J.-O. Hansen, F. Hauenstein, W. Henry, C. J. Horowitz, C. Jantzi, S. Jian, S. Johnston, D. C. Jones, B. Karki, S. Katugampola, C. Keppel, P. M. King, D. E. King, M. Knauss, K. S. Kumar, T. Kutz, N. Lashley-Colthirst, G. Leverick, H. Liu, N. Liyanage, S. Malace, R. Mammei, J. Mammei, M. McCaughan, D. McNulty, D. Meekins, C. Metts, R. Michaels, M. M. Mondal, J. Napolitano, A. Narayan, D. Nikolaev, M. N. H. Rashad, V. Owen, C. Palatchi, J. Pan, B. Pandey, S. Park, K. D. Paschke, M. Petrusky, M. L. Pitt, S. Premathilake, A. J. R. Puckett, B. Quinn, R. Radloff, S. Rahman, A. Rathnayake, B. T. Reed, P. E. Reimer, R. Richards, S. Riordan, Y. Roblin, S. Seeds, A. Shahinyan, P. Souder, L. Tang, M. Thiel, Y. Tian, G. M. Urciuoli, E. W. Wertz, B. Wojtsekhowski, B. Yale, T. Ye, A. Yoon, A. Zec, W. Zhang, J. Zhang, and X. Zheng. Accurate determination of the neutron skin thickness of ^{208}Pb through parity-violation in electron scattering. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 126:172502, Apr 2021. doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.172502. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.172502>.
- [73] Sabrina Huth, Peter T. H. Pang, Ingo Tews, Tim Dietrich, Arnaud Le Fèvre, Achim Schwenk, Wolfgang Trautmann, Kshitij Agarwal, Mattia Bulla, Michael W. Coughlin, and Chris Van Den Broeck. Constraining neutron-star matter with microscopic and macroscopic collisions. *Nature (London)*, 606(7913):276–280, June 2022. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-04750-w.