Observational cosmology with X-ray luminous galaxy clusters

Second Lecture: Cosmological Models and Cluster Abundance

David Rapetti DARK Fellow

Dark Cosmology Centre, Niels Bohr Institute

Dark Cosmology Centre University of Copenhagen



January 6, 2013

Cluster abundance and scaling relations

e.g. Mantz et al 08, 10a, 10b; Vikhlinin et al 09; Rapetti et al. 09, 10; Schmidt et al 09

January 6, 2013



Theory: Growth of structure



- Simulated cosmologies to model the non-linear growth of structure.
- Even looking so apparently different can be conveniently related with the linear growth calculations through a fitting formula. (See e.g. Jenkins et al 2001, Tinker et al 2008, etc.)

Cole et al 2005

January 6, 2013

Cluster abundance as a function of mass and redshift



N-body simulations

Non-linear structure formation

Big clusters steep mass function; sensitive to the cosmological model; quintessence, selfinteracting, early, clustering dark energy as well as modified gravity

January 6, 2013

Cluster abundance as a function of mass and redshift

Nordic Winter School, Gausdal



January 6, 2013

Linear theory

Sensitive to the cosmological model: quintessence, selfinteracting, early, clustering dark energy as well as modified gravity



January 6, 2013

Nordic Winter School, Gausdal

Cluster survey data



Low redshift (z<0.3)

- ➢ BCS (Ebeling et al 98, 00))
 - $F > 4.4 \times 10^{-12} \text{ erg s}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$

~33% sky coverage

REFLEX (Böhringer et al 04)
 F > 3.0 x 10⁻¹² erg s⁻¹ cm⁻²
 ~33% sky coverage

Intermediate redshifts (0.3<z<0.5)
 ➢ Bright MACS (Ebeling et al 01, 10)
 F > 2.0 x 10⁻¹² erg s⁻¹ cm⁻²
 ~55% sky coverage

L > $2.55 \times 10^{44} h_{70}^{-2} \text{ erg s}^{-1}$ (dashed line). Cuts leave 78+126+34=238 massive clusters

All based on RASS detections. Continuous and all 100% redshift complete.

January 6, 2013

Scaling relations data: X-ray follow-up for 94 clusters



Best fit for all the data (survey+follow-up+other data).



Both, power law, self-similar, constant log-normal scatter.

* Crucial: self-consistent and simultaneous analysis of survey+follow-up data, accounting for selection biases, degeneracies, covariances, and systematic uncertainties.

* Data does not require additional evolution beyond self-similar (see tests in Mantz et al 10b).

* Important cluster astrophysics conclusions (see Mantz et al 10b).

January 6, 2013

Gas mass fraction: calibration data Total mass proxy



 $\Lambda \text{CDM} (\Omega_{\text{m}}=0.3, \Omega_{\Lambda}=0.7)$

Only the 6 lowest-z clusters

Hot kT>5keV

z<0.15

Scatter <~10% in f_{gas}

- To properly account for selection biases [in a previous analysis of the mass function, Mantz et al 08 (M08), using an external data set to constrain the luminosity-mass relation, we restrict the data set of Reiprich & Bohringer 02 to low redshift and high fluxes to minimize the effects of selection bias].
- M08, Vikhlinin et al 09a,b binned their detected clusters in redshift and mass with infinitesimally small bins taking the previous approach to its logical limit, but there was still no self-consistent fit for both scaling relations and cosmology.
- Generalization of M08 to allow a simultaneous and self-consistent fit using follow-up observations of flux-selected clusters over the whole redshift range of the data accounting for both Malmquist and Eddington biases.
- Likelihood can be derived from first principles beginning from a Bayesian regression model.
- General problem: counting sources as a function of their properties

- A population function: <dN/dx> theoretical prediction of the distribution (i.e. number) of sources as a function of their properties.
- Population variables x (properties).
- Response variables y obeying a stochastic scaling relation as a function of x.
- Stochastic scaling relation P(y|x): probability distribution of y given x.
- Observed values \hat{x} and \hat{y} (note that not all x and y need to be measured, except for those determining if a source belongs to the sample, i.e. if it is detected).
- Sampling distributions for the observations as a function of the population and response variables $P(\hat{x}, \hat{y} | x, y)$.
- A selection function $P(I | x, y, \hat{x}, \hat{y})$, where *I* represents the inclusion in the sample, i.e. detection.

- For our large sky coverage surveys of massive clusters we assume that the clustering of the sources is not important compared with the purely Poisson probability distribution of their occurrence (Hu & Kravtsov 03; Holder 06).
- Binning derivation: We divide the observed space (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) into infinitesimal bins which contain at a maximum one detected source and the population function and scaling relations are assumed to be constant in each bin.

Expected number of detected sources

$$\langle N_{\det,j} \rangle = (\Delta \hat{x}_j \Delta \hat{y}_j) \int dx \int dy \left\langle \frac{dN}{dx} \right\rangle P(y|x) P(\hat{x}_j, \hat{y}_j|x, y) P(I|x, y, \hat{x}_j, \hat{y}_j)$$

Likelihood (product of Poisson likelihoods)

$$\mathcal{L}(\{N_j\}) = \prod_j \frac{\langle N_{\det,j} \rangle^{N_j} e^{-\langle N_{\det,j} \rangle}}{N_j!} = e^{-\langle N_{\det} \rangle} \prod_{j:N_j=1} \langle N_{\det,j} \rangle$$
$$N_j \in \{0, 1\}$$

January 6, 2013

 Regression derivation: for truncated data (with undetected sources) the total number of sources is the addition of detected plus undetected (missed) sources and is part of the model and must be marginalized over (Gelman et al 04; Kelly 07).

$$\langle N \rangle = \int dx \left\langle \frac{dN}{dx} \right\rangle$$

$$\langle N_{det} \rangle = \int dx \left\langle \frac{dN}{dx} \right\rangle \int dy \ P(y|x) \int d\hat{x} \int d\hat{y} \ P(\hat{x}, \hat{y}|x, y) P(I|x, y, \hat{x}, \hat{y})$$

$$\langle N_{mis} \rangle = \langle N \rangle - \langle N_{det} \rangle$$

- Joint likelihood of the observations (\hat{x}, \hat{y}) and the total number of sources N is



- Using the previous expressions we can calculate the probabilities of detecting a source with given properties and of missing a source

$$P_{\text{det}}(\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, I) = \int dx \int dy \frac{\langle dN/dx \rangle}{\langle N \rangle} P(y|x) P(\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i|x, y) P(I|x, y, \hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i) = \frac{\langle \tilde{n}_{\text{det},i} \rangle}{\langle N \rangle}$$

P(x) Probability for a source to have properties x

$$P_{\rm mis}(\bar{I}) = \int dx \int dy \frac{\langle dN/dx \rangle}{\langle N \rangle} P(y|x) \int d\hat{x} \int d\hat{y} \ P(\hat{x}, \, \hat{y}|x, \, y) P(\bar{I}|x, \, y, \, \hat{x}, \, \hat{y}) = \frac{\langle N_{\rm mis} \rangle}{\langle N \rangle}$$

Substituting these expressions we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, N) = \left[\frac{\langle N \rangle^{N}}{\langle N \rangle^{N_{\text{det}}} \langle N \rangle^{N_{\text{mis}}}}\right] \left[\frac{1}{N_{\text{det}}!}\right] \left[\frac{\langle N_{\text{mis}} \rangle^{N_{\text{mis}}} e^{-\langle N_{\text{mis}} \rangle}}{N_{\text{mis}}!}\right] e^{-\langle N_{\text{det}} \rangle} \prod_{i=1}^{N_{\text{det}}} \langle \tilde{n}_{\text{det},i} \rangle$$
$$\langle \tilde{n}_{\text{det},j} \rangle = \langle N_{\text{det},j} \rangle / (\Delta \hat{x}_{j} \Delta \hat{y}_{j})$$

January 6, 2013

Mantz et al 10b

January 6, 2013



For illustration purposes: Uniform distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

Mantz et al 10b



For illustration purposes: Uniform distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

* The luminosity-mass relation has intrinsic scatter (~40%), which leads to Malmquist bias: brighter cluster are easier to find.



For illustration purposes: Uniform distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

* The luminosity-mass relation has intrinsic scatter (~40%), which leads to Malmquist bias: brighter cluster are easier to find.

* For illustration purposes: fitting by eye (green line) only these data is wrong.

Mantz et al 10b



For illustration purposes: Exponential distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

* The luminosity-mass relation has intrinsic scatter (~40%), which leads to Malmquist bias: brighter cluster are easier to find.

* The shape of the mass function leads to Eddington bias: much more low-mass clusters



Mantz et al 10b



For illustration purposes: Exponential distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

* The luminosity-mass relation has intrinsic scatter (~40%), which leads to Malmquist bias: brighter cluster are easier to find.

* The shape of the mass function leads to Eddington bias: much more low-mass clusters





For illustration purposes: Exponential distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

* The luminosity-mass relation has intrinsic scatter (~40%), which leads to Malmquist bias: brighter cluster are easier to find.

* The shape of the mass function leads to Eddington bias: much more low-mass clusters.

* For illustration purposes: fitting by eye (green line) only these data is wrong.

Allen, Evrard, Mantz 11



For illustration purposes: Exponential distribution of simulated data and fictitious luminosity-mass relation (red line).

* The luminosity-mass relation has intrinsic scatter (~40%), which leads to Malmquist bias: brighter cluster are easier to find.

* The shape of the mass function leads to Eddington bias: much more low-mass clusters

X-ray luminosity-mass relation



Fitted with simple power law model, selfsimilar evolution and constant log-normal scatter σ_{lm}

$$\langle l(m) \rangle = \beta_0^{lm} + \beta_1^{lm} m$$

Using the definitions

$$l = \log_{10} \left(\frac{L_{500}}{E(z) 10^{44} \, erg \, s^{-1}} \right)$$
$$m = \log_{10} \left(\frac{M_{500} E(z)}{10^{15} \, M_{solar}} \right)$$

Current data do not require (i.e. acceptable fit) neither additional evolution beyond selfsimilar and constant scatter or asymmetric scatter (see details in Mantz et al 10b).

January 6, 2013

X-ray luminosity-mass relation



For bolometric luminosities, the best fit using all the data (survey+follow-up+other cosmological data sets):

norm. $\beta_0^{lm} = 1.23 \pm 0.12$ slope $\beta_1^{lm} = 1.63 \pm 0.06$ scatter $\sigma_{lm} = 0.185 \pm 0.019$ (~ 40%)

Slope steeper than the simple virial prediction: $\beta_1^{lm} = 1.33$

Consistent with excess heating

Energy injection heats (e.g. AGN) the gas raising the temperature, decreasing the density and therefore the luminosity, being more important for less massive systems.

January 6, 2013

Temperature-mass relation



Again, simple power law, self-similar, constant log-normal scatter. Best fit for all the data:

norm. $\beta_0^{tm} = 0.89 \pm 0.03$ slope $\beta_1^{tm} = 0.49 \pm 0.04$ scatter $\sigma_{tm} = 0.055 \pm 0.008 \ (\sim 15\%)$

Slope shallower than the simple virial prediction: $\beta_1^{tm} = 0.67$

Consistent with excess heating

Energy injection heats (e.g. AGN) the gas raising the temperature, decreasing the density and therefore the luminosity, being more important for less massive systems.

January 6, 2013



Core-included: scatter ~40%

Data consistent with self-similar evolution suggesting that excess heating occurred at z>0.5

Core-excised r<0.15r₅₀₀. Scatter undetected <5%.

 $\beta_1^{lm} = 1.30 \pm 0.05$ Consistent with the virial th.

Excess heating limited to the centers / effective mass-limited cluster sample could be possible

January 6, 2013

Sampling model: follow-up observations

$$M(r_{500}) = \frac{M_{\text{gas}}(r_{500})}{f_{\text{gas}}(r_{500})} = \frac{4\pi}{3}(500)\rho_{\text{cr}}(z)r_{500}^3$$

Masses, luminosities and temperatures measured at r₅₀₀

$$M_{\rm gas}(r) \propto \rho_{\rm cr}(z) r^3 f_{\rm gas}(r) \propto r^{\eta_g}$$

 $\eta_{g} = 1.092 \pm 0.006$ $r_{500} \propto \left[f_{gas}(r_{500}) H^{2}(z) \right]^{1/(\eta_{g}-3)}$ $n_{g} \text{ logarithmic slope of the gas mass profiles at large radius; fit to the entire sample from 0.7-1.3r_{500}$ $\frac{M^{\text{ref}}(r)}{M(r)} = \frac{M_{\text{gas}}^{\text{ref}}(r)/f_{\text{gas}}(r)}{M_{\text{gas}}(r)/f_{\text{gas}}(r)} R_{\text{NFW}} = \frac{d_{A}^{\text{ref}}(z)^{2.5} f_{\text{gas}}}{d_{A}(z)^{2.5} f_{\text{gas}}} R_{\text{NFW}}$ We assume that the NFW profile is a good approximation here $L_{500}(r) \propto d_{\text{L}}^{2}(z) \left(\frac{r_{500}}{d_{A}(z)}\right)^{\eta_{\text{L}}}$ $n_{\text{L}}=0.1135+-0.0005$

January 6, 2013

Theory: linear and non-linear

$$n(M, z) = \int_0^M f(\sigma) \frac{\bar{\rho}_{\rm m}}{M'} \frac{\mathrm{d} \ln \sigma^{-1}}{\mathrm{d} M'} \,\mathrm{d} M'$$

Number density of galaxy clusters

$$\sigma^{2}(M, z) = \frac{1}{2\pi^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} k^{2} P(k, z) |W_{\rm M}(k)|^{2} dk$$

Variance of the density fluctuations

 $P(k, z) \propto k^{n_{\rm s}} T^2(k, z_{\rm t}) D(z)^2$

Linear power spectrum

$$f(\sigma, z) = A\left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{b}\right)^{-a} + 1\right] e^{-c/\sigma^2}$$

Fitting formula from N-body simulations (Tinker et al 08)

$$x(z) = x_0(1+z)^{\varepsilon \alpha_x} \ x \in \{A, a, b, c\}$$

January 6, 2013



Agreement between cluster experiments

From Weinberg et al 12





Constraints on dark energy

January 6, 2013

All data sets

1. Abundance of massive clusters (X-ray Luminosity Function, XLF) to measure cosmic expansion and growth of matter fluctuations with respect to the mean density.

$$D(z) \equiv \frac{\delta(z)}{\delta(z_{\rm t})} = \frac{\sigma(M, z)}{\sigma(M, z_{\rm t})} \qquad \delta = (\rho_{\rm m} - \bar{\rho}_{\rm m})/\bar{\rho}_{\rm m}$$

2. SNIa, fgas, XLF, CMB, BAO to measure the cosmic expansion of the background density. We use three expansion histories well fitted by these data sets.

$$E(a) = \left[\Omega_{\rm m} a^{-3} + \Omega_{\rm de} a^{-3(1+w)} + \Omega_{\rm k} a^{-2}\right]^{1/2}$$

i) flat \wedge CDM w=-1. $\Omega_{\rm k}$ =0

ii) flat wCDM w constant, $\Omega_k=0$ iii) non-flat Λ CDM w=-1, Ω_k constant

January 6, 2013

Dark Energy results: flat wCDM



January 6, 2013

Dark Energy results: flat wCDM



Green: SNIa (Kowalski et al 08, Union) Blue: CMB (WMAP5) Red: cluster f_{gas} (Allen et al 08) Brown: BAO (Percival et al 07)

XLF(survey+follow-up data): BCS +REFLEX+MACS (z<0.5) 238 clusters (Mantz et al 10a). Including systematics

> $\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.23 + 0.04$ $\sigma_8 = 0.82 + 0.05$ w = -1.01 + 0.20

January 6, 2013

Dark Energy results: flat wCDM



Green: SNIa (Kowalski et al 08, Union) Blue: CMB (WMAP5) Red: cluster f_{gas} (Allen et al 08) Brown: BAO (Percival et al 07) Gold: XLF+f_{gas}+WMAP5+SNIa+BAO

XLF(survey+follow-up data): BCS +REFLEX+MACS (z<0.5) 238 clusters (Mantz et al 10a). Including systematics

> $\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.23 + 0.04$ $\sigma_8 = 0.82 + 0.05$ W = -1.01 + 0.20
Dark Energy results: flat wCDM



Grey: XLF+WMAP5 Blue: CMB (WMAP5) Gold: XLF+f_{gas}+WMAP5+SNIa+BAO

 $\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.272 + 0.016$ $\sigma_8 = 0.79 + 0.03$ W = -0.96 + 0.06

XLF(survey+follow-up data): BCS +REFLEX+MACS (z<0.5) 238 clusters (Mantz et al 10a). Including systematics

> $\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.23 + 0.04$ $\sigma_8 = 0.82 + 0.05$ W = -1.01 + 0.20

January 6, 2013

Dark Energy results: flat wCDM



January 6, 2013

Dark Energy results: flat wCDM

Vikhlinin et al 10



Green: BAO Blue: CMB (WMAP) Red: Clusters Gold: SNIa

$$\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.26 + 0.08$$

 $\sigma_8 = 0.81 + 0.04$
 $W = -1.14 + 0.21$

January 6, 2013

Beyond ACDM: Neutrino properties

January 6, 2013

Neutrinos and Cosmology

- Neutrino flavor oscillation experiments (solar, atmospheric, reactors) have conclusively shown that the neutrino mass eigenstates are non-degenerate (e.g. Fukuda et al 98, Ahn et al 03, 06, Sanchez et al 03, Aharmim et al 05, Beringer et al 12, etc.). However, measuring the absolute mass scale is still challenging.
- Three 'normal' neutrino species: v_e, v_μ, v_τ. There are though some hints for possible additional, sterile neutrinos from oscillation data (Kopp et al 11, Huber 11, etc.). Relatively recent, CMB observations have also seemed to favor the presence of additional radiation at the time of decoupling over that from photons and the three 'normal' neutrino species.
- Recent constraints from laboratory experiments: lower bound on M_v=Σ_im_i (sum of the masses of the different species) of ~0.056 (0.095)eV/c² for the normal (inverted) hierarchy; and an upper bound of ~6eV/c² (from hereon c=1). The Heidelberg-Moscow experiment has limited the mass of the electron neutrino to <0.35eV (Klapdor-Kleingrothaus & Krivosheina 06).

Neutrinos and Cosmology

- Neutrinos play an important role in the early universe and therefore affect cosmological observations (review: Lesgourges & Pastor 06).
- The primary cosmological effect of non-zero neutrino mass is to suppress the formation of cosmic structure on intermediate and small scales. CMB contains information on LSS at early times. The combination with probes today give good constraints on the absolute neutrino mass scale.
- Interference with dark energy and inflation physics. Combining experiments helps.
- Combined cosmological observations: $\Sigma_i m_i < \sim 0.3 0.6 eV$.
- Neutrino oscillation experiments favor a large mass for sterile neutrinos yielding a lower limit on their mass of 1eV which is incompatible with cosmological observations. This can be alleviated with for example initial lepton asymmetry (Hannestad et al 12).

Robust constraints on neutrino properties

Even more useful when allowing N_{eff},

 $\Sigma m_v < 0.7 eV (95.4\%) N_{eff} = 3.7 + -0.7 (68.3\%)$

 Ω_k , r, n_t (tensors) to be free

 $\Lambda CDM + \Sigma m_{v}$: Breaking the degeneracy in the Σm_{ν} , σ_8 plane

Σm_v<0.33eV (95.4%)



Note differences in scale between panels

Mantz et al 10c

January 6, 2013

Robust constraints on neutrino properties

Basic: $\Lambda CDM + \Sigma m_v$

CMB+fgas+SNIa+BAO

CMB+fgas+SNIa+BAO+XLF



Mantz et al 10c

January 6, 2013

Robust constraints on neutrino properties

CMB+fgas+SNIa+BAO

 $\Lambda \text{CDM+N}_{\text{eff}}$

 $\Lambda CDM + N_{eff} + M_v + \Omega_k + r + n_t$



Mantz et al 10c

January 6, 2013

Breaking degeneracies with other data sets



$N_{\text{eff}} \, \text{is free}$

Green contours: CMB+fgas +SNIa+BAO (strong degeneracy).

Blue contours: adding H_0 at the 5% level helps significantly with this degeneracy.

January 6, 2013

Other cosmological constraints on neutrinos



January 6, 2013

Effects of neutrinos on the CMB power spectrum



Recent cosmological constraints on neutrinos



 $N_{\rm eff} = 3.89 \pm 0.67 \ (68\% \ {\rm CL})$

 $WMAP + eCMB; Y_{He}$ fixed

 $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.26 \pm 0.35 \ (68\% \text{ CL})$ $WMAP + eCMB + BAO + H_0; Y_{\text{He}} \text{ fixed}$

 $N_{\rm eff} = 2.83 \pm 0.38$ $Y_{\rm He} = 0.308^{+0.032}_{-0.031} \quad (68\% \text{ CL})$

 $WMAP + eCMB + BAO + H_0$

Y_{he} primordial Helium abundance

No evidence for energy density of extra radiation species

January 6, 2013

Inflation and primordial non-Gaussianities

January 6, 2013

Measuring the primordial spectral index with CMB and BAO data



CMB+BAO gives n_s <1 at 5 σ level

January 6, 2013

Comparing CMB+BAO and CMB+H₀



Constraints on inflation models



Constraints on primordial non-Gaussianities $f_{NL}^{
m local} = 32 \pm 21 \; (68\% \; {
m CL})$ Komatsu et al. 11 The 95% limit is $-10 < f_{NL}^{\text{local}} < 74$ $f_{NL}^{\text{equil}} = 26 \pm 140 \ (68\% \text{ CL})$ The 95% limit is $-214 < f_{NL}^{\text{equil}} < 266$ $f_{NI}^{\text{orthog}} = -202 \pm 104 \ (68\% \text{ CL})$ The 95% limit is $-410 < f_{NL}^{\text{orthog}} < 6$ $-29 < f_{NL}^{\text{local}} < 70$ (95% CL Slosar et al. 2008) $-5 < f_{NL}^{\rm local} < 59 \; (95\% \; {\rm CL}) \;$ WMAP7+LSS data

Beyond Λ CDM: Evolving dark energy w(z)

January 6, 2013

Models and probes of cosmic acceleration

- Some recent dark energy reviews:
 - Copeland, Sami, Tsujikawa, 06, Int. J. Mod Phys D
 - Frieman, Turner, Huterer, 08, Ann. Rev. Astr. & Astrophys., 46, 385
 - Weinberg, Mortonson, Eisenstein, Hirata, Riess, Rozo, 12, for Phys. Reports, arXiv:1201.2434
- Dark energy task forces and future dark energy missions:
 - Albrecht, Bernstein, Cahn, Freedman, Hewitt, Hu, Huth, Kamionkowski, Kolb, Knox, Mather, Staggs, Suntzeff, 06, arXiv/0609591
 - Albrecht, Amendola, Bernstein, Clowe, Eisenstein, Guzzo, Hirata, Huterer, Kirshner, Kolb, Nichol, 09, arXiv:0901.0721
 - Amendola, et al (Euclid Satellite), 12, arXiv:1206.1225

Constraints on w₀, w_{et} marginalizing over z_t



Combined constraints (marginalized 68%) $\Omega_m = 0.299 + 0.029 - 0.027$ $w_0 = -1.27 + 0.33 - 0.39$ $w_{et} = -0.66 + 0.44 - 0.62$

WMAP1+CBI+ACBAR SNIa: Riess et al 04 f_{gas}: Allen et al 04 marginalized over 0.05<z_t<1

Two parameters: $w=w_0+w_1(1-a)$ fix transition at $z_t=1$ between w_0 (present) and $w_{et}=w_0+w_1$ (early times). **Three parameters (R05):** free transition z_t between w_0 and w_{et} : $w = \frac{w_{et}z + w_0z_t}{z + z_t} = \frac{w_{et}(1-a)a_t + w_0(1-a_t)a}{a(1-2a_t) + a_t}$

January 6, 2013

Constraints on w₀, w_{et} marginalizing over z_t



Combined constraints (marginalized 68%) $\Omega_m = 0.254 \pm 0.022$ $w_0 = -1.05 + 0.31 - 0.26$ $w_{et} = -0.83 + 0.48 - 0.43$

WMAP3+CBI+Boomerang+ACBAR SNIa: Davis et al. 07 f_{gas}: Allen et al. 08 marginalized over 0.05<z_t<1

Three parameters (R05): free transition z_t between w_0 and w_{et} : $w = \frac{w_{et}z + w_0 z_t}{z + z_t} = \frac{w_{et}(1 - a)a_t + w_0(1 - a_t)a}{a(1 - 2a_t) + a_t}$

January 6, 2013

Current constraints: evolving w



Combined constraints (marginalized 68%) $\Omega_m = 0.257 + 0.016$ $w_0 = -0.88 + -0.21$ $w_{et} = -1.05 + 0.20 - 0.36$

WMAP5 SNIa: Kowalski et al. 08 f_{gas}: Allen et al. 08 BAO: Percival et al. 07 XLF: Mantz et al. 09a marginalized over 0.05<z_t<1

Three parameters (R05): free transition z_t between w_0 and w_{et} : $w = \frac{w_{et}z + w_0 z_t}{z + z_t} = \frac{w_{et}(1 - a)a_t + w_0(1 - a_t)a}{a(1 - 2a_t) + a_t}$

January 6, 2013

Current constraints: evolving w



Two parameters:

 $w=w_0+w_a(1-a)$ fix transition at z_t=1 between w_0 (present) and $w_{et}=w_0+w_a$ (early times).

Kinematical approaches to dark energy

January 6, 2013

Why kinematical approaches?

- Do not assume any particular gravity theory.
 - Most of current cosmological analyses are dynamical, use the Friedmann equations (and General Relativity) employing Ω_m and w as model parameters.
 - Other dynamical approaches use modified gravity theories.
- Describe directly the expansion history of the Universe, a(t).
 - We measure a late-time cosmic acceleration.
 - It is important now to measure kinematically a transiton to a decelerating phase at earlier times.

Constraints on the deceleration parameter



- Using for example $q(z)=q_0+z(dq/dz)$ as in Riess et al 04.
- Clusters (green contours) ; SNLS SNIa (blue contours) ; Gold SNIa sample (dashed contours); all combined (orange contours)
- Shapiro & Turner 05 and Elgaroy & Multamaki 06 also used other q(z) parameterizations.
- However, the choice of a particular parameterization of q(z) is quite arbitrary.
- And in general does not have a direct meaningful physical interpretation.

January 6, 2013

Our kinematical formalism: (q₀,j) parameter space



January 6, 2013



Both models contain a simple representation of Λ CDM (w=-1, j=1) and are consistent with it at the 1 σ level. This represents an additional support for the Λ CDM paradigm.

January 6, 2013

Hypothesis testing: How many model kinematical parameters are required?



Recent results on the kinematical model for various combinations of data sets



Alcock-Paczynski test data from WiggleZ data



Reconstruction of kinematical quantities



Non-parametric reconstruction of the cosmic expansion history



Blake et al, 11

Beyond ACDM: Gravity at large scales

January 6, 2013

Testing GR on cosmic scales

- 1. From the evolution of the cluster abundance (XLF) we directly measure linear cosmic expansion and growth.
- 2. From a variety of measurements we find cosmic acceleration and face the cosmological constant problems.
- 3. We can either include a new energy component, dark energy, or modify the theory of gravity.
- 4. We test General Relativity (GR) for consistency.
- 5. GR has been very well tested from small to Solar system scales. Here we test modifications of GR at cosmological scales.
Ingredients to test a given theory of gravity with cluster abundance data

- 1. Cosmic expansion model / mean matter density (theory).
- 2. Matter power spectrum / linear density perturbations (theory).
- Halo mass function / nonlinear structure formation (N-body simulations for f(R) or DGP: e.g. Schmidt et al 2009, Schmidt 2009a/ b, Chan & Scoccimarro 2009, Zhao, Li & Koyama 2011).
- 4. Relation between the observed mass (e.g. "dynamical") and the true mass (e.g. "lensing") (Theory/N-body simulations: Schmidt 2010a).

Consistency test of the growth rate of General Relativity

- 1. We use a phenomenological time-dependent parameterization of the growth rate and of the expansion history.
- 2. We assume the same scale-dependence as GR.
- 3. We test only for linear effects (not for non-linear effects). We use the "universal" dark matter halo mass function (Tinker et al 2008). Note that the relevant scales for the cluster abundance experiment are at the low end of the linear regime.
- 4. We match GR at early times and small scales.

Modeling linear, time-dependent departures from GR

$$n(M,z) = \int_0^M f(\sigma) \,\frac{\bar{\rho}_{\rm m}}{M'} \,\frac{d\ln\sigma^{-1}}{dM'} \,dM$$

Number density of galaxy clusters

 $\sigma^{2}(M,z) = \frac{1}{2\pi^{2}} \int_{0}^{\infty} k^{2} P(k,z) |W_{M}(k)|^{2} dk$

Variance of the density fluctuations

$$P(k,z) \propto k^{n_{\rm s}} T^2(k,z_{\rm t}) D(z)^2$$
 Linear power spectrum

General Relativity

Phenomenological parameterization

$$\ddot{\delta} + 2\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\dot{\delta} = 4G\pi\rho_{\rm m}\bar{\delta}$$

 $rac{d\delta}{da} = rac{\delta}{a} \Omega_{
m m}(a)^{\gamma}$ GR y~0.55

Scale independent in the synchronous gauge

$$f(a)\equiv d\ln\delta/d\ln a=\Omega_{
m m}(a)^{\gamma}\,\,$$
 Growth rate

Nordic Winter School, Gausdal

January 6, 2013

Test of GR robust w.r.t evolution in the I-m relation



Current data do not require (i.e. acceptable fit) additional evolution beyond selfsimilar and constant scatter nor asymmetric scatter (Mantz et al 2010b).

January 6, 2013

Investigating luminosity-mass evolution



Within the 238 flux-selected clusters we used pointed observations for

23 clusters (z<0.2) from ROSAT 71 clusters (z>0.2) from Chandra

Mass-luminosity and its intrinsic scatter

$$\langle l(m) \rangle = \beta_0^{lm} + \beta_1^{lm} m + \beta_2^{lm} \log_{10}(1+z)$$

$$\sigma_{lm}(z) = \sigma_{lm}(1 + \sigma'_{lm}z)$$

$$l = \log_{10} \left(\frac{L_{500}}{E(z) 10^{44} erg \, s^{-1}} \right); \quad m = \log_{10} \left(\frac{M_{500} E(z)}{10^{15} M_{solar}} \right)$$

Nordic Winter School, Gausdal

January 6, 2013

flat ΛCDM + growth index γ

Rapetti et al 10



XLF: BCS+REFLEX+MACS (z<0.5) 238 survey with 94 X-ray follow-up CMB (WMAP5) SNIa (Kowalski et al 2008, UNION) cluster f_{qas} (Allen et al 2008)

For General Relativity $\gamma \sim 0.55$

Gold: Self-similar evolution and constant scatter Blue: Marginalizing over β^{Im}_2 and σ'_{Im} (only ~20 weaker: robust result on γ).

Remarkably these constraints are only a factor of ~3 weaker than those forecasted for JDEM/ WFIRST-type experiments (e.g. Thomas et al 2008, Linder 2009).

January 6, 2013

flat wCDM + growth index γ



XLF: BCS+REFLEX+MACS (z<0.5) 238 survey with 94 X-ray follow-up CMB (WMAP5) SNIa (Kowalski et al 2008, UNION) cluster f_{gas} (Allen et al 2008)

For General Relativity γ~0.55

Gold: Self-similar evolution and constant scatter

Simultaneous constraints on the expansion and growth histories of the Universe at late times: Consistent with $GR+\Lambda CDM$

January 6, 2013

Flat ΛCDM + growth index γ

Rapetti et al 10



XLF: BCS+REFLEX+MACS (z<0.5) 238 survey with 94 X-ray follow-up

CMB (WMAP5) SNIa (Kowalski et al 2008, UNION) cluster f_{gas} (Allen et al 2008)

For General Relativity $\gamma \sim 0.55$

Gold: Self-similar evolution and constant scatter Blue: Marginalizing over β^{Im}_2 and σ'_{Im}

$$\gamma \left(\frac{\sigma_8}{0.8}\right)^{6.8} = 0.55^{+0.13}_{-0.10}$$

Tight correlation between σ_8 and γ : $\rho = -0.87$

Redshift space distortions and Alcock-Paczynski effect

e.g. Blake et al 11; Beutler et al 2012; Reid et al 12

January 6, 2013

Anisotropic galaxy clustering: RSD and **AP** effect

Sources of anisotropy in the distribution of galaxies (2-point statistics) used to constrain the cosmological model:

- Redshift space distortions: due to velocity patterns of galaxies infalling into gravitational potential wells



 $f\sigma_8(z)$ f(z) is the linear growth rate and $\sigma_8(z)$ the variance in the density field at 8h-1Mpc

- Alcock-Paczynski distortion: between the tangential and radial dimensions of objects or patterns when the correct cosmological model is assumed to be isotropic

$$F(z) = (1 + z)D_{\mathrm{A}}(z)H(z)/c$$

 $D_{A}(z)$ is the angular diameter distance and $H(z)=H_0E(z)$ is the Hubble parameter

WiggleZ: two-dimensional power spectra



January 6, 2013

WiggleZ and 6dFGS constraints on RSD and AP effect

Blake et al 11 For WiggleZ (Blake et al 11): - We use a bivariate Gaussian likelihood on 0.1 < z < 0.30.3 < z < 0.5 $f\sigma_8(z)$ and F(z) (good approximation): $F/F_{fid}(z)$ F/F_{fid}(z) 2, 0.41, 0.60, 0.78) z = ($(0.53\pm0.14, 0.40\pm0.13, 0.37\pm0.08,$ $f\sigma_8(z)$ 0.5 0.5 0.49 ± 0.12 0.8 0.2 0.2 0.6 0.4 0.6 0.4 0 0 f $\sigma_8(z)$ f $\sigma_8(z)$ $F(z) = (0.28 \pm 0.04, 0.44 \pm 0.07, 0.68 \pm 0.06,$ 0.97±0.12) 0.5 < z < 0.7 0.7 < z < 0.9F/F_{fid}(z) $F/F_{fid}(z)$ r=(0.83, 0.94, 0.89, 0.84) For 6dFGS (Beutler et al 2012): 0.5 0.5 - We use a Gaussian likelihood on $f\sigma_8(z)$ 0.2 0.2 0.6 0.8 0.6 0.8 0 0.4 0 0.4 only (since at low-z the AP effect is f $\sigma_{\rm g}(z)$ f $\sigma_{\rm g}(z)$ negligible): Relative probability density 0 0.5 $f\sigma_8(z=0.067) = 0.423\pm0.055$ January 6, 2013 Nordic Winter School, Gausdal

SDSS-III CMASS BOSS constraints

Reid et al 12



For CMASS BOSS (Reid et al 2012):

- We use either a bivariate (growth) or a trivariate (BAO) Gaussian likelihood on $f\sigma_8$ (z), F(z) and A(z) (good approximation):

 $f\sigma_8(z=0.57) = 0.43\pm0.07$ F(z=0.57) = 0.68±0.04 A(z=0.57) = 1.023±0.019

 $r_{f\sigma F} = 0.87$ $r_{f\sigma A} = -0.0086$ $r_{FA} = -0.080$

 $A(z) \equiv (D_{\rm v}/r_{\rm s})/(D_{\rm v}/r_{\rm s})_{\rm fiducial}$ $D_V(z) = [(1+z)^2 D_A(z)^2 c z/H(z)]^{1/3}$

January 6, 2013

Large scale distributions of galaxies: matter power spectrum

Percival et al 10, SDSS DR7



WiggleZ CosmoMC module: http://smp.uq.edu.au/wigglez-data

January 6, 2013



Combined constraints on growth and expansion: breaking degeneracies

January 6, 2013

Modeling the abundance of clusters and their scaling relations

$$n(M,z) = \int_0^M \mathcal{F}(\sigma,z) \,\frac{\rho_{\rm m}}{M'} \,\frac{d\ln\sigma^{-1}}{dM'} \,dM'$$

Number density of dark matter halos

$$\mathcal{F}(\sigma, z) = A\left[\left(\frac{\sigma}{b}\right)^{-a} + 1\right]e^{-c/\sigma^2}$$
 Fitting formulae from N-body simulations
$$x(z) = x_0(1+z)^{\varepsilon\alpha_x} \qquad \begin{array}{c} x \text{ being A, a, b, or c} \\ (\text{Tinker et al 2008}) \end{array}$$

 $\begin{array}{l} \langle \ell(m) \rangle = \beta_0^{\ell m} + \beta_1^{\ell m} m + \beta_2^{\ell m} \log_{10}(1+z) & \mbox{Luminosity-mass relation} \\ \sigma_{\ell m}(z) = \sigma_{\ell m} (1 + \sigma'_{\ell m} z) & \mbox{Scatter in the luminosity-mass relation} \end{array}$

(same expressions for the temperature-mass relation but changing I for t)

January 6, 2013

Flat ΛCDM + growth index γ



clusters (XLF+f_{gas}): BCS+REFLEX +MACS CMB (ISW): WMAP galaxies (RSD+AP): WiggleZ +6dFGS+BOSS Gold: clusters+CMB+galaxies

(+BAO+SNIa+SH0ES) $\gamma = 0.576^{+0.058}_{-0.059}$ $\sigma_8 = 0.789 \pm 0.019$ $\Omega_m = 0.255 \pm 0.011$ $H_0 = 72.1 \pm 1.0$

January 6, 2013

Flat ΛCDM + growth index γ



Green, dotted line: CMB alone

Magenta, dotted-dashed line: galaxies

Red, dashed line: clusters

Blue, solid line: clusters+CMB(ISW)+galaxies

Flat wCDM + growth index γ: growth plane



For General Relativity $\gamma \sim 0.55$

Magenta: clusters+galaxies Purple: clusters+CMB Turquoise: CMB+galaxies Gold: clusters+CMB+galaxies

Platinum: clusters+CMB+galaxies +BAO (Reid et al 12; Percival et al 10)+SNIa (Suzuki et al 12) +SH0ES (Riess et al 11)

January 6, 2013

Flat wCDM + growth index γ: expansion planes



Platinum: clusters + CMB + galaxies + BAO (Reid et al 12; Percival et al 10) + SNIa (Suzuki et al 12) + SH0ES (Riess et al 11)

January 6, 2013

Flat wCDM + growth index γ: growth+expansion



For General Relativity $\gamma \sim 0.55$ For ΛCDM w=-1

Gold: clusters+CMB+galaxies Platinum: clusters+CMB+galaxies +BAO+SNIa+SH0ES

 $\gamma = 0.546^{+0.071}_{-0.072}$ $\sigma_8 = 0.783^{+0.020}_{-0.019}$ $w = -0.968 \pm 0.049$ $\Omega_m = 0.256 \pm 0.011$ $H_0 = 71.5 \pm 1.3$

January 6, 2013

flat+ACDM expansion history, f(R) gravity model





January 6, 2013

flat+ACDM expansion history, f(R) gravity model



Schmidt, Vikhlinin & Hu et al 10

Cluster mass profiles in DGP and f(R)



January 6, 2013



January 6, 2013

Summary/reminder of the take home messages for cosmological data analyses

- Deep understanding of astrophysical processes and objects
- Careful design of observations
- Justify and continuously revised assumptions
- Account properly for covariances between parameters, instrumental and astrophysical systematic uncertainties and biases
- Simultaneous fits of all the relevant astrophysical and cosmological parameters