

A novel Lagrange-multiplier approach to the effective-one-body dynamics of binary systems in post-Minkowskian gravity

Thibault Damour¹, Alessandro Nagar^{1,2}, Andrea Placidi³, and Piero Retteno³

¹*Institut des Hautes Etudes Scientifiques, 91440 Bures-sur-Yvette, France*

²*INFN Sezione di Torino, Via P. Giuria 1, 10125 Torino, Italy and*

³*Dipartimento di Fisica e Geologia, Università di Perugia, INFN Sezione di Perugia, Via Pascoli, I-06123 Perugia, Italy*

We present a new approach to the conservative dynamics of binary systems, within the effective one-body (EOB) framework, based on the use of a Lagrange multiplier to impose the mass-shell constraint. When applied to the post-Minkowskian (PM) description of the two-body problem in Einsteinian gravity, this Lagrange-EOB (LEOB) approach allows for a new formulation of the conservative dynamics that avoids the drawbacks of the recursive definition of EOB-PM Hamiltonians. Using state-of-the-art values of the waveform and radiation reaction, based on factorized and resummed post-Newtonian (PN) expressions, we apply our new formalism to the construction of an aligned-spin, quasi-circular, inspiralling EOB waveform model, called LEOB-PM, that incorporates analytical information up to the 4PM level, completed by 4PN contributions up to the sixth order in eccentricity, in the orbital sector, and by 4.5PN contributions, in the spin-orbit sector. In the nonspinning case, we find, for the first time, that an *uncalibrated* LEOB-PM model delivers EOB/NR unfaithfulness $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOB/NR}}$ (with the Advanced LIGO noise in the total mass range $10 - 200M_{\odot}$) of at most 1% over all the nonspinning dataset of the Simulating eXtreme Spacetime (SXS) Numerical Relativity (NR) catalog up to mass ratio $q = 15$, also yielding excellent phasing agreement with the $q = 32$ configuration of the RIT catalog. Then, when NR-informing the dynamics of the model (both orbital and spinning sectors) by using only 17 SXS dataset, we find that the EOB/NR unfaithfulness (compared to 530 spin-aligned SXS waveforms) has a median value of 5.39×10^{-4} , or 6.13×10^{-4} (depending on the chosen description of spin-spin interactions), reaching at most $\sim 1\%$ in some of the high-spin corners. Although this global performance is less good (by a factor 3.67) than some of the state-of-the-art PN-Hamiltonian-based models, our finding shows that the LEOB approach is a promising route towards robustly incorporating both PM and PN information in the EOB description of the dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Upcoming observations of binary black hole coalescences by present and future gravitational wave (GW) detectors require ever-improved waveform models. In turn, this requires an ever more accurate analytical knowledge of the dynamics of gravitationally interacting binary systems. One of the prime approaches to the description of the dynamics of (and GW emission from) binary systems, is the effective one-body (EOB) formalism [1–3]. This formalism was historically developed within the post-Newtonian (PN) approach to Einsteinian gravity (see [4] for a review). References [5, 6] showed how to extend the validity of the EOB approach to fast motions by reformulating it within the post-Minkowskian (PM) approach to Einsteinian gravity. The latter works, together with Ref. [7], triggered an intense activity in PM gravity using either quantum scattering amplitudes (notably [8–13]) or worldline approaches (notably [14–17]). The usefulness of incorporating PM results in the EOB formalism has been notably explored in Refs. [18–27] (for other approaches to PM gravity, see Refs. [28–30]).

The EOB dynamics comprises a conservative sector, traditionally described by a Hamiltonian, together with an additional dissipative sector, described by a radiation-reaction force. The Hamiltonian-based EOB approach (HEOB), initially introduced in PN gravity, was general-

ized to PM gravity in Refs. [5, 6, 18–27].

The aim of the present work is to introduce a new way, called Lagrange-EOB (LEOB), of incorporating PM (and PN as well) results in the conservative sector of the EOB formalism. The name Lagrange-EOB comes from a crucial use of a Lagrange multiplier [31] in the EOB action. Our main motivation for this new way of formulating the EOB dynamics is to avoid some drawbacks (illustrated in Fig. 1 below) of the HEOB approach to PM gravity, linked to the *recursive definition* of an explicit EOB-PM Hamiltonian, $H_{\text{PM}}^{\text{EOB}}(q, p)$ (first suggested in Ref. [6], and extended to higher PM orders in Refs. [19, 22, 26, 27, 32]). The LEOB approach is fruitfully applied here to the construction of PM-informed waveform models, with very promising performances (see notably Figs. 6 and 8 below).

The outline of the paper is as follows. In Sec. II we summarize the fundamentals of the EOB approach, we briefly review the HEOB approach to PM gravity pointing some issues that come with it, and we introduce the basic elements of our approach and our gauge fixing choice. In Sec. III we specifically deal with PM information, recasting it consistently within the LEOB approach. We include known (local) information up to the physical 5PM level for both orbital and spinning sectors¹.

¹ When dealing with spinning black holes, each power of spin adds

Since 5PM orbital terms are currently not fully known and 5PM spin-orbit terms contain nonlocal (hyperbolic) information, we replace them by PN results. We hence complete the local PM dynamics with local and (elliptic) nonlocal 4PN-accurate information in the nonspinning sector and 4.5PN-accurate terms in the spin-orbit sector. The reader interested in the main results can skip the technical sections described above and directly jump to Sec. IV to have a sense of the structure of the PM-based LEOB waveform model and to the following Sec. V where the performance of the model is thoroughly evaluated. Concluding remarks are collected in Sec. VI. The paper is completed by a few Appendices. In particular, Appendix A is devoted to assessing the performance of an alternative LEOB model using a different treatment of the spins up to the physical 5PM order; Appendix B concerns the procedure used to calibrate the model spinning sector using NR data; Appendix C discusses the gauge freedom of the LEOB approach in the nonspinning case; in Appendix D we review the techniques adopted to deal with the orbital 4PM information in other HEOB-based works; in Appendix E we recast in LEOB form the currently known Tutti Frutti dynamics up to 7PM-6PN accuracy, and we follow up on that with the derivation of the 6PN-accurate nonlocal terms up to the eighth order in eccentricity, in Appendix F.

Throughout the paper, we use units with $c = 1$. We also often set $G = 1$, except when it is useful to keep track of the PM order.

II. MOTIVATION AND FUNDAMENTALS

A. PM dynamics within the HEOB approach

For simplicity, we restrict our study to binary systems with aligned spins. We use the following notation (with $m_1 \geq m_2$ and $M \equiv m_1 + m_2$)

$$S_1 = m_1 a_1 = Gm_1^2 \chi_1 = GMm_1 \tilde{a}_1, \quad (2.1a)$$

$$S_2 = m_2 a_2 = Gm_2^2 \chi_2 = GMm_2 \tilde{a}_2. \quad (2.1b)$$

In this situation the spins enter the dynamics as constant parameters without adding new degrees of freedom. The basic building blocks of the EOB dynamics of (aligned) spinning binary black holes are:

- (i) The EOB energy map² relating the real total energy, E , of the binary system in the center of mass (cm) frame to the effective energy, $E_{\text{eff}} = -P_0$, of the effective particle of mass $\mu = \frac{m_1 m_2}{m_1 + m_2}$ describing the cm-frame relative motion:

$$E = M \sqrt{1 + 2\nu \left(\frac{E_{\text{eff}}}{\mu} - 1 \right)}$$

¹ a physical PM order.

² This map was found to arise at successive PN orders in Refs. [1, 33, 34], and was proven to be exactly valid in Ref. [5].

$$\equiv M \sqrt{1 + 2\nu (\gamma - 1)}. \quad (2.2)$$

Here, $M = m_1 + m_2$, $\nu = \mu/M = m_1 m_2 / M^2$, and we defined the μ -rescaled effective energy as³

$$\gamma \equiv \frac{E_{\text{eff}}}{\mu} \equiv -\frac{P_0}{\mu}. \quad (2.3)$$

- (ii) A relativistic mass-shell condition for the effective particle which was originally written in the form

$$g^{\mu\nu}(X^\lambda) P_\mu P_\nu + \mu^2 + Q(X^\mu, P_\mu) = 0, \quad (2.4)$$

with an (energy-independent) effective metric $g_{\mu\nu}(X^\lambda)$, and an additional term $Q(X^\mu, P_\mu)$ gathering contributions that are higher-than-quadratic in P_μ ; here (see below) we shall instead use a formally purely geodesic mass-shell condition involving an energy-dependent effective metric:

$$g^{\mu\nu}(X^\lambda, \gamma) P_\mu P_\nu + \mu^2 = 0; \quad (2.5)$$

- (iii) a radiation-reaction force \mathcal{F}_μ ;
- (iv) a waveform decomposed in multipoles:

$$h_+ - ih_\times = \frac{1}{D_L} \sum_{\ell=2}^{\ell_{\text{max}}} \sum_{m=-\ell}^{\ell} h_{\ell m} {}_{-2}Y_{\ell m}, \quad (2.6)$$

where D_L is the luminosity distance to the source and ${}_{-2}Y_{\ell m}$ are the $s = -2$ spin-weighted spherical harmonics.

All the above EOB building blocks depend on (m_1, m_2, a_1, a_2) .

The mass-shell condition Eq. (2.4), or Eq. (2.5), is determined by working with a gauge-invariant description of the conservative dynamics, such as the Delaunay Hamiltonian [1], or the scattering angle [5].

When considering nonspinning bodies the effective metric can be taken to be spherically symmetric, i.e. of the general form

$$g_{\mu\nu}(X^\lambda) dX^\mu dX^\nu = -A(R) c^2 dT^2 + B(R) dR^2 + R^2 C(R) (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2). \quad (2.7)$$

When working in PM gravity (i.e. when expanding in powers of Newton's constant G) the effective metric was shown [5] to coincide with the Schwarzschild metric at the first post-Minkowskian (1PM) order, i.e. at $O(G^1)$. One way to incorporate higher PM contributions [6] is to add a non-geodesic term $Q(X^\mu, P_\mu)$ having a PM expansion of the form

$$\frac{Q(X^\mu, P_\mu)}{\mu^2} = q_2(\gamma, \nu) \left(\frac{GM}{R} \right)^2 + q_3(\gamma, \nu) \left(\frac{GM}{R} \right)^3$$

³ γ is > 1 for scattering motions and < 1 for bound motions.

$$+ q_4(\gamma, \nu) \left(\frac{GM}{R} \right)^4 + \dots \quad (2.8)$$

Here, we used an “energy gauge” of the E-type [19, 32] where the dependence of $Q(X^\mu, P_\mu)$ on P_μ is restricted to be a dependence only on $P_0 = -\mu\gamma$.

In this approach to EOB-PM, one can, without loss of generality, choose the effective metric $g_{\mu\nu}(X^\lambda)$ to be the Schwarzschild metric (of mass $M = m_1 + m_2$), i.e. $A_S(R) = 1 - 2\frac{GM}{R}$, $B_S(R) = 1/A_S(R)$ and $C_S(R) = 1$ (in Schwarzschild coordinates). In this “post-Schwarzschild” approach, $Q(X^\mu, P_\mu)$ [and all the PM-expansion coefficients $q_n(\gamma, \nu)$] vanishes as the symmetric mass ratio ν tends to zero.

The explicit map between the expansion coefficients $q_n(\gamma, \nu)$ entering the EOB mass-shell condition Eq. (2.4) and the PM-expansion coefficients $\chi_n(\gamma, \nu)$ of the scattering angle,

$$\chi(j, \gamma) = \sum_n 2 \frac{\chi_n(\gamma, \nu)}{j^n}, \quad (2.9)$$

[where $j \equiv J/(M\mu)$ is the rescaled angular momentum of the system in center of mass frame] has been determined in Refs. [6, 32].

When starting from an E-type mass-shell condition, Eq. (2.4), there are several ways to absorb the PM-expanded Q term, $Q = \sum_{n \geq 2} q_n(\gamma, \nu)(GM/R)^n$, into an apparently purely geodesic mass-shell condition of the form (2.5), say

$$g_*^{\mu\nu}(X^\mu, \gamma) P_\mu P_\nu + \mu^2 = 0, \quad (2.10)$$

with an energy-dependent effective metric $g_*^{\mu\nu}(X^\lambda, \gamma)$. Let us note that Ref. [6] showed that the high-energy limit ($\gamma \rightarrow \infty$) of the mass-shell condition derived from the Amati-Ciafaloni-Veneziano high-energy scattering [35] was defining (rather remarkably) a 4PM-accurate *energy-independent* high-energy effective metric $\lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \infty} g_*^{\mu\nu}(X^\mu, \gamma)$.

One way to transform the Q -type mass-shell condition, Eq. (2.4), into a formally geodesic one, Eq. (2.5) or Eq. (2.10), is to incorporate $Q(R, \gamma)$ in the A contribution, $-P_0^2/A(R) = -\mu^2\gamma^2/A(R)$. This can be done in various ways (as discussed in [6]). A first way is to redefine the A metric coefficient such that

$$\frac{1}{A_{S^*}(R, \gamma, \nu)} = \frac{1}{A_S(R)} - \frac{Q(R, \gamma, \nu)}{\gamma^2}, \quad (2.11)$$

which yields

$$A_{S^*}(R, \gamma, \nu) = \frac{A_S(R)}{1 - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} A_S(R) Q(R, \gamma, \nu)}. \quad (2.12)$$

The mass-shell condition, Eq. (2.10), with the latter $A = A_{S^*}(R, \gamma, \nu)$, together with Schwarzschild values of the other metric coefficients, $B = B_S(R)$, and $C =$

$C_S(R) = 1$, is then strictly equivalent to the E-type version of Eq. (2.4). The mass-shell condition defined by replacing $A_{S^*}(R, \gamma, \nu)$, Eq. (2.12), by its PM-reexpansion, namely (denoting $u \equiv \frac{GM}{R}$)

$$A_{S^*}^{\text{PM}}(u, \gamma, \nu) = 1 - 2u + a_2^*(\gamma, \nu)u^2 + a_3^*(\gamma, \nu)u^3 + \dots, \quad (2.13)$$

together with the Schwarzschild values, $B_S = 1/(1-2u)$, $C_S = 1$, has been advocated in Ref. [20, 22, 26].

Appendix B.2 of Ref. [22] gives the 4PM-accurate link between the PM-expansion coefficients $a_n^*(\gamma, \nu)$ and the scattering coefficients $\chi_n(\gamma, \nu)$. This link also follows from inserting the $q_n[\chi_n]$ relations of Refs. [6, 32] in Eq. (2.12). As a check (and since it is needed in the other gauge we shall use below) we derived it by directly computing the scattering angle predicted by a general PM metric $g_*^{\mu\nu}(X^\mu, \gamma)$.

When considering (aligned) *spinning* bodies, various forms of the EOB mass-shell condition have been proposed both in the PN approach, e.g. [3, 36, 37], and in the PM one [22, 26]. All the approaches involve an effective metric which is a deformed version of the Kerr metric, and spin-orbit coupling terms involving two different combinations of the two spins S_1 and S_2 , e.g., in our convention (recalling $a_i \equiv S_i/m_i$),

$$S \equiv S_1 + S_2 = m_1 a_1 + m_2 a_2, \quad (2.14a)$$

$$S_* \equiv \frac{m_2}{m_1} S_1 + \frac{m_1}{m_2} S_2 = m_2 a_1 + m_1 a_2, \quad (2.14b)$$

Here, we shall consider a mass-shell condition involving an energy-dependent deformation of a Kerr metric (in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates), namely

$$-\frac{(P_0 + \mathcal{G}P_\varphi)^2}{A} + \frac{P_R^2}{B} + \frac{P_\varphi^2}{R_c^2} + \mu^2 = 0, \quad (2.15)$$

where all metric coefficients A, B, R_c, \mathcal{G} depend on R, γ, a_1, a_2, ν . Here the spin-orbit (LS) coupling term $\mathcal{G}P_\varphi$ (proportional to the orbital angular momentum $P_\varphi = L$) gathers all the terms which are odd in spins, with a radial coefficient of the general form

$$\mathcal{G}(R, \gamma, a_1, a_2, \nu) = G_S(R, \gamma, a_i, \nu)S + G_{S_*}(R, \gamma, a_i, \nu)S_*, \quad (2.16)$$

where G_S and G_{S_*} are even functions of the spin variables. The other metric coefficients, $A(R, \gamma, a_i, \nu)$, $B(R, \gamma, a_i, \nu)$, $R_c^2(R, \gamma, a_i, \nu)$, are even in spins, and are energy-dependent deformations of their Kerr analogs. Let us recall the values of A, B, R_c^2 , and \mathcal{G} in the probe limit of a test black hole (with vanishing spin because of the scaling $S_2 = Gm_2^2\chi_2$ with $|\chi_2| < 1$) moving around a Kerr black hole (in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates), as functions of two Kerr mass and spin parameters, $M_K, S_K = M_K a_K$:

$$R_{cK}^2 = R^2 + a_K^2 \left(1 + \frac{2GM_K}{R} \right), \quad (2.17)$$

$$A_K(R, a_K) = \frac{1 + \frac{2GM_K}{R_c}}{1 + \frac{2GM_K}{R}} \left(1 - \frac{2GM_K}{R_{cK}} \right), \quad (2.18)$$

$$B_K(R, a_K) = \frac{R^2}{R_{cK}^2} \frac{1}{A_K(R, a_K)}, \quad (2.19)$$

and

$$\mathcal{G}(R, a_K, L) = \frac{2GLS_K}{RR_{cK}^2}. \quad (2.20)$$

The precise definitions of the coupling functions, $G_S(R, \gamma, a_i)$, $G_{S^*}(R, \gamma, a_i)$, $A(R, \gamma, a_i)$, $B(R, \gamma, a_i)$, and $R_c(R, \gamma, a_i)$, that we shall use will be given below.

When using the EOB dynamics to compute accurate waveforms it has been traditional to use an explicit Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{EOB}}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})$ obtained by solving the mass-shell condition with respect to $P_0 = -\mu\gamma$. [The real Hamiltonian $H^{\text{EOB}}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})$ being then derived from $H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{EOB}}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})$ by using the energy map (2.2).] Explicit expressions for $H_{\text{eff}}^{\text{EOB}}(\mathbf{Q}, \mathbf{P})$ are obtained by recursively solving the mass-shell condition. This was initiated in Sec. VII of Ref. [32] using standard PM expansions. A slightly different formulation of the 4PM-level solution was later given in Ref. [22].

The main motivation for the novel approach to PM gravity proposed here is that the just-defined HEOB formalism based on such PM-based Hamiltonians obtained by recursively solving the EOB mass-shell condition, Eqs. (2.4) or Eq. (2.10), have several unsatisfactory features. First, the combination of the intricate γ -dependence of the PM coefficients with the recursive steps required to get an explicit Hamiltonian at a given PM accuracy makes the final expression of the Hamiltonian as a function of the phase space variables, $H_{\text{eff}, n\text{PM}}(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$, quite involved and difficult to handle when solving (for $n \geq 4$) the associated EOB equations of motion, especially when considering radiation-reacted dynamics. Second, the Hamiltonians defined by recursively solving the mass-shell condition involve (at high PM orders) both positive and negative powers of the (rescaled, squared) Schwarzschild Hamiltonian [using $p_\lambda \equiv P_\lambda/\mu$, $r \equiv R/(GM)$]

$$\hat{H}_S^2 \equiv \frac{H_{\text{eff}, S}^2}{\mu^2} = (1 - 2u) \left[1 + (1 - 2u)p_r^2 + p_\varphi^2 u^2 \right]. \quad (2.21)$$

Focusing for simplicity on the orbital dynamics, this implies that the 4PM squared radial potential $V_{\text{eff}}^2(r, j) \equiv H_{\text{eff}, 4\text{PM}}^2(r, p_r = 0, p_\varphi = j)$ used in Ref. [27] is a ν -deformation of the test-particle squared radial potential

$$V_S^2(r, j) = \left(1 - \frac{2}{r} \right) \left[1 + \frac{j^2}{r^2} \right], \quad (2.22)$$

with two unsatisfactory features: (i) it is anchored on the Schwarzschild horizon $r = 2$ (i.e. $R = 2GM$) and (ii)

instead of vanishing at $r = 2$ it is singular there, namely

$$V_{\text{eff}, \text{SEOB-PM}}^2(r, j) \stackrel{r \rightarrow 2}{\approx} - \frac{5\nu \left(1 + j^2/r^2 \right)}{256(1 - 2\nu)^{3/2} \hat{H}_S^9}. \quad (2.23)$$

The presence of this singularity was already pointed out in Appendix B of Ref. [27], where the authors identify it as a possible obstacle to properly incorporating higher order information via NR-calibrated parameters.

While it is possible that this divergent behavior around $r = 2$ could be alleviated by defining some *ad hoc* resummation of the PM Hamiltonian, any resummation is likely to produce a rather intricate final expression for the Hamiltonian. The LEOB formalism presented in the next section will allow us to circumvent both problematic issues by removing entirely the need to solve the mass-shell condition for defining a Hamiltonian.

To further motivate our change of paradigm for incorporating PM information into the EOB dynamics, we compare in Fig. 1 the radial potentials⁴ computed with our new LEOB approach (top panel) and with the latest HEOB take on PM gravity [27] (bottom panel). The radial potentials are plotted against the corresponding radial coordinate, for different fixed values of the angular momentum j (indicated in the inset). For each value of j we also show, with black dots, the actual position of the effective body subjected to the full (i.e. with $p_r \neq 0$) radiation-reacted dynamics, determined by using, for simplicity, the Newtonian radiation reaction forces

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\varphi^N = \frac{8\nu p_r^2 p_\varphi}{5r^3} - \frac{16\nu p_\varphi^3}{5r^5} - \frac{16\nu p_\varphi}{5r^4}, \quad (2.24a)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_r^N = \frac{56\nu p_r p_\varphi^2}{5r^5} - \frac{8\nu p_r}{15r^4}. \quad (2.24b)$$

Finally, the coloured dots in each curve highlight the positions of the respective local minima, corresponding to stable circular orbits. The LEOB radial potentials are very similar to the radial potentials defined by the usual PN-based EOB Hamiltonians. They have a single maximum (unstable circular orbit), and a single minimum (stable circular orbit), and are qualitatively similar to the probe radial potential $V_S(r, j)$, defined by Eq. (2.22). By contrast, the SEOB-PM radial potentials are rather dissimilar to $V_S(r, j)$. In particular, they exhibit, for some intermediate values of j (see the green curve), two maxima and two minima, and have a strongly singular behaviour around $r_{\text{SEOB}} = 2$, in keeping with Eq. (2.23).

⁴ As above, each radial potential is defined as the orbital effective energy at zero radial momentum versus the radial coordinate, for a given value of j . In other words, they define the set of turning points in the (r, γ) plane at fixed j .




FIG. 1. Radial potentials for inspiralling orbits against the associated radial coordinate for the PM-informed orbital dynamics determined by our new LEOB approach (upper panel) and the SEOB-PM model of Ref. [27] (bottom panel). For each curve, obtained at different fixed values of the angular momentum j , the colored dots indicate the location of the stable circular orbits. We also show, as black dots, the actual radial position of the system as it moves along the full radiation-reacted dynamics. See text for more details.

B. The LEOB approach

The basic idea of the Lagrange-EOB approach is to replace the EOB Hamiltonian action

$$\begin{aligned} S[X^\mu, P_\mu] &= \int [P_\mu dX^\mu]^{\text{on-shell}} \\ &= \int P_i dX^i - H_{\text{eff}}(X^i, P_i) dT_{\text{eff}}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.25)$$

where the superscript “on-shell” means that one has solved the mass-shell condition for P_0 [to get $P_0^{\text{on-shell}} = -H_{\text{eff}}(X^i, P_i)$], by the action

$$S[X^\mu, P_\mu, e_L] = \int P_\mu dX^\mu - e_L \mathcal{C}(X^\mu, P_\mu) d\tau. \quad (2.26)$$

Here, $\mathcal{C}(X^\mu, P_\mu)$ denotes the EOB mass-shell condition (2.4) (or any equivalent condition), while e_L is a Lagrange multiplier. The choice of normalization of e_L determines a corresponding normalization for the evolution parameter τ . For instance, the choice $e_L = \frac{1}{2}$ (imposed after variation) corresponds to using the proper time when considering a geodetic constraint $\mathcal{C}(X^\mu, P_\mu) = g^{\mu\nu}(X^\mu, P_\mu)P_\mu P_\nu + \mu^2$.

The (Euler-Lagrange) variational equations obtained from the action (2.26) read

$$\frac{dX^\mu}{d\tau} = e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial P_\mu}, \quad (2.27a)$$

$$\frac{dP_\mu}{d\tau} = -e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial X^\mu}, \quad (2.27b)$$

$$\mathcal{C} = 0. \quad (2.27c)$$

When going beyond the conservative dynamics, these equations of motion are generalized by adding a radiation-reaction force \mathcal{F}_μ to Eq. (2.27b), i.e. by replacing it by

$$\frac{dP_\mu}{d\tau} = -e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial X^\mu} + \mathcal{F}_\mu, \quad (2.28)$$

with the condition

$$\frac{dX^\mu}{d\tau} \mathcal{F}_\mu = 0, \quad (2.29)$$

ensuring the preservation of the constraint $\mathcal{C} = 0$ along the radiation-reacted evolution.

In practice, it is usual to work with a dimensionless rescaled action $\hat{S} = \frac{S}{Gm_1 m_2}$, corresponding to dimensionless rescaled dynamical variables $x^\mu = \frac{X^\mu}{GM}$ and $p_\mu = \frac{P_\mu}{\mu}$. As already mentioned, we have $p_0 \equiv -\gamma$, where the so-defined energy variable γ generalizes the Lorentz factor of conservative scattering motions in two ways. First, γ is no longer constant under the evolution, but varies because of the inclusion of the radiation-reaction force \mathcal{F}_μ , and, second, the γ dependence of the scattering mass-shell condition must be analytically continued from the $\gamma > 1$ domain, to the bound-state domain $\gamma < 1$. Note also again the link between the rescaled effective energy $\gamma = -p_0$ and the M -rescaled real cm energy

$$h(\gamma, \nu) \equiv \frac{E}{M} = \sqrt{1 + 2\nu(\gamma - 1)}. \quad (2.30)$$

For notational simplicity, we will drop the hats on S , e_L , \mathcal{C} , τ , and \mathcal{F}_μ , and write

$$S[x^\mu, p_\mu, e_L] = \int \left[p_\mu \frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau} - e_L \mathcal{C}(x^\mu, p_\mu) \right] d\tau, \quad (2.31)$$

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau} = e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial p_\mu}, \quad (2.32a)$$

$$\frac{dp_\mu}{d\tau} = -e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial x^\mu} + \mathcal{F}_\mu, \quad (2.32b)$$

$$\mathcal{C} = 0, \quad (2.32c)$$

with

$$\mathcal{C} = g^{\mu\nu}(x^\lambda)p_\mu p_\nu + 1 + Q(x^\mu, p_\mu), \quad (2.33)$$

or

$$\mathcal{C} = g_*^{\mu\nu}(x^\lambda, p_0)p_\mu p_\nu + 1, \quad (2.34)$$

and

$$\frac{dx^\mu}{d\tau} \mathcal{F}_\mu = 0. \quad (2.35)$$

It is also convenient, in practice, to fix the Lagrange multiplier by requiring the parameter τ to be the (rescaled) “real” time $t_{\text{real}} = \frac{T_{\text{real}}}{GM}$ associated with the dynamical evolution of the binary system in the cm frame, rather than the effective time $x^0 = t_{\text{eff}}$ entering the EOB dynamics. Using $\tau = t_{\text{real}}$ in Eq. (2.32a) for $\mu = 0$, together with $x^0 = t_{\text{eff}}$, yields

$$\frac{dx^0}{d\tau} = \frac{dt_{\text{eff}}}{dt_{\text{real}}} = e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial p_0} = -e_L \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \gamma}. \quad (2.36)$$

On the other hand, $t_{\text{real}} = \frac{T_{\text{real}}}{GM}$ is related to $t_{\text{eff}} = \frac{T_{\text{eff}}}{GM}$ via $dT_{\text{eff}} \wedge dE_{\text{eff}} = dT_{\text{real}} \wedge dE_{\text{real}}$, which implies, using Eq. (2.30),

$$\frac{dt_{\text{eff}}}{dt_{\text{real}}} = \frac{dE_{\text{real}}}{dE_{\text{eff}}} = \frac{1}{\nu} \frac{dh}{d\gamma} = \frac{1}{h}. \quad (2.37)$$

Comparing the latter equation with the zeroth equation of motion (2.36) yields the following condition on the Lagrange multiplier

$$e_L = -\frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^{-1}. \quad (2.38)$$

We now have everything we need to solve the equations of motion above within the EOB approach. In practice it is not necessary to solve all of them. The constraint equation (2.32c) is only necessary to determine the initial conditions, since it will remain satisfied along the full evolution because of the condition (2.35).⁵ The latter condition determines \mathcal{F}_0 in terms of \mathcal{F}_i :

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = -\frac{dx^i}{dt_{\text{eff}}} \mathcal{F}_i = -h \frac{dx^i}{dt_{\text{real}}} \mathcal{F}_i. \quad (2.39)$$

We then end up with only seven first-order evolution equations for the seven variables, x^i, p_i and $p_0 = -\gamma$, namely

$$\frac{dx^i}{dt_{\text{real}}} = -\frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial p_i}, \quad (2.40a)$$

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt_{\text{real}}} = \frac{1}{h} \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \gamma} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial x^i} + \mathcal{F}_i, \quad (2.40b)$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dt_{\text{real}}} = -\mathcal{F}_0, \quad (2.40c)$$

where \mathcal{F}_0 must be replaced from Eq. (2.39), and where we used the fact that the mass-shell constraint \mathcal{C} has no explicit time dependence.

Given some explicit mass-shell constraint $\mathcal{C}(x^i, p_i, \gamma)$, and some explicit spatial radiation-reaction force $\mathcal{F}_i(x^i, p_i, \gamma)$, these equations provide a complete description, within the EOB framework, of the dynamical evolution of the binary system as described by the seven variables (x^i, p_i, γ) .

The traditional Hamiltonian EOB dynamics is regained when using a mass-shell constraint in the explicitly solved form

$$\mathcal{C}_H \equiv \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}(x^i, p_i) - \gamma = 0, \quad (2.41)$$

which implies

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial \gamma} = -1, \quad (2.42a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial p_i} = \frac{\partial \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}}{\partial p_i}, \quad (2.42b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial x^i} = \frac{\partial \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}}{\partial x^i}. \quad (2.42c)$$

Inserting these expressions in Eqs. (2.40a)-(2.40c) yields the usual EOB Hamilton equations plus an explicit evolution equation for \hat{H}_{eff} .

Summing up, our Lagrange-EOB approach avoids the need to solve the mass-shell constraint for $p_0 = -\gamma$ (and the ensuing problematic issues discussed above) at the small cost of having one additional evolution equation (2.40c) for γ . As will be discussed below, the simplification and flexibility brought about by this novel approach have a notable impact on the development of PM-based EOB models built upon the analytical information that is currently available. We expect even more benefits when higher-order PM-perturbative results will become available. In addition, though our approach is motivated by the intricate structure of PM results, it can be directly used when completing PM results by PN-based ones (as we shall do below), and also when using only PN-based results.

C. Gauge flexibility

As already mentioned, the LEOB approach makes it easy to work with a geodetic-like EOB mass-shell condition involving an energy-dependent metric. For non-spinning bodies, this means (in rescaled form),

$$\mathcal{C} = g^{\mu\nu}(x, \gamma)p_\mu p_\nu + 1, \quad (2.43)$$

⁵ It is, however, useful to control the accuracy of our numerical integration by checking that \mathcal{C} stays zero during the evolution.

while the aligned-spin mass-shell condition, with dimensionless rescaled variables,

$$r_c \equiv \frac{R_c}{GM}, \quad \tilde{a}_i = \frac{a_i}{GM}, \quad \hat{S} = \frac{S}{GM^2}, \quad \hat{S}_* = \frac{S_*}{GM^2}, \quad (2.44)$$

(where one should distinguish $\tilde{a}_i = \frac{a_i}{GM}$ from $\chi_i = \frac{a_i}{Gm_i}$) would take the general form

$$-\frac{[\gamma - \mathcal{G}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)p_\varphi]^2}{A(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)} + \frac{p_r^2}{B(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)} + \frac{p_\varphi^2}{r_c(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)^2} + 1 = 0, \quad (2.45)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} = G_S(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)\hat{S} + G_{S_*}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)\hat{S}_*. \quad (2.46)$$

The rescalings in Eq. (2.44) incorporate the fact that black hole spins S_i are proportional to G . Throughout this paper, we shall count the PM order of any given quantity by taking into account the scaling $S_i \propto G$, referring to it as the *physical* PM order. There exists also a different way of counting the PM order for spinning bodies, which we shall call the *formal* PM order, where the proportionality $S_i \propto G$ is ignored.⁶ For instance, a term in the energy $\sim G^3 M^2 S^2 / R^5$ is of formal 3PM order and physical 5PM order.

In PM gravity, the functions (A, B, \mathcal{G}, r_c) admit general G -expansions. In the even-in-spin sector, they take the form

$$A^{\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)}{r^n}, \quad (2.47a)$$

$$B^{\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{b_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)}{r^n}, \quad (2.47b)$$

$$\left[r_c^{\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) \right]^2 = r^2 \left[1 + \sum_{n \geq 2} \frac{r_{c,n}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)}{r^n} \right], \quad (2.47c)$$

where the coefficients $X_n(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$ are even functions of the individual spin variables \tilde{a}_1 and \tilde{a}_2 .

The index n in the above coefficients $X_n(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$ labels the physical PM order. Remembering that $\frac{1}{r} = \frac{GM}{R} = O(G)$, and that each black hole spin parameter $a_i = Gm_i\chi_i$ (which contains a factor G) has the dimension of a length, and therefore enters in the dimensionless combination $\frac{a_i}{R} = \frac{Gm_i\chi_i}{R}$ which is both $O(G^1)$ and $O(\frac{1}{r})$, we see that the index n counts at the same time all the powers of $\frac{1}{r}$ and all the powers of G including those present in the spins. By contrast, the formal PM order would be obtained by subtracting the exponent of

a_i from the exponent of $\frac{1}{r}$. For instance, the probe black-hole value of $[r_c^{\text{PM}}]^2$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \left[r_c^{\text{PM}} \right]_{\text{probeBH}}^2 &= r^2 + \tilde{a}_2^2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{r} \right) \\ &= r^2 \left[1 + \left(\frac{\tilde{a}_2}{r} \right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{2}{r} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

where the term $\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_2}{r} \right)^2$ is a physical 2PM correction, and the term $\left(\frac{\tilde{a}_2}{r} \right)^2 \frac{2}{r}$ a physical 3PM correction.

In the odd-in-spin sector, the G -expanded gyrogravitomagnetic functions read

$$G_S^{\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \frac{1}{r r_c^2(a_K)} g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i), \quad (2.49a)$$

$$G_{S_*}^{\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \frac{1}{r r_c^2(a_K)} g_{S_*}(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i), \quad (2.49b)$$

where the effective Kerr parameter a_K will be chosen below, and where the coefficients g_S and g_{S_*} are expanded as a series in $u \equiv \frac{1}{r}$, with coefficients that are polynomials in \tilde{a}_i , namely

$$\begin{aligned} g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) &= g_0(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) + g_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)u \\ &\quad + g_2(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)u^2 + g_3(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)u^3, \end{aligned} \quad (2.50a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} g_{S_*}(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) &= g_{*0}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) + g_{*1}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)u \\ &\quad + g_{*2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)u^2 + g_{*3}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)u^3, \end{aligned} \quad (2.50b)$$

where the $g_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ and $g_{*n}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ parameters are even functions of the spins. In this case the n subscript indicates the relative PM order with respect to the leading-order spin-orbit couplings $g_0(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ and $g_{*0}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$. As for the absolute PM order, the probe black-hole value of the spin-orbit coupling is given by $\mathcal{G}(R, a_2, L) = \frac{2GLS_2}{RR_c^2}$, Eq. (2.20), which starts at the formal 1PM order, but [because $S_2 = O(G)$] at the physical 2PM order. Consequently, each g_n and g_{*n} term will be at physical $(n+2)$ PM order.

As usual [5, 6], these PM coefficients are constrained by enforcing that the PM-expansion of the real cm scattering angle (with $j \equiv p_\varphi$),

$$\chi^{\text{PM}}(j, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) = \sum_n 2 \frac{\chi_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)}{j^n}, \quad (2.51)$$

coincides with the PM-expansion of the EOB scattering angle, obtained by PM expanding the integral

$$\chi^{\text{EOB}} = -\pi - 2 \int_{r_{\min}}^{+\infty} dr \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\varphi} p_r(\gamma, p_\varphi, r, \tilde{a}_i), \quad (2.52)$$

where

$$p_r(\gamma, p_\varphi, r, \tilde{a}_i) = \sqrt{B \left(-1 + \frac{\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2}{A} - \frac{p_\varphi^2}{r_c^2} \right)}, \quad (2.53)$$

⁶ The formal PM order is useful to make contact with works that count loop orders (e.g. Refs. [38, 39]), since a formal n PM contribution corresponds to a $(n-1)$ -loop correction.

with

$$\gamma_{\text{orb}} \equiv \gamma - p_\varphi \mathcal{G}. \quad (2.54)$$

In Eq. (2.52), r_{min} denotes the largest real root of $p_r(\gamma, p_\varphi, r, \tilde{a}_i) = 0$. In this computation, one assumes that $\gamma > 1$.

Let us separate even and odd-in spin contributions in the PM coefficients of the scattering angle, i.e.

$$\chi_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \chi_n^{\text{even}}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) + \chi_n^{\text{odd}}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu). \quad (2.55)$$

In general, considering that all the PM coefficients of the EOB functions appearing in Eq. (2.53) are by construction even in the spins, the matching procedure described above yields, for any given physical PM order, say the n th, a relation connecting the even-in-spin scattering angle coefficient $\chi_n^{\text{even}}(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$ to the PM coefficients $a_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $b_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $r_{c,n}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ and another connecting its odd-in-spin counterpart, $\chi_n^{\text{odd}}(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$, to $g_{(n-2)}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $g_{*(n-2)}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ (and previously determined coefficients).

Let us show explicitly the first few iterations. At physical 1PM order there is no spin dependence in the scattering angle. Introducing the usual notation (for $\gamma > 1$)

$$p_\infty \equiv \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}. \quad (2.56)$$

the physical 1PM relation hence reads

$$\chi_1(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{p_\infty}{2} b_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2p_\infty} a_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu), \quad (2.57)$$

to be compared with the well-known result

$$\chi_1^{\text{1PM}}(\gamma) = \frac{2\gamma^2 - 1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}} = \frac{2\gamma^2 - 1}{p_\infty}. \quad (2.58)$$

Starting from the physical 2PM-level, we have both even and odd-in-spin contributions to the scattering angle, $\chi_2 = \chi_2^{\text{even}} + \chi_2^{\text{odd}}$.

The physical 2PM even-in-spin contribution to χ is purely orbital and reads

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_2^{\text{even}}(\gamma, \nu) &= -\frac{1}{8}\pi\gamma^2 a_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{32}\pi p_\infty^2 b_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)^2 + \frac{1}{8}\pi p_\infty^2 b_2(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{8}\pi p_\infty^2 r_{c,2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) + \frac{1}{4}\pi\gamma^2 a_1(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)^2 \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{4}\pi\gamma^2 a_2(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu), \end{aligned} \quad (2.59)$$

while the odd-in-spin 2PM contribution to χ is

$$\chi_2^{\text{odd}}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = -\gamma p_\infty [g_0(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) S + g_{*0}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) S_*]. \quad (2.60)$$

The full relations up to the physical 5PM level (excluding the still undetermined orbital part) can be found in the ancillary `Mathematica` file attached to this paper.

As displayed in Eqs. (2.57)-(2.59), there is a large freedom in the determination of the coefficients $a_m(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $b_m(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $r_{c,m}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, for $m \leq n$, as there are more unknowns than equations. More precisely, at each PM order the full gauge-invariant information about the (conservative) dynamics is contained in the single function $\chi_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$. Therefore, one is allowed to impose two *a priori* constraints among the three metric functions $a_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $b_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$, $r_{c,n}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ so as to finally determine the PM expansion of the full effective metric from the sole knowledge of the $\chi_n^{\text{even}}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$'s. This freedom is a gauge freedom which goes beyond the usual coordinate freedom of general relativity (GR). The physical origin of the larger-than-GR freedom of the EOB dynamics is that the EOB mass-shell condition, which is equivalent to a Hamiltonian, admits the larger set of canonical transformations as gauge symmetries. We discuss our particular gauge choices in the next section, while we defer to Appendix C a brief discussion of other possible choices (restricting the analysis to the nonspinning case for simplicity), including the Kerr-Schild-like gauge recently used in Ref. [25]. Let us also note that, while in the present work we will use an energy-dependent geodesic-like gauge, Eq. (2.43), the flexibility of the LEOB approach allows for hybrid gauges where the mass-shell condition involves an additional (Finsler-type) non-geodesic Q contribution, say

$$C = g^{\mu\nu}(x, \gamma) p_\mu p_\nu + 1 + \hat{Q}(x^\mu, p_\mu), \quad (2.61)$$

where $\hat{Q}(x^\mu, p_\mu)$ depends on p_μ in a non-quadratic way.

D. The Lagrange-Just-Boyer-Lindquist gauge

In the present work we explore one particular way of fixing the gauge freedom of our LEOB formalism. The gauge we choose consists in imposing two algebraic constraints on the three metric coefficients A , B and R_c^2 . On the one hand, we impose (similarly to a coordinate condition introduced long ago by Kurt Just [40], see also [41], in scalar-tensor gravity) the constraint that the product AB has the same value as for a Kerr metric (of mass $M_K = M = m_1 + m_2$ and spin parameter $a_K = a_0 \equiv a_1 + a_2$) in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates. On the other hand, we impose the further constraint that R_c^2 also takes the same value as for the latter Kerr metric (in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates). Explicitly, we work in a "Lagrange-Just-Boyer-Lindquist" (LJBL) gauge defined by imposing the following two conditions

$$A(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) B(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) = \frac{R^2}{R_{cK}^2(M, a_0)}, \quad (2.62a)$$

$$R_c^2(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) = R_{cK}^2(M, a_0), \quad (2.62b)$$

where $a_K = a_0 \equiv a_1 + a_2$, and [see Eq. (2.17)],

$$R_{cK}^2(M, a_0) = R^2 + a_0^2 \left(1 + \frac{2GM}{R}\right). \quad (2.63)$$

In particular, these choices will ensure that our effective EOB metric reduces, at the 1PM-level, to the Kerr metric in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates. In the nonspinning case, the conditions above reduce to imposing a Just-Schwarzschild gauge where $AB = 1$ and $R_c^2 = R^2$.

The first condition, Eq. (2.62a), has the advantage of discarding any reference to the Kerr event horizon. When combined with a suitable resummation of the function $A(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)$, the PM information contained in the scattering function $\chi(j, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)$ will then automatically determine the radial location of some effective horizon, as was happening in the traditional, PN-based EOB formalism, especially within the Damour-Jaranowski-Schäfer (DJS) gauge [33].

When imposing the gauge conditions (2.62), Eqs. (2.57)-(2.59) and their higher-order equivalents simplify, leaving as unknowns just one set of coefficients, say a_n . This allows us to obtain them recursively in terms of the PM coefficients χ_n^{even} . The χ_n^{odd} coefficients instead completely determine the g_n and g_{*n} ones, apart from some arbitrariness (discussed below) in collecting spin contributions beyond the linear in spin level.

Following these steps, and using the known values of $\chi_n^{\text{even}}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ [10, 11, 14, 30, 38, 42-53], we can obtain the explicit form of our PM-expanded A metric potential. Recalling the definition of $h(\gamma, \nu) = E/M$ given by Eq.

(2.30), the first two PM orders read

$$a_1(\gamma, \nu) = -2, \quad (2.64a)$$

$$a_2(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{6\nu}{h(h+1)} \frac{(\gamma-1)(5\gamma^2-1)}{3\gamma^2-1}. \quad (2.64b)$$

At the physical 3PM level, spin-spin interactions start to contribute, while spin-quartic terms enter at 5PM. We hence write

$$a_3(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = a_3^0(\gamma, \nu) + a_3^{\tilde{a}_i^2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu), \quad (2.65a)$$

$$a_4(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = a_4^0(\gamma, \nu) + a_4^{\tilde{a}_i^2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu), \quad (2.65b)$$

$$a_5(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = a_5^0(\gamma, \nu) + a_5^{\tilde{a}_i^2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) + a_5^{\tilde{a}_i^4}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu). \quad (2.65c)$$

Introducing the spin combinations

$$\tilde{a}_0 = \frac{a_1 + a_2}{GM} = \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2 = \hat{S} + \hat{S}_*, \quad (2.66)$$

$$\tilde{a}_{12} = \frac{a_1 - a_2}{GM} = \tilde{a}_1 - \tilde{a}_2 = \frac{\hat{S} - \hat{S}_*}{X_{12}}, \quad (2.67)$$

where $X_{12} \equiv X_1 - X_2 \equiv (m_1 - m_2)/M \equiv \sqrt{1 - 4\nu}$, we report here, for illustration, the 3PM results (obtained using the conservative contribution to χ_3)

$$a_3^0(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\nu}{4\gamma^2 - 1} \left\{ \frac{56\gamma(\gamma^2 + \frac{25}{14})}{h^2} - \frac{144(5\gamma^2 - 1)(\gamma^4 - \gamma^2 + \frac{1}{8})}{h(h+1)(\gamma+1)(3\gamma^2-1)} + \frac{96 \left[\gamma^2(\gamma^2 - 3) - \frac{3}{4} \right] \text{arcsinh} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}}{h^2 \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}} \right\}, \quad (2.68a)$$

$$a_3^{\tilde{a}_i^2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = 3 \frac{1 - 2\gamma^2}{1 - 4\gamma^2} \left\{ \tilde{a}_0^2 \left[1 - \frac{2}{(\gamma+1)h^2} \right] - \frac{2(\gamma-1)}{(\gamma+1)h(h+1)} \left[\frac{1 + 2\gamma}{1 - 2\gamma^2} \tilde{a}_0 \left(\tilde{a}_0 - \frac{\sqrt{1-4\nu}\tilde{a}_{12}}{h} \right) + \frac{(\tilde{a}_0 + \sqrt{1-4\nu}\tilde{a}_{12})^2}{2h(h+1)} \right] \right\}. \quad (2.68b)$$

The above mathematical expression of $a_3^0(\gamma, \nu)$ involves the function $f_3(\gamma) = \text{arcsinh} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}} / \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}$ which is originally defined for unbound motions ($\gamma > 1$). This function admits a unique analytic continuation to bound motions ($\gamma < 1$), namely $\arcsin \sqrt{\frac{1-\gamma}{2}} / \sqrt{1-\gamma^2}$ [indeed $f_3(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{x}{12} + \frac{3x^2}{80} + \dots$ is analytic in $x \equiv \gamma^2 - 1$ around $x = 0$]. The 4PM-level metric coefficient $a_4(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ involves tail effects which introduce a non-trivial continuation from unbound to bound motions. This will be discussed separately in Sec. III. The explicit expressions of the $a_n(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$'s are given in electronic form in an ancillary file attached to this work. The functions $a_n(\gamma, \nu)$'s

for $n \geq 2$ contain pole singularities located ⁷ at $\gamma^2 = \frac{1}{3}$. These poles will have no impact in our Lagrange-EOB approach because though γ decreases during the LEOB evolution, it will never end up as low as $\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.57735$.

In the probe black-hole limit $m_2 \rightarrow 0$, implying $\nu \rightarrow 0$ (or equivalently $h \rightarrow 1$) and $\tilde{a}_2 \rightarrow 0$ (so that $\tilde{a}_{12} = \tilde{a}_0 = \tilde{a}_1$), the effective metric coincides (in agreement with the general result of Ref. [5]) with the Kerr metric with $M_K = m_1$ and $a_K = a_1$. In particular, the A po-

⁷ For higher values of n there appear pole singularities also at $\gamma^2 = \frac{1}{4}$, $\gamma^2 = \frac{1}{5}$, and so on.

tential tends to [with $u_c^2(a_K) = \frac{1}{r_c^2(a_K)} = \frac{u^2}{1+a_K^2 u^2(1+2u)}$]

$$A(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) \stackrel{\text{probe BH}}{=} \frac{1 - 4u_c^2(a_1)}{1 + 2u} = 1 - 2u + 4a_1^2 u^4 - 4a_1^4 u^6 + \dots \quad (2.69)$$

In particular, the 3PM spin-square coefficient $a_3^{\tilde{a}_2^2}$ in Eq. (2.68b) above vanishes (because of several cancellations) in the probe BH limit.

Repeating the same steps for the odd-in-spin scattering angle, $\chi_n^{\text{odd}}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu)$ [15, 18, 39, 46, 47, 54], we can compute our PM-expanded gyro-gravitomagnetic function

$$\mathcal{G} = \frac{1}{rr_c^2(\tilde{a}_0)} \left[g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) \hat{S} + g_{S^*}(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) \hat{S}^* \right], \quad (2.70)$$

where the coefficients g_S and g_{S^*} are expanded as a series in $u \equiv \frac{1}{r}$, with coefficients that are polynomials in \tilde{a}_i , namely

$$\begin{aligned} g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) &= g_0(\gamma, \nu) \left[1 + \hat{g}_1(\gamma, \nu) u \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \hat{g}_2(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) u^2 + \hat{g}_3(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) u^3 \right], \\ g_{S^*}(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) &= g_{*0}(\gamma, \nu) \left[1 + \hat{g}_{*1}(\gamma, \nu) u \right. \end{aligned} \quad (2.71a)$$

$$\left. + \hat{g}_{*2}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) u^2 + \hat{g}_{*3}(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) u^3 \right], \quad (2.71b)$$

where we defined $\hat{g}_n = g_n/g_0$ and $\hat{g}_{*n} = g_{*n}/g_{*0}$ [see Eqs.(2.50a)-(2.50b)]. We remind the reader that since the leading-order spin-orbit coupling starts at the physical 2PM level, and given that \hat{g}_n and \hat{g}_{*n} have been expressed as functions of the dimensionless spin parameters $\tilde{a}_i = a_i/(GM)$, each \hat{g}_n and \hat{g}_{*n} is at physical $(n+2)$ PM order.

Spin-cube interactions start at 4PM, with quadratic-in-spin terms entering \hat{g}_2 and \hat{g}_{*2} . At this spin-cube level, there is a choice on how to dispatch the four spin combinations $(a_1^3, a_1^2 a_2, a_1 a_2^2, a_2^3)$ entering \mathcal{G} among the two gyro-gravitomagnetic functions. We have chosen to impose that each spin-squared coefficient only involves the combinations \tilde{a}_0^2 and \tilde{a}_{12}^2 . Therefore, the physical 4PM and 5PM contributions to $g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)$ read

$$\hat{g}_2(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \hat{g}_2^0(\gamma, \nu) + \hat{g}_2^{\tilde{a}_0^2}(\gamma, \nu) \tilde{a}_0^2 + \hat{g}_2^{\tilde{a}_{12}^2}(\gamma, \nu) \tilde{a}_{12}^2, \quad (2.72a)$$

$$\hat{g}_3(\gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu) + \hat{g}_3^{\tilde{a}_0^2}(\gamma, \nu) \tilde{a}_0^2 + \hat{g}_3^{\tilde{a}_{12}^2}(\gamma, \nu) \tilde{a}_{12}^2, \quad (2.72b)$$

and the same decomposition holds for \hat{g}_{*2} and \hat{g}_{*3} .

The first few spin-orbit coefficients read

$$g_0(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{1}{(1+h)\gamma(1+\gamma)} \left[1 + 2\gamma - \frac{1-2\gamma-4\gamma^2}{h} \right], \quad (2.73a)$$

$$g_{*0}(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{1+2\gamma}{h\gamma(1+\gamma)}, \quad (2.73b)$$

$$\hat{g}_1(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\nu}{(1+h)[1-2\gamma-4\gamma^2-h(1+2\gamma)]} \left[2\frac{1+2\gamma}{1+\gamma}(5\gamma^2-3) + \frac{3-15\gamma-15\gamma^2+35\gamma^3}{h} \right], \quad (2.73c)$$

$$\hat{g}_{*1}(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)} \left[\frac{5\gamma^2-3}{1+\gamma} + \frac{3}{2h} \left(\frac{1+2\gamma-5\gamma^2}{1+2\gamma} \right) \right], \quad (2.73d)$$

while, for instance, the first cubic-in-spin (4PM) coefficients read

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_2^{\tilde{a}_0^2}(\gamma, \nu) &= \frac{1}{2(1+h)^2[1-2\gamma-4\gamma^2-h(1+2\gamma)]} \left[h^3(1+2\gamma) + h^2(1+6\gamma+4\gamma^2) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - h \frac{3-5\gamma-14\gamma^2-8\gamma^3}{1+\gamma} - \frac{7+11\gamma-6\gamma^2-4\gamma^3}{(1+\gamma)} + 3\frac{1-6\gamma}{h} + \frac{(1-2\gamma)(3+4\gamma^2)}{h^2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.74a)$$

$$\hat{g}_2^{\tilde{a}_{12}^2}(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{1+\gamma-2h^2}{2h(1+h)^2(1+\gamma)[1-2\gamma-4\gamma^2-h(1+2\gamma)]} \left[-3(1+2\gamma) + \frac{1-6\gamma-8\gamma^2}{h} \right], \quad (2.74b)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{*2}^{\tilde{a}_0^2}(\gamma, \nu) &= \frac{1}{2(1+h)^3(1+2\gamma)} \left[-h^2(1+2\gamma)(3+h) - h \frac{1+9\gamma+6\gamma^2}{1+\gamma} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{(1-\gamma)(5+2\gamma)}{(1+\gamma)} + \frac{3(3-2\gamma)}{h} + \frac{3+2\gamma-4\gamma^2}{h^2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (2.74c)$$

$$\hat{g}_{*2}^{\tilde{a}_{12}^2}(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{1+\gamma-2h^2}{2(1+\gamma)h(1+h)^3} \left[3 + \frac{1+6\gamma+4\gamma^2}{h(1+2\gamma)} \right]. \quad (2.74d)$$

The full list of coefficients up to 5PM can be found in the ancillary file. We also point to Sec. III D for a discussion on the time nonlocalities that appear in $\hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu)$ and $\hat{g}_{*3}^0(\gamma, \nu)$.

In the PN limit, when $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ or, equivalently, $p_\infty \rightarrow 0$, the 2PM and 3PM spin-orbit coefficients read

$$g_0(\gamma, \nu) \sim 2 - \frac{9}{4}\nu p_\infty^2 + O(p_\infty^4), \quad (2.75a)$$

$$g_{*0}(\gamma, \nu) \sim \frac{3}{2} - \left(\frac{5}{8} + \frac{3}{2}\nu\right)p_\infty^2 + O(p_\infty^4), \quad (2.75b)$$

$$\hat{g}_1(\gamma, \nu) \sim -\frac{7}{8}\nu - \left(\frac{35}{16} - \frac{81}{128}\nu\right)\nu p_\infty^2 + O(p_\infty^4), \quad (2.75c)$$

$$\hat{g}_{*1}(\gamma, \nu) \sim -\frac{7}{6} - \nu + \left(\frac{1}{72} - \frac{5}{3}\nu + \frac{3}{4}\nu^2\right)p_\infty^2 + O(p_\infty^4). \quad (2.75d)$$

In the probe BH limit, we reproduce the Kerr spin-orbit sector, with

$$G_S(m_2 \rightarrow 0) = \frac{2}{r_c^2 r}, \quad (2.76)$$

and $S_* = Gm_1 m_2 (\chi_1 + \chi_2) \rightarrow 0$, while G_{S_*} instead is a complicated series in u with γ -dependent coefficients, e.g.

$$G_{S_*}(m_2 \rightarrow 0, \gamma = 1) \sim \frac{3}{2}u^3 \left[1 - \frac{7}{6}u + O(u^2)\right]. \quad (2.77)$$

III. LOCAL AND NONLOCAL CONSERVATIVE PM CONTRIBUTIONS WITHIN LEOB

As was pointed out long ago [55], tail-transported effects generate nonlocal-in-time contributions to the two-body dynamics that arise at order $O(G^4/c^8)$ (i.e at 4PM and 4PN). As a consequence, the conservative part of the 4PM dynamics is described by an action made of two types of contributions: a local-in-time one, S^{loc} , and a (time-symmetric) nonlocal-in-time one, S^{nonloc} [34, 56–61]. The Tutti Frutti approach to binary dynamics [32, 61–63] has determined, in the nonspinning case, both

S^{loc} and S^{nonloc} up to the 6PN accuracy, modulo a few unknown numerical coefficients parametrizing $O(\nu^3)$ effects. The local action is described by a local Hamiltonian which is applicable both to scattering motions and to bound motions. By contrast, the nonlocal action takes quite different explicit forms when considering scattering motions or bound motions.

In the following we address this issue by computing the local 4PM component of the spin-independent part of the A potential in LJBL gauge (Sec. III A), by completing it with local 5PM contributions at 4PN accuracy (Sec. III B), and by adding nonlocal 4PN-accurate contributions specific to elliptic-like motions (Sec. III C). Finally, in Sec. III D, we also discuss the time nonlocalities present in the 4PM spin-orbit sector of the dynamics.

For a discussion of the strategies adopted for tackling this issue in previous HEOB-based works, see Appendix D.

A. Local part of the (nonspinning) orbital dynamics at the 4PM level

Recently, Ref. [64] has computed the 4PM-level [$O(G^4)$] local action to the thirtieth order in velocities (i.e. the 15PN accuracy) by combining results of the Tutti Frutti approach with the results of Refs. [11, 14] and of Ref. [16]. Ref. [64] expressed the gauge-invariant content of the local 4PM action in two different ways: (i) the local contribution to the 4PM scattering angle, χ_4^{loc} , and (ii) the local 4PM contribution to the post-Schwarzschild Q potential, i.e. q_4^{loc} . In the present Section, we use Eq. (C6c) to translate the value of q_4^{loc} derived in Ref. [64] into a corresponding value for the local contribution a_4^{loc} to the orbital⁸ component of the 4PM-accurate A potential in the LJBL gauge.

The structure of $a_4^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, \nu)$ reads

$$a_4^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\nu}{h(h+1)}a_{4,1}(\gamma) + \frac{\nu}{h^2}a_{4,2}(\gamma) + \frac{\nu}{h^3} \left[a_{4,3}^{\pi^2}(\gamma) + a_{4,3}^{\text{rem}}(\gamma) \right], \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$a_{4,1}(\gamma) = \frac{107 - 2743\gamma^2 + 26942\gamma^4 - 128682\gamma^6 + 308235\gamma^8 - 343935\gamma^{10} + 142380\gamma^{12}}{2(\gamma+1)(\gamma^2-1)(3\gamma^2-1)^2(4\gamma^2-1)(5\gamma^2-1)}, \quad (3.2a)$$

$$a_{4,2}(\gamma) = \frac{3 - 30\gamma^2 + 35\gamma^4}{(\gamma^2-1)(4\gamma^2-1)(5\gamma^2-1)} \left[-\frac{9 + 191\gamma - 126\gamma^2 - 962\gamma^3 + 585\gamma^4 + 543\gamma^5 - 900\gamma^6 + 1908\gamma^7}{2(1-3\gamma^2)^2} \right]$$

⁸ In the following, the word ‘‘orbital’’ refers to the zero-spin limit.

$$+ \frac{24(3 + 12\gamma^2 - 4\gamma^4) \operatorname{arcsinh} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma-1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}} \Big], \quad (3.2b)$$

$$a_{4,3}^{\pi^2}(\gamma) = \frac{2\pi^2(\gamma-1)(12 - 64\gamma + 65\gamma^2 + 5\gamma^3 - 25\gamma^4 - 25\gamma^5)}{3(5\gamma^2 - 1)} + \frac{1}{(\gamma^2 - 1)(5\gamma^2 - 1)} \left[(834 + 2095\gamma + 1200\gamma^2) K^2 \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1} \right) + \frac{7}{2}(\gamma+1)(169 + 380\gamma^2) E^2 \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1} \right) - (1183 + 2929\gamma + 2660\gamma^2 + 1200\gamma^3) K \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1} \right) E \left(\frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma+1} \right) \right], \quad (3.2c)$$

K and E being the complete elliptic integrals of the first and second kind, respectively, expressed as functions of the parameter $m = k^2$. While the expressions for the above coefficients are exact, the last contribution $a_{4,3}^{\operatorname{rem}}(\gamma)$

is only known up to order p_∞^{30} (see Ref. [64]). The beginning of the p_∞^{30} -accurate value of $a_{4,3}^{\operatorname{rem}}(\gamma)$ reads

$$a_{4,3}^{\operatorname{rem}}(\gamma) = \frac{10}{p_\infty^2} + \frac{346}{3} + \frac{719p_\infty^2}{9} + \frac{493819p_\infty^4}{16800} - \frac{31001791p_\infty^6}{470400} + \frac{13674094649p_\infty^8}{111767040} + \dots + O(p_\infty^{32}), \quad (3.3)$$

The apparent $10/p_\infty^2 = 10/(\gamma^2 - 1)$ pole in $a_{4,3}^{\operatorname{rem}}$ cancels against similar poles present in $a_{4,1}, a_{4,2}, a_{4,3}^{\pi^2}$. The complete p_∞^{30} -accurate value of $a_{4,3}^{\operatorname{rem}}(\gamma)$ is given in electronic form in the ancillary `Mathematica` file.

B. Completing the local orbital dynamics by 5PM contributions at 4PN accuracy

Having obtained the purely local component of the A potential at the 4PM accuracy (in our LJBL gauge), we are in position to complete it in two different directions: (i) by adding the *local* contribution of higher PM orders up to some given PN order, and (ii) by reintroducing the (tail-related) *nonlocal* contribution in a form appropriate for mildly eccentric orbits up to some given eccentricity order, and up to some given PN order.

The aim of the present Section is to use the results of the Tutti Frutti approach [32, 61–63] and add to the above-determined 4PM-level local A potential in our gauge the current 4PN-limited knowledge of the 5PM contributions to the local orbital dynamics.

We have actually performed this calculation up to 7PM and 6PN accuracy. However, since we are not going to use this information in the construction of our present waveform model, we relegate the presentation of this high-order extension to Appendix E. The inclusion of the nonlocal contributions to the A potential will be instead discussed in the next section. Let us denote the 4PM-accurate local orbital A potential determined in the pre-

vious section as (with $u \equiv 1/r = GM/R$)

$$A_{\leq 4\text{PM}}^{\operatorname{loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu) = 1 - 2u + a_2(\gamma, \nu)u^2 + a_3(\gamma, \nu)u^3 + a_4^{\operatorname{loc}}(\gamma, \nu)u^4. \quad (3.4)$$

Higher PM contributions to the local conservative dynamics are described, in our LJBL gauge, by contributions to $A^{\operatorname{loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu)$ proportional to higher powers of u . In the Tutti Frutti approach such contributions are purely of the power-law type, without any logarithmic dependence on u .⁹ As a consequence, when considering the 4PN accuracy, we must simply complete the 4PM-accurate A potential of Eq. (3.4) by the 5PM static contributions proportional to $u^5 = (GM/R)^5$. In other words, the completed A potential reads

$$A_{4\text{PM completed}}^{\operatorname{loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu) = A_{\leq 4\text{PM}}^{\operatorname{loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu) + u^5 a_{50}^{\operatorname{loc}}(\nu). \quad (3.5)$$

The value of the coefficient $a_{50}^{\operatorname{loc}}(\nu)$ can be directly obtained from the results of Ref. [32]. Indeed, Table XII of [32] gives the coefficients $q_n(p_\infty, \nu)$ of the u expansion of \hat{Q} in the E-type energy gauge. Substituting the values of these coefficients in our Eqs. (C6), which give the $a_n(\gamma, \nu)$'s in terms of the $q_n(\gamma, \nu)$'s, yields

$$a_{50}^{\operatorname{loc}}(\nu) = \left(-\frac{34093}{360} + \frac{3539\pi^2}{6144} \right) \nu$$

⁹ Indeed, the definition of the local-nonlocal separation used in the Tutti Frutti approach incorporates all the $\ln u$ terms (including the ones associated with near-zone effects, or potential gravitons) in the nonlocal part of the dynamics.

$$+ \left(-\frac{1195}{12} + \frac{205\pi^2}{64} \right) \nu^2 + \frac{9\nu^3}{4}. \quad (3.6)$$

This value can also be obtained from the 4PN-accurate determination of the EOB Hamiltonian in Ref. [34].

C. Nonlocal orbital dynamics for elliptic-like motions at 4PN accuracy

As already mentioned, the nonlocal part of the conservative dynamics for bound motions, first appearing at the 4PN order, has a nonperturbative dependence on Newton's constant, which prevents its computation within the PM approach. However, the PN approach does give access to explicit computations of a Delaunay-Hamiltonian description of the nonlocal dynamics of moderately eccentric motions as an expansion in powers of the eccentricity (which, in the DJS gauge, is equivalent to an expansion in powers of the radial momentum p_r). This was first done at the 4PN level and at the sixth order in eccentricity in Refs. [34, 57], and then extended to the 5PN and 6PN orders (including the purely nonlocal 5.5PN contribution), and at the tenth order in eccentricity, in Refs. [32, 61–63].

In this section we will use these results at 4PN and up to the eighth order in eccentricity, corresponding to the eighth power of p_r , to derive a corresponding nonlocal contribution $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(\gamma, u)$ to the local A potential of the previous section. For the extension of this computation to the maximum available PN accuracy, i.e. the 6PN, see Appendix F.

We start from an orbital A potential with the structure

$$A(\gamma, u) = A_{4\text{PNcompleted}}^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, u) + \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(\gamma, u), \quad (3.7)$$

where $A_{4\text{PNcompleted}}^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, u)$ is the local component, determined in Sec. III B with full 4PM accuracy and with additional local 5PM contributions up to the 4PN order.

At 4PN accuracy, the DJS-gauge Tutti Frutti squared effective Hamiltonian for bound state motions, $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$, also contains a nonlocal contribution $H_{\text{eff,nonloc}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$ given, in terms of the DJS-gauge EOB potentials, by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \hat{H}_{\text{eff,nonloc}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi) &= [1 - 2(1 - 2u)p_r^2 \\ &+ p_\varphi^2 u^2] \delta A_{\text{nl}}(r) + (1 - 2u)^2 p_r^2 \delta \bar{D}_{\text{nl}}(r) \\ &+ (1 - 2u) \delta Q_{\text{nl}}(r, p_r). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

The nonlocal components $[\delta A_{\text{nl}}(r), \delta \bar{D}_{\text{nl}}(r), \delta Q_{\text{nl}}(r, p_r)]$ at 4PN accuracy (and beyond, at 5PN and 6PN) can be

found in Table IV of Ref. [62] and Table VI of Ref. [32]; we report them for completeness in Tables VI, VII, and VIII.

Note that $\delta Q_{\text{nl}}^{4\text{PN}}(r, p_r)$ has the structure

$$\begin{aligned} \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}^{4\text{PN}}(r, p_r) &= c_4 q_{43} p_r^4 u^3 + c_6 q_{62} p_r^6 u^2 + c_8 q_{81} p_r^8 u \\ &+ \mathcal{O}(p_r^{10}). \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

The parameters c_4, c_6, c_8 appearing in Eq. (3.9) are eccentricity-keying parameters. They are all equal to 1 and serve the purpose of keeping track of the order in p_r (beyond p_r^2), which is physically equivalent to the order in eccentricity (beyond the e^2 level).

The mapping between the DJS gauge dynamics, described by the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$, and the (PN expansion of the) LJBL-gauge dynamics described by the $A(\gamma, u)$ potential of Eq. (3.7) is obtained by looking for a canonical transformation such that the DJS-gauge constraint

$$0 = \hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi) - \gamma^2, \quad (3.10)$$

be equivalent to the corresponding LJBL constraint

$$0 = A(\gamma, u)[1 + A(\gamma, u)p_r^2 + p_\varphi^2 u^2] - \gamma^2. \quad (3.11)$$

The resulting $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(p_\infty, u)$ contribution to $A(\gamma, u)$, and the canonical transformation itself, are obtained order by order in the PN expansion. This canonical transformation involves logarithms of u . See Refs. [32, 61–63] for similar computations.

The general structure of $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(\gamma, u)$ reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}} &= \sum_{k=1}^5 a_{k,5-k}^{\text{nlh,c}} u^k p_\infty^{2(5-k)} \\ &+ \ln u \sum_{k=4}^5 a_{k,5-k}^{\text{nlh,ln}} u^k p_\infty^{2(5-k)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

with an eccentricity structure

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(\gamma, u) &= \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{\leq e^2}(\gamma, u) \\ &+ c_4 \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^4}(\gamma, u) + c_6 \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^6}(\gamma, u) \\ &+ c_8 \delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^8}(\gamma, u), \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where the parameters c_4, c_6, c_8 are the beyond- e^2 eccentricity-keying parameters introduced in Eq. (3.9). One can prove that $A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^4}(\gamma, u)$, $A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^6}(\gamma, u)$, and $A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^8}(\gamma, u)$ all vanish along circular orbits (when taking into account the link between γ and u that exists for circular motions). Explicitly, we find

$$\delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(\gamma, u) = u^4 p_\infty^2 \left(-\frac{781}{15} + \frac{296\gamma}{15} - \frac{1624 \ln 2}{15} + \frac{729 \ln 3}{5} + \frac{148 \ln u}{15} \right) \nu$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + u^5 \left(-\frac{781}{15} + \frac{136\gamma}{3} - \frac{856 \ln 2}{15} + \frac{729 \ln 3}{5} + \frac{68 \ln u}{3} \right) \nu \\
& + c_4 \left[u^3 p_\infty^4 \left(-\frac{5608}{75} + \frac{496256 \ln 2}{225} - \frac{33048 \ln 3}{25} \right) \nu + u^4 p_\infty^2 \left(-\frac{9814}{75} + \frac{868448 \ln 2}{225} - \frac{57834 \ln 3}{25} \right) \nu \right. \\
& + u^5 \left(-\frac{1402}{25} + \frac{124064 \ln 2}{75} - \frac{24786 \ln 3}{25} \right) \nu \left. \right] \\
& + c_6 \left[u^2 p_\infty^6 \left(-\frac{1027}{12} - \frac{147432 \ln 2}{5} + \frac{1399437 \ln 3}{160} + \frac{1953125 \ln 5}{288} \right) \nu \right. \\
& + u^3 p_\infty^4 \left(-\frac{11297}{60} - \frac{1621752 \ln 2}{25} + \frac{15393807 \ln 3}{800} + \frac{4296875 \ln 5}{288} \right) \nu \\
& + u^4 p_\infty^2 \left(-\frac{2054}{15} - \frac{1179456 \ln 2}{25} + \frac{1399437 \ln 3}{100} + \frac{390625 \ln 5}{36} \right) \nu \\
& + u^5 \left(-\frac{1027}{30} - \frac{294864 \ln 2}{25} + \frac{1399437 \ln 3}{400} + \frac{390625 \ln 5}{144} \right) \nu \left. \right] \\
& + c_8 \left[u p_\infty^8 \left(-\frac{35772}{175} + \frac{10834496 \ln 2}{21} + \frac{6591861 \ln 3}{350} - \frac{27734375 \ln 5}{126} \right) \nu \right. \\
& + u^2 p_\infty^6 \left(-\frac{8943}{20} + \frac{3385780 \ln 2}{3} + \frac{6591861 \ln 3}{160} - \frac{138671875 \ln 5}{288} \right) \nu \\
& + u^3 p_\infty^4 \left(-\frac{259347}{700} + \frac{19637524 \ln 2}{21} + \frac{191163969 \ln 3}{5600} - \frac{804296875 \ln 5}{2016} \right) \nu \\
& + u^4 p_\infty^2 \left(-\frac{26829}{175} + \frac{2708624 \ln 2}{7} + \frac{19775583 \ln 3}{1400} - \frac{27734375 \ln 5}{168} \right) \nu \\
& + u^5 \left(-\frac{8943}{350} + \frac{1354312 \ln 2}{21} + \frac{6591861 \ln 3}{2800} - \frac{27734375 \ln 5}{1008} \right) \nu \left. \right]. \tag{3.14}
\end{aligned}$$

Preliminary investigations suggest that the inclusion of $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{e^8}(\gamma, u)$ slightly deteriorates the behavior of the LEOB dynamics. This is probably due to the low PM order at which some of these e^8 terms enter, such as $O(up_\infty^8)$, which amounts to a 1PM correction. One possible cure for this issue might be the use of an hybrid gauge where such $O(e^8)$ terms are kept in a DJS-like gauge, i.e. in the form $O(p_\infty^8)$. For the time being, we have decided to use, for the orbital part of our LEOB dynamics, a total $A(\gamma, \nu)$ potential of the form (3.7), with a nonlocal PN contribution, $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal}}^{4\text{PN}}(\gamma, u)$, truncated at the sixth order in eccentricity, that is Eq. (3.14) with $c_8 = 0$.

D. About time-nonlocal contributions to the spin-orbit sector of the dynamics

In this section we briefly address the tail-transported time nonlocalities that enter the spin-orbit part of the conservative dynamics at 5PM order.

Similar to the case of the orbital 4PM coefficient of the A potential, the 5PM spin-orbit coefficients $\hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu)$ and $\hat{g}_{*3}^0(\gamma, \nu)$ [see e.g. Eq. (2.72b)] that are determined by the 5PM coefficient of the scattering angle, $\chi_5(\gamma, a_i, \nu)$, have also a nonlocal component, valid only for unbound

motions. In our gauge, the nonlocal contribution to the 5PM spin-orbit coefficients $\hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu)$ and $\hat{g}_{*3}^0(\gamma, \nu)$ start at order $O(p_\infty^2)$ in the low-velocity expansion of the 5PM spin-orbit coefficients:

$$\hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu) = \hat{g}_{30}(\nu) + \hat{g}_{32}(\nu) p_\infty^2 + \dots, \tag{3.15a}$$

$$\hat{g}_{*3}^0(\gamma, \nu) = \hat{g}_{*30}(\nu) + \hat{g}_{*32}(\nu) p_\infty^2 + \dots. \tag{3.15b}$$

To the best of our knowledge there is no work where (similarly to the case of the 4PM orbital dynamics) the local parts of $\hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu)$ and $\hat{g}_{*3}^0(\gamma, \nu)$ have been computed in a 5PM-exact sense. What has been computed so far was obtained within a PN approach, where complete results are available up to the relative 3PN order [65–67]. Partial results were also obtained, using the Tutti Frutti strategy, in Ref. [68], which derived the tail-related local and nonlocal contributions to the gyro-gravitomagnetic coefficients g_S and g_{S^*} at the fractional 4PN order [i.e. $\frac{1}{c^8}$ beyond the leading-order terms $g_0(\gamma, \nu)$ and $g_{*0}(\gamma, \nu)$] and at eight order in eccentricity.

In the present work, we will circumvent the lack of 5PM-exact knowledge of the local parts of $g_S(u, \gamma, \nu)$ and $g_{S^*}(u, \gamma, \nu)$ by approximating their 5PM-level contributions $\hat{g}_3^0(\gamma, \nu)$ and $\hat{g}_{*3}^0(\gamma, \nu)$ simply by their “static” contributions, i.e. their limit as $\gamma \rightarrow 1$ (which are immune to nonlocal effects). These correspond to the fractional

3PN terms¹⁰ first computed in Ref. [65], dubbed $g_S^{\text{N}^3\text{LO}}$ and $g_{S^*}^{\text{N}^3\text{LO}}$ in Eqs. (8) and (9) therein, which in our gauge read

$$\hat{g}_{30}(\nu) = \left(-\frac{7771}{288} + \frac{241\pi^2}{384} \right) \nu + \frac{55\nu^2}{4} - \frac{13\nu^3}{32}, \quad (3.16a)$$

$$\hat{g}_{*30}(\nu) = -\frac{11}{24} - \left(\frac{581}{36} - \frac{41\pi^2}{48} \right) \nu + 14\nu^2 - \frac{3\nu^3}{2}. \quad (3.16b)$$

These contributions are at the fractional 3PM level in the spin-orbit sector. We leave to future work the inclusion of more analytical information in the spin-orbit sector, starting with the fractional 4PN results of Ref. [68] (which however contain an undetermined $O(\nu^2)$ coefficient in the local component).

IV. PM-BASED WAVEFORM MODEL FOR SPIN-ALIGNED BINARIES

In this section we finally construct and validate two different flavors of a complete waveform model based on the LEOB framework and incorporating PM information at various orders in spin (labelled as $S^n = \text{spin}^n$ with $n = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, \dots$).

In our LJBL gauge, even-in-spin effects (S^0, S^2, S^4, \dots) are fully incorporated in the A potential. In order to reduce to the exact Kerr metric in the test-mass limit, we use a structure of A that factors out a Kerr-like term (with spin parameter $\tilde{a}_0 = \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2$). We hence write [with $u \equiv \frac{1}{r}$, and $u_c(\tilde{a}_0) \equiv \frac{1}{r_c(\tilde{a}_0)}$]:

$$A(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) = \frac{1 + 2u_c(\tilde{a}_0)}{1 + 2u} \left[A_{\text{orb}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu) + A_{\text{SS}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) \right], \quad (4.1)$$

where $A_{\text{orb}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu) = 1 - 2u_c + O(u_c)^2$ and $A_{\text{SS}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) = O(\tilde{a}_i^2 u^3)$.

On the other hand, odd-in-spin effects (S^1, S^3, \dots) are described by the \mathcal{G} term:

$$\mathcal{G} = G_S(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) \hat{S} + G_{S^*}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) \hat{S}^*. \quad (4.2)$$

with

$$G_S(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \frac{g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)}{rr_c^2(\tilde{a}_0)}, \quad (4.3a)$$

$$G_{S^*}(r, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i, \nu) = \frac{g_{S^*}(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i)}{rr_c^2(\tilde{a}_0)}, \quad (4.3b)$$

where $g_S(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) = g_0(\gamma, \nu) + O(u)$ and $g_{S^*}(u, \gamma, \tilde{a}_i) = g_{*0}(\gamma, \nu) + O(u)$.

Note the presence of the spin-dependent centrifugal radius $r_c(\tilde{a}_0)$ (with $\tilde{a}_0 = \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2$) as building block in several of the metric coefficients above. We recall that it was found in Ref. [3] that, at leading PN order, the quadratic-in-spin terms in the Hamiltonian depend only on $a_0 = a_1 + a_2$. It was then found in Ref. [45] that, in the aligned spin case, a_0 parametrizes (when accompanied by the covariant orbital angular momentum) the scattering angle at the formal 1PM order, but at all orders in spin. These results motivate using the combination $\tilde{a}_0 = \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2$ to absorb as many spin-dependent effects as possible. For reasons that we shall explain in detail below, the two different flavors of LEOB models that we shall consider in the present exploratory study differ in the choice of the last term $A_{\text{SS}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$. A first choice approximates all spin-spin interactions by the simple use of the spin-dependent centrifugal radius $r_c(\tilde{a}_0)$ as a building block in several of the metric coefficients above, setting then the complementary spin-spin term $A_{\text{SS}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$ to zero. We shall refer to this simplified model (in which spin-spin interactions are treated in a Kerr-like way) as LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$. A second choice includes the term $A_{\text{SS}}(u_c(\tilde{a}_0), \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$ in the A potential. However, we found that using the full presently available (5PM-level) analytical information in A_{SS} leads to a loss of accuracy in certain regions of parameter space. Therefore, we shall instead focus on a model where A_{SS} is truncated to the 4PM level. We shall refer to this second model as LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$.

Let us now indicate the analytical information included in our current LEOB model at various orders in spin. If available, we include terms up to the physical 5PM level.

- (i) S^0 sector (embodied in the metric potential A_{orb}): we omit the incompletely known orbital 5PM coefficient and include local 4PM contributions completed by (local and nonlocal) 4PN terms up to order six in eccentricity;
- (ii) S^1 sector (embodied in the radial functions G_S , and G_{S^*}): we do not include 5PM terms as they contain hyperbolic tails and work at 4PM accuracy, completed only by the static 5PM contributions;
- (iii) S^2 sector: As said above, we either describe them only through the centrifugal radius $r_c(\tilde{a}_0)$ (setting A_{SS} to zero), or we incorporate the A_{SS} term (but only up to the 4PM level).
- (iv) S^3 sector: we work at the full physical 5PM accuracy by adding quadratic-in-spin terms in G_S and G_{S^*} .
- (v) S^4 sector: we add the 5PM contribution through a quartic-in-spin contribution to A_{SS} .

¹⁰ This is sometimes counted as corresponding to the absolute 4.5PN level in the constraint, when allowing for fast spins $\chi_i = O(1)$.

A. Resummation of the dynamics

Since the early days of EOB theory, it was found that leaving the coefficients of the effective metric as polynomials in u entails an unphysical behavior in the late stages of the evolution. Therefore, we follow the usual practice of EOB-based models and resum our PM potentials in the following ways.

In the non-spinning limit, when using the factorized form (4.1) of the A potential, we resum A_{orb} by the following Padé approximant, with u as argument:

$$A_{\text{orb}}(u, \gamma, \nu) = P_4^1 \left[A_{\text{orb}}^{4\text{PM}-4\text{PN}}(u, \gamma, \nu) \right], \quad (4.4)$$

which has the good probe limit

$$A_{\text{orb}}(r, \gamma, \nu = 0) = 1 - 2u. \quad (4.5)$$

In the PM-expanded function $A_{\text{orb}}^{4\text{PM}-4\text{PN}}(u)$ the logarithms $L = \ln u$ are replaced by constants before taking the Padé approximant. They are then replaced back by their values after resummation.

When considering spinning systems, we resum the residual spin-spin contribution, $A_{\text{SS}}(r_c, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)$, entering Eq. (4.1) together with the orbital part, as

$$A(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) = \frac{1 + 2u_c(\tilde{a}_0)}{1 + 2u} A_{\text{tot}}, \quad (4.6a)$$

$$A_{\text{tot}} = P_4^1 \left[A_{\text{orb}}^{4\text{PM}-4\text{PN}}(u_c, \gamma, \nu) + A_{\text{SS}}^{5\text{PM}}(u_c, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) \right], \quad (4.6b)$$

where the Padé approximant is intended here as a resummation in u_c (with constant $\ln u_c$) so that in the probe limit the metric potential will reduce to $\frac{1+2u_c}{1+2u}(1-2u_c)$. The interested reader can find the analysis of a different factorization of the spinning A potential in Appendix A.

After having defined a resummation for the A potential, the corresponding B potential is given [in view of Eq. (2.62a)] by

$$B = \frac{r^2}{r_c^2} \frac{1}{A}. \quad (4.7)$$

The resummed version of the odd-in-spin sector, described by the gyro-gravitomagnetic functions G_S and G_{S^*} , is defined (as usually done [37]) by inverse-resumming the latter gyro-gravitomagnetic coefficients. Explicitly, the G_S function is defined as

$$G_S(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) = \frac{g_0(\gamma, \nu)}{rr_c^2} P_3^0 \left[\hat{g}_S^{5\text{PM}, \text{static}}(u, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) \right], \quad (4.8)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_S^{5\text{PM}, \text{static}}(u, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) &= 1 + \hat{g}_1(\gamma, \nu) u + \hat{g}_2(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) u^2 \\ &+ \left[\hat{g}_{30}(\nu) + \hat{g}_3^{\tilde{a}_0^2}(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) + \hat{g}_3^{\tilde{a}_{12}^2}(\gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) \right] u^3, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

which is obtained from Eq. (2.71a) while using the static 5PM-order contribution $\hat{g}_{30}(\nu)$ of Eq. (3.16a). The same procedure is applied to G_{S^*} , starting from Eq. (2.71b) and using the static 5PM-order contribution of Eq. (3.16b). The explicit expression for these EOB functions can be found in electronic form in the attached `Mathematica` file.

B. Initial data and equations of motion

As discussed in Sec. II B, the Lagrange-EOB approach to the dynamics imposes the solution of five dynamical quantities instead of four. The consistency of this overdetermined system is ensured by the constraint equation, Eq. (2.45), which in the LJBL gauge can be re-written as

$$\mathcal{C} \equiv \frac{-\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2 + p_{r_*}^2}{A} + p_\varphi^2 u_c^2 + 1 = 0, \quad (4.10)$$

where we recall that $\gamma_{\text{orb}} \equiv \gamma - p_\varphi \mathcal{G}$ and we defined the radial momentum $p_{r_*} \equiv \sqrt{A/B} p_r$. In the usual HEOB approach, p_{r_*} is conjugate to some tortoise coordinate r_* , while here p_{r_*} also depends on γ , so that its evolution equation must be computed as

$$\frac{dp_{r_*}}{dt} = \frac{\partial p_{r_*}}{\partial p_r} \frac{dp_r}{dt} + \frac{\partial p_{r_*}}{\partial r} \frac{dr}{dt} + \frac{\partial p_{r_*}}{\partial \gamma} \frac{d\gamma}{dt}. \quad (4.11)$$

The five Euler-Lagrange equations finally read

$$\frac{dr}{dt_{\text{real}}} = \frac{A p_{r_*} r_c u}{h \gamma_{\text{orb}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma_{\text{orb}}} (\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2 + p_{r_*}^2) \partial_\gamma \ln A - p_\varphi \partial_\gamma \mathcal{G} \right]}, \quad (4.12a)$$

$$\frac{d\varphi}{dt_{\text{real}}} = \frac{A p_\varphi u_c^2 + \gamma_{\text{orb}} \mathcal{G}}{h \gamma_{\text{orb}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma_{\text{orb}}} (\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2 + p_{r_*}^2) \partial_\gamma \ln A - p_\varphi \partial_\gamma \mathcal{G} \right]}, \quad (4.12b)$$

$$\frac{dp_{r_*}}{dt_{\text{real}}} = \frac{A^2 p_\varphi^2 u_c^2 u \partial_r r_c - \frac{r_c}{2r} (\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2 - p_{r_*}^2) \partial_r A - A \frac{r_c}{r} \gamma_{\text{orb}} p_\varphi \partial_r \mathcal{G}}{h \gamma_{\text{orb}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma_{\text{orb}}} (\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2 + p_{r_*}^2) \partial_\gamma \ln A - p_\varphi \partial_\gamma \mathcal{G} \right]} + \mathcal{F}_{r_*}, \quad (4.12c)$$

$$\frac{dp_\varphi}{dt_{\text{real}}} = \mathcal{F}_\varphi, \quad (4.12d)$$

$$\frac{d\gamma}{dt_{\text{real}}} = -\mathcal{F}_0, \quad (4.12e)$$

where \mathcal{F}_0 is defined by Eq. (2.39), and where

$$\mathcal{F}_{r_*} = A \frac{r_c}{r} \mathcal{F}_r + p_{r_*} \mathcal{F}_0 \partial_\gamma \ln A. \quad (4.13)$$

As for the constraint equation, we only need to impose it for the initial data. The constraint, Eq. (2.35), on \mathcal{F}_μ , guarantees its conservation also for non-adiabatic evolutions. We have checked numerically that this is indeed the case.

The initial conditions are computed in the following recursive way. For each starting radius r_0 , we first obtain adiabatic values of the starting circular energy and angular momentum $(\gamma_0, p_{\varphi,0})$ by imposing, when setting $p_{r_*,0} = 0$, the two equations

$$\mathcal{C}(r_0, \gamma_0, p_{\varphi,0}, p_{r_*,0} = 0) = 0, \quad (4.14a)$$

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathcal{C}}{\partial r}(r, \gamma_0, p_{\varphi,0}, p_{r_*,0} = 0) \right|_{r=r_0} = 0. \quad (4.14b)$$

These adiabatic circular initial data are then used to compute post-adiabatic [69–71] initial data, which allow one to reduce any initial spurious eccentricity. The post-adiabatic initial radial momentum is computed as

$$p_{r_*}^{\text{1PA}} = -\frac{r_0 h_0}{2 r_{c,0}} \partial_\gamma \mathcal{C} \Big|_0 \mathcal{F}_{\varphi,0}, \quad (4.15)$$

where the subscript 0 indicates quantities computed using the adiabatic initial data described above. Finally, we need to ensure the satisfaction of the mass-shell constraint by computing $(p_\varphi^{\text{1PA}}, \gamma^{\text{1PA}})$, imposing again Eqs. (4.14a)-(4.14b) with $p_{r_*} = p_{r_*}^{\text{1PA}}$ instead of $p_{r_*} = 0$.

C. Waveform and radiation reaction

Let us turn to discussing the radiation reaction and waveform implemented here. Given the high-level of development of the factorized and resummed multipolar waveform, based on the PN-matched Multipolar-Post-Minkowskian formalism [55, 72–77], implemented in the `TEOBResumS` model family, we directly rely on it. More precisely, we employ the factorized and resummed expressions used in the latest avatar of the `TEOBResumS-Dali` model and extensively discussed in Sec. IIB of Ref. [78], with some minor simplifications due to the fact that the model discussed here is restricted to quasi-circular binaries only. As a reminder of the main analytical structure of the radiative sector, each multipolar waveform mode is factorized as [79]

$$h_{\ell m} = h_{\ell m}^N \hat{h}_{\ell m} \hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{NQC}}, \quad (4.16)$$

where $h_{\ell m}^N$ is the Newtonian prefactor¹¹ and $\hat{h}_{\ell m}$ is the factorized and resummed PN correction introduced in Ref. [79] and explicitly detailed in the form we use here starting from Eq. (12) of Ref. [78]. The factor $\hat{h}_{\ell m}^{\text{NQC}}$ is the NR-informed next-to-quasi-circular correction factor that is designed to improve the behavior of the analytical waveform during the plunge so as to smoothly connect it to the post-merger signal. For its explicit analytic form we address the reader to Ref. [78], in particular Eqs. (16) and (17) therein.

The two components of the radiation reaction force are [see Eq. (21) in Ref. [78]]

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\varphi = -\frac{32}{5} \nu r_\Omega^4 \Omega^5 \hat{f}(x; \nu) + \hat{\mathcal{F}}_\varphi^{\text{H}}, \quad (4.17)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}}_r = 0, \quad (4.18)$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_\varphi^{\text{H}}$ is the angular momentum flux absorbed by the two black holes [37]. The factor $\hat{f}(x)$ is a sum of modes $\hat{f}_{\ell m}$ as detailed in Eq. (22a) and (22b) of [78]. Since here we restrict to quasi-circular binaries, we fix the noncircular correction factors $\hat{f}_{\ell m}^{\text{noncircular}} = 1$ in Eq. (22.a) of Ref. [78].

The function argument x , that coincides with $x = \Omega^{2/3}$ in the circular approximation, is actually replaced in the functions above by $x = v_\varphi^2$, where $v_\varphi \equiv r_\Omega \Omega$, so to suitably take into account noncircular effects during the plunge [70, 81, 82]. Generalizing the definition of the Kepler-law-preserving radius r_Ω of Refs. [37, 81] to take into account the γ -derivatives introduced by the present LEOB framework, we obtain

$$r_\Omega = \left\{ \frac{(r_c^3 \psi_c)^{-1/2} + \mathcal{G}}{h \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_{\text{orb}}}{2} \partial_\gamma \ln A - p_\varphi \partial_\gamma \mathcal{G} \right)} \right\}^{-2/3}, \quad (4.19)$$

with

$$\psi_c = -\frac{2}{\partial_r A} \left(\partial_r u_c + \frac{\partial_r \mathcal{G}}{u_c A} \frac{\gamma_{\text{orb}}}{p_\varphi} \right). \quad (4.20)$$

The LEOB dynamics introduced here is found to share with the HEOB dynamics of `TEOBResumS` models the property that the *pure* orbital frequency [37, 83] Ω_{orb} , i.e. the orbital frequency *without* the spin-orbit contribu-

¹¹ Defined in Eqs. (3.21)-(3.3) in Ref. [80] up to $\ell = m = 5$ mode.

tion, defined here as

$$\Omega_{\text{orb}} \equiv \frac{A p_\varphi u_c^2}{h\gamma_{\text{orb}} \left[1 - \frac{1}{2\gamma_{\text{orb}}} (\gamma_{\text{orb}}^2 + p_{r_*}^2) \partial_\gamma \ln A - p_\varphi \partial_\gamma \mathcal{G} \right]} \quad (4.21)$$

develops a local maximum during the plunge¹². This allows us to follow the usual procedure to add the NQC corrections and to attach the postmerger (ringdown) waveform [80, 84, 85]. In particular, the $\ell = m = 2$ ringdown attachment is done as in Ref. [78] at the time $t_{\text{attach}} = t_{\text{peak}} - 2GM$, where t_{peak} corresponds to the maximum of Ω_{orb} .

D. NR-calibration parameters

Similarly to the case of `TEOBResumS` model we will see that the performance of the LEOB-based model can be improved by calibrating two effective parameters against NR simulations: one parameter enters the nonspinning part of the dynamics and another one the spin sector.

In the orbital sector, we have chosen to NR-inform a parameter, dubbed a_{52}^{NR} , that represents an additional (effective) 5PM-5PN term in our $A_{\text{orb}}^{4\text{PM}-4\text{PN}}$. The nonspinning G^5 term in our metric potential will then become

$$a_5^0(p_\infty, \nu) = a_{50}(\nu) + \nu a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu) p_\infty^2, \quad (4.22)$$

with $a_{50}(\nu)$ being the static 5PM contribution coming from our 4PN completion, Eqs. (3.6) and (3.14). The $a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu)$ term is instead an effective function of ν to be informed from nonspinning NR simulations.

In the spin-dependent sector, we act similarly and include effective fractionally 4PN terms in the linear-in-spin 5PM contributions, which will then read

$$\hat{g}_3^0 = \hat{g}_{30}(\nu) + \nu \hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR}}(\nu, \tilde{a}_i) p_\infty^2, \quad (4.23a)$$

$$\hat{g}_{*3}^0 = \hat{g}_{*30}(\nu) + \nu \hat{g}_{*32}^{\text{NR}}(\nu, \tilde{a}_i) p_\infty^2, \quad (4.23b)$$

where $[\hat{g}_{30}(\nu), \hat{g}_{30}(\nu)]$ are the analytically known static 5PM (fractionally 3PN) contributions, see Eqs. (3.16a)-(3.16b). The new $(\hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR}}, \hat{g}_{*32}^{\text{NR}})$ are effective parameters that can be informed via comparisons with NR simulations. For simplicity, we assume in the present work that $\hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR}} = \hat{g}_{*32}^{\text{NR}}$, so that in practice we calibrate only one parameter, \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} against a sample of spinning NR simulations. The determination of $a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu)$ and $\hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR}}(\nu, \tilde{a}_i)$ is presented in Sec. V B below.

This NR-calibration framework differs from the usual one employed in PN-based `TEOBResumS` models [78, 87,

88]. In the latter, the nonspinning NR-informed coefficient (dubbed a_6) generally enters the A metric potential at 5PN-6PM order ($\propto u^6$). Here, our parameters enters at the same PN order but a different PM one (proportionally to $u^5 p_\infty^2$). The main difference however lies in the spinning sector. Within `TEOBResumS`, the NR spin-sector parameter (generally called c_3) enters the gyrogravitomagnetic functions at relative 3PN order, in place of the analytical results [$g_S^{\text{N}^3\text{LO}}$ and $g_{S^*}^{\text{N}^3\text{LO}}$, Eqs. (8) and (9)] of Ref. [65]. The inclusion of the latter analytical 3PN terms within `TEOBResumS` was attempted in Ref. [89], resulting into a worse agreement with NR data. Within our current LEOB approach, we employ the corresponding analytical coefficients at fractional 3PN order [Eqs. (3.16a)-(3.16b)], and postpone the NR information to relative 4PN order. We discuss the performance of such model in the next Section.

V. MODEL PERFORMANCE

The evaluation of the model performance we do here closely follows Ref. [78]. We rely on: time-domain phasing analyses by computing the EOB/NR phase difference; and on the evaluation of the EOB/NR unfaithfulness, essentially following the logic of Sec. III of Ref. [78]. Let us recall some relevant technical details.

Given two waveforms, (h_1, h_2) , the EOB/NR unfaithfulness, $\bar{\mathcal{F}}$, is a function of the total mass M of the binary defined as

$$\bar{\mathcal{F}}(M) \equiv 1 - \mathcal{F} = 1 - \max_{t_0, \phi_0} \frac{\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle}{\|h_1\| \|h_2\|}, \quad (5.1)$$

where (t_0, ϕ_0) are the initial time and phase. Here $\|h\| \equiv \sqrt{\langle h, h \rangle}$, with the inner product between two waveforms defined as $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle \equiv 4\Re \int_{f_{\text{min}}^{\text{NR}}(M)}^{\infty} \tilde{h}_1(f) \tilde{h}_2^*(f) / S_n(f) df$, where $\tilde{h}(f)$ denotes the Fourier transform of $h(t)$, $S_n(f)$ is the detector power spectral density (PSD), and $f_{\text{min}}^{\text{NR}}(M) = \hat{f}_{\text{min}}^{\text{NR}}/M$ is the initial frequency of the NR waveform at highest resolution. To avoid contamination from the NR junk radiation, $\hat{f}_{\text{min}}^{\text{NR}}$ is taken to be 1.35 times larger than the actual initial frequency of $\tilde{h}(f)$ (i.e., 1.35 times the frequency where $|\tilde{h}|$ peaks; this is also the choice adopted in Ref. [90]). Before taking the Fourier transform, the waveforms are tapered in the time-domain to reduce high-frequency oscillations. For S_n , in our comparisons we use the zero-detuned, high-power noise spectral density of Advanced LIGO [91]. For time-domain comparisons, we rely on our usual procedure described in Ref. [92], see Eqs. (29)-(31) therein.

Similarly to Ref. [78], we first assess the performance of the model waveform in the nonspinning case and then we move to the two flavors of the complete spin-aligned case. In particular, focusing on the nonspinning case, we also quantify in detail the performance of the *uncalibrated* LEOB model, i.e. the model obtained by setting $a_{52}^{\text{NR}} =$

¹² By contrast, the PM-based EOB model of Ref. [27], `SEOB-PM`, does not present the same feature and uses a time-attachment shift Δt_{NR} as additional NR-calibration parameter. Moreover, the NQC corrections between the two models differ, with the model of Ref. [27] using an additional free parameter.




FIG. 2. Uncalibrated nonspinning model. Performance of a 4PM-4PN, purely analytic, dynamics on a sample of SXS non-spinning waveform with $1 \leq q \leq 15$. The LEOB waveform is completed only by NR-informed NQC corrections and ringdown, without any NR-calibrated effective parameter entering the dynamics. Left panel: illustrative time-domain phasing for $q = 4.5$, where the vertical, dot-dashed, lines indicate the alignment interval during the inspiral. The vertical dashed line marks the NR merger time, corresponding to the waveform amplitude peak. Middle panel: time-evolution of the waveform amplitude and frequency to illustrate the contributions of the NQC corrections and ringdown (see text for precise description). Twice the orbital frequency Ω is represented with a grey line. Right panel EOB/NR unfaithfulness with the advanced LIGO power spectral density.

TABLE I. Informing the orbital sector of the model using NR data to obtain an effective representation of the 5PM-5PN function $a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu)$ entering the A potential at 5PM. From left to right, the columns report: an ordering index; the name of the SXS simulation used; the mass ratio q and the symmetric mass ratio $\nu = q/(1+q)^2$; $\delta\phi_{\text{mrg}}^{\text{NR}}$ is an estimate of the NR phasing error at merger time, equal to the $\ell = m = 2$ phase difference between the highest and second highest resolution available accumulated between $t = 600M$ and the peak amplitude of the highest resolution waveform (see also Table II of Ref. [80]); the first-guess values of a_{52}^{NR} ; the quantities $\Delta\phi_{22}^{\text{EOBNR}}$ are the phase differences $\Delta\phi_{22}^{\text{EOBNR}} \equiv \phi_{22}^{\text{EOB}} - \phi_{22}^{\text{NR}}$ computed at the NR merger (i.e., the peak of the $\ell = m = 2$ waveform amplitude) for the corresponding values of a_{52}^{NR} .

#	name	q	ν	$\delta\phi_{\text{mrg}}^{\text{NR}}$	a_{52}^{NR}	$\Delta\phi_{22}^{\text{EOBNR}} _{\text{mrg}}$
1	SXS:BBH:0180	1	0.25	-0.42	66	-0.148
2	SXS:BBH:0169	2	2/9	-0.027	58	-0.127
3	SXS:BBH:0168	3	0.1875	-0.0870	49	-0.139
4	SXS:BBH:0166	6	0.1225	...	33	-0.116
5	SXS:BBH:0302	9.5	0.0862	+0.0206	22	-0.040

0 in Eq. (4.22) and thus relying only on the analytic knowledge of the A function.

A. Nonspinning case: uncalibrated model

In the left panel of Fig. 2, we compare the time-domain phasing of the uncalibrated LEOB model, as defined above, to a nonspinning NR dataset with $q \equiv m_1/m_2 = 4.5$. The phase difference $\Delta\phi_{22}^{\text{EOBNR}} \equiv \phi_{22}^{\text{EOB}} - \phi_{22}^{\text{NR}}$ accumulated up to merger time is ~ -1 rad. The left plots use $GM = 1$ units. In this comparison, the dynamics is fully analytical, but the waveform is completed by the NR-informed NQC corrections (to both phase and amplitude) and then by the NR-informed ringdown. The effect of the NQC correction factor and of the NR-informed ringdown is highlighted in the middle panel of Fig. 2 for both the amplitude (top plot) and the frequency (bottom plot).

In both cases we have five curves: (i) the NR waveform, in black; (ii)(twice) the EOB orbital frequency Ω ; (iii) the *purely analytical* EOB resummed waveform (dashed, orange line, dubbed *inspl* in the plot legend), without NQC correction, i.e. fixing $\hat{h}_{22}^{\text{NQC}} = 1$ in Eq. (4.16); (iv) the EOB resummed waveform completed by NQC corrections. We remark the excellent quantitative agreement between NR and *inspl* frequency up to ~ 30 before merger (frequencies are visually indistinguishable on the plot) and NR and *inspl* amplitude up to ~ 50 before merger. Similarly, it is also worth pointing out that $|\Psi_{22}^{\text{inspl}}|$ peaks rather close (differences of order unity) to the actual location of the NR peak; (iv) the outcome of the NR-informed NQC contributions are shown as dash-dotted light-blue curves, dubbed *inspl+NQC* in the plot. While the $\omega_{22}^{\text{inspl+NQC}}$ frequency looks practically indistinguishable from ω_{22}^{NR} , the amplitude difference is notice-




FIG. 3. Uncalibrated, nonspinning model. Time domain phasing comparison for $q = 32$ with the NR waveform of Ref. [86]. The EOB and NR waveforms are aligned around merger time.

able. This is due to our choice of NR-informing only two parameters around the merger amplitude, by only imposing a C^1 continuity condition (see Ref. [93] for the discussion of this point in the test-mass limit); (v) the red curve, dubbed `inspl+NQC+RNG` shows the final result with the NR-informed ringdown attached. The rightmost panel shows the EOB/NR unfaithfulness $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}$ versus M/M_\odot for the same 18 nonspinning datasets considered in Ref. [78], which in particular include the $q = 15$ nonspinning waveform of Ref. [94]. The information in the plot is complemented by Table II which lists the value of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$. We note that $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} < 10^{-3}$ as $q > 4$, with very small values reached for large values of q . In this respect, it is worth to evaluate the model also for large mass ratios, in particular the $q = 32$ nonspinning waveform calculated in Ref. [86]. In Ref. [95], Fig. 5, a time-domain phasing comparison between a $q = 32$, resolution extrapolated, waveform and the quasi-circular `TEOBResumS-GIOTTO` model was presented. The latter model incorporates a NR-informed parameter in the nonspinning sector, on top of the usual NQC corrections. In our Fig. 3 we show the corresponding time-domain phasing comparison obtained with LEOB and $a_{52}^{\text{NR}} = 0$. It looks consistent with, though different from, Fig. 5 of Ref. [95]. In any case, the EOB/NR phasing agreement with $q = 32$ remains remarkable considering that the model does not use any information from this $q = 32$ dataset and also the ringdown modelization was obtained putting together NR-information for mass ratios between $1 \leq q \leq 10$ and the test-mass values of amplitude and frequency at merger (see Ref. [95] for additional information).

TABLE II. EOB/NR maximum unfaithfulness $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ for the NR-uncalibrated nonspinning model, $a_{52}^{\text{NR}} = 0$ or for the NR-calibrated one, $a_{52}^{\text{NR}} = 263.55\nu - 0.171$ evaluated over a sample of nonspinning datasets up to $q = 15$. The median value is 6.3×10^{-4} in the uncalibrated case and 2.86×10^{-4} in the NR calibrated case.

ID	q	ν	uncalibrated	calibrated
			$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$	$\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$
SXS:BBH:0180	1	0.25	0.010161	0.00031815
SXS:BBH:0007	1.5	0.24	0.0076394	0.00032733
SXS:BBH:0169	2	2/9	0.0034206	0.00044425
SXS:BBH:0259	2.5	0.204	0.0033002	0.00016364
SXS:BBH:0168	3	0.1875	0.0011738	0.00035578
SXS:BBH:0294	3.5	0.1728	0.0012745	0.00030085
SXS:BBH:0295	4.5	0.1488	0.00076691	0.00023531
SXS:BBH:0056	5	0.1389	0.00061075	0.00021191
SXS:BBH:0296	5.5	0.1302	0.00051645	0.0002876
SXS:BBH:0166	6	0.1224	0.00035937	0.00018594
SXS:BBH:0298	7	0.1094	0.00092568	0.0003495
SXS:BBH:0299	7.5	0.1038	0.00065203	0.00028902
SXS:BBH:0063	8	0.0988	0.00050494	0.00021772
SXS:BBH:0300	8.5	0.0942	0.00045856	0.00029464
SXS:BBH:0301	9	0.09	0.00037875	0.00026429
SXS:BBH:0302	9.5	0.0862	0.00034149	0.00028545
SXS:BBH:0303	10	0.0826	0.00030641	0.00022792
SXS:BBH:2477	15	0.0586	0.00021437	0.00024229

B. Spinning case: NR-informed LEOB- PM_{a_0} model

Let us now turn first to discuss the performance of the `LEOB- PM_{a_0}` model (defined by setting A_{SS} to zero), when improved by NR-informing the two parameters introduced in Sec. IV D above. Let us focus first on the determination of $a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu)$ for the nonspinning sector of the model, following precisely the procedure described in Sec. III A of Ref. [78]: the EOB and NR waveforms are aligned in the early inspiral and the parameter is chosen so that the EOB-NR phase difference, required to be monotonically decreasing, is minimized around merger. With this rationale in mind, we considered five datasets with mass ratios $q = (1, 2, 3, 6, 9.5)$ and determine the corresponding values of a_{52}^{NR} , which are reported in the sixth column of Table I. One finds that they are quite accurately fitted by the following straight line

$$a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu) = 263.55\nu - 0.171. \quad (5.2)$$

[We recall that $a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu)$ enters the model after multiplication by a factor ν .] The performance of such a NR-informed model for nonspinning configurations is illustrated in Fig. 4. The leftmost panels refer to the time-domain phasing for $q = 1$ and $q = 4.5$, so that it is possible to compare with the corresponding phasing perfor-




FIG. 4. NR-informed, nonspinning case: performance with the 5PM-5PN parameter a_{52}^{NR} informed by NR simulations. Left and middle panels: time-domain phasings for two configurations: compare the $q = 4.5$ one with Fig. 2. Rightmost panel: $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}(M)$ for the same nonspinning NR datasets considered in Fig. 2. The values of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ are listed in Table II. For nearly equal-mass configurations the NR-informed, effective, $a_{52}^{\text{NR}}(\nu)$ function yields an improvement of almost two orders of magnitude.

TABLE III. Coefficients of the fits of the \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} data of Figs. 11 and 12 in Appendix B in the form given by Eq. (5.3). The coefficients refer to either LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ (without 3PM and 4PM residual spin-spin terms and using only equal-mass and equal-spin NR data) or LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$, where these terms are considered.

Model	$\hat{g}_{32}^{\bar{}} \equiv p_0 \left(1 + n_1 \tilde{a}_0 + n_2 \tilde{a}_0^2 + n_3 \tilde{a}_0^3 + n_4 \tilde{a}_0^4 + n_5 \tilde{a}_0^5 \right)$														
	$\hat{g}_{32}^{\neq} \equiv \left(p_1 \tilde{a}_0 + p_2 \tilde{a}_0^2 + p_3 \tilde{a}_0^3 \right) \sqrt{1 - 4\nu} + p_4 \tilde{a}_0 \nu \sqrt{1 - 4\nu} + p_5 \tilde{a}_0^2 \nu \sqrt{1 - 4\nu} + p_6 \tilde{a}_0 (1 - 4\nu) \nu + p_7 \tilde{a}_0 (1 - 4\nu)^2 \nu$						$+ \left(p_8 \tilde{a}_{12} + p_9 \tilde{a}_{12}^2 + p_{10} \tilde{a}_{12}^3 \right) \nu^2 + p_{11} \tilde{a}_0 \sqrt{1 - 4\nu} \nu^2 + p_{12} \tilde{a}_0^2 \nu^2 (1 - 4\nu)$								
	p_0	n_1	n_2	n_3	n_4	n_5	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4	p_5	p_6			
LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$	84.891	-2.621	-0.8459	0.2551	0.6247	-0.6098	0	0	0	0	0	0			
							p_7	p_8	p_9	p_{10}	p_{11}	p_{12}			
							0	0	0	0	0	0			
LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$	102.26	-0.409	-0.323	-0.243	0.05548	-0.095	-1120.04	-184.25	172.45	-45999.59	12.486	15979.72			
							p_7	p_8	p_9	p_{10}	p_{11}	p_{12}			
							51250.62	432.79	-175.476	-2827.247	192213.47	18952.94			

mance of the uncalibrated model in Fig. 2, with basically a gain of 1 rad due a_{52}^{NR} . The plot is complemented by the values of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ listed in Table II. The latter Table quantitatively highlights the improvement reached, which are especially impressive near the equal-mass case.

Moving to the spinning sector, let us tune the second effective parameter (now entering the spin sector) that we introduced above in Sec. IV D. As a starting point, we determine \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} using only equal-mass, equal-spin datasets, both either aligned or anti-aligned with the orbital angular momentum. We do so using a restricted sample of spin-aligned dataset, only 12, that are reported in Table V in Appendix B, with the corresponding best-choice of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} . The corresponding values of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} are accurately fitted by a fifth-order polynomial in \tilde{a}_0 where the coefficients obtained from the fit are reported in Table III with the LEOB label. Although the fit is done for the equal-mass, equal spin case, in which $\tilde{a}_0 = \chi_1 = \chi_2$, we, however, extend the result to the general case, using as argument $\tilde{a}_0 = \tilde{a}_1 + \tilde{a}_2$. Figure 5 shows the EOB/NR

phasings for a few configurations, some of which were also considered in Fig. 9 of Ref. [78]. In particular, it is interesting to note that for the case $(8, -0.80, -0.80)$ LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ performs *better* than the **TEOBResumS-Dalí** model, even if the latter received more NR-tuning for large mass ratios. Note that this comparison might be considered merely qualitative, since the two models are very different, different gauges are used and the spin-orbit sector of LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ includes more analytic information, in particular the fractional 3PN terms which were, in **TEOBResumS-Dalí**, effective and NR-informed. The middle panel of Fig. 5 also shows the phasing performance of **SXS:BBH:1445** that was used in Ref. [27] to illustrate an example of time-domain phasing comparison with **SEOB-PM**, see Fig. 1 therein. Though our phasing agreement is visually less good when looking at the real part of the waveform, this is quite acceptable in view of the minimal amount of calibration that we are using. The EOB/NR performance in terms of unfaithfulness in analyzed in the three panels of Fig. 6. In the




FIG. 5. Illustrative EOB/NR time-domain phasing comparison for a selected sample of spin-aligned configurations using the LEOB-PM_{a₀} model. The vertical lines in the left subpanels mark the alignment frequency interval, while the one in the right bottom panels identifies the NR merger time. The rightmost panel refers to the SXS:BBH:1445 NR simulation, that is also explicitly used in Ref. [27] to show the performance of the SEOBNR-PM model developed there. The EOB/NR phasing agreement also in this case is rather good even if the spin-sector of the model was NR-informed, through the function \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} , by using only the equal-mass, equal-spin SXS dataset listed in Table V in Appendix B.




FIG. 6. EOB/NR unfaithfulness computation with the Advanced LIGO power spectral density all over a sample of 530 spin-aligned NR simulations of the public SXS waveform catalog using the LEOB-PM_{a₀} model. The left panel shows $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}(M)$, while the distribution of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ is shown in the middle panel. The performance of the model progressively degrades as the spins increase, especially when they are positive. The median of the $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ distribution is 5.39×10^{-4} , indicated by a vertical dashed line in the middle panel. Note that $\text{Max}[\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}] \sim 0.01$ and corresponds to configurations with high spins and mass ratios in the range $4.5 \lesssim q \lesssim 8$, as highlighted by the more pinkish points in the right panel of the figure.

leftmost panel of Fig. 6 we show $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}$ in the range $10M_{\odot} \leq M \leq 200M_{\odot}$. Globally, the performance of the model is rather good, with just one dataset with $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ slightly above the 1% level, as illustrated by the histogram in the middle panel of the figure. This corresponds to the NR simulation SXS:BBH:0202, whose binary parameters are $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (7.0, +0.60, 0.00)$ and for which $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} = 1.26\%$. As indicated by the rightmost panel of the figure, the configurations grazing the 1% are those with $\hat{a}_0 \sim 0.7$ and mass ratio $4 \leq q \leq 8$, highlighted as more pinkish points in the figure. By contrast, we also note that the equal-mass configurations with high, positive, values of the spin have $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} \sim 4 \times 10^{-3}$. On the basis of our experience with the NR-calibration of TEOBResumS-Da1í [78], the worsening of the performance of the model for large mass ratios is *a priori* expected since we are only using equal-mass, equal-spin data to NR-inform the function \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} . In fact,

it is remarkable that despite our very mild NR-calibration the performance of the LEOB-PM_{a₀} model remains good also for large mass ratios.

C. Spinning-case: NR-informed LEOB-PM_{SS} model

Let us move on to exploring the LEOB-PM_{SS} model, in which one retains the 4PM-truncated A_{SS} contribution. Here, the A_{SS} contribution is resummed together with the orbital contributions to the A potential by a (1, 4) Padé approximant. In Appendix A we discuss another way to incorporate and resum the A_{SS} contribution [namely, by factorizing it as $\hat{A}_{\text{SS}} = 1 + \dots$, and then resumming it with a P_3^2 approximant, see Eq. (A1)]. Appendix A shows that this factorized approach gives results substantially identical to those displayed in the previous section, but with a worsening of the robustness of




FIG. 7. Incorporating 3PM and 4PM spin-spin effects within the A function and related new determination of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} for the $\text{LEOB-PM}_{\text{SS}}$ model. EOB/NR time-domain phasing comparisons for the same configurations of Fig. 5: note the changes in $\Delta\phi_{22}^{\text{EOBNR}}$ either in the inspiral (where it is flatter than before) and during merger ringdown. The vertical lines in the left subpanels mark the alignment frequency interval, while the one in the right bottom panels identifies the NR merger time.




FIG. 8. Same as Fig. 6 but using the 3PN and 4PM spin-spin terms within the $\text{LEOB-PM}_{\text{SS}}$ model. Note the improvement in the performance in the equal-mass, high spin corner, although globally the median (dashed vertical line) has slightly worsened to 6.13×10^{-4} . Note also the related different qualitative behavior of $\mathcal{F}_{\text{EOBNR}}(M)$ for $M \lesssim 50M_{\odot}$.

the model in some corners of the parameter space. When incorporating spin-spin corrections in the A potential we need to complete the NR-fitted \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} function by adding an additional term, \hat{g}_{32}^{\neq} , needed to improve the description of asymmetric (unequal-mass and unequal-spin) configurations. The NR-fitted \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} function is now separated in two contributions

$$\hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR}}(\nu, \tilde{a}_0, \tilde{a}_{12}) = \hat{g}_{32}^{\bar{\bar{}}} + \hat{g}_{32}^{\neq}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\hat{g}_{32}^{\bar{\bar{}}}$ indicates the function obtained by fitting the values of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} for equal-mass, equal-spin binaries. We start working with all 3PM, 4PM and 5PM contributions, determining \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} by inspecting the phase difference as usual. The configurations we select are reported in Appendix B, notably Fig. 12. In doing so, we realized that there are regions of the parameter space where it is necessary [if we want to keep having a local maximum of the pure orbital frequency, Eq. (4.21), in order to proceed with the usual NQC determination and ringdown attachment] to complete the term $\hat{g}_{32}^{\bar{\bar{}}}$ obtained above by fitting equal-mass, equal-spin binaries, by the extra term, \hat{g}_{32}^{\neq} , useful for describing asymmetric configurations.

For this reason we included several NR points in the range $3 \leq q \leq 4$ and $-0.8 \lesssim \tilde{a}_0 \lesssim 4$, about 20 more than those composing the standard NR-calibration set of TEOBResumS-Dalí (see e.g. [78] and references therein). These points are then fitted with a function of $(\nu, \tilde{a}_0, \tilde{a}_{12})$ that is modeled on the fitting function used for the effective spin-orbit parameter, but with more fitting parameters. Despite the increase of parameters and of NR anchor points, the wave generation might remain not robust (in the sense described above) when using up to 5PM spin-spin, especially around the corner region of parameter space with $q = 3$ and $\tilde{a}_0 \sim -0.6$.

We have also explored this procedure when using the 5PM-accurate spin-spin term. However, this led to a certain lack of robustness in the description of the dynamics. Leaving to the future an attempt to keep the 5PM information by either increasing the number of NR-anchor points or employing more sophisticated fitting procedures, we decided in the present work to work with a 4PM-accurate A_{SS} contribution. We have however verified that, wherever the wave generation mechanism is robust, the 4PM and 5PM waveforms are con-




FIG. 9. Case $(1, +0.98952, +0.98952)$, SXS:BBH:0177: comparing $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}$ calculated with either LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$, LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ or with the TEOBResumS-Dalí model of Ref. [78]. The combined effect of the analytical spin-spin terms and the new \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} yields a qualitative and quantitative improvement of the LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ curve with respect to either the LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ and the TEOBResumS-Dalí one.

sistent among themselves, with the 5PM ones typically closer to the NR waveform by a few tenths of a radian around merger. This indicates that our results are eventually more conservative than what the formalism would, in principle, allow us to get. The result of this choice are reported in Fig. 7 (time-domain phasings) and 8 (EOB/NR unfaithfulness). Concerning the time-domain phasing, it is instructive to compare the left panel of Fig. 7 with corresponding one of Fig. 5, corresponding to a $(8, -0.80, -0.80)$ binary. The waveform is aligned on the same frequency interval (indicated by the two vertical lines in the left panel): the addition of high-order spin-spin terms yields that now $\Delta\phi_{22}^{\text{EOBNR}}$ oscillates around zero during the inspiral and eventually decreases monotonically up to merger. Similar considerations also hold for the other configurations. We have thus here a clear evidence of the effect of the residual, high-order, spin-spin term, an effect that cannot be compensated by the tuning of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} . The calculation of the unfaithfulness is reported in Fig. 8. The results are globally consistent with the previous ones, confirming that the effect of these residual spin-spin information is small. We have, however, a notable improvement of the performance for the $q = 1$, high-spin cases. By contrast, the median of the distribution of maximum unfaithfulness has slightly worsened, to $\text{Me}[\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}] = 6.13 \times 10^{-4}$. There are two datasets corresponding to maximum unfaithfulness larger than 1%: SXS:BBH:1439, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (6.48, +0.72, -0.32)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} = 1.19\%$; and SXS:BBH:1441, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (8.00, +0.60, -0.48)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} = 1.15\%$. Comparing the right panels of Figs. 8 and 6 we see that this result is certainly due to the behavior of the $q \simeq 3$, negative spin configurations and possibly might be improved with a more precise determination of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} (and related fitting function) in this regime.

As a final comment of this analysis and on the

impact of spin-spin subdominant terms, we want to emphasize a point related to the qualitative behavior of the $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}(M)$ curves (for both LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ and LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$) with respect to the corresponding ones of TEOBResumS-Dalí in Fig. 10 of Ref. [78]. For LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ the curves typically have a local maximum between $50 - 100M_{\odot}$ and then progressively decrease for large masses. This is also the case for $q = 1$ datasets with high, positive, spins: the corresponding curves in the left panel of Fig. 6 are those that start at $\simeq 4 \times 10^{-3}$ and then are seen to decrease monotonically versus M . On the contrary, for TEOBResumS-Dalí the curves are mostly monotonically increasing, with a behavior qualitatively closer to the one of LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$. To highlight this fact, in Fig. 9 we display these three curves for $(1, +0.98952, +0.98952)$, corresponding to dataset SXS:BBH:0177, so that the qualitative and quantitative differences are apparent. We remark the qualitative consistency between TEOBResumS-Dalí and LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ curves, although in this second case the model actually performs much better. It is remarkable that for such a high-spin configuration LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ also performs better than the quasi-circular TEOBResumS-GIOTTO model, see Refs. [96, 97]. Since subdominant spin-spin terms are incorporated in both TEOBResumS-GIOTTO and TEOBResumS-Dalí as corrections to the Kerr-like centrifugal radius [37], this comparison suggests that an approach similar to the one used here, i.e. within the corresponding PN-based A_{orb} function, might be useful to further improve the performance of these, HEOB-based, models in the high-spin region of the parameter space.

D. Comparisons with other EOB-based models

We conclude the analysis of our waveform model by comparing and contrasting its performance with the only other existing EOB model incorporating PM information, i.e. the SEOB-PM model of Ref. [27]. As already mentioned in Sec. II, the latter model is based on a recursively-defined Hamiltonian. For our purpose here, one should compare our Figs. 6 and 8 with the left panel of Fig. D.1 in the Supplemental Material of Ref [27]. While our PM-based models, LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ and LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ deliver $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ values at most of the order of 0.01 (with just very few configurations around this value), SEOB-PM delivers $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ values that may reach up to 0.1, with approximately 5% of the configurations with $0.01 < \bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} < 0.1$. Both models are calibrated to NR simulations, but with several qualitative and quantitative differences. The LEOB model relies on a NR-informed dynamics that builds upon a nonspinning, uncalibrated, model which already delivers rather accurate waveforms. Two parameters in the nonspinning sector, Eq. (5.2), and six parameters in the spinning sector, have been then informed by only 17 NR datasets, 5 nonspinning and 12 spinning (notably, only equal-mass and equal-spin ones). The corresponding effective, NR-informed, functions are

TABLE IV. Median (Me) and maximum (Max) values of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$, the unfaithfulness between EOB and SXS $\ell = m = 2$ waveform data for several state-of-the-art EOB models in the spin-aligned, quasi-circular case. The models in the first three rows incorporate PM information. Note that only **TEOBResumS-Da1i** can also deal with eccentric binaries and scattering configurations. The values for the **SEOB** family that are extracted from the literature are computed on 441 SXS NR datasets (partly private) that do not fully overlap with the 530 public ones used here. In this respect, the last row of the table reports the **SEOBNRv5HM** median on the public simulations computed in Ref. [78].

Model	Me $[\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}]$	Max $[\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}]$	Reference
LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$	5.39×10^{-4}	0.0126	this paper
LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$	6.13×10^{-4}	0.0119	this paper
SEOBNR-PM	6.1×10^{-4}	$\sim 2 \times 10^{-1}$	[27]
TEOBResumS-Da1i	3.09×10^{-4}	6.80×10^{-3}	[78]
TEOBResumS-GIOTTO	4.0×10^{-4}	$\sim 10^{-3}$	[98]
SEOBNRv5HM	1.99×10^{-4}	$\sim 2 \times 10^{-3}$	[90]
SEOBNRv5HM	1.47×10^{-4}	2.98×10^{-3}	[78]

also very simple: a straight line for the effective 5PM coefficients a_{52}^{NR} and a fourth-order polynomial for the effective 4PM spin-orbit coefficient \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} . For **SEOB-PM** things look quite different. According to Ref. [27] the **SEOB-PM** model does not seem flexible enough to calibrate the dynamics, so that the NR-calibration is implemented only at the waveform level through the function Δt_{NR} . This is then fitted with a rather complicated function of the spins and of ν characterized by 21 fitting parameters. These parameters are determined using 441 NR simulations, partly private (this set only partly overlaps with our dataset of 530 configurations), see Eq. (C1) of Ref. [27]. Table IV summarizes the comparison between all existing spin-aligned models based on various EOB avatars, with several results taken from the literature and in particular from Ref. [78]. Note that the global performance of **LEOB-PM** is consistent with those of both **TEOBResumS-GIOTTO** and **TEOBResumS-Da1i**, that share with it most of the structure of the radiation reaction force. By contrast, as already pointed out in Ref. [78], the quality of **SEOBNRv5HM** is also due to a NR-calibration of the waveform during merger-ringdown that is more aggressive than the one used in either **TEOBResumS** or **LEOB-PM** models, which can thus be improved further in this respect.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We have presented a new way of incorporating PM (and PN results) in the conservative part of the dynamics within the effective one body formalism, that we called Lagrange-EOB (**LEOB**). This comes from the crucial use

of a Lagrange multiplier in the EOB action to impose the presence of the mass-shell constraint. This method allows us to avoid some drawbacks of the extension of the usual Hamiltonian EOB approach based on a recursive definition of an explicit EOB-PM Hamiltonian, as discussed extensively in Sec. II. The new **LEOB** approach eventually yields one evolution equation more than the standard Hamiltonian approach. The large flexibility of our new formalism allows us to blend together PM and PN information in various forms and to construct reliable, robust and accurate EOB-based waveform models that incorporate PM information. As a first, exploratory, investigation, only some special choices were here analyzed in detail. In particular, we showed that it is possible to construct a complete, reliable and accurate spin-aligned waveform model building upon 4PM-4PN analytical information in the nonspinning sector and 3PM-3PN information in the spin-orbit sector. The model showed sufficient flexibility and could additionally be significantly improved by calibrating some high-order effective parameters to a limited sample of NR simulations. The expressions of radiation reaction and waveform is inherited from previous PN-based EOB models of the **TEOBResumS** family, in particular building upon Refs. [78, 98]. Our main findings are as follows.

- (i) In the nonspinning case, the formalism allows one to build an *uncalibrated* **LEOB** waveform model (completed by NQC corrections and NR-informed ringdown) with unfaithfulness at most of the order of 0.01 evaluated over a meaningful sample of nonspinning SXS datasets with mass ratio $1 \leq q \leq 10$ and $q = 15$. Excellent EOB/NR phasing consistency is also found with the $q = 32$ waveform of Ref. [86].
- (ii) In the spinning case, we can build a waveform model, called **LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$** (incorporating an approximate, Kerr-like description of spin-spin interactions) with minimal calibration of the dynamics whose unfaithfulness is at most 1.26% and has a median of 5.39×10^{-4} over the usual set of 530 public NR configurations of the SXS catalog used in previous works.
- (iii) By incorporating more analytical information in the spin-spin sector (**LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$** model, as defined above) and by implementing a more aggressive NR calibration we could improve the behavior of the model on certain corners of the parameter space, notably in the equal-mass, high spin region, though the global median is seen to increase slightly to the value 6.13×10^{-4} .

The **LEOB** approach, together with PM information, opens a promising route towards constructing EOB-based waveform models able to robustly exploit the analytical information available. However, we found that the **LEOB** model seems somewhat less flexible than PN-based **HEOB** ones. This might, however, be related to

the factorization and resummation strategies used here, which can probably be improved. We leave such a study to the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to D. Chiaramello for help with the EOB/NR unfaithfulness computations. A. P. and P. R. thank the hospitality and the stimulating environment of the IHES, where part of this work was carried out. The present research was also partly supported by the “2021 Balzan Prize for Gravitation: Physical and Astrophysical Aspects”, awarded to Thibault Damour. A. P. and P. R. acknowledge support from the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR) via the PRIN 2022ZHYFA2, GRavitational wavEform models for coalescing compAct binaries with eccenTricity (GREAT) and through the program “Dipartimenti di Eccellenza 2018-2022” (Grant SUPER-C). P. R. also acknowledges support from “Fondo di Ricerca d’Ateneo” of the University of Perugia.

Appendix A: 5PM spin-spin effects in factorized form

In this Appendix we report EOB/NR unfaithfulness, discussed in the main text and summarized in Fig. 6, obtained with a different factorization procedure for the 5PM spin-even terms. We rewrite the even-in-spin potential A , Eqs. (4.6a)-(4.6b), as

$$A_{\text{tot}} = A_{\text{orb}}(u_c, \gamma, \nu) \hat{A}_{\text{SS}}(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i), \quad (\text{A1a})$$

$$\hat{A}_{\text{SS}}(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) = P_3^2 \left[\hat{A}_{\text{SS}}^{5\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) \right]. \quad (\text{A1b})$$

In this formulation, we factorize the orbital term and re-expand the residual spin-spin terms as a series in u , as

$$\hat{A}_{\text{SS}}^{5\text{PM}}(r, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i) = \text{Series}_u \left[1 + \frac{A_{\text{SS}}^{5\text{PM}}(u_c, \gamma, \nu, \tilde{a}_i)}{A_{\text{orb}}^{4\text{PM-4PN}}(u_c, \gamma, \nu)} \right], \quad (\text{A2})$$

which will be of the form $\hat{A}_{\text{SS}}^{5\text{PM}} = 1 + O(\tilde{a}_i^2 u^3)$, and finally resum it through a near-diagonal Padé approximant (in u). The use of a P_3^2 approximant allows for the inclusion of 5PM analytical information in the spin-spin sector with only small changes to the (robust) baseline waveform model. Using the same NR calibration of the LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ model discussed in the main text [see Eqs. (5.2) and (5.3) and leftmost column of Table III], we recompute EOB/NR mismatches against the 530 quasi-circular spin-aligned publicly-available NR simulations from the SXS collaboration. The full results are shown in Fig. 10: the left panel shows $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}(M)$; the middle panel shows the distribution of $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ of Fig. 6, dubbed LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$, superposed to the one obtained with up to 5PM spin-spin terms, dubbed LEOB-PM $_{\text{SSfact}}$; the rightmost panels shows $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}}$ versus (\tilde{a}_0, q) . The overall results are very similar to the ones obtained neglecting even-in-spin PM contributions. There are three datasets with maximum unfaithfulness larger than 1%: SXS:BBH:0202, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (7.00, +0.60, 0.00)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} = 1.33\%$; SXS:BBH:1432, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (5.84, +0.66, 0.79)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} = 1.07\%$; and SXS:BBH:1439, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (6.48, +0.72, -0.32)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} = 1.01\%$.

However, this model could not be compared to every NR simulation, because the analytical spin-spin potential (more precisely, its γ -derivative) develops a pole in a small parameter-space region. Because of this singularity, we excluded from our computations the two following NR simulations: SXS:BBH:1421, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (7.81, -0.61, +0.80)$; and SXS:BBH:1906, with $(q, \chi_1, \chi_2) = (4.00, +0.000058, -0.000085)$.

Appendix B: Numerical relativity configurations

In this section we report the details of the NR datasets that are used in the main text to determine the two expressions of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} used in the text, see Table III. In particular, Fig. 11 shows the behavior of the best \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} values




FIG. 10. EOB/NR unfaithfulness comparison and performance as in Fig. 6 but incorporating the even-in-spin terms through the function \hat{A}_{SS} up to 5PM. Note that now we have more configurations with $\bar{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{EOBNR}}^{\text{max}} \gtrsim 0.01$, in particular the equal-mass ones with rather high values of the spins. The SXS simulations SXS:BBH:1421 and SXS:BBH:1906 have been excluded, since the chosen EOB model develops a pole for the corresponding binary parameters.




FIG. 11. Model LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$: equal-mass, equal-spin values of the \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} reported in Table V and fitted with the 5th order polynomial in \tilde{a}_0 with the corresponding coefficients listed in the LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ line of Table III.

obtained in absence of 3PM, 4PM and 5PM spin-spin contributions to the A function. These values are also listed for convenience in Table V. Finally, Fig. 12 illustrates the full NR information used to determine \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} in the case of spin-spin effects in semi-factorized form including up to residual 4PM effects and addressed as LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ in the text. The left panel of the figures summarizes the part of the parameter space covered by the simulations (including the 5 nonspinning datasets used to determine a_{52}^{NR} , see Table I). The right panel shows the values of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} fitted. The dash-dotted line is the outcome of the fit of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} for the equal-mass, equal-spin configurations.

Appendix C: LEOB gauge flexibility for nonspinning binaries

In this appendix we further discuss the flexibility of the Lagrange multiplier approach, and finally examine some

TABLE V. First-guess values for \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} for equal-mass, equal-spin configurations. These values are then fitted with a 5th order polynomial yielding the corresponding coefficients in Table III. The value correspond to either the LEOB-PM $_{a_0}$ or LEOB-PM $_{\text{SS}}$ models discussed in the main text.

#	ID	$(q, \chi_1 = \chi_2)$	\tilde{a}_0	$\hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR, LEOB-PM}_{a_0}}$	$\hat{g}_{32}^{\text{NR, LEOB-PM}_{\text{SS}}}$
1	BBH:1137	(1, -0.9692)	-0.9692	440	137
2	BBH:2086	(1, -0.80)	-0.80	335	130
3	BBH:2089	(1, -0.60)	-0.60	250	120
4	BBH: 148	(1, -0.4376)	-0.4365	200	115
5	BBH:0149	(1, -0.20)	-0.20	130	110
6	BBH:0150	(1, +0.20)	+0.20	42	95
7	BBH:0170	(1, +0.4365)	+0.20	8	72
8	BBH:2102	(1, +0.60)	+0.60	-17	58
9	BBH:2104	(1, +0.80)	+0.80	-32	32
10	BBH:0160	(1, +0.8997)	+0.8997	-37	10
11	BBH:0157	(1, +0.9495)	+0.949586	-40	-2
12	BBH:0177	(1, +0.9892)	+0.989253	-42	-10

notable examples of gauge choice.

For simplicity, we reduce to the case of nonspinning binaries, for which the effective metric can be taken in the general spherically symmetric form

$$g_{\mu\nu}(x, \gamma) dx^\mu dx^\nu = -A(r, \gamma) dt^2 + B(r, \gamma) dr^2 + r^2 C(r, \gamma) (d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2), \quad (\text{C1})$$

involving three EOB potentials, (A, B, C) . With this effective metric, the corresponding explicit mass-shell condition, Eq. (2.43), reads (when considering planar motions)

$$-\frac{\gamma^2}{A(r, \gamma)} + \frac{p_r^2}{B(r, \gamma)} + \frac{p_\phi^2}{r^2 C(r, \gamma)} + 1 = 0. \quad (\text{C2})$$




FIG. 12. Determination of \hat{g}_{32}^{NR} using 3PM, 4PM and 5PM spin-spin contributions in A for the LEOB-PM_{SS} model. Left panel: configuration chosen (also including the nonspinning ones used to determine a_{52}^{NR}). Right panel: the values chosen. The blue points are the equal-mass, equal-spin ones and the line is the corresponding fit given by Eq. (5.3).

1. Inspecting the gauge freedom

The coordinate freedom of a general diagonal spherically symmetric metric of the type (C1) would be encapsulated in arbitrary changes of the radial coordinate: $r \rightarrow f(r', \gamma)$. The arbitrariness in the PM expansion of the function $f(r) = \sum_n \frac{f_n}{r^n}$ would induce essentially arbitrary changes in the PM expansion of one of the three

functions A , B or C (with correlated changes in the other two). This coordinate freedom would be fixed by choosing, e.g., a Schwarzschild-like radial coordinate such that $C = 1$. Making such a choice [i.e. choosing $c_n(\gamma, \nu) = 0$ for $n \geq 1$] simplifies the relations between the scattering angle and the EOB potential, at the level of their PM coefficients, to

$$\chi_1(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{p_\infty}{2} b_1(\gamma, \nu) - \frac{\gamma^2}{2p_\infty} a_1(\gamma, \nu), \quad (\text{C3a})$$

$$\chi_2(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\pi\gamma^2}{8} \left\{ a_1(\gamma, \nu) [2a_1(\gamma, \nu) - b_1(\gamma, \nu)] - 2a_2(\gamma, \nu) \right\} + \frac{\pi p_\infty^2}{32} \left\{ [b_1(\gamma, \nu)]^2 - 4b_2(\gamma, \nu) \right\}, \quad (\text{C3b})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_3(\gamma, \nu) = & \frac{(-\gamma^2 + \frac{5}{2}\gamma^4 - \frac{35}{24}\gamma^6) a_1(\gamma, \nu)^3}{p_\infty^3} + \frac{(-4\gamma^2 + 5\gamma^4) a_1(\gamma, \nu) [4a_2(\gamma, \nu) + a_1(\gamma, \nu)b_1(\gamma, \nu)]}{8p_\infty} \\ & - \gamma^2 p_\infty \left\{ a_3(\gamma, \nu) + \frac{1}{2} a_2(\gamma, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \nu) - \frac{1}{2} a_1(\gamma, \nu) [b_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 - 4b_2(\gamma, \nu)] \right\} + \frac{1}{24} p_\infty^3 \left\{ b_1(\gamma, \nu) [b_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 \right. \\ & \left. - 4b_2(\gamma, \nu)] + 8b_3(\gamma, \nu) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3c})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_4(\gamma, \nu) = & \frac{3}{8} \pi \gamma^2 (-2 + 5\gamma^2) a_1(\gamma, \nu)^4 + \frac{3}{64} \pi \gamma^2 (-2 + 3\gamma^2) \left\{ 8a_2(\gamma, \nu)^2 + 8a_1(\gamma, \nu) a_2(\gamma, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \nu) \right. \\ & \left. + a_1(\gamma, \nu) [16a_3(\gamma, \nu) - a_1(\gamma, \nu) (b_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 - 4b_2(\gamma, \nu))] \right\} - \frac{3}{64} \pi p_\infty^2 \gamma^2 \left\{ 16a_4(\gamma, \nu) + 8a_3(\gamma, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \nu) \right. \\ & \left. - [2a_2(\gamma, \nu) - a_1(\gamma, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \nu)] [b_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 - 4b_2(\gamma, \nu)] + 8a_1(\gamma, \nu) b_3(\gamma, \nu) \right\} \\ & - \frac{3\pi}{1024} \left\{ -128\gamma^2 a_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 [6a_2(\gamma, \nu) + a_1(\gamma, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \nu)] + 256\gamma^4 a_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 [6a_2(\gamma, \nu) + a_1(\gamma, \nu) b_1(\gamma, \nu)] \right. \\ & \left. + p_\infty^4 [5b_1(\gamma, \nu)^4 - 24b_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 b_2(\gamma, \nu) + 32b_1(\gamma, \nu) b_3(\gamma, \nu) + 16 [b_2(\gamma, \nu)^2 - 4b_4(\gamma, \nu)]] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3d})$$

The simplified Eqs. (C3a) exhibit a residual gauge free-

dom. Namely, after having fixed the radial coordinate by

choosing $C = 1$, one can still arbitrarily impose *one* functional relation among the remaining two functions $A(r, \gamma)$ and $B(r, \gamma)$. Then, the PM expansion of the scattering function $\chi(\gamma, j)$ will uniquely determine the expressions of both $A(r, \gamma)$ and $B(r, \gamma)$. For instance, one can fix at will the functional form of $B(r, \gamma)$ [in addition to the coordinate choice $C(r, \gamma) = 1$] and uniquely determine the PM expansion of $A(r, \gamma)$. This is what is done in Eq. (2.12) when absorbing the post-Schwarzschild po-

tential $Q(r, \gamma)$ in $A(r, \gamma)$, keeping Schwarzschild values for $B(r, \gamma) = (1 - \frac{2}{r})^{-1}$ and $C(r, \gamma) = 1$.

For instance, denoting

$$\Delta\chi_n = \chi_n(\gamma, \nu) - \chi_n^S(\gamma) \quad (\text{C4})$$

where $\chi_n^S(\gamma) = \chi_n(\gamma, \nu = 0)$ is the n PM coefficient of the Schwarzschild scattering angle, and using the fact that $\Delta\chi_1 = 0$, we get

$$a_1(\gamma, \nu) = -2, \quad (\text{C5a})$$

$$a_2(\gamma, \nu) = -\frac{8\Delta\chi_2}{\pi(3\gamma^2 - 1)}, \quad (\text{C5b})$$

$$a_3(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{24(8\gamma^4 - 8\gamma^2 + 1)\Delta\chi_2}{\pi(3\gamma^2 - 1)(4\gamma^2 - 1)p_\infty^2} - \frac{3\Delta\chi_3}{(4\gamma^2 - 1)p_\infty}, \quad (\text{C5c})$$

$$a_4(\gamma, \nu) = -\frac{12(140\gamma^8 - 235\gamma^6 + 123\gamma^4 - 13\gamma^2 + 1)\Delta\chi_2}{\pi(3\gamma^2 - 1)(4\gamma^2 - 1)(5\gamma^2 - 1)p_\infty^4} + \frac{16(35\gamma^4 - 30\gamma^2 + 3)\Delta\chi_2^2}{\pi^2(3\gamma^2 - 1)^2(5\gamma^2 - 1)p_\infty^2} \\ + \frac{3(35\gamma^4 - 30\gamma^2 + 3)\Delta\chi_3}{(4\gamma^2 - 1)(5\gamma^2 - 1)p_\infty^3} - \frac{32\Delta\chi_4}{3\pi(5\gamma^2 - 1)p_\infty^2}. \quad (\text{C5d})$$

Another way of obtaining the expressions of the $a_n(\gamma, \nu)$ coefficients in the LJBL gauge is to relate them to the $q_n(\gamma, \nu)$ coefficients of the PM expansion of the $Q(r, \gamma)$ in the post-Schwarzschild formulation of Ref. [6]. Combining the $\chi_n \leftrightarrow q_n$ map with the $\chi_n \leftrightarrow a_n$ map yields the following relations

$$a_2(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{2q_2(\gamma, \nu)}{-1 + 3\gamma^2}, \quad (\text{C6a})$$

$$a_3(\gamma, \nu) = -\frac{3(-1 + 10\gamma^2)q_2(\gamma, \nu)}{(-1 + 3\gamma^2)(-1 + 4\gamma^2)} \\ + \frac{3q_3(\gamma, \nu)}{-1 + 4\gamma^2}, \quad (\text{C6b})$$

$$a_4(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{6\gamma^2(3 + 25\gamma^2)q_2(\gamma, \nu)}{(-1 + 3\gamma^2)(-1 + 4\gamma^2)(-1 + 5\gamma^2)} \\ + \frac{(-1 + 17\gamma^2)q_2(\gamma, \nu)^2}{(-1 + 3\gamma^2)^2(-1 + 5\gamma^2)} \\ - \frac{(-5 + 57\gamma^2)q_3(\gamma, \nu)}{(-1 + 4\gamma^2)(-1 + 5\gamma^2)} \\ + \frac{4q_4(\gamma, \nu)}{-1 + 5\gamma^2}. \quad (\text{C6c})$$

It should be noted that the coefficients entering these relations depend only on γ , but not on ν (or h). As a consequence, the (local) $a_n(\gamma, \nu)$ coefficients inherit the special h -structure of the (local) $q_n(\gamma, \nu)$ coefficients discussed in Eqs. (2.38)-(2.41) of Ref. [64].

2. Alternative gauge choices

We list here some notable instances of gauge choices that could be made in the nonspinning case, showing the first few corresponding PM-coefficient relations.

a. Post-Schwarzschild gauges

The Post-Schwarzschild (PS) gauge was introduced in Ref. [6] and then used, e.g., in Refs. [19, 20, 22, 26]. It consists of imposing the Schwarzschild relations

$$A(r, \gamma) = B(r, \gamma)^{-1} = 1 - 2u, \quad C(r, \gamma) = 1, \quad (\text{C7})$$

with $u = (GM)/(rc^2)$, and including the full PM knowledge in the $Q(\gamma, r)$ potential. In this case, the first PM-coefficient relations read

$$\chi_1(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{[4\gamma^2 - 2 - q_1(\gamma, \nu)]}{2p_\infty}, \quad (\text{C8a})$$

$$\chi_2(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\pi}{8} [15\gamma^2 - 3 - 2q_1(\gamma, \nu) - 2q_2(\gamma, \nu)]. \quad (\text{C8b})$$

The related PS* gauge (see [20, 22, 26]) can be obtained by keeping $B^{-1} = 1 - 2u$ and transferring all the PM information from Q to A . One has thus $Q = 0$ and a PM-informed A function that is no longer the inverse of the B potential. It is easy to map Q into A (and viceversa), see Eqs. (2.11) and (2.12). The result for this map at the level of the PM coefficients can be found in Appendix B.2 of Ref. [22].

b. $C = 1$, fixed AB gauge

A similar gauge is found when imposing

$$A(r, \gamma)B(r, \gamma) = 1, \quad (\text{C9})$$

together with $C = 1$ and $Q = 0$.

In this case, the complete PM knowledge is incorporated into the A (or, equivalently, B) potential. The first two relations between its coefficients and the scattering-angle terms read as

$$\chi_1(\gamma, \nu) = -\frac{(2\gamma^2 - 1)}{2p_\infty} a_1(\gamma, \nu), \quad (\text{C10a})$$

$$\chi_2(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\pi}{32} \left[3(5\gamma^2 - 1) a_1^2(\gamma, \nu) - 4(3\gamma^2 - 1) a_2(\gamma, \nu) \right]. \quad (\text{C10b})$$

A modification of this setup consists in imposing some PN relations between the metric potentials. For example, we could prefer to keep all-but-one PN-dependent metric functions fixed and focus on a particular one to include the PM terms. For instance, we could ask

$$A(r, \gamma)B(r, \gamma) = D_{3\text{PN}}(r), \quad (\text{C11})$$

where

$$D_{3\text{PN}}(r) = 1 - \frac{6\nu}{r^2} + \frac{2(3\nu - 26)\nu}{r^3} \quad (\text{C12})$$

is the small-velocity expansion of the D potential first computed in Ref.[33]. Indeed this still enforces a relation between each pair of PM coefficients $[a_n(\gamma, \nu), b_n(\gamma, \nu)]$, leaving room for the determination of A (or equivalently B) in terms of the scattering angle. In particular at the lowest orders we find

$$\chi_1(\gamma, \nu) = -\frac{(2\gamma^2 - 1)}{2p_\infty} a_1(\gamma, \nu), \quad (\text{C13a})$$

$$\chi_2(\gamma, \nu) = -\frac{\pi}{32} \left[(3 - 15\gamma^2) a_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 + 4(3\gamma^2 - 1) a_2(\gamma, \nu) + 24\nu p_\infty^2 \right]. \quad (\text{C13b})$$

c. Kerr-Schild gauge

All previous gauges have been constructed using a mass-shell condition in the form of Eq. (C2). This is the quadratic-in-momenta condition which has been most commonly studied in the past.

However, this is not the only possibility. An alternative is presented by the ‘‘canonical Kerr-Schild gauge’’, studied first within the EOB framework in Ref. [25]. The (inverse) effective metric in the Kerr-Schild form, in Cartesian coordinates, reads

$$g_{\text{eff}}^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} - \Phi(r, \gamma) k^\mu k^\nu, \quad (\text{C14})$$

where $k^\mu = (1, \frac{x^i}{r})$ describes an outgoing null 4-vector centered on the origin.

For the Kerr-Schild potential $\Phi(r, \gamma)$ we can consider a PM expansion of the type (2.47a), with coefficients $\phi_n(\gamma, \nu)$, and determine it in terms of the scattering angle. For instance we find

$$\chi_1(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{(2\gamma^2 - 1) \phi_1(\gamma, \nu)}{2p_\infty}, \quad (\text{C15a})$$

$$\chi_2(\gamma, \nu) = \frac{\pi}{32} \left[3(5\gamma^2 - 1) \phi_1(\gamma, \nu)^2 + 4(3\gamma^2 - 1) \phi_2(\gamma, \nu) \right]. \quad (\text{C15b})$$

Appendix D: Treatment of the 4PM dynamics of bound states in other works

In the PM-based HEOB models of Refs. [22, 27] the issue of deriving the 4PM contribution to the EOB bound-state dynamics was tackled by two different formal procedures of limited validity. To be more specific, we start by recalling that the complete, conservative, 4PM-level, hyperbolic-motion coefficient $q_4^{\text{hyp,tot}}$ contains the following 4PM-accurate logarithmic contribution:

$$q_4^{\text{hyp,log}} = \frac{\nu}{h^3} \mathcal{E}(\gamma) \ln p_\infty^2, \quad (\text{D1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\gamma) = & \frac{1}{12p_\infty^2} \left(1151 - 3336\gamma + 3148\gamma^2 - 912\gamma^3 \right. \\ & \left. + 339\gamma^4 - 552\gamma^5 + 210\gamma^6 \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(5 - 76\gamma + 150\gamma^2 - 60\gamma^3 - 35\gamma^4 \right) \log \left(\frac{1+\gamma}{2} \right) \\ & - \frac{\gamma(3-2\gamma^2)(11-30\gamma^2+35\gamma^4) \text{arcosh}(\gamma)}{4p_\infty^3} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D2})$$

The latter term is rooted in the specific hyperbolic-motion physics of tail-transported effects, and cannot (and should not) be directly analytically continued to the elliptic-motion case. A direct analytic continuation from the hyperbolic situation, where $p_\infty^2 = \gamma^2 - 1$ is positive, to the elliptic one, where $p_\infty^2 = \gamma^2 - 1$ is negative, would yield a complex-valued Hamiltonian for elliptic motions. Ref. [22] partially tackled this issue by subtracting from the hyperbolic Hamiltonian a term containing the leading-order, 4PN-level contribution to $q_4^{\text{hyp,log}}$, namely $q_{4\text{PM},4\text{PN}}^{\text{hyp,log}} = \frac{148\nu p_\infty^2}{15} \ln p_\infty^2$. On the one hand, such a formal log-subtraction prescription is not based on a clear theoretical treatment of the difference between tail effects in the two different physical situations. On the other hand, the approximate subtraction used in Ref. [22] leaves some residual contributions $\propto \ln p_\infty^2$ beyond the 4PN order, which are complex-valued along elliptic motions. This explains why, in order to reproduce the re-

sults of Ref. [22], e.g. Fig. (4) therein, we found necessary to take the real part of the Hamiltonians they provide.

In the recent work of Buonanno et al., Ref. [27], an improved treatment of the continuation of tail effects from hyperbolic to elliptic motions has been used. There, the formal replacement $\ln p_\infty^2 \rightarrow \ln u$ was made in a contribution canonically equivalent to $q_4^{\text{hyp,log}}$ in Eq. (D1), and an additional term, $\Delta A^{4\text{PN}}$, was added to the A potential to ensure that the 4PN-level limit of the resulting bound-state dynamics agrees, though only to second order in eccentricity, with the one derived in Ref. [34]. While the EOB model of Ref. [27], calibrated to Numerical Relativity (NR), shows reasonable agreement with simulations, we have adopted the alternative prescription discussed in Sec. III due to its stronger theoretical foundation.

Appendix E: Completing the local nonspinning dynamics by 5PM, 6PM and 7PM contributions at 6PN accuracy

In the present Appendix we extend the 4PN local completion of A discussed in Sec. III B, using all the available results of the Tutti Frutti approach [32, 61–63], i.e. including, up the 6PN accuracy, the 5PM, 6PM and 7PM contributions to the local dynamics.

At this accuracy, the completed A potential reads

$$A_{6\text{PNcompleted}}^{\text{loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu) = A_{\leq 4\text{PM}}^{\text{loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu)$$

$$+ A^{6\text{PNsupp,loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu), \quad (\text{E1})$$

where the supplementary term has the structure

$$A^{6\text{PNsupp,loc}}(r, \gamma, \nu) = a_5^{\text{loc}}(p_\infty^2, \nu)u^5 + a_6^{\text{loc}}(p_\infty^2, \nu)u^6 + a_7^{\text{loc}}(p_\infty^2, \nu)u^7. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Here, the velocity dependent coefficients $a_5(p_\infty^2, \nu)$, $a_6(p_\infty^2, \nu)$, $a_7(p_\infty^2, \nu)$ are only known at a limited order in their expansion in powers of $p_\infty^2 \equiv \gamma^2 - 1$. The 6PN accuracy corresponds to knowing

$$a_5^{\text{loc}}(p_\infty^2, \nu) = a_{50}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) + a_{52}^{\text{loc}}(\nu)p_\infty^2 + a_{54}^{\text{loc}}(\nu)p_\infty^4, \quad (\text{E3})$$

$$a_6^{\text{loc}}(p_\infty^2, \nu) = a_{60}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) + a_{62}^{\text{loc}}(\nu)p_\infty^2, \quad (\text{E4})$$

$$a_7^{\text{loc}}(p_\infty^2, \nu) = a_{70}^{\text{loc}}(\nu), \quad (\text{E5})$$

where $a_{50}^{\text{loc}}(\nu)$ is the 4PN contribution already determined in Sec. III B. Similarly as to what we did for $a_{50}^{\text{loc}}(\nu)$, the values of the other five ν -dependent coefficients $a_{52}(\nu), \dots, a_{70}(\nu)$ can be directly obtained from the coefficients $q_n(p_\infty, \nu)$ given in Table XII of [32], by means of the mapping between A and Q recalled in Eqs. (C6). The resulting local contributions read

$$a_{52}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) = \left(\frac{1549753}{4200} - \frac{840907\pi^2}{40960} \right) \nu + \left(\frac{33369}{160} + \frac{101673\pi^2}{20480} + \frac{\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{5} \right) \nu^2 + \left(\frac{3607}{15} - \frac{1763\pi^2}{256} \right) \nu^3 - \frac{93\nu^4}{16}, \quad (\text{E6a})$$

$$a_{54}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) = \left(-\frac{8899659907}{7056000} + \frac{89734448413\pi^2}{734003200} \right) \nu + \left(-\frac{159563213}{392000} + \frac{1700103\pi^2}{89600} + \frac{3q_{45}^{\nu^2}}{35} - \frac{6\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{25} \right) \nu^2 + \left(-\frac{954911}{3600} - \frac{2816111\pi^2}{245760} - \frac{2\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{5} \right) \nu^3 + \left(-\frac{64479}{160} + \frac{5535\pi^2}{512} \right) \nu^4 + \frac{657\nu^5}{64}, \quad (\text{E6b})$$

$$a_{60}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) = \left(-\frac{1724389}{4200} + \frac{339311\pi^2}{5120} \right) \nu + \left(\frac{47711}{120} - \frac{31343\pi^2}{5120} + a_6^{\nu^2} + \frac{\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{5} \right) \nu^2 + \left(\frac{2077}{15} - \frac{287\pi^2}{64} \right) \nu^3 - \frac{11\nu^4}{8}, \quad (\text{E7a})$$

$$a_{62}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) = \left(-\frac{269524382641}{47628000} + \frac{562658476799\pi^2}{825753600} + \frac{45303\pi^4}{524288} \right) \nu + \left(\frac{268226699}{1764000} + \frac{3835411\pi^2}{1075200} + \frac{11q_{45}^{\nu^2}}{70} - \frac{68\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{75} + \frac{\bar{d}_6^{\nu^2}}{6} \right) \nu^2 + \left(\frac{268226699}{1764000} + \frac{3835411\pi^2}{1075200} + \frac{11q_{45}^{\nu^2}}{70} - \frac{68\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{75} + \frac{\bar{d}_6^{\nu^2}}{6} \right) \nu^2 + \left(-\frac{201377}{480} + \frac{205\pi^2}{16} \right) \nu^4 + \frac{73\nu^5}{16}, \quad (\text{E7b})$$

$$a_{70}^{\text{loc}}(\nu) = \left(-\frac{31138024879}{4762800} + \frac{922426025089\pi^2}{990904320} - \frac{5556443\pi^4}{524288} \right) \nu + \left(\frac{84714437}{88200} - \frac{6504619\pi^2}{215040} + a_7^{\nu^2} + \frac{q_{45}^{\nu^2}}{14} \right) \nu^2 + \frac{q_{45}^{\nu^2}}{14}$$

$$-\frac{13\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{15} + \frac{\bar{d}_6^{\nu^2}}{6})\nu^2 + \left(-\frac{39097}{40} + \frac{91993\pi^2}{4096} - \frac{5a_6^{\nu^2}}{2} + a_7^{\nu^3} - \frac{\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}}{2}\right)\nu^3 + \left(-\frac{14213}{96} + \frac{615\pi^2}{128}\right)\nu^4 + \frac{13\nu^5}{16}. \quad (\text{E8})$$

The coefficients $(\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}, a_6^{\nu^2}; q_{45}^{\nu^2}, \bar{d}_6^{\nu^2}, a_7^{\nu^2}, a_7^{\nu^3})$ entering the 5PN and 6PN orders are numerical coefficients left undetermined by the Tutti Frutti approach, and not yet determined by other methods. Here, we keep the notation of [32]. The coefficients $\bar{d}_n^{\nu^2}$ and $a_n^{\nu^2}$ belong to the n -PM order, while the coefficient $q_{45}^{\nu^2}$ (which parametrizes a term $\propto \nu^2 q_{45}^{\nu^2} p_r^4 u^5$) belongs to the 5PM order. All these coefficients are expected to be of order unity. One could leave them as free parameters in constructing EOB waveforms, and try to best-fit them to numerical-relativity waveforms. Nevertheless, we have checked that they have a rather small effect on EOB waveforms.

Appendix F: Nonlocal orbital dynamics for elliptic-like motions at 6PN accuracy.

In this appendix we extend the computation presented in Sec. III C, i.e. of the nonlocal PN-expanded contribution to the LJBL-gauge EOB potential $A(\gamma, \nu)$, using the full 6PN accuracy of the Tutti Frutti results [32, 61–63], up to the eight eccentricity order.

We start by recalling the structure of the 6PN-accurate Tutti Frutti results we will use.

1. 6PN nonlocal bound-state Hamiltonian in DJS gauge

The DJS-gauge Tutti Frutti squared effective Hamiltonian for bound state motions, $\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$, is decomposed in a local and several nonlocal contributions as

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi) = \hat{H}_{\text{eff,loc,f}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi) + \delta\hat{H}_{\text{eff,nonloc,h}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi) + \delta\hat{H}_{\text{eff,f-h}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi). \quad (\text{F1})$$

Here $\hat{H}_{\text{eff,loc,f}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi, \gamma)$ describes up to the 6PN order the local dynamics studied (in its 4PM-4PN complete version) in Sec. III B. We have added a subscript f to $\hat{H}_{\text{eff,loc,f}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi, \gamma)$ as a reminder that this local Hamiltonian is obtained by splitting the action in local and nonlocal parts with the use of a flexibility factor $f(t)$ entering the time scale Δt^f used as ultraviolet cutoff [62], namely

$$\Delta t^f = f(t)\Delta t^h = f(t)2r_{12}^h/c, \quad (\text{F2})$$

r_{12}^h denoting the two-body radial separation in harmonic coordinates. Let us discuss in turn the two other contributions, $\delta\hat{H}_{\text{eff,nonloc,h}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$ and $\delta\hat{H}_{\text{eff,f-h}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$ to the squared effective Hamiltonian (F1).

TABLE VI. Coefficients of the 4+5+6PN nonlocal potential in DJS gauge.

Coefficient	Expression
$a_5^{\text{nl,c}}$	$(\frac{128}{5}\gamma_E + \frac{256}{5}\ln 2)\nu$
$a_5^{\text{nl,ln}}$	$\frac{64}{5}\nu$
$a_6^{\text{nl,c}}$	$(-\frac{128}{5} - \frac{14008}{105}\gamma_E - \frac{31736}{105}\ln 2 + \frac{243}{7}\ln 3)\nu$ $+ (\frac{64}{5} - \frac{288}{5}\gamma_E + \frac{928}{35}\ln 2 - \frac{972}{7}\log 3)\nu^2$
$a_6^{\text{nl,ln}}$	$-\frac{7004}{105}\nu - \frac{144}{5}\nu^2$
$a_7^{\text{nl,c}}$	$(\frac{206740}{567}\ln 2 + \frac{12664}{105} - \frac{4617}{14}\ln 3 - \frac{5044}{405}\gamma_E)\nu$ $+ (-\frac{1139672}{945}\ln 2 + \frac{10132}{105} + \frac{10449}{7}\ln 3 + \frac{101272}{315}\gamma_E)\nu^2$ $+ (-\frac{112}{5} + 32\gamma_E + \frac{1214624}{945}\ln 2 - \frac{4860}{7}\ln 3)\nu^3$
$a_7^{\text{nl,ln}}$	$-\frac{2522}{405}\nu + \frac{50636}{315}\nu^2 + 16\nu^3$

The first contribution, $\delta\hat{H}_{\text{eff,nonloc,h}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$, is the nonlocal part of the squared effective Hamiltonian, obtained with $f(t) = 1$ and thus with regularization time scale $\Delta t^h = 2r_{12}^h/c$. Its expression is precisely Eq. (3.8), that is

$$\delta\hat{H}_{\text{eff,nonloc,h}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi) = [1 - 2(1 - 2u)p_r^2 + p_\varphi^2 u^2] \delta A_{\text{nl,h}}(r) + (1 - 2u)^2 p_r^2 \delta \bar{D}_{\text{nl,h}}(r) + (1 - 2u) \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r). \quad (\text{F3})$$

where the subscript ‘‘h’’ signals the use of the cutoff timescale Δt^h .¹³

As already mentioned in the main text, the nonlocal components $[\delta A_{\text{nl,h}}(r), \delta \bar{D}_{\text{nl,h}}(r), \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r)]$ of the EOB potentials are given at 4PN, 5PN, and 6PN in Table IV of Ref. [62] and Table VI of Ref. [32], and reported here in Tables VI, VII, and VIII.

Each of the nonlocal components in Eq. (F3) has been completed by a 5.5PN contribution, obtained in Sec. XII of Ref. [62]) [see Eq. (12.9) there]. These additional 5.5PN contributions explicitly read

$$\delta A_{\text{nl,h}}^{5.5\text{PN}} = \frac{13696\pi}{525} \nu u^{13/2}, \quad (\text{F4a})$$

$$\delta \bar{D}_{\text{nl,h}}^{5.5\text{PN}} = \frac{264932\pi}{1575} \nu u^{11/2}, \quad (\text{F4b})$$

$$\delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}^{5.5\text{PN}} = \frac{88703\pi}{1890} \nu p_r^4 u^{9/2} - \frac{2723471\pi}{756000} \nu p_r^6 u^{7/2} + \frac{5994461\pi}{12700800} \nu p_r^8 u^{5/2} + O(p_r^{10}). \quad (\text{F4c})$$

¹³ In Sec. III C there was no need for this subscript since any difference in the cutoff timescale considered has no impact before the 5PN order.

TABLE VII. Coefficients of the 4+5+6PN nonlocal part of the \bar{D} potential in DJS gauge.

Coefficient	Expression
$d_4^{\text{nl,c}}$	$(-\frac{992}{5} + \frac{1184}{15}\gamma_E - \frac{6496}{15}\ln 2 + \frac{2916}{5}\ln 3)\nu$
$d_4^{\text{nl,log}}$	$\frac{592}{15}\nu$
$d_5^{\text{nl,c}}$	$(-\frac{7318}{35} - \frac{2840}{7}\gamma_E + \frac{120648}{35}\ln 2 - \frac{19683}{7}\ln 3)\nu$ $+ (\frac{67736}{105} - \frac{6784}{15}\gamma_E - \frac{326656}{21}\ln 2 + \frac{58320}{7}\ln 3)\nu^2$
$d_5^{\text{nl,log}}$	$-\frac{1420}{7}\nu - \frac{3392}{15}\nu^2$
$d_6^{\text{nl,c}}$	$(-\frac{6381680}{189}\ln 2 + \frac{2043541}{2835} + \frac{1765881}{140}\ln 3 - \frac{64096}{45}\gamma_E + \frac{9765625}{2268}\ln 5)\nu$ $+ (\frac{28429312}{189}\ln 2 - \frac{3576231}{70}\ln 3 + \frac{167906}{105} + \frac{302752}{105}\gamma_E - \frac{9765625}{378}\ln 5)\nu^2$ $+ (-\frac{9908480}{63}\ln 2 - \frac{744704}{945} + \frac{9765625}{252}\ln 5 + \frac{2944}{3}\gamma_E + \frac{1275021}{28}\ln 3)\nu^3$
$d_6^{\text{nl,log}}$	$-\frac{32048}{45}\nu + \frac{151376}{105}\nu^2 + \frac{1472}{3}\nu^3$

Note that, generalizing Eq. (3.9), the quantity

$$\delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r) \equiv \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r)^{4\text{PN}} + \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r)^{5\text{PN}} + \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r)^{5.5\text{PN}} + \delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r)^{6\text{PN}}, \quad (\text{F5})$$

has the structure

$$\delta Q_{\text{nl,h}}(r, p_r) = c_4 p_r^4 (u^3 q_{43} + u^4 \bar{q}_{44} + u^{9/2} q_{4,4.5} + u^5 \bar{q}_{45}) + c_6 p_r^6 (u^2 q_{62} + u^3 \bar{q}_{63} + u^{7/2} q_{6,3.5} + u^4 \bar{q}_{64}) + c_8 p_r^8 (u q_{81} + u^2 \bar{q}_{82} + u^{5/2} \bar{q}_{8,2.5} + u^3 q_{83}) + \mathcal{O}(p_r^{10}). \quad (\text{F6})$$

Here the undecorated coefficients q_{nm} depend only on ν , whereas the barred coefficients \bar{q}_{nm} have a linear dependence on $\ln u$ as well. As in Eq. (3.9), the parameters c_4, c_6, c_8 appearing in Eq. (F6) are eccentricity-keying parameters.

The last term, $\delta \hat{H}_{\text{eff},f-h}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$, in Eq. (F1) is an additional contribution coming from the flexibility factor f . Its expression in EOB coordinates has the same structure of Eq. (F3), with the corresponding coefficients of the EOB potentials, say $(\delta^{f-h}A, \delta^{f-h}\bar{D}, \delta^{f-h}Q)$, that are given in Eqs. (7.32)-(7.34) of Ref. [63] in terms of six flexibility parameters, $(C_2, C_3, D_2^0, D_3^0, D_4^0, D_1^0)$; see Sec.VII of Ref. [63] for more details.

2. Transforming the 6PN nonlocal bound-state dynamics to the LJBL gauge

Let us indicate how it is possible to map the results recalled in the previous subsection into corresponding additional contributions [respectively $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u)$ and $\delta A_{f-h}(\gamma, u)$] to the basic $A(\gamma, u)$ potential of our LJBL gauge, so that

$$A(\gamma, u) = A_{6\text{PNcompleted}}^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, u) + \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u) + \delta A_{f-h}(\gamma, u). \quad (\text{F7})$$

Here $A_{6\text{PNcompleted}}^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, u)$ is the local 6PN-completed component, determined in Appendix E.

The mapping between the DJS gauge dynamics, described by the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}}^2(r, p_r, p_\varphi)$ in Eq. (F1), and the (PN expansion of the) LJBL-gauge dynamics described by the $A(\gamma, u)$ potential of Eq. (F7) is obtained, as we did at 4PN accuracy in Sec. III C, by looking for a canonical transformation such that the DJS gauge restriction is equivalent to the corresponding LJBL condition.

The resulting $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u)$ and $\delta A_{f-h}(\gamma, u)$ contributions to $A(\gamma, u)$, and the canonical transformation itself, are obtained order by order in the PN expansion. This canonical transformation involves logarithms of u . See Refs. [32, 61–63] for similar computations.

Focusing first on the nonlocal part, it has the structure

$$\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u) = \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{4\text{PN}}(p_\infty, u) + \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{5\text{PN}}(p_\infty, u) + \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{5.5\text{PN}}(p_\infty, u) + \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{6\text{PN}}(p_\infty, u) \quad (\text{F8})$$

where each PN contribution is a polynomial in p_∞^2 :

$$\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{n\text{PN}} = \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} a_{k,n+1-k}^{\text{nlh,c}} u^k p_\infty^{2(n+1-k)} + \ln u \sum_{k=4}^{n+1} a_{k,n+1-k}^{\text{nlh,ln}} u^k p_\infty^{2(n+1-k)}, \quad (\text{F9})$$

for $n = 4, 5, 6$ and

$$\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{5.5\text{PN}} = a_{k,n+1-k}^{\text{nlh},\sqrt{u}} \sqrt{u} \sum_{k=2}^{n+1} u^k p_\infty^{2(n+1-k)}. \quad (\text{F10})$$

Note the presence of square roots and logarithms of u . All the ν -dependent parameters $(a_{m,n}^{\text{nlh,c}}, a_{m,n}^{\text{nlh,ln}}, a_{m,n}^{\text{nlh},\sqrt{u}})$ are collected in Tables IX and X. The 6PN-accurate nonlocal contribution to the A potential, $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u)$

TABLE VIII. Coefficients of the 4+5+6PN nonlocal part of the Q potential in DJS gauge.

Coefficient	Expression
$q_{43}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{5608}{15} + \frac{496256}{45} \ln 2 - \frac{33048}{5} \ln 3\right) \nu$
$q_{43}^{\text{nl,ln}}$	0
$q_{44}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(\frac{1007633}{315} + \frac{10856}{105} \gamma_E - \frac{40979464}{315} \ln 2 + \frac{14203593}{280} \ln 3 + \frac{9765625}{504} \ln 5\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{74436}{35} - \frac{1184}{5} \gamma_E + \frac{33693536}{105} \ln 2 - \frac{6396489}{70} \ln 3 - \frac{9765625}{126} \ln 5\right) \nu^2$
$q_{44}^{\text{nl,ln}}$	$\frac{5428}{105} \nu - \frac{592}{5} \nu^2$
$q_{62}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{4108}{15} - \frac{2358912}{25} \ln 2 + \frac{1399437}{50} \ln 3 + \frac{390625}{18} \ln 5\right) \nu$
$q_{62}^{\text{nl,ln}}$	0
$q_{63}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(\frac{1300084}{525} + \frac{6875745536}{4725} \ln 2 - \frac{23132628}{175} \ln 3 - \frac{101687500}{189} \ln 5\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{160124}{75} - \frac{4998308864}{1575} \ln 2 - \frac{45409167}{350} \ln 3 + \frac{26171875}{18} \ln 5\right) \nu^2$
$q_{63}^{\text{nl,ln}}$	0
$q_{45}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(\frac{70925884}{63} \ln 2 + \frac{13212013}{5670} - \frac{3873663}{16} \ln 3 - \frac{8787109375}{27216} \ln 5 - \frac{617716}{315} \gamma_E\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{92560887}{280} \ln 3 - \frac{12619052648}{2835} \ln 2 - \frac{1437979}{63} + \frac{632344}{315} \gamma_E + \frac{7755859375}{4536} \ln 5\right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{177316}{35} + \frac{11263031264}{2835} \ln 2 + \frac{16544}{9} \gamma_E - \frac{4091796875}{2268} \ln 5 + \frac{2908467}{20} \ln 3\right) \nu^3$
$q_{45}^{\text{nl,log}}$	$-\frac{308858}{315} \nu + \frac{316172}{315} \nu^2 + \frac{8272}{9} \nu^3$
$q_{64}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{211076833264}{14175} \ln 2 - \frac{137711989}{28350} - \frac{9678652821}{5600} \ln 3 + \frac{447248}{1575} \gamma_E + \frac{153776136875}{23328} \ln 5 + \frac{96889010407}{116640} \ln 7\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{44592947739}{2800} \ln 3 + \frac{2411178384736}{42525} \ln 2 - \frac{126070663}{4725} - \frac{26848}{175} \gamma_E - \frac{796015515625}{27216} \ln 5 - \frac{96889010407}{19440} \ln 7\right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{40513708}{4725} - \frac{109566260523}{5600} \ln 3 + \frac{1424826953125}{54432} \ln 5 + \frac{96889010407}{12960} \ln 7 + \frac{2368}{5} \gamma_E - \frac{431564554688}{8505} \ln 2\right) \nu^3$
$q_{64}^{\text{nl,log}}$	$\frac{223624}{1575} \nu - \frac{13424}{175} \nu^2 + \frac{1184}{5} \nu^3$
$q_{81}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{35772}{175} + \frac{21668992 \ln 2}{45} + \frac{6591861 \ln 3}{350} - \frac{27734375 \ln 5}{126}\right) \nu$
$q_{82}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(\frac{5788281}{2450} - \frac{16175693888 \ln 2}{1575} - \frac{393786545409 \ln 3}{156800} + \frac{875090984375 \ln 5}{169344} + \frac{13841287201 \ln 7}{17280}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{703189497728 \ln 2}{33075} + \frac{869626}{525} + \frac{332067403089 \ln 3}{39200} - \frac{468490234375 \ln 5}{42336} - \frac{13841287201 \ln 7}{4320}\right) \nu^2$
$q_{83}^{\text{nl,c}}$	$\left(\frac{5196312336176}{35721} \ln 2 + \frac{17515638027261}{313600} \ln 3 - \frac{63886617280625}{1016064} \ln 5 - \frac{29247366220639}{933120} \ln 7 - \frac{709195549}{132300}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{177055674739808}{297675} \ln 2 - \frac{43719724468071}{156800} \ln 3 + \frac{366449151015625}{1524096} \ln 5 + \frac{26506549233199}{155520} \ln 7 - \frac{1746293}{70}\right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(\frac{57604236136064}{99225} \ln 2 + \frac{10467583300341}{39200} \ln 3 - \frac{73366198046875}{381024} \ln 5 - \frac{7709596970957}{38880} \ln 7 - \frac{154862}{21}\right) \nu^3$
$q_{83}^{\text{nl,log}}$	0

in Eq. (F8), has the same eccentricity structure of its 4PN-accurate analogue, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u) &= \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{\leq e^2}(\gamma, u) \\ &+ c_4 \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{e^4}(\gamma, u) + c_6 \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{e^6}(\gamma, u) \\ &+ c_8 \delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{e^8}(\gamma, u). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F11})$$

In the ancillary file we explicitly provide the full expression (6PN-accurate and up to e^8) of $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}(\gamma, u)$, according to the separation shown in Eq. (F11).

Coming now to the f-h component, our result has the structure

$$\delta A_{\text{f-h}} = (a_{5,2}^{\text{f-h}} p_\infty^2 + a_{5,4}^{\text{f-h}} p_\infty^4) u^5$$

$$+ (a_{6,0}^{\text{f-h}} + a_{6,2}^{\text{f-h}} p_\infty^2) u^6 + a_{7,0}^{\text{f-h}} u^7. \quad (\text{F12})$$

This contribution starts at 5PN and 5PM, and has no logarithms or square roots. The canonical transformation yields the result

$$a_{5,2}^{\text{f-h}} = \frac{2C_2}{5} \nu^2, \quad (\text{F13a})$$

$$a_{5,4}^{\text{f-h}} = \left(\frac{6D_2^0}{35} - \frac{7C_2}{25}\right) \nu^2 - \frac{4C_2}{5} \nu^3, \quad (\text{F13b})$$

$$a_{6,0}^{\text{f-h}} = \left(\frac{2C_2}{5} + 2C_3\right) \nu^2, \quad (\text{F13c})$$

TABLE IX. Resulting coefficients for $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{4\text{PN}}$ and $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{5\text{PN}}$. Here γ_E is Euler's constant.

Coefficient	Expression
$a_{1,4}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{35772}{175} + \frac{10834496 \ln 2}{21} + \frac{6591861 \ln 3}{350} - \frac{27734375 \ln 5}{126}\right) \nu$
$a_{2,3}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{7991}{15} + \frac{16486604 \ln 2}{15} + \frac{3995649 \ln 3}{80} - \frac{68359375 \ln 5}{144}\right) \nu$
$a_{3,2}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{66523}{105} + \frac{1374117716 \ln 2}{1575} + \frac{145758933 \ln 3}{2800} - \frac{387109375 \ln 5}{1008}\right) \nu$
$a_{4,1}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{49682}{105} + \frac{296\gamma_E}{15} + \frac{541043288 \ln 2}{1575} + \frac{36333117 \ln 3}{1400} - \frac{77734375 \ln 5}{504}\right) \nu$
$a_{5,0}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(-\frac{29388}{175} + \frac{136\gamma_E}{3} + \frac{28504144 \ln 2}{525} + \frac{876258 \ln 3}{175} - \frac{1562500 \ln 5}{63}\right) \nu$
$a_{4,1}^{\text{nh,ln}}$	$\frac{148}{15} \nu$
$a_{5,0}^{\text{nh,ln}}$	$\frac{68}{3} \nu$
$a_{1,5}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(\frac{71544}{175} - \frac{21668992 \ln 2}{21} - \frac{6591861 \ln 3}{175} + \frac{27734375 \ln 5}{63}\right) \nu$
$a_{2,4}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(\frac{77118197}{44800} - \frac{1623588763 \ln 2}{315} - \frac{2256723902277 \ln 3}{2867200} + \frac{7501679921875 \ln 5}{3096576} + \frac{96889010407 \ln 7}{442368}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{434813}{960} + \frac{5493667951 \ln 2}{945} + \frac{332067403089 \ln 3}{143360} - \frac{2342451171875 \ln 5}{774144} - \frac{96889010407 \ln 7}{110592}\right) \nu^2$
$a_{3,3}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(\frac{9328833077}{2822400} - \frac{34463337173 \ln 2}{3675} - \frac{5588225526843 \ln 3}{2867200} + \frac{33236879515625 \ln 5}{7225344} + \frac{429079903231 \ln 7}{737280}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{10137109}{6720} + \frac{165305397617 \ln 2}{11025} + \frac{30789270513261 \ln 3}{5017600} - \frac{14147997265625 \ln 5}{1806336} - \frac{429079903231 \ln 7}{184320}\right) \nu^2$
$a_{4,2}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(\frac{5424084823}{1411200} - \frac{411\gamma_E}{35} - \frac{260768957761 \ln 2}{33075} - \frac{2778338476377 \ln 3}{1433600} + \frac{43123869265625 \ln 5}{10838016} + \frac{650540498447 \ln 7}{1105920}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{7435079}{3360} - \frac{148\gamma_E}{5} + \frac{482118519718 \ln 2}{33075} + \frac{15468076580319 \ln 3}{2508800} - \frac{20708641015625 \ln 5}{2709504} - \frac{650540498447 \ln 7}{276480}\right) \nu^2$
$a_{5,1}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(\frac{3371152901}{1176000} - \frac{3741\gamma_E}{25} - \frac{20705210921 \ln 2}{6125} - \frac{3256431610833 \ln 3}{3584000} + \frac{9395870828125 \ln 5}{5419008} + \frac{152254159211 \ln 7}{552960}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{2122033}{1200} - \frac{2156\gamma_E}{15} + \frac{215891035208 \ln 2}{33075} + \frac{3585448178811 \ln 3}{1254400} - \frac{4649392578125 \ln 5}{1354752} - \frac{152254159211 \ln 7}{138240}\right) \nu^2$
$a_{6,0}^{\text{nh,c}}$	$\left(\frac{191444741}{196000} - \frac{7276\gamma_E}{25} - \frac{96607902652 \ln 2}{165375} - \frac{298360928979 \ln 3}{1792000} + \frac{819577984375 \ln 5}{2709504} + \frac{13841287201 \ln 7}{276480}\right) \nu$ $+ \left(\frac{873471}{1400} - \frac{2576\gamma_E}{15} + \frac{37411207016 \ln 2}{33075} + \frac{321481778769 \ln 3}{627200} - \frac{403390234375 \ln 5}{677376} - \frac{13841287201 \ln 7}{69120}\right) \nu^2$
$a_{4,2}^{\text{nh,ln}}$	$-\frac{411\nu}{70} - \frac{74\nu^2}{5}$
$a_{5,1}^{\text{nh,ln}}$	$-\frac{3741\nu}{50} - \frac{1078\nu^2}{15}$
$a_{6,0}^{\text{nh,ln}}$	$-\frac{3638\nu}{25} - \frac{1288\nu^2}{15}$

$$a_{6,2}^{\text{f-h}} = \left(\frac{11D_2^0}{35} + \frac{D_3^0}{3} + \frac{104C_2}{75} - \frac{4C_3}{3}\right) \nu^2 + \left(-\frac{9C_2}{5} - 5C_3\right) \nu^3, \quad (\text{F13d})$$

$$a_{7,0}^{\text{f-h}} = \left(\frac{D_2^0}{7} + \frac{D_3^0}{3} + 2D_4^0 + \frac{19C_2}{15} + \frac{23C_3}{3}\right) \nu^2 + \left(2D_4^1 - C_2 - 6C_3\right) \nu^3. \quad (\text{F13e})$$

When adding $\delta A_{\text{f-h}}$ to $A_{6\text{PNcompleted}}^{\text{loc}}(\gamma, u)$ we checked that the six flexibility parameters ($C_2, C_3, D_2^0, D_3^0, D_4^0, D_1^0$) have only the effect of shifting the values of the six undetermined parameters ($\bar{d}_5^{\nu^2}, a_6^{\nu^2}; q_{45}^{\nu^2}, \bar{d}_6^{\nu^2}, a_7^{\nu^2}, a_7^{\nu^3}$) [entering Eqs. (E6a)-(E8)], in keeping with Eqs. (7.35) of Ref. [63].

We highlight that we explicitly checked that the results of canonical transformation detailed above can be equivalently derived from a scattering angle matching analogous to the one used for the 6PN-accurate local completion of Appendix E.

TABLE X. Resulting coefficients for $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{5.5\text{PN}}$ and $\delta A_{\text{nonlocal,h}}^{6\text{PN}}$. Here γ_E is Euler's constant

Coefficient	Expression
$a_{2,4}^{\text{nh},\sqrt{u}}$	$\frac{5994461\pi\nu}{75184200}$
$a_{3,3}^{\text{nh},\sqrt{u}}$	$-\frac{242219431\pi\nu}{1608106500}$
$a_{4,2}^{\text{nh},\sqrt{u}}$	$\frac{2995946714\pi\nu}{723647925}$
$a_{5,1}^{\text{nh},\sqrt{u}}$	$\frac{7276481179\pi\nu}{187960500}$
$a_{6,0}^{\text{nh},\sqrt{u}}$	$\frac{83295355783\pi\nu}{1378377000}$
$a_{1,6}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\nu \left(-\frac{143088}{175} + \frac{43337984 \ln 2}{21} + \frac{13183722 \ln 3}{175} - \frac{55468750 \ln 5}{63} \right)$
$a_{2,5}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\left(-\frac{313773279}{89600} + \frac{2111141083 \ln 2}{210} + \frac{7256176434639 \ln 3}{5734400} - \frac{9546479921875 \ln 5}{2064384} - \frac{96889010407 \ln 7}{294912} \right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{434813}{640} - \frac{5493667951 \ln 2}{630} - \frac{996202209267 \ln 3}{286720} + \frac{2342451171875 \ln 5}{516096} + \frac{96889010407 \ln 7}{73728} \right) \nu^2$
$a_{3,4}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\left(-\frac{179112164569}{30481920} + \frac{94783454497241 \ln 2}{3214890} + \frac{67243020174387 \ln 3}{8028160} - \frac{15571051587341875 \ln 5}{1170505728} - \frac{877215707820361 \ln 7}{214990848} \right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{153263413}{40320} - \frac{88831649433773 \ln 2}{1071630} - \frac{10703991524229 \ln 3}{286720} + \frac{31037329281015625 \ln 5}{877879296} + \frac{1910557705211407 \ln 7}{89579520} \right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{154862}{189} + \frac{57604236136064 \ln 2}{893025} + \frac{1163064811149 \ln 3}{39200} - \frac{73366198046875 \ln 5}{3429216} - \frac{7709596970957 \ln 7}{349920} \right) \nu^3$
$a_{4,3}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\left(-\frac{30492532967}{6096384} + \frac{11612\gamma_E}{315} + \frac{45246337124803 \ln 2}{918540} + \frac{153054539029089 \ln 3}{8028160} - \frac{2812054420105625 \ln 5}{130056192} - \frac{2243037691275955 \ln 7}{214990848} \right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{2988885587}{302400} + \frac{1751\gamma_E}{70} - \frac{42852920634415 \ln 2}{214326} - \frac{232856210028969 \ln 3}{2508800} + \frac{2551367966640625 \ln 5}{31352832} + \frac{1259330630494909 \ln 7}{22394880} \right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{92957869}{30240} + 37\gamma_E + \frac{164772199472387 \ln 2}{893025} + \frac{106829150283279 \ln 3}{1254400} - \frac{6635329272265625 \ln 5}{109734912} - \frac{714307308582007 \ln 7}{11197440} \right) \nu^3$
$a_{5,2}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\left(-\frac{1343296717549}{592704000} + \frac{492514\gamma_E}{6125} + \frac{4011985837440181 \ln 2}{89302500} + \frac{19587014970857253 \ln 3}{1003520000} - \frac{154259538621875 \ln 5}{7962624} - \frac{6631680016091291 \ln 7}{597196800} \right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{50618075581}{3528000} + \frac{331157\gamma_E}{1050} - \frac{613647346154779 \ln 2}{2976750} - \frac{305083228792563 \ln 3}{3136000} + \frac{501076363859375 \ln 5}{6096384} + \frac{5860271869361 \ln 7}{97200} \right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{1693354921}{352800} + \frac{3743\gamma_E}{15} + \frac{790301920439 \ln 2}{3969} + \frac{115626711539763 \ln 3}{1254400} - \frac{783616805078125 \ln 5}{12192768} - \frac{17370815437255 \ln 7}{248832} \right) \nu^3$
$a_{6,1}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\left(-\frac{109102461857}{666792000} - \frac{3119672\gamma_E}{165375} + \frac{4210267059801826 \ln 2}{200930625} + \frac{1197825049766241 \ln 3}{125440000} - \frac{1311429915923125 \ln 5}{146313216} - \frac{370461805777623 \ln 7}{671846400} \right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{619513589}{55125} + \frac{595496\gamma_E}{525} - \frac{1337797760209928 \ln 2}{13395375} - \frac{149608543096413 \ln 3}{3136000} + \frac{2159121776609375 \ln 5}{54867456} + \frac{837731963172853 \ln 7}{27993600} \right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{1474770263}{396900} + \frac{7928\gamma_E}{15} + \frac{86858343124312 \ln 2}{893025} + \frac{7071646351059 \ln 3}{156800} - \frac{422975045703125 \ln 5}{13716864} - \frac{48430663916299 \ln 7}{1399680} \right) \nu^3$
$a_{7,0}^{\text{nh},c}$	$\left(\frac{63540120697}{166698000} - \frac{784991\gamma_E}{99225} + \frac{157306259361746 \ln 2}{40186125} + \frac{11443865567679 \ln 3}{6272000} - \frac{61083824984375 \ln 5}{36578304} - \frac{35593777993529 \ln 7}{33592320} \right) \nu$ $+ \left(-\frac{3809736181}{1058400} + \frac{375754\gamma_E}{315} - \frac{50267711665576 \ln 2}{2679075} - \frac{22712673038121 \ln 3}{2508800} + \frac{1608509992109375 \ln 5}{219469824} + \frac{128297312282489 \ln 7}{22394880} \right) \nu^2$ $+ \left(-\frac{189399347}{158760} + 348\gamma_E + \frac{3241904436308 \ln 2}{178605} + \frac{527833234161 \ln 3}{62720} - \frac{154715013671875 \ln 5}{27433728} - \frac{3667941108265 \ln 7}{559872} \right) \nu^3$
$a_{4,3}^{\text{nh},\ln}$	$\frac{5806\nu}{315} + \frac{1751\nu^2}{140} + \frac{37\nu^3}{2}$
$a_{5,2}^{\text{nh},\ln}$	$\frac{246257\nu}{6125} + \frac{331157\nu^2}{2100} + \frac{3743\nu^3}{30}$
$a_{6,1}^{\text{nh},\ln}$	$-\frac{1559836\nu}{165375} + \frac{297748\nu^2}{525} + \frac{3964\nu^3}{15}$
$a_{7,0}^{\text{nh},\ln}$	$-\frac{784991\nu}{198450} + \frac{187877\nu^2}{315} + 174\nu^3$

-
- [1] A. Buonanno and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 084006 (1999), arXiv:gr-qc/9811091.
- [2] A. Buonanno and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 064015 (2000), arXiv:gr-qc/0001013.
- [3] T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 124013 (2001), arXiv:gr-qc/0103018.
- [4] L. Blanchet, Living Rev. Relativity **17**, 2 (2014), arXiv:1310.1528 [gr-qc].
- [5] T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D94**, 104015 (2016), arXiv:1609.00354 [gr-qc].
- [6] T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D97**, 044038 (2018), arXiv:1710.10599 [gr-qc].
- [7] C. Cheung, I. Z. Rothstein, and M. P. Solon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 251101 (2018), arXiv:1808.02489 [hep-th].
- [8] Z. Bern, C. Cheung, R. Roiban, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon, and M. Zeng, JHEP **10**, 206 (2019), arXiv:1908.01493 [hep-th].
- [9] Z. Bern, C. Cheung, R. Roiban, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 201603 (2019), arXiv:1901.04424 [hep-th].
- [10] Z. Bern, J. Parra-Martinez, R. Roiban, M. S. Ruf, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 171601 (2021), arXiv:2101.07254 [hep-th].
- [11] Z. Bern, J. Parra-Martinez, R. Roiban, M. S. Ruf, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 161103 (2022), arXiv:2112.10750 [hep-th].
- [12] P. H. Damgaard, E. R. Hansen, L. Planté, and P. Vanhove, JHEP **09**, 183 (2023), arXiv:2307.04746 [hep-th].
- [13] Z. Bern, E. Herrmann, R. Roiban, M. S. Ruf, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov, and M. Zeng, JHEP **10**, 023 (2024), arXiv:2406.01554 [hep-th].
- [14] C. Dlapa, G. Kälin, Z. Liu, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 161104 (2022), arXiv:2112.11296 [hep-th].
- [15] G. U. Jakobsen, G. Mogull, J. Plefka, B. Sauer, and Y. Xu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 151401 (2023), arXiv:2306.01714 [hep-th].
- [16] C. Dlapa, G. Kälin, Z. Liu, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 221401 (2024), arXiv:2403.04853 [hep-th].
- [17] M. Driesse, G. U. Jakobsen, G. Mogull, J. Plefka, B. Sauer, and J. Usovitsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 241402 (2024), arXiv:2403.07781 [hep-th].
- [18] D. Bini and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D98**, 044036 (2018), arXiv:1805.10809 [gr-qc].
- [19] T. Damour, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 024060 (2020), arXiv:1912.02139 [gr-qc].
- [20] A. Antonelli, A. Buonanno, J. Steinhoff, M. van de Meent, and J. Vines, Phys. Rev. **D99**, 104004 (2019), arXiv:1901.07102 [gr-qc].
- [21] P. H. Damgaard and P. Vanhove, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 104029 (2021), arXiv:2108.11248 [hep-th].
- [22] M. Khalil, A. Buonanno, J. Steinhoff, and J. Vines, Phys. Rev. D **106**, 024042 (2022), arXiv:2204.05047 [gr-qc].
- [23] T. Damour and P. Retegno, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 064051 (2023), arXiv:2211.01399 [gr-qc].
- [24] P. Retegno, G. Pratten, L. M. Thomas, P. Schmidt, and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 124016 (2023), arXiv:2307.06999 [gr-qc].
- [25] A. Ceresole, T. Damour, A. Nagar, and P. Retegno, Class. Quant. Grav. **42**, 025004 (2025), arXiv:2312.01478 [gr-qc].
- [26] A. Buonanno, G. U. Jakobsen, and G. Mogull, Phys. Rev. D **110**, 044038 (2024), arXiv:2402.12342 [gr-qc].
- [27] A. Buonanno, G. Mogull, R. Patil, and L. Pompili, Phys. Rev. Lett. **133**, 211402 (2024), arXiv:2405.19181 [gr-qc].
- [28] A. Cristofoli, N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, P. H. Damgaard, and P. Vanhove, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 084040 (2019), arXiv:1906.01579 [hep-th].
- [29] G. Kälin and R. A. Porto, JHEP **01**, 072 (2020), arXiv:1910.03008 [hep-th].
- [30] G. Kälin and R. A. Porto, JHEP **02**, 120 (2020), arXiv:1911.09130 [hep-th].
- [31] J. Lagrange, *Mécanique analytique*, Mécanique analytique No. v. 1 (Ve Courcier, 1811).
- [32] D. Bini, T. Damour, and A. Geralico, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 024061 (2020), arXiv:2004.05407 [gr-qc].
- [33] T. Damour, P. Jaranowski, and G. Schaefer, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 084011 (2000), arXiv:gr-qc/0005034 [gr-qc].
- [34] T. Damour, P. Jaranowski, and G. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 084024 (2015), arXiv:1502.07245 [gr-qc].
- [35] D. Amati, M. Ciafaloni, and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. B **347**, 550 (1990).
- [36] E. Barausse and A. Buonanno, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 084024 (2010), arXiv:0912.3517 [gr-qc].
- [37] T. Damour and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 044018 (2014), arXiv:1406.6913 [gr-qc].
- [38] G. U. Jakobsen and G. Mogull, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 141102 (2022), arXiv:2201.07778 [hep-th].
- [39] G. U. Jakobsen, G. Mogull, J. Plefka, and B. Sauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 241402 (2023), arXiv:2308.11514 [hep-th].
- [40] K. Just, Zeitschrift für Naturforschung A **14** (1959), <https://doi.org/10.1515/zna-1959-0810>.
- [41] R. Coquereaux and G. Esposito-Farese, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Theor. **52**, 113 (1990).
- [42] A. V. Manohar, A. K. Ridgway, and C.-H. Shen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 121601 (2022), arXiv:2203.04283 [hep-th].
- [43] C. Dlapa, G. Kälin, Z. Liu, J. Neef, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 101401 (2023), arXiv:2210.05541 [hep-th].
- [44] D. Bini, T. Damour, and A. Geralico, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 024012 (2023), arXiv:2210.07165 [gr-qc].
- [45] J. Vines, Class. Quant. Grav. **35**, 084002 (2018), arXiv:1709.06016 [gr-qc].
- [46] J. Vines, J. Steinhoff, and A. Buonanno, Phys. Rev. D **99**, 064054 (2019), arXiv:1812.00956 [gr-qc].
- [47] A. Guevara, A. Ochirov, and J. Vines, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 104024 (2019), arXiv:1906.10071 [hep-th].
- [48] D. Kosmopoulos and A. Luna, JHEP **07**, 037 (2021), arXiv:2102.10137 [hep-th].
- [49] W.-M. Chen, M.-Z. Chung, Y.-t. Huang, and J.-W. Kim, JHEP **08**, 148 (2022), arXiv:2111.13639 [hep-th].
- [50] R. Aoude, K. Haddad, and A. Helset, Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, 141102 (2022), arXiv:2205.02809 [hep-th].
- [51] Z. Bern, A. Luna, R. Roiban, C.-H. Shen, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 065014 (2021), arXiv:2005.03071 [hep-th].
- [52] Z. Bern, D. Kosmopoulos, A. Luna, R. Roiban, and F. Teng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 201402 (2023), arXiv:2203.06202 [hep-th].
- [53] F. Febres Cordero, M. Kraus, G. Lin, M. S. Ruf, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **130**, 021601 (2023),

- arXiv:2205.07357 [hep-th].
- [54] D. Bini and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D96**, 104038 (2017), arXiv:1709.00590 [gr-qc].
- [55] L. Blanchet and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 1410 (1988).
- [56] S. Foffa and R. Sturani, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 044056 (2013), arXiv:1111.5488 [gr-qc].
- [57] T. Damour, P. Jaranowski, and G. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 064058 (2014), arXiv:1401.4548 [gr-qc].
- [58] C. R. Galley, A. K. Leibovich, R. A. Porto, and A. Ross, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 124010 (2016), arXiv:1511.07379 [gr-qc].
- [59] L. Bernard, L. Blanchet, A. Bohé, G. Faye, and S. Marsat, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 104043 (2017), arXiv:1706.08480 [gr-qc].
- [60] S. Foffa, R. A. Porto, I. Rothstein, and R. Sturani, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 024048 (2019), arXiv:1903.05118 [gr-qc].
- [61] D. Bini, T. Damour, and A. Geralico, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 231104 (2019), arXiv:1909.02375 [gr-qc].
- [62] D. Bini, T. Damour, and A. Geralico, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 024062 (2020), arXiv:2003.11891 [gr-qc].
- [63] D. Bini, T. Damour, and A. Geralico, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 084047 (2020), arXiv:2007.11239 [gr-qc].
- [64] D. Bini and T. Damour, Phys. Rev. D **110**, 064005 (2024), arXiv:2406.04878 [gr-qc].
- [65] A. Antonelli, C. Kavanagh, M. Khalil, J. Steinhoff, and J. Vines, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 011103 (2020), arXiv:2003.11391 [gr-qc].
- [66] M. Levi, A. J. McLeod, and M. Von Hippel, JHEP **07**, 115 (2021), arXiv:2003.02827 [hep-th].
- [67] A. Placidi, P. Rettegno, and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 084065 (2024), arXiv:2401.12290 [gr-qc].
- [68] M. Khalil, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 124015 (2021), arXiv:2110.12813 [gr-qc].
- [69] T. Damour and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 024043 (2008), arXiv:0711.2628 [gr-qc].
- [70] T. Damour, A. Nagar, and S. Bernuzzi, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 084035 (2013), arXiv:1212.4357 [gr-qc].
- [71] A. Nagar and P. Rettegno, Phys. Rev. **D99**, 021501 (2019), arXiv:1805.03891 [gr-qc].
- [72] L. Blanchet and T. Damour, Phil. Trans. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **320**, 379 (1986).
- [73] L. Blanchet, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **409**, 383 (1987).
- [74] L. Blanchet and T. Damour, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Theor. **50**, 377 (1989).
- [75] T. Damour and B. R. Iyer, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3259 (1991).
- [76] L. Blanchet, G. Faye, Q. Henry, F. Larrouturou, and D. Trestini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 121402 (2023), arXiv:2304.11185 [gr-qc].
- [77] L. Blanchet, G. Faye, Q. Henry, F. Larrouturou, and D. Trestini, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 064041 (2023), arXiv:2304.11186 [gr-qc].
- [78] A. Nagar, D. Chiaramello, R. Gamba, S. Albanesi, S. Bernuzzi, V. Fantini, M. Panzeri, and P. Rettegno, (2024), arXiv:2407.04762 [gr-qc].
- [79] T. Damour, B. R. Iyer, and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 064004 (2009), arXiv:0811.2069 [gr-qc].
- [80] A. Nagar, G. Pratten, G. Riemenschneider, and R. Gamba, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 024041 (2020), arXiv:1904.09550 [gr-qc].
- [81] T. Damour and A. Gopakumar, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 124006 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0602117.
- [82] T. Damour and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 064028 (2007), arXiv:0705.2519 [gr-qc].
- [83] E. Harms, S. Bernuzzi, A. Nagar, and A. Zenginoglu, Class.Quant.Grav. **31**, 245004 (2014), arXiv:1406.5983 [gr-qc].
- [84] T. Damour, A. Nagar, E. N. Dorband, D. Pollney, and L. Rezzolla, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 084017 (2008), arXiv:0712.3003 [gr-qc].
- [85] T. Damour and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 081503 (2009), arXiv:0902.0136 [gr-qc].
- [86] C. O. Lousto and J. Healy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 191102 (2020), arXiv:2006.04818 [gr-qc].
- [87] A. Nagar, E. Harms, S. Bernuzzi, and A. Zenginoglu, Phys. Rev. **D90**, 124086 (2014), arXiv:1407.5033 [gr-qc].
- [88] A. Nagar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D98**, 104052 (2018), arXiv:1806.01772 [gr-qc].
- [89] A. Nagar and P. Rettegno, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 104004 (2021), arXiv:2108.02043 [gr-qc].
- [90] L. Pompili *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 124035 (2023), arXiv:2303.18039 [gr-qc].
- [91] “Updated Advanced LIGO sensitivity design curve,” <https://dcc.ligo.org/LIGO-T1800044/public>.
- [92] L. Baiotti, T. Damour, B. Giacomazzo, A. Nagar, and L. Rezzolla, Phys. Rev. **D84**, 024017 (2011), arXiv:1103.3874 [gr-qc].
- [93] S. Albanesi, S. Bernuzzi, T. Damour, A. Nagar, and A. Placidi, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 084037 (2023), arXiv:2305.19336 [gr-qc].
- [94] J. Yoo, V. Varma, M. Giesler, M. A. Scheel, C.-J. Haster, H. P. Pfeiffer, L. E. Kidder, and M. Boyle, Phys. Rev. D **106**, 044001 (2022), arXiv:2203.10109 [gr-qc].
- [95] A. Nagar, J. Healy, C. O. Lousto, S. Bernuzzi, and A. Albertini, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 124061 (2022), arXiv:2202.05643 [gr-qc].
- [96] A. Nagar, G. Riemenschneider, G. Pratten, P. Rettegno, and F. Messina, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 024077 (2020), arXiv:2001.09082 [gr-qc].
- [97] G. Riemenschneider, P. Rettegno, M. Breschi, A. Albertini, R. Gamba, S. Bernuzzi, and A. Nagar, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 104045 (2021), arXiv:2104.07533 [gr-qc].
- [98] A. Nagar, P. Rettegno, R. Gamba, S. Albanesi, A. Albertini, and S. Bernuzzi, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 124018 (2023), arXiv:2304.09662 [gr-qc].