

THE STATUS OF NUMERICAL RELATIVITY

MIGUEL ALCUBIERRE

*Instituto de Ciencias Nucleares, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
A.P. 70-543, México D.F. 04510, México*

Numerical relativity has come a long way in the last three decades and is now reaching a state of maturity. We are gaining a deeper understanding of the fundamental theoretical issues related to the field, from the well posedness of the Cauchy problem, to better gauge conditions, improved boundary treatment, and more realistic initial data. There has also been important work both in numerical methods and software engineering. All these developments have come together to allow the construction of several advanced fully three-dimensional codes capable of dealing with both matter and black holes. In this manuscript I make a brief review the current status of the field.

1. Introduction

General relativity is a highly successful theory. It has radically modified our vision of space and time and possesses an enormous predictive power. Its more important achievements include the prediction of exotic objects such as black holes and neutron stars, and the cosmological model of the Big Bang. In addition, it predicts the existence of gravitational waves, which will probably be detected for the first time before the end of this decade. Still, the field equations of general relativity are extremely complex. These equations form a system of ten coupled non-linear partial differential equations in four dimensions. When fully expanded in a general coordinate system they have thousands of terms. Because of this, exact solutions to these equations usually involve high degrees of symmetry, either in space or in time: spherical or axially symmetry, homogeneity, isotropy, staticity, stationarity, etc. When one is interested in studying highly dynamic systems that have little or no symmetry it is simply impossible to solve the equations exactly and one must fall back on numerical solutions.

Numerical relativity started in the 1960's with the pioneering work of Hahn and Lindquist [1], but it wasn't until the mid 1970's that the first successful simulations were performed by Smarr and Eppley in the context of the head-on collision of two black holes [2,3]. Since then numerical rela-

tivity has come a long way. The availability of powerful super-computers, together with an improved understanding of the fundamental theoretical issues that underlie the field, have finally allowed simulations of fully three-dimensional (3D) systems with strong and highly dynamical gravitational fields. All this activity has arrived at the right time, as the first generation of advanced gravitational wave detectors are finally coming on line [4–7]. We are living a very exciting stage in the development of this field.

In this manuscript I will discuss the current status of numerical relativity, starting from studies of theoretical issues having to do with formulations of the equations, gauge conditions and initial data. I will also discuss the latest achievements in the simulation of astrophysical systems such as neutron stars and black holes. Of necessity this report will be very brief. I will therefore limit myself to discussing the main ideas and results, and will leave all the details to the list of references at the end.

2. The 3+1 decomposition

The Einstein field equations are usually written in fully covariant form, with no distinction between space and time. This is elegant and mathematically powerful, but it is not very useful when one is interested in studying the evolution in time of a gravitational system starting from some appropriate initial data, the so called “initial value problem”.

It is well known from the seminal work of Choquet-Bruhat [8] that general relativity does allow an initial value formulation. Today there are three main procedures in which one can obtain such a formulation: the “Cauchy” or “3+1” formalism, the “conformal” formalism, and the “characteristic” formalism. The 3+1 and conformal approaches share the property of splitting spacetime into a foliation of spacelike hypersurfaces. The main difference lies in the fact that in the 3+1 approach these hypersurfaces reach spatial infinity, while in the conformal approach the hypersurfaces are hyperboloidal and reach future null infinity instead. This allows the hypersurfaces to be conformally compactified, permitting a rigorous treatment of fields at infinity and eliminating the need for the boundary conditions at a finite distance that have to be introduced in the standard 3+1 approach. The characteristic formalism, on the other hand, foliates spacetime using null cones emanating from a central world tube and also allows a compactification that brings null infinity to a finite coordinate distance.

Each approach has its strong points, but to date most work in numerical relativity has been done using the 3+1 formalism, so here I will concentrate

on this approach. However, interested readers are referred to the excellent review of Winicour on the characteristic approach [9] and the articles of Friedrich, Fraundtner and Husa on the conformal approach [10–12].

In the 3+1 approach one introduces a global time function t whose levels sets are the hypersurfaces defining the foliation. One then defines three main ingredients: 1) The three-dimensional metric γ_{ij} ($i, j = 1, 2, 3$) that measures distances within a given hypersurface, 2) the “lapse” function α that measures proper time between adjacent hypersurfaces, and 3) the “shift vector” β^i that measures the relative speed between observers moving along the normal direction to the hypersurfaces, and those keeping constant spatial coordinates. One then writes the four dimensional metric as

$$ds^2 = (-\alpha^2 + \beta_i \beta^i) dt^2 + 2 \beta_i dt dx^i + \gamma_{ij} dx^i dx^j, \quad (1)$$

where $\beta_i := \gamma_{ij} \beta^j$.

Having split the metric, one introduces the “extrinsic curvature” tensor K_{ij} (also known as the “second fundamental form”) that measures how the spatial hypersurfaces are immersed in spacetime. This tensor is given by the Lie derivative of γ_{ij} along the time lines, or in 3+1 language:

$$\partial_t \gamma_{ij} = -2\alpha K_{ij} + D_i \beta_j + D_j \beta_i, \quad (2)$$

with D_i the covariant derivative associated with γ_{ij} .

The next step is to decompose the Einstein equations. Doing this one finds that they naturally split in two groups. One group involves no time derivatives and represents constraints that must be satisfied at all times. The “Hamiltonian constraint” is given by (in units such that $G = c = 1$)

$$R + (\text{tr } K)^2 - K_{ij} K^{ij} = 16\pi\rho, \quad (3)$$

with R the scalar curvature of the spatial geometry, $\text{tr } K \equiv \gamma^{ij} K_{ij}$ the trace of the extrinsic curvature and ρ the energy density of matter measured by the normal observers. The “momentum” constraints take the form

$$D_j [K^{ij} - \gamma^{ij} \text{tr } K] = 8\pi j^i, \quad (4)$$

with j^i the momentum flux of matter measured by the normal observers. The existence of the constraints implies, in particular, that one is not free to specify the 12 dynamical quantities $\{\gamma_{ij}, K_{ij}\}$ as arbitrary initial conditions. The remaining 6 Einstein equations contain the dynamics of the system:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t K_{ij} &= \beta^a D_a K_{ij} + K_{ia} D_j \beta^a + K_{ja} D_i \beta^a - D_i D_j \alpha \\ &+ \alpha [R_{ij} - 2K_{ia} K_j^a + K_{ij} \text{tr } K] + 4\pi\alpha [\gamma_{ij} (\text{tr } S - \rho) - 2S_{ij}], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with S_{ij} the stress tensor of matter.

It is important to mention that the Bianchi identities imply that the evolution equations preserve the constraints, that is, if they are satisfied initially they will remain satisfied at subsequent times. The equations just described are known as the Arnowitt-Deser-Misner equations, or ADM for short. They represent the starting point of practically all of 3+1 numerical relativity. The reader interested in seeing how these equations are derived is referred to the original ADM article [13] or the classic review by York [14].

3. Hyperbolic reductions

The ADM evolution equations introduced in the previous section are in fact highly non-unique. This is because one can easily add arbitrary multiples of the constraints to them, that is multiples of zero, without affecting their physical solutions. The key word here is “physical”, since non-physical solutions, *i.e.* those that do not satisfy the constraints, will certainly change. Constraint violating solutions, though not of interest physically, are nevertheless inevitable in numerical simulations since truncation errors imply that the constraints are never satisfied exactly. Adding constraints to the evolution equations can also seriously alter their mathematical properties. This non-uniqueness of the evolution equations is well known. For example, the original equations of ADM [13] differ from those of York [14] precisely by the addition of a multiple of the Hamiltonian constraint. The reformulation of York can be shown to be better behaved mathematically [15] and has become the standard form used in numerical relativity.

A key point that one has to worry about when studying the Cauchy problem is the well-posedness of the system of evolution equations, by which one understands that solutions exist (at least locally) and are stable in the sense that small changes in the initial data produce small changes in the solution. In this respect, one usually looks for either symmetric or strongly hyperbolic systems of equations as such systems are well posed under very general conditions [16]. In the case of general relativity, the problem of well-posedness was studied already by Choquet-Bruhat in the 1950’s [8]. By the mid 1980’s a number of hyperbolic reductions were known [17–20], though they played a very minor role in numerical relativity (an excellent review of the subject can be found in a recent article by Friedrich and Randall [21]). In the early 1990’s, Bona and Masso started studying hyperbolic formulations for numerical relativity [22–24], and this effort was later followed by a number of people [25–28]. However, a generalized interest of the numerical

community in hyperbolicity had to wait until 1999, when Baumgarte and Shapiro [29] showed that a reformulation of the ADM equations proposed by Nakamura, Oohara and Kojima [30], and Shibata and Nakamura [31], had far superior numerical stability properties than ADM. Baumgarte and Shapiro attributed this to the fact that the new formulation, known as BSSN, had “more hyperbolic flavor”. This was later put on firmer ground in [32–34], and today it is understood that ADM is only weakly hyperbolic (and thus not well posed) [35], whereas BSSN is strongly hyperbolic [33,34].

The search for ever more general hyperbolic reductions of the Einstein evolution equations has continued in the last few years, and today many such formulations exist, several of which have dozens of free parameters [36, 37]. The focus has now changed to finding hyperbolic formulations that allow dynamical gauge choices, both for the lapse and the shift [38–40], and formulations that work well with fewer free parameters, maybe keeping a second order in space form [41, 42], or motivated by covariant approaches like the recently developed “Z4” system of the Majorca group [43]. At the same time, there is a growing realization that well-posedness is not enough, as empirically some hyperbolic formulations have proven to be far more robust than others. Some work has been done on the analytic side trying to understand what makes some hyperbolic formulations better suited for numerical work. In particular one can mention the work of Shinkai and Yoneda [44] and the work of Lindblom and Scheel [45]. Work in this area continues, and today there is no consensus as to which, if any, is the best formulation of the evolution equations for numerical purposes.

4. Constrained evolution

There is another approach, parallel but not inconsistent with the drive for hyperbolic formulations. This approach comes from the observation that numerical instabilities are usually related with the violation of the constraints. It would then seem that imposing the constraints at every time step should improve the stability of the simulations.

Such “constrained evolution” is in fact a old approach, and is commonly used in situations with high symmetry. In fact, it is the standard way to do numerical simulations in spherical symmetry, where for specific gauge choices, *e.g.* an areal radial coordinate, one can solve for the metric directly from the Hamiltonian constraint and ignore the evolution equations (in this case the Hamiltonian constraint is an ordinary differential equation and therefore easy to solve numerically). In situations with less symmetry,

and in particular in fully 3D simulations, constrained evolution has not been very popular since it involves solving systems of coupled elliptic equations every time step, which makes it a hard problem. The elliptic equations can be solved, but it makes the evolution code extremely slow (though this problem can be considerably ameliorated by using different numerical techniques such as spectral methods).

Another reason why constrained evolution is less popular than “free evolution” is that mathematical results on the well-posedness of mixed elliptic-hyperbolic systems are sparse, and a priori there is no good reason to expect that such constrained systems will be any better behaved than standard approaches. Still, a number of groups are exploring the use of constrained evolution in axi-symmetry and even in full 3D [46–49], and the idea seems to be gaining popularity. It will be very interesting to see if this approach can cure the stability problems faced by free evolution codes.

5. Gauge

The Einstein equations provide us with evolution equations for the spatial metric γ_{ij} and extrinsic curvature K_{ij} . However, they do not say anything about the evolution of the lapse function α and shift vector β^i . This is as it should be, as the lapse and shift represent our freedom in choosing the coordinate system, *i.e.* they are “gauge” functions. Choosing a good gauge is crucial when one solves the Einstein equations numerically, and one must choose carefully if one wants to avoid coordinate (and physical) singularities and to cover the interesting regions of spacetime. One can’t just specify the lapse and shift as *a priori* known functions of spacetime for a simple reason: Which functions are a good choice? The lapse and shift must therefore be chosen dynamically as functions of the evolving geometry, that is, we choose the coordinates as we go.

5.1. Slicing conditions

Since the seminal work of Smarr and York in 1978 [50, 51], a lot has been learned about slicing conditions. Some classical choices such as maximal slicing are still in use today. Maximal slicing asks for the trace of the extrinsic curvature to remain equal to zero, which implies that the normal volume elements do not change. Through the ADM equations one finds that this implies that the lapse function must satisfy the elliptic equation:

$$D^2\alpha = \alpha K_{ij}K^{ij}, \quad (6)$$

with D^2 the spatial Laplace operator. Maximal slicing is an extremely robust slicing condition, producing smooth evolutions whenever it can be applied. It also has the important property of being “singularity avoiding”. This means that when a physical singularity is approached, the slicing reacts by making the lapse collapse to zero in that region, thus halting the evolution there while allowing it to continue in regions away from the singularity. Of course, there is a price to pay, and singularity avoiding slicings develop a problem known as “slice stretching”, where the radial metric components grow rapidly as the slices are stretched between the frozen inner regions and the evolving outer ones. Maximal slicing continues to be used to this day, and recently there has been some important analytical insight into numerical results for black hole evolutions using maximal slicing [52].

The drive towards hyperbolicity and computational efficiency has made hyperbolic slicing conditions increasingly popular in recent years, and there have been a number of important developments in this respect. In the first place, we have learned that it is much better to prescribe the “densitized lapse” $\tilde{\alpha} := \alpha / \det(\gamma)^{1/2}$ than the lapse itself, as a prescribed densitized lapse allows hyperbolic formulations to be constructed while a prescribed lapse does not. Anderson and York have given important insight as to why this is so [53], and Spherhake *et al.* have recently shown dramatic numerical evidence of this [54]. In the case of dynamical lapse conditions, gauges of the Bona-Masso type [24], $\partial\alpha = -\alpha^2 f(\alpha) \text{tr}K$, have also been shown to allow hyperbolic formulations to be constructed [37, 38, 55]. These type of gauge conditions are becoming very popular, in particular “1+log” slicing ($f = 2/\alpha$), which has singularity avoiding properties similar to maximal slicing but is far easier to implement numerically. Finally, there is now a better understanding of the singularity avoidance properties of Bona-Masso type slicing conditions, as well as the possibility of gauge shock formation [56] (*i.e.* coordinate singularities caused by the crossing of the characteristics associated with the propagation of the gauge).

5.2. Shift conditions

Considerably less is known about shift conditions, and the classic conditions of Smarr and York [50] are still in use today in one way or another. In particular, the “minimal distortion” shift condition, which was designed to minimize the distortion in the volume elements over the hypersurface and requires that one solves a system of three coupled elliptic equations, is still a common choice. However, some recent results are important.

The main development has been the introduction of hyperbolic type shift conditions associated with the BSSN formulation. This formulation introduces as auxiliary variables the contracted conformal Christoffel symbols $\tilde{\Gamma}^i := \gamma^{jk}\tilde{\Gamma}_{jk}^i$, and shift conditions have been designed that make the second time derivatives of the shift proportional to the time derivatives of the $\tilde{\Gamma}^i$: $\partial_t^2\beta^i \sim \partial_t\tilde{\Gamma}^i$. It turns out that the principal part of the operator on the right hand side of this equation is identical with that of the minimal distortion condition, so these ‘‘Gamma driver’’ conditions can be seen as a hyperbolic version of minimal distortion. These type of shift conditions are extremely easy to implement numerically, in contrast with the difficulty involved in solving the minimal distortion elliptic equations. Moreover, they have proven to be extremely robust in practice, controlling the slice stretching associated with singularity avoiding slicings, and allowing very long term evolutions of black hole spacetimes [57]. Because of this, such shift conditions are now being used by a large fraction of existing 3D codes. Recently, shift conditions of this type have been shown to yield well-posed systems when considered together with Einstein’s evolution equations [38, 39].

It has also become clear that 3D simulations of rotating and/or orbiting compact objects require non-trivial shift vectors to avoid large shears in the metric and allow long lived simulations. The use of co-rotating coordinates using a shift that approaches a rigid rotation far away has been found to be crucial for achieving long lived binary black hole evolutions [58, 59].

6. Boundaries

Most physical systems one is interested in extend all the way to infinity, but 3+1 simulations have a boundary at a finite distance (however far). One must therefore impose some artificial boundary condition at the edge of the computational domain. This is not the case in the conformal and characteristic approaches that allow one to reach all the way out to null infinity, but it represents a serious problem in standard 3+1 simulations.

For a very long time boundary conditions were not given the attention the deserved by the numerical community. The reason was that the interior evolution was already extremely difficult and was usually plagued with instabilities, so people considered themselves lucky if the boundaries remained stable, however inconsistent they could be with the physics. With the development of more stable and robust hyperbolic formulations for the interior evolution, the boundary problem has come back to the attention

of researchers in the field, and today there is a lot of work in trying to ensure that the boundaries are compatible with Einstein's equations (so-called "constraint preserving" boundaries). The use of hyperbolic formulations has also implied that one can separate incoming and outgoing fields at the boundaries, allowing for boundary conditions that are well-posed. This means that there is now a rigorous way to apply the intuitive notion of giving boundary data only for incoming modes while allowing outgoing modes to leave the computational domain undisturbed.

The crucial result in this field has been the first demonstration by Friedrich and Nagy in 1999 of the well posedness of the initial-boundary value problem for Einstein's equations [60]. Since then a number of studies have been made of maximally dissipative boundary conditions for linearized gravity by Szilagyi *et al.* [61] and Calabrese *et al.* [62] and also non-linear gravity with harmonic coordinates [63,64]. More recently other groups have looked at the problem of boundaries, in particular one can mention the work of Gundlach and Martin-Garcia in studying boundary conditions for second order in space systems [42], and the work of Novak and Bonazzola on absorbing boundary conditions for gravitational waves [65].

7. Initial data

Before starting a numerical simulation we need initial data that represents the physical situation we want to evolve. The existence of the constraint equations implies that one needs to solve a system of coupled elliptic equations to find such initial data. Recently, there have been important developments both in the general methods for finding initial data, and in the search for better initial data for black hole spacetimes.

7.1. *The thin sandwich formalism*

The classic method for finding initial data is the York-Lichnerowicz conformal decomposition that finds initial data in the form of the 3-metric and the extrinsic curvature [14,66]. In this approach one gives as free data the conformal metric, the trace of the extrinsic curvature and its transverse part, and solves the constraints for the conformal factor and the longitudinal part of the extrinsic curvature.

A very important recent development has been the introduction of the "conformal thin sandwich" approach by York, where initial data is obtained in the form of the 3-metric and its time derivative [67]. Pfeiffer and York have also shown the equivalence of both conformal approaches [68].

7.2. *Binary black holes*

One of the most active areas of research in numerical relativity is the simulation of the collision of orbiting black holes. In the following sections I will come back to this problem, but at this point I will concentrate on the fact that in order to do those simulations one must have some initial data.

Traditionally, initial data for black hole binaries has been obtained using a topological construction. This idea is based on the fact that even a single Schwarzschild black hole contains a wormhole (the “Einstein-Rosen” bridge) joining two asymptotically flat universes. Initial data for multiple black holes can then be constructed by adding one new throat for each hole. A formal procedure for doing this is well known and comes in two “flavors”: Misner type data joins two universes by multiple wormholes, whereas Brill-Lindquist type data joins one universe through a series of wormholes with disjoint multiple other universes. In the case of time-symmetric initial data (corresponding to momentarily static black holes), both types of data have an analytic expression. When the black holes have momentum, as in the case of black holes in orbit around each other, exact solutions do not exist, but numerical solutions are not difficult to find. In 1994 Cook found Misner type data for black holes in quasi-circular orbits using an effective potential method [69]. Later, in 1997 Brandt and Bruegmann showed that Brill-Lindquist type data could be obtained much more easily by factoring out analytically the poles representing each black hole [70], and in 2000 this “puncture” method was used by Baumgarte to construct Brill-Lindquist type data for orbiting black holes [71]. There has also been an effort to construct initial data for binary black holes that does not use the topological approach. Matzner, Huq and Shoemaker have introduced the idea of superposing single black hole data using Kerr-Schild type coordinates and the solving the constraints [72]. This Kerr-Schild type data has the advantage of reducing to stationary Kerr for separated holes.

More recently, the thin sandwich approach has been used to construct initial data for black holes that is more “astrophysically motivated”. The main idea comes from the fact that black holes in orbit have an approximate helical symmetry as they rotate. The symmetry is not exact since the orbit shrinks as the system emits gravitational waves, but for sufficiently separated holes this happens very slowly. One can then exploit the fact that an approximate helical Killing field exists to obtain black hole initial data in a co-rotating frame. Grandclement, Gourgoulhon and Bonazzola have used this approach to construct binary black hole initial data of the Misner

type [73]. This data seems to agree closer with high order post-Newtonian predictions than the data based on the effective potential method. Tichy and Bruegmann have also applied this approach to puncture type data [74], and Yo *et al.* have done the same for Kerr-Schild type data [75].

8. Horizons

When studying the numerical simulations of black hole spacetimes it is important to locate the horizons associated with them. Traditionally, the apparent horizon has been used as an indicator of the presence of a black holes since such horizons are defined locally and can be found on a given hypersurface during the evolution. On the other hand, the existence of an event horizon represents the true definition of a black hole, so locating the event horizon would be much better. However, the global nature of the definition of an event horizon means that one can not locate them during the evolution since one needs to know the full history of the spacetime, and that is precisely what one is trying to solve for. Still, algorithms exist to find event horizons *a posteriori*. The basic idea was developed by Libson *et al.* [76], and consists on evolving a null surface backwards in time once an evolution is finished. As the event horizon is an attractor for light rays moving back in time, such null surfaces rapidly converge to the event horizon and track it all the way to its initial formation (or to the initial data if already present there). An important recent event has been the development of a 3D event horizon finder using these ideas by Diener [77].

Another development has been the introduction of the theoretical framework of isolated and dynamic horizons of Ashtekar *et al.* [78,79] to numerical relativity by Dreyer *et al.* [80]. The formalism permits to calculate both the mass and the angular momentum associated with horizons found during a numerical simulation. These techniques have also recently been applied to the binary coalescence of orbiting black holes [59].

9. Evolving black hole spacetimes

The simulation of black holes spacetimes has been a major theme in numerical relativity since its beginnings. The pioneering work of Hahn and Lindquist in the 1960's [1], as well as the work of Smarr and Eppley in the 1970's [2, 3], was precisely on simulations of collisions of black holes.

Black hole spacetimes are in vacuum, so the simulation of these systems has the advantage of not having to deal with complicated hydrodynamics. On the other hand, black holes have a singularity where the gravitational

field becomes infinite, and dealing with this singularity is far from trivial. The traditional technique to evolve black holes has been the use of singularity avoiding slicing conditions such as maximal slicing, but this has the weakness of leading to slice stretching which eventually becomes a serious problem on its own. An alternative approach is known as “singularity excision” (previously called “apparent horizon boundary condition”). The original idea has been attributed to Unruh by Thornburg [81, 82], and consists on placing a boundary inside the black hole, thus excising its interior from the computational domain, and also using a non-zero shift vector that keeps the horizon roughly in the same coordinate location during the evolution. Since no information can leave the interior of the black hole, excision should have no effect on the physics outside. Black hole excision was first attempted successfully by Seidel and Suen in spherical symmetry [83], and was later studied in more detail by Anninos *et al.* [84]. Work in singularity excision for 3D codes continues to this day.

In the early 1990’s, a lot of work was done in simulating single static or perturbed black holes [85], as well as more advanced versions of the head-on collision [86, 87]. By the middle of that decade, the simulation of the inspiral collision of orbiting black holes was identified as a key project, motivated by the fact that the large interferometric gravitational wave detectors were finally starting construction. This led to the NSF “Binary Black Hole Grand Challenge” project, that brought together a large number of institutions in the United States. The problem turned out to be considerably more complicated than at first thought, among other reasons because the issue of the well-posedness of the evolution equations was not yet fully understood. Still, a number of important developments did take place, among which one can mention improved singularity excision techniques [88], and a long term stable evolution of a single black hole using the characteristic formalism [89].

Since the end of the Grand Challenge project, a number of groups have continued independently trying to simulate the inspiral collision of two black holes. In the last few years there has been rapid progress, coming on the one hand from the use of more robust well-posed formulations such as BSSN [29], a better understanding of black hole excision techniques [90–94], and the development of improved gauge conditions, particularly related to the choice of the shift vector [57]. This led to the first simulations of the grazing collision of two black holes done in 2000 by Brandt *et al.* [95] and Alcubierre *et al.* [96].

Research has now moved into the realm of orbiting black holes, with two different approaches taking the lead, both of them based on the BSSN

formulation. One approach uses advanced excision techniques to move black holes across the computational domain and has recently achieved a true milestone by having single black holes move in oscillating and even circular trajectories (controlled by gauge choices) in a stable way for essentially unlimited time [97] (See Fig. 1). A second approach uses less advanced excision techniques and attempts to keep the orbiting black holes on a fixed coordinate location by using instead advanced gauge choices and a co-rotating frame. This approach is further along the road, and has finally led to the first ever simulation of a full orbit of two black holes by Bruegmann *et al.* [58] (See Fig. 2). More recently, using the same approach but an independent code, Alcubierre *et al.* have studied sequences of black holes in quasi-circular orbits of the Cook/Baumgarte type and have come to the surprising discovery that the black holes are in fact not orbiting, but are instead in an extended plunge [59] (See Fig. 3). Other groups are also working on the binary black hole problem using a variety of techniques, among them one can mention the NASA-Goddard group that uses a BSSN code with mesh refinement [98], and the Cornell/Caltech collaboration that uses advanced pseudo-spectral methods together with a multi-parameter hyperbolic formulation of the evolution equations [99].




Figure 1. Space-time plot of the BSSN conformal factor ϕ for a single black hole oscillating in coordinate space. (Figure from Ref. [97])

A very important development has been the combination of fully non-linear techniques with perturbation techniques by Baker *et al.* to study




Figure 2. Evolution of the AH mass for one of the individual black holes in an orbiting binary. The evolution lasts longer than one orbital period of $114M$ defined by the initial data, and no common horizon is found (Figure from Ref. [58])




Figure 3. The time to appearance of a common apparent horizon for black hole in quasi-circular orbits for progressive separations, starting from the Cook/Baumgarte innermost stable circular orbit. Filled circles indicate the results of numerical simulations. The upper line indicates the expected orbital period, based on the initial angular velocity. Empty circles indicate the fraction of an orbit before common horizon formation. As the black holes are further separated, they take longer to coalesce, but they do it in a smaller fraction of an orbit (Figure from Ref. [59])

the black hole coalescence problem [100–103]. This approach evolves the black holes using a full non-linear code only to a “linearization” time where the two holes are close enough that the system can be treated as a single

distorted Kerr black hole, after which a perturbative approach is used to complete the evolution. The approach has been called “Lazarus”, making reference to the fact that a “dying” non-linear evolution (about to crash because of instabilities) can be resurrected by continuing the evolution using perturbation methods. The Lazarus approach has already given the first complete gravitational wave-forms to come from the coalescence of two orbiting black holes (See Fig. 4).




Figure 4. Wave forms for the Cook/Baumgarte innermost stable circular orbit using the Lazarus technique. The different lines show the effects of extracting data for a perturbative evolution at different times. (Figure from Ref. [103])

10. Relativistic hydrodynamics

Apart from black hole spacetimes, there is also a lot of interest in systems with matter. In particular, there has been considerable work on fully 3D general relativistic hydro-dynamical codes. At this time, several codes exist that are capable of simulating core collapse, rotating stars and binary star mergers. Among the groups with advanced 3D hydro codes one can mention the Tokyo group [104–106], the Illinois group [107, 108], the EU-Network group [109] and the JPL-WashU group [110].

It is interesting to notice the convergence of the techniques used in the different codes: All the codes mentioned above use some variety of the BSSN evolution system for the evolution of the geometry; all use either maximal slicing or a hyperbolic slicing condition of the Bona-Masso

type (1+log for the most part); all use a non-zero shift vector, with the shift controlled by an evolution equation of the Gamma-driver type; advanced numerical techniques of the type of high-resolution shock-capturing schemes are becoming standard for the hydro-dynamical equations; several codes have already, or are implementing, fixed mesh refinement techniques; several codes have excision techniques for handling black hole formation.

Among the most important results so far one can mention the studies of collapse of super-massive stars [108] and the studies of collapsing rapidly rotating neutron stars [109]. A particularly interesting result has been the study of the strong effects of boundary conditions on the orbital dynamics of binary neutron stars by Miller *et al.* [110] (see Fig. 5). The field is moving rapidly, and many interesting results are sure to follow in the near future.




Figure 5. Evolution of geodesic distance between the centers of two orbiting neutron stars as a function of time, for various initial data sets representing the same physical situation but differing in grid resolution and position of outer boundary. Model NS-A shows a qualitatively very different behavior, attributed to the fact that in this case the boundaries of the computational domain were much further out than in the other cases. (Figure from Ref. [110])

11. Conclusions

Numerical relativity has come a long way in the last three decades. We are gaining a deeper understanding of the fundamental theoretical issues that underlie the field, such as well posedness of the evolution equations, gauge conditions, boundary conditions and initial data. At the same time, several advanced 3D codes exist that can handle both black holes and hydrodynamics. These codes are capable of singularity excision and mesh refinement, and have complex analysis tools incorporated: apparent and event horizon finding, horizon studies (mass, angular momentum), gravitational wave extraction, etc. The field is now reaching a state of maturity. In the next few years we hope to be able to simulate interesting astrophysical systems and extract gravitational waveforms that can be compared with the observations coming from the large interferometric detectors. Numerical relativity is truly entering a golden age!

Acknowledgments

It is a great pleasure to thank the organizers of the GR17 conference for their invitation to give a talk and write these notes. I also wish to thank Pablo Laguna, Bernd Bruegmann, Carlos Lousto, Manuela Campanelli, John Baker and Mark Miller for allowing me to show plots from their work in this manuscript. Finally, I want to thank the whole numerical relativity community for their enthusiastic response to my request for information about their current work. This work was supported in part by DGAPA-UNAM through grants IN112401 and IN122002.

References

1. S. G. Hahn and R. W. Lindquist, *Ann. Phys.* **29**, 304 (1964).
2. K. Eppley, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, 1975.
3. L. Smarr, A. Čadež, B. DeWitt, and K. Eppley, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 2443 (1976).
4. LIGO - <http://www.ligo.caltech.edu/>.
5. VIRGO - <http://www.virgo.infn.it/>.
6. GEO600 - <http://www.geo600.uni-hannover.de/>.
7. TAMA - <http://tamago.mtk.nao.ac.jp/>.
8. Y. Bruhat, *Acta Mathematica* **88**, 141 (1952).
9. J. Winicour, *Living Reviews in Relativity* **1**, 5 (1998), [Online article].
10. H. Friedrich, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **604**, 1 (2002).
11. J. Frauendiener, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **604**, 261 (2002).
12. S. Husa, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **604**, 239 (2002).

13. R. Arnowitt, S. Deser, and C. W. Misner, in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, edited by L. Witten (John Wiley, New York, 1962), pp. 227–265.
14. J. W. York, in *Sources of Gravitational Radiation*, edited by L. L. Smarr (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1979), pp. 83–126.
15. S. Frittelli, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 5992 (1997).
16. H.-O. Kreiss and J. Lorenz, *Initial-Boundary Value Problems and the Navier-Stokes Equations* (Academic Press, New York, 1989).
17. Y. Choquet-Bruhat, in *Gravitation: An Introduction to Current Research*, edited by L. Witten (John Wiley, New York, 1962).
18. Y. Choquet-Bruhat and J. W. York, Jr., in *General Relativity and Gravitation*, edited by A. Held (Plenum, New York, 1980), Vol. 1, pp. 99–172.
19. Y. Choquet-Bruhat and T. Ruggeri, *Comm. Math. Phys* **89**, 269 (1983).
20. H. Friedrich, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **100**, 525 (1985).
21. H. Friedrich and A. D. Rendall, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **540**, 127 (2000).
22. C. Bona and J. Massó, *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 1022 (1989).
23. C. Bona and J. Massó, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1097 (1992).
24. C. Bona, J. Massó, E. Seidel, and J. Stela, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 600 (1995).
25. S. Frittelli and O. Reula, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 4667 (1996).
26. A. Abrahams, A. Anderson, Y. Choquet-Bruhat, and J. York, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris t. 323, Serie II*, 835 (1996).
27. H. Friedrich, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13**, 1451 (1996).
28. A. Anderson and J. W. York, *Phy. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 4384 (1999).
29. T. W. Baumgarte and S. L. Shapiro, *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 024007 (1999).
30. T. Nakamura, K. Oohara, and Y. Kojima, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement* **90**, 1 (1987).
31. M. Shibata and T. Nakamura, *Phys. Rev. D* **52**, 5428 (1995).
32. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 124011 (2000).
33. O. Sarbach, G. Calabrese, J. Pullin, and M. Tiglio, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 064002 (2002).
34. H. Beyer and O. Sarbach, *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 104004 (2004).
35. S. Frittelli and R. Gómez, *J. Math. Phys.* **41**, 5535 (2000).
36. L. E. Kidder, M. A. Scheel, and S. A. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 064017 (2001).
37. O. Sarbach and M. Tiglio, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 064023 (2002).
38. L. Lindblom and M. A. Scheel, *Phys. Rev.* **D67**, 124005 (2003).
39. C. Bona and C. Palenzuela, *Phys. Rev.* **D69**, 104003 (2004).
40. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **20**, 3951 (2003).
41. G. Nagy, O. E. Ortiz, and O. A. Reula, *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 044012 (2004).
42. C. Gundlach and J. M. Martin-Garcia, *Phys. Rev.* **D70**, 044032 (2004).
43. C. Bona, T. Ledvinka, C. Palenzuela, and M. Zacek, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 104005 (2003).
44. H. Shinkai and G. Yoneda, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **19**, 1027 (2002).
45. L. Lindblom and M. A. Scheel, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 084014 (2002).
46. M. W. Choptuik, E. W. Hirschmann, S. L. Liebling, and F. Pretorius, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20**, 1857 (2003).

47. S. Bonazzola, E.ourgoulhon, P. Grandclement, and J. Novak, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 104007 (2004).
48. M. Holst *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 084017 (2004).
49. R. A. Matzner, (2004).
50. L. Smarr and J. York, Phys. Rev.D **17**, 1945 (1978).
51. L. Smarr and J. W. York, Jr., Phys. Rev. D **17**, 2529 (1978).
52. B. Reimann and B. Brügmann, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 044006 (2004).
53. A. Anderson and J. York, James W., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1154 (1998).
54. U. Sperhake *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 024012 (2004).
55. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 104021 (2003).
56. M. Alcubierre, Class. Quantum Grav. **20**, 607 (2003).
57. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 084023 (2003).
58. B. Brügmann, W. Tichy, and N. Jansen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 211101 (2004).
59. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, submitted to Physical Review D (2004).
60. H. Friedrich and G. Nagy, Commun. Math. Phys. **201**, 619 (1999).
61. B. Szilágyi, R. Gómez, N. T. Bishop, and J. Winicour, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 104006 (2000).
62. G. Calabrese *et al.*, Communications in Mathematical Physics **240**, 377 (2003).
63. B. Szilágyi and J. Winicour, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 041501 (2002).
64. B. Szilágyi, B. Schmidt, and J. Winicour, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 064015 (2002).
65. J. Novak and S. Bonazzola, J. Comp. Phys. **197/1**, 186 (2004).
66. A. Lichnerowicz, J. Math Pures et Appl. **23**, 37 (1944).
67. J. W. York, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1350 (1999).
68. H. P. Pfeiffer and J. York, James W., Phys. Rev. **D67**, 044022 (2003).
69. G. B. Cook, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 5025 (1994).
70. S. Brandt and B. Brügmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3606 (1997).
71. T. W. Baumgarte, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 024018 (2000).
72. R. A. Matzner, M. F. Huq, and D. Shoemaker, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 024015 (1999).
73. P. Grandclément, E.ourgoulhon, and S. Bonazzola, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044021 (2002).
74. W. Tichy and B. Brügmann, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 024006 (2004).
75. H.-J. Yo, J. N. Cook, S. L. Shapiro, and T. W. Baumgarte, (2004).
76. J. Libson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 4335 (1996).
77. P. Diener, Class. Quantum Grav. **20**, 4901 (2003).
78. A. Ashtekar, C. Beetle, and S. Fairhurst, Class. Quantum Grav. **16**, L1 (1999).
79. A. Ashtekar and B. Krishnan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 261101 (2002).
80. O. Dreyer, B. Krishnan, D. Shoemaker, and E. Schnetter, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 024018 (2002).
81. J. Thornburg, Class. Quantum Grav. **4**, 1119 (1987).
82. J. Thornburg, Ph.D. thesis, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, 1993.
83. E. Seidel and W.-M. Suen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 1845 (1992).
84. P. Anninos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 5562 (1995).

85. P. Anninos *et al.*, in *Computational Astrophysics: Gas Dynamics and Particle Methods*, edited by W. Benz, J. Barnes, E. Muller, and M. Norman (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997), in press.
86. P. Anninos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2851 (1993).
87. P. Anninos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **52**, 2044 (1995).
88. G. B. Cook *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2512 (1998).
89. R. Gómez *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 3915 (1998).
90. M. Alcubierre and B. Brügmann, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 104006 (2001).
91. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 61501 (R) (2001).
92. G. Calabrese *et al.*, Class. Quantum Grav. **20**, L245 (2003).
93. J. Thornburg, Class. Quantum Grav. **21**, 3665 (2004).
94. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, submitted to Phys. Rev. D (2004).
95. S. Brandt *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5496 (2000).
96. M. Alcubierre *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 271103 (2001).
97. D. Shoemaker *et al.*, Class. Quantum Grav. **20**, 3729 (2003).
98. B. Imbiriba *et al.*, (2004).
99. M. A. Scheel *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 124005 (2002).
100. J. Baker, B. Brügmann, M. Campanelli, and C. O. Lousto, Class. Quantum Grav. **17**, L149 (2000).
101. J. Baker *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 121103 (2001).
102. J. Baker, M. Campanelli, and C. O. Lousto, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 044001 (2002).
103. J. Baker, M. Campanelli, C. O. Lousto, and R. Takahashi, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 124012 (2002).
104. M. Shibata, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 024033 (2003).
105. M. Shibata, Astrophys. J. **595**, 992 (2003).
106. M. Shibata, K. Taniguchi, and K. Uryu, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 084020 (2003).
107. M. D. Duez, S. L. Shapiro, and H.-J. Yo, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 104016 (2004).
108. M. D. Duez, Y. T. Liu, S. L. Shapiro, and B. C. Stephens, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 104030 (2004).
109. L. Baiotti *et al.*, gr-qc/0403029 (unpublished).
110. M. Miller, P. Gressman, and W.-M. Suen, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 064026 (2004).