

NANOGrav's 12.5-yr analysis for an isotropic stochastic GW background

(Arzoumanian et al 2020 ApJL 905 L34;
arxiv:2009.04496v1 [astro-ph.HE] 9 Sep 2020)

Joe Romano, LAPP Seminar, 2 April 2021

The NANOGrav 12.5-year Data Set: Search For An Isotropic Stochastic Gravitational-Wave Background

ABSTRACT

We search for an isotropic stochastic gravitational-wave background (GWB) in the 12.5-year pulsar-timing data set collected by the North American Nanohertz Observatory for Gravitational Waves. Our analysis finds strong evidence of a stochastic process, modeled as a power-law, with common amplitude and spectral slope across pulsars. Under our fiducial model, the Bayesian posterior of the amplitude for an $f^{-2/3}$ power-law spectrum, expressed as the characteristic GW strain, has median 1.92×10^{-15} and 5%–95% quantiles of $1.37\text{--}2.67 \times 10^{-15}$ at a reference frequency of $f_{\text{yr}} = 1 \text{ yr}^{-1}$; the Bayes factor in favor of the common-spectrum process versus independent red-noise processes in each pulsar exceeds 10,000. However, we find no statistically significant evidence that this process has quadrupolar spatial correlations, which we would consider necessary to claim a GWB detection consistent with general relativity. We find that the process has neither monopolar nor dipolar correlations, which may arise from, for example, reference clock or solar system ephemeris systematics, respectively. The amplitude posterior has significant support above previously reported upper limits; we explain this in terms of the Bayesian priors assumed for intrinsic pulsar red noise. We examine potential implications for the supermassive black hole binary population under the hypothesis that the signal is indeed astrophysical in nature.

Keywords: Gravitational waves – Methods: data analysis – Pulsars: general

Arzoumanian et al 2020 ApJL 905 L34

arXiv:2009.04496v1 [astro-ph.HE] 9 Sep 2020



+




+




=




sky map of ~50 IPTA millisecond pulsars




Rapidly rotating neutron star; strong magnetic field; narrow beam of radiation




Nature's most precise clocks!
($\Delta T_p/T_p < 10^{-14}$)





GW spectrum



Primary source of GWs for pulsar timing





PTA is a galactic-scale GW detector





GWs perturb the arrival times of pulses -> look for the presence of GWs in the **timing residuals**

GW perturbations are correlated across pulsars





Timing residuals are the data for pulsar timing analyses

timing residual = observed arrival – predicted arrival
= unmodeled deterministic processes + noise sources + GW signals




Signal+noise models for the 12.5-yr analysis




The various signal+noise models are then assessed using both **Bayesian** and **frequentist** analyses (e.g., optimal CC statistic)

$$P(f) = \frac{A^2}{12\pi^2} \left(\frac{f}{f_{\text{yr}}} \right)^{-\gamma} f_{\text{yr}}^{-3}$$

RESULT 1: Strong evidence of a common red-noise process




$$\gamma_{\text{CP}} = 13/3 \text{ (binary inspiral)}$$
$$A_{\text{CP}} = 1.92 \times 10^{-15} \text{ (median)}$$



NG 12.5-yr and 11-yr results consistent
when analyzed in a similar manner


Previous analyses had lower ULs due to differences in the analyses

1. Earlier **solar system ephemeris** models had relatively large **uncertainties** in the position of Jupiter, which needed to be **marginalized over**





2. Previous analyses used **uniform priors** for the amplitude of **pulsar red noise**, which gave more weight to **larger pulsar noise**

→ **absorb power** from a potential GWB, lowering ULs



RESULT 2: No significant evidence of HD correlations



(Bayes factor in favor of HD correlations is only ~3:1, or ~1.5 σ)



RESULT 3: Monopole & dipole correlations are disfavored


(Bayes factors of ~ 100 and 200 against, or $\sim 3\sigma$)

- **Monopole** correlations could be sign of a **clock offset** affecting all pulsars
- **Dipole** correlations could be due to inaccurate determination of the **solar system barycentre**
- **Quadrupolar** (i.e., **Hellings-Downs**) correlations are **expected from GR**



[pulsar timing GWB equivalent of LIGO-Virgo
detector characterization]


Bayes factor model comparison



[credit: X. Siemens]

Astrophysical implications of the 12.5-yr analysis

- SMBBH models that were in tension with NG11-yr upper limit are **no longer ruled out**
- Broad posterior for spectral index allows for **possible cosmological sources**
- Roughly **~30 papers** on the arxiv since submission
- NANOGrav is also **analyzing** the 12.5-yr data for **other potential GW sources** (CWs, non-GR polarizations, etc.)



Summary

- **Strong evidence for an uncorrelated red-noise process common to all pulsars** in the NANOGrav 12.5-yr data
- **No significant evidence for HD correlations**, but monopole and dipole correlations are disfavored
- **Larger data sets** (e.g., NG 15-yr) and **alternative analyses** (independent pipelines or data sets, e.g., IPTA) will either confirm or rule out these results
- Unlike the gold-plated detection of GW150914, the detection of a GWB will be a **gradual process**, with **more evidence accumulating over time**