Measuring NS tidal deformability from LIGO observations of disruptive NSBH binaries

Michael Pürrer (AEI) in collaboration with P. Kumar and H. Pfeiffer (CITA)

PRD 95, 044039 (2017)



GWPAW 2017, Annecy, France



Motivation: NSBHs

- Neutron star black hole (NSBH) binaries are promising sources for detection with LIGO
- In O1, we barely probed the range of predicted NSBH merger rates. First observations expected in O2 / O3.
- At design sensitivity, observation rate: 0.2 - 300 per year¹.
- In NSBH systems, neutron stars are deformed by the tidal field $E_{ij}\sim\partial_i\partial_j\phi$ of their companion
- The induced quadrupole moment $Q_{ij} = -\lambda(\mathrm{EOS};m)E_{ij}$ depends on the bulk properties of the NS





Motivation: NSBH merger

- During inspiral, the GW phasing is altered (weakly) at 5PN order, parametrized by the dimensionless tidal deformability parameter $\Lambda \sim \lambda/M^5 \sim (R/M)^5$. LIGO can (barely) resolve these effects for NSBHs¹⁻³.
- When BH size is comparable to the NS, its tidal field can disrupt the star during late inspiral.
- NS disruption can happen before/after reaching ISCO, depending on
 (a) mass ratio
 (b) black hole spin.





Scope of this work

- We study the the measurability of ∧_{NS} with aLIGO, considering effects of NS distortion during inspiral, and disruption near merger
- We do so for both, single events and populations of observations of NSBH binaries

Waveform Model

- Aligned-spin waveform model for **disruptive** NSBH mergers¹
- Calibrated to 134 NR simulations, 21 NS EoS (polytropic)
- Mass-ratio 2 <= q <= 5; ВН spin -0.5 <= х_{вн,z} <= +0.75
- Reduced order effective-one-body^{2,3} as the base BBH model. Intrinsic parameters { M, q, X_{BH}, ∧_{NS} }

$$\tilde{h}_{\text{NSBH}}(f,\vec{\theta},\Lambda_{\text{NS}}) = \tilde{h}_{\text{BBH}}(f,\vec{\theta})A(f,\vec{\theta},\Lambda_{\text{NS}})e^{i\Delta\Phi(f,\vec{\theta},\Lambda_{\text{NS}})}$$

1. How well can we measure \wedge_{NS} from a single event?

Inject tidal signals into zero noise and recover with tidal templates.

Prior: ANS flat in [0, 4000]

Quantify the measurability of \wedge_{NS} using the full width of its recovered 90% credible intervals ($\Delta \wedge_{NS}$) 90%





1. How well can we measure \wedge_{NS} from a single event?

Inject tidal signals into zero noise and recover with tidal templates.

Prior: ANS flat in [0, 4000]

Quantify the measurability of \wedge_{NS} using the full width of its recovered 90% credible intervals ($\Delta \wedge_{NS}$) 90%





1. How well can we measure \wedge_{NS} from a single event?

Inject tidal signals into zero noise and recover with tidal templates.

Prior: ANS flat in [0, 4000]

Quantify the measurability of \wedge_{NS} using the full width of its recovered 90% credible intervals ($\Delta \wedge_{NS}$) 90%



- 1) Below SNR ~ 30, our measured PDF for \wedge_{NS} spans the entire prior range!
- 2) Only when the BH is small with positive spins, and/or the NS is fairly deformable can we constrain \wedge_{NS} to better than ±50% of its true value.

3500

2. How about multiple realistic observations?

- We combine information for populations of multiple independent disruptive NSBH mergers
- To fix EOS per population:
 - + M_{NS} = 1.35 M_☉, χ_{NS} = 0
 - ↑ ∧_{NS} = {500, 800, 1000, 1500, 2000}
- Events in the population are generated by sampling remaining NSBH parameters:
 - ◆ Mass-ratio: 2 <= q <= 5,
 - ◆ BH spin: 0 <= χ_{BH,z} <= 1,
 - source location: uniform in volume,
 - source orientation: uniform on a 2-sphere.

$$p(\Lambda_{\rm NS}|d_1, d_2, \cdots, d_N; K) = p(\Lambda_{\rm NS}|K)^{1-N} \prod_{i=1}^N p(\Lambda_{\rm NS}|d_i, K)$$



Illustration: Recovered A_{NS} probability distributions for different number of events

2. Measuring \wedge_{NS} from a realistic population



 \wedge_{NS} measurements from NSBH populations with different NS deformabilities.

We can distinguish between soft and hard EOSs with ~20 disruptive NSBH observations.

These results are valid for specific population realizations. We marginalize our results over the population generation process.

2. Measuring \wedge_{NS} from a realistic population



 \wedge_{NS} measurements from NSBH populations with different NS deformabilities.

We can distinguish between soft and hard EOSs with ~20 disruptive NSBH observations.



With 20-35 observations: \land_{NS} measurement will have ±25% error-bars for $\land^{true}_{NS} > 1000$ (black circles), and ±50% error-bars for $\land^{true}_{NS} < 1000$ (black crosses)

With 10-20 observations: median \land_{NS} will be within ±10% of \land^{true}_{NS}

2. Measuring \wedge_{NS} from a realistic population



Q: Does most of the tidal information come from all low-SNR events together or a few loud ones?

The loudest 10 events with SNR > 20 contribute the most, and will be interesting for detailed follow-ups.



With 20-35 observations: \land_{NS} measurement will have ±25% error-bars for $\land^{true}_{NS} > 1000$ (black circles), and ±50% error-bars for $\land^{true}_{NS} < 1000$ (black crosses)

2. Measuring \wedge_{NS} from realistic populations: Mass gap vs no-Mass gap



If BH masses are outside the astrophysical mass-gap (~ 2-5 M_{\odot}), \wedge_{NS} measurement gains accuracy more slowly, requiring 25+% additional events to attain the same accuracy.

Conclusions

∧ _{NS} error bars			
#Events	Λ _{NS} > 1000 (MG)	Λ _{NS} <= 1000 (MG)	-gap
10 - 20	±50% (±60%)	-	Mass ed
20 - 35	±20% (±35%)	±40% (±50%)	IG = specte
70+	± 15 % (±25%)	± 25% (±30%)	₹ ₹

- Disruptive NSBH binaries are as good probes as BNS for constraining the NS tidal deformability, and distinguishing between NS candidate EOSs.
- With the first 10-20 events, we may begin to place factor of 1-2 bounds on ∧_{NS}. With 30-40 events we can constrain ∧_{NS} to within a few 10s of percent.
- The loudest 10 events (SNR > 20) provide most of tidal information, with little furnished by other low-SNR events.
- Accounting for the reduced size of the disruptive NSBH parameter space, we can see up to 30 of such sources a year with design aLIGO. Therefore all of the above is possible within a few years of aLIGO's operation.



Followup study

H. Fong, P. Kumar, MP, V. Raymond, S. Field

- Assess systematic errors in LEA+ waveform model by comparing against TEOB-NR hybrids
- Study accumulation of information on tidal deformability in **detector noise**.
- Fast PE in noise: leverage LEA+ reduced order quadrature (S. Field, MP).