High accuracy PN and NR comparisons involving higher modes for eccentric BBHs and a dominant mode eccentric IMR model
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Spherical harmonic modes of gravitational waveforms for inspiraling compact binaries in eccentric orbits from post-Newtonian (PN) theory accurate to third post-Newtonian order, and those extracted from Numerical Relativity (NR) simulations for binary black holes (BBHs) are compared. We combine results from the two approaches (PN and NR) to construct time-domain hybrid waveforms that describe the complete evolution of BBH mergers through inspiral(I), merger(M) and the ringdown(R) stages. These hybrids are then used in constructing a fully analytical dominant mode $(\ell=2, |m|=2)$ eccentric IMR model. Overlaps with quasi-circular IMR waveform models including the effect of higher modes, maximized over a time- and phase-shift, hint at the importance (mismatches $>1\%$) of including eccentricity in gravitational waveforms when analysing BBHs lighter than $\sim 80M_\odot$, irrespective of the binary’s eccentricity (as it enters the LIGO bands), or mass-ratio. Combined impact of eccentricity and higher modes seems to become more apparent through smaller overlaps with increasing inclination angles and mass ratios. Finally, we show that the state-of-the-art quasi-circular models including the effect of higher modes will not be adequate in extracting source properties for signals with initial eccentricities $e_0 \gtrsim 0.1$.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

Since the first detection of gravitational waves (GWs) from the merger of two black holes [1], the LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA (LVK) collaboration has reported over 90 compact binary mergers [2–5]. These include two confirmed mergers of neutron stars [6, 7] and two neutron star-black hole mergers [8] apart from close to 85 binary black hole (BBH) mergers (see Ref. [9] for a complete catalog). Besides providing numerous new insights into the compact binary physics and astrophysics, these observations have proved to be unique probes into binary’s ultra-relativistic dynamics [10–13] and have improved our understanding of the underlying astrophysical population of these objects [14–16]. However, questions linked with compact binary formation channels largely remain unanswered [17, 18] (see also Ref. [15] and references therein). A definitive answer to these although can come from the measurements of the orbital eccentricity [19].

Current template-based search methods make use of quasi-circular templates owing to the expected circularisation of compact binary orbits due to radiation reaction forces [20]. However, binaries formed through the dynamical interactions in dense stellar environments or through Kozai-Lidov processes [21, 22] (if part of stable triples), are likely to be observed in ground-based detectors such as advanced LIGO [23] and advanced Virgo [24] with residual eccentricities $e_0 \gtrsim 0.1$ [25]. In fact, the first ever observation of an intermediate mass black hole, GW190521 [26], hints at it being an eccentric merger of two black holes [18] (see also [27–29] which also discusses other events with signs of eccentricity apart from the event GW190521). While quasi-circular templates should be able to detect systems with initial eccentricities $e_0 \lesssim 0.1$, binaries with larger eccentricities would require constructing templates including the effect of eccentricity [30, 31]. Moreover, presence of even smaller eccentricities ($e_0 \sim 0.01$) can induce significant systematic biases in extracting source properties [32, 33]. Furthermore, future ground based detectors, Cosmic Explorer (CE) [34–36] and Einstein Telescope (ET) [37, 38], due to their low frequency sensitivities should frequently observe systems with detectable eccentricities [19, 39].

Even though inspiral waveforms from eccentric binary mergers involving non-spinning compact components are sufficiently accurate [40–46], waveform models including contributions from merger and ringdown stages compared to quasi-circular versions are less developed. Numerous efforts towards constructing eccentric inspiral-merger-ringdown waveforms useful for data analysis purposes are underway [47–50]. However, they do not include important physical effects such as spins and higher order modes. While one can argue that since most mergers observed so far are consistent with
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a zero-effective spin \(^1\) \([14, 15]\), models neglecting spin effects can still be useful\(^2\) \([48]\), modelling of higher order modes seems necessary as far as full IMR eccentric waveform models are concerned as Ref. \([51]\) argues and also discussed in detail in the current work. Only recently an eccentric version of the EOB (effective-one-body) waveforms including higher modes \([52]\) appeared online. In the absence of reliable inspiral-merger-ringdown models for eccentric mergers sub-optimal search methods (with little or no dependence on signal model being searched) are used \([25]\). While these methods should detect binaries with arbitrary eccentricities, these are sensitive to high mass searches (typically \(\gtrsim 50 M_\odot\)) \([25]\), while most observed events have a mass smaller than this limit \([4, 15]\); see for instance Fig. 3 of \([53]\).

\[\text{A. Summary of the Current Work}\]

The current work assesses the parameter space where the eccentricity and associated higher modes become crucial in GW parameter estimation. This is illustrated through an injection analysis presented in Fig. 9 attempting recovery of an eccentric signal with quasi-circular waveforms (see Sec. IV for details). Both the injections and the recovery templates include the same set of modes to avoid biases due to additional modes in target/template waveforms. Figure 9 also shows recovery of a circular injection as a reference. Both circular and eccentric injections correspond to a BBH system of total mass \(40 M_\odot\), and the eccentric simulations have an orbital eccentricity of \(e_0 \sim 0.1\) at 20Hz. Non-recovery of the injected value of the chirp mass for the eccentric case can be interpreted as the bias induced due to the neglect of eccentricity and associated higher modes.

The injected waveforms have been computed by matching the post-Newtonian inspiral waveforms for individual modes \([41–44]\) with those extracted from eccentric numerical relativity simulations of the Simulating eXtreme Spacetimes (SXS) collaboration \([47]\) following extensive comparisons involving waveforms due to the two approaches performed here (see Fig. 1). The construction of the injected waveforms (or hybrids as we refer them through the paper) being longer in length compared to NR simulations prove to be critical in accessing the impact of higher modes and eccentricity in the entire mass range accessible to ground based detectors such as LIGO and Virgo. A set of 20 eccentric hybrids have been constructed with varying initial eccentricity in the range \(0.1 \lesssim e_0 \lesssim 0.4\) and with mass ratios \(q = 1, 2, 3\). All the hybrids have a start frequency of \(x_0 = 0.045\) and typically have 30-40 orbital cycles before the merger. See Table I for the details.

The inadequacy of quasi-circular templates in extracting an eccentric IMR signal including higher modes is also demonstrated through (simple) mismatch calculations (see Fig. 3) using state-of-the-art quasi-circular waveform families including higher modes SEOBNRv4HM \([54]\) and IMRPhenomXHM \([55]\). These mismatch plots indicate the need for including eccentricity in gravitational waveforms for analysing BBH systems with masses below \(80 M_\odot\), irrespective of eccentricity or mass ratio. Additionally, as should be clear from middle and right top/bottom panels of Fig. 3 with increasing orbit’s inclination w.r.t our line of sight, the combined impact of eccentricity and related higher modes become more apparent.

Further, a fully analytical dominant mode \((\ell, |m|) = (2, 2)\) model obtained by matching an eccentric PN inspiral with a quasi-circular prescription for the merger-ringdown phase calibrated against the 20 eccentric hybrids constructed here is presented. The method used for construction of the model and other relevant details are discussed in Sec. III. The performance of the model can be assessed from the plots presented in Fig. 7 as well as from the mismatch plots displayed in the left panel of Fig. 8. Since all 20 hybrids were utilised in calibrating the model, these models are tested against an independent family of eccentric waveforms ENIGMA \([49]\). The mismatch plots are shown in the right panel of Fig. 8.

This paper is structured as follows: In Sec. II we discuss the PN and NR inputs as well as the method for combining them for constructing the hybrids. Section II D discusses overlaps (or match maximized over time and phase shifts) between our target hybrids and quasi-circular IMR waveforms and eccentric templates. Section III describes the method used for construction of the dominant mode model. In Sec. IV, we discuss systematic biases in parameter estimation studies due to presence of eccentricity and associated higher mode contributions. Finally, we conclude our work in Sec. V and summarize our findings.

\[\text{II. METHODOLOGY}\]

\[\text{A. PN inspiral and NR inputs}\]

Spin-weighted spherical harmonic modes of the inspiral waveforms from the PN theory, in terms of an amplitude

\[\text{1 Only nine of the 44 BBHs reported in GWTC-2 catalog \([3]\) have been identified with a positive effective spin parameter with zero outside the 95% credible interval.}\]

\[\text{2 Ref. \([29]\) explores correlations between binary’s spins and eccentricity.}\]
The PN expressions for mode amplitudes ($\hat{\eta}$ from the observer while and $D$) evolve assuming an initial eccentricity of $e_0=0.108$, and mean anomaly of $l_0=-2.495$ (measured at an initial frequency of $\nu_0=0.045$ using the prescription of [42]). Since the mode amplitudes and frequencies are in reasonable agreements for PN and NR waveforms in a time window of (1000$M$, 2000$M$) it should be possible to perform hybridization in this window.

and orbital phase, can be written as follows

$$h_{\ell m}^{\text{PN}}(t) = \frac{2GM\eta}{c^2D} \sqrt{\frac{16\pi}{5}} \hat{\eta}_{\ell m} e^{-i\varphi_{\text{orb}}(t)},$$

where $\hat{\eta}_{\ell m}$ is amplitude of a given ($\ell, m$) mode and $\varphi_{\text{orb}}(t)$ represents binary’s orbital phase. Symbols $M$ and $D$ represent the binary’s total mass and its distance from the observer while $\eta$ is given by the ratio of binary’s reduced mass to total mass. Unless explicitly mentioned, we work with $G=c=1$ and set $M=1M_\odot$, $D=1$ Mpc.

The PN expressions for mode amplitudes ($\hat{\eta}_{\ell m}$) contributing up to 3PN order for binaries with non-spinning compact components in quasi-circular orbits have been computed in Refs. [56–60]. In fact, some of the leading modes are actually known (or can easily be computed using available inputs) with higher PN accuracy and contribute to relevant modes at higher PN orders [61–64]. The orbital phase accurate to the 3.5PN order has been computed in [65–67] (see Ref. [68] for a review on the subject). Expressions for mode amplitudes constituting 3PN inspiral waveforms assuming binaries with non-spinning compact objects in quasi-elliptical orbits have been computed in [40, 43, 44] by employing generalised 3PN quasi-Keplerian representation of [69, 70]. On the other hand a 3.5 PN prescription for the orbital phase for an eccentric system has been presented in Ref. [45] and is based on phasing formulation of [71] and generalised quasi-Keplerian representation of [70]. While the phasing of [45] includes contributions due to binary’s reactive dynamics to relative 1PN order (or absolute order of 3.5PN of phase), Ref. [41] extends these results to the relative 3PN order under the assumption that binary’s initial orbital eccentricity is small ($e_0 \lesssim 0.2$). In another effort [42] the results of Ref. [72] were extended to the 2PN order and included eccentricity to $O(e^5)$. While the results of Ref. [41]

should capture relativistic dynamics better (being more accurate in PN sense) results of Ref. [42] should be applicable to systems with larger eccentricities.

The NR simulations (describing the non-perturbative, late-time evolution of eccentric BBH mergers) used here have been performed using the Spectral Einstein Code (SpEC) [73, 74] developed by the SXS collaboration and are publicly available [75]. A set of 20 eccentric simulations with varying initial eccentricities ($e \leq 0.2$) and mass ratios ($q = 1, 2, 3$) were first presented in [47].

Since the NR simulations we intend to compare PN results with, include waveforms with eccentricities as large as 0.2, we have made use of the results of [42] while comparing the phase (and the angular frequency), due to its ability to probe larger eccentricities compared to the ones presented in Ref. [41]. As far as the amplitude comparisons are concerned we make use of the PN mode amplitudes computed in [43, 44]. We present the results of these comparisons in the next section.

### B. PN-NR comparison

Figure 1 compares the waveform data of a NR simulation (SXS:BBH:1364) and related results from the PN theory for a number of relevant modes. The colored lines represent the NR data, mimicked closely in first few GW cycles by the PN results that are displayed as black lines. Close agreements between the PN and NR waveforms in the inspiral part of the signal allow for hybridization discussed in the next section. However, we choose to ignore
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3 See Table I of [47] for other relevant properties of these simulations.
FIG. 2. PN-NR hybrid waveform corresponding to NR simulation SXS:BBH:1364, an asymmetric mass binary with mass ratio $q=2$. The initial eccentricity of the constructed waveform is $e_0 = 0.108$ at $x_{\text{low}} = 0.045$. The blue dotted line marks the beginning of the NR waveform and the shaded grey region $t \in (1000M, 2000M)$ shows the matching window where hybridization was performed. Overlapping hybrid and NR waveforms on the left of the matching window, hint at the quality of hybridization performed here.
TABLE I. Hybrids constructed by matching NR simulations from the SXS collaboration and available PN prescriptions for BBHs in eccentric orbits. SXS simulation ids are retained for identification with NR simulation used in the process of construction of the hybrids. Each hybrid starts at an averaged orbital frequency of \( x_0 = 0.045 \) where eccentricity \( (e_0) \), mean anomaly \( (l_0) \) are estimated. Mass ratio \( (q) \) and number of orbits prior to the merger are also listed. \( N_{\text{orb}} \) has been computed by taking the phase difference between the start of the waveform and the peak of the \((2,2)\) mode amplitude. The NR simulation, SXS:BBH:1132, is longer than the hybrids constructed here and hence the NR data is directly used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Simulation Id</th>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>( e_0 )</th>
<th>( l_0 )</th>
<th>( N_{\text{orb}} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SXS:BBH:1132</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1355</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1356</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>1.606</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1357</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>-1.020</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1358</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>-2.937</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1359</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>1.850</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1361</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.305</td>
<td>1.146</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1362</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>-0.726</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1363</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.385</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.308</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1364</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>-2.495</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1365</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1366</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.218</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1367</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>-0.964</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1368</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.222</td>
<td>-1.553</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1369</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>-1.116</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1370</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.754</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1371</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.302</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1372</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.212</td>
<td>-2.101</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1373</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>-2.655</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>HYB:SXS:BBH:1374</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td>-2.953</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. In the context of eccentric orbits, we require that \( \ell \) and \( |m| \) lead in the PN inspiral waveforms of [44] that are used in constructing the target hybrids.

C. Construction of hybrid waveforms

Complete inspiral-merger-ringdown (IMR) waveforms are constructed by matching PN and NR waveforms for individual modes in a region where the PN prescription closely mimics the NR data following the method of Ref. [78]. These are traditionally referred to as hybrids and used as targets for modelling and data-analysis purposes. As discussed in [78] construction of hybrids including higher modes (in circular case) is possible by performing at least two rotations (and a time-shift) so as to align the frames in which PN/NR waveforms are defined.\(^4\) We simply extend this argument to the case of eccentric orbits assuming that the effect of marginalising over parameters such as eccentricity and mean anomaly will not signiﬁcantly affect the hybridization. The prescription for construction of hybrids is discussed in detail in [78] and we reproduce some of the steps here for completeness.

A least-square minimization of the integrated difference between the GW modes from the PN and NR in a time interval \( (t_i, t_f) \), in which the two approaches give similar results, is performed and can be defined as

\[
\delta = \min_{t_0, \varphi_0, \psi} \int_{t_i}^{t_f} dt \sum_{\ell, m} |\hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{NR}}(t - t_0)e^{i(m\varphi_0 + \psi)} - \hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{PN}}(t)|^2 .
\]

(2)

where the minimization is performed over a time-shift \( (t_0) \) and the two angles \( (\varphi_0, \psi) \) as discussed above. The hybrid waveforms are then constructed by combining the NR data with the “best matched” PN waveform in the following way:

\[
\hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{hyb}}(t) \equiv \tau(t) \hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{NR}}(t - t'_0) e^{i(m\varphi_0 + \psi')} + (1 - \tau(t)) \hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{PN}}(t),
\]

(3)

where \( (t'_0, \varphi'_0, \psi') \) are the values of \( (t_0, \varphi_0, \psi) \) that minimize the integral of Eq. (2). In the above, \( \tau(t) \) is a weighting function defined by:

\[
\tau(t) \equiv \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } t < t_i \\
\frac{t - t_i}{t_f - t_i} & \text{if } t_i \leq t < t_f \\
1 & \text{if } t_f \leq t.
\end{cases}
\]

(4)

The hybrids corresponding to a representative NR simulation (SXS:BBH:1364) for all relevant modes are shown in Fig. 2. The blue dotted line marks the beginning of the NR waveform and the shaded grey

---

\(^4\) It is assumed that the third Euler angle can easily be fixed in the direction of binary’s total angular momentum (See Fig. 2 and the discussions in section III C of [78].)
region \( t \in (1000M, 2000M) \) shows the matching window where hybridization was performed. Overlapping hybrid and NR waveforms outside (on the left of) the matching window hint at the quality of hybridization performed here.

We construct IMR hybrids corresponding to all 20 eccentric NR simulations listed in Ref. [47]. These are listed in Table I and the SXS simulation IDs have been retained so as be be able to identify the hybrids with the corresponding NR simulation. All the hybrids have a start frequency of \( x_0 = 0.045 \) and typically have 30-40 orbital cycles before the merger. On the other hand NR simulations used here evolve over 10-15 cycles before the merger. Being longer in length, these hybrids should prove to be critical in assessing the impact of higher modes and eccentricity in the entire mass range accessible to the ground based detectors such as LIGO and Virgo. We use these hybrids to demonstrate the impact of eccentricity as well as of higher modes in the section that follows.

D. Impact of eccentricity and higher modes on detection and parameter estimation: match calculations

Figure 3 displays the mismatch between a set of hybrids including the effect of eccentricity and related higher modes constructed here, and the state-of-the-art quasi-circular waveform families including higher modes SEOBNRv4HM [54] (top panels) and IMRPhenomXHM [55] (bottom panels). As discussed above our target hybrids include \((\ell, |m|)=(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (5, 5), (2, 1), (3, 2), \) and \((4, 3)\) modes. The SEOBNRv4HM [54] templates (quasi-circular) include \((\ell, |m|)=(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (5, 5), \) and \((2, 1)\) modes whereas those of IMRPhenomXHM [55] include \((\ell, |m|)=(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (2, 1), \) and \((3, 2)\) modes. This means target waveforms may have an additional mode or two depending upon which template is used for recovery. The mismatch plots indicate the need for including eccentricity in gravitational waveforms for analysing BBH systems with masses below \(80M_\odot\), irrespective of eccentricity or mass ratio for face-on systems. The mismatches are larger for larger eccentricities. Furthermore, with increasing inclination angle, inclusion of eccentricity in waveforms seems to become important even for heavier systems. For instance, mismatches are \(>1\%\) for systems lighter than \(90M_\odot (160M_\odot)\) for inclination angle of \(\pi/4 (\pi/2)\). Additionally, as should be clear from middle and right top/bottom panels of Fig. 3, with increasing orbit’s inclination w.r.t. our line of sight, the combined impact of eccentricity and higher modes becomes more apparent.

III. A DOMINANT MODE MODEL

Here we develop a fully analytical dominant \((\ell, |m|)=(2, 2)\) mode model obtained by matching an eccentric PN inspiral with a quasi-circular prescription for the merger-ringdown phase, the model is calibrated against a set of 20 eccentric hybrids constructed here. The method used
for construction of the hybrids is discussed in Sec. II. We use another set of hybrids here (constructed by simply matching waveforms of [42] with NR simulations of [47]) as only a dominant mode target is required. A graphical representation of this hybrid corresponding to the simulation SXS:BBH:1364 is shown in Fig. 4. Overlapping hybrid and NR waveforms outside (on the left of) the matching window hint at the quality of hybridization performed here. The inspiral part of the model is the waveform presented in [42] while the quasi-circular merger-ringdown part is described by the waveform from EOB family discussed in [54]. Below we discuss the construction of the model as well as present the analytical prescription for the same.

### A. Time-shift

As described in Sec. II C, the process of hybridization involves minimization over a time shift. So when producing the amplitude model, we first perform a time shift of the inspiral waveform relative to the circular IMR waveform, because we do not know the exact time to merger. This is done by first setting the merger time for the circular IMR waveform to zero and then time sliding the eccentric inspiral about the merger. We obtain a numerical estimate of the time shift for each target hybrid and denote it by $t_{\text{shift}}$. Once the time shift is performed, the amplitude and frequency model is generated using the prescription as discussed in III B and III C respectively.

#### B. Amplitude model

As shown in the plots in Figure 1, the waveforms tend to circularize near merger.\(^5\) Hence, in order to model this effect we can suitably join the eccentric inspiral to the circular IMR at an appropriate time $t_{\text{match}}$. The amplitude model is obtained by joining the eccentric inspiral with the circular IMR using a transition function over a fixed time interval of 500$M$ which ends at $t_{\text{match}}$. Given a target hybrid, we start with a trial choice of $t_{\text{match}}$ roughly 500$M_{\odot}$ before the merger and produce the amplitude model as given below.
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\(^5\) See also the discussion around Figure 3 of [47] which clearly shows all NR simulations become circular 30$M$ before the merger.
After the amplitude model is obtained for a particular target hybrid, we combine it with the target hybrid phase to obtain the polarizations, and then calculate the match with the target hybrid. We then change the trial choice of \( t_{\text{match}} \) by 5\( M \), bringing it closer to the merger and repeat the process of producing the amplitude model, and calculating the match. This variation of \( t_{\text{match}} \) is done till roughly 30\( M \) before merger. We thus obtain a set of match values for varying \( t_{\text{match}} \) and pick the one which has the highest value of match. The corresponding amplitude \( t_{\text{match}} \) is the numerical estimate for a particular target hybrid. We obtain numerical estimates using the same process for all the 20 target hybrids.

### C. Frequency model

For the frequency model, we follow a similar procedure as described in Sec. III B with the only difference being the duration of the time interval where the inspiral frequency is joined with the circular IMR frequency. Once again, similar to the amplitude model procedure, we determine an appropriate \( t_{\text{match}} \) for joining the inspiral frequency with the circular IMR frequency. However, the time interval where the two are joined starts at \( t_{\text{match}} \) and ends at a time close to 30\( M \) before merger. Just like the amplitude model, we start with the choice of a trial value of \( t_{\text{match}} \) roughly 6000\( M \) before merger and obtain the frequency model as given below

\[
\omega_{22}^{\text{model}}(t) \equiv \tau_a(t) \omega_{22}^{\text{IMR}}(t) + (1 - \tau_a(t)) \omega_{22}^{\text{inspiral}}(t),
\]

where, \( \tau_a(t) \) is defined as

\[
\tau_a(t) \equiv \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } t < t_i \\
\frac{t - t_i}{t_f - t_i} & \text{if } t_i \leq t < t_f \\
1 & \text{if } t \leq t_f.
\end{cases}
\]

we set \( t_i = t_{\text{match}} - 500M \) and \( t_f = t_{\text{match}} \) as the bounds of the time interval over which the two waveforms are joined. Figure 5 demonstrates the process. The grey region is the time interval ending at \( t_{\text{match}} \) where the inspiral and circular IMR is joined.

After the amplitude model is obtained for a particular choice of trial \( t_{\text{match}} \), we combine it with the target hybrid phase to obtain the polarizations, and then calculate the match with the target hybrid. We then change the trial choice of \( t_{\text{match}} \) by 5\( M \), bringing it closer to the merger and repeat the process of producing the amplitude model, and calculating the match. This variation of \( t_{\text{match}} \) is done till roughly 30\( M \) before merger. We thus obtain a set of match values for varying \( t_{\text{match}} \) and pick the one which has the highest value of match. The corresponding amplitude \( t_{\text{match}} \) is the numerical estimate for a particular target hybrid. We obtain numerical estimates using the same process for all the 20 target hybrids.

\[
\omega_{22}^{\text{model}}(t) \equiv \tau_a(t) \omega_{22}^{\text{IMR}}(t) + (1 - \tau_a(t)) \omega_{22}^{\text{inspiral}}(t),
\]

where, \( \tau_a(t) \) is as defined in Eq. (6) with the difference being, \( t_i = t_{\text{match}} \) and \( t_f \lesssim -30M \). Figure 5 demonstrates the process.

Once the frequency model is obtained for the choice of trial \( t_{\text{match}} \), we calculate the phase by integrating the frequency model. This is then combined with the amplitude model obtained for the same target hybrid to produce the polarizations and a match with the target hybrid is calculated. We then change the trial choice of \( t_{\text{match}} \) by 1\( M \), bringing it closer to the merger and repeat the process of producing the frequency model, and calculating the match. Once again we do this variation till roughly 30\( M \) before merger to obtain a set of match values for varying \( t_{\text{match}} \) and pick the one which has the highest value of match. The corresponding value of frequency \( t_{\text{match}} \) is the numerical estimate for a particular target hybrid. We obtain numerical estimates for all the 20 target hybrids using the same process.

### D. Analytical model

We have described the procedure of producing (numerical) time domain model fits for the dominant mode model, where we used a set of 20 eccentric hybrids as targets to calibrate our model. For each hybrid we obtained a numerical estimate for \( t_{\text{shift}} \), amplitude \( t_{\text{match}} \), and frequency \( t_{\text{match}} \). In order to be able to generate
FIG. 7. (Top panel) Amplitude and frequency of the dominant mode model (constructed out of stitching an inspiral and a merger-ringdown model) plotted together with target hybrids for comparison for three representative low eccentricity simulations. (Bottom panel) One of the polarizations, obtained by combining the amplitude and the frequency model shown in the top panel for $q = 3$ case, is shown as a visual proof of the quality of the model being presented.

FIG. 8. (Left panel) Mismatches between set of eccentric hybrids presented in Table I and the dominant mode model presented in Sec. III. (Right panel) Mismatches between the dominant mode model of ENIGMA [49] and the model presented here. The two horizontal lines report 96.5% and 99% agreement, respectively. The eccentricity values displayed with color bars are computed at $x_0 = 0.045$ for all hybrids.

waveforms for an arbitrary configuration these numerical fits need to be mapped into the physical parameter space for eccentric systems characterised by binary’s eccentricity, mean anomaly at a reference frequency and the mass ratio parameter. In this section we determine a functional form by performing analytical fits to these numerical estimates. The fitted functions obtained are of the form

$$t_{\text{shift}} (q, e, l) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} e^\alpha q^\beta \cos(\gamma l + \delta e l + a_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta})$$

(8)

for time shift, where $A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = a_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = 0$ for $\alpha + \beta > 4$ and/or $\gamma + \delta > 1$, and $A_{a010} = A_{a001} = A_{0310} = A_{0301} = A_{007\delta} = a_{0\alpha\beta00} = 0$.

$$t_{\text{match}} (\eta, e, l) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta} B_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} e^\alpha \eta^\beta \cos(\gamma l + \delta e l + b_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta})$$

(9)

for amplitude, where $B_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = b_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = 0$ for $\alpha + \beta > 4$ and/or $\gamma + \delta > 1$, and $B_{a010} = B_{a001} = B_{0310} = B_{0301} = B_{007\delta} = b_{0\alpha\beta00} = 0$. 
\[ t_{\text{match}}(\eta, \epsilon, l) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} e^{\alpha \eta} \cos(\gamma l + \delta e l + c_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}) \]

for frequency, where \( C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = c_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = 0 \) for \( \alpha + \beta > 5 \) and/or \( \gamma + \delta > 1 \), and \( C_{0010} = C_{0001} = C_{0210} = C_{0031} = C_{007\delta} = c_{0000} = 0 \). The values for the coefficients \( A_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, B_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, a_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, b_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, \) and \( c_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \) obtained by performing a fit to the numerical values are tabulated in Tables II, III, and IV.

Figure 6 shows comparisons between the numerically obtained values for \( t_{\text{shift}}, \) amplitude \( t_{\text{match}}, \) and frequency \( t_{\text{match}} \), with the values predicted by our analytical fits. The predictions are within \( \pm 12M \) of the numerical estimates for time shift, within \( \pm 7M \) for amplitude \( t_{\text{match}}, \) and within \( \pm 51M \) for frequency \( t_{\text{match}} \). We show amplitude and frequency comparison between the target hybrids and our models for three cases along with the full waveform for the \( q=3 \) case in Fig. 7.

The performance of the model can be assessed from the plots presented in Fig. 7 as well as from the mismatch plots displayed in the left panel of Fig. 8. Since all 20 hybrids were utilised in calibrating the model, these models are tested against an independent waveform ENIGMA [49]. For this comparison we choose to sample a parameter space which is not identical to the calibration set (hybrids). We choose to generate both the target (ENIGMA) and the template (dominant eccentric model) by randomly sampling values of a reference eccentricity \( (e_0) \), mass ratio \( (q) \) and reference mean anomaly \( (l_0) \) in range \( 0 \lesssim e_0 \lesssim 0.2, 1 \lesssim q \lesssim 3, \) and \(-\pi \lesssim l_0 \lesssim \pi \) respectively. The mismatch plot obtained is shown in the right panel of Fig. 8.

### V. DISCUSSION

We started by comparing high accuracy PN inspiral waveform results for compact binaries in eccentric orbits of [42, 44, 79] with SXS NR data for eccentric BBH mergers presented in [47]. Figure 1 compares the waveform data for one particular data set. Based on this comparison we select a set of modes which will be included in the target IMR model (hybrids). The hybrids are constructed for \((\ell, |m|)=(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (5, 5), (2, 1), (3, 2), (4, 3)\) modes. The hybridization procedure is discussed in Sec. II.C. We use these hybrids to show the impact of eccentricity and associated higher modes by computing the mismatch with the state-of-the-art quasi-circular waveforms such as SEOBNRv4HM [54] and IMRPhenomXHM [55]. The mismatches are shown in Fig. 3. In Sec. III we develop a fully analytical dominant mode \((\ell, |m|)=(2, 2)\) model obtained by matching an eccentric PN inspiral with a quasi-circular prescription for the merger-ringdown phase calibrated against a set of eccentric hybrids. Figure 5-6 demonstrate the procedure while Fig. 7-8 display the performance of the model developed here. Finally, in Sec. IV, with an injection analysis we demonstrate it will not be possible to ignore the presence of eccentricity and related higher modes while recovering GW signals using current state-of-the-art quasi-circular waveforms including the effect of higher order modes.
FIG. 9. Chirp-mass recovery of circular and eccentric injections using quasi-circular waveforms is shown. Thick-black line denotes the injected value of the chirp-mass parameter and the dashed lines denote 90% credible intervals. The orange (olive) posteriors denote measurement of the chirp mass for the injected circular (eccentric) signal. Both circular and eccentric injections correspond to a BBH of total mass $40 \, M_\odot$, and the eccentric simulations have an orbital eccentricity of $e_0 \sim 0.1$ at 20Hz. Non-recovery of the injected value of the chirp mass for the eccentric case can be interpreted as the bias induced due to the neglect of eccentricity and associated higher modes.
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Appendix A: Details of parameter estimation study

In this section, we include the corner plots for all the injections which have been performed in order to highlight the correlations between various binary parameters. The parameters chosen for corner plots are chirp mass ($M_c$), total mass ($M$), symmetric mass ratio ($\eta$), luminosity distance ($d_L$) and binary’s inclination angle w.r.t the line of sight ($\iota$). Figures 10, 11 and 12 show the corner plots for $q = 1, 2,$ and $3$ respectively (see also [29]). These plots clearly show the correlations among various mass parameters ($M_c$, $M$, and $\eta$) and strong correlations between luminosity distance $d_L$ and inclination angle ($\iota$).

It is interesting to note that the symmetric mass ratio $\eta$ has an upper limit of $\eta \leq 0.25$ (by definition), thus for $q=1$, since $\eta = 0.25$, the posterior hits the prior boundary on the right. Now, because of the correlations between chirp mass ($M_c$) and $\eta$, this translates into slight shifting of the posterior which results in the injection value not coinciding with the median of the posterior. This is observed both in Figs.9-10. This feature also appears when we inject a signal using IMRPhenomXHM and recover using the same waveform, thus indicating that this is solely because of the correlations between $\eta$ and $M_c$ and not because of differences in the injected and recovery waveform. The slight shift in $q=3$ posterior of circular injection (HYB:SXS:BBH:1221) though can be attributed to the slight differences in the injected and recovered signal.

Another interesting feature of these plots is that while the mass parameters show a shift in the posterior with eccentric injections, the distance and inclination posteriors are still able to recover the injected values even for eccentric injections. This hints at the fact that while the eccentricity parameter is strongly correlated with the mass parameters of the binary, it is not so with the case of extrinsic parameters like luminosity distance and inclination angle (see also [29]).


FIG. 10. Corner plot for $q=1$, where circular (SXS:BBH:1132) simulation is shown in orange, and eccentric (HYB:SXS:BBH:1356) simulation is shown in dark green. Histograms on the diagonal show marginalized 1D posteriors, whereas the contours denote the joint 2D posteriors for various parameters. The vertical dashed lines in 1D histograms mark 90% credible intervals, and dotted lines in orange show the prior. The black lines mark the injected values for various system parameters.
FIG. 11. Corner plot for $q=2$, where circular (HYB:SXS:BBH:1167) simulation is shown in orange, and eccentric (HYB:SXS:BBH:1364) simulation is shown in dark green. Histograms on the diagonal show marginalized 1D posteriors, whereas the contours denote the joint 2D posteriors for various parameters. The vertical dashed lines in 1D histograms mark 90% credible intervals, and dotted lines in orange show the prior. The black lines mark the injected values for various system parameters.
FIG. 12. Corner plot for $q=3$, where circular (SXS:BBH:1221) simulation is shown in orange, and eccentric (HYB:SXS:BBH:1371) simulation is shown in dark green. Histograms on the diagonal show marginalized 1D posteriors, whereas the contours denote the joint 2D posteriors for various parameters. The vertical dashed lines in 1D histograms mark 90% credible intervals, and dotted lines in orange show the prior. The black lines mark the injected values for various system parameters.
\[ a_0 = 0 \quad 1198.5024 \quad -700.73289 \quad 1483.6558 \]
\[ a_1 = 45323.781 \quad -25867.453 \quad -11881.667 \]
\[ a_2 = -277961.63 \quad 205622.54 \quad 19756.350 \]
\[ a_3 = 480903.69 \quad -394215.78 \quad 0 \]

\[ \alpha = 0 \quad 317.56597 \quad -0.317485 \quad 2.374015 \]
\[ \alpha = 1 \quad 374015.60 \quad -3.9854127 \times 10^6 \quad 1.0318033 \times 10^7 \]
\[ \alpha = 2 \quad 1.5126993 \times 10^6 \quad 1.8270088 \times 10^7 \quad -5.4439513 \times 10^7 \]
\[ \alpha = 3 \quad 2.6114991 \times 10^6 \quad -1.7913253 \times 10^7 \quad 0 \]

\[ B_{\alpha,00} \quad \beta = 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \]
\[ \alpha = 0 \quad 317.56597 \quad 107515.46 \quad -449629.32 \]
\[ \alpha = 1 \quad -72361.787 \quad -913714.19 \quad 4.9085757 \times 10^6 \]
\[ \alpha = 2 \quad 889870.52 \quad -953568.19 \quad -1.0660253 \times 10^7 \]
\[ \alpha = 3 \quad -2.0028862 \times 10^6 \quad 8.1132219 \times 10^6 \quad 0 \]

\[ C_{\alpha,00} \quad \beta = 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \]
\[ \alpha = 0 \quad 374015.60 \quad -3.9854127 \times 10^6 \quad 1.0318033 \times 10^7 \]
\[ \alpha = 1 \quad -1.5126993 \times 10^6 \quad 1.8270088 \times 10^7 \quad -5.4439513 \times 10^7 \]
\[ \alpha = 2 \quad 1.0112138 \times 10^6 \quad -1.6624831 \times 10^7 \quad 7.1280945 \times 10^7 \]
\[ \alpha = 3 \quad 2.6114991 \times 10^6 \quad -1.7913253 \times 10^7 \quad 0 \]

TABLE II. Table of coefficients for the analytical expression of \( t_{\text{shift}} \) in Eq. (8). All other coefficients not included in the table are zero.

TABLE III. Table of coefficients for the analytical expression of amplitude \( t_{\text{match}} \) in Eq. (9). All other coefficients not included in the table are zero.

TABLE IV. Table of coefficients for the analytical expression of frequency \( t_{\text{match}} \) in Eq. (10). All other coefficients not included in the table are zero.