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ABSTRACT

Using data from the IceCube Neutrino Observatory, we searched for high-energy neutrino emission from the gravitational-wave events detected by advanced LIGO and Virgo detectors during their third observing run. We did a low-latency follow-up on the public candidate events released during the detectors’ third observing run and an archival search on the 80 confident events reported in GWTC-2.1 and GWTC-3 catalogs. An extended search was also conducted for neutrino emission on longer timescales from neutron star containing mergers. Follow-up searches on the candidate optical counterpart of GW190521 were also conducted. We used two methods; an unbinned maximum likelihood analysis and a Bayesian analysis using astrophysical priors, both of which were previously used to search for high-energy neutrino emission from gravitational-wave events. No significant neutrino emission was observed by any analysis and upper limits were placed on the time-integrated neutrino flux as well as the total isotropic equivalent energy emitted in high-energy neutrinos.

Keywords: high-energy astrophysics, neutrino astronomy, multi-messenger astrophysics

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the initial discoveries of astrophysical high-energy neutrinos in 2013 (Aartsen et al. 2013, 2014) and gravitational waves (GWs) in 2015 (Abbott et al. 2016), we have entered an exciting era of multi-messenger astronomy. We now have over 10 years of IceCube neutrino data from the full detector configuration and 90 reported GW events with high astrophysical probability by the LIGO Scientific, Virgo and KAGRA Collaborations (LVK). This abundance of multi-messenger data allows for statistically robust searches for common sources of GWs and high-energy neutrinos. Searches dating back before the individual confident discoveries of astrophysical GWs and high-energy neutrinos have not found a significant joint emission (Aso et al. 2008; van Elewyck et al. 2009; Bartos et al. 2011; Baret et al. 2012; Adrián-Martínez et al. 2013; Aartsen et al. 2014a; Adrián-Martínez et al. 2016). Following the first confident GW observation, several attempts from IceCube and ANTARES have not found significant emission of coincident high energy neutrinos (Albert et al. 2017a,b; Albert et al. 2020; Aartsen et al. 2020; Veske et al. 2021b). Searches for neutrinos in the low-energy regime have also been conducted by IceCube (Abbasi et al. 2021), Super-Kamiokande (Abe et al. 2021a), KamLAND (Abe et al. 2021b), and Borexino (Agostini et al. 2017).

The discovery of such a joint emission would provide important information about physics of the source and improve our understanding of the sources of the individual messengers. Currently, a joint emission is expected to come from formed jets during the GW emission, which accelerates charged particles. These charged particles would produce mesons. From their decays and the decays of their secondaries, high-energy neutrino emission is expected (Fang & Metzger 2017; Kimura et al. 2018). Moreover, the inclusion of neutrino information to the gravitational-wave observation would help in constraining the location of the source more precisely
in the sky, enabling more explorations to be done on it via the telescopes with narrow field of views. These motivations keep the search efforts vibrant despite the estimated low chance for joint detections with the current detectors (Bartos et al. 2011; Baret et al. 2012; Fang & Metzger 2017).

In this article, we present our low-latency follow-up searches and archival searches for high-energy neutrino emission from the GW events detected during the complete third observing run of advanced LIGO and Virgo detectors (O3). In Section 2, we describe the IceCube detector and its neutrino data used for this analysis, and the GW detector runs followed up in this paper. In Section 3, we provide relevant details about the searches done by two main analysis methods; unbinned maximum likelihood (UML) and Low Latency Algorithm for Multi-messenger Astrophysics (LLAMA). More detailed discussions on the methods can also be found in our previous publication (Aartsen et al. 2020). Section 4 describes the low-latency operation of the pipelines for follow-up the candidate GW events alerts reported during the O3 run at the Gravitational-wave Candidate Event Database (GraceDB) 1, and summarizes the results. In Section 5, we present the results of our archival searches using both LLAMA and UML methods. These archival searches were performed on the 44 confident GW events from GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a) 2 and 36 GW events from GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b). These analyses include a search within a time window of ±500 s around the GW events, a dedicated follow-up on the candidate optical flare from GW190521 (Abbott et al. 2020a; Graham et al. 2020), and an extended two-week search on the neutron star containing events by the UML pipeline.

2. THE NEUTRINO AND GRAVITATIONAL WAVE OBSERVATIONS

2.1. The IceCube Detector

The IceCube Neutrino Observatory is a cubic-kilometer detector array located at the geographic South Pole (Aartsen et al. 2017). The detector consists of 86 strings drilled deep into ice. These strings hold 60 Digital Optical Modules (DOMs) between depths of 1.5 km and 2.5 km in the Antarctic ice. The main component of the DOMs are photomultiplier tubes used to detect the Cherenkov light emitted by charged particles produced when neutrinos interact in ice.

There are two main event topologies seen within IceCube data: tracks and cascades. Tracks are produced when muon neutrinos undergo charged-current interactions and produce muons that travel along a straight line and deposit Cherenkov light along its path. Cascades, which mainly consist of electromagnetic showers, are generated via charged-current interactions of electron neutrinos and neutral-current interactions of neutrinos of all flavors within the ice. Tracks are excellent for pointing towards various astrophysical sources since they have an angular resolution of ≲ 1°, which is much better than the pointing resolution of cascades (≳ 10°)(Aartsen et al. 2014b,c).

The analyses presented here use neutrino data from a low-latency data stream known as the Gamma-ray Follow-Up (GFU) Online event stream. The GFU Online event selection is able to rapidly reconstruct neutrino events observed in the IceCube detector and the data is made available within roughly 30 s, allowing for rapid neutrino follow-ups. The GFU dataset uses track events detected with IceCube, since their pointing resolutions are well suited for follow-up analyses. The details of the selection can be found in Aartsen et al. (2016) and the online version of the dataset, which we use in this article, is described further in Kintscher (2016).

The dataset consists of through-going muon tracks originating primarily from cosmic-ray backgrounds from the atmosphere. In the southern sky, the sample is dominated by the atmospheric muons while in the northern sky, the sample is dominated by atmospheric neutrinos. Atmospheric muons do not contribute to the rate in the northern sky due to Earth absorption. The all-sky neutrino event rate ranges from 6-7 mHz depending on seasonal variation of atmospheric neutrinos (Heix et al. 2020). Overall the rate of astrophysical neutrinos is roughly three orders of magnitude lower than that of the atmospheric backgrounds (Aartsen et al. 2016).

2.2. The third observing run of ground-based gravitational-wave detectors

On April 1st 2019 at 15:00 UTC the LIGO and Virgo detectors network (Aasi et al. 2015; Acernese et al. 2014) started their third observing run with an increased sensitivity enabling the detection of gravitational waves from compact binary coalescences at a rate of greater than 1 merger per week (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a,b). During the period of October 1st 15:00 UTC to November 1st 15:00 UTC the detectors were not collecting data, thus separating the ob-
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1 https://gracedb.ligo.org/

2 Most of the events in GWTC-2.1 were already reported in the catalog GWTC-2 (Abbott et al. 2021a). These were previously analyzed by both LLAMA and UML searches (Veske et al. 2021b). The LLAMA pipeline reanalyzed them with a refined background distribution, while the UML results remained the same.
Figure 1. A comparison of the sky localizations of the 90% probability regions of the GW skymaps (orange) and the 90% contours of the neutrino localizations (blue). The skymaps shown here include all 91 GW events from O1, O2 and O3. It can be seen that we are mainly limited by the large areas of the GW skymaps, which reduces if three detectors from LVC detects the event simultaneously.

In this paper, since a combination of the events from IceCube and the GW events from O3 are used, the analyses becomes dependent on the localizations of both the neutrino and the GW events. Figure 1 compares the sky localizations of the skymaps of the candidate GW events published in the GW catalogs (O1 to O3) and the neutrino events detected by IceCube, within the GFU dataset. The 90% localizations of both are used to make the comparison. It is seen that we are mainly limited by the localization uncertainties of the GW skymaps. These uncertainties are expected to reduce within the future runs of the ground-based gravitational-wave detectors.

3. METHODS

There are two main searches that we employed: the UML and LLAMA searches. Both the UML and LLAMA analyses performed short time scale follow-ups for each reported GW event. The analyses searched for neutrino emission within a ±500 s time window centered around the GW merger time. This time window was used both in the realtime and archival searches. The time window is a conservative empirical estimate of the delay between the GW and neutrino emission for a model based on gamma-ray bursts (Baret et al. 2011).

Additionally, the UML analysis performed a long time scale analysis on all binary neutron star (BNS) and neutron star-black hole (NSBH) candidates. This search, called the 2-week follow-up, is motivated by models which predict neutrino emission on longer time scales from binaries with at least one neutron star (Fang & Metzger 2017; Decoene et al. 2020). We searched within a time period of [−0.1,+14] days around the GW merger times.

Both analyses also performed a neutrino follow-up search on the candidate optical counterpart to the binary black hole (BBH) merger GW190521 observed by Zwicky Transient Facility (ZTF) (Graham et al. 2020). ZTF observed a flaring active galactic nuclei (AGN), J124942.3+344929, which coincided with the 90% credible region of the GW event's sky localization. This flare can be explained by the accretion of the gas in the AGN disk to the kicked black hole of the merger (McKer- nan et al. 2019). The motivation for the neutrino follow-up was the expected formation of a jet accelerating particles due to the chaotic accretion dynamics around the kicked black hole travelling through the AGN disk.

3.1. Unbinned Maximum Likelihood

The unbinned maximum likelihood (UML) method tests for a point-like neutrino source coincident with the GW localization region. The likelihood takes into account the direction, angular error, and reconstructed energy of each neutrino on the sky. The sky is divided into equal area bins using the Healpix pixelization scheme (Górski et al. 2005). We then perform a likelihood ratio test where the test statistic (TS) is the log-likelihood ratio. The TS is computed at each pixel in the sky by maximizing the log-likelihood ratio and weighting the result by the GW localization probability in the given pixel. The pixel with the largest TS value is taken to be the best-fit location for a joint GW-neutrino source and the associated TS is considered the final observed TS for the analysis. For a full detailed description of the likelihood and TS used here, see Hussain et al. (2019).

To compute the significance for each GW follow-up, we perform 30,000 pseudo-experiments with scrambled neutrino data to generate a background TS distribution. Then scrambling is carried out by randomly assigning a time for the neutrinos, which is equivalent to a scramble in right ascension, while maintaining the declination dependence of the data. The final observed TS for a given GW event is then compared to its background distribution to compute a p-value.
In the case where the observed TS is consistent with background, we place 90% upper limits (ULs) on the time-integrated neutrino flux, $E^2 F$, assuming an $E^{-2}$ spectrum, where $F = dN/dE dA$. The limits are computed by injecting simulated signal neutrinos into the sky according to the GW localization probability. We then follow the all-sky scan procedure described above to compute a TS for a given value of injected neutrino flux. We run 500 trials for a given injected neutrino flux with a random injection location chosen for each trial. The 90% UL on the neutrino flux is then defined as the flux for which 90% of trials produce a TS value greater than the observed TS value for the GW event.

Upper limits to the isotropic equivalent energy ($E_{\text{iso}}$ ULs) are computed in a similar manner. Once again we assume an $E^{-2}$ spectrum and convert our injected $E_{\text{iso}}$ into a flux at Earth by sampling a location on the sky as well as a distance to the GW source according the the 3D localization probability provided by LIGO/Virgo. The flux is then converted to an expected number of events observed at IceCube using the dataset’s declination dependence and effective area.

Note that all reported ULs are only valid within a certain range of energies. The energy range of our data sample depends strongly on declination. The central 68% energy range in the southern hemisphere is roughly $5 \times 10^5$ GeV - $10^7$ GeV and in the northern hemisphere ranges from roughly $5 \times 10^8$ GeV to $10^9$ GeV.

For the follow-up of the potential optical counterpart, AGN J124942.3+344929, we do not include any of the GW spatial information because we are testing for neutrino emission from the precise location of the AGN rather than the full GW contour. This method is equivalent to the full all-sky scan method described above except the localization skymap is a delta function at the single pixel containing the AGN.

3.2. Low Latency Algorithm for Multi-messenger Astrophysics (LLAMA)

The LLAMA analysis is based on the calculation of Bayesian probabilities of the observed coincidences of GWs and high-energy neutrinos (Bartos et al. 2019). The odds ratio of the coincidence arising from a joint astrophysical emission of GWs and neutrinos being unrelated, considering any of them being not astrophysical as well, is used as a test statistic. For the analysis of confirmed GW detections followed up in this study, the GW events are assumed to be certainly astrophysical. The origins of the neutrinos are quantified for astrophysical or background scenarios. This requires the effective area of IceCube, past triggers of the GFU stream (which are predominantly of atmospheric origin), and the reconstructed energies of the neutrinos and their sky localizations. In addition to this, an $E^{-2}$ astrophysical spectrum is assumed. The relation between the GW and neutrinos are quantified via the difference between their detection times, their respective sky localizations, and the mean distance reconstruction of the GW event.

Together with the astrophysical emission energy $E_{\text{iso}}$, which is log-uniform between $10^46$ - $10^51$ erg, the distance reconstruction of the GW event accounts for the propagation of the neutrinos in space.

Precomputed background distributions are used for calculating the $p$-values. In order to include the distance information of the GW events appropriately, different background distributions are constructed for different source types (BNS, NSBH, BBH coalescences). For this purpose, GW events are simulated for each source category and they are randomly matched with scrambled past GFU detections. The number of neutrinos matched with each GW event is drawn according to a Poisson distribution with a mean corresponding to the average GFU trigger count in 1000 s. The 90% upper limits on the time-integrated neutrino flux are calculated as described in the appendix of Aartsen et al. (2020).

The neutrino follow-up on the candidate optical counterpart of GW190521 assumes the described emission model in Graham et al. (2020). The model assumes a linearly decreasing emission intensity. The start and end times of the emission were found from the observed light curves by following the same model, which also includes an optical diffusion delay obeying a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution. The least-squares estimations for the start and end times of the emission were found to be 23 and 80 days after the merger respectively, the same as that found in Graham et al. (2020). For the search, the neutrino emission is assumed to be linearly decreasing in this time window, as assumed in Graham et al. (2020), free of any diffusion effect; and coming from a point source located at the AGN’s position.

4. LOW-LATENCY OPERATION

Both UML (Aartsen et al. 2020) and LLAMA (Countryman et al. 2019; Bartos et al. 2019) analyses deployed low-latency pipelines designed to perform automated neutrino follow-up searches after receiving notices from LVC through the Gamma-ray Coordinates Network (GCN) (Keivani et al. 2019; Hussain et al. 2019).

These pipelines allow for rapid neutrino follow-ups and the dissemination of results to the astronomical community via GCN circulars. Low-latency neutrino information can help inform the observing strategies of electromagnetic observatories searching for electromagnetic counterparts to GW events. For example, obser-
Figure 2. Latency of IceCube GCN circulars relative to GW merger times for all 56 events reported during the O3 observing run. The outlier near 20 hours is S190421ar, where the LIGO GCN notice was not received until roughly 19 hours after the GW merger. This plot only shows the follow-ups which were triggered automatically via GCN notices sent by LVC.

Both analyses take advantage of the GCN notices to receive information about a given GW event and trigger a dedicated neutrino follow-up search. The pipelines use a python package, PyGCN (Singer 2021), to continuously monitor the GCN system for GCN notices sent by LVC. Due to the low-latency of the GFU Online stream (~30 s) and the speed of the follow-up analyses (~56 min), IceCube was able to rapidly circulate results from neutrino follow-ups to the astronomical community by using subsequent GCN circulars. Figure 2 shows the distribution of response times between the IceCube GCN circulars and the GW merger time. The latency shown in the figure takes into account the time taken by LVC to send the initial GCN notice. Also included in the latency is the final vetting of the IceCube results by the collaboration’s Realtime Oversight Committee (ROC) before sending the IceCube follow-up results via GCN circulars. Follow-ups with observed p-value ≤ 1% in either pipeline or any follow-ups that were deemed interesting to the astronomical community by the ROC, resulted in releasing the directional information of the potentially significant neutrino candidate via GCN circulars.

During O3, there were a total of 56 non-retracted candidate GW events that were publicly shared. We ran follow-ups on these events and 4 of them resulted in the release of the directional information of a neutrino to the astronomical community. These released coincidences were further followed-up by different telescopes and observatories, e.g. Swift-XRT. For each of these events, the LVC GCN notices and the GCN circular archives are linked. The archives show all follow-ups performed by each observatory, including the follow-ups that use IceCube information. These events were the following:

- **S190517h**: This candidate BBH merger event had one neutrino located in the 90% credible sky region of the GW localization. Due to this spatial coincidence the neutrino’s localization was shared with the community, despite its low statistical significance.

- **S190728q**: This candidate BBH merger event originally had a two-detector localization which did not yield any significant neutrino coincidence. The localization was later improved by the incorporation of the Virgo data, which increased the significance of one of the neutrinos. With the final online skymap the coincidence had the p-values 1.0% and 1.6% for the LLAMA and UML searches, respectively.

Figure 3 shows the various localization skymaps sent by LVC and the associated results from each pipeline, which were reported in low-latency via GCN circulars. The skymaps were refined over a period of roughly 14 hours following the initial GCN notice sent by LVC. It is seen that the p-values from both pipelines become more significant as the localization is refined, since the neutrino candidate remains within the high probability region of the skymap as the GW localization shrinks. Figure 4 shows the zoomed in
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3 GW event GCN notice: https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/notices_3/S190517h.lvc
4 GCN circular archive: https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/other/GW190517h.gcn3
5 https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/gcn/gcn3/24573.gcn3
6 GW event GCN notice: https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/notices_3/S190728q.lvc
7 GCN circular archive: https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/other/GW190728q.gcn3
8 https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/gcn/gcn3/25210.gcn3
Figure 3. Evolution of the localization skymap for S190728q and the associated follow-up results from each pipeline which were sent via GCN circulars. As the localization is refined, the \( p \)-values from both pipeline become more significant. The colormap in the figure represents the probability per pixel in the skymap and the green crosses show the neutrino observations.

updated skymap of GW190728_064510 with the coincident neutrino overlaid.

- S191216ap\(^9\), \(^{10}\): This candidate BBH merger event was one of the events for which the results of the two analyses disagreed. It was located relatively close, at \( \sim 400 \text{ Mpc} \). Due to this atypically close distance for a BBH merger, the neutrino-GW coincidence was favored by the LLAMA search which assigned a \( p \)-value of 0.6%, whereas the UML search obtained a \( p \)-value of 22%.

\(^9\) GW event GCN notice https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/notices_l/S191216ap.lvc
\(^{10}\) GCN circular archive https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/other/GW191216ap.gcn3

The most interesting response to our GCN notices came after the release of the neutrino coinciding with this event. HAWC observatory sent out another notice saying their most significant sub-threshold gamma-ray trigger coincides both with the neutrino and GW’s localizations.\(^{11}\) No further counterpart was found from the region and due to the uncertain nature of the gamma-ray trigger the state of the triple coincidence remained inconclusive.

\(^{11}\) https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/gcn/gcn3/26460.gcn3
\(^{12}\) https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/gcn/gcn3/26472.gcn3
This event was the only candidate BNS merger for which a coincident neutrino was released. However, it didn’t find a place in the published GW catalogs unlike the three events above. The UML and LLAMA searches obtained p-values of 0.3% and 1.7% respectively for the neutrino coincidence.

Figure 4. Skymap of GW190728 064510 overlaid with the coincident neutrino. The red region represents the GW localization probability per pixel. The blue cross shows the best-fit neutrino direction with the circle showing the 90% containment angular error region. The neutrino arrived 360 s before the GW merger. The final pre-trial p-values for this event are p = 0.013 and p = 0.04 with the LLAMA and UML analyses, respectively. The GCN circular describing this event was also sent in realtime (https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/gcn3/25210.gcn3).

Both of these low-latency pipelines are being prepared to continue neutrino follow-ups during the fourth observing run of LIGO, Virgo and KAGRA detectors, planned to start in 2023.

5. ARCHIVAL SEARCHES ON CATALOGS

Once the catalogs containing the confident GW detections were published by LVC, we performed archival searches on these events. There were several GW events added or subtracted in the catalog when compared to the the candidate events shared with the community by LVC during the O3 run. Initially, LVC released the catalog GWTC-2 (Abbott et al. 2021a), which contained 39 events from the first half of O3. These events were analyzed using both UML and LLAMA methods and no significant neutrino emission was found (Veske et al. 2021b). Later, this catalog was renewed by LVC resulting in the publication of GWTC-2.1(The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a), which has an updated statistic used for the classification of the events as confident detections. This updated catalog has 44 GW events out of which 8 were new when compared to GWTC-2. Three events from GWTC-2 were retracted in the updated catalog. Here, we present the results of the 44 confident events in GWTC-2.1. The 36 common events were reanalyzed by the LLAMA search with a renewed background distribution, which was generated with the latest population estimates for the binary black holes. No appreciable change was found with the previous analysis. The results of the UML analysis for the common events stayed the same. Finally, LVC also published GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b), a catalog containing the confident GW events observed during the second half of the O3 run (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b). These events were also analyzed as a part of the archival search.

First, we present the results of the searches for neutrino emission within a time window of ±500 s around the 80 mergers in GWTC-2.1 and GWTC-3. We did not observe a significant neutrino emission from any GW event by any analysis. ULs were placed on the time-integrated, energy scaled neutrino flux, $E^2 F$, as well as the $E_{iso}$, emitted in high-energy muon neutrinos. Table 1 summarizes the results for each follow-up of GW events in GWTC-2.1 performed by both analyses. Similarly, Table 2 shows the results for the GW events in GWTC-3. Figure 5 shows the histogram of the p-values for the collection of GW events from GWTC-1 (Abbott et al. 2019), GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a) and GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b) from both analyses and the background expectations. The set of events did not show any significant sign of emission. The shown background expectation for the UML analysis was derived from the background TS distributions of each GW. The LLAMA analyses’ background p-value distribution is seen to be uniform for all kinds of events. The different results for the LLAMA and the UML analyses arise from the inherent differences in the statistical approaches of the two — one being a Bayesian approach including priors of the GW source and the other being a purely frequentist approach. This is also true for the p-values obtained in the low-latency search described in section 4.

---

13 GW event GCN notice https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/notices/S200213t.lvc
14 GCN circular archive https://gcn.gsfc.nasa.gov/other/GW200213t.gcn3
Abbasi et al.  Figure 5. $p$-value distribution for the LLAMA (top panel) and UML (bottom panel) analyses of the 11 events in GWTC-1 (Abbott et al. 2019), 44 GW events in GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a), and the 36 GW events in GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b). The distributions are consistent with background expectations. The $p$-value distributions obtained for the events in GWTC-1 were already published in Aartsen et al. (2020). The LLAMA background expectations shown here is taken from that of one representative GW, and scaled to 91 GW events. The orange and blue bands represent the Poisson errors on the observed distribution of LLAMA and UML $p$-values, respectively.

Figure 6 shows the $E_{\text{iso}}$ ULs for 91 GW candidates in GWTC-1, GWTC-2.1 and GWTC-3. The blue, green, and orange triangles show the BBH, BNS and NSBH events, respectively. Note that the 36 GW candidates present in both GWTC-2 and GWTC-2.1 do not have updated skymaps available so the results shown here are using the GWTC-2 skymaps. The black crosses represent the total rest mass energy of the progenitors of the binary merger. The grey plusses represent the total energy radiated by the binary system. Also shown for reference is the observed $E_{\text{iso}}$ in photons by Fermi GBM for GW170817 (red star) (Abbott et al. 2017). The grey band represents the best and worst median UL that IceCube can place based on a point source hypothesis. The $E_{\text{iso}}$ ULs for the 11 GW events from GWTC-1 remain the same as those published in Aartsen et al. (2020).

Finally, no significant neutrino emission was found for the follow-ups on the candidate optical counterpart of GW190521 by both analysis methods. The modelled search of LLAMA yielded a $p$-value of 0.79, 90% upper limit on the $E^2F$ of 0.05 GeV cm$^{-2}$ and 90% upper limit on $E_{\text{iso}}$ of $8 \times 10^{53}$ erg. The UML analysis found a $p$-value of 0.25, with a 90% upper limit on the time-integrated flux of $E^2F=0.081$ GeV cm$^{-2}$.

6. CONCLUSION

Finding joint sources of GWs and high-energy neutrinos can help shed light on the sources of the highest energy neutrinos and cosmic rays (Murase & Bartos...
Studying these joint sources will also further expand our understanding of energetic outflows from the mergers of compact objects. The completion of the O3 realtime observing run and the release of the update to the second GW catalog, GWTC-2.1, followed by the release of GWTC-3 have provided a substantial increase in the number of reported GW candidates available for follow-up searches.

We developed low-latency pipelines which ran automated neutrino follow-ups for all GW events reported by LVK during the O3 observing run. Two different analyses, UML and LLAMA, both ran in low-latency and followed up each of the 56 candidate events reported during the O3 run. Four of the follow-up searches resulted in the release of the neutrino candidate’s direction to the public via GCN circulars. This information prompted follow-up searches in electromagnetic observatories such as Swift-XRT, demonstrating the power of low-latency multi-messenger observations in informing the observing strategies of other observatories. The unresolved triple coincidence for GW191216, involving a subthreshold gamma-ray trigger from HAWC observatory, triggered the development of general multi-messenger search methods for many messengers (Veske et al. 2021a).

In addition to the low-latency follow-ups, we performed three offline analyses of the GW events reported in GWTC-2.1 and GWTC-3. The first analysis searched for neutrino emission within a ±500 s time window centered around the GW merger time. Both the UML and LLAMA methods performed this search and no significant neutrino emission was observed in either search.

The second analysis was a 2-week follow-up of all BNS and NSBH candidate events with the UML search. All the GW events followed up in this analysis had at least one progenitor object with a mass estimate of < 3 M⊙. No significant neutrino emission was observed and 90% ULs were placed on the time-integrated neutrino flux from each source.

The third analysis searched for neutrino emission from the potential optical counterpart of the BBH merger GW190521 reported by ZTF. The UML analysis tested a time window of 112 days following the GW merger time which covers the entire flare in the optical light curve. The UML analysis assumed a uniform neutrino emission within the time window. The LLAMA analysis assumed linearly decreasing neutrino emission in a 57 day time window according to the contemplated emission scenario for the optical flare. No significant neutrino emission was observed in both analysis methods and we derived 90% ULs on the time-integrated flux and the Eiso from the AGN J124942.3+344929.

Apart from the analyses presented here, there also exists a gravitational wave follow-up analysis with neutrinos of a few 10^-100s of GeV energies detected by IceCube (Balagopal V. et al. 2022). This upcoming analysis will provide additional information, complimentary to the analyses with high-energy neutrinos presented here. Additionally, a search for extremely low energy neutrinos, with 0.5-5 GeV energies, from IceCube was conducted, and found no significant emission of neutrinos (Abbasi et al. 2021).

The low-latency and archival searches will continue to function during the upcoming O4 run of LVK. It is expected that the O4 operational run will demonstrate enhanced performance, thereby increasing the rate of expected mergers. This would provide more opportunities to conduct multi-messenger studies which may lead to a potential discovery of neutrino and gravitational wave correlations. Additionally, the inclusion of more detectors from LVK will reduce the area of the sky localizations of the GW skymaps. This is also expected to contribute towards higher significances in case of coincident detections.
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Table 1. Results for the events in GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a) for the 1000 s follow-up. GW190814 is labelled as a BBH merger here although the type of the lighter object with \( \sim 2.6 \, M_\odot \) is unknown (Abbott et al. 2020b). GW190917,144630 is labelled as NSBH since its estimated source properties are more like that of an NSBH event although the event was found to be significant by a BBH template. The table also shows the area on the sky containing 90% probabilities from the GW skymap.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Area [deg$^2$]</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>$E^2 F$ UL [GeV cm$^{-2}$]</th>
<th>$p$-value</th>
<th>$E^2 F$ UL [GeV cm$^{-2}$]</th>
<th>$E_{iso}$ UL [erg]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GW191103_012549 BBH</td>
<td>2519.6</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>1.96 × 10$^{53}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191105_143521 BBH</td>
<td>728.7</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>1.28 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191109_010717 BBH</td>
<td>1784.3</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>5.03 × 10$^{44}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191113_071753 BBH</td>
<td>2993.3</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>3.12 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191126_115259 BBH</td>
<td>1514.5</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>1.42 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191127_050227 BBH</td>
<td>1499.2</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>2.96 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191129_134029 BBH</td>
<td>848.3</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>8.95 × 10$^{53}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191204_110529 BBH</td>
<td>4747.7</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>1.46 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191204_171526 BBH</td>
<td>344.9</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.280</td>
<td>3.96 × 10$^{53}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191215_223052 BBH</td>
<td>595.8</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>2.98 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191216_213338 BBH</td>
<td>480.1</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>2.57 × 10$^{52}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191219_163120 NSBH</td>
<td>2232.1</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>2.80 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191222_035357 BBH</td>
<td>2299.2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>1.1 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191230_180458 BBH</td>
<td>1012.2</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>3.18 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200105_162426 NSBH</td>
<td>7881.8</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>2.98 × 10$^{52}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200112_155838 BBH</td>
<td>4250.4</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>8.43 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200115_042309 NSBH</td>
<td>511.9</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>2.12 × 10$^{42}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200128_022011 BBH</td>
<td>2677.5</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.243</td>
<td>9.31 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200129_065458 BBH</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>1.73 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200202_154313 BBH</td>
<td>159.3</td>
<td>0.0057</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>2.43 × 10$^{52}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200208_130117 BBH</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.518</td>
<td>9.25 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200208_222617 BBH</td>
<td>1889.2</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>4.98 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200209_085452 BBH</td>
<td>924.5</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.81 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200210_092254 BBH</td>
<td>1830.7</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>2.51 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200216_220804 BBH</td>
<td>3009.5</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>2.82 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200219_094415 BBH</td>
<td>702.1</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>9.57 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200220_061928 BBH</td>
<td>3484.7</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>4.23 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200220_124850 BBH</td>
<td>3168.9</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>6.31 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200224_222234 BBH</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>9.33 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200225_060421 BBH</td>
<td>509.0</td>
<td>0.0048</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>3.03 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200302_015811 BBH</td>
<td>7010.8</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>4.34 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200306_003714 BBH</td>
<td>4371.2</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>9.99 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200308_173609 BBH</td>
<td>18705.7</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>7.18 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200311_115853 BBH</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>4.38 × 10$^{53}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200316_215756 BBH</td>
<td>410.4</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>5.19 × 10$^{54}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200322_061133 BBH</td>
<td>31571.1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>4.39 × 10$^{55}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Results for the events in GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b) for the 1000 s follow-up. The central 68% energy range of the events contributing to the limits shown here ranges from $5 \times 10^5$ GeV - $10^7$ GeV in the southern hemisphere and $5 \times 10^3$ GeV - $10^5$ GeV in the northern hemisphere.
Table 3. Results for the 2 week follow-up analysis using the UML method. 3 events from GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a) and 4 events from GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b) were followed up as they were the only potential BNS/NSBH candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>$E^2F$ UL [GeVcm$^{-2}$]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GW190425</td>
<td>BNS</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW190917_114630</td>
<td>NSBH</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW190814</td>
<td>BBH</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW191219_163120</td>
<td>NSBH</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200105_162426</td>
<td>NSBH</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200115_042309</td>
<td>NSBH</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GW200210_092254</td>
<td>NSBH</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX

A. SKYMAPS

This appendix includes the skymaps obtained in the context of this analysis. Figure 7 shows the TS maps for the two-week follow-up analysis. Figures 9 and 10 show the skymaps with the GW probabilities and the observed neutrinos within the 1000 s time window in the archival search.

Figure 7. Final test statistic maps for the 3 BNS and NSBH candidates in GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a), and the 4 NSBH candidates in GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b). The pixel with highest test statistic in the sky is shown in the blue crosshairs. The color scale shows the test statistic weighted by the GW localization information. Here \( w = P_{GW}(\Omega)/A_{pix} \) where \( P_{GW}(\Omega) \) is the probability of the GW source being in a given pixel and \( A_{pix} \) is the pixel area.
Figure 9. Skymaps for the 1000 s follow-up of all events from the GWTC-2.1 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021a) catalog. Shown in red is the localization probability of the GW event with the black contour representing the 90% containment region of the GW localization. The blue crosses show the best fit neutrino candidate directions with the blue circles representing the 90% angular error region of the neutrino candidates.
Figure 10. Skymaps for the 1000 s follow-up of all events from the GWTC-3 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2021b) catalog.