

# Stochastic gravitational wave background due to gravitational wave memory

Zhi-Chao Zhao<sup>1</sup> and Zhoujian Cao<sup>\*1,2,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,  
Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China*

Gravitational waves from binary black hole merger leave permanent imprint on space-time, called gravitational wave memory. Amounts of memory events can form a “stochastic gravitational wave memory background” (SGWMB). Here we find that SGWMB can be described as a Brownian motion. The power spectral density (PSD) of SGWMB corresponding to a set of binary black hole coalescence is proportional to  $1/f^2$  where  $f$  is the frequency of the background. And the strength of the SGWMB PSD depends on the event rate of the binary black hole coalescence. Not like the stochastic non-memory gravitational wave background of a set of binary black hole coalescence whose PSD has an upper frequency bound due to the merger frequency, SGWMB can expand to much higher frequency because of the Brownian motion behavior. Consequently SGWMB dominates the stochastic gravitational wave background in the relatively higher frequency band. If not counting SGWMB properly one may confuse it with the stochastic non-memory gravitational wave background. Investigating SGWMB properly may let LIGO to detect the population of supermassive binary black hole systems. Also SGWMB provides a brand new mean to detect gravitational wave memory and it opens a new window to explore the gravity theory.

*Introduction.*— Gravitational wave (GW) memory is an important prediction of general relativity [1–6], which can be related to the asymptotic symmetry and soft theorem [7–10]. The detection of GW memory may reveal fundamental issues of physical laws [11–16] through infrared triangle [17]. The pulsar timing arrays (PTAs) may detect GW memory generated by the mergers of supermassive black hole binaries [18–21]. But the rates of detectable mergers are expected to be too low for practical detection [22, 23]. For LIGO-like detectors, the quasi-direct behavior of GW memory makes the detection of a single event extremely hard [24] (but see Ref. [25] for special data analysis technique). Multiple events are consequently needed for GW memory detection [24]. Accurate waveform models [26–33] may optimistically help the multiple events method realize the GW memory detection in the coming years [34–36].

Even though there is no clear detection of GW memory, the existence of GW memory is a certain prediction of general relativity [5]. The nature of a single GW memory event has been extensively studied. But the superposition of multiple GW memory events has attracted much less attention before. A stochastic background of GW memory could be formed by composing multiple GW memory events [37]. Moreover, the stochastic background of GW memory may be detected even though the detection of a single event is impossible. For an example the usual non-memory stochastic gravitational wave background [hereafter we call it non-memory SGWB to distinguish the stochastic gravitational wave memory background (SGWMB) which represents the memory part of SGWB] is much easier for PTA

to detect than single event of binary black hole (BBH) merger [38].

Similar to the stochastic gravitational wave background generated by the non-memory gravitational wave part, the SGWMB can be analyzed through GW energy density [37]. The GW energy density analysis method is valid for those superposition whose waveforms have overlap. Due to the burst behavior of GW memory event, consecutive GW memory events may not have overlap [39]. Specifically, the GW memory events produced by BBH merger typically do not overlap. In the following we will show that the stochastic gravitational wave memory background composing non-overlapping GW memory events can be described by a Brownian motion. Based on our Brownian motion model, we find that the power spectrum index of SGWMB is -2 which is characteristically different to that of the non-memory GW part background of compact binary coalescence. Our Brownian motion model of SGWMB is similar but different to the analysis method used in the Ref. [39].

Compared to the corresponding non-memory GW, the SGWMB got by GW energy density analysis admits lower frequency [37]. Differently, the SGWMB described by our Brownian motion model has both lower and higher frequency than the corresponding non-memory GW. Consequently the SGWMB described by our Brownian motion model extends the frequency range of the GW background of compact binary coalescence to higher bound. The SGWMB can provide a new mean for GW memory detection. In addition, LIGO-like detectors and space based detectors may provide information on the event rate of supermassive BBH coalescence through SGWMB detection.

*From a single event of gravitational wave memory to a background.*— Bursts of GWs, especially those from BBH

---

\*corresponding author




FIG. 1: Three examples of the detector responses to SGWMB. Wave strain respect to time is plotted. From left to right, the panels respectively show the SGWMB corresponding to SOBH, IMBH, and SMBH binaries.

mergers, cause a small permanent change of metric and leave a permanent imprint on space-time [5]. Based on Bondi-Metzner-Sachs (BMS) balance relation [31, 32] we can calculate the GW memory of a BBH merger event if only the binary parameters are known [33]. Using spin-weighted  $-2$  spherical harmonic functions  $Y_{-2lm}$  to decompose the GW memory  $h \equiv h_+ - ih_\times$ , we have

$$h(q, M, \vec{\chi}_1, \vec{\chi}_2, d_L, \iota, \phi_c) \equiv \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^l h_{lm}(q, M, \vec{\chi}_1, \vec{\chi}_2, d_L) Y_{-2lm}(\iota, \phi_c), \quad (1)$$

where  $q$ ,  $M$ ,  $\vec{\chi}_{1,2}$  and  $d_L$  are the mass ratio, the total mass, the spins and the luminosity distance of the binary,  $\iota$  is the inclination angle of the orbital plane, and  $\phi_c$  is the gravitational wave phase at merger. In [33] we have shown that the memory can be well approximated as

$$h(q, M, \vec{\chi}_1, \vec{\chi}_2, d_L, \iota, \phi_c) \approx h_{20}(q, M, \vec{\chi}_1, \vec{\chi}_2, d_L) Y_{-220}(\iota). \quad (2)$$

GW background means a lot of GW signals acting on the detector. We can express the SGWMB as

$$\mathfrak{M} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \Re[(F^+(\theta_j, \phi_j, \psi_j) + iF^\times(\theta_j, \phi_j, \psi_j)) \times h(q_j, M_j, \vec{\chi}_{1j}, \vec{\chi}_{2j}, d_L, \iota_j, \phi_{cj})] \quad (3)$$

where  $j$  is the index denoting the  $j$ -th memory signal, and  $F^{+, \times}$  are the pattern functions of the detector.

*Brownian motion model of SGWMB.*— When GW memory relating to a binary black hole merger happens relatively fast respect to a SGWMB detection, we can approximate such an individual memory signal as a step function of time [19]. Consequently the SGWMB (3) behaves as a sum of a lot of step functions respect to time. The amplitude and the sign of each step function are determined by the property of the corresponding binary [33]. We treat the parameters of each binary merger as random variables which reduce a random amplitude and a random sign of the corresponding step function.

In Fig. 1 we show three typical examples of detector responses to the SGWMB. In the current work we consider a detector with pattern function

$$F^+(\theta, \phi, \psi) \equiv -\frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 \theta) \cos 2\phi \cos 2\psi - \cos \theta \sin 2\phi \sin 2\psi, \quad (4)$$

$$F^\times(\theta, \phi, \psi) \equiv +\frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 \theta) \cos 2\phi \sin 2\psi - \cos \theta \sin 2\phi \cos 2\psi. \quad (5)$$

All kinds of detection scheme including pulsar timing array, space based interferometry and ground based interferometry admit similar pattern function to the above one upto minor changement [40]. Uniform distribution is applied to the parameters  $\iota, \theta, \phi, \psi, \phi_c$ . Three types of BBH have been considered here including Stellar Original Black-hole (SOBH), Intermediate Mass Black-hole (IMBH), and SuperMassive Black-hole (SMBH), whose total mass range are respectively set as about  $(10^1, 10^2)M_\odot$ ,  $(10^2, 10^5)M_\odot$ , and  $(10^2, 10^7)M_\odot$ . The parameters  $q, M, \vec{\chi}_1, \vec{\chi}_2, d_L$  are set according to the specific event rate of the binary merger events. In Fig. 1, a combination of M33.A and M43.A of Ref. [41, 42],  $\mu = 0.01, \alpha = 0.1, q = 1$  case of Ref. [43] and LS-stalled model of Ref. [44] are used for respectively SOBH, IMBH and SMBH binaries.

As we mentioned before, SGWMB behaves as a sum of a lot of step functions with random amplitude and random sign. Such behavior is nothing but an one-dimensional Brownian motion  $\mathfrak{M}(t)$ . Apparently we have  $\mathfrak{M}(0) = 0$  and  $\langle \mathfrak{M}(t) \rangle = 0$  where  $\langle \cdot \rangle$  means the ensemble average. Since  $\mathfrak{M}(t_1) - \mathfrak{M}(0)$  and  $\mathfrak{M}(t_2) - \mathfrak{M}(t_1)$  are independent ( $t_1 \neq t_2$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\mathfrak{M}(t_1) - \mathfrak{M}(0)][\mathfrak{M}(t_2) - \mathfrak{M}(t_1)] \rangle &= \\ \langle \mathfrak{M}(t_1) - \mathfrak{M}(0) \rangle \langle \mathfrak{M}(t_2) - \mathfrak{M}(t_1) \rangle &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Consequently we have  $\langle \mathfrak{M}(t_1)\mathfrak{M}(t_2) \rangle = \langle \mathfrak{M}^2(t_1) \rangle$ . The random amplitude and the random sign of the step functions are reduced from the independent random parameters of the binary mergers. Although the number of parameters is not huge, we can still assume the distribution of the step function is Gaussian [33]. Consequently we have

$$\langle \mathfrak{M}^2(t) \rangle = 2Dt, \quad (7)$$

where  $D$  corresponds to the strength of the diffusion corresponding to the Brownian motion. We have checked the behavior of the Brownian motions shown in Fig. 1. All of them satisfy the above relation which verifies our assumption. By numerical simulation, we get  $D$  to be  $3.16 \times 10^{-50}$ ,  $8.42 \times 10^{-47}$ , and  $1.73 \times 10^{-42}$  for SOBH, IMBH, and SMBH respectively in Fig. 1.

Let us assume the variance of each memory step function mentioned above is  $\sigma$  and the average time between

two consecutive memory step function is  $\Delta t$ . We could write  $D$  as [45]

$$D = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\Delta t}, \quad (8)$$

which can be deduced from standard Brownian motion theory.

Combine the results of Ref. [32] and Ref. [33] the amplitude of the step function, which corresponds to a single GW memory event, can be expressed as

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{M}{D_L} F^+(\theta, \phi, \psi) Y_{-220}(\iota) [0.0969 + 0.0562\chi_{\text{up}} + 0.0340\chi_{\text{up}}^2 + 0.0296\chi_{\text{up}}^3 + 0.0206\chi_{\text{up}}^4] (4\eta)^{1.65}, \quad (9)$$

$$\chi_{\text{up}} \equiv \chi_{\text{eff}} + \frac{3}{8} \sqrt{1 - 4\eta} \chi_A, \quad (10)$$

$$\chi_{\text{eff}} \equiv (m_1 \vec{\chi}_1 + m_2 \vec{\chi}_2) \cdot \hat{N} / M, \quad (11)$$

$$\chi_A \equiv (m_1 \vec{\chi}_1 - m_2 \vec{\chi}_2) \cdot \hat{N} / M, \quad (12)$$

where  $\hat{N}$  is the direction the orbital angular momentum of the binary and  $\eta \equiv \frac{m_1 m_2}{M^2}$  is the symmetric mass ratio. Regarding to SGWMB, parameters  $m_{1,2}$ ,  $\vec{\chi}_{1,2}$ ,  $D_L$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$ , and  $\psi$  are random variables. Consequently we have

$$\sigma^2 = \langle \mathcal{A}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A} \rangle^2. \quad (13)$$

Since the parameters  $m_{1,2}$ ,  $\vec{\chi}_{1,2}$ ,  $D_L$ ,  $\iota$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$ , and  $\psi$  are independent with each other, we can treat them individually:

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\text{bbh}} \mathcal{A}_{\text{ang}}, \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{bbh}} \equiv \frac{M}{D_L} [0.0969 + 0.0562\chi_{\text{up}} + 0.0340\chi_{\text{up}}^2 + 0.0296\chi_{\text{up}}^3 + 0.0206\chi_{\text{up}}^4] (4\eta)^{1.65}, \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{ang}} \equiv F^+(\theta, \phi, \psi) Y_{-220}(\iota). \quad (16)$$

The last equation is because the  $h_{\times}$  part of GW memory in the source frame always vanishes [32, 33].

Especially, the distributions of  $\iota$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\phi$ , and  $\psi$  are always uniform which makes  $\langle \mathcal{A}_{\text{ang}} \rangle = 0$  and consequently  $\langle \mathcal{A} \rangle = 0$ . After further calculation, we get the corresponding variance as

$$\langle \mathcal{A}_{\text{ang}}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A}_{\text{ang}} \rangle^2 \equiv \sigma_{\text{ang}}^2 = \frac{1}{20\pi}. \quad (17)$$

The distributions of  $m_{1,2}$ ,  $\vec{\chi}_{1,2}$ , and  $D_L$  are determined by the event rate of the binary systems. When the event rate information of the binary systems is given, we can calculate the rest part of  $\sigma$

$$\sigma_{\text{bbh}}^2 \equiv \langle \mathcal{A}_{\text{bbh}}^2 \rangle - \langle \mathcal{A}_{\text{bbh}} \rangle^2, \mu_{\text{bbh}} \equiv \langle \mathcal{A}_{\text{bbh}} \rangle, \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma = \sigma_{\text{ang}} \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{bbh}}^2 + \mu_{\text{bbh}}^2} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{20\pi}} \sqrt{\sigma_{\text{bbh}}^2 + \mu_{\text{bbh}}^2}. \quad (19)$$

Corresponding to Fig. 1, the above theoretical predictions (8) and (19) to the diffusion strengths of SOBH,

IMBH, and SMBH are respectively  $3.16 \times 10^{-50}$ ,  $8.41 \times 10^{-47}$  and  $1.73 \times 10^{-42}$ . Our theoretical results are almost the same to the direct numerical simulation results which validates our theory for GW memory background.

Similar to the description of usual stochastic gravitational wave background (SGWB), we investigate the power spectral density (PSD) of  $\mathfrak{M}(t)$

$$S^{\mathfrak{M}}(f) \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \left| \int_0^T e^{-2\pi i f t} \mathfrak{M}(t) dt \right|^2 \quad (20)$$

$$= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \int_0^T dt_1 dt_2 \cos(2\pi f(t_1 - t_2)) \langle \mathfrak{M}(t_1) \mathfrak{M}(t_2) \rangle \quad (21)$$

$$= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{D}{\pi^2 f^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{\sin(2\pi f T)}{2\pi f T} \right] \quad (22)$$

$$= \frac{D}{\pi^2 f^2}. \quad (23)$$

Equivalently we can also use the characteristic strain to describe the SGWMB [46]

$$h_c^{\mathfrak{M}}(f) = \sqrt{2f S^{\mathfrak{M}}} = \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{\text{bbh}}^2 + \mu_{\text{bbh}}^2}{20\pi f \Delta t}}. \quad (24)$$

*Detectability of SGWMB.*— Besides the newly proposed SGWMB in the current work, the stochastic gravitational wave background [46, 47] may originated from compact binary coalescence [48] and the cosmological perturbation in the early universe. Due to the unknown detail of the cosmological perturbation, the related power spectrum of the SGWB from the cosmological perturbation may be big or small for detection in the near future [49–51]. Compact binary coalescence may produce both non-memory SGWB and SGWMB. The dominate one between the non-memory SGWB and the SGWMB is easier to be detected.

The power spectrum of the non-memory SGWB due to the compact binary coalescence can be divided into three parts which admit different power index [48, 52]. These three parts are highly related to the inspiral, merger and ringdown stage of a BBH system. As shown in Fig. 2 the transition frequencies for SOBH, IMBH and SMBH are respectively about thousands Hz, several Hz and mini Hz. Differently the power spectrum of the SGWMB always admit power index -2 as shown in (23). So we can expect that the non-memory SGWB may dominate in some frequency region, while the SGWMB may dominate in other frequency region. We plot our calculation results in Fig. 2, from which we can see that the SGWMB dominate in the relatively high frequency region.

Based on the above finding, we do not expect that pulsar timing array can detect SGWMB without a specially designed algorithm which can extract SGWMB buried in the total SGWB data. On the contrary, the future




FIG. 2: The characteristic strains of SGWMB for several different typical event rates of BBH coalescence are compared. Together with the SGWMB, representative SGWB originated from usual non-memory part of GW of BBH coalescence are shown as the dashed lines. The expected detection limit of LISA for SGWB based on 4 years observation is shown as the blue line. The existing limits from LIGO, Cassini and pulsar timing array observations are shown as the stars.

space-based detector like LISA may detect SGWMB of supermassive BBH because the SGWMB is stronger than the corresponding non-memory SGWB. In order to indicate such detectability we plot the power-law integrated (PI) curve of LISA [53–55] together with the kinds of non-memory SGWB in Fig. 2. Possibly even the transition behavior of the power spectrum from non-memory background to memory background can be detected.

The strength of the non-memory SGWB has been constrained by several experiments. Pulsar timing array (PTA) has limited the characteristic strain of the non-memory SGWB less than about  $3 \times 10^{-15}$  at a reference frequency about  $10^{-8}$  Hz [56]. Cassini data has been applied to limit the characteristic strain of the non-memory SGWB and constrain the amplitude to less than  $2 \times 10^{-15}$  at reference frequency about 0.3 mHz [57]. The O3a data of LIGO can limit the characteristic strain of the non-memory SGWB to less than about  $1.3 \times 10^{-24}$  at reference frequency about 25 Hz [54]. We plot these limit points in Fig. 2.

Outstandingly we find that the SGWMB strength for supermassive black hole binary is stronger than the non-memory SGWB limit got by LIGO [54]. We have tested several different event rates including all cases in Ref. [58], LS-Stalled and HS-Stalled cases in Ref. [44], and all three cases in Ref. [59] whose diffusions are  $D = 2.53 \times 10^{-44}$ ,  $D = 8.75 \times 10^{-45}$ , and  $D = 1.57 \times 10^{-44}$  for popIII, Q3-delay, and Q3-nodelay models respectively [60]. All of these event rates predict that the SGWMB are stronger than the non-memory SGWB limit got by LIGO as shown in Fig. 2. We do not think this finding means that supermassive BBH merger has been ruled

out by LIGO detection. Firstly, the data analysis done by LIGO science collaboration focused only on the non-memory SGWB. More detail analysis is needed for the SGWMB proposed here. Secondly, the averaged event rate for supermassive BBH are between 1 to 200 per year. While the observation time of LIGO is less than three years in total. Maybe more observation time is needed for LIGO detectors to reveal SGWMB of supermassive BBH.

*Implication of SGWMB detection.*— GW memory is an outstanding prediction of general relativity. But single GW memory event is extremely hard to detect [19, 20, 25, 33, 37, 61–67]. The newly finding SGWMB provides an alternative way to detect GW memory. From our Brownian motion model, we are sure that the power spectrum index of the SGWMB is always -2 which is independent of the gravity theory. Different gravity theory may result in different strength of SGWMB which can be tested through detection.

Similar to the usual non-memory SGWB, SGWMB also encodes the information of the tensor  $+/ \times$ , vector  $x/y$  and breathing/longitudinal polarizations [68]. Methods designed for SGWB [69] to extract those information could be applied to SGWMB straightforwardly. Such information can also be used to test gravity theory.

The merger rate of supermassive BBH is highly uncertain. Especially, people are still debating what kind of mechanism drives the supermassive BBH to pass the final parsec. The PTA observation sensitivity gradually increases. But the corresponding SGWB detection of supermassive BBH is still missing. And more even PTA detected the corresponding SGWB, we are still not sure that the BBH merges or not. This is because inspiral only binary produce the dominate part of the non-memory SGWB. In contrast, the detection of SGWMB indicates the merger of BBHs without ambiguity.

Our calculation shows that both LISA and LIGO are promising to detect SGWMB. For LISA the frequency range is optimal for the SGWMB of supermassive BBH. So we expect LISA is ideal for SGWMB detection. For LIGO, the sensitivity is good enough for SGWMB detection. But more observation time or more exhaustive data analysis technique is needed.

In the coming years, no matter LISA or LIGO detected SGWMB the first detection of GW memory will be realized. And more the merger rate of supermassive BBH will be determined. On the contrary, if no SGWMB was found either general relativity or the theory of supermassive BBH merger should be checked carefully.

*Acknowledgments.*— We greatly thank Jin-Ping Zhu and He Wang for useful suggestions. We are also thankful to Xing-Jiang Zhu for his comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by the NSFC (No. 11690023, No. 11633001, No. 11920101003 and No. 12021003). Z. Cao was supported by “the Interdiscipline Research



Funds of Beijing Normal University” and CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research YSBR-006.

<sup>†</sup> Zhoujian Cao: zjcao@amt.ac.cn

- [1] Y. B. Zel’dovich and A. G. Polnarev, *Soviet Astronomy* **18**, 17 (1974).
- [2] P. N. Payne, *Phys. Rev. D* **28**, 1894 (1983).
- [3] V. B. Braginsky and L. P. Grishchuk, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **62**, 427 (1985).
- [4] V. B. Braginsky and K. S. Thorne, *Nature* **327**, 123 (1987).
- [5] D. Christodoulou, *Physical review letters* **67**, 1486 (1991).
- [6] J. Frauendiener, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **9**, 1639 (1992).
- [7] A. Strominger and A. Zhiboedov, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 86 (2016).
- [8] P. Mao, H. Ouyang, J.-B. Wu, and X. Wu, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 125011 (2017).
- [9] S. W. Hawking, M. J. Perry, and A. Strominger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 231301 (2016), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.231301>.
- [10] S. Pasterski, A. Strominger, and A. Zhiboedov, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **1612**, 53 (2016).
- [11] S. M. Du and A. Nishizawa, *Physical Review D* **94**, 104063 (2016).
- [12] S. Hollands, A. Ishibashi, and R. M. Wald, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **34**, 155005 (2017).
- [13] H. Yang and D. Martynov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 071102 (2018).
- [14] S. Hou and Z.-H. Zhu, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2021**, 83 (2021), ISSN 1029-8479, URL [https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01\(2021\)083](https://doi.org/10.1007/JHEP01(2021)083).
- [15] A. C. Jenkins and M. Sakellariadou, **38**, 165004 (2021), URL <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6382/ac1084>.
- [16] S. Tahura, D. A. Nichols, A. Saffer, L. C. Stein, and K. Yagi, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 104026 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.103.104026>.
- [17] S. Pasterski, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2017**, 154 (2017), 1505.00716.
- [18] R. Van Haasteren and Y. Levin, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **401**, 2372 (2010).
- [19] J. Cordes and F. Jenet, *The Astrophysical Journal* **752**, 54 (2012).
- [20] D. Madison, J. Cordes, and S. Chatterjee, *The Astrophysical Journal* **788**, 141 (2014).
- [21] J. B. Wang, G. Hobbs, W. Coles, R. M. Shannon, X. J. Zhu, D. R. Madison, M. Kerr, V. Ravi, M. J. Keith, R. N. Manchester, et al., *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **446**, 1657 (2015), 1410.3323.
- [22] K. Aggarwal, Z. Arzoumanian, P. T. Baker, A. Brazier, P. R. Brook, S. Burke-Spolaor, S. Chatterjee, J. M. Cordes, N. J. Cornish, F. Crawford, et al., **889**, 38 (2020), URL <https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ab6083>.
- [23] A. D. Johnson, S. J. Kapadia, A. Osborne, A. Hixon, and D. Kennefick, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 044045 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.99.044045>.
- [24] P. D. Lasky, E. Thrane, Y. Levin, J. Blackman, and Y. Chen, *Physical review letters* **117**, 061102 (2016).
- [25] J. D. Scargle, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2110.07754 (2021), 2110.07754.
- [26] M. Favata, *Physical Review D* **80**, 024002 (2009).
- [27] M. Favata, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **696**, L159 (2009).
- [28] M. Favata, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **27**, 084036 (2010).
- [29] D. Pollney and C. Reisswig, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **732**, L13 (2010).
- [30] Z. Cao and W.-B. Han, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **33**, 155011 (2016).
- [31] K. Mitman, D. A. Iozzo, N. Khera, M. Boyle, T. De Lorenzo, N. Deppe, L. E. Kidder, J. Moxon, H. P. Pfeiffer, M. A. Scheel, et al., *Physical Review D* **103**, 024031 (2021).
- [32] X. Liu, X. He, and Z. Cao, *Physical Review D* **103**, 043005 (2021).
- [33] Z.-C. Zhao, X. Liu, Z. Cao, and X. He, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 064056 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.064056>.
- [34] O. M. Boersma, D. A. Nichols, and P. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 083026 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.083026>.
- [35] M. Hübner, C. Talbot, P. D. Lasky, and E. Thrane, *Physical Review D* **101**, 023011 (2020).
- [36] M. Hübner, P. Lasky, and E. Thrane, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 023004 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.104.023004>.
- [37] L. O. McNeill, E. Thrane, and P. D. Lasky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 181103 (2017).
- [38] Z. Arzoumanian, P. T. Baker, H. Blumer, B. Bécsy, A. Brazier, P. R. Brook, S. Burke-Spolaor, S. Chatterjee, S. Chen, J. M. Cordes, et al., *The Astrophysical Journal Letters* **905**, L34 (2020), 2009.04496.
- [39] B. Allen, *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 012034 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevResearch.2.012034>.
- [40] M. Maggiore, *Gravitational waves: Volume 1: Theory and experiments*, vol. 1 (Oxford university press, 2008).
- [41] K. Belczynski, J. Klencki, C. Fields, A. Olejak, E. Berti, G. Meynet, C. Fryer, D. Holz, R. O’Shaughnessy, D. Brown, et al., *Astronomy & Astrophysics* **636**, A104 (2020).
- [42] J.-P. Zhu, S. Wu, Y.-P. Yang, B. Zhang, Y.-W. Yu, H. Gao, Z. Cao, and L.-D. Liu, *Astrophys. J.* **921**, 156 (2021), 2106.15781.
- [43] A. Rasskazov, G. Fragione, and B. Kocsis, *The Astrophysical Journal* **899**, 149 (2020).
- [44] M. Bonetti, A. Sesana, F. Haardt, E. Barausse, and M. Colpi, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **486**, 4044 (2019).
- [45] D. Krapf, E. Marinari, R. Metzler, G. Oshanin, X. Xu, and A. Squarcini, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 023029 (2018).
- [46] M. Maggiore, *Physics Reports* **331**, 283 (2000).
- [47] M. Maggiore, *Gravitational waves: Volume 2: Astrophysics and Cosmology*, vol. 1 (Oxford university press, 2018).
- [48] Y. B. Ginat, V. Desjacques, R. Reischke, and H. B. Perets, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 083501 (2020), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.102.083501>.
- [49] J. Liu, Z.-K. Guo, R.-G. Cai, and G. Shiu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 031301 (2018), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.120.031301>.
- [50] R.-G. Cai, S. Pi, and M. Sasaki, *Phys.*

- Rev. Lett. **122**, 201101 (2019), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.122.201101>.
- [51] J. Liu, R.-G. Cai, and Z.-K. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 141303 (2021), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.126.141303>.
- [52] X.-J. Zhu, E. Howell, T. Regimbau, D. Blair, and Z.-H. Zhu, The Astrophysical Journal **739**, 86 (2011).
- [53] S. S. Bavera, G. Franciolini, G. Cusin, A. Rito, M. Zevin, and T. Fragos, arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.05836 (2021).
- [54] R. Abbott et al. (KAGRA, Virgo, LIGO Scientific), Phys. Rev. D **104**, 022004 (2021), 2101.12130.
- [55] E. Thrane and J. D. Romano, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 124032 (2013), URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevD.88.124032>.
- [56] L. Lentati, S. R. Taylor, C. M. F. Mingarelli, A. Sesana, S. A. Sanidas, A. Vecchio, R. N. Caballero, K. J. Lee, R. van Haasteren, S. Babak, et al., Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **453**, 2576 (2015).
- [57] J. W. Armstrong, L. Iess, P. Tortora, and B. Bertotti, The Astrophysical Journal **599**, 806 (2003), URL <https://doi.org/10.1086/379505>.
- [58] C. DeGraf, D. Sijacki, T. Di Matteo, K. Holley-Bockelmann, G. Snyder, and V. Springel, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **503**, 3629 (2021), 2012.00775.
- [59] A. Klein, E. Barausse, A. Sesana, A. Petiteau, E. Berti, S. Babak, J. Gair, S. Aoudia, I. Hinder, F. Ohme, et al., Physical Review D **93**, 024003 (2016).
- S.-X. Yi, G. Nelemans, C. Brinkerink, Z. Kostrzewa-Rutkowska, S. T. Timmer, F. Stoppa, E. M. Rossi, and S. F. P. Zwart, arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13662 (2021).
- N. Seto, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society: Letters **400**, L38 (2009).
- [62] R. Van Haasteren and Y. Levin, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **401**, 2372 (2010).
- [63] M. Pshirkov, D. Baskaran, and K. Postnov, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **402**, 417 (2010).
- [64] Z. Arzoumanian, A. Brazier, S. Burke-Spolaor, S. J. Chamberlin, S. Chatterjee, B. Christy, J. M. Cordes, N. J. Cornish, P. B. Demorest, X. Deng, et al., The Astrophysical Journal **810**, 150 (2015).
- [65] P.-M. Zhang, C. Duval, G. Gibbons, and P. Horvathy, Physics Letters B **772**, 743 (2017), ISSN 0370-2693.
- [66] P. D. Lasky, E. Thrane, Y. Levin, J. Blackman, and Y. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 061102 (2016).
- [67] A. K. Divakarla, E. Thrane, P. D. Lasky, and B. F. Whiting, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 023010 (2020).
- [68] T. Callister, A. S. Biscoveanu, N. Christensen, M. Isi, A. Matas, O. Minazzoli, T. Regimbau, M. Sakellariadou, J. Tasson, and E. Thrane, Phys. Rev. X **7**, 041058 (2017), 1704.08373.
- [69] Z.-C. Chen, C. Yuan, and Q.-G. Huang, Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron. **64**, 120412 (2021), 2101.06869.