High spin NR and NR follow-up

Alex Vano-Vinuales



Cardiff University

Cardiff GW Group - O3 Retreat - 24th January 2019

Disclaimer

Most of the contents of this brief talk will not be related to O3.

Sorry

- Highly spinning black holes are out there.
- To detect them and measure their parameters correctly, models that include waveforms for large values of spins $\chi_i = S_i/m_i^2 \sim 1$ need to be developed.
- Simulating highly spinning binaries is difficult: complicated to create initial data and tricky to evolve.
- In [gr-qc] 1804.03704, these non-precessing SXS waveforms

•
$$q = 1.22, \chi_1 = 0.330, \chi_2 = -0.439$$
 (not high spin)

•
$$q = 1.3, \chi_1 = 0.961, \chi_2 = -0.899$$

•
$$q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.998, \chi_2 = 0.998$$
 (new)

•
$$q = 1, \chi_1 = -0.969, \chi_2 = -0.969$$
 (new)

were analyzed with LALInference: even when both spins are aligned, recovered spins are less extreme, spin priors disfavour large spins, need higher SNR.

SXS waveforms in open catalog

(Excision).

Spins above $\chi_i = 0.9$, non-precessing, included in LVC NR repository:

•
$$q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.96, \chi_2 = 0.96, SXS:BBH:0176$$

• $q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.99, \chi_2 = 0.99, SXS:BBH:0177$
• $q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.995, \chi_2 = 0.995, SXS:BBH:0178$
• $q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.98, \chi_2 = 0.98, SXS:BBH:0172$
• $q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.95, \chi_2 = 0.95, SXS:BBH:0157$
• $q = 1, \chi_1 = 0.97, \chi_2 = 0.97, SXS:BBH:0158$
• $q = 1, \chi_1 = -0.9498, \chi_2 = -0.9498, SXS:BBH:0156$
• $q = 1.31, \chi_1 = 0.9617, \chi_2 = -0.8997, SXS:BBH:0306$
• $q = 1.5, \chi_1 = 0.9910, \chi_{2x} = 0.1414, \chi_{2z} = 0.1414, precessing$

Question for Cardiff: put existing interesting waveforms in LVC NR repo or make new simulations in uncovered areas of parameter space?

RIT waveforms in open catalog

(Moving punctures). Spins above $\chi_i = 0.85$, non-precessing:

• $q = 1, \chi_1 = \chi_2 = 0.95$

•
$$q = 1, \chi_1 = \chi_2 = 0.9$$

- q = 1.33, $\chi_1 = \chi_2 = 0.95$
- q = 1.33, $\chi_1 = \chi_2 = -0.95$

•
$$q = 1.508, \chi_1 = 0.95, \chi_2 = -0.95$$

Create more $\chi_i > 0.9$ simulations to decrease extrapolation error.



Figures from [gr-qc] 1901.02553.

NR follow-up simulations - useful?

- Current models are expected to cover most events to be detected.
- However, PE results may correspond to a poorly described area of parameter space, or available models may give different results.
- Possibility to run simulations around the event, to improve coverage of existing models or to create a local model.
- Many aspects to take into account:
 - Number of waveforms
 - Distance in parameter space
 - Time needed for performing simulations
 - Time needed to create the model
 - Etc.
- Discussion: better leave computational resources for developing current models or use some for follow-ups? Related issues?