Eccentric Pairs: Analytic Gravitational Waves from Binary Black Holes in Elliptic Orbits

D. Buskirk ‡ and M. Babiuc-Hamilton §
Department of Physics, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755, USA

If you thought that science was certain - well, that is just an error on your part.

Richard P. Feynman

Abstract. Gravitational waves (GW) from eccentric binaries have intricate signals encoding important features about the location, creation and evolution of the sources. Eccentricity shortens the merger time, which will make those GWs statistically predominant in the observed data once detectors will reach the required sensitivity. We accurately implement fully analytical GW templates from eccentric binary black hole (BBH) mergers. We start by bringing together all the ingredients, then assemble the strain for the inspiral by employing high-order post-Newtonian (PN) corrections. In preparation for the merger we compile analytical approximations available in the field for estimating the final black hole’s mass and spin, essential for building the two models chosen for the merger: Backwards one Body (BoB) and Implicit Rotating Source (IRS). We calculate the spin, mass, ringdown frequency and damping time of the remnant and implement the BoB model for the merger, weighing it up against the IRS model and the numerical data. We achieve overall agreement between the BoB and IRS models with excellent match in frequency around merger, expected discrepancy in amplitude, and a phase difference in the IRS waveform. We complete the eccentric inspiral with the quasi-circular BoB merger model in frequency, amplitude and phase, then we build the hybrid GW strain for the whole evolution of the binary. For low eccentricity we reach coincidence in the overlap, with no ambiguity in the time interval. For high-eccentricity we compensate for the implicit quasi-circular assumption of the BoB approach. The applicability of our calculations stems from their thorough and streamlined implementation, which offers researchers in the field of gravitational waves a tool straightforward to understand, reproduce, use and extend.
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1. Introduction

In the 17th century, Johannes Kepler introduced elliptical orbits and his three famous laws of planetary motion. Since then, it is universally accepted that all binary systems move in elliptical orbits around the center of mass. Those empirical observations were used by Newton to build the law of universal gravitation, that remained unchallenged for three centuries, until Einstein introduced the theory of general relativity (GR) in 1915. This theory explained the observed slight precession of Mercury’s elliptical orbit, known as the relativistic perihelion advance. More important, it showed that a binary is bound to spiral inward and circularize by releasing orbital energy as gravitational waves (GW) until the inevitable collision occurs. It may seem like a rare scenario that two compact objects lock each other into a collapsing orbit. However, stars are usually born in pair, and more than 70% of them are massive enough to end up either as black holes or neutron stars [1].

By the time they reach Earth, GW have extremely small amplitude, and their expected strain on a given length is only \( \approx 10^{-20} \). This makes their detection very challenging, and possible only for very strong gravity, such as was the case of the two merging black holes first detected by the Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory in September 2015 [2]. This discovery created a new branch of astronomy, the gravitational-wave astronomy (GW) [3]! The data and software employed in those detections are freely available [4], which facilitates testing and replication by peer scientists [5], an essential requirement for the upholding of high scientific standards.

The detection of GW is important because it enables scientists to study and classify the population of black holes in the universe, not visible in electromagnetic spectrum [6, 7]. Encoded in the GW’s signal there is information about the composition, formation and evolution of not only black holes, but also of neutron or dwarf star binaries [8, 9, 10], about galaxy evolution [11], the early cosmology [12, 13], and even about physics beyond GR [14], such as fundamental interactions and unification theories [15, 16].

All the detections reported until now come from circularized binaries, but this is not necessarily because they had zero eccentricity [17]. The emission of GW decreases the orbital eccentricity [18], thus it is expected, especially for isolated compact binaries that evolved for a long time, very small eccentricity close to the merger, when the signal enters the sensitivity band of the current detectors. Eccentricity can be present even at small separation in certain populations of merging binaries living in the dense stellar environment of a galactic core and globular cluster [19, 20], or in isolated triplets [21].

Current ground-based detectors such as ALIGO, AVirgo, KAGRA and IndIGO had not yet reached the sensitivity levels required for the detection of eccentricity and are only tuned to observe the brightest sources of GW, in a limited frequency band, very close to collision [22]. In the near future though, as detection techniques are perfected, detection of small orbit eccentricities will become possible [23]. But we just scratched the surface of the GW detection potential! The next generation of ground-based gravitational-wave detector network, which includes both ground-based
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observatories such as the Cosmic Explorer [24] and the Einstein Telescope [25], and space-borne instruments such as LISA [26, 27], DECIGO [28], or TianQin [29], are in various stages of development. When those observatories will come online, they will make possible the detection of GW at a much faster pace, and will reach so deep into the space as to reveal all the merging black holes in the universe [30]. Those instruments will also be able to detect GW at an earlier stage in the life of the binary, when orbital eccentricity is still large, and to track their evolution for a long time. It is thus only a matter of time until GW from eccentric compact binaries will be detected.

GW with eccentricity are much richer in structure and they reveal valuable information on how the binary came together, its long-time evolution, and the medium in which the pair resides [31, 32, 33]. Moreover, the eccentricity decreases the merger time, which means that GWs with eccentricity encoded in the signal might become ubiquitous once detectors will have the demanded sensitivity. But to decipher any detection of GW from binaries in eccentric orbits, and to determine their proprieties, it is essential to have complete and accurate templates that are valid for small to moderate eccentricities. GW templates are generated mainly using two families of models currently implemented in the LIGO Scientific Collaboration Algorithm Library (LALSuite) [LAL]: (1) the Effective-one-Body approach (EOB) [34, 35, 36] and the phenomenological frequency domain model (IMRPhenom) and flavors [37, 38, 39, 40]. Those waveform models are following in essence the same two-steps procedure to construct complete templates for the signal, from the time it enters the detector’s frequency band, through the peak of the amplitude (“chirp”) emitted when the two black holes collide, until it gradually become smaller, and ending when the final black hole settles down. First, the binary motion is split in three distinct regions: inspiral, merger and ringdown, and different mathematical formalisms are being applied to obtain the waveform for each of those regions. After that, a complete template of the GW is generated for the whole evolution of the binary, by matching those regions in time or in frequency.

The inspiral, called also the weak field region, is modeled using different versions of the post-Newtonian (PN) formalism, in which solutions of Einstein’s equations of GR are obtained as higher-order expansions of Newton’s law of gravity in terms of the small PN parameter \( x_{PN} = \frac{v^2}{c^2} \), also called the “slowness”, where \( v \) is the orbital velocity and \( c \) the speed of light. See [41, 42, 43, 44, 45] for details on this analytical technique.

In the second region, during merger, the orbital speed of the binary gets closer to the speed of light and the PN approximation becomes invalid. Here, the dynamics of the binary’s orbit is modeled by numerically solving Einstein’s equations of GR on supercomputers and extrapolating at larger distance to calculate the resulting waveform (see [46] for an excellent review). Informed by numerical relativity (NR) [47, 48, 49, 50, 51], the analytical models are extended to envelop the complicated dynamics of the merger, either by using the empirical MRPhenom approach [52, 53], or the EOB reformulation the PN theory [54, 55, 56].

In the third region, when the new black hole formed after collision settles down by “ringing out” the extra energy in form of quasi-normal modes radiation, analytical
models are valid again, and the GW is calculated with the black hole perturbation theory [57, 58, 59, 60, 61].

The state-of-art methods mentioned above are continuously developed and improved, driven by the increasing demands of the GW detection. However most of them are limited to quasi-circular orbits (for good reviews see Refs. [62, 63]). The LALSuite data analysis libraries has only one routine for generating eccentric GW templates based on [64], and current analytical models that include eccentricity [64, 65, 66] require more work to accurately describe the complex physics of elliptic binaries [67, 68].

Motivated by the impending detection of GWs from eccentric binaries, we align our present work with the demand for eccentric waveforms and we aim to accurately implement fully analytical, easily reproducible GW templates from eccentric binary black hole (BBH) mergers. We develop a fully analytical model for calculating the complete GW emitted by compact binaries in eccentric orbits, starting with their inspiral, following through the highly nonlinear regime of the coalescence, and ending with the ringdown phase. We describe in a coherent and detailed way how the template is built, by gathering valuable information from numerous research papers, most of them focusing only on specific regions of the orbit and exhibiting a high level of complexity and scientific jargon, which makes the problem hard to understand. We open this black box and layout its intricate content at an approachable level, in a clear, logic and intuitive way, keeping the balance with the scientific rigor. Our purpose is for the reader to understand the assumptions that go in the construction of those templates and to reproduce our results, even without formal training in GW research. Besides streamlining the procedure to make the reproducibility of the results straightforward, it is important to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the models employed and to find out if they are approximating correctly the signal. To achieve this purpose, we implement two approaches for the merger, the BoB and the IRS methods, and we compare them, opting for the BoB model. The novelty of our findings relies in the way we build the hybrid GW strain for the whole evolution of the binary, matching the eccentric inspiral with the quasi-circular BoB merger by completing them in frequency, amplitude and phase. We find that for low eccentricity we can connect the two waveforms with no ambiguity in the time interval, which is potentially relevant for the production of unambiguous GW waveforms from eccentric binaries. The applicability of our research stems from a thorough and efficient implementation, which offers researchers in the field a blueprint for understanding, reproducing, use and extending our results, in order to reveal the physics of this kind of sources, in preparation for their imminent detection.

We start our presentation with a review of the Keplerian problem for eccentric binaries and it’s extension to the post-Keplerian parametrization in Section 2. We clarify the complex physical and mathematical concepts that are necessary to solve analytically the problem of motion when eccentricity intertwined with strong gravity comes into play, a topic often either overlooked, or hidden in heavy technical language. Our choice of solving the post-Newtonian Kepler’s equation is purely analytical, based on [69]. We finish this section by outlining the procedure we will follow to assemble
the analytic gravitational waveform during the inspiral. We continue in Section 3 by introducing first the essential ingredients we must know before attempting to model the merger. First, we expose the difficulty in analytically determining the location of the transition between the inspiral and merger, then we follow with analytical estimations for the spin, mass and ringdown frequency of the final black hole. Next, we summarize the analytical prescriptions given by the two merger models: IRS and BoB, to arrive at the strain of the gravitational waves emitted during merger. Once the theoretical framework is laid out clearly, it’s time for us to build the complete waveform in Section 4. We start by establishing the time bounds for the binary evolution in subsection 4.1, then we implement the inspiral waveform starting in subsection 4.2 and continuing in subsection 4.3. Before turning to the merger waveform implementation, we dive into calculations to obtain the final spin, mass and fundamental ringdown frequency of the merged black hole in subsection 4.4. We continue in subsection 4.5 by implementing and testing two analytical methods describing the strong-field region of the merger: (1) the well-known and widely used implicit rotating source (IRS) model [70, 71, 72, 73, 74], and (2) the recently developed backwards-one-body (BOB) model [75, 76]. We compare the two models both in frequency and amplitude against each other, and the BoB model with the data given by the NR waveform catalogue SXS catalogue [76, 77]. Lastly, we generate the complete GW template for the whole evolution of the binary in subsection 4.6 by matching in time and frequency the solutions obtained for the inspiral and merger regions of the binary orbit, first for small, then for large eccentricity. We conclude in Section 5 by summarizing our findings, their implications for the field of gravitational wave astrophysics and suggest extensions of our work.

Note that we will use geometrized units where $G = c = 1$ throughout, which allows us to measure time, space and mass in terms of the mass of the binary system at infinity, a number defined as $M = M(\text{kg})/M_\odot(\text{kg})$ where $M_\odot$ is the mass of the sun. In this way, our results can be easily scaled for a given total mass. In order to recover the required physical units, we simply multiply mass with $M_\odot(\text{kg}) = 1.98892 \times 10^{30}\text{kg}$, space with $M_\odot(\text{km}) = 1.477\text{ km}$, and time with $M_\odot(\text{s}) = 4.92674 \times 10^{-6}\text{s}$.

2. Theoretical Framework: the Weak-Field Region

2.1. The Keplerian Problem

Let us suppose that our eccentric pair consists of two black holes reduced to material points of masses $m_1$ and $m_2$, separated by a distance $r$, each revolving in elliptical orbits around a common center of mass. This model is known as the two-body problem. Imposing the conservation of momentum, this is further simplified to the one-body problem of a single particle of reduced mass $\mu = m_1m_2/M$ and position $r$, moving in the external gravitational field created by the mass $M = m_1 + m_2$ located at the center of mass. Due to the conservation of angular momentum, the position vector will be confined to the plane, which restricts this to a two-dimensional problem. Thus, we can
write \( r = r(\cos \theta, \sin \theta) \), which means that we only need to know how the angle \( \theta \) varies in time, in order to describe the motion of the point mass \( \mu \). This deceptively simple one-dimensional ansatz is also known as the Kepler problem, but even in Newtonian gravity it is very complicated to solve. At the heart of the model for the evolution of the eccentric binary system lies Kepler’s equation, with still unknown exact analytical solution, although scientists tried to find one for centuries! Luckily, we have analytical methods that can approximate this solution with high degree of accuracy.

In order to arrive at Kepler’s equation, we will take a closer look at the elliptical orbit and make further simplifications. The ellipse is described by four quantities: the two extreme points that bound the trajectory: \( r_\pm \) (periastron, or point of closest approach to the origin) and \( r_+ \) (apo astron or maximum distance from the origin), the semi-major axis \( a = (r_+ + r_-)/2 \), and the eccentricity \( e = (r_+ - r_-)/(r_+ + r_-) \). We align our one-dimensional x-coordinate with the major axis of the ellipse, and draw a circle of radius \( a \) with origin in the center of the ellipse. Then we raise a perpendicular from the x-axis through the orbiting point-mass \( \mu \), thus projecting its motion onto this circle (see Figure 1).

The motion is now reduced to a circular orbit on this reference circle and to describe it we introduce the angular coordinate \( u \), called eccentric anomaly. In order to calculate this angle \( u \), we must use the famous Kepler’s equation (not to be confused with Kepler’s three laws of orbital motion), deduced from purely geometric considerations as a relationship between this eccentric anomaly and the eccentricity of the ellipse:

\[
\ell = u - e \sin u.
\]

where \( \ell = w(t - t_0) \) is called the mean anomaly, and \( w = 2\pi t/P \) is the mean motion, namely the angular speed of the body \( \mu \) averaged over the period \( P \) of the orbit, measured with respect to the periastron, between \( \ell = 0 \) and \( \ell = 2\pi \), and given by Kepler’s third law, \( w = \sqrt{GM/a^3} \). Once we know this angle, we calculate the separation with the shape equation \( r = a(1 - e \cos u) \). From here, the location of each star in the binary with respect to the center of mass will be given by \( |r_{1,2}| = rm_{1,2}/M \).
The Kepler equation \( u = \ell + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i \sin(i\ell) \), \( a_i = \frac{2}{i} J_i(ie) \sin(i\ell) \), where \( J_i(x) \) are the modified Bessel function of the first kind \( [82] \). This gives an analytical expression for the eccentric anomaly, which is geometrically related to the orbital phase \( \phi \), also known as the true anomaly, by the equation:
\[
\phi = 2 \tan^{-1} \left( \sqrt{\frac{1 + e}{1 - e}} \tan \frac{u}{2} \right)
\]
(3)
Once we know the orbital phase, in Newtonian gravity the problem is solved!

2.2. The quasi-Keplerian Problem

Up to this point we have not taken into account the loss of orbital energy due to the emission of GW. Let us now include this essential component into our treatment of the binary’s orbit, while assuming that the orbit decays much slower compared to the orbital period. This important conjecture, called the adiabatic approximation, allows us to model the emission of GW with the balance equation, which states that the loss of orbital energy is balanced by the flux of GW for a binary system in a slowly-evolving circular orbit:
\[
-\frac{dE}{dt} = \dot{E} = \mathcal{F}.
\]
(4)
Here \( E \) is the binding energy of the binary and \( \mathcal{F} \) is the energy flux emitted in GW. This equation is valid for most of the inspiral, while the separation is large and the orbital speed is much smaller than the speed of light, making the parameter \( x_{PN} \ll 1 \). In this region the gravitational field is weak and the GR equations can be solved in terms of power series expansions of the parameter \( x_{PN} \), that start from the familiar Newtonian two-body equation of motion. This is the post-Newtonian formalism, introduced in fact by Einstein \( [83] \), and to the reader interested din learning about it we recommend \( [84] \) or \( [44] \). This powerful and surprisingly accurate method provides us with the expressions for the binding energy and the emitted flux, enabling us to integrate the balance equation \( [4] \), and thus to obtain the evolution equation for the parameter \( x_{PN} \),
\[
\frac{dx_{PN}}{dt} = \dot{x}_{PN} = -\frac{\mathcal{F}}{(dE/dx_{PN})}.
\]
(5)
The dynamics of the binary becomes much more complicated when we add eccentricity to the orbit. Due to the ellipticity, the curvature of the orbit changes,
which makes the angle of the tangent to the orbit vary along the trajectory, and this is described by the extrinsic curvature in GR. This theory assumes a four-dimensional spacetime, and the orbit will depend on how we chose the three-dimensional spatial slice in this 4D geometry. This means that how we track the evolution of the eccentricity is not invariant of the coordinate system, and will depend on how we define it. In mathematical language, the eccentricity it’s not gauge invariant and depends on our gauge choice. To circumvent this problem, we employ again the adiabatic approximation and assume that the change in eccentricity due to emission of GW occurs on a timescale much longer than the orbital timescale. This allows us to average the eccentricity over the orbital period and to track its variation only from one orbit to the next, computing thus the orbit-averaged version of the evolution equations for the eccentricity. As a note of caution, this approximation breaks down in the late inspiral of the binary, when the orbit becomes quasi-circular and the orbital velocity approaches the speed of light. In this region, starting roughly around $v \approx 0.25c$, the emission of GW forces the orbit to decay faster and to circularize under the effect of radiation-reaction [85]. As long as the inspiral does not reach this region, the orbit decays slowly enough for the motion within one orbit to be conservative, which ensured that the adiabatic approximation is valid with high accuracy.

What will happen though when the orientation of the orbit changes due to precession, and the eccentricity decreases in time due to the emission of GW, while the orbital velocity increases? This highly complicates the binary two-body problem, which does not have an analytic solution in GR. Nevertheless, we can generalize the solution to Kepler’s equation to include these relativistic effects, following [69].

\[ u = \ell + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i \sin(i\ell), \]  
\[ A_i = \frac{1}{i} J_i(ie_t) + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \alpha_j \left[ J_{i+j}(ie_t) - J_{i-j}(ie_t) \right] \]  

where $e_t$ is the time-dependent eccentricity, $J_i$ are again the modified Bessel functions, and $\alpha_j$ are the perturbative, post-Newtonian corrections that depend on $e_t$, on the parameter $x_{PN}$, as well as on the chosen coordinate system. This slightly perturbed form of Kepler’s equation [6] can still be applied to accurately describe the orbital evolution in GR. This formalism is called the quasi-Keplerian parametrization, and comes at a price, namely we must take into account three eccentricity parameters, to describe the three important changes in the orbit introduced in GR, namely: (1) $e_t$ for the change in the orbital period due to the emission of GW, (2) $e_\theta$ for the relativistic precession of periastron and (3) $e_r$ for the shrinking of the orbit [86, 87, 88]. These eccentricities all depend of the energy and angular momentum of the binary and thus on each other, allowing us choose only one of them, namely $e_t$ in our calculations, as is customary in the literature [22]. Finding analytic solutions for the quasi-Kepler equation is, as expected, much more complicated now, but it has been achieved up to 3PN order [69, 89, 90, 91].
2.3. The Inspiral Waveform

Up to this point we described in detail the motion of the binary in the weak-field region. Armed with this knowledge, we can turn now to our main objective, namely to calculate the analytical form of the emitted GW. We will start with the formula for the dimensionless strain,

$$h = h_+ - i h_\times = A(r, \phi)e^{-i\phi_{GW}}, \quad (8)$$

where the two strain components \((h_+, h_\times)\) describe the two possible polarizations of the wave, \(\phi_{GW}\) is the phase of the GW and \(A(r, \phi)\) is its complex amplitude. At the optimal orientation, namely when the binary is face-on and right overhead the detector, located at a distance \(R\) from it, the amplitude of GW is maximum, and is given by [65]:

$$A = A_1 + iA_2 = -\frac{2\mu}{R} \left[ \left( \dot{r}^2 + r\dot{\phi}^2 + \frac{M}{r} \right) + 2i\dot{r}\dot{\phi} \right]. \quad (9)$$

GW are quadrupolar due to the law of conservation of linear and angular momentum, which means that the signal goes through maxima and minima twice during one orbital cycle, thus: \(\phi_{GW} = 2\phi\). The strain from eq. (8) is usually decomposed in spin-weighted \(s = -2\) spherical harmonics modes \((l, m)\) [92],

$$h = \sum_{l=2}^{\infty} \sum_{m=-l}^{l} -2Y_{lm}h_{lm}, \quad (10)$$

with the leading mode \((l = 2, m = \pm 2)\) typically dominating this sum, thus for optimal orientation (spherical polar angles of the observer \(\theta = \varphi = 0\)), \(h \approx \sqrt{5/4\pi}h_{22}\) [93].

To calculate the strain in eq. (8) we need to know the equations of motion for the orbital phase \(\phi(t)\) and the orbital separation \(r(t)\). In the post-Newtonian approximation those quantities are written as powers of the small parameter \(x_{PN}\), as shown below:

$$r_{PN} = M \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} \rho_{jPN}x_{PN}^{j-1} \right), \quad (11)$$

$$\dot{\phi}_{PN} = M^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} \varphi_{jPN}x_{PN}^{j+3} \right). \quad (12)$$

Here \(N\) is the order of the post-Newtonian expansion and the terms \((\rho_{jPN}, \varphi_{jPN})\) are numerical expansion coefficients. To calculate those expressions we need to know how \(x_{PN}\) changes with time, and this is given by the balance equation [5]. There are several ways of further expanding this equation in post-Newtonian powers of \(x_{PN}\), and we will choose the TaylorT4 approximant method [94], which gives for \(x_{PN}\) the expression [67]:

$$\dot{x}_{PN} = M^{-1}x_{PN}^{5} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} \chi_{jPN}x_{PN}^{j} \right) + \dot{x}_{HT}, \quad (13)$$

Note that \(\dot{x}_{HT}\) are called hereditary terms and enter in the equation as fractional \(\frac{1}{2}j\) PN corrections [95]. Those terms describe the nonlinear interaction of the GW propagating away from the sources at a later time with the GW that propagated towards the source
at an earlier time (memory effects) and again back-scattered by the spacetime curvature of the binary (tail effects). Those hereditary terms, containing both memory and tail effects, depend on all the past dynamical history of the source (see [44, 62] for details).

We must add to eq. (13) the following equation of motion for the eccentricity, because the eccentricity diminishes and the orbit circularizes while the binary inspirals emitting GW as it approaches the merger,

\[ \dot{e}_{\text{PN}} = M^{-1} \lambda \sum_{j=0}^{N} \epsilon_{j,\text{PN}} x_{\text{PN}}^j + \dot{e}_{\text{HT}}. \]  

(14)

Next, we find the evolution of the mean anomaly \( \ell \) that describes how the orbital angular velocity changes in the course of an orbital evolution due to the eccentricity.

\[ \dot{\ell}_{\text{PN}} = w = M^{-1} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{N} \lambda_{j,\text{PN}} x_{\text{PN}}^{(j+3)} \right) \]  

(15)

After we know how the key quantities \( e_{\text{PN}}, x_{\text{PN}} \) and \( l_{\text{PN}} \) change with time, we must solve the quasi-Keplerian equation (6) to find the eccentric anomaly \( u_{\text{PN}} \). The last steps before obtaining the strain in eq. (8) are to integrate equation (12) to find the evolution of the orbital phase \( \phi(t) \), and to calculate the orbital separation \( r(t) \) from equation (11).

3. Theoretical Framework: the Strong-Field Region

3.1. Location, Location, Location

Let us now attempt to tackle the problem of the binary motion during the late inspiral, when the orbital velocity approaches the speed of light and the post-Newtonian formalism can no longer be applied. Going beyond this approximation brings us up against the strong gravitational field region, which can be described accurately only by Einstein equations of GR that connect the gravitational field with the geometry of spacetime through the curvature. In this theory time can no longer be considered invariant and this means that a complete solution of the gravitational system under consideration will have to include its whole past, present and future. This demand makes the problem particularly challenging to solve analytically, and solutions to Einstein’s equations can be found only in highly symmetric cases [96]. As expected then, for spacetimes as complex as those of binary systems, we must rewrite Einstein’s equations of GR in forms suitable for numerical integration and then resort to computer simulations of binary mergers to obtain accurate results (see [97] for a review). However, in order to bypass the complexity and the cost of numerical simulations, semi-analytical models were developed for the merger case as well, that fit high-order polynomials to the existent NR data. This analytical approach is correct, and is supported by the Weierstrass approximation theorem, a well known theorem in mathematics, which assures us that any continuous function on a bounded domain can be uniformly represented by polynomials to any degree of accuracy [98]. This is very useful, because
it allows us to employ approximate functions that are much simpler to work with, but contain the physical information we need to a high degree of accuracy.

The transition between the weak and strong field starts at the last stable orbit a particle would have when moving around the central black hole, called the *innermost stable circular orbit* (ISCO). This is well defined only for a small point-like body orbiting a much more massive one, and is increasingly less delimited as the masses of the two bodies become similar [99]. We will stay within the one-body problem model considered before, in which a particle of mass $\mu$ is orbiting the central black hole of mass $M$, only this time we will extend the size of the central body from a material point to a static Schwarzschild black hole of radius $r_{Sch}$ (the Schwarzschild radius). In this case, it is analytically proved that ISCO is located at $r_{ISCO} = 3r_{Sch} = 6M$ in geometrical units [100]. If the central black hole is spinning though, ISCO will move closer or further away from this position, depending on the direction of the particle’s orbit relative to the black hole’s spin. In this case, the analytical expression for the dimensionless radius of the last stable prograde orbit $\tilde{r}_{ISCO} = r_{ISCO}/M$ is given in [101, 102].

$$\tilde{r}_{ISCO} = 3 + Z_2 - \sqrt{(3 - Z_1)(3 + Z_1 + 2Z_2)},$$

(16)

where $Z_1 = 1 + (1 - \chi_f^2)^{1/3}[1 + (\chi_f)^{1/3} + (1 - \chi_f)^{1/3}]$ and $Z_2 = \sqrt{3\chi_f^2 + Z_1^2}$, with $\chi_f$ the spin of the final black hole.

Beyond ISCO we enter the *plunge* region, which ends at the *light ring* (LR) – the last stable photon orbit. The LR is located at $r_{LR} = 1.5r_{Sch} = 3M$, and changes as well if the black hole is spinning, depending on the orbit of the photon with respect to its spin. It’s location, calculated analytically in [101, 103] for a rotating black hole, plays an important role in the matching procedure, and is given by:

$$r_{LR} = 2M \left[ 1 + \cos \left( \frac{2}{3} \cos^{-1}(-\chi_f) \right) \right]$$

(17)

for the prograde orbit, where $\chi_f$ is the final spin. After the LR, the *coalescence* (or *merger*) begins, during which the two black holes come in contact and collide, forming a highly distorted common envelope, called *apparent horizon* (AH) [104, 105]. This is the third dimensional surface, locally defined as the place where the photons directed outward from the interior region cannot escape to the exterior. The AH coincides with the boundary of the black hole, namely the *event horizon* (EH), only for static black holes $r_{EH} = 2M$. This is because the EH is a four dimensional surface in GR, and it’s clear location can be calculated only at the end of time! In dynamical spacetimes the EH is approximated with the AH, which is used to mark the boundary of the distorted black hole formed by collision [106]. The general expression for the radius of the outer event horizon of a rotating (Kerr) black hole is:

$$r_{AH} = r_+ = M(1 + \sqrt{1 - \chi_f^2}).$$

(18)

After the merger, we must switch models from the one-body problem, to the *close limit approximation* (CLA) [107]. This is an analytical approach that uses perturbation theory to analyze how a highly perturbed Schwarzschild black hole *rings down* the
remaining energy in form of GW and becomes quiescent [108, 109]. The amplitude of the GW emitted increases between the ISCO and the LR, reaches the peak amplitude (or chirps) around the AH, and then diminishes in the ringdown phase, while the frequency increases monotonically.

We separated thus the strong field in three regions: plunge, merger and ring down, and defined three locations: \( r_{\text{ISCO}} \), \( r_{\text{LR}} \), and \( r_{\text{AH}} \). These locations enter in the analytical calculation of the GW emitted in the strong field region, and we will return to this tricky problem when we will devise a method to glue together the weak and strong field waveforms.

As a side note, it is worth mentioning that several authors [102, 56, 53] replace the location of the LR with the position of the minimal energy circular orbit (MECO). This is based on the observation that there is no constraining connection between the LR, which marks a peak in the effective radial potential, and the dynamics of the spacetime during the collision, that is governed by the curvature potential, as is argued in [110]. However, in the same paper it is pointed out that those two locations are very close to each other, and that the wavelength of the GW is large enough to be insensitive to such small variation in the position of the peak. We will consider in this work that the LR is an accurate approximation for the peak of the curvature potential.

3.2. Let’s give it a spin

We pointed out previously that the spin of the final black hole will influence the location of the transition region, and therefore will affect the orbital dynamics of the strong field regime. The spin interacts with the spacetime through relativistic frame-dragging, a well-known and tested gravitomagnetic GR effect, known also as the Lense-Thirring precession [111, 112]. Moreover, if each individual BH in the binary does spin, the interactions between them can make the orbital angular momentum precess and nutate, and this gets imprinted in the GW as well [113, 114, 115]. We should not be surprised to find out that, due to the conservation of the angular momentum, even when the two bodies do not spin, the final black hole acquires an appreciable spin. This spin is usually aligned with the orbital angular momentum at large separations [116]. In time, interactions such as spin-orbit and spin-spin resonances will tend to align the individual spins with each other and with the orbital angular momentum [117, 118, 119, 120, 95]. Thus, although the misalignment between the orbital angular momentum and the individual spins could lead to interesting effects such as orbital precession and recoil ([121, 122]), we will take into consideration in this work only the components of the individual spins parallel to the orbital momentum, leaving the problem of their orientation to a future study. This is not as restrictive as it seems, and it can be applied also to spins with arbitrary orientation, because the misalignment between the orbital angular momentum and the individual spins has small impact on the magnitude of the final black hole’s spin [123, 124]. This simplification introduces some loss of accuracy, that adds to our previous approximations, and is within the typical Advanced LIGO and
Virgo observations [125, 126, 127, 128], even for unusual mergers [129, 130, 131, 132]. We group the individual BHs spins into the effective spin defined as a mass-weighted combination of the individual dimensionless spins $\chi_i = S_i/m_i^2$, with $i = 1, 2$:

$$\chi_{\text{eff}} = \frac{m_1^2 \chi_1 + m_2^2 \chi_2}{m_1^2 + m_2^2}.$$  

(19)

The spin of the final black hole depends on the masses of the individual black holes and on the magnitude of their spins. This physical dependence is nonlinear and can only be determined from numerical simulation. The final spin $\chi_f$ is subsequently modeled analytically with the help of a fitting polynomial in the dimensionless quantities $\eta = \mu/M$ called symmetric mass ratio, and $\chi_{\text{eff}}$ to the numerical results. We will use the simple expression for the final spin given in [117], which is written as

$$\chi_f = \sum_{i,j=0}^{3} s_{ij} \eta^i \chi_{\text{eff}}^j,$$  

(20)

with the coefficients $s_{ij}$ determined by tuning the analytical expression to NR results and by calibrating them to the analytical results valid in the extreme mass-ratio regime. This formula gives the correct result $\chi_f = 0.68646$ for equal-mass non-spinning binaries, and can be applied to binaries with unequal masses and spins. Details of the various coefficients proposed in the expression given by (20) can be found in [55, 133, 134, 116, 118, 135]. A phenomenological formulation for the spin of the final black hole is proposed in [133, 136] and revised in [135]. Another empirical formula for the spin, mass and recoil of the final black hole in terms of mass ratios and individual spins is developed in [137, 119] based on an analytical fit to numerical simulations data using Taylor expansions, and is extended in [120, 121, 122]. Another analytical formulation, based on a hierarchical approach, is introduced in [138, 53]. They start from the dimensionless orbital angular momentum at ISCO, $\tilde{L}_{\text{ISCO}} = L_{\text{ISCO}}/M^2$ [101, 103] and find a workaround its implicit dependence on $\chi_f$ by rewriting it instead as a polynomial in $\eta$ and $\chi_{\text{eff}}$ with coefficients from the fit to numerical data, and recovering the final spin with the formula $\chi_f = \tilde{L}_{\text{ISCO}} + \chi_1 + \chi_2$.

3.3. Weight Matters

In GR mass is not an invariant concept, and in order to define it independent of coordinates we must either find a fix point, or take into account the mass of the whole Universe! Because neither of those alternatives are possible, to define mass we must rely on two plausible assumptions, namely that the Universe is finite, and that objects occupy certain regions in space. This allows us to introduce the notion of local mass for isolated objects, called the ADM mass [139], which measures the energy of the spacetime, it is independent of the choice of coordinates, and coincides with the mass at infinity, when the space becomes asymptotically flat. The problem is even more complicated for a binary system. First, some of their mass is used up in the gravitational binding energy that keeps the binary together, thus the ADM mass of the system is smaller than the sum of the individual black hole masses. Moreover, as expected, mass is lost as energy
when the system emits GW, causing the ADM mass to decrease even further during the evolution of the binary. As result, the final mass of the remnant black hole $M_f$ is smaller than the mass of the system at infinity. This final mass, called the Christodoulou mass [140], is proportional with the area of the remnant black hole and can only be deduced numerically, from the properties of the common apparent horizon [141, 142]. Here we are looking for analytic expressions, and we will take the other route, namely we will find estimates of the mass loss through gravitational radiation, which will then be subtracted from the ADM mass to give the mass of the final black hole. We start with mentioning some of the earlier papers that report analytic expressions for the loss of mass due to GW emission, such as [143, 99, 55, 133, 70, 136]. Intuitively, the strategy followed get the formula for the energy carried away by the GW is to look for a a second-order Taylor expansion in terms of the mass ratio and the spins of the two black holes

$$\tilde{E}_{GW} = \sum_{i=0}^{2} p_{ij} \eta^i (\chi_1 + \chi_2)^j,$$

(21)

where $\tilde{E}_{GW} = E_{GW}/M_{ADM}c^2$ and is dimensionless. The coefficients $p_{ij}$ are obtained again by fitting with the results from numerical simulations. For equal-mass binaries, this formula predicts that about 3% of the total ADM mass is released as GW energy, with the highest efficiency of about 10% when the individual spins are aligned. Another empirical relation, based also on a Taylor expansion in terms of mass ratios and spins, was introduced in [137], refined in [119, 120] to include binaries with different masses and spins, and recalibrated in [121, 122]. A different phenomenological model for the analytical fit to the radiated energy is built in [53], based on an hierarchical approach starting from the radiated energy of a test-particle that plunges into a rotating (or Kerr) black hole after passing ISCO, which is known analytically, as function the ISCO radius [101, 103].

$$\tilde{E}_{ISCO} = \eta \frac{\tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{3/2} - 2 \tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{1/2} + \chi_f}{\tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{3/4} \sqrt{\tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{3/2} - 3 \tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{1/2} + 2 \chi_f}}$$

(22)

This model creates a three-dimensional parameter space for the distribution of mass and spin, which is calibrated with both NR and PN results [35, 144], and is subsequently refined to include spin precession in [145, 40].

3.4. Good Vibrations

We should not be surprised to find out that for calculating the frequency of the GW emitted during the merger we must to know what are the last notes reverberating by the final black hole as it settles down after the collision. These are its resonance perturbations, similar to the rich strike tones of bells when they are hit. The frequencies of those perturbations become complex due to the emission of GW:

$$\omega = \omega_R + i \omega_I,$$

(23)

with the real part representing the actual frequency of the GW modes $\omega_R = \omega_{lmn}$, and the imaginary part encoding the damping time $\tau_{lmn} = 1/\omega_I$ [146]. This kind of
perturbation is called quasi-normal ringing, and is modeled as a linear superposition of exponentially damped quasinormal modes (QNM). When the final black hole has angular momentum, those natural modes are described by spin-weighted spheroidal harmonics $sS_{lmn}$, that reduce to spin-weighted spherical harmonics $sY_{lmn}$ for non-rotating (Schwarzschild) black holes. The strain of the GW is now written as:

$$h = \frac{M}{r} \sum_{lmn} A_{lmn} e^{i(\omega_{lmn} t + \phi)} e^{-t/\tau_{lmn}} - 2S_{lmn}$$

where $s = -2$ is the spin, $l$ is the principal and $|m| \leq l$ the azimuthal index of the multipolar order, while $n$ is the overtone of the mode. The $l = m$ modes are more energetic, and most of the GW’s energy ($\approx 95\%$) is carried away by the $l = m = 2$ mode, while the higher harmonics are much quieter. For comparison, the next energetic mode ($l = m = 4$) is $\approx 10^{-4}$ smaller than the dominant mode.

We will denote the frequency of the fundamental mode ($l = 2, m = 0, n = 0$) by $\Omega_{QNM}$ and drop the indices. The higher modes can be derived from this mode, with the simple expression $\omega_{lm} = m\Omega_{QNM}$, and $\tau_{lnm} = |m|\tau_{QNM}$. Intuitively, $\Omega_{QNM}$ is equal with the orbital frequency of photons trapped in the LR (or photon-sphere) around a Schwarzschild black hole, or with the orbital frequency of the prograde photon ring in the case of rotating black holes. Thus, the QNM ringing is interpreted as the frequency of the GW that is trapped in an unstable orbit at the light ring, and is slowly diffusing out in a time given by the damping time. Whatever initial data we provide inside the $r < 3M$ region (remember, the peak of the potential barrier is around 3M) the barrier will “filter” it, and an outside observer will detect only the QNM ringing.

The damping time is linked with the QNM frequency by the quality factor $Q_{QNM}$, a dimensionless quantity that measures the number of oscillations observed before the mode dissipates, or its energy gets attenuated by a factor of $e^{2\pi}$. The frequency and quality factor of the QNMs are completely determined by the mass and the spin of the final black hole, and can be calculated precisely, either with the perturbation theory, or by fitting simple analytical functions to numerical data. An important result in this regard was provided by where the QNM frequencies are calculated analytically using a variational formalism, applicable to slowly rotating black holes. Another expression for the frequency of QNMs, which is valid also for arbitrary spins, was computed by, using a different analytical approach. This formula is in very good agreement with the numerical data, but is restricted to only $m = 0$ and $l = |m|$ modes. A comprehensive analysis of the ring-down oscillation modes of black holes is given in. We choose a simple analytical fit for the pair $(\Omega_{QNM}, Q_{QNM})$ constructed in:

$$M f_{1} \Omega_{QNM} = f_{1} + f_{2}(1 - \chi f)^{l_{1}}, \quad Q_{QNM} = q_{1} + q_{2}(1 - \chi f)^{q_{1}}$$

where the numerical values for the coefficients $f_{1,2,3}$ and $q_{1,2,3}$ are obtained by calibration with results from numerical simulations.

Lastly, one other key element is the orbital angular frequency of the binary around ISCO, where the transition from the weak to the strong field regime is located, as
explained in Section 3.1. Knowing this frequency will provide us with a starting point for the merger, when we will attempt to smoothly attach the waveform generated during the late inspiral onto the merger and ring-down waveform. This frequency, as given in [101, 103], is:

\[ M_f \Omega_{ISCO} = \frac{1}{\tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{3/2} + \chi_f} \]  

(26)

The reader is reminded that although for equal mass ratio one can’t even define an ISCO, this frequency is useful because we work in the one-body approximation. The simplest case, when \( \chi_f = 0 \), gives \( M_f \Omega_{ISCO} = 1/\tilde{r}_{ISCO}^{3/2} \), which is the orbital frequency of a test particle orbiting a Schwarzschild black hole at the ISCO location.

Once the ring-down frequency and the quality factor are known, we can find the damping time of each QNM, using the definition [149]:

\[ Q_{lmn} = \frac{1}{2} \omega_{lmn} \tau_{lmn} = \frac{1}{2} m^2 \Omega_{QNM} \tau_{QNM}. \]  

(27)

3.5. BOB versus the IRS

After carefully building the stage by first grounding it in a specific location, then furnishing it with analytical expressions for the final spin, mass and frequency, we are ready to introduce the two main candidates: the Backward-one-Body (BoB) and the Implicitly-Rotating-Source (IRS) models. Let’s stage an open discussion between these two front-runners, aiming at determining which one will prevail, or if an agreement can be reached between them. We will recapitulate the conceptual basis of those models, while referring the reader to the original papers for details on the mathematics.

Both approaches rely on NR simulations, which is the only tool that will correctly model the highly nonlinear regime of the merger. The computer simulations evolve the gravitational field as prescribed by the GR equations, by encoding the curvature of the geometry in the Riemann tensor \( R_{abcd} \), with indices \( a, b, c, d = 1...4 \). This quantity is further separated into the Ricci tensor \( R_{ab} \) containing the curvature of the spacetime due to matter distribution, and the Weyl tensor \( C_{abcd} \) describing the curvature of the vacuum without matter and energy, but with non-zero gravitational field, when the spacetime is not flat. Thus, the Weyl tensor informs how the gravitational perturbation travels in empty space, and contains all the information needed to calculate the outgoing GWs in the asymptotic limit. To ensure that the GWs extracted are gauge-free and independent of coordinates, the Weyl tensor is projected onto a vector basis called complex null tetrad \((l, n, m, \bar{m})\) in the Newman-Penrose formalism [155]. Here \((l, n)\) are real light-like (null) inward and outward radial vectors, and \((m, \bar{m})\) is a complex vector mapping a 2-sphere. This projection yields the outgoing Weyl scalar \( \Psi_4 = C_{abcd} a^a \bar{m}^b n^c \bar{m}^d \), a key term in the numerical calculation of GW, which is related to the strain by the formula:

\[ \Psi_4 = \frac{\partial^2 h_{NR}}{\partial^2 t} \]  

(28)

Then, the numerical relativistic strain \( h_{NR} \) is obtained from the Weyl scalar \( \Psi_4 \) by simply integrating twice in time.
To build analytical models for the merger strain, we start from this Weyl scalar and assume that its physics is well described by a wave function $\Psi_4 = A_0 e^{-i\phi_{GW}}$ where $\phi_{GW} = \omega_{GW} t$ is the phase of the GW. The strain is obtained with a simple integration:

$$h = \frac{|\Psi_4|}{\omega_{GW}^2} e^{-i\phi_{GW}} = \frac{\Psi_4}{\omega_{GW}^2}$$

where $|\Psi_4|$ is the amplitude of the Weyl scalar $\Psi_4$. Now we are ready to expose the differences and similarities of the two contenders.

### 3.5.1. The IRS model

Introduced in [70], this model is grounded in the CLA and considers that the merger can be modeled as a single perturbed black hole that generates the GW implicitly through its rotation, wherefore the name of *Implicit Rotating Source*. The waveforms thus emitted are approximated with damped sinusoids orbiting the forming black hole at the LR, with frequency and amplitude determined by the mass and the spin of the final black hole resulting after the merger.

The model was generalized to include the ringdown waveform at the end of the merger (gIRS) and was used in a series of papers to build complete waveform for dynamical capture binaries [72], neutron star-black hole mergers [73], and eccentric binaries [74, 95, 156].

IRS employs a hyperbolic tangent function to analytically model the evolution of the frequency for the fundamental mode during the merger and ring-down, of the form:

$$\Omega(t) = \Omega_i + (\Omega_{QLM} - \Omega_i) \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \tanh[\ln \sqrt{k} + \frac{t - t_0}{\tau}] \right) \right)^k$$

In this formula $\Omega_i$ is the initial frequency that has to match with the inspiral frequency in the transition region near the LR, $\tau$ is the damping time of the QNM from eq. (27), $t_0$ is the time at which the strain of the wave reaches its peak amplitude, and $k$ is a parameter that controls the shape of the analytic fit, to stay close to the NR results. As the frequency approaches $\Omega_{QLM}$, it will asymptotically tend to the one prescribed by the black hole perturbation theory:

$$\Omega(t) = \Omega_{QLM} - (\Omega_{QLM} - \Omega_i) e^{-2(t-t_0)/\tau}$$

This expression is further rewritten in [71] as depending only on the frequency of the fundamental QNM of the final black hole:

$$\Omega(t) = \Omega_{QNM}(1 - f(t))$$

where the analytic function $f(t)$ takes the form:

$$f(t) = \frac{c}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k} \right)^{1+k} \left[ 1 - \left( 1 + \frac{1}{k} e^{-2(t-t_0)/\tau} \right)^{-k} \right]$$

The parameter $k$ is constrained by ensuring the continuity between the inspiral and the merger frequency at the matching region, and cannot be precisely determined, because it depends on the values of the empirical overlap region. This parameter is found through an heuristic fit to a large number of simulated waveforms. Using this method,
[71][72][95] provide numerical values for both the $k$ and $c = \dot{\Omega}_i \tau / 2\Omega_{QLM}$ coefficients. Once the frequency is known, the phase of the GW during the merger is given by:

$$\phi_{IRS} = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \Omega(t) dt.$$

(34)

With the evolution of the frequency in hand, we turn now to the amplitude of the wave. Given the well known proportionality between the energy flux of a wave and its squared amplitude, and knowing from the balance equation [4] that the flux radiated by the GW is equal to the energy lost by the source, we write amplitude of the waveform [70]:

$$A = \sqrt{16\pi \dot{E}}.$$

(35)

In the IRS model, the source generates GW by losing its rotational energy, which is proportional to the square of the orbital frequency, thus its time derivative will be:

$$\dot{E} = \xi \Omega \dot{\Omega},$$

(36)

where the parameter $\xi = \partial J / \partial \Omega$ measures the change in the angular momentum with the orbital frequency. The conservation of the angular momentum assures us that this parameter must be constant and can determined by imposing its continuity with the matching region, close to the light ring. It is shown in [71][74] that a good approximation of the amplitude for the fundamental mode is given by:

$$A(t) = \frac{A_0}{\Omega(t)} \left( \frac{|f(t)|}{1 + \alpha(f(t)^2 - f(t)^4)} \right)^{1/2},$$

(37)

where $A_0$ is an amplitude scale factor and $\alpha$ is a parameter chosen by tuning the model to numerical simulations [95].

Once the phase (34) and the amplitude (37) of the GW are determined, the strain is easily formed with the analytical expression:

$$h_{IRS} = A(t)e^{-i \phi_{IRS}}$$

(38)

The free numerical parameters required to construct this model are $\alpha$, $k$ and $c$, which are determined from fits with NR. As initial data we must know the initial frequency $\Omega_i$ and time $t_i$, which depend on the chosen matching region with the inspiral, around the LR.

3.5.2. The BOB Model  Introduced in [75], this model approaches the merger dynamics in a backward fashion, by starting at the CLA and building the GW back in time, to arrive at the LR, wherefore the name of Backward-one-Body. In this picture, the GW are emitted by the mass $\mu$ called here perturber who loses orbital energy as its orbit shrinks, until it falls onto the stationary massive body $M$. As the perturber inspirals emitting GW, this radiation reflects off the LR, providing thus the majority of signal. The ring-down starts once the perturber passes through the LR, and from that point on most of it’s radiated GWs fall onto the massive black hole, thus can no longer be observed. However, the GW perturbations emitted very close to the light-ring, just before its crossing, have higher frequencies, and are trapped there longer in closed null
orbits, as it was the case with the photons. This high-frequency radiation, reflected and trapped at the LR and then escaping at later time, is what we observe during and even after the merger, as the QNM of the ring-down GW.

The QNM of the ring-down GWs can be modeled analytically as exponentially decaying sinusoids that break free from the LR on null geodesics. By tracing those waves back in time to the point where the null geodesics meet again, we can find the behavior of the signal at earlier times. We sketch below the mathematical ansatz of the BoB which, following [152], starts with modeling the trajectory of the perturber around the LR with the equation:

\[ r = r_{LR}[1 + \epsilon f(t - t_0)], \]

where \( r_{LR} \) marks the position of the LR, \( \epsilon \) is a small scaling factor and \( t_0 \) is the time when the gravitational waves reach their peak amplitude. The shape of the perturbation function is chosen to be:

\[ f(t) = \sinh \left( \frac{t - t_0}{\tau} \right), \]

It has long been known from geometric optics that in the eikonal approximation the amplitude of the energy carried by the waves along the null rays satisfies the transport equation [157]:

\[ \frac{d}{dt}(drA) = 0 \]

Using eq.(39) we can see that \( dr \propto \cosh \left( \frac{t - t_p}{\tau} \right) \). With this expression, we integrate eq.(41) to obtain:

\[ A = A_0 \text{sech} \left( \frac{t - t_0}{\tau} \right) \]

where \( A_0 \) is again an integration constant that enters as a scaling factor. This is taken to be the amplitude of the Weyl scalar \( A = |\Psi_4| \). According to eq.(29), the amplitude of the waveform will be \( |h| = \Psi_4 \omega_{GW}^2 = A m^2 \Omega^2 \) where \( m \) is the order of higher QNM modes (here \( \Omega \) the frequency of the fundamental mode). Now, using eqs. (35) and (36) from the IRS model, we can write for the fundamental mode:

\[ \text{sech}^2 \left( \frac{t - t_0}{\tau} \right) = 16\pi \xi \Omega^3 \dot{\Omega}. \]

Noting that \( \xi \) stays constant during the merger timescale given by the damping or e-folding time \( \tau \), [75] introduces a constant \( \kappa \) to encapsulate this proportionality: \( \kappa = \tau/(4\pi \xi) \). Subsequently, eq.(43) is integrated to obtain the frequency:

\[ \Omega(t) = \left( \Omega_i^4 + \kappa \left[ \tanh \left( \frac{t - t_0}{\tau} \right) - \tanh \left( \frac{t_i - t_0}{\tau} \right) \right] \right)^{1/4} \]

This equation allows us to determine the parameter \( k \) by matching the final frequency with \( \Omega_{QNM} \), instead of fitting to the numerical data, as in the case of the IRS model.
Once the analytical form of the $\kappa$ constant is known, we replace it back into eq. (44) and calculate analytically the initial time $t_i$ corresponding to the matching frequency $\Omega_i$ between the end of the inspiral and the beginning of the merger:

$$t_i = t_0 - \frac{\tau}{2} \ln \left( \frac{\Omega_{QNM}^4 - \Omega_i^4}{27 \Omega_i^2 \Omega_{QNM}^2} \right).$$

(46)

The previously mentioned eq. (44) is essential, because by its analytical integration we obtain the phase of this model, which is the second key ingredient in constructing the strain. The result of this integration, as given in [75], has the compact form:

$$\Phi_{BoB} = \int_{t_i}^{t_f} \Omega dt = \arctan_{+} - \arctan_{-} + \text{arctanh}_{+} - \text{arctanh}_{-}.$$  

(47)

With the three key equations (42), (44) and (47) derived, we are able to build the strain. As a cautionary remark, because eq. (42) refers to the amplitude of the Weyl scalar $\Psi_4$ and not of the strain, we need to use eq. (29):

$$h_{BOB} = \frac{A(\Psi_4)}{\Omega^2} e^{-i \phi_{BOB}}$$

(48)

The obvious advantage of this model is that it does not depend on parameters obtained by directly fitting with numerical simulations data, so from this point of view is purely analytical. There are still ambiguities due to the choice of the matching region with the inspiral, and indirect dependence on NR data through the analytical formulas used to determine the mass, spin and QNM frequency of the final black hole.

4. Results: Building the Compete Waveform

4.1. It’s about time

Before we turn all this formalism into concrete waveforms, let us take a better look at the independent variable, that dictates the evolution of the whole system, namely the time coordinate, which is taken to coincide with the proper time of distant observers.

Let’s start with the expression given in [18] for the coalescence time until a binary in quasi-circular orbit reaches the merger, from a known initial separation or semi-major axis $a_0$, due to the emission of GW. In geometrical units, this formula is

$$T_c = \frac{5}{256} \frac{a_0^4}{m_1 m_2 (m_1 + m_2)} = \frac{5}{256} \frac{a_0^4 (1 + q)^2}{M^3 q}.$$  

(49)

where $q = m_1/m_2$ is the mass ratio of the binary. The addition of a small initial eccentricity $e_0$ is accounted for by replacing in eq. (49) $a_0$ with

$$a_0 = a_0 \frac{8.70127 (1 - e_0^2)}{(304 + 121 e_0^2)^{870/229}}.$$  

(50)

Recently, improved estimations of this time, that include also 1st order PN perturbations, were given in [158, 159]. The choice of the initial separation $a_0$ is limited by the low frequency cutoff of Earth’s seismic activity $f_{low}$, which dictates the threshold value for
the advanced LIGO GW detection band. For a cutoff frequency $f_{\text{low}} = 10$ Hz, we obtain, from Kepler’s third law,

$$a_0 = \left( \frac{M}{\pi^2 f_{\text{low}}^2} \right)^{1/3}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (51)

For an equal mass binary of total mass $M = 50M_\odot$, this amounts to a separation of about $1278M_\odot = 1888$ km, and gives a coalescence time $T_c = 8.22$ s of the GW signal in the aLIGO band. The coalescence time decreases for eccentric binaries, and if we assume for example that the binary enters the aLIGO band with $e_0 = 0.25$, it will take $T_c = 6.11$ s to collide, which will be enough time for the eccentricity to be detectable. The LISA band cutoff frequency however is much lower, $f_{\text{low,LISA}} = 10^{-4}$ Hz, which, for a $50M_\odot$ equal-mass binary gives a separation of $4 \times 10^6$ km, and consequently a collision time of about five millions years, thus systems with large eccentricities are expected to be regularly detected by space-borne instruments. Conversely, GW signals lasting only a few seconds in the LISA band will come from billions solar masses binaries!

The issue we must tackle next is to find an appropriate estimate for the time when the inspiral model breaks down and must be replaced with the merger model. The transition between the weak and strong regime happens around the last stable orbit (ISCO), located around $r_{\text{ISCO}} = 6M$. The problem with choosing this time as the start of the merger phase is that, as we explained previously in Sec.3.1, ISCO is not well defined for comparable mass binaries. Fortunately, we can still define an approximate ISCO even in this case, closer to the light-ring eq.(17), which in the non-spinning case ($\chi_f = 0$) is $r_{\text{LR}} = 4M$. Using eq.(49) for $a_0 = r_{\text{LR}} = 4M$, we get $t = 20M$, which corresponds to the initial time $t_i$ of the strong region. This, in the 0th PN approximation, corresponds to the orbital frequency $M\omega_{\text{LR}} = 0.125$, and represents a lower limit for the orbital frequency of the inspiral model predicted by the PN theory around $t_{\text{LR}}$. Another constraint, offered by eq.(46), provides a third independent check for the relationship between this time and the frequency at which the merger waveform joins smoothly with the inspiral. The reader is warned that some arbitrariness will be introduced, depending on the assumptions we will make, because there is no unique way of defining this transition time unambiguously.

Lastly, we will choose the time at which the amplitude of the fundamental mode has a maximum, as the origin of the time axis $t_0 = 0$.

4.2. Eccentric Slowness

Our procedure for the implementation of the inspiral waveform follows the outline given in Sec.2.3. First, we implement all the expressions for the coefficients that appear in the equations (11), (12), (13), (14) and (15). Those coefficients are currently known up to the 3.5th leading post-Newtonian order, with up to 6PN quasi-circular correction terms and hereditary corrections \cite{160,161,162,163}, and impressive efforts are continuously made to calculate new terms in the expansion \cite{164,165,166,167}. Following \cite{95}, we include up to 6PN self-force and hereditary correction terms, to increase the accuracy
in modeling the region near the merger. We use NDSolve \cite{168} within the Wolfram Mathematica symbolic computation program \cite{169} to solve the coupled equations of motion \cite{13} and \cite{14}, with the $\chi_{jPN}$ terms as in \cite{95} and the eccentricity coefficients $\epsilon_{ijPN}$ from \cite{93,170}. We start from the aLIGO cutoff frequency $f_{\text{low}}$, work with 20 precision digits and pick the time $T_s$ when the equations fail to yield a solution as the approximate collision time, then mark $t_{LR} = T_s - 20M$ as the end of the weak field.

Let’s look now at the predicted evolution of the eccentricity, for an equal mass binary of 50$M_\odot$ total mass and three values for the eccentricity: $e_0 = 0.5, 0.25, 0.1$ at $f_{\text{low}}$. We choose the highest eccentricity to be $e_0 = 0.5$ because is close to the average eccentricity for wide binaries \cite{171}. Fig.2 shows that collisions of highly eccentric binaries happen faster, thus we expect a higher number of GW detections to come from initially highly eccentric systems.

![Figure 2. Time evolution of the eccentricity, for an equal mass binary of 50$M_\odot$ (the time is measured in units of mass, $1M = 4.92674 \times 10^{-6} s$).](image)

Fig. 3 shows the effect of the mass ratio on the eccentricity evolution, starting from $e_0 = 0.25$ eccentricity, for a 50$M_\odot$ mass binary with three mass ratios $q = 4, 2, 1$. We see that small-mass ratio binaries take less time to merge than high-mass ratio ones, which has the expected consequence that more GW signals will come from those binaries.

As expected, the evolution of the eccentricity depends also on the method used. Fig. 4 shows that taking into account the hereditary terms, that add the fractional $n/2$ powers is important, because they cancel out terms that will depend on the chosen system of coordinates, thus ensuring the gauge-invariance of the equations \cite{172,95}.

In table 1 we give the values for the eccentricity, slowness, and orbital frequency at the LR for an equal-mass binary with total mass 50$M$, starting from three different
Figure 3. Time evolution of the eccentricity, for a mass binary of $50M_\odot$ and three mass ratios: $q = 1, 2, 4$.

Figure 4. Time evolution of the eccentricity, for a mass binary of $50M_\odot$, mass ratio $q = 2$ and eccentricity $e_0 = 0.25$, with three PN models.

eccentricities, as well as a comparison between the numerical value of the collision time obtained when the equations become stiff $T_s$ and the collision time $T_c$ predicted by
The slowness reaches a constant value at the LR \( x_{LR} \approx 0.178 \), while the eccentricity decreases dramatically, more than 15 times near LR, which proves that by the beginning of the strong field region the orbit of the system is circularized, even for large initial eccentricity, which can happen for capture binaries in dense clusters [173].

It is reassuring that the eccentricity becomes close enough to zero by the time we reach the strong-field region, because the merger models are built for quasi-circular binaries.

### Table 1

Comparison between the computed time to LR and the estimated collision time for three initial eccentricities at \( f_{low} \), \( x_{PN} \) and the angular frequency at the LR for a 50M⊙ binary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( e_0 )</th>
<th>( e_{LR} )</th>
<th>( x_{LR} )</th>
<th>( M\Omega_{LR} )</th>
<th>( T_{LR}(s) )</th>
<th>( T_c(s) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>5.952 × 10^{-3}</td>
<td>0.1782</td>
<td>7.525 × 10^{-2}</td>
<td>7.746</td>
<td>7.842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.671 × 10^{-2}</td>
<td>0.1782</td>
<td>7.526 × 10^{-2}</td>
<td>6.074</td>
<td>6.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.779 × 10^{-2}</td>
<td>0.1776</td>
<td>7.483 × 10^{-2}</td>
<td>2.010</td>
<td>2.251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. All kinds of anomalies

In a previous work [174] we implemented an analytical calculation of GWs from quasi-circular binaries up to the 3.5PN order, with 6PN corrections to the binding energy, first by solving only eq.(13), and then by relying on Kepler’s third law to obtain the phase: \( \dot{\phi}_{PN} = \omega_{PN} = M^{-1}x_{PN}^{3/2} \). The addition of the eccentricity greatly complicates things by introducing the angular anomalies and we must use Kepler’s equation instead.

The orbital angular velocity is now represented by the mean motion \( n \), which changes in the course of an orbital evolution due to the presence of the eccentricity, and is described by eq.(15). To find the evolution of the mean anomaly \( l \), we integrate this equation with the \( \lambda_{jPN} \) coefficients from [93]. With this anomaly in hand, we proceed to calculating the eccentric anomaly given in eq.(6), with the 3PN coefficients \( \alpha_j \) entering in the term \( A_i \) taken from [69] for the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner (ADM) coordinates. The evaluation of the Bessel functions is computationally expensive, and in order to speed up the calculation we devised a method detailed in [175]. In here, we increase the truncation of the sum in the Bessel functions to 10, tabulate \( u(t) \) with a time step \( \Delta t = 4M \), and apply a high order interpolating polynomial to keep the error around 10^{-20} precision.

With the hardest part of the implementation out of our way, the next two steps are to calculate the orbital separation \( r(t) \) given by eq.(11) and the derivative of the phase as in eq.(12), with the coefficients \( \rho_{jPN} \) and \( \phi_{jPN} \) from [93]. In order to keep the desired precision and speed up the calculation, before we evaluate the time derivative of the separation, we use the same procedure of fitting a high-order polynomial to \( r(t) \). Lastly, we solve for the phase \( \phi \) and build the strain with eq.(8). We use the following formulas for the polarizations of the strain for optimal orientation of the observer [174]:

\[
h_{+,x} = \frac{2M\eta}{R} \left[ \left( -\dot{r} + r^2\dot{\phi}^2 + \frac{M}{r} \right) \pm 2r\dot{r}\dot{\phi}\sin 2\phi \right]
\] (52)
Those expressions can be extended to take into account the orientation of the binary with respect to detector by performing three consecutive rotations from the frame of the orbit \( \{x, y, z\} \) onto the frame of the observer \( \{X, Y, Z\} = P \{x, y, z\} \), where \( P \) is the rotation matrix written function of the three Euler angles, namely the longitude of the ascending node \( \psi \), the inclination \( \iota \) and the argument of the pericenter \( \nu \), as described in [81]. In this case, the true anomaly must be corrected to: \( \phi \rightarrow \Phi = \phi - \nu \).

We accomplished this implementation hierarchically, building first the 2PN corrections, then adding the 3PN terms, and lastly the hereditary term \( \dot{x}_{HT} \), while testing our results against the zero eccentricity limit for the first gravitational wave detection (see [175]). Using higher order and hereditary corrections is desired because, besides the added accuracy, the validity of the inspiral model extends closer to the merger, increasing the overlap region with the merger models.

We show in figures 5 and 6 the amplitude and the argument of the strain for optimal orientation of the observer. It is clear again from fig.5 that the eccentricity plays a vital role in determining the strength and duration of the signal, because highly eccentric system are more energetic but much shorter. In fig.6 we plot the argument of the strain, which in absolute value is equal to twice the orbital phase \( \phi \). We see that both the amplitude and the argument (phase) exhibit oscillations that diminish with the decrease of the eccentricity, and are absent in the quasi-circular region near the merger.

![Figure 5. Time evolution for the amplitude of the strain, with the time is measured in units of mass.](image)
Figure 6. Time evolution of the unwrapped argument of the strain, with time measured in units of mass.

4.4. Cart before the horse

The reader is warned that we will temporarily abandon the logical sequence of events because, before we proceed to model the merger part of the GW strain, we must know first the mass, spin and ring-down frequency of the final black hole.

Observations of black holes show that they are spinning very fast, between 0.3\(c\) and 0.95\(c\), with most of their spin in the \((0.5 - 0.8)c\) range [176]. For the building of the inspiral strain we have not taken this spin into account because we treated the black holes as particles. Once the separation becomes comparable to the LR radius, we cannot ignore it any longer.

We start by calculating the remnant black hole spin and give the equations used in [Appendix A]. We use first eq. (20) with parameters for \(s_{ij}\) from [133, 134], as detailed in (A.1). We also implement an alternate form of the final spin given in [120, 122] and presented in (A.3). Moreover, as a third check, we work through the hierarchical approach presented in [138, 53] as well, and give in eq. (A.7) the formula used. We do not take into account spin orientation or precession, implicitly assuming only the component of the spins along the angular momentum. To test our implementation we choose as a first example a binary system in which the individual black holes have the same dimensionless spin \(\chi_1 = \chi_2 = 0.5\), which is on the lower-end of stellar-mass black holes spins [177]. From eq. (19) the effective spin will be \(\chi_{eff} = 0.5\), and using the three methods mentioned above we obtain \(\chi_f = 0.831419\) with \(10^{-4}\) deviation order for equal-mass binaries with a total mass normalized to 1\(M\). Even when the individual spins are
not equal, but $\chi_1 + \chi_2 = 1$, this value is unchanged. Increasing the mass-ratio while keeping the spins equal will lower the final spin, while increasing the spin of the heavier black hole will increase the final spin as well. If the spins are equal and antiparallel, or the black holes don’t spin, then the final spin is $\chi_0 = 0.686$. In this case eq.(17) shows that the location of the LR will move to about $r_{LR,\chi_0} = 2.04M$, and the position of the apparent horizon, given by eq.(18), will be around $r_{AH,\chi_0} = 1.73M$.

With the final spin known, we proceed next to calculate the mass loss to GW energy, which subtracted from the total mass gives the mass of the final black hole, an essential quantity for the merger models, as explained in Sec.3.3. A simple estimate for the final mass is given by the formula:

$$M_f = \sqrt{M_{irr}^2 + \frac{\chi_f^2}{4M_{irr}^2}},$$

where $M_{irr} = \frac{\sqrt{A_{AH}}}{16\pi} = \frac{r_{AH}}{2}$.

To improve upon this estimate for the mass, we implement next five more formulas, based on polynomial fits, as in eq.(21), and for convenience we also give the equations used, together with the coefficients, in Appendix B. The first three formulas are the AEI and RIT fits given in [136] for equal-mass spin-aligned black holes, and we transcribe them in eq.(B.1) with coefficients in (B.2), eq.(B.3) with coefficients in (B.4) and eq.(B.5) with coefficients in (B.6). The next two formulas are extended to include unequal masses, and we give them in eq.(B.7) with the two sets of coefficients (B.8) from [120], and (B.9) from [122] and in (B.10) with coefficients in (B.11) as outlined in [53].

We test all these formulas starting with the simplest case of an equal-mass non-spinning system and obtain again a mean deviation of about $10^{-4}$ between the models. For unequal masses we can use only eqs.(B.7) and (B.10). The analytical dependence on the final mass of the spins and mass ratio of the individual black holes in the binary show that the final mass increases with mass ratio and decreases with the increase of the individual spins. Thus, highly spinning equal mass binaries will release more energy into GW, making those events easier to be detected than collisions of unequal-mass, slowly spinning back holes.

The last essential ingredients we must added to the initial data of the merger models is the knowledge of fundamental QNM frequency $\Omega_{QNM}$ of the remnant black hole and the quality factor $Q_{QNM}$, which is necessary to calculate the damping or $e$-folding time in which the amplitude of the GW will decay. For calculating the resonant frequency we use eq.(25) with the set of coefficients for the dominant mode given in eq.(C.1), and for consistency, we compare the results against the values calculated with the coefficients (C.2) as given in [60], for different $\chi_f$. The damping time of the fundamental mode is given by eq.(27). We calculate the mean values of the final mass $M_f$, spin $\chi_f$, dominant $(l = m = 2)$ mode of the resonant frequency $\omega_{QNM}$, corresponding quality factor $Q_{QNM}$ and damping time $\tau$ for three non-spinning binary systems with mass rations $q = 1, 2, 4$ and give the values in table 2. We add to this table the PN values for $\Omega_i$ and its time derivative $\dot{\Omega}_i$, calculated in the inspiral model at the light ring.
### Table 2. Initial data required for comparing the merger models BoB and IRS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$q$</th>
<th>$\chi_f$</th>
<th>$M_f$</th>
<th>$\omega_{QNM}$</th>
<th>$Q_{QNM}$</th>
<th>$\tau_i$</th>
<th>$\Omega_i$</th>
<th>$\dot{\Omega}_i$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6865</td>
<td>0.9516</td>
<td>0.5698</td>
<td>3.301</td>
<td>11.586</td>
<td>$7.529 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$8.577 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6231</td>
<td>0.9612</td>
<td>0.5385</td>
<td>3.056</td>
<td>11.349</td>
<td>$7.414 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$7.399 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4637</td>
<td>0.9779</td>
<td>0.4782</td>
<td>2.642</td>
<td>11.049</td>
<td>$7.169 \times 10^{-2}$</td>
<td>$5.046 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.5. Playing in Tune

With the initial data in hand, we are ready to compare against each other the two analytical approximations for calculating the waveform emitted during the merger: BoB and IRS. The implementation of the IRS model does not require the knowledge of the frequency at the light ring, relying instead on direct fits to NR simulations to estimate the coefficients for each case in part. We take those coefficients from [95], which gives only the fits for non-spinning binaries, limiting thus our comparison to modeling mergers for non-spinning binaries. The BoB model (as emphasized in [75]) does not depend directly on any other numerically fitted coefficients except of the initial data.

Let’s proceed by calculating first the angular frequency of the dominant mode. For the IRS model this is given by eq.(32) with the function $f(t)$ from eq.(33) and numerical values for the constants $(c,k)$ as in eq.(C.3). For the BoB model we start by calculating the angular frequency of the fundamental mode using eq.(44), with $\kappa$ given by eq.(45) and $t_i$ from eq.(46), then we obtain the dominant mode by multiplying it with $m = 2$. We compare those frequencies by translating them to overlap at the peak of their increase in rate. This time coincides with the peak in amplitude for IRS, while for BoB it occurs earlier, at a time $t_f$, which is the expected behavior [70]. This results into a remarkably good overlap in frequency for both models near, during and after the merger time, with an expected discrepancy around the light ring. As mentioned before, the IRS model hard-codes this frequency to match numerical data and seems to overestimate its value. We also implement eqs.(30) and (31) for comparison, but they give a less accurate fit with the angular frequency of the BoB model.

Once the frequency is known, we calculate the amplitude, given for the IRS model by eq.(37) with the numerical constant $\alpha$ as in eq.(C.4), and for the BoB model by eq.(42). For comparison, we fit the amplitudes at their maximum values, which for IRS coincides with $t_0 = 0$, while for the BOB model, it occurs before that, at a time $t_A$. The plot shown in fig.7 reveals a larger discrepancy, which is again expected, considering the different formulas the models use for the evaluation of those amplitudes.

We proceed next to calculate the phase, which for BoB is given by eq.(47) and for IRS by eq.(34). We identify a phase difference between the two models at the peak in frequency variation, and after correcting the IRS model for it, we translate $\phi_{BoB}$ with this time $t_f$, obtaining an excellent fit, shown in fig.8.

Lastly we calculate the strain, given for the IRS model by eq.(38) and by (48)
Figure 7. Comparison of the normalized amplitudes matched at the peak, for an equal-mass non-spinning BBH. The BoB amplitude was translated with $t_A$.

Figure 8. Phase comparison, with $\phi_{IRS}$ corrected with the phase difference at $t_0$ and $\phi_{BoB}$ translated with $t_f$ for an equal-mass non-spinning BBH.

for the BoB model. Due to the phase difference we uncovered, simply matching the two strains at the amplitude peak does not give the best overlap, even if we account
for the phase difference in eq. (38) when computing the strain of the IRS model. This discrepancy is due to the differences in amplitude, and instead of making an effort to match the peaks of the strains, our recourse is to employ the excellent match we found in frequency around the merger. Indeed, we obtain a very good fit, both in period and amplitude, by simply translating the BoB model by the time of the peak in the frequency rate $t_f$ and correcting the IRS model with the phase difference.

Let’s examine now in more depth the consonance between the two models by comparing their strains, as described previously, for three mass ratios $q = 1, 2, 4$. We plot in fig. 9 the average between the two models and the standard deviation or the confidence interval for three mass ratios $q = 1, 2, 4$. We see that, although around the light-ring the two models start a little bit out of sync due to the different values of their initial frequencies, they quickly get in sync with each other and continue in harmonious agreement around the peak and at ring-down, for all three mass ratios.

![Figure 9. Comparison between the BoB and phase corrected IRS for three mass ratios. The BoB strain was translated with $t_f$.](image)

Up to this point we have assumed that the BHs entering the merger do not spin, or their effective spin is zero, and indeed this is a good approximation for more than half of the binaries detected in the LIGO and Virgo O1–O3 observing runs [4, 6].

In order to take into consideration their individual spins, we will have to resort to numerical GW templates, which, because they include all the nonlinear physics, are guaranteed to correctly model the merger. A large open-source database of numerical GW templates is provided by the Simulating eXtreme Spacetimes project (SXS). Details on the generation and content of this database, as well as its accessibility is provided
in [77, 76]. From this catalog we choose the SXS:BBH:0746 simulation of an equal mass binary with large individual spins, for a direct comparison with the BoB model, to confirm its accuracy at high spins as well. Although [75] brings clear proof of excellent correlation of the model with NR data, our analysis will provide an independent endorsement for the BoB model.

As initial data for the BoB model we use $\chi_f \approx 0.881$, and $M_f = 0.9187$, calculated by SXS:BBH:074, while we generate the QNM frequency and quality factor analytically, as explained in sec.4.4. The only quantity left to determine is $\Omega_i$ which cannot be provided by the inspiral model, because it does not account for the spins of the individual black holes, which will change the orbital frequency. Instead, we determine this initial frequency by starting with the known analytic expression for the angular orbital momentum of a Newtonian binary in close orbit at ISCO, $L_{\text{isco}} = \mu \sqrt{M r_0}$ where \( r_0 = (M \Omega_0)^{-2/3} \), and we calculate the three-dimensional $L_{\text{isco}}$ at the light ring as in [53]. We also implement the fit for the initial frequency $\Omega_{\text{isco}}$ used in [75], which we give in eq.(C.5). For $\dot{\Omega}_i$ we use the same value provided previously for the equal-mass binary. Although we recognize this ambiguity introduced by the choice of the initial frequency, we find that it has only a small effect on the shape of the signal close to and after the merger, which proves the robustness of the BoB model, as pointed in [75].

We proceed next to compare the frequencies matched at the time of the steepest increase. The BoB frequency calculated with $\Omega_i = \Omega_0$ gives a very good overlap with the frequency of the numerical SXS template, with a mean deviation of about $10^{-3}$ throughout the whole domain of comparison $t \in (-50, 50)M$. If we use the numerical fit to the initial frequency $\Omega_i = \Omega_{\text{isco}}$, we obtain in the beginning a weaker overlap with the frequency of the numerical SXS template, but this improves quickly towards the merger and stays around $10^{-3}$ all the way to the ringdown. The amplitudes are first normalized and aligned at the peak for comparison, as is shown in fig.10. The BoB amplitude calculated using the second frequency choice exhibits a remarkable overlap with the SXS amplitude from the peak onwards, while the BoB amplitude that uses the frequency estimated from the angular momentum has an overall weaker concordance with the shape of the SXS amplitude. In both cases, the amplitude of the BoB model reveals a large discrepancy before the peak.

We compare next the analytic phase predicted by the BoB model for the two initial frequencies and the phase of the SXS model, matched at the peak of increase in frequency. We display in fig.11 the BoB phase calculated with $\Omega_0$, which gives a remarkable overall fit, as expected. Nevertheless, even the difference in phase introduced by the second choice in frequency diminishes rapidly, such that during and after the merger it aligns well with the SXS phase.

Finally, we build the BoB strain and juxtapose it with the SXS template, matched at the highest peak in the strain amplitude and corrected with $\pi/2$ difference of phase. This phase difference between the numerical and analytical strain does not uncover a mismatch, because it is most likely due to a difference in the sign convention between the numerical and analytical calculations. We see in fig.12 that before the merger, as
Figure 10. Comparison of the normalized BoB and SXS amplitudes matched at the peak, for an equal-mass binary merger with final spin $\chi_f = 0.88$.

Figure 11. The BoB phase for two initial frequencies compared with the SXS phase, aligned at the peak of the increase in frequency, for an equal-mass BBH with $\chi_f = 0.88$.

expected, the error seems to be large, but after the merger both the amplitude and the period of the two BoB strains are in concordance with the SXS data.
4.6. Fasten It Tight

We proved without doubt that the BoB model is a very strong contender to both the IRS and the NR for the generation of GW merger templates, while straightforward to implement and use. It is due season now to reap its benefits of BoB by attaching it to the GW template for the inspiral and construct a complete GW template that encompasses the whole evolution of the BBH collision, from the time it enters the detection band till the quiescence of the final BH.

Here we will use an equal-mass binary of normalized mass $m_1 + m_2 = 1M_\odot$ and start the inspiral at a separation $r = 10M$, but those assumptions can be easily modified to fit any separation and total mass of the BBH system. For the initial eccentricity we will consider two values, $e_{i,1} = 10^{-3}$ corresponding to the quasi-circular case, and an eccentric close orbit of $e_{i,2} = 0.15$. This initial data is enough to run the PN portion of the binary evolution. The quasi-circular case evolves up to $T_{s,1} = 530M$, its eccentricity drops to $e_{f,1} = 1.7 \times 10^{-4}$ and its orbital frequency yields $\Omega_{f,1} = 0.13407$. We take the initial frequency for the BoB model at $t_{LR,1} = T_{s,1} - 20M$ corresponding to the location of the LR, which yields $\Omega_{i,1} = 7.4085 \times 10^{-2}$. The large eccentricity case has a shorter span up to $T_{s,2} = 460M$, its eccentricity drops to $e_{f,2} = 1.988 \times 10^{-2}$ and its orbital frequency raises to $\Omega_{f,2} = 0.19466$. Even for this case, the initial frequency for the BoB model at $t_{LR,2} = T_{f,2} - 20M$ is $\Omega_{i,2} = 7.5837 \times 10^{-2}$, which is close to the values found in table 1. Note that the orbital frequency at the LR stays $\approx 0.075$ with a mean deviation of $\approx 10^{-4}$, marking the transition from the weak (far field) to the strong (near
field) zone where the reduced wavelength of the gravitational wave $\lambda_{GW} = \Omega^{-1}$ becomes comparable to the binary separation $r$.

Save for the slight difference in the initial frequency, we start the BoB model with the same values for the ringdown frequency and quality factor. We perform the stitching in frequencies at the initial time of the BoB model calculated in eq.(46) $t_i$ by employing the piecewise function:

$$\sigma(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & t \leq t_i \\ 1 & t > t_i \end{cases}$$

(54)

to create the hybrid frequency with the formula:

$$\omega_{hyb} = (1 - \sigma(t))\omega_{PN}(t - t_i) + \sigma(t)\omega_{BoB}(t).$$

(55)

We obtain an excellent overlap at and around $t_i$, as shown in fig.13, without introducing any other time shift. Even the high-eccentricity case, as shown in fig.14, exhibits this excellent behavior at the chosen matching time. It seems that we drastically reduced the ambiguity in time for the matching in frequency, which is a remarkable result.

---

**Figure 13.** Hybrid frequency, by matching the PN at $t_{LR,1}$ with BoB at $t_i$, for an equal-mass binary merger with initial eccentricity $e_i = 10^{-3}$ at $r = 10M$.  

Before stitching together the strain, we normalize the BoB amplitude and rescale the amplitude of the inspiral with this rescaled amplitude divided by the PN amplitude at the light ring $t_{LR}$.

We form the hybrid strain with the same technique, this time translating also the BoB strain with the peak time of increase in frequency $t_f$, and correcting it for sign, which indicates a phase difference of $\pi/2$. We note again that this does not introduce a
Figure 14. Hybrid frequency, by matching the PN at $t_{LR,2}$ with BoB at $t_i$, for an equal-mass binary merger with initial eccentricity $e_i = 0.15$ at $r = 10M$.

shift ambiguity because, as we mentioned before, the two models might not to use the same sign convention. The formula for the normalized hybrid strain is:

$$\bar{h}_{hyb} = (1 - \sigma(t))\bar{h}_{PN}(t - t_i) - \sigma(t)\bar{h}_{BoB}(t + t_p).$$

For the low-eccentricity case this provides again an excellent overlap at and around $t_i$, as seen in fig.15. When matching the high-eccentricity inspiral with the BoB merger strain we encounter a slight mismatch, both in amplitude and time of the matching. This is most likely due to the fact that the orbit is not fully circularized by the time the binary enters the strong-field zone, abd the BoB model does not take into account the eccentricity. We account for these residual effects or the eccentricity by matching the two strains at the closest peak in their amplitude near $t_i$ and rescaling slightly the inspiral strain to match the amplitude of the BoB at that time, as shown in fig.16. This indeed introduces an expected ambiguity in the matching interval for high-eccentricities, which can be mitigated in further studies.
Figure 15. Hybrid strain, by matching the PN at $t_{LR,1}$ with BoB at $t_i$, translated with $t_p$, for an equal-mass binary merger with initial eccentricity $e_i = 10^{-3}$ at $r = 10M$.

Figure 16. Hybrid strain, by matching the PN at $t_{LR,2}$ with BoB at $t_i$, translated with $t_p/3$, for an equal-mass binary merger with initial eccentricity $e_i = 0.15$ at $r = 10M$. 
5. Conclusion

In this work we collate and assemble into a coherent way all the building blocks required to ensure the accurate implementation of analytical GW templates from eccentric binary black hole mergers. We start with an exposition of the essential theoretical framework, paying particular attention to introduce the specific terminology and to give clear explanations to prevent confusion for readers from a different scientific background. We carefully choose, from the rich scientific literature, a fully analytical procedure to build an inspiral GW that contains high-order post-Newtonian corrections for enhanced accuracy. For the eccentricity and slowness we employ up to 3.5 \( P N \) order instantaneous and hereditary coefficients with energy corrections up to 6 \( P N \). We use up to 3 \( P N \) order for the solution of Kepler’s equation that gives the eccentric anomaly, for the orbital separation and for the phase, and keep the errors below machine precision with a high order interpolating polynomial when necessary to speed up the calculation. We assemble the strain and display its dependence on eccentricity and mass ratio, indicating that we expect a higher number of GW detections from eccentric comparable mass ratios binaries, which emphasizes the relevance of modeling such systems. Preliminary to building the merger waveform, we make a compendium of the analytical methods available in the field for estimating the spin, mass, ringdown frequency and damping time of the final black hole, and use their mean values as initial data for the merger models. We implement and compare the IRS and BoB models for the merger in the quasi-circular assumption, finding an expected discrepancy in amplitude and obtaining an excellent match in frequency around merger. We unveil a phase difference in the IRS waveform, which we account for to achieve a very good agreement for their prediction of the strain for three mass ratios. We briefly ascertain the performance of the BoB model for high spins against the numerical data, mitigating for the uncertainty in choosing the initial frequency. At last, we bring together the eccentric inspiral and the quasi-circular merger waveforms by completing them in frequency, amplitude and phase and we build the hybrid GW strain for the whole evolution of the binary. For low eccentricity, the match between the BoB and PN approximations are on-point, with coincidence in the overlap, which indicates no ambiguity in the time interval, while for high-eccentricity we must make a slight adjustment to compensate for the implicit quasi-circular assumption built into the BoB approach.

The applicability of our calculations stems from their thorough and streamlined implementation, which offers researchers in the field of gravitational waves a tool straightforward to understand, reproduce, use and extend. For example, future developments might incorporate higher PN orders or include the spin, precession, kick and tides in the inspiral part of the model, or augment the BoB model to improve the amplitude and include eccentricity close to the merger. We are happy to share our Mathematica notebooks with the reader interested in pursuing similar investigations.
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Appendix A. Formulas and Coefficients for the Final Spin

The first formula used for the spin is from [133].

\[
\chi_{f,1} = s_{00} + \eta s_{01} + \eta^2 s_{02} + \eta^3 s_{03} + s_{10} \chi_{\text{eff}} \\
+ \eta s_{11} \chi_{\text{eff}} + \eta^2 s_{12} \chi_{\text{eff}} + s_{20} \chi_{\text{eff}}^2 + \eta s_{21} \chi_{\text{eff}}^2 + s_{30} \chi_{\text{eff}}^3
\]  

(A.1)

The coefficients entering in the equation (A.1) are given below, in eq(A.2):

\[
\begin{align*}
s_{00} &= s_{20} = s_{30} = 0, \ s_{10} = 1, \ s_{01} = 2\sqrt{3}, \ s_{21} = -0.1229, \\
s_{12} &= 0.4537, \ s_{11} = -2.8904, \ s_{02} = -3.5171, \ s_{03} = 2.5763.
\end{align*}
\]  

(A.2)

The second, alternative formula used in calculating the spin are from [120] [122]

\[
\chi_{f,2} = 16\mu^2 (\delta_\chi^4 L_{4c} + \delta_\mu^3 \delta_m L_{4b} + \delta_\mu^2 L_{2c} + \delta_\mu^2 L_{3a} + \delta_\chi^3 L_{4b} + \delta_\mu^3 L_{2d} + \delta_\mu^3 L_{4a} + \delta_\mu^3 L_{2c} + \delta_\chi^3 L_{4g} + L_0 + L_1 \sigma + L_2 \sigma + \delta_\chi^3 L_{2d} + L_3 \sigma + \delta_\mu^3 L_{4e} + \delta_\chi^3 L_{4f} + \delta_\chi^3 L_{4d} + \delta_\mu^3 L_{2c} + \delta_\chi^3 L_{4f}) + \delta_\mu^3 (8\mu + 1) \sigma.
\]  

(A.3)

Here,

\[
\delta_m = \frac{m_1 - m_2}{m}, \ \delta_\chi = \frac{\chi_2 - \chi_1 q}{1 + q}, \ \sigma_\chi = \frac{\chi_2 + \chi_1 q^2}{(1 + q)^2}.
\]  

(A.4)

The two fits for the coefficients entering in the equation (A.3) are given in eq.(A.5) [120] and eq.(A.6) [122] below:

\[
\begin{align*}
L_0 &= 0.686710, \ L_1 = 0.613247, \ L_2a = -0.145427, \ L_{2b} = -0.115689, \\
L_{2c} &= -0.005254, \ L_{2d} = 0.801838, \ L_{3a} = -0.073839, \ L_{3b} = 0.004759, \\
L_{3c} &= -0.078377, \ L_{3d} = 1.585809, \ L_{4a} = -0.003050, \ L_{4b} = -0.002968, \\
L_{4c} &= 0.004364, \ L_{4d} = -0.047204, \ L_{4e} = -0.053099, \ L_{4f} = 0.953458, \\
L_{4g} &= -0.067998, \ L_{4b} = 0.001629, \ L_{4i} = -0.066693.
\end{align*}
\]  

(A.5)

\[
\begin{align*}
L_0 &= 0.686732, \ L_1 = 0.613285, \ L_2a = -0.148530, \ L_{2b} = -0.113826, \\
L_{2c} &= -0.003240, \ L_{2d} = 0.798011, \ L_{3a} = -0.068782, \ L_{3b} = 0.001291, \\
L_{3c} &= -0.078014, \ L_{3d} = 1.557286, \ L_{4a} = -0.005710, \ L_{4b} = 0.005920, \\
L_{4c} &= -0.001706, \ L_{4d} = -0.058882, \ L_{4e} = -0.010187, \ L_{4f} = 0.964445, \\
L_{4g} &= -0.110885, \ L_{4b} = 0.006821, \ L_{4i} = -0.081648.
\end{align*}
\]  

(A.6)

The third formula for the spin is taken from [53]

\[
\chi_{f,3} = \frac{\eta(a_{10} + \eta(a_{2a}a_{20} + a_{3a}a_{30}))}{a_{5a}a_{50} + 1} \\
+ \left( \eta \chi_{\text{eff}} (b_1 b_{10}(-4\eta^2(4f_{11} + f_{12} - 16) + f_{11} + f_{12} \eta)) \\
+ b_2 b_{20} \chi_{\text{eff}} (-4\eta^2(4f_{21} + f_{22} - 16) + f_{21} + f_{22} \eta)) \\
+ b_3 b_{30} \chi_{\text{eff}}^2 (-4\eta^2(4f_{31} + f_{32} - 16) + f_{31} + f_{32} \eta)) \right) \\
\left/ \left( b_5 b_{50} \chi_{\text{eff}} (-4\eta^3(16f_{50} + 4f_{51} + f_{52} - 16) + f_{50} + f_{51} \eta + f_{52} \eta^2) + 1 \right) \right.
\]
\[ + \Delta d_{10} \eta^2 \chi_{diff} (d_{11} \eta + 1) + d_{20} \eta^3 \chi_{diff}^2 \]
\[ + \Delta d_{30} \eta^3 \chi_{diff} \chi_{eff} (d_{31} \eta + 1) + \chi_{tot}. \]  
(A.7)

Again, there are two fits to numerical data results for the coefficients, presented below:
\[ a_{10} = 2 \sqrt{3}, \ a_{20} = 5.28, \ a_{30} = 1.27, \ a_{50} = 2.89, \]
\[ b_{10} = -0.194, \ b_{20} = 0.075, \ b_{30} = 0.00782, \ b_{50} = -0.527, \]
\[ a_2 = 3.7724, \ a_3 = -9.6278, \ a_5 = 2.4874, \]
\[ b_1 = 1.0005, \ b_2 = 0.88234, \ b_3 = 0.76128, \ b_5 = 0.91392, \]
\[ d_{10} = 0.27628, \ d_{11} = 11.562, \ d_{20} = -0.059758, \ d_{30} = 2.7297, \ d_{31} = -3.3883, \]
\[ f_{11} = 4.4110, \ f_{12} = 0.36422, \ f_{21} = 8.8879, \ f_{22} = -40.354, \]
\[ f_{31} = 23.927, \ f_{32} = -178.78, \ f_{50} = 1.8982, \ f_{51} = -5.5570, \ f_{52} = 0 \]  
(A.8)

\[ a_{10} = 2 \sqrt{3}, \ a_{20} = 5.24, \ a_{30} = 1.3, \ a_{50} = 2.88, \]
\[ b_{10} = -0.194, \ b_{20} = 0.0851, \ b_{30} = 0.00954, \ b_{50} = -0.579, \]
\[ a_2 = 3.8326, \ a_3 = -9.4874, \ a_5 = 2.5135, \]
\[ b_1 = 1.00096, \ b_2 = 0.78775, \ b_3 = 0.65401, \ b_5 = 0.83967, \]
\[ d_{10} = 0.32237, \ d_{11} = 9.3326, \ d_{20} = -0.059808, \ d_{30} = 2.31704, \ d_{31} = -3.2625, \]
\[ f_{11} = 4.4092, \ f_{12} = 0.51183, \ f_{21} = 8.7737, \ f_{22} = -32.061, \]
\[ f_{31} = 22.830, \ f_{32} = -153.84, \ f_{50} = 1.88047, \ f_{51} = -4.7702, \ f_{52} = 0 \]  
(A.9)

Appendix B. Formulas and Coefficients for the Final Mass

From [136], we pick two formulas for estimating the radiated energy at the collision of an equal-mass spin-aligned binary black holes system, namely eq. (B.1) with coefficients given in eq. (B.2), and eq. (B.3) with coefficients given in eq. (B.4).
\[ M_f^{eq} = M - E_{GW} = M - p_0 - p_1 (\chi_1 + \chi_2) - p_2 (\chi_1 + \chi_2)^2 \]  
(B.1)

where
\[ p_0 = \frac{4.826}{100}, \ p_1 = \frac{1.559}{100}, \ p_2 = \frac{0.485}{100} \]  
(B.2)

and
\[ M_f^{eq} = M - q_0 - q_1 (\chi_1 + \chi_2) - q_2 (\chi_1 + \chi_2)^2 - q_3 (\chi_1 + \chi_2)^3 \]  
(B.3)

where
\[ q_0 = \frac{5.025}{100}, \ q_1 = \frac{1.352}{100}, \ q_2 = -\frac{0.0219}{100}, \ q_3 = \frac{0.270}{100}. \]  
(B.4)

From [119] we gather an improved fit for the radiated energy, valid also only for equal-mass binaries with aligned spins, written in eq. (B.5) with coefficients given in eq. (B.6).
\[ M_f^{eq} = M - E_0 - E_2 \chi_f^2 - E_4 \chi_f^4 \]  
(B.5)

where
\[ E_0 = 0.048332, \ E_2 = 0.000743, \ E_4 = 0.000124. \]  
(B.6)
One more formula for the radiated energy in GW is implemented in \cite{120} and given in \cite{B.7} with two sets of coefficients, the first one from the same paper, given on eq. (B.8), and the second set, and improved fit to NR, from \cite{122} and given in eq. (B.9).

\[
M_f = 16\mu^2\left(\delta_1^1K_{4c} + \delta_2^3\delta_mK_{4b} + \delta_2^3K_{2c} + \delta_1^2K_{3b}\sigma + \delta_2^2K_{4e}\sigma^2 + \delta_2^2\delta_2^2mK_{4h} + \delta_3^mK_{2a} + \delta_5^mK_{3a}\sigma + \delta_5^mK_{4a}\sigma^2 + \delta_2^mK_{4b}\sigma^2 + \delta_2^mK_{2d} + \delta_3^mK_{3d}\sigma + \delta_4^d\sigma^4 + \delta_1^mK_{4f} + \delta_2^mK_{4i}\sigma^2 + M_0\right) \tag{B.7}
\]

The first set of coefficients is:

\[
M_0 = 0.951507, \quad K_1 = -0.051379, \quad K_{2a} = -0.004804, \quad K_{2b} = -0.054522, \\
K_{2c} = -0.000022, \quad K_{2d} = 1.995246, \quad K_{3a} = 0.007064, \quad K_{3b} = -0.017599, \\
K_{3c} = -0.119175, \quad K_{3d} = 0.025000, \quad K_{4a} = -0.068981, \quad K_{4b} = -0.011383, \\
K_{4c} = -0.002284, \quad K_{4d} = -0.165658, \quad K_{4e} = 0.019403, \quad K_{4f} = 2.980990, \\
K_{4g} = 0.020250, \quad K_{4h} = -0.004911, \quad K_{4i} = 0.078441, \quad (B.8)
\]

and the second set of coefficients:

\[
K_1 = -0.051130, \quad K_{2a} = -0.005699, \quad K_{2b} = -0.058064, \quad K_{2c} = -0.001867, \\
K_{2d} = 1.995705, \quad K_{3a} = 0.004991, \quad K_{3b} = -0.009238, \quad K_{3c} = -0.120577, \\
K_{3d} = 0.016417, \quad K_{4a} = -0.060721, \quad K_{4b} = -0.001798, \quad K_{4c} = 0.000654, \\
K_{4d} = -0.156626, \quad K_{4e} = 0.010303, \quad K_{4f} = 2.978729, \quad K_{4g} = 0.007904, \\
K_{4h} = 0.000631, \quad K_{4i} = 0.084478, \quad M_0 = 0.951659. \quad (B.9)
\]

Lastly, we implement a third formula for the mass, taken from \cite{53}

\[
M_f = m - \Delta d_{10}\eta^2\chi_{eff}(d_{11}\eta + 1)(\eta(a_1 + \eta(a_2 + \eta(a_3 + a_4\eta))) \\
\times (0.346b_1\chi_{eff}(f_{10} + \eta(f_{11} + f_{12}\eta)) + 0.211b_2\chi_{eff}^2(f_{20} + \eta(f_{21} + f_{22}\eta)) \\
+ 0.128b_3\chi_{eff}^3(f_{30} + \eta(f_{31} + f_{32}\eta)) + 1))/\left(1 - 0.212b_5\chi_{eff}
\right) \\
\times (f_{50} + \eta(f_{51} + f_{52}\eta)) - d_{20}\eta^2\chi_{eff}^2 - \Delta d_{30}\eta\chi_{eff}\chi_{eff}(d_{31}\eta + 1) \tag{B.10}
\]

with the coefficients:

\[
a_1 = 0.057191, \quad a_2 = 0.5610, \quad a_3 = -0.847, \quad a_4 = 3.145, \\
b_1 = -0.209, \quad b_2 = -0.197, \quad b_3 = -0.159, \quad b_5 = 2.985, \\
d_{10} = -0.098, \quad d_{11} = -3.23, \quad d_{20} = 0.0112, \quad d_{30} = -0.0198, \quad d_{31} = -4.92, \\
f_{10} = 1.80908, \quad f_{11} = 15.7, \quad f_{12} = -75.74528, \quad f_{20} = 4.27, \\
f_{21} = 0, \quad f_{22} = -52.448, \quad f_{30} = 31.09, \quad f_{31} = -243.6, \\
f_{32} = 492.96, \quad f_{50} = 1.56735, \quad f_{51} = -0.58, \quad f_{52} = -6.7576. \quad (B.11)
\]
Appendix C. Coefficients for the IRS and BOB Models

The set of coefficients entering in the equation (25) for calculating the frequency of the dominant QNM mode \((l = m = 2)\) and the quality factor are taken from [143]:

\[
\begin{align*}
    f_1 &= 1, \quad f_2 = -0.63, \quad f_3 = 0.3, \\
    g_1 &= 0, \quad g_2 = 2, \quad g_3 = -0.45.
\end{align*}
\]  
(C.1)

This result is verified against the value given in [149, 60], where the coefficients are:

\[
\begin{align*}
    f_1 &= 1.5251, \quad f_2 = -1.1568, \quad f_3 = 0.1292, \\
    g_1 &= 0.7, \quad g_2 = 1.4187, \quad g_3 = -0.4990.
\end{align*}
\]  
(C.2)

The fundamental \((l = 2, m = 0)\) mode is simply \(M\Omega_{QNM} = M\omega_2/2\). The numerical constants entering in the IRS model, obtained as a fit with NR data for a non-spinning binary are from [95]

\[
\begin{align*}
    c &= \frac{206}{903} + \frac{180}{1141} \sqrt{\eta} + \frac{424}{1205} \eta^2, \\
    k &= \frac{713}{1056} - \frac{23}{193} \eta, \\
    \alpha &= \frac{1}{Q_{QNM}^2} \left( \frac{16313}{562} - \frac{21345}{124} \eta \right), \\
    \Omega_{isco} &= -0.091933 \chi_f + 0.097593 \chi_f^2 - 2.4228 \chi_f + 1.4366.
\end{align*}
\]  
(C.3) (C.4) (C.5)