

Gravitational recoil from binary black hole mergers in scalar field clouds

Yu-Peng Zhang^a, Miguel Gracia-Linares^b, Pablo Laguna^b, Deirdre Shoemaker^b, Yu-Xiao Liu^a

^a*Lanzhou Center for Theoretical Physics, Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics of Gansu Province,
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Research Center of Gravitation,*

School of Physical Science and Technology, Lanzhou University, Lanzhou 730000, China

^b*Center of Gravitational Physics, Department of Physics,
University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712, U.S.A.*

In vacuum, the gravitational recoil of the final black hole from the merger of two black holes depends exclusively on the mass ratio and spins of the coalescing black holes, and on the eccentricity of the binary. If matter is present, accretion by the merging black holes may modify significantly their masses and spins, altering both the dynamics of the binary and the gravitational recoil of the remnant black hole. This paper considers such scenario. We investigate the effects on the kick of the final black hole from immersing the binary in a scalar field cloud. We consider two types of configurations: one with non-spinning and unequal-mass black holes, and a second with equal mass and spinning holes. For both types, we investigate how the gravitational recoil of the final black hole changes as we vary the energy density of the scalar field. We find that the accretion of scalar field by the merging black holes could have a profound effect. For the non-spinning, unequal-mass binary black holes, the kicks are in general larger than in the vacuum case, with speeds of $\sim 1,200$ km/s for binaries with mass ratio 2:1, one order of magnitude larger than in vacuum. For equal mass, binaries with black holes with spins aligned with the orbital angular momentum, kicks larger than in vacuum are also found. For systems with spins in the super-kick configuration, the scalar field triggers a similar dependence of the kicks with the entrance angle at merger as in the vacuum case but in this case depending on the strength of the scalar field.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

The gravitational waves (GWs) emitted during the inspiral and coalescence of a binary black hole (BBH) carry energy, angular momentum, and linear momentum [1]. A net loss of linear momentum by the binary in certain direction implies a recoil of the final black hole (BH) in the opposite direction [2–4]. In vacuum, this recoil or kick depends exclusively on the mass ratio and spins of the coalescing BHs, and if the binary is not in a quasi-circular orbit, the recoil depends also on the eccentricity of the binary system [5]. When matter is present, the situation is more complex. For instance, in mixed binary mergers, i.e. coalescences of BHs with neutron stars, the kick will depend also on any accretion of matter by the BH during the merger [6].

For this work, we focus on BH environments permeated by a scalar field. Scalar fields have been considered as sources of dark matter [7], in inflationary theories [8–13], and in the context of modified theories of gravity, such as scalar-tensor and $f(R)$ theories [14–16]. In the presence of BHs, scalar fields have also been used to probe the transition from inspiraling BHs to a single perturbed BH [17]. BBH systems in scalar-tensor [18, 19], $f(R)$ [20], and Einstein-Maxwell-dilation [21] theories have been also studied, as well as BBHs in dynamical Chern-Simons gravity [22], axion-like scalar fields [23], and scalar Gauss-Bonnet gravity [24].

Here, we are interested in investigating the effect that a scalar field may have on the kick of the final BH, an aspect not considered by the studies mentioned above. We focus on a simple scenario, a BBH immersed in a

spherical shell of a massive scalar field and study two types of BBH configurations. One consists of un-equal mass binaries with non-spinning BHs, and in the other, binaries with equal-mass holes but spinning BHs. For the later, we consider BH spins aligned with the orbital angular momentum (i.e., non-precessing binaries) and BH spins in the orbital plane in the super-kick configuration [25, 26]. In addition to the kick on the final BH, we also studied the characteristics of the GWs and the angular momentum radiated in GWs and by the scalar field.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present the method to construct initial data. Sec. III summarizes the equations of motion for the BBH with scalar field sources. Sec. IV presents the methodology to extract kicks, energy, and angular momentum radiated. The BBH configurations are given in Sec. V. Results for un-equal mass, non-spinning BHs binaries are given in Sec. VI and for equal mass, spinning BHs binaries in Sec. VII. Conclusions are found in Sec. VIII. Greek indices denote space-time indices, and Latin indices are used for spatial indices. We use geometrical units in which $G = c = 1$. A subscript 0 denotes initial values. Unless explicitly stated, we report results in units of M_0 , the total initial mass of the BBH system.

II. INITIAL DATA

Under a 3+1 decomposition of the Einstein field equations [27], the initial data consist of $(\gamma_{ij}, K_{ij}, \rho, S_i)$, with γ_{ij} the spatial metric and K_{ij} the extrinsic curvature of

the constant time, space-like hypersurfaces. ρ and S_i are the energy and momentum densities, respectively. The initial data must satisfy the following equations:

$$R + K^2 - K_{ij}K^{ij} = 16\pi\rho \quad (1)$$

$$\nabla_j K_i^j - \nabla_i K = 8\pi S_i, \quad (2)$$

namely the Hamiltonian and momentum constraints, respectively. Here R is the Ricci scalar, and ∇ denotes covariant differentiation associated with γ_{ij} . For our case of a massive scalar field:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2}\Pi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\nabla^i\nabla_i\phi + \frac{1}{2}m_\phi^2\phi^2, \quad (3)$$

$$S_i = -\Pi\partial_i\phi, \quad (4)$$

with m_ϕ the mass of the scalar field ϕ and Π its conjugate momentum.

We solve the constraints (1) and (2) following the York-Lichnerowicz conformal approach [28–31] in which

$$\gamma_{ij} = \psi^4\eta_{ij} \quad (5)$$

$$K_{ij} = A_{ij} = \psi^{-2}\tilde{A}_{ij}, \quad (6)$$

with $A^i_i = 0$, $K = 0$, and η_{ij} the flat metric. In addition, we impose $\phi = \tilde{\phi}$ and $\Pi = \psi^{-6}\tilde{\Pi}$ [32, 33]. With these transformations, the Hamiltonian (1) and the momentum (2) constraints read respectively:

$$\Delta\psi + \frac{1}{8}\tilde{A}^{ij}\tilde{A}_{ij}\psi^{-7} = -\pi\tilde{\Pi}^2\psi^{-7} - \pi\psi\partial^i\phi\partial_i\phi - \pi m_\phi^2\phi^2\psi^5 \quad (7)$$

$$\partial_j\tilde{A}_i^j = -8\pi\tilde{\Pi}\partial_i\phi, \quad (8)$$

where $\Delta = \eta^{ij}\partial_i\partial_j$.

Since we are modeling BHs as punctures, the conformal factor ψ diverges at the punctures. Therefore, we will exploit the freedom for choosing initial data for ϕ and Π and zero out the divergent terms proportional to ψ and ψ^5 in Eq. (7). We accomplish this by setting initially $\phi = 0$. With this assumption, (7) and (8) become

$$\Delta\psi + \left(\frac{1}{8}\tilde{A}^{ij}\tilde{A}_{ij} + \pi\tilde{\Pi}^2\right)\psi^{-7} = 0 \quad (9)$$

$$\partial_j\tilde{A}_i^j = 0, \quad (10)$$

respectively.

In Eq. (8), we use the Bowen-York solutions for \tilde{A}_{ij} [34]. Since we are interested in asymptotically flat solutions to the conformal factor, we require $\tilde{\Pi}$ to have compact support. For simplicity, we set

$$\tilde{\Pi}(r) = \Pi_0 \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{r-r_0}{\sigma}\right)^2\right]. \quad (11)$$

That is, the scalar field source is a shell with radius r_0 , thickness σ , and amplitude Π_0 . We solve Eq. (9) equation with the 2PUNCTURES solver [35], which was modified to include the $\tilde{\Pi}^2$ term.

III. EVOLUTION EQUATIONS

The evolution equation for the scalar field is

$$\square\phi = m_\phi^2\phi, \quad (12)$$

with $\square = \nabla^\mu\nabla_\mu$ and ∇_μ covariant differentiation with respect to the space-time metric $g_{\mu\nu}$. Under a 3+1 decomposition, the space-time metric is decomposed as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \gamma_{\mu\nu} - n_\mu n_\nu, \quad (13)$$

with $n^\mu = (\alpha^{-1}, -\beta^i\alpha^{-1})$ the time-like unit normal vector to the $t = \text{constant}$ space-like hypersurfaces. Here α and β^i are the lapse function and shift vector, respectively. Given (13), we rewrite Eq. (12) as

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_o\phi = -\Pi, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{1}{\alpha}\partial_o\Pi = -\nabla^i\nabla_i\phi - \nabla_i\ln\alpha\nabla^i\phi + K\Pi + m_\phi^2\phi, \quad (15)$$

where $\partial_o = \partial_t - \beta^i\partial_i$.

The evolution of the geometry of the space-like hypersurfaces, namely γ_{ij} and K_{ij} , is handled with the BSSN formulation of the Einstein equations [36, 37]. For a scalar field, the stress-energy tensor source in these equations is given by

$$S_{ij} = \nabla_i\phi\nabla_j\phi + \frac{1}{2}\gamma_{ij}(\Pi^2 - \nabla^k\nabla_k\phi - m_\phi^2\phi^2). \quad (16)$$

We used the moving puncture gauge [38, 39] to evolve α and β^i . The resulting set of evolution equations is solved numerically using the MAYA code [40–45], our local version of the EINSTEINTOOLKIT code [46].

IV. PHYSICS EXTRACTION

The physical quantities of interest are the spin and masses of the BHs, as well as the properties of the radiated emission. The BH masses and spins are computed using the dynamical apparent horizons framework [47] as implemented in the EINSTEINTOOLKIT [46]. On the other hand, the energy, linear and angular momentum radiated are computed from the Weyl scalar Ψ_4 as follows [1]:

$$\frac{dE^{\text{gw}}}{dt} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r^2}{16\pi} \oint \left| \int_{-\infty}^t \Psi_4 dt' \right|^2 d\Omega, \quad (17)$$

$$\frac{dP_i^{\text{gw}}}{dt} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r^2}{16\pi} \oint \hat{l}_i \left| \int_{-\infty}^t \Psi_4 dt' \right|^2 d\Omega, \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dJ_i^{\text{gw}}}{dt} = & - \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r^2}{16\pi} \text{Re} \left[\oint \left(\int_{-\infty}^t \bar{\Psi}_4 dt' \right) \right. \\ & \times \left. \hat{J}_i \left(\int_{-\infty}^t \int_{-\infty}^{t'} \Psi_4 dt'' dt' \right) d\Omega \right], \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $d\Omega = \sin\theta d\theta d\varphi$, $\hat{l}_i = (\sin\theta \cos\varphi, \sin\theta \sin\varphi, \cos\theta)$, and \hat{J}_i is the angular momentum operator. Integration of (18) yields the recoil or kick of the final BH from the emission of GWs.

In addition to GW emission, we also have emission of energy, linear, and angular momentum associated with the scalar field. We compute this emission following the method in Ref. [24] as follows:

$$\frac{dE^{\text{sf}}}{dt} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^2 \oint T_{tr} d\Omega, \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{dP_i^{\text{sf}}}{dt} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^2 \oint T_{ir} d\Omega, \quad (21)$$

$$\frac{dJ_z^{\text{sf}}}{dt} = \lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} r^2 \oint T_{\phi r} d\Omega, \quad (22)$$

where the components of the stress-energy tensor are given by

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \nabla_\mu \phi \nabla_\nu \phi - g_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{1}{2} \nabla_\alpha \phi \nabla^\alpha \phi + \frac{1}{2} m_\phi^2 \phi^2 \right). \quad (23)$$

In all these fluxes, we evaluate the integrals at a finite radius and then extrapolate the values to infinity.

V. BINARY CONFIGURATIONS

The initial configuration for all BBH systems have the holes separated by a coordinate distance $d = 8 M_0$. The scalar field momentum shell has radius $r_0 = 12 M_0$ and thickness $\sigma = 1 M_0$. We also set the mass of the scalar field to $m_\phi = 0.4/M_0$. Each simulation was carried out with 8 levels of mesh refinements, outer boundary at $317.44 M_0$, and resolution in the finest grid of $M_0/64.5$.

We considered two types of binaries. One is binaries with non-spinning BHs and initial mass ratios $q_0 = m_1/m_2 = (2, 3, 4)$. The other type is binaries with equal mass BHs and their spins anti-aligned spins with magnitudes $a = 0.6$. For the spinning cases, we investigated two setups: one with the BH spins aligned with the orbital momentum (non-precessing binaries) and spins in the orbital plane (super-kick configuration). With the exception of the super-kick configuration binaries, we considered initial amplitude values of the scalar momentum $\hat{\Pi}_0 \equiv \Pi_0 M_0 \times 10^3 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$. On the other hand, for super-kick binaries, we have added more cases and set $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (1.25, 2.5, 3.75, 5.0, 6.25, 7.5, 8.50, 10.0)$. In order to do comparisons with the vacuum case, we did simulations with $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 0$ for all types. The labeling of the simulations is as follows: A non-spinning, $q_0 = x$ with $\hat{\Pi}_0 = y.y$ simulation is labeled $qx\text{-}0yy$. Similarly, an equal mass simulation with spins perpendicular and parallel to the orbital angular momentum with the same $\hat{\Pi}_0$ are labeled $a_\perp 0yy$ and $a_\parallel 0yy$, respectively.

Tables I and II show the scalar field energies E_ϕ and total ADM energy E_{ADM} in the initial data for each of

Case	E_ϕ/M_0	E_{ADM}/M_0
q2-000	0.0000	0.989
q2-050	0.0289	1.018
q2-075	0.0643	1.053
q2-100	0.1126	1.102
q3-000	0.0000	0.991
q3-050	0.2889	1.019
q3-075	0.0643	1.055
q3-100	0.1126	1.104
q4-000	0.0000	0.992
q4-050	0.2889	1.021
q4-075	0.0643	1.056
q4-100	0.1126	1.105

TABLE I: ADM and scalar field energies in the initial data for un-equal mass, non-spinning BBH configurations.

Case	E_ϕ/M_0	E_{ADM}/M_0
$a_\parallel 000$	0.0000	0.987
$a_\parallel 050$	0.0289	1.016
$a_\parallel 075$	0.0643	1.052
$a_\parallel 100$	0.1127	1.101
$a_\perp 0000$	0.0000	0.987
$a_\perp 0125$	0.0018	0.989
$a_\perp 0250$	0.0072	0.995
$a_\perp 0375$	0.0163	1.004
$a_\perp 0500$	0.0289	1.017
$a_\perp 0625$	0.0449	1.033
$a_\perp 0750$	0.0643	1.052
$a_\perp 0875$	0.0869	1.075
$a_\perp 1000$	0.1127	1.101

TABLE II: ADM and scalar field energies in the initial data for equal mass, spinning BBH configurations.

the cases. Notice that $E_{ADM} \simeq E_{ADM}^{\text{vac}} + E_\phi$ where [48]

$$E_\phi = \int \rho \sqrt{\gamma} d^3x = \frac{1}{2} \int \tilde{\Pi}^2 \psi^{-6} \sqrt{\eta} d^3x. \quad (24)$$

VI. UN-EQUAL MASS, NON-SPINNING BH BINARIES

Figure 1 shows the mode $l = 2, m = 2$ of the Weyl scalar Ψ_4 for the un-equal mass and non-spinning BH binaries. The top panels from left to right are for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively, with lines blue, red, and green corresponding to $q_0 = (2, 3, 4)$, respectively. The bottom panels from left to right are for $q_0 = (2, 3, 4)$, respectively, with lines blue, red, and green corresponding to $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively. From the top

panels we see that, for a given $\hat{\Pi}_0$, the binary merges earlier for smaller q_0 , as expected from the vacuum case, since the luminosity in GW during the inspiral scales as $q^2/(1+q)^4$ [27]. At the same time, for a given q_0 , the larger the given value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$ is, the smaller the difference among the merger times.

From the bottom panels in Fig. 1, one sees that for a given q_0 , the larger $\hat{\Pi}_0$, the earlier the binary merges. This is because the luminosity in GW also depends on the total mass of the binary M as M^2 [27]. And as we shall see next, M grows monotonically with $\hat{\Pi}_0$. Also, when one slices the data this way, we observe that the differences with $\hat{\Pi}_0$ in merger times remain roughly the same independently of q_0 .

The accretion of the scalar field by the BHs modifies the total binary mass M and its mass ratio q as it evolves. Figure 2 shows the evolution of m_1 , m_2 , and M for each initial q_0 . As expected, accretion starts when the scalar field shell reaches the BHs, approximately at a time $\sim r_0$. The bottom right panel also shows the evolution of q due to the changes of the BH masses. In all panels, lines terminate at the time when the binary merges, as signaled by the appearance of a common apparent horizon. The colors black, blue, red and green denote $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (0, 5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively. Figure 3 shows the corresponding BH accretion rates.

From Figs. 2 and 3, we observe that the BH masses and accretion rates grow monotonically with $\hat{\Pi}_0$ for a given initial q_0 . Furthermore, the growth is such that the increase in q is also monotonic with $\hat{\Pi}_0$. From Fig. 3, given a value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$, $\dot{m}_1 > \dot{m}_2$, similar to Bondi accretion behaviour in which the accretion rate is proportional to the mass of the accreting object. By taking into consideration the growth in q observed in Fig. 2, namely $\dot{q} > 0$, one obtains that $\dot{m}_1 > q\dot{m}_2$.

Figure 4 shows the energy, angular momentum, and linear momentum radiated in GWs (dashed lines) and in the scalar field (solid lines) for the case $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$. We observe in the left panel that the energy radiated by the scalar field is higher than in GWs. This can be explained as follows: the ADM energy at the end of the simulations is given by $E_{ADM} = E_{GW}^{rad} + E_{\phi}^{rad} + m_f$, with m_f the mass of the final BH. For the case $q_0 = 2$ and $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$, we have from Table I that $E_{ADM} = 1.102 M_0$ and from Table III that $m_f = 1.0147 M_0$; thus, $E_{GW}^{rad} + E_{\phi}^{rad} = E_{ADM} - m_f \simeq 0.087 M_0$. Since energy radiated in GWs is typically a few percent, in this case $E_{GW} \simeq 0.025 M_0$, we have that $E_{\phi}^{rad} \simeq 0.06 M_0$, consistent with the value in Fig. 4. Another characteristic in this figure is that, as with GWs, the energy radiated in the scalar field decreases monotonically with q_0 .

The angular momentum radiated is depicted in the middle panel of Fig. 4. As expected, GWs carry away angular momentum and shrink the binary. The scalar field also extracts angular momentum but in smaller amounts. The reason why the scalar field angular momentum radiation is much smaller than the one in GWs is because

initially the scalar field shell does not have any angular momentum. All the momentum generated is from the “stirring” of the scalar field by the binary.

The right panel in Fig. 4 shows the magnitude of linear momentum emitted, which for these non-precessing binaries lies in the xy -plane. As with the energy radiated, the emission of scalar field linear momentum is significantly larger than in the GWs. Also interesting is the oscillations in the scalar field linear momentum radiated, which are also observed in the energy and angular momentum but at a much smaller scale. The reason for this is because in systems of BBH with massive scalar fields, as it is in our case, the scalar fields develops long-lived modes due to the presence of an effective potential.

Tables III shows the mass m_f , spin a_f , and kick velocity v_{kick} of the remnant BH, where we have combined the emission of linear momentum by GWs and the scalar field to estimate the gravitational recoil. Independently of q_0 , m_f grows monotonically with $\hat{\Pi}_0$. This is expected from the way the BHs accrete the scalar field, namely, the more massive the hole, the more it accretes.

Regarding the final spin, we found that for a given $\hat{\Pi}_0$, a_f decreases as q_0 increases. Which is the same trend observed in the vacuum case; that is, the scalar field modifies the spin magnitude but not its dependence with q . On the other hand, if one fixes the attention to the final spin for a given q_0 , one sees monotonicity in the $q_0 = 3$ and 4, decreasing its value with $\hat{\Pi}_0$ increasing. At first look, this seems counter intuitive because one would think that, since the larger the value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$, the earlier the binary merger, there would be a larger residual of angular momentum that goes into the final spin. Yes, there is more angular momentum in the final BH, but one has to also remember that $a_f = S_f/m_f^2$ is the dimensionless spin parameter, not the angular momentum S_f . It is the growth in the final mass of the BH responsible for the decrease in a_f . Since the growth in the masses for $q_0 = 2$ is not as large (see Fig. 2), the monotonicity of a_f with $\hat{\Pi}_0$ only shows for large values.

For the kick velocity, given a value of q_0 , the recoil is larger than in the vacuum case and increases monotonically with $\hat{\Pi}_0$. In vacuum, the maximum kick velocity of the final BH in non-spinning, unequal-mass BBH occurs near $q_0 = 3$ [3]. In the presence of scalar field, we observe that the maximum kick for a given $\hat{\Pi}_0$ occurs for $q_0 \leq 2$, with $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$ reaching super-kick levels. For a given $\hat{\Pi}_0$, all the kicks are larger than in the vacuum case, the reason for this is because in these configurations the emission of linear momentum is larger through the scalar field channel. The initial momentum in the scalar field is not directly responsible for this since it does not have net linear momentum; it is spherically symmetric. It is through the interactions with the binary that linear momentum in the scalar field is redistributed and emitted in a particular direction. It turns out that this direction is aligned with that of the linear momentum emitted in GWs.




FIG. 1: Mode $l = 2, m = 2$ of the Weyl scalar Ψ_4 for the un-equal mass and non-spinning BH binaries. The top panels from left to right are for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively, with lines blue, red, and green corresponding to $q_0 = (2, 3, 4)$, respectively. The bottom panels from left to right are for $q_0 = (2, 3, 4)$, respectively, with lines blue, red, and green corresponding to $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively.

Case	m_f/M_0	a_f	v_{kick} (km/s)
q2-000	0.9612	0.6232	146
q2-050	0.9743	0.6218	550
q2-075	0.9893	0.6230	946
q2-100	1.0147	0.6267	1303
q3-000	0.9712	0.5405	166
q3-050	0.9869	0.5378	289
q3-075	1.0055	0.5370	409
q3-100	1.0337	0.5355	543
q4-000	0.9777	0.4713	149
q4-050	0.9942	0.4686	202
q4-075	1.0137	0.4646	256
q4-100	1.0422	0.4624	304

TABLE III: Mass m_f , spin a_f and kick of the final BH for the unequal mass, non-spinning BBH.

VII. EQUAL MASS, SPINNING BH BINARIES

As mentioned before, we considered two setups for binaries with equal mass and anti-aligned spinning BHs. The a_{\parallel} cases have BH spins along the direction of the orbital angular momentum (i.e., non-precessing binaries), and the a_{\perp} cases have BH spins in the orbital plane in the super-kick configuration [25, 26].

Figure 5 shows the mode $l = 2, m = 2$ of the Weyl scalar Ψ_4 . Panels from left to right are for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively, with red lines for a_{\parallel} and blue for a_{\perp} . It is interesting to notice that for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$ there is very little difference in the $(2,2)$ mode between the a_{\parallel} and a_{\perp} case, this in spite of the large difference they have, as we shall see, in kicks produced. After all, the a_{\perp} cases are in the super-kick class. This means that the differences are in the higher modes. We also observe from the waveforms in Fig. 5 that, as for the un-equal mass and non-spinning BH binaries, the larger the value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$, the earlier the binary merges, and the reasons are similar. The accretion of scalar field by the BH increases their masses and thus the luminosity of the binary.

Figure 6, shows from top to bottom the evolution of m_1 , m_2 , and M , respectively. Left panels are for the a_{\parallel} cases and the right ones for a_{\perp} . The line colors black, blue, red, and green correspond $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (0, 5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively. The behaviour in the growth of the masses is similar to that of unequal mass, non-spinning BH binaries. Namely, the growth is monotonic with $\hat{\Pi}_0$. Interesting to point out that the growth in m_1 and m_2 is identical in the a_{\perp} ; thus, q remains unity. This is because for both holes, the orientation of their spins relative to the orbital angular momentum, are identical. On the other hand, since for the a_{\parallel} cases, the BH with mass m_1 has its spin aligned with the orbital angular momentum and for the other anti-aligned, it is clear from panel top-




FIG. 2: Un-equal mass, non-spinning BBHs: Evolution of the BH masses m_1 and m_2 , the total mass M , and the mass ratio q due to scalar field accretion. The black, red, blue, and green correspond to $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (0, 5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively. The lines end at the time when the merger occurs.

left and middle-left that there is a slight difference in the growth between hole m_1 and m_2 . The BH with mass m_2 grows slightly more than m_1 . This translates into mass ratios at merger of $q = 1.0049, 1.0073, 1.0102$ for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0, 7.5, 10$, respectively. This is consistent with accretion of spinning black holes immersed in a gaseous environment or circumbinary disks [49].

Figure 7 shows the energy, angular momentum, and linear momentum radiated as a function of time in GWs (blue lines), in the scalar field (red lines), and the total (black lines) for the $a_{||}$ cases, with the top panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ and the bottom panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$. We observe that the angular and linear momentum radiated in GWs is larger than in the scalar field for both $\hat{\Pi}_0$ values. This is not the case for the energy radiated. Not surprisingly, the larger the value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$, i.e. the larger the initial energy in the scalar field, the larger the energy

emission. This does not imply that the remnant BH will have a smaller mass. As we can see from Table IV and saw from Fig. 6, the larger $\hat{\Pi}_0$, the larger the final BH because of the accretion of scalar field.

Case	m_f/M_0	a_f	$ v $ (km/s)
$a_{ 000}$	0.9512	0.6851	302
$a_{ 050}$	0.9603	0.6856	285
$a_{ 075}$	0.9691	0.6844	297
$a_{ 100}$	0.9850	0.6970	362

TABLE IV: Mass m_f , spin a_f and magnitude of the kick of the final BH for equal mass, spinning BBHs in the $a_{||}$ cases.

Regarding the radiated angular momentum from the middle panels of Fig. 7, the scalar field emission is sig-




FIG. 3: Un-equal mass, non-spinning BBH: Mass accretion rates for each BH, top to bottom panels $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (0, 5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, blue, red, and green correspond to $q_0 = (2, 3, 4)$, respectively.

nificantly smaller than from GWs. However, when comparing the emission in GWs from $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ (top-middle panel) with that of $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$ (bottom-middle panel), the former is slightly larger. Since the initial configuration has mostly orbital angular momentum because the spins are anti-aligned, this implies that the spin of the final BH for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ will be smaller than for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$, as we can see Table IV. This is consistent because the $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$ binary merges earlier (see Fig. 5), and thus it does not radiate as much angular momentum as with the $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ case.

The situation seems to reverse with the linear momentum radiated. Similar to the angular momentum radiated, it is still the case that, as the binary merges earlier because of the presence of the scalar field, it does not “accumulate” as much kick as in the vacuum case (see kick values for $a_{||050}$ and $a_{||075}$ in Table IV). However, as we can see from the right panels in Figure 7, the kick contribution from the scalar field increases with $\hat{\Pi}_0$ and eventually turns things around. At $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$ this contribution is such that the kick becomes larger than in the vacuum case.




FIG. 4: Un-equal mass, non-spinning BBH: energy, angular momentum, and linear momentum radiated in GWs (dashed lines) and in the scalar field (solid lines) for the case $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$. Colors blue, red and green correspond to $q_0 = (2, 3, 4)$, respectively.




FIG. 5: Mode $l = 2, m = 2$ of the Weyl scalar Ψ_4 for the equal mass, spinning BH binaries. Panels from left to right correspond to $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$, respectively, with red lines for a_{\parallel} and blue for a_{\perp} .




FIG. 6: Evolution of m_1 , m_2 and M for equal mass, spinning BH binaries cases. Left panel for a_{\parallel} and right panel a_{\perp} (right). The colors black, blue, and green correspond to the scalar shell clouds with $\hat{\Pi}_0 = (0, 5.0, 7.5, 10.0)$ respectively. The lines end at the time when the merger occurs.

Figure 8 shows the energy, angular momentum, and linear momentum radiated as a function of time in GWs (blue lines), in the scalar field (red lines), and the total (black lines) for the a_{\perp} cases, with the top panels for

$\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ and the bottom panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$. It is interesting to observe that the spin configuration does not have a big effect on the energy and angular momentum radiated. Left and middle panels in Fig. 8 are very sim-




FIG. 7: Energy (left panels), angular momentum (middle panels), and linear momentum (right panels) radiated as a function of time in GWs (blue lines), in the scalar field (red lines), and the total (black lines) for the a_{\parallel} cases, with the top panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ and the bottom panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$.

ilar to those in Fig. 7 for the a_{\parallel} cases. The differences come in the linear momentum radiated (right panels in Fig. 8). Although the trend of which radiation dominates is similar to those in the a_{\parallel} cases, the magnitude of the emission in the a_{\perp} cases is much larger, after all these are super-kick setups.

Table V shows the mass, spin, and the z -component kick velocity (the most dominant in this cases) for the a_{\perp} cases. Regarding the mass of the final BH, for the same reasons as all the previous binary types, m_f increases monotonically with $\hat{\Pi}_0$. There seems to be also monotonicity with $\hat{\Pi}_0$ in a_f . The reason is because the larger the value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$, the faster the binary merges thus the lower the angular momentum radiated and the larger residual angular momentum that goes into the final spin.

There is no monotonicity in the kicks. To help understand the situation, we plot the kicks as a function of $\hat{\Pi}_0$ in Fig. 9. In this figure, we observe hints of an oscillatory trend in the z -component of the kick as a function of $\hat{\Pi}_0$. The reason for this oscillatory behaviour is similar to the one found in the first studies of super-kicks, namely that the magnitude and direction of the kick is proportional to the cosine of the angle that the in-plane components of the spins make with the infall direction at merger [50]. In the vacuum case, this dependence is obtained by changing the be initial direction of the spins. In our case, it is the effect that the scalar field has on the mass growth of the holes, and thus its orbital dynamics, that produces the changes of the spin alignment relative

to the infall direction.

Case	m_f/M_0	a_f	v_z (km/s)
$a_{\perp}0000$	0.9500	0.6797	-2113
$a_{\perp}0125$	0.9500	0.6786	-2138
$a_{\perp}0250$	0.9515	0.6801	-1422
$a_{\perp}0375$	0.9560	0.6860	1020
$a_{\perp}0500$	0.9582	0.6802	2113
$a_{\perp}0625$	0.9650	0.6834	-1281
$a_{\perp}0750$	0.9691	0.6829	335
$a_{\perp}0875$	0.9734	0.6848	1669
$a_{\perp}1000$	0.9841	0.6966	-1576

TABLE V: Mass m_f , spin a_f and z -component of the kick of the final BH for equal mass, spinning BBHs in the a_{\perp} cases

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented results from a numerical study of BBH mergers immersed in a scalar field cloud, focusing on the effects that the cloud has on the gravitational recoil, as well as on the spin of the final BH. We considered two initial configuration scenarios: binaries with non-spinning, un-equal mass BHs and binaries with equal mass BHs and their spins anti-aligned spins. For the later case we had to subcategories, one in which the BH




FIG. 8: Energy (left panels), angular momentum (middle panels), and linear momentum (right panels) radiated as a function of time in GWs (blue lines), in the scalar field (red lines), and the total (black lines) for the a_\perp cases, with the top panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 5.0$ and the bottom panels for $\hat{\Pi}_0 = 10.0$.




FIG. 9: Final kick as a function of $\hat{\Pi}_0$ for the a_\perp (super-kick setup) values in Table V

spins were parallel to the orbital angular momentum (i.e. non-precessing), and the other with the BH spins in the orbital plane in the so-called super-kick setup. The initial geometry of the scalar field cloud was a thin shell encapsulating the binary.

In all cases, because of scalar field accretion, the BHs gained mass, thus increased the emission of GWs, and as a consequence accelerated the merger. This also induced changes in the mass ratio of the binary, with the

exception of the binaries in the super-kick configuration because the spin relative to the orbital momentum were the same.

We computed the radiated energy, angular momentum, and linear momentum emitted in both the GW and scalar field channels. For the un-equal mass BH binaries, we found that the scalar field emission was dominant in energy and linear momentum. Because of the later, the kicks were larger than in the vacuum case. Since the emission of angular momentum by the scalar field was smaller than from GWs, the spins varied very little from their vacuum counterparts. A similar situation took place with the equal mass, spinning BH binaries; the presence of the scalar field did not translate into significant changes in the spin of the final BH relative to the vacuum case. The main reason for this general situation is because the initial scalar field cloud did not have angular momentum that could be transferred via accretion to the BHs.

Regarding the gravitational recoil of the final BH, for the case of unequal mass, non-spinning BH binaries, we obtained that the kicks were larger than their vacuum counterparts because in these configurations the emission of linear momentum is larger via the scalar field channel. Some of the kicks reached super-kick levels of $\sim 1,300$ km/s.

For the binaries with equal mass BHs and spins aligned with the orbital angular momentum, we observed two effects competing against each other as we increased $\hat{\Pi}_0$. The scalar field accretion increased the BH masses and

accelerated the merger. This ameliorated the “accumulation” of the kick. Acting in the opposite direction was the linear momentum radiated in the scalar field, increasing with the value of $\hat{\Pi}_0$ and eventually yielding kicks larger than in the vacuum case.

Finally, for equal mass and spinning BH binaries in the super-kick configuration, we observed hints of the oscillatory behavior observed in the vacuum case. The reasons are similar; that is, the magnitude and direction of the kick is proportional to the cosine of the angle that the in-plane components of the spins make with the infall direction at merger [50]. However, instead of this dependence be from changing the initial direction of the spins, in our case, it is the change in the dynamics of the binary from the mass growth of the holes that produces the changes of the spin alignment relative to the infall direction.

One, of course, must take our results with a grain of salt regarding astrophysical implications. The purpose of our study was solely to investigate the sensitivity of BBH merger dynamics and the resulting final BH to the presence of a scalar field. Our results should be taken as a guide of the scale of energy in a scalar field necessary

to imprint noticeably effects on the merger time of the binary and the gravitational recoil of the final black hole. In a subsequent study, we will focus on the impact in parameter estimation under the eyepiece of GW analysis.

IX. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by NSF awards 2207780 and 2114582 to PL and DS, the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2020YFC2201503), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12105126, No. 11875151, No. 11705070, No. 12075103, and No. 12047501), the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant No. 2021M701531), the 111 Project under (Grant No. B20063), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. lzujbky-2021-pd08).

References

-
- [1] Milton Ruiz, Miguel Alcubierre, Darío Núñez, and Ryoji Takahashi. Multiple expansions for energy and momenta carried by gravitational waves. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 40(8):1705–1729, Dec 2007.
 - [2] M. J. Fitchett. The influence of gravitational wave momentum losses on the centre of mass motion of a newtonian binary system. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 203(4):1049–1062, 08 1983.
 - [3] José A. González, Ulrich Sperhake, Bernd Brügmann, Mark Hannam, and Sascha Husa. Maximum kick from nonspinning black-hole binary inspiral. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:091101, Feb 2007.
 - [4] James Healy, Frank Herrmann, Ian Hinder, Deirdre M. Shoemaker, Pablo Laguna, and Richard A. Matzner. Superkicks in Hyperbolic Encounters of Binary Black Holes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 102:041101, 2009.
 - [5] Carlos F. Sopuerta, Nicolás Yunes, and Pablo Laguna. Gravitational Recoil Velocities from Eccentric Binary Black Hole Mergers. *Ap. J. Lett.*, 656(1):L9–L12, February 2007.
 - [6] Bhavesh Khamesra, Miguel Gracia-Linares, and Pablo Laguna. Black hole-neutron star binary mergers: the imprint of tidal deformations and debris. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 38(18):185008, September 2021.
 - [7] David J.E. Marsh. Axion cosmology. *Physics Reports*, 643:1 – 79, 2016. Axion cosmology.
 - [8] Fedor Bezrukov and Mikhail Shaposhnikov. The standard model higgs boson as the inflaton. *Physics Letters B*, 659(3):703 – 706, 2008.
 - [9] C.P. Burgess, Hyun Min Lee, and Michael Trott. Power-counting and the validity of the classical approximation during inflation. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2009(09):103–103, sep 2009.
 - [10] C.P. Burgess, Hyun Min Lee, and Michael Trott. Comment on Higgs Inflation and Naturalness. *JHEP*, 07:007, 2010.
 - [11] Gian F. Giudice and Hyun Min Lee. Unitarizing Higgs Inflation. *Phys. Lett. B*, 694:294–300, 2011.
 - [12] Rose N. Lerner and John McDonald. Higgs Inflation and Naturalness. *JCAP*, 04:015, 2010.
 - [13] David H. Lyth and Antonio Riotto. Particle physics models of inflation and the cosmological density perturbation. *Phys. Rept.*, 314:1–146, 1999.
 - [14] Robert V. Wagoner. Scalar tensor theory and gravitational waves. *Phys. Rev. D*, 1:3209–3216, 1970.
 - [15] Antonio De Felice and Shinji Tsujikawa. f(R) theories. *Living Rev. Rel.*, 13:3, 2010.
 - [16] Thomas P. Sotiriou and Valerio Faraoni. f(R) Theories Of Gravity. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 82:451–497, 2010.
 - [17] Eloisa Bentivegna, Deirdre M. Shoemaker, Ian Hinder, and Frank Herrmann. Probing the Binary Black Hole Merger Regime with Scalar Perturbations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 77:124016, 2008.
 - [18] James Healy, Tanja Bode, Roland Haas, Enrique Pazos, Pablo Laguna, Deirdre M. Shoemaker, and Nicolás Yunes. Late Inspiral and Merger of Binary Black Holes in Scalar-Tensor Theories of Gravity. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 29:232002, 2012.
 - [19] Emanuele Berti, Vitor Cardoso, Leonardo Gualtieri, Michael Horbatsch, and Ulrich Sperhake. Numerical simulations of single and binary black holes in scalar-tensor theories: circumventing the no-hair theorem. *Phys. Rev. D*, 87(12):124020, 2013.
 - [20] Zhoujian Cao, Pablo Galaviz, and Li-Fang Li. Binary black hole mergers in f(R) theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 87(10):104029, 2013.
 - [21] Eric W. Hirschmann, Luis Lehner, Steven L. Liebling, and Carlos Palenzuela. Black Hole Dynamics in Einstein-

- Maxwell-Dilaton Theory. *Phys. Rev. D*, 97(6):064032, 2018.
- [22] Maria Okounkova, Leo C. Stein, Mark A. Scheel, and Daniel A. Hemberger. Numerical binary black hole mergers in dynamical Chern-Simons gravity: Scalar field. *Phys. Rev. D*, 96(4):044020, 2017.
- [23] Qing Yang, Li-Wei Ji, Bin Hu, Zhou-Jian Cao, and Rong-Gen Cai. An axion-like scalar field environment effect on binary black hole merger. *Res. Astron. Astrophys.*, 18(6):065, 2018.
- [24] Helvi Witek, Leonardo Gualtieri, Paolo Pani, and Thomas P. Sotiriou. Black holes and binary mergers in scalar Gauss-Bonnet gravity: scalar field dynamics. *Phys. Rev. D*, 99(6):064035, 2019.
- [25] José A. González, Mark Hannam, Ulrich Sperhake, Bernd Brügmann, and Sascha Husa. Supermassive recoil velocities for binary black-hole mergers with antialigned spins. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:231101, Jun 2007.
- [26] Manuela Campanelli, Carlos O. Lousto, Yosef Zlochower, and David Merritt. Maximum gravitational recoil. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 98:231102, Jun 2007.
- [27] Thomas W. Baumgarte and Stuart L. Shapiro. *Numerical Relativity: Solving Einstein's Equations on the Computer*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [28] A. Lichnerowicz. L'integration des équations relativistes et le problème des n corps. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 23:37, 1944.
- [29] James W. York. Gravitational degrees of freedom and the initial-value problem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 26:1656–1658, Jun 1971.
- [30] James W. York. Role of conformal three-geometry in the dynamics of gravitation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 28:1082–1085, Apr 1972.
- [31] Gregory B. Cook. Initial data for numerical relativity. *Living Rev. Rel.*, 3:5, 2000.
- [32] Pablo Laguna, Hannu Kurki-Suonio, and Richard A. Matzner. Inhomogeneous inflation: The initial-value problem. *Phys. Rev. D*, 44:3077–3086, Nov 1991.
- [33] Jayashree Balakrishna, Ruxandra Bondarescu, Gregory Daues, F. Siddhartha Guzman, and Edward Seidel. Evolution of 3-D boson stars with waveform extraction. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 23:2631–2652, 2006.
- [34] Jeffrey M. Bowen and James W. York. Time-asymmetric initial data for black holes and black-hole collisions. *Physical Review D*, 21(8):2047–2056, April 1980.
- [35] Marcus Ansorg, Bernd Bruegmann, and Wolfgang Tichy. A Single-domain spectral method for black hole puncture data. *Phys. Rev. D*, 70:064011, 2004.
- [36] Thomas W. Baumgarte and Stuart L. Shapiro. Numerical integration of einstein's field equations. *Phys. Rev. D*, 59:024007, Dec 1998.
- [37] Masaru Shibata and Takashi Nakamura. Evolution of three-dimensional gravitational waves: Harmonic slicing case. *Phys. Rev. D*, 52:5428–5444, Nov 1995.
- [38] Manuela Campanelli, C.O. Lousto, P. Marronetti, and Y. Zlochower. Accurate evolutions of orbiting black-hole binaries without excision. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:111101, 2006.
- [39] John G. Baker, Joan Centrella, Dae-Il Choi, Michael Koppitz, and James van Meter. Gravitational wave extraction from an inspiraling configuration of merging black holes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 96:111102, 2006.
- [40] Tom Goodale, Gabrielle Allen, Gerd Lanfermann, Joan Masso, Thomas Radke, Edward Seidel, and John Shalf. The Cactus Framework and Toolkit: Design and Applications. In *VECPA Vector and Parallel Processing R'2002, 5th International Conference*, Berlin, 2003. Springer.
- [41] Sascha Husa, Ian Hinder, and Christiane Lechner. Kranc: A Mathematica package to generate numerical codes for tensorial evolution equations. *Computer Physics Communications*, 174(12):983–1004, June 2006.
- [42] Roland Haas, Roman V. Shcherbakov, Tanja Bode, and Pablo Laguna. Tidal Disruptions of White Dwarfs from Ultra-close Encounters with Intermediate-mass Spinning Black Holes. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 749(2):117, 2012.
- [43] Christopher Evans, Pablo Laguna, and Michael Eracleous. Ultra-close Encounters of Stars with Massive Black Holes: Tidal Disruption Events with Prompt Hyperaccretion. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 805(2):L19, 2015.
- [44] Michael Clark and Pablo Laguna. Bowen-York-type initial data for binaries with neutron stars. *Physical Review D*, 94(6):064058, September 2016.
- [45] Karan Jani, James Healy, James A. Clark, Lionel London, Pablo Laguna, and Deirdre Shoemaker. Georgia tech catalog of gravitational waveforms. *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 33(20):204001, 2016.
- [46] Steven R. Brandt, Gabriele Bozzola, Cheng-Hsin Cheng, Peter Diener, Alexandru Dima, William E. Gabella, Miguel Gracia-Linares, Roland Haas, Yosef Zlochower, Miguel Alcubierre, Daniela Alic, Gabrielle Allen, Marcus Ansorg, Maria Babiuc-Hamilton, Luca Baiotti, Werner Bengert, Eloisa Bentivegna, Sebastiano Bernuzzi, Tanja Bode, Brockton Brendal, Bernd Bruegmann, Manuela Campanelli, Federico Cipolletta, Giovanni Corvino, Samuel Cupp, Roberto De Pietri, Harry Dimmelmeier, Rion Dooley, Nils Dorband, Matthew Elley, Yaakoub El Khamra, Zachariah Etienne, Joshua Faber, Toni Font, Joachim Friebe, Bruno Giacomazzo, Tom Goodale, Carsten Gundlach, Ian Hawke, Scott Hawley, Ian Hinder, E. A. Huerta, Sascha Husa, Sai Iyer, Daniel Johnson, Abhishek V. Joshi, Wolfgang Kastaun, Thorsten Kellermann, Andrew Knapp, Michael Koppitz, Pablo Laguna, Gerd Lanfermann, Frank Löffler, Joan Masso, Lars Menger, Andre Merzky, Jonah Maxwell Miller, Mark Miller, Philipp Moesta, Pedro Montero, Bruno Mundim, Andrea Nerozzi, Scott C. Noble, Christian Ott, Ravi Paruchuri, Denis Pollney, David Radice, Thomas Radke, Christian Reisswig, Luciano Rezzolla, David Rideout, Matei Ripeanu, Lorenzo Sala, Jascha A. Schewtschenko, Erik Schnetter, Bernard Schutz, Ed Seidel, Eric Seidel, John Shalf, Ken Sible, Ulrich Sperhake, Nikolaos Stergioulas, Wai-Mo Suen, Bela Szilagyi, Ryoji Takahashi, Michael Thomas, Jonathan Thornburg, Malcolm Tobias, Aaryn Tonita, Paul Walker, Mew-Bing Wan, Barry Wardell, Leonardo Werneck, Helvi Witek, Miguel Zilhão, and Burkhard Zink. The einstein toolkit, December 2021. To find out more, visit <http://einstein toolkit.org>.
- [47] Abhay Ashtekar and Badri Krishnan. Isolated and Dynamical Horizons and Their Applications. *Living Reviews in Relativity*, 7(1):10, December 2004.
- [48] William E. East and Frans Pretorius. Superradiant instability and backreaction of massive vector fields around kerr black holes. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 119:041101, Jul 2017.
- [49] Federico G. Lopez Armengol, Luciano Combi, Manuela Campanelli, Scott C. Noble, Julian H. Krolik, Dennis B. Bowen, Mark J. Avara, Vassilios Mewes, and Hiroyuki

- Nakano. Circumbinary disk accretion into spinning black hole binaries. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 913(1):16, may 2021.
- [50] Manuela Campanelli, Carlos Lousto, Yosef Zlochower, and David Merritt. Large merger recoils and spin flips from generic black hole binaries. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 659(1):L5–L8, mar 2007.