

Systematic uncertainty of standard sirens from the viewing angle of binary neutron star inspirals

Hsin-Yu Chen^{1,2,3}

¹*Black Hole Initiative, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA*

²*LIGO Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

³*Department of Physics and Kavli Institute for Astrophysics and Space Research, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA**

The independent measurement of Hubble constant with gravitational-wave standard sirens will potentially shed light on the tension between the local distance ladders and Planck experiments. Therefore, thorough understanding of the sources of systematic uncertainty for the standard siren method is crucial. In this paper, we focus on two scenarios that will potentially dominate the systematic uncertainty of standard sirens. First, simulations of electromagnetic counterparts of binary neutron star mergers suggest aspherical emissions, so the binaries available for the standard siren method can be selected by their viewing angles. This selection effect can lead to $\gtrsim 2\%$ bias in Hubble constant measurement even with mild selection. Second, if the binary viewing angles are constrained by the electromagnetic counterpart observations but the bias of the constraints is not controlled under $\sim 10^\circ$, the resulting systematic uncertainty in Hubble constant will be $> 3\%$. In addition, we find that both of the systematics cannot be properly removed by the viewing angle measurement from gravitational-wave observations. Comparing to the known dominant systematic uncertainty for standard sirens, the $\leq 2\%$ gravitational-wave calibration uncertainty, the effects from viewing angle appear to be more significant. Therefore, the systematic uncertainty from viewing angle might be a major challenge before the standard sirens can resolve the tension in Hubble constant, which is currently $\sim 9\%$.

Introduction— Gravitational-wave (GW) standard sirens provide an independent way to measure the Hubble constant (H_0), which is crucial for our understanding of the evolution of the Universe [1, 2]. Currently, the H_0 measurements from cosmic microwave background [3] and some local distance ladders [4–6] appear to be inconsistent at $> 2\sigma$ level. Independent H_0 measurement with the standard siren method has shown its potential to resolve the inconsistency [2, 7].

GW observations of compact binary mergers probe the luminosity distance (D_L) of the mergers directly. If the mergers also have electromagnetic (EM) counterparts [8], e.g. short gamma-ray bursts (GRBs) or kilonova emissions that come with binary neutron star mergers (BNSs), the observation of the counterparts could allow for precise sky localization of the mergers and identification of the host galaxies [9, 10]. With the luminosity distance of the GW source and the redshift of the host galaxy, cosmological parameters can be constrained. This is the so-called standard siren method with the use of EM counterparts. GW170817 was the first successful standard siren [2]. Several forecasts predict that a 2% H_0 measurement can be achieved by combining ~ 50 BNSs with identified host [7, 11, 12].

In order to resolve the H_0 controversy, the systematic uncertainty in the standard siren method has to be well-understood. One dominant systematics comes from the calibration of amplitude measurement of GW signals. The calibration uncertainty currently leads to $\leq 2\%$ systematics in the GW distance measurement, while this uncertainty is expected to reduce in the future [13, 14]. Another source of systematics comes from the reconstruction

of the peculiar velocity fields around the host galaxies [15–17]. This systematic is remarkable for nearby events, while the majority of events are expected to lie at further distances and less affected by the uncertainty of peculiar motions. Other known sources of systematic uncertainty, e.g. the accuracy of GW waveforms [18], are expected to play a secondary role.

In this paper, we highlight two sources of systematic uncertainties for standard sirens that have not been thoroughly discussed before. Both of the systematics are related to the EM counterpart observations and the viewing angle of the binaries (ζ)¹: First, simulations of BNSs suggest that their EM emissions are likely aspherical [19–22]. For example, the brightness of kilonovae can have a factor of 2-3 angular dependent variation. The color of kilonovae can also change with the viewing angle. Therefore the EM-observing probability for BNSs can depend on the viewing angle (e.g., [23]). If this viewing angle selection effect is not accounted for correctly, H_0 measurement will be biased after combining multiple standard sirens. Second, EM observations of BNSs provide constraint on the viewing angle. The viewing angle of BNS GW170817 [24] has been reconstructed from the profiles of its EM emissions [25, 26] and from the observations of the jet motions [27]. These reconstructions help breaking the degeneracy between the luminosity distance and incli-

¹ Since the EM counterpart emissions barely depend on the direction of the binary rotation (clockwise or counterclockwise), in this paper we define the viewing angle as $\zeta \equiv \min(\theta_{\text{JN}}, 180^\circ - \theta_{\text{JN}})$, where θ_{JN} denotes the inclination angle of the binary.

nation angle of BNSs in GW parameter estimations [28], improving the precision of distance measurement, and reducing the H_0 measurement uncertainty [29, 30]. However, if the EM constraints on the viewing angle are systematically biased, the distance and H_0 estimation will also be biased.

We find that both of the systematics can yield significant bias in H_0 measurement, undermining the standard siren’s potential to resolve the H_0 tension. Since both of the scenarios we discuss originate from the uncertainty of EM observations, we also explore if it is possible to independently determine the systematics by analyzing the viewing angle measured from GWs. Unfortunately, most of the events suffer from the large uncertainty of the estimations and the systematics can be difficult to disclose.

Simulations– We simulate $1.4M_\odot$ - $1.4M_\odot$ non-spinning BNS detections with the `IMRPhenomPv2` waveform and assumed a network signal-to-noise ratio of 12 GW-detection threshold. We use Advanced LIGO-Virgo O4 sensitivity [31] for the simulations ². With this sensitivity, it is valid to assume the BNS astrophysical rate does not evolve over redshifts, and the BNSs are uniformly distributed in comoving volume before detections. Planck cosmology is used ($H_0 = 67.4$ km/s/Mpc, $\Omega_m = 0.315$, $\Omega_k = 0$) [3]. Suppose the data from GW and EM are denoted as \mathcal{D}_{GW} and \mathcal{D}_{EM} respectively, one can follow [7, 32] to write down the H_0 likelihood for single event as:

$$p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | H_0) = \frac{\int p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}} | \vec{\Theta}) p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\Theta}) p_{\text{pop}}(\vec{\Theta} | H_0) d\vec{\Theta}}{\int p_{\text{det}}(\vec{\Theta}) p_{\text{pop}}(\vec{\Theta} | H_0) d\vec{\Theta}}, \quad (1)$$

where $\vec{\Theta}$ represents all the binary parameters, such as the mass, spin, luminosity distance, sky location, and inclination angle etc.. $p_{\text{pop}}(\vec{\Theta} | H_0)$ is proportional to the abundance of binaries with parameters $\vec{\Theta}$ in the Universe.

$$p_{\text{det}}(\vec{\Theta}) \equiv \iint_{\substack{\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}} > \text{GW}_{\text{th}}, \\ \mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} > \text{EM}_{\text{th}}}} p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}} | \vec{\Theta}) p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\Theta}) d\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}} d\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}}, \quad (2)$$

in which the integration only goes over data above the GW- and EM-detection threshold, GW_{th} and EM_{th} . We note that \mathcal{D}_{GW} and \mathcal{D}_{EM} in the numerator of Equation 1 are the data from the detections, so they are above the detection threshold by definition.

For GW likelihood $p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}} | \vec{\Theta})$ the relevant binary parameters are the luminosity distance (D_L) and the inclination angle (θ_{JN}), so we use the algorithms developed

in [28] to estimate $p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}} | D_L, \theta_{\text{JN}})$ ³. We will discuss the EM likelihood $p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\Theta})$ and how it affects the H_0 estimation in the next two sections. We use the H_0 posterior of GW170817 [2] as the prior and combine multiple H_0 likelihoods from simulated events to produce the final H_0 posterior. We repeat the simulations 100 times and report the average for the results throughout this paper.

Systematics from viewing angle selection effect– If the EM counterpart emissions are aspherical, BNSs with some viewing angles could be easier to observe than from other directions. How the EM-observing probability depends on the viewing angle should be included in the EM likelihood $p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\Theta})$. However, if such dependency is unknown or ignored, Equation 1 and the combined H_0 posteriors from multiple events will be incorrect.

How the EM-observing probability depending on the viewing angle is determined by the EM emissions, the EM facilities and the observing strategies. Here we explore two generic examples ⁴: In the first example, we assume only BNSs with viewing angle less than ζ_{max} are observable in EM. Smaller ζ_{max} represents stronger selection since the viewing angle is more limited. Short GRBs with beamed emissions are likely to lead to such abrupt decay in EM-observing probability beyond the beaming angle. In Figure 1 we show the symmetric $1-\sigma$ uncertainty in H_0 for different ζ_{max} if 50 events are combined. If this selection on viewing angle is unknown or ignored, we find the H_0 measurement significantly biased even if ζ_{max} is as large as $\sim 60^\circ$ (the band *W/o correction*). Only as a demonstration, we also show the H_0 uncertainty assuming the viewing angle selection ζ_{max} is perfectly known (the band *With correction*). If ζ_{max} is known, $p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\Theta})$ is taken as 0 when $\zeta > \zeta_{\text{max}}$.

In the second example, we assume the EM-observing probability is a continuous function of viewing angle and the EM likelihood is taken as $p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\Theta}) = 0.5(\cos(\zeta) + 1)$. With this assumption, all face-on binaries are observable, while only 50% of edge-on binaries can be observed. Aspherical kilonova emission can result in this continuous observing function (e.g., [23]). Without correction, we find the $1-\sigma$ uncertainty in H_0 for 50 events lying between [67.5, 70.2] km/s/Mpc, equivalent to $\sim 2\%$ bias in H_0 .

A possible way to determine the viewing angle selection effect is to analyze the viewing angle measurements from GWs for events with EM counterparts. We try to estimate ζ_{max} in the first example above from the GW

² Specifically, the `aligo_04high.txt` file for LIGO-Livingston/LIGO-Hanford, and `avirgo_04high_NEW.txt` for Virgo in this document: <https://dcc.ligo.org/LIGO-T2000012/public>.

³ Note that this step also generates the distance-inclination angle posterior $p(D_L, \theta_{\text{JN}} | \mathcal{D}_{\text{GW}})$ when the likelihood is multiplied by a prior, which will be used in later part of this paper.

⁴ Since a telescope, an EM model, and an EM search pipeline have to be specified before the noise properties of EM data can be quantified, in this paper we assume there is no EM observing noise for simplification.




FIG. 1. Hubble constant measurement uncertainty ($1\text{-}\sigma$) from 50 standard sirens as a function of the maximum viewing angle of the binaries. The Hubble constant used for the simulations is 67.4 km/s/Mpc . If the maximum viewing angle is known, appropriate corrections can be applied (as described in Equation 1) and the uncertainty is the *With correction* band. In contrast, the *W/o correction* band shows the level of bias if the maximum viewing angle is unknown. For reference, the two horizontal bands denote the H_0 reported by Riess et al. [4] ($74.03 \pm 1.42\text{ km/s/Mpc}$) and Planck [3] ($67.4 \pm 0.5\text{ km/s/Mpc}$).

data of N events $\{\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2 \dots \mathcal{D}_N\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 p(\zeta_{\max} | \mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2 \dots \mathcal{D}_N) &= \frac{p(\zeta_{\max}) \prod_{k=1}^N p(\mathcal{D}_k | \zeta_{\max})}{\prod_{k=1}^N p(\mathcal{D}_k)} \\
 &= p(\zeta_{\max}) \prod_{k=1}^N \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{p(\zeta | \mathcal{D}_k) p(\zeta_{\max} | \zeta, \mathcal{D}_k) d\zeta}{p(\zeta_{\max})} \\
 &= p(\zeta_{\max}) \prod_{k=1}^N \int_0^{\pi/2} \frac{p(\zeta | \mathcal{D}_k) p(\zeta | \zeta_{\max}) d\zeta}{p(\zeta)} \\
 &= p(\zeta_{\max}) \prod_{k=1}^N \frac{\int_0^{\zeta_{\max}} p(\zeta | \mathcal{D}_k) d\zeta}{\int_0^{\zeta_{\max}} p(\zeta) d\zeta}. \tag{3}
 \end{aligned}$$

The first line comes from the fact that each event are independent. The third line considers $p(\zeta_{\max} | \zeta, \mathcal{D}_k) = p(\zeta_{\max} | \zeta)$, and the last line takes $p(\zeta | \zeta_{\max}) \propto p(\zeta)$ for $\zeta < \zeta_{\max}$. Equation 3 can then be calculated from the GW-viewing angle posterior $p(\zeta | \mathcal{D}_k)$, which is obtained by integrating the distance-inclination angle posterior $p(D_L, \theta_{\text{JN}} | \mathcal{D}_k)$ over D_L , and the prior on viewing angle $p(\zeta)$ [33]. Without any prior on ζ_{\max} , i.e. $p(\zeta_{\max})$ is taken as a constant, in Figure 2 we show the symmetric $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty of the ζ_{\max} posteriors (Equation 3) as a function of the maximum EM viewing angle of 50 simulated




FIG. 2. Maximum viewing angle ζ_{\max} estimated from 50 BNSs' GW-viewing angle posteriors. The band denotes the symmetric $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty of the estimations, and the grey dashed line is the equal-axis line to guide the eye. Small simulated ζ_{\max} are not estimated accurately due to large uncertainty of the viewing angle posteriors.

BNSs. We find that ζ_{\max} can only be confined to $\sim 20^\circ$ $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty. In addition, the estimated ζ_{\max} is biased for small ζ_{\max} because GW-viewing angle posteriors typically peak around 30° with about 20° uncertainty [28]. Small ζ_{\max} is therefore difficult to reconstruct even if all BNSs with observable EM counterparts are face-on/off.

Systematics from biased EM-constraint on viewing angle— Another possible bias comes from the interpretation of the EM observations. The angular dependency of EM emissions can be used to estimate the viewing angle of BNSs. However, lack of robust understanding of the EM emission model can lead to biased interpretation of the viewing angle.

Suppose the EM observations suggest a viewing angle of ζ_{EM} with $1\text{-}\sigma$ uncertainty of σ_ζ , the EM likelihood in Equation 1 is then proportional to

$$p(\mathcal{D}_{\text{EM}} | \vec{\theta}) \propto \begin{cases} \mathcal{N}(\theta_{\text{JN}}; \zeta_{\text{EM}}, \sigma_\zeta) & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta_{\text{JN}} \leq \pi/2 \\ \mathcal{N}(\theta_{\text{JN}}; \pi - \zeta_{\text{EM}}, \sigma_\zeta) & \text{if } \pi/2 < \theta_{\text{JN}} \leq \pi, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(\theta_{\text{JN}}; \zeta_{\text{EM}}, \sigma_\zeta)$ denotes a normal distribution with mean ζ_{EM} and standard deviation σ_ζ evaluated at θ_{JN} . Since Equation 4 provides constraint on the inclination angle and reduces the binary parameter space in Equation 1, the Hubble constant can be measured more precisely [28]. However, if the EM constraint on the viewing angle is off by

$$\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}} \equiv \zeta_{\text{EM}} - \zeta_{\text{real}},$$

where ζ_{real} denotes the real viewing angle of the event, the H_0 measurements will be biased. For single event the bias in H_0 may not be obvious, because the statistical uncertainty in H_0 dominates the overall uncertainty.




FIG. 3. Hubble constant measurement uncertainty ($1-\sigma$) from 20 standard sirens as a function of the systematic bias in the binary viewing angle constrained by EM observations. Three different statistical uncertainties in the EM-constrained viewing angle ($\sigma_\zeta = 5^\circ, 10^\circ, 20^\circ$) are shown. The Hubble constant used for the simulations is 67.4 km/s/Mpc .

The bias will become clear after the H_0 posteriors are combined over multiple events. In Figure 3 we show the extent of overall bias in H_0 if the EM constraint on viewing angle is always off by $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$ for 20 events.

When the viewing angles are overestimated (underestimated), the combined H_0 is overestimated (underestimated). Smaller σ_ζ affects the H_0 measurement more significantly for the same $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$. Note that $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$ is not necessarily a constant across different events. We choose a fixed bias $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$ across 20 events only to reveal the *average* level of H_0 bias for a given $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$, since the systematic uncertainty in H_0 is not expected to evolve with the total number of events. Combining 20 events instead of using a single event reduces the statistical fluctuations and manifests the systematic uncertainty in H_0 . Our simulations map the systematic uncertainty in viewing angle inferred from EM observations to H_0 for the first time. From Figure 3, $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$ has to be $\lesssim 10^\circ$ to be accurate enough to address the tension between *Planck* and the local distance ladders.

Next, we wonder if a comparison between the GW and EM measurement of the viewing angle will help disclosing the bias in EM interpretations. Suppose the viewing angle posteriors from GW and EM for a BNS are $\Upsilon(\zeta)$ and $\varepsilon(\zeta)$ respectively, we can define their difference as

$$\Delta\zeta_{\text{EM-GW}} \equiv \int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^{\pi/2} (\zeta_2 - \zeta_1) \times \Upsilon(\zeta_1) \times \varepsilon(\zeta_2) d\zeta_1 d\zeta_2. \quad (5)$$

We find that the average of $\Delta\zeta_{\text{EM-GW}}$ over 20 BNSs traces $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$ with $1-\sigma$ uncertainty $> 18^\circ$, as shown in Figure 4. This uncertainty of $\Delta\zeta_{\text{EM-GW}}$ is larger than the required accuracy of ζ_{EM} above, making it difficult to resolve the H_0 systematics from biased EM constraint.




FIG. 4. The average difference between EM- and GW-viewing angle posteriors $\Delta\zeta_{\text{EM-GW}}$ for 20 BNSs with EM posteriors systematically off by $\Delta\zeta_{\text{sys}}$. The $1-\sigma$ uncertainty of the difference for three EM posterior statistical uncertainties, $\sigma_\zeta = 5^\circ, 10^\circ, 20^\circ$, are $18.5^\circ, 20^\circ$, and 24° , respectively. The grey dashed line is the equal-axis line to guide the eye.

Discussion— In this paper we evaluate the extent of bias in H_0 as a result of the geometry of EM emissions from BNSs.

If the geometry affects the EM-observing probability, the selection effect can introduce a $\gtrsim 2\%$ bias on H_0 . The example of maximum viewing angle we present may happen due to the choice of kilonova observing strategies or the sharp decline beyond a viewing angle for short GRB emission. Future studies of the jet structure of GRBs will be crucial to correct the selection effect for standard sirens. On the other hand, the example of continuous viewing angle selection is relevant for kilonova observations. Simulations show that edge-on BNSs are more difficult to localize [28], and their kilonova emissions can be redder and dimmer [22]. The resulting selection effects will depend on the telescopes, the observing strategies, and the observing conditions, so the overall effects can be subtle to estimate and correct.

Even if the selection effect is corrected, when the geometry of EM emissions is used to confine the BNSs' viewing angle, the systematic uncertainty in viewing angle introduced by the EM interpretations has to be less than $\sim 10^\circ$. Since the binary rotational axis doesn't have to be perfectly aligned with the major axis of EM emissions, and the geometry of EM emissions is unknown, to control the systematics of EM inferred viewing angle can be challenging. We also show that the comparison between EM- and GW-viewing angle measurements can help estimating the systematics, but the precision of the estimation may not be good enough to completely remove the bias.

We note that in reality other binary parameters will also affect the EM-observing probability. Therefore, more complete considerations of EM models and projec-

tions of EM-observing probability for future telescopes involved in the search for EM counterparts will result in more accurate estimation of the bias in H_0 . Unlike the viewing angle measurement, some parameters, such as the mass, are estimated precise enough from GW signals for the selection effect to be taken care of. Overall, we find the selection over viewing angle discussed in this paper the most subtle and difficult to resolve.

If the viewing angle selection effect is significant, it is possible to reconstruct the selection by comparing the number of BNSs with and without EM counterparts. The distribution of viewing angle for BNSs detected in GWs is well-understood [33]. For example, it is known that about 15% of BNS detections have viewing angle larger than 60° . If 15% of BNSs miss counterparts, one explanation is that the maximum EM viewing angle is around 60° . A reconstruction of short GRB viewing angles using the inclination angles and distances of GW-GRB joint detections has been shown in [34]. However, the reconstruction for kilonova will be more difficult since their EM-observing probability has more complicated dependency on the viewing angle. Such reconstruction can also be easily contaminated by other factors that affect the EM-observing probability and will have to be evaluated carefully.

Although our discussion focuses on BNSs, there are simulations suggesting stronger viewing angle dependency for EM counterparts of neutron star-black hole mergers [22]. Therefore neutron star-black hole mergers can possibly introduce larger bias when they are used as standard sirens [35].

We note that the standard siren method we discuss in this paper relies on the observations of EM counterparts and the measurements of the BNSs' redshift. A complementary approach of the standard siren method doesn't require the EM counterparts but make use of galaxy catalogs may help deducing the systematics discussed in this paper. However, the galaxy catalogs approach will suffer from lower H_0 precision and other sources of systematics [7, 36], making it complicated to contribute to the issues.

Finally, the calibration uncertainty in GWs currently dominates the known systematic uncertainty for standard sirens. The bias in H_0 from calibration can be as large as $\sim 2\%$ [13, 14]. Both of the systematics we find in this work can introduce H_0 bias larger than 2%. In summary, the systematic uncertainty from viewing angle for standard sirens can be a major challenge to resolve the tension in Hubble constant, and we look forward to future development to explore this topic.

acknowledgments— We acknowledge valuable discussions with Sylvia Biscoveanu, Michael Coughlin, Carl-Johan Haster, Daniel Holz, Kwan-Yeung Ken Ng, and Salvatore Vitale. HYC was supported by the Black Hole Initiative at Harvard University, which is funded

by grants from the John Templeton Foundation and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to Harvard University.

* himjiu@mit.edu; NHFP Einstein Fellow

- [1] B. F. Schutz, *Nature (London)* **323**, 310 (1986).
- [2] B. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, 1M2H, Dark Energy Camera GW-E, DES, DLT40, Las Cumbres Observatory, VINROUGE, MASTER), *Nature* **551**, 85 (2017), 1710.05835.
- [3] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck) (2018), 1807.06209.
- [4] A. G. Riess, S. Casertano, W. Yuan, L. M. Macri, and D. Scolnic, *Astrophys. J.* **876**, 85 (2019), 1903.07603.
- [5] K. C. Wong, S. H. Suyu, G. C. F. Chen, C. E. Rusu, M. Millon, D. Sluse, V. Bonvin, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Taubenberger, M. W. Auger, et al., arXiv e-prints arXiv:1907.04869 (2019), 1907.04869.
- [6] D. W. Pesce, J. A. Braatz, M. J. Reid, A. G. Riess, D. Scolnic, J. J. Condon, F. Gao, C. Henkel, C. M. V. Impellizzeri, C. Y. Kuo, et al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **891**, L1 (2020), 2001.09213.
- [7] H.-Y. Chen, M. Fishbach, and D. E. Holz, *Nature (London)* **562**, 545 (2018), 1712.06531.
- [8] B. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, Fermi GBM, INTEGRAL, IceCube, AstroSat Cadmium Zinc Telluride Imager Team, IPN, Insight-Hxmt, ANTARES, Swift, AGILE Team, 1M2H Team, Dark Energy Camera GW-EM, DES, DLT40, GRAWITA, Fermi-LAT, ATCA, ASKAP, Las Cumbres Observatory Group, OzGrav, DWF (Deeper Wider Faster Program), AST3, CAAS-TRO, VINROUGE, MASTER, J-GEM, GROWTH, JAGWAR, CaltechNRAO, TTU-NRAO, NuSTAR, Pan-STARRS, MAXI Team, TZAC Consortium, KU, Nordic Optical Telescope, ePESSO, GROND, Texas Tech University, SALT Group, TOROS, BOOTES, MWA, CALET, IKI-GW Follow-up, H.E.S.S., LOFAR, LWA, HAWC, Pierre Auger, ALMA, Euro VLBI Team, Pi of Sky, Chandra Team at McGill University, DFN, ATLAS Telescopes, High Time Resolution Universe Survey, RIMAS, RATIR, SKA South Africa/MeerKAT), *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **848**, L12 (2017), 1710.05833.
- [9] D. E. Holz and S. A. Hughes, *Astrophys. J.* **629**, 15 (2005), astro-ph/0504616.
- [10] N. Dalal, D. E. Holz, S. A. Hughes, and B. Jain, *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 063006 (2006), astro-ph/0601275.
- [11] S. Nissanke, D. E. Holz, N. Dalal, S. A. Hughes, J. L. Sievers, and C. M. Hirata, arXiv e-prints arXiv:1307.2638 (2013), 1307.2638.
- [12] S. M. Feeney, H. V. Peiris, A. R. Williamson, S. M. Nissanke, D. J. Mortlock, J. Alsing, and D. Scolnic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 061105 (2019), 1802.03404.
- [13] S. Karki, D. Tuyenbayev, S. Kandhasamy, B. P. Abbott, T. D. Abbott, E. H. Anders, J. Berliner, J. Betzwieser, C. Cahillane, L. Canete, et al., *Review of Scientific Instruments* **87**, 114503 (2016), 1608.05055.
- [14] L. Sun, E. Goetz, J. S. Kissel, J. Betzwieser, S. Karki, A. Viets, M. Wade, D. Bhattacharjee, V. Bossilkov, P. B. Covas, et al., arXiv e-prints arXiv:2005.02531 (2020), 2005.02531.
- [15] C. Howlett and T. M. Davis, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*

- 492**, 3803 (2020), 1909.00587.
- [16] S. Mukherjee, G. Lavaux, F. R. Bouchet, J. Jasche, B. D. Wandelt, S. M. Nissanke, F. Leclercq, and K. Hotokezaka, arXiv e-prints arXiv:1909.08627 (2019), 1909.08627.
- [17] C. Nicolaou, O. Lahav, P. Lemos, W. Hartley, and J. Braden, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* (2020), 1909.09609.
- [18] B. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 011001 (2019), 1805.11579.
- [19] L. F. Roberts, D. Kasen, W. H. Lee, and E. Ramirez-Ruiz, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **736**, L21 (2011), 1104.5504.
- [20] B. D. Metzger, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **20**, 3 (2017), 1610.09381.
- [21] M. Bulla, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **489**, 5037 (2019), 1906.04205.
- [22] S. Darbha and D. Kasen, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2002.00299 (2020), 2002.00299.
- [23] A. Sagués Carracedo, M. Bulla, U. Feindt, and A. Goobar, arXiv e-prints arXiv:2004.06137 (2020), 2004.06137.
- [24] B. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 161101 (2017), 1710.05832.
- [25] D. Finstad, S. De, D. A. Brown, E. Berger, and C. M. Biwer, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **860**, L2 (2018), 1804.04179.
- [26] S. Dhawan, M. Bulla, A. Goobar, A. Sagués Carracedo, and C. N. Setzer, *Astrophys. J.* **888**, 67 (2020), 1909.13810.
- [27] K. P. Mooley, A. T. Deller, O. Gottlieb, E. Nakar, G. Hallinan, S. Bourke, D. A. Frail, A. Horesh, A. Corsi, and K. Hotokezaka, *Nature (London)* **561**, 355 (2018), 1806.09693.
- [28] H.-Y. Chen, S. Vitale, and R. Narayan, *Physical Review X* **9**, 031028 (2019), 1807.05226.
- [29] C. Guidorzi, R. Margutti, D. Brout, D. Scolnic, W. Fong, K. D. Alexander, P. S. Cowperthwaite, J. Annis, E. Berger, P. K. Blanchard, et al., *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **851**, L36 (2017), 1710.06426.
- [30] K. Hotokezaka, E. Nakar, O. Gottlieb, S. Nissanke, K. Masuda, G. Hallinan, K. P. Mooley, and A. T. Deller, *Nature Astronomy* **3**, 940 (2019), 1806.10596.
- [31] B. Abbott et al. (KAGRA, LIGO Scientific, VIRGO), *Living Rev. Rel.* **21**, 3 (2018), 1304.0670.
- [32] I. Mandel, W. M. Farr, and J. R. Gair, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **486**, 1086 (2019), 1809.02063.
- [33] B. F. Schutz, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **28**, 125023 (2011), 1102.5421.
- [34] A. Farah, R. Essick, Z. Doctor, M. Fishbach, and D. E. Holz, arXiv e-prints arXiv:1912.04906 (2019), 1912.04906.
- [35] S. Vitale and H.-Y. Chen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 021303 (2018), 1804.07337.
- [36] R. Gray, I. Magaña Hernandez, H. Qi, A. Sur, P. R. Brady, H.-Y. Chen, W. M. Farr, M. Fishbach, J. R. Gair, A. Ghosh, et al., arXiv e-prints arXiv:1908.06050 (2019), 1908.06050.