Uncertainty in correlation function estimators and BAO detection in current galaxy surveys

Antoine Labatie

PhD Supervisors: Jean-Luc Starck and Marc Lachièze-Rey

Study of the galaxy distribution

- Galaxy surveys become very large
 - Testing cosmological model (Λ CDM)
 - Constraints on cosmic parameters (precision cosmology)



- Method:
 - Comparison with N-body simulations
 - Comparison with theoretical predictions



Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (I)

- 1- single pulse propagation with baryons and photons
- 2- drag of baryons and photons on dark matter
- 3- start of recombination: photons leak away
- 4- end of recombination: photons freely steam away from the 150Mpc over-density
- 5 & 6- dark matter drags baryon to the origin and baryons drag dark matter to the 150Mpc overdensity



Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (II)

- BAOs are a feature imprinted in the galaxy distribution
- They create an excess of clustering at the sound horizon scale r_s
- They provide a statistical standard ruler for studying the geometry of the Universe
- If we can find this scale r_s in a redshif survey, we know the corresponding distance:



I) Uncertainty in the 2-point Correlation function & BAO study

Standard tool for analysis: 2-point correlation function

• Probability to find a galaxy in volume δV :

 $\delta P = \bar{n} \delta V$

• Conditional to the existence of a galaxy, the probability to find another galaxy in volume δV at a distance r:

 $(\delta P)_p(r) = \bar{n}(1+\xi(r))\delta V$

 ξ(r) gives excess of probability to find pairs at distance r compared to a random distribution:



excess of galaxies at distance **r**



Correlation function in Λ CDM model

- Power law behavior at small scale: $\xi(\mathbf{r}) \approx C \mathbf{r}^{-\gamma}$
- Baryon Acoustic Peak at distance $r \approx 105 \ h^{-1} \ \mathrm{Mpc}$
- Correlation function can be computed for given cosmological parameters (assuming mass-luminosity bias)



Estimators of the Correlation function

- Estimated with *uncertainty*:
 - only a finite volume (cosmic variance)
 - only finite number of galaxies (shot noise)
- Use random catalogues to calculate excess of pairs at distance *r*
- Different estimators:
 - Peebles-Hauser (1974)
 - Davis-Peebles (1983)
 - Hamilton (1993)
 - Landy-Szalay (1993)

$$\tilde{\xi}_{PH}(r) = \frac{N_{RR}}{N_{DD}} \frac{DD(r)}{RR(r)} - 1$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{DP}(r) = \frac{N_{DR}}{N_{DD}} \frac{DD(r)}{DR(r)} - 1$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{HAM}(r) = \frac{N_{DR}^2}{N_{DD}N_{RR}} \frac{DD(r)RR(r)}{[DR(r)]^2} - 1$$

$$\tilde{\xi}_{LS}(r) = 1 + \frac{N_{RR}}{N_{DD}} \frac{DD(r)}{RR(r)} - 2\frac{N_{RR}}{N_{DR}} \frac{DR(r)}{RR(r)}$$

The integral constraint (I)

• By construction the estimators verify the integral constraint (because mean density is only estimated using sample)

/ estimated with sample density

$$(\delta P)_p(r) = \bar{n}(1 + \xi(r))\delta V$$
$$\int \hat{\xi}(\mathbf{r}) d^3\mathbf{r} \approx 0$$

- However the real correlation function ξ(r) does *not* necessarily verify it
- Imposes a bias on the estimation

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\int \hat{\xi}(\mathbf{r}) d^3 \mathbf{r}\right] = \int \mathbb{E}[\hat{\xi}(\mathbf{r})] d^3 \mathbf{r} \approx 0$$
$$\int \xi(\mathbf{r}) d^3 \mathbf{r} \neq 0$$

The integral constraint (II)

- The integral constraint has an effect for all survey sizes in a fractal Universe:
 - Idea supported by group of researchers (Labini et al.) claiming integral constraint makes estimation unreliable
- If we assume homogeneity at large scale, the integral constraint has an effect for too small survey sizes

Toy Model: Cox Segments (I)

- Segments of length *l* put randomly in the volume
- Points put randomly on each segment



• Correlation function known analytically and *always* ≥ 0

$$\xi(r) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\pi r^2 L_V} - \frac{1}{2\pi r l L_V} & \text{for} \quad r \le l \\ 0 & \text{for} \quad r \ge l \end{cases}$$



Toy Model: Cox Segments (II)

Presence of a bias for cubic volumes of size a=20 and a=50 with *l*=10



Toy Model: Cox Segments (III)

• Verification of the integral constraint:

$$\int \hat{\xi}(\mathbf{r}) d^3 \mathbf{r} = \sum_i f(r_i) \xi(r_i) \approx 0 \quad ?$$

• The weighted correlation function sums up to 0 (effect is clear for a=20 but not for a=50)



• Estimation is affected by integral constraint until volume gets large enough

Goals of our study

- We assume a Λ CDM model and generate lognormal realizations of galaxy surveys:
 - Compare the different estimators at large-scale for BAO study (bias and variance)
 - Evaluate the effect of the integral constraint: Is it causing a bias in the estimation for current galaxy surveys?
 - Is BAO detection reliable using correlation function ?

SDSS galaxy survey DR7

- 8 year program with 2.5m telescope at Apache Point (New Mexico)
 - Mapped 7500 square degree of the sky
 - Spectrum for 930 000 galaxies (largest galaxy survey up to date)
 - 1 magnitude-limited samples of galaxies (main) up to $D \approx 600 \text{ h}^{-1}\text{Mpc}$
 - 1 approximately volume-limited of luminous red galaxies (LRG) up to D \approx 1150 h⁻¹Mpc







Integral Constraint in SDSS (I)

- 200 lognormal simulations of SDSS main sample:
 - Superiority of Landy-Szalay and Hamilton estimators
 - Bias for all estimators \approx half of the variance
 - Bias must be taken into account in *uncertainty*



Integral Constraint in SDSS (II)

- 2000 lognormal simulations of SDSS LRG sample:
 - Superiority of Landy-Szalay and Hamilton estimators
 - Estimators are *unbiased*



BAO detection in SDSS DR7 (I)

• Signal is too low in main Sample for BAO study



BAO detection in SDSS DR7 (II)

- Reliable detection of the BAO in LRG sample (*without any bias in the estimation*)
- Problem: peak wider than expected (χ^2 test: *p*-value ≈ 0.01)



Conclusion

- We find agreement with previous studies: superiority of Landy-Szalay and Hamilton estimators
- We find that SDSS LRG sample used for BAO is not affected by the integral constraint (unbiased estimation)
- We find BAO detection is not possible in Main sample but is possible in LRG sample
- This agrees with BAO peak in SDSS LRG correlation but:
 unexplained excess of clustering (peak wider than expected)