

Search for primordial black holes from gravitational wave populations using deep learning

Hai-Long Huang^{1,2*}, Jun-Qian Jiang^{2†}, Jibin He^{3‡},

Yu-Tong Wang^{4,1,2§}, and Yun-Song Piao^{1,2,4,5¶}

¹ *School of Fundamental Physics and Mathematical Sciences,
Hangzhou Institute for Advanced Study, UCAS, Hangzhou 310024, China*

² *School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese
Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

³ *Department of Physics and Chongqing Key Laboratory for Strongly Coupled Physics,
Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, P. R. China*

⁴ *International Center for Theoretical Physics Asia-Pacific, Beijing/Hangzhou, China and*

⁵ *Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
P.O. Box 2735, Beijing 100190, China*

Abstract

Gravitational waves (GWs) signals detected by the LIGO/Virgo/KAGRA collaboration might be sourced (partly) by the merges of primordial black holes (PBHs). The conventional hierarchical Bayesian inference methods can allow us to study population properties of GW events to search for the hints for PBHs. However, hierarchical Bayesian analysis require an analytic population model, and becomes increasingly computationally expensive as the number of sources grows. In this paper, we present a novel population analysis method based on deep learning, which enables the direct and efficient estimation of PBH population hyperparameters, such as the PBH fraction in dark matter, f_{PBH} . Our approach leverages neural posterior estimation combined with conditional normalizing flows and two embedding networks. Our results demonstrate that inference can be performed within seconds, highlighting the promise of deep learning as a powerful tool for population inference with an increasing number of GW signals for next-generation detectors.

* huanghailong18@mailsucas.ac.cn

† jiangjunqian21@mailsucas.ac.cn

‡ 20242701016@stu.cqu.edu.cn

§ Corresponding author: wangyutong@ucas.ac.cn

¶ Corresponding author: yspiao@ucas.ac.cn

Contents

I. Introduction	2
II. Modelling BH binary populations	4
A. Primordial black hole population	4
B. Astrophysical black hole population	5
III. Hierarchical Bayesian population methods	6
IV. Deep learning methods	10
A. Neural network architecture	10
B. Training the networks	13
C. Generating the training set	14
D. Split sub-populations	15
V. Results	16
VI. Conclusions	20
Acknowledgments	21
References	22

I. INTRODUCTION

First proposed by Refs.[1–3], primordial black holes (PBHs) have been a subject of extensive research due to their potential implications for cosmological evolution [4–9], and the origin of supermassive black holes in galactic nuclei [10, 11]¹. See also e.g. Refs. [16–37] for further discussions. However, definitive evidence for the existence of PBHs remains elusive. Gravitational wave (GW) signals from PBH binaries could offer a direct probe of potential PBH populations. These populations are expected to exhibit distinct characteristics

¹ Recent high-redshift JWST observations seem to imply that some of those supermassive black holes might be primordial, e.g.[12, 13], in particular the GHZ9 and UHZ1 (at $z > 10$) observed by the JWST, as well as Little Red Dots (at $z > 4$), can be explained naturally with supermassive primordial black holes [14, 15]

compared to astrophysical black hole (ABH) populations, including differences in mass distribution [38, 39], the redshift dependence of the merger rate [40, 41], spin properties [42, 43], and even spatial distribution [33, 44, 45]. Fully utilizing the potential of GW observations is crucial for enhancing the theoretical understanding of both populations (see [46] for recent review).

The conventional hierarchical Bayesian inference methods usually are adopted when one used GW data to search for the evidence for PBHs, which allow us to go beyond individual events to study population properties [38, 39, 47]. However, hierarchical Bayesian analysis require an analytic population model, and becomes increasingly computationally expensive as the number of sources in the analysis grows, due both to the cost of obtaining posterior samples for each event and the cost of combining the events to derive the population posterior. Given the large number of events expected from upcoming detector networks, there is a growing need for new methods to efficiently measure PBH population hyperparameters from GW events.

Thanks to the rapid advancements in machine learning, there has been significant progress in the use and development of simulation-based inference (SBI) approaches for data analysis [48–50]. These SBI methods differ in how they sample from the likelihood to construct posterior densities or posterior samples, and are classified into three categories: neural posterior estimation (NPE) [51, 52], neural likelihood estimation (NLE) [53–55], and neural ratio estimation (NRE) [56–61]. They have been widely used in cosmology and astrophysics, including CMB analysis [62], strong lensing image analysis [63], point source searches [64], field-level cosmology [65], and others [66–69].

In this work, we present a novel population analysis method based on NPE that enables the direct and efficient estimation of PBH population hyperparameters. We model the population posterior distribution using a conditional normalizing flow network [70–75]. There have been several studies applying deep learning techniques to aspects of the population inference problem [76–81], however, we are the first to apply this method to search for PBHs from GW populations without the need for MCMC analysis. In addition to the significant computational speed-up, our approach avoids the explicit construction of complex likelihood functions, only a realistic forward simulator to be provided. Moreover, it provides an advantage in addressing potential biases that may arise in the intermediate steps—biases that are challenging to account for in conventional methods or when directly modeling the

population likelihood. For example, this includes the potential variation in waveforms used for generating single-event posterior samples [81].

The structure of this paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we introduce the models used for both the PBH and ABH binary populations, including their respective mass functions and merger rates. Section III provides a review of the standard hierarchical Bayesian inference method, which serves as a baseline for comparison. In Section IV, we describe the deep learning methodology developed in this work in detail. Our main results are presented in Section V. Finally, we conclude with a summary and discussion of the broader implications in Section VI.

II. MODELLING BH BINARY POPULATIONS

A. Primordial black hole population

PBHs can form binaries through several formation channels both in the early Universe when two PBHs are produced sufficiently close to each other [82–84], and in the late Universe by capture in clusters [82, 85, 86], as discussed in the recent review by [41]. In this study, we focus on the formation channel of PBH binaries in the early Universe, which is known to make a dominant contribution to the PBH merger rate [41, 87, 88]. In this case, the merger rate density per unit volume at cosmic time t for PBHs is [89, 90]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dR_{\text{PBH}}}{dm_i dm_j} &\approx \frac{1.99 \times 10^6}{\text{Gpc}^3 \text{yr}} f^{1.46} \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_{\text{eq}}^2}{f^2}\right)^{-0.27} \left(\frac{m_i}{M_\odot}\right)^{-0.92} \left(\frac{m_j}{M_\odot}\right)^{-0.92} \\ &\times \left(\frac{m_i + m_j}{M_\odot}\right)^{0.97} \left(\frac{t}{t_0}\right)^{-0.92} \psi(m_i) \psi(m_j), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $f \approx 0.85 f_{\text{PBH}}$ is the total abundance of PBHs in nonrelativistic matter, t_0 is the present time and σ_{eq}^2 is the variance of density perturbations of the rest of dark matter at z_{eq} . We will focus only on PBHs in the stellar mass range, thus the effect of cosmic expansion on the comoving distance of PBH pairs is negligible [89]. In addition, we assume that PBHs are initially randomly distributed according to a spatial Poisson distribution. Generalizing to the case of initial clustering is straightforward [44, 91–93].

The PBH mass function in (1) is defined by $\psi(m) \equiv \frac{m}{\rho_{\text{PBH}}} \frac{dn_{\text{PBH}}}{dm}$ normalized as $\int \psi(m) dm = 1$. As an example, we consider a mass function where PBHs are sourced

by supercritical bubbles that nucleated during slow-roll inflation [12, 44]

$$\psi_{\text{bubble}}(m|M_c, \sigma) = e^{-\sigma^2/8} \sqrt{\frac{M_c}{2\pi\sigma^2 m^3}} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2(m/M_c)}{2\sigma^2}\right). \quad (2)$$

As mentioned in the introduction, we use the deep learning tool `dingo`² [94] to analyze the strain data and generate single-event posterior samples for the subsequent population analysis.

Since the current design of `dingo` does not guarantee that faithfully it can be applied to all parameter ranges, especially beyond those explored in its training set. we conservatively consider only the events with (detector rest-frame) mass range $m_1, m_2 \in [10, 100]M_\odot$ and luminosity distance $d_L \in [100, 1000]$ Mpc.³ This same selection is also made for the case of the ABH model below. We anticipate that future fast single-event strain methods will allow us to expand their range.

B. Astrophysical black hole population

To describe the ABH population, one can use, for example, the widely used phenomenological POWER-LAW+PEAK model [105–108] to model the differential merger rate of ABHs $dR_{\text{ABH}}/dm_i dm_j$

$$\frac{dR_{\text{ABH}}}{dm_1 dm_2} = R_{\text{ABH}}^0 (1+z)^\kappa p_{\text{ABH}}^{m_1}(m_1) p_{\text{ABH}}^{m_2}(m_2|m_1), \quad (3)$$

where R_{ABH}^0 is the local merger rate at redshift $z = 0$, and $\kappa \simeq 2.9$ describes the merger rate evolution with redshift [107, 108]. The probability density function of the primary mass is modeled as a combination of a power law and a Gaussian peak

$$p_{\text{ABH}}^{m_1}(m_1) = [(1-\lambda)P_{\text{ABH}}(m_1) + \lambda G_{\text{ABH}}(m_1)] S(m_1|\delta_m, m_{\min}), \quad (4)$$

where

$$P_{\text{ABH}}(m_1|\alpha, m_{\min}, m_{\max}) \propto \Theta(m - m_{\min})\Theta(m_{\max} - m)m_1^{-\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

² We modified `dingo` to enable faster parallel inference: <https://github.com/JiangJQ2000/dingo>.

³ In the following analysis, we focus only on the distribution of redshift and mass, neglecting the spin distribution. Therefore, the parameters defining each single GW event are the masses of the PBH binary components, m_1 and m_2 , and the redshift z (or equivalently, the luminosity distance as we fixed our cosmology to Planck 2018 [95]). Here, we do not consider the effect of the Hubble tension on H_0 and relevant results (e.g. [96–104]), which may be actually negligible.

$$G_{\text{ABH}}(m_1|\mu_G, \sigma_G, m_{\text{min}}, m_{\text{max}}) \propto \Theta(m - m_{\text{min}})\Theta(m_{\text{max}} - m) \exp\left(-\frac{(m_1 - \mu_G)^2}{2\sigma_G^2}\right) \quad (6)$$

are restricted to masses between m_{min} and m_{max} and normalized. The term $S(m_1|m_{\text{min}}, \delta_m)$ is a smoothing function, which rises from 0 to 1 over the interval $(m_{\text{min}}, m_{\text{min}} + \delta_m)$,

$$S(m | m_{\text{min}}, \delta_m) = \begin{cases} 0, & m < m_{\text{min}} \\ [f(m - m_{\text{min}}, \delta_m) + 1]^{-1}, & m_{\text{min}} \leq m < m_{\text{min}} + \delta_m \\ 1, & m \geq m_{\text{min}} + \delta_m \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

with

$$f(m', \delta_m) = \exp\left(\frac{\delta_m}{m'} + \frac{\delta_m}{m' - \delta_m}\right). \quad (8)$$

The distribution of the secondary mass is modelled as a power law,

$$p_{\text{ABH}}^{m_2}(m_2|m_1, \beta, m_{\text{min}}) \propto \left(\frac{m_2}{m_1}\right)^\beta. \quad (9)$$

where the normalization ensures that the secondary mass is bounded by $m_{\text{min}} \leq m_2 \leq m_1$.

In the later analysis, we shall consider two hypotheses: (1) All black hole binaries (BHBs) are of primordial origin; (2) All BHBs are of astrophysical origin. In the latter hypothesis, the merger rate is given by (3) while in the former hypothesis, which we shall refer to as the PBH model, the merger rate is (1) with mass distribution given by (2). In a more realistic scenario, BHBs could be either astrophysical or primordial, with the total merger rate given by $dR/dm_1dm_2 = dR_{\text{PBH}}/dm_1dm_2 + dR_{\text{ABH}}/dm_1dm_2$. We leave the exploration of this combined scenario, as well as other potential PBH and ABH models (e.g. [109–114]), for future work. The hyperparameters of our PBH/ABH model, along with the parameters describing each BHB, are listed in Table. I.

III. HIERARCHICAL BAYESIAN POPULATION METHODS

The classical approach will function as our reference point against which we will compare the outcomes with the deep learning methods. Below, we refer to the classical method as HBA and to the deep learning model as DL. In this section, we introduce the HBA methods, following the approach outlined in [38].

According to the Bayes' theorem, the population posterior distribution

$$p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d}) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda)p(\Lambda)}{\mathcal{Z}_\Lambda}, \quad (10)$$

Event Parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$	
m_1	Source-frame primary mass
m_2	Source-frame secondary mass
z	Merger redshift
Hyperparameters Λ	
M_c	The characteristic mass
σ	The width of the distribution
f_{PBH}	The fraction of dark matter in PBHs
R_{ABH}^0	Integrated merger rate of ABHs at $z = 0$
λ	Fraction of the Gaussian component in the primary mass distribution
m_{min}	Minimum mass of the power law component in the primary mass distribution
m_{max}	Maximum mass of the power law component in the primary mass distribution
α	Inverse of the slope of the primary mass distribution for the power law component
μ_G	Mean of the Gaussian component
σ_G	Width of the Gaussian component
δ_m	Range of mass tapering on the lower end of the mass distribution
β	Spectral index for the power law of the mass ratio distribution

TABLE I: Event parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ of the binary and hyperparameters Λ of the PBH/ABH model used in this work. Detector-frame masses m_d and source-frame masses m_s are related as $m_d = (1+z)m_s$. We do not consider the mass growth of PBHs caused by accretion, nor the spin distribution.

where we define the date measured from observed GW populations as \mathbf{d} . Hyper-prior $p(\Lambda)$ denotes the prior knowledge of Λ (listed in Tab. II) and

$$\mathcal{Z}_\Lambda = \int \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda)p(\Lambda)d\Lambda \quad (11)$$

is the hyper-evidence, the probability of observing data \mathbf{d} . The hyper-likelihood is [115–118]

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda) \propto e^{-N(\Lambda)} \prod_{i=1}^{N_{\text{obs}}} \int T_{\text{obs}} \mathcal{L}(d_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda)d\boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (12)$$

Here, $\mathcal{L}(d_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the single event likelihood, given some parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, and $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda)$ is called the hyperprior and governs the distribution of mass, spin, redshift and merger rate (the

effect of the spin will be ignored in this work), given by

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda) = \frac{1}{1+z} \frac{dV_c}{dz} \frac{dR}{dm_1 dm_2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda), \quad (13)$$

where dV_c/dz represents the differential comoving volume, and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \equiv \{m_1, m_2, z\}$ constitutes the parameters that defining the GW event. $N(\Lambda) = T_{\text{obs}}\xi(\Lambda)$ represents the Poisson probability of observing the expected number of detections over the observation timespan T_{obs} , with the selection bias $\xi(\Lambda)$ accounting for the selection biases introduced by the detector's sensitivity

$$\xi(\Lambda) = \int p_{\text{det}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda)d\boldsymbol{\theta}, \quad (14)$$

where $p_{\text{det}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ denotes the detection probability, and depends primarily on the masses and redshift of the system [116]. The estimation of $\xi(\Lambda)$ is performed using simulated injections samples, where a Monte Carlo integral over N_{inj} injections samples is used to approximate it as

$$\xi(\Lambda) \approx \frac{1}{N_{\text{inj}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{det}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j|\Lambda)}{\pi_{\text{inj}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)} \equiv \frac{1}{N_{\text{inj}}} \sum_{j=1}^{N_{\text{det}}} s_j, \quad (15)$$

where $\pi_{\text{inj}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)$ is the prior probability of the j th event (the probability density function from which the injections are drawn), N_{det} denoting the count of successfully detected injections samples.

On the other hand, the single event likelihood is usually not available. Instead, posterior samples are provided. The intergral appearing in (12) for each event can be approximated using Monte-Carlo integration as [116]

$$\int \mathcal{L}(d_i|\boldsymbol{\theta})\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda)d\boldsymbol{\theta} \approx \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}|\Lambda)}{\pi_{\varnothing}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}|\Lambda)} \equiv \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \omega_{ij}, \quad (16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}$ denotes the intrinsic parameters of the j th sample (n_i posterior samples totally) of the i th event, and $\pi_{\varnothing}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}|\Lambda)$ is the prior used for the initial parameter estimation. The sum above is taken over the posterior samples $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij} \sim p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}|d_i)$.

Finally, the log-likelihood is evaluated as [119]

$$\ln \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda) \approx -\frac{T_{\text{obs}}}{N_{\text{inj}}} \sum_j^{N_{\text{det}}} s_j + \sum_i^{N_{\text{obs}}} \ln \left(\frac{T_{\text{obs}}}{n_i} \sum_j^{n_i} \omega_{ij} \right). \quad (17)$$

The posterior of the hyperparameters Λ given the observed dataset \mathbf{d} is obtained by `emcee` [120].

Parameter	Unit	Prior	True value	Posterior(HBA)	Posterior(DL)
M_c	M_\odot	U(20, 70)	40.97	$40.42_{-0.80}^{+0.87}$	$40.53_{-0.98}^{+0.98}$
$\log \sigma$	-	U(-1, 0)	-0.70	$-0.74_{-0.05}^{+0.05}$	$-0.72_{-0.07}^{+0.07}$
$\log f_{\text{PBH}}$	-	U(-5, 0)	-3.01	$-3.08_{-0.03}^{+0.03}$	$-3.02_{-0.01}^{+0.01}$
$\log R_{\text{ABH}}^0$	$\text{Gpc}^{-3}\text{yr}^{-1}$	U(-2, 3)	-1.13	$0.065_{-0.62}^{+1.85}$	$-2.07_{-0.51}^{+0.53}$
$\log \lambda$	-	U(-6, 0)	-5.31	$-3.76_{-2.02}^{+3.76}$	$-3.97_{-1.38}^{+1.88}$
m_{min}	M_\odot	U(10, 20)	10.96	$10.53_{-0.40}^{+0.80}$	$10.97_{-0.61}^{+1.43}$
m_{max}	M_\odot	U(40, 100)	86.69	$69.32_{-20.97}^{+20.52}$	$69.53_{-21.71}^{+23.01}$
α	-	U(-4, 12)	10.94	$11.82_{-0.67}^{+0.14}$	$11.50_{-0.94}^{+0.81}$
μ_G	M_\odot	U(20, 50)	26.29	$21.00_{-0.98}^{+12.38}$	$33.09_{-8.93}^{+11.24}$
σ_G	M_\odot	U(1, 10)	2.62	$1.57_{-0.56}^{+5.27}$	$3.98_{-2.54}^{+3.92}$
δ_m	M_\odot	U(0, 10)	3.39	$3.92_{-2.67}^{+2.99}$	$5.33_{-4.10}^{+3.20}$
β	-	U(-4, 12)	-1.99	$-3.87_{-0.09}^{+0.44}$	$2.52_{-4.87}^{+6.05}$

TABLE II: Prior and posterior credible intervals (84%) of both our PBH model and the POWER LAW+PEAK ABH model are shown. We simulate a detected population of 64 events, with posterior samples for each event obtained using `dingo`. These posterior samples, together with the observation time computed via Eq. (25), serve as the input to both the HBA and ML (deep learning) methods for hyperparameter inference.

Model selection is a common challenge in GW population analyses. To distinguish between competing models, such as PBH and ABH models, the Bayes factor is often used. The log-Bayes factor comparing two models is defined as

$$\ln \mathcal{B}_{\text{ABH}}^{\text{PBH}} = \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\text{PBH}} - \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\text{ABH}}, \quad (18)$$

where the Bayesian evidence (or marginal likelihoods) for a model \mathcal{Z}_Λ is computed as (11). The sign of log-Bayes tells us which model is preferred. When the absolute value of it is large, we say that one model is preferred over the other. In conventional approaches, the computation of Bayesian evidence requires resource-intensive techniques such as Markov Chain Monte Carlo (e.g., `emcee`) or nested sampling (e.g., `dynesty` [121]), both of which can become computationally expensive, particularly when dealing with high-dimensional parameter spaces or large datasets.

IV. DEEP LEARNING METHODS




FIG. 1: Schematic overview of the deep learning model which is composed of a normalizing flow and two embedding neural networks. Solid arrows represent input-output relations: red apply during training, blue ones when performing inference while black and orange ones are always present.

In this section, we describe how we apply the NPE method to directly estimate the posterior density, enabling fast and accurate hierarchical Bayesian inference for gravitational wave populations.

A. Neural network architecture

Our method uses a normalizing flow (NF) combined with two embedding neural networks for data compression to directly estimate population hyperparameters from a collection of individual source observations. The general structure of our pipeline is depicted in Fig. 1, showing the input/output relations between its building blocks.

The pipeline takes as input $n_{\text{event}} = 64$ events⁴, each described by whitened strain

⁴ Here, we fix the number of events in a single neural network (NN) analysis, since NNs typically require a fixed input size. To handle more events, we can divide them into sub-groups, as will be discussed later.

Model	PBH	ABH
Dimensions of hyperparameters of the physical model	3	9
Events per batch n_{event}	64	64
Posterior samples per event n_{post}	128	128
Dimensions embedding network 1	(512, 256, 256, 128, 128, 64)	(512, 256, 256, 256, 128, 128, 64)
Dimensions embedding network 2	(256, 256, 128, 128, 64)	(512, 512, 256, 256, 128)
Number of residual blocks in the NF	5	13
Number of hidden units in the NF	24	104
Training epochs	200	200
Initial learning rate	0.001	0.001
Batch size	256	256
Training population samples	5×10^3	1×10^4

TABLE III: Architecture of the embedding networks and the NF for PBH and ABH model.

time series and their observation time T_{obs} , and $n_{\text{event}} \times n_{\text{post}}$ outputs samples ($n_{\text{post}} = 128$ samples per event) from the posterior probability distribution of the component masses and luminosity distance generated from `dingo`⁵. We use posterior samples that have been standardized by subtracting their mean and dividing by their standard deviation for each variable, which helps accelerate model convergence. Embedding network 1 compresses each event (standardized posterior samples) into n_1 summary parameters. These $n_{\text{event}} \times n_1$ scalars are then further compressed by Embedding network 2 into n_2 scalars. Together with T_{obs} , they are fed into the flow model. The use of the two embedding networks significantly reduces the number of free parameters in the model, helping to mitigate overfitting. Specifically, the architecture of the embedding networks is composed of several fully connected layers, each followed by a ReLU activation function to introduce non-linearity.

⁵ However, even if the `dingo` algorithm is not a perfect approximation to the single event posterior, this does not invalidate our approach. By construction, the DL model learns the posterior distribution marginalized over the `dingo` uncertainty. While it is possible to correct for potential inaccuracies in `dingo` using importance sampling, this would significantly increase the computation time in the process of training our networks. In addition to the single event posterior samples, the method could be applied to any input data that summarizes the GW observations sufficiently well, e.g. time series data and spectrogram visualizations.

For PBH, embedding network 1 has 6 hidden layers with (512, 256, 256, 128, 128, 64) neural units for each hidden layer and embedding network 2 has 5 hidden layers with (256, 256, 128, 128, 64) neural units for each hidden layer. While for ABH model, which is a much more complex model, embedding network 1 has 7 hidden layers with (512, 256, 256, 256, 128, 128, 64) neural units for each hidden layer and embedding network 2 has 5 hidden layers with (512, 512, 256, 256, 128) neural units for each hidden layer. Furthermore, to prevent over-fitting in the case of ABH, we additionally added dropout layers with a probability of 0.4 between each layer of the embedding network 2. We summarize the details of the specific network in Tab. III.

The core of the model is the normalizing flow (NF), which is responsible for reconstructing the posterior distribution. A brief introduction to the NF is provided below.

NFs offer an effective method for representing complex probability distributions using neural networks. This approach facilitates efficient sampling and density estimation by expressing the distribution as a sequence of mappings, or "flows", $f : u \rightarrow \Lambda$, which maps from a simpler base distribution u (typically a standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$) to the parameter space, which in our case corresponds to the hyperparameters of the PBH/ABH model. When the mapping f depends on the observed data, denoted as $f_{\mathbf{d}}$, it describes a conditional probability distribution $q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})$. The probability density function is given by the change of variables formula:

$$q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d}) = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)^D(f_{\mathbf{d}}^{-1}(\Lambda))|\det f_{\mathbf{d}}^{-1}(\Lambda)|, \quad (19)$$

where D is the dimensionality of the parameter space. The term "normalizing flows" refers to the sequence of transformations that progressively "normalize" the distribution into the desired complex form.

It is essential to design and combine multiple transformations to model complex distribution. Each transformation should be both invertible (so that $f_{\mathbf{d}}^{-1}(\Lambda)$ can be evaluated for any Λ) and possess a tractable Jacobian determinant (allowing for efficient computation of $\det f_{\mathbf{d}}^{-1}(\Lambda)$). These properties enable efficient sampling and density estimation, as described in equation (19). Various normalizing flow architectures have been developed to satisfy these conditions, typically by composing several simpler transformations $f^{(j)}$, with each transformation being parameterized by the output of a neural network. To sample from the posterior, $\Lambda \sim q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})$, we first sample $u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)^D$ and then apply the flow in

the forward direction, as illustrated by the blue arrows in Fig. 1.

For each flow step, we employ a conditional coupling transformation [122]. In this setup, the first k components of the input are fixed, while the other undergo an elementwise transformation conditioned on all components and the data:

$$f_{\mathbf{d},i}^{(j)}(u) = \begin{cases} u_i & \text{if } i \leq k, \\ f_i^{(j)}(u_{1:D}, \mathbf{d}) & \text{if } k < i \leq D. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

When the elementwise functions $f_i^{(j)}$ are chosen to be monotonic, quadratic, rational spline functions, the transformation inherently satisfies the conditions required for a normalizing flow. The spline parameters for each $f_i^{(j)}$ are learned from the neural network’s output, which takes as input the concatenated data, $u_{1:D}$ and \mathbf{d} . To maintain the flexibility of the entire flow, we randomly permute the parameters between each transformation. Before the vectors obtained by embedding network 2 are input into this spline function, they will also pass through a residual network. The detail of the NF is summarized in Table III. We utilize the implementation of this structure provided by `normflows`⁶ [123].

B. Training the networks

Fitting a flow-based model $q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})$ to a target distribution $p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})$ can be done by minimizing some divergence or discrepancy between them. One of the most popular choices is the forward Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence that is mass-covering [124],

$$D_{\text{KL}}(p||q) = \int d\Lambda p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d}) \log \frac{p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})}{q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})}. \quad (21)$$

This measure indicates how much information is lost when using q as an approximation to p . The forward KL divergence is well-suited for situations in which we have samples from the target distribution (or the ability to generate them), but we cannot necessary evaluate the target density. By taking the expectation over data samples $\mathbf{d} \sim p(\mathbf{d})$, we can simplify

⁶ <https://github.com/VincentStimper/normalizing-flows>.

the expression, resulting in the loss function:

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \int d\mathbf{d} p(\mathbf{d}) \int d\Lambda p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d}) \log \left(\frac{p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})}{q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})} \right) \\
&= \int d\mathbf{d} p(\mathbf{d}) \int d\Lambda p(\Lambda|\mathbf{d}) [-\log q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})] + \text{constant}. \\
&= \int d\Lambda p(\Lambda) \int d\mathbf{d} p(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda) [-\log q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})] + \text{constant}. \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

On the third line, we applied Bayes’ theorem to rewrite the cross-entropy between the two distributions in terms of the likelihood, thereby avoiding dependence on the unknown true posterior. Finally, the loss function can be approximated on a mini-batch of samples, omitting constant terms that are independent of the flow’s parameters,

$$L \approx -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log q(\Lambda^{(i)}|\mathbf{d}^{(i)}), \tag{23}$$

where N samples are drawn ancestrally in a two-step process: sample from the prior, $\Lambda^{(i)} \sim p(\Lambda)$ and simulate data according to the population model, $\mathbf{d}^{(i)} \sim p(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda^{(i)})$. Minimizing the above Monte Carlo approximation of the loss function is equivalent to fitting the flow-based model to the samples by maximum likelihood estimation.

In order to avoid over-fitting, we add a L^2 regularization term to the loss function:

$$L = -\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \log q(\Lambda^{(i)}|\mathbf{d}^{(i)}) + \lambda \sum_{\text{NN}} w, \tag{24}$$

where $\sum_{\text{NN}} w$ is the sum of weights in the network and λ is chosen to be 1×10^{-5} for the PBH model. For the ABH model, we set $\lambda = 1 \times 10^{-3}$ as it is likely to be over-fitted for small training sets. We then take the gradient of L with respect to network parameters and minimize using the Adam optimizer [125]. The learning rate is started from 10^{-3} and is reduced during training using the Plateau scheduler.

In our work, the parameters of two embedding networks implicitly appear in the loss function and are thus optimized jointly with the parameters defining the flow transformation. The batch size is 256 for each model.

C. Generating the training set

For computational reasons, we precompute the samples Λ_i from the prior $p(\Lambda)$ and for each sample Λ , we draw 128 events, characterized by $\{m_1, m_2, d_L\}$ for each event, according

to the PBH/ABH population model (13) for each sample Λ . We simulate their observed strains (passing some specified selection threshold) and produce 256 posterior samples for each sample Λ with `dingo`. Specifically, we sample an event according to the population model $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda)$, generate its waveform, and compute its signal-to-noise ratio (SNR)⁷. This process continues until we obtain 256 events with $\text{SNR} > \text{SNR}_c = 12$. In this process, the total number of samples generated is $N(\Lambda)$. Therefore, the required observation time $T_{\text{obs},128}$ for the 128 events, which is crucial for inferring the average number density of BHBs in the PBH/ABH population model later, is given by

$$T_{\text{obs},128}(\Lambda) = \frac{N(\Lambda)}{\int \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\Lambda) d\boldsymbol{\theta}}. \quad (25)$$

By construction, the model contains the selection effect term $\xi(\Lambda)$. We thus avoid the computation of this term during inference.

During each training epoch, for each hyperparameter Λ , we randomly take $n_{\text{event}} = 64$ out of the 128 events we generated. Meanwhile, for each event, we also randomly take $n_{\text{post}} = 128$ out of the 256 samples we generated. These can help prevent overfitting. Combined with the observation time for $n_{\text{event}} = 64$, $T_{\text{obs}} = T_{\text{obs},128}/2$, Our training dataset contains $(n_{\text{event}} \times n_{\text{post}} \times 3) + 1$ scalars for each Λ . Due to the limitation of computational resources, we generated 4×10^3 population samples (i.e., Λ) for the PBH model and 1×10^4 population samples for the ABH model.

D. Split sub-populations

A major complication is that the number of events to be observed is typically not known a priori and will increase over time while NNs typically require a fixed input dimension. This issue can be addressed using the “divide-and-conquer” strategy proposed by Ref. [81], which splits the population into smaller sub-populations for independent analysis, and then merges them to obtain the final result by analyzing the complete catalog through importance sampling. Specifically, the GW population is divided into smaller sub-populations of events,

⁷ Here, we assume the O1 sensitivity curve [126] for the Laser Interferometer Gravitational Wave Observatory (LIGO) Hanford and LIGO Livingston detectors. As noted in [81], this is an approximation, as the application of this method to real data will require more intricate selection criteria, such as incorporating the false alarm rate. To fully account for selection effects, an injection campaign would be necessary, similar to the one conducted in the HBA methods discussed in Section III.

$\mathbf{d} = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m_b} d_{K_i}$, where each $d_{K_i} \equiv \{d_k\}_{k \in K_i}$ contains n_{event} events, such that $n_b \equiv N_{\text{obs}}/n_{\text{event}}$. Here, we assume the number of events in each subset, n_{event} , divides the total number of observed events N_{obs} . The deep learning model generates a population posterior, $q(\Lambda|d_{K_i})$, for each sub-population, which approximates $p(\Lambda|d_{K_i})$. The complete posterior is obtained by combining the individual posteriors of each sub-population (see Ref. [81] for further details). This approach also ensures that the computational cost of generating the training dataset remains manageable.




FIG. 2: Loss for the PBH (left) and ABH (right) model. Since the test loss (blue) and train loss (orange) do not differ much, we conclude that the model can generalize effectively to data that were not included in the optimization process.

V. RESULTS

The training time of the model was only 30 minutes on an NVIDIA V100S GPU. The associated training and test loss curves of model are plotted in Fig. 2. The train and test loss coincide, suggesting tht the model can process unseen input data and generate accurate hyperparameter posterior distributions.

As a test, we evaluate our model on data that is fully consistent with the training distribution. We draw posterior samples from 1024 simulated datasets and construct a P-P plot shown in Fig. 3. For each hyperparameter, we compute the percentile score of the true value within its marginalized posterior, and plot the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of these scores. For the true posteriors, the percentiles should be uniformly dis-

tributed, meaning the CDF should follow a diagonal line. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test p -values are reported in the legend, ranging from 35.2% to 92.6% (1.55% to 92.9%) for the PBH (ABH) model, with a combined p -value of 0.59 (0.14). This indicates that our model correctly reconstructs the population posterior.




FIG. 3: Probability-Probability plot for a set of 1024 posterior evaluations from the training set for the PBH (left) and ABH (right) model. Each cumulative distribution aligns well with the diagonal, with the spread mostly confined within the 2σ gray regions for almost the entire confidence level interval. The legend shows the p -values of the individual parameters, with a combined p -value of 0.59 (0.14) for PBH (ABH) model, implying that the network has correctly learned the desired posterior distribution.

We now proceed to our main result, which is a comparison of the deep learning method with traditional HBA methods. Fig. 4 and Fig is representative of the majority of cases, where we generally observe good agreement between the two methods (The one- and two-sigma intervals are summarized in Tab. II.). The deep learning approach allows us to generate an effective sample size of 2^{14} posterior samples in just 5 seconds of computation time. In contrast, it takes more than ten minutes to generate the same sample points using the conventional HBA method, even with parallel computation on multiple nodes. This highlights the significant computational advantage of the deep learning approach over traditional methods. Moreover, we find that the deep learning method outperforms the




FIG. 4: Results from deep learning method (DL without IS, red) compared to a conventional hierarchical Bayesian analysis (HBA, grey) for PBH model. The posterior is inferred from a GW population consisting of $n_{\text{event}} = 64$ events, with both analyses using `dingo` samples as input data. The deep learning method outperforms the traditional Bayesian approach in estimating $\log f_{\text{PBH}}$, as it produces a narrower distribution (i.e., smaller variance) while remaining centered around the injected value. In other cases, discrepancies with the conventional HBA results can be reduced by applying importance sampling with the classical likelihood. The reweighted posterior (DL with IS, blue) closely matches the classical result for M_c and $\log \sigma$.

traditional HBA approach in some cases. For example, it can be seen from Fig. 4 that the deep learning method is particularly effective in estimating $\log f_{\text{PBH}}$. We attribute this to the fact that f_{PBH} represents the average number density of PBHs, and this set of properties is almost perfectly captured by just one parameter: the observation time T_{obs} for n_{event} events.




FIG. 5: Results from deep learning method (DL, red) compared to a conventional hierarchical Bayesian analysis (HBA, blue) for ABH model.

This parameter is well-learned by the neural network, allowing it to efficiently capture the underlying distribution. As a result, the neural network exhibits exceptional performance in inferring f_{PBH} , leading to superior behavior in comparison to traditional methods. In other cases, the discrepancies between the deep learning results and the HBA approach can be addressed by reweighting the NPE samples to match the target HBA posterior using

importance sampling weights:

$$\omega(\Lambda) \propto \frac{\mathcal{L}(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})}{q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})}, \quad (26)$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})$ represents the classical hyper-likelihood given in (12). The reweighted posterior, shown in orange (DL with IS), aligns well with the classical result (HBA). While this process increases the computational cost of our method, it still requires significantly fewer likelihood evaluations than the standard HBA approach. Additionally, importance sampling serves as a validation step: if the posterior remains unchanged after reweighting, it indicates that the model has successfully learned the correct HBA distribution.

Lastly, we comment that although the product of a normalizing flow model is a direct approximation of the posterior, the evidence can be estimated as well through importance sampling, which is nothing but a Monte Carlo estimate [127]. More precisely

$$\mathcal{Z}_\Lambda = \int d\Lambda \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda)\pi(\Lambda) = \int d\Lambda \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda)\pi(\Lambda)}{q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})}q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d}), \quad (27)$$

By sampling the flow posterior $q(\Lambda|\mathbf{d})$, which is optimized by minimizing the mass covering forward KL divergence, we can get an estimator of the evidence from importance sampling weights:

$$\mathcal{Z}_\Lambda \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{d}|\Lambda_i)\pi(\Lambda_i)}{q(\Lambda_i|\mathbf{d})}. \quad (28)$$

The only disadvantage is that (28) relies on the analytical likelihood to be computed. As mentioned before, it still requires significantly fewer likelihood evaluations than the conventional approach. Besides, since they can be computed separately, the whole procedure can be parallelized in principle, reducing its computational cost.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

It can be expected that with next-generation GW detectors the volume of data would rapidly grow, thus deep learning techniques like the one presented here will become crucial for efficiently extracting cosmological information from these observations. Indeed, deep learning is already having a profound impact on GW data analysis, spanning applications such as GW waveform modeling [128–132], signal detection [133–138], parameter estimation [139–143], and so on. In this work, we have developed a novel deep learning method to efficiently infer the population properties (of PBHs) from GW population observations. Our

method can significantly reduce computational costs compared to conventional hierarchical Bayesian analysis while maintaining comparable accuracy.

One of the key advantages of our approach is its ability to bypass the need for explicit likelihood function construction, which is a major computational bottleneck in conventional MCMC-based HBA methods. The ability to rapidly estimate the PBH fraction in dark matter f_{PBH} and other key population parameters allows for real-time population analysis, which could be crucial for distinguishing between astrophysical and primordial origins of black hole mergers, making it particularly well-suited for analyzing large GW datasets expected from space-based detectors, such as LISA [144], Taiji, [145], Tianqin [146], and the next-generation ground-based detectors. This computational efficiency is crucial as the number of GW detections continues to grow, enabling real-time population analysis and rapid updates to cosmological constraints. Moreover, the flexibility of our method indicate that it can be extended to incorporate more complex models, including mixed PBH-ABH populations, accretion effects, and spin distributions. This adaptability is particularly important as the next-generation GW detectors may reveal more nuances of black hole populations, requiring more sophisticated models to capture their behavior.

There is still much room for improvement. The accuracy of our method depends on the quality and coverage of the training dataset, and systematic biases may arise if real GW events fall outside the parameter space explored during training. It is also noteworthy that while normalizing flows provide a powerful density estimation technique, further improvements in architecture design and regularization strategies could enhance robustness. How to extend our method to multi-messenger observations, incorporating real GW data, and further refining the underlying the models of PBHs is also an issue worth focusing on. In particular, the inclusion of spin distributions and more detailed accretion models could provide a more comprehensive understanding of PBH populations.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by National Key Research and Development Program of China, No. 2021YFC2203004, and NSFC, No.12075246. We acknowledge the use of high performance computing services provided by the International Centre for Theoretical Physics Asia-Pacific cluster, the Tianhe-2 supercomputer and Scientific Computing Center of Uni-

versity of Chinese Academy of Sciences. We would also like to thank the Dingo Collaboration team <https://github.com/dingo-gw/dingo>.

- [1] S. Hawking, *Gravitationally collapsed objects of very low mass*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **152** (1971) 75.
- [2] B. J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, *Black holes in the early Universe*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **168** (1974) 399–415.
- [3] Y. B. Zel’dovich and I. D. Novikov, *The Hypothesis of Cores Retarded during Expansion and the Hot Cosmological Model*, *Soviet Astron. AJ (Engl. Transl.)*, **10** (1967) 602.
- [4] B. Carr, F. Kuhnel, and M. Sandstad, *Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016), no. 8 083504, [[arXiv:1607.06077](https://arxiv.org/abs/1607.06077)].
- [5] G. F. Chapline, *Cosmological effects of primordial black holes*, *Nature* **253** (1975), no. 5489 251–252.
- [6] P. Meszaros, *Primeval black holes and galaxy formation*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **38** (1975) 5–13.
- [7] B. Carr, K. Kohri, Y. Sendouda, and J. Yokoyama, *Constraints on primordial black holes*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **84** (2021), no. 11 116902, [[arXiv:2002.12778](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.12778)].
- [8] M. Calzà, D. Pedrotti, and S. Vagnozzi, *Primordial regular black holes as all the dark matter. I. Time-radial-symmetric metrics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **111** (2025), no. 2 024009, [[arXiv:2409.02804](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.02804)].
- [9] M. Calzà, D. Pedrotti, and S. Vagnozzi, *Primordial regular black holes as all the dark matter. II. Non-time-radial-symmetric and loop quantum gravity-inspired metrics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **111** (2025), no. 2 024010, [[arXiv:2409.02807](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.02807)].
- [10] B. Carr, S. Clesse, J. Garcia-Bellido, M. Hawkins, and F. Kuhnel, *Observational evidence for primordial black holes: A positivist perspective*, *Phys. Rept.* **1054** (2024) 1–68, [[arXiv:2306.03903](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03903)].
- [11] T. Nakama, T. Suyama, and J. Yokoyama, *Supermassive black holes formed by direct collapse of inflationary perturbations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016), no. 10 103522, [[arXiv:1609.02245](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.02245)].
- [12] H.-L. Huang, Y. Cai, J.-Q. Jiang, J. Zhang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Supermassive Primordial Black Holes for Nano-Hertz Gravitational Waves and High-redshift JWST Galaxies*, *Res. Astron.*

- Astrophys.* **24** (2024), no. 9 091001, [[arXiv:2306.17577](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.17577)].
- [13] H.-L. Huang, J.-Q. Jiang, and Y.-S. Piao, *High-redshift JWST massive galaxies and the initial clustering of supermassive primordial black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024), no. 10 103540, [[arXiv:2407.15781](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.15781)].
- [14] H.-L. Huang, Y.-T. Wang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Supermassive primordial black holes for the GHZ9 and UHZ1 observed by the JWST*, [arXiv:2410.05891](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.05891).
- [15] H.-L. Huang, J.-Q. Jiang, J. He, Y.-T. Wang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Sub-Eddington accreting supermassive primordial black holes explain Little Red Dots*, [arXiv:2410.20663](https://arxiv.org/abs/2410.20663).
- [16] J. García-Bellido, *Massive Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter and their detection with Gravitational Waves*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **840** (2017), no. 1 012032, [[arXiv:1702.08275](https://arxiv.org/abs/1702.08275)].
- [17] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka, and S. Yokoyama, *Primordial black holes—perspectives in gravitational wave astronomy*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **35** (feb, 2018) 063001.
- [18] B. Carr and F. Kühnel, *Primordial black holes as dark matter: Recent developments*, *Annual Review of Nuclear and Particle Science* **70** (2020), no. Volume 70, 2020 355–394.
- [19] B. Carr and F. Kuhnel, *Primordial black holes as dark matter candidates*, *SciPost Phys. Lect. Notes* **48** (2022) 1, [[arXiv:2110.02821](https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.02821)].
- [20] A. M. Green and B. J. Kavanagh, *Primordial black holes as a dark matter candidate*, *Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics* **48** (feb, 2021) 043001.
- [21] A. Escrivà, F. Kuhnel, and Y. Tada, *Primordial Black Holes*, [arXiv:2211.05767](https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.05767).
- [22] G. Domènech and M. Sasaki, *Probing primordial black hole scenarios with terrestrial gravitational wave detectors*, *Classical and Quantum Gravity* **41** (jun, 2024) 143001.
- [23] M. Y. Khlopov, *Primordial Black Holes*, *Res. Astron. Astrophys.* **10** (2010) 495–528, [[arXiv:0801.0116](https://arxiv.org/abs/0801.0116)].
- [24] Z.-H. Wang, H.-L. Huang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Broad primordial power spectrum and μ -distortion constraints on primordial black holes*, [arXiv:2501.08542](https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.08542).
- [25] S. Pi, M. Sasaki, V. Takhistov, and J. Wang, *Primordial Black Hole Formation from Power Spectrum with Finite-width*, [arXiv:2501.00295](https://arxiv.org/abs/2501.00295).
- [26] Y. Jiang, C. Yuan, C.-Z. Li, and Q.-G. Huang, *Constraints on the primordial black hole abundance through scalar-induced gravitational waves from Advanced LIGO and Virgo’s first three observing runs*, *JCAP* **12** (2024) 016, [[arXiv:2409.07976](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.07976)].
- [27] Z.-M. Zeng and Z.-K. Guo, *Phase transition catalyzed by primordial black holes*, *Phys. Rev.*

- D* **110** (2024), no. 4 L041301, [[arXiv:2402.09310](#)].
- [28] P.-X. Lin, H.-L. Huang, J. Zhang, and Y.-S. Piao, *On primordial universe in anti-de Sitter landscape*, *Phys. Lett. B* **855** (2024) 138768, [[arXiv:2211.05265](#)].
- [29] P.-X. Lin and Y.-S. Piao, *Populating the landscape in an inhomogeneous universe*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 6 063534, [[arXiv:2111.09174](#)].
- [30] X. Wang, X.-H. Ma, and Y.-F. Cai, *Primordial Black Hole Formation from the Upward Step Model: Avoiding Overproduction*, [arXiv:2412.19631](#).
- [31] Y. Cai, M. Zhu, and Y.-S. Piao, *Primordial Black Holes from Null Energy Condition Violation during Inflation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133** (2024), no. 2 021001, [[arXiv:2305.10933](#)].
- [32] Q.-H. Zhu, Z.-C. Zhao, S. Wang, and X. Zhang, *Unraveling the early universe's equation of state and primordial black hole production with PTA, BBN, and CMB observations**, *Chin. Phys. C* **48** (2024), no. 12 125105, [[arXiv:2307.13574](#)].
- [33] F. Crescimbeni, V. Desjacques, G. Franciolini, A. Iannicari, A. J. Iovino, G. Perna, D. Perrone, A. Riotto, and H. Veermäe, *The Irrelevance of Primordial Black Hole Clustering in the LVK mass range*, [arXiv:2502.01617](#).
- [34] S. Fakhry, *Ultradense Dark Matter Halos with Poisson Noise from Stellar-Mass Primordial Black Holes*, [arXiv:2502.00914](#).
- [35] X. Pritchard and C. T. Byrnes, *Constraining the impact of standard model phase transitions on primordial black holes*, *JCAP* **01** (2025) 076, [[arXiv:2407.16563](#)].
- [36] C. Stahl, V. Poulin, B. Famaey, and R. Ibata, *A primordial origin to cosmic tensions: towards a joint solution to the H_0 and S_8 tensions with early dark energy and scale-dependent primordial non-Gaussianities*, [arXiv:2502.14608](#).
- [37] J. Luo et al., *Fundamental Physics and Cosmology with TianQin*, [arXiv:2502.20138](#).
- [38] J. He, H. Deng, Y.-S. Piao, and J. Zhang, *Implications of GWTC-3 on primordial black holes from vacuum bubbles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 4 044035, [[arXiv:2303.16810](#)].
- [39] M. Andrés-Carcasona, A. J. Iovino, V. Vaskonen, H. Veermäe, M. Martínez, O. Pujolàs, and L. M. Mir, *Constraints on primordial black holes from LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA O3 events*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024), no. 2 023040, [[arXiv:2405.05732](#)].
- [40] V. Stasenko, *Redshift evolution of primordial black hole merger rate*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 12 123546, [[arXiv:2403.11325](#)].
- [41] M. Raidal, V. Vaskonen, and H. Veermäe, *Formation of primordial black hole binaries and*

- their merger rates*. 4, 2024. [arXiv:2404.08416](#).
- [42] V. De Luca and N. Bellomo, *The accretion, emission, mass and spin evolution of primordial black holes*, [arXiv:2312.14097](#).
- [43] V. De Luca, G. Franciolini, P. Pani, and A. Riotto, *The evolution of primordial black holes and their final observable spins*, *JCAP* **04** (2020) 052, [[arXiv:2003.02778](#)].
- [44] H.-L. Huang and Y.-S. Piao, *Toward supermassive primordial black holes from inflationary bubbles*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024), no. 2 023501, [[arXiv:2312.11982](#)].
- [45] S. Clesse, V. Dandoy, and S. Verma, *Probing Primordial Black Hole Mergers in Clusters with Pulsar Timing Data*, [arXiv:2412.15989](#).
- [46] **LISA Cosmology Working Group** Collaboration, E. Bagui et al., *Primordial black holes and their gravitational-wave signatures*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **28** (2025), no. 1 1, [[arXiv:2310.19857](#)].
- [47] Q.-G. Huang, C. Yuan, Z.-C. Chen, and L. Liu, *GW230529_181500: a potential primordial binary black hole merger in the mass gap*, *JCAP* **08** (2024) 030, [[arXiv:2404.05691](#)].
- [48] K. Cranmer, J. Brehmer, and G. Louppe, *The frontier of simulation-based inference*, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* **117** (Dec., 2020) 30055–30062, [[arXiv:1911.01429](#)].
- [49] J. Brehmer and K. Cranmer, *Simulation-based inference methods for particle physics*, [arXiv:2010.06439](#).
- [50] U. Bhardwaj, J. Alvey, B. K. Miller, S. Nissanke, and C. Weniger, *Sequential simulation-based inference for gravitational wave signals*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023), no. 4 042004, [[arXiv:2304.02035](#)].
- [51] J. Wildberger, M. Dax, S. R. Green, J. Gair, M. Pürrer, J. H. Macke, A. Buonanno, and B. Schölkopf, *Adapting to noise distribution shifts in flow-based gravitational-wave inference*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 8 084046, [[arXiv:2211.08801](#)].
- [52] M. Dax, S. R. Green, J. Gair, M. Pürrer, J. Wildberger, J. H. Macke, A. Buonanno, and B. Schölkopf, *Neural Importance Sampling for Rapid and Reliable Gravitational-Wave Inference*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** (2023), no. 17 171403, [[arXiv:2210.05686](#)].
- [53] J. Alsing, T. Charnock, S. Feeney, and B. Wandelt, *Fast likelihood-free cosmology with neural density estimators and active learning*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **488** (2019), no. 3 4440–4458, [[arXiv:1903.00007](#)].

- [54] K. Lin, M. von Wietersheim-Kramsta, B. Joachimi, and S. Feeney, *A simulation-based inference pipeline for cosmic shear with the Kilo-Degree Survey*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **524** (2023), no. 4 6167–6180, [[arXiv:2212.04521](#)].
- [55] G. Papamakarios and I. Murray, *Fast ϵ -free Inference of Simulation Models with Bayesian Conditional Density Estimation*, *arXiv e-prints* (May, 2016) arXiv:1605.06376, [[arXiv:1605.06376](#)].
- [56] B. K. Miller, A. Cole, P. Forré, G. Louppe, and C. Weniger, *Truncated Marginal Neural Ratio Estimation*, in *35th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 7, 2021. [arXiv:2107.01214](#).
- [57] F. Rozet and G. Louppe, *Arbitrary Marginal Neural Ratio Estimation for Simulation-based Inference*, *arXiv e-prints* (Oct., 2021) arXiv:2110.00449, [[arXiv:2110.00449](#)].
- [58] A. Delaunoy, J. Hermans, F. Rozet, A. Wehenkel, and G. Louppe, *Towards Reliable Simulation-Based Inference with Balanced Neural Ratio Estimation*, *arXiv e-prints* (Aug., 2022) arXiv:2208.13624, [[arXiv:2208.13624](#)].
- [59] B. K. Miller, C. Weniger, and P. Forré, *Contrastive Neural Ratio Estimation for Simulation-based Inference*, [arXiv:2210.06170](#).
- [60] J. Hermans, V. Begy, and G. Louppe, *Likelihood-free MCMC with Amortized Approximate Ratio Estimators*, *arXiv e-prints* (Mar., 2019) arXiv:1903.04057, [[arXiv:1903.04057](#)].
- [61] C. Durkan, I. Murray, and G. Papamakarios, *On Contrastive Learning for Likelihood-free Inference*, *arXiv e-prints* (Feb., 2020) arXiv:2002.03712, [[arXiv:2002.03712](#)].
- [62] A. Cole, B. K. Miller, S. J. Witte, M. X. Cai, M. W. Grootes, F. Nattino, and C. Weniger, *Fast and credible likelihood-free cosmology with truncated marginal neural ratio estimation*, *JCAP* **09** (2022) 004, [[arXiv:2111.08030](#)].
- [63] N. A. Montel, A. Coogan, C. Correa, K. Karchev, and C. Weniger, *Estimating the warm dark matter mass from strong lensing images with truncated marginal neural ratio estimation*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **518** (2022), no. 2 2746–2760, [[arXiv:2205.09126](#)].
- [64] N. Anau Montel and C. Weniger, *Detection is truncation: studying source populations with truncated marginal neural ratio estimation*, in *36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems: Workshop on Machine Learning and the Physical Sciences*, 11, 2022. [arXiv:2211.04291](#).
- [65] T. L. Makinen, T. Charnock, J. Alsing, and B. D. Wandelt, *Lossless, scalable implicit*

- likelihood inference for cosmological fields*, *JCAP* **11** (2021), no. 11 049, [[arXiv:2107.07405](#)]. [Erratum: *JCAP* 04, E02 (2023)].
- [66] A. Dimitriou, C. Weniger, and C. A. Correa, *Towards reconstructing the halo clustering and halo mass function of N -body simulations using neural ratio estimation*, [arXiv:2206.11312](#).
- [67] S. Gagnon-Hartman, J. Ruan, and D. Haggard, *Debiasing standard siren inference of the Hubble constant with marginal neural ratio estimation*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520** (2023), no. 1 1–13, [[arXiv:2301.05241](#)].
- [68] A. Delaunoy, A. Wehenkel, T. Hinderer, S. Nissanke, C. Weniger, A. R. Williamson, and G. Louppe, *Lightning-Fast Gravitational Wave Parameter Inference through Neural Amortization*, [arXiv:2010.12931](#).
- [69] K. Karchev, R. Trotta, and C. Weniger, *SICRET: Supernova Ia Cosmology with truncated marginal neural Ratio Estimation*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **520** (2023), no. 1 1056–1072, [[arXiv:2209.06733](#)].
- [70] E. G. Tabak and E. Vanden-Eijnden, *Density estimation by dual ascent of the log-likelihood*, *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* **8** (2010), no. 1 217–233.
- [71] E. G. Tabak and C. V. Turner, *A family of nonparametric density estimation algorithms*, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics* **66** (2013), no. 2 145–164.
- [72] L. Dinh, D. Krueger, and Y. Bengio, *NICE: Non-linear Independent Components Estimation*, *arXiv e-prints* (Oct., 2014) arXiv:1410.8516, [[arXiv:1410.8516](#)].
- [73] D. Jimenez Rezende and S. Mohamed, *Variational Inference with Normalizing Flows*, [arXiv:1505.05770](#).
- [74] I. Kobyzev, S. J. D. Prince, and M. A. Brubaker, *Normalizing Flows: An Introduction and Review of Current Methods*, [arXiv:1908.09257](#).
- [75] G. Papamakarios, E. Nalisnick, D. Jimenez Rezende, S. Mohamed, and B. Lakshminarayanan, *Normalizing Flows for Probabilistic Modeling and Inference*, *arXiv e-prints* (Dec., 2019) arXiv:1912.02762, [[arXiv:1912.02762](#)].
- [76] C. Talbot and E. Thrane, *Flexible and Accurate Evaluation of Gravitational-wave Malmquist Bias with Machine Learning*, *Astrophys. J.* **927** (2022), no. 1 76, [[arXiv:2012.01317](#)].
- [77] F. Gerardi, S. M. Feeney, and J. Alsing, *Unbiased likelihood-free inference of the Hubble constant from light standard sirens*, [arXiv:2104.02728](#).

- [78] K. W. K. Wong, G. Contardo, and S. Ho, *Gravitational wave population inference with deep flow-based generative network*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 12 123005, [[arXiv:2002.09491](#)].
- [79] M. Mould, D. Gerosa, and S. R. Taylor, *Deep learning and Bayesian inference of gravitational-wave populations: Hierarchical black-hole mergers*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022), no. 10 103013, [[arXiv:2203.03651](#)].
- [80] D. Ruhe, K. Wong, M. Cranmer, and P. Forré, *Normalizing Flows for Hierarchical Bayesian Analysis: A Gravitational Wave Population Study*, [arXiv:2211.09008](#).
- [81] K. Leyde, S. R. Green, A. Toubiana, and J. Gair, *Gravitational wave populations and cosmology with neural posterior estimation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 6 064056, [[arXiv:2311.12093](#)].
- [82] S. Bird, I. Cholis, J. B. Muñoz, Y. Ali-Haïmoud, M. Kamionkowski, E. D. Kovetz, A. Raccanelli, and A. G. Riess, *Did LIGO detect dark matter?*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016), no. 20 201301, [[arXiv:1603.00464](#)].
- [83] M. Sasaki, T. Suyama, T. Tanaka, and S. Yokoyama, *Primordial Black Hole Scenario for the Gravitational-Wave Event GW150914*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117** (2016), no. 6 061101, [[arXiv:1603.08338](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 121, 059901 (2018)].
- [84] T. Nakamura, M. Sasaki, T. Tanaka, and K. S. Thorne, *Gravitational waves from coalescing black hole MACHO binaries*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **487** (1997) L139–L142, [[astro-ph/9708060](#)].
- [85] H. Nishikawa, E. D. Kovetz, M. Kamionkowski, and J. Silk, *Primordial-black-hole mergers in dark-matter spikes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019), no. 4 043533, [[arXiv:1708.08449](#)].
- [86] Y. Ali-Haïmoud, E. D. Kovetz, and M. Kamionkowski, *Merger rate of primordial black-hole binaries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017), no. 12 123523, [[arXiv:1709.06576](#)].
- [87] M. Raidal, V. Vaskonen, and H. Veermäe, *Gravitational Waves from Primordial Black Hole Mergers*, *JCAP* **09** (2017) 037, [[arXiv:1707.01480](#)].
- [88] G. Franciolini, K. Kritos, E. Berti, and J. Silk, *Primordial black hole mergers from three-body interactions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022), no. 8 083529, [[arXiv:2205.15340](#)].
- [89] H.-L. Huang, J.-Q. Jiang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Merger rate of supermassive primordial black hole binaries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 6 063515, [[arXiv:2312.00338](#)].
- [90] L. Liu, Z.-K. Guo, and R.-G. Cai, *Effects of the surrounding primordial black holes on the*

- merger rate of primordial black hole binaries, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019), no. 6 063523, [[arXiv:1812.05376](#)].
- [91] V. Desjacques and A. Riotto, *Spatial clustering of primordial black holes*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018), no. 12 123533, [[arXiv:1806.10414](#)].
- [92] D. Inman and Y. Ali-Haïmoud, *Early structure formation in primordial black hole cosmologies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019), no. 8 083528, [[arXiv:1907.08129](#)].
- [93] V. De Luca, V. Desjacques, G. Franciolini, and A. Riotto, *The clustering evolution of primordial black holes*, *JCAP* **11** (2020) 028, [[arXiv:2009.04731](#)].
- [94] M. Dax, S. R. Green, J. Gair, J. H. Macke, A. Buonanno, and B. Schölkopf, *Real-Time Gravitational Wave Science with Neural Posterior Estimation*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127** (2021), no. 24 241103, [[arXiv:2106.12594](#)].
- [95] **Planck** Collaboration, N. Aghanim et al., *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6, [[arXiv:1807.06209](#)]. [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
- [96] G. Ye and Y.-S. Piao, *Is the Hubble tension a hint of AdS phase around recombination?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 8 083507, [[arXiv:2001.02451](#)].
- [97] G. Ye, B. Hu, and Y.-S. Piao, *Implication of the Hubble tension for the primordial Universe in light of recent cosmological data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021), no. 6 063510, [[arXiv:2103.09729](#)].
- [98] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Testing AdS early dark energy with Planck, SPTpol, and LSS data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **104** (2021), no. 10 103524, [[arXiv:2107.07128](#)].
- [99] G. Ye, J.-Q. Jiang, and Y.-S. Piao, *Toward inflation with $n_s=1$ in light of the Hubble tension and implications for primordial gravitational waves*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022), no. 10 103528, [[arXiv:2205.02478](#)].
- [100] J.-Q. Jiang, *Status of early dark energy after DESI: the role of Ω_m and $r_s H_0$* , [[arXiv:2502.15541](#)].
- [101] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Can the sound horizon-free measurement of H_0 constrain early new physics?*, [[arXiv:2501.16883](#)].
- [102] J.-Q. Jiang, D. Pedrotti, S. S. da Costa, and S. Vagnozzi, *Nonparametric late-time expansion history reconstruction and implications for the Hubble tension in light of recent DESI and type Ia supernovae data*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024), no. 12 123519,

- [[arXiv:2408.02365](#)].
- [103] J.-Q. Jiang and Y.-S. Piao, *Toward early dark energy and $ns=1$ with Planck, ACT, and SPT observations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 10 103514, [[arXiv:2202.13379](#)].
- [104] H. Wang and Y.-S. Piao, *Dark energy in light of recent DESI BAO and Hubble tension*, [arXiv:2404.18579](#).
- [105] **LIGO Scientific, Virgo** Collaboration, B. P. Abbott et al., *Binary Black Hole Population Properties Inferred from the First and Second Observing Runs of Advanced LIGO and Advanced Virgo*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **882** (2019), no. 2 L24, [[arXiv:1811.12940](#)].
- [106] V. De Luca, G. Franciolini, P. Pani, and A. Riotto, *Bayesian Evidence for Both Astrophysical and Primordial Black Holes: Mapping the GWTC-2 Catalog to Third-Generation Detectors*, *JCAP* **05** (2021) 003, [[arXiv:2102.03809](#)].
- [107] **KAGRA, VIRGO, LIGO Scientific** Collaboration, R. Abbott et al., *Population of Merging Compact Binaries Inferred Using Gravitational Waves through GWTC-3*, *Phys. Rev. X* **13** (2023), no. 1 011048, [[arXiv:2111.03634](#)].
- [108] P. Madau and M. Dickinson, *Cosmic Star Formation History*, *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **52** (2014) 415–486, [[arXiv:1403.0007](#)].
- [109] A. Dolgov and J. Silk, *Baryon isocurvature fluctuations at small scales and baryonic dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **47** (May, 1993) 4244–4255.
- [110] B. Carr, T. Tenkanen, and V. Vaskonen, *Primordial black holes from inflaton and spectator field perturbations in a matter-dominated era*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017), no. 6 063507, [[arXiv:1706.03746](#)].
- [111] J. Yokoyama, *Cosmological constraints on primordial black holes produced in the near critical gravitational collapse*, *Phys. Rev. D* **58** (1998) 107502, [[gr-qc/9804041](#)].
- [112] J. C. Niemeyer and K. Jedamzik, *Dynamics of primordial black hole formation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **59** (1999) 124013, [[astro-ph/9901292](#)].
- [113] I. Musco and J. C. Miller, *Primordial black hole formation in the early universe: critical behaviour and self-similarity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30** (2013) 145009, [[arXiv:1201.2379](#)].
- [114] B. J. Carr, K. Kohri, Y. Sendouda, and J. Yokoyama, *Constraints on primordial black holes from the Galactic gamma-ray background*, *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016), no. 4 044029, [[arXiv:1604.05349](#)].
- [115] T. J. Loredo, *Accounting for source uncertainties in analyses of astronomical survey data*,

- AIP Conf. Proc.* **735** (2004), no. 1 195–206, [[astro-ph/0409387](#)].
- [116] **LIGO Scientific, Virgo** Collaboration, R. Abbott et al., *Population Properties of Compact Objects from the Second LIGO-Virgo Gravitational-Wave Transient Catalog*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **913** (2021), no. 1 L7, [[arXiv:2010.14533](#)].
- [117] E. Thrane and C. Talbot, *An introduction to Bayesian inference in gravitational-wave astronomy: Parameter estimation, model selection, and hierarchical models*, *PASA* **36** (Mar., 2019) e010, [[arXiv:1809.02293](#)].
- [118] I. Mandel, W. M. Farr, and J. R. Gair, *Extracting distribution parameters from multiple uncertain observations with selection biases*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **486** (2019), no. 1 1086–1093, [[arXiv:1809.02063](#)].
- [119] S. Mastrogiovanni, G. Pierra, S. Perriès, D. Laghi, G. Caneva Santoro, A. Ghosh, R. Gray, C. Karathanasis, and K. Leyde, *ICAROGW: A python package for inference of astrophysical population properties of noisy, heterogeneous, and incomplete observations*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **682** (2024) A167, [[arXiv:2305.17973](#)].
- [120] D. Foreman-Mackey, D. W. Hogg, D. Lang, and J. Goodman, *emcee: The MCMC Hammer*, *Publ. Astron. Soc. Pac.* **125** (2013) 306–312, [[arXiv:1202.3665](#)].
- [121] J. S. Speagle, *dynesty: a dynamic nested sampling package for estimating Bayesian posteriors and evidences*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **493** (2020), no. 3 3132–3158, [[arXiv:1904.02180](#)].
- [122] C. Durkan, A. Bekasov, I. Murray, and G. Papamakarios, *Neural Spline Flows*, *arXiv e-prints* (June, 2019) arXiv:1906.04032, [[arXiv:1906.04032](#)].
- [123] V. Stimper, D. Liu, A. Campbell, V. Berenz, L. Ryll, B. Schölkopf, and J. M. Hernández-Lobato, *normflows: A pytorch package for normalizing flows*, *Journal of Open Source Software* **8** (2023), no. 86 5361.
- [124] S. Kullback and R. A. Leibler, *On Information and Sufficiency*, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **22** (1951), no. 1 79–86.
- [125] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, *Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization*, *arXiv e-prints* (Dec., 2014) arXiv:1412.6980, [[arXiv:1412.6980](#)].
- [126] **LIGO Scientific** Collaboration, J. Aasi et al., *Advanced LIGO*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32** (2015) 074001, [[arXiv:1411.4547](#)].
- [127] F. De Santi, M. Razzano, F. Fidecaro, L. Muccillo, L. Papalini, and B. Patricelli, *Deep*

- learning to detect gravitational waves from binary close encounters: Fast parameter estimation using normalizing flows*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 10 102004, [[arXiv:2404.12028](#)].
- [128] J. McGinn, C. Messenger, I. S. Heng, and M. J. Williams, *Generalised gravitational wave burst generation with generative adversarial networks*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **38** (2021), no. 15 155005, [[arXiv:2103.01641](#)].
- [129] C.-H. Liao and F.-L. Lin, *Deep generative models of gravitational waveforms via conditional autoencoder*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 12 124051, [[arXiv:2101.06685](#)].
- [130] A. Khan, E. A. Huerta, and H. Zheng, *Interpretable AI forecasting for numerical relativity waveforms of quasicircular, spinning, nonprecessing binary black hole mergers*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 2 024024, [[arXiv:2110.06968](#)].
- [131] T. Islam, S. E. Field, S. A. Hughes, G. Khanna, V. Varma, M. Giesler, M. A. Scheel, L. E. Kidder, and H. P. Pfeiffer, *Surrogate model for gravitational wave signals from nonspinning, comparable-to large-mass-ratio black hole binaries built on black hole perturbation theory waveforms calibrated to numerical relativity*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022), no. 10 104025, [[arXiv:2204.01972](#)].
- [132] E. A. Huerta et al., *Eccentric, nonspinning, inspiral, Gaussian-process merger approximant for the detection and characterization of eccentric binary black hole mergers*, *Phys. Rev. D* **97** (2018), no. 2 024031, [[arXiv:1711.06276](#)].
- [133] C. Ma, W. Wang, H. Wang, and Z. Cao, *Ensemble of deep convolutional neural networks for real-time gravitational wave signal recognition*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (Apr., 2022) 083013, [[arXiv:2204.12058](#)].
- [134] H. Gabbard, M. Williams, F. Hayes, and C. Messenger, *Matching matched filtering with deep networks for gravitational-wave astronomy*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120** (2018), no. 14 141103, [[arXiv:1712.06041](#)].
- [135] H. Wang, S. Wu, Z. Cao, X. Liu, and J.-Y. Zhu, *Gravitational-wave signal recognition of LIGO data by deep learning*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 10 104003, [[arXiv:1909.13442](#)].
- [136] W.-H. Ruan, H. Wang, C. Liu, and Z.-K. Guo, *Rapid search for massive black hole binary coalescences using deep learning*, *Phys. Lett. B* **841** (2023) 137904, [[arXiv:2111.14546](#)].
- [137] H. Xia, L. Shao, J. Zhao, and Z. Cao, *Improved deep learning techniques in gravitational-wave data analysis*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 2 024040,

- [arXiv:2011.04418].
- [138] P. G. Krastev, *Real-Time Detection of Gravitational Waves from Binary Neutron Stars using Artificial Neural Networks*, *Phys. Lett. B* **803** (2020) 135330, [arXiv:1908.03151].
- [139] S. R. Green, C. Simpson, and J. Gair, *Gravitational-wave parameter estimation with autoregressive neural network flows*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020), no. 10 104057, [arXiv:2002.07656].
- [140] H. Shen, E. A. Huerta, E. O’Shea, P. Kumar, and Z. Zhao, *Statistically-informed deep learning for gravitational wave parameter estimation*, *Mach. Learn. Sci. Tech.* **3** (2022), no. 1 015007, [arXiv:1903.01998].
- [141] S. R. Green and J. Gair, *Complete parameter inference for GW150914 using deep learning*, *Mach. Learn. Sci. Tech.* **2** (2021), no. 3 03LT01, [arXiv:2008.03312].
- [142] P. G. Krastev, K. Gill, V. A. Villar, and E. Berger, *Detection and Parameter Estimation of Gravitational Waves from Binary Neutron-Star Mergers in Real LIGO Data using Deep Learning*, *Phys. Lett. B* **815** (2021) 136161, [arXiv:2012.13101].
- [143] S. Sasaoka, Y. Hou, K. Somiya, and H. Takahashi, *Localization of gravitational waves using machine learning*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 10 103030, [arXiv:2202.12784].
- [144] P. Amaro-Seoane, H. Audley, S. Babak, J. Baker, E. Barausse, P. Bender, E. Berti, P. Binetruy, M. Born, D. Bortoluzzi, J. Camp, C. Caprini, V. Cardoso, M. Colpi, J. Conklin, N. Cornish, C. Cutler, K. Danzmann, R. Dolesi, L. Ferraioli, V. Ferroni, E. Fitzsimons, J. Gair, L. Gesa Bote, D. Giardini, F. Gibert, C. Grimani, H. Halloin, G. Heinzl, T. Hertog, M. Hewitson, K. Holley-Bockelmann, D. Hollington, M. Hueller, H. Inchauspe, P. Jetzer, N. Karnesis, C. Killow, A. Klein, B. Klipstein, N. Korsakova, S. L. Larson, J. Livas, I. Lloro, N. Man, D. Mance, J. Martino, I. Mateos, K. McKenzie, S. T. McWilliams, C. Miller, G. Mueller, G. Nardini, G. Nelemans, M. Nofrarias, A. Petiteau, P. Pivato, E. Plagnol, E. Porter, J. Reiche, D. Robertson, N. Robertson, E. Rossi, G. Russano, B. Schutz, A. Sesana, D. Shoemaker, J. Slutsky, C. F. Sopuerta, T. Sumner, N. Tamanini, I. Thorpe, M. Troebis, M. Vallisneri, A. Vecchio, D. Vetrugno, S. Vitale, M. Volonteri, G. Wanner, H. Ward, P. Wass, W. Weber, J. Ziemer, and P. Zweifel, *Laser Interferometer Space Antenna*, *arXiv e-prints* (Feb., 2017) arXiv:1702.00786, [arXiv:1702.00786].
- [145] W.-R. Hu and Y.-L. Wu, *The Taiji Program in Space for gravitational wave physics and the*

nature of gravity, *Natl. Sci. Rev.* **4** (2017), no. 5 685–686.

- [146] **TianQin** Collaboration, J. Luo et al., *TianQin: a space-borne gravitational wave detector*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33** (2016), no. 3 035010, [[arXiv:1512.02076](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.02076)].