Observation of Gravitational Waves from Binary Black Hole Mergers with Advanced LIGO Hanford and Livingston detectors



Nicolas Leroy on behalf of LSC and Virgo, LAL CNRS/Université Paris-Sud







Overview

- General relativity, generation of Gravitational Waves and sources
- Experimental challenge
- The different detections
- What's next?

General relativity



- Gravitation is a curvature of the space-time metric
- Any massive object will introduce a deformation of the metric



$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$$

- Free falling objects will follow geodesics
- There is no absolute referential
- Widely tested/used



What are Gravitational waves ?



- Solution from General Relativity derived by A. Einstein in 1916
- Far from sources they can be seen as a perturbation of the metrics ie :
 - They are ripples of space-time produced by rapidly accelerating mass distributions
 - Provide info on mass displacement
 - Weakly coupled access to very dense part of objects
- Main proprieties:
 - Propagate at speed of light
 - Two polarizations '+' and 'x'
 - Produce a differential effect on metric
 - Emission is quadrupolar at lowest order

Compact and relativist

Source : mass *M*, size *R*, period *T*, asymmetry $a \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \ddot{Q} \approx a M R^2 / T^3$

Quadrupole formula becomes :



« G/c⁵ very small , c⁵/G will be better » @ J. Weber(1974)



Needs to have •Compact object : R~Rs •Relativist : v ~ c •asymmetric



Neutron star (NS) Black hole (BH)

Deformation @ Earth < 10⁻¹⁸ m

Clues on their existence

- Observation done from binary pulsars
- Such system will loose energy due to GW emission
- Change in orbital period
- One beautiful example is PSR1913+16
- Observed for more than 30 years
- Nobel Prize in 1993



A century of progress

1916: GW prediction (Einstein)

1957 Chapel Hill Conference

1963: rotating BH solution (Kerr)

Theoretical developments

Experiments

- 1990's: CBC PN expansion (Blanchet, Damour, Deruelle, Iyer, Will, Wiseman, etc.)
- 2000: BBH effective one-body approach (Buonanno, Damour)
- 2006: BBH merger simulation (Baker, Lousto, Pretorius, etc.)

🛱 1960's: first Weber bars

(Bondi, Feynman, Pirani, etc.)

1970: first IFO prototype (Forward)
1972: IFO design studies (Weiss)
1974: PSRB 1913+16 (Hulse & Taylor)

1980's: IFO prototypes (10m-long)(Caltech, Garching, Glasgow, Orsay)

1990's: LIGO and Virgo funded

2005-2011: initial IFO « science » » runs

2007: LIGO-Virgo Memorandum Of Understanding

2015: First Advanced LIGO science run

The Gravitational Wave Spectrum



GW zoology



Multimessenger astronomy

Gamma-rays

HE (>1 TeV) ν





Optical





GW ground-based detectors science case

- Test general relativity in strong field regime, measure GW speed (on progress)
- Direct detection of black hole
- Probe progenitor for GRB
- Test equation of state of neutron stars
- Provide constraints on stellar population (on progress)
- Cosmology : Hubble constant, primodial universe
- •

.

Suspended interferometer

- Mirrors act as test masses of the metric
- Using differentiel effect -> variation of detected light at ouput ports



Main challenges for a detector on Earth

- Maximizing length of the detector -> kilometric optical cavities
- Avoid perturbation on optical path -> everything under high vacuum ie 7000 m³ for Virgo
- Mirrors as free falling masses ie decoupled from external perturbations -> suspended optics
- Precise control of the length between the different suspended optics
- Precise ruler -> stable high power laser both in power and frequency
- Reduce at maximum technical noises

Advanced generation !



Main sources of noise



Sensitivity



unpolarized

Quantum noise =

error on phase measurement + fluctuation of radiation pressure

Thermal noise Brownian motion of the suspension, mirror and coating on the surface of the mirror



The GW detectors networks





Ground based network

- Increase the detection confidence
- Source sky localization
- Source parameters inference
- GW polarization determination
- Astrophysics of the sources

LSC 15 countries – 900 contributors

Virgo 5 countries – 200 contributors

Since 2007, LIGO, GEO & Virgo data are jointly analyzed by the LIGO Scientific Collaboration and the Virgo Collaboration.

Advanced LIGO run 01

- 2010-2014: installation
- 2014-2015: commissioning
- September 2015: O1 run start! End Jan 19th 2016

- Horizon (BNS): 70 80 Mpc
- 3-4 times more sensitive than LIGO
- 30-60 times larger in volume



The 14th of Septembre 2015

Abbott et al. PRL 116, 061102



- Event reported within 3 minutes by an unmodelled search
- Within one hour, first (of a very long list) email reporting an interesting event
- In less than two hours nature and first parameters derived : BBH !!!
- Very low false alarm probability reported message from directorate : this is not an hardware injection
- Decision to keep the interferometer in same state to accumulate enough data for background estimation

Time series of GW150914

Data bandpass filtered between 35 Hz and 350 Hz Time difference 6.9 ms with Livingston first

Second row – calculated GW strain using Numerical Relativity Waveforms for quoted parameters compared to reconstructed waveforms (Shaded)

Third Row –residuals



Abbott et al. PRL 116, 061102

Φ

Looking for unmodelled signal



Excess in time-frequency map – using wavelet Similar efficiency for high mass binaries (< 10 Msun) Was running online Background estimation with timeslides Cross-correlation between detectors

$$\eta_c = \sqrt{\frac{2E_c}{(1 + E_n/E_c)}}$$

Residual noise energy

Results for the first 16 days coincident data



False Alarm Rate < 1 / 67 400 years

False Alarm Prob. < 2 10⁻⁶ - > 4.6 σ

Abbott et al. PRL 116, 061102

Search for modelled waveform

 $2\pi i f t df$

FFT of data

Template can be generated in frequency domain using stationary phase approximation

Noise power spectral density (in this case this is the two-sided Power spectrum)



Chi2 test with best match template – coincidence 15 ms Calculate quadratic sum of SNR in each detector Background estimation done with time slides 24





 $\mathcal{C}(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{x}(f)h^*(f)}{S_r(f)}e^{\frac{1}{2}}$

Results for BBH search during O1

using match filtering



Results for BBH search during O1

using match filtering



Comparing the signals

Abbott et al, PRX 6 041015 (2016)



Can it be something else?

- Noise investigation: 200,000 auxiliary channels scrutinized
 - Un-correlated noise: anthropogenic, earthquakes, radio-frequency modulation, unknown origin / known family glitches.
 - Correlated noise: potential EM noise sources (lightning exciting Schumann resonances, solar wind, ...).
- Detector's control systems have been checked for hacking hazard (thorough investigation to rule out that none has injected a signal).
- Detectors outputs are stable around the events



Abbott et al. CQG 33, 13, 134001

Sky location

Abbott et al, PRX 6 041015 (2016)



230 sq deg 850 sq deg 1600 sq deg

different pipelines with different assumptions got similar results

Follow-up with externals observatories



GW150914 alert sent to a private network first event sent with 48 hours of delay Followed up by 21 teams



External observatories first focus on BNS systems

Follow-up with externals observatories

Abbott et al. ApJL vol. 826 pg. L13



No clear signal yet reported

O2 run

- Began 30th of November 2016 still in progress, end date 28th of August 2017
- Sensitivity quite similar to O1 run



O2 range and alerts

- Average reach of the LIGO network
 - BNS ~70 Mpc
 - BBH (10 solar masses each) ~300 Mpc
 - BBH (30 solar masses each) ~700 Mpc
- 6 alerts were sent to EM partners with False alarm rate : 1/month





And one of them...

- Is a new detection : GW170104 !
- Announced yesterday at 5 PM CET
- Sky error region : 1200 sq. deg.



Exemple of follow-up with SVOM/mini-GWAC

Parameters of the sources



Parameters inference



36

Parameters inference



Parameters inference

Abbott et al. PRL 118, 221101



Abbott et al, PRX 6 041015 (2016)

Main parameters

Abbott et al, PRX 6 041015 Abbott *et al*. PRL 118, 221101

| Event | GW150914 | GW151226 | GW170104 | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Primary mass $m_1^{\rm source}/{ m M}_{\odot}$ | $36.2^{+5.2}_{-3.8}$ | $14.2^{+8.3}_{-3.7}$ | $31.2^{+8.4}_{-6.0} M_{\odot}$ | Event | GW150914 | GW151226 | GW170104 |
| Secondary mass $m_2^{\rm source}/{ m M}_{\odot}$ | $29.1^{+3.7}_{-4.4}$ | $7.5^{+2.3}_{-2.3}$ | $19.4^{+5.3}_{-5.9}M_{\odot}$ | Radiated energy $E_{\rm rad}/({\rm M}_{\odot}c^2)$ | $3.0\substack{+0.5\\-0.4}$ | $1.0\substack{+0.1 \\ -0.2}$ | $2.0^{+0.6}_{-0.7} M_{\odot} c^2$ |
| Chirp mass $\mathcal{M}^{\text{source}}/M_{\odot}$ | $28.1^{+1.8}_{-1.5}$ | $8.9^{+0.3}_{-0.3}$ | $21.1^{+2.4}_{-2.7}M_{\odot}$ | Peak luminosity | $3.6^{+0.5}_{-0.4} \times$ | $3.3^{+0.8}_{-1.6} \times$ | $3.1^{+0.7}_{-1.3} \times$ |
| Total mass $M^{\rm source}/M_{\odot}$ | $65.3^{+4.1}_{-3.4}$ | $21.8^{+5.9}_{-1.7}$ | $50.7^{+5.9}_{-5.0}M_{\odot}$ | Luminosity distance | 1050 | 10^{-50} | 10-00 |
| Effective inspiral spin | $-0.06\substack{+0.14\\-0.14}$ | $0.21\substack{+0.20 \\ -0.10}$ | $-0.12^{+0.21}_{-0.30}$ | $D_{\rm L}/{\rm Mpc}$ | 420-180 | 440-190 | 880-390 |
| Final mass $M_{\rm f}^{\rm source}/{\rm M}_{\odot}$ | $62.3^{+3.7}_{-3.1}$ | $20.8^{+6.1}_{-1.7}$ | $48.7^{+5.7}_{-4.6} M_{\odot}$ | Source redshift z | $0.09^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$ | $0.09^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$ | $0.18^{+0.08}_{-0.07}$ |
| Final spin $a_{\rm f}$ | $0.68^{+0.05}_{-0.06}$ | $0.74_{-0.06}^{+0.06}$ | $0.64^{+0.09}_{-0.20}$ | | | | |

- GW150914 is compatible with a coalescence of 2 black holes with similar mass, more asymmetries for the others
- GW150914 : 3 M_☉ in energy were radiated through GW emission – highest luminosity ever observed
- Final object is compatible with a Kerr black hole

BBH merger rate

Abbott et al, PRX 6 041015 (2016)



- Assuming constant volume up to horizon (z~0.5)
- Different distributions
- Using all infos R = 12 213 Gpc ⁻³ yr ⁻¹ (including GW170104)

Black hole population ?

- Events observed are much heavier than what has been observed in Xrays binaries
- Not yet possible to distinguish between isolated binaries or capture in dense environment (globular clusters, galaxies center, ...
- Favor low metallicity stars and then weak massive-stars wind





Testing General relativity in a new regime

- We have for the first time test under highly relativistic and non linear conditions
- Different tests can be peformed :
 - Remove waveform and see any deviation from noise in the data : possible deviations less than 4 %
 - Check the consistency of the waveform if:
 - Look only the pre merger phase
 - Use the remaining time serie



Abbott et al. PRL 116, 221101



Abbott et al. PRL 118, 221101

Constraining parametrization deviations

- We can test any non linear deviation to GR
- Using the complete waveform it then possible to test any deviation in the different orders of the post-Newtonian development of the waveforms with phase evolution



Can we say something on graviton ?

- If we postulate a massive graviton we need to take into account Yukawa type correction to Newtonian potential
- This will induce a dispersion depending of the frequency and can tested with 1 PN order



Abbott *et al.* PRL 116, 221101

Some news from Virgo

- Installation process take more time than expected
 - Need to modify part of the suspensions due to aging of some components
 - Problem with monolithic suspensions (related to vacuum system)
- Lock acquired in few months
- Advanced Virgo operating with stable lock on dark fringe
- >85% duty cycle in recent commissioning run
- Sensitivity steadily improving
- Plan to join O2 in the next weeks (BNS > 15 Mpc)



AdV best BNS range (from May 7 to May 27)

LIGO and Virgo in the next years

- Third detector :
 - May increase number of sources (more up time with at least two detectors)
 - Improve sky localization if seen by the three : from x00 sq deg. to x0 sq deg.
 - One more measure is more constraints
- Upgrade plans on LIGO and Virgo interferometers



New detectors not far away

- KAGRA is well advanced we may have comparable sensitivity before 2020 (?) – new technologies will also be tested
- India recently accepted to host a LIGO interferometer, we may have a 5th detector in 2020-2022

Fairhurst, proceedings of ICGC2011 conference



Comparison between 3 and 5 detectors for sky localization

Observing scenario



At the end

- We have made the first direct detections of an astrophysical event with gravitational wave
- We have for the first time observed two binary black hole systems and their mergers
- We have observed several high mass binary systems

We are opening new ways to observe the Universe and its densest parts We will also be able to test GR in new regimes

Time around 2020 will be very interesting for transient sky (including LSST) and tests for gravitation !



GW : a crossroad of science frontiers

General relativity: relativistic & compact objects (strong field relativity tests).

Laser interferometry detectors: first generation of detectors has proven technology works. Second generation should be more sensitive by 1 order of magnitude.



Cosmology: reach cosmological distances for black hole GW sources.

Astrophysics of compact objects: black holes & neutron stars with matter effects. Most energetic objects in the Universe.

Data analysis: how to extract low signal-to-noise ratio signals in high dimensional parameter space & in non-Gaussian/non-stationary data environment.









Checks on data quality

 Stability for the whole period used for background estimations : OK



In terms of rates for BNS

| | Estimated | | | | | Number | % BNS | Localized |
|----------------|------------|-------------------|---------|-----------------|----------|------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| | Run | Burst Range (Mpc) | | BNS Range (Mpc) | | of BNS | within | |
| Epoch | Duration | LIGO | Virgo | LIGO | Virgo | Detections | $5\mathrm{deg}^2$ | $20 \mathrm{deg}^2$ |
| 2015 | 3 months | 40 - 60 | | 40 - 80 | | 0.0004 - 3 | - | - |
| 2016 - 17 | 6 months | 60 - 75 | 20-40 | 80 - 120 | 20 - 60 | 0.006 - 20 | 2 | 5 - 12 |
| 2017 - 18 | 9 months | 75 - 90 | 40-50 | 120 - 170 | 60-85 | 0.04 - 100 | 1-2 | 10 - 12 |
| 2019+ | (per year) | 105 | 40 - 70 | 200 | 65 - 130 | 0.2 - 200 | 3-8 | 8-28 |
| 2022 + (India) | (per year) | 105 | 80 | 200 | 130 | 0.4 - 400 | 17 | 48 |

Abbott et al, Living Reviews in Relativity 19, 1



Constraining parametrization deviations

- Constraints depend of the evolution
- Can be done either allowing all parameters to fluctuate or a single one



Go further and more compact

Source : mass M, size R, period T, asymmetry $a = \ddot{Q} \approx a M R^2 / T^3$

Quadrupole formula becomes :

$$P \approx \frac{G}{c^5} a^2 \frac{M^2 R^4}{T^6}$$

New parameters •characteristic speed v•Schwarzschild Radius $R_s = 2GM/c^2$



Needs to have •Compact object : R~Rs •Relativist : v ~ c •asymmetric



Neutron star (NS) Black hole (BH)