Enhancing confidence in the detection of gravitational waves from compact binaries via Bayesian model comparison
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We show that gravitational-wave signals from compact binary mergers may be better distinguished from instrumental noise transients using Bayesian model comparison, even when the signal power is below the usual threshold for detection. This method could reject the vast majority of noise transients, and therefore increase sensitivity to weak gravitational waves. We demonstrate this using simulated signals, as well as data for GW150914 and LVT151012. Finally, we explore ways of incorporating our method into existing Advanced LIGO and Virgo searches to make them significantly more powerful.

Introduction. A pair of neutron stars or black holes merges somewhere in the observable universe roughly every 15–200s, releasing large amounts of energy in the form of gravitational waves (GWs) [1–7]. One of the limiting factors in detecting such GWs with existing detectors, like Advanced LIGO (aLIGO) and Virgo [8, 9], is data contamination by instrumental noise transients (glitches) that may mimic astrophysical signals [10]. Glitches can lower the inferred statistical significance of GW signals, making their detection more difficult. In this Letter, we show how Bayesian model comparison may be used to address this problem by significantly improving our ability to distinguish genuine GW signals from glitches.

We demonstrate that Bayesian models—as proposed in [11]—may successfully distinguish real GWs from glitches by using the fact that the former must be coherent across detectors, while the latter will generally not be. Here, coherence means that a real GW must produce strain signals in different instruments that: (i) are coincident in time (up to a time-of-flight delay); (ii) are well-described by a compact-binary-coalescence (CBC) waveform; and (iii) share a phase evolution consistent with a single astrophysical source. In contrast, glitches should not be expected to fully satisfy these criteria. Making full use of this information—the expected coherence of signals and incoherence of glitches—may allow us to detect weaker signals than is currently possible.

From a subset of glitches and detection candidates (triggers) from aLIGO’s first observation run (O1), we find that: (a) the majority of glitches are significantly more incoherent than coherent across detectors, irrespective of their loudness or the detection significance assigned by one of the main detection pipelines; (b) simulated signals can be identified by their coherence, as long as they are distinguishable from Gaussian noise in at least two detectors; and finally, (c) the “gold-plated” detection GW150914 (detection significance > 5.1σ) [1] and the “silver-plated” candidate LVT151012 (detection significance ∼ 2.1σ) [3] are both significantly more coherent than incoherent. This implies that the Bayesian comparison of coherent and incoherent signal models has the potential to significantly improve the sensitivity of CBC searches.

Searches. Templated searches for transient gravitational waves work by constructing a ranking statistic based on matched filtering [12–17]. In order to make a statement about the statistical significance of a pair of time-coincident triggers, it is necessary to know the probability that a given event was produced by instrumental noise, rather than an actual GW. This likelihood may be estimated empirically from the value of the ranking statistic for a large representative set of triggers known with certainty to be spurious. Such a set of signal-free triggers is denoted background, in contrast to the foreground of candidates that may contain a signal.

Because detectors cannot be physically shielded from gravitational waves, ad hoc data analysis techniques must be used to estimate the background. One such strategy is to construct time slides by applying relative time offsets (longer than the light-travel time between sites) between the data of different detectors [16, 17]. Detection significance can then be inferred, in a frequentist way, by comparing the value of the ranking statistic for a time-coincident foreground trigger to that of time-slip background triggers. The rate at which background triggers are produced with a given value of the ranking statistic is usually referred to as the false-alarm rate (FAR).

Efficient signal detection requires a ranking statistic that extracts the most information from the data, in order to discriminate between noise and weak astrophysical signals. However, existing CBC searches are not optimal in this sense: they do not incorporate knowledge of all features that may distinguish GWs from noise. Moving towards an optimal statistic is a great challenge, but one large step is to demand that foreground triggers in two or more detectors should be better described as coherent gravitational-wave signals, rather than incoherent glitches. Importantly, it is not enough to provide some measure of
Coherence vs incoherence. To achieve this, we introduce the Bayesian coherence ratio (BCR): the odds between the hypothesis that the data comprise a coherent CBC signal plus Gaussian noise ($H_S$), vs that of incoherent instrumental features ($H_I$)—meaning either a glitch in Gaussian noise ($H_G$), or pure Gaussian noise ($H_N$) in each detector. For a network of $D$ detectors:

$$BCR = \frac{\alpha Z^S}{\prod_{i=1}^{D} [\beta Z^G_i + (1 - \beta) Z^N_i]} ,$$

where $Z^S$ is the evidence for $H_S$, and $Z^G_i$ and $Z^N$ are, respectively, the evidences for $H_G$ and $H_N$, in the $i^{th}$ detector. The arbitrary weights $\alpha$ and $\beta$ parametrize our prior belief in each model: $\alpha = P(H_S)/P(H_I)$ and $\beta = P(H_G) = 1 - P(H_S) - P(H_I)$ for all $i$ (see, e.g., Eq. (59) in [18]). These priors will be chosen to minimize overlap between the signal and noise trigger populations.

Evidences (marginalized likelihoods) are the conditional probability ($P$) of observing some data ($d$) given some hypothesis ($H$). For the coherent-signal hypothesis this is

$$Z^S = P(\{d_i\}_{i=1}^{D} | H_S) = \int p(\theta | H_S) p(\{d_i\}_{i=1}^{D} | \theta, H_S) d\theta .$$

The vector $\theta$ represents a point in the space of parameters that describe the CBC signal, such as the component masses and spins; the terms in the integrand are the prior, $p(\theta | H_S)$, and the multi-detector likelihood, $p(\{d_i\}_{i=1}^{D} | \theta, H_S) = \prod_{i=1}^{D} p(d_i | \theta, H_S)$. The specific functional form of the single-detector likelihood, $p(d_i | \theta)$, is derived from the statistical properties of the noise (e.g. a normal distribution for a Gaussian process). The integral is performed numerically using algorithms like nested sampling [19, 20].

Because of their inherently unpredictable nature, it is impossible to produce a template that $a$ priori captures all features of a glitch. Therefore, we define a surrogate glitch hypothesis by the presence of simultaneous, but incoherent, CBC-like signals in different detectors. Thus, for the $i^{th}$ detector, the glitch evidence is

$$Z^G_i = P(d_i | H_G) = \int p(\theta_i | H_G) p(d_i | \theta_i, H_G) d\theta_i ,$$

where now we allow a different set of signal parameters $\theta_i$ for each detector. We will set $p(\theta_i | H_G) = p(\theta_i | H_S)$ and $p(d_i | \theta_i, H_G) = p(d_i | \theta_i, H_S)$, but this may be relaxed to better capture specific glitch features, if necessary. The surrogate $H_G$ model captures the portion of glitches that lie within the manifold of CBC signals and, in a sense, corresponds to the worst possible glitch—one that looks exactly like coincident CBC signals. Variations of this strategy have been used before in the analysis of compact binary coalescences [11], minimally-modeled transients [21–23], and continuous waves [24–26].

Finally, because we assume a perfect measurement of the detector noise power-spectral-density (PSD), the Gaussian-noise evidence is just the usual null likelihood:

$$Z^N_i = P(d_i | H_N) = \mathcal{N}(d_i) ,$$

where $\mathcal{N}$ is a multidimensional normal distribution with zero mean and variance derived from the noise PSD.

**Analysis.** During O1, the two aLIGO detectors operated from September 12, 2015 to January 19, 2016. Ideally, we would like to compute the BCR for all triggers produced during this period to show that it can efficiently discriminate between glitches and CBC signals. However, computational limitations prevent this [27]. Instead, we pick a subset of 983 multi-detector background binary-black-hole triggers identified by PyCBC, one of the staple search pipelines [15–17, 28]. We pick the background triggers by sampling from the full trigger-set uniformly in the log of the inverse-FAR (IFAR $\equiv 1/FAR$) for IFARs in $[5 \times 10^{-5}, 10^6]$ yr, which is the total range reported by the pipeline. This sampling allows us to analyze common (low IFAR) and rare (high IFAR) background events.

To compute the evidences making up the BCR, Eq. (1), we run the nested-sampling algorithm implemented in the LALInference library on 4s-long data segments containing each trigger [20, 29]. Given the large number of triggers involved, this would not be feasible without the
reduction in the computational cost of Bayesian inference provided by reduced order quadrature (ROQ) methods (see, e.g., [30]).

Templates are produced using IMRPhenomP, a standard waveform family [30–33]. We restrict the priors on the masses such that we only consider signals that are less than 4s in duration, resulting in a chirp-mass range of $12.3M_\odot \leq M \leq 44.7M_\odot$. We further restrict the mass ratio to lie within $1 \leq q \leq 8$. The dimensionless spin magnitudes are taken to be within $[0, 0.89]$, and we consider all spin angles. The prior on luminosity distance assigns probability uniformly in volume, with an upper cutoff of 5 Gpc. These priors, as well as the priors for all other parameters, follow the default for standard LALInference analyses with ROQ [20, 30]. The PSD used for matched filtering is calculated using the BayesWave algorithm [34, 35].

The search that originally produced our set of triggers considered a wider range of masses and spins than we do in the BCR computation for the purpose of this demonstration. To accommodate this, we prescreened the background to only allow triggers with masses within our priors. It would be straightforward in principle to broaden our constraints to encompass all triggers produced by the pipelines. However, we refrain from doing so to keep our computational costs manageable. Our preliminary analyses of slightly longer triggers (8s, 16s and 32s) yield results qualitatively similar to those presented below.

We compare the BCRs from our background selection to several foreground triggers. The foreground includes eight hardware injections, which were performed by physically actuating the test masses of the detectors to simulate signals similar to GW150914 [36]. We also analyze a set of 648 software injections: simulated signals inserted in O1 data, with arbitrary sky location and orientation, and with masses and spins that span our priors (in particular, the luminosity distance distribution is uniform in volume with cutoff at 2.5 Gpc). On top of these artificial triggers, we also compute the BCR for GW150914 [1] and LVT151012 [3]. The freedom provided by the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ parameters in Eq. (1) may be used to minimize the overlap between the simulated-signal and background distributions; the results below correspond to values of $\alpha = 10^{-6}$ and $\beta = 10^{-4}$, but may be adjusted in future analyses.

Results. Fig. 1 shows the BCR distributions obtained for background triggers and software injections. The figure also displays the values obtained for GW150914, LVT151012 and hardware injections, all of which show much stronger evidence for being coherent CBC signals, rather than incoherent glitches (high BCR). We find a clear separation between software and hardware injections, and background events, suggesting that the BCR is good at distinguishing CBC signals from glitches. If we consider the intrinsic probabilistic meaning of the BCR, a value of log BCR $< 0$ indicates a preference for the instrumental-artifact hypothesis ($H_I$) over the coherent-signal one ($H_S$). As expected, the vast majority (98%) of background triggers fall below this mark, while the opposite is true for injections. GW150914 and LVT151012 yield log BCR values of 8.5 and 3.8 respectively.

Fig. 2 shows the same populations from Fig. 1, plotted also as a function of the network signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) recovered by our coherent Bayesian analysis. Fig. 2 reveals that the BCR values of the signal population are correlated with SNR, which reflects the fact that we are better able to evaluate the coherence of signals that stand clearly above the noise floor. As a result, the separation between our signal and glitch populations improves with SNR. Because this population of background triggers was purposely selected to be uniform in log-IFAR, the gray contours in Fig. 2 should not be taken to be representative of the actual glitch distribution: this would include vastly more low-SNR triggers. In any case, BCR seems to be largely independent of SNR for background triggers.

There are three software injections with SNR $> 12$, but BCR $< 1$. This is due to two facts that make the noise
be to run existing CBC pipelines as usual, with an extra search strategies and help increase their sensitivity from glitches, the BCR may supplement detection confidence for marginal events like LVT151012. Irrespective of its Bayesian interpretation, we may treat the BCR as a traditional detection statistic to obtain a frequentist estimate of the significance of any given foreground event based on the measured background (e.g. a p-value, or better, a likelihood ratio). Again, our background triggers were selected to represent common and rare events in equal numbers, so the distribution in Fig. 1 need not be the same as that of the whole background and should not be used for this purpose. However, as shown in Fig. 3, we find that there is no evidence for strong correlation between BCR and the IFAR assigned by the detection pipeline. This suggests that the background BCR distribution shown in Fig. 1 might indeed be representative of the whole. Furthermore, Fig. 3 implies that the BCR may be used to more easily reject incoherent glitches, irrespective of IFAR, and thus increase our detection confidence for marginal events like LVT151012.

**Future implementation.** Given its ability to separate signals from glitches, the BCR may supplement existing search strategies and help increase their sensitivity. The most straightforward way to achieve this would be to run existing CBC pipelines as usual, with an extra threshold on BCR (e.g. discarding any triggers with, say, BCR < 1). Our results suggest that this would be an efficient way of discarding the vast majority of instrumental artifacts, thereby increasing detection confidence of real signals [37].

Computational costs would currently preclude obtaining BCRs for all triggers (foreground and background) produced during a regular observation run, so this extra step would have to be reserved for the most significant ones, as determined by the main pipeline. However, processing all triggers would have the added advantage of potentially enabling the detection of weak GW events that would otherwise be missed (e.g. low-IFAR, but high-BCR, injections in Fig. 3). In the future, this would also enable us to move beyond a simple BCR veto, and instead use large numbers of simulated signals and background events to define empirical probability distributions over a space of multiple figures of merit (e.g. BCR and SNR, as in Fig. 2). This could be used to obtain likelihood ratios to categorize a trigger as signal or noise, which can be shown to be an optimal strategy for classification problems such as this, and have been used successfully by some existing searches [13, 14, 21]. Future improvements in ROQ methods, like their implementation on graphical processing units, will be vital in making this possible.

The values of the α and β weights in Eq. (1) have a strong effect on the shape of the distributions of Fig. 2. While here we have set them to values that yield a good separation between the signal and background populations, future studies may systematically optimize these parameters using a more comprehensive set of software injections and a large, representative set of background triggers. This may be achieved via any standard optimization scheme that attempts to minimize the overlap between the two populations. The values would, of course, be fixed before analyzing foreground data.

**Conclusion.** We have demonstrated that Bayesian models based on the coherence of GW triggers across detectors may successfully distinguish between real CBC signals and transient instrumental noise (Figs. 1 and 2). We introduced a specific figure of merit, the BCR, which responds to incoherent glitches in a way that is complementary to that of standard CBC pipelines (Fig. 3). Finally, we suggested a few avenues for incorporating this (or similar) measure of coherence into existing GW search strategies, the simplest of which would take the form of a new veto for detection candidates.

Versions of the ranking statistic used by PyCBC in recent analyses have incorporated some measure of coherence [15], and it remains to be seen whether this introduces some correlation between BCR and IFAR in Fig. 3. Furthermore, while this study focused on detection candidates produced by the two aLIGO detectors during O1, we are currently investigating how the power of the BCR is affected by the addition of new detectors, like Virgo. Finally, although here we focused on short-duration (4s) triggers from high-mass binary-black-hole mergers, our
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preliminary results on slightly longer (8s, 16s and 32s) show qualitatively similar behavior.

Acknowledgements. We thank Alan Weinstein, Alex Nitz, Carl-Johan Haster, Stefan Hild, Reed Essick, Colm Talbot, Eric Thrane, John Veitch and Thomas Dent for helpful comments. Rory Smith is supported by the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Gravitational Wave Discovery (OzGrav), through project number CE170100004. The authors thank the LIGO Scientific Collaboration for access to the data and gratefully acknowledge the support of the United States National Science Foundation (NSF) for the construction and operation of the LIGO Laboratory and Advanced LIGO (PHY-0757058), as well as the Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) of the United Kingdom, and the Max-Planck-Society (MPS) for support of the construction of Advanced LIGO. Additional support for Advanced LIGO was provided by the Australian Research Council. This manuscript has LIGO Document ID LIGO-P1700414.