



HAL
open science

Theory-Agnostic Constraints on Black-Hole Dipole Radiation with Multiband Gravitational-Wave Astrophysics

Enrico Barausse, Nicolás Yunes, Katie Chamberlain

► **To cite this version:**

Enrico Barausse, Nicolás Yunes, Katie Chamberlain. Theory-Agnostic Constraints on Black-Hole Dipole Radiation with Multiband Gravitational-Wave Astrophysics. *Physical Review Letters*, 2016, 116, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.241104 . hal-03645134

HAL Id: hal-03645134

<https://hal.science/hal-03645134>

Submitted on 23 May 2022

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Theory-Agnostic Constraints on Black-Hole Dipole Radiation with Multiband Gravitational-Wave Astrophysics

Enrico Barausse,¹ Nicolás Yunes,² and Katie Chamberlain²

¹*Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 6 & CNRS, UMR 7095, Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris, 98 bis bd Arago, 75014 Paris, France*

²*eXtreme Gravity Institute, Department of Physics, Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana 59717, USA*

(Received 13 March 2016; published 17 June 2016)

The aLIGO detection of the black-hole binary GW150914 opens a new era for probing extreme gravity. Many gravity theories predict the emission of dipole gravitational radiation by binaries. This is excluded to high accuracy in binary pulsars, but entire classes of theories predict this effect predominantly (or only) in binaries involving black holes. Joint observations of GW150914-like systems by aLIGO and eLISA will improve bounds on dipole emission from black-hole binaries by 6 orders of magnitude relative to current constraints, provided that eLISA is not dramatically descope.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.241104

Introduction.—The advanced LIGO (aLIGO) [1] observation of gravitational waves (GWs) from GW150914 [2] heralds a new era in astrophysics in which GWs will probe the Universe in a new and complementary way to traditional telescopes [3]. The GWs detected were emitted in the late inspiral, merger, and ringdown of a black-hole (BH) binary with masses $36_{-4}^{+5}M_{\odot}$ and $29_{-4}^{+4}M_{\odot}$ at a redshift $z = 0.09_{-0.04}^{+0.03}$ [2]. While the existence of GWs had been demonstrated indirectly by their backreaction on the orbital evolution of binary pulsars [4], GW150914 represents their first direct detection, and also provides the most convincing evidence to date of the very existence of BHs.

With several new GW detectors coming online soon, GW150914 is just the beginning. Advanced Virgo [5] is expected to start science runs in 2016, while KAGRA [6] is under construction and LIGO India [7] has been approved. Pulsar timing arrays [8–11] are already observing at nanohertz frequencies, and ESA's evolving Laser Interferometer Space Antenna (eLISA) [12] will target millihertz frequencies; these frequency bands are complementary to the 10–10³ Hz range probed by terrestrial detectors. Some GW sources will likely have electromagnetic, neutrino or cosmic-ray counterparts, which could provide additional information on their nature, formation, and environment.

GW150914-like sources will not only be visible in the aLIGO band, but also in the millihertz eLISA band, thus opening the prospect for multiband GW astronomy [13,14]). Indeed, Ref. [13] predicts that anywhere from a few to thousands of BH binaries with total masses of $\sim 50\text{--}100M_{\odot}$ will be detected by eLISA in a five year mission. These systems inspiral in the eLISA band for years before chirping out of it and reappearing in the aLIGO band to merge typically a few weeks later. Observations with eLISA will allow measurements of system parameters before detection with aLIGO. This may help localize the

source in the sky in a timely and more accurate manner, thus increasing the chances of finding an electromagnetic counterpart, and will also allow for the prediction of the coalescence time in the aLIGO band weeks or months in advance, with errors $\lesssim 10$ s [13].

This exciting prospect, however, depends heavily on whether or not the eLISA design is dramatically descope, a topic currently under investigation by ESA (see, e.g., Refs. [15–18] for investigations of the impact of different designs on eLISA science). Indeed, as highlighted in Ref. [13], cost-saving measures, such as the decrease in the number of laser links from six to four, or shortening the mission duration or the length of the interferometer arms, may dangerously impact eLISA's capability to resolve GW150914-like binaries. In this Letter, we show that an excessive descope of the eLISA configuration—one that makes the detection of GW150914-like BH binaries impossible—will miss out on an incredible opportunity to perform a generic test of gravitational theories: to constrain the existence of BH dipole gravitational radiation to an accuracy that surpasses current constraints by 6 orders of magnitude.

Motion and GW emission in extensions of general relativity.—Gravity theories that extend general relativity (GR) typically affect the motion of bodies and GW emission. Though details of these changes to the dynamics depend on the specific theory, some common traits can be identified. In most theories, the gravitational field is described by a spin-2 metric tensor field, and by additional fields (see, e.g., Ref. [19]). The interaction between matter and the new fields may give rise to “fifth forces,” both conservative and dissipative. The latter can be thought of as energy-momentum exchanges between matter and the new fields; i.e., the stress-energy tensor of matter is not generally conserved. For weakly gravitating bodies or in regimes of weak gravitational fields (like on Earth or in the

Solar System), modifications to the dynamics are excluded to high confidence by particle-physics and gravitational experiments [20]. However, if the additional fields do not couple to matter at tree level, their effect on the motion will be suppressed; i.e., the “weak” equivalence principle—the universality of free fall in weak-gravity regimes—will be satisfied, and these experimental tests will be passed.

The motion of strongly gravitating bodies, such as neutron stars (NSs) and BHs, can more easily deviate from the GR expectation in modified gravity theories. Indeed, an effective coupling between the extra fields and matter, even if suppressed at tree level, typically reappears at higher perturbative orders. This is because the extra fields generally couple nonminimally to the metric, which in turn is coupled to matter via gravity. Therefore, when gravity is strong, the nonminimal coupling causes the emergence of (effective) fifth forces and energy-momentum exchanges between matter and the extra fields, thus leading to deviations from the universality of free fall [21,22]. These are referred to as violations of the “strong” equivalence principle, or “Nördtvedt effect.”

A modification of the motion of strongly gravitating bodies will leave an imprint in the GWs these bodies emit. In GR, GW emission is predominantly quadrupolar, as monopole and dipole emission are forbidden by the conservation of the matter stress-energy tensor. In modified gravity, however, the matter stress-energy tensor is generally not conserved due to the Nördtvedt effect, thus allowing monopole and dipole emission [20]. Dipole radiation, in particular, is the dominant effect for quasircular binary systems, although its actual presence and magnitude generally depend on the nature of the binary components and the modified theory of gravity in question. Besides dipole radiation, conservative modifications to the dynamics (e.g., to the binary’s binding energy and Hamiltonian) may also be present, but they are typically subdominant as they enter at higher post-Newtonian (PN) order [23–26].

To understand how dipole radiation comes about, consider one of the simplest GR extensions. In “scalar-tensor” (ST) theories of the Fierz, Jordan, Brans, and Dicke (FJBD) type [27–29], the gravitational interaction is mediated by the metric and by a gravitational scalar. The latter has a standard kinetic term in the action (up to a field redefinition), is minimally coupled to matter, and is directly coupled to the Ricci scalar. Because of the standard kinetic term, the scalar obeys the Klein-Gordon equation, with a source (due to the coupling to the Ricci scalar in the action) that depends on the matter stress-energy. Therefore, the scalar is not excited in globally vacuum spacetimes, and can only be nonconstant because of nontrivial boundary or initial conditions (e.g., if the scalar field is not initially uniform, in which case it undergoes a transient evolution before settling to a constant [30], or if boundary conditions that are cosmological or not asymptotically flat are imposed

[31,32]). Therefore, BH spacetimes (isolated or binary) generally do not excite a scalar field (i.e., have “no hair”) and do not emit dipole radiation in these theories [33,34].

Nevertheless, FJBD-like ST theories predict that dipole emission should be present in binaries involving at least one NS. This has been historically very important, because binary pulsar observations constrain deviations of the orbital period decay away from the GR prediction to high accuracy. For example, the double binary pulsar PSR J0737-3039 [35,36] constrains $\delta \equiv |(\dot{P}/P)_{\text{non GR}} - (\dot{P}/P)_{\text{GR}}|/(\dot{P}/P)_{\text{GR}} \lesssim 10^{-2}$ [37–39], while the binary pulsar J1141-6545 [40,41] constrains $\delta \lesssim 6 \times 10^{-4}$. These observations place very stringent constraints on several gravitational theories, including FJBD-like ST ones.

To derive a precise bound on gravitational dipole emission with binary-pulsar observations, let us parametrize a dipole flux correction as

$$\dot{E}_{\text{GW}} = \dot{E}_{\text{GR}} \left[1 + B \left(\frac{Gm}{r_{12}c^2} \right)^{-1} \right], \quad (1)$$

where \dot{E}_{GR} is the GR GW flux (given at leading order by the quadrupole formula), m and r_{12} are the binary’s total mass and orbital separation, and B is a theory-dependent parameter regulating the strength of the dipole term [e.g., in FJBD-like ST theories, $B = 5(\Delta\alpha)^2/96$, where $\Delta\alpha$ is the difference between the scalar charges of the two bodies [34,42]]. Dipole emission is enhanced (relative to quadrupolar emission) by a factor $(Gm/r_{12}c^2)^{-1}$, i.e., a -1 PN effect dominating over the GR prediction at large separations (or low frequencies). Since $\dot{P}/P = -(3/2)\dot{E}_{\text{GW}}/|E_b|$, E_b being the Newtonian binding energy of the binary, one obtains $\delta = |\dot{E}_{\text{GW}}/\dot{E}_{\text{GR}} - 1| = |B|(Gm/r_{12}c^2)^{-1} \lesssim 10^{-2}$. This leads to the approximate bound $|B| \lesssim 6 \times 10^{-8}$ with PSR 0737-3039 [39] and $|B| \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-9}$ with PSR J1141-6545. Other binary pulsars lead to similar bounds.

These bounds place stringent constraints on several theories that predict dipole GW emission in the inspiral of binaries involving at least one NS, e.g., numerous FJBD-like ST theories (especially those predicting spontaneous scalarization for isolated NSs [42–45]), Lorentz-violating gravity [23,24], or theories with a MOND-like phenomenology [46]. Binary pulsars, however, are less efficient at testing theories where dipole radiation activates late in the inspiral—e.g., certain FJBD-like ST theories where NSs do not spontaneously scalarize in isolation, but undergo “dynamical scalarization” in close binaries [47–52]—or theories that predict dipole emission predominantly (or only) in BH binaries.

Let us focus on the latter case. ST theories more general than FJBD-like ones couple the scalar field not only to the Ricci scalar, but also to more general curvature invariants such as the Gauss-Bonnet invariant or the Pontryagin density [53,54]. In these cases, the equation for the scalar has a source that depends not only on the matter stress

energy (like in FJBD-like theories) but also on matter-independent curvature terms. The former typically induces dipole radiation in NS binaries and follows from coupling the scalar field to the Ricci scalar in the action, while the latter do not vanish in vacuum, may induce dipole radiation in BH binaries, and follow from coupling the scalar to more general curvature invariants. Therefore, bounds on dipole emission from binary pulsars and BH binaries are *complementary*, as they constrain different couplings in the action. As an extreme example, one can select these couplings to eliminate dipole emission in binary pulsars altogether, while retaining dipole emission in BH binaries. This is the case in shift-symmetric dilatonic Gauss-Bonnet gravity [53,55], where the scalar interacts with the curvature only via a linear coupling to the Gauss-Bonnet invariant in the action [56].

A similar situation is expected in theories with vector fields (e.g., Lorentz violating gravity and theories with a MOND phenomenology) or tensor fields (i.e., bimetric gravity theories), where the contribution of the extra fields does not vanish in vacuum. This causes BHs to possess extra “hairs” besides the GR ones (mass and spin) [57–63], leading to dipole emission from BH binaries, at least in principle [64]. Finally, as mentioned above, even within FJBD-like ST theories, dipole BH emission might arise from nontrivial (e.g., cosmological) boundary conditions. In light of all this, it makes sense to constrain dipole radiation without theoretical bias.

Currently, the most stringent constraint on vacuum dipole radiation follows from the orbital decay rate of the A0620-00 low-mass x-ray binary (LMXB), a main sequence star in orbit around a BH. By assuming that the observed orbital decay is consistent with GR, one obtains the 1σ constraint $|B| < 1.9 \times 10^{-3}$ [65]. This bound is sensitive to systematics in the astrophysical model. For example, BH accretion forces the orbital decay rate to depend on the mass transfer rate and on the angular momentum carried away by stellar winds, which are not known *a priori*.

Projected constraints on dipole GW emission from BH binaries.—Since aLIGO only sees BH binaries near merger, the GW dipole term is subdominant in the aLIGO band, and thus can only be weakly constrained [66]. However, if a GW150914-like BH binary is first observed by eLISA and then by aLIGO, dipole emission can be constrained with exquisite precision.

Let us provide an approximate physical argument for why this is so. If GR is correct, the GW150914 binary was emitting at a GW frequency $f_{\text{GW},i} \approx 0.016$ Hz (in the middle of the eLISA band) five years before merger. If eLISA had been in operation in its best configuration (i.e., the “classic LISA” N2A5M5L6 configuration of Ref. [15]), it would have measured the system parameters with outstanding accuracy, predicting in particular the time at which the system would have merged in the aLIGO band to within 10s. However, if the GR flux is modified by a dipole term

as in Eq. (1), the binary will coalesce earlier, because dipole emission will shed additional energy and angular momentum. To qualitatively assess this effect, consider the evolution of the GW frequency f_{GW} under Eq. (1): $df_{\text{GW}}/dt = -(df_{\text{GW}}/dE_b)E_{\text{GW}}$. One can compute the time Δt needed by GW150914 to evolve from $f_{\text{GW},i}$ to $f_{\text{GW},m} \approx 132$ Hz by integrating $(df_{\text{GW}}/dt)^{-1}$. By requiring that the difference $|(\Delta t)_{\text{GR}} - (\Delta t)_{\text{nonGR}}|$ be less than an uncertainty of 10 s on the merger time, a joint eLISA-aLIGO observation of GW150914 would roughly constrain $|B| \lesssim 10^{-10}$.

To improve this rough estimate, we perform a Fisher-matrix analysis to obtain bounds on B . We use the (quasicircular, non-spin-precessing) PhenomB inspiral-merger-ringdown waveform of Refs. [67,68], with the addition of a single parametrized post-Einsteinian [25,69,70] inspiral phase term at -1 PN order [$\Psi_{\text{ppE}} = \beta(\pi\mathcal{M}f)^{b/3}$ with $\beta = -(3/224)\eta^{2/5}B$ and $b = -7$, where $\eta = m_1m_2/m^2$, $m = m_1 + m_2$ is the total mass, and $\mathcal{M} = m\eta^{3/5}$ is the chirp mass]. The parameters of this model are then $(A, \phi_c, t_c, \mathcal{M}, \eta, \chi_{\text{eff}}, B)$, where A is an overall amplitude, (ϕ_c, t_c) are the phase and time of coalescence, and χ_{eff} is an effective spin parameter.

We take the aLIGO noise curve at design sensitivity from Ref. [71], and that at the time of the GW150914 detection from Ref. [72]. For eLISA, we use sky-averaged, six-link sensitivity curves, since GW150914-like events will be considerably more difficult to resolve with four links [13]. We consider a five year mission, and allow multiple options for the arm length (1, 2, or 5 Gm, i.e., A1, A2, A5) and the low frequency noise (N2 for the expected LISA Pathfinder performance, N1 for a noise 10 times worse) [15]. We assume that the observation is simultaneously done by two instruments (either the two independent eLISA interferometers, or the aLIGO Hanford and Livingston sites). To combine aLIGO and eLISA results, we add the Fisher matrices and then invert the sum to obtain the variance-covariance matrix [73–75].

We explore the projected bounds on B with several BH binaries. For GW150914-like systems, we consider total masses $m = (50, 80, 100)M_{\odot}$ (as well as $m = 65M_{\odot}$ for the actual GW150914 event), a mass ratio $q \equiv m_1/m_2 = 0.8$, dimensionless spin parameters $(\chi_1, \chi_2) = (0.4, 0.3)$, and a luminosity distance $d_L = 400$ Mpc (i.e., redshift $z \sim 0.085$). For massive BH binaries, we consider $m = (10^4, 10^5, 10^6)M_{\odot}$, with large $(\chi_1, \chi_2) = (0.9, 0.8)$ spins, mass ratios $q = (0.3, 0.8)$, and $d_L = (16, 48)$ Gpc (i.e., $z \sim 2$ and 5). We also consider extreme/intermediate mass-ratio inspirals (EMRIs/IMRIs), for which we take individual masses $(10, 10^5)M_{\odot}$, $(10, 10^4)M_{\odot}$, $(10^2, 10^5)M_{\odot}$, $(10^3, 10^5)M_{\odot}$, $d_L = (1, 5)$ Gpc [$z \sim (0.2, 0.8)$], and spins $(\chi_1, \chi_2) = (0.5, 0.8)$ in all cases.

Figure 1 summarizes our projected 1σ bounds on B and compares them to the existing ones. eLISA observations of GW150914-like systems lead to constraints typically 5

orders of magnitude stronger than the current A0620-00 constraints, and 6 orders of magnitude stronger than current aLIGO constraints. This is because when these binaries produce GWs in the eLISA band, they are widely separated and thus emit dipole radiation abundantly. For example, five years prior to merger (while in the eLISA band), the GW150914 binary had an orbital velocity of $0.025c$. When exiting the eLISA band at ~ 0.1 Hz, the velocity was $0.048c$, which increased to $0.22c$ upon entering the aLIGO band at ~ 10 Hz. Notice that eLISA is sensitive to the very low-velocity/early inspiral, where not only does dipole radiation dominate over quadrupole radiation, but any systematics due to the PN approximation are negligible (unlike for events including the merger). We have confirmed this by repeating the Fisher analysis with two waveform models (PhenomB and PhenomD [66,77]), which lead to very similar constraints on dipole radiation, since the models are almost indistinguishable in the early inspiral (see also Ref. [66]).

Combined eLISA and design-aLIGO observations lead to constraints ~ 10 times better than eLISA observations alone. If design aLIGO is upgraded, e.g., to one of the LIGO Explorer designs with a tenfold increase in




FIG. 1. 1σ constraints on the BH dipole flux parameter B from various sources—GW150914-like BH binaries (stars and pluses), massive BH binaries (filled circles), and EMRIs/IMRIs (filled triangles)—as a function of the instrument—aLIGO at the time of the GW150914 event (Curr. aLIGO), aLIGO at design sensitivity (Design aLIGO), various six-link eLISA configurations ($N \times A \times$) with target/pessimistic low-frequency noise ($N2/N1$) and 1 Gm/2 Gm arms ($A1/A2$), a Classic LISA design with six links, 5-Gm arms and target-level low-frequency noise, and joint observations by design aLIGO and eLISA ($C-N \times A \times$), or by design aLIGO and Classic LISA (aLIGO-LISA). For comparison, we also include the current constraint on vacuum dipole radiation from LMXB A0620-00 [65]. The combined aLIGO-eLISA observation of GW150914-like sources leads to the most stringent constraints, which are 6 orders of magnitude stronger than current bounds.

sensitivity at 100 Hz [78], these combined constraints would become $\sim 10^2$ times better than eLISA observations alone. Note that the eLISA and design-aLIGO combined constraints are roughly 1 order of magnitude worse than the approximate calculation presented earlier, because the latter does not account for correlations between parameters. We have indeed verified that the bound from the Fisher analysis becomes stronger and approaches the approximate estimate if we assume that all parameters except β (or equivalently B) are known exactly, i.e., if we assume that the variance on β is simply given by the inverse of the corresponding diagonal Fisher matrix entry.

eLISA observations of massive BH binaries and EMRIs/IMRIs would also constrain BH dipole radiation, although bounds are typically weaker. How strong these constraints are depends on the orbital separation (or relative velocity) of these binaries when they emit in the eLISA band. For example, eLISA will be sensitive only to the late inspiral and merger-ringdown of very massive BH binaries, which is why these lead to weaker constraints in Fig. 1.

One may wonder whether the projected constraints discussed above are robust, since gravity modifications inducing dipole emission, if present, will typically change the GW model not only at -1 PN order in the waveform phase, but also at higher PN orders. However, as shown explicitly in Ref. [66], at least in FJBD theory, these higher-order PN corrections only affect a Fisher analysis like ours by at most 10%. The addition of many terms in the GW phase at multiple PN orders is not only unnecessary, but actually counterproductive as it dilutes the ability to extract information from the signal (as pointed out in Refs. [79,80] and verified in Ref. [77]).

Finally, our constraints apply to theories where the gravity modifications are not completely screened on the scale of BH binaries. Indeed, there is no proposed mechanism that can completely screen gravity modifications at small scales in dynamical situations such as those of interest here (see, e.g., Refs. [46,81–83] and the discussion in Ref. [55]). Similarly, we implicitly assume that modified gravity effects do not appear suddenly and nonperturbatively at specific energy scales/resonances (see, e.g., Refs. [33,47–52,84]).

Conclusion.—The realization that GW150914-like BH binaries could be multiband GW-astronomy targets for aLIGO and eLISA opens a unique door to study various physical mechanisms in extreme-gravity regimes. The generation of dipole radiation (and other potential effects) can be tested by such joint eLISA-aLIGO observations with unprecedented precision. The exciting prospect of multiband observation, however, will only materialize if the eLISA design is not excessively descoped.

We would like to thank Kent Yagi for helpful discussions and code comparisons, Alberto Sesana for useful discussions about the detectability of GW150914-like sources by

eLISA, and Emanuele Berti and Vitor Cardoso for reading a preliminary version of this Letter and providing useful and insightful comments. Special thanks go to Neil Cornish for insightful comments on how to combine aLIGO and eLISA observations. E. B. acknowledges support from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/PEOPLE-2011-CIG) through Marie Curie Career Integration Grant No. GALFORMBHS PCIG11-GA-2012-321608, and from H2020-MSCA-RISE-2015 Grant No. StronGrHEP-690904. N. Y. and K. C. acknowledge support from NSF CAREER Grant No. PHY-1250636.

-
- [1] LIGO, www.ligo.caltech.edu.
- [2] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016).
- [3] N. Yunes and X. Siemens, *Living Rev. Relativity* **16** (2013).
- [4] T. Damour and J. H. Taylor, *Phys. Rev. D* **45**, 1840 (1992).
- [5] VIRGO, www.virgo.infn.it.
- [6] Kagra, <http://gwcenter.icrr.u-tokyo.ac.jp/en/>.
- [7] LIGO India, www.gw-indigo.org.
- [8] EPTA, www.epta.eu.org.
- [9] NANOGrav, nanograv.org.
- [10] PPTA, www.atnf.csiro.au/research/pulsar/ppta.
- [11] G. Hobbs *et al.*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 084013 (2010).
- [12] P. A. Seoane *et al.* (eLISA Collaboration), [arXiv:1305.5720](https://arxiv.org/abs/1305.5720).
- [13] A. Sesana, [arXiv:1602.06951](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.06951).
- [14] P. Amaro-Seoane and L. Santamaria, *Astrophys. J.* **722**, 1197 (2010).
- [15] A. Klein, E. Barausse, A. Sesana, A. Petiteau, E. Berti, S. Babak, J. Gair, S. Aoudia, I. Hinder, F. Ohme *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 024003 (2016).
- [16] C. Caprini, M. Hindmarsh, S. Huber, T. Konstandin, J. Kozaczuk, G. Nardini, J. M. No, A. Petiteau, P. Schwaller, G. Servant *et al.*, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **04** (2016) 001.
- [17] N. Tamanini, C. Caprini, E. Barausse, A. Sesana, A. Klein, and A. Petiteau, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **04** (2016) 002.
- [18] E. K. Porter, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 064001 (2015).
- [19] E. Berti *et al.*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32**, 243001 (2015).
- [20] C. M. Will, *Living Rev. Relativity* **9** (2006).
- [21] D. M. Eardley, *Astrophys. J.* **196**, L59 (1975).
- [22] K. Nordtvedt, *Phys. Rev.* **169**, 1014 (1968).
- [23] K. Yagi, D. Blas, N. Yunes, and E. Barausse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 161101 (2014).
- [24] K. Yagi, D. Blas, E. Barausse, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 084067 (2014).
- [25] E. Barausse, V. Cardoso, and P. Pani, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 104059 (2014).
- [26] The PN approximation solves the field equations perturbatively in the ratio v/c , where v is the binary's relative velocity. Terms suppressed by $(v/c)^{2n}$ relative to leading order are said to be of n PN order.
- [27] M. Fierz, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **29**, 128 (1956).
- [28] P. Jordan, *Z. Phys.* **157**, 112 (1959).
- [29] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke, *Phys. Rev.* **124**, 925 (1961).
- [30] J. Healy, T. Bode, R. Haas, E. Pazos, P. Laguna, D. M. Shoemaker, and N. Yunes, *Classical Quantum Gravity* **29**, 232002 (2012).
- [31] M. W. Horbatsch and C. P. Burgess, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **05** (2012) 010.
- [32] E. Berti, V. Cardoso, L. Gualtieri, M. Horbatsch, and U. Sperhake, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 124020 (2013).
- [33] N. Yunes, P. Pani, and V. Cardoso, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 102003 (2012).
- [34] S. Mirshekari and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 084070 (2013).
- [35] R. N. Manchester, M. Kramer, A. Possenti, A. G. Lyne, M. Burgay, I. H. Stairs, A. W. Hotan, M. A. McLaughlin, D. R. Lorimer, G. B. Hobbs *et al.*, *Astrophys. J. Lett.* **621**, L49 (2005).
- [36] A. G. Lyne, M. Burgay, M. Kramer, A. Possenti, R. N. Manchester, F. Camilo, M. A. McLaughlin, D. R. Lorimer, N. D'Amico, B. C. Joshi *et al.*, *Science* **303**, 1153 (2004).
- [37] I. H. Stairs, *Living Rev. Relativity* **6**, 5 (2003).
- [38] M. Kramer, I. H. Stairs, R. Manchester, M. McLaughlin, A. Lyne *et al.*, *Science* **314**, 97 (2006).
- [39] N. Yunes and S. A. Hughes, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 082002 (2010).
- [40] N. D. Bhat, M. Bailes, and J. P. W. Verbiest, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 124017 (2008).
- [41] J.-M. Gérard and Y. Wiaux, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 024040 (2002).
- [42] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese, *Classical Quantum Gravity* **9**, 2093 (1992).
- [43] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 2220 (1993).
- [44] P. C. C. Freire, N. Wex, G. Esposito-Farèse, J. P. W. Verbiest, M. Bailes, B. A. Jacoby, M. Kramer, I. H. Stairs, J. Antoniadis, and G. H. Janssen, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **423**, 3328 (2012).
- [45] N. Wex, [arXiv:1402.5594](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.5594).
- [46] M. Bonetti and E. Barausse, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 084053 (2015); **93**, 029901(E) (2016).
- [47] E. Barausse, C. Palenzuela, M. Ponce, and L. Lehner, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 081506 (2013).
- [48] C. Palenzuela, E. Barausse, M. Ponce, and L. Lehner, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 044024 (2014).
- [49] L. Sampson, N. Yunes, N. Cornish, M. Ponce, E. Barausse, A. Klein, C. Palenzuela, and L. Lehner, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124091 (2014).
- [50] M. Shibata, K. Taniguchi, H. Okawa, and A. Buonanno, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 084005, (2014).
- [51] K. Taniguchi, M. Shibata, and A. Buonanno, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 024033 (2015).
- [52] M. Ponce, C. Palenzuela, E. Barausse, and L. Lehner, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 084038 (2015).
- [53] K. Yagi, L. C. Stein, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 024010 (2016).
- [54] K. Yagi and L. C. Stein, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **33**, 054001 (2016).
- [55] E. Barausse and K. Yagi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 211105 (2015).
- [56] In these theories dipole emission from NS binaries vanishes due to both (i) shift symmetry and (ii) NS-NS spacetimes being simply connected [53,55]. Assumption (ii) is not valid for BH spacetimes, which is why BH binaries emit dipole

- radiation while NS-NS binaries do not, although the latter will present deviations from GR at higher PN orders.
- [57] E. Barausse, T. Jacobson, and T. P. Sotiriou, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 124043 (2011).
- [58] E. Barausse and T. P. Sotiriou, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **30**, 244010 (2013).
- [59] E. Barausse and T. P. Sotiriou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 181101 (2012).
- [60] E. Barausse and T. P. Sotiriou, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 087504 (2013).
- [61] E. Barausse, T. P. Sotiriou, and I. Vega, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 044044 (2016).
- [62] R. Brito, V. Cardoso, and P. Pani, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 064006 (2013).
- [63] E. Babichev and R. Brito, *Classical Quantum Gravity* **32**, 154001 (2015).
- [64] A rigorous proof of the existence of BH dipole radiation in these theories is not yet available, as GW emission in the presence of extra vector and tensor modes is quite involved; cf. the calculation in Ref. [24] for NS binaries in Lorentz-violating gravity.
- [65] K. Yagi, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 081504 (2012).
- [66] N. Yunes, K. Yagi, and F. Pretorius (to be published).
- [67] P. Ajith, M. Hannam, S. Husa, Y. Chen, B. Bruggmann, N. Dorband, D. Muller, F. Ohme, D. Pollney, C. Reisswig, L. Santamaria, and J. Seiler, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 104017 (2008); **79**, 129901(E) (2009).
- [68] P. Ajith *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 241101 (2011).
- [69] N. Yunes and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 122003 (2009).
- [70] K. Chatziioannou, N. Yunes, and N. Cornish, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 022004 (2012).
- [71] <https://dcc.ligo.org/cgi-bin/DocDB/ShowDocument?docid=2974>.
- [72] <https://dcc.ligo.org/LIGO-T1600030/public>.
- [73] E. Berti, A. Buonanno, and C. M. Will, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 084025 (2005).
- [74] A. Heavens, [arXiv:0906.0664](https://arxiv.org/abs/0906.0664).
- [75] This is a good approximation if the signal in the two detectors is phase-connected, i.e., if the chirp mass is measured by eLISA with sufficient accuracy so as to account for all the cycles between the two bands [76]. We have verified that this is indeed the case.
- [76] N. Cornish (private communication).
- [77] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (Virgo, LIGO Scientific), [arXiv:1602.03841](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.03841).
- [78] Instrument science white paper, LIGO technical document, <https://dcc.ligo.org/LIGO-T1400316/public>.
- [79] L. Sampson, N. Cornish, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 064037 (2014).
- [80] N. Cornish, L. Sampson, N. Yunes, and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 062003 (2011).
- [81] J. B. Jiménez, F. Piazza, and H. Velten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061101 (2016).
- [82] C. de Rham, A. J. Tolley, and D. H. Wesley, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 044025 (2013).
- [83] C. de Rham, A. Matas, and A. J. Tolley, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 064024 (2013).
- [84] V. Cardoso, S. Chakrabarti, P. Pani, E. Berti, and L. Gualtieri, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 241101 (2011).