

The degeneracy between microlensing wave effect and precession in strongly lensed gravitational wave

XIKAI SHAN,¹ HUAN YANG,¹ SHUDE MAO,² AND OTTO A. HANNUKSELA³

¹*Department of Astronomy, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

²*Department of Astronomy, Westlake University, Hangzhou 310030, Zhejiang Province, China*

³*Department of Physics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, NT, Hong Kong*

ABSTRACT

Microlensing induced by the stellar field within a strong lensing galaxy can introduce fluctuations in the waveforms of strongly-lensed gravitational waves (SLGWs), e.g. binary black holes. When fitting these signals with templates that do not account for microlensing, possible degeneracies can lead to false evidence of certain intrinsic parameters, resulting in a misinterpretation of the properties of the underlying system. For example, the wave effect of microlensing may mimic spin precessions, as both effects generically induce periodic waveform modulations. Although previous studies suggest that lensing-induced modulations can be distinguished from precession using parameter estimation under a geometric-optic approximation, it does not directly apply for lensed image through stellar fields due to large number of stars involved and wave-optic effects. This study aims to evaluate the degree of degeneracy between the stellar-field microlensing and spin precession, investigating whether microlensing leads to false evidence of precession. In other words, to what extent observed SLGWs are identified with false evidence of precession. The main findings are as follows. First, assuming O5 sensitivity and parallel spins for the underlying binary black holes, microlensing-induced false evidence of precession is generally weak (15% of the events show significant evidence, 30% if the signal-to-noise ratio doubles). Second, for highly magnified events (magnification $\mu \simeq 100$), about 72% of the population show significant evidence of precession, which could serve as an identification criterion for microlensing. This implies the possibility of strong lensing for the recent event GW231123 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2025), which is in the mass gap and also shows evidence of precession. Finally, a moderate to strong positive correlation exists between microlensing strength and precession evidence, more pronounced in Type II (saddle images) SLGWs. This suggests that stronger precession evidence may imply a stronger microlensing effect.

Keywords: Gravitational wave — Gravitational lensing — Microlensing — Strong lensing

1. INTRODUCTION

Strongly-lensed gravitational waves (SLGWs) offer a new method for probing the Universe (Li et al. 2018; Oguri 2019; Hannuksela et al. 2020; Cao et al. 2022; Liao et al. 2022; Jana et al. 2023; Seo et al. 2024; Poon et al. 2025). Unlike strongly lensed quasars or supernovae, the characteristic GW wavelength of these transient events, i.e. binary black hole coalescence, may be comparable to the lens mass as the images pass through a stellar field within the lensing galaxy, introducing additional interference and diffraction effects (Nakamura & Deguchi 1999; Nakamura 1998; Takahashi & Nakamura 2003; Diego et al. 2019; Cheung et al. 2021; Mishra et al. 2021; Meena et al. 2022; Yeung et al. 2023; Seo et al. 2025). By extracting the interference imprints within GWs, it may be possible to reconstruct substructure information of the lens galaxy, such as the properties of intermediate-mass black holes (Lai et al. 2018) and dark matter substructures (Liu et al. 2023).

xk_shan@mail.bnu.edu.cn

shude.mao@westlake.edu.cn

The most critical step in the application of SLGW is the accurate and efficient identification of such events. However, the two main methods currently available—the posterior-overlap method (Haris et al. 2018; Barsode et al. 2024) and the joint Parameter Estimation (joint PE) method (Lo & Magaña Hernandez 2021; Liu et al. 2021; Janquart et al. 2021, 2023a)—are affected to varying degrees by issues related to false positive rates (Çalışkan et al. 2023; Wierda et al. 2021b). Introducing a novel third-party criterion would be a valuable contribution to these detection strategies. On the other hand, neglecting such wave optics effects can lead to missed signals (Chan et al. 2024) and biased parameter estimation for SLGWs, particularly when an event is highly magnified or propagates through regions with a high density of compact lenses (Meena et al. 2022; Mishra et al. 2024; Shan et al. 2024). In these scenarios, wave optics can provide additional evidence for strong lensing. Indeed, understanding wave optics is a crucial avenue not only for learning about small-scale lenses but also for ensuring the robust detection of strongly lensed events.

As research into microlensing wave optics progresses, it has been observed that the effects of microlensing on GW waveforms bear similarities to intrinsic precession effects, with both producing a beat-pattern-like modulation on the waveform (note that overlapping signals can also introduce a similar beat-pattern-like effect, which is beyond the scope of this study (Hu 2025)). Although the study by Liu & Kim (2024) demonstrated that these two effects can be disentangled using template matching, this conclusion is primarily applicable to cases where template construction is relatively straightforward, such as in the Eikonal limit, where the wavelength of the GW is still much smaller than the characteristic size of the lens but the waveforms superpose, targeting lenses above around 100 solar masses (millilenses and microlenses). For a microlensing field composed of stars smaller than around 10 solar masses, constructing such templates becomes extremely challenging, resulting in a “similarity” between the two effects that cannot be easily disentangled, leading to the emergence of degeneracies. This suggests that microlensing effects could be mistakenly interpreted as intrinsic precessional effects.

In population studies of binary black holes, such degeneracies could lead to incorrect conclusions about the formation mechanisms of binary black hole systems, potentially misleading one into believing that the black holes are formed through dynamical interactions in dense clusters (the dynamical channel) (Sigurdsson & Hernquist 1993; Portegies Zwart & McMillan 2000; Rodriguez et al. 2016; Mapelli et al. 2022), rather than through the evolution of massive binary stars (the EMBS channel) (Abbott et al. 2016; Belczynski et al. 2016; Giacobbo & Mapelli 2018). However, in the context of strong lensing identification, these degeneracies could serve as new evidence for strong lensing events. In other words, one might further filter candidate strong lensing events by identifying events with evidence of precession, thereby reducing the false positive rate.

In this work, we systematically investigate the degeneracies between microlensing wave-optics effects and precession effects in SLGWs. Specifically, we quantify the percentage of strongly-lensed events that would show significant evidence of precession assuming the presence of microlensing and non-precessing underlying binary systems. We find that microlensing can indeed lead to evidence of precession, depending on the strength of the microlensing effect and the detector’s sensitivity level. In fact, if a future lower-noise detector detects a high mismatch microlensing event, e.g., a highly magnified event, there is a high probability that such an event will also be identified as a precessional binary. Thus, precession may be treated as a third-party criterion for SLGWs.

The structure of the paper is as follows: in Section 2, we introduce the fundamental theories of strong lensing and microlensing, along with the simulation processes used for the data. Section 3 presents our results, and finally, we provide a summary and discussion in Section 4.

2. BASIC THEORY AND MOCK DATA SIMULATION

The GW lensing effect induced by a microlensing field embedded within a strong lensing galaxy can be described through the diffraction integral (Schneider et al. 1992; Nakamura & Deguchi 1999; Takahashi & Nakamura 2003), as described in the following equation:

$$F(\omega, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{2G\langle M_L \rangle(1+z_L)\omega}{\pi c^3 i} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d^2x \exp[i\omega t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})]. \quad (1)$$

Here, $F(\omega, \mathbf{y})$ represents the amplification factor, while ω and \mathbf{y} denote the GW angular frequency and its position in the source plane (normalized by the Einstein radius of average microlens mass $\langle M_L \rangle$), respectively. z_L refers to the microlens redshift and \mathbf{x} corresponds to the coordinates in the lens plane (normalized by the Einstein radius of $\langle M_L \rangle$).




Figure 1. Illustrative sketch of a SLGW influenced by a microlensing stellar field. A GW source is depicted on the far left. The signal propagating towards the lens galaxy (elliptical shape) represents the unlensed waveform. Individual stars within the lens galaxy act as microlenses. The signal emerging after passing through the lens galaxy is the lensed waveform, observed by a GW detector on the far right. This figure is adapted from Figure 2 in Seo et al. (2025).

In Eq. (1), the term $t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ represents the time delay function for the microlensing field embedded in the lens galaxy or galaxy cluster, which can be expressed as (Wambsganss 1990; Schneider et al. 1992; Chen et al. 2021):

$$t(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^i, \mathbf{y} = 0) = \underbrace{\frac{k}{2} \left((1 - \kappa + \gamma)x_1^2 + (1 - \kappa - \gamma)x_2^2 \right)}_{t_{\text{smooth}}(\kappa, \gamma, \mathbf{x})} - \underbrace{\left[\frac{k}{2} \sum_i^{N_*} \frac{M_{L,i}}{\langle M_L \rangle} \ln(\mathbf{x}^i - \mathbf{x})^2 + k\phi_-(\mathbf{x}) \right]}_{t_{\text{micro}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^i)}. \quad (2)$$

In this equation, $k = 4G\langle M_L \rangle(1 + z_L)/c^3$, $M_{L,i}$ and \mathbf{x}^i refer to the mass and position of the i th microlens, respectively, and N_* indicates the number of microlenses. The parameters κ and γ denote the convergence and shear of the macro lens, respectively. Additionally, $t_{\text{smooth}}(\kappa, \gamma, \mathbf{x})$ and $t_{\text{micro}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^i)$ represent the macro and microlensing time delays, respectively. For simplicity, the macro image position is set to the origin ($\mathbf{y} = 0$). A negative mass sheet, represented by $\phi_-(\mathbf{x})$, is included to ensure that the total convergence κ remains unchanged when microlenses are added (Wambsganss 1990; Chen et al. 2021; Zheng et al. 2022).

Figure 1 shows an illustrative sketch of the strong lensing GW influenced by a microlensing stellar field in the lens galaxy. One can see that the strongly-lensed GW waveform is further modulated by the microlensing effect. Note that the number of stars depicted in the lens galaxy in this figure is purely illustrative and not intended to represent realistic values. Typically, the number of stars can range from 10^3 to 10^6 (Katz et al. 1986; Shan et al. 2023b).

In this study, we adopt the same strategy as in Shan et al. (2023a, 2024) to simulate SLGW signals. Specifically, we assume that the merger rate of binary black holes is proportional to the star formation rate (Haris et al. 2018), and determine whether a GW event is a strong lensing event based on the multi-image optical depth of the singular isothermal sphere (SIS) model. We then calculate the microlensing stellar field density at the positions of the strong lensing images, which follow the Sérsic light profile (Vernardos 2018).

The microlensing stellar field consists of two components: stars and remnants. Here, we assume that the stellar mass function follows the Chabrier initial mass function (Chabrier 2003), while the remnant mass function is determined using the initial-final mass relation described in Spera et al. (2015). Finally, we use the TAAH (Trapezoid Approximation-based Adaptive Hierarchical) method proposed by Shan et al. (2025) to evaluate the microlensing wave effects. For further details, please refer to Appendix A.

Based on the previous procedure, we will build two SLGW data sets: one containing events detectable at the O5 noise level (Abbott et al. 2020), and the other containing events with the same GW waveform (the same strong and microlensing effects), but at a lower noise level (with the noise power spectrum reduced by a factor of 4 compared to O5). Each data set contains 125 binary black hole merger signals. The reason why we also choose a lower noise detector is that we want to investigate the influence of noise on the degeneracy and to see whether the precession evidence induced by microlensing could be a useful criterion for SLGWs in the future.

3. RESULT




Figure 2. This figure shows the Bayes factor for microlensing-induced precession under O5 sensitivity. The gray circles within the shaded region represent events where the Bayes factor is less than 1.16, indicating insignificant evidence. Red stars indicate Bayes factors greater than 4.6, representing decisive evidence. Blue squares represent Bayes factors between 2.3 and 4.6, indicating strong evidence, while black triangles represent Bayes factors between 1.16 and 2.3, indicating substantial evidence. Only values with Bayes factors greater than zero are shown.

3.1. Microlensing induced precession evidence

In this section, we characterize the degree of degeneracy between microlensing and precession by quantifying the precession Bayes factor induced by microlensing effects in SLGW signals. Specifically, the SLGW data generated in Section 2 do not include spin precession effects. However, in the parameter estimation procedure, we recover the GW parameters using the Dynesty (Higson et al. 2019) sampler and two different templates: IMRPhenomXP (Pratten et al. 2021) that includes precession effects, and IMRPhenomXAS (Pratten et al. 2020) that assumes parallel spins. We then compute the Bayes factor for the precession effect by comparing the detection evidences of the two templates.

Figure 2 shows the natural logarithm of the Bayes factor, $\ln B$, for 125 simulated SLGW events injected at the O5 noise level, where the x-axis represents the index of the SLGW events. Five events of the catalog, marked with red stars, have $\ln B$ greater than 4.6, indicating decisive evidence for precession (according to Jeffreys’s scale (Jeffreys 1998)). One event, marked with a blue square, has $\ln B$ in the range of 2.3 to 4.6, corresponding to a strong evidence for precession. Additionally, eight events, marked with black triangles, have $\ln B$ in the range of 1.16 to 2.3, representing substantial evidence for precession. The remaining events, marked with grey circles under the shaded region, does not have statistically significant evidence to favour the precessing spin model. In summary, approximately 15%(14/125) of the SLGW events show non-negligible evidence of precession induced by microlensing wave-optical effects.

To further demonstrate that this precession-like effect is indeed caused by microlensing and that the events with $\ln B > 4.6$ reflects a degeneracy between the two factors, we analyze the time-domain waveform of one of the events with decisive evidence for precession, as shown in Figure 3. One can see that the waveform incorporating precession provides a better fit to the data. This result suggests that there is indeed some degeneracy between microlensing and precessional effects, leading to detectable evidence for precession.

Next, we apply the same method to analyze the second simulated data set assuming a more sensitive detector configuration with the same BBH population. In this dataset, the SLGW waveform remains consistent with the previous dataset; however, the noise power spectrum exhibits a four-fold reduction, leading to a two-fold enhancement in the SNR.

The results are shown in Figure 4. One can see that more events show detectable microlensing wave-optical effects mimicking the ‘precession’ effects. There are 17, 9, and 11 events showing decisive, strong, and substantial evidence for precession, respectively. Overall, 30% of the SLGW events demonstrate non-negligible evidence for precession. This result is intuitive, as the waveform modulation caused by microlensing is easier to detect under a lower noise level. It is also easier to distinguish precessional and non-precessional events with better signal SNR. Therefore, false evidence of spin precession is expected to become a more common feature of SLGW detections as detector sensitivities improve.

Although the precessional waveform can mimic a subset of the microlensing features, it can not describe and fully match the waveform. It means that for these high SNR event, if we use precessional waveform to fit the microlensing event, the residual might be exceptionally large given the detector noise level. This may be one way to distinguish precessional systems from microlensed systems: by using a residual test method similar to that proposed in Seo et al. (2025); Chakraborty & Mukherjee (2025a,b), even without having or using a microlensing waveform for parameter estimation.




Figure 3. Comparison between the reconstructed signal (blue curve) and the data (orange curve) for an example with a $\ln B$ greater than 4.6, using different templates. The top panel shows the result obtained using a precession template (IMRPhenomXP), while the bottom panel presents the result obtained without considering precession (IMRPhenomXAS). The numbers indicate the match value between the reconstructed waveform and the injected signal. This comparison demonstrates that the precession template can partially capture the microlensing-induced oscillation effect (around 0 s on the x-axis), leading to detectable evidence for precession.

Based on the above findings, we conclude that the microlensing-induced precession is more pronounced as the detector noise decreases. Therefore, the frequent presence of precession could indicate the presence of SLGW events in future detectors.

3.2. Precession false alarm event

Aside from microlensing-induced precession measurements, one might also wonder whether other effects could influence precession measurements, such as false precession signals induced by noise. For this reason, this section will investigate false alarm precession events arising from noise within the data. To achieve this, we simulate 125 standard GW events (i.e., events that are neither strongly lensed nor exhibit any precession effects) under O5 sensitivity, alongside 125 additional common GWs with their SNR boosted by a factor of two.

Figure 5 illustrates the events that exhibit decisive precession evidence ($\ln B > 4.6$) among these 250 standard GW events and 250 strongly lensed GWs (SLGWs). Notably, some standard events (22 out of 250) exhibit precession




Figure 4. Similar to the results shown in Figure 2, but using a more sensitive detector configuration.

signatures purely due to noise present in the GW data. These events can be categorized as false alarms in the analysis of microlensing-induced precession effects.

However, the false alarm probability should be bounded by Markov's inequality:

$$\text{False alarm probability} \leq \frac{\text{E}[\text{Bayes factor}|H_0]}{\text{Bayes factor threshold}}, \quad (3)$$

where the null hypothesis, H_0 , is a non-precessing signal. The term $\text{E}[\text{Bayes factor}|H_0]$ is the expectation value of the Bayes factor under this null hypothesis, given by:

$$\text{E}[\text{Bayes factor}|H_0] = \int \frac{P_{\text{model}}(D|H_1)}{P_{\text{model}}(D|H_0)} P_{\text{true}}(D|H_0) dD, \quad (4)$$

where D represents the GW data. In the ideal case where the model for the null hypothesis perfectly matches the true data-generating process ($P_{\text{model}}(D|H_0) = P_{\text{true}}(D|H_0)$), this expectation value is exactly 1. The inequality would then imply a theoretical upper bound for the threshold used here:

$$\text{false alarm probability} \leq \frac{1}{e^{4.6}} \approx 1/100 = 1\%. \quad (5)$$

However, our analysis finds an empirical false alarm probability of approximately 10% (22/250), which significantly exceeds this theoretical bound.

This discrepancy arises because the more complex precession model (H_1) has sufficient flexibility to opportunistically fit random fluctuations within the Gaussian noise of our simulations. This means the additional free parameters of the H_1 model can better capture these noise-driven variations compared to the more rigid H_0 model. This phenomenon also implies a slight degeneracy between features of the precession model and random Gaussian like noise, which systematically inflates the expectation value $\text{E}[\text{Bayes factor}|H_0]$ to be greater than 1. However, a detailed investigation of this degeneracy is beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, we use the Bayes factor as a robust ranking statistic rather than a direct measure of probability. A higher Bayes factor is taken to indicate a stronger candidate for precession, guiding the selection of significant events.

Additionally, by comparing the two datasets, we observe that all standard events with decisive precession evidence have a detector-frame chirp mass below 35 solar masses (based on current population model) and exhibit a relatively lower SNR, whereas the strongly lensed events can have a detector-frame chirp mass exceeding 35 solar masses with a higher SNR. This distinction arises because lower detector-frame chirp mass events evolve more slowly, resulting in longer signal durations compared to those with higher detector-frame chirp masses. This relationship can be understood more clearly with the following equation:

$$\dot{f} = \frac{96}{5} \pi^{8/3} \left(\frac{GM_{\ddagger}}{c^3} \right)^{5/3} f^{11/3}, \quad (6)$$

where $\dot{f} = \frac{df}{dt}$ represents the time derivative of the GW frequency, indicating its rate of change over time, and M_{\ddagger} is the detector-frame chirp mass of the binary black hole system.

Long-duration signals with lower SNR are more susceptible to periodic modulation effects from noise at lower frequencies, where the precession effect is easier to detect. This susceptibility explains why false alarm events tend to have lower detector-frame chirp masses and lower SNRs statistically.




Figure 5. Signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) and detector-frame chirp mass for GW events with decisive precession evidence ($\ln B > 4.6$). Blue stars denote common GW events (neither strongly lensed nor exhibiting precession effects in the injected waveforms), while red stars represent SLGW events.

Figure 6 provides an example of an event with decisive precession evidence that is purely induced by noise. One can see that the precession modulation better aligns with a long-period noise fluctuation, especially for parts that are within the black dashed boxes.

Based on these results, we conclude that for a event identified with detectable precession, a higher detector-frame chirp mass and a higher SNR correspond to a lower probability of a false alarm caused by noise.

3.3. Test high magnification events

One proposed explanation for GW events residing in the mass gap, such as GW190425 (Abbott et al. 2020), GW190426_152155 (Abbott et al. 2021a), GW190521 (Abbott et al. 2020), GW230529 (Abac et al. 2024) and recent GW231123 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2025), is that they are highly magnified by the strong lensing galaxy (Broadhurst et al. 2018, 2020; Broadhurst et al. 2020), although direct evidence to support these claims from the actual data is lacking (Hanukuksela et al. 2019; Abbott et al. 2021b, 2024; Janquart et al. 2023b, 2024). To align with stellar evolution theory, such events would require strong lensing magnifications ranging from 10 to even 1000 (Pang et al. 2020; Abbott et al. 2021c), which effectively lowers the observed source mass in the source frame, given by $m_s = m_{\text{obs}}/(1+z)$. However, strong lensing magnification can also enhance the effective microlens mass by a factor of μ , which, in turn, leads to a more significant wave-optical effects Diego et al. (2019). In this section, we simulate a subset (22 events) of highly magnified, strongly lensed events with magnifications around 100 to investigate whether precession measurements could serve as additional evidence for extreme lensing. The BBH source parameters are generated through the same process as described in the previous section, with further details provided in Appendix A. The results are presented in Figure 7.

To mitigate the influence of such noise-induced false alarms, we focus our analysis on the subset of events with detector-frame chirp masses above 35 solar masses, which comprises 11 of the 22 simulated events. We can see that 8/11, i.e., $\sim 72\%$ of these events, show at least strong evidence for precession. Thus, for highly magnified events (with detector-frame chirp mass $> 35 M_\odot$), microlensing-induced precession may serve as a characterization tool to further ascertain whether an event is a highly magnified candidate.

3.4. Correlation between microlensing and precession

The preceding results indicate a degeneracy between microlensing and precession. Testing whether larger values of the precession evidence, $\ln B$, indicate a stronger microlensing signature is crucial. This knowledge would allow us to infer microlensing strength from $\ln B$. To this end, in this section, we investigate the correlation between the




Figure 6. Comparison between the reconstructed signal (blue curve) and data (orange curve) for a common GW event (i.e., an event that is not strongly lensed and has no precession effect in the injected waveform) with $\ln B > 4.6$, using different templates. The top panel shows the result obtained using a precession template (IMRPhenomXP), while the bottom panel presents the result obtained without considering precession (IMRPhenomXAS).

strength of microlensing and the precession evidence $\ln B$. Here, we use the mismatch in the GW waveform induced by microlensing to quantify the microlensing strength. The mismatch is defined as follows:

$$\text{mismatch} = 1 - \max_{\phi_0, t_0} \frac{\langle h_1 | h_2 \rangle}{\sqrt{\langle h_1 | h_1 \rangle \langle h_2 | h_2 \rangle}}, \quad (7)$$

where h_1 and h_2 represent the waveforms of signals 1 and 2, respectively. ϕ_0 and t_0 are the initial phase and start time of signal 1. This equation accounts for the time delays caused by both macrolensing and microlensing. The operator $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ represents the noise-weighted inner product, defined as:

$$\langle h_1 | h_2 \rangle = 4 \text{Re} \int_{f_{\text{low}}}^{f_{\text{high}}} df \frac{h_1^*(f) h_2(f)}{S_n(f)}, \quad (8)$$

where $S_n(f)$ is the single-sided power spectral density of the detector noise, and “*” denotes the complex conjugate. In this analysis, signal 1 represents the unlensed waveform h_U , while signal 2 represents the macro and micro lensed waveform h_L .




Figure 7. Signal to noise ratio (SNR) and detector-frame chirp mass for highly magnified ($\mu \simeq 100$) GW events. The gray circles represent events where the Bayes factor is less than 1.16, indicating evidence barely worth mentioning. Red stars indicate Bayes factors greater than 4.6, representing decisive evidence. Blue squares represent Bayes factors between 2.3 and 4.6, indicating strong evidence.

To quantify the correlation between microlensing and precession, we used Spearman’s correlation coefficient. Specifically, we aim to determine whether stronger microlensing effects generally lead to higher evidence for precession, or conversely, whether higher evidence for precession corresponds to a stronger microlensing effect. Figure 8 shows the $\ln B$ distribution of SLGW events as a function of microlensing mismatch. The left panel shows the events under O5 sensitivity, while the right panel shows the events with SNR boosted by a factor of 2, here referred to as O5 plus. In this analysis, we calculate the correlation between microlensing and precession using two different datasets.

First, we use the complete dataset to determine if stronger microlensing effects generally lead to higher evidence for precession. Second, we use a subset containing only events with a Bayes factor $\ln B > 0$, which indicates positive evidence of precession. This second dataset allows us to investigate the converse question: whether higher evidence for precession corresponds to a stronger microlensing effect. The rationale for using this second, filtered dataset is that evidence for precession is an observable quantity. We want to determine if stronger observational evidence for it implies a more significant microlensing effect. The correlation coefficient r and P value for these two scenarios are shown in the legend, distinguished by the colors grey and blue.

To minimize the influence of false positives from detector noise effects (discussed in Section 3.2), we restrict our analysis to events with a detector-frame chirp mass greater than 35 solar masses.

One can see that for the complete dataset, the correlation between microlensing and precession is weak for both O5 and O5 plus sensitivities. Therefore, regarding the first question—whether a stronger microlensing effect corresponds to higher evidence of precession—the answer is that the correlation is weak. For the O5 plus sensitivity, we can reject the null hypothesis of “no correlation” at a significance level of 2×10^{-2} . However, for the selected dataset, which includes only events with $\ln B > 0$, both the correlation coefficient and the P value are higher compared to the complete dataset. Specifically, for the O5 plus sensitivity, the correlation coefficient increases to 0.43, and the P value decreases to approximately 0.001.

Therefore, at the 0.001 significance level, we can confidently conclude that there is a moderate positive correlation between the precession evidence and the strength of the microlensing effect. This suggests that for events with $\ln B > 0$, stronger evidence of precession may imply a more significant microlensing effect.

Finally, we have investigated the correlation between microlensing strength and precession evidence for two types of SLGW images: Type I, originating from the minimum point of the time delay surface, and Type II, originating from the saddle point of the time delay surface. In this analysis, we only consider events under O5 plus sensitivity (shown in the right panel of Figure 8) and 10 high-magnification events (evenly divided between Type I and Type II images), as described in Section 3.3. The results are shown in Figure 9.




Figure 8. Correlation (Spearman correlation coefficient) between the Bayes factor and microlensing mismatch for events with detector-frame chirp mass greater than 35. The left panel shows the O5 sensitivity, while the right panel shows the O5 plus sensitivity. Red stars indicate a Bayes factor greater than 4.6, blue square markers indicate a Bayes factor between 2.3 and 4.6, and black triangles indicate a Bayes factor between 1.16 and 2.3. In the legend, grey indicates the correlation coefficient (r) and P value for the complete dataset, while blue represents the results for events with a Bayes factor of $\ln B > 0$.

The left panel of the figure corresponds to Type I images, while the right panel shows Type II images. Here, we also restrict our analysis to events with detector-frame chirp masses greater than 35 solar masses to reduce the impact of false positives caused by noise effects.

One can find that the correlation for Type II images appears to be stronger than for Type I images, a trend observed in both the complete dataset (grey in the legend) and the subset of events with $\ln B > 0$ (blue in the legend).

For the complete dataset, the correlation coefficients for Type I and Type II images are 0.34 and 0.55, respectively. Both image types yield P values of approximately 10^{-3} , demonstrating statistical significance at this level. Therefore, we can conclude that for each strong lensing image type, there is a weak to moderate positive correlation between the strength of the microlensing effect and the evidence for precession. Thus, one can expect to observe stronger evidence for precession when the microlensing effect is more significant.

The correlation appears stronger when the data is separated by image type, as presented here, compared to the combined analysis in Figure 8. This is because the strength of the correlation differs between Type I and Type II images.

For the sub-dataset of events with $\ln B > 0$, the correlation is even stronger, with coefficients of 0.56 for Type I and 0.81 for Type II images, respectively. Both results yield P values of approximately 5×10^{-5} , indicating a high degree of statistical significance. Given these strong correlation coefficients and extremely low P values, one can confidently conclude that for events already showing evidence of precession ($\ln B > 0$), stronger evidence for precession corresponds to a more significant microlensing effect.

Finally, it is noteworthy that in both datasets (the complete set and the $\ln B > 0$ subset), the correlation between precession and the microlensing effect is consistently stronger for Type II images than for Type I images.

These results suggest that microlensing effects in Type II images more easily mimic precession effects. For a better understanding, consider the following equation, which describes the Bayes factor in the linear signal approximation:

$$\ln B \approx \frac{1}{2} FF^2 \rho_{\text{mf}}^2 + \text{const} \quad (9)$$

where FF is the fitting factor and ρ_{mf} is the matched-filter SNR. This scaling relationship indicates that, from a statistical perspective, Type II images will exhibit a larger fitting factor than Type I images at a comparable SNR. Consequently, this suggests that orbital precession is more effective at capturing the microlensing-induced fluctuations in Type II events compared to Type I. This is likely because the microlensing effects in these Type II images exert a more pronounced modulation on the phase. The phase modulation between Type I and Type II can be compared in the rightmost panel of Figure 10, as clearly shown there. Therefore, for one SLGW pair, one may expect to observe one event with a precession effect and another without a precession effect. Consequently, in the identification of SLGW using the parameter overlapping method or joint parameter estimation method, we need to carefully treat these precession parameters.

4. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION




Figure 9. Correlation (Spearman correlation coefficient) between Bayes factor and microlensing mismatch for different types of strong lensing images. The left panel shows the Minimum point, while the right panel shows the Saddle point. Red stars indicate a Bayes factor greater than 4.6, blue square markers indicate a Bayes factor between 2.3 and 4.6, and black triangles indicate a Bayes factor between 1.16 and 2.3. In the legend, grey indicates the correlation coefficient (r) and P value for the complete dataset, while blue represents the results for events with a Bayes factor of $\ln B > 0$. It is observed that the correlation between microlensing and Bayes factor is stronger for the Saddle point, suggesting that microlensing at Saddle points is more likely to mimic precession effects.

The wave-optical effect in gravitational lensing can induce frequency-dependent fluctuations in GW waveforms, often referred to as a “beat pattern” (Diego et al. 2019; Hou et al. 2020). In addition to the beat pattern caused by lensing, intrinsic physical characteristics, such as precession effects due to misaligned spins in binary black hole (BBH) sources, can also produce similar beat patterns.

Liu & Kim (2024) demonstrated that these two types of beat patterns can be distinguished using a nested sampling method, which involves creating a template that includes both the lensing effect and spin-induced precession. However, their approach is feasible under specific conditions, such as the millilensing scenario, where only nearby massive objects ($M > 10^2 M_\odot$) need to be considered. In this scenario, the number of such objects is sufficiently small to make template construction manageable.

In contrast, the stellar microlensing field contains many objects, and the number of stars and remnants that need to be accounted for can be as high as 10^6 (Katz et al. 1986). Consequently, building a comprehensive template in this context is challenging. Therefore, distinguishing between microlensing-induced beat patterns and intrinsic precession using a template-based method becomes difficult.

In this work, we have investigated the probability of precession-like features induced by microlensing wave effects caused by a stellar-mass microlensing field embedded within a strongly lensing galaxy, and the correlation between precession evidence and microlensing wave effects. We simulated two SLGW datasets observed by two detector networks (LIGO-Virgo-like) with different noise sensitivity curves. One dataset is generated under O5 noise conditions, while the other assumes a noise power spectrum reduced by a factor of four, which we refer to as O5 plus for simplicity.

Figure 2 shows the precession Bayes factor for SLGWs under O5 sensitivity. One can see that, approximately 15% of the simulated SLGW events exhibits substantial evidence for precession, with about 4% showing decisive evidence (Bayes factor $\ln B > 4.6$) under the Jeffrey’s criterion. This suggests that microlensing wave-optical effects in SLGW can indeed mimic precession phenomena. Here, we emphasize that we do not treat the threshold of $\ln B > 4.6$ as a definitive criterion for confirming an event is caused by microlensing-induced precession. Rather, a higher Bayes factor indicates a greater probability that the event constitutes evidence for such a phenomenon. One can refer section 3.2 for more details.

We further demonstrate that this effect becomes even more pronounced with improved detector sensitivity. Figure 4 shows the results using a more sensitive detector. One can see that the proportion of SLGW events showing at least “substantial” precession evidence increased to 30%. Compared to the O5 sensitivity, this represents an increase by a factor of 2, consistent with the enhancement in the SNR. These findings suggest that as detector sensitivity improves, microlensing-induced precession features become more detectable.

This result suggests that precession signature may serve as distinctive feature of SLGW event, potentially providing supplementary evidence for its identification. This will be particularly valuable for third-generation (3G) detectors (Reitze et al. 2019; Branchesi et al. 2023), where the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) could be enhanced by up to a factor of 10 compared to O5 detectors. Moreover, although the precessional waveform mimics some microlensing features, it fails to fully describe or match the waveform. For high-SNR events, this mismatch means fitting with a precessional

model will likely produce residuals exceeding detector noise expectations. This discrepancy offers a way to distinguish precessional from microlensed systems, even in the absence of a microlensing waveform template for PE.

In this study, we have also explored the occurrence of false-positive precession events due to noise, the results are shown in Figure 5. We find that common GW events (i.e., not strongly lensed and without intrinsic precession signals) with lower detector-frame chirp masses and lower SNR were more susceptible to false positives, due to their longer and weaker waveform, which makes them more easily influenced by long-periodic noise fluctuations. Therefore, for events with higher detector-frame chirp mass and SNR, the detection of significant precession evidence indicates a higher probability of corresponding to a genuine precession-like effect, whether originating from intrinsic precession or as a mimicker of microlensing phenomena.

In addition, we investigated the correlation between the strength of the microlensing effect and the evidence for precession. We analyzed this correlation assuming two different detector noise levels, with the results presented in Figure 8.

We found that the overall correlation between the microlensing effect and precession evidence is weak (as we discussed above, precession cannot fully capture the microlensing-induced mismatch, as shown in Figure 3), though it increases as detector sensitivity improves. However, when considering a subset of events with existing evidence for precession ($\ln B > 0$), the correlation between these two quantities is significantly enhanced, particularly for the O5 plus sensitivity. For this subset, the correlation coefficient is 0.43, and the P value of approximately 0.001 allows us to reject the null hypothesis—that “there is no correlation between precession and microlensing effects”—at the 0.001 significance level. This result implies that stronger evidence for precession may indicate a more significant microlensing effect.

Finally, we have examined the correlation for two different types of SLGW images—those originating from the minimum point of the time delay surface (Type I) and those from the saddle point (Type II). The results indicate that microlensing effects in Type II images are more likely to mimic precession evidence, exhibiting stronger correlation coefficients compared to Type I images. This is likely because microlensing effects exert a more pronounced modulation on the phase of Type II images, making them more susceptible to being misinterpreted as precession.

In conclusion, the findings of this study emphasize the need for caution when interpreting precession evidence in GW detections. Significant evidence for precession may not only indicate genuine precession, suggesting that the binary black hole (BBH) originated from a dynamical channel, but could also be interpreted as an SLGW event influenced by microlensing wave effects. Due to the fact that, among the approximately 200 GW events currently cataloged, only GW200129 (Hannam et al. 2022) and recent GW231123 (The LIGO Scientific Collaboration et al. 2025) exhibits evidence of precession, the observed precession rate in the standard GW dataset is only 1%. Therefore, in certain cases, precession can serve as supplementary evidence for SLGW, particularly in high-magnification events. This also means that those GW events that fall within the mass gap and exhibit significant precession effects are also consistent with the scenario of being high-magnification SLGW events.

1 This work is partly supported by the National Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12133005). X.S. acknowledges
 2 support from Shuimu Tsinghua Scholar Program (No. 2024SM199) and the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation
 3 (Certificate Number: 2025M773189). O.A.H. acknowledges support by grants from the Research Grants Council of
 4 Hong Kong (Project No. CUHK 14304622, 14307923, and 14307724), the start-up grant from the Chinese University
 5 of Hong Kong, and the Direct Grant for Research from the Research Committee of The Chinese University of Hong
 6 Kong. This material is based upon work supported by NSF’s LIGO Laboratory which is a major facility fully funded
 7 by the National Science Foundation.

APPENDIX

A. SIMULATION PROCEDURES

Complementing Section 2, this appendix details the simulation procedures used to generate a mock dataset. Using the Monte Carlo method and following the procedure described in Haris et al. (2018); Xu et al. (2022); Shan et al. (2024), we synthesized a population of GW events. The key simulation steps were:

Source Parameterization: We use the IMRPhenomXAS waveform approximation to generate a population of simulated BBH events with parameters defined as follows:

- The source redshift (z_s) is sampled from a star formation rate (SFR) based merger model with a 50 Myr delay (see Appendix B of Xu et al. (2022)). The component masses (m_1, m_2) are drawn from a power-law plus peak distribution (Abbott et al. 2019).
- The dimensionless spin magnitudes are drawn from $a_1, a_2 \sim U(0, 0.99)$.
- The sky location and orientation angles are sampled from their isotropic distributions:
 - Inclination: $p(\iota) \propto \sin(\iota)$ for $\iota \in [0, \pi]$.
 - Declination: $p(\delta) \propto \cos(\delta)$ for $\delta \in [-\pi/2, \pi/2]$.
 - Right Ascension: $\alpha \sim U(0, 2\pi)$.
 - Polarization: $\psi \sim U(0, \pi)$.
- The merger time (t_c) is drawn uniformly over a 1-year period.

Strong Lensing Selection: The likelihood of an sBBH at redshift z_s undergoing strong lensing (multiple imaging) was evaluated using the SIS optical depth, $\tau(z_s)$ (Haris et al. 2018). A stochastic selection was performed: if $\tau(z_s)$ exceeded a random variate drawn from $U(0, 1)$, the event was flagged as an SLGW; otherwise, it was discarded.

Lens Modeling for SLGWs: Lensing effects for candidates were computed using an SIE model (Kormann et al. 1994), with lens properties (σ_v, q) drawn from SDSS galaxy survey statistics (Choi et al. 2007; Wierda et al. 2021a).

Observational Filtering: Detectability was assessed using a three-detector network (LIGO Livingston/Hanford, Virgo) and an SNR threshold of 12. The simulation proceeded until 125 detectable SLGW events were obtained.

Microlensing Environment Simulation: The final stage involved modeling the microlensing environment pertinent to each detected SLGW. This included defining a stellar mass function based on the Chabrier IMF (Chabrier 2003) for stars in the mass range $[0.1, 1.5]M_\odot$ (Diego et al. 2022), and assuming an elliptical Sérsic profile (Vernardos 2018) for their density. A population of remnant objects was also incorporated, using an initial-final mass relation (Spera et al. 2015) for their masses and assuming their mass density constitutes 10% of the stellar mass density.

Figure 10 presents the microlensing diffraction results for these simulated SLGW events. Different curves represent different events. The first and second rows illustrate results for Type I and Type II SLGWs, respectively. The first column shows the residual time-domain amplification factor ($F(t) - F_{\text{smooth}}(t)$, where $F_{\text{smooth}}(t)$ excludes microlensing effects). The second and third columns display the normalized frequency-domain amplification factor and the complex phase. The gradual convergence of each curve’s tail towards zero in the first column indicates the convergence of the diffraction integral (Shan et al. 2023b).

REFERENCES

- Abac, A. G., Abbott, R., Abouelfettouh, I., et al. 2024, ApJL, 970, L34, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ad5beb](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ad5beb)
- Abbott, B. P., et al. 2016, Phys. Rev. Lett., 116, 061102, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.061102)
- . 2019, Astrophys. J. Lett., 882, L24, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab3800](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab3800)
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2020, Living Reviews in Relativity, 23, 3, doi: [10.1007/s41114-020-00026-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s41114-020-00026-9)
- Abbott, B. P., Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., et al. 2020, The Astrophysical Journal Letters, 892, L3, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ab75f5](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ab75f5)
- Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., Abraham, S., et al. 2020, ApJL, 900, L13, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/aba493](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/aba493)
- Abbott, R., et al. 2021a, Phys. Rev. X, 11, 021053, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevX.11.021053](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.11.021053)
- Abbott, R., Abbott, T. D., Abraham, S., et al. 2021b, The Astrophysical Journal, 923, 14, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/AC23DB](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/AC23DB)
- . 2021c, The Astrophysical Journal, 923, 14, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac23db](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac23db)
- Abbott, R., Abe, H., Acernese, F., et al. 2024, The Astrophysical Journal, 970, 191, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/AD3E83](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/AD3E83)
- Barsode, A., Goyal, S., & Ajith, P. 2024, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2412.01278v1>
- Belczynski, K., Holz, D. E., Bulik, T., & O’Shaughnessy, R. 2016, Nature, 534, 512–515, doi: [10.1038/nature18322](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature18322)




Figure 10. Microlensing diffraction results for 125 SLGW events observed by a LIGO-Virgo detector network. Each curve corresponds to a different event. The first and second rows depict the results for Type I and Type II SLGWs, respectively. The first, second, and third columns display the residual time-domain amplification factor ($F(t) - F_{\text{smooth}}(t)$, where $F_{\text{smooth}}(t)$ excludes microlensing effects), the normalized frequency-domain amplification factor, and the complex phase, respectively.

Branchesi, M., Maggiore, M., Alonso, D., et al. 2023, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2023, 068, doi: [10.1088/1475-7516/2023/07/068](https://doi.org/10.1088/1475-7516/2023/07/068)

Broadhurst, T., Diego, J. M., & Smoot, III, G. 2018, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:1802.05273, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.1802.05273](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1802.05273)

Broadhurst, T., Diego, J. M., & Smoot, G. F. 2020, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2002.08821, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2002.08821](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2002.08821)

Broadhurst, T., Diego, J. M., & Smoot, G. F. 2020, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.13219>

Cao, S., Qi, J., Cao, Z., et al. 2022, *A&A*, 659, L5, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202142694](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202142694)

Çalışkan, M., Anil Kumar, N., Ji, L., et al. 2023, *Phys. Rev. D*, 108, 123543, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.108.123543](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.108.123543)

Chabrier, G. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763, doi: [10.1086/376392](https://doi.org/10.1086/376392)

Chakraborty, A., & Mukherjee, S. 2025a, *The First Model-Independent Chromatic Microlensing Search: No Evidence in the Gravitational Wave Catalog of LIGO-Virgo-KAGRA*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2503.16281>

—. 2025b, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 984, 107, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/adc578](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/adc578)

Chan, J. C. L., Seo, E., Li, A. K. Y., Fong, H., & Ezquiaga, J. M. 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.13058v1>

Chen, X., Shu, Y., Li, G., & Zheng, W. 2021, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 923, 117, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac2c76](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac2c76)

Cheung, M. H., Gais, J., Hannuksela, O. A., & Li, T. G. 2021, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 503, 3326, doi: [10.1093/MNRAS/STAB579](https://doi.org/10.1093/MNRAS/STAB579)

Choi, Y., Park, C., & Vogeley, M. S. 2007, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 658, 884–897, doi: [10.1086/511060](https://doi.org/10.1086/511060)

Diego, J. M., Bernstein, G., Chen, W., et al. 2022, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 662, A34, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/202143009](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/202143009)

Diego, J. M., Hannuksela, O. A., Kelly, P. L., et al. 2019, *Astron. Astrophys.*, 627, A130, doi: [10.1051/0004-6361/201935490](https://doi.org/10.1051/0004-6361/201935490)

Giacobbo, N., & Mapelli, M. 2018, *MNRAS*, 480, 2011, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty1999](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty1999)

Hannam, M., Hoy, C., Thompson, J. E., et al. 2022, *Nature*, 610, 652, doi: [10.1038/s41586-022-05212-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-05212-z)

Hannuksela, O. A., Collett, T. E., Çalışkan, M., & Li, T. G. F. 2020, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 498, 3395, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa2577](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa2577)

- Hannuksela, O. A., Haris, K., Ng, K. K. Y., et al. 2019, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 874, L2, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/AB0C0F](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/AB0C0F)
- Haris, K., Mehta, A. K., Kumar, S., Venumadhav, T., & Ajith, P. 2018. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1807.07062>
- Higson, E., Handley, W., Hobson, M., & Lasenby, A. 2019, *Statistics and Computing*, 29, 891, doi: [10.1007/s11222-018-9844-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11222-018-9844-0)
- Hou, S., Fan, X.-L., Liao, K., & Zhu, Z.-H. 2020, *Phys. Rev. D*, 101, 064011, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.101.064011](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.101.064011)
- Hu, Q. 2025. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2507.05209>
- Jana, S., Kapadia, S. J., Venumadhav, T., & Ajith, P. 2023, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 130, 261401, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.261401](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.130.261401)
- Janquart, J., Haris, K., Hannuksela, O. A., & Van Den Broeck, C. 2023a, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 526, 3088–3098, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad2838](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad2838)
- Janquart, J., Seo, E., Hannuksela, O. A., Li, T. G. F., & Broeck, C. V. D. 2021, *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, 923, L1, doi: [10.3847/2041-8213/ac3bcf](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8213/ac3bcf)
- Janquart, J., Wright, M., Goyal, S., et al. 2023b, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 526, 3832, doi: [10.1093/MNRAS/STAD2909](https://doi.org/10.1093/MNRAS/STAD2909)
- Janquart, J., Keitel, D., Lo, R. K. L., et al. 2024. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.07298v2>
- Jeffreys, H. 1998, *Theory of Probability*, International series of monographs on physics (Clarendon Press). https://books.google.com.tw/books?id=_PuRmAEACAAJ
- Katz, N., Balbus, S., & Paczynski, B. 1986, *ApJ*, 306, 2, doi: [10.1086/164313](https://doi.org/10.1086/164313)
- Kormann, R., Schneider, P., & Bartelmann, M. 1994, *A&A*, 284, 285
- Lai, K.-H., Hannuksela, O. A., Herrera-Martín, A., et al. 2018, *Phys. Rev. D*, 98, 083005, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.98.083005](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.98.083005)
- Li, S.-S., Mao, S., Zhao, Y., & Lu, Y. 2018, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 476, 2220, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty411](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty411)
- Liao, K., Biesiada, M., & Zhu, Z.-H. 2022, *Chin. Phys. Lett.*, 39, 119801, doi: [10.1088/0256-307X/39/11/119801](https://doi.org/10.1088/0256-307X/39/11/119801)
- Liu, A., & Kim, K. 2024, *Phys. Rev. D*, 110, 123008, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevD.110.123008](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.110.123008)
- Liu, A., Wong, I. C. F., Leong, S. H. W., et al. 2023, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 525, 4149, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stad1302](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stad1302)
- Liu, X., Magana Hernandez, I., & Creighton, J. 2021, *Astrophys. J.*, 908, 97, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/abd7eb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/abd7eb)
- Lo, R. K. L., & Magaña Hernandez, I. 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.09339>
- Mapelli, M., Bouffanais, Y., Santoliquido, F., Arca Sedda, M., & Artale, M. C. 2022, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 511, 5797–5816, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac422](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac422)
- Meena, A. K., Mishra, A., More, A., Bose, S., & Bagla, J. S. 2022, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 517, 872, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stac2721](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stac2721)
- Mishra, A., Meena, A. K., More, A., & Bose, S. 2024, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 531, 764, doi: [10.1093/MNRAS/STAE836](https://doi.org/10.1093/MNRAS/STAE836)
- Mishra, A., Meena, A. K., More, A., Bose, S., & Bagla, J. S. 2021, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.*, 508, 4869, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stab2875](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stab2875)
- Nakamura, T. T. 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80, 1138, doi: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.1138](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.80.1138)
- Nakamura, T. T., & Deguchi, S. 1999, *Progress of Theoretical Physics Supplement*, 133, 137, doi: [10.1143/PTPS.133.137](https://doi.org/10.1143/PTPS.133.137)
- Oguri, M. 2019, *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 82, 126901, doi: [10.1088/1361-6633/ab4fc5](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6633/ab4fc5)
- Pang, P. T. H., Hannuksela, O. A., Dietrich, T., Pagano, G., & Harry, I. W. 2020, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 495, 3740–3750, doi: [10.1093/mnras/staa1430](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/staa1430)
- Poon, J. S. C., Rinaldi, S., Janquart, J., Narola, H., & Hannuksela, O. A. 2025, *MNRAS*, 536, 2212, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stae2660](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stae2660)
- Portegies Zwart, S. F., & McMillan, S. L. W. 2000, *ApJL*, 528, L17, doi: [10.1086/312422](https://doi.org/10.1086/312422)
- Pratten, G., Husa, S., García-Quirós, C., et al. 2020, *Physical Review D*, 102, doi: [10.1103/physrevd.102.064001](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.102.064001)
- Pratten, G., García-Quirós, C., Colleoni, M., et al. 2021, *Physical Review D*, 103, doi: [10.1103/physrevd.103.104056](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevd.103.104056)
- Reitze, D., Adhikari, R. X., Ballmer, S., et al. 2019, *Cosmic Explorer: The U.S. Contribution to Gravitational-Wave Astronomy beyond LIGO*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.04833>
- Rodriguez, C. L., Haster, C.-J., Chatterjee, S., Kalogera, V., & Rasio, F. A. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 824, L8, doi: [10.3847/2041-8205/824/1/l8](https://doi.org/10.3847/2041-8205/824/1/l8)
- Schneider, P., Ehlers, J., & Falco, E. E. 1992, in *Gravitational Lenses* (Springer), 467–515
- Schneider, P., Ehlers, J., & Falco, E. E. 1992, *Gravitational Lenses*, doi: [10.1007/978-3-662-03758-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03758-4)
- Seo, E., Li, T. G. F., & Hendry, M. A. 2024, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 966, 107, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ad35bb](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ad35bb)

- Seo, E., Shan, X., Janquart, J., et al. 2025, *Astrophys. J.*, 988, 159, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ade4bf](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ade4bf)
- Shan, X., Chen, X., Hu, B., & Cai, R.-G. 2023a, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.06117>
- Shan, X., Chen, X., Hu, B., & Li, G. 2024, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.*, 67, 269511, doi: [10.1007/s11433-023-2334-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11433-023-2334-9)
- Shan, X., Li, G., Chen, X., et al. 2025, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.*, 68, 219512, doi: [10.1007/s11433-024-2502-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11433-024-2502-1)
- Shan, X., Li, G., Chen, X., Zheng, W., & Zhao, W. 2023b, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.*, 66, 239511, doi: [10.1007/s11433-022-1985-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11433-022-1985-3)
- Sigurdsson, S., & Hernquist, L. 1993, *Nature*, 364, 423, doi: [10.1038/364423a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/364423a0)
- Spera, M., Mapelli, M., & Bressan, A. 2015, *MNRAS*, 451, 4086, doi: [10.1093/mnras/stv1161](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/stv1161)
- Takahashi, R., & Nakamura, T. 2003, *Astrophys. J.*, 595, 1039, doi: [10.1086/377430](https://doi.org/10.1086/377430)
- The LIGO Scientific Collaboration, the Virgo Collaboration, the KAGRA Collaboration, et al. 2025, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2507.08219, doi: [10.48550/arXiv.2507.08219](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2507.08219)
- Vernardos, G. 2018, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 483, 5583, doi: [10.1093/mnras/sty3486](https://doi.org/10.1093/mnras/sty3486)
- Wambsganss, J. 1990, Dissertation for doctoral degree, Munich University
- Wierda, A. R. A. C., Wempe, E., Hannuksela, O. A., Koopmans, L. e. V. E., & Van Den Broeck, C. 2021a, *Astrophys. J.*, 921, 154, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac1bb4](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac1bb4)
- Wierda, A. R. A. C., Wempe, E., Hannuksela, O. A., Koopmans, L. V. E., & Broeck, C. V. D. 2021b, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 921, 154, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/AC1BB4](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/AC1BB4)
- Xu, F., Ezquiaga, J. M., & Holz, D. E. 2022, *Astrophys. J.*, 929, 9, doi: [10.3847/1538-4357/ac58f8](https://doi.org/10.3847/1538-4357/ac58f8)
- Yeung, S. M., Cheung, M. H., Seo, E., et al. 2023, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 526, 2230, doi: [10.1093/MNRAS/STAD2772](https://doi.org/10.1093/MNRAS/STAD2772)
- Zheng, W., Chen, X., Li, G., & Chen, H.-Z. 2022, An Improved GPU-Based Ray-Shooting Code For Gravitational Microlensing, arXiv, doi: [10.48550/ARXIV.2204.10871](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2204.10871)