Upgraded VIRGO detector(s) and stochastic gravitational waves backgrounds

D.Babusci^(a) and M.Giovannini^{(b) y}

^(a) INFN — Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, 00044 Frascati, Italy

^(b) Institute for Theoretical Physics, Lausanne University, BSP-Dorigny, CH-1015 Switzerland

The sensitivity achievable by a pair of V IRGO detectors to stochastic and isotropic gravitational wave backgrounds of cosm ological origin is discussed in view of the developm ent of a second V IRGO interferom eter. We describe a sem i-analytical technique allowing to compute the signal-to-noise ratio for (monotonic or non-monotonic) logarithm ic energy spectra of relic gravitons of arbitrary slope. We apply our results to the case of two correlated and coaligned V IRGO detectors and we compute their achievable sensitivities. The maximization of the overlap reduction function is discussed. We focus our attention on a class of models whose expected sensitivity is more promising, namely the case of string cosm ological gravitons. We perform our calculations both for the case of minimal string cosm ological scenario and in the case of a non-minimal scenario where a long dilaton dominated phase is present prior to the onset of the ordinary radiation dominated phase. In this fram ework, we study possible in provements of the achievable sensitivities by selective reduction of the thermal contributions (pendulum and pendulum 's internal modes) to the noise power spectra of the detectors. Since a reduction of the shot noise does not increase signi cantly the expected sensitivity of a V IRGO pair (in spite of the relative spatial location of the two detectors) our ndings support the experimental e orts directed tow ards a substantial reduction of thermal noise.

I.THE PROBLEM AND ITSMOTIVATIONS

It is well known that every variation of the background geom etry produces graviton pairs which are stochastically distributed and whose logarithm ic energy spectra represent a faithful snapshot of the (tim e) evolution of the curvature scale at very early tim es [1]. Indeed, one of the peculiar features of stochastic graviton backgrounds is that their energy spectra extend over a huge interval of (present) frequencies. This feature can be appreciated by comparing the graviton backgrounds with other backgrounds of electrom agnetic origin (like the cosm ic microw are background [CMB]). The analysis of the CMB background (together with its spatial anisotropies) is relevant for very large (length) scales [2] (roughly ranging between the present horizon [i.e. 10¹⁸ Hz] and the horizon at decoupling [i.e. 10¹⁶ Hz]). Since gravitational interactions are much weaker than electrom agnetic interactions they also decouple much earlier and, therefore, the logarithm ic energy spectra of relic gravitons produced by the pumping action of the gravitational eld can very well extend for (approximately) twenty veorders of magnitude in frequency [3]. From the physical point of view, this observation in plies that the energy spectra of relic gravitons can be extrem ely relevant in order to probe the past history of the U niverse in a regime which will never be directly accessible with observations of electrom agnetic backgrounds.

In spite of the fact that the nature of the production mechanism is shared by dient types of models [1], the specie c amplitudes of the energy spectra can very well change depending upon the behavior of the background evolution. An example in this direction are logarithmic energy spectra increasing in frequency [4]. Dient theoretical signals (with dient spectral distributions) lead to detector outputs of dient amplitudes. We are facing a non-linear problem where a change in the detector signal can be determined either by an improvement in the features of the detector or by a dient functional form of the logarithmic energy spectrum [5]. Therefore, in order to evaluate the performances of a given detector one has to choose the specie c functional form of the logarithmic energy spectrum. A possible choice is represented by scale invariant spectra [6,7]. Another rather interesting choice is represented by tilted (\blue" [8]) spectra whose energetical content is typically concentrated at frequencies larger than the mHz [9]. String cosm ologicalm odels [10] are yet another interesting theoretical laboratory leading usually to sizable theoretical signals in the operating window of wide band interferom eters (W BI) [11]. A possible detection of these backgrounds would represent an interesting test for cosm ologicalm odels inspired by the low energy string e ective action.

Every measurement in cosmology turns out to be di cult for di erent and independent reasons. The CMB anisotropy experiments have to cope with the mandatory subtraction of di erent electrom agnetic foregrounds which

E lectronic address: danilo babusci@ lnf.infn.it

^yE lectronic address: M assim o.G iovannini@ ipt.unil.ch

can be much larger than the \cosm ological" signal one ought to detect. In order to detect gravitational waves of cosm ological origin with terrestrial measurem ents we are facing sim ilar problem s.

The signal induced in the detector output by stochastic gravitational waves backgrounds is indistinguishable from the intrinsic noise of the detector itself. This in plies that, unless the am plitude of the signal is very large, the only chance of direct detection of these backgrounds lies in the analysis of the correlated uctuactions of the outputs of, at least, two detectors a ected by independent noises. The problem of the optim alprocessing of the detector outputs required for the detection of the stochastic background has been considered by various authors [12,13] and it was also reviewed in ref. [14].

Suppose, indeed, that the signal registered at each detector can be written as (we lim it ourselves to the case of two detectors (i = 1;2))

$$s_i = h_i(t) + n_i(t);$$
 (1.1)

where we have indicated with n the intrinsic noise of the detector, and with h the gravitational strain due to the stochastic background. By assuming that the detector noises are stationary and uncorrelated, the ensemble average of their Fourier components satis es

$$hn_{i}(f)n_{j}(f^{0})i = \frac{1}{2} (f \quad f')_{ij}S_{n}^{(i)}(jf); \qquad (1.2)$$

where S_n (jf) is usually known as the one-sided noise power spectrum and is expressed in seconds. Starting to the signals s_1 and s_2 , a correlation \signal" for an observation time T can be de ned in the following way:

$$S = dt dt^{0} s_{1} (t) s_{2} (t^{0}) Q (t t^{0})$$
(1.3)

where Q is a lter function that depends only by t ^Q because we assume that n and h are both stationary. The optim alchoice of Q corresponds to the maximization of the signal-to-noise ratio associated to the \signal" S. Under the further assumptions that detector noises are G aussian, much larger in am plitude than the gravitational strain and statistically independent on the strain itself, it can be shown [12{14] that the signal-to-noise ratio in a frequency range (f_m ; f_M) is given by ¹:

$$SNR^{2} = \frac{3H_{0}^{2}}{2^{p}\overline{2}^{2}}F^{p}\overline{T} \int_{f_{m}}^{f_{m}} df \frac{2(f)}{f^{6}S_{n}^{(1)}(f)S_{n}^{(2)}(f)} + \frac{1}{2}$$
(1.4)

where H₀ is the present value of the Hubble parameter and F is a numerical factor depending upon the geometry of the two detectors. In the case of the correlation between two interferom eters F = 2=5, how ever, in the correlation of detectors of dimension detectors of dimension of detectors of dimension of detectors are certainly controlled by the noise power spectra (NPS) $S_n^{(1;2)}$. How ever in Eq. (1.4), on top of NPS, there are two important quantities. The rst one is the theoretical background signal de ned through the logarithm ic energy spectrum (normalized to the critical density _c) and expressed at the present (conform al) time² 0

$$_{GW}(f;_{0}) = \frac{1}{c} \frac{d_{GW}}{d\ln f} = -(_{0})!(f;_{0}):$$
(1.5)

The second one is the overlap reduction function (f) [13,14] which is a dimensionless function describing the reduction in the sensitivity of the two detectors (at a given frequency f) arising from the fact that the two detectors are not in the same place and, in general, not coaligned (for the same location and orientation (f) = 1). Since the overlap reduction function cuts of the integrand of Eq. (1.4) at a frequency which approximately corresponds to the inverse separation between the two detectors, it may represent a dangerous (but controllable) element in the reduction of the sensitivity of a given pair of detectors.

¹In order to avoid possible confusions we stress that the de nition of the SNR is the one discussed in [5] and it is essentially the square root of the one discussed in $[12\{14]$.

² In most of our equations we drop the dependence of spectral quantities upon the present time since all the quantities introduced in this paper are evaluated today.

Various ground-based interferom etric detectors are presently under construction (GEO [15], LIGO-LA, LIGO-WA [16], TAMA [17], VIRGO [18]). Among them, the pair consisting of most hom ogeneous (from the point of view of the noise perform ances) detectors with m inim um separation is given by the two LIGOs (VIRGO and GEO are even closer, but they have di erent perform ances for what concerns the NPS). However, this separation (' 3000 km) is still too large. The overlap reduction function (f) for the pair LIGO-LA LIGO-WA encounters its rst zero at 64 Hz, falling o (swiftly) at higher frequencies, i.e., right in the region where the two LIGOs, at least in their initial version, have better noise perform ances.

Recently, within the european gravitational wave community, the possibility of building in European interferom etric detector of dimensions comparable to VIRGO has received close attention [19]. Therefore, there is a chance that in the near future the VIRGO detector, now under construction at Cascina (Pisa) in Italy, will be complemented by another interferom eter of even better performances very close (at a distance d < 1000 km) to it. In this paper we exam ine in detail the possible in provements in the VIRGO sensitivity as a result of direct correlation of two VIRGO-like detectors. Furthermore, since technological improvements in the construction of the interferom eters can be reasonably expected in the next years, it is easy to predict that also VIRGO, as for the LIGO detectors, will gradually evolve toward an advanced conguration. For this reason we also examine the possible consequences of a selective improvements of the noise characteristics of the two detectors on the obtained results.

In order to evaluate precisely the perform ances of a pair of VIRGO detectors we will use the following logic. First of all we will pick up a given class of theoretical models which look particularly promising in view of their spectral properties in the operating window of the W BI. Secondly we will analyze the signal-to-noise ratios for di erent regions of the parameter space of the model. Finally we will implement some selective reduction of the noises and we will compare the results with the ones obtained in the cases where the noises are not reduced. We will repeat the same procedure for di erent classes of models.

The results and the investigations we are reporting can be applied to spectra of arbitrary functional form. The only two requirements we assume will be the continuity of the logarithmic energy spectra (as a function of the present frequency) and of their rst derivative. We will also give some other examples in this direction.

In order to make our analysis concrete we will pay particular attention to the evaluation of the perform ances of a pair of VIRGO detectors in the case of string cosm ological models [10,11].

The plan of our paper is then the following. In Section II we introduce the basic sem i-analytical tecnique which allows the evaluation of the SNR for a pair of W BI. In Section III we will evaluate the performances of a pair of V IRGO detectors in the case of string cosm ologicalm odels. In Section IV we will show how to implement a selective noise reduction and we will investigate the impact of such a reduction in the case of the parameter space of the models previously analyzed. Section V contains our naldiscussion and the basic sum mary of our results. We collect in the Appendices some technical results useful for our analysis and other interesting complements to our investigation.

II. SNR EVALUATION

In the operating window of the VIRGO detectors the theoretical signal will be de ned through the logarithm ic energy spectrum reported in Eq. (1.5). In the present Section we shall not make any speci c assumption concerning ! (f) and our results have general applicability. We will only assume that it is a continuous function of the frequency and we will also assume that its rst derivative is well de ned in the operating window of WBI. This means that ! (f) can be, in principle, a non-monotonic function.

A . Basic Form alism

The noise power spectrum of the VIRGO detector is well approximated by the analytical tofRef. [21], namely

$$\int_{n} (f) = \frac{S_{n}(f)}{S_{0}} = \frac{\int_{a}^{b} 1}{\int_{a}^{b} f_{a}} + \int_{a}^{b} \frac{f_{a}}{f_{a}} + \int_{a}^{b} \frac{f_{a}}{f_{a}} + \int_{a}^{c} \frac{f_{a}$$

(2.1)

where

$$S_0 = 10^{44} s;$$
 $f_a = 500 Hz;$ $f_b = 2Hz;$ $\begin{pmatrix} 1 = 3.46 & 10^{\circ} \\ 2 = 6.60 & 10^{2} \\ 3 = 3.24 & 10^{2} : \end{cases}$

In order to compute reliably (and beyond naive power counting arguments) the SNR we have to specify the overlap reduction function (f). The relative location and orientation of the two detectors determines the functional form of

(f) which has to be gauged in such a way that the overlap between the two detectors is maximized (i.e. (f)' 1 for most of the operating window of the two VIRGO). Moreover, the two interferom eters of the pair should also be su ciently far apart in order to decorrelate the local seism is and electrom agnetic noises. Since the precise location of the second VIRGO detector has not been specified so far [19], we induseful to elaborate about this point by computing the overlap reduction functions corresponding to two coaligned VIRGO interferom eters with dimensional separations. The results of these calculations are reported in Fig. 1. Needless to say that these choices are purely theoretical and are only meant to illustrate the elects of the distance on the perform ances of the VIRGO pair².



FIG.1. We report the overlap reduction function (s) for the correlation of the VIRGO detector presently under construction in Cascina (43.6 N, 10.5 E) with a coaligned interferom eter whose (corner) station is located at: A) (43.2 N, 10.9 E), d = 58km (Italy); B) (43.6 N, 4.5 E), d = 482.7 km (France); C) (52.3 N, 9.8 E), d = 958.2 km (Germ any). The third site (C) corresponds to the present location of the GEO detector. Notice that from A to C the position of the rst zero of (f) gets shifted in the infra-red. See also Appendix A concerning this last point.

The curves labeled with A, B, and C shown in Fig. 1 correspond to dimensional distances dimensional between the site of the VIRGO detector (presently under construction in Cascina, near Pisa) and the central corner station of a second coaligned VIRGO interferom eter. Let us now book at the position of the frequency fifter which $(f_i) = 0$ for each of the curves. We can notice that by increasing d (i.e., going from A to C) the value of f_i gets progressively shifted towards lower and lower frequencies, linearly with d. This means that, for the specific course of the detection of a stochastic gravitational waves background, the position of the frequency region where the sensitivity of the pair of wide band detectors is maximal. In the explicit examples presented in this paper we will focus our attention on the case A. The other two con gurations will be the subject of a related investigation [20].

³For illustrative purposes, we assumed that a distance of about 50 km is su cient to decorrelate local seism ic and em. noises. Such a hypothesis is fair at the present stage and it is certainly justi ed within the spirit of our exercise. However, at the moment, we do not have any indication either against or in favor of our choice.

B.SNR versus phenom enological bounds on the graviton spectrum

By inserting the parametrization (1.5) into Eq. (1.4) we can write

$$SNR^{2} = \frac{3H_{0}^{2}}{5^{5}\overline{2}^{2}} p_{T} \frac{-}{f_{0}^{5=2}S_{0}} J; \qquad (2.2)$$

where we introduced the (dimension-less) integral

$$J^{2} = \int_{m}^{M} d \frac{2(f_{0})!^{2}(f_{0})}{\frac{6}{n}(1)(f_{0}) - \frac{n^{2}}{n}(f_{0})} :$$
(2.3)

Here the integration variable is $= f = f_0$, with f_0 a generic frequency scale within the operating window of the interferom eter, and the integration domain is restricted to the region f_m f $f_{\rm H}$ (i.e., m M). In the following we will choose $f_0 = 100$ Hz and, taking into account the frequency behavior of (f) (see Fig. 1), we can assume $f_{\rm M} = 10$ kHz (i.e., M = 100). The lower extreme $f_{\rm m}$ is put equal to the frequency $f_{\rm b}$ entering Eq. (2.1) (i.e., m = 0.02).

For the chosen values of f_0 and S_0 (see Eq. (2.1)) one has:

$$h_0^2 - \prime \frac{4.0 \ 10^7}{J} \frac{1 \ yr}{T} SN R^2$$
: (2.4)

Since we will often refer to this form ula we want to stress its physical meaning. Suppose that the functional form of ! (f) is given. Then the numerical value of the integral J can be precisely computed and, through Eq. (2.4), can be estimated. This quantity, inserted in Eq. (1.5), determines for each frequency f the minimum $_{GW}$ detectable (for an observation time T, with a signal-to-noise ratio SNR) by the correlation of the two detector outputs.

In the next section, will be compared with two other quantities: $^{-\text{th}}$ and $^{-\text{m}ax}$. The rst is the theoretical value of the norm alization of the spectrum, while the second represents the largest norm alization compatible with the phenom enological bounds applicable to the stochastic GW backgrounds. These quantities are of dimensional in order to be more precise let us consider an example.

Suppose, for simplicity, that we are dealing with a logarithm ic energy spectrum which is a monotonic function of the present frequency. Suppose, moreover, that the spectrum decreases su ciently fast in the infra-red in order to be compatible both with the pulsar tim ing bound and with the CMB anisotropies bounds. Then the most relevant bound will be compacted on the present frequency, from Big-Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) [22{24]. Therefore, in this particular case, we will have that max is determined by demanding that

$$h_0^2$$
 _{GW} (f; ₀) d ln f < 0.2 h_0^2 (₀) ' 5 10⁶; (2.5)

where $(_{0}) = 2.6$ $10^{5} h_{0}^{2}$ is the present fraction of critical energy density stored in radiation. A coording to our de nition, max is the maximal normalization of the spectrum compatible with the previous inequality, namely,

$$h_0^2 \xrightarrow{-m ax}$$
, $\frac{5 \quad 10^6}{I}$; $I = \int_{f_{m ax}}^{Z_{f_{m ax}}} ! (f) d \ln f$: (2.6)

Notice that f_{ns} ' 10 ¹⁰ Hz is the present value of the frequency corresponding to the horizon at the nucleosynthesis time; f_{max} stands for the maximal frequency of the spectrum and it depends, in general, upon the specie c theoretical model. If the spectrum has di erent slopes, will be determined not only by the nucleosynthesis bound but also by the combined action of the CMB anisotropy bound [2,25] and of the pulsar timing bound [26]. Indeed, we know that the very small fractional timing error in the arrival times of the millisecond pulsar's pulses in plies that

 $_{GW}$ < 10 8 for a frequency which is roughly comparable with the inverse of the observation time along which pulsars have been monitored (i.e., $!_p$ 1=T_{obs} = 10 8 Hz). Moreover, the observations of the large scale anisotropies in the microwave sky [25] in ply that the graviton contribution to the integrated Sachs-W olfe e ect has to be smaller than (or at most of the order of) the detected amount of anisotropy. This observation in plies that $_{GW}$ 6:9 10^{11} for frequencies ranging between the typical frequency of the present horizon and a frequency thirty of forty times larger. In the case of a logarithm ic energy density with decreasing slope the mainly determined by the Sachs-W olfe bound and it will be the maximal norm alization of the spectrum compatible with such a bound.

On a general ground, we will have that -m ax, namely the theoretical norm alization of the spectrum is bounded, from above, by the maximal norm alization compatible with all the phenom enological bounds. Therefore, the mism atching between these quantities can be interpreted as an elective measure of the theoretical error in the determ ination of the absolute norm alization of the spectrum.

Since ! (f) enters (in a highly non-linear way) into the form of J (as de ned in Eq. (2.3)), the corresponding in Eq. (2.4) will be di erent for any (speci c) frequency dependence in ! (f). The consequence of this statement is that it is not possible to give a general (and simple) relationship between the sensitivity at a given frequency, the spectral slope and the (generic) theoretical amplitude of the spectrum. However, given the form of the theoretical spectrum, the phenom enological bounds (depending upon the theoretical slope) will x uniquely the theoretical error and the maximal achievable sensitivity. So, if we want to evaluate the perform ances of the VIRGO pair we should pick up a given class of theoretical models (characterized by a speci c functional form of ! (f)) and compute the corresponding sensitivity. The same procedure should then be repeated for other classes of models and, only at the end, the respective sensitivities can be compared.

III.PR IM ORD IAL GRAVITON BACKGROUND VERSUS VIRGO*VIRGO

We can consider, in principle, logarithm ic energy spectra with hypothetical analytical form s and arbitrary norm alizations. If the logarithm ic energy spectrum is either a at or a decreasing function of the present frequency [6], we can expect, on general grounds, that the theoretical signal will be of the order of (but sm aller than) 10¹⁵ [27] for present frequencies comparable with the operating window of the VIRGO pair. This happens because of the combined action of the Sachs-W olfe bound together with the spectral behavior of ther infra-red branch of the spectrum produced thanks to the matter-radiation transition. Of course this observation holds for models where the graviton production occurs because of the adiabatic variation of the background geometry ⁴.

In order to have large signals falling in the operating window of the V IRGO pair we should have deviations from scale invariance for frequencies larger than few mHz. Moreover, these deviations should go in the direction of increasing logarithm ic energy spectra. This is what happens in the case of quintessential in ationary models [9]. In this case, how ever, as we discussed in a previous analysis [5], the BBN bound put strong constraints on the theoretical signal in the operating window of the VIRGO pair.

A nother class ofm odel leading to a large theoretical signal for frequencies between few Hz and 10 kHz is represented by string cosm ological models [4,10,11]. Therefore, in order to evaluate the perform ances of the VIRGO pair and in order to implement a procedure of selective noise reduction we will use string cosm ological spectra.

A.M inim alm odels of pre-big-bang

In string cosm ology and, m ore speci cally, in the pre-big-bang scenario, the curvature scale and the dilaton coupling are both growing in cosm ic time. Therefore the graviton spectra will be increasing in frequency instead of decreasing as it happens in ordinary in ationary models.

In the context of string cosm ological scenarios the U niverse starts its evolution in a very weakly coupled regime with vanishing curvature and dilaton coupling. A fler a phase of sudden grow the of the curvature and of the coupling the corrections to the tree level action become important and the U niverse enters a true stringy phase which is followed by the ordinary radiation dom inated phase. It should be stressed that the duration of the stringy phase is not precisely known and it could happen that all the physical scales contained within our present Hubble radius crossed the horizon during the stringy phase as pointed out in [31].

The maxim alam pli ed frequency of the graviton spectrum is given by [4,11]

$$f_1(_0)$$
 ' $64.8^p \frac{q_1}{q_1} = \frac{10^3}{n_r} = G H z$ (3.1)

where n_r is the elective number of spin degrees of freedom in thermal equilibrium at the end of the stringy phase, and $g_1 = M_s = M_{P1}$ where M_s and M_{P1} are the string and Planck masses, respectively. Notice that g_1 is the value

 $^{^{4}}$ An exception to this assessment is represented by cosm ic strings models leading to a at logarithm ic energy spectrum for frequencies between 10 12 Hz and 10 8 Hz [28]. Another possible exception is given by the gravitational power radiated by magnetic (and hypermagnetic) [29] knot con gurations at the electroweak scale [30].

of the dilaton coupling at the end of the stringy phase, and is typically of the order of 10² 10¹ [B2]. In order to red-shift the maximal amplie d frequency of the spectrum from the time $_1$ (which marks the beginning of the radiation dominated evolution) up to the present time we assumed that the cosm obgical evolution prior to $_0$ and after $_1$ is adiabatic. M inimal models of pre-big-bang are the ones where a dilaton dominated phase is followed by a stringy phase which term inates at the onset of the radiation dominated evolution. In the context of minimal models, the function ! (f) introduced in Eq. (1.5) can be written as

$$\begin{array}{c} \overset{\circ}{\underbrace{}} & z_{s}^{2} & \frac{f}{f_{s}}^{3} & 1 + z_{s}^{2}^{3} & \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{f}{f_{s}}^{2} & f & f_{s} = \frac{f_{1}}{z_{s}} \\ \end{array} \\ \overset{\circ}{\underbrace{}} & (f) = \underbrace{\texttt{"}}_{\underbrace{}} & \underbrace{\texttt{f}}_{f_{1}}^{3} & + \frac{f}{f_{1}}^{4} & f_{s} & f_{s} < f & f_{1} \end{array}$$

$$(3.2)$$

where,

$$= \frac{\ln (g_1 = g_s)}{\ln z_s}$$
(3.3)

In this form ula $z_s = f_1=f_s$ and g_s are, respectively, the red-shift during the string phase and the value of the coupling constant at the end of the dilaton dom inated phase. The set of the two branches appearing in Eq. (3.2) is originated by m odes leaving the horizon during the dilaton dom inated phase and re-entering during the radiation dom inated phase. The second branch is mainly originated by m odes leaving the horizon during the and re-entering during the stringy phase and re-entering always in the radiation dom inated phase. The theoretical norm alization

$$-th = 2.6 g_1^2 - \frac{10^3}{n_r} = (0); \qquad (3.4)$$

multiplied by ! (f) (as given in Eq. (3.2)) leads to the theoretical form of the spectrum. Notice that n_r is of the order of 10^2 10^3 (depending upon the speci c string m odel) and it represents a theoretical uncertainty.

However, as anticipated in the previous section, the theoretical norm alization of the spectrum should be contrasted with the one saturating the BBN bound (i.e., m^{ax}). This quantity is obtained by Eq. (2.6), where in the case under consideration

$$I = I_{d} + I_{s} \quad \text{with} \quad I_{d} = \frac{Z_{f_{s}}}{f_{f_{s}}} \frac{df}{f} ! (f) ; \quad I_{s} = \frac{Z_{f_{1}}}{f_{s}} \frac{df}{f} ! (f) : \qquad (3.5)$$

The analytical expressions of I_d and I_s are reported in Appendix B.W e have to bear in m ind that in the interm ediate frequency region of the graviton spectra an important bound comes from the pulsar tim ing m easurements. Therefore, if one ought to consider rather long stringy phases (i.e., large z_s), the BBN constraint should be supplemented by the requirement that $_{GW}$ (10 8 Hz) < 10 8 [26].W e will come back to this point later.

Following the explicit expression of the function ! (f), Eq. (2.4) can be re-written as follows:

$$h_0^2 - \prime 4 = 10^7 = \frac{1 \text{ yr}}{T} = \frac{\text{SN R}^2}{\text{P} \frac{\text{SN R}^2}{\text{J}_d^2 + \text{J}_s^2}};$$
 (3.6)

where, introduced the following notation

0

$$J_{k} = \sum_{m=1}^{Z} d \frac{2(f_{0})}{n(f_{0}) n(f_{0})} h^{k} ; \quad k = 0;1;2;3;4$$

$$J_{m(3-2)} = \sum_{s=1}^{Z} d \frac{2(f_{0})}{n(f_{0}) n(f_{0}) n(f_{0})} h^{m(3-2)}; \quad m = 1;2$$

$$C_{d} = 1 + z_{s}^{2} + \frac{1}{2} h_{s};$$
(3.7)

one has

$$J_{d} = \frac{z_{s}^{3}}{1}^{2} C_{d}^{4} J_{0} \qquad 2C_{d}^{3} J_{1} + \frac{3}{2} C_{d}^{2} J_{2} \qquad \frac{1}{2} C_{d} J_{3} + \frac{1}{16} J_{4} \qquad ;$$

$$J_{s} = \frac{1}{1} \quad 6J_{0} + \frac{J_{6}}{1} \frac{4}{6} + \frac{J_{4}}{1} \frac{6}{6} + 4\frac{J_{3}}{1} \frac{2}{3} \frac{2}{2} + 4\frac{J_{2}}{2} \frac{3}{3} \qquad : \qquad (3.8)$$

The previous expressions are general in the sense that they are applicable for a generic value of f_s . If $f_m < f_s < f_M$ then both J_s and J_d give contribution to the sensitivity. If, on the other hand $f_s < f_m$ (i.e., a long stringy phase) the main contribution to the sensitivity will come from J_s . The integrals appearing in $J_{d,s}$ have to be evaluated numerically. In allour calculations we will assume that both VIRGO detectors are characterized by the same (rescaled) NPS (reported in Eq. (2.2)).

The main steps of our calculation are the following. We rstly x g and for each pair $(z_s; g_1=g_s)$ (within the range of their physical value) we compute (for T = 1 yr and SNR = 1), and max. We then compare these two quantities to the theoretical normalization given in Eq. (3.4). If max will be larger than (but smaller than max) we will say that the theoretical signal will be \visible" by the VIRGO pair. In this way we will identify in the plane $(z_s; g_1=g_s)$ a visibility region according to the sensitivity of the VIRGO pair. The theoretical error on the border of this region can be estimated by substituting max to max.

To illustrate this point we consider a speci c case. The value of the coupling at the end of the stringy phase can be estimated to lie between 0.3 and 0.03 [32]. The knowledge of g_1 will not x uniquely the theoretical spectrum which does also depend on the number of relativistic degrees of freedom at the end of the stringy phase. Therefore, the theoretical error in the determ ination of the absolute normalization of the spectrum could be also viewed as the error a ecting the determ ination of n_r . In all the plots shown we will take, when not otherwise stated, $g_1 = 1=20$ and $n_r = 10^3$ as ducial values. Die erent choices of g will lead to sim ilar results. We will also assume that the overlap reduction function associated with the pair is the one reported in the curve A of Fig. 1.

reduction function associated with the pair is the one reported in the curve A of Fig. 1. In Fig. 2 (top left) we report the result of our calculation for the ratio between \max and \max as a function of $g_1 = g_s$ and $\log z_s$. The contour plot (bottom left) shows the region of the plane ($\log z_s; g_1 = g_s$) where this ratio is greater than 1, i.e. the maximal visibility region allowed by the BBN bound. In the opposite case, i.e., $\max = -1$, the VIRGO pair is sensitive to a region excluded by the BBN. In the right part of Fig. 2 we go one step further and we plot the ratio between \max and \max . The shaded area in the contour plot (bottom right) is the region of the plane ($\log z_s; g_1 = g_s$) where the conditions $\max = -1$ and $\max = -1$ are simultaneously met. The shaded area in this plot de nes the visibility region of the VIRGO pair assuming the theoretical norm alization of the spectrum. From Fig. 2, by ideally subtracting the shaded area of the left contour plot from the shaded area of the right contour plot we obtain an estimate of the theoretical error. The results we just presented can be obviously recovered for di errent values of g_1 close to one. However, if g_1 gets too sm all (and typically below 1/25) the visibility area gets sm aller and sm aller eventually disappearing.

The visibility regions appearing in Fig. 2 extend from interm ediate values of z_s (of the order of 10^8) towards large values of z_s (of the order of 10^{18}). Notice that for our choice of g_1 , f_s can become as small as 10^{-8} for z_s of the order of 10^{18} . As we recalled in the previous Section, this frequency corresponds to the inverse of the observation time along which pulsar signals have been monitored and, therefore, for this frequency, a further \local" bound applies to the logarithm ic energy spectra of relic gravitons. This bound in plies that $_{GW}$ (10^{-8} Hz) < 10^{-8} . In our examples, the compatibility with the BBN bound in plies also that the pulsar tim ing constraint is satisticed. Given our choice for g_1 we can clearly see that the visibility regions depicted in Fig. 2 extend for values of g_s which can be as small as 1/60 in the case of right part of Fig. 2).

B.Non-m inim alm odels of pre-big-bang

In the context of minimal models of pre-big-bang, the end of the stringy phase coincides with the onset of the radiation dominated evolution. At the moment of the transition to the radiation dominated phase the dilaton seats at its constant value. This means that $g_1 = 0.03 = 0.3$ at the beginning of the radiation dominated evolution. As spointed out in [31], it is not be impossible to imagine a scenario where the coupling constant is still growing while the curvature scale starts decreasing in time. In this type of scenario the stringy phase is followed by a phase where the dilaton still increases, or, in other words, the coupling constant is rather small at the moment where the curvature starts decreasing so that $g_1 = 1$.



FIG.2. We report the ratios $m^{ax} = (left)$ and $t^{th} = (right)$ as a function of $g_1 = g_s$ and $\log z_s$ (is calculated for T = 1 yr and SNR = 1). The lower contour plots show the regions where these ratios are greater than 1. The shaded area (bottom right) represents the region where the combination of the theoretical parameters is such that the corresponding t^{th} does not violate the BBN bound. A swe can see the visibility region is reduced. The di erence between the shaded area in the right plot and the one in the left plot measures the error m ade by assuming as normalization of the spectrum not the theoretical one but the maxim al one compatible with the BBN. The value $z_s = 10^8$ roughly corresponds to f_s for Notice that log denotes not the N eperian logarithm but the logarithm in ten basis.

A first a transient period (whose precise duration will be xed by the value of q), we will have that the radiation dom instead evolution will take place when the value of the coupling constant will be of order one (i.e., g_r 1).

An interesting feature of this speculation is that the graviton spectra will not necessarily be monotonic [31] (as the ones considered in the previous analysis). We then ind interesting to apply our considerations also to this case. The function ! (f) in the non-minimalm odel described above is given by [31]⁵

where, in the present case

$$f_1$$
 ' $64 \cdot 3^p \frac{q_r}{q_1} = \frac{q_r}{q_1} = \frac{10^3}{n_r} = \frac{10^3}{0} = \frac{10^3}{12} = \frac{10^3}{0} = \frac{10^3}$

The frequency f_r corresponds to the onset of the radiation dom insted evolution. If we adopt a purely phenom enological approach we can say that f_r has to be bounded (from below) since we want the Universe to be radiation dom insted

 $^{^{5}}$ N otice that the form of ! (f) reported in β 1] di ers from our expression only by logarithm ic correction whose presence is, indeed, not relevant. We kept them only for sake of completeness.

not later than the BBN epoch. Thence, we have that $f_r > f_{ns}$. Recalling the value of the nucleosynthesis frequency and assuming that $g_r < 1$ this condition in plies $g_1 > 82$ 10⁻¹⁶. This simply means that in order not to consist with the correct abundances of the light elements we have to require that the coupling constant should not be too small when the curvature starts decreasing. Notice that for frequencies $f < f_r$ the spectrum evolves as f^{-3} . The ultra-violet branch of the spectrum is mainly originated by modes leaving the horizon during the stringy phase and re-entering when the dilaton coupling is still increasing.

Concerning the non-m inimal spectra few comments are in order. Owing to the fact that g_1 can be as small as 10¹⁵ we have that the highest frequency of the spectrum can become substantially smaller than in the minimal case. Moreover, the spectrum might also be non-monotonic with a peak at f_s . Looking at the analytical form of the spectrum we see that this behavior occurs if > 2. A non-monotonic logarithm ic energy spectrum (with a maximum falling in the sensitivity region of the VIRGO pair) represents an interesting possibility.

The results of our calculation for $g_1 = 10^{12}$, $n_r = 10^3$, $g_r = 1$, and > 2 are reported in Fig. 3. As done in the case of m in in all spectra we analyse the visibility window in the plane of the relevant parameters of the model. As we can see from the left part of Fig. 3 the region compatible with the BBN is rather large but it shrinks when we im pose the theoretical norm alization (right part of Fig. 3) which is always smaller than the maxim alnorm alization allowed by BBN.



FIG.3. In order to make clear the comparison with the visibility region of the minimal models, we report $m^{ax} = (\text{left})$ and $m^{th} = (\text{right})$ as a function of and of the $\log z_s$ in the non-minimal scenario. Notice that we took $g_1 = 10^{12}$, $n_r = 10^3$, and $g_r = 1$. As for Fig. 2, the shaded areas in the lower contour plots represent the region where each ratio is greater than 1, and, in the case of the right plot, also the BBN is satisfied.

It is interesting to compare directly the three dimensional plots appearing in Fig. 2 with the corresponding three dimensional plots of Fig. 3. We can see that the regions of parameter space where $max = and^{th} = are$ larger than one is larger in the case of minimal models. However, the shaded region in the case of minimal models corresponds to ratios $max = and^{th} = which can be 3 \text{ or } 2$, respectively. On the other hand the shaded region in the case of Fig. 3 corresponds to ratios $max = and^{th} = and^{th} = which can be, respectively, as large as 50 or 25. So, in the latter case the signal is larger for a smaller region of the parameter space.$

As we stressed in the previous Section, represents the sensitivity of the VIRGO pair to a given spectrum whose functional form is given by ! (f). One m ight be interested, in principle, in the sensitivity of the VIRGO pair at a speci c frequency f. This can be easily computed by multiplying by ! (f). In Fig. 4 we show the sensitivity of the VIRGO pair at the frequency f = 100 Hz, both, for the minimal and non-minimal models considered in the

present Section. One can easily discuss the same quantity for any other frequency in the operating window of the VIRGO detectors.



FIG.4. We report the logarithm of the sensitivity of the VIRGO pair at 100 Hz for T = 1 yr and SNR = 1 in the case of m inim al (left plot) and non-m inim al (right plot) energy spectra.

IV.NOISE REDUCTION AND THE VISIBILITY REGION OF A VIRGO PAIR

There are two ways of looking at the calculations reported in this paper. One can look at these ideas from a purely theoretical perspective. In this respect we presented a study of the sensitivity of a pair of VIRGO detectors to string cosm ological gravitons. There is also a second way of looking at our exercise. Let us take at face value the results we obtained and let us ask in what way we can enlarge the visibility region of the VIRGO pair. In this type of approach the speci c form of graviton spectrum is not strictly essential. We could use, in principle, any motivated theoretical spectrum. As we stressed, we will use string cosm ological spectra because, on one hand, they are theoretically motivated and, on the other hand, they give us a signal which could be, in principle detected. Of course, there are other wellm otivated spectra (like the ones provided by ordinary in ationary models). However, the signal would be, to begin with, quite small.

In this Section we will then consider the following problem. Given a pair of VIRGO detectors, we suppose to be able, by some means, to reduce, in a selective fashion, the contribution of a speci c noise source to the detectors output. The question we ought to address is how the visibility regions will be modiled with respect to the case in which the selective noise reduction is not present. We will study the problem for the pair of VIRGO detectors considered in the previous Sections, i.e., for identical detectors with NPS given in Eq. (2.1), and characterized by the overlap reduction function of the case A of Fig. 1. As for the theoretical graviton spectrum we will focus our attention on the case of minimalm odels considered in Section IIIA, with the same parameters used to produce Fig. 2. A lso here, the quantity will be computed for T = 1 yr and SNR = 1.

As shown in Section II the NPS is characterized by three dimension-less numbers $_{1;2;3}$, and two frequencies f_a and f_b . Roughly, $_1$ and $_2$ control, respectively, the strength of the pendulum and pendulum 's internalm odes noise, whereas $_3$ is related to the shot noise (see R ef. [33] for an accurate description of the phenom ena responsible of these noises). Below the frequency f_b the NPS is dominated by the seism ic noise (assumed to be in nitum in Eq. (2.1)). The frequency f_a is, roughly, where the NPS gets its minimum. The frequency behavior of this three contributions

and of the total NPS is shown in Fig. 5. The stochastic processes associated with each source of noise are assumed to be Gaussian and stationary.



FIG.5. The analytical t of the rescaled noise power spectrum $_n$ de ned in Eq. (2.1) in the case of the VIRGO detector. W ith the full (thick) line we denote the totalNPS.W e also report the separated contribution of the three main (G aussian and stationary) sources of noise.

In the following, without entering in details concerning the actual experimental strategy adopted for the noise reduction, we will suppose to be able to reduce each of the coe cients $_i$ by keeping the other xed. In order to make our notation simpler we de ne a \reduction vector"

$$= (_{1}; _{2}; _{3});$$
 (3.1)

whose components de ne the reduction, respectively, of the seism ic, therm al and shot noises with respect to their ducial values appearing in Eq. (2.1) (corresponding to the case ~ = (1;1;1)).

As shown in Fig. 5 the pendulum noise dominates the sensitivity of the detectors in the low frequency region, namely below about 40 Hz. In Fig. 6 we report the results of our calculation for the case $\sim = (0.1;1;1)$. Here the parameters of the theoretical spectrum are exactly the same as in Fig. 2. The only change is given by a reduction of the pendulum noise. From the comparison between Fig. 6 and Fig. 2, we see that the visibility region in the parameter space of our model gets in mediately larger especially towards the region of small g_s . This enlargement is quite interesting especially in terms of $\overline{}^{th} = \overline{}$.

In the frequency region between 50 and 500 Hz the perform ances of the detectors are, essentially, limited by the pendulum 's internal modes noise. The results obtained for a selective reduction of this component are summarized in Fig. 7, where the pendulum and shot noises are left unchanged but the internal modes component is reduced by a factor of ten (in Fig. 8). As we can see the visibility region gets larger and the increase in the area is comparable with the one obtained by selecting only the pendulum noise.

Finally, for sake of completeness, we want to discuss the case of the shot noise, i.e., the noise characteristic of the detector above 500 Hz. Our results for $_3 = 0.1$ are reported in Fig. 9. As we can see by comparing Figs. 6, 7, and 8 we gain much more in visibility by reducing the therm allouise components than by reducing the shot noise. In Fig. 8 the shot noise is reduced by one tenth but the visibility region does not increase by much (left plot). This result is consequence of the fact that, as shown by Fig. 5, the shot noise contribution to the NPS starts to be relevant for f 1 kHz, i.e., in a frequency region where the overlap between the detectors begins to deteriorate (see Fig. 1). In Figs. 6 and 7 the therm allouise is reduced by one tenth and the increase in the visibility region is, comparatively, larger. This shows, am usingly enough, that a reduction in the shot noise will lead to an e lect whose practical relevance is already questionable at the level of our analysis. Notice that a selective noise reduction can be also discussed in the case of a purely at spectrum [20].



FIG.6. We report the ratios $m^{ax} = (left plots)$, and $m^{th} = (right plots)$ in the case in which the shot noise and the noise related to the pendulum 's internal modes are not reduced, whereas the pendulum noise is diminished by a factor of ten with respect to the values quoted in Eq. (2.1), i.e., $\sim = (0.1;1;1)$.



FIG.7. We report the result of selective reduction in the case where the noise cause by the pendulum 's internal modes is reduced by a factor often, whereas the pendulum and shot contributions are left unchanged, i.e., $\sim = (1;0;1;1)$.



FIG.8. We report the same quantities discussed in Fig. 6 for the case $\sim = (1;1;0:1)$. The shaded areas in the lower plots are the relevant visibility regions which should be compared with the shaded regions in the lower plots of Figs. 6 and 7. By direct comparison we can argue that a reduction in the shot noise (by a factor of ten) is not as e cient as a reduction, by the same am ount, in the therm allows components.

In order to conclude this Section we want to show the combined action of the simultaneous reduction of both the components of the thermal noise. In Fig. 9, owing to the results of our analysis we kept the shot noise xed but we reduced both the thermal and seism is noises by a factor of ten. C learly we observe a consistent increase in the visibility region. However, even if a combined reduction of these components cannot be achieved we want to stress that already a reduction of the pendulum 's internal modes noise alone (by one tenth) can be of relevant practical interest.

V.DISCUSSION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There are no compelling reasons why one should not consider the appealing theoretical possibility of a second VIRGO detector coaligned with the second of the rest one. Moreover, recent experimental suggestions seem coherently directed towards this goal [19]. While the location of the second detector is still under debate we presented a theoretical analysis of some of the scientic copportunities suggested by this proposal.

We focused our attention on possible cosm ological sources of relic gravitons and we limited our attention to the case of stochastic and isotropic background produced by the adiabatic variation of the background geometry. In the fram ework of these models we can certainly argue that in order to have a large signal in the frequency window covered by VIRGO we have to focus our attention on models where the logarithm is energy spectrum increases at large frequencies. A liternatively we have to look form odels where the logarithm is energy spectrum exhibits some bump in the vicinity of the VIRGO operating window. If the logarithm is energy spectrum exhibits some bump in the vicinity of the VIRGO operating window. If the logarithm is energy spectra are decreasing as a function of the present frequencies. In the case of string cosm ologicalm odels the situation seem sm ore rosy and, therefore, we use these models as a theoretical laboratory in order to investigate, in a speci c m odel the possible in provements of a possible VIRGO pair. The choice of a speci c m odel is, in some sense, m andatory. In fact, owing to the form of the SNR we can immediately see that di erent models lead to di erent SNR not only because the am plitude at 100 H z but di erent spectral behaviors between 2 H z and 10 kH z lead to di erent SNR.



FIG.9. We illustrate the case of a simultaneous reduction of $_1$ and $_2$ by a factor 10, whereas $_3$ is the same of Eq. (2.1), i.e., ~ = (0:1;0:1;1).

In order to analyze the sensitivity of the V IRGO pair we described a sem i-analytical technique whose main advantage is to produce the sensitivity of the V IRGO pair to a theoretical spectrum of arbitrary slopes and am plitudes. The theoretical error is estimated, in our approach, by requiring the compatibility with all the phenom enological bounds applicable to the graviton spectra. As an intersting example, we asked what is the sensitivity of a V IRGO pair to string cosm ological spectra assuming that a second V IRGO detector (coaligned with the rst one) is built in a european site. By assuming that the second V IRGO detector has the same features of the rst one we computed the SNR and the related sensitivity achievable after one year of observation in the case of string cosm ological spectra.

By using the string cosm ological spectra as a theoretical laboratory we then studied som e possible noise reduction. Our main goal, in this respect, has been to spot what kind of stationary and stochastic noise should be reduced in order to increase the visibility region of the VIRGO pair in the parameter space of the theoretical models under considerations. Our main result is that a selective reduction of each of the three main sources of noise is not equivalent. A reduction in the shot noise by a factor often does not increase signic cantly the visibility region of the VIRGO pair. A selective reduction of the thermal noise components is farm ore endert. In particular, we could see that a reduction (of one tenth) of the pendulum 's internalm odes increases the visibility region of four times. The simultaneous reduction of the two components of the thermal noise leads to an even more relevant increase.

The construction of a second V RGO detector coaligned with the rst one and an overall reduction of the therm al noise of each detector of the pair leads to what we called \upgraded V RGO " program. The results presented in this paper are obtained in the case of a particularly prom ising class of theoretical models but can be generally applied to any logarithm ic energy spectrum with sim ilar qualitative results. However, owing to the non-linearities present in the evaluation of the SNR it would not be correct assess that they hold, quantitatively, without change. We hope that our results and our suggestions m ay turn out to be useful in the actual process of design of the upgraded V IRGO program [19].

ACKNOW LEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank A.G iazotto for very useful hints and for his kind interest in this investigation.

In this Appendix we discuss the reduction in sensitivity due to the fact that, in general, these detectors will not be either coincident or coaligned. This e ect is quanti ed by the (dimensionless) overlap reduction function (f) appearing in Eq. (1.4). Suppose that we have a gravitational wave propagating along a generic direction characterized, in spherical coordinates, by the unit vector $\hat{} = (\cos \sin ; \sin \sin ; \cos)$. If we now introduce a pair of orthogonal unit vectors directed in the plane perpendicular to $\hat{}$

$$\hat{m}(\hat{})$$
 (cos cos; sin cos; sin) $\hat{m}(\hat{})$ (sin; cos; 0); (B.1)

the polarization tensors can be written, in terms of the polarization angle \circ of the GW, as

$$\mathbf{"}^{+}(\hat{;}) = \mathbf{e}^{+}(\hat{)}\cos 2 \qquad \mathbf{e}(\hat{)}\sin 2$$
$$\mathbf{"}(\hat{;}) = \mathbf{e}^{+}(\hat{)}\sin 2 + \mathbf{e}(\hat{)}\cos 2 ; \qquad (B.2)$$

where

$$e^{+}(\hat{}) = \hat{m}(\hat{}) \quad \hat{m}(\hat{}) \quad \hat{n}(\hat{}) \quad \hat{n}(\hat{}) \quad e^{-}(\hat{}) = \hat{m}(\hat{}) \quad \hat{n}(\hat{}) + \hat{n}(\hat{}) \quad \hat{m}(\hat{})$$
(B.3)

with the norm alization

$$Irfe^{A}(\hat{})e^{A^{\circ}}(\hat{})g = 2^{AA^{\circ}}$$

If the graviton background is isotropic and unpolarized we will have that

$$(f) = \frac{1}{F} \sum_{A}^{X} < e^{i2 f^{*}} F_{1}^{A} (\hat{r}_{1}; \hat{r};)F_{2}^{A} (\hat{r}_{2}; \hat{r};) >_{\hat{r}_{i}} = \frac{(f)}{F}$$
(B.4)

where $r = r_1$ r_2 is the separation vector between the two detector sites, F_i^A is the pattern function characterizing the response of the i-th detector (i = 1;2) to the A = +; polarization, and the following notation

$$< :::>_{n} = \sum_{S^2}^{Z} \frac{d^n}{4} \sum_{0}^{Z^2} \frac{d}{2} (:::)$$
 (B.5)

has been introduced to indicate the average over the propagation direction (;) and the polarization angle $\$. The norm alization factor F is given by:

$$F = \bigvee_{A} \langle F_{1}^{A}(\hat{r}_{1};\hat{r};)F_{2}^{A}(\hat{r}_{2};\hat{r};) \rangle_{\hat{r}_{1}} \dot{I}_{2}; \qquad (B.6)$$

where the notation 1 2 is a compact way to indicate that the detectors are coincident and coaligned and, if at least one of them is an interferom eter, the angle between its arm s is equal to /2 (L-shaped geom etry). In this situation, by de nition, (f) = 1.W hen the detectors are shifted apart (so there is a phase shift between the signals in the two detectors), or rotated out of coalignment (so the detectors have di erent sensitivity to the same polarization) it turns out that: j (f) j < 1.

The pattern functions (or orientation factors) of a GW detector can be written in the following form

$$F^{A}(\hat{r}; \hat{j}) = TrfD(\hat{r})^{*}(\hat{j})g$$
 (B.7)

where the symmetric, trace-less tensor D (r) describes the orientation and geometry of the detector located at r.

The tensor D (\hat{r}) depends upon the geom etrical features of the detector. For instance, in the case of an interferom eter, indicating with \hat{u} and \hat{v} the unit vectors in the directions of its arm s, one has:

$$D(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\mathbf{u}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \quad \hat{\mathbf{u}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \quad \hat{\mathbf{v}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) :$$
(B.8)

In the case of the lowest longitudinal mode of a cylindrical GW antenna with axis in the direction determ ined by the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{l}}_{r}$ one has

D
$$(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \hat{\mathbf{l}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \quad \hat{\mathbf{l}}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) \quad \frac{1}{3}\mathbf{I};$$
 (B.9)

where I is the unit matrix. Finally, in the case of the lowest ve degenerate quadrupole modes (m = 2; :::;+2) of a spherical detector, the corresponding tensors are

$$D^{(0)}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2^{2} 3} e^{+}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) + 2g^{+}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2^{2} 3} 2f^{+}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) e^{+}(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$$

$$D^{(+1)}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2}g(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) D^{(-1)}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2}f(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$$

$$D^{(+2)}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2}e^{+}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) D^{(-2)}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}) = \frac{1}{2}e^{-}(\hat{\mathbf{r}})$$
(B.10)

where

and $e^{\dagger i}$ (f) are the tensors of Eq. (B.3) written in terms of the unit vectors \hat{m} (f) and \hat{n} (f) lying on the plane perpendicular to \hat{r} . From these expressions for the tensors D^{ij} and interpreting each of the vem odes of a sphere as a single detector, it is possible to show that in the case of coincident detectors one has:

$$< F_{1}^{A}(\hat{r};\hat{j})F_{2}^{B}(\hat{r};\hat{j})>_{\hat{j}} = c_{12}^{AB}$$
 (A; B = +;) (B.11)

where c_{12} depends only on the geom etry and the relative orientations of the two detectors. The corresponding values of F (see Eq. (B.6)) for the three di erent geom etries considered (interferom eter, cylindrical bar, sphere) are sum marized in Table I. By introducing the following notation

$$r = d\hat{s} = 2 fd;$$

where \hat{s} is the unit vector along the direction connecting the two detectors and d is the distance between them, it can be shown [13] that the overlap reduction function assumes the following form (D_k = D (\hat{r}_k)):

$$(f) = _{0}() D_{1}^{ij} D_{2ij} + _{1}() D_{1}^{ij} D_{2i} s_{j} s_{k} + _{2}() D_{1}^{ij} D_{2}^{kl} s_{i} s_{j} s_{k} s_{l}$$
(B.12)

where

with j_k () the standard spherical Bessel functions:

$$j_0() = \frac{\sin}{2}; \quad j_1() = \frac{j_0()}{2}; \quad j_2() = 3\frac{j_1()}{2}; \quad j_2() = 3\frac{j_1()}{2};$$

TABLE I. The norm alization factor F for three di erent geom etries of the detectors: interferom eter (ITF), cylindrical bar (BAR), and sphere (SPH). A ? denotes entries that can be obtained from the sym m etry of the table.

	IT F	BAR	m = 0	SPH m =	1 m = 2
IT F	2=5	?	?	?	?
BAR	2=5	8=15	?	?	?
m = 0	0	p_ 2 3=15	2=5	?	?
SPH m = 1	0	0	0	2=5	?
m = 2	2=5	2=5	0	0	2=5

In the case of m in in alm odels the integrals determ in ing the analytical expression of the BBN bound are given by:

$$I_{d} = z_{s}^{2} \left(\frac{1}{54} (z_{s}^{2} + 6 z_{s} + 18) - \frac{1}{108} - \frac{f_{ns}}{f_{s}} \right)^{3} 2 (z_{s}^{2} + 6 z_{s} + 18)$$

$$6 z_{s} (z_{s} + 6) \ln \frac{f_{ns}}{f_{s}} + 9 z_{s}^{2} \ln^{2} \frac{f_{ns}}{f_{s}} ;$$

$$I_{s} = \frac{3}{2 (3 2)} + \frac{z_{s}^{2}}{2 6} - \frac{z_{s}^{2}}{2} :$$
(B.1)

In the case of non-m inim alm odels the integrals determ ining the BBN bound are given by

$$I_{1} = A (;z_{s}) + B (;z_{s}) \ln z_{s} + C (;z_{s}) \ln^{2} z_{s};$$

$$I_{2} = \frac{z_{s}^{4}}{4} z_{s}^{2} + z_{s}^{2+} z_{s}^{4} z_{t}^{4} (1 + \ln z_{s})^{2};$$
(B.2)

where and $z_r = f_1 = f_r$ and

$$A(;z_{s}) = \frac{z_{s}^{2}}{16(^{2} 4)^{\beta}} \int_{0}^{n} 13 z_{s}^{2(2+)} (^{2} 4)^{3} 4 z_{s}^{4} (+2)^{3} (2^{2} 10 + 13) + 4 z_{s}^{4(1+)} (2)^{3} (2^{2} + 10 + 13) z_{s}^{2} (13^{6} 172^{4} + 832^{2} 1664);$$

$$B(;z_s) = \frac{z_s^2}{4(2-4)^2} + 2(1+2)^2 + (2-5) + 2z^4 + (1-2)^2 + (2+5) + 5z^2 + (1-2)^2 + (2-4)^2 ;$$
(B.3)

C (;
$$z_s$$
) = $\frac{z_s^4}{2(^2 4)}$ 2 z_s^4 (2) + z_s^2 (2 4)) :

- [1] L.P.Grishchuk, Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz. 67, 825 (1974) [Sov.Phys.JETP 40, 409 (1975)]; L.P.Grishchuk, Usp.Fiz.Nauk.
 156, 297 (1988) [Sov.Phys.Usp.31, 940 (1988)];
- [2] M.White, D.Scott, and J.Silk, Ann.Rev.Astron.Astrophys 32, 319 (1994).
- [3] L.P.Grishchuk, Usp.Fiz.Nauk. 156, 297 (1988) [Sov.Phys.Usp. 31, 940 (1988)].
- [4] M.Gasperini and M.Giovannini, Phys. Lett. B 282, 36 (1992).
- [5] D.Babusci and M.Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D 60, 083511 (1999).
- [6] L.P.Grishchuk and M. Solokhin, Phys. Rev. D 43, 2566 (1991); V. Sahni, Phys. Rev. D 42, 453 (1990); B.Allen, Phys. Rev. D 37, 2078 (1988).
- [7] K.S.Thome, in 300 Years of Gravitation, edited by S.W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1987); L.P.Grishchuk, talk given at 34th Rencontres de Moriond: Gravitational Waves and Experimental Gravity, Les Arcs, France, 23-30 Jan 1999; B.Allen, in Proceedings of the Les Houches School on Astrophysical Sources of Gravitational Waves, edited by J.Marck and J.P.Lasota (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge England, 1996).
- [8] L.P.G rishchuk, talk given at 34th Rencontres de Moriond: Gravitational W aves and Experim ental Gravity, Les Arcs, France, 23-30 Jan 1999, gr-qc/9903079.
- [9] M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D 58, 083504 (1998); Class. Quant. Grav. 16, 2905 (1999); Phys. Rev. D (to be published), astro-ph/9903004.
- [10] G. Veneziano, Phys.Lett. B 265, 287 (1991); M. Gasperini, in Proc. of the Second SIGRAV Schoolon Gravitational Waves in A strophysics Cosm ology and String Theory, hep-th/9907067.
- [11] M. Gasperini and M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D 47, 1519 (1993); R. Brustein, M. Gasperini, M. Giovannini, and G. Veneziano, Phys.Lett. B 361, 45 (1995); M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D 55, 595 (1997); R. Brustein, M. Gasperini, and G. Veneziano, Phys.Rev. D 55, 3882 (1997).
- [12] P.M ichelson, M on. Not. Roy. A stron. Soc. 227, 933 (1987).
- [13] N.Christensen, Phys. Rev. D 46, 5250 (1992); E.Flanagan, Phys. Rev. D 48, 2389 (1993).
- [14] B.Allen and J.D.Rom ano, Phys.Rev.D 59, 102001 (1999)
- [15] K.Danzmann, in GravitationalW ave Experiments, edited by E.Coccia, G.Pizzella, F.Ronga (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1995).
- [16] F.J.Raab, in Gravitational W ave Experiments, edited by E.Coccia, G.Pizzella, F.Ronga (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1995).
- [17] K. Tsubono, in Gravitational W ave Experiments, edited by E. Coccia, G. Pizzella, F. Ronga (W orld Scientic, Singapore, 1995).
- [18] B.Caron et al, Class.Quantum Grav.14, 1461 (1997).
- [19] The importance of building an advanced high-tech interferom eter in Europe has been clearly stated during the European Gravitational W ave M eeting, held in London on 27 M ay 1999 (A.G iazotto, private communication).
- [20] D.Babusci and M.Giovannini, in preparation.
- [21] E. Cuoco, G. Curci, and M. Beccaria, to appear in the Proceedings of the 2nd Edoardo Am aldi Conference, Geneva, Switzerland, 1997, gr-qc/9709041.
- [22] V.F.Schwartzman, Pisma Zh.Eksp.Teor.Fiz 9, 315 (1969) [JETP Lett 9, 184 (1969)].
- [23] T.Walker et al., A strophys. J. 376, 51 (1991).
- [24] C.Copiet al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3981 (1995); R.E. Lopez and M.S. Tumer, Phys. Rev. D 59, 103502 (1999).
- [25] C.L.Bennett, A.Banday, K.M.Gorski, G.Hinshaw, P.Jackson, P.Keegstra, A.Kogut, G.F.Smoot, D.T.W ilkinson, and E.L.W right, A strophys.J.464, L1 (1996).
- [26] V.Kaspi, J.Taylor, and M.Ryba, Astrophy. J. 428, 713 (1994).
- [27] V.A. Rubakov, M.V. Sazhin, and A.V. Veryaskin, Phys. Lett. B 115, 189 (1982); R. Fabbri and M. D. Pollock, Phys. Lett. B 125, 445 (1983); L.F. Abbott and M.B.W ise, Nucl. Phys. 224, 541 (1984).
- [28] T. Vachaspati and A. Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. D 31, 3052 (1985).
- [29] M. Giovannini, Phys. Rev. D 58, 124027 (1998); Phys. Rev. D (to be published), hep-ph/9905358; Phys. Rev. D (to be published), hep-ph/9906241.
- [30] M.Giovannini and M.Shaposhnikov, Phys. Rev. D 57, 2186 (1998); Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 22 (1998).
- [31] M. Gasperini, in String theory in curved space times, Paris 1996, p. 333
- [32] V.Kaplunovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 1036 (1985).
- [33] P.R. Saulson, Fundam entals of interferom etric gravitational wave detectors, (W orld Scienti c, 1994).