



## Searching for Gravitational Waves from Coalescing Binary Systems

#### Stephen Fairhurst

Cardiff University and LIGO Scientific Collaboration



twenty ten | 350 years of and beyond | excellence in science







## Outline

- Motivation
- Searching for Coalescing Binaries
- Latest Results and Future Prospects









Why a gravitational wave talk at Abhayfest?

- A search of Abhay's publication list reveals:
  - A. Ashtekar, J. Bicak, Bernd G. Schmidt, Behavior of Einstein-Rosen
    Waves at Null Infinity, Physical Review D 55, 687-694 (1997)
  - A. Ashtekar, Quantization of the Radiative Modes of the Gravitational Field, In: Quantum Gravity 2
  - A. Ashtekar and M. Streubel, Symplectic Geometry of Radiative Modes and Conseved Quantities at Null Infinity
- Sad to say, none of these are required reading for new GW PhD students
- However, Abhay has made a big contribution to the LSC...







The LSC search groups:

Stochastic Sources



- Continuous Waves



Coalescing Binaries



Unmodeled Burst Sources
 **??**





The LSC search groups - Abhay's contribution:

**Stochastic Sources** 



Joe Romano, "Geometrodynamics vs. Connection Dynamics"



Chris Van Den Broeck, "Black Holes and Neutron Stars: Fundamental and Phenomenological Issues"

**Continuous Waves** 



Badri Krishnan, "Isolated Horizons in Numerical Relativity" SF, "Isolated Horizons and Distorted BH"

**Unmodeled Burst Sources** •







#### Why a gravitational wave talk at Abhayfest?

#### • The Quantum Alternative?

#### U(1) polymer and fock representations

Abhay Ashtekar $^1$  , Stephen Fairhurst  $^{1,2}$   $\,$  and Amit Ghosh  $^1$ 

1. Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University University Park, PA 16802, USA and

> 2. Theoretical Physics Institute University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2J1, Canada







Why a gravitational wave talk at Abhayfest?

• The Quantum Alternative?

U(1) polymer and fock representations

Abhay Ashtekar $^1$  , Stephen Fairhurs<br/>t $^{1,2}$   $\,$  and Amit Ghosh  $^1$ 

1. Center for Gravitational Physics and Geometry Department of Physics, The Pennsylvania State University University Park, PA 16802, USA and

2. Theoretical Physics Institute University of Alberta Edmonton, Alberta T6G 2J1, Canada

I've moved 10,000 miles since the last edit







## Outline

- Motivation
- Searching for Coalescing Binaries
- Latest Results and Future Prospects









# Why search?

Many payoffs from observing GW from binaries:

- Determine the gravitational waveform emitted during merger
  - Compare with strong gravity predictions (numerical relativity)
  - Constrain Neutron Star equation of state.
- Perform "Multi-messenger Astronomy"
  - Determine if short  $\gamma$ -ray bursts have binary coalescence progenitor.
  - Perform joint observations with radio, optical, x-ray,  $\gamma$ -ray, neutrino, ...
- Tests of cosmology:
  - Independent measurement of distance (GW), redshift (EM)
- Test general relativity:
  - Bound the mass of the graviton.
  - Test alternative theories of gravity.







# Why search?

Many payoffs from observing GW from binaries:

- Determine the gravitational waveform emitted during the graveform e
  - Compare with strong gravity predictions (numerical relativity)
  - Constrain Neutron Star equation of st
- Perform "Multi-messenger Action on
  - Determine if short  $\gamma$ -ray better the beary coalescence progenitor.
  - Perform joint observations for reality, optical, x-ray, γ-ray, neutrino, ...
- Tests of cosmol cy
  - Independent e surement of distance (GW), redshift (EM)
- Test general statistic
  - Bound the mass of the graviton.
  - Test alternative theories of gravity.







#### The LIGO Detectors



#### Livingston, LA 4km detector "L1"

Hanford, WA 4km detector "H1" 2km detector "H2"









# LIGO Science Runs

- Five science runs, S1 - S5.
- S5:
  - at design sensitivity
  - from November 2005 to September 2007
  - 1 year of two site coincident data.









Virgo







#### How do we search?

- Gravitational waves are emitted as the binary inspirals.
- The waveform depends upon masses, spins, binary orientation.
- Inspiral waveform can be well modeled by post-Newtonian formalism.
- When the waveform is known, use matched filtering.









# Geometry of the parameter space

- Need to search a large parameter space
  - Binary components with mass from 1 to  $20 \ensuremath{M_{\odot}}$  (or higher)
  - Spins of the components
  - Sky location, orientation of the signal
- Facilitated by introducing a "metric" on the parameter space

$$\frac{\langle h(\mathbf{x})|h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{dx}) \rangle}{|h(\mathbf{x})||h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{dx})|} = 1 - g_{ab}(\mathbf{x})dx^a dx^b$$







# Template placement

- Need to cover the mass space, ensuring that for any point, no more than 3% of signal is lost
- Use metric for efficient placement of templates (Owen, Sathyaprakash)
- Difficult to place grid in higher dimensions
  - Use "random bank" (Harry, Allen, Sathyaprakash; ...)
  - Place initial points randomly, use metric to determine which to keep







## Life isn't Gaussian

• Time-frequency "Q-scans" showing excess power

**Inspiral Hardware Injection** 



Non-stationary time

0.5

25



- Reject false alarms by requiring event is seen at 2 locations with similar time and masses.
- Account for correlations
  between parameters by
  using metric.
  (Robinson, Sengupta, Sathyaprakash) \* 0.45







- We know how the SNR varies over parameter space for a true signal.
- Various tests developed to check if it does (Allen; Rodrigues; Hanna)
- Example: loudest surviving event in S1









## Outline

- Motivation
- Searching for Coalescing Binaries
- Latest Results and Future Prospects









# Results

- Data from the first 18 months of the S5 run have been analyzed (Abbott et. al. arXiv:0901.0302, 0905.3710)
  - Last 6 months being searched jointly with Virgo
- No GW candidates in the first 18 months of data
  - Set upper limits on the rate of binary coalescences (Brady, SF; Biswas, Brady, Creighton, SF)
  - Binary coalescence rate in a galaxy approximately follows star formation rate, or blue light luminosity
    - Quote results per L<sub>10</sub> per year;
    - 1  $L_{10} = 10^{10} L_{\odot,B}$ ; Milky Way ~ 1.7  $L_{10}$







# **Upper Limits**

- BNS rate < 1.4 x  $10^{-2} L_{10}^{-1} yr^{-1}$
- BBH rate < 7.3 x  $10^{-4} L_{10}^{-1} yr^{-1}$
- BHNS rate < 3.6 x  $10^{-3} L_{10}^{-1} yr^{-1}$ 
  - All rates quoted at 90% confidence
  - NS taken as 1.35  $M_{\odot};$  BH as 5.0  $M_{\odot}$
- These results are 1 to 2 orders of magnitude above optimistic astrophysical predictions, ~3 orders of magnitude above best estimates.







#### **GRB** searches

- Binary mergers are one candidate
  progenitor for short GRBs
- Search for GW around time of GRB 070201 (Abbott et. al. arXiv:0711.1163)
  - Exclude at 99% confidence that this is a merger in Andromeda
  - Gives weight to SGR scenario for this GRB
- Search around times of all 22 short GRBs during S5 data ongoing









#### **Future Prospects**

- Enhanced LIGO science run begins in 1 month
  - Hoping for factor of 2 improvement in sensitivity
  - Would increase search volume by almost an order of magnitude
- Advanced LIGO scheduled for 2014
  - Order of magnitude more sensitive than initial detector
  - Sensitive to 1000 times as large source volume









# **Future Prospects**

- Determine the gravitational waveform emitted during merger
  - Compare with strong gravity predictions (numerical relativity)
  - Constrain Neutron Star equation of state.
- Perform "Multi-messenger Astronomy"
  - Determine if short  $\gamma$ -ray bursts have binary coalescence progenitor.
  - Perform joint observations with radio, optical, x-ray,  $\gamma$ -ray, neutrino, ...
- Tests of cosmology:
  - Independent measurement of distance (GW), redshift (EM)
- Test general relativity:
  - Bound the mass of the graviton.
  - Test alternative theories of gravity.
- Test Quantum Gravity ??

