

Classifying binary black holes from Population III stars with the Einstein Telescope: a machine-learning approach

Filippo Santoliquido^{*} ^{1,2}, Ulyana Dupletsa ^{1,2}, Jacopo Tissino ^{1,2}, Marica Branchesi ^{1,2},
Francesco Iacovelli ^{3,4}, Giuliano Iorio ^{5,6}, Michela Mapelli ^{7,5,6}, Davide Gerosa ^{8,9,10}, Jan Harms ^{1,2},
and Mario Pasquato ^{5,6,11,12,13}

¹ Gran Sasso Science Institute (GSSI), 67100 L'Aquila, Italy

² INFN, Laboratori Nazionali del Gran Sasso, 67100 Assergi, Italy

³ Département de Physique Théorique, Université de Genève, 24 quai Ernest Ansermet, 1211 Genève, Switzerland

⁴ Gravitational Wave Science Center (GWSC), Université de Genève, 1211 Genève, Switzerland

⁵ Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia “G. Galilei”, Università degli studi di Padova, vicolo dell'Osservatorio 3, 35122 Padova, Italia

⁶ INFN, Sezione di Padova, via Marzolo 8, 35131 Padova, Italy

⁷ Institut für Theoretische Astrophysik, ZAH, Universität Heidelberg, Albert-Ueberle-Str. 2, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

⁸ Dipartimento di Fisica “G. Occhialini”, Università degli studi di Milano-Bicocca, piazza della Scienza 3, 20126 Milano, Italy

⁹ INFN, Sezione di Milano-Bicocca, piazza della Scienza 3, 20126 Milano, Italy

¹⁰ School of Physics and Astronomy & Institute for Gravitational Wave Astronomy, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

¹¹ Département de Physique, Université de Montréal, 1375 Avenue Thérèse-Lavoie-Roux, Montréal, Canada

¹² Mila – Quebec Artificial Intelligence Institute, 6666 Rue Saint-Urbain, Montréal, Canada

¹³ Ciela – Montréal Institute for Astrophysical Data Analysis and Machine Learning, Montréal, Canada

April 17, 2024

ABSTRACT

Third-generation (3G) gravitational-wave (GW) detectors like the Einstein Telescope (ET) will observe binary black hole (BBH) mergers at redshifts up to $z \sim 100$. However, unequivocal determination of the origin of high-redshift sources will remain uncertain, due to the low signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and poor estimate of their luminosity distance. This study proposes a machine learning approach to infer the origins of high-redshift BBHs, specifically differentiating those arising from Population III (Pop. III) stars — likely the first progenitors of stellar-born BBH mergers in the Universe — and those originated from Population I-II (Pop. I-II) stars. We have considered a wide range of state-of-the-art models encompassing current uncertainties on Pop. III BBH mergers. We then estimate parameter errors of detected sources with ET using the Fisher-information-matrix formalism, followed by classification using XGBoost, a machine learning algorithm based on decision trees. For a set of mock observed BBHs, we provide the probability that they belong to the Pop. III class while considering the parameter errors of each source. In our fiducial model, we accurately identify $\sim 10\%$ of detected BBHs originating from Pop. III stars with $> 90\%$ precision. Our study demonstrates how machine learning enables to achieve some pivotal aspects of ET science case by exploring the origin of individual high-redshift GW observations. We set the basis for further studies, which will integrate additional simulated populations and account for population modeling uncertainties.

Key words. stars: Population III – black hole physics – gravitational waves – methods: numerical – methods: statistical

1. Introduction

The Einstein Telescope (ET) will be a forefront instrument for observing gravitational waves (GW) in Europe (Punturo et al. 2010; Maggiore et al. 2020). In particular, ET will observe mergers of binary black holes (BBHs) at redshifts as high as $z \sim 100$ (Ng et al. 2021; Kalogera et al. 2021; Ng et al. 2022b; Yi et al. 2022; Branchesi et al. 2023). However, the detection of high-redshift events does not automatically imply an accurate inference of their parameters. Several works have demonstrated the challenge ET will face in constraining the redshift distribution of detected sources, which in turn is a crucial step to unveil their astrophysical origins (e.g. Ng et al. 2022a; Chen et al. 2022; Iacovelli et al. 2022a; Fairhurst et al. 2023; Marcoccia et al. 2023; Mancarella et al. 2023).

To this end, Ng et al. (2022a, 2023) investigated the accuracy of redshift measurements for a single BBH merger, specifically questing the feasibility of establishing its primordial origin. Their findings indicate that, for BBHs with total masses ranging between $20 M_{\odot}$ and $40 M_{\odot}$ and merging at $z > 40$, it is possible to infer that $z > 30$ up to 70% credibility using a single ET observatory. Mancarella et al. (2023) studied a population of BBHs with parameter distributions extrapolated from that of current LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA events (Abbott et al. 2023b) and found that only $\sim 3\%$ of the sources with $z \geq 30$ can be reliably constrained to be beyond redshift 30 at 99% credibility. These findings limit the scientific potential of ET and Cosmic Explorer (Reitze et al. 2019), given that the detection of BBHs in the early Universe is a pivotal element of the science objectives for third-generation (3G) GW interferometers.

* filippo.santoliquido@gssi.it

Population III (Pop. III) stars form from pristine, metal-free gas following cosmic nucleosynthesis at $z > 20$ (Haiman et al. 1996; Tegmark et al. 1997; Abel et al. 2002; Yoshida et al. 2003; Klessen & Glover 2023) and are believed to lead to the formation of the first stellar-origin black holes in the Universe (Kinugawa et al. 2014, 2016; Hartwig et al. 2016; Belczynski et al. 2017; Tanikawa et al. 2022a; Costa et al. 2023; Nandal et al. 2023; Iwaya et al. 2023; Tanikawa 2024). As of now, there have been no direct observations of Pop. III stars (Rydberg et al. 2013; Schauer et al. 2022; Larkin et al. 2023; Meena et al. 2023; Trussler et al. 2023) and detecting them directly with the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) is feasible only with gravitational lensing (Zackrisson et al. 2023; Bovill et al. 2024; Wiggins et al. 2024). In recent years, BBHs originating from Pop. III stars have gained significant attention in the context of GW astronomy (Kinugawa et al. 2020; Liu & Bromm 2020a,b; Tanikawa et al. 2022a,b; Wang et al. 2022). In particular, Santoliquido et al. (2023) showed that between $\sim 20\%$ and $\sim 70\%$ of detectable mergers from Pop. III BBHs occur at $z > 8$. These percentages depend on assumptions regarding the star-formation rate density and the adopted initial conditions, resulting in distinct redshift distributions.

This manuscript presents a novel method to distinguish the origins of GW sources. Specifically, we differentiate between BBHs originating from Pop. III stars and those from Pop. I-II stars, encompassing sources that merge across a broad redshift range. Determining the most likely formation scenarios for GW sources has been previously explored (Abbott et al. 2019a; Kimball et al. 2020; Singh et al. 2022; Tong et al. 2022; Ng et al. 2023). Two distinct methodologies are proposed. The first one involves classification where categorical variables are inferred through a hierarchical Bayesian analysis that considers hyperparameters describing each sub-population (Farr et al. 2015; Mould et al. 2022; Godfrey et al. 2023). The second one is based on Machine Learning (ML), where ML algorithms are trained on simulated sources (Antonelli et al. 2023) and subsequently applied to GW detections. Both these methods have been directly applied to GW sources found in LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA catalogs (Abbott et al. 2016, 2019b, 2021, 2023b).

In our analysis, we combine the outcomes of ML classifiers trained on Pop. III and Pop. I-II BBHs with the inferred posterior distribution of detected sources, taking into account the parameter estimation capabilities of ET. Consequently, we assign a probability for each source to be associated with either origin. In addition to previous studies (e.g., Antonelli et al. 2023), we assess the performance of our classification and understand how data inform the classification process. Our investigation covers systematic variations within various models describing Pop. III BBHs, including astrophysical merger rates.

ML, deep learning, and artificial intelligence have become increasingly critical in astronomy and astrophysics (e.g., Ivezić et al. 2014; Baron 2019; Djorgovski et al. 2022; Moriwaki et al. 2023; Pasquato et al. 2023; Riggi et al. 2024), with a growing emphasis on applications within the GW field (Cuoco et al. 2021a,b). In this context, a significant focus of ML techniques involves classification tasks (e.g., Baker et al. 2015; Chatterjee et al. 2020; Sasaoka et al. 2023; Alhassan et al. 2023; Antonelli et al. 2023; Berbel et al. 2023). Furthermore, the large amount of detections expected with 3G GW observatories (Reitze et al. 2019; Maggiore et al. 2020; Branchesi et al. 2023) will make full Bayesian parameter estimation computationally expensive (Couvares et al. 2021; Roulet & Venumadhav 2024). Hence, ML and deep learning hold particular promise for rapid inference of GW

parameters (Green et al. 2020; Dax et al. 2021; Williams et al. 2021; Gabbard et al. 2022; Dax et al. 2023).

This manuscript is organized as follows: in Sec. 2.1, we delineate the simulation setup for generating BBHs from Pop. III and Pop. I-II stars. In Sec. 2.2, we evaluate the merger rate density as a function of redshift, while Sec. 2.3 provides a brief overview of the Fisher-information-matrix (FIM) approximation used for parameter estimation. Sec. 2.4 details the methodology for assigning the probability of each source to belong to the Pop. III class, while Sec. 2.5 delineates the training process for the ML classifiers. Our results along with a discussion of our methodology caveats are presented in Sec. 3 and 4. Conclusion are drawn in Sec. 5.

2. Methods

2.1. Astrophysical populations

Santoliquido et al. (2023) presented a comprehensive investigation on the main sources of uncertainty affecting BBHs born from Pop. III stars. Here, we focus on three of their models: their fiducial model, along with the two models yielding the lowest and highest comoving merger rate density among those they calculated.

2.1.1. Population III stars

The catalogs of BBH mergers reported by Santoliquido et al. (2023) have been generated using the binary population synthesis code `SEVN` (Spera et al. 2019; Mapelli et al. 2020) for both Pop. III (Costa et al. 2023) and Pop. I-II stars (Iorio et al. 2023). `SEVN` combines single and binary evolution by interpolating a set of pre-computed single stellar-evolution tracks (Iorio et al. 2023). Pop. III stellar tracks were computed using the `PARSEC` code (Bressan et al. 2012; Costa et al. 2021; Nguyen et al. 2022) with a metallicity of $Z = 10^{-11}$ and covering a zero-age main sequence (ZAMS) mass range of $2.2\text{--}600 M_{\odot}$; for details see Costa et al. (2023).

Santoliquido et al. (2023) explored a large set on initial conditions for Pop. III binary systems. The three models analyzed here correspond to setup labeled LOG1, LAR1, and TOP5. The initial mass function (IMF) is defined as a flat-in-log probability distribution for model LOG1 (Stacy & Bromm 2013; Susa et al. 2014; Hirano et al. 2015; Wollenberg et al. 2020; Chon et al. 2021; Tanikawa et al. 2021; Jaura et al. 2022; Prole et al. 2022)

$$\xi(M_{\text{ZAMS},1}) \propto M_{\text{ZAMS},1}^{-1}, \quad (1)$$

a Larson (1998) distribution for model LAR1

$$\xi(M_{\text{ZAMS},1}) \propto M_{\text{ZAMS},1}^{-2.35} e^{M_{\text{cut}}/M_{\text{ZAMS},1}}, \quad (2)$$

with $M_{\text{cut}} = 20 M_{\odot}$ (Valiante et al. 2016), and a top-heavy distribution for model TOP5 (Stacy & Bromm 2013; Jaacks et al. 2019; Liu & Bromm 2020a):

$$\xi(M_{\text{ZAMS},1}) \propto M_{\text{ZAMS},1}^{-0.17} e^{(M_{\text{cut}}/M_{\text{ZAMS},1})^2}, \quad (3)$$

with $M_{\text{cut}} = 20 M_{\odot}$.

For the LOG1 and LAR1 models, the mass ratio ($q = M_{\text{ZAMS},2}/M_{\text{ZAMS},1}$), orbital period (P) and eccentricity (e) are drawn from the distributions by Sana et al. (2012). These distributions are fits to O- and B-type binary stars in the local Universe

$$\xi(q) \propto q^{-0.1} \text{ with } q \in [0.1, 1] \text{ and } M_{\text{ZAMS},2} > 2.2 M_{\odot}, \quad (4)$$

Tab. 1. Summary of the astrophysical populations used in this work. For each model we list the name of the initial conditions configuration (IC), the distribution of the ZAMS masses of the primary star $M_{\text{ZAMS},1}$, the distribution of the mass ratios q , the distribution of the orbital periods P , the distribution of the orbital eccentricities e , and the adopted SFRD model. The rightmost column reports the total number of mergers from Eq. (16) assuming $T_{\text{obs}} = 10$ yr.

Name	IC	$M_{\text{ZAMS},1}$	q	P	e	SFRD	$\mathcal{N}$
Pop. III fiducial	LOG1	Eq. (1)	Eq. (4)	Eq. (5)	Eq. (6)	H22	6916
Pop. III optimistic	LAR1	Eq. (2)	Eq. (4)	Eq. (5)	Eq. (6)	J19	119399
Pop. III pessimistic	TOP5	Eq. (3)	Eq. (7)	Eq. (8)	Eq. (9)	SW20	202
Pop. I-II	Fiducial	Eq. (10)	Eq. (4)	Eq. (5)	Eq. (6)	MF17	887364

$$\xi(\log P) \propto (\log P)^{-0.55} \text{ with } \log P \in [0.15, 5.5], \quad (5)$$

$$\xi(e) \propto e^{-0.142} \text{ with } e \in (0, 1]. \quad (6)$$

Model TOP5 instead adopts the mass ratio and the eccentricity distributions derived from cosmological simulations by Stacy & Bromm (2013)

$$\xi(q) \propto q^{-0.55} \text{ with } q \in [0.1, 1] \text{ and } M_{\text{ZAMS},2} > 2.2 M_{\odot}, \quad (7)$$

$$\xi(\log P) \propto \exp[-(\log P - \mu)^2 / (2\sigma^2)], \quad (8)$$

with $\mu = 5.5$ and $\sigma = 0.85$, and a thermal distribution for the eccentricity (Kinugawa et al. 2014; Hartwig et al. 2016; Tanikawa et al. 2021):

$$\xi(e) \propto 2e \text{ with } e \in [0, 1]. \quad (9)$$

We considered three independent estimates of the Pop. III star formation rate density (SFRD). These are based on the models by Hartwig et al. (2022, hereafter H22), Jaacks et al. (2019, hereafter J19), and Skinner & Wise (2020, hereafter SW20) and are adopted in model LOG1, LAR1 and TOP5, respectively.

We name hereafter LOG1, LAR1 and TOP5 models as fiducial, optimistic and pessimistic, respectively. A summary of our models is reported in Tab. 1.

2.1.2. Population I-II stars

We consider the fiducial model from Iorio et al. (2023) as representative of BBHs formed from Pop. I-II stars. The initial ZAMS mass of primary stars follows a Kroupa (2001) IMF:

$$\xi(M_{\text{ZAMS},1}) \propto M_{\text{ZAMS}}^{-2.3} \text{ with } M_{\text{ZAMS},1} \in [5, 150] M_{\odot}. \quad (10)$$

The secondary masses, initial orbital periods, and eccentricities are distributed using the prescriptions by Sana et al. (2012) (Eq. (4), (5), and (6)).

2.1.3. Population synthesis with SEVN

We adopt the rapid model for core-collapse supernovae (Fryer et al. 2012) to convert the final properties of stars into BH masses. Additionally, we incorporated the outcomes of electron-capture supernovae, as described by Giacobbo & Mapelli (2019). For pulsational pair-instability and pair-instability supernovae, we adopted the model by Mapelli et al. (2020). Black-hole natal kicks were drawn from the formalism presented by Giacobbo & Mapelli (2020).

SEVN integrates wind mass transfer (Bondi & Hoyle 1944), stable Roche-lobe overflow (Lubow & Shu 1975; Ulrich & Burger 1976), common-envelope evolution (Webbink 1984), and GW emission leading to orbital decay and circularization (Peters 1964). We used the same setup as the fiducial model by Iorio et al. (2023), using their default values for all relevant parameters. We adopted a common-envelope efficiency parameter of $\alpha = 1$, which corresponds to assuming that all of the orbital energy lost from the system contributes to unbind the common envelope.

2.2. COSMORATE

We determine the evolution of BBH merger rate density using COSMORATE (Santoliquido et al. 2020, 2021), which interfaces catalogs of simulated BBHs with a metallicity-dependent SFRD model. The merger rate density in the source frame is given by:

$$\mathcal{R}(z) = \int_{z_{\text{max}}}^z \left[\int_{Z_{\text{min}}}^{Z_{\text{max}}} \psi(z') p(Z|z') \mathcal{F}(z', z, Z) dZ \right] \frac{dt(z')}{dz'} dz', \quad (11)$$

where $\psi(z')$ represents the chosen SFRD evolution, selected from those presented in Tab. 1, and $p(Z|z')$ is the distribution of metallicity Z at a fixed formation redshift z' . Considering that we model Pop. III stars with a single metallicity value, we simply set $p(Z|z')$ equal to a Dirac delta function centered on the chosen value $Z = 10^{-11}$. For the case of Pop. I-II stars, we use (Madau & Fragos 2017)

$$\psi(z) = a \frac{(1+z)^b}{1 + [(1+z)/c]^d}, \quad (12)$$

with $a = 0.01 M_{\odot} \text{ Mpc}^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, $b = 2.6$, $c = 3.2$, and $d = 6.2$ while for the metallicity distribution we adopt (Madau & Fragos 2017)

$$p(Z|z') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_Z^2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{[\log(Z(z')/Z_{\odot}) - \langle \log Z(z')/Z_{\odot} \rangle]^2}{2\sigma_Z^2} \right\}, \quad (13)$$

where $\langle \log Z(z')/Z_{\odot} \rangle = \log \langle Z(z')/Z_{\odot} \rangle - \ln(10)\sigma_Z^2/2$ and $\sigma_Z = 0.2$ (Bouffanais et al. 2021a).

In Eq. (11) we introduced the expression $dt(z')/dz' = (1+z')^{-1}H(z')^{-1}$, where the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ in a flat Λ CDM Universe is given by

$$H(z) = H_0 \sqrt{(1+z)^3 \Omega_M + (1 - \Omega_M)}, \quad (14)$$

with H_0 denoting the Hubble constant and Ω_M representing the adimensional matter density parameter. We use the cosmological

Tab. 2. Summary of signal parameters and their adopted priors. $\mathcal{U}(a, b)$ denotes a uniform distribution between a and b . See Sec. 2.3 for details.

Parameter	Units	Prior
$m_{1,d}$	[$M_\odot$]	$\mathcal{U}(0, \infty)$
$m_{2,d}$	[$M_\odot$]	$\mathcal{U}(0, m_{1,d})$
d_L	[Mpc]	Eq. (18)
ra	[rad]	$\mathcal{U}(0, 2\pi)$
sin dec	[rad]	$\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$
cos ι	[rad]	$\mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$
ϕ_c	[rad]	$\mathcal{U}(0, 2\pi)$
ψ	[rad]	$\mathcal{U}(0, \pi)$
t_c	[s]	$\mathcal{U}(0, \infty)$

parameters reported by Aghanim et al. (2020). The expression $\mathcal{F}(z', z, Z)$ from Eq. (11) is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(z', z, Z) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{M}_{\text{TOT}}(Z)} \frac{d\mathcal{N}(z', z, Z)}{dt(z)}, \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\text{TOT}}(Z) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{sim}}(Z)/(f_{\text{bin}} f_{\text{IMF}})$. Here $\mathcal{M}_{\text{sim}}(Z)$ is the total simulated initial stellar mass in SEVN, $f_{\text{bin}} = 0.4$ account for the assumed binary fraction (Sana et al. 2012), and $f_{\text{IMF}} = 0.255$ accounts for the incomplete sampling of the IMF (Iorio et al. 2023). Additionally, $d\mathcal{N}(z', z, Z)/dt(z)$ denotes the rate of BBH mergers originating from progenitor stars with metallicity Z at redshift z' and merging at redshift z .

The total number of BBH mergers for each model, regardless if they are detectable, is reported in Tab. 1. This is given by

$$\mathcal{N} = T_{\text{obs}} \int \mathcal{R}(z) p(m_1, m_2 | z) \frac{1}{1+z} \frac{dV_c}{dz} dm_1 dm_2 dz, \quad (16)$$

where $\mathcal{R}(z)$ is the merger rate density (Eq. (11)) and $p(m_1, m_2 | z)$ is the two-dimensional source-frame mass distribution at a given redshift extracted with COSMORATE for each astrophysical model (Tab. 1). The factor $1/(1+z)$ converts source-frame time to detector-frame time, dV_c/dz is the differential comoving volume element, and T_{obs} is the observing time.

For each of our models, we draw a realization of $\mathcal{N}$ BBHs assuming $T_{\text{obs}} = 10$ yr, obtaining a number of Pop. III mergers that is orders of magnitude smaller for the fiducial ($\sim 7 \times 10^4$), optimistic ($\sim 1 \times 10^5$), and pessimistic ($\sim 2 \times 10^2$) model compared to Pop. I-II BBHs ($\sim 9 \times 10^5$).

2.3. Parameter estimation

We simulate the parameter-estimation performance of ET using the FIM formalism (Cutler & Flanagan 1994; Vallisneri 2008; Chan et al. 2018; Grimm & Harms 2020; Borhanian 2021; Iacovelli et al. 2022a) as implemented in GWFish (Dupletsa et al. 2023). In this approach, the likelihood of the data realization d is approximated as a multivariate Gaussian distribution, hence the posterior is given by

$$p(\theta | d) \propto \pi(\theta) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (\theta - \bar{\theta})^T \mathcal{F} (\theta - \bar{\theta})\right), \quad (17)$$

where $\bar{\theta}$ are the injected parameters. We assume the prior distributions $\pi(\theta)$ reported in Tab. 2 (Dupletsa et al. in prep). In particular, for the luminosity distance we choose a prior uniform in comoving volume and source-frame time:

$$\pi(d_L) \propto \frac{dV_c}{dd_L} \frac{1}{1+z} = \frac{dV_c}{dz} \frac{dz}{dd_L} \frac{1}{1+z}, \quad (18)$$

where $d_L \in [0, d_L(z = 1000)]$ Mpc. The FIM is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{ij} = \left(\frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta_i} \left| \frac{\partial h}{\partial \theta_j} \right| \right) \bigg|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}}, \quad (19)$$

where GWFish adopts $\theta = \{m_{1,d}, m_{2,d}, d_L, \text{ra}, \text{dec}, \iota, \phi_c, \psi, t_c\}$, where $m_{1,d}$, $m_{2,d}$, and d_L denote the detector-frame masses and luminosity distance, respectively; ra and dec are sky position coordinates, ι is the inclination angle of the binary with respect to the line of sight, ϕ_c is the phase at coalescence, ψ is the polarization angle and t_c is the time of coalescence. Waveforms also depend on spin parameters, that we set to zero. We motivate and discuss this choice in Sec. 4.3.

We use the waveform approximant IMRPHEMOMHM (Kalaghatgi et al. 2020). The inner product in Eq. (19) is defined as

$$(a|b) = 4\text{Re} \int_{f_{\text{low}}}^{f_{\text{high}}} \frac{a(\theta, f) b^*(\theta, f)}{S_n(f)} df, \quad (20)$$

with $f_{\text{low}} = 2$ Hz and $f_{\text{high}} = 2048$ Hz, and $a(\theta, f)$ and $b(\theta, f)$ are the Fourier transforms of the time-domain signals $a(\theta, t)$ and $b(\theta, t)$. The noise power spectral density $S_n(f)$ is taken to be that of a single triangular-shaped ET detector with 10 km arm-length located in Sardinia (latitude $40^\circ 31'$, longitude $9^\circ 25'$) which is a possible site candidate (Branchesi et al. 2023). We use the HFLF-cryogenic sensitivity curve¹ which includes both a high-frequency instrument and a cryogenic low-frequency instrument.

As the signal observed at the detector depends on the redshifted masses and the luminosity distance to the source, we convert the source-frame masses and redshift obtained through COSMORATE in Sec. 2.2 into detector-frame masses and luminosity distances:

$$m_{i,d} = m_i(1+z), \quad (21)$$

$$d_L = c(1+z) \int_0^z \frac{dz'}{H(z')}, \quad (22)$$

where $i = 1, 2$ denoting primary and secondary mass, respectively; and the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ is given in Eq. (14).

The parameters $m_{1,d}$, $m_{2,d}$, and d_L are distributed accordingly to their astrophysical populations (Tab. 1). The other parameters are extracted from their prior distributions (Tab. 2). Furthermore, we assume a 100% duty cycle such that T_{obs} corresponds to the full data-taking time.

In Fig. 1, we show the parameter estimation for BBHs originating from Pop. III and Pop. I-II stars observed with ET. Notably, a few Pop. III sources in the optimistic model are measured with extremely high precision having $\Delta d_L/d_L \leq 0.01$, as they are at low redshifts ($z \lesssim 1$) and with high source-frame masses ($m_1 \gtrsim 30 M_\odot$).

For the rest of the manuscript, we select sources with SNR ≥ 12 and relative errors smaller than 0.3 on $m_{1,d}$, $m_{2,d}$ and d_L . We further discuss this choice in Sec. 4.4. As a result, the number of detected and selected Pop. I-II BBHs is $N_{\text{Pop. I-II}} = 11397$ while the number of Pop. III BBHs is $N_{\text{Pop. III}} = 464, 10185, 22$ for the fiducial, optimistic and pessimistic case, respectively. Despite applying these thresholds, our analysis considers sources at both low and high redshifts, with maximum redshift values of $z_{\text{max}} \approx 23, 19$, and 21 for the fiducial, pessimistic, and optimistic models, respectively. We also create balanced datasets, that is we increase T_{obs} in Eq. (16) to get exactly 11397 events also for the Pop. III models.

¹ The sensitivity curve can be downloaded at <https://apps.et-gw.eu/tds/?content=3&r=14065>.




Fig. 1. Distribution of SNRs (top-left panel), and relative errors for detector-frame primary masses (top-right panel), detector-frame secondary masses (bottom-left panel), and luminosity distances (bottom-right panel). Blue, green, and orange histograms correspond to optimistic, fiducial, and pessimistic models for Pop. III BBHs, respectively, while the red histograms refers to BBHs from Pop. I-II stars (see Sec. 2.1 and 2.3 for details). In the top-left panel, the dash-dotted black line marks the adopted SNR limit, while dashed black lines in the other panels represent the adopted threshold for relative errors, where Δx are 1σ errors and $x = \{m_{1,d}, m_{2,d}, d_L\}$.




Fig. 2. Pair plot illustrating the distribution for the fiducial balanced case, with red and blue distributions indicating mergers of BBHs from Pop. I-II and Pop. III stars, respectively. The lower plots show kernel density estimations; the upper plots show the individual samples, and the diagonal plots show the marginalized distributions.

2.4. Classification of a single detection

The probability that the detected event j belongs to the Pop. III class (hereafter, k for brevity) is given by

$$p(j \in k | d_j, \{\beta\}) = \int d\mathbf{x} p(j \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_j, \{\beta\}) p(\mathbf{x} | d_j, \{\beta\}), \quad (23)$$

where d_j is the data stream of the event j , $\{\beta\} = \{\beta_{\text{I-II}}, \beta_{\text{III}}\}$ are the fractions of Pop. I-II and Pop. III BBH mergers, respectively, and $\mathbf{x}$ are a subset of the waveform parameters (see Sec. 2.5). The term $p(i \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_i, \{\beta\})$ is the probability that the event j belongs to the Pop. III class given the waveform parameters $\mathbf{x}$, the data stream d_j , and the mixing fractions. We evaluate it by using a ML algorithm trained on true waveform parameters (see Sec. 2.5).

We approximate the integral in Eq. (23) with a Monte Carlo summation. In this work, we make the simplifying assumption that the posterior samples of the single event j do not depend on the mixing fractions β , i.e. they are obtained using uninformative priors. We further discuss this choice in Sec. 4.5. Therefore, to solve Eq. (23), we draw N_s posteriors samples from $p(\mathbf{x} | d_j)$ that are given as in Eq. (17) for each detection j :

$$p(j \in k | d_j, \{\beta\}) \approx \left\langle p(j \in k | \mathbf{x}_i, d_j, \{\beta\}) \right\rangle_{\mathbf{x}_i \sim p(\mathbf{x} | d_j)}, \quad (24)$$

where i spans the N_s posterior samples. The presence of noise typically leads to a deviation of the likelihood maximum (Eq. (17)) from the injected values in GWFISH (Rodríguez et al. 2013; Gupta et al. 2022). To simulate this, the N_s posterior samples are centered around a new maximum likelihood randomly sampled from Eq. (17) for each detected source (for further details see Section 2.1 in Iacovelli et al. 2022a).

Figs. 2, 3, and 4 illustrate the distributions of parameters of Pop. III BBHs in the fiducial, optimistic, and pessimistic balanced models compared to those of Pop. I-II. Upon examining the one-dimensional histograms along the diagonal axes of the pair-plots, distinct peaks exist in the distributions of all the parameters. For instance, in the detector frame, the primary mass peaks at $20 - 30 M_\odot$ for Pop. I-II BBHs, whereas for Pop. III objects, the maximum is at $200 - 300 M_\odot$. On average, Pop. III BBHs exhibit a detector-frame masses approximately 100 times larger than that of Pop. I-II. The peak of the source-frame primary mass distribution for BBHs generated from Pop. III stars falls within the range of $m_1 \sim 30 - 40 M_\odot$ and the peak of the merger rate density occurs at $z \sim 8 - 16$ (Santoliquido et al. 2023). Thus, in the detector frame, the primary masses of Pop. III BBHs are $m_{1,d} \sim 240 - 640 M_\odot$. In contrast, Pop. I-II BBHs exhibit a peak in the source-frame primary mass distribution at $10 - 15 M_\odot$ (Broekgaarden et al. 2022; van Son et al. 2023; Santoliquido et al. 2023) and the merger rate density peaks at $z \sim 2 - 3$ (Santoliquido et al. 2021). The secondary mass distribution of Pop. I-II objects peaks at $\sim 20 - 30 M_\odot$, contrasting with Pop. III, for which it peaks at $\sim 100 - 200 M_\odot$. The luminosity distance peaks at $\sim 2 \times 10^4$ Mpc for Pop. I-II BBHs, while for Pop. III sources it peaks at $\sim 10^5$ Mpc.

Nevertheless, the two populations do overlap: the tails of the distributions of Pop. I-II $m_{1,d}$, $m_{2,d}$, and d_L intersect with the maxima of Pop. III. This suggests that efficiently distinguishing between these populations is not trivial.




Fig. 3. Same as Fig. 2 but for the optimistic balanced model.




Fig. 4. Same as Fig. 2 but for the pessimistic balanced model.

2.5. Classification probability of a single event

Determining the probability that the event j belongs to the Pop. III class given its fixed waveform and population parameters [$p(j \in k|\mathbf{x}, d_j, \beta)$ in Eq. (23)] can be seen as a classification problem, easily addressed with a ML algorithm. The classifica-

Tab. 3. Hyperparameters adopted in XGBoost training after randomized search. Hyperparameters are distributed log-uniformly in the provided ranges. Column names stand for fiducial (fid.), optimistic (opt.), pessimistic (pes.), and balanced (bal.)

hyperparameter	fid. bal.	opt. bal.	pes. bal.	range
max_depth	13	13	12	[2, 15]
learning_rate	0.034	0.034	0.016	[0, 0.1]
gamma	0.36	0.36	0.25	[0, 3]

tion we perform, despite it can be done in principle on every waveform parameter (see Sec. 2.3), is based only on the detector-frame primary and secondary mass and on the luminosity distance, i.e. $\mathbf{x} = \{m_{1,d}, m_{2,d}, d_L\}$. These parameters are those linked to astrophysical processes, while the remaining are assigned randomly in our simulations.

We train three different classifiers, keeping the BBHs from Pop. I-II stars fixed and varying those from Pop. III stars (fiducial, optimistic and pessimistic). We train the classifiers on balanced datasets, since classification performances are maximized when the number of elements in the two classes does not vary by orders of magnitude (Haixiang et al. 2017). Following customary practice, among the instances of the balanced data sets, we reserve 70% of sources for training and validation, and the remaining 30% to test the performance of the balanced classifiers.

To perform the classification, we adopt the ML algorithm XGBoost (eXtreme Gradient Boosting, Chen & Guestrin 2016). The key idea behind XGBoost is to sequentially add shallow decision trees to an ensemble of learners, each one correcting its predecessor. At every iteration this algorithm fits the new decision tree to the residual errors from the previous iterations.

The performance of XGBoost relies on a set of user-adjustable hyperparameters aimed at enhancing the classifier performance on a specific dataset. To determine the optimal hyperparameters, we employed the RANDOMIZEDSEARCHCV method from SKLEARN (Pedregosa et al. 2011), which randomly selects a fixed number of hyperparameter combinations from a predefined search space. This random sampling makes the process computationally efficient and well-suited for extensive search spaces (Bergstra & Bengio 2012; Lones 2021). We loop over three hyperparameters; Tab. 3 outlines the ranges we tested and the identified optimal values. In particular, max_depth is the maximum depth of a tree in XGBoost. Increasing max_depth allows the model to learn more complex relationships in the data but can also lead to overfitting, where the classifier learns the training data excessively but struggles to generalize to new, unseen data. learning_rate determines the size of the steps taken during training. A lower learning_rate makes the model more robust but requires more iterations to converge. gamma also controls overfitting by penalizing the complexity of the trees: higher values of gamma lead to fewer splits.

To prevent overfitting, we also employ k -fold cross-validation. We divide the training dataset into $k = 5$ subsets. The model undergoes training k times, with each iteration using $k - 1$ subsets for training and the remaining set for validation. Implemented for extra robustness, we employed the so-called nested cross-validation, introducing an inner level of cross-validation with $k = 2$ during the hyperparameter tuning process.

When trained on balanced datasets, XGBoost provides $p(j \in k|\mathbf{x}, d_j)$, a probability independent on the mixing fraction. To evaluate the performances of the balanced classifiers, we consider a fixed threshold, i.e. whenever $p(j \in k|\mathbf{x}, d_j) > 0.5$ the j event is predicted to be a Pop. III BBH.

Results are presented using confusion matrices which consist of four entries: true positive (hereafter TP, correctly predicted Pop. III BBHs), true negative (hereafter TN, correctly predicted Pop. I-II BBHs), false positive (hereafter FP, incorrectly predicted Pop. III), and false negative (hereafter FN, incorrectly predicted Pop. I-II). We evaluate the performance of our classifiers using precision, recall and F1 score. Precision is defined as

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FP}}, \quad (25)$$

where a high value indicates that a positive prediction from the classifier is likely to be correct. When $\text{TP} = 0$, we set $\text{Precision} = 0$. Recall (or sensitivity) is defined as

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}} \quad (26)$$

and measures the ability of the classifier to capture all the positive instances (i.e. Pop. III), with a high value indicating that the model is effective at identifying most of the positive instances. The F1 score

$$\text{F1} = 2 \frac{\text{Precision} \times \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}, \quad (27)$$

is the harmonic mean of the precision and recall, providing a balance between the two.

Training a ML classifier on artificially balanced dataset introduces a bias favoring the minority class (Weiss 2013). Among the suggested mitigation strategies (Tian et al. 2020), we opt for the following Bayesian approach which relies on simulation-informed priors (Chan et al. 2019; Berbel et al. 2023). The probability we want to evaluate is $p(j \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_j, \beta)$ that enters Eq. (23). We start from Bayes' theorem written in terms of odds:

$$\frac{p(i \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_i, \{\beta\})}{p(i \notin k | \mathbf{x}, d_i, \{\beta\})} = \frac{\pi(i \in k | \{\beta\})}{\pi(i \notin k | \{\beta\})} \frac{p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k, \{\beta\})}{p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \notin k, \{\beta\})}. \quad (28)$$

Note that the likelihood of the single event j , denoted as $p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k, \{\beta\})$, does not depend on the fractions $\{\beta\}$, which could only vary its normalization. We can then write $p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k, \{\beta\}) = p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k)$ and apply Bayes' theorem once more to obtain:

$$p(i \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_i) = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k) \pi(i \in k)}{p(\mathbf{x}, d_i)} = \frac{p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k)}{\sum_k p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k)}, \quad (29)$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that $\pi(i \in k) = 1/2$. We substitute Eq. (29) twice in Eq. (28), making use of the fact that the normalization $\sum_k p(\mathbf{x}, d_i | i \in k)$ is independent of k and therefore cancels out. The relevant prior probabilities are $\pi(i \notin k | \{\beta\}) = \beta_{\text{I-II}}$ and $\pi(i \in k | \{\beta\}) = \beta_{\text{III}}$. Eq. (28) then becomes

$$p(i \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_i, \{\beta\}) = \frac{p(i \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_i) \beta_{\text{III}}}{p(i \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_i) (\beta_{\text{III}} - \beta_{\text{I-II}}) + \beta_{\text{I-II}}}, \quad (30)$$

where $\beta_{\text{III}} = N_{\text{Pop. III}}/N_{\text{tot}}$ and $\beta_{\text{I-II}} = N_{\text{Pop. I-II}}/N_{\text{tot}}$ with $N_{\text{tot}} = N_{\text{Pop. III}} + N_{\text{Pop. I-II}}$ (see Sec. 2.3)

3. Results

3.1. Classification performances on balanced datasets

Fig. 5 shows that precision-recall curves evaluated on the test sets and with the best hyperparameters listed in Tab. 3 remain consistent across the 5 folds. Moreover, the classifiers exhibit




Fig. 5. Precision-recall curves evaluated on the test sets for the fiducial balanced model (top panel), optimistic balanced (middle panel), and pessimistic balanced (bottom panel). Colors indicate results obtained for different folds. F1 is reported as a scoring parameter for each fold and has been evaluated by applying a threshold equal to 0.5 on $p(j \in k | \mathbf{x}, d_j)$ (see Sec. 2.5 for details). The red dashed horizontal line represents the precision-recall curve of a classifier making random guesses.

almost same performances across different data splits, indicating strong generalization capabilities to unseen data.

The confusion matrices evaluated on the test sets are presented in Fig. 6 and indicate good classification performances across all three models. The majority of instances are correctly classified as shown with high fractions (≥ 0.45) on the diagonal of each matrix. These robust performances are further corroborated by the scoring parameters evaluated on the test sets presented in Tab. 4. In particular, the achieved precision evaluated on the test sets consistently exceeds 0.90 for each classifier.




Fig. 6. Confusion matrix evaluated on the test sets for the fiducial balanced model (left panel), optimistic balanced model (middle panel) and pessimistic balanced model (right panel). Entries are color-coded and normalized to one.

Tab. 4. Scoring parameters evaluated on the balanced test sets for the three classifiers of Pop. III BBHs (see Sec. 2.5 for details).

Model	Precision	Recall	F1 score
fiducial balanced	0.90	0.97	0.94
optimistic balanced	0.90	0.96	0.93
pessimistic balanced	0.92	0.98	0.95

The classifiers exhibit a higher rate of confusing Pop. I-II BBHs as Pop. III compared to vice-versa (top-right corners of the confusion matrices). This is because the tails of the parameter distribution ($m_{1,d}$, $m_{2,d}$, and d_L) of Pop. I-II BBHs extend in the ranges occupied by Pop. III BBHs, see Figs. 2, 3, and 4. This fact might imply worse classifier performances in presence of BBHs generated through alternative formation channels, as discussed in more detail in Sec. 4.5.

3.2. Classification of single detections

When taking into account the expected merger rate ratio between detected Pop. III and Pop. I-II BBHs, we count that $\sim 4\%$, $\sim 47\%$ and $\sim 0.2\%$ of the total number of BBH mergers are generated from the fiducial, optimistic and pessimistic model, respectively (Sec. 2.3). We use the probability defined in Eq. (23), which provides a confidence in determining whether a source belongs to the Pop. I-II or Pop. III class. We can thus introduce a threshold on $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$: setting a higher threshold results in fewer Pop. III BBHs being identified, albeit with higher certainty. We evaluate Eq. (23) only for those sources that are in the test sets.

Tab. 5 presents the scores as function of this threshold. Our results reveal that we can effectively distinguish BBHs from Pop. III stars with high precision. For instance, Tab. 5 illustrates that with threshold equal to 0.7, we can identify $\sim 10\%$ of Pop. III BBHs in the fiducial model with $> 90\%$ precision.

As shown in Fig. 7, sources confidently identified as Pop. III BBHs, i.e. with high $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$ typically exhibit a high median detector-frame primary mass ($m_{1,d} \gtrsim 500 M_\odot$) and secondary mass ($m_{2,d} \gtrsim 400 M_\odot$) as well as high median luminosity distance ($d_L \gtrsim 1 \times 10^5 \text{ Mpc}$).

Tab. 5. Scoring of the fiducial (top), optimistic (middle) and pessimistic (bottom) models for different thresholds on $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$, as reported in the first column. The scoring metrics are reported in Sec. 2.5.

Fiducial						
Thr.	%TP	%TN	%FP	%FN	Precision	Recall
0.1	96	85	15	4	0.20	0.96
0.2	86	90	10	14	0.26	0.86
0.5	33	98	2	67	0.43	0.33
0.7	11	100	0	89	0.94	0.11
0.9	3	100	0	97	1.00	0.03

Optimistic						
Thr.	%TP	%TN	%FP	%FN	Precision	Recall
0.1	100	77	23	0	0.80	1.00
0.2	99	80	20	1	0.81	0.99
0.5	95	85	15	5	0.85	0.95
0.7	87	89	11	13	0.88	0.87
0.9	46	96	4	54	0.91	0.46

Pessimistic						
Thr.	%TP	%TN	%FP	%FN	Precision	Recall
0.1	50	100	0	50	0.60	0.50
0.2	33	100	0	67	1.00	0.33
0.5	0	100	0	100	0	0
0.7	0	100	0	100	0	0
0.9	0	100	0	100	0	0

4. Discussion

4.1. Interpretability and manual classifier

One of the well-known limitations of ML algorithms is their lack of interpretability; that is, it is not always clear why or on what basis an algorithm predicts a specific outcome. Various methods exist to address this issue, ranging in sophistication (Angelino et al. 2018; Li et al. 2022; Molnar et al. 2021; Angelov et al. 2021). However, given the simplicity of the problem we aim to solve here — classifying BBHs based on only three features — we can opt for a straightforward yet highly interpretable approach: a manual classifier.

We devised a simple algorithm that systematically explores a fine grid of values within the feature space. The objective of




Fig. 7. Probability ($p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$ in Eq. (23)) of each mock observation to belong to the Pop. III class in the left-to-right columns as function of primary mass ($m_{1,d}$), secondary mass ($m_{2,d}$), and luminosity distance (d_L). Each dot corresponds to the median of the posterior samples. The top, middle, and bottom rows correspond to the fiducial, optimistic, and pessimistic scenarios, respectively. Red (blue) dots indicate observations known to belong to Pop. I-II (Pop. III). Refer to Sec. 2.4 for details.

this manual classifier is to identify thresholds for primary mass, secondary mass, and luminosity distance that yield the highest precision [Eq. (25)]. We use the same balanced training and testing dataset described in Sec. 2.5.

The results of this approach are straightforward: we found optimal scores for the manual classifier exclusively determined by the threshold on the detector-frame primary mass, while both the secondary mass and luminosity distance are just required to be above zero.

For the fiducial, optimistic, and pessimistic models, the found thresholds are $m_{1,d}^{\text{thr}} \simeq 62 M_\odot$, $m_{1,d}^{\text{thr}} \simeq 57 M_\odot$, and $m_{1,d}^{\text{thr}} \simeq 72 M_\odot$, respectively. This cut-based manual classifier assigns any source with $m_{1,d} > m_{1,d}^{\text{thr}}$ to the class of Pop. III BBHs with $p(j \in k|\mathbf{x}, d_j) = 1$.

The performances of this manual classifier are comparable to those of XGBoost, with the corresponding confusion matrices reported in Fig. 8. The F1 scores [Eq. (27)] evaluated on the balanced test sets are 0.87, 0.86, and 0.89 for the fiducial, optimistic, and pessimistic models, respectively.

The manual classifier highlights the primary mass as the most influential factor in distinguishing Pop. III BBHs. However, it cannot replace XGBoost, as it yields inadequate per-

formance with imbalanced classes, as shown in Fig. 9. Precision with $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\}) > 0.9$ evaluated with the manual classifier is equal to 0.16. One may attempt to improve the performance of the manual classifier in unbalanced cases by introducing additional complexity, such as incorporating a sigmoid function and fitting its free parameters. However, in our view, this approach is more intricate compared to simply employing an easy-to-train ML algorithm.

4.2. Impact of extrinsic parameters

In Sec. 2.3, we randomly choose the extrinsic parameters for each injected source based on their prior distributions (see Tab. 2). These parameters, like sky position and inclination angle, can affect our results. The sensitivity of the detector varies across sky, and the luminosity distance is degenerate with the inclination angle. Consequently, altering these extrinsic parameters can either reduce or increase both the total number of detected sources and the accuracy of their parameter estimations.

We generate ten catalogs drawing different independent values for the extrinsic parameters. This procedure is performed exclusively for the pessimistic model, as it is more likely to be




Fig. 8. Confusion matrix for the balanced fiducial model (left panel), balanced optimistic (middle panel), and balanced pessimistic (right panel) adopting manual classification (see Sec. 4.1 for details). Entries are color-coded and normalized to one.




Fig. 9. Probability ($p(j \in kd_j, \{\beta\})$ in Eq. (23)) of each mock observation of the fiducial model to belong to the Pop. III class as function of primary mass ($m_{1,d}$), evaluated with the manual classifier (see Sec. 4.1). Each dot corresponds to the median of the posterior samples. Red (blue) dots indicate observations known to belong to Pop. I-II (Pop. III).

sensitive to the choice of extrinsic parameters due to its lower expected number of mergers as compared to the other models. Subsequently, we inject these new populations in GWF_{ISH}.

By varying the extrinsic parameters ten times while keeping the intrinsic parameters (i.e., $m_{1,d}$, $m_{2,d}$, and d_L) fixed, the total number of detected sources with a relative error of ≤ 0.3 fluctuates between $N_{\text{Pop. III}} = 13$ and $N_{\text{Pop. III}} = 25$. The percentage of BBHs correctly identified with $p(j \in kd_j, \{\beta\}) \geq 0.1$ as being generated from Pop. III ranges between 33% and 75% with corresponding precision between 0.4 and 1.

4.3. Spin parameters

In our analysis we set spin parameters equal to zero. This is because *sevn*, in the setup adopted by Costa et al. (2023), provides as output only the tilt angle, which is the angle between the rotation axis of the single BH with the direction of the angular momentum of the orbital system (Iorio et al. 2023). There is no significant difference in the distribution of cosines of tilt angles between Pop. I-II and Pop. III BBHs, being $> 99\%$ of them equal to 1 in both populations and across redshift. In our case, spin magnitudes must be added in post-processing (e.g., Wysocki et al.

2018; Gerosa et al. 2018; Belczynski et al. 2020; Bavera et al. 2020; Périgois et al. 2023), making differences, if any, between Pop. III and Pop. I-II BBHs artificial.

4.4. Fisher-information-matrix approximation

The FIM formalism is widely used in forecasting studies, shaping the design and scientific objectives of advanced detectors (Borhanian & Sathyaprakash 2022; Pieroni et al. 2022; Iacovelli et al. 2022a; Branchesi et al. 2023). However, this approximation is valid under certain conditions, most notably the high SNR limit (Vallisneri 2008). Even when dealing with loud sources, disparities may emerge between the parameter uncertainties estimated using the FIM formalism and those derived through full Bayesian inference (van der Sluys et al. 2008; Veitch et al. 2015; Romero-Shaw et al. 2020). For instance, Rodriguez et al. (2013) found systematic discrepancies in the high-mass ($m_1 > 10 M_\odot$) and high-SNR limit ($\text{SNR} > 12$), demonstrating FIM tends to overestimate uncertainties in parameter estimation, sometimes by orders of magnitude with respect to full Bayesian inference. However, the chosen priors in Tab. 2 and the cuts on relative errors and SNR mitigate this effect (Dupletsa et al., in prep.).

4.5. Population modelling uncertainty

The general performances of the classifiers may be influenced by the interplay of three factors. First, the simulated populations of Pop. I-II and Pop. III BBHs might differ from those that will be observed with the ET. We addressed this by considering simulated populations resulting from a comprehensive parameter exploration, aiming to bracket uncertainties. However, once observations become available, a comparison with simulated data can be conducted (Yang et al. 2021; Pasquato et al. 2023). Additionally, retraining on alternative data is easily achievable, as XGBoost requires only few minutes on 10 CPUs for training, considering both optimization and cross-validation.

Classifying detected events can also face challenges due to the presence of sources originating from different astrophysical phenomena. For instance, the dynamical formation channels predict a subpopulation of BBHs with primary masses ranging from 40 to 100 $M_\odot$ (e.g., Ziosi et al. 2014; Rodriguez et al. 2015, 2019; Antonini & Rasio 2016; Mapelli 2016; Askar et al. 2017; Banerjee 2017, 2021; Antonini et al. 2018; Di Carlo et al. 2019, 2020; Arca Sedda & Benacquista 2019; Rastello et al. 2020; Ku-

mamoto et al. 2020; Arca Sedda et al. 2023; Kritos et al. 2023; Arca sedda et al. 2024). Considering the peak of their merger rate density at redshift $z \sim 2$ (Santoliquido et al. 2020), dynamically formed BHs would exhibit a detector-frame primary mass in the range of ~ 80 to $200 M_{\odot}$. Consequently, the tails of the distribution for Pop. I-II BBHs would be thicker in the overlapping regions with Pop. III BBHs, potentially leading to less accurate classification performances (cf. Figs. 2, 3 and 4). Moreover, Pop. III BBHs could be subject to contamination from primordial black holes, that are expected to form at high redshift with a wide range of masses (e.g., De Luca et al. 2020; De Luca 2022; Franciolini et al. 2022; Ng et al. 2022b). When considering the possibility of sources with various astrophysical origins, which we leave for future studies, it might become crucial to account for additional features to effectively disentangle them, e.g. spin properties (Gerosa et al. 2013; Qin et al. 2018, 2019; Fuller & Ma 2019; Bavera et al. 2020; Belczynski et al. 2020; Olejak & Belczynski 2021; Stevenson 2022; Périgois et al. 2023) and eccentricity (Samsing et al. 2014; Samsing & D’Orazio 2018; Zevin et al. 2019; Arca Sedda et al. 2021; Romero-Shaw et al. 2023; Codazzo et al. 2023; Dall’Amico et al. 2024). Additionally, one might consider using a network of third-generation detectors to enhance precision in parameter estimation (Iacovelli et al. 2022b; Borhanian & Sathyaprakash 2022).

In our analysis, while evaluating $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$ from Eq. (23), we assumed to perfectly know the hyperparameters population governing the distribution of single-event parameters. This is not generally true even with the ET, where uncertainties on hyperparameters are expected. Posterior distributions of population hyperparameters can be inferred by considering a set of gravitational-wave observations, via hierarchical Bayesian analysis (e.g. Loredó 2004; Mandel et al. 2019; Bouffanais et al. 2021b; Zevin et al. 2021; Vitale et al. 2022). We leave for future studies the integration of hyperparameters uncertainty on $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$ and the inclusion of population-informed priors (Moore & Gerosa 2021; Abbott et al. 2023a) to analyze the single-event posterior ($p(\mathbf{x}|d_j, \{\beta\})$ in Eq. (23)). In this way, we will quantify the variance affecting our results due to modeling systematics.

5. Conclusions

The ability to trace the origins of individual GW events upon their detection is pivotal to understand compact object formation and evolution. To address this problem and with the goal of enhancing the scientific output of future GW astronomy, we couple the heightened sensitivity of ET with innovative ML techniques. Here, we propose a robust yet straightforward ML approach, leveraging the power of XGBoost (Chen & Guestrin 2016), a fast-to-train algorithm based on decision trees leading to high performances.

Costa et al. (2023) investigated a broad parameter space of initial conditions of Pop. III progenitor stars in binary systems using advanced population-synthesis simulations, based on stellar tracks (SEVN, Iorio et al. 2023). Santoliquido et al. (2023) combined these Pop. III BBHs with different star-formation-rate histories to estimate their merger density evolution with redshift (COSMORATE, Santoliquido et al. 2021). From the array of available models, we specifically choose three populations of Pop. III BBHs – fiducial, optimistic, and pessimistic – based on their respective detection rates. These are classified against a population of Pop. I-II stars taken from the fiducial model by Iorio et al. (2023). Parameter estimation of these populations is performed using the FIM formalism (GWFish, Dupletsa et al. 2023).

We train XGBoost on balanced datasets and this yields high performances with precision exceeding 90% for all the models (Sec. 2.5). We apply these classifiers in an event-by-event scenario, where we take in account posterior samples of detected sources, the relative ratio of Pop. III and Pop. I-II BBH merger rate, and classification confidence via $p(j \in k|d_j, \{\beta\})$ (Sec. 2.4). Our analysis reveals that the classifiers consistently achieve $> 90\%$ precision in classifying a fraction of BBHs from Pop. III stars. In particular, we confidently identify $\sim 10\%$, $\sim 46\%$ and $\sim 33\%$ of BBHs from Pop. III stars in the fiducial, optimistic, and pessimistic models, respectively, with $> 90\%$ precision (Tab. 5).

This study proposes a new methodology that integrates simulation-based information of GW source populations with parameter estimation inference and demonstrates its validity in discerning the origins of individual GW detections.

Acknowledgements. We thank Banerjee Biswajit, Manuel Arca Sedda, Samuele Ronchini, Stefano Tornamenti, Elena Cuoco, Guglielmo Costa, and Davide Piras for valuable discussions. F.S. and M.B. acknowledge financial support from the AHEAD2020 project (grant agreement n. 871158). M.B. also acknowledges support from the PRIN grant METE under the contract no. 2020KB33TP. M.M., F.S., and G.I. acknowledge financial support from the European Research Council for the ERC Consolidator grant DEMOBLACK, under contract no. 770017 (PI: Mapelli). M.M. also acknowledges support from the German Excellence Strategy via the Heidelberg Cluster of Excellence (EXC 2181 - 390900948) STRUCTURES. D.G. is supported by ERC Starting Grant No. 945155–GWmining, Cariplo Foundation Grant No. 2021-0555, MUR PRIN Grant No. 2022-Z9X4XS, MSCA Fellowships No. 101064542–StochRewind and No. 101149270–ProtoBH, and the ICSC National Research Centre funded by NextGenerationEU. F.I. is supported by Swiss National Science Foundation Grant No. 200020_191957 and the SwissMap National Center for Competence in Research. The research leading to these results has been conceived and developed within the Einstein Telescope Observational Science Board ET-0101A-24.

DATA AVAILABILITY

SEVN is publicly available at <https://gitlab.com/sevncodes/sevn.git>: the version used in this work is the commit 0f9ae3bf in the branch COSTA23POPIII (<https://gitlab.com/sevncodes/sevn/tree/COSTA23POPIII>). COSMORATE is publicly available at gitlab.com/Filippo.santoliquido/cosmo_rate_public. GWFish is publicly available at github.com/janosch314/GWFish.

References

- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2016, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **116**, 061102 [arXiv:1602.03837]
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2019a, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, **882**, L24 [arXiv:1811.12940]
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2019b, *Phys. Rev. X*, **9**, 031040 [arXiv:1811.12907]
- Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., Acernese, F., et al. 2023a, *Phys. Rev. X*, **13**, 011048 [arXiv:2111.03634]
- Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., Zhu, X. J., et al. 2021, *Phys. Rev. X*, **11**, 021053 [arXiv:2010.14527]
- Abbott, R. et al. 2023b, *Phys. Rev. X*, **13**, 041039 [arXiv:2111.03606]
- Abel, T., Bryan, G. L., & Norman, M. L. 2002, *Science*, **295**, 93 [arXiv:astro-ph/0112088]
- Aghanim, N., Akrami, Y., Ashdown, M., et al. 2020, *Astron. Astrophys.*, **641**, A6 [arXiv:1807.06209]
- Alhassan, W., Bulik, T., & Suchenek, M. 2023 [arXiv:2310.10409]
- Angelino, E., Larus-Stone, N., Alabi, D., Seltzer, M., & Rudin, C. 2018, Learning Certifiably Optimal Rule Lists for Categorical Data
- Angelov, P. P., Soares, E. A., Jiang, R., Arnold, N. I., & Atkinson, P. M. 2021 Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, **11**
- Antonelli, A., Kritos, K., Ng, K. K. Y., Cotesta, R., & Berti, E. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, **108**, 084044 [arXiv:2306.11088]
- Antonini, F. & Rasio, F. A. 2016, *Astrophys. J.*, **831**, 187 [arXiv:1606.04889]
- Antonini, F., Rodriguez, C. L., Petrovich, C., & Fischer, C. L. 2018, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **480**, L58 [arXiv:1711.07142]

- Arca Sedda, M. & Benacquista, M. 2019, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 482, 2991 [arXiv:1806.01285]
- Arca sedda, M., Kamlah, A. W. H., Spurzem, R., et al. 2024, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 528, 5140
- Arca Sedda, M., Li, G., & Kocsis, B. 2021, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 650, A189 [arXiv:1805.06458]
- Arca Sedda, M., Mapelli, M., Benacquista, M., & Spera, M. 2023, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 520, 5259 [arXiv:2109.12119]
- Askar, A., Szkudlarek, M., Gondek-Rosińska, D., Giersz, M., & Bulik, T. 2017, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 464, L36 [arXiv:1608.02520]
- Baker, P. T., Caudill, S., Hodge, K. A., et al. 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, 91, 062004 [arXiv:1412.6479]
- Banerjee, S. 2017, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 467, 524 [arXiv:1611.09357]
- Banerjee, S. 2021, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 500, 3002 [arXiv:2004.07382]
- Baron, D. 2019 [arXiv:1904.07248]
- Bavera, S. S., Fragos, T., Qin, Y., et al. 2020, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 635, A97 [arXiv:1906.12257]
- Belczynski, K., Klencik, J., Fields, C. E., et al. 2020, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 636, A104 [arXiv:1706.07053]
- Belczynski, K., Ryu, T., Perna, R., et al. 2017, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 471, 4702 [arXiv:1612.01524]
- Berbel, M., Miravet-Tenés, M., Chaudhary, S. S., et al. 2023 [arXiv:2311.00045]
- Bergstra, J. & Bengio, Y. 2012, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 13, 281
- Bondi, H. & Hoyle, F. 1944, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 104, 273
- Borhanian, S. 2021, *Class. Quantum Gravity*, 38, 175014 [arXiv:2010.15202]
- Borhanian, S. & Sathyaprakash, B. S. 2022 [arXiv:2202.11048]
- Bouffanais, Y., Mapelli, M., Santoliquido, F., et al. 2021a, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 507, 5224 [arXiv:2102.12495]
- Bouffanais, Y., Mapelli, M., Santoliquido, F., et al. 2021b, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 505, 3873 [arXiv:2010.11220]
- Bovill, M. S., Stiavelli, M., Wiggins, A. I., Ricotti, M., & Trenti, M. 2024, *Astrophys. J.*, 962, 49 [arXiv:2210.10190]
- Branchesi, M., Maggiore, M., Alonso, D., et al. 2023, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2023, 068 [arXiv:2303.15923]
- Bressan, A., Marigo, P., Girardi, L., et al. 2012, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 427, 127 [arXiv:1208.4498]
- Broekgaarden, F. S., Berger, E., Stevenson, S., et al. 2022, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 516, 5737 [arXiv:2112.05763]
- Chan, M. L., Messenger, C., Heng, I. S., & Hendry, M. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 97, 123014 [arXiv:1803.09680]
- Chan, R., Rottmann, M., Hüger, F., Schlicht, P., & Gottschalk, H. 2019, [arXiv:1901.08394]
- Chatterjee, D., Ghosh, S., Brady, P. R., et al. 2020, *Astrophys. J.*, 896, 54 [arXiv:1911.00116]
- Chen, H.-Y., Ricarte, A., & Pacucci, F. 2022 [arXiv:2202.04764]
- Chen, T. & Guestrin, C. 2016, in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '16* (New York, NY, USA: ACM), 785–794
- Chon, S., Omukai, K., & Schneider, R. 2021, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 508, 4175 [arXiv:2103.04997]
- Codazzo, E., Di Giovanni, M., Harms, J., Dall’Amico, M., & Mapelli, M. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 107, 023023 [arXiv:2207.01326]
- Costa, G., Bressan, A., Mapelli, M., et al. 2021, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 501, 4514 [arXiv:2010.02242]
- Costa, G., Mapelli, M., Iorio, G., et al. 2023, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 525, 2891 [arXiv:2303.15511]
- Couvares, P., Bird, I., Porter, E., et al. 2021 [arXiv:2111.06987]
- Cuoco, E., Iess, A., Morawski, F., & Razzano, M. 2021a, in *Handbook of Gravitational Wave Astronomy* (Springer), 46
- Cuoco, E., Powell, J., Cavaglià, M., et al. 2021b, *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol.*, 2, 011002 [arXiv:2005.03745]
- Cutler, C. & Flanagan, E. E. 1994, *Phys. Rev. D*, 49, 2658 [arXiv:gr-qc/9402014]
- Dall’Amico, M., Mapelli, M., Torniamenti, S., & Arca Sedda, M. 2024, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 683, A186 [arXiv:2303.07421]
- Dax, M., Green, S. R., Gair, J., et al. 2021, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 127, 241103 [arXiv:2106.12594]
- Dax, M., Green, S. R., Gair, J., et al. 2023, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 130, 171403 [arXiv:2210.05686]
- De Luca, V. 2022 [arXiv:2207.08638]
- De Luca, V., Franciolini, G., Pani, P., & Riotto, A. 2020, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2020, 044 [arXiv:2005.05641]
- Di Carlo, U. N., Giacobbo, N., Mapelli, M., et al. 2019, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 487, 2947 [arXiv:1901.00863]
- Di Carlo, U. N., Mapelli, M., Giacobbo, N., et al. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 498, 498 [arXiv:2004.09525]
- Djorgovski, S. G., Mahabal, A. A., Graham, M. J., Polsterer, K., & Krone-Martins, A. 2022 [arXiv:2212.01493]
- Dupletsa, U., Harms, J., Banerjee, B., et al. 2023, *Astron. Comput.*, 42, 100671 [arXiv:2205.02499]
- Fairhurst, S., Mills, C., Colpi, M., et al. 2023 [arXiv:2310.18158]
- Farr, W. M., Gair, J. R., Mandel, I., & Cutler, C. 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, 91, 023005 [arXiv:1302.5341]
- Franciolini, G., Musco, I., Pani, P., & Urbano, A. 2022, *Phys. Rev. D*, 106, 123526 [arXiv:2209.05959]
- Fryer, C. L., Belczynski, K., Wiktorowicz, G., et al. 2012, *Astrophys. J.*, 749, 91 [arXiv:1110.1726]
- Fuller, J. & Ma, L. 2019, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 881, L1 [arXiv:1907.03714]
- Gabbard, H., Messenger, C., Heng, I. S., Tonolini, F., & Murray-Smith, R. 2022, *Nature Physics*, 18, 112 [arXiv:1909.06296]
- Gerosa, D., Berti, E., O’Shaughnessy, R., et al. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 98, 084036 [arXiv:1808.02491]
- Gerosa, D., Kesden, M., Berti, E., O’Shaughnessy, R., & Sperhake, U. 2013, *Phys. Rev. D*, 87, 104028 [arXiv:1302.4442]
- Giacobbo, N. & Mapelli, M. 2019, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 482, 2234 [arXiv:1805.11100]
- Giacobbo, N. & Mapelli, M. 2020, *Astrophys. J.*, 891, 141 [arXiv:1909.06385]
- Gupta, P. K., Edelman, B., & Farr, B. 2023 [arXiv:2304.01288]
- Green, S. R., Simpson, C., & Gair, J. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, 102, 104057 [arXiv:2002.07656]
- Grimm, S. & Harms, J. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, 102, 022007 [arXiv:2004.01434]
- Gupta, P. K., Puecher, A., Pang, P. T. H., et al. 2022 [arXiv:2205.01182]
- Haiman, Z., Thoul, A. A., & Loeb, A. 1996, *Astrophys. J.*, 464, 523 [arXiv:astro-ph/9507111]
- Haixiang, G., Yijing, L., Shang, J., et al. 2017, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 73, 220
- Hartwig, T., Magg, M., Chen, L.-H., et al. 2022, *Astrophys. J.*, 936, 45 [arXiv:2206.00223]
- Hartwig, T., Volonteri, M., Bromm, V., et al. 2016, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 460, L74 [arXiv:1603.05655]
- Hirano, S., Hosokawa, T., Yoshida, N., Omukai, K., & Yorke, H. W. 2015, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 448, 568 [arXiv:1501.01630]
- Iacovelli, F., Mancarella, M., Foffa, S., & Maggiore, M. 2022a, *Astrophys. J.*, 941, 208 [arXiv:2207.02771]
- Iacovelli, F., Mancarella, M., Foffa, S., & Maggiore, M. 2022b, *Astrophys. J. Supp.*, 263, 2 [arXiv:2207.06910]
- Iorio, G., Mapelli, M., Costa, G., et al. 2023, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 524, 426 [arXiv:2211.11774]
- Ivezić, Ž., Connolly, A., Vanderplas, J., & Gray, A. 2014, *Statistics, Data Mining and Machine Learning in Astronomy* (Princeton University Press)
- Iwaya, M., Kinugawa, T., & Tagoshi, H. 2023 [arXiv:2312.17491]
- Jaacks, J., Finkelstein, S. L., & Bromm, V. 2019, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 488, 2202 [arXiv:1804.07372]
- Jaura, O., Glover, S. C. O., Wollenberg, K. M. J., et al. 2022, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 512, 116 [arXiv:2202.09803]
- Kalaghatgi, C., Hannam, M., & Raymond, V. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, 101, 103004 [arXiv:1909.10010]
- Kalogera, V., Sathyaprakash, B. S., Bailes, M., et al. 2021 [arXiv:2111.06990]
- Kimball, C., Talbot, C., Berry, C. P. L., et al. 2020, *Astrophys. J.*, 900, 177 [arXiv:2005.00023]
- Kinugawa, T., Inayoshi, K., Hotokezaka, K., Nakauchi, D., & Nakamura, T. 2014, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 442, 2963 [arXiv:1402.6672]
- Kinugawa, T., Miyamoto, A., Kanda, N., & Nakamura, T. 2016, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 456, 1093 [arXiv:1505.06962]
- Kinugawa, T., Nakamura, T., & Nakano, H. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 498, 3946 [arXiv:2005.09795]
- Klessen, R. S. & Glover, S. C. O. 2023 [arXiv:2303.12500]
- Kritos, K., Berti, E., & Silk, J. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 108, 083012 [arXiv:2212.06845]
- Kroupa, P. 2001, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 322, 231 [arXiv:astro-ph/0009005]
- Kumamoto, J., Fujii, M. S., & Tanikawa, A. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 495, 4268 [arXiv:2001.10690]
- Larkin, M. M., Gerasimov, R., & Burgasser, A. J. 2023, *Astron. J.*, 165, 2 [arXiv:2210.09185]
- Larson, R. B. 1998, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 301, 569 [arXiv:astro-ph/9808145]
- Li, X.-H., Cao, C. C., Shi, Y., et al. 2022, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 34, 29
- Liu, B. & Bromm, V. 2020a, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 495, 2475 [arXiv:2003.00065]
- Liu, B. & Bromm, V. 2020b, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 497, 2839 [arXiv:2006.15260]
- Lones, M. A. 2021 [arXiv:2108.02497]
- Loredo, T. J. 2004, in *American Institute of Physics Conference Series*, Vol. 735, *Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering: 24th International Workshop on Bayesian Inference and Maximum Entropy Methods in Science and Engineering*, ed. R. Fischer, R. Preuss, & U. V. Toussaint, 195–206
- Lubow, S. H. & Shu, F. H. 1975, *Astrophys. J.*, 198, 383

- Madau, P. & Fragos, T. 2017, *Astrophys. J.*, 840, 39 [arXiv:1606.07887]
- Maggiore, M., Van Den Broeck, C., Bartolo, N., et al. 2020, *J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys.*, 2020, 050 [arXiv:1912.02622]
- Mancarella, M., Iacovelli, F., & Gerosa, D. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 107, L101302 [arXiv:2303.16323]
- Mandel, I., Farr, W. M., & Gair, J. R. 2019, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 486, 1086 [arXiv:1809.02063]
- Mapelli, M. 2016, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 459, 3432 [arXiv:1604.03559]
- Mapelli, M., Spera, M., Montanari, E., et al. 2020, *Astrophys. J.*, 888, 76 [arXiv:1909.01371]
- Marcoccia, P., Nardini, G., & Pieroni, M. 2023 [arXiv:2311.11760]
- Meena, A. K., Zitrin, A., Jiménez-Teja, Y., et al. 2023, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 944, L6 [arXiv:2211.13334]
- Molnar, C., König, G., Herbig, J., et al. 2021, General Pitfalls of Model-Agnostic Interpretation Methods for Machine Learning Models
- Moore, C. J. & Gerosa, D. 2021, *Phys. Rev. D*, 104, 083008 [arXiv:2108.02462]
- Moriwaki, K., Nishimichi, T., & Yoshida, N. 2023, *Rep. Prog. Phys.*, 86, 076901 [arXiv:2303.15794]
- Mould, M., Gerosa, D., & Taylor, S. R. 2022, *Phys. Rev. D*, 106, 103013 [arXiv:2203.03651]
- Nandal, D., Regan, J. A., Woods, T. E., et al. 2023, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 677, A155 [arXiv:2306.17223]
- Ng, K. K. Y., Chen, S., Goncharov, B., et al. 2022a, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 931, L12 [arXiv:2108.07276]
- Ng, K. K. Y., Franciolini, G., Berti, E., et al. 2022b, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 933, L41 [arXiv:2204.11864]
- Ng, K. K. Y., Goncharov, B., Chen, S., et al. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 107, 024041 [arXiv:2210.03132]
- Ng, K. K. Y., Vitale, S., Farr, W. M., & Rodriguez, C. L. 2021, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 913, L5 [arXiv:2012.09876]
- Nguyen, C. T., Costa, G., Girardi, L., et al. 2022, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 665, A126 [arXiv:2207.08642]
- Olejak, A. & Belczynski, K. 2021, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 921, L2 [arXiv:2109.06872]
- Pasquato, M., Trevisan, P., Askar, A., et al. 2023 [arXiv:2310.18560]
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., et al. 2011, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 12, 2825 [arXiv:1201.0490]
- Pérgois, C., Mapelli, M., Santoliquido, F., Bouffanais, Y., & Rufolo, R. 2023, *Universe*, 9, 507 [arXiv:2301.01312]
- Peters, P. C. 1964, *Phys. Rev.*, 136, 1224
- Pieroni, M., Ricciardone, A., & Barausse, E. 2022, *Scientific Reports*, 12, 17940 [arXiv:2203.12586]
- Prole, L. R., Clark, P. C., Klessen, R. S., & Glover, S. C. O. 2022, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 510, 4019 [arXiv:2112.10800]
- Punturo, M., Abernathy, M., Acernese, F., et al. 2010, *Class. Quantum Gravity*, 27, 194002
- Qin, Y., Fragos, T., Meynet, G., et al. 2018, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 616, A28 [arXiv:1802.05738]
- Qin, Y., Marchant, P., Fragos, T., Meynet, G., & Kalogera, V. 2019, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 870, L18 [arXiv:1810.13016]
- Rastello, S., Mapelli, M., Di Carlo, U. N., et al. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 497, 1563 [arXiv:2003.02277]
- Reitze, D., Adhikari, R. X., Ballmer, S., et al. 2019, in *Bulletin of the American Astronomical Society*, Vol. 51, 35
- Riggi, S., Umana, G., Trigilio, C., et al. 2024 [arXiv:2402.15232]
- Rodriguez, C. L., Farr, B., Farr, W. M., & Mandel, I. 2013, *Phys. Rev. D*, 88, 084013 [arXiv:1308.1397]
- Rodriguez, C. L., Morscher, M., Pattabiraman, B., et al. 2015, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 115, 051101 [arXiv:1505.00792]
- Rodriguez, C. L., Zevin, M., Amaro-Seoane, P., et al. 2019, *Phys. Rev. D*, 100, 043027 [arXiv:1906.10260]
- Romero-Shaw, I. M., Gerosa, D., & Loutrel, N. 2023, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 519, 5352 [arXiv:2211.07528]
- Romero-Shaw, I. M., Talbot, C., Biscoveanu, S., et al. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 499, 3295 [arXiv:2006.00714]
- Roulet, J. & Venumadhav, T. 2024 [arXiv:2402.11439]
- Rydborg, C.-E., Zackrisson, E., Lundqvist, P., & Scott, P. 2013, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 429, 3658 [arXiv:1206.0007]
- Samsing, J. & D'Orazio, D. J. 2018, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 481, 5445 [arXiv:1804.06519]
- Samsing, J., MacLeod, M., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2014, *Astrophys. J.*, 784, 71 [arXiv:1308.2964]
- Sana, H., de Mink, S. E., de Koter, A., et al. 2012, *Science*, 337, 444 [arXiv:1207.6397]
- Santoliquido, F., Mapelli, M., Bouffanais, Y., et al. 2020, *Astrophys. J.*, 898, 152 [arXiv:2004.09533]
- Santoliquido, F., Mapelli, M., Giacobbo, N., Bouffanais, Y., & Artale, M. C. 2021, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 502, 4877 [arXiv:2009.03911]
- Santoliquido, F., Mapelli, M., Iorio, G., et al. 2023, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 524, 307 [arXiv:2303.15515]
- Sasaoka, S., Koyama, N., Dominguez, D., et al. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 108, 123033 [arXiv:2310.09551]
- Schauer, A. T. P., Bromm, V., Drory, N., & Boylan-Kolchin, M. 2022, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 934, L6 [arXiv:2207.02863]
- Singh, N., Bulik, T., Belczynski, K., & Askar, A. 2022, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 667, A2 [arXiv:2112.04058]
- Skinner, D. & Wise, J. H. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 492, 4386 [arXiv:2001.04480]
- Spera, M., Mapelli, M., Giacobbo, N., et al. 2019, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 485, 889 [arXiv:1809.04605]
- Stacy, A. & Bromm, V. 2013, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 433, 1094 [arXiv:1211.1889]
- Stevenson, S. 2022, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 926, L32 [arXiv:2202.03584]
- Susa, H., Hasegawa, K., & Tominaga, N. 2014, *Astrophys. J.*, 792, 32 [arXiv:1407.1374]
- Tanikawa, A. 2024 [arXiv:2403.04389]
- Tanikawa, A., Chiaki, G., Kinugawa, T., Suwa, Y., & Tominaga, N. 2022a, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Jpn.*, 74, 521 [arXiv:2202.00230]
- Tanikawa, A., Susa, H., Yoshida, T., Trani, A. A., & Kinugawa, T. 2021, *Astrophys. J.*, 910, 30 [arXiv:2008.01890]
- Tanikawa, A., Yoshida, T., Kinugawa, T., et al. 2022b, *Astrophys. J.*, 926, 83 [arXiv:2110.10846]
- Tegmark, M., Silk, J., Rees, M. J., et al. 1997, *Astrophys. J.*, 474, 1 [arXiv:astro-ph/9603007]
- Tian, J., Liu, Y.-C., Glaser, N., Hsu, Y.-C., & Kira, Z. 2020 [arXiv:2010.11820]
- Tong, H., Galadage, S., & Thrane, E. 2022, *Phys. Rev. D*, 106, 103019 [arXiv:2209.02206]
- Trussler, J. A. C., Conselice, C. J., Adams, N. J., et al. 2023, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 525, 5328 [arXiv:2211.02038]
- Ulrich, R. K. & Burger, H. L. 1976, *Astrophys. J.*, 206, 509
- Valiante, R., Schneider, R., Volonteri, M., & Omukai, K. 2016, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 457, 3356 [arXiv:1601.07915]
- Vallisneri, M. 2008, *Phys. Rev. D*, 77, 042001 [arXiv:gr-qc/0703086]
- van der Sluis, M., Raymond, V., Mandel, I., et al. 2008, *Class. Quantum Gravity*, 25, 184011 [arXiv:0805.1689]
- van Son, L. A. C., de Mink, S. E., Chruślińska, M., et al. 2023, *Astrophys. J.*, 948, 105 [arXiv:2209.03385]
- Veitch, J., Raymond, V., Farr, B., et al. 2015, *Phys. Rev. D*, 91, 042003 [arXiv:1409.7215]
- Vitale, S., Gerosa, D., Farr, W. M., & Taylor, S. R. 2022, in *Handbook of Gravitational Wave Astronomy*, 45
- Wang, L., Tanikawa, A., & Fujii, M. 2022, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 515, 5106 [arXiv:2207.09621]
- Webbink, R. F. 1984, *Astrophys. J.*, 277, 355
- Weiss, G. M. 2013, *Foundations of Imbalanced Learning* (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd), 13–41
- Wiggins, A. I., Bovill, M. S., Strolger, L.-G., Stiavelli, M., & Bowling, C. 2024, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2402.17076 [arXiv:2402.17076]
- Williams, M. J., Veitch, J., & Messenger, C. 2021, *Phys. Rev. D*, 103, 103006 [arXiv:2102.11056]
- Wollenberg, K. M. J., Glover, S. C. O., Clark, P. C., & Klessen, R. S. 2020, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 494, 1871 [arXiv:1912.06377]
- Wysocki, D., Gerosa, D., O'Shaughnessy, R., et al. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 97, 043014 [arXiv:1709.01943]
- Yang, J., Zhou, K., Li, Y., & Liu, Z. 2021 [arXiv:2110.11334]
- Yi, S.-X., Stoppa, F., Nelemans, G., & Cator, E. 2022, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 663, A156 [arXiv:2201.06196]
- Yoshida, N., Abel, T., Hernquist, L., & Sugiyama, N. 2003, *Astrophys. J.*, 592, 645 [arXiv:astro-ph/0301645]
- Zackrisson, E., Hultquist, A., Kordt, A., et al. 2023 [arXiv:2312.09289]
- Zevin, M., Bavera, S. S., Berry, C. P. L., et al. 2021, *Astrophys. J.*, 910, 152 [arXiv:2011.10057]
- Zevin, M., Samsing, J., Rodriguez, C., Haster, C.-J., & Ramirez-Ruiz, E. 2019, *Astrophys. J.*, 871, 91 [arXiv:1810.00901]
- Ziosi, B. M., Mapelli, M., Branchesi, M., & Tormen, G. 2014, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, 441, 3703 [arXiv:1404.7147]