

# Map-making, power spectrum and likelihood tools (a survey)

## Luca Pagano

many inputs from Maurizio, Giuseppe, Paolo, Marina, Loris





Workshop LiteBIRD-Italia 2023 @ INFN-LNF – 2023/05/22-24

## Map-making, PS and likelihood

- Various independent activities in the last years. Mainly to characterize systematic effects and propagate them to cosmological parameters
- Simple approaches adopted
  - binning map-making
  - Pseudo-C
  - exact likelihood (fullsky, white noise)
- New group just created, lead by Yuji Chinone.
- Objectives (email sent last wednesday)
  - "define the guidelines to be met when establishing requirements and making recommendations for the tools"
  - "assess "off-the-shelf" packages available within the LiteBIRD Collaboration and the general CMB community, and determine their suitability for the task at hand"
  - "In the long-term, dedicated R&D will seek to improve on these tools or develop new tools to meet LiteBIRD-specific requirements, i.e. scientific requirements, feasibility, computational resources and in terms of ease-of-integration into the LiteBIRD frameworks"

## Map-making - current status

- What is available at hand?
  - Binner
    - Natively implemented in <u>lbs</u>
  - o <u>Madam</u>
    - **Destriper** built for Planck, used for LFI and, with few changes, for NPIPE analysis
    - "Interfaced" with lbs. lbs produces inputs files for madam in the proper format then the map-maker is called as external code
    - Used in the post-PTEP simulations
    - Library with python interface available. Interface provided through toast
  - Toast map-maker (see next slide)
- Other approaches:
  - GLS implementation with SANEPIC
    - Used in BLAST, PACS, SPIRE, HFI
    - Used in PTEP paper for HWP systematic studies
  - <u>Commander</u>
    - running on post-PTEP simulations

## Map-making - options

#### • <u>Toast map-maker</u>

- Implemented in Toast2
- Implements a destriper and supports for systematics templates
- Ibs interface coded, some <u>debug still necessary</u>

#### • <u>dacapo</u>

- Implementation of the calibration algorithm used in LFI
- Calibration + destriper map-maker
- Python interface available
- Ibs interface missing but easily achievable (local expertise)

#### <u>ROMA</u>

- GLS implementation
- Developed for BOOMERanG and Planck, used for Hi-GAL and <u>SWIPE simulated data</u>
- Ibs interface missing (local expertise)

## Map-making - activities

- From Yuji's email:
  - "What is the optimal map-maker to achieve enough sensitivity at lower ell ranges with continuously rotating half-wave plates? Is there any difference: map-making after demodulation or map-making by solving the map-making equation w/ modulation information? Which is better?"
- Priorities:
  - Have at **least a destriper and GLS implementation** stably interfaced with lbs
    - toast map-maker and/or libmadam (directly or through toast)
    - Consider the options we have for the GLS. Preferably ROMA
  - Start development/optimization activity
- A small group already formed for pursue this activity:
  - Avinash, Giuseppe, Maurizio, Marco, Nicolò, Margherita, Thejs, PaoloC, PaoloN, Luca
- Specific task on LiteBIRD map-making within the Spoke 2 Centro HPC
  - People involved Thejs (RTDa), Paolo, Luca

## Power spectrum - status and options

- What is available at hand?
  - o <u>cROMAster</u>
    - Implements the <u>Master algorithm</u>. Developed for **BOOMERanG** and **Planck**
    - No interface with python. No pure implementation
    - Competitors: <u>NaMaster</u> (widely used in LiteBIRD), <u>PolSPICE</u> (use in Planck)
  - <u>BolPol</u>.
    - Implements the QML algorithm for the auto-spectrum.
  - <u>pse\_qml</u>.
    - Implements the QML algorithm for the auto and cross-spectrum.
  - Loris' QML
    - Implements the **QML** algorithm with the **SMW approximation**
- Common issues:
  - Lack of high level interface
  - No documentation
  - Not **public** (except pse\_qml and Loris' QML)

## Power spectrum - activities

- From Yuji's email:
  - "Which type of power-spectrum approach is suitable for LiteBIRD, auto spectrum vs. cross spectrum? How do we estimate noise bias precisely for the auto spectrum? Which kind of data splits are useful to mitigate certain systematics in cross-spectra?
  - Which kind of power-spectra estimator is optimal for the cross-correlation of these splits?
    Which kind of estimator is more adequate for LiteBIRD for a given ell-range and accuracy demand? E.g., pseudo-Cl, pure-Cl, QML (auto- vs cross-)."
- Priorities:
  - Select one or two codes on which we want to invest development time. Mainly for: high level interface, documentation and public release
  - **QML** seems the most **promising candidate** for this
  - Compete with <u>NaMaster</u> is difficult. But having a modern interface for cROMAster and a public repository might be valuable

## Likelihood - status and options

- What is available at hand?
  - Several implementations of exact likelihood
    - Suited for estimating biases on cosmological parameters
  - **Pixel-Based** implemented for Planck
    - For reionization peak
    - Requires estimation of noise covariance
- Hybrid likelihood, combining reionization and recombination peaks
- Options:
  - Multi-frequency C<sub>1</sub> likelihood
  - **C**<sub>1</sub> likelihood on component separated maps
  - Map based likelihood on component separated maps
  - Likelihood free inference (e.g. NN)

## Likelihood - activities

- From Yuji's email:
  - "Which interfaces should be prepared between component separation and map-making, power-spectra estimator, and likelihood? map-based component separation, power-spectra-based component separation?"
  - "Which likelihood algorithms are best for LiteBIRD, Gaussian approximation, (Q)ML, or (Bayesian) sampling? Depending on ell ranges?"
- Priorities:
  - Build a pipeline for <u>multi frequency cross-C<sub>1</sub> likelihood</u> based on <u>HL</u> (Gaussian) approximation, for r estimation
  - Build a **pipeline for <u>C</u>, likelihood</u> based on HL (Gaussian) approximation, for both τ and r**