

A theory-agnostic hierarchical Bayesian framework for black-hole spectroscopy: a case study on GW250114 in Einstein–dilaton–Gauss–Bonnet gravity

Shitong Guo^{*} and Yan-Gang Miao[†]

School of Physics, Nankai University, 94 Weijin Road, Tianjin 300071, China

Black-hole spectroscopy has emerged as a powerful probe of strong-field gravity in the era of gravitational-wave astronomy. In this context, many current tests of modified or extended gravity are implemented by searching for predicted signatures modeled as perturbative corrections to general-relativistic waveforms; however, this approach may introduce model-dependent systematics and limit applicability to broader classes of theories. To complement such methods, we develop a theory-agnostic hierarchical Bayesian framework that connects ringdown observations—modeled as damped sinusoids—directly with theoretical quasinormal mode spectra, performing the comparison at the spectral level rather than through theory-specific waveform matching. The framework incorporates a soft-truncation module to account for the finite domain of validity in the theory’s parameter space and is equipped with quantitative diagnostics that identify stable analysis time windows. As an illustrative application, we implement the framework within Einstein–dilaton–Gauss–Bonnet gravity and apply it to the gravitational-wave event GW250114, finding that the resulting posterior for the dimensionless coupling ζ is robust against prior assumptions yet remains only weakly informative over the range considered in this work. We further perform controlled ringdown injection studies across different values of ζ , confirming that nonzero couplings can be recovered while also indicating a potential systematic effect: Kerr-based priors in the ζ inference may partially absorb spectral deviations arising in alternative theories of gravity. This work establishes a transparent and extensible foundation for future strong-field gravity tests, naturally compatible with the growing precision and modal resolution of next-generation gravitational-wave detectors.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the first gravitational-wave (GW) event GW150914 was detected in 2015 [1–3], the LIGO–Virgo–KAGRA (LVK) Collaboration has reported hundreds of compact binary coalescences (CBCs) over the past decade [4–10]. The recent event GW250114.082203, henceforth GW250114, with a signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) approximately as high as 80, represents the clearest binary–black-hole (BBH) merger signal observed to date [11, 12]. These detections provide direct access to the full dynamical evolution of CBCs, whose GW signals can be broadly divided into three stages: a slow inspiral motion, followed by a violent merger under strong nonlinear dynamics, and a ringdown phase during which the remnant black hole (BH) rings as it relaxes to a final stationary state. Among these stages, the ringdown phase occupies a uniquely privileged position: it encodes the characteristic quasinormal modes (QNMs) of the remnant BH [13], which depend solely on the underlying spacetime geometry. This property makes the ringdown an exceptionally clean probe of strong-field gravity [14]. The systematic extraction and interpretation of these modes—known as BH spectroscopy [15–21]—provide a direct avenue for verifying the Kerr nature of astrophysical BHs [11, 22–26]. In recent years, BH spectroscopy has developed into a central framework for GW data analysis [27–30], providing a coherent means to test the no-hair theorem [31–34] and the BH area law [12, 35].

While BH spectroscopy has achieved significant success in testing general relativity (GR), its systematic extensions toward specific modified or extended gravity theories remain limited. Most existing efforts to confront beyond-GR scenarios with GW data have instead concentrated on the inspiral regime, where the *post-Newtonian* (PN) [36, 37] and *parameterized post-Einsteinian* (ppE) [38–40] formalisms enable direct mapping between theoretical deviations and GW phase corrections. However, these methods rely on weak-field expansions and gradually lose accuracy as the compact binary approaches the nonlinear, strong-field regime. In this regime, efforts have increasingly focused on modeling the ringdown spectrum itself, leading to the development of frameworks such as the *Parametrized Ringdown Spin Expansion Coefficients* (ParSpec) [41, 42] and the *Metric pErTuRbations wIth speCtral methodS* (METRICS) [43–45], designed to explore possible beyond-GR effects in the post-merger spectrum. These frameworks, however, are built upon perturbative formulations of GR-based waveform models, where the deviations are assumed to satisfy $|\delta\omega| \ll \omega_{\text{Kerr}}$, thus constraining their applicability to small departures from the Kerr spectrum. Furthermore, for certain gravitational or BH theories, the intrinsic structure of their field equations and metric solutions renders a purely phenomenological deviation from the Kerr spectrum insufficient to capture the full dynamics of the ringdown signal [46, 47]. Nevertheless, the construction of self-consistent ringdown waveforms directly from such theories remains limited in scope [48], as current approaches still face theoretical and computational challenges in capturing the complexity of strong-field dynamics [49, 50]. These challenges motivate the development of complementary,

^{*} shitongg@mail.nankai.edu.cn

[†] miaoyg@nankai.edu.cn (Corresponding author)

data-driven approaches that minimize dependence on any theory-specific waveform modeling.

To this end, we develop a hierarchical Bayesian framework for BH spectroscopy that operates directly at the spectral level, establishing a direct link between theoretical predictions and QNM spectra inferred observationally without imposing any *a priori* parameter constraints. To achieve a robust, theory-agnostic characterization of the ringdown signal, we employ the damped-sinusoid representation, which captures the essential behavior of linear perturbations in the post-merger regime while remaining independent of any specific spacetime geometry or mode structure [51]. Building upon this formulation, we further introduce two structured elements to enhance the internal consistency and interpretability of the analysis. A quantitative stable-window diagnostic is designed to assess the temporal stability of the recovered QNM parameters, providing an empirical criterion for identifying time intervals that are likely compatible with linear perturbation theory. Complementarily, within the Bayesian inference, a soft-truncation scheme is implemented to quantify the extent to which the perturbative expansion of the theory can be consistently applied to a given event. With this modular design, the spectral posteriors extracted from ringdown data can be readily reused across different theoretical contexts without rerunning the strain-level analysis. These elements together yield a self-consistent and extensible spectral-level methodology for testing gravity through ringdown observations.

To illustrate the practical implementation of this framework, we apply it to Einstein–dilaton–Gauss–Bonnet (EdGB) gravity—a well-motivated string-inspired extension of Einstein gravity [52–54] that smoothly reduces to the GR limit in the weak-coupling regime [54–56]. Its perturbative structure further enables analytic predictions for the QNM spectrum, including the formulation [57] employed in this work, which is valid up to the dimensionless spin $\chi \lesssim 0.7$ and covers the spin range of most observed BBH remnants. These properties make EdGB gravity an effective testbed for assessing our spectral-level inference framework on events such as GW250114. In this case study, the analysis yields remnant posteriors that are robust against prior assumptions and consistent with standard GR inspiral–merger–ringdown (IMR) estimates, demonstrating that the determination of astrophysical parameters is stable and not biased by the additional EdGB degree of freedom. Furthermore, controlled ringdown injection tests with synthetic signals at nonzero EdGB coupling ($\zeta \neq 0$) confirm that, in idealized settings where the remnant mass and spin are fixed to the values used to generate the injections, the injected value of ζ can be recovered, demonstrating that the framework can resolve even the subtle, sub-percent spectral corrections induced by this nonzero coupling relative to GR, and thereby quantifying both the sensitivity and internal consistency of the spectral-level methodology. At the same time, our anal-

ysis suggests that when these parameters are allowed to vary—particularly in the presence of Kerr-inferred remnant priors—the beyond-GR signatures may be partially absorbed into the remnant estimates, highlighting the critical importance of theory-agnostic comparisons.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we provide a brief overview of EdGB gravity and summarize its implications for the QNM spectrum of the remnant BH. Sec. III details the analysis pipeline, covering the rationale for selecting GW250114, the extraction of QNM parameters, and the hierarchical Bayesian framework constructed for parameter estimation and theoretical comparison. The practical application of the framework, using GW250114 as a representative case study, is presented in Sec. IV. Finally, Sec. V summarizes our conclusions and outlines possible extensions of this framework to future high-SNR detections. Additional details are provided in the Appendices. Unless otherwise specified, we adopt geometric units with $G = c = 1$.

II. EINSTEIN–DILATON–GAUSS–BONNET GRAVITY

Before introducing the details of our analysis framework, we briefly review the theoretical background of EdGB gravity—a theory whose spacetime dynamics depart from the Kerr description—and outline how our framework naturally accommodates such theories in GW analyses.

EdGB gravity is a well-motivated scalar–tensor extension of GR [58, 59]. In this formalism, a *dilaton* scalar field ϕ couples nonminimally to the Gauss–Bonnet invariant,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{GB}} = R^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} - 4R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} + R^2, \quad (2.1)$$

where $R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$, $R_{\mu\nu}$, and R denote the Riemann tensor, Ricci tensor, and Ricci scalar, respectively. This coupling introduces quadratic curvature corrections to the Einstein–Hilbert action. The corresponding four-dimensional action can be written as [60, 61]

$$S = \int d^4x \frac{\sqrt{-g}}{16\pi} \left(R - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi + \frac{\alpha_{\text{GB}}}{4} f(\phi) \mathcal{R}_{\text{GB}} \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Here, $g \equiv \det(g_{\mu\nu})$ denotes the determinant of the metric, and α_{GB} is a coupling constant with dimensions of length squared. The exponential coupling $f(\phi) = e^\phi$ defines the canonical form of the EdGB model, characterized by a single dimensionless coupling parameter

$$\zeta = \frac{\alpha_{\text{GB}}}{M^2}, \quad (2.3)$$

where M denotes the ADM mass.¹ Perturbative analyses

¹ This quantity is equivalent to the source-frame mass in the absence of cosmological redshift.

show that physically regular boundary conditions exist only for $0 \leq \zeta < \zeta_{\max} \simeq 0.691$ [62]; we therefore restrict ζ to this weak-coupling regime, where the theory admits a well-controlled perturbative expansion around the Kerr solution, allowing direct comparison with GR.

In GR, stationary BHs are uniquely described by the Kerr family [63–66]. In EdGB gravity, however, the dynamical coupling between the scalar field and curvature endows BHs with a scalar monopole charge and modifies their perturbative response. This scalar–curvature interaction modifies the QNM spectrum in several characteristic ways, including the breaking of axial–polar isospectrality, the appearance of scalar-led modes, and the potential dominance of these modes in certain coupling regimes [54, 67–69]. The QNM frequencies can be expressed perturbatively as

$$\omega_{\text{EdGB}}^{n\ell m} = \omega_{\text{Kerr}}^{n\ell m} + \delta\omega^{n\ell m}(M, \chi, \zeta), \quad (2.4)$$

where (ℓ, m, n) label the angular, azimuthal, and overtone numbers of the mode, respectively. Details of the perturbative formulation and the fitting functions are provided in Appendix A.

Because these spectral deviations arise from the intrinsic scalar–curvature coupling, they cannot be fully captured by phenomenological frequency deformations. Our framework, designed to operate directly at the spectral level, provides a natural interface for confronting such deviations, with EdGB gravity—analytically controlled and physically well motivated—serving as a representative case for its application.

III. DATA ANALYSIS AND INFERENCE FRAMEWORK

Having reviewed the theoretical background of EdGB gravity, we now turn to the data-analysis stage, where the proposed methodology is applied to GW observations. In Sec. III A, we motivate the selection of GW250114 as the target event, emphasizing its high signal quality and parameter range particularly well suited to this study. Sec. III B details the extraction of QNM parameters from the ringdown data, and Sec. III C introduces the hierarchical Bayesian framework that links the EdGB-predicted spectra to the empirically inferred parameters.

A. Event selection

In this work, we focus on the BBH event GW250114, the highest-SNR detection to date, which provides a well-resolved ringdown signal ideally suited for testing the applicability of our framework to EdGB-predicted spectra. In general, more massive remnants radiate at lower ringdown frequencies, while lighter black holes emit at higher frequencies [70]. Both extremes challenge precise QNM extraction [71]: at low frequencies (below a few tens of hertz), detector performance is limited by seismic and

thermal noise [1], while at high frequencies (above several kilohertz), it is constrained by quantum shot noise in the optical readout [72, 73]. The selected event GW250114 features a source-frame remnant mass of approximately $M \simeq 62.7 M_{\odot}$ and a moderately high spin, with IMR-based posteriors lying below $\chi \simeq 0.7$ for most waveform models. For these parameters, the dominant ringdown QNM lies close to the most sensitive region of the detector band, maximizing the signal fidelity in the post-merger regime where our analysis is performed. At the same time, the remnant-spin range remains within the domain of validity of the perturbative EdGB expansion adopted in this study, making GW250114 an ideal benchmark for validating the proposed framework under realistic data conditions.²

B. Extraction of QNMs from the Gravitational-Wave ringdown

Having selected the target event, we now turn to the extraction of the complex QNM frequencies from the observed GW signals. For this purpose, we employ `pyRing` [75], a Python package that performs BH ringdown analysis, model comparison, and parameter estimation. It is specifically optimized for the post-merger stage of CBCs, where a time-domain treatment is essential to resolve the exponentially damped behavior of the signal [20, 23, 34]. In this work, we adopt the **Damped sinusoids** (DS) model, which represents the strain as a superposition of exponentially damped sinusoids:

$$h_+ - ih_{\times} = \sum_j A_j(t) e^{-(t-t_0)/\tau_j} e^{-2\pi i f_j(t-t_0) + i\phi_j}, \quad (3.1)$$

a functional form motivated by both theoretical modeling [51] and the empirically observed behavior of GW signals [22–24]. For each mode, the frequencies, damping times, initial amplitudes, and phases $\{f_j, \tau_j, A_j, \phi_j\}$ are treated as free parameters, while t_0 denotes the start time of the analyzed segment.³ By allowing these quantities to vary independently, this agnostic formulation captures the generic behavior of linear perturbations without enforcing Kerr-specific mode relations, thereby enabling a model-independent reconstruction of the ringdown signal well suited for testing deviations from GR.

The determination of the ringdown start time t_0 remains one of the central open challenges in BH spectroscopy, as defining the regime of validity for linear perturbative models across parameter space and SNR has

² In this work, the remnant mass and spin are referenced from the `NRSur7dq4` waveform model [74].

³ This analysis implicitly assumes that, within the time window considered in this work, the ringdown lies in the stationary relaxation regime—i.e., at sufficiently late times such that the background mass and spin have stabilized and the QNM amplitudes can be treated as constant ($A_j(t) = A_j$), yet early enough that late-time tail effects remain negligible [30].

proven difficult in practice [30]. Numerical simulations indicate that the GW frequency typically settles to its quasinormal value about $10M$ – $20M$ after the merger, signaling the onset of the linear regime in which the ringdown can be reliably described by QNMs (as discussed in Ref. [22]; see also Refs. [76–78]). More recent analyses incorporating multiple overtones have shown that consistent fits can also be obtained at earlier times, in some cases even near the amplitude peak, providing a complementary approach that may extend the effective modeling region of the signal [79–81].

Building on these insights, we develop a data-driven diagnostic to quantitatively assess the choice of t_0 , establishing a unified criterion for identifying regions where the extracted QNM parameters remain stable and physically interpretable. As the first step, we perform a time-domain scan over the interval $t_0 \in [10.5, 20]t_M$, where $t_M = (1+z)GM/c^3$ is the redshift-corrected mass scale of the remnant (written here in SI units for clarity) and z denotes the source redshift. For each chosen start time, the ringdown signal is analyzed with the DS model to obtain posterior samples of the frequency and damping time (f, τ) , thereby producing a sequence of posteriors that trace the evolution of the recovered QNM parameters as functions of t_0 . Given that the analyzed binaries are nearly equal-mass and exhibit negligible effective spin ($\chi_{\text{eff}} \approx 0$), the $(\ell, m) = (2, 2)$ mode is expected to dominate the ringdown emission, while higher-order modes such as $(3, 3)$ and $(2, 1)$ remain strongly suppressed by symmetry [82, 83]. Numerical-relativity (NR) simulations further show that roughly $10t_M$ after the merger, the first overtone ($n = 1$) has decayed below the long-lived fundamental ($n = 0$) mode, which then dominates the late-time ringdown emission (following Ref. [12] and related works Refs. [15, 77, 79, 81, 84–87]). Accordingly, the analyzed portion of the signal is expected to be well captured by the fundamental $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode, which thus provides the spectral component on which our subsequent theory–data comparison is based.

After identifying the relevant spectral content, we next outline the implementation of the extraction procedure. The resulting sequence of posteriors obtained from the DS analysis provides a time-resolved view of how the inferred frequencies and damping times evolve with t_0 . To assess the consistency and temporal stability of the recovered QNM parameters, we introduce a composite metric that quantifies posterior agreement with IMR-informed baselines and variations across start times. This metric combines three complementary diagnostics—the posterior overlap, the credible interval (CI) coverage, and the median-based bias—together with a local smoothness estimator that measures the variation of the recovered frequency and damping time across adjacent t_0 values. Taken together, these elements form a coherent scoring scheme that provides a quantitative complement to existing approaches for identifying stable post-merger windows [20, 21, 87, 88], ensuring a more reproducible and systematically defined choice of t_0 across

analyses. Once the stability region has been determined, we consolidate the inference results across start times by performing an equal-weight combination over the selected t_0 values, yielding the marginalized posteriors of the QNM frequency and damping time for the analyzed event. This step completes the theory-agnostic extraction of the QNM observables from the ringdown signal, providing the quantities that interface with theoretical predictions.

In Appendix B, we provide details of the sampling configurations, data preprocessing steps, and prior specifications used in this analysis. The quantitative diagnostics used to identify these start times are described in Appendix C. Additional validation tests involving the inclusion of the first overtone and the evaluation of its contribution to the recovered spectra are presented in Appendix D, ensuring the robustness and internal consistency of the analysis pipeline.

C. Hierarchical Bayesian framework

The previous section established an empirical characterization of the ringdown signal in terms of the observed QNM frequencies and damping times. To place these observationally inferred quantities within a theoretical context, we construct a spectral-level linkage between the (f, τ) posteriors and the analytically predicted mode relations from gravitational theories, formulated within a hierarchical Bayesian framework.

In this formulation, the coupling parameter ζ serves as a fundamental parameter linking theory and data. The marginalized posterior probability distribution function (PDF) for ζ is given by

$$P(\zeta | d, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I}) = \int d\vec{\theta} P(\zeta, \vec{\theta} | d, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I}), \quad (3.2)$$

where $\vec{\theta}$ denotes the other source parameters such as the remnant mass and spin (M, χ) ; d represents the observational data, which in this context correspond to the GW ringdown strain segment d_{RD} ; \mathcal{H} denotes the hypothesis that the signal contains QNMs consistent with a given gravitational theory; and \mathcal{I} represents prior information, including theoretical input on the mode spectra. According to Bayes’ theorem, the integrand in the above equation is given by

$$P(\zeta, \vec{\theta} | d, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I}) = \frac{\mathcal{L}(d | \zeta, \vec{\theta}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I}) \pi(\zeta, \vec{\theta} | \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I})}{\mathcal{Z}(d | \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I})}, \quad (3.3)$$

where \mathcal{L} , π , and \mathcal{Z} are the likelihood, prior, and Bayesian evidence, respectively.

In this context, the likelihood \mathcal{L} is not evaluated directly on the strain data but through the empirically recovered posterior of the QNM parameters (f, γ) , where $\gamma = 1/\tau$. The joint posterior density $p_{\text{obs}}(f, \gamma)$ thus defines a data-driven likelihood surface in the (f, γ) plane, encapsulating the ringdown information while remaining

agnostic to the underlying gravitational theory. Theoretical predictions, such as those from EdGB gravity, specify $f_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi)$ and $\gamma_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi)$, allowing the likelihood to be evaluated as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}}(d | \zeta) \propto \int p_{\text{obs}}(f_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi), \gamma_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi)) \pi(M, \chi) w_{\sigma}(\chi) dM d\chi, \quad (3.4)$$

where $w_{\sigma}(\chi)$ denotes a *soft-truncation* weight used to assess the applicability of the perturbative expansion within its theoretical domain of validity. Here, we implement the truncation as a smooth Gaussian weighting scheme:

$$w_{\sigma}(\chi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \chi \leq \chi_0, \\ \exp\left[-\frac{(\chi - \chi_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right], & \chi > \chi_0, \end{cases} \quad (3.5)$$

where $\chi_0 = 0.7$ corresponds to the moderate-spin regime where the EdGB expansion considered here is formally controlled, and σ serves as a control parameter governing the transition width. Rather than imposing a strict cutoff or disregarding the validity range, this formulation functions as a dynamic diagnostic tool: by systematically varying σ and comparing the resulting posteriors against the un-truncated baseline, we can quantitatively measure the extent to which the inference relies on perturbative extrapolations. For the primary analysis presented in this work, we adopt a fiducial width of $\sigma = 0.03$. By construction, this formulation completes the methodological implementation of our framework, ensuring a robust interface between observational data and theoretical predictions.

To complement the inference framework, we introduce two Bayesian metrics that quantify the information content and robustness of the inference process. The Bayes factor,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\text{GR}}^{\text{EdGB}} = \frac{\mathcal{Z}(d | \mathcal{H}_{\text{EdGB}})}{\mathcal{Z}(d | \mathcal{H}_{\text{GR}})}, \quad (3.6)$$

quantifies the relative evidence in favor of EdGB gravity compared to GR, serving as a model-level consistency check. Complementarily, the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence

$$D_{\text{KL}}(P(\zeta | d) \| \pi(\zeta)) = \int P(\zeta | d) \ln \left[\frac{P(\zeta | d)}{\pi(\zeta)} \right] d\zeta, \quad (3.7)$$

provides a quantitative measure of the discrepancy between two probability distributions and, in the present context, characterizes how effectively the data update the prior knowledge about the coupling parameter ζ . For instance, the 90% credible upper bound ζ_{90} ,

$$\int_0^{\zeta_{90}} P(\zeta | d, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{I}) d\zeta = 0.9, \quad (3.8)$$

serves as a direct and interpretable summary of the observational bound on ζ .




FIG. 1. Posterior distributions of the dimensionless EdGB coupling parameter ζ obtained from the ringdown segment of the GW250114 signal. The analysis uses the dominant post-merger mode, interpreted within our framework as the $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ QNM. The curves show the marginalized posteriors derived under three different priors on the remnant parameters (M, χ) : a broad ringdown-only uniform prior (light blue), a uniform prior within an IMR-informed extended range (violet), and the IMR posterior itself used directly as a prior (rose pink). Vertical dashed lines of matching color denote the corresponding 90% upper credible limits, while colored triangles and rectangles mark the maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) estimates and the boundaries of the 90% credible intervals, respectively.

The formal derivation of the hierarchical likelihood is provided in Appendix E, while the detailed implementation and quantitative assessment of the soft-truncation scheme are presented in Appendix F.

IV. APPLICATION AND VALIDATION

We now apply the developed hierarchical framework to the event GW250114 as a proof of concept. In Sec. IV A, we characterize the framework’s robustness and confirm its agreement with GR-based IMR estimates. Subsequently, in Sec. IV B, we perform targeted ringdown injection tests with synthetic signals to verify the framework’s ability to recover nonzero EdGB couplings.

A. Performance of the framework on GW250114

Figure 1 displays the marginalized posteriors for the EdGB coupling ζ obtained under three prior configurations for the remnant parameters (M, χ) : a broad ringdown-only uniform prior (RD-uniform), a uniform prior constrained within an IMR-informed extended range (IMR-extended), and the IMR posterior itself adopted as a prior (IMR-posterior).

For $\zeta \lesssim 0.3$, the three prior choices yield highly consistent one-dimensional posteriors: all curves are nearly flat with only a slight preference for a maximum, differing primarily in the steepness of their decline near the upper boundary. The IMR-posterior prior produces a slightly sharper fall-off in this region, reflecting the reuse of IMR-encoded information as the ringdown prior. In this sense, the coupling posteriors are largely shaped by the prior support rather than by likelihood features. Over the weak-coupling domain considered here ($\zeta \lesssim 0.3$), the posterior density varies only weakly with ζ , indicating that the GW250114 ringdown data alone provide limited constraining power on the EdGB coupling while remaining compatible with the GR value $\zeta = 0$ within the quoted uncertainties.

A formal upper bound on ζ can still be derived from the posterior distribution; however, its interpretation is limited by the posterior support approaching the prior boundary. The inferred 90% credible upper limit, $\zeta_{90} \simeq 0.27$, lies close to the edge of the perturbative domain, indicating that most of the likelihood support accumulates near the boundary and that the constraint is predominantly prior-dominated. The corresponding posterior estimates for each prior configuration are summarized in Table I.

Prior	MAP	90% CIs	$\zeta_{90\%}$	ℓ_{GB} [km]
RD-uniform	0.183	[0.015, 0.285]	0.270	9.03
IMR-extended	0.243	[0.015, 0.285]	0.270	9.03
IMR-posterior	0.144	[0.015, 0.284]	0.268	9.00

TABLE I. Summary of ζ posteriors for GW250114 under three priors on (M, χ) . The corresponding length scale^a ℓ_{GB} is computed from the 90% upper value of ζ , with the remnant mass taken to be $M = 62.7 M_{\odot}$.

^a Note that the different conventions in coupling strength ζ lead to a correction factor of $4\sqrt[4]{\pi}$, i.e., $\sqrt{\alpha_{\text{EdGB}}} = 4\sqrt[4]{\pi} \ell_{\text{GB}}$.

To quantify the effective information content more systematically, we compute two complementary Bayesian metrics: the Bayes factor and the KL divergence. The Bayes factor between the EdGB and GR hypotheses, $\mathcal{B}_{\text{GR}}^{\text{EdGB}} \approx 1$, shows no statistical preference for either model. Similarly, the KL divergence between posterior and prior distributions, $D_{\text{KL}} \sim 10^{-6} - 10^{-4}$, indicates that the ringdown data provide negligible information gain on ζ under current detector sensitivity. These quantitative indicators align with the qualitative behavior observed in Fig. 1, where the likelihood remains broad and only weakly informative across the region of interest.

We further evaluate the robustness of the recovered remnant parameters against different prior assumptions on (M, χ) and verify their consistency with GR-based IMR estimates. Figure 2 compares the corresponding posteriors for both the GR limit ($\zeta = 0$) and the full EdGB model under the RD-uniform prior. In the GR




FIG. 2. Posterior comparisons of the EdGB coupling ζ , the remnant mass M , and spin χ from our ringdown-only analysis of GW250114 using a RD-uniform prior on (M, χ) . Results are shown under the GR assumption ($\zeta = 0$) in orange (solid lines) and when allowing ζ to vary in the weak-coupling regime in light blue (dashed lines). Shaded regions in the two-dimensional panels indicate 90% credible regions, with the corresponding one-dimensional marginal posteriors displayed along the diagonal.

limit, the recovered distributions of M and χ align closely with IMR analyses, validating that the single-mode DS model provides a physically faithful reconstruction of the dominant $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ QNM. Notably, when ζ is allowed to vary, the (M, χ) posteriors remain virtually unchanged relative to the GR case and exhibit weak correlations with ζ , consistent with the perturbative nature of EdGB corrections in the coupling range considered. Taken together, the observed overlap suggests that the ringdown-only analysis yields stable, self-consistent remnant-parameter recovery when extended to EdGB gravity. Similar comparisons for the IMR-extended and IMR-posterior priors lead to consistent conclusions. These results, along with the detailed prior configurations, are presented in Appendix G. The corresponding numerical summaries are provided in Table II.

B. Injection-based validation

While the analysis of GW250114 reveals no statistically significant deviation from GR at the current detector sensitivity, such a null result by itself does not show how the framework would behave if a genuine EdGB signal were present. To check that our spectral framework can, in principle, recover a nonzero coupling when it ex-

Prior	$\mathcal{B}_{\text{GR}}^{\text{EdGB}}$	D_{KL}	GR inference		EdGB inference	
			$M [M_{\odot}]$	χ	$M^{\text{EdGB}} [M_{\odot}]$	χ^{EdGB}
RD-uniform	1.00	3.31×10^{-6}	$61.22^{+5.19}_{-9.28}$	$0.64^{+0.10}_{-0.29}$	$61.04^{+5.09}_{-9.09}$	$0.64^{+0.10}_{-0.29}$
IMR-extended	1.01	5.82×10^{-6}	$62.76^{+3.63}_{-3.54}$	$0.68^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$	$62.51^{+3.61}_{-3.51}$	$0.68^{+0.06}_{-0.07}$
IMR-posterior	0.99	3.87×10^{-4}	$62.72^{+0.91}_{-1.01}$	$0.68^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$	$62.68^{+0.92}_{-0.99}$	$0.68^{+0.01}_{-0.01}$
<i>IMR reference</i>	—	—	$62.70^{+0.97}_{-1.06}$	$0.68^{+0.01}_{-0.02}$	—	—

TABLE II. Model-selection metrics and recovered remnant parameters for GW250114 under three prior choices on (M, χ) . The GR and EdGB columns show the median and 90% credible intervals inferred from the ringdown-only analysis, while the last row lists the IMR-derived reference values for comparison.




FIG. 3. Posterior distributions of the EdGB coupling ζ from ringdown-only injection tests. The three curves correspond to injections with $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0$ (blue), 0.15 (violet), and 0.25 (rose), respectively. Colored triangles mark the MAP estimates, and rectangular bars indicate the boundaries of the 90% credible intervals.

ists in the data, we perform a set of controlled ringdown injections. We generate synthetic ringdown signals with a single EdGB-corrected $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ component, modeled as a DS waveform whose frequency and damping time are set by the same QNM fits used in the main analysis, with the final mass and spin fixed to the median posterior values of GW250114, and inject them into real off-source detector noise from the same observing run. The overall amplitude is rescaled to yield a ringdown SNR $\rho_{\text{RD}} = 100$, and the resulting data are analyzed with the same sampling configuration as in the GW250114 case. Three injections are considered, with injected couplings $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0, 0.15, 0.25$, chosen to provide a simple cross-check across different signal realizations (see Appendix H 1 for details).

In an idealized limit in which the remnant mass and spin are fixed to their injected values, the resulting posteriors $P(\zeta | d_{\text{RD}})$ for the three injections considered in Fig. 3 peak close to the corresponding injected couplings $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0, 0.15$, and 0.25. In particular, the $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.15$




FIG. 4. Posterior distributions of the EdGB coupling ζ from ringdown injections with $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.25$, analyzed with two different fixed remnant configurations: the injected (M, χ) (rose) and the Kerr-based (M, χ) obtained from a GR ringdown fit to the same data (blue). Triangles mark the MAP estimates and rectangle bars indicate the boundaries of the 90% credible intervals.

and $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.25$ cases yield clearly shifted, well-localized posteriors with maxima near the injected values and 90% credible intervals that do not include $\zeta = 0$, whereas the $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0$ injection produces a broad posterior compatible with the GR limit. Quantitatively, the injected couplings of $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.15$ and $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.25$ induce fractional spectral shifts ranging from $\sim 0.3\%$ to $\sim 1.4\%$ relative to the GR prediction. This demonstrates that, in the high-SNR regime and in the absence of parameter degeneracies, our spectral-level likelihood is internally consistent and capable of resolving the minute physical signatures associated with EdGB-level deviations.

While this fixed- (M, χ) setup provides a clean proof-of-principle test, it is not directly realized in actual observations: the underlying gravity theory is *a priori* unknown, and the information entering beyond-GR analyses is typically inferred from GR-based models. Motivated by this practical situation, we next examine how the recovery behaves when the remnant is constrained us-

ing GR-informed estimates rather than the injected values. We further find that this recovery ability is sensitive to how information about the remnant is supplied. For a representative injection with $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.25$, if, instead of fixing (M, χ) to their injected values, we fix them to the median values obtained from a Kerr-based single-mode ringdown analysis of the same injected data, the behavior of $P(\zeta | d_{\text{RD}})$ changes qualitatively: the posterior no longer needs to peak near ζ_{true} and can appear broadly compatible with $\zeta = 0$ even when the injected coupling is nonzero (see Fig. 4). This illustrates that using GR-inferred point estimates of the remnant mass and spin as fixed inputs for beyond-GR spectral inference can, in some cases, absorb genuine EdGB-induced shifts into the effective (M, χ) and thereby obscure the imprint of ζ on the ringdown spectrum.

More generally, when this idealization is relaxed by describing the remnant mass and spin with nontrivial priors, the imprint of ζ may be partially absorbed into the effective remnant properties: the posterior no longer needs to peak near the injected coupling and can become noticeably irregular, even at high-SNR. For illustration, Appendix H 2 shows representative examples of how this behavior manifests in practical injection tests.

V. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

In this work, we have developed and demonstrated a theory-agnostic hierarchical Bayesian framework for BH spectroscopy that operates directly at the spectral level. On the data side, the framework condenses the ringdown information into an observational posterior $p_{\text{obs}}(f, \gamma)$ inferred with a DS model that makes no assumptions about the underlying theory of gravity, while on the theory side, it maps physical parameters (ζ, M, χ) to predicted QNM spectra through a forward model $(f_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi), \gamma_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi))$. This separation establishes a transparent interface between GW data and theoretical predictions, decoupling parameter estimation from theory-specific waveform modeling. Methodologically, the framework is supported by quantitative time-window diagnostics for selecting stable ringdown start times and incorporates a soft-truncation scheme that encodes finite domains of validity in parameter space and tracks how strongly the inference relies on perturbative extrapolations. Applied to GW250114 in the context of EdGB gravity, the framework yields remnant-parameter posteriors that remain robustly consistent with IMR estimates across several prior choices, demonstrating the stability of the inference against theoretical extensions, while the coupling posterior for ζ stays broad and only weakly informative over the coupling range considered. Complementary injection tests with nonzero ζ demonstrate that, in idealized fixed-remnant settings, the framework successfully recovers the injected coupling. This confirms that the weak constraints on GW250114 stem from the limited information content of current data, not a

methodological limitation. At the same time, our injections suggest that relying on GR-based remnant priors may partially absorb beyond-GR signatures into the inferred mass and spin, potentially obscuring the imprint of ζ . This observation underscores the importance of theory-agnostic comparisons with carefully treated remnant priors.

Despite these advantages, the present implementation also has several limitations that point to concrete avenues for future refinement. It deliberately focuses on a single spectral component interpreted as the fundamental $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode, extracted from relatively late start-time windows where the signal is expected to be dominated by this contribution, so that the recovered parameters remain directly interpretable as those of the theoretical $(2, 2, 0)$ QNM. When a second damped sinusoid is added to the DS model at these start times, the Bayes factor shows no statistical preference for the more complex description, and the additional component tends to acquire a longer damping time than the fundamental, suggesting that it is more likely absorbing residual noise than capturing a genuine overtone (see Table III in Appendix D). At earlier start times, where overtones are expected to be more prominent, multi-mode fits may in principle recover additional structure, but the coexistence of nonlinear merger dynamics and multiple simultaneously excited modes makes unambiguous (ℓ, m, n) identification increasingly challenging [20]. In addition, as illustrated by the injection tests, the recovered posterior for ζ can depend noticeably on the adopted remnant prior, with different choices leading to substantially different posterior shapes and constraining power. Systematic studies of these effects, including the early-time multi-mode regime and the dependence on remnant priors and SNR, are therefore a natural target for future work aimed at assessing the robustness and range of applicability of the present framework.

Looking ahead, a key strength of the framework lies in its modular separation between the data-side spectral posterior and the theory-side forward model. As well-measured ringdown events accumulate and dedicated pipelines mature, one can envisage a reliable library of benchmark spectral posteriors $p_{\text{obs}}(f, \gamma)$ that can be reused to test analytic, numerical, or surrogate QNM predictions from different gravity theories without rerunning the time-domain analysis. In the era of future high-SNR observations with third-generation ground-based detectors such as the Einstein Telescope (ET) [89] and the Cosmic Explorer (CE) [90], together with space-based missions [91–93], theoretical uncertainties in the QNM spectrum may begin to rival statistical errors. In this regime, such a spectral-level, theory-agnostic interface provides a natural organizing framework for strong-field gravity tests, enabling direct and systematic comparisons between increasingly precise ringdown measurements and progressively refined QNM calculations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper employs the following software, listed in alphabetical order: `corner` [94], `cpnest` [95], `GWpy` [96], `H5py` [97], `LALSuite` [98, 99], `Matplotlib` [100], `NumPy` [101], `pandas` [102], `PESummary` [103], `PyCBC` [104], `pyRing` [20, 75], `qnm` [105], `SciPy` [106], and `seaborn` [107].

The authors are grateful to Gregorio Carullo for the advice on `pyRing`. They also thank Jiajie Chen and He Wang for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 12175108.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The gravitational-wave strain and `NRSur7dq4`-based IMR posterior samples used in this analysis are publicly available from the Gravitational-Wave Open Science Center (GWOSC).

Appendix A: EdGB QNM corrections

Here, we summarize the perturbative formulation adopted for the computation of the QNM spectrum in EdGB gravity, as used in the main analysis. The presentation follows the perturbative framework developed in Ref. [57], which provides a systematically controlled expansion of the QNM frequencies for rotating BHs.

Within this approach, the complex QNM frequency is expanded up to second order in the spin parameter χ as

$$\omega^{n\ell m}(\chi, \zeta) = \omega_0^{n\ell}(\zeta) + \chi m \omega_1^{n\ell}(\zeta) + \chi^2 [\omega_{2a}^{n\ell}(\zeta) + m^2 \omega_{2b}^{n\ell}(\zeta)] + \mathcal{O}(\chi^3). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The functions $\omega_r^{n\ell}(\zeta)$ entering Eq. (A.1) are represented by sixth-order polynomial fits in ζ ,

$$M \omega_r^{n\ell}(\zeta) = \sum_{i=0}^6 \zeta^i C_{ri}^{n\ell}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The fits are calibrated over the coupling range $\zeta \in [0, 0.4]$ for the real parts and $\zeta \in [0, 0.3]$ for the imaginary parts. The analysis focuses on the gravitational-led (polar-led) sector of perturbations, which are expected to be predominantly excited during realistic BBH mergers [54, 108]. Axial-led perturbations, whose scalar-metric coupling vanishes at zeroth order in rotation and whose QNM spectra remain nearly identical to their GR counterparts [54], are therefore neglected.

For improved convergence and numerical stability, the spin expansion in Eq. (A.1) can be optionally resummed

using the Padé approximation of order $[1, 1]$:

$$P_{[1,1]}^{n\ell m}(\chi, \zeta) = \frac{m \omega_0^{n\ell}(\zeta) \omega_1^{n\ell}(\zeta) + [m^2 \omega_1^{n\ell^2}(\zeta) - \omega_0^{n\ell}(\zeta) \omega_2^{n\ell m}(\zeta)] \chi}{m \omega_1^{n\ell}(\zeta) - \omega_2^{n\ell m}(\zeta) \chi}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\omega_2^{n\ell m} = \omega_{2a}^{n\ell} + m^2 \omega_{2b}^{n\ell}$. This representation ensures better behavior at moderate spins ($\chi \lesssim 0.7$), which corresponds to the regime of perturbative validity.

In practical use, the resulting QNM frequencies are expressed as perturbative deviations from the Kerr spectrum:

$$\omega_{\text{EdGB}}^{n\ell m}(\chi, \zeta) = \omega_{\text{Kerr}}^{n\ell m}(\chi) + \delta\omega^{n\ell m}(\chi, \zeta), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the deviation term

$$\delta\omega^{n\ell m}(\chi, \zeta) = P_{[1,1]}^{n\ell m}(\chi, \zeta) - P_{[1,1]}^{n\ell m}(\chi, 0). \quad (\text{A.5})$$

This prescription isolates the Gauss–Bonnet-induced contribution while preserving the exact Kerr contribution for the same spin. The real and imaginary parts of Eq. (A.4) provide, respectively, the theoretical frequency and damping rate,

$$f_{\text{th}} \equiv \text{Re}(\omega_{\text{EdGB}}^{n\ell m}/2\pi), \quad \gamma_{\text{th}} = 1/\tau_{\text{th}} \equiv -\text{Im}(\omega_{\text{EdGB}}^{n\ell m}), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

which are directly compared to the empirically inferred posteriors within the Bayesian framework.

In the main analysis we specialize to the fundamental $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode; the motivations for this choice are discussed in Sec. III B.

Appendix B: Sampling configurations

This appendix describes the specific configuration adopted for extracting QNM content from the ring-down data. The publicly available strain data from the GWOSC are used for both the Hanford and Livingston detectors, employing the 16 kHz, 4096 s data segments corresponding to the analyzed event. The data are downsampled to 4096 Hz and band-pass filtered using a fourth-order Butterworth filter in the frequency range $[20, 2043]$ Hz, with the upper cutoff chosen slightly below the Nyquist frequency to suppress aliasing artifacts introduced by resampling. An analysis duration of $T = 0.6$ s is adopted, with the Hanford peak time fixed to $t_{\text{peak}}^{\text{LHO}} = 1420878141.2190118$ s.

At each selected start time t_0 , uniform priors are assigned to the intrinsic parameters over wide intervals encompassing the expected values of the dominant $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode: $f \in [100, 500]$ Hz, $\tau \in [0.5, 20]$ ms, $\log_{10} A \in [-23, -19]$, and $\phi \in [0, 2\pi]$ rad. The detector strain is modeled as

$$h(t) = F_+(\alpha, \delta, \psi) h_+ + F_\times(\alpha, \delta, \psi) h_\times, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $F_+(\alpha, \delta, \psi)$ and $F_\times(\alpha, \delta, \psi)$ denote the detector antenna response functions. The sky coordinates are fixed

to $(\alpha, \delta) = (2.333, 0.19)$ following the LVK parameter-estimation results for the same event [12], while the polarization angle ψ is allowed to vary freely under a uniform prior in $[0, \pi]$.

Appendix C: Data-driven identification of stable post-merger windows

This appendix presents the methodology used in this work to identify stable post-merger analysis windows through a quantitative and physically motivated procedure. Appendix C1 introduces the diagnostic framework that combines multiple consistency and smoothness metrics into a unified stability score, while Appendix C2 examines the empirical behavior of these diagnostics when applied to the GW250114 event.

1. Stability diagnostic scheme

To evaluate the stability of the recovered QNM parameters, we analyze a discrete set of start times t_0 within the interval suggested by NR simulations, comparing the resulting $(f(t_0), \tau(t_0))$ posteriors against IMR-based reference distributions. We quantify this consistency by defining a composite stability metric S_x that combines three complementary diagnostics—the overlap coefficient OC_x , the credible interval coverage Cov_x , and the median-based Gaussian consistency score G_x —as follows:

$$S_x = (\text{OC}_x^\alpha \text{Cov}_x^\beta G_x^\gamma)^{1/(\alpha+\beta+\gamma)}, \quad x \in \{f, \tau\}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Here, OC_x is defined as:

$$\text{OC}_{x,t_0} = \int \min[p_{t_0}(x), p_{\text{IMR}}(x)] dx, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

quantifying the common support between the t_0 -dependent and IMR posteriors; The coverage metric Cov_x is given by

$$\text{Cov}_{x,t_0} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\int_{L_{\text{IMR}}}^{H_{\text{IMR}}} p_{t_0}(x) dx + \int_{L_{t_0}}^{H_{t_0}} p_{\text{IMR}}(x) dx \right], \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where L_i and H_i denote the lower and upper bounds of the 90% credible interval for the posterior $p_i(x)$, with $i \in \{t_0, \text{IMR}\}$, measuring the mutual inclusion fraction of the two intervals; The third term, G_x , follows a Gaussian-likelihood form:

$$G_{x,t_0} = \exp \left[-\frac{(\tilde{x}_{t_0} - \tilde{x}_{\text{IMR}})^2}{2(\sigma_{t_0}^2 + \sigma_{\text{IMR}}^2)} \right], \quad (\text{C.4})$$

treating the median difference between the two posteriors as a normalized residual, where \tilde{x}_i and σ_i denote the median and scale (estimated via the interquartile range) of each posterior. Since the posterior distributions are

approximately Gaussian in both f and τ , this normalization provides a consistent measure of their statistical consistency across different t_0 values.

To regularize abrupt variations in the evolution of f and τ , a local smoothness-based stability score is defined as

$$S_{\text{stab},t_0} = \exp \left[-\frac{(\ln V_{t_0} - \text{median}(\ln V))^2}{2\sigma_V^2 (1 + \eta \omega_{t_0})} \right], \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where V_{t_0} denotes the local variance of the log-scaled median trajectories $\hat{f}(t_0)$ and $\hat{\tau}(t_0)$ —defined as $\hat{f}_{t_0} = \ln(\tilde{f}_{t_0}/\text{median}(\tilde{f}))$ and $\hat{\tau}_{t_0} = \ln(\tilde{\tau}_{t_0}/\text{median}(\tilde{\tau}))$ —in the discrete list $V = \{V_{t_0}\}$ computed from finite-difference slopes between adjacent start times. The dispersion σ_V is estimated using the median absolute deviation (MAD) of $\ln V$ for robustness against outliers. An asymmetric weighting function,

$$\omega_{t_0} = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[\kappa(\ln V_{t_0} - \text{median}(\ln V))/\sigma_V]}, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

is introduced to penalize strongly fluctuating segments while treating smoother intervals more leniently.

The overall diagnostic score is then obtained as

$$W = \sqrt{S_{\text{bal}} S_{\text{stab}}}, \quad S_{\text{bal}} = \sqrt{S_f S_\tau}, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

combining model–data consistency (S_{bal}) with temporal stability (S_{stab}).

2. Empirical behavior on GW250114

For the GW250114 event, the start times t_0 are sampled within the interval $[10.5, 20] t_M$, with values of t_0/t_M spaced every 0.5 between 10.5 and 17 to resolve early-time structures where spectral trends vary rapidly, and every 1.0 between 17 and 20. This range corresponds to the post-merger regime where the signal transitions from nonlinear merger dynamics to linear perturbative evolution. Given the nearly symmetric BBH system considered here, the post-merger radiation is expected to be dominated by the fundamental $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode, while higher-order modes such as $(3, 3)$ and $(2, 1)$ remain strongly suppressed due to symmetry and inclination effects.

Applying the above diagnostics to this event yields the quantitative behavior shown in Fig. 5. For this figure, we adopt equal weighting coefficients $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 1$ in Eq. (C.1), reflecting no prior preference among the three consistency measures. The local-stability component employs $\eta = 2$ and $\kappa = 3$ (Eqs. (C.5) and (C.6)), a choice that provides moderate suppression of irregular segments while preserving smoothly varying regions.⁴

⁴ Even for symmetric weighting ($\eta = 0$), $W(t_0)$ yields a stable plateau near $14\text{--}14.5 t_M$, showing weak sensitivity to the weighting scheme. Nonetheless, the parameters (η, κ) still carry physical meaning by penalizing stronger local fluctuations.




FIG. 5. Quantitative diagnostics for selecting stable post-merger start times t_0 . The upper panel shows the combined score W (black solid) together with its components S_{bal} (blue dashed) and S_{stab} (pink dotted). The lower panel displays the one-dimensional consistency metrics for the recovered QNM parameters: S_f for the frequency (cyan dashed) and S_τ for the damping time (orange dotted). The shaded band marks the stable window identified by the joint criterion of maximal W and smooth S_{stab} .

In particular, the balance score S_{bal} rises sharply at early start times, reaches a quasi-stationary region after $t_0 \approx 13.5 t_M$, and gradually decreases at later times. This evolution is physically consistent with the expected transition of the post-merger waveform: during the early stages, the signal remains partially influenced by non-linear merger dynamics, where residual overtone and mode-mixing contributions reduce its consistency with the IMR-based reference. As these transient components decay, the waveform becomes well described by linear perturbation theory, resulting in higher S_{bal} values. At later times, however, the amplitude of the fundamental mode diminishes while the relative contribution of noise increases, leading to a gradual decline in S_{bal} as the ringdown becomes increasingly noise-dominated.

The complementary evolution of the frequency and damping time diagnostics further illustrates this behavior. The corresponding metrics S_f and S_τ , shown in the lower panel of Fig. 5, quantify this transition. At early start times, S_f is already high and varies only mildly with t_0 , whereas S_τ is strongly suppressed, indicating that the discrepancy is dominated by the damping time sector. Around $t_0 \sim 13\text{--}14 t_M$, S_τ rises rapidly and settles into a plateau, so that both frequency and damping time become simultaneously consistent with the IMR-based ref-




FIG. 6. Joint posterior distributions of the QNM frequency f and damping time τ obtained from the ringdown-only analysis of GW250114 at several start times $t_0 = \{11, 13, 15, 17, 19\} t_M$. Contours represent the 90% credible regions, colored as indicated in the legend. The black dashed curves show the IMR-based Kerr prediction, derived from the remnant mass and spin posteriors, while the dotted lines mark the median values of the predicted f_{Kerr} and τ_{Kerr} for reference.

erence, in line with the peak of S_{bal} and $W(t_0)$ in the upper panel. At later times, both scores gradually decrease as the signal amplitude diminishes and the ringdown becomes increasingly noise-dominated. A more direct visualization of this complementary behavior is shown in Fig. 6. Taken together, these observations suggest that the physically informative regime for spectral inference is the intermediate plateau where both consistency and signal strength are simultaneously maintained. When S_{bal} becomes nearly flat, the combined stability metric $W(t_0)$ is primarily governed by the smoothness term S_{stab} . This behavior reflects a methodological limitation rather than a numerical artifact: the selection of t_0 becomes increasingly sensitive to the definition of temporal stability once the balance metric ceases to evolve significantly. Such dependence highlights the importance of refining the stability criterion to ensure interpretability across events of varying signal strength.

Based on these considerations, we adopt $t_0 = 14 t_M$ and $t_0 = 14.5 t_M$ —which lie within the plateau and correspond to the highest values of $W(t_0)$ —as representative start times for the spectral analyses in this work, with the corresponding joint (f, τ) posteriors shown in Fig. 7.




FIG. 7. Joint posteriors of the dominant QNM frequency f and damping time τ obtained from the ringdown-only analysis. The contours show the 90% credible regions for two quantitatively selected start times, $t_0 = 14 t_M$ (rose pink) and $t_0 = 14.5 t_M$ (light blue). The one-dimensional marginalized distributions are shown along the top and right axes. Gray contours indicate results for all other sampled start times for reference. Black dashed lines denote the IMR-based Kerr prediction, obtained by mapping the IMR posterior of the remnant mass and spin to the corresponding Kerr QNM frequency and damping time. Vertical and horizontal dotted lines mark the median values of the predicted f_{Kerr} and τ_{Kerr} , serving as reference coordinates for comparison.

Appendix D: Additional mode extraction

To assess sensitivity to additional components, we repeated the DS fit at $t_0 = \{14, 14.5\} t_M$ including a second damped sinusoid. The dominant $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ frequency shows a slight downward shift in the median, and its 90% credible interval widens toward the lower bound; a comparable lower-side broadening is seen for the damping time. In addition, we find that the added component prefers a longer τ than the fundamental, which is incompatible with an overtone interpretation and instead suggests partial absorption of residual noise or interference. The Bayes factor comparing the single-mode and two-mode DS models likewise does not indicate any statistical preference for the inclusion of the additional component. These trends are consistent with the expectation that, in this window, the signal is expected to be primarily described by the fundamental $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode: adding a second sinusoid does not materially shift the central estimate of the dominant mode but inflates its uncertainty, indicative of mild overfitting at the current SNR. The corresponding quantitative comparison is




FIG. 8. Amplitude evolution of the dominant $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ QNM as a function of the analysis start time t_0/t_M . Blue circles indicate the recovered median amplitudes from single-mode analyses, with thick bars representing the 50% credible intervals and thin bars the 90% credible intervals. Pink squares denote the corresponding amplitudes obtained when a second mode is included at selected t_0 . Gray shading shows the expected amplitude decay of the $(2, 2, 0)$ mode as inferred from the reference time $t_0 = 10.5 t_M$ of the single-mode analysis, with darker and lighter regions marking the 50% and 90% credible intervals, respectively.

summarized in Table III.

t_0	Model	f [Hz]	τ [ms]	$\ln \mathcal{B}$
$14 t_M$	1-mode	$248.75^{+8.42}_{-9.02}$	$4.49^{+1.33}_{-1.00}$	75.54
	2-mode	$243.06^{+12.70}_{-121.34}$	$4.63^{+11.84}_{-2.68}$	75.09
$14.5 t_M$	1-mode	$248.73^{+8.40}_{-9.15}$	$4.44^{+1.31}_{-1.02}$	73.91
	2-mode	$242.42^{+13.33}_{-122.01}$	$4.61^{+12.11}_{-2.73}$	73.49

TABLE III. Dominant-mode posteriors with and without an extra sinusoid. Values report the median and the 90% credible interval. The last column lists the logarithm of the Bayes factor, $\ln \mathcal{B} = \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\text{signal}} - \ln \mathcal{Z}_{\text{noise}}$, evaluated for each model at the corresponding start time.

For complementary context, Fig. 8 shows the evolution of the recovered amplitude with respect to the start time, comparing single-mode results with the two-mode checks. The recovered A_{220} values follow the expected exponential decay trend, suggesting that the signal in this regime is well-described by linear perturbation theory.

Appendix E: Derivation of the hierarchical inference formalism

To establish a direct connection between the observed strain data and the theoretical parameter space at the spectral level, the ringdown-only analysis is formulated within a hierarchical Bayesian framework.

At the data level, the observed post-merger strain segment d_{RD} is modeled using the agnostic DS parameters $x = (f, \tau, A, \phi)$ through the likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{\text{RD}}(d_{\text{RD}} | x)$. Among these parameters, only the spectral quantities (f, τ) carry direct information about the underlying spacetime geometry. Consequently, the observational likelihood can be effectively represented in the reduced spectral subspace as $p_{\text{obs}}(f, \gamma)$, where $\gamma = 1/\tau$. This distribution corresponds to the marginal posterior obtained by integrating over (A, ϕ) —or, equivalently, by projecting the full posterior samples onto the (f, γ) plane. Assuming uniform priors on the DS parameters, $p_{\text{obs}}(f, \gamma)$ serves as a direct representation of the marginalized spectral likelihood. At the theoretical level, the spectral quantities $(f_{\text{th}}, \gamma_{\text{th}})$ are defined by the forward map $x_{\text{th}} = x_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi)$, $x \in \{f, \gamma\}$, which uniquely determines the QNM spectrum from the underlying physical parameters (ζ, M, χ) within a given gravitational theory.

The full hierarchical posterior is then

$$P(\zeta, M, \chi | d_{\text{RD}}) \propto \mathcal{L}(d_{\text{RD}} | \zeta, M, \chi) \pi(M, \chi) \pi(\zeta), \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where $\pi(M, \chi)$ represents the prior on the remnant properties, which may be either uniform (ringdown-only) or informed by the IMR posteriors. Since the theoretical parameters (ζ, M, χ) uniquely determine the spectral quantities $(f_{\text{th}}, \gamma_{\text{th}})$, the likelihood can equivalently be expressed in the spectral domain as $\mathcal{L}_{\text{RD}}(d_{\text{RD}} | x_{\text{th}})$. In practice, the data-level information is encoded in the empirical spectral distribution $p_{\text{obs}}(f, \gamma)$, obtained by marginalizing the full DS likelihood over amplitude and phase parameters. This allows the likelihood for the coupling parameter to be evaluated by marginalizing over the remnant mass and spin:

$$\mathcal{L}(d_{\text{RD}} | \zeta) \propto \int p_{\text{obs}}(f_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi), \gamma_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi)) \pi(M, \chi) dM d\chi. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

When accounting for the finite validity of perturbative models, a soft-truncation weight $w_{\sigma}(\chi)$ is applied to downweight contributions beyond the theoretical domain, leading to the effective likelihood \mathcal{L}_{eff} defined in Eq. (3.4). The posterior of the coupling parameter then follows as $P(\zeta | d_{\text{RD}}) \propto \mathcal{L}(d_{\text{RD}} | \zeta) \pi(\zeta)$. Once the posterior of the coupling parameter is obtained, the hierarchical structure also allows conditional resampling from

$$P(M, \chi | \zeta, d_{\text{RD}}) \propto \mathcal{L}(d_{\text{RD}} | f_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi), \gamma_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi)) \pi(M, \chi), \quad (\text{E.3})$$

which enables reconstruction of the implied remnant distribution for different values of ζ .

Appendix F: Soft truncation for theoretical validity

This appendix introduces the soft-truncation framework used to systematically examine how a theory's finite

validity domain affects Bayesian inference at the spectral level.

To quantify the sensitivity of the analysis to the finite validity domain, we introduce a continuous control parameter that governs the truncation strength. Specifically, the soft-truncation weight is defined as

$$w_{\sigma}(\chi) = \begin{cases} 1, & \chi \leq \chi_0, \\ \exp\left[-\frac{(\chi - \chi_0)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right], & \chi > \chi_0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{F.1})$$

where $\chi_0 = 0.7$ corresponds to the upper spin limit of perturbative validity for the EdGB QNM expansion considered in this work, and σ determines how rapidly the weight decreases beyond this limit. The analysis adopts the same RD-uniform prior on (M, χ) as used in the main text. By varying σ across a monotonic sequence $\{\infty, 0.20, 0.10, 0.05, 0.03, 0\}$ —with $\sigma = \infty$ corresponding to no truncation and $\sigma = 0$ representing a hard cutoff at χ_0 —we continuously suppress out-of-domain contributions and track how the resulting posteriors respond.

To quantify the impact of varying the truncation strength, we first define, for each σ and for a fixed coupling value ζ_0 , an effective out-of-domain likelihood fraction

$$R_{\text{out}}(\sigma; \zeta_0) = \frac{\int_{\chi > \chi_0} p_{\text{obs}}(x_{\text{th}}(\zeta_0, M, \chi)) \pi(M, \chi) w_{\sigma}(\chi) dM d\chi}{\int p_{\text{obs}}(x_{\text{th}}(\zeta_0, M, \chi)) \pi(M, \chi) w_{\sigma}(\chi) dM d\chi}, \quad (\text{F.2})$$

where $x_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi) \equiv (f_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi), \gamma_{\text{th}}(\zeta, M, \chi))$ denotes the theoretical QNM summary vector. This quantity measures, at fixed ζ_0 , the relative contribution of samples outside the theoretical domain ($\chi > \chi_0$) to the overall likelihood. In practice, we adopt $\zeta_0 = 0$ (the GR limit) here as a representative diagnostic. In addition, it is useful to consider a ζ -marginalized diagnostic that averages the fixed- ζ fractions over the coupling posterior,

$$R_{\text{out}}^{\text{weighted}}(\sigma) = \int R_{\text{out}}(\sigma; \zeta) P(\zeta | d_{\text{RD}}) d\zeta, \quad (\text{F.3})$$

which plays the role of a posterior-weighted mean out-of-domain fraction. As σ decreases, both $R_{\text{out}}(\sigma; \zeta_0)$ and $R_{\text{out}}^{\text{weighted}}(\sigma)$ progressively approach zero, corresponding to a gradual suppression of out-of-domain information. We then monitor how the marginalized posterior of ζ under different truncation widths σ , denoted as $P_{\zeta}^{(\sigma)}$, responds to this suppression by tracking the Jensen–Shannon (JS) divergence between each $P_{\zeta}^{(\sigma)}$ and the baseline posterior $P_{\zeta}^{(\infty)}$,

$$D_{\text{JS}}(P_{\zeta}^{(\sigma)} \| P_{\zeta}^{(\infty)}) = \frac{1}{2} D_{\text{KL}}(P_{\zeta}^{(\sigma)} \| \bar{P}) + \frac{1}{2} D_{\text{KL}}(P_{\zeta}^{(\infty)} \| \bar{P}), \quad (\text{F.4})$$

where

$$\bar{P} = \frac{1}{2} (P_{\zeta}^{(\sigma)} + P_{\zeta}^{(\infty)}), \quad (\text{F.5})$$




FIG. 9. Robustness curve showing the JS divergence $D_{\text{JS}}(P_{\zeta}^{(\sigma)} | P_{\zeta}^{(\infty)})$ as a function of the out-of-domain likelihood fraction $R_{\text{out}}(\sigma)$, evaluated at $\zeta = 0$, for different truncation widths σ . Blue markers denote the values corresponding to $\sigma \in \{0, 0.03, 0.05, 0.10, 0.20, \infty\}$, with labels placed near each point. A grey arrow indicates the direction of increasing truncation strength ($\sigma \downarrow$). The vertical axis is shown on a logarithmic scale.

and D_{KL} is the KL divergence defined in Eq. (3.7).

Applying this procedure to the GW250114 event yields the results summarized in Fig. 9 and Table IV. As detailed in Table IV, for weak or vanishing truncation, a substantial fraction of the total likelihood weight—at the level of roughly one half—arises from the region $\chi > \chi_0$, which lies outside the nominal perturbative domain of the EdGB QNM expansion. This behavior is not unexpected: the remnant spin of GW250114 lies close to the theoretical limit $\chi_0 \approx 0.7$, so a sizeable portion of the (M, χ) prior volume consistent with the data naturally extends beyond the perturbative validity boundary. Nevertheless, the JS divergence across the full range of σ values remains confined to the remarkably small level of 10^{-5} – 10^{-6} . This indicates that the out-of-domain regions, while occupying a sizable volume in the (M, χ) prior space, map under the forward model to portions of the (f, γ) plane where the observational likelihood is negligible. As a result, progressively reducing their contribution (i.e., taking $R_{\text{out}} \rightarrow 0$) leaves the inferred posterior P_{ζ} effectively unchanged. The limited amplitude of the robustness curve (see Fig. 9) indicates that the posterior on ζ is only weakly affected by the suppression of out-of-domain contributions, confirming that the perturbative model remains reliable for GW250114 and that the inferred constraints are robust against uncertainties in its theoretical validity domain.

For reference, we also list in Table IV the ζ -weighted out-of-domain fraction $R_{\text{out}}^{\text{weighted}}(\sigma)$, which differs only marginally from the fixed- $\zeta=0$ measure used in Fig. 9.

σ	$R_{\text{out}}^{\text{weighted}}(\sigma)$	$R_{\text{out}}(\sigma)$ at $\zeta=0$	D_{JS}
0	0.0000	0.0000	1.91×10^{-5}
0.03	0.2422	0.2409	2.52×10^{-5}
0.05	0.3475	0.3465	2.55×10^{-5}
0.10	0.4757	0.4779	1.13×10^{-5}
0.20	0.5372	0.5425	1.50×10^{-6}
∞	0.5627	0.5694	0

TABLE IV. Out-of-domain likelihood fractions under different truncation widths σ . Both the fixed- $\zeta=0$ measure $R_{\text{out}}(\sigma)$ and the ζ -weighted fraction $R_{\text{out}}^{\text{weighted}}(\sigma)$ are shown, together with the JS divergence relative to the no-truncation baseline.

Appendix G: Prior configurations and additional results

This appendix summarizes the prior configurations adopted in our analysis and presents the supplementary posterior distributions obtained under different prior assumptions on the remnant mass M and spin χ . The three priors considered in this work are: (1) a broad ringdown-only uniform prior (RD-uniform), (2) a uniform prior within an IMR-informed extended range (IMR-extended), and (3) the IMR posterior itself used as a prior (IMR-posterior). The corresponding parameter ranges are listed in Table V.

Prior type	$M [M_{\odot}]$	χ
RD-uniform	[20, 100]	[0.01, 0.99]
IMR-extended	[55, 70]	[0.60, 0.75]
IMR-posterior	—	—

TABLE V. Prior configurations adopted for the remnant mass M and spin χ . The IMR-posterior prior directly reuses posterior samples from the IMR analysis (obtained with the `NRSur7dq4` model), while the IMR-extended prior spans an enlarged region around the IMR-posterior 90% credible intervals.

Figure 10 displays the posteriors of the EdGB coupling ζ , remnant mass M , and spin χ obtained under the IMR-extended and IMR-posterior priors.

Appendix H: Details of ringdown injection tests

This appendix provides additional details on the ringdown injections employed in this work. Appendix H1 describes the construction of synthetic EdGB-corrected ringdown signals, while Appendix H2 presents a representative example with nonzero coupling, illustrating how different assumptions about the remnant mass and spin affect the recovered posterior for ζ .




FIG. 10. Posterior distributions for the coupling parameter ζ , final mass M , and spin χ obtained under two different prior choices on (M, χ) . Results derived using the IMR-extended prior are shown in the left panel, while those using the IMR-posterior prior are shown in the right panel. In both panels, results under the GR assumption ($\zeta = 0$) are shown in orange (solid lines), while those allowing ζ to vary (EdGB) are in light blue (dashed lines). Shaded regions denote the 90% credible contours, with marginal one-dimensional posteriors displayed along the diagonals. The IMR-posterior prior yields tighter and more localized distributions, consistent with the physical constraints implied by the IMR analysis.

1. Construction of EdGB ringdown injections

We briefly outline the procedure used to construct the synthetic ringdown signals analyzed in Sec. IV. All injections are based on a single damped sinusoid component representing the EdGB-corrected fundamental $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode. The corresponding complex QNM frequency is computed from the perturbative EdGB fits summarized in Appendix A, evaluated at a fiducial remnant mass and spin (M, χ) fixed to the median values inferred for GW250114 in the main analysis. For a given choice of the coupling ζ , these fits provide the theoretical frequency and damping time $(f_{\text{th}}, \tau_{\text{th}})$, which are then used to specify the time-domain DS waveform.

The synthetic strain is constructed by embedding this single-mode signal into real off-source detector data from the same observing run, and then applying the same sampling rate, bandpass filtering, and whitening as in the GW250114 analysis. The amplitude of the $(\ell, m, n) = (2, 2, 0)$ mode is first chosen so that the DS waveform evaluated at $t_0 = 10.5 t_M$ reproduces the median strain amplitude inferred for GW250114 at the same start time, and is then uniformly rescaled so that the resulting ringdown segment attains a target ringdown SNR, computed with the same noise power spectral density and time window adopted in the main text. For simplicity, all injections are analyzed at a fixed start time $t_0 = 14 t_M$ within the stability plateau identified for GW250114. Throughout, the injections are analyzed with the same

DS model, priors on ζ , and sampling configuration as in the GW250114 case. In Sec. IV we focus on three representative injections with couplings $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0, 0.15$, and 0.25 , which are used to assess the response of the spectral framework under controlled conditions.

2. Impact of remnant priors on ζ recovery

To illustrate more concretely how remnant priors affect the recovery of the EdGB coupling, we consider a representative injection with $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.25$ and ringdown SNR $\rho_{\text{RD}} = 100$. For $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.15$ the EdGB corrections to the QNM spectrum are at the sub-percent level and the qualitative trends are harder to visualize, so we focus here on the larger coupling for clarity. Figure 11 shows the resulting posteriors $P(\zeta | d_{\text{RD}})$ obtained under four different choices for the remnant prior: the RD-uniform and IMR-extended priors introduced in Sec. IV, and two Gaussian priors with widths comparable to those of a Kerr-based ringdown analysis, centered respectively on the injected (M, χ) (EdGB-Gaussian) and on the GR-inferred (M, χ) (GR-Gaussian).

For the RD-uniform and IMR-extended cases, the posteriors are only weakly modulated across the coupling range, closely resembling the behavior seen in the real GW250114 analysis; in particular, broad remnant priors of this type do not lead to a sharply peaked recovery of ζ . Introducing Gaussian remnant priors has a more vis-




FIG. 11. Posterior distributions of the EdGB coupling ζ for a representative injection with $\zeta_{\text{true}} = 0.25$ and ringdown SNR $\rho_{\text{RD}} = 100$, obtained under four different remnant-prior choices: RD-uniform (blue), IMR-extended (pink), EdGB-Gaussian (violet), and GR-Gaussian (yellow). Triangles mark the MAP values of ζ .

ible impact: when the prior is centered on the injected (M, χ) , the posterior develops a mild peak near ζ_{true} , whereas centering the same Gaussian around the GR-based (M, χ) instead pulls the posterior toward smaller couplings and yields a shape that remains broadly compatible with $\zeta = 0$. These examples illustrate that both the width and the centering of the remnant prior can influence the apparent information content on ζ , and suggest that GR-informed remnant estimates, when used as priors, may in some circumstances partially absorb beyond-GR signatures even in high-SNR ringdown injections.

-
- [1] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 131103 (2016), [arXiv:1602.03838 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [2] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 061102 (2016), [arXiv:1602.03837 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [3] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 241102 (2016).
 - [4] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 041015 (2016), [arXiv:1606.04856 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [5] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 031040 (2019).
 - [6] R. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *ApJ* **915**, 86 (2021), [arXiv:2010.14550 \[astro-ph\]](#).
 - [7] R. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *GWTC-2.1: Deep Extended Catalog of Compact Binary Coalescences Observed by LIGO and Virgo During the First Half of the Third Observing Run* (2022), [arXiv:2108.01045 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [8] R. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, KAGRA), *Phys. Rev. X* **13**, 041039 (2023), [arXiv:2111.03606 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [9] A. G. Abac *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, KAGRA), *ApJ* **983**, 99 (2025), [arXiv:2501.01495 \[astro-ph\]](#).
 - [10] A. G. Abac *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, KAGRA), *GWTC-4.0: Updating the Gravitational-Wave Transient Catalog with Observations from the First Part of the Fourth LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA Observing Run* (2025), [arXiv:2508.18082 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [11] LIGO Scientific Collaboration, Virgo Collaboration, and KAGRA Collaboration, *Black Hole Spectroscopy and Tests of General Relativity with GW250114* (2025), [arXiv:2509.08099 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [12] A. G. Abac *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, KAGRA), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **135**, 111403 (2025), [arXiv:2509.08054 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [13] E. Berti, V. Cardoso, and A. O. Starinets, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **26**, 163001 (2009), [arXiv:0905.2975 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [14] M. Isi and W. M. Farr, *Analyzing black-hole ringdowns* (2021), [arXiv:2107.05609 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [15] L. London, J. Healy, and D. Shoemaker, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124032 (2014), [arXiv:1404.3197 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [16] R. Prix, *Bayesian QNM search on black hole ringdown modes (applied to GW150914)*, Tech. Rep. LIGO-T1500618-v4 (LIGO Scientific Collaboration, 2016) LIGO Technical Report.
 - [17] H. Yang, K. Yagi, J. Blackman, L. Lehner, V. Paschalidis, F. Pretorius, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 161101 (2017), [arXiv:1701.05808 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [18] R. Brito, A. Buonanno, and V. Raymond, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 084038 (2018), [arXiv:1805.00293 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [19] V. Baibhav and E. Berti, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 024005 (2019), [arXiv:1809.03500 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [20] G. Carullo, W. D. Pozzo, and J. Veitch, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 123029 (2019), [arXiv:1902.07527 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [21] V. Baibhav, M. H.-Y. Cheung, E. Berti, V. Cardoso, G. Carullo, R. Cotesta, W. D. Pozzo, and F. Duque, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 104020 (2023), [arXiv:2302.03050 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [22] B. P. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 221101 (2016).
 - [23] R. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo), *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 122002 (2021), [arXiv:2010.14529 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [24] R. Abbott *et al.* (LIGO Scientific, Virgo, KAGRA), *Tests of General Relativity with GWTC-3* (2021), [arXiv:2112.06861 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [25] X. J. Forteza, S. Bhagwat, S. Kumar, and P. Pani, *A novel ringdown amplitude-phase consistency test* (2022), [arXiv:2205.14910 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [26] V. Gennari, G. Carullo, and W. D. Pozzo, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 233 (2024), [arXiv:2312.12515 \[gr-qc\]](#).
 - [27] O. Dreyer, B. Kelly, B. Krishnan, L. S. Finn, D. Garri-

- son, and R. Lopez-Aleman, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **21**, 787 (2004), [arXiv:gr-qc/0309007](#).
- [28] E. Berti, M. H.-Y. Cheung, and S. Yi, *Physics Today* **78**, 32 (2025).
- [29] G. Carullo, *Gen Relativ Gravit* **57**, 76 (2025).
- [30] E. Berti *et al.*, *Black hole spectroscopy: From theory to experiment* (2025), [arXiv:2505.23895 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [31] S. Gossan, J. Veitch, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 124056 (2012), [arXiv:1111.5819 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [32] E. Thrane, P. Lasky, and Y. Levin, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 102004 (2017), [arXiv:1706.05152 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [33] G. Carullo, L. van der Schaaf, L. London, P. T. H. Pang, K. W. Tsang, O. A. Hannuksela, J. Meidam, M. Agathos, A. Samajdar, A. Ghosh, T. G. F. Li, W. D. Pozzo, and C. V. D. Broeck, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 104020 (2018), [arXiv:1805.04760 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [34] M. Isi, M. Giesler, W. M. Farr, M. A. Scheel, and S. A. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 111102 (2019), [arXiv:1905.00869 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [35] M. Cabero, C. D. Capano, O. Fischer-Birnholtz, B. Krishnan, A. B. Nielsen, A. H. Nitz, and C. M. Biwer, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 124069 (2018), [arXiv:1711.09073 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [36] L. Blanchet, *Living Rev. Relativ.* **5**, 3 (2002), [arXiv:gr-qc/0202016](#).
- [37] S. E. Perkins, R. Nair, H. O. Silva, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 024060 (2021), [arXiv:2104.11189 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [38] N. Yunes and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 122003 (2009), [arXiv:0909.3328 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [39] S. Mezzasoma and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 024026 (2022), [arXiv:2203.15934 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [40] B. Wang, C. Shi, J.-d. Zhang, Y.-M. hu, and J. Mei, *Constraining the EdGB theory with higher harmonics and merger-ringdown contribution using GWTC-3* (2023), [arXiv:2302.10112 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [41] A. Maselli, P. Pani, L. Gualtieri, and E. Berti, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 024043 (2020), [arXiv:1910.12893 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [42] H. O. Silva, A. Ghosh, and A. Buonanno, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 044030 (2023), [arXiv:2205.05132 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [43] A. K.-W. Chung and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 064019 (2024), [arXiv:2406.11986 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [44] A. K.-W. Chung, K. K.-H. Lam, and N. Yunes, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 124052 (2025), [arXiv:2503.11759 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [45] A. K.-W. Chung and N. Yunes, *Probing quadratic gravity with black-hole ringdown gravitational waves measured by LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA detectors* (2025), [arXiv:2506.14695 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [46] E. Berti *et al.*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **32**, 243001 (2015), [arXiv:1501.07274 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [47] T. Johannsen, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 124017 (2013), [arXiv:1304.7786 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [48] L. Barack *et al.*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **36**, 143001 (2019), [arXiv:1806.05195 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [49] G. Franciolini, L. Hui, R. Penco, L. Santoni, and E. Trincherini, *J. High Energ. Phys.* **2019** (2), 127, [arXiv:1810.07706 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [50] K. Glampedakis and H. O. Silva, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 044040 (2019), [arXiv:1906.05455 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [51] C. T. Cunningham, R. H. Price, and V. Moncrief, *ApJ* **230**, 870 (1979).
- [52] F. Moura and R. Schiappa, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **24**, 361 (2007).
- [53] A. Maselli, P. Pani, L. Gualtieri, and V. Ferrari, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 083014 (2015).
- [54] J. L. Blázquez-Salcedo, C. F. B. Macedo, V. Cardoso, V. Ferrari, L. Gualtieri, F. S. Khoo, J. Kunz, and P. Pani, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 104024 (2016).
- [55] P. Pani and V. Cardoso, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 084031 (2009), [arXiv:0902.1569 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [56] L. Pierini and L. Gualtieri, *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 124017 (2021), [arXiv:2103.09870 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [57] L. Pierini and L. Gualtieri, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 104009 (2022), [arXiv:2207.11267 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [58] G. W. Horndeski, *Int J Theor Phys* **10**, 363 (1974).
- [59] T. Kobayashi, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **82**, 086901 (2019), [arXiv:1901.07183 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [60] P. Kanti, N. E. Mavromatos, J. Rizos, K. Tamvakis, and E. Winstanley, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 5049 (1996), [arXiv:hep-th/9511071](#).
- [61] S. Mignemi and N. R. Stewart, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 5259 (1993), [arXiv:hep-th/9212146](#).
- [62] T. P. Sotiriou and S.-Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 124063 (2014), [arXiv:1408.1698 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [63] W. Israel, *Phys. Rev.* **164**, 1776 (1967).
- [64] B. Carter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **26**, 331 (1971).
- [65] S. W. Hawking, *Commun.Math. Phys.* **25**, 152 (1972).
- [66] D. C. Robinson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 905 (1975).
- [67] J. L. Blázquez-Salcedo, F. S. Khoo, and J. Kunz, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 064008 (2017), [arXiv:1706.03262 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [68] J. L. Blázquez-Salcedo, F. S. Khoo, B. Kleihaus, and J. Kunz, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, L021505 (2025), [arXiv:2407.20760 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [69] J. L. Blázquez-Salcedo, F. S. Khoo, B. Kleihaus, and J. Kunz, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 064015 (2025), [arXiv:2412.17073 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [70] H. Nakano, H. Takahashi, H. Tagoshi, and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Rev. D* **68**, 102003 (2003), [arXiv:gr-qc/0306082](#).
- [71] E. Capote *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 062002 (2025), [arXiv:2411.14607 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [72] M. Page, J. Qin, J. La Fontaine, C. Zhao, L. Ju, and D. Blair, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 124060 (2018).
- [73] C. M. Jungkind, B. C. Seymour, A. Laeuger, and Y. Chen, *Prospects for High-Frequency Gravitational-Wave Detection with GEO600* (2025), [arXiv:2506.08315 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [74] V. Varma, S. E. Field, M. A. Scheel, J. Blackman, D. Gerosa, L. C. Stein, L. E. Kidder, and H. P. Pfeiffer, *Phys. Rev. Research* **1**, 033015 (2019), [arXiv:1905.09300 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [75] G. Carullo, W. Del Pozzo, and J. Veitch, *PyRing: a time-domain ringdown analysis python package*, [git.ligo.org/lscsoft/pyring](#) (2023).
- [76] E. Berti, V. Cardoso, J. A. Gonzalez, U. Sperhake, M. Hannam, S. Husa, and B. Bruegmann, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 064034 (2007), [arXiv:gr-qc/0703053](#).
- [77] A. Buonanno, G. B. Cook, and F. Pretorius, *Phys. Rev. D* **75**, 124018 (2007).
- [78] I. Kamaretsos, M. Hannam, S. Husa, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 024018 (2012).
- [79] M. Giesler, M. Isi, M. A. Scheel, and S. A. Teukolsky, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041060 (2019).
- [80] R. Cotesta, G. Carullo, E. Berti, and V. Cardoso, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 111102 (2022), [arXiv:2201.00822 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [81] M. Giesler, S. Ma, K. Mitman, N. Oshita, S. A. Teukolsky, M. Boyle, N. Deppe, L. E. Kidder, J. Moxon, K. C. Nelli, H. P. Pfeiffer, M. A. Scheel, W. Throwe, and N. L. Vu, *Phys. Rev. D* **111**, 084041 (2025), [arXiv:2411.11269 \[gr-qc\]](#).

- [82] I. Kamaretsos, M. Hannam, and B. S. Sathyaprakash, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 141102 (2012).
- [83] X. J. Forteza, S. Bhagwat, P. Pani, and V. Ferrari, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 044053 (2020), [arXiv:2005.03260 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [84] M. H.-Y. Cheung, E. Berti, V. Baibhav, and R. Cotesta, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 044069 (2024), [arXiv:2310.04489 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [85] C. Pacilio, S. Bhagwat, F. Nobili, and D. Gerosa, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 103037 (2024), [arXiv:2408.05276 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [86] L. M. Zertuche, L. C. Stein, K. Mitman, S. E. Field, V. Varma, M. Boyle, N. Deppe, L. E. Kidder, J. Moxon, H. P. Pfeiffer, M. A. Scheel, K. C. Nelli, W. Throwe, and N. L. Vu, *Phys. Rev. D* **112**, 024077 (2025), [arXiv:2408.05300 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [87] K. Mitman *et al.*, Probing the ringdown perturbation in binary black hole coalescences with an improved quasi-normal mode extraction algorithm (2025), [arXiv:2503.09678 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [88] A. Correia and C. D. Capano, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 044018 (2024), [arXiv:2312.15146 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [89] M. Branchesi *et al.*, *J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys.* **2023** (07), 068, [arXiv:2303.15923 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [90] M. Evans *et al.*, A Horizon Study for Cosmic Explorer: Science, Observatories, and Community (2021), [arXiv:2109.09882 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [91] J. Luo *et al.*, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **33**, 035010 (2016), [arXiv:1512.02076 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [92] P. Amaro-Seoane *et al.*, *Laser Interferometer Space Antenna* (2017), [arXiv:1702.00786 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [93] W.-H. Ruan, Z.-K. Guo, R.-G. Cai, and Y.-Z. Zhang, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **35**, 2050075 (2020), [arXiv:1807.09495 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [94] D. Foreman-Mackey, *The Journal of Open Source Software* **1**, 24 (2016).
- [95] J. Veitch, W. D. Pozzo, Cody, M. Pitkin, and Ed1d1a8d, *Johnveitch/cpnest: Minor optimisation*, Zenodo (2017).
- [96] D. M. Macleod, J. S. Areeda, S. B. Coughlin, T. J. Massinger, and A. L. Urban, *SoftwareX* **13**, 100657 (2021).
- [97] A. Collette, *Python and HDF5* (O'Reilly Media, Inc., Sebastopol, Calif., 2013).
- [98] LIGO Scientific Collaboration, Virgo Collaboration, and KAGRA Collaboration, *LVK Algorithm Library - LALSuite*, Free software (GPL) (2018).
- [99] K. Wette, *SoftwareX* **12**, 100634 (2020).
- [100] J. D. Hunter, *Computing in Science & Engineering* **9**, 90 (2007).
- [101] C. R. Harris *et al.*, *Nature* **585**, 357 (2020).
- [102] The pandas development team, *Pandas-dev/pandas: Pandas*, Zenodo (2024).
- [103] C. Hoy and V. Raymond, *SoftwareX* **15**, 100765 (2021), [arXiv:2006.06639 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [104] T. D. Canton, A. H. Nitz, B. Gadre, G. S. C. Davies, V. Villa-Ortega, T. Dent, I. Harry, and L. Xiao, *ApJ* **923**, 254 (2021), [arXiv:2008.07494 \[astro-ph\]](#).
- [105] L. C. Stein, *J. Open Source Softw.* **4**, 1683 (2019), [arXiv:1908.10377 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [106] P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, *et al.*, *Nature Methods* **17**, 261 (2020).
- [107] M. L. Waskom, *Journal of Open Source Software* **6**, 3021 (2021).
- [108] E. Barausse, V. Cardoso, and P. Pani, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 104059 (2014).