

Eccentric Black Hole Mergers Forming in Stellar Clusters

Johan Samsing*

*Department of Astrophysical Sciences, Princeton University,
Peyton Hall, 4 Ivy Lane, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.*

We derive the probability for a newly formed binary black hole (BBH) to undergo an eccentric gravitational wave (GW) merger during binary-single interactions inside a stellar cluster. By integrating over the hardening interactions such a BBH must undergo before ejection, we find that the observable rate of BBH mergers with eccentricity > 0.1 at 10 Hz relative to the rate of circular mergers can be as high as $\sim 5\%$ for a typical globular cluster (GC). This further suggests that BBH mergers forming through GW captures in binary-single interactions, eccentric or not, are likely to constitute $\sim 10\%$ of the total BBH merger rate from GCs. Such GW capture mergers can only be probed with an N -body code that includes General Relativistic corrections, which explains why several recent cluster studies report an eccentric merger rate that is ~ 100 times too low. Finally, we show that the relative rate of eccentric BBH mergers depends on the compactness of their host cluster, suggesting that an observed eccentricity distribution can be used to probe the origin of BBH mergers.

I. INTRODUCTION

Gravitational waves (GWs) from merging binary black holes (BBHs) have been observed [1–5], but their astrophysical origin is still unknown. Several formation channels and sites have been proposed in the literature, including stellar clusters [6–14], isolated field binaries [15–19], galactic nuclei [20–24], active galactic nuclei discs [25–27], as well as primordial black holes [28–31], however, how to observationally distinguish them from each other has shown to be a major challenge. For this, several recent studies have explored to which degree the distributions of BBH spins and orbital eccentricities might differ between different models [32, 33], as these are quantities that can be extracted from the observed GW waveform [34, 35]. In general, for BBH merges evolved in isolation one finds the spins to be preferentially aligned with the orbit [36] and eccentricity to be indistinguishable from zero, whereas dynamically assembled BBH mergers will have random spin orientations, and a non-zero probability for appearing eccentric at observation [20, 29, 37, 38]. For such studies it has especially become clear that implementing General Relativistic (GR) effects is extremely important, .e.g. GR precession and spin-orbit coupling affect both the eccentricity [39] and the BBH spins [40] in secular evolving systems, where GW emission in few-body scatterings is essential for resolving the fraction of highly eccentric mergers [37, 41]. Despite this importance, many recent studies are still based on purely Newtonian codes.

In this paper, we study the assembly of eccentric BBH mergers forming in clusters through binary-single interactions. Such binary-single interactions not only play a dynamical role [42], but seem also to be the dominating channel for producing both eccentric and circular BBH mergers, at least in globular clusters (GCs) [11, 41]. Us-

ing simple analytical arguments we show that the relative number of eccentric BBH mergers observable at 10 Hz with an eccentricity > 0.1 is ~ 100 times higher than reported by recent Monte-Carlo (MC) cluster studies [11, 43]. In fact, this might even be a lower limit, as binary-binary interactions also are expected to produce a significant number of eccentric GW capture mergers. As recently pointed out by [41], the reason for this discrepancy is that current MC cluster studies are based on purely Newtonian N -body codes [44], which do not allow for eccentric mergers to form through GW captures inside the cluster during bound few-body states [37, 38].

By integrating over the binary-single interactions a typical BBH undergoes in a stellar cluster, we show that the rate of BBH mergers with eccentricity > 0.1 at 10 Hz relative to the rate of circular BBH mergers can be as high as $\sim 5\%$ for a typical GC. This fraction depends on the cluster compactness, suggesting that the eccentricity distribution of BBH mergers can be used to probe their formation environment. Our calculations further suggest that GW capture mergers, eccentric or not, forming during three-body interactions are likely to constitute $> 10\%$ of the observable BBH merger rate from GCs. This population is currently unexplored, but is likely to play a key role in constraining the time dependent dynamical state of BHs in clusters, as it leaves truly unique signals across frequencies observable by both ‘The Laser Interferometer Space Antenna’ (LISA) and ‘The Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory’ (LIGO).

Throughout the paper we assume that all three interacting BHs have the same mass m , and that the total initial energy of the three-body system is dominated by that of the initial target binary – a limit formally known as the hard binary (HB) limit [42, 45]. We only discuss effects from dynamical GW emission, which appears in the post-Newtonian (PN) expansion formalism at the 2.5 order [46]. The lower PN terms leading to precession are important for describing secular systems [47], but not the chaotic ones we consider in this work [37, 38].

* Email: jsamsing@gmail.com

II. ECCENTRIC CAPTURE DISTANCES

There are two characteristic pericenter distances related to the formation of eccentric BBH mergers: the distance at which the GW peak frequency of a BBH has a certain value f , denoted by r_f , and the distance from which a BBH can undergo a GW capture and still have a non-negligible eccentricity e_f when its GW peak frequency is f , denoted by r_{EM} , where ‘EM’ is short for ‘Eccentric Merger’. In the resonating three-body problem [38], a third relevant distance exists, namely the characteristic distance from which two of the three interacting BHs will be able to undergo a GW capture during the interaction without being interrupted by the bound single, referred to as r_{cap} . As shown in [48], the distance r_{cap} does not equal a constant value, in contrast to r_f and r_{EM} , but differs between each of the temporarily lived BH pairs, also referred to as intermediate state (IMS) BBHs [38, 48], assembled during the resonating three-body state. In this paper we assume that $r_{cap} > r_{EM}$, i.e., we work in the limit where all IMS BBHs with pericenter distance $r_p \leq r_{EM}$ also undergo a GW capture merger. This is an excellent approximation for LIGO sources, but not necessarily for LISA sources, as will be described later. In the following three paragraphs we estimate r_f (GW frequency distance), r_{EM} (Eccentric merger distance), and r_{cap} (GW capture distance), respectively. For further descriptions of the resonating three-body problem with and without GR we refer the reader to [38, 41, 48–51].

A. GW frequency distance

The GW peak frequency f of a BBH with SMA a and eccentricity e , can be approximated by that found from assuming the two BHs are on a circular orbit with a SMA equal to the pericenter distance $r_p = a(1-e)$ [52]. Using that the emitted GW frequency is two times the Keplerian orbital frequency, one now finds the relation,

$$f \approx \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{2Gm}{r_f^3}}. \quad (1)$$

For a BBH to emit GWs with peak frequency f , its pericenter distance must therefore be,

$$r_f \approx \left(\frac{2Gm}{f^2 \pi^2} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (2)$$

As a result, if a BBH has a pericenter distance $r_p \leq r_f$ ($f = 10$ Hz) then it will emit GWs at a frequency $f \geq 10$ Hz and therefore be immediately observable by an instrument similar to LIGO. As the r_f relevant for LIGO is $\ll a$ for all realistic astrophysical systems, the corresponding BBH eccentricity will therefore be extremely high, as indeed found using numerical PN scattering ex-




FIG. 1. Formation of an eccentric BBH GW merger during a resonating binary-single interaction between three equal mass BHs. The location of the eccentric GW capture merger is denoted by ‘GW capture’, where the initial paths of the incoming BBH and single BH, are denoted by ‘Binary’ and ‘Single’, respectively. The GW capture forms as a result of GW emission during a close encounter between two of the three BHs while they temporarily form a bound three-body state. Such GW capture mergers often appear highly eccentric at 10 Hz.

periments [41]. Such GW sources are said to be born in the LIGO band [41].

B. Eccentric merger distance

A BBH that forms with an initial pericenter distance $r_p > r_f$ is not immediately observable at GW frequency f . For that, its pericenter distance must decrease, which naturally happens through GW emission during inspiral [53]. However, in that process, the BBH also undergoes significant circularization [53], and will as a result generally appear with a relative low eccentricity once the GW peak frequency is f . To estimate the characteristic pericenter distance r_{EM} for which the eccentricity is e_f at frequency f , we make use of the analytical relation between the time evolving pericenter distance and eccentricity derived in [53],

$$r_p(e) = r_f \times F(e)/F(e_f), \quad (3)$$

where $F(e)$ denotes the function,

$$F(e) = \frac{e^{12/19}}{1+e} \left(1 + \frac{121}{304} e^2 \right)^{870/2299}. \quad (4)$$

We have here normalized the expression for $r_p(e)$ such that $r_p = r_f$ when $e = e_f$. Using that the eccentricity of

a typical IMS BBH at the time of its formation is close to unity, as $r_{\text{EM}} \ll a$, one finds that r_{EM} is simply given by Equation (3) evaluated in the limit for which $e \rightarrow 1$,

$$r_{\text{EM}} \approx r_f \times \frac{1}{2F(e_f)} \left(\frac{425}{304} \right)^{870/2299}. \quad (5)$$

For $e_f = 0.1$ follows that $r_{\text{EM}}/r_f \approx 2.7$, i.e., GW capture mergers with an initial r_p up to about three times the distance r_f will appear eccentric at the time of observation for an instrument similar to LIGO. Note here that this ratio is independent of the frequency f .

C. GW capture distance

The characteristic pericenter distance from which two of the three interacting BHs can undergo a GW capture, r_{cap} , is that for which the GW energy loss integrated over one pericenter passage [54], ΔE_p , is comparable to the total energy of the three-body system [48, 49]. In the HB limit, the total energy is dominated by the orbital energy of the initial binary $E_B(a) = Gm^2/(2a)$, by then setting $E_B(a) = \Delta E_p$, one can now solve for the corresponding pericenter distance,

$$r_{\text{cap}} \approx \mathcal{R}_m \times (a/\mathcal{R}_m)^{2/7}, \quad (6)$$

where \mathcal{R}_m denotes the Schwarzschild radius of a BH with mass m . As described earlier, r_{cap} is not a fixed distance, the normalization of the above estimate is therefore only approximate. However, to get a sense of the relevant scale, one finds for $m = 20M_\odot$ and $a = 1$ au that $r_{\text{cap}}/\mathcal{R}_m \approx 100$, i.e., the effective size of the BHs are for these values $\sim 100 \times \mathcal{R}_m$, as passages below this distance will lead to a merger. This estimate is in fact very close to the one found by a more sophisticated dynamical treatment [48]. An example of a GW capture forming during a resonating binary-single interaction is shown in Figure 1.

III. ECCENTRIC MERGER PROBABILITY

The probability for a BBH to undergo a GW capture merger during binary-single interactions inside a cluster, can be estimated by first calculating the probability for a single interaction, and then integrating over all interactions the BBH must undergo before ejection is possible. Below we estimate this probability, and show that it depends on the cluster compactness. The process of hardening and ejection is further illustrated and described in Figure 2.

A. A single interaction

We first estimate the probability for an IMS BBH to form and undergo a GW capture merger with an initial $r_p \leq r_{\text{EM}}$, during an interaction between a BBH with initial SMA a , and a single incoming BH. We generally refer to this probability as $P_{\text{EM}}(a)$. For this, we start by noting that the SMA of each formed IMS BBH, denoted by a_{IMS} , is similar to the SMA of the initial target binary, i.e., $a_{\text{IMS}} \approx a$. For a BBH to form with an initial $r_p < r_{\text{EM}}$ its eccentricity at formation must therefore be $> e_{\text{EM}}$, where $e_{\text{EM}} = 1 - r_{\text{EM}}/a$. The probability for a single IMS BBH to form with $r_p < r_{\text{EM}}$ is therefore equal to that of forming with $e > e_{\text{EM}}$, which is given by $(1 - e_{\text{EM}}^2) \approx 2(1 - e_{\text{EM}}) = 2r_{\text{EM}}/a$, under the assumption that the eccentricity distribution follows a so-called thermal distribution $P(e) = 2e$ [42]. By weighting with the average number of IMS BBHs forming during a HB binary-single interaction, denoted here by N_{IMS} , one now finds,

$$P_{\text{EM}}(a) \approx \frac{2r_{\text{EM}}}{a} \times N_{\text{IMS}}. \quad (7)$$

We note here that N_{IMS} in the collisionless non-relativistic HB limit is independent of both the absolute mass scale and the initial SMA [45, 55]. As $r_{\text{cap}} \ll a$, we can therefore take N_{IMS} to be constant in this work. Its value can be analytically estimated by using that the normalized orbital energy distribution of binaries assembled in three-body interactions approximately follows [42, 56],

$$P(E_B) \approx (7/2)E_B(a)^{7/2} \times E_B^{-9/2}, \quad (8)$$

Following this approach, the number N_{IMS} is simply equal to the probability for an assembled BBH to have $E_B < E_B(a)$ (remain bound to the single) divided by the probability for $E_B > E_B(a)$ (unbind the single). These probabilities can be found from integrations of Equation (8), from which follows that $N_{\text{IMS}} \approx (\max(a_{\text{IMS}})/a)^{7/2}$, where $\max(a_{\text{IMS}})$ denotes the maximum value of a_{IMS} . The ratio $\max(a_{\text{IMS}})/a$ is between 2 – 3 (an exact value cannot be derived, as our framework breaks down when the three-body state no longer can be described by a binary with a bound single [48]), which then translates to an N_{IMS} between 10 ~ 40. Using a large set of isotropic three-body scatterings we determined its average value to be $N_{\text{IMS}} \approx 20$, which is the value we will use throughout the paper.

B. Integrating over hardening interactions

The majority of BBHs in a cluster are formed with an initial a , denoted by a_{in} , that is greater than the maximum a that leads to a dynamical ejection of the BBH out of the cluster through a binary-single interaction (we determine this value later in the paper, see also [11]), a

value we refer to as a_{ej} . A newly formed BBH will therefore typically have to undergo several hardening binary-single interactions, each of which slightly decreases its SMA, before ejection from the cluster is possible. During each of these interactions there is a finite probability for two of the three BHs to undergo an eccentric GW capture merger, implying that the relative number of eccentric mergers forming per BBH is larger than the number evaluated at, e.g., a_{ej} . The eccentric merger fraction must therefore be larger than the recently reported $1 \sim 2\%$ by [41, 48]. In the paragraphs below we estimate the expected increase from including the dynamical hardening process.

1. Binary-single hardening process

We start by considering a single BBH, and assume that its SMA per interaction changes from a (before the binary-single interaction) to δa (after the interaction), where $\delta < 1$ (see Figure 2). We note here that δ can be considered a constant in the HB limit, due to the scale free nature of the problem [45]. A representative value for δ can be found by the use of the binary energy distribution $P(E_{\text{B}}) \propto E_{\text{B}}^{-9/2}$ introduced in Equation (8). By changing variable from E_{B} to δ , one finds that the mean value of δ , denoted by $\langle \delta \rangle$, is given by,

$$\langle \delta \rangle = \frac{7}{2} \int_0^1 \delta^{7/2} d\delta = \frac{7}{9}. \quad (9)$$

For simplicity, we will therefore use $\delta = 7/9$ throughout the paper when evaluating actual numbers. It is here worth noting that the average value of E_{B} , found by simply integrating over $E_{\text{B}}P(E_{\text{B}})$, is given by $\langle E_{\text{B}} \rangle = (7/5)E_{\text{B}}(a)$, which implies that the average fractional increase in binding energy per binary-single interaction is $7/5 - 1 = 0.4$. This estimate is in full agreement with that found from numerical scatterings experiments [14], and might possibly be the first analytical estimation of its value. Finally, one should note that the (correct) average value of δ derived in Equation (9) is not simply given by $E_{\text{B}}(a)/\langle E_{\text{B}} \rangle$, as $\langle 1/\delta \rangle \neq 1/\langle \delta \rangle$. However, these small differences will not be discussed further, and we will in the rest of the paper therefore simply refer to δ as having a single value given by $7/9$.

Following this approach, each binary-single interaction therefore releases an amount of energy equal to $\Delta E_{\text{bs}} = (1/\delta - 1) \times E_{\text{B}}(a)$, which relates to the recoil velocity the BBH receives in the three-body center-of-mass (COM) as $\Delta E_{\text{bs}} = 3mv_{\text{B}}^2$, where v_{B} is the BBH recoil velocity defined at infinity. When a is such that $v_{\text{B}} > v_{\text{esc}}$, where v_{esc} denotes the escape velocity of the cluster, then, per definition, the BBH escapes. By assuming that v_{esc} is about the velocity dispersion of the cluster, one can write the ratio between the HB limit for a [45], denoted by a_{HB} ,

and the ejection value a_{ej} by,

$$\frac{a_{\text{HB}}}{a_{\text{ej}}} \approx \frac{9}{1/\delta - 1}. \quad (10)$$

We note here that this is a lower limit as v_{esc} in general is slightly greater than the dispersion value. For $\delta = 7/9$ one finds $a_{\text{HB}}/a_{\text{ej}} \approx 50$, i.e., a binary formed with $a = a_{\text{HB}}$ needs to decrease its SMA by about a factor of 50 before its binding energy is large enough for the three-body recoil to eject it from the cluster.

Finally, the number of binary-single interactions required to bring a BBH from a_{in} to a_{ej} , denoted by $N_{\text{bs}}(a_{\text{in}}, a_{\text{ej}})$, is given by,

$$N_{\text{bs}}(a_{\text{in}}, a_{\text{ej}}) = \int_{a_{\text{ej}}}^{a_{\text{in}}} \frac{1}{1-\delta} \frac{1}{a} da = \frac{1}{1-\delta} \ln \left(\frac{a_{\text{in}}}{a_{\text{ej}}} \right), \quad (11)$$

where we have used that $da = -a(1-\delta)dN_{\text{bs}}$. For $\delta = 7/9$ one finds that $N_{\text{bs}}(a_{\text{HB}}, a_{\text{ej}}) \approx 15$, which illustrates the point that a BBH formed in a cluster generally undergoes a non-negligible number of scatterings before ejection (see [14, 57] for complementary descriptions of the binary hardening and ejection process).

2. Eccentric mergers forming during hardening

We now estimate the probability for a BBH to undergo a GW capture merger with an initial $r_{\text{p}} < r_{\text{EM}}$ (eccentric GW capture merger), during the binary-single interactions that harden it from its initial SMA a_{in} to its final ejection value a_{ej} . A probability we refer to as $P_{\text{EM}}(a_{\text{in}}, a_{\text{ej}})$. By using that the differential eccentric merger probability can be written as $dP_{\text{EM}}(a) = P_{\text{EM}}(a)dN_{\text{bs}}$, together with $da = -a(1-\delta)dN_{\text{bs}}$, one finds,

$$P_{\text{EM}}(a_{\text{in}}, a_{\text{ej}}) = \frac{1}{1-\delta} \int_{a_{\text{ej}}}^{a_{\text{in}}} \frac{P_{\text{EM}}(a)}{a} da \approx \frac{P_{\text{EM}}(a_{\text{ej}})}{1-\delta}, \quad (12)$$

where for the last term we have assumed that $a_{\text{in}} \gg a_{\text{ej}}$. As seen, in this limit P_{EM} does not depend on a_{in} , i.e., our estimate is to leading order insensitive to the BBH initial conditions and to how it exactly formed. For $\delta = 7/9$, we therefore conclude that our model, although idealized, seems to robustly predict that the series of hardening binary-single interactions the BBH must undergo before ejection, leads to a relative increase in the eccentric GW capture merger probability by a factor of $\approx 9/2$, compared to simply evaluating the probability at a_{ej} .

Considering all mergers forming through GW captures during binary-single interactions, eccentric or not, the merger probability instead scales as $r_{\text{cap}}/a \propto a^{-5/7}$, as given by Equation (6) and further discussed in [48], which leads to an additional increase of $7/5$.




FIG. 2. Illustration of a BBH undergoing hardening binary-single interactions in a stellar cluster. Initially the BBH (labeled by ‘initial’) forms with a SMA $a_{ej} < a_{in} < a_{HB}$, either dynamically or primordially, after which it sinks to the core due to dynamical friction. The BBH here undergoes a HB binary-single interaction, which classically concludes with the BBH receiving a kick velocity v_B that unbinds it from the single and sends it back into the cluster. It then sinks back to the core, after which the process repeats. Each of these HB binary-single interactions gradually decreases the SMA of the BBH, as illustrated in the insert box, which correspondingly leads to increasing dynamical kicks. When the SMA of the BBH reaches $a \approx a_{ej}$, i.e., when the dynamical kick velocity is about the escape velocity of the cluster, then the preceding binary-single interaction will eject the BBH out of the cluster (labeled by ‘ejected’), after which it merges in isolation. However, if GW emission is included in the N -body solver, then the BBH can also undergo a GW capture merger inside the cluster during the series of HB binary-single interactions in the core, as illustrated in Figure 1. The fraction between eccentric GW capture mergers and ejected circular mergers scales linearly with the cluster compactness, suggesting that an observed fraction of eccentric GW sources can be used to constrain the origin of BBH mergers.

C. Relation to cluster compactness

The value of $P_{EM}(a_{in}, a_{ej})$ depends on a_{ej} , which we note in turn depends on the cluster environment through its escape velocity v_{esc} . By using the relations for ΔE_{bs} presented back in Section III B 1, and that $v_B \approx v_{esc}$ when $a \approx a_{ej}$, per definition, one finds the following re-

lation,

$$a_{ej} \approx \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - 1 \right) \frac{Gm}{v_{esc}^2}. \quad (13)$$

The probability P_{EM} is therefore $\propto v_{esc}^2$, leading to the general result that the higher v_{esc} is, the higher P_{EM} is. Using that the escape velocity relates to the cluster environment approximately as $v_{esc}^2 \approx GM_C/R_C$, where M_C and R_C denote the characteristic mass and radius of the cluster, respectively, one finds,

$$P_{EM}(a_{in}, a_{ej}) \approx \frac{12\delta N_{IMS}}{(1-\delta)^2} \frac{r_{EM}}{m} \times \frac{M_C}{R_C}. \quad (14)$$

This leads to the important conclusion that the fraction of BBHs that undergoes an eccentric GW capture merger before being ejected from the cluster, increases linearly with the compactness of the cluster. Measuring the fraction of eccentric to circular merges can therefore be used to probe the environmental origin of BBH mergers, as described later in Section IV.

In addition, this also suggests that GW capture mergers could play a significant dynamical role in relative compact clusters, as they are intrinsically formed inside and bound to the cluster in contrast to the ejected population that normally is considered. If this would lead to a runaway BH build up, or unique GW observables, is straight forward to study with full N -body simulations including PN effects (as with the MC cluster studies [11, 13], recent N -body studies on BH dynamics in clusters do not include PN terms [14]). We reserve that for a future study.

D. In-side mergers vs. ejected mergers

Recent work on the eccentricity distribution of BBH mergers forming in GCs have only considered the population ejected from the cluster [11], however, this BBH population is not representative for eccentric studies [41]. To clarify this further, we first note that the probability for an ejected BBH to have $r_p < r_{EM}$, i.e. to appear with an $e > e_f$ at frequency f , denoted here by $P_{EM}^{ej,bin}(a_{ej})$, is simply given by $P_{EM}(a_{ej})/N_{IMS}$. This leads us to the following expression,

$$\frac{P_{EM}(a_{in}, a_{ej})}{P_{EM}^{ej,bin}(a_{ej})} = \frac{N_{IMS}}{1-\delta} \approx 100, \quad (15)$$

which states that if one (correctly) takes into account the possibility for eccentric GW capture mergers to form during the hardening binary-single interactions taking place inside the cluster, then the probability for forming an eccentric BBH merger is about *two orders of magnitude higher* than one finds from only considering the ejected BBH population. This clearly illustrates the importance of including PN terms.

IV. RATE OF ECCENTRIC MERGERS

The relevant measure for using eccentric GW mergers to constrain the formation environment of merging BBHs, is not the absolute probability P_{EM} , but instead the fraction between the rate of eccentric and circular mergers, as this is directly observable, whereas P_{EM} itself is not (P_{EM} might be indirectly observable if the in-cluster GW capture mergers are able to significantly alter the cluster dynamics, which could affect the overall BBH merger rate, spin and mass distributions). For deriving this fraction, we first need to estimate the probability for an ejected BBH to merge within a Hubble time t_{H} , denoted here by $P_{\text{CM}}^{<t_{\text{H}}}$, where ‘CM’ refers to ‘Circular Merger’ as the ejected population greatly dominates the circular population. Using that the GW inspiral life time $t_{\text{life}}(a, e) \approx t_{\text{life}}(a)(1 - e^2)^{7/2}$ [53], where $t_{\text{life}}(a)$ refers to the life time for which $e = 0$, and assuming the eccentricity distribution of the ejected BBHs follows $P(e) = 2e$ [42], one finds that

$$P_{\text{CM}}^{<t_{\text{H}}}(a) \approx \begin{cases} (t_{\text{H}}/t_{\text{life}}(a))^{2/7}, & \text{for } t_{\text{life}}(a) > t_{\text{H}} \\ 1, & \text{for } t_{\text{life}}(a) \leq t_{\text{H}} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Finally, by assuming that the average rate of binary-single interactions is approximately constant, one can now approximate the ratio between the present rate of eccentric mergers (forming in binary-single interactions inside the cluster), Γ_{EM} , and circular mergers (dominated by the ejected population), Γ_{CM} , by

$$R_{\text{E/C}} = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{EM}}}{\Gamma_{\text{CM}}} \approx \frac{1}{1 - \delta} \frac{P_{\text{EM}}(a_{\text{ej}})}{P_{\text{CM}}^{<t_{\text{H}}}(a_{\text{ej}})}, \quad (17)$$

as further described in [48]. The ratio $R_{\text{E/C}}$, although derived using very idealized assumptions, evaluated for the relevant LIGO values $e_f = 0.1$ and $f = 10$ Hz is shown in Figure 3, as a function of v_{esc} and m . As seen, our model suggests that $\sim 5\%$ of all observable GW mergers will have an eccentricity $e \geq 0.1$ when entering the LIGO band for BHs with $m \sim 30M_{\odot}$ assembled in a typical GC system with $v_{\text{esc}} \sim 50\text{kms}^{-1}$. In more dense environments, such as in galactic nuclei where the escape velocity is $> 100\text{kms}^{-1}$, one interestingly finds that both P_{EM} and $R_{\text{E/C}}$ start to reach unity. Although our current model breaks down in that limit, it does raise the interesting question if BBH mergers in very dense environments are dominated by GW captures forming in resonating few-body states.

Finally, we do note from Figure 3, that $R_{\text{E/C}}$ does not take unique values for any combination of v_{esc} and m , making it difficult to accurately infer the environment based on $R_{\text{E/C}}$ alone. However, it is possible to break this degeneracy by the use of absolute rates, which illustrates both the promising future and necessity for including GR terms in cluster studies.




FIG. 3. The contours show the ratio $P_{\text{EM}}(a_{\text{in}}, a_{\text{ej}})/P_{\text{CM}}^{<t_{\text{H}}}(a_{\text{ej}})$, evaluated for the relevant LIGO values $e_f = 0.1$ and $f = 10$ Hz, as a function of the escape velocity of the host cluster v_{esc} (x-axis), and the BH mass m (y-axis). As described in the text, this ratio equals approximately the ratio between the rate of eccentric GW capture mergers and ejected circular mergers, $\Gamma_{\text{EM}}/\Gamma_{\text{CM}}$, which is an observable quantity. As seen, the relative rate of GW mergers with $e \geq 0.1$ when entering the LIGO band is $\approx 5\%$ for a typical GC population of BHs. This fraction changes with v_{esc} and thereby the cluster compactness as $v_{\text{esc}}^2 \propto M_{\text{C}}/R_{\text{C}}$. This overall suggests that eccentric LIGO sources assembled in clusters not only are relative frequent, but also that their relative rate can be used to constrain their origin. We note that the shown ratio has been truncated at 10% as our current model is not accurate for much larger fractions. However, it is intriguing that the eccentric fraction reaches unity for cluster systems similar to galactic nuclei.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have in this paper shown that the number of binary-single assembled eccentric GW mergers observable by LIGO, is likely to be ~ 100 times larger than recent studies report [11]. This brings the ratio between the present rate of eccentric GW capture mergers and circular mergers up to $R_{\text{E/C}} \sim 5\%$, which strongly suggests that eccentric sources will be frequent at the percent level. Furthermore, we find that the eccentric fraction $R_{\text{E/C}}$ depends on the compactness of the cluster environment, which lead us to propose that the origin of BBH mergers can be probed by accurate measurements of the distribution of BBH eccentricity. We note that our reported estimates only include binary-single interactions, and the relative rate can therefore be significantly higher as binary-binary interactions also are expected to contribute.

The reason why all recent cluster studies greatly under-

estimate the eccentric fraction, is that they only consider the ejected BBH population, as dynamical GW capture mergers cannot form in their codes due to the lack of a consistent inclusion of PN terms (see [41] for a comparison). Each BBH has therefore essentially only 1 chance for undergoing an eccentric GW merger, however, we have in this paper shown that a single BBH in fact is more likely to have about $N_{\text{bs}} \times N_{\text{IMS}} \approx 300$ chances, due to the hardening binary-single interactions it has to go through before ejection. Although including PN terms in current cluster codes, including [11], would fix this problem, we do note that many other families of resonating few-body systems also are believed to exist in dense clusters [58, 59]. These systems are not only important dynamically, but will also lead to a wealth of unique GW observables. However, a consistent formation and evolution of such systems is not possible using the current numerical scheme employed by most MC cluster codes [60]. This strongly suggests that a new generation of hybrid codes must be developed for the future of GW astrophysics.

Our results further suggest that the rate of GW capture mergers, eccentric or not, to the rate of ejected mergers is higher than the $\sim 2\%$ previously stated [41, 48], as a newly formed BBH generally undergoes several interactions before being ejected, and not only one. The

enhancement from this hardening process evaluates to about $(7/5) \times (1/(1 - \delta)) \approx 6$ for $\delta = 7/9$, suggesting that GW capture mergers forming during binary-single interactions are likely to constitute $\sim 10\%$ of all observable BBH mergers assembled in GCs. As noted by [48], the GW capture mergers will remain bound to their host cluster if the GW kick is low, which could lead to significant dynamical changes of the cluster at especially early times where the GW capture scenario likely dominates the BBH merger rate [48]. These changes could propagate to what we observe today, implying that GW captures might be indirectly probed even if their current rate is low. This is straight forward to study using a PN N -body code.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks B. Bar-Or, A. Hammers, M. Zaldarriaga, D. Spergel, N. Leigh, M. MacLeod, L. Randell, E. Ramirez-Ruiz, M. Giersz, A. Askar, B. McKernan, and N. Stone, for stimulating discussions. Support for this work was provided by NASA through Einstein Postdoctoral Fellowship grant number PF4-150127 awarded by the Chandra X-ray Center, which is operated by the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for NASA under contract NAS8-03060.

-
- [1] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **116**, 061102 (2016), 1602.03837.
 - [2] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **116**, 241103 (2016), 1606.04855.
 - [3] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, Physical Review X **6**, 041015 (2016), 1606.04856.
 - [4] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **118**, 221101 (2017), 1706.01812.
 - [5] B. P. Abbott *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **119**, 141101 (2017), 1709.09660.
 - [6] S. F. Portegies Zwart and S. L. W. McMillan, Astrophys. J. **528**, L17 (2000).
 - [7] S. Banerjee, H. Baumgardt, and P. Kroupa, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **402**, 371 (2010), 0910.3954.
 - [8] A. Tanikawa, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **435**, 1358 (2013), 1307.6268.
 - [9] Y.-B. Bae, C. Kim, and H. M. Lee, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **440**, 2714 (2014), 1308.1641.
 - [10] C. L. Rodriguez *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **115**, 051101 (2015), 1505.00792.
 - [11] C. L. Rodriguez, S. Chatterjee, and F. A. Rasio, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 084029 (2016), 1602.02444.
 - [12] C. L. Rodriguez, C.-J. Haster, S. Chatterjee, V. Kalogera, and F. A. Rasio, Astrophys. J. Lett. **824**, L8 (2016), 1604.04254.
 - [13] A. Askar, M. Szkudlarek, D. Gondok-Rosińska, M. Giersz, and T. Bulik, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **464**, L36 (2017), 1608.02520.
 - [14] D. Park, C. Kim, H. M. Lee, Y.-B. Bae, and K. Belczynski, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **469**, 4665 (2017), 1703.01568.
 - [15] M. Dominik *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **759**, 52 (2012), 1202.4901.
 - [16] M. Dominik *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **779**, 72 (2013), 1308.1546.
 - [17] M. Dominik *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **806**, 263 (2015), 1405.7016.
 - [18] K. Belczynski *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **819**, 108 (2016), 1510.04615.
 - [19] K. Belczynski, D. E. Holz, T. Bulik, and R. O’Shaughnessy, Nature (London) **534**, 512 (2016), 1602.04531.
 - [20] R. M. O’Leary, B. Kocsis, and A. Loeb, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **395**, 2127 (2009), 0807.2638.
 - [21] J. Hong and H. M. Lee, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **448**, 754 (2015), 1501.02717.
 - [22] J. H. VanLandingham, M. C. Miller, D. P. Hamilton, and D. C. Richardson, Astrophys. J. **828**, 77 (2016), 1604.04948.
 - [23] F. Antonini and F. A. Rasio, Astrophys. J. **831**, 187 (2016), 1606.04889.
 - [24] B.-M. Hoang, S. Naoz, B. Kocsis, F. A. Rasio, and F. Dosopoulou, ArXiv e-prints (2017), 1706.09896.
 - [25] I. Bartos, B. Kocsis, Z. Haiman, and S. Márka, Astrophys. J. **835**, 165 (2017), 1602.03831.
 - [26] N. C. Stone, B. D. Metzger, and Z. Haiman, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **464**, 946 (2017), 1602.04226.
 - [27] B. McKernan *et al.*, ArXiv e-prints (2017), 1702.07818.
 - [28] S. Bird *et al.*, Physical Review Letters **116**, 201301 (2016), 1603.00464.

- [29] I. Cholis *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 084013 (2016), 1606.07437.
- [30] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka, and S. Yokoyama, Physical Review Letters **117**, 061101 (2016), 1603.08338.
- [31] B. Carr, F. Kühnel, and M. Sandstad, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 083504 (2016), 1607.06077.
- [32] C. L. Rodriguez, M. Zevin, C. Pankow, V. Kalogera, and F. A. Rasio, Astrophys. J. Lett. **832**, L2 (2016), 1609.05916.
- [33] X. Chen and P. Amaro-Seoane, Astrophys. J. Lett. **842**, L2 (2017), 1702.08479.
- [34] I. Harry, S. Privitera, A. Bohé, and A. Buonanno, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 024012 (2016), 1603.02444.
- [35] E. A. Huerta *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 024038 (2017), 1609.05933.
- [36] V. Kalogera, Astrophys. J. **541**, 319 (2000), astro-ph/9911417.
- [37] K. Gültekin, M. C. Miller, and D. P. Hamilton, Astrophys. J. **640**, 156 (2006).
- [38] J. Samsing, M. MacLeod, and E. Ramirez-Ruiz, Astrophys. J. **784**, 71 (2014), 1308.2964.
- [39] S. Naoz, B. Kocsis, A. Loeb, and N. Yunes, Astrophys. J. **773**, 187 (2013), 1206.4316.
- [40] B. Liu and D. Lai, Astrophys. J. Lett. **846**, L11 (2017), 1706.02309.
- [41] J. Samsing and E. Ramirez-Ruiz, Astrophys. J. Lett. **840**, L14 (2017), 1703.09703.
- [42] D. C. Heggie, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **173**, 729 (1975).
- [43] F. Antonini *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **816**, 65 (2016), 1509.05080.
- [44] J. Fregeau, Astrophysics Source Code Library , 08011 (2012).
- [45] P. Hut and J. N. Bahcall, Astrophys. J. **268**, 319 (1983).
- [46] L. Blanchet, Living Reviews in Relativity **17** (2014), 1310.1528.
- [47] S. Naoz, Annual Rev. of Astron. and Astrophys. **54**, 441 (2016), 1601.07175.
- [48] J. Samsing, M. MacLeod, and E. Ramirez-Ruiz, ArXiv e-prints (2017), 1706.03776.
- [49] J. Samsing, M. MacLeod, and E. Ramirez-Ruiz, Astrophys. J. **846**, 36 (2017), 1609.09114.
- [50] J. Samsing and T. Ilan, ArXiv e-prints (2017), 1706.04672.
- [51] J. Samsing and T. Ilan, ArXiv e-prints (2017), 1709.01660.
- [52] L. Wen, Astrophys. J. **598**, 419 (2003).
- [53] P. Peters, Phys. Rev. **136**, B1224 (1964).
- [54] R. Hansen, Phys. Rev. D **5**, 1021 (1972).
- [55] P. Hut, Astron. Journal **88**, 1549 (1983).
- [56] M. Valtonen and H. Karttunen, *The Three-Body Problem* (, 2006).
- [57] P. Hut, S. McMillan, and R. W. Romani, Astrophys. J. **389**, 527 (1992).
- [58] A. Tanikawa, P. Hut, and J. Makino, New Astron. **17**, 272 (2012), 1107.3866.
- [59] A. Tanikawa, D. C. Heggie, P. Hut, and J. Makino, Astronomy and Computing **3**, 35 (2013), 1208.4131.
- [60] M. Morscher, B. Pattabiraman, C. Rodriguez, F. A. Rasio, and S. Umbreit, Astrophys. J. **800**, 9 (2015), 1409.0866.