The merger history of primordial-black-hole binaries inferred from GWTC-3

Zu-Cheng Chen,[1, 2, *] Zhi-Qiang You,[1, 2, †] You Wu,[3, ‡] and Lang Liu[1, 2, §]

[1]*Department of Astronomy, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*
[2]*Advanced Institute of Natural Sciences, Beijing Normal University, Zhuhai 519087, China*
[3]*College of Mathematics and Physics, Hunan University of Arts and Science, Changde, 415000, China*

Primordial black holes (PBHs), as dark matter candidates, have attracted more and more attentions as they could be possible progenitors of the heavy binary black holes (BBHs) observed by LIGO/Virgo. Accurately estimating the merger rate of PBH binaries will be crucial to reconstruct the mass distribution of PBHs. It was pointed out the merger history of PBHs may shift the merger rate distribution depending on the mass function of PBHs. In this paper, we use BBH events from LIGO/Virgo GWTC-3 data release to constrain the merger rate distribution of PBHs by taking into account the effect of merger history. It is found that the second merger process makes subdominant contribution to the total merger rate, and hence the merger history effect can be safely neglected. We also confirm that the main components of dark matter should not be made of stellar mass PBHs.

I. INTRODUCTION

The direct detection of gravitational wave (GW) from a binary black hole (BBH) coalescence [1] has opened a new window into the universe. Over the past few years, ten BBH mergers have been reported by LIGO/Virgo during the O1 and O2 observing runs [1–7]. The progenitors of these BBHs are still unknown and under intensively investigation (see *e.g.* [8–27]). These LIGO/Virgo BBHs present a much heavier mass distribution (in particular the source-frame primary mass of GW170729 event can be as heavy as $50.2^{+16.2}_{-10.2} M_\odot$ [7]) than that inferred from X-ray observations [28–31], which would challenge the formation and evolution mechanisms of astrophysical black holes. One possible explanation for LIGO/Virgo BBHs is the primordial black holes (PBHs) [8–10] formed through the gravitational collapse of the primordial density fluctuations [32, 33], which may accompany the induced GWs [34–43]. On the other hand, PBHs can also be a candidate of cold dark matter (CDM), and the abundance of PBHs in CDM has been constrained by various experiments [34, 36, 44–66].

In order to account for the LIGO/Virgo BBHs, the merger rate of PBH binaries has been estimated to be $17 \sim 288 \mathrm{~Gpc}^{-3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$ [61]. One should notice that theoretically there exist some uncertainties in estimating the merger rate distribution of PBH binaries, and the accuracy of the estimation has been continuously improved. The merger rate of PBH binaries with monochromatic mass function has already been given in [9, 67] for the case where two neighboring PBHs having sufficiently small separation can form a binary in the early Universe due to the torque from the third nearest PBH. These binaries would then evolve and coalesce within the age of the Universe and finally explain the merger events ob-

served by LIGO/Virgo [9]. Later, the merger rate estimation is improved in [15] by taking into account the torques exerted by all CDM (including all the PBHs and linear density perturbations), but it is also assumed that all PBHs have the same mass. It is also pointed out in [15] that the effects such as encountering with other PBHs, tidal field from the smooth halo, and the baryon accretion are subdominant and can be neglected when estimating the merger rate.

Various attempts have been made to estimate the merger rate distribution of PBH binaries when PBHs have an extended mass function [10, 61, 68–72]. In particular, a formalism to estimate the effect of merger history of PBHs on merger rate distribution has been developed in [73], and it is argued that the multiple-merger effect may not be ignored if PBHs have a power-law or a log-normal mass function by choosing some specific parameter values of the mass function. An accurate estimation of the merger rate will be crucial to infer the event rate of LIGO/Virgo BBHs and constrain the abundance of PBHs in CDM either through null detection of sub-solar mass PBH binaries or the null detection of stochastic GW background (SGWB) from PBH binaries.

In this paper, we will use the publicly available GW data from LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observations to estimate the merger rate distribution of PBH binaries with a general mass function assuming all of LIGO/Virgo BBHs are of primordial origin. We find that the merger history effect makes no significant contribution to the merger rate of PBHs and can be safely ignored. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we review the calculation of merger rate distribution accounting for the merger history effect. In Sec. III, we elaborate the data analysis method used to infer the PBH populations from LIGO/Virgo data. In Sec. IV, we present the results for PBHs with a power-law and a log-normal mass function respectively. Finally, we summarize and discuss our results in Sec. V.

---

[*] zucheng.chen@bnu.edu.cn
[†] zhiqiang.you@bnu.edu.cn
[‡] youwuphy@gmail.com
[§] Corresponding author: liulang@bnu.edu.cn

II. MERGER RATE DISTRIBUTION OF PBHS

In this section, we will briefly review the calculation of merger rate density by closely following [73]. We denote the probability distribution function (PDF) of PBH masses by $P(m)$ which satisfies the following normalization condition

$$\int_0^\infty P(m)\,\mathrm{d}m = 1. \tag{1}$$

Consequently the abundance of PBHs in the mass interval $(m, m + \mathrm{d}m)$ is given by [61]

$$0.85 f_{\mathrm{pbh}}\, P(m)\,\mathrm{d}m, \tag{2}$$

where f_{pbh} is the fraction of PBHs in CDM, and the coefficient 0.85 is roughly the fraction of CDM in non-relativistic matter. Similar to [73], one may define a quantity m_{pbh} as

$$\frac{1}{m_{\mathrm{pbh}}} = \int \frac{P(m)}{m}\mathrm{d}m. \tag{3}$$

Furthermore, the present average number density of PBHs with mass m in the present total average number density of PBHs, $F(m)$, can be obtained by [73]

$$F(m) = P(m)\frac{m_{\mathrm{pbh}}}{m}. \tag{4}$$

With the above definitions at hand, one can go directly to estimate the merger rate densities of PBH binaries contributed from different merger processes. We assume that PBHs are randomly distributed in the early Universe when they decouple from the cosmic background evolution [9, 15, 67]. Due to gravitational interactions, two nearest PBHs would attract each other and form a bound system if they get the angular momentum from the torque of the third closest PBH. Because of gravitational radiations, PBH binaries would eventually merge and may be detected by LIGO/Virgo. Let us consider the first-merger process now. Assuming PBHs posses a random distribution in the early Universe, the differential distribution, for three PBHs with masses $(m_i, m_i + dm_i)$, $(m_j, m_j + dm_j)$ and $(m_l, m_l + dm_l)$, is given by [73]

$$\begin{aligned} dP_1 =&16\pi^2 n_T^2 x^2 y^2 F(m_i)F(m_j)F(m_l) \\ &\times e^{-4\pi y^3 n_T/3}\mathrm{d}m_i\mathrm{d}m_j\mathrm{d}m_l\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\Theta(y - x), \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where Θ is the Heaviside step function, and x is the comoving distance between two closest PBHs with masses m_i and m_j. Note that these two nearest PBHs will form a binary due to the torque of third PBH with mass m_l. In Eq. (5), y is the comoving distance from the binary to the third PBH, and n_T is the average number density of PBHs defined by

$$n_T = \frac{f_{\mathrm{pbh}}\rho_{\mathrm{CDM}}}{m_{\mathrm{pbh}}}, \tag{6}$$

where ρ_{CDM} is the energy density of CDM. Notice that the e-factor in Eq. (5) guarantees that there are no other PBHs within the distance y. It is now straightforward to obtain the fraction of PBHs that have merged before cosmic time t [73]

$$G_1(t) = \int \mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}m_l \frac{\mathrm{d}P_1}{\mathrm{d}x\mathrm{d}y\mathrm{d}m_i\mathrm{d}m_j\mathrm{d}m_l}\Theta(t - \tau), \tag{7}$$

where τ is the cosmic time at which the PBH binary with masses of m_i and m_j merges. Therefore the merger rate density of first-merger process, $\mathcal{R}_1(t, m_i, m_j)$, is given by [73]

$$\mathcal{R}_1(t, m_i, m_j) = \frac{1}{2}n_T\frac{\mathrm{d}G_1(t, m_i, m_j)}{\mathrm{d}t} = \int \hat{\mathcal{R}}_1\mathrm{d}m_l, \tag{8}$$

where the factor $1/2$ accounts for the symmetry of m_i and m_j, and

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_1(t, m_i, m_j, m_l) =&\, 1.32 \times 10^6 \times \left(\frac{t}{t_0}\right)^{-\frac{34}{37}} \left(\frac{f_{\mathrm{pbh}}}{m_{\mathrm{pbh}}}\right)^{\frac{53}{37}} \\ &\times m_l^{-\frac{21}{37}}(m_i m_j)^{\frac{3}{37}}(m_i + m_j)^{\frac{36}{37}}F(m_i)F(m_j)F(m_l). \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

After the first-merger process, the mass of the remnant BH will approximately be $m_i + m_j$ if the two initial PBHs have masses of m_i and m_j. A second-merger process would happen if this remnant BH and the nearest PBH with mass m_k form a new binary by the torque from another PBH with mass m_l. Similarly, the merger rate density of second-merger process, $\mathcal{R}_2(t, m_i, m_j)$, is given by [73]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_2(t, m_i, m_j) =&\, \frac{1}{2}\int \hat{\mathcal{R}}_2(t, m_i - m_e, m_e, m_j, m_l)\,\mathrm{d}m_l\mathrm{d}m_e \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\int \hat{\mathcal{R}}_2(t, m_j - m_e, m_e, m_i, m_l)\,\mathrm{d}m_l\mathrm{d}m_e, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_2(t, m_i, m_j, m_k, m_l) =&\, 1.59 \times 10^4 \times \left(\frac{t}{t_0}\right)^{-\frac{31}{37}} \left(\frac{f_{\mathrm{pbh}}}{m_{\mathrm{pbh}}}\right)^{\frac{69}{37}} \\ &\times m_k^{\frac{6}{37}}m_l^{-\frac{42}{37}}(m_i + m_j)^{\frac{6}{37}}(m_i + m_j + m_k)^{\frac{72}{37}} \\ &\times F(m_i)F(m_j)F(m_k)F(m_l). \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Following the same spirit, in principle one can derive the merger rate density $\mathcal{R}_n(t, m_i, m_j)$ contributed from the n-th merger process. Therefore the total merger rate density, $\mathcal{R}(t, m_i, m_j)$, of PBHs at cosmic time t with masses m_i and m_j is

$$\mathcal{R}(t, m_i, m_j) = \sum_{n=1} \mathcal{R}_n(t, m_i, m_j), \tag{12}$$

and the total merger rate can be directly obtained by

$$R(t) = \int \mathcal{R}(t, m_i, m_j) \mathrm{d}m_i \mathrm{d}m_j = \sum_{n=1} R_n(t), \quad (13)$$

where

$$R_n(t) = \int \mathcal{R}_n(t, m_i, m_j) \mathrm{d}m_i \mathrm{d}m_j. \quad (14)$$

As demonstrated in [73], $\mathcal{R}_{n+1}(t, m_i, m_j)$ is not necessarily be smaller than $\mathcal{R}_n(t, m_i, m_j)$ (see Fig. 7 and Fig. 8 in [73]). However, $R_{n+1}(t)$ should be smaller than $R_n(t)$ as expected [73]. Here, we only consider the merger history up to second-merger process.

III. INFERENCE ON PBH MASS DISTRIBUTION FROM GW DATA

Given a general mass function of PBHs $P(m|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ which satisfy the normalization condition of Eq. (1), the time (or redshift) dependent merger rate can be obtained by Eq. (13), namely

$$R(t|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int \mathcal{R}(t, \boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \quad (15)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \equiv \{m_1, m_2\}$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are the parameters that characterize the mass function and will be inferred from GW data. For instance, $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\alpha, M\}$ for the power-law PDF (see Eq. (26)) and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{m_c, \sigma\}$ for the log-normal PDF (see Eq. (23)). The local merger rate density distribution then reads [61]

$$\mathcal{R}(t_0, \boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = R_0 \, p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (16)$$

where $R_0 \equiv R(t_0|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the local merger rate, and $p(m_1, m_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the population distribution of BBH mergers. Note that Eq. (16) guarantees $p(m_1, m_2|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is normalized, namely

$$\int p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \, \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda} = 1. \quad (17)$$

Given the GW data, $\boldsymbol{d} = (d_1, \ldots, d_N)$, which consist of N BBH merger events, we aim to extract the population parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\}$ from $\boldsymbol{d}$. In order to do that, it is necessary to perform the hierarchical Bayesian inference on the BBHs' mass distribution [3, 74–79]. In this work, we will use the data of ten BBHs [3, 7] reported by LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observations, and hence $N = 10$. The posterior samples of these BBHs are publicly available from [80]. Because the standard priors on masses for each event in LIGO/Virgo analysis are taken to be uniform [3, 7], the likelihood of an individual event $p(d_i|\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is proportional to the posterior of that event $p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|d_i)$. The total likelihood for an inhomogeneous Poisson process can be evaluated as [76–79]

$$p(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0) \propto R_0^N e^{-R_0 \beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})} \prod_i^N \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda} \, p(d_i|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \, p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (18)$$

where $\beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is defined as

$$\beta(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda} \, VT(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \, p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (19)$$

in which $VT(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ is the sensitive spacetime volume [74, 75] of LIGO. We adopt the semi-analytical approximation from [74, 75] to estimate VT, where we use the "IMR-PhenomPv2" waveform to simulate the BBH templates and neglect the effect of spins for BHs. Furthermore, the threshold signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) of detection for a single-detector is set to 8, which corresponds to a network SNR threshold of around 12.

Assuming the prior distributions $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0)$ are uniform for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ parameters and log-uniform for local merger rate R_0 [4, 74], namely

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0) \propto \frac{1}{R_0}, \quad (20)$$

the posterior probability distribution $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0|\boldsymbol{d})$ can be directly calculated by

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0|\boldsymbol{d}) \propto p(\boldsymbol{d}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0) \, p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0). \quad (21)$$

The marginalized posterior $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{d})$ can then be readily obtained by integrating over R_0 in Eq. (21), namely

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\boldsymbol{d}) \propto [\beta(\boldsymbol{\theta})]^{-N} \prod_i^N \int \mathrm{d}\boldsymbol{\lambda} \, p(d_i|\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \, p(\boldsymbol{\lambda}|\boldsymbol{\theta}). \quad (22)$$

This marginalized posterior has been widely used in previous population inferences [3, 4, 61, 74, 75, 81]. In the following section, we will utilize the posterior (21) to infer the population parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\}$ by considering two concrete mass distributions, a power-law PDF and a log-normal PDF, respectively.

IV. RESULTS

A. Log-normal mass function

We now consider a log-normal mass function of PBHs as [82]

$$P(m) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma m} \exp\left(-\frac{\ln^2(m/m_c)}{2\sigma^2}\right), \quad (23)$$

where m_c presents the peak mass of $mP(m)$, and σ denotes the width of the mass spectrum. The log-normal mass function is a good approximation to a large class of extended mass distributions if PBHs are formed from smooth symmetric peaks in the inflationary power spectrum [83], as demonstrated in [84, 85]. Note that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{m_c, \sigma\}$, and the free parameters are $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{m_c, \sigma, R_0\}$ in this case. Using Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), it is easily to get

$$m_{\mathrm{pbh}} = m_c \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\right), \quad (24)$$

$$F(m) = \frac{m_c}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma m^2} \exp\left(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2} - \frac{\ln^2(m/m_c)}{2\sigma^2}\right). \quad (25)$$

Using data of 10 BBHs observed by LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observations and performing the hierarchical Bayesian inference, we obtain $m_c = 8.9^{+7.8}_{-7.3}M_\odot$, $\sigma = 0.91^{+0.50}_{-0.42}$, and $R_0 = 55^{+42}_{-27}\mathrm{Gpc}^{-3}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. It is then easy to infer the abundance of PBHs in CDM to be $f_{\mathrm{pbh}} = 2.6^{+6.8}_{-1.4} \times 10^{-3}$ from the posterior distribution of local merger rate R_0. The results of local merger rate and abundance of PBHs are consistent with the previous estimations, confirming that the main components of CDM should not be made of stellar mass PBHs. The posteriors of parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{m_c, \sigma, R_0\}$ are shown in Fig. 1.

FIG. 1. The marginalized one- and two-dimensional posterior distributions for parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{m_c, \sigma, R_0\}$ in the log-normal mass function of PBHs, by using 10 BBH events from LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observing runs. The contours are at the 68% and 95% credible levels, respectively.

Fig. 2 shows the ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, namely $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$, by fixing $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\}$ to their best-fit values. The correction to total merger rate density from second-merger history is larger as component masses are heavier. However, the ratio of merger rate from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history is negligible, namely $R_2(t_0)/R_1(t_0) = 3.0\%$. This is because the major contribution to the merger rate comes from the binaries with masses less than $50M_\odot$. Therefore the merger history effect can be safely ignored when estimating the merger rate of PBHs.


FIG. 2. The ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to that from first-merger history, $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$. Note that the parameters $\{m_c, \sigma\}$ in Eq. (23) are fixed to their best-fit values.

B. Power-law mass function

We now consider a power-law mass function of PBHs as [86]

$$P(m) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{M}\left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{-\alpha}, \quad (26)$$

where $m > M$, and $\alpha > 1$ is the power-law index. The power-law form is a commonly used mass function as it naturally arises if PBHs are formed from primordial energy density fluctuations due to a scale-invariant primordial power spectrum [83, 87]. Note that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\alpha, M\}$ and the free parameters are $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ in this case. Using Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), it is easily to get

$$m_{\mathrm{pbh}} = M\frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1}, \quad (27)$$

$$F(m) = \frac{\alpha}{m}\left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{-\alpha}. \quad (28)$$

Using data of 10 BBHs observed by LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observations and performing the hierarchical Bayesian inference, we obtain $\alpha = 2.41^{+1.00}_{-0.87}$, $M = 7.4^{+1.4}_{-3.3}M_\odot$, and $R_0 = 48^{+37}_{-24}\mathrm{Gpc}^{-3}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. It is then easy to infer the abundance of PBHs in CDM to be $f_{\mathrm{pbh}} = 2.8^{+1.8}_{-1.2} \times 10^{-3}$ from the posterior distribution of local merger rate R_0. The results of local merger rate and abundance of PBHs are consistent with the previous estimations, confirming that the main components of CDM should not be made of stellar mass PBHs. The posteriors of parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ are shown in Fig. 3.

rection of total merger rate density from second-merger history is less than 10%. It is then readily to calculate the ratio of merger rate from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, $R_2(t_0)/R_1(t_0) = 0.5\%$. We therefore conclude that the merger history effect can be safely ignored when estimating the merger rate (density) of PBHs.

C. Broken Power-law mass function

We now consider a power-law mass function of PBHs as [86]

$$P(m) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{M} \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{-\alpha}, \qquad (29)$$

where $m > M$, and $\alpha > 1$ is the power-law index. The power-law form is a commonly used mass function as it naturally arises if PBHs are formed from primordial energy density fluctuations due to a scale-invariant primordial power spectrum [83, 87]. Note that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\alpha, M\}$ and the free parameters are $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ in this case. Using Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), it is easily to get

$$m_{\mathrm{pbh}} = M \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1}, \qquad (30)$$

$$F(m) = \frac{\alpha}{m} \left(\frac{m}{M} \right)^{-\alpha}. \qquad (31)$$

Using data of 10 BBHs observed by LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observations and performing the hierarchical Bayesian inference, we obtain $\alpha = 2.41^{+1.00}_{-0.87}$, $M = 7.4^{+1.4}_{-3.3}M_\odot$, and $R_0 = 48^{+37}_{-24}\mathrm{Gpc}^{-3}\,\mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. It is then easy to infer the abundance of PBHs in CDM to be $f_{\mathrm{pbh}} = 2.8^{+1.8}_{-1.2} \times 10^{-3}$ from the posterior distribution of local merger rate R_0. The results of local merger rate and abundance of PBHs are consistent with the previous estimations, confirming that the main components of CDM should not be made of stellar mass PBHs. The posteriors of parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ are shown in Fig. 3.

Fig. 4 shows the ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, namely $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$, by fixing $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\}$ to their best-fit values. It is clearly that the correction of total merger rate density from second-merger history is less than 10%. It is then readily to calculate the ratio of merger rate from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, $R_2(t_0)/R_1(t_0) = 0.5\%$. We therefore conclude that the merger history effect can be safely ignored when estimating the merger rate (density) of PBHs.


FIG. 3. The marginalized one- and two-dimensional posterior distributions for parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ in the power-law mass function of PBHs, by using 10 BBH events from LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observing runs. The contours are at the 68% and 95% credible levels, respectively.


FIG. 4. The ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to that from first-merger history, $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$. Note that the parameters $\{\alpha, M\}$ in Eq. (26) are fixed to their best-fit values.

Fig. 4 shows the ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, namely $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$, by fixing $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\}$ to their best-fit values. It is clearly that the cor-

FIG. 5. The marginalized one- and two-dimensional posterior distributions for parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ in the power-law mass function of PBHs, by using 10 BBH events from LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observing runs. The contours are at the 68% and 95% credible levels, respectively.

FIG. 6. The ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to that from first-merger history, $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$. Note that the parameters $\{\alpha, M\}$ in Eq. (26) are fixed to their best-fit values.

D. CC mass function

We now consider a power-law mass function of PBHs as [86]

$$P(m) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{M} \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{-\alpha}, \tag{32}$$

where $m > M$, and $\alpha > 1$ is the power-law index. The power-law form is a commonly used mass function as it naturally arises if PBHs are formed from primordial energy density fluctuations due to a scale-invariant primordial power spectrum [83, 87]. Note that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\alpha, M\}$ and the free parameters are $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ in this case. Using Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), it is easily to get

$$m_{\rm pbh} = M \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1}, \tag{33}$$

$$F(m) = \frac{\alpha}{m} \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{-\alpha}. \tag{34}$$

Using data of 10 BBHs observed by LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observations and performing the hierarchical Bayesian inference, we obtain $\alpha = 2.41^{+1.00}_{-0.87}$, $M = 7.4^{+1.4}_{-3.3} M_\odot$, and $R_0 = 48^{+37}_{-24} \mathrm{Gpc}^{-3} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. It is then easy to infer the abundance of PBHs in CDM to be $f_{\rm pbh} = 2.8^{+1.8}_{-1.2} \times 10^{-3}$ from the posterior distribution of local merger rate R_0. The results of local merger rate and abundance of PBHs are consistent with the previous estimations, confirming that the main components of CDM should not be made of stellar mass PBHs. The posteriors of parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ are shown in Fig. 3.

Fig. 4 shows the ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, namely $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$, by fixing $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\}$ to their best-fit values. It is clearly that the correction of total merger rate density from second-merger history is less than 10%. It is then readily to calculate the ratio of merger rate from second-merger history to the one from first-merger history, $R_2(t_0)/R_1(t_0) = 0.5\%$. We therefore conclude that the merger history effect can be safely ignored when estimating the merger rate (density) of PBHs.

FIG. 7. The marginalized one- and two-dimensional posterior distributions for parameters $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}, R_0\} = \{\alpha, M, R_0\}$ in the power-law mass function of PBHs, by using 10 BBH events from LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observing runs. The contours are at the 68% and 95% credible levels, respectively.


FIG. 8. The ratio of merger rate density from second-merger history to that from first-merger history, $\mathcal{R}_2(t_0, m_1, m_2)/\mathcal{R}_1(t_0, m_1, m_2)$. Note that the parameters $\{\alpha, M\}$ in Eq. (26) are fixed to their best-fit values.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we use the publicly available GW data of 10 BBH events from LIGO/Virgo O1 and O2 observing runs to constrain the merger rate distribution of PBHs by taking into account the effect of merger history. Considering two concrete mass functions of PBHs, a power-law PDF and a log-normal one, we demonstrate that the contribution of merger rate (density) from second-merger history to total merger rate (density) is subdominant, and hence the second-merger history effect can be safely ignored. As third-merger (and later merger) history will make even less contribution to the total merger rate (density), we conclude that the effect of merger history is subdominant and can be neglected when evaluating the merger rate of PBH binaries.

Furthermore, the results of local merger rate and abundance of PBHs inferred from the updated analysis are consistent with the previous estimations, confirming that the main components of CDM should not be made of stellar mass PBHs.

[1] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 061102 (2016), arXiv:1602.03837 [gr-qc].

[2] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "GW151226: Observation of Gravitational Waves from a 22-Solar-Mass Binary Black Hole Coalescence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 241103 (2016), arXiv:1606.04855 [gr-qc].

[3] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "Binary Black Hole Mergers in the first Advanced LIGO Observing Run," Phys. Rev. **X6**, 041015 (2016), arXiv:1606.04856 [gr-qc].

[4] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (VIRGO, LIGO Scientific), "GW170104: Observation of a 50-Solar-Mass Binary Black Hole Coalescence at Redshift 0.2," Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 221101 (2017), arXiv:1706.01812 [gr-qc].

[5] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "GW170608: Observation of a 19-solar-mass Binary Black Hole Coalescence," Astrophys. J. **851**, L35 (2017), arXiv:1711.05578 [astro-ph.HE].

[6] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "GW170814: A Three-Detector Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Coalescence," Phys. Rev. Lett. **119**, 141101 (2017), arXiv:1709.09660 [gr-qc].

[7] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), "GWTC-1: A Gravitational-Wave Transient Catalog of Compact Binary Mergers Observed by LIGO and Virgo during the First and Second Observing Runs," (2018), arXiv:1811.12907 [astro-ph.HE].

[8] Simeon Bird, Ilias Cholis, Julian B. Muñoz, Yacine Ali-Haïmoud, Marc Kamionkowski, Ely D. Kovetz, Alvise Raccanelli, and Adam G. Riess, "Did LIGO detect dark matter?" Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 201301 (2016), arXiv:1603.00464 [astro-ph.CO].

[9] Misao Sasaki, Teruaki Suyama, Takahiro Tanaka, and Shuichiro Yokoyama, "Primordial Black Hole Scenario for the Gravitational-Wave Event GW150914," Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 061101 (2016), arXiv:1603.08338 [astro-ph.CO].

[10] Zu-Cheng Chen and Qing-Guo Huang, "Merger Rate Distribution of Primordial-Black-Hole Binaries," Astrophys. J. **864**, 61 (2018), arXiv:1801.10327 [astro-ph.CO].

[11] Maya Fishbach, Daniel E. Holz, and Ben Farr, "Are LIGO's Black Holes Made From Smaller Black Holes?" Astrophys. J. **840**, L24 (2017), arXiv:1703.06869 [astro-ph.HE].

[12] Sebastien Clesse and Juan García-Bellido, "The clustering of massive Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter: measuring their mass distribution with Advanced LIGO," Phys. Dark Univ. **15**, 142–147 (2017), arXiv:1603.05234 [astro-ph.CO].

[13] Fabio Antonini and Frederic A. Rasio, "Merging black hole binaries in galactic nuclei: implications for advanced-LIGO detections," Astrophys. J. **831**, 187 (2016), arXiv:1606.04889 [astro-ph.HE].

[14] Kohei Inayoshi, Ryosuke Hirai, Tomoya Kinugawa, and Kenta Hotokezaka, "Formation pathway of Population III coalescing binary black holes through stable mass transfer," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **468**, 5020–5032 (2017), arXiv:1701.04823 [astro-ph.HE].

[15] Yacine Ali-Haïmoud, Ely D. Kovetz, and Marc Kamionkowski, "Merger rate of primordial black-hole binaries," Phys. Rev. **D96**, 123523 (2017), arXiv:1709.06576 [astro-ph.CO].

[16] Rosalba Perna, Yi-Han Wang, Nathan Leigh, and Matteo Cantiello, "On the Apparent Dichotomy Between the Masses of Black Holes Inferred via X-rays and via Gravitational Waves," (2019), arXiv:1901.03345 [astro-ph.HE].

[17] Bradley J. Kavanagh, Daniele Gaggero, and Gianfranco Bertone, "Merger rate of a subdominant population of primordial black holes," Phys. Rev. **D98**, 023536 (2018), arXiv:1805.09034 [astro-ph.CO].

[18] Carl L. Rodriguez, Meagan Morscher, Bharath Pattabiraman, Sourav Chatterjee, Carl-Johan Haster, and Frederic A. Rasio, "Binary Black Hole Mergers from Globular Clusters: Implications for Advanced LIGO," Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 051101 (2015), [Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett.116,no.2,029901(2016)], arXiv:1505.00792 [astro-ph.HE].

[19] Carl L. Rodriguez, Sourav Chatterjee, and Frederic A. Rasio, "Binary Black Hole Mergers from Globular Clusters: Masses, Merger Rates, and the Impact of Stellar Evolution," Phys. Rev. **D93**, 084029 (2016), arXiv:1602.02444 [astro-ph.HE].

[20] Dawoo Park, Chunglee Kim, Hyung Mok Lee, Yeong-Bok Bae, and Krzysztof Belczynski, "Black Hole Binaries Dynamically Formed in Globular Clusters," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **469**, 4665–4674 (2017), arXiv:1703.01568 [astro-ph.HE].

[21] Krzysztof Belczynski, Alessandra Buonanno, Matteo Cantiello, Chris L. Fryer, Daniel E. Holz, Ilya Mandel, M. Coleman Miller, and Marek Walczak, "The Formation and Gravitational-Wave Detection of Massive Stellar Black-Hole Binaries," Astrophys. J. **789**, 120 (2014), arXiv:1403.0677 [astro-ph.HE].

[22] Krzysztof Belczynski, Daniel E. Holz, Tomasz Bulik, and Richard O'Shaughnessy, "The first gravitational-wave source from the isolated evolution of two 40-100 Msun stars," Nature **534**, 512 (2016), arXiv:1602.04531 [astro-ph.HE].

[23] S. E. Woosley, "The Progenitor of Gw150914," Astrophys. J. **824**, L10 (2016), arXiv:1603.00511 [astro-ph.HE].

[24] Carl L. Rodriguez and Abraham Loeb, "Redshift Evolution of the Black Hole Merger Rate from Globular Clusters," Astrophys. J. **866**, L5 (2018), arXiv:1809.01152 [astro-ph.HE].

[25] Nick Choksi, Marta Volonteri, Monica Colpi, Oleg Y. Gnedin, and Hui Li, "The star clusters that make black hole binaries across cosmic time," (2018), arXiv:1809.01164 [astro-ph.GA].

[26] S. E. de Mink, M. Cantiello, N. Langer, and O. R. Pols, "Chemically Homogeneous Evolution in Massive Binaries," in *American Institute of Physics Conference Series*, American Institute of Physics Conference Series, Vol. 1314, edited by Vicky Kalogera and Marc van der Sluys (2010) pp. 291–296, arXiv:1010.2177 [astro-ph.SR].

[27] S. E. de Mink and I. Mandel, "The chemically homogeneous evolutionary channel for binary black hole mergers: rates and properties of gravitational-wave events de-

tectable by advanced LIGO," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **460**, 3545–3553 (2016), arXiv:1603.02291 [astro-ph.HE].

[28] Grzegorz Wiktorowicz, Krzysztof Belczynski, and Thomas J. Maccarone, "Black Hole X-ray Transients: The Formation Puzzle," (2013), arXiv:1312.5924 [astro-ph.HE].

[29] J. Casares and P. G. Jonker, "Mass Measurements of Stellar and Intermediate Mass Black-Holes," Space Sci. Rev. **183**, 223–252 (2014), arXiv:1311.5118 [astro-ph.HE].

[30] J. M. Corral-Santana, J. Casares, T. Muñoz-Darias, P. Rodríguez-Gil, T. Shahbaz, M. A. P. Torres, C. Zurita, and A. A. Tyndall, "A Black Hole Nova Obscured by an Inner Disk Torus," Science **339**, 1048–1051 (2013), arXiv:1303.0034 [astro-ph.GA].

[31] Jesus M. Corral-Santana, Jorge Casares, Teo Munoz-Darias, Franz E. Bauer, Ignacio G. Martinez-Pais, and David M. Russell, "BlackCAT: A catalogue of stellar-mass black holes in X-ray transients," Astron. Astrophys. **587**, A61 (2016), arXiv:1510.08869 [astro-ph.HE].

[32] Stephen Hawking, "Gravitationally collapsed objects of very low mass," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **152**, 75 (1971).

[33] Bernard J. Carr and S. W. Hawking, "Black holes in the early Universe," Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **168**, 399–415 (1974).

[34] Chen Yuan, Zu-Cheng Chen, and Qing-Guo Huang, "Probing primordial–black-hole dark matter with scalar induced gravitational waves," Phys. Rev. **D100**, 081301 (2019), arXiv:1906.11549 [astro-ph.CO].

[35] Chen Yuan, Zu-Cheng Chen, and Qing-Guo Huang, "Log-dependent slope of scalar induced gravitational waves in the infrared regions," (2019), arXiv:1910.09099 [astro-ph.CO].

[36] Zu-Cheng Chen, Chen Yuan, and Qing-Guo Huang, "Pulsar Timing Array Constraints on Primordial Black Holes with NANOGrav 11-Year Data Set," (2019), arXiv:1910.12239 [astro-ph.CO].

[37] Chen Yuan, Zu-Cheng Chen, and Qing-Guo Huang, "Scalar Induced Gravitational Waves in Different Gauges," (2019), arXiv:1912.00885 [astro-ph.CO].

[38] Rong-Gen Cai, Zong-Kuan Guo, Jing Liu, Lang Liu, and Xing-Yu Yang, "Primordial black holes and gravitational waves from parametric amplification of curvature perturbations," (2019), arXiv:1912.10437 [astro-ph.CO].

[39] Rong-gen Cai, Shi Pi, and Misao Sasaki, "Gravitational Waves Induced by non-Gaussian Scalar Perturbations," Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 201101 (2019), arXiv:1810.11000 [astro-ph.CO].

[40] Rong-Gen Cai, Shi Pi, Shao-Jiang Wang, and Xing-Yu Yang, "Pulsar Timing Array Constraints on the Induced Gravitational Waves," (2019), 10.1088/1475-7516/2019/10/059, [JCAP1910,no.10,059(2019)], arXiv:1907.06372 [astro-ph.CO].

[41] V. De Luca, G. Franciolini, A. Kehagias, and A. Riotto, "On the Gauge Invariance of Cosmological Gravitational Waves," (2019), arXiv:1911.09689 [gr-qc].

[42] N. Bartolo, V. De Luca, G. Franciolini, M. Peloso, D. Racco, and A. Riotto, "Testing primordial black holes as dark matter with LISA," Phys. Rev. **D99**, 103521 (2019), arXiv:1810.12224 [astro-ph.CO].

[43] N. Bartolo, V. De Luca, G. Franciolini, A. Lewis, M. Peloso, and A. Riotto, "Primordial Black Hole Dark Matter: LISA Serendipity," Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 211301 (2019), arXiv:1810.12218 [astro-ph.CO].

[44] B. J. Carr, Kazunori Kohri, Yuuiti Sendouda, and Jun'ichi Yokoyama, "New cosmological constraints on primordial black holes," Phys. Rev. **D81**, 104019 (2010), arXiv:0912.5297 [astro-ph.CO].

[45] A. Barnacka, J. F. Glicenstein, and R. Moderski, "New constraints on primordial black holes abundance from femtolensing of gamma-ray bursts," Phys. Rev. **D86**, 043001 (2012), arXiv:1204.2056 [astro-ph.CO].

[46] Peter W. Graham, Surjeet Rajendran, and Jaime Varela, "Dark Matter Triggers of Supernovae," Phys. Rev. **D92**, 063007 (2015), arXiv:1505.04444 [hep-ph].

[47] Hiroko Niikura et al., "Microlensing constraints on primordial black holes with the Subaru/HSC Andromeda observation," (2017), arXiv:1701.02151 [astro-ph.CO].

[48] Kim Griest, Agnieszka M. Cieplak, and Matthew J. Lehner, "New Limits on Primordial Black Hole Dark Matter from an Analysis of Kepler Source Microlensing Data," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 181302 (2013).

[49] Hiroko Niikura, Masahiro Takada, Shuichiro Yokoyama, Takahiro Sumi, and Shogo Masaki, "Earth-mass black holes? - Constraints on primordial black holes with 5-years OGLE microlensing events," (2019), arXiv:1901.07120 [astro-ph.CO].

[50] P. Tisserand et al. (EROS-2), "Limits on the Macho Content of the Galactic Halo from the EROS-2 Survey of the Magellanic Clouds," Astron. Astrophys. **469**, 387–404 (2007), arXiv:astro-ph/0607207 [astro-ph].

[51] Timothy D. Brandt, "Constraints on MACHO Dark Matter from Compact Stellar Systems in Ultra-Faint Dwarf Galaxies," Astrophys. J. **824**, L31 (2016), arXiv:1605.03665 [astro-ph.GA].

[52] Daniele Gaggero, Gianfranco Bertone, Francesca Calore, Riley M. T. Connors, Mark Lovell, Sera Markoff, and Emma Storm, "Searching for Primordial Black Holes in the radio and X-ray sky," Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 241101 (2017), arXiv:1612.00457 [astro-ph.HE].

[53] Yacine Ali-Haïmoud and Marc Kamionkowski, "Cosmic microwave background limits on accreting primordial black holes," Phys. Rev. **D95**, 043534 (2017), arXiv:1612.05644 [astro-ph.CO].

[54] Daniel Aloni, Kfir Blum, and Raphael Flauger, "Cosmic microwave background constraints on primordial black hole dark matter," JCAP **1705**, 017 (2017), arXiv:1612.06811 [astro-ph.CO].

[55] Benjamin Horowitz, "Revisiting Primordial Black Holes Constraints from Ionization History," (2016), arXiv:1612.07264 [astro-ph.CO].

[56] Lu Chen, Qing-Guo Huang, and Ke Wang, "Constraint on the abundance of primordial black holes in dark matter from Planck data," JCAP **1612**, 044 (2016), arXiv:1608.02174 [astro-ph.CO].

[57] Sai Wang, Yi-Fan Wang, Qing-Guo Huang, and Tjonnie G. F. Li, "Constraints on the Primordial Black Hole Abundance from the First Advanced LIGO Observation Run Using the Stochastic Gravitational-Wave Background," Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 191102 (2018), arXiv:1610.08725 [astro-ph.CO].

[58] B. P. Abbott et al. (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), "Search for sub-solar mass ultracompact binaries in Advanced LIGO's first observing run," Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 231103 (2018), arXiv:1808.04771 [astro-ph.CO].

[59] Ryan Magee, Anne-Sylvie Deutsch, Phoebe McClincy,

Chad Hanna, Christian Horst, Duncan Meacher, Cody Messick, Sarah Shandera, and Madeline Wade, "Methods for the detection of gravitational waves from subsolar mass ultracompact binaries," Phys. Rev. **D98**, 103024 (2018), arXiv:1808.04772 [astro-ph.IM].

[60] Sai Wang, Takahiro Terada, and Kazunori Kohri, "Prospective constraints on the primordial black hole abundance from the stochastic gravitational-wave backgrounds produced by coalescing events and curvature perturbations," (2019), arXiv:1903.05924 [astro-ph.CO].

[61] Zu-Cheng Chen, Fan Huang, and Qing-Guo Huang, "Stochastic Gravitational-Wave Background from Binary Black Holes and Binary Neutron Stars," Astrophys. J. **871**, 97 (2019), arXiv:1809.10360 [gr-qc].

[62] Zu-Cheng Chen and Qing-Guo Huang, "Distinguishing Primordial Black Holes from Astrophysical Black Holes by Einstein Telescope and Cosmic Explorer," (2019), arXiv:1904.02396 [astro-ph.CO].

[63] Paulo Montero-Camacho, Xiao Fang, Gabriel Vasquez, Makana Silva, and Christopher M. Hirata, "Revisiting constraints on asteroid-mass primordial black holes as dark matter candidates," JCAP **1908**, 031 (2019), arXiv:1906.05950 [astro-ph.CO].

[64] Ranjan Laha, "Primordial black holes as a dark matter candidate are severely constrained by the Galactic Center 511 keV gamma-ray line," Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 251101 (2019), arXiv:1906.09994 [astro-ph.HE].

[65] Basudeb Dasgupta, Ranjan Laha, and Anupam Ray, "Neutrino and positron constraints on spinning primordial black hole dark matter," (2019), arXiv:1912.01014 [hep-ph].

[66] Andrew D. Gow, Christian T. Byrnes, Alex Hall, and John A. Peacock, "Primordial black hole merger rates: distributions for multiple LIGO observables," JCAP **2001**, 031 (2020), arXiv:1911.12685 [astro-ph.CO].

[67] Takashi Nakamura, Misao Sasaki, Takahiro Tanaka, and Kip S. Thorne, "Gravitational waves from coalescing black hole MACHO binaries," Astrophys. J. **487**, L139–L142 (1997), arXiv:astro-ph/9708060.

[68] Martti Raidal, Christian Spethmann, Ville Vaskonen, and Hardi Veermäe, "Formation and Evolution of Primordial Black Hole Binaries in the Early Universe," (2018), arXiv:1812.01930 [astro-ph.CO].

[69] Martti Raidal, Ville Vaskonen, and Hardi Veermäe, "Gravitational Waves from Primordial Black Hole Mergers," JCAP **1709**, 037 (2017), arXiv:1707.01480 [astro-ph.CO].

[70] Lang Liu, Zong-Kuan Guo, and Rong-Gen Cai, "Effects of the surrounding primordial black holes on the merger rate of primordial black hole binaries," Phys. Rev. **D99**, 063523 (2019), arXiv:1812.05376 [astro-ph.CO].

[71] Lang Liu, Zong-Kuan Guo, Rong-Gen Cai, and Sang Pyo Kim, "Merger rate distribution of primordial black hole binaries with electric charges," (2020), arXiv:2001.02984 [astro-ph.CO].

[72] Ville Vaskonen and Hardi Veermäe, "A lower bound on the primordial black hole merger rate," (2019), arXiv:1908.09752 [astro-ph.CO].

[73] Lang Liu, Zong-Kuan Guo, and Rong-Gen Cai, "Effects of the merger history on the merger rate density of primordial black hole binaries," Eur. Phys. J. **C79**, 717 (2019), arXiv:1901.07672 [astro-ph.CO].

[74] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "The Rate of Binary Black Hole Mergers Inferred from Advanced LIGO Observations Surrounding GW150914," Astrophys. J. **833**, L1 (2016), arXiv:1602.03842 [astro-ph.HE].

[75] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), "Supplement: The Rate of Binary Black Hole Mergers Inferred from Advanced LIGO Observations Surrounding GW150914," Astrophys. J. Suppl. **227**, 14 (2016), arXiv:1606.03939 [astro-ph.HE].

[76] Daniel Wysocki, Jacob Lange, and Richard O. 'shaughnessy, "Reconstructing phenomenological distributions of compact binaries via gravitational wave observations," (2018), arXiv:1805.06442 [gr-qc].

[77] Maya Fishbach, Daniel E. Holz, and Will M. Farr, "Does the Black Hole Merger Rate Evolve with Redshift?" Astrophys. J. **863**, L41 (2018), [Astrophys. J. Lett.863,L41(2018)], arXiv:1805.10270 [astro-ph.HE].

[78] Ilya Mandel, Will M. Farr, and Jonathan R. Gair, "Extracting distribution parameters from multiple uncertain observations with selection biases," (2018), arXiv:1809.02063 [physics.data-an].

[79] Eric Thrane and Colm Talbot, "An introduction to Bayesian inference in gravitational-wave astronomy: parameter estimation, model selection, and hierarchical models," (2018), arXiv:1809.02293 [astro-ph.IM].

[80] https://www.gw-openscience.org/.

[81] Maya Fishbach and Daniel E. Holz, "Where Are LIGO's Big Black Holes?" Astrophys. J. **851**, L25 (2017), arXiv:1709.08584 [astro-ph.HE].

[82] Alexandre Dolgov and Joseph Silk, "Baryon isocurvature fluctuations at small scales and baryonic dark matter," Phys. Rev. **D47**, 4244–4255 (1993).

[83] Bernard Carr, Martti Raidal, Tommi Tenkanen, Ville Vaskonen, and Hardi Veermäe, "Primordial black hole constraints for extended mass functions," Phys. Rev. **D96**, 023514 (2017), arXiv:1705.05567 [astro-ph.CO].

[84] Anne M. Green, "Microlensing and dynamical constraints on primordial black hole dark matter with an extended mass function," Phys. Rev. **D94**, 063530 (2016), arXiv:1609.01143 [astro-ph.CO].

[85] Kristjan Kannike, Luca Marzola, Martti Raidal, and Hardi Veermäe, "Single Field Double Inflation and Primordial Black Holes," JCAP **1709**, 020 (2017), arXiv:1705.06225 [astro-ph.CO].

[86] Bernard J. Carr, "The Primordial black hole mass spectrum," Astrophys. J. **201**, 1–19 (1975).

[87] Bernard Carr, Florian Kuhnel, and Marit Sandstad, "Primordial Black Holes as Dark Matter," Phys. Rev. **D94**, 083504 (2016), arXiv:1607.06077 [astro-ph.CO].

[88] Michele Vallisneri, Jonah Kanner, Roy Williams, Alan Weinstein, and Branson Stephens, "The LIGO Open Science Center," *Proceedings, 10th International LISA Symposium: Gainesville, Florida, USA, May 18-23, 2014*, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **610**, 012021 (2015), arXiv:1410.4839 [gr-qc].