General Relativity: when heavy stars run out of fuel, nothing can halt their gravitational collapse to a black hole.

Our aim: understand observational signatures of merging BH binaries, required to identify such events in gravitational wave observations.
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The Dark Universe

• Black holes have taken center stage in astrophysics & fundamental physics.
  
  • Extraordinarily clean systems, described by their mass $M$ and spin $\chi = \frac{|\vec{J}|}{M^2}$
  
  • Allow precision astrophysics and fundamental physics:
    • life cycle of stars
    • supermassive black holes in galaxy cores
    • testing general relativity - find new physics?
    • direct observation?

• Electromagnetic waves taught us what we know about the universe. Superposition of waves from many particles
  • $\rightarrow$ image of the source.

• Electromagnetic spectrum is blind to some of the most violent and exotic objects in the universe.
Gravitational Waves

• Spacetime in general relativity is a deformable entity, ripples in spacetime travel at the speed of light and carry with the information on their source.

• Close binary systems of BH/NS are most efficient sources of gravitational waves.

• GW signal carries information about the bulk motion of objects: analogous to hearing sound.

  • “soundtrack of the universe”

• GW signal encodes masses, spins, eccentricity of binary & possibly new physics - needs to be decoded.
Since first LIGO science run in 2002 upper limits have been set, but no direct detection, LIGO-Virgo Scientific collaboration has grown to ~1000 scientists.

- Computational challenge 1: Searches for BH merger events are based on “matched filtering” with template waveforms.

- Computational challenge 2: “template banks” need to be computed in general relativity - Inaccurate templates: lose events & incorrectly identify them (masses & spins of a binary, identification as BH or NS).
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• Inspiral: energy loss to GWs leads to adiabatic inspiral, well described by post-Newtonian perturbation theory.

• Late inspiral & merger: post-Newtonian expansion breaks
  • solve full Einstein equations numerically as PDEs, “match” to post-Newtonian inspiral.
  • Most of the energy released (< 12 % of the mass).

• Ringdown: superposition of damped harmonics, frequencies known from perturbation theory.
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- **Inspiral**: Energy loss to GWs leads to adiabatic inspiral, well described by post-Newtonian perturbation theory.

- **Late inspiral & merger**: Post-Newtonian expansion breaks
  - solve full Einstein equations numerically as PDEs, “match” to post-Newtonian inspiral.
  - Most of the energy released (< 12% of the mass).

- **Ringdown**: Superposition of damped harmonics, frequencies known from perturbation theory.
Solving the Einstein equations

- Einstein equations describe geometry of spacetime, not fields on a fixed spacetime -> technical problems took 4 decades to solve for 2-body problem.

- EE can be viewed as 10 coupled nonlinear wave equations (hyperbolic) plus elliptic constraint equations (solved initially, then just monitored).

- We evolve BSSNOK version: 24 evolution equations + monitor 9 constraints.
  - 1000s of terms, hard to optimize for compiler.

- Einstein equations form singularities hidden inside BHs, not shocks -> use 6-8th oder finite differencing. More efficient, but less robust: spectral.
Scales and mesh refinement

• BH binaries have several length & time scales:
  • individual BHs (most compact objects)
  • resolution around BHs determines accuracy of tracking orbital phase
  • “recipe” to configure box sizes
  • orbital scale: typically start at separations > 15 km M/Msun

• wave scale frequency increases ~ factor of 10
• $1/distance^n$ background falloff

• ambiguity in boundary conditions:
  • causally isolate boundaries
  • -> 1000s of km M/Msun
Project History & Strategy

- 2006: Uni Jena + 1 million hours from DECI LRZ/HLRB-II + MPI Hannover/Potsdam

- phenomenological waveform program: analytical waveform models in the frequency domain
  - make use of degeneracies and hierarchy in 7D parameter space
  - robust finite difference code to explore parameter space
- 43 publications
- 16.7 + 37 million hours in PRACE 3+5, waiting for current evaluation
  - need hundreds of cases @ $10^4 - 10^6$ CPU hours to ensure detection and parameter estimation ~100s of million of CPU hours.
  - High throughput for many independent simulations at hundreds of cores.
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Competing project: SXS collaboration Calibration of Effective-One-Body models in time domain with long simulations, use spectral code.

- High throughput for many independent simulations at hundreds of cores.
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Code infrastructure

- Use 2 codes, use MPI and OpenMP domain decomposition parallelization:
  - BAM (developed originally at Uni Jena, C) - used for most production runs
  - Einstein toolkit (open source, C, C++, F90) - very active development
  - performance & scaling very similar

- Use explicit Runge-Kutta time-stepping: time step limited by Courant condition
  - Use ghost-point based variant of Berger-Oliger to refine temporal and spatial resolution.

- Outer grids dominate memory requirements, innermost grids speed.

- Checkpointing: longest simulation ran ~ 4 months.

- Run on the minimal number of cores for the problem, use available memory/core.

Figure 2. Results from weak scaling tests evolving the Einstein equations on a refinement grid structure with nine levels. This shows the time required per grid point in a logarithmic-logarithmic plot (the ideal scaling is shown as a straight line).
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Simulations performed & Job-bundling strategy

- PRACE-5: calibrate non-precessing model up to mass ratio 18, 37 million hours
- 12 high mass ratio cases: most expensive BH-simulations we are aware of > $10^6$ hours.
- Prepare large scale precessing study.
- Bundle several cases into bigger jobs, possibly reconfigure after each checkpoint.
- Monitor throughput, queue times, manage job chaining etc. with cron.
- LRZ provided workaround for bug in IBM parallel environment:
  - https://www.lrz.de/services/compute/supermuc/loadleveler/special/index.html#subjobs-intel
- Used > 20 million hours during last ~4 months of allocation.

![Graph showing job sizes and run times]
The Challenge of Precession

- Spins parallel to orbital angular momentum: no precession, orbital plane preserved.

- Orbital angular momentum and individual spins slowly precess around total angular momentum.
A path toward understanding precession

- In a co-rotating frame the phasing and radiated angular momentum are essentially unaffected by precession - “simple standard form” of a precessing WF: align z-axis with principal axis of the radiation quadrupole moment [Schmidt+ PRD 2011]

- Spherical harmonic mode structure in standard frame corresponds to non-precessing case -> “twisting up” accurate aligned spin model with “post-Newtonian” Euler angles works well [Schmidt+ PRD 2012, Hannam+ PRL 2013]
Fitting factors: Models vs. PN-NR-hybrids

FF ~ detection efficiency: 0.97 standard detection limit

\[ \langle h_1, h_2 \rangle = \max_{\phi_0, t_0} 4\Re \int_{f_1}^{f_2} \frac{\tilde{h}_1(f) \tilde{h}_2^*(f)}{S_n(f)} \, df \]

- PhenomC: nonprecessing model
- PhenomP: PhenomC twisted up with PN

• Future: need to calibrate merger/ringdown to actual precessing NR waveforms.
Understanding the significance of subdominant modes

• Learned how to systematically glue post-Newtonian and numerical relativity data for general spherical harmonic modes.

• Understand where in parameter space higher modes are important when neglecting spin, starting to analyze general spinning case.
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PhenomD - Phenom re-imagined

- Currently used in GW data analysis: PhenomA/B/C/P
  - calibrated to $m_1/m_2=4$, moderate spins
  - want $|\text{spins}| \sim 1$, $m_1/m_2 \sim 100$
  - good for detection, parameter estimation “toy models”

Based on non-precessing equal spin SXS & BAM simulations up to $q=18$. 
Raw data for modelling

- Dominant spherical harmonic only: $l=2, |m|=2$
- Frequency domain amplitude & phase
- Model rescaled amplitude & phase derivative
Phenomenological parameter fits

Example: merger/ringdown:

\[ h_{MR} = \frac{ae^{-\lambda(f-f_{\text{ring}})}}{f_{\text{damp}}^2 + (f - f_{\text{ring}})^2} \]

\[ \Phi'_{MR} = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 f^{-2} + \alpha_3 f^{-1/4} + \frac{\alpha_4 f_{\text{damp}}}{f_{\text{damp}}^2 + (f - f_{\text{ring}})^2} \]

Total: 2 x 8-10 parameters as functions of \((\eta, \chi_{\text{eff}})\)

\[ \eta = \frac{m_1 m_2}{(m_1 + m_2)^2}, \quad \chi_{\text{eff}} = \frac{m_1 \chi_1 + m_2 \chi_2}{m_1 + m_2} - \frac{76}{113} \frac{1}{2} (\chi_1 + \chi_2) \eta \]


- Polynomial fit
- Rational function fit
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Need more high spin data points
How well does this work: waveforms

\[ q=8, \ S=0.8 \]

\[ d\Phi(f) = \frac{\Phi(f)}{df} \]

q4, no spin, 2x BAM + SXS
Matches vs. hybrids & between models


FIG. 16. The match TaylorF2 and TaylorT4 approximants, with 3.5PN spin-orbit and 3.0PN spin-orbit tail corrections, is shown as a function of the spin of the black hole and the mass ratio. The approximants include only the known spin terms in 2.5PN. Matches are calculated using a 30Hz lower frequency to approximate the sensitivity of the early aLIGO detector. It

PhenD vs. SEOBNRv2
Conclusions

• Systematic study of highest mass ratio spinning BH mergers to date.

• Calibrated most accurate dominant mode non-precessing model to date.
  
  • Model accuracy drops significantly when BHs have large positive spins, astrophysical likely & “louder”.

  • —> further need for refinement

• Developed a plan to conquer precessing spin space.
  
  • supported by ERC Consolidating grant to Mark Hannam.

  • Technically ready to run 100s of precessing cases.

• Advanced GW detectors ready for first observing run 09/2015, 6-month run in 2016.
  
  • Follow up simulations in 2017?
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