

A Sufficient Condition for two Gravitational Waveforms to Furnish Equivalent Parameter Estimates

Will M. Farr

Department of Physics and Astronomy, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook NY 11790, USA

Center for Computational Astrophysics, Flatiron Institute, New York NY 10010, USA

will.farr@stonybrook.edu

wfarr@flatironinstitute.org

Abstract—I derive a condition on the difference between two gravitational waveforms that is sufficient to guarantee that they will furnish equivalent parameter estimates in a Bayesian analysis. The condition is that the log-likelihood difference between the two waveforms at the same point in parameter space is small. I show that this condition is equivalent to the difference between the two waveforms being small compared to the signal-to-noise ratio of the waveforms; the condition does not require that either waveform be a good model for any signal in the data.

1. Introduction

TODO: dump some references here.

2. Bounding the Log Likelihood Difference

Consider the difference in log-likelihood between two waveforms g and h given data d (we will imagine that g and h are two different *models* for the waveform that is actually contained in d , but our argument here is fully general). We can write

$$\Delta \log \mathcal{L} := \log \mathcal{L}_h - \log \mathcal{L}_g = -\frac{1}{2}(\langle d - h | d - h \rangle - \langle d - g | d - g \rangle). \quad (1)$$

A sufficient condition that the two models are equivalent in a parameter analysis in some region in parameter space is that $|\Delta \log \mathcal{L}| \ll 1$ for parameter values in that region; we may refer to this as “pointwise equivalence” because the log-likelihood difference is evaluated at corresponding points in parameter space.

Applying the law of cosines, Equation 22, with $a = d - g$, $b = g - h$, and $c = d - h$, the log likelihood becomes

$$\Delta \log \mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \langle g - h | g - h \rangle - \langle d - g | g - h \rangle \quad (2)$$

Let us suppose that the two waveforms of interest, h and g , are close, so that we can write $g = h + \delta h$ with $|\delta h| \ll 1$. Then we see that the first term in Equation 2 is second order in $|\delta h|$; we will neglect it from here onward. Expanding the second term, and preserving only to first-order in $|\delta h|$, we have

$$|\Delta \log \mathcal{L}| \simeq |\langle d - h | \delta h \rangle|. \quad (3)$$

In words: the change in the log likelihood is the projection of the residuals onto the waveform difference.

At this point, due to the presence of d in Equation 3 we cannot say much more in general (it is, in principle, possible for the projection of $d - h$ onto δh to be essentially arbitrarily large). But if we are willing to assume that the data contain a waveform H that is reasonably close to h (and g)

$$d = H + n, \quad (4)$$

plus noise n that is consistent with the spectral density used to define our inner product, then

$$| \Delta \log \mathcal{L} | \simeq | \langle n | \delta h \rangle + \langle H | \delta h \rangle - \langle h | \delta h \rangle |. \quad (5)$$

(Note that it is not the case that $\langle H - h | H - h \rangle \ll 1$, since the difference between the true waveform and a fitted waveform can be—in fact, must be— $\mathcal{O}(1)$ for waveforms h with good posterior support in a parameter estimation.)

The first term in the right hand side of Equation 5 is a random variable with zero mean and variance $\langle \delta h | \delta h \rangle \ll 1$, and is therefore $\mathcal{O}(\delta h)$ in magnitude. We will see below that the other two terms are $\mathcal{O}(\rho \delta h)$ (see Equation 7); presuming that $\rho \gg 1$, we will ignore the first term. Applying the triangle inequality to the remainder of Equation 5, and using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$| \Delta \log \mathcal{L} | \lesssim \left(\sqrt{\langle H | H \rangle} + \sqrt{\langle h | h \rangle} \right) \sqrt{\langle \delta h | \delta h \rangle} \quad (6)$$

(we use \lesssim to remind the reader that we are ignoring sub-leading-order contributions in $\rho \delta h$). From here we will assume that h is a sufficiently good model for H that the leading order behavior of $\langle H | H \rangle$ is the same as $\langle h | h \rangle$, both scaling as

$$\rho^2 := \langle h | h \rangle = \langle H | H \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\rho). \quad (7)$$

Under this assumption,

$$\Delta \log \mathcal{L} \lesssim 2\rho \sqrt{\langle \delta h | \delta h \rangle} = 2\rho^2 \frac{|\delta h|}{|h|}. \quad (8)$$

We can relate $\langle \delta h | \delta h \rangle = |\delta h|^2$ to the mismatch between g and h , which is defined by

$$\mathcal{M} := 1 - \frac{\langle g | h \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle g | g \rangle} \sqrt{\langle h | h \rangle}}. \quad (9)$$

To linear order in δh this becomes

$$\mathcal{M} \simeq 2 \frac{\langle h | \delta h \rangle}{\langle h | h \rangle}. \quad (10)$$

Again applying Cauchy-Schwarz, we have

$$| \mathcal{M} | \lesssim 2 \frac{\sqrt{\langle \delta h | \delta h \rangle}}{\sqrt{\langle h | h \rangle}}. \quad (11)$$

This is the **wrong direction** to claim with certainty that

$$\Delta \log \mathcal{L} \lesssim \rho^2 \mathcal{M}, \quad (12)$$

but assuming there is no special orientational issues (i.e. that the projection of δh onto h is not particularly small compared to their magnitudes), we can say that

$$\Delta \log \mathcal{L} \sim \rho^2 \mathcal{M}; \quad (13)$$

but in any case, it is **bounded** by

$$\Delta \log \mathcal{L} \lesssim 2\rho^2 \frac{|\delta h|}{|h|}. \quad (14)$$

3. Definitions

3.1. Mismatch

The mismatch \mathcal{M} between two waveforms g and h is given by

$$\mathcal{M} := 1 - \frac{\langle g | h \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle g | g \rangle} \sqrt{\langle h | h \rangle}} = 1 - \langle \hat{g} | \hat{h} \rangle \quad (15)$$

3.2. Log Likelihood

The log-likelihood for some waveform h given data d is

$$\log \mathcal{L} := -\frac{1}{2} \langle d - h | d - h \rangle \quad (16)$$

3.3. Triangle Inequality

The triangle inequality applies to any vector space and states that for any vectors a and b

$$\| a + b \| \leq \| a \| + \| b \| \quad (17)$$

Equivalently, for vectors c and d

$$\| c \| - \| d \| \leq \| c - d \| \quad (18)$$

where $\| x \|$ is the norm of x . (this latter follows from the former by setting $a = c - d$ and $b = d$).

We can also square Equation 17 to obtain

$$\| a + b \|^2 \leq \| a \|^2 + 2 \| a \| \| b \| + \| b \|^2, \quad (19)$$

or

$$\| c \|^2 - \| d \|^2 \leq \| c - d \|^2 + 2 \| c - d \| \| d \|. \quad (20)$$

3.4. Cauchy-Schwarz Inequality

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for an inner product states that for all vectors a and b

$$| \langle a | b \rangle | \leq \sqrt{\langle a | a \rangle} \sqrt{\langle b | b \rangle} \quad (21)$$

3.5. The Law of Cosines

For vectors a , b , and c with $c = a + b$ we have

$$\langle c | c \rangle = \langle a | a \rangle + \langle b | b \rangle + 2 \langle a | b \rangle \quad (22)$$