# Breaking cosmic degeneracies? (with non-standard observables)



Wojciech "Voytek" Hellwing Center for Theoretical Physics in Warsaw Polish Academy of Sciences

Córdoba 9th of April, orbit no. 2019

Collaborators: Boajiu Li (Durham), Maciek Bilicki (Warsaw), Kazuya Koyama (Portsmouth), Ben Bose (Geneva),





## Standard model of cosmology: core assumptions

- Hot relativistic Big Bang
- Gaussian initial conditions (adiabatic, Inflation)





• global homogeneity and isotropy (early Universe ok, late-time under scrutiny)

Dominant Dark Matter (detected in CMB, physical nature unknown)





• GR is theory of gravity on all scales

(tested only on Solar System scales and strong-field regime)



Gravity





# GR - a successful story (of metric)

**General Relativity** is a metric theory. Einstein field equations can be derived by varying the Einstein-Hilbert action integral with respect to metric.







# Paving the road to new paradigm



In 1859 **Urbain Le Verrier** showed that slow precession of Mercury's orbit perihelion could not be explained by Newton's theory of gravity.



A conjecture – hypothetical planet Vulcan as a cause of the anomaly.





Vulcan was never discovered.

Instead the Newtonian theory was improved to GR

![](_page_3_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Picture_10.jpeg)

![](_page_3_Picture_11.jpeg)

## Testing GR/DE – bold task of XXI century extra-galactic astronomy

![](_page_4_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_4_Picture_4.jpeg)

## **Charting MG. From GR to the land of dragons**

#### Diagram of Modified Gravity plethora of treasure trove

![](_page_5_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_5_Picture_5.jpeg)

## MG is even more non-linear then GR

![](_page_6_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_6_Picture_4.jpeg)

## **Beyond GR – looking for cosmological effects**

![](_page_7_Figure_1.jpeg)

 $P(k) = \langle |\delta_{\mathbf{k}}|^2 \rangle$  Power spectrum of density fluctuations

Linear evolution equation for density perturbations.

$$\frac{\partial^2 \delta_k}{\partial t^2} + 2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\frac{\partial \delta_k}{\partial t} + \left(\frac{c_s^2 k^2}{a^2} - 4\pi G\rho_0\right)\delta_k = 0.$$

Linear growth rate: 
$$f$$
  
 $f(z)\sigma_8(z) \propto \frac{dD}{da}a$   
 $f \equiv \frac{d\ln D}{d\ln a}$ 

![](_page_7_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_7_Picture_7.jpeg)

## MG predict ehnaced growth of structures

![](_page_8_Figure_1.jpeg)

FIG. 5. The matter density power spectrum computed at z = 0 for our fiducial GR model (solid line) and two nDGP flavours (dotted and dashed-dotted lines). The shaded region illustrate the cosmic variance error. The bottom panel illustrates the fractional difference of both MG models w.r.t. the GR case.

![](_page_8_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_8_Picture_5.jpeg)

#### Do not trust baryons, they make up everything (more complicated!)

![](_page_9_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_9_Picture_3.jpeg)

# Do not trust baryons, they make up everything (more complicated!)

![](_page_10_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_10_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### **RSD** and the conspiracy of the damping tail

$$P_g^s(k,\mu) = D(k\mu\sigma_v)P_K(k,\mu,b)$$

where

$$D(k\mu\sigma_{\rm v}) = \begin{cases} \exp[-(k\mu\sigma_{\rm v})^2] \\ 1/[1+(k\mu\sigma_{\rm v})^2] \end{cases}$$

and

 $P_K(k,\mu,b) =$ 

$$\begin{cases} b^{2}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + 2\mu^{2}fb(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + \mu^{4}f^{2}P_{\delta\delta}(k) & (\text{mod. A}) \\ b^{2}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + 2\mu^{2}fb(k)P_{\delta\theta}(k) + \mu^{4}f^{2}P_{\theta\theta}(k) & (\text{mod. B}) \\ b^{2}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + 2\mu^{2}fb(k)P_{\delta\theta}(k) + \mu^{4}f^{2}P_{\theta\theta}(k) \\ + C_{A}(k,\mu;f,b) + C_{B}(k,\mu;f,b) & (\text{mod. C}) \end{cases}$$

$$b(k) = \begin{cases} b_{\rm L} \\ b_{\rm L} b_{\rm NL}(k) \end{cases}$$

![](_page_11_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_9.jpeg)

![](_page_11_Picture_10.jpeg)

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 748525.

(24)

#### **RSD** and the conspiracy of the damping tail

![](_page_12_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_12_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Signal modeling is degenerated with assumed gravity!

(24)

$$P_g^s(k,\mu) = D(k\mu\sigma_v)P_K(k,\mu,b),$$

where

$$D(k\mu\sigma_{\rm v}) = \begin{cases} \exp[-(k\mu\sigma_{\rm v})^2] \\ 1/[1+(k\mu\sigma_{\rm v})^2] \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{split} P_{K}(k,\mu,b) &= \\ \begin{cases} \underline{b}^{2}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + 2\mu^{2} \underline{f} \underline{b}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + \mu^{4} \underline{f}^{2} P_{\delta\delta}(k) & (\text{mod. A}) \\ \underline{b}^{2}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + 2\mu^{2} \underline{f} \underline{b}(k)P_{\delta\theta}(k) + \mu^{4} \underline{f}^{2} P_{\theta\theta}(k) & (\text{mod. B}) \\ \underline{b}^{2}(k)P_{\delta\delta}(k) + 2\mu^{2} \underline{f} \underline{b}(k)P_{\delta\theta}(k) + \mu^{4} \underline{f}^{2} P_{\theta\theta}(k) & (\text{mod. C}) \\ + \underline{C}_{A}(k,\mu;f,b) + \underline{C}_{B}(k,\mu;f,b) & (\text{mod. C}) \end{split}$$

$$b(k) = \begin{cases} b_{\rm L} \\ b_{\rm L} b_{\rm NL}(k) \end{cases}$$

![](_page_13_Picture_7.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_8.jpeg)

![](_page_13_Picture_10.jpeg)

#### **RSD** and the conspiracy of the damping tail

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_14_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### **Gravity agnostic modeling leads to theoretical bias** 0.98 MG GR 0.96 Ben Bose 0.94 0.92 0.90 Ben Bose 0.12 0.14 .08 0.10 0.16 0.18 0.20 0.22 $k_{max} \left[ h/Mpc \right]$

\* \* \* \* \* \* \* Bose, Koyama, WAH, Zhao, Winther 2017

MARIE CURIE ACTIONS

#### What about direct velocity data?

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_16_Picture_2.jpeg)

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 748525.

MARIE CURIE ACTIONS

#### What about direct velocities data?

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_17_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### Signal is model independent but there are big systematics

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_18_Picture_4.jpeg)

## **Cosmo gravity probes list of bad deeds**

Theoretical bias prone
Weak lensing statistics
RSD clustering probes
Cluster mass comparison

![](_page_19_Picture_2.jpeg)

Solution? - Look for model independent observable.. or/and - Study galaxy formation in the acies MG regime. - LSS clustering probes

LSS clustering probes
Cluster mass comparison
Galaxy satellite dynamics

![](_page_19_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_7.jpeg)

## **Cosmic density field: A Gaussian random field**

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Picture_4.jpeg)

## Non-standard GR tests: clustering amplitudes

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

Negative kurtosis

Baseline: Kurtosis value of 0

Positive kurtosis

![](_page_21_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Picture_6.jpeg)

## Non-standard GR tests: clustering amplitudes

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

## Non-standard GR tests: clustering amplitudes

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

WAH, Koyama, Bose, Zhao 2017 (arXiv:1703.03395)

![](_page_23_Picture_3.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_5.jpeg)

## **RSD mild for clustering amplitudes!**

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_4.jpeg)

## **Take home messages**

- Crucial to test GR on cosmological and intergalactic distances.
- Clean test (both for GR and MG) are hard to achieve: degeneracies leading to systematics effects.
- Outlook for difficult but cleaner methods (i.e. velocities, hierarchical clustering in RSD)
- Really need MG-hydro galaxy formation run to test most of the methods against baryonic effects (happened for f(R) → see Christian Arnold's work/talk!

![](_page_25_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_6.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Picture_7.jpeg)