Cocoon emission in neutron star mergers
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In the neutron star (NS) merger events the short gamma-ray burst (sGRB) jet heats up part of the merger ejecta producing the cocoon component. The cocoon is expected to produce a bright early electromagnetic (EM) counterpart. However, in GW170817, sky localization took \sim 10 \text{ hours} and early EM counterparts were missed. Here, in anticipation of future GW170817-like events, we analytically model the cocoon. Then, we calculate its EM cooling emission. We find that the cocoon outshines the r-process powered kilonova/macronova at early times (10–1000 s), peaking at UV bands. In particular, later engine activity makes the cocoon emission brighter and longer. We show that the relativistic velocity of the cocoon’s photosphere is measurable with instruments such as Swift, ULTRASAT and LSST. Also, we show that energetic cocoons, including failed jets, can be detected as X-ray flashes. Our model clarifies the physics and parameter dependence, enabling the extraction of important physical information (about the jet and the merger ejecta) with future multi-messenger observations of NS mergers.
1. Introduction

Binary Neutron Star mergers have been proposed to explain short Gamma-Ray Bursts (sGRBs) [1–3]. In 2017, the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) and the Virgo Consortium (LVC) detected the first gravitational wave (GW) signal from the BNS merger event, GW170817 [4]. ∼1.7 s later, Fermi telescope recorded a sGRB, sGRB 170817A [5]. And 10 hours later, the merger site was localized and follow-up observation across the electromagnetic (EM) spectrum started. This enabled the discovery of the a red component; i.e., kilonova/macronova (KN hereafter); indicating presence of r-process nucleosynthesis [6, 7] as previously predicted in [8–10]. Follow-up observations were also able to find clear evidence of a relativistic jet [11] viewed off-axis. All these discoveries were perfectly consistent with the scenario of sGRBs.

In this scenario, the merger powers relativistic jets through mass accretion [1–3]). However, the expanding merger ejecta surrounds the jet birth place. Therefore, the jet-ejecta interaction is inevitable [12, 13]. During this interaction, the jet outflow is continuously mixed with the ejecta, creating a hot component in the surroundings of the jet called the “cocoon”. And once the outer edge of ejecta is reached, both of the jet and the cocoon can escape to the outside of the ejecta (i.e., breakout) powering a unique astrophysical transient [14–17].

Here, we are interested in the EM cocoon emission as a counterpart to GW signal from NS mergers (NS-NS and BH-NS) as in GW170817. Our goal is to model the cocoon emission so that we can directly link the observational features with the physical properties of central engine jets and the ejecta in NS mergers.

In this paper, we use numerical simulations of hydrodynamical jets propagating in the dynamical ejecta of NS mergers. We found that most of the cocoon is “trapped” inside the ejecta. We focus on the “escaped” cocoon part (that breaks out of the ejecta) that is relevant to the prompt jet-powered cocoon emission. For simplicity we categorize the escaped cocoon into the “relativistic cocoon” and “non-relativistic cocoon”, and model it analytically. Combining these two parts, we then analytically estimate the observed cocoon emission.

2. Numerical simulations of sGRB-jet’s cocoon

We use the same numerical code as in [18], [19], and [20]. We investigate the jet propagation in sGRB – NS merger context where the medium is expanding (see Figure 1). Table 1 shows the representative subsample of jet models simulated: “narrow”, “wide”, and “failed” (for more information see [16, 17]).

Simulations were set to start at $t = t_0$. The jet is launched (injected) at the same time, for a duration of $t_e - t_0 = 2$ s. The delay between the merger time and the jet launch time is set as $t_0 - t_m = 0.160$ s. All simulations are carried out, through the jet breakout, until $t - t_0 = 10$ s. This is considerably a much longer simulation time compared to previous studies (e.g. [20]) and requires a large computational domain. The motivation behind this longer computation time is to follow the late time evolution of the cocoon, until the free expansion phase is reached and the system is fully ballistic, i.e., interaction between the jet/cocoon/ejecta becomes negligible. We refer to this time, the time at which the system is ballistic, as $t_1 \leq 10$s (for more information see [16, 17]).
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**Figure 1:** Schematic illustration of the timeline and key phases in NS mergers, and the cocoon emission. Initially, a pair of compact objects in the inspiral phase [NS-NS here; applies also for a NS-BH system] (A). Then, the two objects merge (B) while triggering mass ejection (C). Soon after, a system of a central compact object with an accretion disk is formed (D) powering two polar jets (D) [white]. Each jet propagates through the surrounding dense ejecta (D) [red and dark green]. This forms a bubble of hot gas, “cocoon”, around the jet (D) [yellow]. Then, the jet-cocoon breaks out of the ejecta, and expands freely (E). Three EM transients are highlighted; from hard to soft, short to long, and narrow to wide emission’s opening angle: sGRB [white], cocoon emission [yellow], and KN [dark green] (E).

**Table 1:** The subsample of the simulated models and their corresponding parameters. From the left: The model name; the ejecta mass, assuming polar densities; the jet initial opening angle; and the engine’s isotropic equivalent luminosity. All the other parameters are the same for these three jet models [16, 17].

| Jet models | $M_e$ [$M_\odot$] | $\theta_0$ [deg] | $L_{iso,0}$ [erg s$^{-1}$] |
|------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Narrow     | 0.002            | 6.8              | $5 \times 10^{50}$          |
| Wide       | 0.002            | 18.0             | $5 \times 10^{50}$          |
| Failed     | 0.010            | 18.0             | $1 \times 10^{50}$          |
3. Analytic modeling of the cocoon

3.1 Jet propagation and breakout

The jet propagation through the expanding ejecta can be solved analytically following the same arguments in [21] for the collapsar case. Detailed calculations in [19, 20] give a full description of the cocoon properties as a function of time until the jet breakout.

3.2 Cocoon escape from the ejecta

As explained in [16] the cocoon escape from the ejecta can be very well modeled by the parameter $\alpha$ which is defined as the ratio of energy density between the cocoon and the ejecta, and can be found analytically (as a function of the jet, ejecta, and cocoon parameters) up to the breakout time.

Results showing the fraction of the escaped cocoon are shown in Figure 2 and indicate that our simple analytic model reproduces well the numerical results (for more information see [16]).

3.3 Freely expanding cocoon

From our late time numerical simulations (up to $\sim 10s$), we analysed the escaped cocoon and measured its mass density, and internal energy density, in particular. In our analysis we divide the escaped cocoon into two parts: relativistic cocoon ($10 > \Gamma \beta > \Gamma_l \beta_l \sim 1.33$) and the non-relativistic cocoon ($\beta_i > \beta > \beta_m$); and found that mass and internal energy density for each of these cocoon components, and a function of $\Gamma \beta$, can be fitted with simple power-law functions (with indices; for the mass density as $l = 0$, and $m \approx 8$; and for the internal energy density as: 2, and $-3$; respectively) (for more details see [17]).
4. Analytic modeling of the cocoon emission

4.1 Optical depth

After finding the mass and internal energy distribution of the escaped cocoon, we analytically solve the radiation transfer using a sharp diffusion shell (see [22]). We follow a relativistic treatment. We calculate the optical depth using the mass density profile. Then, we calculate luminosity using the internal energy density’s profile. We find that the classical radiation diffusion criteria \( \tau \sim \frac{c}{v_d} \) is not ideal for the relativistic cocoon due the steep density profile, and found \( \tau \sim \frac{20}{\beta_d} \) is more reasonable approximation. For the photospheric radius we use \( \tau_{ph} = 1 \). Then we use Stefan–Boltzmann law, in the relativistic limit, to find the blackbody temperature.

5. Results and Discussion

The isotropic luminosity from jet-shock heating in the different phases [calibrating to the parameters of the wide (successful) jet model; see Table 1] can be estimated reasonably well as

\[
L_{bl}^I \sim 3.3 \times 10^{43} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \left( \frac{L_{iso,0}}{5 \times 10^{50} \text{ erg s}^{-1}} \right) \left( \frac{t_b - t_0}{0.46 \text{ s}} \right) \left( \frac{t_b}{0.62 \text{ s}} \right) \left( \frac{E_{c,i,r}}{E_{c,i}} \right) \left( \frac{\theta_0}{0.63} \right)^2 \left( \frac{\kappa}{1 \text{ cm}^2 \text{ g}^{-1}} \right) \left( \frac{t_{obs}}{75 \text{ s}} \right)^{-p},
\]

where, \( L_{iso,0} \) is the central engine’s isotropic luminosity, \( \theta_0 \) is the initial jet opening angle, \( t_b - t_0 \) is the breakout time since the jet launch, \( t_b \) is the breakout time since the merger, \( E_{c,i,r}^{es} \) is the fraction of escaped cocoon internal energy, \( E_{c,i}^{es} \) is the fraction of escaped cocoon internal energy in the relativistic cocoon, and \( \kappa \) is the opacity in the escaped cocoon. The time index \( p \) has been introduced to reproduce the temporal properties of the luminosity \( p = 4/3 \) for \( t_{obs} < t_{obs}(\Gamma_d = 1/\theta_c^{es}) \), and \( p = 2 \) for \( t_{obs} > t_{obs}(\Gamma_d = 1/\theta_c^{es}) \); and one can find the timescale \( t_{obs}(\Gamma_d = 1/\theta_c^{es}) \sim \tau_{ph}^{-1} \) \(~75 \text{ s} \) here for the wide jet case; and \(~6 \text{ s} \) for the narrow jet case) (for more details see [17]).

Results are shown in Figure 3. We found that the cocoon emission is brighter for wider jets, and dominates the KN in the early 10-1000 s. We also found that UV is the best band to detect this emission. Furthermore, at early times, due to the high blackbody temperatures, in particular for the failed jet case, the cocoon can be a bright X-ray source. Finally, as \( L_{bl}^I \propto t_b^2 \), we estimate that for late engine activities (e.g., extended emission where \( t_b \) is expected to be much longer) this cocoon luminosity can be much brighter.

6. Conclusion

We presented numerical simulations of the cocoon breakout in NS mergers, for three representative jets: narrow, wide, and failed. We followed the cocoon evolution for timescales much longer than the breakout time (up to \(~10 \text{ s} \gg t_b - t_0\)). We analysed the distribution of mass and energy...
Figure 3: Bolometric isotropic luminosity (top), photospheric four-velocity (middle), and observed temperature (bottom), for three representative jet models [narrow (blue), wide (red), and failed (green) in Table 1], as a function of the observed time since the merger. The predicted early KN is shown (dotted black; following the analytic model by [23]), as well as the recorded measurements on GW170817 (grey circles [6, 7]). This illustrates the expected imprint of the cocoon depending on the jet model in future GW170817-like events (NS mergers with or without a sGRB).
in the cocoon, finding that, contrary to previous considerations, only a tiny fraction of the cocoon manages to escape from the ejecta (~0.5 – 5% in terms of mass; see Figure 2). We then modeled the escaped cocoon mass and internal energy distribution, and estimated its emission using the approximation of a sharp diffusion shell, as a function of the parameters of the jet and the ejecta [see equation (1)].

Our results indicate that with the new generation of GW detectors (the upcoming LIGO O4; also with ET, and CE), the cocoon emission is bright enough to be detectable in future GW170817-like events; especially for events with late engine activity (e.g., extended emission jet). And with its observational features (luminosity, temperatures, and photospheric velocity) understood (with our analytic model), the cocoon emission can be used to better understand NS mergers, sGRBs, and KNe (together with the other EM counterparts: prompt emission, KN emission, and afterglow emission); practically, the cocoon emission can be used to indirectly measure the cocoon’s mass and relate it to the mass of the ejecta, infer the type of jet, and indirectly trace r-process nucleosynthesis (through measurement of the opacity $\kappa$ [24]).
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