Sapienza University of Rome, September 16th, 2024

Aldo Gamboa1 (aldo.gamboa@aei.mpg.de), Alessandra Buonanno, $^{\rm 1,2}$  Raffi Enficiaud, $^{\rm 1}$  Mohammed Khalil, $^{\rm 3}$  Antoni Ramos-Buades, $^{\rm 4}$  & Harald P. Pfeiffer $^{\rm 1}$ 



<sup>1</sup> Max Planck Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert Einstein Institute), Am Mühlenberg 1, D-14476 Potsdam, Germany 2 Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA <sup>3</sup> Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, 31 Caroline Street North, Waterloo, ON N2L 2Y5, Canada



- 
- 
- 4 Nikhef, Science Park 105, 1098 XG Amsterdam, The Netherlands





# A new multipolar waveform model for eccentric, spin-aligned binary black holes within the effective-one-body formalism

# Eccentric binary black hole systems





- Binary black hole (BBH) formation channels: isolated binary evolution and dynamical formation.
- Gravitational waves (GWs) circularize binaries  $\rightarrow$  only binaries which are dynamically formed close to merger or which are not isolated will have a detectable imprint of eccentricity [e.g. Zevin+, APJL 921, L43 (2021); Samsing, PRD 97, 103014 (2018)].
- 
- 
- 
- Waveform models will play a fundamental role in the analysis of eccentric GWs: TEOBResumS-Dalí, SEOBNRPE, SEOBNRv4EHM, SEOBNRv5EHM, ESIGMAHM, extensions of IMRPhenom, and more!



Detecting (or not detecting) eccentricity will allow us to constrain the populations of BBHs and to understand their origin and evolution [e.g. LVK Collaboration, arXiv:2308.03822; Zeeshan & O'Shaughnessy, arXiv:2404.08185].

• Eccentricity is needed for a correct estimation of BBH parameters and to avoid false violations of General Relativity [e.g. Divyajyoti+, PRD 109, 043037 (2024); Gil Choi+, PRD 110, 024025 (2024); Saini+, PRD 109, 084056 (2024)].

 $\bullet$  More sensitive GW detectors and improved data-analysis techniques  $\longrightarrow$  the detection or confirmation of an eccentric signal will happen very soon! [e.g. Gupte+, arXiv:2404.14286; Romero-Shaw+, APJ 940, 171 (2022)].

# SEOBNR waveform family

- deformation parameter being the symmetric mass ratio,  $\nu = m_1 m_2 / (m_1 + m_2)^2$ .
- 

• In the effective-one-body (EOB) formalism [Buonanno & Damour, PRD 59, 084006 (1999), PRD 62, 064015 (2000)], the dynamics of a compact binary is mapped to that of a test mass in a deformed Kerr background, with the

 $\bullet$  The BBH dynamics is determined by an EOB Hamiltonian  $H_{\rm EOB}$  supplemented by a radiation-reaction (RR) force  $\mathscr{F}$ :

- for the losses of energy and angular momentum due to the emission of GWs.
- GWs are decomposed in terms of waveform modes  $h_{\ell m}$  which satisfy:  $h_+ i\,h_\times =$ ∞ ∑ *ℓ*=2 *m*=−*ℓ m*=*ℓ* ∑  $-2Y_{\ell m}(t, \varphi)h_{\ell m}(\Theta; t),$

the source frame, and  $\Theta$  are the *intrinsic* parameters of the binary.

- $\bullet$  The waveform modes  $h_{\ell m}$  are computed with factorized formulas and physically-motivated ansatz, and are further improved with calibrations to numerical relativity (NR) and BH perturbation theory.
- In this way, SEOBNR = EOB dynamics + NR + BH perturbation theory  $\longrightarrow$  GWs!

$$
H_{\rm EOB} = M \sqrt{1 + 2\nu \left(\frac{H_{\rm eff}}{\mu} - 1\right)} \longrightarrow
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}\n\dot{r} &= \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_r}, & \dot{p}_r &= -\frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial r} + \mathcal{F}_r, \\
\Omega &= \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_\phi}, & \dot{p}_\phi &= -\frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial \phi} + \mathcal{F}_\phi.\n\end{aligned}
$$

 $\bullet$   $H_{\rm EOB}$  and  ${\mathscr F}$  represent a *resummation* of analytical information of the gravitational two-body problem.  ${\mathscr F}$  accounts

where  $_{-2}Y_{\ell,m}$  are the  $-2$  spin-weighted spherical harmonics which depend on the line of sight  $(\iota,\varphi)$  measured in

- A new time-domain inspiral-merger-ringdown multipolar waveform model for aligned-spin, eccentric BBHs, developed within the EOB formalism, with higher-order modes:  $(2,2), (2,1), (3,2), (3,3), (4,3), (4,4).$
- Developed in the python pySEOBNR package, and built upon the quasi-circular (QC) waveform model SEOBNRv5HM.\*
- Based on SEOBNRv4EHM [Khalil+, PRD 104, 024046 (2021), Ramos-Buades+, PRD 105, 044035 (2022)].
- Includes new analytical results for the non-spinning eccentricity contributions to the EOB waveform modes, RR force, and fluxes at 3PN order [Gamboa+, in prep. (2024); Henry & Khalil, PRD 108, 104016 (2023)].
- Faster, more accurate and more robust compared to SEOBNRv4EHM (developed in LALSuite) [Ramos-Buades+, PRD 105, 044035 (2022)].

# Overview of SEOBNRv5EHM

\*: SEOBNRv5 papers: Pompili+, PRD 108, 124035 (2023); Khalil+, PRD 108, 124036 (2023); Ramos-Buades+, PRD 108, 124037 (2023); van de Meent+, PRD 108, 124038 (2023); Mihaylov+, arXiv:2303.18203 (2023)



#### SEOBNRv5EHM equations of motion

• We employ the eccentricity e defined by the Keplerian parametrization:

$$
r = \frac{1}{u_p(1 + e \cos \zeta)}
$$

where  $u_p$  is the inverse semi-latus rectum,  $\zeta$  is the relativistic anomaly and  $x$  is the orbit-averaged frequency.

• Equations of motion for  $(r, \phi, p_r, p_\phi, e, \zeta)$ :

$$
u_p = u_p(e, x) \qquad x = \langle M\Omega \rangle^{2/3}
$$

$$
\dot{r} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_r} \qquad \qquad \Omega = \dot{\phi} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_{\phi}}
$$

$$
= \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_r} \qquad \Omega = \dot{\phi} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_{\phi}} \qquad \dot{p}_r = -\frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial r} + \mathcal{F}_r(x, e, \zeta) \qquad \dot{p}_{\phi} = \mathcal{F}_{\phi}(x, e, \zeta)
$$

$$
\dot{e} = \frac{\nu e x^4}{M} \Big[ -\frac{(121e^2 + 304)}{15 \left(1 - e^2\right)^{5/2}} + 3 \text{PN expansion} \Big] \qquad \dot{\zeta} = \frac{x^{3/2}}{M} \Big[ \frac{(1 + e \cos \zeta)^2}{(1 - e^2)^{3/2}} + 3 \text{PN expansion} \Big]
$$

$$
x = (M\Omega)^{2/3} \Big[ \frac{1 - e^2}{(1 + e \cos \zeta)^{4/3}} + 3 \text{PN expansion} \Big]
$$

$$
\dot{\phi} = \frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial p_{\phi}} \qquad \dot{p}_r = -\frac{\partial H_{\text{EOB}}}{\partial r} + \mathcal{F}_r(x, e, \zeta) \qquad \dot{p}_{\phi} = \mathcal{F}_{\phi}(x, e, \zeta)
$$
  

$$
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \theta^2} + 3\text{PN expansion} \left[ \dot{\zeta} = \frac{x^{3/2}}{M} \left[ \frac{(1 + e \cos \zeta)^2}{(1 - e^2)^{3/2}} + 3\text{PN expansion} \right] \right]
$$

$$
x = (M\Omega)^{2/3} \left[ \frac{1 - e^2}{(1 + e \cos \zeta)^{4/3}} + 3\text{PN expansion} \right]
$$

#### SEOBNRv5EHM radiation-reaction (RR) force and waveform modes

• Eccentric effects are included as multiplicative corrections to the modes and RR force:

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\phi} = \mathcal{F}_{\text{modes}} \mathcal{F}_{\phi, \text{corr}}(x, e, \zeta) \qquad \mathcal{F}_{r}
$$

$$
\mathcal{F}_r = \frac{p_r}{p_\phi} \mathcal{F}_{\text{modes}} \mathcal{F}_{r, \text{corr}}(x, e, \zeta)
$$



$$
\frac{M\Omega}{8\pi}\sum_{\ell=2}^8\sum_{m=1}^{\ell}m^2\left|d_Lh_{\ell m}^F\right|^2
$$

 $S_{\text{eff}} T^{\text{qc}}_{\ell m} f^{\text{qc}}_{\ell m}$  $e^{i\delta_{\ell m}^{qc}}h_{\ell m}^{ecc, corr}(x, e, \zeta)$ 

$$
h_{\ell m}^{\mathrm{F}} = h_{\ell m}^{\mathrm{N, qc}} S_{\mathrm{eff}} T_t^{\mathrm{c}}
$$

• This choice is ideal for recovering the underlying QC model in the  $e \to 0$  limit:

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\text{modes}}^{\text{qc}} = -\frac{\Phi_E}{\Omega} = -\Phi_J, \qquad \mathcal{F}_{\phi,\text{corr}} = 1, \qquad \mathcal{F}_{r,\text{corr}} = 1, \qquad \text{and} \qquad h_{\ell m}^{\text{ecc, corr}}(x, e, \zeta) = 1
$$

441 public + private QC NR simulations from the SXS collaboration (see [Pompili+, PRD 108, 124035 (2023)] and references therein)



# Validation against Numerical Relativity waveforms



where  $\langle \tilde{h}_{\rm s} | \tilde{h}_{\rm t} \rangle$  denotes the noise-weighted (Advanced LIGO's power-spectral density) inner-product between the Fourier transforms of the waveforms.

- multipoles  $(\ell,m)$ .
- 



• Mismatch between the NR waveform  $h_s$  and the EOB waveform  $h_t$ :  $\mathscr{M}(M) = 1 - \max_{s \in A} |\langle h_s | h_t \rangle|_{\Theta_{s,0}^{qc} = \Theta_{t,0}^{qc}}|$  $t_{\rm c}, \varphi_{\rm t}$  $\left[\langle \tilde{h}_s | \tilde{h}_t \rangle \right]_{\Theta_{s,0}^{qc} = \Theta_{t,0}^{qc}}$ 

• SEOBNRv5EHM has the same accuracy as SEOBNRv5HM in the QC limit: excellent agreement for all

• Important to avoid biases in PE [e.g. Bonino+, PRD 107, 064024 (2023), Ramos-Buades+, arXiv:2309.15528].

# Quasi-circular (QC) limit of SEOBNRv5EHM



- 
- 
- 



### Eccentric waveforms: Higher-order modes





# Parameter estimation: NR injections



• We inject three equal-mass, non-spinning NR simulations with increasing eccentricity.



### Parameter estimation: GW150914

• Strong support in the zero eccentricity region, which is in agreement with other analyses of GW150914 with eccentric waveforms [e.g. Romero-Shaw+, MNRAS 490, 5210-5216 (2019); Bonino+, PRD 107, 064024

(2023); Ramos-Buades+, PRD 108, 124063 (2023)].



### Parameter estimation: GW190521

- Controversial event due to its short duration [LVK Collaboration, PRL 125, 101102 (2020)].
- Buades et al. PRD 108, 124063 (2023)].



• Some references find support for eccentricity [e.g. Romero-Shaw+, APJL 903, L5 (2020); Gamba+, Nature Astro. 7, 11 (2023)], whereas other references find no clear evidence for eccentricity [e.g. Gupte+, arXiv:2404.14286; Ramos-



#### Conclusions

14

- 
- Eccentric GW signals will play a key role in the identification of binary formation channels.
- 
- Therefore, eccentric waveform models will be fundamental for current and future GW science.
- parameter space.
- waveform systematics studies.
- Furthermore, SEOBNRv5EHM is being reviewed by the LVK collaboration. The review will finish soon!
- Future work:
	-
	- ‣ Improvement with calibration to eccentric NR simulations.
	- ‣ Spin-precession + eccentricity will be fundamental for the complete characterization of GWs [e.g. Liu+,  $arXiv:2310.04552$ ; Gamba+,  $arXiv:2404.15408$   $\longrightarrow$  SEOBNRv5EPHM.

• Current detectors are already sensible to eccentric GW signals, and the expectations of observing eccentric GWs will increase significantly for upcoming LVK runs and next-generation detectors (e.g. LISA, Einstein Telescope, Cosmic Explorer).

• Ignoring the effects of eccentricity could lead to biases in parameter estimation (PE) and tests of General Relativity.

• SEOBNRv5EHM: a new time-domain IMR multipolar waveform model for spin-aligned, eccentric BBHs, which incorporates new analytical results for the EOB formalism. It is being validated with NR simulations and thoroughly tested across

• The accuracy, robustness, and speed of SEOBNRv5EHM are suitable for PE studies (e.g. analysis of GW events) and

‣ We plan a PE study with DINGO of the O3 signals and possibly confirm the results found with SEOBNRv4EHM.



#### Thanks for your attention!





# Back-up slides

#### Unfaithfulness formulae

• Eccentric (2,2) mode unfaithfulness:

• Higher-order modes unfaithfulness:

where

$$
\mathcal{F}_{22}^{ecc}(M) = \max_{t_{ct}, \varphi_{0t}, e_t, \langle M\Omega \rangle_t} \left[ \left\langle \tilde{h}_{s} \middle| \tilde{h}_{t} \right\rangle \right]_{\substack{\zeta_t = \pi \\ \Theta_{s,0}^{qc} = \Theta_{t,0}^{qc}}} \right]
$$

$$
\overline{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{SNR}}(M, \iota_{\text{s}}) = \sqrt{\frac{\int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi_{0\text{s}} \int_0^{2\pi} d\kappa_{\text{s}} \mathcal{F}^3(M_{\text{s}}, \iota_{\text{s}}, \varphi_{0\text{s}}, \kappa_{\text{s}}) \text{ SNR}^3(\iota_{\text{s}}, \varphi_{0\text{s}}, \kappa_{\text{s}})}{\int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi_{0\text{s}} \int_0^{2\pi} d\kappa_{\text{s}} \text{ SNR}^3(\iota_{\text{s}}, \varphi_{0\text{s}}, \kappa_{\text{s}})}},
$$

$$
SNR(t_s, \varphi_{0s}, \kappa_s, \theta_s, \phi_s, D_L) = \sqrt{\langle h_s | h_s \rangle}
$$

#### Problematic NR eccentric waveforms

#### $SXS$ \_BBH\_0089\_Res5





- Some of the old NR waveforms employed (e.g. SXS:BBH:0089) show unphysical features which are particularly relevant for HoMs. • SEOBNRv5EHM is highly accurate.  $\frac{0.0020 \text{ m}}{20.001}$ Hence, the mismatch  $O(10^{-4})$ becomes affected by these
- features.
- This explains some relatively high mismatches ( $\lesssim 10^{-2}$ ) in the HoM waveforms.