Unravelling Binary Evolution from Gravitational-Wave Signals and Source Statistics

Ilya Mandel
(Northwestern University)
with Vicky Kalogera, Richard O'Shaughnessy
with thanks to members of the CBC group of the LVC for feedback

LIGO-G0900690

Astrophysics to GW Event Rates

Unraveling Binary Evolution

...but on a hazy day

...but on a hazy day

Rates predictions

- All astrophysical rates estimates depend on limited observations and/or models with many ill-understood parameters, and are still significantly uncertain at present
- Ground-based interferometric detectors (LIGO, Virgo, GEO 600, AIGO, LCGT) are sensitive @ tens/hundreds Hz: ideal for detecting NS-NS, NS-BH, BH-BH binaries
- Coalescence rate predictions from:
  - extrapolation from observed binary pulsars
  - simulations of isolated binary evolution
  - dynamical-formation models
  - intermediate-mass-black holes ?
- Instrument sensitivity and conversion to detection rates

Extrapolation from BNS observations

- Best NS-NS merger-rate estimates come from observed Galactic binary pulsars
- Small-number statistics (~10 total, ~4 merging in 15 Gyr)
- Selection effects (pulsar luminosity distribution)
- [Kim et al., 2003 ApJ 584 985, 2006 astro-ph/0608280; Kalogera et al., 2004, ApJ 601 L179]



Population synthesis models

- No observed NS-BH or BH-BH binaries
- Predictions based on population-synthesis models for isolated binary evolution with StarTrack [Belczynski et al., 2005, astro-ph/0511811] or similar codes
- Thirty poorly constrained parameters
- [O'Shaughnessy et al., 2005 ApJ 633 1076, 2008 ApJ 672 479] vary seven most important parameters:

1. power-law index in binary mass ratio

2, 3, 4. supernovae kicks described by two independent Maxwellians and their relative contribution

5. strength of massive stellar wind

6. common-envelope efficiency

7. fractional mass retention during nonconservative mass transfer

Constraining models



- Add constraints from observations; binary pulsars: NS-NS, NS-WD, supernovae, etc.
- Average over models that satisfy constraints

Effect of adding constraints, 1



Single constraint satisfaction - no accounting for sampling uncertainties or model fitting errors

Effect of adding constraints, 1





Single constraint satisfaction - no accounting for sampling uncertainties or model fitting errors

Effect of adding constraints, 2



Constraints from observed binary pulsars



BH-NS and NS-NS rate/MWEG predictions

[O'Shaughnessy et al., 2008, ApJ 672 479]

Rates per Galaxy

Source	$R_{\rm low}$	$R_{\rm re}$	$R_{\rm pl}$
NS-NS (L_{10}^{-1} Myr^{-1})	0.6	50	500
NS-BH (L_{10}^{-1} Myr^{-1})	0.03	2	60
BH-BH (L_{10}^{-1} Myr^{-1})	0.006	0.2	20

- In simplest models, coalescence rates are proportional to stellar-birth rates in nearby spiral galaxies, so we quote rates in units of L_{10} (blue-light luminosity of 10^{10} Suns)
- However, this does not properly account for delay of coalescence relative to star formation (esp. elliptical galaxies)

LIGO sensitivity

[Kopparapu et al., 2008 ApJ 675 1459]

$$\dot{N} = R \times N_G$$

(merger rate) =
(merger rate per L10) *
(Ng in L10's)

$$\rho \equiv \sqrt{4 \int_0^{f_{\rm ISCO}} \frac{|\tilde{h}(f)|^2}{S_n(f)} df}$$

$$\rho(D_{\rm horizon}) \equiv 8$$

1/2.26 -- sky and orientation averaging; 0.02 L_{10} per Mpc^3

$$N_G\ (L_{10}) = \frac{4}{3}\pi \left(\frac{D_{\rm horizon}}{\rm Mpc}\right)^3 (2.26)^{-3}(0.02)$$

$$|\tilde{h}(f)| = 2/D * (5\mu/96)^{1/2}(M/\pi^2)^{1/3} f^{-7/6}$$



Detection Rates

IFO	Source	$\dot{N}_{\rm low}$ yr^{-1}	$\dot{N}_{\rm re}$ yr^{-1}	$\dot{N}_{\rm pl}$ yr^{-1}
Initial	NS-NS	2×10^{-4}	0.02	0.2
	NS-BH	9×10^{-5}	0.006	0.2
	BH-BH	2×10^{-4}	0.009	0.7
Advanced	NS-NS	0.4	40	400
	NS-BH	0.2	10	300
	BH-BH	0.5	20	1000

Dynamical Formation

- BH-BH mergers in dense black-hole subclusters of globular clusters
  - » [O'Leary, O'Shaughnessy, Rasio, 2007 PRD 76 061504]
  - » Predicted rates 10^{-4} to 1 per Mpc^3 per Myr
  - » Plausible optimistic values could yield 0.5 events/year for Initial LIGO
- BH-BH scattering in galactic nuclei with a density cusp caused by a massive black hole (MBH)
  - » [O'Leary, Kocsis, Loeb, 2009 arXiv:0807.2638]
  - » Based on a number of optimistic assumptions
  - » Predicted detection rates of 1 to 1000 per year for Advanced LIGO
- BH-BH mergers in nuclei of small galaxies without an MBH
  - » [Miller and Lauburg, 2009 ApJ 692 917]
  - » Predicted rates of a few X 0.1 per Myr per galaxy
  - » Tens of detections per year with Advanced LIGO

Inspirals into IMBHs

- Intermediate-mass-ratio inspirals of compact objects (1.4 solar-mass NSs or 10 solar-mass BHs) into intermediate-mass black holes in globular clusters

- Dominant mechanism:
  IMBH swaps into binaries,
  3-body interactions tighten
  IMBH-CO binary, merger
  via GW radiation reaction
  [IM et al., 2008 ApJ 681 1431]



- Rate per globular cluster: few x 10^{-9} yr^{-1}
- Predicted Advanced LIGO event rates between 1/few years and ~30/year

Inspirals of two IMBHs

- Two very massive stars could form in globular clusters with sufficient binary fraction, then grow through run-away collision to form two IMBHs in same GC

- Rates of order 1/year are possible for Advanced LIGO [Fregeau et al., 2006 ApJ 646 L135]
- IMBH binaries could also form when two GCs merge [Amaro-Seoane and Freitag, 2006, ApJ 653 L53]



Binary characteristics: masses

- Chirp-mass predictions

$$\mathcal{M}_c = \frac{M_1^{3/5} M_2^{3/5}}{(M_1 + M_2)^{1/5}}$$

  - Early predictions from [Bulik and Belczynski, 2003 ApJ 589 L37]
  - BH-BH chirp mass is typically in the [5,10] solar-mass range for most systems that merge in less than 10 Gyr [O'Shaughnessy, Kalogera, Belczynski, 2009, in prep.]
  - Value can change depending on applied constraints, etc.; e.g., factor of 1.3 for BH-NS between [O'Shaughnessy et al., 2005 ApJ 633 1076 and ibid., 2008, ApJ 672 479]



Bulik and Belczynski, 2003 ApJ 589 L37

Informing GW searches with Astro, 1

- Selecting IFO configuration based on astro predictions



Public LIGO document T-070247

Informing GW searches with Astro, 2

- Rates predictions can help to determine which searches we should focus resources on
- Choice of waveform templates for detection:
  - » Example 1: Low chirp masses may make merger/ringdown waveforms unnecessary for most stellar-mass BH-BH mergers; however, searches with the full inspiral-merger-ringdown waveforms informed by numerical relativity will be necessary for GWs from IMBH sources
  - » Example 2: Spin is important for accurate parameter estimation of BH-NS and BH-BH binaries
  - » Example 3: Could cut down on template number (and reduce FAR) for spinning BH-NS template banks since very massive BHs will be hard to spin up [Pan et al., 2004, PRD 69 104017]

Astrophysics with GW searches

- Constraints on astrophysical parameters from existing electromagnetic observations
  [O'Shaughnessy et al., 2008 ApJ 672 479]:



Astrophysics with GW searches

- Constraints on astrophysical parameters from existing electromagnetic observations [O'Shaughnessy et al., 2008 ApJ 672 479]:
- Observed GW event rates can be compared with models to determine important astrophysical parameters;



Rates to parameter constraints - theory

- Let f(R) be the measured rates distribution
- The constrained distribution of astrophysical parameters is given by Bayes Rule: $$p(\vec{\Theta}|f(R)) = \frac{p(f(R)|\vec{\Theta})p(\vec{\Theta})}{p(f(R))}$$
- For a given choice of model parameters, population synthesis codes coupled to information about galaxy distributions and detector sensitivity provide a distribution of the detectable event rate, $p(\hat{R}|\vec{\Theta})$
- If an actual rate R is measured, then the likelihood that the model with a given choice of parameters fits the measurement is $$\mathcal{L}(R|\vec{\Theta}) = e^{-\frac{|R-\hat{R}|^2}{2\sigma_R^2}}$$
- Then $$p(f(R)|\vec{\Theta}) = \int d\hat{R}\mathcal{L}(R|\vec{\Theta})p(\hat{R}|\vec{\Theta})$$

Astrophysics with GW searches

- Constraints on astrophysical parameters from existing electromagnetic observations [O'Shaughnessy et al., 2008 ApJ 672 479]:
- Observed GW event rates can be compared with models to determine important astrophysical parameters;
- Could match measured mass distributions, etc. to models (requires accurate parameter determination)



Accurate Parameter Estimation



van der Sluys, IM, Raymond, IM et al., 0905.1323

Astrophysics with GW searches

- Constraints on astrophysical parameters from existing electromagnetic observations [O'Shaughnessy et al., 2008 ApJ 672 479]:
- Observed GW event rates can be compared with models to determine important astrophysical parameters;
- Could match measured mass distributions, etc. to models (requires accurate parameter determination)
- As detector sensitivity improves, even upper limits can be useful in constraining parameter space for birth kicks, common-envelope efficiency, winds, etc.



Constraints from upper limits - example



Constraints from upper limits - example



Common Envelope Efficiency

Double Compact Object Formation Channels

Formation Channel	Relative Efficiency[α]	Evolutionary History[β]
NSNS:01	20.3 %	NC:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:02	10.8 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, NC:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:03	5.5 %	SCE:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:04	4.0 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, SCE:b→a, SN:b, HCE:a→b, SN:a
NSNS:05	3.2 %	DCE:a→b, SCE:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:06	2.5 %	SCE:a→b, SCE:b→a, NC:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:07	2.2 %	NC:a→b, NC:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:08	2.0 %	NC:a→b, DCE:b→a, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:09	2.0 %	DCE:a→b, DCE:a→b, SN:a, SN:b
NSNS:10	1.6 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, SN:b, HCE:a→b, SN:a
NSNS:11	1.5 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, DCE:b→a, SN:a, SN:b
NSNS:12	1.5 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, DCE:a→b, SN:a, SN:b
NSNS:13	1.0 %	DCE:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
NSNS:14	3.0 %	all other
BHNS:01	4.5 %	NC:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
BHNS:02	1.6 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, SN:a, SN:b
BHNS:03	1.3 %	SCE:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, NC:b→a, SN:b
BHNS:04	2.0 %	all other
BHBH:01	17.7 %	NC:a→b, SN:a, HCE:b→a, SN:b
BHBH:02	10.5 %	NC:a→b, SCE:b→a, SN:a, SN:b
BHBH:03	1.4 %	all other

[Kalogera et al., 2007, Physics Reports 442, 75]



Also possible to constrain common-envelope model with LISA observations:
[Belzcynski, Benacquista, Bulik, 2008, arXiv:0811.1602]

Conclusion

- Current understanding of coalescence rates and properties of compact binaries is imperfect
- Advanced LIGO is likely to see NS-NS, NS-BH, BH-BH coalescences; tens or more coalescences may be seen according to some models, including dynamical formation
- Chirp masses for binaries formed via isolated evolution are likely ≤ 10 solar masses; rapid spins are possible
- Improved understanding of astrophysics can help GW search by informing detector configuration, template family
- GW detections and upper limits for compact-object coalescences will allow us to constrain the astrophysical parameters