

Investigating the retention of intermediate-mass black holes in star clusters using N -body simulations

Symeon Konstantinidis^{1,5*}, Pau Amaro-Seoane^{2**} & Kostas D. Kokkotas^{3,4***}

¹ Astronomisches Rechen-Institut, Mönchhofstraße 12-14, 69120, Zentrum für Astronomie, Universität Heidelberg, Germany

² Max Planck Institut für Gravitationsphysik (Albert-Einstein-Institut), D-14476 Potsdam, Germany

³ Theoretical Astrophysics (TAT), IAAT, Eberhard Karls University of Tübingen, Auf der Morgenstelle 10, 72076 Tübingen, Germany

⁴ Department of Physics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124 Greece

⁵ Departamento de Astronomía y Astrofísica, Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, 782-0436 Macul, Santiago, Chile

May 28, 2013

ABSTRACT

Context. Contrary to supermassive and stellar-mass black holes (SBHs), the existence of intermediate-mass black holes (IMBHs) with masses ranging between $10^{2-5} M_{\odot}$ has not yet been confirmed. The main problem in the detection is that the innermost stellar kinematics of globular clusters (GCs) or small galaxies, the possible natural loci to IMBHs, are very difficult to resolve. However, if IMBHs reside in the centre of GCs, a possibility is that they interact dynamically with their environment. A binary formed with the IMBH and a compact object of the GC would naturally lead to a prominent source of gravitational radiation, detectable with future observatories.

Aims. We use N -body simulations to study the evolution of GCs containing an IMBH and calculate the gravitational radiation emitted from dynamically formed IMBH-SBH binaries and the possibility that the IMBH escapes the GC after an IMBH-SBH merger.

Methods. We run for the first time direct-summation integrations of GCs with an IMBH including the dynamical evolution of the IMBH with the stellar system and relativistic effects, such as energy loss in gravitational waves (GWs) and periastron shift, and gravitational recoil.

Results. We find in one of our models an intermediate mass-ratio inspiral (IMRI), which leads to a merger with a recoiling velocity higher than the escape velocity of the GC. The GWs emitted fall in the range of frequencies that a LISA-like observatory could detect, like the European eLISA or in mission options considered in the recent preliminary mission study conducted in China. The merger has an impact on the global dynamics of the cluster, as an important heating source is removed when the merged system leaves the GC. The detection of one IMRI would constitute a test of GR, as well as an irrefutable proof of the existence of IMBHs.

Key words. (Galaxy:) globular clusters: general - gravitational waves - Methods: numerical - Stars: kinematics and dynamics

1. Motivation

Intermediate-mass black holes (IMBHs), with masses $M \sim 10^{2-5} M_{\odot}$ possibly exist at the centres of globular clusters (GCs) or small galaxies, if we assume that they follow the observed correlations between super-massive BHs (SMBHs) and their stellar surroundings (see Tremaine et al. 2002; Gültekin et al. 2009; Miller & Colbert 2004; Miller 2009, and references therein). Due to their mass, these objects cannot form via the formation scenarios of stellar-mass black holes, which are the final results of stellar evolution of massive stars (Fryer 1999; Fryer & Kalogera 2001; Belczynski et al. 2010) or SMBHs with masses $M \sim 10^{6-9} M_{\odot}$, that exist at the centres of galaxies (Rees 1978, 1984; Gillessen et al. 2009) and for which

there exists an emerging consensus about their formation (Volonteri & Rees 2005; Madau & Rees 2001).

There have been proposed several scenarios for the formation of IMBHs most of which require extremely dense environments, similar to the centers of GCs, for the IMBHs to form and grow in mass (van der Marel 2004; Miller & Colbert 2004). Miller & Hamilton (2002) suggest in their work that such massive black holes (BHs) can form from repeated mergers of a $\sim 50 M_{\odot}$ BH, located at the center of a GC, with other SBH of lower mass. The $\sim 50 M_{\odot}$ threshold is required to ensure that the BH will not receive large recoil velocities after each merger and so will remain bound to the GC. According to (Miller & Hamilton 2002) the initial $\sim 50 M_{\odot}$ BH could be formed either directly from the collapse of a massive star, or from a large number of SBH-SBH mergers, which would produce mostly escaping SBHs, but also a minority of large BHs, bound to the GC.

An interesting scenario for the formation of IMBHs in the early evolution of GCs, has been studied by

* e-mail: Simos@ari.uni-heidelberg.de

** e-mail: Pau.Amaro-Seoane@aei.mpg.de

*** e-mail: Kostas.Kokkotas@uni-tuebingen.de

Quinlan & Shapiro (1990); Portegies Zwart & McMillan (2002, 2000); Gürkan et al. (2004); Portegies Zwart et al. (2004); Freitag et al. (2006). According to this scenario, the most massive stars sink to the centre of a GC even before they become BHs and thus the cluster experiences an early core collapse during which the central density of stars becomes large enough, that massive stars start to rapidly and continuously merge with each other (see also Portegies Zwart et al. 2004; Goswami et al. 2012). This runaway process very soon leads to the formation of a very massive star (VMS), located close to the centre of the GC. It is unknown how stellar evolution proceeds in such a VMS (Glebbeek et al. 2009), but if it is assumed that the star directly collapses to a BH, without significant mass-loss, this could form an IMBH. Accretion of stars and gas during the next Myrs could increase its mass up to two orders of magnitude (Vesperini et al. 2010). Finally, as in SMBHs, Population III stars have been proposed as possible progenitors of IMBHs (see van der Marel 2004; Whalen & Fryer 2012, and references therein), but there are still many uncertainties in the evolution of such a star (Heger & Woosley 2002).

Although the formation of IMBHs has been studied extensively during the last decades and their existence has been proposed in the early 70s (Wyller 1970; Bahcall & Ostriker 1975; Frank & Rees 1976), there is still no direct proof of their existence. However, there is an increasing number of favouring evidences that suggest that they should exist. The most prominent evidence is from the observations of ultra-luminous X-ray sources (ULXs, Feng & Soria 2011), which are usually associated to IMBHs. The brightest known ULX, known as HLX-1, is located in the outskirts of the edge-on S0a type galaxy ESO243-49 and is currently the strongest IMBH candidate. Based on the extreme luminosity of the X-ray source, which has a maximum of up to $1.1 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ in the 0.2 – 10 keV band, Farrell et al. (2009) derive a conservative lower limit of $500 M_{\odot}$ for the potential IMBH (see also Godet et al. 2009; Farrell et al. 2010). More recent observations measured a peak luminosity of $1.3 \times 10^{42} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (Godet et al. 2011) and a possible period of variability of $\sim 1 \text{ yr}$ (Godet et al. 2012; Servillat et al. 2011). X-ray luminosities up to $\sim 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ can be explained by super-Eddington accretion to $\sim 20 M_{\odot}$ SBHs (Begelman 2002) and/or beaming (King 2008). However, larger BH masses are needed for explaining luminosities $> 10^{41} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$. For HLX-1 the most recent estimate for the mass of the potential IMBH is $\sim 3 \times 10^3 - 10^5 M_{\odot}$ (Godet et al. 2012; Servillat et al. 2011; Davis et al. 2011), very well in the range of masses of IMBHs. Further investigations of HLX-1 confirmed its extraordinary luminosity by proving its association with galaxy ESO243-49 at a distance of 95 Mpc (Wiersema et al. 2010), and thus made the evidence of an IMBH even stronger. Interestingly, the X-ray source is not located at the center of the host galaxy, but it lies at a distance $\sim 3.3 \text{ kpc}$ from its center and $\sim 0.8 \text{ kpc}$ out of the galactic plane, possibly associated with a star cluster which appears to be in the same area. According to Farrell et al. (2012) this cluster has a mass of $\sim 4 \times 10^6 M_{\odot}$ and is either a massive young star cluster or an old GC. Optical observations of HLX-1 with VLT seem to rule out the case of a massive star cluster and favour the presence of a $\sim 10 \text{ Gyr}$ old globular cluster with mass $< 10^6 M_{\odot}$ or a $< 10 \text{ Myr}$

small star cluster with mass $\sim 10^4 M_{\odot}$ (Soria et al. 2010, 2012).

Other recent interesting observational examples that point to the existence of these objects can be found in the work of Sutton et al. (2012), which evaluates a sample of eight extreme luminosity ultra-luminous X-ray source candidates and state that the observed luminosities can be explained in terms of IMBHs with masses in the range of $10^3 - 10^4 M_{\odot}$. Another X-ray source that might be associated with an IMBH is found at the center of the nearby ($d = 3.1 \text{ Mpc}$, Karachentsev et al. (2004)) dwarf lenticular galaxy NGC 404 (Binder et al. 2011). Using both stellar and gas dynamical mass estimates, Seth et al. (2010) estimated the mass of the potential IMBH to be $\sim 10^5 M_{\odot}$, which agrees with recent estimates from Expanded Very Large Array observations (Nyland et al. 2012) and from X-ray observations (Binder et al. 2011). Finally, Nyland et al. (2012) confirmed the location of the source at the center of the nuclear star cluster hosted by NGC 404 and ruled out other possible scenarios such as an X-ray binary, stellar formation or a supernova remnant.

The above observational examples provide strong evidence of the existence of IMBHs, but do not indisputably prove that they exist. A direct proof would come from detailed kinematical observations of stars moving under the influence of the IMBH at the centers of GCs. Unfortunately, the radius of influence of an IMBH is only of a few arc seconds (Peebles 1972; Chanamé et al. 2010; Miller & Colbert 2004), so it is very difficult, if not impossible, to accurately determine its mass by measuring the velocities of stars moving under its influence, with the currently available instruments. This technique has been successfully used for determining the mass of the SMBH at the centre of the Milky Way galaxy, where the stellar environment is less dense than the core of GCs and also there exists a number of young and bright stars, moving under the gravitational influence of the SMBH which have been followed by observations for more than 15 years (Gillessen et al. 2009). The radius of influence R of an IMBH of mass M_{\bullet} can be defined as:

$$R = \frac{GM_{\bullet}}{\sigma^2}, \quad (1)$$

where σ the velocity dispersion at the center of the cluster. At a distance d this translates to an angular radius of influence (Bender 2005):

$$\alpha = 1'' \left(\frac{M_{\bullet}}{10^3 M_{\odot}} \right) \left(\frac{\sigma}{10 \text{ km s}^{-1}} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{d}{10 \text{ kpc}} \right)^{-1} \quad (2)$$

For a $10^4 M_{\odot}$ IMBH the influence radius is of $\sim 5''$, assuming a central velocity dispersion of $\sigma = 20 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and a distance of $\sim 5 \text{ kpc}$ (see also Miller & Colbert 2004, for a similar example). Also, since GCs are old systems, this small sphere of influence contains mainly massive stellar remnants and old, dim stars that could not be easily observed and traced. For the above reasons, kinematical techniques can currently only give upper limits on the mass of the potential IMBHs at the centers of galactic GCs (Anderson & van der Marel 2010; van der Marel & Anderson 2010; Noyola et al. 2010; Lützgendorf et al. 2012) (see also Kirsten & Vlemmings 2012; Strader et al. 2012, for observations that do not support the IMBH scenario). Since such limits are based on measurements of proper motions, velocity dispersion or line

of sight motions away of the sphere of influence of the potential IMBH, alternative to IMBH explanations cannot be ruled out (Baumgardt et al. 2003, 2005). Hence, we would need the Very Large Telescope Interferometer (VLTI) and one of the next-generation near-infrared instruments, the VSI or GRAVITY (Gillessen et al. 2006; Eisenhauer et al. 2008). In that case we could improve the astrometric accuracy by an order of magnitude and thus we would possibly be in the position of detecting the innermost kinematics of a GC around a potential IMBH and thus measure accurately its mass.

An interesting avenue towards the *direct* detection of an IMBH, which would not require future optical or infrared telescopes and several years of observations, is GW astronomy. Additionally, IMBH-SBH binaries that might form in GCs represent an excellent test of GR, since they are similar to extreme mass-ratio inspirals (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2007). In particular, space-borne detectors such as the ESA-led eLISA (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2012) or Chinese mission study options (“ALIA” from now onwards, see Bender et al. 2005; Crowder & Cornish 2005; Gong et al. 2011) will be able to catch these systems (which might also be referred as intermediate mass-ratio inspirals, IMRIs) with good signal-to-noise ratios (SNR) if the GC is not further than $z \sim 0.7$ (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2012; Miller & Hamilton 2002; Miller 2006). According to Miller & Hamilton (2002), LISA will be able to detect around 10 IMBH-SBH binaries at any given time, while the merger of the BHs might be detectable by LIGO-II (and Advanced LIGO should see many of them Amaro-Seoane & Santamaria 2009; Fregeau et al. 2006).

If an IMRI forms in a GC, it is undoubted that sooner or later it will lead to an IMBH-SBH merger. Recent studies from numerical relativity (Koppitz et al. 2007; Pollney et al. 2007; Rezzolla et al. 2008; Rezzolla 2009; Lousto et al. 2010; Lousto & Zlochower 2011b,a) show that BH-BH mergers result to a gravitational wave recoil which, depending on the mass-ratio and spins of the merging BHs, might be as large as $\sim 5000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (Lousto & Zlochower 2011a). The mass-ratio of an IMRI in a GC is large enough to avoid such large recoils, but it is still possible for an IMBH of mass up to $\sim 10^3 M_{\odot}$ to receive a kick greater than the escape velocity of the GC and therefore leave the system (Holley-Bockelmann et al. 2008).

In this work we use N -body simulations to study the interactions of an IMBH with SBHs in young star clusters and describe, for the first time, the production on an IMRI with our direct-summation code in one of our integrations. In Section 2 we describe the numerical tool and choice of the initial data used for the simulations. In Section 3 we describe the interactions of the IMBH with SBHs in the simulation we observed an IMRI, and we discuss the possibility that the gravitational recoil velocity assigned to the IMBH after the merger, kicks the IMBH out of the GC. In Section 4 we calculate the gravitational radiation from such an IMRI in an approximate way. Finally, in Section 5 we conclude our work showing that an IMRI would be detectable by future space-based GW detectors, such as LISA, we discuss the effects of the ejection of the IMBH on the GC, their possible connection with ULXs not associated with GCs and we present our future plans for a statistical study of IMBH-SBH interactions in GCs.

2. Numerical tool and initial conditions

We integrate the dynamical evolution of a globular cluster containing a $500 - 1000 M_{\odot}$ IMBH with Myriad (Konstantinidis & Kokkotas 2010), a direct-summation N -body code that integrates all gravitational forces for all particles at every time step. The programme uses the Hermite integration scheme (Aarseth 1999, 2003). This requires computation of not only the accelerations, but also their time derivatives. Particles that are tightly bound or with very small separation are integrated using the time-symmetric Hermite scheme (Kokubo et al. 1998), which is a symplectic integrator that makes the numerical errors oscillate between two limits that can be controlled by the choice of the time step. The code uses post-Newtonian correcting terms to the Newtonian forces, including 1, 2 and 2.5 order, as described for the first time in an N -body code by Kupi et al. (2006) (their equations 1, 2 and 3), as well as a recipe for gravitational recoil. The recoil velocity depends strongly on the mass ratio of the two holes, on the magnitude of their spins and on their directions with respect to the plane of the orbit (see e.g. Rezzolla 2009, and references therein). The equation that we have implemented in the code is taken from Lousto et al. (2010),

$$\mathbf{v} = (v_m + v_{\perp} \cos \xi) \hat{e}_1 + v_{\perp} \sin \xi \hat{e}_2 + v_{\parallel} \hat{e}_3. \quad (3)$$

In the last equation, the indices \perp and \parallel stand for perpendicular and parallel directions with respect to the orbital angular momentum vector \mathbf{L} of the binary. \hat{e}_1 is a unit vector and lies on the plane of the orbit connecting the two MBHs, with direction from the heavier to the lighter one. \hat{e}_2 is also on the plane of the orbit, but perpendicular to \hat{e}_1 , with direction such that \hat{e}_1 , \hat{e}_2 and \hat{e}_3 construct an orthonormal system, with \hat{e}_3 defined such that it is the unit vector parallel to \mathbf{L} . ξ is the angle between the unequal contributions of mass and spin to the recoil velocity. We assign random, maximal spins to the stars of the GC, and in particular we initially give the IMBH a spin $a = S/M^2$ (see e.g. Lousto et al. 2010) of 0.998.

We assume that the IMBH forms at the center of the cluster when the GC is 10 Myr old. This agrees with the formation scenario of runaway stellar mergers (Portegies Zwart & McMillan 2002) and also of the repeated SBH-SBH mergers (Miller & Hamilton 2002). For our study the number and masses of SBHs are of particular importance. Therefore, before creating the initial data for our simulations, we studied the number of SBHs and their masses assuming different initial mass functions (IMF) and metallicities. For the initial mass function (IMF) we use Kroupa-like distributions (see Kroupa et al. 1993; Kroupa 2001a) and also simple power law distributions with different values for the slope α (see Salpeter 1955). We fix the total number of stars to $N = 32768$, the lower stellar mass limit to $m_{\text{low}} = 0.2 M_{\odot}$ and the upper mass limit to $m_{\text{upper}} = 150 M_{\odot}$. Finally, we use values for the metallicity Z ranging from 0.0001 to 0.02. We investigate in total 15 models with different slopes of the IMF and metallicities and for each one of them we create a set of 100 random realisations. We evolve the stars of each realisation to 10 Myr using the stellar evolution code `sse` (Hurley et al. 2000) and we calculate averages for the number of SBH created and also for their higher and lower masses. The results are described in Table 1. Assuming no supernova kicks, the

number of SBHs created depends strongly on the choice of the IMF slopes and ranges from ~ 20 to ~ 70 in our models. On the other hand the masses of the SBHs depend on the metallicity and range from $\sim 3 M_{\odot}$ (for $Z = 0.02$) to $\sim 27 M_{\odot}$ (for $Z < 0.001$).

For the initial data of our simulations, we picked 4 representative cases from our investigation that produce low and high numbers of SBHs. We also picked a value $Z = 0.001$ for the metallicity as typical for a GC which resulted in the formation of SBHs with masses between $\sim 13 M_{\odot}$ and $27 M_{\odot}$. In those models all stars with masses above $20 M_{\odot}$ have evolved off the main sequence at 10 Myr.

For our fiducial simulation A, we choose slopes $\alpha_1 = 1.3$ and $\alpha_2 = 2.4$, which, after stellar evolution until $t = 10$ Myr, result in 62 stellar-mass BHs in the system, close to the highest number of SBHs created in our models. For the distribution of stars and BHs in the cluster, we use a King profile (King 1966) with concentration parameter $W_0 = 7$. The initial escape velocity at the centre of the cluster is $\sim 17 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. At the centre of the cluster we introduce an IMBH of mass $M_{\bullet} = 500 M_{\odot}$ and correct the velocities of all stars and BHs of the GC to reach dynamical equilibrium. We created also three additional initial data changing the IMF, the mass of the IMBH and/or the initial concentration of the clusters. Case B is like A but with $M_{\bullet} = 1,000 M_{\odot}$ and $\alpha_2 = 2.5$, which results in 52 SBHs; case C is like B but with a King parameter of 6 and 48 SBHs. Finally, case D is like A but with a King parameter of 6 and $\alpha_1 = 1.2$ and $\alpha_2 = 2.7$, which result in only 17 SBHs, close to the lower number of SBHs created in our test models. The initial data for the 4 simulations are described in Table 2.

We performed the dynamical evolution of each of the 4 models using *Myriad*, which treats the stars and stellar remnants as point particles, but takes into account their sizes in the case of collisions. No primordial mass segregation is taken into account, so the BHs are formed in all the distances from the centre of the cluster. The absence of initial mass-segregation leads to an underestimate of the initial frequency of IMBH-SBH interactions, but, as we will show below, most of the most massive SBHs sink to the center and interact with the IMBH very soon. Stellar evolution is only used for creating the initial data for our models. During the N -body simulations stellar evolution is turned off, so the masses of stars and the masses and the number of remnants remain constant in time. This is a simplification, which does not have a significant impact on the dynamics of the IMBH and therefore on our results. Further (i.e. after the 10 Myr of the initial data) stellar evolution would create a number of SBHs with very low mass ($< 10 M_{\odot}$), which would have a negligible influence on the dynamics of the IMBH and on a possible binary that the IMBH would form with one of the higher-mass SBHs. Low-mass SBHs are expected not to be able to replace higher-mass SBH as companions of the IMBH. Instead, they are expected to be ejected easily through natal kicks and interactions with the IMBH and other higher-mass SBHs (Baumgardt et al. 2004).

From our set of simulations, only case A had an IMRI; we will therefore focus on this case in the remainder of the article. As of now, *Myriad* runs only with the assistance of the special-purpose GRAPE system (Makino et al. 2003), so that we are subjected to the the availability and performance of GRAPE systems.

3. Dynamics of the system

Initially, the IMBH interacts strongly with a sub-group of stars and SBHs that contains approximately 20 members. As the system evolves, the members of this sub-group change. Soon, most of the stellar-mass BHs of the system sink towards the centre and start to interact with the IMBH and its environment. During this process, some of them receive big kicks due to 3-body interactions and are slingshot away from the centre of the cluster or GC itself. After $T \sim 3$ Myr the first stable IMBH-SBH binary forms. The companion of the IMBH is a SBH with mass $m_{\bullet,11} = 23.9 M_{\odot}$ and the initial semi-major axis of this binary is $a \sim 88$ AU. At $T \sim 9.2$ Myr this binary has a strong interaction with another SBH of the system. The interaction leads to a change of companion for the IMBH, which now builds a binary with a SBH of mass $m_{\bullet,18} = 20.1 M_{\odot}$. The initial semi-major axis of the new binary is $a \sim 17.6$ AU. This binary survives for nearly 40 Myr, but its characteristics vary significantly. At $T \sim 49$ Myr the semi-major axis changes to $a \sim 5$ AU, while the eccentricity increases to $e = 0.965$. At this point in the simulation, this binary interacts strongly with the second most massive SBH, which leads to a companion exchange. The new binary has an initial semi-major axis of $a \sim 6.55$ AU and a very high eccentricity, of $e = 0.999$. The mass of the new companion SBH is $m_{\bullet,2} = 26.54 M_{\odot}$. In Fig.(1) we show the evolution of the semi-major axis and eccentricity for all of these binaries combined into a single curve. After some $T \sim 13,000$ yr the binary merges and the resulting IMBH receives a random recoil velocity that depends on the mass ratio of the two members of the system and on the random spins that the code assigned to them. This “gravitational rocket” or recoil is such that the resulting velocity exceeds the escape velocity and the merged system leaves the GC. This is due to the fact that we are using a low number of stars for the clusters; more realistic clusters will have larger escape velocities, so that the retained fraction of recoiling IMBH is larger and not well-represented by our case. We studied the distribution of recoil velocities for a merger of a binary similar to that of simulation A. We ran a two-body interaction 10^7 times and calculated the recoil using equation (3) with different spin orientations and magnitudes for the two black holes. We found that the most probable recoil velocity for a binary such as the one of case A peaks around 25 km s^{-1} , with a probability of 21% that the merged system achieves velocities greater than 50 km s^{-1} , of the order of realistic GC escape velocities.

In Fig. (2) we show the evolution of the distances of the 10 most massive SBHs from the center. The SBHs inspiral the center very rapidly, as long as the IMBH exists in the cluster. Some of them escape the system, after passing very close to the central binary. After the IMBH merges with its binary companion SBH, the coalesced system leaves the GC and the trajectories of the remaining SBHs are not as steep, because they orbit the center of density of the GC without sinking rapidly into it.

In Fig. (3) we show the Lagrange radii of the cluster during the simulation. We stop the simulation at ~ 10 Myr after the ejection of the IMBH. From $t=0$ until the ejection of the IMBH, which happened at $t \sim 49$ Myr, the Lagrange radii increase constantly. This agrees with other results of other N -body (Baumgardt et al. 2004) and recent Monte Carlo (Umbreit et al. 2012) simulations of GCs containing

Table 1. Description of the full set of initial data created for the investigation of the BH number and masses using different IMFs. We use a Kroupa '93 (Kroupa et al. 1993), a Kroupa '01 (Kroupa 2001b), a Salpeter (Salpeter 1955) and two simple power law mass functions with slopes $\alpha = -2.5, -2.4$. For each IMF we use three different values for the metallicity (Z), 0.0001, 0.001 and 0.02 and we create 100 realisations for each IMF-Z combination. We then evolve the stars up to 10 Myr using the stellar evolution code `sse`. Finally, we find averages for the number of BHs (third column) and their minimum (fourth column) and maximum (fifth column) masses. In all data sets the total number of stars is 32768 and their initial masses range from $0.2M_{\odot}$ to $150M_{\odot}$.

| IMF | Z | N_{BHs} | $M_{\text{BH max}}$ | $M_{\text{BH min}}$ |
|------------------------------|--------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Kroupa '93 | 0.02 | 26 ± 4 | 14.11 ± 0.90 | 3.33 ± 0.28 |
| Kroupa '93 | 0.001 | 22 ± 5 | 25.58 ± 2.60 | 14.50 ± 0.22 |
| Kroupa '93 | 0.0001 | 23 ± 4 | 26.46 ± 0.64 | 15.35 ± 1.54 |
| Kroupa '01 | 0.02 | 71 ± 9 | 15.00 ± 0.26 | 3.14 ± 0.15 |
| Kroupa '01 | 0.001 | 68 ± 9 | 26.19 ± 0.16 | 13.88 ± 0.08 |
| Kroupa '01 | 0.0001 | 69 ± 9 | 26.88 ± 0.23 | 14.13 ± 1.24 |
| Salpeter | 0.02 | 54 ± 6 | 14.77 ± 0.47 | 3.19 ± 0.17 |
| Salpeter | 0.001 | 50 ± 6 | 26.05 ± 0.30 | 13.38 ± 0.01 |
| Salpeter | 0.0001 | 51 ± 6 | 26.74 ± 0.40 | 14.12 ± 1.51 |
| Power Law ($\alpha = 2.5$) | 0.02 | 29 ± 5 | 14.21 ± 0.85 | 3.38 ± 0.32 |
| Power Law ($\alpha = 2.5$) | 0.001 | 26 ± 4 | 25.86 ± 0.52 | 14.88 ± 0.22 |
| Power Law ($\alpha = 2.5$) | 0.0001 | 27 ± 4 | 26.38 ± 0.62 | 15.66 ± 2.06 |
| Power Law ($\alpha = 2.4$) | 0.02 | 45 ± 6 | 14.60 ± 0.68 | 3.25 ± 0.24 |
| Power Law ($\alpha = 2.4$) | 0.001 | 41 ± 6 | 26.03 ± 0.28 | 13.11 ± 1.70 |
| Power Law ($\alpha = 2.4$) | 0.0001 | 42 ± 6 | 26.77 ± 0.32 | 14.47 ± 1.67 |

Table 2. Initial data for the 4 simulations.

| Case | α_1 | α_2 | N_{BHs} | W_0 | $M_{\text{IMBH}} [M_{\odot}]$ |
|------|------------|------------|------------------|-------|-------------------------------|
| A | 1.3 | 2.4 | 62 | 7 | 500 |
| B | 1.3 | 2.5 | 52 | 7 | 1000 |
| C | 1.3 | 2.5 | 48 | 6 | 1000 |
| D | 1.2 | 2.7 | 17 | 6 | 500 |

IMBHs, and it happens because the central IMBH and the IMBH-SBH binary that forms almost instantly after the beginning of the simulation, act as a heating source for the cluster. Kinetic energy is transferred from the IMBH-SBH binary to the stars and SBHs that pass close from the density center making the binary constantly harder and the stars more energetic and thus expanding the cluster. When the IMBH is removed from the cluster, the heating source is absent, so the cluster starts contracting slowly as is obviously shown in the Lagrange radii. The shrinkage of the cluster would continue until the central number density of stars becomes high enough that another heating source (i.e. a new binary) is formed at the center. Even though we integrated the system for another ~ 10 Myr after the ejection, no such source formed.

In all simulations the IMBH had as a companion a SBH, which was replaced several times with another SBH usually of greater mass. In the end, the companion of the IMBH was one of the most massive SBHs of the cluster. Most of the lower-mass SBHs after sinking to the center and interacting with the central IMBH-SBH binary, were kicked out of the GC. Also, in none of the simulations we find a main-sequence or giant star tidally disrupted by the IMBH. This is in agreement with the models of (Baumgardt et al. 2004) which contain a number of massive SBHs. In our models, apart from the IMBH, SBHs are the most massive objects in the GC and therefore sink to the center faster than any other star. As a result a IMBH-SBH binary forms very soon with the companion of the IMBH being more massive than any other non-SBH object of the cluster. Thus, only inter-

actions of the binary with another SBH of comparable or higher mass than the current companion of the IMBH may lead to a companion exchange, so it is almost impossible for a normal star to come too close to the IMBH to get tidally disrupted. Therefore, tidal disruptions of stars are not favoured in our models.

After the merger, the IMBH leaves the GC without any companion. This may be an artifact of the low number of stars used in the simulation. In real clusters a small number of stars or remnants are expected to be bound to the IMBH, so if the IMBH receives a large kick, they will follow it outside the GC. In this case, and if there are no massive SBHs among the IMBH companions, some stars might be tidally disrupted by the IMBH, and thus the system might become a ULX not associated with a GC.

4. Gravitational waves from an IMRI

In this section we follow the binary IMBH-SBH from the standpoint of emission of GWs. In Fig.(4) we can see the evolution of the IMRI in a semi-major axis and orbital period – eccentricity plane. The binary enters the plot from the top with a high eccentricity, which places it very close to the innermost stable circular orbit, but the loss of energy quickly circularises it and drives it to lower eccentricities. As we discussed in the previous section, the binary forms with a very small initial semi-major axis, so that it hardens very efficiently. Hence, the binary follows closely what we can expect from the approach of Peters (1964), since the post-Newtonian terms lead the evolution of the sys-




Fig. 1. Evolution of the semi-major axis and eccentricity of the different three binaries formed with the IMBH. Shortly after the beginning of the simulation, the IMBH builds a binary with the SBH with the 11th most massive mass, $m_{\bullet, 11}$. This corresponds to the first part of the curve (dashed blue curve). Later there is an interaction which leads to a companion exchange for the binary, the SBH with the 18th most massive mass, $m_{\bullet, 18}$. This binary lives for about 40 Myr. We can see that the two first binaries have phases of very high eccentricity, $e_{\text{bin}} \sim 1$, but not high enough to lead to a coalescence. The jumps in e_{bin} indicate that the IMBH-SBH is still in a regime in which interactions with other stars play an important role. The system shrinks further and further until there is a three-body interaction. The binary is unbound and for a short period of time the IMBH has no companion, as indicated in the zoom-in subplots embedded in both, the upper and lower panels. Then the final binary forms, with the second most massive SBH. This binary is very hard and quickly losses energy via GWs radiation, which very efficiently leads to circularization and the final merger.

tem, which can be regarded as dynamically decoupled from the GC. It then enters the band of a LISA-like or ALIA detector with a significant eccentricity and the simulation is stopped when the semi-major axis is $a = 5 R_{\text{Schw}}$, the Schwarzschild radius of the IMBH. That is the moment at which the code assigns a recoil velocity to the merged system based on the spins of the two compact objects.

In Fig.(5) we can see the same from the perspective of the characteristic amplitude and frequency of the waves. We display the first harmonics in the approximation of Keplerian ellipses of Peters & Mathews (1963).

5. Conclusions

In this work we have investigated with a direct-summation code the evolution of GCs that harbour an IMBH in their center. The code uses relativistic corrections and a prescription for gravitational recoil. For one of the cases we find that an IMRI forms with a SBH due to close interactions, which leads to the ejection of IMBH after coalescence. We follow the properties of the IMRI from a standpoint of the global evolution of the cluster and of GW.




Fig. 2. Distance R_{\bullet} to the density center of the GC of the ten most massive SBHs and the IMBH (solid black line). Strong interactions of the SBHs lead to ejection of four of them before the IMBH merges. They are removed from the simulation when $R_{\bullet} > 10$ pc and they are unbound with the GC. At $T \sim 47.7$ Myr the IMRI leads to a coalescence that kicks the resulting merged system off the GC.




Fig. 3. Lagrangian radii showing the evolution of different mass fractions in the cluster: from the top to the bottom 90, 80 ... 20, 10, 5, 3, 2, 1 and 0.1% of the total mass. The green rectangle shows the interval of time before and after the kick of the IMBH off the cluster. All mass curves suffer a jump at the moment of ejection. After the removal of the heating source from the center, the curves are flatter and their slopes start to decrease.

Before the formation of the IMRI and the subsequent ejection of the IMBH, the cluster experiences strong expansion as a result of two-body relaxation in the presence of an IMBH. The IMBH-SBH binaries that are formed transfer kinetic energy to the stars that sink to the center and as a result the GC expands significantly. Some of the inner Lagrange radii of the cluster almost double in size during the first ~ 50 Myr of dynamical evolution. Also, most of the massive SBHs sink to the center very rapidly and after interacting with the IMBH, if they do not become its




Fig. 4. Inspiral of the SBH into the IMBH from the top to the bottom and from the left to the right in the eccentricity–semi-major axis plane. The red, solid curve starting at a very eccentric orbit shows the results of the NBODY simulation. The dashed, green region corresponds to the band of a LISA-like mission. Dashed, blue curves correspond to the trajectories due only to the emission of GWs in the Peters & Mathews (1963) approximation. We also plot the corresponding merger timescales in the same approximation in dashed, blue lines starting at 10^{10} years, and in solid, black lines the corresponding trajectories for evolution by GW emission Peters (1964) approximation. The black-shaded region on the right corresponds to the last stable circular orbit. Since the binary starts at a very high eccentricity, it basically follows one of the solid black lines, because it merges quickly and does not interact with other stars in the system.

companions, they receive large kicks and get ejected violently from the GC. After the ejection of the IMBH, the GC slowly starts to contract as a result of the absence of the heating source at the center. This might lead to another core collapse of the GC, something we do not observe in the simulation in the first 10 Myr after the ejection if the IMBH.

In our simulations, the IMBH forms a binary with a SBH very early and then exchanges its companion several times. In the simulation we observed an IMRI, the IMBH formed a binary with the second most massive SBH of the system. The initial high eccentricity of the IMBH-SBH binary lead to an IMRI and a subsequent merger. We showed that for $z \leq 0.7$ the energy loss of the binary in GWs is easily detectable by space-borne missions such as a LISA-like observatory (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2012) or ALIA in its 8 pc configuration. Moreover, the IMRI enters the bandwidth of the detectors with a very high eccentricity, $e = 0.9987$, as with the EMRIs. One year before the final coalescence, the system still retains a residual eccentricity of $e \sim 0.12$, and ten minutes before merger of $e \sim 10^{-3}$, which is de-




Fig. 5. Characteristic amplitude h_c of the first harmonics of the quadruple gravitational radiation emitted during the inspiral of the IMRI. The numbers show the first four of the harmonics. The orbital evolution is calculated in the Peters (1964) approximation and the amplitudes as in Peters & Mathews (1963). We assume the source is at a distance $D = 1$ Gpc. We indicate with a solid curve the noise curve $\sqrt{f} S_h(f)$ for the ALIA detector with an armlength of 3×10^9 m, a telescope diameter of 0.58 m, and a 1-way position noise of $8/\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$ pm; i.e. the 3H configuration of Gong et al. (2011). We also add the noise curve for a LISA-like detector (in grey, Larson et al. 2000), with the Galactic binary white dwarf confusion background (Bender & Hills 1997). Note that the SNR is not given by the height above the curve, but by the area below it. For each panel we show the ratio R_p^0/R_s , the initial periastron distance over the Schwarzschild radius of the system. We indicate the moments in the evolution for which the time to coalescence is 5, 1 yr, 1 hour, 10 minutes and 1 sec.

tectable by data-analysis techniques (Amaro-Seoane et al. 2010; Porter & Sesana 2010; Key & Cornish 2011).

IMRIs represent a test of GR, as well as a probe of space and time around massive black holes and also of the innermost kinematics of GCs to very large distances, of the order of a few Gpc. On the top of that, a successful detection would represent very robust proof for the existence of IMBHs. The fact that the kick is making the merged system leave the GC is possibly an artifact of the low particle number we used in the simulations, though in principle recoiling velocities can be much higher than the escape velocity of a cluster, of the order of $\sim 50 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (see e.g. Rezzolla 2009; Holley-Bockelmann et al. 2008). However, we have also demonstrated that there is a non-negligible statistical probability that a similar case leads to a kick of the IMBH off a realistic GC.

In our simulations we do not observe any tidal disruption of stars and also in the simulation in which we had an IMRI, the IMBH left the system without any companion.

This is probably also an artifact of the low number of stars used in the simulations. In real clusters normally there is a small number of stars bound to the IMBH, so after all the SBHs are ejected and probably after some IMBH-SBH mergers, the IMBH will be followed by a number of main-sequence or giant stars, even if it is ejected from the GC. Therefore, if after the IMBH-SBH merger the IMBH remains in the GC, it might soon become an X-ray source at the center of the cluster, similar to the ULXs that are located at the centers of GCs (e.g. the ULX at NGC 404 Nyland et al. 2012; Binder et al. 2011). On the other hand, if it escapes the GC, followed by the stars bound to it, it might soon become a ULX outside of the GC. In this context, HLX-1 might be an escaping IMBH that originated at the center of ESO243-49 and received a large recoil velocity after a merger with a massive SBH. The kick is responsible for the escape if the IMBH, which is followed by a number of stars gravitationally bound to it. This scenario supports one of the possible scenarios for HLX-1 suggested by Soria et al. (2012) according to which the HLX-1 is an IMBH embedded in a young population of stars with ages < 10 Myr and total mass with upper bound of $\sim 10^4 M_{\odot}$. A larger number of simulations of escaping IMBHs using a realistic number of stars would be appropriate for testing this scenario.

In spite of the code been ported to run on a PC with special-purpose hardware GRAPE, we can not cover a broader parameter space, nor study cases with a larger number of stars, or study the global dynamical evolution of the GC after the kick for a longer time. We plan on performing a better parameter space exploration thanks to the availability of GPUs, which will allow us to address the limitations we described above. This will allow us to investigate the potential global structure of the GC after the kick, since the impact on the cluster could in principle be a signature for the process. Also, it will allow us to study also the properties and detectability of the escaping IMBHs and their possible companions.

Acknowledgements. We thank Emma Robinson for comments on the manuscript and Nikolaos Stergioulas for suggesting us to examine also the possibility of kicks. SK and PAS are indebted to Xuefei Gong, Shan Bai and Yun Kau Lau for conversations, their hospitality in Beijing and for sharing with us the data for the sensitivity curve of the ALIA detector. PAS thanks the organizers of the 2011 summer workshop at the Aspen Center for Physics for inviting him to attend. SK and PAS are thankful to Rainer Spurzem and Fukun Liu for the invitation to the meeting in Lijiang on black holes and to visit the KIAA and NAOC in Beijing in summer of 2011, where this work was finished. The work of SK was funded by the Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt (DLR; through the LISA Germany project), also by the German Science Foundation (DFG) via SFB/TR7 on “Gravitational Waves” and by the FONDECYT Postdoctoral Fellowship number 3130570. SK would like to thank Kleomenis Tsiganis for discussions.

References

Aarseth S. J., 1999, *The Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 111, 1333
 Aarseth S. J., 2003, *Gravitational N-Body Simulations*. ISBN 0521432723. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, November 2003.
 Amaro-Seoane P., Aoudia S., Babak S., Binétruy P., et. al 2012, accepted for publication at *GW Notes*.
 Amaro-Seoane P., Eichhorn C., Porter E. K., Spurzem R., 2010, *MNRAS*, 401, 2268
 Amaro-Seoane P., Gair J. R., Freitag M., Miller M. C., Mandel I., Cutler C. J., Babak S., 2007, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 24, 113

Amaro-Seoane P., Santamaria L., 2009, *ApJ* in press
 Anderson J., van der Marel R. P., 2010, *ApJ*, 710, 1032
 Bahcall J. N., Ostriker J. P., 1975, *Nature*, 256, 23
 Baumgardt H., Hut P., Makino J., McMillan S., Portegies Zwart S., 2003, *ApJ Lett.*, 582, L21
 Baumgardt H., Makino J., Ebisuzaki T., 2004, *ApJ*, 613, 1143
 Baumgardt H., Makino J., Hut P., 2005, *ApJ*, 620, 238
 Baumgardt H., Makino J., Hut P., McMillan S., Portegies Zwart S., 2003, *ApJ Lett.*, 589, L25
 Begelman M. C., 2002, *ApJ*, 568, L97
 Belczynski K., Bulik T., Fryer C. L., Ruiter A., Valsecchi F., Vink J. S., Hurley J. R., 2010, *ApJ*, 714, 1217
 Bender P. L., Armitage P. J., Begelman M. C., Pema R., 2005, *White Paper submitted to the NASA SEU Roadmap Committee*
 Bender P. L., Hils D., 1997, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 14, 1439
 Bender R., 2005, in Merloni A., Nayakshin S., Sunyaev R. A., eds, *Growing Black Holes: Accretion in a Cosmological Context Supermassive Black Holes in Nearby Galaxy Centers*. pp 147–153
 Binder B., Williams B. F., Eracleous M., Seth A. C., Dalcanton J. J., Skillman E. D., Weisz D. R., Anderson S. F., Gaetz T. J., Plucinsky P. P., 2011, *ApJ*, 737, 77
 Chanamé J., Bruursema J., Chandar R., Anderson J., van der Marel R., Ford H., 2010, in de Grijs R., Lépine J. R. D., eds, *IAU Symposium Vol. 266 of IAU Symposium, HST’s hunt for intermediate-mass black holes in star clusters*. pp 231–237
 Crowder J., Cornish N. J., 2005, *Physical Review D*, 72, 083005
 Davis S. W., Narayan R., Zhu Y., Barret D., Farrell S. A., Godet O., Servillat M., Webb N. A., 2011, *ApJ*, 734, 111
 Eisenhauer F., Perrin G., Brandner W., Straubmeier C., et al. 2008, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series Vol. 7013 of Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, GRAVITY: getting to the event horizon of Sgr A**
 Farrell S. A., Servillat M., Oates S. R., Heywood I., Godet O., Webb N. A., Barret D., 2010, *X-ray Astronomy 2009: Present Status, Multi-Wavelength Approach and Future Perspectives*, 1248, 93
 Farrell S. A., Servillat M., Pforr J., Maccarone T. J., Knigge C., Godet O., Maraston C., Webb N. A., Barret D., Gosling A. J., Belmont R., Wiersema K., 2012, *ApJ Lett.*, 747, L13
 Farrell S. A., Webb N. A., Barret D., Godet O., Rodrigues J. M., 2009, *Nat*, 460, 73
 Feng H., Soria R., 2011, *New A Rev.*, 55, 166
 Frank J., Rees M. J., 1976, *MNRAS*, 176, 633
 Fregeau J. M., Larson S. L., Miller M. C., O’Shaughnessy R., Rasio F. A., 2006, *ApJ Lett.*, 646, L135
 Freitag M., Gürkan M. A., Rasio F. A., 2006, *MNRAS*, 368, 141
 Fryer C. L., 1999, *ApJ*, 522, 413
 Fryer C. L., Kalogera V., 2001, *ApJ*, 554, 548
 Gürkan M. A., Freitag M., Rasio F. A., 2004, *ApJ*, 604, 632
 Gillessen S., Eisenhauer F., Trippe S., Alexander T., Genzel R., Martins F., Ott T., 2009, *ApJ*, 692, 1075
 Gillessen S., Perrin G., Brandner W., Straubmeier C., Eisenhauer F., Rabien S., Eckart A., Lena P., Genzel R., Paumard T., Hippler S., 2006, in *Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series Vol. 6268 of Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers (SPIE) Conference Series, GRAVITY: the adaptive-optics-assisted two-object beam combiner instrument for the VLTI*
 Glebbeek E., Gaburov E., de Mink S. E., Pols O. R., Portegies Zwart S. F., 2009, *A&A*, 497, 255
 Godet O., Barret D., Webb N. A., Farrell S. A., Gehrels N., 2009, *ApJ*, 705, L109
 Godet O., Farrell S., Barret D., Webb N., Servillat M., 2011, *The Astronomer’s Telegram*, 3569, 1
 Godet O., Plazolles B., Kawaguchi T., Lasota J.-P., Barret D., Farrell S. A., Braitto V., Servillat M., Webb N., Gehrels N., 2012, *ApJ*, 752, 34
 Gong X., Xu S., Bai S., Cao Z., Chen G., Chen Y., He X., Heinzel G., Lau Y.-K., Liu C., Luo J., Luo Z., Pulido Patón A., Rüdiger A., Shao M., Spurzem R., Wang Y., Xu P., Yeh H.-C., Yuan Y., Zhou Z., 2011, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 28, 094012
 Goswami S., Umbreit S., Bierbaum M., Rasio F. A., 2012, *ApJ*, 752, 43
 Gültekin K., Richstone D. O., Gebhardt K., Lauer T. R., Tremaine S., Aller M. C., Bender R., Dressler A., Faber S. M., Filippenko A. V., Green R., Ho L. C., Kormendy J., Magorrian J., Pinkney J., Siopis C., 2009, *ApJ*, 698, 198
 Heger A., Woosley S. E., 2002, *ApJ*, 567, 532

- Holley-Bockelmann K., Gültekin K., Shoemaker D., Yunes N., 2008, *ApJ*, 686, 829
- Hurley J. R., Pols O. R., Tout C. A., 2000, *MNRAS*, 315, 543
- Karachentsev I. D., Karachentseva V. E., Huchtmeier W. K., Makarov D. I., 2004, *AJ*, 127, 2031
- Key J. S., Cornish N. J., 2011, *Phys Rev D*, 83, 083001
- King A. R., 2008, *MNRAS*, 385, L113
- King I. R., 1966, *AJ*, 71, 64
- Kirsten F., Vlemmings W. H. T., 2012, *A&A*, 542, A44
- Kokubo E., Yoshinaga K., Makino J., 1998, *MNRAS*, 297, 1067
- Konstantinidis S., Kokkotas K. D., 2010, *A&A*, 522, A70+
- Koppitz M., Pollney D., Reisswig C., Rezzolla L., Thornburg J., Diener P., Schnetter E., 2007, *Physical Review Letters*, 99, 041102
- Kroupa P., 2001a, *MNRAS*, 322, 231
- Kroupa P., 2001b, *MNRAS*, 322, 231
- Kroupa P., Tout C. A., Gilmore G., 1993, *MNRAS*, 262, 545
- Kupi G., Amaro-Seoane P., Spurzem R., 2006, *MNRAS*, pp L77+
- Larson S. L., Hiscock W. A., Hellings R. W., 2000, *Physical Review D*, 62, 062001
- Lousto C. O., Campanelli M., Zlochower Y., Nakano H., 2010, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 27, 114006
- Lousto C. O., Zlochower Y., 2011a, *Physical Review Letters*, 107, 231102
- Lousto C. O., Zlochower Y., 2011b, *Phys. Rev. D*, 83, 024003
- Lützgendorf N., Kissler-Patig M., Gebhardt K., Baumgardt H., Noyola E., Jalali B., de Zeeuw P. T., Neumayer N., 2012, *A&A*, 542, A129
- Madau P., Rees M. J., 2001, *ApJ*, 551, L27
- Makino J., Fukushige T., Koga M., Namura K., 2003, *PASJ*, 55, 1163
- Miller C., 2006, in *APS April Meeting Abstracts Gravitational Radiation from Intermediate-Mass Black Holes*. p. 4003P
- Miller M. C., 2009, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 26, 094031
- Miller M. C., Colbert E. J. M., 2004, *International Journal of Modern Physics D*, 13, 1
- Miller M. C., Hamilton D. P., 2002, *MNRAS*, 330, 232
- Noyola E., Gebhardt K., Kissler-Patig M., Lützgendorf N., Jalali B., de Zeeuw P. T., Baumgardt H., 2010, *ApJ*, 719, L60
- Nyland K., Marvil J., Wrobel J., Young L., Zauderer B. A., 2012, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Peebles P. J. E., 1972, *ApJ*, 178, 371
- Peters P. C., 1964, *Physical Review*, 136, 1224
- Peters P. C., Mathews J., 1963, *Physical Review*, 131, 435
- 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
- Portegies Zwart S. F., Baumgardt H., Hut P., Makino J., McMillan S. L. W., 2004, *Nat*, 428, 724
- Portegies Zwart S. F., McMillan S. L. W., 2000, *ApJ Lett.*, 528, L17
- Portegies Zwart S. F., McMillan S. L. W., 2002, *ApJ*, 576, 899
- Porter E. K., Sesana A., 2010, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Quinlan G. D., Shapiro S. L., 1990, *ApJ*, 356, 483
- Rees M. J., 1978, in E. M. Berkhuijsen & R. Wielebinski ed., *Structure and Properties of Nearby Galaxies Vol. 77 of IAU Symposium*, Emission from the nuclei of nearby galaxies - Evidence for massive black holes. pp 237–242
- Rees M. J., 1984, *ARA&A*, 22, 471
- Rezzolla L., 2009, *Classical and Quantum Gravity*, 26, 094023
- Rezzolla L., Dorband E. N., Reisswig C., Diener P., Pollney D., Schnetter E., Szilágyi B., 2008, *ApJ*, 679, 1422
- Salpeter E. E., 1955, *ApJ*, 121, 161
- Servillat M., Farrell S. A., Lin D., Godet O., Barret D., Webb N. A., 2011, *ApJ*, 743, 6
- Seth A. C., Cappellari M., Neumayer N., Caldwell N., Bastian N., Olsen K., Blum R. D., Debattista V. P., McDermid R., Puzia T., Stephens A., 2010, *ApJ*, 714, 713
- Soria R., Hakala P. J., Hau G. K. T., Gladstone J. C., Kong A. K. H., 2012, *MNRAS*, 420, 3599
- Soria R., Hau G. K. T., Graham A. W., Kong A. K. H., Kuin N. P. M., Li I.-H., Liu J.-F., Wu K., 2010, *MNRAS*, 405, 870
- Strader J., Chomiuk L., Maccarone T. J., Miller-Jones J. C. A., Seth A. C., 2012, *Nature*, 490, 71
- Sutton A. D., Roberts T. P., Walton D. J., Gladstone J. C., Scott A. E., 2012, *MNRAS*, 423, 1154
- Tremaine S., Gebhardt K., Bender R., Bower G., Dressler A., Faber S. M., Filippenko A. V., Green R., Grillmair C., Ho L. C., Kormendy J., Lauer T. R., Magorrian J., Pinkney J., Richstone D., 2002, *ApJ*, 574, 740
- Umbreit S., Fregeau J. M., Chatterjee S., Rasio F. A., 2012, *ApJ*, 750, 31
- van der Marel R. P., 2004, *Coevolution of Black Holes and Galaxies*, p. 37
- van der Marel R. P., Anderson J., 2010, *ApJ*, 710, 1063
- Vesperini E., McMillan S. L. W., D'Ercole A., D'Antona F., 2010, *ApJ*, 713, L41
- Volonteri M., Rees M. J., 2005, *ApJ*, 633, 624
- Whalen D. J., Fryer C. L., 2012, *ApJ*, 756, L19
- Wiersema K., Farrell S. A., Webb N. A., Servillat M., Maccarone T. J., Barret D., Godet O., 2010, *ApJ*, 721, L102
- Wyller A. A., 1970, *ApJ*, 160, 443