

SPIN DIAGRAMS FOR EQUAL-MASS BLACK-HOLE BINARIES WITH ALIGNED SPINS

LUCIANO REZZOLLA,^{1,3} ERNST NILS DORBAND,¹ CHRISTIAN REISSWIG,¹ PETER DIENER,^{2,3} DENIS POLLNEY,¹ ERIK SCHNETTER,^{2,3} BÉLA SZILÁGYI¹

Draft version October 27, 2018

ABSTRACT

Binary black-hole systems with spins aligned with the orbital angular momentum are of special interest as they may be the preferred end-state of the inspiral of generic supermassive binary black-hole systems. In view of this, we have computed the inspiral and merger of a large set of binary systems of equal-mass black holes with spins aligned with the orbital angular momentum but otherwise arbitrary. By least-square fitting the results of these simulations we have constructed two “spin diagrams” which provide straightforward information about the recoil velocity $|v_{\text{kick}}|$ and the final black-hole spin a_{fin} in terms of the dimensionless spins a_1 and a_2 of the two initial black holes. Overall they suggest a maximum recoil velocity of $|v_{\text{kick}}| = 441.94$ km/s, and minimum and maximum final spins $a_{\text{fin}} = 0.3471$ and $a_{\text{fin}} = 0.9591$, respectively.

Subject headings: black hole physics – relativity – gravitational waves – stars: statistics

1. INTRODUCTION

A number of recent developments in numerical relativity have allowed for stable evolution of binary black holes and opened the door to extended and systematic studies of these systems. Of particular interest to astrophysics are the calculations of the recoil velocity and of the spin of the final black hole produced by the merger. It is well known that a binary with unequal masses or spins will radiate gravitational energy asymmetrically. This results in an uneven flux of momentum, providing a net linear velocity to the final black hole. The knowledge of both the “kick” velocity and of the final spin could have a direct impact on studies of the evolution of supermassive black holes and on statistical studies on the dynamics of compact objects in dense stellar systems.

Over the past year, a number of simulations have been carried out to determine the recoil velocities for a variety of binary black-hole systems. Non-spinning but unequal-mass binaries were the first systems to be studied and several works have now provided an accurate mapping of the unequal-mass space of parameters (Herrmann et al. 2007a; Baker et al. 2006b; Gonzalez et al. 2007b). More recently, the recoils from binaries with spinning black holes have also been considered by investigating equal-mass binaries in which the spins of the black holes are either aligned with the orbital angular momentum (Herrmann et al. 2007b; Koppitz et al. 2007), or not. In the first case, a systematic investigation has shown that the largest recoil possible from such systems is of the order of 450 km/s (Pollney et al. 2007). In the second case, instead, specific configurations with spins orthogonal to the orbital one have been shown to lead to recoils as high as 2500 km/s (Campanelli et al. 2007a; Gonzalez et al. 2007a), suggesting a maximum kick of about 4000 km/s for maximally-spinning black holes (Campanelli et al. 2007b). Recoil velocities of this

magnitude could lead to the ejection of massive black holes from the hosting galaxies, with important consequences on their cosmological evolution.

Here, we extend the analysis carried out in Pollney et al. (2007) of binary black hole systems with equal-mass and spins aligned with the orbital one. Our interest in this type of binaries stems from the fact that systems of this type may represent a preferred end-state of the binary evolution. Post-Newtonian studies have shown that in vacuum the gravitational spin-orbit coupling has a tendency to align the spins when they are initially close to the orbital one (Schnittman 2004). Furthermore, if the binary evolves in a disc, as expected for supermassive black holes, the matter can exert a torque tending to align the spins (Bogdanovic et al. 2007). Finally, a recoiling supermassive black hole could retain the inner part of its accretion disc and thus the fuel for a continuing QSO phase lasting millions of years as it moves away from the galactic nucleus (Loeb 2007). Yet, the analysis of QSOs from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey shows no evidence for black holes carrying an accretion disc and hence for very large recoiling velocities (Bonning et al. 2007).

2. NUMERICAL SETUP AND INITIAL DATA

The numerical simulations have been carried out using the CCATIE code, a three-dimensional finite-differences code using the Cactus Computational Toolkit (Cactus 2007) and Carpet mesh refinement infrastructure (Schnetter et al. 2007). The main features of the code have been recently reviewed in Pollney et al. (2007), where the code has been employed using the so-called “moving-punctures” technique (Baker et al. 2006a; Campanelli et al. 2006a). The initial data consists of five sequences with constant orbital angular momentum, which is however different from sequence to sequence. In the r and ra -sequences, the initial spin of one of the black holes \mathbf{S}_2 is held fixed along the z -axis and the spin of the other black hole is varied so that the spin ratio a_1/a_2 takes the values between -1 and $+1$, with $a_i \equiv \mathbf{S}_i/M_i^2$. In the t -sequence, instead, the spin with a negative z -component is held fixed, while

¹ Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitationsphysik, Albert-Einstein-Institut, Potsdam-Golm, Germany

² Center for Computation & Technology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

³ Department of Physics and Astronomy, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA, USA

TABLE 1

BINARY SEQUENCES FOR WHICH NUMERICAL SIMULATIONS HAVE BEEN CARRIED OUT, WITH DIFFERENT COLUMNS REFERRING TO THE PUNCTURE INITIAL LOCATION $\pm x/M$, THE LINEAR MOMENTA $\pm p/M$, THE MASS PARAMETERS m_i/M , THE DIMENSIONLESS SPINS a_i , THE NORMALIZED ADM MASS $\widetilde{M}_{\text{ADM}} \equiv M_{\text{ADM}}/M$ MEASURED AT INFINITY, AND THE NORMALIZED ADM ANGULAR MOMENTUM $\widetilde{J}_{\text{ADM}} \equiv J_{\text{ADM}}/M^2$. FINALLY, THE LAST SIX COLUMNS CONTAIN THE NUMERICAL AND FITTED VALUES FOR $|v_{\text{kick}}|$ (IN km/s), a_{fin} AND THE CORRESPONDING ERRORS.

	$\pm x/M$	$\pm p/M$	m_1/M	m_2/M	a_1	a_2	$\widetilde{M}_{\text{ADM}}$	$\widetilde{J}_{\text{ADM}}$	$ v_{\text{kick}} $	$ v_{\text{kick}}^{\text{fit}} $	err. (%)	a_{fin}	$a_{\text{fin}}^{\text{fit}}$	err. (%)
<i>r0</i>	3.0205	0.1366	0.4011	0.4009	-0.584	0.584	0.9856	0.825	261.75	258.09	1.40	0.6891	0.6883	0.12
<i>r1</i>	3.1264	0.1319	0.4380	0.4016	-0.438	0.584	0.9855	0.861	221.38	219.04	1.06	0.7109	0.7105	0.06
<i>r2</i>	3.2198	0.1281	0.4615	0.4022	-0.292	0.584	0.9856	0.898	186.18	181.93	2.28	0.7314	0.7322	0.11
<i>r3</i>	3.3190	0.1243	0.4749	0.4028	-0.146	0.584	0.9857	0.935	144.02	146.75	1.90	0.7516	0.7536	0.27
<i>r4</i>	3.4100	0.1210	0.4796	0.4034	0.000	0.584	0.9859	0.971	106.11	113.52	6.98	0.7740	0.7747	0.08
<i>r5</i>	3.5063	0.1176	0.4761	0.4040	0.146	0.584	0.9862	1.007	81.42	82.23	1.00	0.7948	0.7953	0.06
<i>r6</i>	3.5988	0.1146	0.4638	0.4044	0.292	0.584	0.9864	1.044	45.90	52.88	15.21	0.8150	0.8156	0.07
<i>r7</i>	3.6841	0.1120	0.4412	0.4048	0.438	0.584	0.9867	1.081	20.59	25.47	23.70	0.8364	0.8355	0.11
<i>r8</i>	3.7705	0.1094	0.4052	0.4052	0.584	0.584	0.9872	1.117	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.8550	0.855	0.00
<i>ra0</i>	2.9654	0.1391	0.4585	0.4584	-0.300	0.300	0.9845	0.8250	131.34	132.58	0.95	0.6894	0.6883	0.16
<i>ra1</i>	3.0046	0.1373	0.4645	0.4587	-0.250	0.300	0.9846	0.8376	118.10	120.28	1.85	0.6971	0.6959	0.17
<i>ra2</i>	3.0438	0.1355	0.4692	0.4591	-0.200	0.300	0.9847	0.8499	106.33	108.21	1.77	0.7047	0.7035	0.17
<i>ra3</i>	3.0816	0.1339	0.4730	0.4594	-0.150	0.300	0.9848	0.8628	94.98	96.36	1.46	0.7120	0.7111	0.13
<i>ra4</i>	3.1215	0.1321	0.4757	0.4597	-0.100	0.300	0.9849	0.8747	84.74	84.75	0.01	0.7192	0.7185	0.09
<i>ra6</i>	3.1988	0.1290	0.4782	0.4602	0.000	0.300	0.9850	0.9003	63.43	62.19	1.95	0.7331	0.7334	0.04
<i>ra8</i>	3.2705	0.1261	0.4768	0.4608	0.100	0.300	0.9852	0.9248	41.29	40.55	1.79	0.7471	0.7481	0.13
<i>ra10</i>	3.3434	0.1234	0.4714	0.4612	0.200	0.300	0.9853	0.9502	19.11	19.82	3.72	0.7618	0.7626	0.11
<i>ra12</i>	3.4120	0.1209	0.4617	0.4617	0.300	0.300	0.9855	0.9750	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.7772	0.7769	0.03
<i>s0</i>	2.9447	0.1401	0.4761	0.4761	0.000	0.000	0.9844	0.8251	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.6892	0.6883	0.13
<i>s1</i>	3.1106	0.1326	0.4756	0.4756	0.100	0.100	0.9848	0.8749	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.7192	0.7185	0.09
<i>s2</i>	3.2718	0.1261	0.4709	0.4709	0.200	0.200	0.9851	0.9251	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.7471	0.7481	0.13
<i>s3</i>	3.4098	0.1210	0.4617	0.4617	0.300	0.300	0.9855	0.9751	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.7772	0.7769	0.03
<i>s4</i>	3.5521	0.1161	0.4476	0.4476	0.400	0.400	0.9859	1.0250	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.8077	0.8051	0.33
<i>s5</i>	3.6721	0.1123	0.4276	0.4276	0.500	0.500	0.9865	1.0748	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.8340	0.8325	0.18
<i>s6</i>	3.7896	0.1088	0.4002	0.4002	0.600	0.600	0.9874	1.1246	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.8583	0.8592	0.11
<i>t0</i>	4.1910	0.1074	0.4066	0.4064	-0.584	0.584	0.9889	0.9002	259.49	258.09	0.54	0.6868	0.6883	0.22
<i>t1</i>	4.0812	0.1103	0.4062	0.4426	-0.584	0.438	0.9884	0.8638	238.37	232.62	2.41	0.6640	0.6658	0.27
<i>t2</i>	3.9767	0.1131	0.4057	0.4652	-0.584	0.292	0.9881	0.8265	200.25	205.21	2.48	0.6400	0.6429	0.45
<i>t3</i>	3.8632	0.1165	0.4053	0.4775	-0.584	0.146	0.9879	0.7906	174.58	175.86	0.73	0.6180	0.6196	0.26
<i>t4</i>	3.7387	0.1204	0.4047	0.4810	-0.584	0.000	0.9878	0.7543	142.62	144.57	1.37	0.5965	0.5959	0.09
<i>t5</i>	3.6102	0.1246	0.4041	0.4761	-0.584	-0.146	0.9876	0.7172	106.36	111.34	4.68	0.5738	0.5719	0.33
<i>t6</i>	3.4765	0.1294	0.4033	0.4625	-0.584	-0.292	0.9874	0.6807	71.35	76.17	6.75	0.5493	0.5475	0.32
<i>t7</i>	3.3391	0.1348	0.4025	0.4387	-0.584	-0.438	0.9873	0.6447	35.36	39.05	10.45	0.5233	0.5227	0.11
<i>t8</i>	3.1712	0.1419	0.4015	0.4015	-0.584	-0.584	0.9875	0.6080	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.4955	0.4976	0.42
<i>u1</i>	2.9500	0.1398	0.4683	0.4685	-0.200	0.200	0.9845	0.8248	87.34	88.39	1.20	0.6893	0.6883	0.15
<i>u2</i>	2.9800	0.1384	0.4436	0.4438	-0.400	0.400	0.9846	0.8249	175.39	176.78	0.79	0.6895	0.6883	0.17
<i>u3</i>	3.0500	0.1355	0.3951	0.3953	-0.600	0.600	0.9847	0.8266	266.39	265.16	0.46	0.6884	0.6883	0.01
<i>u4</i>	3.1500	0.1310	0.2968	0.2970	-0.800	0.800	0.9850	0.8253	356.87	353.55	0.93	0.6884	0.6883	0.01

in the *s* and *u*-sequences $a_1/a_2 = 1$ and -1 , respectively. In all cases, the masses are $M_i = M/2 = 1/2$. For the orbital initial data parameters we use the effective-potential method, which allows one to choose the initial data parameters such that the resulting physical parameters (*e.g.*, masses and spins) describe a binary black-hole system on a quasi-circular orbit. The free parameters are: the coordinate locations \mathbf{C}_i , the mass parameters m_i , the linear momenta \mathbf{p}_i , and the spins \mathbf{S}_i . Quasi-circular orbits are then selected by setting $\mathbf{p}_1 = -\mathbf{p}_2$ to be orthogonal to $\mathbf{C}_2 - \mathbf{C}_1$, so that $\mathbf{L} \equiv \mathbf{C}_1 \times \mathbf{p}_1 + \mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{p}_2$ is the orbital angular momentum. The initial parameters are collected in the left part of Table 1, while the right part reports the results of simulations. For all of them we have employed 8 levels of refinement and a minimum resolution $0.024 M$, which has been reduced to $0.018 M$ for binaries *r5*, *r6*. Note that our results for the *u*-sequence differ slightly from those reported by Herrmann et al. (2007b), probably because of our accounting of the in-

tegration constant in $|v_{\text{kick}}|$ (Pollney et al. 2007).

3. SPIN DIAGRAMS AND FITS

Clearly, the recoil velocity and the spin of the final black hole are among the most important pieces of information to be extracted from the inspiral and coalescence of binary black holes. For binaries with equal masses and aligned but otherwise arbitrary spins, this information depends uniquely on the dimensionless spins of the two black holes a_1 , a_2 and can therefore be summarized in the portion of the (a_1, a_2) plane in which the two spins vary. It is therefore convenient to think in terms of “spin diagrams”, which summarize in a simple way all of the relevant information. In addition, since the labelling “1” and “2” is arbitrary, the line $a_1 = a_2$ in the spin diagram has important symmetries: the recoil velocity vector undergoes a π -rotation, *i.e.*, $\vec{v}_{\text{kick}}(a_1, a_2) = -\vec{v}_{\text{kick}}(a_2, a_1)$ but $|v_{\text{kick}}(a_1, a_2)| = |v_{\text{kick}}(a_2, a_1)|$, while no change is expected for the final spin, *i.e.*, $a_{\text{fin}}(a_1, a_2) = a_{\text{fin}}(a_2, a_1)$. These symmetries not only allow us to consider only one




FIG. 1.— Position in the (a_1, a_2) space of the five sequences r , ra , s , t , and u for which the inspiral and merger has been computed.

portion of the (a_1, a_2) space (*cf.* Fig. 1), thus halving the computational costs (or doubling the statistical sample), but they will also be exploited later on to improve our fits. The position of the five sequences within the (a_1, a_2) space is shown in Fig. 1.

Overall, the data sample computed numerically consists of 38 values for $|v_{\text{kick}}|$ and for a_{fin} which, for simplicity, we have considered to have constant error-bars of 8 km/s and 0.01, which represent, respectively, the largest errors reported in Pollney et al. (2007). In both cases we have modelled the data with generic quadratic functions in a_1 and a_2 so that, in the case of the recoil velocity, the fitting function is

$$|v_{\text{kick}}| = |c_0 + c_1 a_1 + c_2 a_1^2 + d_0 a_1 a_2 + d_1 a_2 + d_2 a_2^2|. \quad (1)$$

Note that the fitting function on the right-hand-side of (1) is smooth everywhere but that its absolute value is not smooth along the diagonal $a_1 = a_2$. Using (1) and a blind least-square fit of the data, we obtained the coefficients (in km/s)

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= 0.67 \pm 1.12, & d_0 &= -18.56 \pm 5.34, \\ c_1 &= -212.85 \pm 2.96, & d_1 &= 213.69 \pm 3.57, \\ c_2 &= 50.85 \pm 3.48, & d_2 &= -40.99 \pm 4.25, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

with a reduced- $\chi^2 = 0.09$. Clearly, the errors in the coefficients can be extremely large and this is simply the result of small-number statistics. However, the fit can be improved by exploiting some knowledge about the physics of the process to simplify the fitting expressions. In particular, we can use the constraint that no recoil velocity should be produced for binaries having the same spin, *i.e.*, that $|v_{\text{kick}}| = 0$ for $a_1 = a_2$, or the symmetry condition across the line $a_1 = a_2$. Enforcing both constraints yields

$$c_0 = 0, \quad c_1 = -d_1, \quad c_2 = -d_2, \quad d_0 = 0, \quad (3)$$




FIG. 2.— Contour plots of $|v_{\text{kick}}|$ as a function of the spin parameters a_1 and a_2 . The diagram has been computed using expressions (4) and (5).

thus reducing the fitting function (1) to the simpler expression

$$|v_{\text{kick}}| = |c_1(a_1 - a_2) + c_2(a_1^2 - a_2^2)|. \quad (4)$$

Performing a least-square fit using (4) we then obtain

$$c_1 = -220.97 \pm 0.78, \quad c_2 = 45.52 \pm 2.99, \quad (5)$$

with a comparable reduced- $\chi^2 = 0.14$, but with error-bars that are much smaller on average. Because of this, we consider expression (4) as the best description of the data at second-order in the spin parameters. Using (4) and (5), we have built the contour plots shown in Fig. 2.

A few remarks are worth making. Firstly, we recall that post-Newtonian calculations have so far derived only the linear contribution in the spin to the recoil velocity (see Favata et al. (2004) and references therein). However, the size of the quadratic coefficient (5) is not small when compared to the linear one and it can lead to rather sizeable corrections. These are maximized when $a_1 = 0$ and $a_2 = \pm 1$, or when $a_1 = \pm 1$ and $a_2 = 0$, and can be as large as $\sim 20\%$; while these corrections are smaller than those induced by asymmetries in the mass, they are instructive in pointing out the relative importance of spin-spin and spin-orbit effects during the merger and can be used as a guide in further refinements of the post-Newtonian treatments. Secondly, expression (4) clearly suggests that the maximum recoil velocity should be found when the asymmetry is the largest and the spins are antiparallel, *i.e.*, $a_1 = -a_2$. Thirdly, when $a_2 = \text{const.}$, expression (4) confirms the quadratic scaling proposed in Pollney et al. (2007) with a smaller data set [*cf.*, eq. (42) there]. Fourthly, for $a_1 = -a_2$, expression (4) is only linear and reproduces the scaling suggested by Herrmann et al. (2007b). Finally, using (4) the maximum recoil velocity is found to be $|v_{\text{kick}}| = 441.94 \pm 1.56$ km/s, in very good agreement with

the results of Herrmann et al. (2007b) and Pollney et al. (2007).

In the same way we have first fitted the data for a_{fin} , with a function

$$a_{\text{fin}} = p_0 + p_1 a_1 + p_2 a_1^2 + q_0 a_1 a_2 + q_1 a_2 + q_2 a_2^2, \quad (6)$$

and found coefficients with very large error-bars. As a result, also for a_{fin} we resort to physical considerations to constrain the coefficients $p_0 \dots q_2$. More specifically, we expect that, at least at lowest order, binaries with equal and opposite spins will not contribute to the final spin and thus behave essentially as nonspinning binaries. Stated differently, we assume that $a_{\text{fin}} = p_0$ for binaries with $a_1 = -a_2$. In addition, enforcing the symmetry condition across the line $a_1 = a_2$ we obtain

$$p_1 = q_1, \quad p_2 = q_2 = q_0/2, \quad (7)$$

so that the fitting function (6) effectively reduces to

$$a_{\text{fin}} = p_0 + p_1(a_1 + a_2) + p_2(a_1 + a_2)^2. \quad (8)$$

Performing a least-square fit using (8) we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_0 &= 0.6883 \pm 0.0003, & p_1 &= 0.1530 \pm 0.0004, \\ p_2 &= -0.0088 \pm 0.0005, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

with a reduced- $\chi^2 = 0.02$.

It should be noted that the coefficient of the quadratic term in (9) is much smaller than the linear one and with much larger error-bars. Given the small statistics it is hard to assess whether a quadratic dependence is necessary or if a linear one is the correct one (however, see also the comment below on a possible interpretation of expression (8)). In view of this, we have repeated the least-square fit of the data enforcing the conditions (7) together with $p_2 = 0$ (*i.e.*, adopting a linear fitting function) and obtained $p_0 = 0.6855 \pm 0.0007$ and $p_1 = 0.1518 \pm 0.0012$, with a worse reduced- $\chi^2 = 0.16$. Because the coefficients of the lowest-order terms are so similar, both the linear and the quadratic fits are well within the error-bars of the numerical simulations. Nevertheless, since a quadratic scaling yields smaller residuals, we consider it to be the best representation of the data and have therefore computed the contour plots in Fig. 3 using (8) and (9).

Here too, a few remarks are worth making: Firstly, the fitted value for the coefficient p_0 agrees very well with the values reported by several groups (Gonzalez et al. 2007b; Berti et al. 2007) when studying the inspiral of unequal-mass nonspinning binaries. Secondly, expression (8) has maximum values for $a_1 = a_2$, suggesting that the maximum and minimum spins are $a_{\text{fin}} = 0.9591 \pm 0.0022$ and $a_{\text{fin}} = 0.3471 \pm 0.0224$, respectively. Thirdly, the quadratic scaling for a_{fin} substantially confirms the suggestions of Campanelli et al. (2006b) but provides more accurate coefficients. Finally, although very simple, expression (9) lends itself to an interesting interpretation. Being effectively a power series in terms of the initial spins of the two black holes, its zeroth-order term can be seen as the orbital angular momentum not radiated in gravitational waves and which amounts, at most, to $\sim 70\%$ of the final spin. The first-order term, on the other hand, can be seen as the contribution to the final spin coming from the initial spins of the two black holes and this contribution, together with the one coming from




FIG. 3.— Contour plots of a_{fin} as a function of the spin parameters a_1 and a_2 . The diagram has been computed using expressions (8) and (9).

the spin-orbit coupling, amounts at most to $\sim 30\%$ of the final spin. Finally, the second-order term, which is natural to expect as nonzero in this view, can then be related to the spin-spin coupling, with a contribution to the final spin which is of $\sim 4\%$ at most.

As a side remark we also note that the monotonic behaviour expressed by (9) does not show the presence of a local maximum of $a_{\text{fin}} \simeq 0.87$ for $a_1 = a_2 \sim 0.34$ as suggested by Damour (2001) in the effective one-body (EOB) approximation. Because the latter has been shown to be in good agreement with numerical-relativity simulations of nonspinning black holes (Damour and Nagar 2007; Damour et al. 2007), additional simulations will be necessary to refute these results or to improve the EOB approximation for spinning black holes.

Reported in the right part of Table 1 are also the fitted values for a_{fin} and $|v_{\text{kick}}|$ obtained through the fitting functions (4) and (8), and the corresponding errors. The latter are of few percent for most of the cases and increase up to $\sim 20\%$ only for those binaries with very small kicks and which are intrinsically more difficult to calculate. As a concluding remark we note that the fitting coefficients computed here have been constructed using overall moderate values of the initial spin; the only exception is the binary u4 which has the largest spin and which is nevertheless fitted with very small errors (*cf.* Table 1). In addition, since the submission of this work, another group has reported results from equal-mass binaries with spins as high as $a_1 = a_2 = \pm 0.9$ (Marronetti et al. 2007). Although also for these very high-spin binaries the error in the predicted values is of 1% at most, a larger sample of high-spin binaries is necessary to validate that the fitting expressions (4) and (8) are robust also at very large spins.

4. CONCLUSIONS

We have performed least-square fits to a large set of numerical-relativity data. These fits, combined with symmetry arguments, yield analytic expressions for the recoil velocity and final black hole spin resulting from the inspiral and merger of equal-mass black holes whose spins are parallel or antiparallel to the orbital angular momentum. Such configurations represent a small portion of the space of parameters, but may be the preferred ones if torques are present during the evolution. Using the analytic expressions we have constructed two spin diagrams that summarize simply this information and predict a maximum recoil velocity of $|v_{\text{kick}}| = 441.94 \pm 1.56$ km/s for systems with $a_1 = -a_2 = 1$ and maximum (minimum) final spin $a_{\text{fin}} = 0.9591 \pm 0.0022$ (0.3471 ± 0.0224) for systems with $a_1 = a_2 = 1$ (-1).

It is a pleasure to thank Thibault Damour and Alessandro Nagar for interesting discussions. The computations were performed on the supercomputing clusters of the AEI. This work was supported in part by the DFG grant SFB/Transregio 7.

NOTE ADDED IN PROOF. Since the publication on the preprint archive of this analysis, our work on the modelling of the final spin has progressed rapidly, yielding new results that complement and complete the ones presented here. In particular, the work published in Rezzolla et al. (2008a) complements the analysis carried here to unequal-mass, equal-spin aligned binaries, while the work reported in Rezzolla et al. (2008b) extends it to generic binaries.

REFERENCES

- Baker, J. G., Centrella, J., Choi, D.-I., Koppitz, M., & van Meter, J. 2006a, *Phys. Rev. D*, **73**, 104002
- Baker, J. G., Centrella, J., Choi, D.-I., Koppitz, M., van Meter, J. R., Miller, M. C., 2006b, *ApJ*, **653**, L93
- Berti, E., Cardoso, V., Gonzalez, J. A., Sperhake, U., Hannam, M., Husa, S., Bruegmann, B., 2007, preprint (gr-qc/0703053)
- Bogdanovic, T., Reynolds, C. S., & Miller, M. C. 2007, *ApJ*, **661**, L147
- Bonning, E. W., Shields, G. A., Salviander, S. *ApJ*, **666**, L13
- Cactus Computational Toolkit, <http://www.cactuscode.org>
- Campanelli, M., Lousto, C. O., Marronetti, P., & Zlochower, Y. 2006a, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **96**, 111101
- Campanelli, M., Lousto, C. O., & Zlochower, Y. 2006b, *Phys. Rev. D*, **73**, 061501(R)
- Campanelli, M., Lousto, C. O., Zlochower, Y., & Merritt, D. 2007a, *ApJ*, **659**, L5
- Campanelli, M., Lousto, C. O., Zlochower, Y., & Merritt, D. 2007b, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98**, 231102
- Damour, T. 2001, *Phys. Rev. D*, **64**, 124013
- Damour, T., & Nagar, A. *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 044003 (2007).
- Damour, T., Nagar, A., Dorband, E. N., Pollney, D., & Rezzolla, L. 2007, preprint (arXiv:0712.3003)
- Favata, M., Hughes, S. A., Holz, D. E., *ApJ* 2004, *ApJ*, **607**, L5
- Gonzalez, J. A., Hannam, M. D., Sperhake, U., Bruegmann, B., & Husa, S. 2007a, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98**, 231101
- Gonzalez, J. A., Sperhake, U., Bruegmann, B., Hannam, M., & Husa, S. 2007b, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **98**, 091101
- Herrmann, F., Hinder, I., Shoemaker, D., & Laguna, P., 2007a, *Class. and Quantum Grav.*, **24**, S33
- Herrmann, F., Hinder, I., Shoemaker, D., Laguna, P., & Matzner, R. A. 2007b, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 084032
- Koppitz, M., Pollney, D., Reisswig, C., Rezzolla, L., Thornburg, J., Diener, P., & Schnetter, E. 2007, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **99**, 041102
- Loeb, A. 2007, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 041103
- Marronetti, P., Tichy, W., Brüggmann, B., González, J., Sperhake, U., 2007, preprint (arXiv:0709.2160).
- Pollney, D., Reisswig, C., Rezzolla, L., Szilágyi, B., Ansorg, M., Deris, B., Diener, P., Dorband, E. N., Koppitz, M., Nagar, A., & Schnetter, E., 2007 *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 124002
- Rezzolla, L., Diener, P., Dorband, E. N., Pollney, D., Reisswig, C., Schnetter, E., & Seiler, J., 2008 *ApJ* **674**, L29
- Rezzolla, L., Barausse, E., Dorband, E. N., Pollney, D., Reisswig, C. & Seiler, J., 2008 preprint (arXiv:0712.3541)
- Schnetter, E., Hawke, I., Hawley, S. H., 2004, *Class. and Quantum Grav.*, **21**, 1465
- Schnittman, J. D. 2004, *Phys. Rev.*, **D70**, 124020