

Circular Polarization of the Astrophysical Gravitational Wave Background

L. Valbusa Dall’Armi,^{1,2} A. Nishizawa,³ A. Ricciardone,^{4,1,2} and S. Matarrese^{1,2,5,6}

¹*Dipartimento di Fisica e Astronomia “G. Galilei”,*

Università degli Studi di Padova, via Marzolo 8, I-35131 Padova, Italy

²*INFN, Sezione di Padova, via Marzolo 8, I-35131 Padova, Italy*

³*Research Center for the Early Universe (RESCEU),*

School of Science, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

⁴*Dipartimento di Fisica “E. Fermi”, Università di Pisa, I-56127 Pisa, Italy*

⁵*INAF - Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, Vicolo dell’Osservatorio 5, I-35122 Padova, Italy*

⁶*Gran Sasso Science Institute, Viale F. Crispi 7, I-67100 L’Aquila, Italy*

(Dated: Friday 20th January, 2023)

The circular polarization of gravitational waves is a powerful observable to test parity violation in gravity and to distinguish between the primordial or the astrophysical origin of the stochastic background. This property comes from the expected unpolarized nature of the homogeneous and isotropic astrophysical background, contrary to some specific cosmological sources that can produce a polarized background. However, in this work we show that there is a non-negligible amount of circular polarization also in the astrophysical background, generated by Poisson fluctuations in the number of unresolved sources, which can be detected by the third-generation interferometers with signal-to-noise ratio larger than one. We also explain in which cases the gravitational wave maps can be cleaned from this extra source of noise, exploiting the frequency and the angular dependence, in order to search for signals from the early Universe. Future studies about the detection of polarized cosmological backgrounds with ground- and space-based interferometers should account for the presence of such a foreground contribution.

Introduction The astrophysical gravitational wave background (AGWB), generated by the superposition of many unresolved signals, is one of the main targets of future GW detectors, like the 2.5-generation detector, Voyager [1, 2], or the third-generation (3G) interferometers, Einstein Telescope (ET) [3] and Cosmic Explorer (CE) [4]. This background could be produced by different kinds of astrophysical objects [5, 6], like binary systems [7, 8], core-collapse supernovae [9–11], rotating pulsars [12, 13] or pulsar glitches [14]. The GWs emitted by stellar-mass binary black holes (BBH) are expected to give the dominant contribution to the signal in the frequency band covered by terrestrial detectors [15–19]. At the same time they will be a foreground difficult to be subtracted for space-based interferometers [20–22] like LISA [23], Taiji [24, 25], or DECIGO [26]. Given the enormous effort in the detection of stochastic backgrounds of cosmological origin (CGWB) [27–33], it is crucial to characterize the AGWB at best, in order to properly remove it from the data and obtain a better estimate of the primordial signal. This task is highly nontrivial, since difficulties arise in the parameter estimation of overlapping signals [34–37], the spectral reconstruction of the stochastic background [20–22], or the subtraction of the resolved sources, that, if not detected with sufficiently high signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), could produce an additional residual error on the characterization of the AGWB [38–42].

The detection of an isotropic and circularly polarized stochastic background has been extensively studied in the literature and it has been shown that cosmological signals could be detected if the circular polarization has sufficiently large an amplitude [43–46]. The measurement of

the circular polarization of an isotropic background can be done if the interferometers in a network are not coplanar, since in this case the contribution to the circular polarization induced from a given direction (and polarization) is not compensated by the one coming from the opposite direction with same polarization. While for coplanar interferometers one can take into account the motion of the solar system with respect to the cosmic reference frame [44]. A circularly-polarized CGWB is generated by several mechanisms in the early Universe, (e.g., axion inflation [47–51], Chern-Simons operators [52]). On the other hand, the AGWB is expected to be unpolarized in General Relativity, since the V Stokes parameter of the gravitational wave emitted by each binary is washed out by the average over the inclination angle of the system w.r.t. the direction of observation, if such an angle is distributed isotropically.

However, the AGWB is not perfectly homogeneous and isotropic, but it exhibits anisotropies due to clustering, velocity dispersion of the sources and propagation effects through the perturbed Universe (intrinsic anisotropies) [53–58], due to our peculiar motion w.r.t. the rest frame of the sources (kinetic dipole) [59–61] and due to Poisson fluctuations in the merger rate of the sources per unit volume (shot-noise anisotropies) [62–64]. The shot-noise contribution is expected to dominate over these tiny fluctuations in the energy density of the AGWB by orders of magnitude [17, 62–64]. A proper way to clean the AGWB maps from this source of noise consists in exploiting the different frequency shapes of the intrinsic and the kinetic fluctuations, in order to perform a very accurate component separation, in light of the many fre-

quencies accessible by future interferometers [60].

In this work we show that the anisotropic distribution of the GW sources generates an effective circular polarization of the AGWB. The signal emitted by each BBH is polarized and the averaged total polarization is nonzero as in the isotropic case, but it fluctuates according to the sum of the covariance of the shot-noise, of the intrinsic and of the kinetic anisotropies. According to the results found in [17, 60], the intrinsic and the kinetic terms can be neglected and it is sufficient to focus on the shot-noise produced by fluctuations in the number of BBH sources. Such a term is sufficiently large to be detected by a network of 3G interferometers, like ET and CE, with $\text{SNR} > 1$ for one year of observations, which makes it clear that also measurements of V -modes should carefully take into account such non-negligible astrophysical signals. Poisson fluctuations of the number of objects along different directions in the sky are independent, thus the angular power spectrum of the circular polarization is flat, as the intensity one [62–64], which means that the direction dependence could be exploited to disentangle the astrophysical signal from a homogeneous and isotropic cosmological one. In this *letter* we show how the total background can be cleaned by a joint combination of the angular dependence and the frequency shape of the shot-noise fluctuation, which goes as $f^{2/3}$ at low frequencies, when all the sources emit during the inspiral phase, and then it changes when some of the BBH are in the merger and in the ring-down stages. The frequency range with the large correlation of the shot-noise is below 100 Hz, which coincides with the range of frequencies in which the sensitivity of the network of ET+CE reaches its maximum, making therefore possible to identify this term and to eventually separate it from a cosmological contribution with a spectral shape f^{n_T} , with a precision that increases when $n_T \neq 2/3$. We found that, when a homogeneous and isotropic cosmological background is considered, the different angular dependence allows us to discriminate between the primordial and astrophysical contributions. Even if a detection of the CGWB is possible also in the presence of this foreground, the circular polarization of the AGWB plays a non-negligible role in the computation of the SNR and thus in the parameter estimation.

Characterization of the astrophysical background A GW of frequency f is described by the strain $h_{ij}(f, \hat{n}) = h_+(f)e_{ij,+}(\hat{n}) + h_\times(f)e_{ij,\times}(\hat{n})$, where \hat{n} is the direction of observation in the sky. Given a direction of observation \hat{n} and a coordinate system $\{\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}\}$ arbitrarily oriented, we define the orthonormal basis $\{\hat{n}, \hat{u}, \hat{v}\}$ by using $\hat{u} \equiv \hat{n} \times \hat{z}/|\hat{n} \times \hat{z}|$ and $\hat{v} \equiv \hat{n} \times \hat{u}$. These allow us to define the following real polarization tensors [44, 65],

$$e_{ij,+} \equiv \frac{u_i u_j - v_i v_j}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad e_{ij,\times} \equiv \frac{u_i v_j + u_j v_i}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (1)$$

which are related to the chiral ones by

$$h_R = \frac{h_+ - ih_\times}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad h_L = \frac{h_+ + ih_\times}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (2)$$

The intensity and the circular polarization associated to this wave are defined by using

$$S_I \equiv |h_R|^2 + |h_L|^2, \quad S_V \equiv |h_R|^2 - |h_L|^2. \quad (3)$$

We characterize the AGWB in terms of energy density per logarithmic frequency, normalized to the critical energy density of the Universe today, for the intensity and polarization

$$\Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^I \equiv \frac{4\pi^2 f^3}{3H_0^2} S_I, \quad \Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^V \equiv \frac{4\pi^2 f^3}{3H_0^2} S_V, \quad (4)$$

where H_0 is the value of the Hubble parameter at present and the Stokes parameters have been computed by considering the total AGWB strain, h_{AGWB} , which is the sum of the strains emitted by all the unresolved sources. To compute the GW energy density associated to the intensity and polarization we use the prescription given by [5, 6],

$$\Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^\alpha(\hat{n}, f) = \frac{f^2}{\rho_{\text{crit}} c^2} \sum_{t_d, \vec{\theta}, z} \frac{N_{\text{GW}}(\hat{n}, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) \frac{dE^\alpha}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, z, f)}{(1+z)H(z)T_{\text{obs}} \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z)} \quad (5)$$

where α identifies the Stokes parameters I and V , $\vec{\theta}$ represents the intrinsic parameters of a binary, z is the redshift at which the GWs are emitted, and t_d the time-delay between the formation of the binary and the merger [66]. We have discretized the parameter space in small bins of width Δt_d , $\Delta \vec{\theta}$ and Δz . $N_{\text{GW}}(\hat{n}, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z)$ is the number of unresolved BBH mergers in the observation time T_{obs} , characterized by the parameters $\vec{\theta}$ in the comoving volume along the direction \hat{n} at redshift z and formed at $t(z) - t_d$. Additional details about the population of BBHs can be found in the Supplemental Material. We have also introduced the ‘‘polarized energy spectrum’’

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dE^\alpha}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, f_e) \Big|_{f_e=(1+z)f} &\equiv \frac{\pi d_L^2(z) c^3 f^2}{2G(1+z)^2} S_\alpha(\vec{\theta}, f) \\ &= A_E(m_1, m_2, \chi_1, \chi_2, z, f) Q_\alpha(\iota), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with χ_1, χ_2 the spin of the BHs in the binary, d_L the luminosity distance of the source, G the gravitational constant and S_α defined in Eq. (3). The dependence on the inclination angle of the binary ι is encoded in the factor [67–70]

$$Q_\alpha(\iota) \equiv \begin{cases} \left(\frac{1+\cos^2 \iota}{2} \right)^2 + \cos^2 \iota & \alpha = I \\ \frac{1+\cos^2 \iota}{2} \cos \iota & \alpha = V \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

We consider all the events with $\text{SNR} \leq 20$ for each of the interferometers of the network as unresolved sources. This very conservative choice has been made to avoid errors in the estimate of the AGWB amplitude due to the subtraction of the resolved sources [39–42]. The important thing is that the number of GW events depends on the inclination angle through

$$N_{\text{GW}}(\hat{n}, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) \sim p(\iota) = \frac{\sin \iota}{2}, \quad (8)$$

where we have considered a uniform distribution for the inclination angle of the binary. The homogeneous and isotropic contribution to the AGWB depends on the following integrals over the inclination angle of the binary,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{AGWB}}^I &\sim \int d\iota p(\iota) Q_I(\iota) = \frac{4}{5}, \\ \bar{\Omega}_{\text{AGWB}}^V &\sim \int d\iota p(\iota) Q_V(\iota) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with $Q_\alpha(\iota)$ defined in Eq. (7). This means that the isotropic distribution of sources washes out the circular polarization of the single sources, which sum incoherently, as expected [6].

Shot-noise contribution to the circular polarization
However, the astrophysical background is produced by the superposition of the finite number of unresolved signals, therefore it is affected by shot-noise. More specifically, the number of GW events N_{GW} that contribute to the background is obtained as the sum of the GW events over all halos in the Universe. Both the number of halos and the GW events in a single halo fluctuate following a Poisson distribution, therefore the total number of mergers is described by a Compound Poisson Distribution (CPD) [62, 63]. The expectation value of the CPD, \bar{N}_{GW} , is used in Eq. (5) to compute the homogeneous and isotropic contribution to the background, $\bar{\Omega}_{\text{AGWB}}^\alpha$, which results in the integrals of Eq. (9) over the inclination angle. In the Supplemental Material, we show that the covariance associated to the shot-noise fluctuation is

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{\alpha\alpha'} &\equiv \text{cov} \left[\Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^\alpha(\hat{n}, f), \Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^{\alpha'}(\hat{n}', f') \right] \\ &= \sum_{t_d, \vec{\theta}, z} \frac{1}{[(1+z)H(z)]^2 (\rho_{\text{crit}} c^2)^2} \bar{N}_h(M_h, t_d, z) \\ &\quad \times \frac{\frac{dE^\alpha}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, z, f) \frac{dE^{\alpha'}}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, z, f')}{\left[T_{\text{obs}} \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z) \right]^2} \frac{\delta_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'}}{\Delta\Omega} \\ &\quad \times \left[\bar{N}_{\text{GW|h}}(M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) + \bar{N}_{\text{GW|h}}^2(M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where \bar{N}_h is the average number of halos with mass M_h in the Universe at time $t(z) - t_d$, while $\bar{N}_{\text{GW|h}}$ is the average number of GW sources per halo of mass M_h with parameters $\vec{\theta}$ produced at $t(z) - t_d$. $\Delta\Omega$ is the solid angle

of the pixels in which we have divided the sky, $\Delta\Omega \equiv 4\pi/N_{\text{pix}}$. The two contributions to the shot-noise match the results of [62–64] and, in agreement with [17], we have found that the $N_{\text{GW|h}}^2$ term is subdominant. The covariance of the shot-noise is proportional to $\delta_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'}$, which means that the angular power spectrum of the signal is the same at all multipoles [62–64]. In this case, the sum over all possible inclination angles of the binaries does not give a vanishing contribution to the circular polarization of the astrophysical background as in Eq. (9), because the integral over the inclination angle that determines the amplitude of the fluctuations is quadratic in Q_α defined in Eq. (7),

$$C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{\alpha\alpha'} \sim \int d\iota p(\iota) Q_\alpha(\iota) Q_{\alpha'}(\iota) \rightarrow \begin{cases} C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{II} \sim \frac{284}{315} \\ C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{IV} = 0 \\ C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{VV} \sim \frac{23}{105} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

Although the correlation of GW signals at different frequencies and in different regions of the sky is zero,

$$\langle h_{\text{AGWB}, \sigma}(f, \hat{n}) h_{\text{AGWB}, \sigma'}(f', \hat{n}') \rangle = 0 \quad (12)$$

when $f \neq f'$ or $\hat{n} \neq \hat{n}'$, the amplitude of the signals correlate at different frequencies. Eq. (10) shows indeed that the correlation of the shot-noise at different frequencies, for $f \lesssim 300$ Hz, is equal to one, where we have defined the correlation as

$$r \equiv \frac{C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{\alpha\alpha'}}{\sqrt{C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{\alpha\alpha'} C_{f'f', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{\alpha\alpha'}}}. \quad (13)$$

This correlation emerges because the AGWB is generated by many sources, which emit at different frequencies and different sky locations but with the common frequency dependence at the Newtonian order (at low frequencies in an early inspiral stage). Since the shot-noise arises from the fluctuations in the number of binaries, the fluctuations of the amplitudes of the AGWB at different frequencies are correlated. At low frequencies the frequency dependence of the cross-correlation ($f^{2/3} f'^{2/3}$ at the Newtonian order) can be factored out. At higher frequencies, when the binaries emit GWs at different stages of their evolution, the frequency dependence cannot be factored out and the correlation is smaller.

As we will see in the next paragraph, the spectral tilt predicted by the binary evolution is a crucial ingredient to detect (and to subtract) the intensity and the circular polarization of the AGWB.

There is a large amount of uncertainty in the covariance of the circular polarization due to shot-noise, for example, coming from the BBH merger rate and from the distribution of the intrinsic parameters of the binaries. The shot-noise fluctuation is also sensitive to the number of sources that the detector network can resolve;

thus the shot-noise changes if the sensitivity of the instruments changes and if a different SNR threshold of the single source is chosen. The shot-noise scales indeed with $\sqrt{N_{\text{GW}}}$, while the homogeneous and isotropic term depends linearly on N_{GW} .

Detection with 3G interferometers The detectability of the anisotropies of the intensity of the AGWB, including the shot-noise, has been already discussed in [17], therefore in this section we focus on the detectability of the circular polarization of the AGWB, marginalizing w.r.t. the intensity (monopole + shot-noise) of the AGWB. In analogy with the computations of [44–46], it can be shown that the covariance matrix associated to the determination of the shot-noise map, $\Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^V(\hat{n}, f)$, is

$$\mathcal{COV}_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{VV} = \frac{1}{T_{\text{obs}}} \frac{2\delta_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'}}{\sum_f \text{Tr} \left(B_{f,\hat{n}}^V S_f^{-1} B_{f,\hat{n}}^V S_f^{-1} \right)}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$B_{f,\hat{n}}^{V,AB} \equiv \Delta\Omega \frac{3H_0^2}{4\pi^2 f^3} \left(F_{A,f\hat{n}}^+ F_{B,f\hat{n}}^{\times*} - F_{A,f\hat{n}}^\times F_{B,f\hat{n}}^{+*} \right) i \frac{f^{2/3}}{f_{\text{piv}}^{2/3}}, \quad (15)$$

with $f_{\text{piv}} = 1$ Hz in our case and F_A the pattern function of the detector A along the direction of observation \hat{n} . The matrix S_f is proportional to the covariance matrix of the data,

$$S_f^{AB} \equiv N_f^{AB} + \sum_{\hat{n}'} \sum_{\alpha} B_{f,\hat{n}'}^{\alpha,AB} \Omega_{\text{piv},\hat{n}'}^{\alpha,\text{SN}}, \quad (16)$$

with N_f^{AB} the power spectrum of the noise of the interferometers and $\Omega_{\text{piv},\hat{n}'}^{\alpha,\text{SN}}$ the realization of the shot-noise we would like to measure at $f = f_{\text{piv}}$. The value of the SNR depends on the specific realization of the shot-noise of the circular polarization, but we know that on average it is equal to

$$\langle \text{SNR} \rangle = \sqrt{\sum_{\hat{n},\hat{n}'} C_{f_{\text{piv}},f_{\text{piv}},\hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{VV} (\mathcal{COV}^{-1})_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{VV}}}. \quad (17)$$

We have computed the SNR for the detector network assuming ET in a 10-km arm triangular configuration placed in Sardinia [71], a L-shape 40km CE in Hanford, and 20km CE in Livingston [72]. We find $\langle \text{SNR} \rangle \approx 1.1 \sqrt{\frac{T_{\text{obs}}}{1 \text{ yr}}}$, showing that the circular polarization of the AGWB can be a target for the 3G detectors. In Figure 1 we have plotted the result of the “mean amplitude” of the fluctuation in the circular polarization and the intensity of the AGWB and we have compared them with the Power-Law Sensitivity (PLS) curves for the network ET+CE. The PLS for the polarized background extends the result obtained in [73] to the case of




FIG. 1: Plot of the intensity and circular polarization of the AGWB (intensity of the isotropic contribution to the monopole + intensity and circular polarization of the “average shot noise amplitude for a single multipole”) as a function of the frequency. In the same figure the ET+CE PLS curves (SNR = 1) for the intensity (green) and circular polarization (dashed green) for five years of observation.

an anisotropic background with constant angular power spectrum. Furthermore, a joint estimate of the AGWB anisotropies with other Stokes parameters (as the intensity), would increase the SNR and could be used to constrain the BBH population too, as we will discuss in the next paragraph.

Foreground subtraction We have shown that the circular polarization of the AGWB constitutes a target for the 3G interferometers, but, at the same time, it could also be a limitation for the detection of polarized cosmological signals. For simplicity, we consider a homogeneous and isotropic cosmological background characterized by a power-law spectrum of the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Omega}_{\text{CGWB}}^I(f) &= \bar{A}_{\text{CGWB}}^I f^{n_T^I}, \\ \bar{\Omega}_{\text{CGWB}}^V(f) &= \bar{A}_{\text{CGWB}}^V f^{n_T^V}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where \bar{A}_{CGWB}^I , \bar{A}_{CGWB}^V (the amplitudes of the background at 1 Hz), n_T^I and n_T^V are the cosmological parameters we would like to estimate. Intuitively, to distinguish the cosmological signal from an astrophysical one, different tools can be exploited, such as the ratio of the circular polarization to the intensity (which is equal to $69/284 \approx 0.24$ for the AGWB by looking at Eq. (11)), or the different frequency dependence or the different angular pattern of the GW sky maps. As in [60], the frequency dependence of the anisotropies would be a powerful tool to disentangle different contributions to the anisotropies in the total map when the spectral shape of the components differs a lot, like for example when $n_T^I \neq n_T^V$ or if $n_T^I = n_T^V \neq 2/3$. When a homogeneous and isotropic cosmological background is considered, the feature that allows to subtract efficiently the astrophysical foreground

is the angular dependence of the fluctuations in the spectrum of the intensity and of the circular polarization. Since the angular power spectrum of the AGWB is flat in multipole space, all the multipoles have the same amplitude, therefore the degeneracy with the CGWB is broken, because the monopole of the primordial background dominates by many orders of magnitude over the anisotropies, generated by the propagation of the GWs through the perturbed Universe [30, 74–77]. In this *letter*, we show an example of foreground removal for $n_T^I = n_T^V = n_T$, estimating the amplitude \bar{A}_{CGWB}^V , marginalizing over all the other parameters. Since the background is isotropic, the marginalized covariance of the amplitude of the circular polarization is

$$\sigma_{A^V}^2 = \frac{1}{T_{\text{obs}}} \frac{2}{\sum_f \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\gamma}_f^V S_f^{-1} \hat{\gamma}_f^V S_f^{-1} \right) + \frac{\sum_{\hat{n}, \hat{l}, f, f'} \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\gamma}_f^V S_f^{-1} B_{f, \hat{n}}^V S_f^{-1} \right) \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\gamma}_{f'}^V S_{f'}^{-1} B_{f', \hat{l}}^V S_{f'}^{-1} \right)}{\left[\sum_{f''} \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\gamma}_{f''}^V S_{f''}^{-1} \hat{\gamma}_{f''}^V S_{f''}^{-1} \right) \right]^2} \times \frac{C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{l}}^{VV}}{f^{n_T} f'^{n_T}}, \quad (19)$$

where $\hat{\gamma}_f^{V,AB} \equiv \sum_{\hat{n}} B_{f, \hat{n}}^{V,AB}$ is proportional to the overlap reduction function of the interferometer pair (A, B) . The tensor B is defined as in Eq. (15), but with f^{n_T} instead of $f^{2/3}$. The first term is the standard one computed, for instance, in [33, 78–81], while the second one is the covariance due to the component separation evaluated for the first time for the anisotropic case in [60]. It is clear that when $n_T \rightarrow 2/3$ and when $C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{l}}^{VV}$ is independent of \hat{n} and \hat{l} (i.e., monopole signal), the CGWB and the AGWB are indistinguishable and the second contribution is proportional just to the amplitude of the AGWB fluctuations and it looks like the cosmic variance term computed in [82], $\sigma_{A^V}^2 \sim \sigma_{\text{instr}}^2 + |A_{\text{foreground}}^V|^2$. In our case, the AGWB is not isotropic, but flat in multipole space. This means that the factor that multiplies $C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{l}}^{VV}$ is much smaller than one also in the case $n_T \rightarrow 2/3$. This is equivalent to say that measurements of the first few multipoles allow to break the degeneracy between the AGWB and the CGWB monopoles. The covariance due to the component separation is independent on the observation time, which implies that for large T_{obs} the impact of the foreground on the SNR becomes larger. We have found indeed that, although the detection of the circular polarization of the CGWB is mainly limited by instrumental noise as for the intensity, the SNR receives corrections from the presence of the astrophysical foreground of the order of 6% for one year of observations and of 20% for five years.

Conclusions Usually, measurements of the Stokes parameters of the SGWB are considered an efficient way

to separate signals that overlap at interferometers, since the homogeneous and isotropic part of the astrophysical signal has a vanishing circular polarization, contrary to some cosmological models that can show up a polarized background. In this *letter* we have shown that a non-negligible amount of circular polarization is present also in the AGWB, induced by the anisotropic distribution of the sources. In particular, we have focused on the AGWB generated by BBH mergers, for which the Poisson fluctuation of the number of sources dominates the contributions due to clustering and to our peculiar motion by orders of magnitude. The number of sources with given intrinsic parameters that contribute to the background is a random realization of the shot-noise distribution, which has mean and covariance equal to the total number of sources in a given bin of redshifts and intrinsic parameters of the binary. The average over the inclination angle in this case gives a non-zero amount of circular polarization, which coherently sums at low frequencies, showing a $f^{2/3}$ trend and a flat angular power spectrum. We have found that the V -Stokes parameter produced by Poisson fluctuations is sufficiently large that can be detected with an SNR $\simeq 2.5$ in five years of observation by the detector network ET+CE. The circular polarization of the AGWB due to shot noise, together with the intensity, could be used to constrain the population of BBH, by looking at the shape of the peak of the signal at high frequencies, or to improve the description of the merger rate at high redshifts, looking at the total amplitude of the fluctuations. Furthermore, the circular polarization of the AGWB constitutes a troublesome foreground that limits the detection of a stochastic background of cosmological origin. In this preliminary work we have evaluated the efficiency of the subtraction of the circular polarization of the AGWB for ET+CE in the presence of a cosmological signal described by a power law. By exploiting the different features of the cosmological and astrophysical spectra, such as the ratio between the intensity and the polarization, the frequency dependence and the features in the sky maps, it is possible to reconstruct the primordial background with very good precision, being limited just by instrumental noise as for the case of the intensity. The small error associated to the component separation of the cosmological and the astrophysical background is mainly due to the significant difference between the sky maps of the CGWB we have considered (isotropic) and the AGWB map (white noise in the angular space). In our analysis we have not estimated the tensor tilt n_T and we have not performed a joint-analysis of polarization and intensity. Naively, the former can worsen the result, while the latter can improve it. We leave this for a future work.

Acknowledgments. L.V. thanks the U. of Tokyo for the warm hospitality during the development of this work and the support from JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. JP20H04726. A. N. is supported by JSPS KAK-

ENHI Grants No. JP19H01894 and No. JP20H04726 and by Research Grants from the Inamori Foundation. A. R. acknowledges financial support from the Supporting Talent in ReSearch@University of Padova (STARS@UNIPD) for the project ‘‘Constraining Cosmology and Astrophysics with Gravitational Waves, Cosmic Microwave Background and Large-Scale Structure cross-correlations’’. S.M. acknowledges partial financial support by ASI Grant No. 2016-24-H.0.

POPULATION OF BINARY BLACK HOLES

BBHs are characterized by their intrinsic properties $\vec{\theta}$, by the redshift of the merger z and by the time delay between the formation of the binary and the merger of the two objects¹. In our work we assume that we can factor out the dependence of the binary parameters w.r.t. the redshift and the time delay,

$$\frac{d\bar{N}_{\text{GW}}}{dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz}(t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) = p(\vec{\theta}) \frac{dR(t_d, z)}{dt_d} T_{\text{obs}} \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z_d) w(\vec{\theta}, z), \quad (20)$$

where T_{obs} is the observation time, while the comoving volume element is defined by

$$\frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z_d) = \frac{c \chi^2(z_d)}{H(z_d)}, \quad (21)$$

with χ comoving distance. Note that however this is not true in general and one should use a generic, non-factorable expression, derived from the posterior of the observation of resolved sources at interferometers. Furthermore, we assume that the distribution of the astrophysical parameters that characterize the binary can be factorized in the following way,

$$p(\vec{\theta}) = p(m_1, m_2) p(\chi_1, \chi_2) p(\iota). \quad (22)$$

We use the Power-Law + Peak mass distribution for BHs of masses between $m_{\text{min}} = 2.5 M_{\odot}$ and $m_{\text{max}} = 100 M_{\odot}$, and a uniform distribution in the mass ratio $q \equiv m_2/m_1$, with $q \leq 1$ [16, 18]. We assume that the spin distribution of the compact objects is a Gaussian centered in 0 and covariance 0.1, while for the inclination angle we are considering an isotropic distribution of the sources, therefore we assume that $\cos \iota$ is drawn from a uniform PDF, thus

$$p(\iota) = p(\cos \iota) \frac{d \cos \iota}{d(-\iota)} = \frac{1}{2} \sin \iota \quad \text{for } 0 \leq \iota \leq \pi. \quad (23)$$

The merger rate has been derived from the Star Formation Rate (SFR) at a given redshift, by using

$$R_{\star}(z) = \int dM_h \langle \text{SFR}(M_h, z) \rangle \frac{d\bar{N}_h}{dM_h}(M_h, z) [\text{yr}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{-3}], \quad (24)$$

where we have used the average SFR per halo from Universe Machine [83] as in [17] and the halo mass function of [84]. We connect the merger rate to the SFR by using

$$R(z) = R_{\text{LVK}}(z=0) \frac{\int dt_d p(t_d) R_{\star}[z_d(z, t_d)]}{\int dt_d p(t_d) R_{\star}[z_d(z=0, t_d)]}, \quad (25)$$

where the LVK normalization considered has been taken from the central value of (for BBH), $R_{\text{LVK}}(z=0) = 23.9_{-8.6}^{+14} \text{Gpc}^{-3} \text{yr}^{-1}$ [18]. The time delay distribution has been taken as an inverse power law from 50 Myr to the age of the Universe [85, 86]. It is therefore straightforward to see that the merger rate for a given time delay is

$$\frac{dR(t_d, z)}{dt_d} \equiv R_{\text{LVK}}(z=0) \frac{p(t_d) R_{\star}[z_d(z, t_d)]}{\int dt_d p(t_d) R_{\star}[z_d(z=0, t_d)]}. \quad (26)$$

By combining Eqs. (20), (26), it is straightforward to see that the mean number of GW events per halo is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}(M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) &= \frac{R_{\text{LVK}}(0) \langle \text{SFR}(M_h, t_d, z) \rangle}{\int dt_d p(t_d) R_{\star}[z_d(z=0, t_d)]} \\ &\quad p(t_d) p(\vec{\theta}) w(\vec{\theta}, z) T_{\text{obs}} \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z) \\ &\quad \Delta t_d \Delta \vec{\theta} \Delta z. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

SHOT-NOISE COMPUTATION

We are looking at the fluctuations of the object $dN_{\text{GW}}/dt_d d\vec{\theta}$, which is the number of GW event at z with parameters $\vec{\theta}$ and time delay t_d . We describe this events by using

$$\frac{dN_{\text{GW}}}{dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz}(\hat{n}, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) = \sum_{M_h} \frac{dN_{\text{GW}}}{dM_h dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz}(\hat{n}, M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) \Delta M_h, \quad (28)$$

where we have defined the discrete summation in the following way,

$$\sum_{M_h} \frac{dN_{\text{GW}}(M_h)}{dM_h dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz} \Delta M_h \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{i_{\text{max}}} \frac{dN_{\text{GW}|h}(M_h^{(i)})}{dM_h dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz} \Delta M_h^{(i)}, \quad (29)$$

and we have defined the number of GW events per each bin in all the halos of mass M_h as

$$\frac{dN_{\text{GW}}(M_h)}{dM_h dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz} \Delta M_h \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{N_h(\hat{n}, M_h, t_d, z)} \frac{dN_{\text{GW}|h}^i}{dt_d d\vec{\theta} dz}(M_h). \quad (30)$$

¹ For practical purposes, here we include in the description of the population the detector window function w , thus the population discussed here is not the full BBH population, but the one that contributes to the astrophysical background.

Both the number of GW events per halo and the number of halos with a given mass fluctuate according to a Poisson distribution,

$$p(N_{\text{GW}|h}^i, \bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}) = \frac{\bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}^{N_{\text{GW}|h}^i} e^{-\bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}}}{N_{\text{GW}|h}^i!}, \quad (31)$$

$$p(N_h, \bar{N}_h) = \frac{\bar{N}_h^{N_h} e^{-\bar{N}_h}}{N_h!},$$

where the mean number of GW events per halo has been computed in Eq. (27), while the average number of halos is simply defined by

$$\bar{N}_h(M_h, t_d, z) = \frac{d\bar{N}_h}{dM_h}(M_h, t_d, z) \Delta M_h, \quad (32)$$

with $d\bar{N}_h/dM_h$ the halo mass function. Note that $p(\vec{\theta})$ contains also information about the orientation angle of the binary. N_{GW} is obtained by the sum of many Poisson variables, therefore it follows a Compound Poisson Distribution [62–64]. The expectation value of the CPD is the product of the expectation values of the two Poisson distributions,

$$\bar{N}_{\text{GW}}(t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) = \sum_{M_h} \bar{N}_h(M_h, t_d, z), \bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}(M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z). \quad (33)$$

This expectation value has been used in Eqs. (4) to compute the homogeneous and isotropic contribution to the background, which results in the integrals of Eq. (9) over the inclination angle. In this section we are interested in evaluating the impact of the fluctuation of N_{GW} to the signal. It is possible to show [62–64] that the fluctuation of this shot-noise contribution is equal to

$$\sigma_{N_{\text{GW}}N'_{\text{GW}}}^2 \equiv \text{cov} \left[N_{\text{GW}}(\hat{n}, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z), N_{\text{GW}}(\hat{n}', t'_d, \vec{\theta}', z') \right] = \sum_{M_h} \bar{N}_h \left(\bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h} + \bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}^2 \right) \delta_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'} \delta_{t_d t'_d} \delta_{\vec{\theta}\vec{\theta}'} \delta_{zz'}, \quad (34)$$

where we have introduced the short notation for the Kronecker delta,

$$\begin{cases} X \equiv x_i \\ X' \equiv x_j \end{cases} \rightarrow \delta_{XX'} \equiv \delta_{ij}. \quad (35)$$

On average the shot-noise fluctuation does not contribute to the AGWB signal, but since the covariance is not zero a net AGWB Stokes parameter is produced by a random realization of the Compound Poisson Distribution,

$$C_{ff', \hat{n}\hat{n}'}^{\alpha\alpha'} \equiv \text{cov} \left[\Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^\alpha(\hat{n}, f), \Omega_{\text{AGWB}}^{\alpha'}(\hat{n}', f') \right] = \sum_{t_d, \vec{\theta}, z} \sum_{t'_d, \vec{\theta}', z'} \frac{1}{(1+z)H(z)} \frac{1}{(1+z')H(z')} \frac{(ff')^2}{(\rho_{\text{crit}} c^2)^2} \frac{dE^V}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, z, f) \frac{dE^V}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}', z', f') \frac{\sigma_{N_{\text{GW}}N'_{\text{GW}}}^2}{T_{\text{obs}}^2 \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z) \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z')} = \sum_{t_d, \vec{\theta}, z} \frac{1}{[(1+z)H(z)]^2} \frac{\frac{dE^\alpha}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, z, f) \frac{dE^{\alpha'}}{df_e d\Omega_e}(\vec{\theta}, z, f')}{\left[T_{\text{obs}} \frac{dV}{dz d\Omega_e}(z) \right]^2} \frac{(ff')^2}{(\rho_{\text{crit}} c^2)^2} \bar{N}_h(M_h, t_d, z) \left[\bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}(M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) + \bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}^2(M_h, t_d, \vec{\theta}, z) \right] \delta_{\hat{n}\hat{n}'}. \quad (36)$$

We note that the $\bar{N}_{\text{GW}|h}^2$ term is always subdominant, independently of the width of the bins, because of the low number of GW events per single halo. From now on we will therefore focus our analysis just on the linear term, which is analogous to the covariance obtained by a simple Poisson distribution.

Quant. Grav., vol. 36, no. 24, p. 245010, 2019.

- [2] R. X. Adhikari *et al.*, “A cryogenic silicon interferometer for gravitational-wave detection,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 37, no. 16, p. 165003, 2020.
- [3] M. Maggiore *et al.*, “Science Case for the Einstein Telescope,” *JCAP*, vol. 03, p. 050, 2020.
- [4] M. Evans *et al.*, “A Horizon Study for Cosmic Explorer: Science, Observatories, and Community,” 9 2021.
- [5] E. S. Phinney, “A Practical theorem on gravitational wave backgrounds,” 7 2001.
- [6] T. Regimbau, “The astrophysical gravitational wave stochastic background,” *Res. Astron. Astrophys.*, vol. 11, pp. 369–390, 2011.

[1] R. X. Adhikari *et al.*, “Astrophysical science metrics for next-generation gravitational-wave detectors,” *Class.*

- [7] X.-J. Zhu, E. Howell, T. Regimbau, D. Blair, and Z.-H. Zhu, “Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background from Coalescing Binary Black Holes,” *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 739, p. 86, 2011.
- [8] X.-J. Zhu, E. J. Howell, D. G. Blair, and Z.-H. Zhu, “On the gravitational wave background from compact binary coalescences in the band of ground-based interferometers,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 431, no. 1, pp. 882–899, 2013.
- [9] V. Ferrari, S. Matarrese, and R. Schneider, “Gravitational wave background from a cosmological population of core collapse supernovae,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 303, p. 247, 1999.
- [10] A. Buonanno, G. Sigl, G. G. Raffelt, H.-T. Janka, and E. Muller, “Stochastic gravitational wave background from cosmological supernovae,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 72, p. 084001, 2005.
- [11] B. Finkel, H. Andresen, and V. Mandic, “Stochastic gravitational-wave background from stellar core-collapse events,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 105, no. 6, p. 063022, 2022.
- [12] V. Ferrari, S. Matarrese, and R. Schneider, “Stochastic background of gravitational waves generated by a cosmological population of young, rapidly rotating neutron stars,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 303, p. 258, 1999.
- [13] P. A. Rosado, “Gravitational wave background from rotating neutron stars,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 86, p. 104007, 2012.
- [14] L. Warszawski and A. Melatos, “Gravitational-wave bursts and stochastic background from superfluid vortex avalanches during pulsar glitches,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 423, pp. 2058–2074, July 2012.
- [15] L. Boco, A. Lapi, S. Goswami, F. Perrotta, C. Baccigalupi, and L. Danese, “Merging Rates of Compact Binaries in Galaxies: Perspectives for Gravitational Wave Detections,” 7 2019.
- [16] R. Abbott *et al.*, “Population Properties of Compact Objects from the Second LIGO-Virgo Gravitational-Wave Transient Catalog,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, vol. 913, no. 1, p. L7, 2021.
- [17] N. Bellomo, D. Bertacca, A. C. Jenkins, S. Matarrese, A. Raccanelli, T. Regimbau, A. Ricciardone, and M. Sakellariadou, “CLASS_GWB: robust modeling of the astrophysical gravitational wave background anisotropies,” *JCAP*, vol. 06, no. 06, p. 030, 2022.
- [18] R. Abbott *et al.*, “The population of merging compact binaries inferred using gravitational waves through GWTC-3,” 11 2021.
- [19] G. Capurri, A. Lapi, C. Baccigalupi, L. Boco, G. Scelfo, and T. Ronconi, “Intensity and anisotropies of the stochastic gravitational wave background from merging compact binaries in galaxies,” *JCAP*, vol. 11, p. 032, 2021.
- [20] C. Caprini, D. G. Figueroa, R. Flauger, G. Nardini, M. Peloso, M. Pieroni, A. Ricciardone, and G. Tasinato, “Reconstructing the spectral shape of a stochastic gravitational wave background with LISA,” *JCAP*, vol. 11, p. 017, 2019.
- [21] G. Boileau, N. Christensen, R. Meyer, and N. J. Cornish, “Spectral separation of the stochastic gravitational-wave background for LISA: Observing both cosmological and astrophysical backgrounds,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 10, p. 103529, 2021.
- [22] R. Flauger, N. Karnesis, G. Nardini, M. Pieroni, A. Ricciardone, and J. Torrado, “Improved reconstruction of a stochastic gravitational wave background with LISA,” *JCAP*, vol. 01, p. 059, 2021.
- [23] P. Amaro-Seoane *et al.*, “Laser Interferometer Space Antenna,” 2 2017.
- [24] W.-R. Hu and Y.-L. Wu, “The Taiji Program in Space for gravitational wave physics and the nature of gravity,” *Natl. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 4, no. 5, pp. 685–686, 2017.
- [25] W.-H. Ruan, Z.-K. Guo, R.-G. Cai, and Y.-Z. Zhang, “Taiji program: Gravitational-wave sources,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, vol. 35, no. 17, p. 2050075, 2020.
- [26] S. Kawamura *et al.*, “Current status of space gravitational wave antenna DECIGO and B-DECIGO,” *PTEP*, vol. 2021, no. 5, p. 05A105, 2021.
- [27] N. Bartolo *et al.*, “Science with the space-based interferometer LISA. IV: Probing inflation with gravitational waves,” *JCAP*, vol. 12, p. 026, 2016.
- [28] M. C. Guzzetti, N. Bartolo, M. Liguori, and S. Matarrese, “Gravitational waves from inflation,” *Riv. Nuovo Cim.*, vol. 39, no. 9, pp. 399–495, 2016.
- [29] C. Caprini and D. G. Figueroa, “Cosmological Backgrounds of Gravitational Waves,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 35, no. 16, p. 163001, 2018.
- [30] N. Bartolo, D. Bertacca, S. Matarrese, M. Peloso, A. Ricciardone, A. Riotto, and G. Tasinato, “Characterizing the cosmological gravitational wave background: Anisotropies and non-Gaussianity,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, no. 2, p. 023527, 2020.
- [31] P. Bari, A. Ricciardone, N. Bartolo, D. Bertacca, and S. Matarrese, “Signatures of Primordial Gravitational Waves on the Large-Scale Structure of the Universe,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 129, no. 9, p. 091301, 2022.
- [32] P. Auclair *et al.*, “Cosmology with the Laser Interferometer Space Antenna,” 4 2022.
- [33] N. Bartolo *et al.*, “Probing Anisotropies of the Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background with LISA,” 1 2022.
- [34] A. Samajdar, J. Janquart, C. Van Den Broeck, and T. Dietrich, “Biases in parameter estimation from overlapping gravitational-wave signals in the third generation detector era,” 2 2021.
- [35] E. Pizzati, S. Sachdev, A. Gupta, and B. Sathyaprakash, “Bayesian inference of overlapping gravitational wave signals,” 2 2021.
- [36] Y. Himemoto, A. Nishizawa, and A. Taruya, “Impacts of overlapping gravitational-wave signals on the parameter estimation: Toward the search for cosmological backgrounds,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, no. 4, p. 044010, 2021.
- [37] A. Antonelli, O. Burke, and J. R. Gair, “Noisy neighbours: inference biases from overlapping gravitational-wave signals,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 507, no. 4, pp. 5069–5086, 2021.
- [38] C. Cutler and J. Harms, “BBO and the neutron-star-binary subtraction problem,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 73, p. 042001, 2006.
- [39] S. Sachdev, T. Regimbau, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, “Subtracting compact binary foreground sources to reveal primordial gravitational-wave backgrounds,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, no. 2, p. 024051, 2020.
- [40] B. Zhou, L. Reali, E. Berti, M. Çalıřkan, C. Creque-Sarbinowski, M. Kamionkowski, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, “Compact Binary Foreground Subtraction in Next-Generation Ground-Based Observatories,” 9 2022.
- [41] B. Zhou, L. Reali, E. Berti, M. Çalıřkan, C. Creque-

- Sarbinowski, M. Kamionkowski, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, “Subtracting Compact Binary Foregrounds to Search for Subdominant Gravitational-Wave Backgrounds in Next-Generation Ground-Based Observatories,” 9 2022.
- [42] H. Zhong, R. Ormiston, and V. Mandic, “Detecting cosmological gravitational waves background after removal of compact binary coalescences in future gravitational wave detectors,” 9 2022.
- [43] S. G. Crowder, R. Namba, V. Mandic, S. Mukohyama, and M. Peloso, “Measurement of Parity Violation in the Early Universe using Gravitational-wave Detectors,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 726, pp. 66–71, 2013.
- [44] V. Domcke, J. Garcia-Bellido, M. Peloso, M. Pieroni, A. Ricciardone, L. Sorbo, and G. Tasinato, “Measuring the net circular polarization of the stochastic gravitational wave background with interferometers,” *JCAP*, vol. 05, p. 028, 2020.
- [45] G. Orlando, M. Pieroni, and A. Ricciardone, “Measuring Parity Violation in the Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background with the LISA-Taiji network,” *JCAP*, vol. 03, p. 069, 2021.
- [46] K. Martinovic, C. Badger, M. Sakellariadou, and V. Mandic, “Searching for parity violation with the LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA network,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 104, no. 8, p. L081101, 2021.
- [47] M. M. Anber and L. Sorbo, “N-flationary magnetic fields,” *JCAP*, vol. 10, p. 018, 2006.
- [48] N. Barnaby and M. Peloso, “Large Nongaussianity in Axion Inflation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 106, p. 181301, 2011.
- [49] L. Sorbo, “Parity violation in the Cosmic Microwave Background from a pseudoscalar inflaton,” *JCAP*, vol. 06, p. 003, 2011.
- [50] N. Barnaby, R. Namba, and M. Peloso, “Phenomenology of a Pseudo-Scalar Inflaton: Naturally Large Nongaussianity,” *JCAP*, vol. 04, p. 009, 2011.
- [51] N. Barnaby, E. Pajer, and M. Peloso, “Gauge Field Production in Axion Inflation: Consequences for Monodromy, non-Gaussianity in the CMB, and Gravitational Waves at Interferometers,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 85, p. 023525, 2012.
- [52] N. Bartolo and G. Orlando, “Parity breaking signatures from a Chern-Simons coupling during inflation: the case of non-Gaussian gravitational waves,” *JCAP*, vol. 07, p. 034, 2017.
- [53] T. Namikawa, A. Nishizawa, and A. Taruya, “Anisotropies of gravitational-wave standard sirens as a new cosmological probe without redshift information,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 116, no. 12, p. 121302, 2016.
- [54] T. Namikawa, A. Nishizawa, and A. Taruya, “Detecting Black-Hole Binary Clustering via the Second-Generation Gravitational-Wave Detectors,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 94, no. 2, p. 024013, 2016.
- [55] G. Cusin, C. Pitrou, and J.-P. Uzan, “Anisotropy of the astrophysical gravitational wave background: Analytic expression of the angular power spectrum and correlation with cosmological observations,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 96, no. 10, p. 103019, 2017.
- [56] G. Cusin, I. Dvorkin, C. Pitrou, and J.-P. Uzan, “First predictions of the angular power spectrum of the astrophysical gravitational wave background,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 120, p. 231101, 2018.
- [57] A. C. Jenkins, R. O’Shaughnessy, M. Sakellariadou, and D. Wysocki, “Anisotropies in the astrophysical gravitational-wave background: The impact of black hole distributions,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 122, no. 11, p. 111101, 2019.
- [58] D. Bertacca, A. Ricciardone, N. Bellomo, A. C. Jenkins, S. Matarrese, A. Raccanelli, T. Regimbau, and M. Sakellariadou, “Projection effects on the observed angular spectrum of the astrophysical stochastic gravitational wave background,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, no. 10, p. 103513, 2020.
- [59] G. Cusin and G. Tasinato, “Doppler boosting the stochastic gravitational wave background,” *JCAP*, vol. 08, no. 08, p. 036, 2022.
- [60] L. Valbusa Dall’Armi, A. Ricciardone, and D. Bertacca, “The dipole of the astrophysical gravitational-wave background,” *JCAP*, vol. 11, p. 040, 2022.
- [61] A. K.-W. Chung, A. C. Jenkins, J. D. Romano, and M. Sakellariadou, “Targeted search for the kinematic dipole of the gravitational-wave background,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 106, no. 8, p. 082005, 2022.
- [62] A. C. Jenkins and M. Sakellariadou, “Shot noise in the astrophysical gravitational-wave background,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 100, no. 6, p. 063508, 2019.
- [63] A. C. Jenkins, J. D. Romano, and M. Sakellariadou, “Estimating the angular power spectrum of the gravitational-wave background in the presence of shot noise,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 100, no. 8, p. 083501, 2019.
- [64] D. Alonso, G. Cusin, P. G. Ferreira, and C. Pitrou, “Detecting the anisotropic astrophysical gravitational wave background in the presence of shot noise through cross-correlations,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 102, no. 2, p. 023002, 2020.
- [65] N. Bartolo, V. Domcke, D. G. Figueroa, J. García-Bellido, M. Peloso, M. Pieroni, A. Ricciardone, M. Sakellariadou, L. Sorbo, and G. Tasinato, “Probing non-Gaussian Stochastic Gravitational Wave Backgrounds with LISA,” *JCAP*, vol. 11, p. 034, 2018.
- [66] M. Fishbach and V. Kalogera, “The Time Delay Distribution and Formation Metallicity of LIGO-Virgo’s Binary Black Holes,” *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, vol. 914, no. 2, p. L30, 2021.
- [67] P. C. Peters and J. Mathews, “Gravitational radiation from point masses in a Keplerian orbit,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 131, pp. 435–439, 1963.
- [68] L. S. Finn and D. F. Chernoff, “Observing binary inspiral in gravitational radiation: One interferometer,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 47, pp. 2198–2219, 1993.
- [69] C. Cutler and E. E. Flanagan, “Gravitational waves from merging compact binaries: How accurately can one extract the binary’s parameters from the inspiral wave form?,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 49, pp. 2658–2697, 1994.
- [70] M. Maggiore, *Gravitational Waves. Vol. 1: Theory and Experiments*. Oxford Master Series in Physics, Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [71] <http://www.et-gw.eu/index.php/etsensitivities>.
- [72] <https://cosmicexplorer.org/sensitivity.html>.
- [73] E. Thrane and J. D. Romano, “Sensitivity curves for searches for gravitational-wave backgrounds,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 88, no. 12, p. 124032, 2013.
- [74] V. Alba and J. Maldacena, “Primordial gravity wave background anisotropies,” *JHEP*, vol. 03, p. 115, 2016.
- [75] C. R. Contaldi, “Anisotropies of Gravitational Wave Backgrounds: A Line Of Sight Approach,” *Phys. Lett. B*, vol. 771, pp. 9–12, 2017.

- [76] N. Bartolo, D. Bertacca, S. Matarrese, M. Peloso, A. Ricciardone, A. Riotto, and G. Tasinato, “Anisotropies and non-Gaussianity of the Cosmological Gravitational Wave Background,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 100, no. 12, p. 121501, 2019.
- [77] L. Valbusa Dall’Armi, A. Ricciardone, N. Bartolo, D. Bertacca, and S. Matarrese, “Imprint of relativistic particles on the anisotropies of the stochastic gravitational-wave background,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 103, no. 2, p. 023522, 2021.
- [78] B. Allen and A. C. Ottewill, “Detection of anisotropies in the gravitational wave stochastic background,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 56, pp. 545–563, 1997.
- [79] N. J. Cornish, “Mapping the gravitational wave background,” *Class. Quant. Grav.*, vol. 18, pp. 4277–4292, 2001.
- [80] G. Mentasti and M. Peloso, “ET sensitivity to the anisotropic Stochastic Gravitational Wave Background,” *JCAP*, vol. 03, p. 080, 2021.
- [81] D. Alonso, C. R. Contaldi, G. Cusin, P. G. Ferreira, and A. I. Renzini, “Noise angular power spectrum of gravitational wave background experiments,” *Phys. Rev. D*, vol. 101, no. 12, p. 124048, 2020.
- [82] A. Ricciardone, L. V. Dall’Armi, N. Bartolo, D. Bertacca, M. Liguori, and S. Matarrese, “Cross-Correlating Astrophysical and Cosmological Gravitational Wave Backgrounds with the Cosmic Microwave Background,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 127, no. 27, p. 271301, 2021.
- [83] P. Behroozi, R. H. Wechsler, A. P. Hearin, and C. Conroy, “UniverseMachine: The correlation between galaxy growth and dark matter halo assembly from $z = 0–10$,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 488, no. 3, pp. 3143–3194, 2019.
- [84] J. L. Tinker, A. V. Kravtsov, A. Klypin, K. Abazajian, M. S. Warren, G. Yepes, S. Gottlober, and D. E. Holz, “Toward a halo mass function for precision cosmology: The Limits of universality,” *Astrophys. J.*, vol. 688, pp. 709–728, 2008.
- [85] M. Mapelli, N. Giacobbo, E. Ripamonti, and M. Spera, “The cosmic merger rate of stellar black hole binaries from the Illustris simulation,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 472, no. 2, pp. 2422–2435, 2017.
- [86] M. Mapelli, N. Giacobbo, F. Santoliquido, and M. C. Artale, “The properties of merging black holes and neutron stars across cosmic time,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, vol. 487, no. 1, pp. 2–13, 2019.