

A test of the standard cosmological model with geometry and growth

Rodrigo von Marttens

VI Escola José Plínio Baptista de Cosmologia
September 20, 2022



A test of the standard cosmological model with geometry and growth

Uendert Andrade^{*a,b*}, Dhayaa Anbajagane^{*b,c,d*},
Rodrigo von Marttens,^{*a*} Dragan Huterer^{*b,c,e*} and Jailson Alcaniz^{*a*}




TO DO LIST

1. Introduction
2. The splitting technique
3. Cosmological probes
4. Results
5. Conclusions and perspectives...

Introduction


(Late-time) Standard Cosmological Model:

GR and FLRW metric



+

CDM



+


Cosmological
Constant

Λ

Λ CDM model

Introduction

(Late-time) Standard Cosmological Model:




Introduction

Current status of the Λ CDM model:

Observational challenges:

I. H_0 tension;

Recent Published H_0 Values



Wendy L. Freedman ApJ 919 16 (2021).


Introduction

Current status of the Λ CDM model:


Observational challenges:

I. H_0 tension;

Recent Published H_0 Values



Wendy L. Freedman ApJ 919 16 (2021).



Early x Late?

The tension is emphatically not “early vs late” cosmology since baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) distances (together with primordial element abundances [19–21] or marginalizing over or sidestepping the sound horizon at the baryon drag epoch [22, 23]), i.e. without use of the primordial CMB, gives the same answer as from the CMB.


Eric V. Linder, arXiv: 2105.02903

Introduction

Current status of the Λ CDM model:

Observational challenges:

2. S_8 tension;





Introduction

Current status of the Λ CDM model:

Observational challenges:

2. S_8 tension;



Testing the limits of the standard cosmological model is a crucial task to understand whether the Λ CDM still holds the status of a concordance model...

In particular, comparing measurements with **geometric** nature with those describing **growth** of structure is particularly interesting because a key signature of many modified gravity theories is a mismatch between **geometry** and **growth**.

The splitting technique

The split technique:

The splitting technique consists in turn a conventional cosmological parameter into new two meta-parameters: $X \longrightarrow \{X^{\text{geom}}, X^{\text{grow}}\}$

The splitting technique

The split technique:

The splitting technique consists in turn a conventional cosmological parameter into new two meta-parameters: $X \longrightarrow \{X^{\text{geom}}, X^{\text{grow}}\}$

$$\Lambda\text{CDM split} : \Omega_M \longrightarrow \{\Omega_M^{\text{geom}}, \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}\}$$

$$w\text{CDM split} : \Omega_M, w \longrightarrow \{\Omega_M^{\text{geom}}, \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}, w^{\text{geom}}, w^{\text{grow}}\}$$

The splitting technique

The split technique:

The splitting technique consists in turn a conventional cosmological parameter into new two meta-parameters: $X \longrightarrow \{X^{\text{geom}}, X^{\text{grow}}\}$

$$\Lambda\text{CDM split} : \Omega_M \longrightarrow \{\Omega_M^{\text{geom}}, \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}\}$$

$$w\text{CDM split} : \Omega_M, w \longrightarrow \{\Omega_M^{\text{geom}}, \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}, w^{\text{geom}}, w^{\text{grow}}\}$$

Ex 1: Luminosity distance

$$H(\tilde{z}) = H_0 \sqrt{(1 - \Omega_M^{\text{geom}})(1 + z)^{3(1+w^{\text{geom}})} + \Omega_M^{\text{geom}}(1 + z)^3}$$

$$d_L = c(1 + z) \int_0^z \frac{d\tilde{z}}{H(\tilde{z})}$$

The splitting technique

The split technique:

The splitting technique consists in turn a conventional cosmological parameter into new two meta-parameters: $X \longrightarrow \{X^{\text{geom}}, X^{\text{grow}}\}$

$$\Lambda\text{CDM split} : \Omega_M \longrightarrow \{\Omega_M^{\text{geom}}, \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}\}$$

$$w\text{CDM split} : \Omega_M, w \longrightarrow \{\Omega_M^{\text{geom}}, \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}, w^{\text{geom}}, w^{\text{grow}}\}$$

Ex 1: Luminosity distance

$$H(\tilde{z}) = H_0 \sqrt{(1 - \Omega_M^{\text{geom}})(1 + z)^{3(1+w^{\text{geom}})} + \Omega_M^{\text{geom}}(1 + z)^3}$$

$$d_L = c(1 + z) \int_0^z \frac{d\tilde{z}}{H(\tilde{z})}$$

Ex 2: Sub-horizon matter fluctuations

$$\ddot{\delta}_m + 2H\dot{\delta}_m = 4\pi G \rho_m \delta_m$$
$$\rho_m = \frac{8\pi G}{3H_0^2} \Omega_M^{\text{grow}} (1 + z)^3$$

$$H = H_0 \sqrt{(1 - \Omega_M^{\text{grow}})(1 + z)^{3(1+w^{\text{grow}})} + \Omega_M^{\text{grow}}(1 + z)^3}$$

The splitting technique

What can we learn from this test?

Let us define:

$$\Delta\Omega_M = \Omega_M^{\text{grow}} - \Omega_M^{\text{geom}} \qquad \Delta w = w^{\text{grow}} - w^{\text{geom}}$$

Using the splitting approach to perform a parameter selection, the following conclusions are possible:

- $\Delta\Omega_M = 0$ (and $\Delta w = 0$) :
 Λ CDM (or w CDM) is consistent with the data;
- $\Delta\Omega_M \neq 0$ (and $\Delta w \neq 0$) :
 Λ CDM (or w CDM) is not consistent with the data;
- $\Delta\Omega_M = 0$ (and $\Delta w \neq 0$) :
Clustering of the DE component (possibly scale dependent!);
Modified gravity;

Cosmological probes

We can characterize the cosmological observables as:

- **Geometric observable**: depends only on geometric quantities;
- **Growth observables**: depends only on growth quantities;
- **Hybrid observables**: depends on both, geometrical and growth quantities;

Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity

Grow quantity

Geom quantity

Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB):

Angular Power Spectrum of the CMB Temperature Anisotropy:

$$C_{\ell}^{TT} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int \frac{dk}{k} \Theta(k, z=0) \mathcal{P}_R(k)$$

Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity

Grow quantity

Geom quantity

Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB):

Angular Power Spectrum of the CMB Temperature Anisotropy:

$$C_{\ell}^{TT} = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int \frac{dk}{k} \Theta(k, z=0) \mathcal{P}_R(k)$$

Temperature fluctuations:

$$\Theta(k, z=0) = \int dz' S_T(k, z') j_{\ell}[k\chi(z')]$$

$S_T(k, z')$: Source function (obtained via Einstein – Boltzmann equations)

$\chi(z')$: Comoving distance

**Similar for the TE, EE
and lensing spectra!**

Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity

Grow quantity

Geom quantity

Weak Lensing (WL):

Two-point correlation function:

$$\xi_{\pm}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\ell \, \ell P_{\kappa}^{ij}(\ell) J_{0,4}(\ell\theta)$$

Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity
Grow quantity
Geom quantity

Weak Lensing (WL):

Two-point correlation function:

$$\xi_{\pm}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\ell \, \ell P_{\kappa}^{ij}(\ell) J_{0,4}(\ell\theta)$$

Convergence power spectrum (Limber approximation):

$$P_{\kappa}^{ij}(\ell) = \int_0^{\chi_H} d\chi \frac{q_i(\chi) q_j(\chi)}{\chi^2} P_{\delta} \left(\frac{\ell + 1/2}{\chi}, \chi \right)$$

Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity
Grow quantity
Geom quantity

Weak Lensing (WL):

Two-point correlation function:

$$\xi_{\pm}^{ij} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int d\ell \ell P_{\kappa}^{ij}(\ell) J_{0,4}(\ell\theta)$$

Convergence power spectrum (Limber approximation):

$$P_{\kappa}^{ij}(\ell) = \int_0^{\chi_H} d\chi \frac{q_i(\chi) q_j(\chi)}{\chi^2} P_{\delta} \left(\frac{\ell + 1/2}{\chi}, \chi \right)$$

Lensing efficiency function:

$$q_i(\chi) = \frac{3H_0 \Omega_M}{2c^2} \frac{\chi}{a(\chi)} \int_{\chi}^{\chi_H} d\chi' n_i(\chi') \frac{\chi' - \chi}{\chi}$$

Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity

Grow quantity

Geom quantity


Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Redshift Space Distortion:

- Transverse BAO:

$$\text{Observable} = \frac{(1+z) D_A}{r_d}$$

- Radial BAO:

$$\text{Observable} = \frac{D_H}{r_d}$$



Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity

Grow quantity

Geom quantity

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Redshift Space Distortion:

- Transverse BAO:


$$\text{Observable} = \frac{(1+z) D_A}{r_d}$$

- Radial BAO:

$$\text{Observable} = \frac{D_H}{r_d}$$

- RSD:

$$\text{Observable} = f\sigma_8$$



Cosmological probes

Hybrid quantity
Grow quantity
Geom quantity

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and Redshift Space Distortion:

- Transverse BAO:


$$\text{Observable} = \frac{(1+z) D_A}{r_d}$$

- Radial BAO:

$$\text{Observable} = \frac{D_H}{r_d}$$

- RSD:

$$\text{Observable} = f\sigma_8$$



Type Ia Supernovae (SN Ia):

Apparent magnitude:

$$m(z) = 5 \log_{10} (H_0 D_L) + \mathcal{M}$$

Cosmological probes

Summary:

Cosmological Probe	Geometry	Growth
SN Ia	$H_0 D_L(z)$	—
BAO	$\{D_M(z); D_H(z)\}$	$r_d(z_d)$
CMB	$j_\ell[k\chi(z)]$	$S_T(k, z)$
Weak lensing	$\frac{d\chi(z)}{d(z)} g_i(z) g_j(z)$	$\Omega_m^2 P_\delta \left(\frac{\ell}{\chi}, z \right)$
RSD	—	$f(z) \sigma_8(z)$

Results

The analysis:

Our analysis consists in constraining the geometry and growth parameters in the (extended) Λ CDM model, and in the (extended) wCDM model


Cosmological data:

Paper	Data				
	CMB	Weak lensing	BAO/RSD	SN Ia	Galaxy clusters
This work	Planck 2018 (TTTEEE+lensing)	KiDS-1000 (COSEBIs)	eBOSS DR16	Pantheon	—
Wang et. al [20]	WMAP3, ACBAR, BOOMERanG and CBI (TTTEEE)	CTIO (Aperture mass statistic)	2dFGRS and SDSS LRG	SNLS	—
Ruiz & Huterer [21]	Planck 2013 (Shift parameter and early universe priors)	CFHTLenS (Shear 2PCF $\xi_{\pm}^{ij}$)	6dFGS, SDSS LRG and BOSS CMASS	SNLS	MaxBCG (Cluster counts)
Bernal et. al [22]	Planck 2015 (TTTEEE+lensing)	—	6dFGS, SDSS-MGS, BOSS-LOWZ, BOSS-CMASS and BOSS-Ly α	JLA	Chandra X-ray and Planck tSZ $\left(\sigma_8 \left(\frac{\Omega_M}{\alpha}\right)^\beta\right)$
Muir et. al [23]	Planck 2018 (Shift parameter)	DES Y1 (Shear 2PCF $\xi_{\pm}^{ij}$)	DES Y1 and BOSS DR12	DES Y1	—
Ruiz-Zapatero et. al [24]	Planck 2018 (Shift parameter and primordial power spectrum)	KiDS-1000 (Band powers spectrum)	6dFGS, BOSS DR12 and BOSS DR14	—	—

Results

(Extended) Λ CDM model:

Parameter selection




- WL doesn't have enough power to provide significant constraints;
- SN Ia only constraints geometry contribution;
- BAO/RSD provides significant constraints in both, geometrical and growth parameters;
- CMB provides strong constraints, however, we can see a degeneracy between geometrical and growth parameters;

Results

(Extended) Λ CDM model:

How important is each of the data sets?





- Removing WL data doesn't affect the final result;
- Removing SN Ia also doesn't affect considerably the final result;
- Removing BAO/RSD indicates a deviation in the growth direction, however, compatible in 1σ with the null-hypothesis;
- Removing CMB results in a deviation in the geometry direction, however, also compatible in 1σ with Λ CDM;

Results

(Extended) wCDM model:

Parameter selection




Similarly to the (extended) Λ CDM case, **WL** and **SN Ia** provide the weakest constraints, and **BAO** and **CMB** are the most relevant data sets. The **Joint analysis** satisfy the null-hypothesis as well.

Results

(Extended) wCDM model:

Importance of the data sets

- Removing WL data doesn't affect the final result;
- Removing SN Ia also doesn't affect considerably the final result;
- Removing CMB indicates a deviation in the geometry direction for both parameters and increase the error bars, however, compatible in 1σ with wCDM;
- Removing BAO/RSD results in a 4.2σ discrepancy with the null-hypothesis;



Conclusions and perspectives

1. (Extended) Λ CDM analysis: all data sets are individually compatible, and the posteriors for the joint analysis are consistent with the null-hypothesis, showing no preference for departures from GR;
2. (Extended) w CDM analysis: the joint-probe posteriors are entirely consistent with the null. Interestingly, the individual constraints from BAO/RSD prefer a deviation for w in the growth direction. Removing BAO/RSD from the joint analysis results in an anomalous deviation in the geometry direction.
3. The result from (Extended) w CDM can be interpreted as a consequence of the well-known preference of the CMB data for phantom DE models. However, it might also indicate a possible signal for new physics.
4. Next steps - add different observables (e.g., clusters) and consider different cosmological scenarios;

תודה
감사 感謝 धन्यवाद təʒəkˈkʊr danksy
shukrani vd'aka
diolch 多謝 grazie дякуй multumiri dzięki takk
спасибі благодарам grazzi شكري faleminderit спасибо tak
gratias salamat நன்றி hvala díky
raibh maith agat
tānan شكرا mēsi kiitos gràcies grazas
hvala paldies ありがとうございます ଆભାରଦશରୁକ୍ତ શબ્દો
bedankt gracias Dank ačiū
ευχαριστίες با تشکر благодаря хвала
nhò tack merci
teşekkürler köszönöm obrigado