





Vniver§itat DğValència



Deng Wang

In collaboration with Olga Mena, 2311.14423

IFIC (CSIC-University of Valencia)

Les Diablerets (20/03/2024)



Standard cosmology

• Cosmic structure growth

• Confronting theory with data

Prediction from SKA

Standard cosmology

Standard cosmology



Cosmic microwave background



Isotropic on large scales, but, anisotropic on small scales at the order of O(-5).
 The most standard probe is CMB, the most standard data combination is CBS.
 Planck Collaboration, 1807.06209.



LCDM = Cosmological Constant + CDM

6 basic parameters

 $\omega_{c}, \omega_{b}, n_{s}, A_{s}, \theta, \tau$

Actually, many underlying assumptions

Problems

Cosmological constant problem

Coincidence problem

Cosmological tensions

Cosmic structure growth

Growth index

$$f(a) \equiv d \ln D(a)/d \ln a = \Omega_m^{\gamma}(a)$$

$$D(a) \equiv \delta(a)/\delta(a=1)$$

$$D(\gamma, a) = \exp - \left(\int_{a}^{1} da \frac{\Omega_m(a)^{\gamma}}{a}\right)$$

- γ=0.55 corresponds to
 LCDM. (Li-Min Wang and
 P. J. Steinhardt, 1998)
- * $\gamma < 0.55$: enhanced growth

γ>0.55: suppressed growth

 $P(\gamma, k, a) = D^2(\gamma, a) P_{\Lambda \text{CDM}}(k, a)$

Growth index



CMB



 \star CMB+BAO+SNe Ia gives 0.511^{+0.022}_{-0.019}, which is a 2 σ signal.

- Without CMB lensing, CBS gives $+0.017_{-0.029}$, which is a 3 σ evidence.
- * Planck CMB lensing data can reduce the significance of enhanced structure growth.

CMB





* The signal disappears when considering both anisotropic stress and CMB lensing amplitude.

* It is too early to claim the evidence of enhanced structure growth. (N.Nguyen et al. 2302.01331)

Cosmological simulations



Statistical analysis of simulations



When γ <0.55, halo mass function is obviously larger than that in LCDM, and has more halos in the whole halo mass range.

For γ =0.3, the halos will be more compact than in LCDM. For best fit γ =0.506 from CMB-only constraint, halos have lower densities than in LCDM at large radius.

SKA forecast





SKA

The existing antennas of South Africa's MeerKAT radio telescope (on the right; actual photo) will be incorporated into SKA-Mid (the SKA dishes are on the left in this composite image)

HI galaxy redshift survey

$$P_{g}(\gamma, k, z) = \left[b(z) + f\xi^{2}\right]^{2} e^{-\frac{\left[k\sigma_{\rm NL}(z,\xi)\right]^{2}}{2}} P(\gamma, k, z)$$

$$F_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} V_{\mathrm{eff}}(k) \left(\frac{\partial \ln S_T}{\partial p_\alpha} \frac{\partial \ln S_T}{\partial p_\beta} \right)$$

Here we use the HI galaxy redshift survey SKA Phase 2 to forecast.

SKA2 is expected to achieve an rms flux sensitivity S \approx 5 µJy covering a sky area of 30000 deg² for 10000 hours. SKA2 aims to produce a catalogue of one billion HI galaxies in the redshift range $z \in (0.18, 1.84)$, Which is far beyond any planned optical or near infrared experiments when $z \in (0, 1.4)$.

Strong constraining power



Parameters	SKA2	Planck
$\sigma(\gamma)$	0.0083	0.022
$\sigma(H_0)$	0.19	0.54
$\sigma(\sigma_8)$	0.00079	0.006

- \star Assuming perfect foreground subtraction.
- \star Optimistically theoretical limit from SKA2.

Your takeaways

- Current data can't give any signal of enhanced or suppressed growth of cosmic structure when considering CMB lensing amplitude and anisotropic stress of relativistic species simultaneously.
- Cosmological simulations is consistent with our simple theoretical prediction.
- * SKA2 can improve the constraining power of Planck on the growth index parameter by a factor of three.

A new punch on the nose of LCDM





In light of Planck CMB data, we find a 2σ deviation from LCDM at redshift z = 500 using tomographic ISW effect.

DW, Olga Mena, 2402.18248

谢谢! Thanks! Gracias!