

Toward an Understanding of Foregrounds in the BICEP2 Region

Raphael Flauger

arXiv:1405.7351

w/ Colin Hill and David Spergel


Theoretical Seminar, CERN, July 9, 2014

Outline

- Introduction and Motivation
- Testing the null hypothesis (dust+synchrotron+lensing)
- Estimates of the polarized emission from dust
- Conclusions

Introduction and Motivation

The Angular Power spectrum




Planck

100 GHz

$$a_{T,\ell m} = \int d^2\hat{n} Y_\ell^{m*}(\hat{n}) \Delta T(\hat{n})$$

$$C_{TT,\ell}^{\text{obs}} \equiv \frac{1}{2\ell + 1} \sum_m |a_{T,\ell m}^{\text{obs}}|^2$$

The Angular Power spectrum




not generated at linear order by scalar perturbations

The pre-Planck era


Until ca. 1997 data was consistent with defects (such as strings) generating the primordial perturbations.

(Pen, Seljak, Turok 1997)




The pre-Planck era

(Jaffe et al. 2001)




Shortly after it became clear that defects were not the dominant source of primordial perturbations.

The pre-Planck era




Planck



BICEP2



BICEPI (2006-2008)




BICEP2 (2010-2012)







DASI MOUNT

BICEP3 (2015-2016)



EXISTING BICEP MOUNT




-5 0 5
Longitude (degrees)

98 NTDs (95/150 GHz)

0.93°/0.60° FWHM

18° FOV

44 m² deg² AQ




-5 0 5
Longitude (degrees)

512 TESs (150 GHz)

0.52° FWHM

17° FOV


44 m² deg² AQ



-5 0 5
Longitude (degrees)

2560 TESs (150 GHz)

222 m² deg² AQ



-10 -5 0 5 10
Longitude (degrees)


2560 TESs (95 GHz)

0.37° FWHM

26° FOV

502 m² deg² AQ optical throughput


A map of B-modes




Noise level: 87 nK deg - the deepest map at 150 GHz of this patch of sky

(Planck noise level: few μK deg)

B-mode Power Spectrum



B-mode Power Spectrum



B-mode Power Spectrum

If the signal is cosmological, inflation is our best candidate to explain it.

In this case the detection would imply that we have seen quantum fluctuations in the spacetime metric, and

- $H(t_*) \approx 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$ or $V^{1/4} \approx 2 \times 10^{16} \text{ GeV}$.
- The field range is roughly Planckian (Lyth 1996)

Implications

Theory


- Our theories make meaningful predictions at these high energies.
- We should think harder about
 - large field models, moduli, gravitino problem, ...
- The graviton mass is below $3 \times 10^{-28} eV$
- ...

Experiment

- If the signal is this large a per cent-ish measurement of r is achievable!
- Even the inflationary consistency condition may become testable.

Implications

Theory - Part II



- The value of the tensor-to-scalar ratio and the tilt are extremely valuable to distinguish between different models of the early universe, but one has to understand the contribution from foregrounds to measure them

Origin of B-modes

Is it in the sky?

- The measurement is extremely challenging.
- It requires exquisit control over differential gain, differential pointing, beams,...
- These and many more systematics are briefly discussed in the BICEP2 paper, and will be discussed in the systematics paper


One should wait for the promised systematics paper, but in my opinion what has been shown suggests it is in the sky.

Origin of B-modes

Is it cosmological?

- One needs to understand polarized foregrounds
- WMAP can help with synchrotron

Southern Hole



measurement in the BICEP patch,
but on larger angular scales than
BICEP's

Origin of B-modes

Is it cosmological?



- One needs to understand polarized foregrounds
- WMAP can help with synchrotron
- Planck would help with both synchrotron and dust, but its polarization data is not yet public

Even under conservative assumptions synchrotron radiation cannot make up the entire signal.

To make progress on dust, one has to be creative (or wait)

Effect of foregrounds

Foreground models initially presented by BICEP






Effect of foregrounds

Effect of foregrounds on tensor-to-scalar ratio

r	unsubtracted	DDM2 cross	DDM2 auto
BICEP2	$0.2^{+0.07}_{-0.05}$	$0.16^{+0.06}_{-0.05}$	$0.12^{+0.05}_{-0.04}$
BICEP2×Keck	$0.13^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	$0.10^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$	$0.06^{+0.04}_{-0.03}$

Not negligible, especially if one wants to discuss potential tensions with Planck.



BICEP's foreground models


BICEP's DDMI and DDM2

- based on maps shown by Bernard at ESLAB meeting

Polarization Fraction

Apparent polarization fraction (p) at 353 GHz, 1° resolution
Not CIB subtracted

$$p = \frac{\sqrt{Q^2 + U^2}}{I}$$



0%  0.20

p ranges from 0 to ~20%

Low p values in inner MW plane. Consistent with unpolarized CIB

Large p values in outer plane and intermediate latitudes

BICEP's foreground models


BICEP's DDMI and DDM2

- based on maps shown by Bernard at ESLAB meeting

Polarization Fraction

Apparent polarization fraction (p) at 353 GHz, 1° resolution
Not CIB subtracted

$$p = \frac{\sqrt{Q^2 + U^2}}{I}$$



p ranges from 0 to ~20%


Low p values in inner MW plane. Consistent with unpolarized CIB

Large p values in outer plane and intermediate latitudes

BICEP's foreground models

BICEP's DDMI and DDM2

- based on maps shown by Bernard at ESLAB meeting



Field direction consistent with B in MW plane
Field homogeneous over large regions with strong p (e.g. Fan)

BICEP's foreground models



DDM1

- Planck Dust model map
- Average polarization fraction from Bernard (before CIB correction)
- Polarization angles from Planck Sky Model

DDM2

- Planck Dust model map
- Polarization fraction and angles from Bernard

BICEP's foreground models



BICEP's foreground models

The auto spectra are only a factor of a few below the signal, but are quadratically sensitive to polarization fraction.

What is actually shown in these maps, and how reliable are they?

BICEP's foreground models

The auto spectra are only a factor of a few below the signal, but are quadratically sensitive to polarization fraction.


What is actually shown in these maps, and how reliable are they?

There were Q and U maps shown by Boulanger
Let's try to reproduce the polarization fraction map

Bernard's polarization fraction

Apparent polarization fraction (p) at 353 GHz, 1° resolution
Not CIB subtracted

$$p = \frac{\sqrt{Q^2 + U^2}}{I}$$




p ranges from 0 to ~20%



Bernard's polarization fraction


gif of my digitization



0  20%


Boulanger's Q and U maps

I map 1deg resolution




- ▶ First all sky maps of dust polarization.
- ▶ The data provides the sensitivity to image the polarization of dust emission over the whole sky
- ▶ Complementary to observations of stellar polarization which provide detailed information on smaller angular scales

Q map 1deg resolution




U map 1deg resolution



Boulanger's Q and U maps


gif of my digitization

Q



-0.0005  0.001 μK


U



-0.0005  0.001 μK

Bernard's polarization fraction


- Q and U from Boulanger, T from nominal Planck data, CMB removed, all zero levels set from LAB HI data



does not look like Bernard's map

Bernard's polarization fraction



- Q and U from Boulanger, T from nominal Planck data, CMB removed, all zero levels set from LAB HI data, CIB added



much closer to Bernard's map

Bernard's polarization fraction



- The map shown at the meeting seems to have had a CIB monopole contribution in it.



- This seems to be supported by the map in 1405.0871, which generally has higher polarization fractions.

Bernard's polarization fraction

Dependence on zero levels in unmasked region



Bernard's polarization fraction


- One should correct for the CIB when using Bernard's map in regions of low galactic emission (both zero level and fluctuations)

$$p_{\text{corr}} = p_{\text{B}} \frac{I_{\text{Gal}} + I_{\text{CIB}} + I_{\text{CMB}}}{I_{\text{Gal}}}$$

- There are large uncertainties in low emission regions in using the polarization fraction map (zero levels and noise bias)
- Similar uncertainties exist for polarization angle map because it also involves a ratio of maps (largely problematic only for the cross spectra)

Bernard's polarization fraction



- To avoid dealing with these issues, BICEP2 has removed DDM2 from the published version



Testing the Null Hypothesis

Testing the Null Hypothesis


- Could the observed excess be consistent with lensing of E-mode, synchrotron, and dust?



- Requires $\ell(\ell + 1)C_{\ell}^{BB} / 2\pi = 0.01 \mu\text{K}^2$ at $\ell = 46$ from dust
- Can we constrain the dust amplitude well enough from Planck data to rule it out?

Testing the Null Hypothesis

- Eventually observations at multiple frequencies will distinguish CMB from dust.
- Currently, a joint fit to BICEP1xBICEP2 100x150 and BICEP2150 GHz data weakly favors the gravitational wave hypothesis ($1.3 - 1.7 \sigma$), but does not convincingly rule out foregrounds as source of the excess.



(fiducial Gaussian approximation for covariance matrix)

Estimates of Polarized Emission from Dust

CIB corrected foreground models

Models for polarized foreground need three ingredients, typically

- Intensity map
- Polarization fraction
- Polarization angles

$$Q(\hat{n}) = p(\hat{n})I(\hat{n}) \cos(\psi(\hat{n}))$$

$$U(\hat{n}) = p(\hat{n})I(\hat{n}) \sin(\psi(\hat{n}))$$

CIB corrected foreground models

DDM-P1

- Planck dust model
- Average polarization fraction from Bernard polarization fraction map corrected for CIB
- Polarization angles from starlight data, PSM, or Q and U maps


DDM-P2

- Planck dust model
- Polarization fraction from Bernard polarization fraction map corrected for CIB
- Polarization angles from starlight data, PSM, or Q and U maps


CIB corrected foreground models

Foregrounds plus lensing contribution

DDM-P1+lensing



DDM-P2+lensing



bands reflect uncertainties in polarization fraction and angles and uncertainty in frequency rescaling.

CIB corrected foreground models

Remarks

- DDM-P1 ignores fluctuations in polarization fraction which causes it to under-predict the foregrounds
- DDM-P1 overpredicts foregrounds on small scales because dust model contains CIB fluctuations
- This is true of all models relying on average polarization fractions (and one might argue they should not be used at all)
- DDM-P2 should over-predict the foregrounds from dust because of noise bias and noise in polarization fraction map (but ignores synchrotron)

CIB corrected foreground models

Can we find other estimates?


- HI traces the dust and its column density can be used to predict polarized emission (Aumont's ESLAB presentation)
- If we think they are reliable, we can attempt to measure BB directly from the digitization of Boulanger's maps

Estimate from HI column density

Correlation with HI column density


Aumont ESLAB presentation

$F_{\text{sky}} = 0.9$ model best fit amplitude



differences in column density due to change in Planck dust model 1.10 vs 1.20

Preliminary Q and U maps



corrected for instrumental noise and effects of digitization

Estimate from HI column density

This tells us how to extrapolate to low column density at 353 GHz


How do we extrapolate in frequency?

- Using a modified black body assuming the same parameters in the patch as given in the recent Planck papers
- Measuring the coefficient for cleaning the 143 GHz map with CMB-free 353 GHz map in the patch assuming the same frequency dependence as in intensity
- or using additional results from Aumont directly for BB


Estimate from HI column density

Good agreement

N_{HI} -lensing



DDM-P2+lensing




Estimate from HI column density

Points to take away from this analysis

- DDM-P2 models and an estimate based on HI column density agree well
- Foregrounds may be OK if the lower end of the estimates is correct, but the uncertainty is large
- The preliminary maps produce reasonable results on sky fractions studied by Aumont suggesting that one can attempt a direct measurement

Measurement from Q/U maps

- Estimator based on PolSpice, apodization and range of correlation function based on simulations.
- Weighting based on BICEP hit count (made by eye).



reverse engineered mask made based on description of scan strategy before outline was released

released BICEP outline

Measurement from Q/U maps


Effect of HEALPix \rightarrow gif \rightarrow pdf \rightarrow gif \rightarrow HEALPix

- simulate CMB temperature and polarization
- map2gif
- Keynote
- export to pdf
- convert figure back to gif
- convert back to fits map
- measure spectrum with same estimator as for simulations

Measurement from Q/U maps

- Direct measurement from the preliminary Q and U maps agrees well with DDM-P2 models and the estimates based on HI column density

Is it all bandpass or calibration leakage?







Measurement from Q/U maps

bandpass leakage

$< 0.25\%$

for detector pairs 3-5




$\sim 3.5\%$


for detector pairs 6

Measurement from Q/U maps

- Bandpass and calibration leakage should not be a problem even for the preliminary Q and U maps, essentially because of the low dust intensity, and can certainly be controlled by Planck
- To what extent noise is a problem remains to be seen, but Planck's noise is lower than average in the BICEP2 region of the sky




Summary of Foreground Estimates



- For the FDS and LSA models, foregrounds are not expected to be the entire signal
- For all other models, foregrounds may be OK if the lower end of the estimates is correct, but the uncertainty is large

Cross-Spectra of Data with Models

- None of the models capture the foregrounds in the BICEP2 region of the sky well on the relevant scales.
- As a consequence, the cross-spectra between the models and the data underestimate the true foreground contribution.




correlation matrix at $\ell = 46$

Conclusions


Conclusions

- BICEP has provided us with the deepest maps of any patch of the sky at 150 GHz and has detected degree scale B-modes
- According to all estimates, foregrounds may be small enough to allow a primordial signal, but the uncertainty on foregrounds is large and measurements at other frequencies are important for a definitive measurement


DDM-P1+lensing



DDM-P2+lensing



N_{HI} -lensing



Conclusions

- 100 GHz Keck Array data will be available soon (1-2 months?)
- Three frequency BICEP3/Keck Array data (coming 2015?), should be able to characterize foregrounds
- Planck will soon release its polarization data which will be extremely valuable for our understanding of foregrounds because of its frequency coverage
- If the tensor to scalar ratio is 0.1 or larger, Planck may also be able to confirm the measurement directly
- It looks like Planck and BICEP will collaborate so that we will soon know whether there is a primordial tensor contribution hiding in the excess B-mode power on degree angular scales observed by BICEP2

Thank you