Effective two-body approach to the three-body problem

Adrien Kuntz

GDR Ondes Gravitationnelles

In collaboration with : Enrico Trincherini, Francesco Serra



11/10/2022



Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare

Detection of GW so far beautifully corresponds to two-body systems

۱

$$\Phi(f) = \phi_0 + 2\pi f t_0 + \sum_{k=0}^7 \alpha_k f^{(k-5)/3}$$

 m_1, m_2, χ_1, χ_2

Detection of GW so far beautifully corresponds to two-body systems

$$M = \phi_0 + 2\pi f t_0 + \sum_{k=0}^7 \alpha_k f^{(k-5)/3}$$

 m_1, m_2, χ_1, χ_2

If we ever detect a new feature in data, we have (as 19th century astronomers) two possible explanations:

- Modification of GR
- Perturbation by a third body (this talk)

This question is not purely academic !

• 90% of low-mass binaries are expect to belong to a 'hierarchical' triple system

Tokovinin et al. 2006

• 'Migration traps' around SMBH at $R\sim 20-600R_{
m sch}$

Bellovary et al. 2015



THIS QUESTION IS NOT PURELY ACADEMIC !

• 90% of low-mass binaries are expect to belong to a 'hierarchical' triple system

• 'Migration traps' around SMBH at $R\sim 20-600R_{
m sch}$

Bellovary et al. 2015



Tokovinin et al. 2006

Priorities in gravitational waveform modelling for future space-borne detectors: vacuum accuracy or environment?

Lorenz Zwick,^{*} Pedro R. Capelo and Lucio Mayer Center for Theoretical Astrophysics and Cosmology, Institute for Computatio Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

Led by these considerations, we argue that *systematically including environmental effects* in waveform templates should take priority with respect to further increasing the accuracy of vacuum templates. If the goal is to maximise the science yield of future missions, the community could be better served by shifting the focus from the source of GWs to its surroundings.

This question is not purely academic !

• 90% of low-mass binaries are expect to belong to a 'hierarchical' triple system

'Migration traps' around SMBH at $R\sim 20-600R_{
m sch}$

Bellovary et al. 2015



Tokovinin et al. 2006

Priorities in gravitational waveform modelling for future space-borne detectors: vacuum accuracy or environment?

Lorenz Zwick,^{*} Pedro R. Capelo and Lucio Mayer Center for Theoretical Astrophysics and Cosmology, Institute for Computatio Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

Led by these considerations, we argue that *systematically including environmental effects* in waveform templates should take priority with respect to further increasing the accuracy of vacuum templates. If the goal is to maximise the science yield of future missions, the community could be better served by shifting the focus from the source of GWs to its surroundings.

What is the influence of a third body on the waveform?

 \Rightarrow We have to formulate the 3-body problem in GR and solve it perturbatively

Relativistic three-body problem

EOM in post-Newtonian

$$a_{a} = -\sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \mathbf{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \mathbf{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \left[4 \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} + 5 \frac{Gm_{a}}{r_{ab}} + \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}} + 4 \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{ac}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}^{3}} (\mathbf{x}_{ab} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{bc}) - v_{a}^{2} + 4 \mathbf{v}_{a} \cdot \mathbf{v}_{b} - 2\mathbf{v}_{b}^{2} + \frac{3}{2} (\mathbf{v}_{b} \cdot \mathbf{n}_{ab})^{2} \right] - \frac{7}{2c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c} \mathbf{x}_{bc}}{r_{bc}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \mathbf{x}_{ab} \cdot (4\mathbf{v}_{a} - 3\mathbf{v}_{b})(\mathbf{v}_{a} - \mathbf{v}_{b}),$$

$$(3.1)$$

EOM in post-Newtonian

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{a} = -\sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \left[4 \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} + 5 \frac{Gm_{a}}{r_{ab}} + \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}} + 4 \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{ac}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}^{3}} (\boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}) - \boldsymbol{v}_{a}^{2} + 4 \boldsymbol{v}_{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{b} - 2\boldsymbol{v}_{b}^{2} + \frac{3}{2} (\boldsymbol{v}_{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{ab})^{2} \right] - \frac{7}{2c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c} \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}}{r_{bc}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot (4\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - 3\boldsymbol{v}_{b})(\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - \boldsymbol{v}_{b}),$$

$$(3.1)$$

• No analytic waveform template

EOM in post-Newtonian

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{a} = -\sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \left[4 \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} + 5 \frac{Gm_{a}}{r_{ab}} + \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}} + 4 \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{ac}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}^{3}} (\boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}) - \boldsymbol{v}_{a}^{2} + 4 \boldsymbol{v}_{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{b} - 2\boldsymbol{v}_{b}^{2} + \frac{3}{2} (\boldsymbol{v}_{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{ab})^{2} \right] - \frac{7}{2c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c} \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}}{r_{bc}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot (4\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - 3\boldsymbol{v}_{b})(\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - \boldsymbol{v}_{b}),$$

$$(3.1)$$

- No analytic waveform template
- Lack of physical intuition



EOM in post-Newtonian

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{a} = -\sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \left[4 \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} + 5 \frac{Gm_{a}}{r_{ab}} + \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}} + 4 \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{ac}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}^{3}} (\boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}) - \boldsymbol{v}_{a}^{2} + 4 \boldsymbol{v}_{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{b} - 2\boldsymbol{v}_{b}^{2} + \frac{3}{2} (\boldsymbol{v}_{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{ab})^{2} \right] - \frac{7}{2c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c} \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}}{r_{bc}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot (4\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - 3\boldsymbol{v}_{b})(\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - \boldsymbol{v}_{b}),$$

$$(3.1)$$

- No analytic waveform template
- Lack of physical intuition



• Numerical evolution over long timescales difficult

EOM in post-Newtonian

$$\boldsymbol{a}_{a} = -\sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \left[4 \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} + 5 \frac{Gm_{a}}{r_{ab}} + \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}} + 4 \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{ac}} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c}}{r_{bc}^{3}} (\boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}) - \boldsymbol{v}_{a}^{2} + 4 \boldsymbol{v}_{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{v}_{b} - 2\boldsymbol{v}_{b}^{2} + \frac{3}{2} (\boldsymbol{v}_{b} \cdot \boldsymbol{n}_{ab})^{2} \right] - \frac{7}{2c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}} \sum_{c \neq a, b} \frac{Gm_{c} \boldsymbol{x}_{bc}}{r_{bc}^{3}} + \frac{1}{c^{2}} \sum_{b \neq a} \frac{Gm_{b}}{r_{ab}^{3}} \boldsymbol{x}_{ab} \cdot (4\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - 3\boldsymbol{v}_{b})(\boldsymbol{v}_{a} - \boldsymbol{v}_{b}),$$

$$(3.1)$$

- No analytic waveform template
- Lack of physical intuition



- Numerical evolution over long timescales difficult
- Issues in the radiative sector





3-body motion = 2-body with spin!









PROPER TIME

The equivalence principle fixes nearly everything!

$$\mathscr{E} = m - \frac{G_N m \mu}{2a}, \qquad \begin{array}{l} J_{ij} = \epsilon_{ijk} J^k ,\\ \Omega_{ij} = \epsilon_{ijk} \Omega^k , \end{array} \qquad \mathbf{J} = \sqrt{G_N m a (1 - e^2)} \, \hat{\mathbf{j}} , \qquad \mathbf{\Omega} = \hat{\mathbf{e}} \times \dot{\hat{\mathbf{e}}} \end{array}$$

 $\hat{\mathbf{e}} \equiv \mathbf{U}$ NIT RUNGE-LENZ VECTOR



AK, F. Serra, E. Trincherini 2021

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm EFT} = -\mathscr{C}_{\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}V^{\mu}_{\rm CM}V^{\nu}_{\rm CM}} + \frac{1}{2}J_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu} - m_3\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}v^{\mu}_3v^{\nu}_3$$

As in any EFT, the Lagrangian is organised with power-counting rules:

$$v^2 \equiv \frac{Gm}{a}$$
 and $\varepsilon \equiv \frac{a}{a_3}$



AK, F. Serra, E. Trincherini 2021

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm EFT} = -\mathscr{C}_{\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}V^{\mu}_{\rm CM}V^{\nu}_{\rm CM}} + \frac{1}{2}J_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu} - m_3\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}v^{\mu}_3v^{\nu}_3}$$

As in any EFT, the Lagrangian is organised with power-counting rules:

$$v^2 \equiv \frac{Gm}{a}$$
 and $\varepsilon \equiv \frac{a}{a_3}$

To get the EOM for the point-particles, one should 'integrate out' the gravitational field

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{2a} - 3m\frac{G^2m_1m_2}{a^2\sqrt{1-e^2}}$$

Hamiltonian of inner orbit $\varepsilon^{-1}v^0 + \varepsilon^{-1}v^2$



AK, F. Serra, E. Trincherini 2021

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm EFT} = -\mathscr{C}_{\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}V^{\mu}_{\rm CM}V^{\nu}_{\rm CM}} + \frac{1}{2}J_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu} - m_3\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}v^{\mu}_3v^{\nu}_3}$$

As in any EFT, the Lagrangian is organised with power-counting rules:

$$v^2 \equiv \frac{Gm}{a}$$
 and $\varepsilon \equiv \frac{a}{a_3}$

To get the EOM for the point-particles, one should 'integrate out' the gravitational field

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{2a} - 3m\frac{G^2m_1m_2}{a^2\sqrt{1-e^2}} \\ &- \frac{Gmm_3}{2a_3} - 3M\frac{G^2mm_3}{a_3^2\sqrt{1-e_3^2}} \end{aligned}$$

Hamiltonian of inner orbit $\varepsilon^{-1}v^0 + \varepsilon^{-1}v^2$

Hamiltonian of outer orbit $\varepsilon^0 v^0 + \varepsilon^1 v^2$



AK, F. Serra, E. Trincherini 2021

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm EFT} = -\mathscr{E}_{\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}V^{\mu}_{\rm CM}V^{\nu}_{\rm CM}} + \frac{1}{2}J_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu} - m_3\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}v^{\mu}_3v^{\nu}_3}$$

As in any EFT, the Lagrangian is organised with power-counting rules:

$$v^2 \equiv \frac{Gm}{a}$$
 and $\varepsilon \equiv \frac{a}{a_3}$

To get the EOM for the point-particles, one should 'integrate out' the gravitational field

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{2a} - 3m\frac{G^2m_1m_2}{a^2\sqrt{1-e^2}} \\ &- \frac{Gmm_3}{2a_3} - 3M\frac{G^2mm_3}{a_3^2\sqrt{1-e_3^2}} \\ &+ \frac{4m+3m_3}{2m}\frac{G}{a_3^3(1-e_3^2)^{3/2}}\mathbf{J}\cdot\mathbf{J}_3 \end{aligned}$$

Hamiltonian of inner orbit $\varepsilon^{-1}v^0 + \varepsilon^{-1}v^2$

Hamiltonian of outer orbit $\varepsilon^0 v^0 + \varepsilon^1 v^2$

Spin-orbit coupling $e^{3/2}v^2$



AK, F. Serra, E. Trincherini 2021

$$\mathscr{L}_{\rm EFT} = -\mathscr{E}_{\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}V^{\mu}_{\rm CM}V^{\nu}_{\rm CM}} + \frac{1}{2}J_{\mu\nu}\Omega^{\mu\nu} - m_3\sqrt{-g_{\mu\nu}}v^{\mu}_3v^{\nu}_3$$

As in any EFT, the Lagrangian is organised with power-counting rules:

$$v^2 \equiv \frac{Gm}{a}$$
 and $\varepsilon \equiv \frac{a}{a_3}$

To get the EOM for the point-particles, one should 'integrate out' the gravitational field

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= -\frac{Gm_1m_2}{2a} - 3m\frac{G^2m_1m_2}{a^2\sqrt{1-e^2}} & \text{Hamiltonian of inner orbit} \quad \varepsilon^{-1}v^0 + \varepsilon^{-1}v^2 \\ &- \frac{Gmm_3}{2a_3} - 3M\frac{G^2mm_3}{a_3^2\sqrt{1-e_3^2}} & \text{Hamiltonian of outer orbit} \quad \varepsilon^0v^0 + \varepsilon^1v^2 \\ &+ \frac{4m + 3m_3}{2m}\frac{G}{a_3^3(1-e_3^2)^{3/2}}\mathbf{J}\cdot\mathbf{J}_3 & \text{Spin-orbit coupling} & \varepsilon^{3/2}v^2 \\ &+ \mathcal{H}_{quad} & 21 & \text{Quadrupolar coupling} & \varepsilon^2v^0 + \varepsilon^2v^2 \end{aligned}$$

LONG-TERM EVOLUTION OF RELATIVISTIC 3-BODY SYSTEMS

$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{inner}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{outer}} + \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon^{3/2}v^2} + \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon^2v^0} + \mathcal{H}_{\varepsilon^2v^2} + \dots$



AK, F. Serra, E. Trincherini (In prep.)

CONCLUSIONS

- Very rich phenomenology in the Newtonian 3-body problem, even more in the relativistic one...
- EFT formulation suited to precision computations
- Future work: more precise waveforms for 3-body problem

CONCLUSIONS

- Very rich phenomenology in the Newtonian 3-body problem, even more in the relativistic one...
- EFT formulation suited to precision computations
- Future work: more precise waveforms for 3-body problem



RELATIVISTIC DOPPLER EFFECT IN WAVEFORMS

• Longitudinal Doppler effect: Randall Xianyu '18 Inayoshi et al. '17 Strokov et al. '17...



RELATIVISTIC DOPPLER EFFECT IN WAVEFORMS

• Longitudinal Doppler effect: Randall Xianyu '18 Inayoshi et al. '17 Strokov et al. '17...



• Transverse Doppler effect: break degeneracies

$$f_r = \frac{f_s \sqrt{1 - V^2}}{1 + V_{||}}$$

AK, K. Leyde (In prep.)

RELATIVISTIC DOPPLER EFFECT IN WAVEFORMS

• Longitudinal Doppler effect: Randall Xianyu '18 Inayoshi et al. '17 Strokov et al. '17...



• Transverse Doppler effect: break degeneracies

$$f_r = \frac{f_s \sqrt{1 - V^2}}{1 + V_{||}}$$

AK, K. Leyde (In prep.)

M

• Higher order effects in waveforms like spin-orbit coupling...



New resonances

• Resonances are a fascinating phenomenon of the 3-body problem



New resonances

• Resonances are a fascinating phenomenon of the 3-body problem



• When relativistic effects are included, there are other kinds of resonances



Perihelion angle Outer orbit frequency $\begin{tabular}{l} \hline \\ \hline \\ p \ \dot{\omega} + q \ \sqrt{\frac{GM}{a_3^3}} = 0 \end{tabular}$

 $p,q\in\mathbb{Z}$

AK 2021

New resonances

$$a(t) = a_0 \left(1 - \frac{t}{t_{\rm RR}}\right)^{1/4}$$



THE TWO-BODY PROBLEM IN GR

The two-body dynamics is encoded in the EFFECTIVE ACTION :



HAMILTONIAN FOR PRECESSION RESONANCE

$$\mathcal{H} = -\frac{G_N m \mu}{2a} - \frac{G_N M \mu_3}{2a_3} - 3\mu \frac{G_N^2 m^2}{a^2 \sqrt{1 - e^2}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{quad}}$$

• One should NOT average over the outer orbit (this is why it was never studied up to now)

• Resonant terms in
$$\mathcal{H}_{quad} \supset \cos\left(2\omega - q\sqrt{GM/a_3^3}t\right)$$

• Exchange of energy

• Radiation-reaction:
$$a(t) = a_0 \left(1 - \frac{t}{t_{\rm RR}}\right)^{1/4}$$

ISSUES IN RADIATIVE SECTOR



ISSUES IN RADIATIVE SECTOR



SUPPLEMENTARY SLIDE ON CROSS TERMS

