

Cosmology and Cosmography

Micol Benetti

Federico II University of Naples, Italy

XXIV SIGRAV Conference Sept 7 2021

Outline

Cosmology - current state
 Open questions in cosmology
 New approach: Cosmograpy

Recombination: charged electrons and protons first became bound to form electrically neutral hydrogen atoms

Reionization (hydrogen): Objected started to condense are now enough energetic to re-ionize neutral hydrogen \rightarrow the universe reverted from being neutral to (once again) being ionized



XXIV SIGRAV Conference

Dark ages: electrons of neutral hydrogen absorb photons of wavelengths by rising to an excited state \rightarrow the universe became trasparent at the other wavelenght



It is essential to have access to accurate and precise data of cosmological observables, independent and also cover different cosmological scales Cosmological analysis are conducted with the use of four fundamental factors:

- the formulation of a self-consistent theory
- the translation of this theory into codes and algorithms capable of producing simulations and observational predictions
- the comparison of these predictions with observational data using algorithms capable of exploring parametric space and thus giving constraints on the parameters of the theory
- the use of reliable statistical tools for a proper model comparison, that allow to infer conclusions with physical significance





 $z= 1100 \rightarrow CMB$ probe initial perturbation physics (initial conditions!) ALSO, it probe physics at several universe epoch

Years after the Big Bang







 $Z=11 \rightarrow$ Thomson scattering of CMB on free electrons (whose density is decreasing..): leave its mark on the CMB anisotropy map, introducing secondary anisotropies \rightarrow electron column density at the time of reionization can be determined \rightarrow the **age of the universe when reionization occurred** can then be calculated.

Years after the Big Bang



 $Z=6 \rightarrow$ Lyman alpha forest : absorption lines in the spectra of distant galaxies and quasars arising from the Lyman-alpha electron transition of the neutral hydrogen atom. It probe the end of the reionization of the universe

XXIV SIGRAV Conference



Years after the Big Bang



XXIV SIGRAV Conference

Standard candles: measure the luminosity distance as a function of redshift.
Standard rulers: measure the angular diameter distance as a function of redshift.
Lensing Gravitational waves

SNe, Quasars and GRB



XXIV SIGRAV Conference





Barionic Acoustic Oscillation



The transverse baryonic acoustic scale from the SDSS DR11 galaxies, G. C. Carvalho et al. Astroparticle Physics119, 10243 (2020)

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations from the SDSS DR10 galaxies angular correlation function G. C. Carvalho et al. PRD. 93, 023530 (2016)







Gravitational Waves



Supernova: Explosion caused by the collapse of an old, burnt-out star
Produces a burst of gravitational radiation, *if it is non-symmetric!*

Neutron star: A city-sized atomic nucleus!
Can spin at up to 600 cycles per second
Emits continuous gravitational radiation (again, if it is non-symmetric)





Merging compact binary: Collision of two stellar remnants (neutron stars or *black holes*)

Primordial background: Leftover radiation from the beginning of the Universe

- Tells us about the state of the Universe immediately after the Big Bang!
- Sounds like "noise" with a characteristic spectrum

Gravitational Waves



Open questions

- Did the universe have an inflationary period? How did it happen? What stopped it? What is the level of nongaussianities?
- Does gravity behave like General Relativity even at horizon size scales? Is it necessary to consider Modified Gravity?
- Do we actually need physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics?
- What dark energy and dark matter are? Do we need them?
- What is the origin of the tension in the observed and inferred values of H0 and σ8? Is this a crisis of the standard model?

H0 = 67.44 ± 0.58 km s⁻¹ Mpc ⁻¹ Plank Collaboration

 $H0 = 74.03 \pm 1.42$

km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹

SHOES Collaboration

XXIV SIGRAV Conference



CMB with Planck

CMB without Planck

No CMB, with BBN

P₁(k) + CMB lensing

Riess et al. (2020), R20: 73.2±1.3 Bre uval et al. (2020): 72.8 ± 2.7 Riess et al. (2019), R19: 74.0±1.4 Camarena, Marra (2019): 75.4 ± 1.7

Burns et al. (2018): 73.2 ± 2.3 Dhawan, Jha, Leibundgut (2017), NIR: 72.8±3.1 Follin, Knox (2017): 73.3 ± 1.7 Feeney, Mortlock, Dalmasso (2017): 73.2 ± 1.8 Riess et al. (2016), R16: 73.2±1.7

Cepheids – SNIa

TRGB – SNIa

Miras – SNIa Huang et al. (2019): 73.3 ± 4.0

Masers

SNII

Aiola et al. (2020), ACT: 67.9 ± 1.5

Alola et al. (2020), WMAP9+ACT: 67.6 ± 1.1

Hinshaw et al. (2013), WMAP9: 70.0±2.2

Zhang, Huang (2019), WMAP9+BAO: 68.36^{+0.53} Henning et al. (2018), SPT: 71.3 + 21

D'Amico et al. (2020), BOSS DR12+BBN: 68.5 ± 2.2 Ivanov et al. (2020), BOS5+BBN: 67.9±1.1

Alam et al. (2020), BOSS+eBOSS+BBN: 67.35 ± 0.97

Philcox et al. (2020), P₁(k)+CMB lensing: 70.6⁺³

Cardona, Kunz, Pettorino (2016), HPs: 73.8 ± 2.1 Freedman et al. (2012): 743 ± 21

> Soltis, Casertano, Riess (2020): 72.1±2.0 Freedman et al. (2020): 69.6 ± 1.9

Reid, Pesce, Riess (2019), 5H0ES: 71.1 ± 1.9

Tully – Fisher Relation (TFR) Kourkchi et al. (2020): 76.0±2.6 Schombert, McGaugh, Lell (2020): 75.1±2.8

Surface Brightness Fluctuations Blake slee et al. (2021) IR-SBF w/ HST: 73.3 ± 2.5 Khetan et al. (2020) w/ LMC DEB: 71.1 ± 4.1

de Jaeg er et al. (2020): 75.8^{±5.2} Fernández Arenas et al. (2018): 71.0 ± 3.5

Shajib et al. (2019), STRIDES: 74.2-(2) Wong et al. (2019), HOLICOW 2019: 73.3-17 Birner et al. (2019), HOLICOW 2018: 72.5-23 Bonvin et al. (2016), HOLICOW 2016: 71.9-16 Bonvin et al. (2016), HOLICOW 2016: 71.9-16

Gayathri et al. (2020), GW190521+GW170817: 73.4 18: Effi et al. (2020), GH 1902211311474276174276174276 Mukherjee et al. (2019), GW170817+2TF: 67.515 Mukherjee et al. (2019), GW170817+VIBI 68.314 Abbott et al. (2017), GW170817: 70.0120

Lensing related, mass model – dependent

Birrer et al. (2020), TDCOSMO +SLACS: 67.4⁺C1, TDCOSMO: 74.5⁺C1 Millon et al. (2020), TDCOSMO: 74.2 ± 1.6

Freedman et al. (2019): 69.8 ± 1.9

Yuan et al. (2019): 72.4±2.0

Pesce et al. (2020): 73.9 ± 3.0

Denzel et al. (2021): 71.8-33

Baxteretal. (2020): 73.5 ±5.3 Qi et al. (2020): 73.6+1

Liao et al. (2020): 72.8+ Liao et al. (2019): 72.2+2.1

Optimist average

GW related

Di Valentino (2021): 72.7 ± 1.1

Jang, Lee (2017): 71.2 ± 2.5

Pogosian et al. (2020), eBOSS+Planck Ω_wH²: 69.6±1.8 Achanim et al. (2020). Planck 2018: 67.27 ± 0.60

Aghanim et al. (2020), Planck 2018+CMB lensing: 67.36±0.54





Credit: Di Valentino et al Ultra - conservative, no Cepheids, no lensing 2021

Explored Solutions:

✓ radical departures from conventional cosmology:

i.e. Modified Gravity models in which gravity changes with redshift, such that the H0 estimate from CMB can have larger values today

changes to the physics of the early universe that alters the value of the sound horizon:
 i.e Extra relativistic degrees of freedom at recombination
 or Decaying dark matter or interacting v

 \checkmark changes to the physics at late times:

i.e Interacting dark energy (IDE) models, where DM and DE share interactions other than gravitational



 D_{L} = luminosity distance

D(z) = comoving angular diameter distance

Cosmography

Low redshift approximation

$$v(z) = H_0 D(z)$$

$$z \sim \frac{v(z)}{c}$$

$$D_L = (1+z) \frac{zc}{H_0}$$

$$z = \frac{a(t_0)}{a(t_e)} - 1$$

$$a(t) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k a}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=t_0} (t-t_0)^k$$

 $D_L = (1+z)D(z)$

Cosmography

$$\begin{split} H(t) &\equiv \frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{dt} & j(t) \equiv \frac{1}{aH^3} \frac{d^3a}{dt^3} \\ q(t) &\equiv -\frac{1}{aH^2} \frac{d^2a}{dt^2} & s(t) \equiv \frac{1}{aH^4} \frac{d^4a}{dt^4} \end{split}$$

Low redshift approximation

$$v(z) = H_0 D(z)$$
$$z \sim \frac{v(z)}{c}$$
$$D_L = (1+z) \frac{zc}{H_0}$$

$$D_L(z) = \frac{zc}{H_0} \left[1 + \frac{z}{2}(1 - q_0) - \frac{z^2}{6} \left(1 - q_0 - 3q_0^2 + j_0 \right) + \frac{z^3}{24} \left(2 - 2q_0 - 15q_0^2 - 15q_0^3 + 5j_0 + 10q_0j_0 + s_0 \right) + \mathcal{O}(z^4) \right]$$

$$a(t) = 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \frac{d^k a}{dt^k} \Big|_{t=t_0} (t-t_0)^k$$

Cosmography Low redshift approximation $v(z) = H_0 D(z)$ $z \sim \frac{v(z)}{z}$



Cosmography – Padé polinomials



Extended Gravity Cosmography, Capozziello et al. Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 28, 1930016 (2019)

Cosmography – Padé polinomials $a_i z^i$ $P_{n,m}(z) =$ 2,2 $P_0 + P_1 z + P_2 z^2$ $1 + Q_1 z + Q_2 z^2$

Extended Gravity Cosmography, Capozziello et al. Int. J. Mod. Phys. D 28, 1930016 (2019)

Model independent constraints on dark energy evolution from low-redshift observations, Capozziello et al. Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 484, 4484 (2019)

$$\begin{split} P_0 &= 1 \\ P_1 &= H_1 + Q_1 \\ P_2 &= \frac{H_2}{2} + Q_1 H_1 + Q_2 \\ Q_1 &= \frac{-6H_1 H_4 + 12H_2 H_3}{24H_1 H_3 - 36H_2^2} \\ Q_2 &= \frac{3H_2 H_4 - 4H_3^2}{24H_1 H_3 - 36H_2^2} \\ H_1 &= H_{10}/H_0 = 1 + q_0 \\ H_2 &= H_{20}/H_0 = -q_0^2 + j_0 \\ H_3 &= H_{30}/H_0 = 3q_0^2(1 + q_0) - j_0(3 + 4q_0) - s_0 \\ H_4 &= H_{40}/H_0 = \dots \end{split}$$



Connecting early and late epochs by f(z)CDM cosmography, M. Benetti and S. Capozziello, JCAP,



Connecting early and late epochs by f(z)CDM cosmography, M. Benetti and S. Capozziello, JCAP,

Analysis

 $\checkmark f(z)CDM$ model truncated to 2° order \rightarrow q0

 \sim f(z)CDM model truncated to 3° \rightarrow qo and jo

→ f(z)CDM model truncated to 4° order \rightarrow q0, j0, s0

Dataset

Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB)

Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO)

Supernovae Type Ia (Pantheon sample)

$$H(t) \equiv \frac{1}{a} \frac{da}{dt} \qquad \qquad j(t) \equiv \frac{1}{aH^3} \frac{d^3a}{dt^3}$$
$$q(t) \equiv -\frac{1}{aH^2} \frac{d^2a}{dt^2} \qquad \qquad s(t) \equiv \frac{1}{aH^4} \frac{d^4a}{dt^4}$$

Cosmography + cosmological model tr

We note:

- dependence of Ωm value with cosmographic parameters
- non-negligible effect of the cosmographic parameters on the CMB temperature anisotropy power spectrum





f(z)CDM model truncated to 2°



Cosmography + cosmological model

We note:

- good parameter constraints on qo and jo, while so needs further data accuracy.

f(z)CDM model

truncated to 4°

 $q_0 = -1.2 \pm 0.1$

 $s_0 = -0.1 \pm 0.6$

 $j_0 = 1.5 \pm 0.5$

f(z)CDM modeltruncated t0 3° $q_0 = -1.2 ± 0.1$ $j_0 = 1.5 ± 0.5$ $s_0 = 0$



Cosmography + cosmological model

We note:

- f(z)CDM model truncated at third order show $\Delta \chi^2 \sim 7$ with respect to vanilla Λ CDM model \rightarrow can this be interpreted as a requirement to consider higher orders, with respect to the General Relativity theory, to properly describe the data?

Connecting early and late epochs by f(z)CDM cosmography, M. Benetti and S. Capozziello, JCAP, 12 008 (2019).

Thanks for your attention

XXIV SIGRAV Conference