Title: General Relativistic Simulations of Binary Neutron Star Mergers

Date: Jun 26, 2010 10:50 AM

URL: http://pirsa.org/10060084

Abstract: I will report on some recent results obtained using the fully general relativistic magnetohydrodynamic code Whisky in simulating equal and unequal-mass binary neutron star (BNS) systems during the last phases of inspiral, merger and collapse to black hole surrounded by a torus. BNSs are among the most important sources of gravitational waves which are expected to be detected by the current or next generation of gravitational wave detectors, such as LIGO and Virgo, and they are also thought to be at the origin of very important astrophysical phenomena, such as short gamma-ray bursts. I will in particular describe both the gravitational wave signals generated by these sources and the properties of the tori that can be formed. I will also describe how the Effective One Body (EOB) model can be used to accurately compute the gravitational wave signal generated during the inspiral of BNSs by comparing it with the longest general relativistic numerical simulations of BNSs performed up to now.

Due to their duration and dynamics, Binary Neutron Stars are very good sources for gravitational wave detectors such as Virgo (Italy) and Ligo (USA)



Virgo (Pisa, Italy)

Due to their duration and dynamics, Binary Neutron Stars are very good sources for gravitational wave detectors such as Virgo (Italy) and Ligo (USA)



Virgo (Pisa, Italy)



Binary neutron stars mergers are also possible sources for short gamma-ray bursts

Pirsa: 10060084

Due to their duration and dynamics, Binary Neutron Stars are very good sources for gravitational wave detectors such as Virgo (Italy) and Ligo (USA)



Virgo (Pisa, Italy)



Pirsa: 10060084

To sharp the second

Binary neutron stars mergers are also possible sources for short gamma-ray bursts

COMID

Page 5/16



TORUS PROPERTIES: UNEQUAL-MASS CASE

We have considered the inspiral and merger of 6 irrotational binaries with variable total mass and mass ratio

Model	Total ADM Mass	MI, M2
M3.6q1.00	3.23	1.64, 1.64
M3.7q0.94	3.33	1.64, 1.74
M3.4q0.91	3.11	1.51, 1.64
M3.4q0.80	3.08	1.40, 1.72
M3.5q0.75	3.14	1.39, 1.80
M3.4q0.70	3.07	1.30, 1.81

Pirsa: 10060084

Page 7/16

Total initial mass chosen to have prompt collapse to BH







SUMMARY

 Able to perform long and stable simulations of all the phases of BNS inspiral, merger and collapse to BH plus torus

Formation of massive tori observed in the unequal-mass case

Studied in details the properties of the tori formed by BNS mergers

 Currently investigating more realistic EOS, magnetic fields and possible jet formation in connection with short-GRBs

 Used very long numerical simulations of BNSs to extend the application of EOB to GWs from equal-mass BNS

Verified the need of NLO tidal correction to match with computed GWs

•Very good agreement over more than 20 cycles (phase error ~0.2 rad)



The different mass of the torus has an effect also on the GWs. Larger tori suppress the QNM part of the signal due to the continuous accretion of matter on the BH.

Pirsa: 10060084



 M_{toru} Mtotal q (M_{\odot}) (M_{\odot}) M3.6q1.00 0.001 3.558 1 0.0100M3.7q0.94 3.680 0.94 0.0994 M3.4q0.91 3.404 0.91M3.4q0.80 0.2088 3.375 0.80 M3.5q0.75 3.464 0.75 0.080 M3.4q0.70 3.371 0.70 0.211 For smaller $q=M_2/M_1$ the less massive star is tidal

disrupted producing massive tail.

Smaller q produce large tori with masses up to

+ Ca

A systematic investigation shows that: the torus mass decreases with the mass ratio and with the total mass Pirsa: 10060084 Page 13/16 $(a M_{11}) = [c_2(1+a)M_1 - M_{11}][c_1(1-a)]$

Incorporating tidal effects in the EOB Hamiltonian is straightforward: $A(r) = A_0(r) + A^{tidal(N)}(r)$

where $A^{tidal(N)}(r)$ is computed in a Newtonian-like form (but with relativistic Love numbers)

$$\begin{split} A^{tidal(N)}(r) &= \sum_{\ell \ge 2} A_{\ell}^{tidal(N)}(r) = \sum_{\ell \ge 2} \kappa_{\ell}^{T} u^{2\ell+2} \qquad u \equiv \frac{M}{r} \\ \kappa_{\ell}^{T} &= 2 \frac{M_{B} M_{A}^{2\ell}}{M^{2\ell+1}} \frac{k_{\ell}^{A}}{c_{A}^{2\ell+1}} + 2 \frac{M_{A} M_{B}^{2\ell}}{M^{2\ell+1}} \frac{k_{\ell}^{B}}{c_{B}^{2\ell+1}} \qquad M \equiv M_{A} + M_{B} \end{split}$$

and higher NLO PN tidal corrections can be added (Damour&Naga 2009): $\begin{aligned} A_{\ell}^{tidal} &= A_{\ell}^{tidal(N)} \hat{A}_{\ell}^{tidal} \\ \hat{A}_{\ell}^{tidal} &= 1 + \bar{\alpha}_{1PN} u + \bar{\alpha}_{2PN} u^2 + \dots \\ \kappa_{\ell}^{T,eff} &= \kappa_{\ell}^T \hat{A}^{tidal} \end{aligned}$

where $\bar{\alpha}_{1PN}, \bar{\alpha}_{2PN}$, can be computed analytically (in principle) of estimated by comparing with numerical simulations (in practice)

COMPUTING LONG NR GWS



To compare and tune the tidal corrections we have computed very long (>10 orbits) gws of BNSs with two different (ideal) EOSs, using different extraction radii and different resolutions.

We have considered two different initial data:

• $M_A = M_B = 1.36$, C=0.12 • $M_A = M_B = 1.51$, C=0.14

TPirsa: 10060084 R data show a very good numerical accuracy with an Page 15/16 or i

EOBVS NR INCLUDING NLO EFFECTS MA=MB=1.36, C=0.12 MA=MB=1.51, C=0.14

