

## Constraining Black Hole Populations in Globular Clusters using Microlensing: Application to Omega Centauri

JOHN ZARIS,<sup>1</sup> DOĞA VESKE,<sup>1</sup> JOHAN SAMSING,<sup>2</sup> ZSUZSA MÁRKA,<sup>3</sup> IMRE BARTOS,<sup>4</sup> AND SZABOLCS MÁRKA<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Columbia University in the City of New York, 550 W 120th St., New York, NY 10027, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Niels Bohr International Academy, The Niels Bohr Institute, Blegdamsvej 17, DK-2100, Copenhagen, Denmark*

<sup>3</sup>*Columbia Astrophysics Laboratory, Columbia University in the City of New York, 550 W 120th St., New York, NY 10027, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Florida, PO Box 118440, Gainesville, FL 32611-8440, USA*

### ABSTRACT

We estimate the rate of gravitational microlensing events of cluster stars due to black holes (BHs) in the globular cluster NGC 5139 ( $\omega Cen$ ). Theory and observations both indicate that  $\omega Cen$  contains thousands of BHs, but their mass spectrum and exact distribution are not well constrained. In this Letter we show that one is able to observe microlensing events on a timescale of years in  $\omega Cen$ , and such an event sample can be used to infer the BH distribution. Direct detection of BHs will, in the near future, play a major role in distinguishing binary BH merger channels. Here we explore how gravitational microlensing can be used to put constraints on BH populations in globular clusters.

*Keywords:* Black holes (162) — Globular star clusters (656) — Gravitational microlensing (672)

### 1. INTRODUCTION

The detection of gravitational waves (GWs) by Advanced LIGO (Aasi et al. 2015) and Advanced Virgo (Acernese et al. 2014) has confirmed the existence of merging binary black holes (BBHs) (Abbott et al. 2016a,b,c, 2017a,b; Zackay et al. 2019; Venumadhav et al. 2019). However, there is limited evidence to explain how and where this observed BBH population forms in our universe. The growing list of proposed formation channels includes field binaries (Dominik et al. 2012; Belczynski et al. 2016; Silsbee & Tremaine 2017; Murguia-Berthier et al. 2017; Rodriguez & Antonini 2018; Schröder et al. 2018), active galactic nuclei discs (Bartos et al. 2017; Stone et al. 2017; McKernan et al. 2017; Yang et al. 2019), galactic nuclei (O’Leary et al. 2009; Hong & Lee 2015; VanLandingham et al. 2016; Antonini & Rasio 2016; Stephan et al. 2016; Hamers et al. 2018), and dynamical assembly in globular clusters (GCs) (Portegies Zwart & McMillan 2000; Banerjee et al. 2010; Rodriguez et al. 2016a; Askar et al. 2017; Park et al. 2017; Antonini & Gieles 2019). In this work we study methods to constrain the BH population in GCs independently of GW observations.

Theory and observations indicate that individual GCs are able to retain a large fraction of their initial BH population, depending on their mass and dynamical history (e.g. Morscher et al. 2015; Rodriguez et al. 2016a; Askar et al. 2018; Kremer et al. 2018; Zocchi et al. 2019; Weatherford et al. 2019). One way of probing this population is through GW observations; but distinguishing BBHs mergers assembled in GCs from those formed through other channels has been shown to be difficult. Using inferred distributions of BH spins (e.g. Rodriguez et al. 2016b), masses (e.g. Zevin et al. 2017), and orbital eccentricities (e.g. Gültekin et al. 2006; Samsing et al. 2014; Samsing & Ramirez-Ruiz 2017; Samsing & Ilan 2018; Samsing et al. 2018b; Samsing & Ilan 2019; Samsing 2018; Samsing et al. 2018a; Zevin et al. 2019; Samsing et al. 2019; Romero-Shaw et al. 2019) from GW observations is possible; but gives only an indirect and statistical measure of the contribution of GC BBHs to the set of observed BBH mergers.

In this Letter, we explore the possibility of directly constraining the BH population of GCs located in the Milky Way (MW) through their gravitational lensing effects (e.g. Udalski et al. 1994; Paczynski 1994; Bennett et al. 2002). If BHs populate the core of GCs, then they will occasionally gravitationally lens and magnify the background cluster stars, an effect known as microlensing (e.g. Paczynski 1986).

Previous microlensing studies have investigated several types of lens-source systems. For example, research has been conducted on the lensing of galactic center stars by GC stars (Paczynski 1994; Pietrukowicz et al. 2012), planetary mass objects (Sahu et al. 2001) and dark matter (Jetzer et al. 1998), and the lensing of GC stars by galactic compact dark matter (Rhoads & Malhotra 1998) and intermediate-mass BHs theorized to inhabit GCs (Safonova & Stalin 2010).

In this work, we study the microlensing of GC stars by stellar-mass GC BHs, focusing our attention on the massive GC  $\omega Cen$ . Recent studies indicate that a BH population with total mass  $\sim 10^5 M_\odot$  is likely to occupy the core of  $\omega Cen$  (Zocchi et al. 2019), which makes this cluster a particularly interesting candidate to monitor in current and future surveys. Using both analytical and numerical techniques we illustrate that an observable microlensing rate  $\sim 1 yr^{-1}$  is expected for  $\omega Cen$  and investigate how this rate depends on the properties of the BH population. Any detection or non-detection can therefore be used constrain the current BH distribution in  $\omega Cen$ . This, in turn, can help determine the degree to which GCs contribute to the observed BBH merger rate.

The Letter is structured as follows. We begin in Section 2 by applying microlensing theory to the case of a GC, from which we derive an order-of-magnitude estimate for the lensing rate in  $\omega Cen$ . In Section 3 we improve on our rate estimate using a more sophisticated Monte-Carlo (MC) technique, where we take into account the observed stellar profile of  $\omega Cen$ . We conclude our study in Section 4.

## 2. LENSING THEORY AND TOY MODEL

Here, we first review the standard lensing equations (e.g. Paczynski 1986), which we then use to derive an approximate but closed form expression for the rate of stellar microlensing by BHs in GCs. This expression provides general insight into how the microlensing rate depends on properties such as the mass and velocity dispersion of both the BH and star distributions.


When a lensing object (the BH) passes near the line of sight (l.o.s) from an observer to a source (the star), the source will appear magnified in the observer's frame by a factor

$$\mu = \frac{\alpha^2 + 2}{\alpha(\alpha^2 + 4)^{1/2}} \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the rescaled angular impact parameter defined by

$$\alpha = \beta/\theta_E \quad (2)$$

In this equation,  $\beta$  is the angular distance between the lensed star and the BH, and  $\theta_E$  is the angular Einstein



**Figure 1.** Illustration of the lensing setup described in Section 2. The illustration shows two planes; the source plane (*S-Plane*), which here is populated with stars (*orange dots*), and the lensing plane (*L-Plane*), which is populated with BHs (*black dots*). The observer is located to the right at a distance  $D_L$  and  $D_S$  to the L-Plane and S-Plane, respectively. The rate at which stars in the S-Plane cross the Einstein ring (*grey circle* in the S-Plane with radius  $R_S$ ) is linked to the observable microlensing rate, as further described in Section 2.

radius defined by

$$\theta_E = \sqrt{\frac{4Gm_{BH}}{c^2} \frac{D_S - D_L}{D_S D_L}} \quad (3)$$

where  $D_S$  and  $D_L$  are the distances from the observer to the lensed star and to the BH, respectively,  $m_{BH}$  is the mass of the lensing BH,  $G$  is Newton's gravitational constant, and  $c$  is the speed of light. Figure 1 illustrates this setup.

Using these equations, we now derive an expression for the rate of microlensing in a GC consisting of stars and BHs. We begin by calculating the rate at which stars located in the source-plane (S-plane) cross the Einstein ring of a given BH located in the lens-plane (L-plane), where the radii of the Einstein rings in the L-plane and the S-plane are given by  $R_L \approx D_L \theta_E$  and  $R_S \approx D_S \theta_E$ , respectively. Defining  $r$  as the distance between the two planes, it follows that the rate at which stars in the S-plane from  $r$  to  $r + dr$  pass through the Einstein ring is given by

$$d\Gamma \approx 2n(r)R_S w dr \quad (4)$$

where  $n(r)$  is the density of stars in the S-plane at distance  $r$ , and  $w$  is the velocity dispersion of the stars relative to the Einstein ring in the S-plane. Note here that we have ignored the curvature of the S-plane, which is

a valid approximation as  $\theta_E \ll 1$ . The relative velocity dispersion can be expressed as  $w^2 = v_S^2 + (D_S/D_L)^2 u_L^2$ , where  $v_S$  is the velocity dispersion of the stars in the S-plane and  $u_L$  is the velocity dispersion of the lensing BHs in the L-plane. Since  $D_L \gg r$  we have that  $R_S \approx R_L$ , and  $w^2 \approx v_S^2 + u_L^2 \approx u_L^2$ , where the last approximation is accurate within a factor of unity depending on the stellar velocity profile, and on the degree to which the BHs are in energy equipartition with the stars (e.g. [Kocsis et al. 2006](#); [Trenti & van der Marel 2013](#)). Generally, the BHs are located near the center of the GC as they are individually much heavier than the stars. Therefore, their velocity dispersion is  $u_L \approx v_0$ , where  $v_0$  is the central value. With these approximations, the differential microlensing rate per BH lens can be written as,

$$d\Gamma \approx 2n(r)D_L\theta_E v_0 dr \quad (5)$$

Expressing the Einstein angle as  $\theta_E = \sqrt{2\mathcal{R}r/D_L^2}$ , where  $\mathcal{R}$  is the Schwarzschild radius of a BH with mass  $m_{\text{BH}}$ , Eq. (5) can also be written as  $d\Gamma = \sqrt{8}n(r)\sqrt{\mathcal{R}}\sqrt{r}v_0 dr$ . This is the rate for stars in an infinitesimally thin slab located at a distance  $(r, r + dr)$  from the L-plane, assuming one BH. Therefore, the total rate for a GC with  $N_{\text{BH}}$  BHs is given by

$$\Gamma \approx \sqrt{8}N_{\text{BH}}n_0\mathcal{R}^2v_0 \left(\frac{R_{\text{GC}}}{\mathcal{R}}\right)^{3/2} \int n'\sqrt{r'}dr' \quad (6)$$

where  $n' = n/n_0$  is the stellar density scaled by the cluster's central value,  $R_{\text{GC}}$  is the radius of the cluster core,  $r' = r/R_{\text{GC}}$ , and we have assumed that the BHs cluster in the center. As seen, in this simple model we find that  $\Gamma \propto N_{\text{BH}}m_{\text{BH}}^{1/2} \propto (N_{\text{BH}}m_{\text{BH}})m_{\text{BH}}^{-1/2}$ . Therefore, if the number of BHs is kept fixed  $\Gamma \propto m_{\text{BH}}^{1/2}$ , whereas if the total mass of BHs is kept fixed  $\Gamma \propto m_{\text{BH}}^{-1/2}$ .

We can now use Eq. (6) to provide an estimate for the rate of microlensing events in  $\omega\text{Cen}$ . For this we take  $N_{\text{BH}} = 10^4$ ,  $n_0 = 2 \times 10^4 \text{pc}^{-3}$ ,  $m_{\text{BH}} = 10M_\odot$ ,  $v_0 = 25 \text{km s}^{-1}$ ,  $R_{\text{GC}} = 3.25 \text{pc}$  ([Zocchi et al. 2019](#)), the observable threshold of  $\mu$  to be  $\mu_{\text{obs}} = 1.01$  ([Bellini et al. 2017](#)),  $\int n'\sqrt{r'}dr' = 1$  (this integral is  $\approx 1$  for most relevant astrophysical profiles), and find  $\Gamma \approx 0.3 \text{yr}^{-1}$ . This rate is promising and serves as our motivation for exploring this problem in greater detail. We continue below with a more accurate numerical approach.

### 3. LENSING RATE FOR OMEGA CENTAURI

Having motivated our lensing study of  $\omega\text{Cen}$  in Section 2 using analytical arguments, we now move on to a more accurate model using MC techniques. Below, we first describe our model of the stars and BHs in  $\omega\text{Cen}$ , after which we present our MC approach and corresponding results.

#### 3.1. Cluster Model

Studies of stellar kinematics hint that  $\omega\text{Cen}$  is likely to harbor a population of BHs with a total mass of  $\sim 10^5 M_\odot$  ([Zocchi et al. 2019](#)); however, the BH mass spectrum and distribution are not well constrained. Therefore, to keep our study as model-independent as possible, we adopt the simple ‘energy equipartition’ model from [Kocsis et al. \(2006\)](#) to describe the radial position and velocity distributions of the BHs, although we note that GCs likely never acquire perfect equipartition (e.g. [Trenti & van der Marel 2013](#)). In addition, we focus on modeling the microlensing rate from a BH population with a single mass  $m_{\text{BH}}$  to isolate the mass dependence on our results. Following [Kocsis et al. \(2006\)](#), the BHs uniformly distribute within a sphere of radius

$$R_{\text{BH}} = R_{\text{GC}}\sqrt{\langle m \rangle / m_{\text{BH}}} \quad (7)$$

with a corresponding velocity dispersion of

$$\sigma_{\text{BH}} = \sigma_{\text{GC}}\sqrt{\langle m \rangle / m_{\text{BH}}} \quad (8)$$


where  $\sigma_{\text{GC}} \approx \sqrt{(3/5)GM_{\text{GC}}/R_{\text{GC}}}$ ,  $M_{\text{GC}}$  and  $R_{\text{GC}}$  are the mass and radius of the cluster core, respectively, and  $\langle m \rangle$  is the mean mass of the GC objects (stars + BHs).

In contrast to the BH population, the stellar distribution in  $\omega\text{Cen}$  is well constrained from observations. In this study we use the inferred stellar density and velocity dispersion profiles from [D’Souza & Rix \(2013\)](#) and [Sollima et al. \(2009\)](#), respectively, and assume the total core mass of  $\omega\text{Cen}$  is  $M_{\text{GC}} = 5 \times 10^5 M_\odot$ .

#### 3.2. Monte Carlo method

With the two distribution models for the BHs and stars presented above, we are now in a position to derive the expected microlensing rate for  $\omega\text{Cen}$ . For this, we developed a MC code that operates in the following way.

We first generate a BH assuming that it follows a circular orbit around the center of the core. The inclination angle of the orbit with respect to the l.o.s is randomized uniformly while the orbital radius and velocity are chosen according to Eqs. (7) and (8), respectively. Next, we generate a star whose position and velocity are chosen from the observationally inferred radial density and velocity dispersion profiles, as described in Section 3.1. At each timestep in the BH’s orbit, we then estimate the microlensing magnification  $\mu$  of the star and store its maximum value,  $\mu_{\text{max}}$ . This entire process is repeated until a representative sample of star and BH pairs has been simulated. The final rate can then be calculated by counting the total number of microlensing events per unit time with  $\mu_{\text{max}} > \mu_{\text{obs}}$ , where  $\mu_{\text{obs}}$  is the observational threshold.



**Figure 2.** Event rates of cluster stars being microlensed by a corresponding population of cluster BHs in  $\omega Cen$ . The shown rates are estimated using MC techniques as described in Section 3.2, where the stars and BHs are distributed according to the models outlined in Section 3.1. The *green*, *orange*, and *red* lines show results for BH distributions with a radial size of  $\{1/2, 1, 2\} \times R_{BH}$  from Eq. (7), respectively. The *solid* and *dashed* lines show results for when the total number,  $N_{BH}$ , and total mass,  $M_{BH}$ , of the BHs are held fixed at  $N_{BH} = 10^4$  and  $M_{BH} = 10^5 M_{\odot}$ , respectively. Results are discussed in Section 3.3.

### 3.3. Results

Microlensing rates for  $\omega Cen$  derived using our MC simulations described in the above sections 3.1 and 3.2 are shown in Fig. 2. The solid and dashed lines show results for when the total number,  $N_{BH}$ , and total mass,  $M_{BH}$ , of the BHs are held fixed, respectively. To illustrate the dependence of our results on the uncertain scale of the radial distribution of the BHs,  $R_{BH}$ , we further show, in colored lines, results for when  $R_{BH}$  is varied by a factor of 2 from its fiducial value given by Eq. (7). For all simulations we assume an observational microlensing threshold of  $\mu_{obs} = 1.01$ , as suggested by Bellini et al. (2017), and a total of  $3 \times 10^6$  visible stars.

As seen, our numerical results indicate that the expected microlensing rate is in the range  $0.1 - 1 \text{ yr}^{-1}$  for  $\omega Cen$ , which is in good agreement with our analytical results from Section 2. For the constant BH number scenario the rate increases slightly faster than  $m_{BH}^{1/2}$ , and for the constant total BH mass scenario it decreases slower than  $m_{BH}^{-1/2}$ . These behaviors can be explained by the localization of the massive BHs closer to the cluster’s center where the star density and, consequently, lensing rate are higher.

## 4. DISCUSSION

Is there a significant population of BHs currently residing in GCs throughout our local volume? That is one

of the current major questions in the rising field of GW astrophysics, where merging BHs, but not their origins, are directly observed. As suggested by both theory (e.g. Morscher et al. 2015; Rodriguez et al. 2016a) and observations (e.g. Askar et al. 2018; Kremer et al. 2018; Zocchi et al. 2019; Weatherford et al. 2019), GCs are likely able to retain a non-negligible number of BHs; but direct evidence for BHs in GCs in the upper mass range observed by Advanced LIGO and Advanced Virgo ( $\sim 30 M_{\odot}$ ) is still lacking.

In this Letter we have explored the possibility for constraining BH populations in GCs through the use of gravitational microlensing. We find it possible to detect BHs in the core of  $\omega Cen$  using microlensing observations with an expected rate range of  $\sim 0.1 - 1 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ . This rate, each individual lensing lightcurve, and the spatial location of the lensed stars all depend on the BH mass spectrum and distribution. Hence, detections or non-detections of microlensing events can be used to constrain these quantities, although this is not trivial (e.g. Udalski et al. 1994; Paczynski 1994). This strategy is naturally not limited to  $\omega Cen$ , but can be applied to any of the  $\sim 150$  GCs in the MW. In this case, it would be highly interesting to target a few of the GCs that recently were shown by Askar et al. (2018); Kremer et al. (2018); Weatherford et al. (2019) to have a relative large population of BHs in their center.

Observing BH microlensing events in GCs is challenging, but will likely soon become possible as telescopes with improved performance continue to be constructed. This includes both ground-based telescopes, such as the Thirty Meter Telescope, and space-based ones, such as The Wide Field Infrared Survey Telescope (WFIRST). Past studies of data from the Hubble Space Telescope have already been used to analyze microlensing events near the galactic center and have successfully constrained lens masses (e.g. Kains et al. 2017). Determining the mass of GC BHs may be more difficult as the source and lens distances are similar and, therefore, must be measured precisely. Our simulations suggest that microlensing events last on the order of several weeks, so intermittent observation is likely sufficient to detect most events. Even though resolution continues to improve, observations near the GC core center may still face the issue of crowding, in which it is impossible to resolve two nearby stars. In this case, lensing will still be observable, but since the localization of the lensed stars can be ambiguous, the uncertainty of the inferred BH population parameters will be higher. In follow up work we will study how to optimize current and future search strategies for observing such BH microlensing events.

## 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Noé Kains for discussions. The authors appreciate the generous support of Columbia University in the City of New York and the University of Florida. JZ is grateful for support from the Ng Teng

Fong Student Internship Fund administered through the Columbia College Summer Fund. JS acknowledges support from the Lyman Spitzer Fellowship, and funding from the European Unions Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 844629. DV is grateful to the Ph.D. grant of the Fulbright foreign student program.

## REFERENCES

- Aasi, J., et al. 2015, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 32, 074001, doi: [10.1088/0264-9381/32/7/074001](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/32/7/074001)
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2016a, *Physical Review Letters*, 116, 061102, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102)
- . 2016b, *Physical Review Letters*, 116, 241103, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.241103](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.241103)
- . 2016c, *Physical Review X*, 6, 041015, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevX.6.041015](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.6.041015)
- . 2017a, *Physical Review Letters*, 118, 221101, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.221101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.221101)
- . 2017b, *Physical Review Letters*, 119, 141101, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.141101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.119.141101)
- Acernese, F., et al. 2014, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 32, 024001, doi: [10.1088/0264-9381/32/2/024001](https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/32/2/024001)
- Antonini, F., & Gieles, M. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1906.11855. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1906.11855>
- Antonini, F., & Rasio, F. A. 2016, *ApJ*, 831, 187, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/831/2/187](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/831/2/187)
- Askar, A., Arca Sedda, M., & Giersz, M. 2018, *MNRAS*, 478, 1844, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1186](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1186)
- Askar, A., Szkudlarek, M., Gondek-Rosińska, D., Giersz, M., & Bulik, T. 2017, *MNRAS*, 464, L36, doi: [10.1093/mnrasl/slw177](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnrasl/slw177)
- Banerjee, S., Baumgardt, H., & Kroupa, P. 2010, *MNRAS*, 402, 371, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15880.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.15880.x)
- Bartos, I., Kocsis, B., Haiman, Z., & Márka, S. 2017, *ApJ*, 835, 165, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/835/2/165](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/835/2/165)
- Belczynski, K., Repetto, S., Holz, D. E., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 819, 108, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/819/2/108](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/819/2/108)
- Bellini, A., Anderson, J., Bedin, L. R., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 842, 6, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa7059](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa7059)
- Bennett, D. P., Becker, A. C., Quinn, J. L., et al. 2002, *ApJ*, 579, 639, doi: [10.1086/342225](https://doi.org/10.1086/342225)
- Dominik, M., Belczynski, K., Fryer, C., et al. 2012, *ApJ*, 759, 52, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/759/1/52](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/759/1/52)
- D'Souza, R., & Rix, H.-W. 2013, *MNRAS*, 429, 1887, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sts426](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sts426)
- Gültekin, K., Miller, M. C., & Hamilton, D. P. 2006, *ApJ*, 640, 156
- Hamers, A. S., Bar-Or, B., Petrovich, C., & Antonini, F. 2018, *ApJ*, 865, 2, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aadae2](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aadae2)
- Hong, J., & Lee, H. M. 2015, *MNRAS*, 448, 754, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv035](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv035)
- Jetzer, P., Straessle, M., & Wandeler, U. 1998, *A&A*, 336, 411. <https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9807101>
- Kains, N., Calamida, A., Sahu, K. C., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 843, 145, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa78eb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa78eb)
- Kocsis, B., Gáspár, M. E., & Márka, S. 2006, *ApJ*, 648, 411, doi: [10.1086/505641](https://doi.org/10.1086/505641)
- Kremer, K., Ye, C. S., Chatterjee, S., Rodriguez, C. L., & Rasio, F. A. 2018, *ApJ*, 855, L15, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aab26c](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aab26c)
- McKernan, B., Ford, K. E. S., Bellovary, J., et al. 2017, ArXiv e-prints. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.07818>
- Morscher, M., Pattabiraman, B., Rodriguez, C., Rasio, F. A., & Umbreit, S. 2015, *ApJ*, 800, 9, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/800/1/9](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/800/1/9)
- Murguia-Berthier, A., MacLeod, M., Ramirez-Ruiz, E., Antoni, A., & Macias, P. 2017, *ApJ*, 845, 173, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa8140](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa8140)
- O'Leary, R. M., Kocsis, B., & Loeb, A. 2009, *MNRAS*, 395, 2127, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14653.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14653.x)
- Paczynski, B. 1986, *ApJ*, 304, 1, doi: [10.1086/164140](https://doi.org/10.1086/164140)
- . 1994, *AcA*, 44, 235. <https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9407096>
- Park, D., Kim, C., Lee, H. M., Bae, Y.-B., & Belczynski, K. 2017, *MNRAS*, 469, 4665, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stx1015](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stx1015)
- Pietrukowicz, P., Minniti, D., Jetzer, P., Alonso-García, J., & Udalski, A. 2012, *ApJL*, 744, L18, doi: [10.1088/2041-8205/744/2/L18](https://doi.org/10.1088/2041-8205/744/2/L18)
- Portegies Zwart, S. F., & McMillan, S. L. W. 2000, *ApJ*, 528, L17
- Rhoads, J. E., & Malhotra, S. 1998, *ApJL*, 495, L55, doi: [10.1086/311211](https://doi.org/10.1086/311211)
- Rodriguez, C. L., & Antonini, F. 2018, *ApJ*, 863, 7, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aace4](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aace4)
- Rodriguez, C. L., Chatterjee, S., & Rasio, F. A. 2016a, *PhRvD*, 93, 084029, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.93.084029](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.93.084029)

- Rodriguez, C. L., Zevin, M., Pankow, C., Kalogera, V., & Rasio, F. A. 2016b, *ApJL*, 832, L2, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/832/1/L2](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/832/1/L2)
- Romero-Shaw, I. M., Lasky, P. D., & Thrane, E. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1909.05466. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.05466>
- Safonova, M., & Stalin, C. S. 2010, *NewA*, 15, 450, doi: [10.1016/j.newast.2009.12.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.newast.2009.12.004)
- Sahu, K. C., Casertano, S., Livio, M., et al. 2001, *Nature*, 411, 1022
- Samsing, J. 2018, *PhRvD*, 97, 103014, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.97.103014](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.97.103014)
- Samsing, J., Askar, A., & Giersz, M. 2018a, *ApJ*, 855, 124, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaab52](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaab52)
- Samsing, J., D’Orazio, D. J., Kremer, K., Rodriguez, C. L., & Askar, A. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1907.11231. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11231>
- Samsing, J., & Ilan, T. 2018, *MNRAS*, 476, 1548, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty197](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty197)
- . 2019, *MNRAS*, 482, 30, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty2249](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty2249)
- Samsing, J., MacLeod, M., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2014, *ApJ*, 784, 71, doi: [10.1088/0004-637X/784/1/71](https://doi.org/10.1088/0004-637X/784/1/71)
- . 2018b, *ApJ*, 853, 140, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaa715](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaa715)
- Samsing, J., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2017, *ApJL*, 840, L14, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aa6f0b](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aa6f0b)
- Schröder, S. L., Batta, A., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2018, *ApJL*, 862, L3, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aacf8d](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aacf8d)
- Silsbee, K., & Tremaine, S. 2017, *ApJ*, 836, 39, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa5729](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa5729)
- Sollima, A., Bellazzini, M., Smart, R. L., et al. 2009, *MNRAS*, 396, 2183, doi: [10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14864.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2966.2009.14864.x)
- Stephan, A. P., Naoz, S., Ghez, A. M., et al. 2016, *MNRAS*, 460, 3494, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw1220](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw1220)
- Stone, N. C., Metzger, B. D., & Haiman, Z. 2017, *MNRAS*, 464, 946, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stw2260](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stw2260)
- Trenti, M., & van der Marel, R. 2013, *MNRAS*, 435, 3272, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stt1521](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stt1521)
- Udalski, A., Szymanski, M., Stanek, K. Z., et al. 1994, *AcA*, 44, 165. <https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/9407014>
- VanLandingham, J. H., Miller, M. C., Hamilton, D. P., & Richardson, D. C. 2016, *ApJ*, 828, 77, doi: [10.3847/0004-637X/828/2/77](https://doi.org/10.3847/0004-637X/828/2/77)
- Venumadhav, T., Zackay, B., Roulet, J., Dai, L., & Zaldarriaga, M. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1904.07214. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.07214>
- Weatherford, N. C., Chatterjee, S., Kremer, K., & Rasio, F. A. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1911.09125. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.09125>
- Yang, Y., Bartos, I., Gayathri, V., et al. 2019, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 123, 181101, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.181101](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.123.181101)
- Zackay, B., Venumadhav, T., Dai, L., Roulet, J., & Zaldarriaga, M. 2019, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1902.10331. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.10331>
- Zevin, M., Pankow, C., Rodriguez, C. L., et al. 2017, *ApJ*, 846, 82, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aa8408](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aa8408)
- Zevin, M., Samsing, J., Rodriguez, C., Haster, C.-J., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2019, *ApJ*, 871, 91, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/aaf6ec](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/aaf6ec)
- Zocchi, A., Gieles, M., & Hénault-Brunet, V. 2019, *MNRAS*, 482, 4713, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1508](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1508)