Characterizing the observation bias in gravitational-wave detections and finding structured population properties
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ABSTRACT

The observed distributions of the source properties from gravitational-wave detections are biased due to the selection effects and detection criteria in the detections, analogous to the Malmquist bias. In this work, this observation bias is investigated through its fundamental statistical and physical origins. An efficient semi-analytical formulation for its estimation is derived which is as accurate as the standard method of numerical simulations, with only a millionth of the computational cost. Then, the estimated bias is used for model independent inferences on the binary black hole population. These inferences show additional structures, specifically two potential mass gaps in the joint mass distribution, which were not found via modelled inferences. Example ready-to-use scripts and some produced datasets for this method are shared in an online repository.

1. INTRODUCTION

The vast majority of gravitational-wave detections, including the first detection (Abbott et al. 2016), have been from binary black hole (BBH) mergers (Abbott et al. 2019a, 2021a). With the increasing number of detected BBH pairs from mergers, inferences on the population of BBHs and their formation channels have been made (Abbott et al. 2019b, 2021b). Such analyses shed light on the origins of binary black holes (Zevin et al. 2021), providing hints on stellar evolution (Rodriguez et al. 2016), pair-instability mass gap (Woosley & Heger 2021; Woosley 2017), hierarchical mergers (Veske et al. 2020, 2021; Kimball et al. 2020; Gayathri et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2019), primordial black holes (Bird et al. 2016; Claeys & García-Bellido 2017) and other exotic objects (Bustillo et al. 2021). For the accurate estimates of the actual populations and also for the other interpretations based on observations, the effect of population parameters on the observation should be correctly understood as the observed population parameters can have an observation bias; i.e. the observed relative fraction of the events which are detected easier will be higher than their actual astrophysical relative fraction, analogously to the Malmquist bias (Malmquist 1922).

Usually, such biasing effects on the observations are accounted with numerical simulation campaigns where a large set of BBH mergers’ waveforms according to a population model are numerically simulated. Then the simulated mergers are tried to be detected similarly to the real detection pipelines in the presence of a noise similar to the actual detectors’ noise. The difference between the simulated and detected populations characterizes the observation bias (Mandel et al. 2019; Abbott et al. 2021b). Early investigation of this problem under certain simplifying conditions was made in Finn & Chernoff (1993). Recently, this problem is being attacked with new data processing techniques such as machine learning as well (Talbot & Thrane 2020; Gerosa et al. 2020).

In this paper, that observation bias is analyzed semi-analytically with the aim of devising a computationally much less expensive way for finding the bias while also providing physical intuitions on it. The method is verified by the traditional ways of computing it via simulations. Finally, it is applied on the BBH mergers in the gravitational wave transient catalogs GWTC-1 (Abbott et al. 2019a) and GWTC-2 (Abbott et al. 2021a) to find model-independent estimates for the representative black hole population. This initial study is limited to the mergers of non-spinning quasicircular BBHs observed by interferometric gravitational-wave detectors via conventional matched filtering (Couch 2012) in the presence of an additive Gaussian noise. First, fundamentals of the
bias are explained in Sec. 2 referring to the statistics and physics behind it. In Sec. 3, the effects of the bias on the observed mass distributions are calculated semi-analytically with a list of numerically generated signal-to-noise ratios in the detectors for different masses. In Sec. 4 the bias is used to infer astrophysical distributions from detections. Finally, we summarize and conclude in Sec. 5.

2. UNDERSTANDING THE BIAS

Interferometric gravitational-wave detectors are designed to measure the variations in the lengths of the arms of them. They are very sensitive position detectors and the signal power measured by them via matched filtering in the presence of a white noise is proportional to the square of the distance difference between the ends of their arms. This methodology intrinsically differs from most of other astronomical detections where a fraction of the radiated energy in an event is directly detected, generally via excitation of electrons in a semiconductor device or a crystal through the absorption of the received energy. Whereas, as one would expect from non-relativistic classical physics, the physical power deposited to an interferometric gravitational-wave detector at rest is proportional to the square of the induced oscillation speed to the free ends of the arms. This non-proportionality between the signal energy and the absorbed physical energy in gravitational-wave detection demonstrates a non-trivial observation bias where not necessarily events with high emitted energy are favored in the detection.

2.1. Origin of the bias

The observational bias essentially depends on the signal power generated by a physical configuration and the noise power present in the detector. The configurations which generate a higher signal to noise power ratio (SNR) are easier to be observed and consequently the relative fraction of observed sources become biased in favor of those which generate a higher SNR. In this paper the physical configuration for a BBH of interest includes the source frame masses of the heavy and light black holes \( m_1, m_2 \) respectively, the luminosity distance between the BBH and the detector \( r \), the corresponding cosmological redshift at that distance \( z(r) \), angular location of the BBH on the sky \( \Omega \), the inclination angle of the binary’s orbital angular momentum to the line of sight \( i \) and the polarization angle \( \psi \) which is the angle between the x-y coordinates of the detector frame and radiation frame which varies with the orientation of the orbital angular momentum around the direction of the line of sight. The black holes are considered to be non-spinning and consequently the binary systems are not precessing. For simplicity the variations in the signal power induced by the initial orbital phase of the binary, which has the only effect of shifting the oscillatory waveform in the envelope of the waveform for non-precessing systems, are neglected. Such an effect on the signal power is expected to be on the order of few percent maximum. If one desires to be more accurate, the signal power for each configuration can be averaged uniformly over the initial orbital phase of the binary as well.

The main properties of the BBHs which are affected by an observation bias investigated in this paper are the masses of the involved black holes and the distance of BBHs; such as the joint or marginalized distributions of the masses \( P(m_1, m_2) \) or \( P(m_1) \), or the evolution of the BBH merger rate which is related to the distance distribution \( P(r) \).

Since the power generated in the gravitational-wave detectors are dependent on the masses, observed mass distributions are different than the actual distributions; i.e. \( P(m_1|D) \neq P(m_1) \) where \( D \) is used to denote the events being detected. Below, \( m_1 \) is used to demonstrate the relations between the observed and actual distributions. Similar relations can be written for any property along these lines. The relation between the actual and observed distributions can be written by using the Bayes’ rule as

\[
P(m_1|D) = \frac{P(D|m_1)P(m_1)}{P(D)}
\]

\( P(D|m_1) \) can be further expanded as

\[
P(D|m_1) = \int P(D|m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, i)P(m_2|m_1)
\times P(\Omega)P(r)P(i)P(\psi)dm_2drd\Omega d\psi
\]

where the extrinsic properties are considered to be independent of all the other properties and \( m_2 \) is considered to be dependent on \( m_1 \) since there is at least one dependency of \( m_2 \leq m_1 \) by their definition. Denoting the average power SNR generated in the detector from certain intrinsic and extrinsic properties with \( E \), and neglecting the difference between the expected and observed SNR due to noise fluctuations, the detection likelihood can be written as

\[
P(D|m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, i, \psi) = P(E(m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, i, \psi) > \rho^2_{th})
= \Theta(E(m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, i, \psi) - \rho^2_{th})
\]

where \( \Theta \) is the Heaviside step function. If the difference between the expected and observed SNR were not neglected, a smoothly increasing function around \( \rho^2 \) from
0 to 1 (similar to the error function) would be used instead of the step function.

Dependency of $E$ to extrinsic properties can be calculated analytically where as the dependency on mass cannot be found exactly due to complete gravitational-waveforms being non-analytical (see Sec. A.1). Only the inspiral and ringdown phases of the waveforms have analytical forms without an analytical solution for the merger phase. In order to understand the full dependency of SNR on the mass, in the next section, numerical computations were performed which takes in account the detectors’ different sensitivities at different frequencies.

### 2.2. Mass dependency of SNR

As mentioned in the previous section, the exact mass dependency of the SNR cannot be found analytically. Even the contribution from the phases which has an analytical solution cannot be determined as the SNR is proportional to the integral of the amplitude square of the wave (see Sec. A.2). Although the integrand is analytical, integration limits are not since the next merger phase is non-analytical. Due to the overall non-analytic behaviour of the SNR with masses, the dependency is investigated empirically by computing the generated SNR over a range of mass combinations with fixed extrinsic properties. The waveforms are generated by using the NRHybSur3dq8 surrogate waveform model (Varma et al. 2019) via the gwsurrogate package (Field et al. 2014). In order to make comparisons with the results from traditional simulation studies, the detectors’ noise the power spectral densities (PSD) are chosen as aLIGOMidLowSensitivityP1200087 which is the PSD used in the simulation studies of gravitational-waves (i.e. via LIGO.SKYMAP package) used for representing a pessimistic sensitivity estimate for the LIGO detectors (Aasi et al. 2015) during their third observing run O3. The power SNR was calculated via matched filtering (via Eq. (A8)) for every pair of integer valued black hole masses in $[10,100]M_\odot \times [10,100]M_\odot$. The low frequency cut for the waveforms was set to 25Hz.

It was observed that the SNR increases approximately linearly with the mass of the smaller black hole for a constant heavier mass. A similar dependency is present in the emitted gravitational-wave energy as well but there needs not be a direct correspondence as mentioned before. On the other hand, SNR varies non-trivially with the heavier mass $m_1$ for a constant small mass $m_2$. The variation with the heavier mass has a sub-linear increase at the start which eventually becomes a stall and then a decrease at extreme mass ratios. The variations of the SNR with smaller and heavier masses when the other one is constant are given in Fig. 1 for select masses. The final analyzed dependency is on the total mass. For a constant mass ratio, SNR may be expected to increase with $(m_1 + m_2)^{5/2}$ (see Eq. (A7)). Although there are several non-analytical complications, the SNR is nevertheless found to be fit very well by a power of the total mass for a constant mass ratio

$$
\rho^2 \propto (m_1 + m_2)^{6} \alpha (m_2/m_1),
$$

where the exponent $\alpha (m_2/m_1)$ is a function of the mass ratio. The empirically found $\alpha (m_2/m_1)$ is shown in Fig. 1. This relation is needed when determining the bias in the presence of a cosmological redshift where the observed mass ratio remains unchanged but the observed total mass is amplified.

### 3. FINDING THE BIAS AND ESTIMATING OBSERVED DISTRIBUTIONS

In the previous section the basics for estimating the bias on the properties of the BBH mergers were laid down. In this Section, the effect of the bias is computed and observed distributions are estimated. First the case without the cosmological redshift is considered and then redshift will also be included. Accuracy of the obtained distributions are verified via simulated injections. Such simulations are currently the used method for accounting the observation bias.

#### 3.1. Static universe

When there is no expansion hence cosmological redshift, the power SNR generated in the network of $N_d$ detectors can be written by decoupling dependency of several properties

$$
E(m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, \iota) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_d} E_0, i(m_1, m_2) f_i(\Omega, \iota, \psi) / r^2 / r_0^6
$$

where $f$ is defined as $f(\Omega, \iota, \psi) = (F^2_+ (\Omega, \psi) (1 + \cos^2 \iota) + F^2_\times (\Omega, \psi) \cos^2 \iota) / F_+ F_\times$, $F_+$ and $F_\times$ are the antenna patterns of the detectors for two tensor polarizations, and $E_0 (m_1, m_2)$ is the power SNR generated by masses $m_1$ and $m_2$ when $f = 1$ at a distance $r_0$ in the absence of cosmological redshift, and sum over $i$ represents different detectors. When there is no redshift, the distribution of $r$ is $P(r) = 3r^2 / r_{max}^3$ for $r < r_{max}$ where $r_{max}$ is well beyond the observation horizon of the detector network.

---

2. The emitted energy is in $m_2 [9.5%, 12%]$ for mass ratio $m_1/m_2$ in $[1.9]$ (Barausse et al. 2012).
and the detection likelihood of \( m_1 \) can be written as

\[
P(D|m_1) = \Theta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_d} E_{0,i}(m_1, m_2) f_i(\Omega, \psi) - \rho_{\ell h}^2 \right) \times P(m_2|m_1) \frac{3r^2}{P_{\max}^3} P(\Omega) P(\psi) dm_2 d\Omega d\psi dr
\]

or

\[
P(D|m_1) = \int \Theta \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_d} E_{0,i}(m_1, m_2) f_i(\Omega, \psi) - \rho_{\ell h}^2 \right) \times P(m_2|m_1) \frac{3r^2}{P_{\max}^3} P(\Omega) P(\psi) dm_2 d\Omega d\psi dr
\]

Interestingly, if the frequency sensitivities of the detectors are proportional to each other, i.e. \( E_{0,1} = c_1 E_{0,2} \) and if the merger rate is constant, then neither the distributions of \( \Omega \) and \( \psi \) nor the \( f \) function do not change the \( m_1 \) dependency of the result of Eq. (3). They only bring an overall factor which is eventually cancelled with the normalization constant in Eq. (2). In this case, \( E_0 \) can be factored out from the sum and the detection likelihood becomes

\[
P(D|m_1) = \int E_0(m_1, m_2) \frac{3r^2}{P_{\max}^3} P(\Omega) P(\psi) dm_2 d\Omega d\psi dr
\]

The factor in the second line of Eq. (6) is cancelled with the normalization in the denominator in Eq. (2) since it does not depend on \( m_1 \). The observational bias on \( m_1 \) becomes proportional to \( \int E_0(m_1, m_2) \frac{3r^2}{P_{\max}^3} P(\Omega) P(\psi) dm_2 d\Omega d\psi dr \) and consequently the observed distribution can be written as

\[
P(m_1|D) = \int \frac{P(m_1) \int E_0(m_1, m_2) \frac{3r^2}{P_{\max}^3} P(\Omega) P(\psi) dm_2 d\Omega d\psi dr}{\int P(m_1) E_0(m_1, m_2) \frac{3r^2}{P_{\max}^3} P(\Omega) P(\psi) dm_2 d\Omega d\psi}
\]

When the frequency sensitivities of the detectors are proportional to each other, neither the antenna factors, distribution of the sources in the sky, the distribution of the inclination of the orbits of BBHs nor the detection threshold on SNR affect the observed distribution of \( m_1 \) when there is no cosmological redshift. In reality with cosmological redshift, this simple calculation is appropriate for use with high detection thresholds or with weak detectors, where the horizon of the search is at low redshifts. Likewise, it can be used for searches of less powerful sources such as binary neutron stars. With current detectors; LIGO (Aasi et al. 2015) Hanford is \( \sim 1.5 \) and Virgo (Acernese et al. 2014) is \( \sim 6 \) times less sensitive than LIGO Livingston (from their noise power spectral densities around 100Hz \(^3\) with a similar frequency dependency. Therefore this approximation can be used for them for more crude estimations.

In order to demonstrate the accuracy of this estimation, a simulation study using the LALApps and LIGO.SKYMAP packages was done, injecting a population of BBH mergers in the absence of a cosmological redshift with uniformly distributed masses in the \( (m_1, m_2) = [10, 100]M_\odot \times [10, 100]M_\odot \) space. The orbital orientation of the BBHs and their position in volume were uniformly randomized. The local rate density of the mergers was assumed to be constant. The mergers

\(^3\) [https://www.gw-openscience.org/detector_status/](https://www.gw-openscience.org/detector_status/)

---

**Figure 1.** Dependencies of power SNR for different mass configurations: (a) \( m_1 \) dependency of SNR for constant \( m_2 \), (b) \( m_2 \) dependency of SNR for constant \( m_1 \), (c) exponent of the total mass dependency of SNR for fixed mass ratios. The SNRs were calculated for a face-on BBH mergers at 1 Gpc in the absence of cosmological redshift considering one of the polarizations with a unit antenna factor.
were detected with two LIGO detectors with the same PSD used to compute the SNRs via surrogate waveforms (aLIGOMidLowSensitivityP1200087) with a detection threshold on the network SNR. SEOBNRv4 waveforms were used. The histogram of \( m_1 \) values for the injected and detected BBHs overlayed with the estimation using Eq. (7) and the SNR distribution used in Sec. 2.2 can be seen in Fig 2. It is seen that the observed distribution is accurately estimated. The small differences can be attributed to the use of different waveform families (SEOBNRv4 and NRHybSur3dq8) and the statistical uncertainty of the results from the injection study which had total of 1500 detections.

3.2. Expanding universe

The cosmological redshift \( 1 + z(r) \) modifies the received gravitational-waveform as if the masses are multiplied by \( 1 + z(r) \). Therefore the SNR generated as a function of BBH properties can be written as

\[
E(m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, \iota) = \sum_i E_{0,i}(m_1(1 + z(r)), m_2(1 + z(r)))f_i(\Omega, \iota, \psi)/r^2/r_0^2
\]

As found earlier, for a constant mass ratio, the SNR has a power law dependency on the total mass. So

\[
E(m_1, m_2, r, \Omega, \iota) = \sum_i E_{0,i}(m_1, m_2)(1 + x)^{\alpha(m_2/m_1)}f_i(\Omega, \iota, \psi)/r^2/r_0^2
\]

Assuming uniformly distributed BBHs in the comoving volume with constant local merger rate, uniform orientation for orbital planes, and using the cosmological measurements, the distributions of the extrinsic properties are The radial distribution of the sources and the relationship between the luminosity distance \( (r) \) and redshift \( (z) \) are given as

\[
P(r) = \frac{r^2}{(1+z)^4N}, \quad r < r_{\text{max}}
\]

\[
r = \frac{c}{H_0}(1+z)\int_0^z ((1+x)^3\Omega_m + \Omega_\Lambda)^{-1/2}dx
\]

where maximum luminosity distance \( r_{\text{max}} \) is assumed for the sources which is well beyond the observation horizon of the detector. \( N \) is a normalization constant which may not have an analytical expression. Factor of \( (1 + z(r))^{-4} \) in Eq. (10a) accounts for the source density dilution and event rate suppression due to cosmological redshift. Eq. (10b) gives the relation between the luminosity distance and the cosmological redshift. \( c \) is the speed of light, \( H_0 = 67.6 \text{ km/s/Mpc}^{-1} \) is the Hubble constant, \( \Omega_m = 0.31 \) and \( \Omega_\Lambda = 0.69 \) are the local energy density parameters of matter and cosmological constant (2018 estimates of Planck (Aghanim et al. 2020)).

Due to the complicated form of \( E \) with additional coupling of mass ratio and redshift, the calculations cannot be simplified more analytically, unlike for the static universe. All of the properties including the detection threshold remain coupled and affects the result.

The accuracy of our calculation is demonstrated with a simulation study with LIGO.SKYMAP. Using the same cosmological estimates, BBH masses in the \((m_1, m_2) = [10, 100]M_\odot \times [10, 100]M_\odot \) space were simulated. The mass distribution was chosen to be proportional to the reciprocal of the masses \( (P(m_1, m_2) \propto (m_1m_2)^{-1}) \). The mergers were detected with one LIGO detector at the same sensitivity used before. The detection threshold was chosen to be \( \rho^2_{\text{th}} = 64 \). IMRPhenomPv2 waveforms were used for the simulation. The comparison between the estimation and the results of the simulation study can be seen in Fig. 2. The estimation agrees with the result of the simulation study well.

4. MODEL INDEPENDENT INFERENCE OF BLACK HOLE POPULATION PROPERTIES

In Sec. 3, the observation bias was analyzed from the point of view of a known astrophysical mass distribution of BBHs and an estimation of the distribution of the masses of detected BBH mergers. In this Section, the observation bias is used from the reverse point of view; for making astrophysical inferences from the observations. These inferences are done without assumption of any model. This model independence allows the inferences to show new structures that are not included in the current models which were found as described below.

The astrophysical joint distribution of the luminosity distance and source frame masses can be expanded in terms of the observed distributions and the detection probability for various detector networks as

\[
P(m_1, m_2, r) \propto \frac{P(m_1, m_2, r|D)}{\sum_d P(D|d, m_1, m_2, r)P(d|m_1, m_2, r)}
\]

\[
E_{0,i}(m_1(1 + z(r)), m_2(1 + z(r)))f_i(\Omega, \iota, \psi)/r^2/r_0^2
\]
where $d$ represents a specific detector network to be in observing mode. The probability $P(d|m_1, m_2, r)$ is independent of BBH properties and is directly proportional to the cumulative observation time of the specific network. $P(D|d, m_1, m_2, r)$ can be computed similar to Eq. (2), without marginalizing over $m_1$, $m_2$ or $r$ and without any assumption on their distributions. Using the SNR of the weakest signals in each catalog, the detection threshold for O3a networks were chosen as amplitude SNR=8 and for O1-O2 networks as amplitude SNR=10. Changing the SNR threshold for O1 and O2 to 8 negligibly changes the results. For O3 detection probabilities for networks other than the ones had detections (HLV, HL, LV, L) were taken as 0. For SNR calculations PSDs of GW151012, GW170809 and GW190412 were used for O1, O2 and O3 networks respectively. One caveat Eq. (11) has is; without more assumptions it can’t be used for the estimations on $m_1$, $m_2$ and $r$ where $\sum_{d} P(D|d, m_1, m_2, r)P(d|m_1, m_2, r) = 0$.

First, the joint mass distribution $P(m_1, m_2)$ is investigated by integrating $P(m_1, m_2, r)$ over $r$. It was found that beyond $r > 1.2$ Gpc, a merger with two $5M_\odot$ cannot be detected with the best configuration. Due to the caveat mentioned above, the analysis was limited to $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq 5 M_\odot$, $r < 1.2$ Gpc. This cut corresponds to $\sim 34\%$ of the data in GWTC-1 and GWTC-2. The obtained distribution is shown in Fig. 3. That distribution shows two mass gaps in the $m_1, m_2$ space, which can be empirically represented with the relations $m_1m_2 = 55M_\odot^2$ and $m_1m_2 = 145M_\odot^2$. These mass gaps are not for the individual black holes; but rather the combination of the two black holes. Therefore they can give important hints on the formation mechanisms of BBHs. The gaps remain in the full observed distribution $P(m_1, m_2, r|D)$ without any mass or distance cuts. It is emphasized that the gaps are located near very sharp peaks which can also be related to the same phenomenon creating the gaps. A third low density region is also present around $m_1m_2 = 400M_\odot^2$. Corresponding similar structures in the chirp mass distribution were also pointed out in Tiwari & Fairhurst (2020).

Second, by integrating $P(m_1, m_2)$ over $m_2$, the distribution of the heavier mass was obtained which is shown in Fig. 3. For comparison, the best estimation of the power law+peak model from Abbott et al. (2021b) was also plotted. The effect of the mass gaps are evident on the distribution by having dips right after around 6 and 10 $M_\odot$. Such additional structures cannot be found by model fits as in Abbott et al. (2021b). Moreover, having such extra features in the distributions results in not well fitting models and pushes on heaving more and more complex models with arbitrary parametrizations. Similar to the power law+peak model, a peak around 30-35 $M_\odot$ is observed in the distribution, but with a higher amplitude.

Next, the extent of the black hole masses to the higher values was investigated with the specific purpose of observing the behaviour of the distributions around the upper mass gap which is expected to be present due to the pair instability supernova phenomenon (Woosley & Heger 2021; Woosley 2017). In order not to miss observed heavy BBH at far distances, the considered mass range was bounded by $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq 30 M_\odot$ which has the detection horizon around 6.3 Gpc. The obtained distribution for the mixture of both component masses in the observed BBHs is given in Fig. 3. In contrast to
the expectation of a mass gap around 50-70 M\(_{\odot}\), a peak around 63 M\(_{\odot}\) is observed. The distribution apart that peak seems to be well parametrized by a power law with index -4.8.

Finally, the rate evolution of the BBH mergers through the distance is investigated. First, the distribution of BBHs along the distance \(P(r)\) was found by integrating \(P(m_1, m_2, r)\) over \(m_1\) and \(m_2\). In order to reach farther distances, while not missing the evolution of the lighter BBHs, three different mass ranges were considered constraining both \(m_1\) and \(m_2\): 20-30 M\(_{\odot}\) for \(r < 4.0\) Gpc, 30-40 M\(_{\odot}\) for \(r < 6.3\) Gpc and 40+ M\(_{\odot}\) for \(r < 9.0\) Gpc. Beyond a few hundreds of Mpc of these distances, lower limits on the mass constraints become non-observable. After accounting for the effects of redshift and assuming a uniform distribution, the rate evolution is obtained by recalibrating the distance distribution via multiplying it by \((1+z)^M\). Again the latest Planck (Aghanim et al. 2020) estimates of the cosmological evolution were used for converting \(r\) to \(z\). The obtained rate evolutions are shown in Fig. 4 with an arbitrary overall factor for each curve. However, due to narrow constraint of the masses, each estimation is dominated by single events at peculiar locations rather than having a homogeneous distribution. Especially the events observed at closer distances produce big jumps in the rate evolution due to the \(r^{-2}\) factor. Nevertheless, the different evolutions can be due to an actual dependency of distance distribution on the masses. In that case, a corresponding dependency will also be present in the mass distributions of the merging BBHs as a function of distance. Therefore mass functions such as \(P(m_1)\) can also expected to be evolving.

5. CONCLUSION

In this paper, the observation bias in gravitational-wave detections was investigated for non-spinning black holes. By explaining the fundamental origin of the bias, analytical expressions of SNR and source properties were derived. By using a numerically computed list of SNRs as a function of \(m_1\) and \(m_2\), these expressions were evaluated and the agreement with the results from traditional simulations was verified. The advantage of using this semi-analytical method is mainly the reduction of the computational cost; resulting in faster, efficient and more precise estimations. With this algorithm, computations equivalent to \(O(10^{10})\) realizations can be done in \(O(1)\) hours with an average commercial central processing unit core with the processing speed \(O(1)\) GHz. For comparison, the injection campaign described in Abbott et al. (2021b) has \(O(10^8)\) realizations which is assumed to have been performed in dedicated computing clusters over longer timescales. Conservatively, it is estimated that the computation of the observation bias can be done \(10^4\) times faster with this method than doing it with traditional simulations. Example ready-to-use scripts and some produced datasets for this method are shared in the online repository https://github.com/dveske/observation-bias-gw.

Applying the developed method, model independent estimations for the populations of BBHs in GWTC-1 and GWTC-2 were carried out. Due to their model independence, estimates were able to show and showed additional structures in the mass distributions compared to the models with limited number of parameters used in other studies. Potentially two mass gaps in the \(m_1, m_2\) parameter space were observed near two sharp peaks which can give hints on the formation channels of BBHs. Also despite the expectation of an upper mass gap starting around 50-70 M\(_{\odot}\), a peak around 63 M\(_{\odot}\) was observed for the mixed distribution of \(m_1\) and \(m_2\). Apart from that peak, the distribution seemed to agree with a power law with index -4.8. Finally the rate evolution of the BBH merger rates are estimated for different mass ranges. The evolution of the merger rate seems to have dependency on the masses of the black holes although the rate evolutions are currently dominated by individual events at specific locations and therefore do not represent a homogeneous evolution currently. Main advantage of modelled estimations is the suppression of violent fluctuations in the estimations due to lack of sufficient data. As more data is collected and parameter spaces are better populated, effects alike to those seen in the rate estimations are expected to disappear and more representative estimations will be acquired where extra structures can be observed more reliably.

This study concentrated on the bias originating from and effecting the mass distributions while assuming non-spinning black holes; similar to the bias accounting in Abbott et al. (2021b). Therefore the differences between the estimates done here and there cannot be originating from the neglect of spin. Any work on spinning black holes is left for future study.
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A. BASICS ON GRAVITATIONAL-WAVE DETECTION

A.1. Detected inspiral waveform

The observed strain in a detector network can be written by decomposing the contributions from two polarizations \( h_+ \) and \( h_\times \) as

\[
h(t) = h_+(t)F_+(\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \psi) + h_\times(t)F_\times(\boldsymbol{\Omega}, \psi) \tag{A1}
\]

where \( F_+ \) and \( F_\times \) are the antenna patterns of the detector network for the two polarizations. For a single two-armed interferometric detector with 90° angle between its arms, the antenna patterns are given as (Schutz 2011)

\[
\begin{align*}
F_+ &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 \delta) \cos 2\theta \cos 2\psi - \cos \delta \sin 2\theta \sin 2\psi \tag{A2a} \\
F_\times &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 \delta) \cos 2\theta \sin 2\psi + \cos \delta \sin 2\theta \cos 2\psi \tag{A2b}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \boldsymbol{\Omega} = (\delta, \theta) \) are the zenith (measured from z axis to xy plane) and azimuth (measured from x axis to y axis) angles in a detector centered coordinate system where detector’s arms lie along x and y axes. \( \psi \) is the rotational angle between the x axis of the detector centered coordinate system and the projection of the x axis of the coordinate system where \( h_+ \) and \( h_\times \) are defined (radiation frame) to the detector’s plane.

For two polarizations, the inspiral waveforms for the dominant mode (2,2) in radiation frame are (Finn & Chernoff 1993)

\[
\begin{align*}
h_+(t) &= 2 \frac{G^{5/3} M^{5/3}}{r c^{2/3}} (1 + \cos^2 t)(\pi f(t))^{2/3} \cos(\phi_0 + \Phi(t)) \tag{A3a} \\
h_\times(t) &= 4 \frac{G^{5/3} M^{5/3}}{r c^{2/3}} \cos(\pi f(t))^{2/3} \sin(\phi_0 + \Phi(t)) \tag{A3b}
\end{align*}
\]

where chirp mass \( M \) is defined as

\[
\mathcal{M} = \frac{(m_1 m_2)^{0.6}}{(m_1 + m_2)^{0.2}} \tag{A4}
\]

The frequency of the wave \( f(t) \) and the accumulated phase \( \Phi(t) \) are given as

\[
f(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{c}{G M} \right)^{5/8} \left( \frac{5}{256(t_m - t)} \right)^{3/8} \tag{A5}
\]

\[
\Phi(t) = \int_0^t 2\pi f(\tau) d\tau = -2\left( \frac{c(t_m - t)}{5GM} \right)^{5/8} \tag{A6}
\]

where \( t_m \) is the time of the merger. However, these given inspiral waveforms do not hold up to \( t_m \). The actual waveforms start deviating from these forms as the black holes come closer. Collecting all the constants under a single constant \( C \), \( h(t)^2 \) can be written as

\[
h(t)^2 = \frac{\mathcal{M}^{5/2}}{(t_m - t)^{1/2}} \left( \frac{F_+^2(1 + \cos^2 t)^2 + F_\times^2 \cos^2 t}{2} \right) \times \cos^2(\phi_0 + \Phi(t) + \arctan\left( \frac{2F_\times \cos \Phi}{F_+(1 + \cos^2 t)} \right)) \tag{A7}
\]

A.2. Matched filtering

Matched filtering is the optimal method for detecting a signal with a known waveform in the presence of an additive Gaussian noise with a known spectrum (Couch 2012). The filtering maximizes the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) which is a monotonically increasing function of the likelihood ratio of having the sought signal in the data to having only noise. Consequently, setting an SNR threshold as a detection criteria can be used optimally when the mentioned conditions above are satisfied. The power SNR \( \rho^2(t) \) for a search looking for a real waveform \( h(t) \) with unknown amplitude and arrival time, in the noisy data \( w(t) = ah(t - t_0) + n(t) \) can be calculated as

\[
\rho^2(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{H^*(f) W(f)}{S_n(f)} e^{-j2\pi ft} df \tag{A8}
\]

where \( j = \sqrt{-1} \), \( H^*(f) \) is the complex conjugate of the Fourier transform of \( h(t) \), \( W(f) \) is the Fourier transform of \( w(t) \) and \( S_n(f) \) is the two-sided power spectral density of the noise \( n \). If the noise additionally has a white spectrum, then up to constants, SNR can be calculated in time domain as

\[
\rho^2(t) \propto \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(\tau - t) w(\tau) d\tau \tag{A9}
\]

The time dependency of SNR represents the delay in the arrival time of the signal with respect to the start of \( w(t) \). If \( \rho^2(t_d) \) exceeds the predetermined SNR threshold \( \rho^2_{th} \), which is based on the allowed false alarm probability of the search, one can claim to have detected the signal with the determined false alarm probability, \( t_d \) after the start of the data taking. Although in gravitational-wave searches based on matched filtering the detection threshold is the false-alarm rate but not the bare SNR.
because of the non-Gaussian Poisson-like noise called glitches, the detections happen in well correlation with SNR especially after glitch involving data parts are removed (Abbott et al. 2020). The important take away from this subsection is the fact that the mean power SNR increases linearly with the integral of $h^2$. 