Astroparticle Physics 63 (2015) 2-22



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## **Astroparticle Physics**



CrossMark

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/astropart

### Distance probes of dark energy

A.G. Kim<sup>a,\*</sup>, N. Padmanabhan<sup>b</sup>, G. Aldering<sup>a</sup>, S.W. Allen<sup>c,d</sup>, C. Baltay<sup>b</sup>, R.N. Cahn<sup>a</sup>, C.B. D'Andrea<sup>e</sup>, N. Dalal<sup>f</sup>, K.S. Dawson<sup>g</sup>, K.D. Denney<sup>h</sup>, D.J. Eisenstein<sup>i</sup>, D.A. Finley<sup>j</sup>, W.L. Freedman<sup>k</sup>, S. Ho<sup>1</sup>, D.E. Holz<sup>m</sup>, D. Kasen<sup>n,o</sup>, S.M. Kent<sup>p</sup>, R. Kessler<sup>q</sup>, S. Kuhlmann<sup>r</sup>, E.V. Linder<sup>a,s</sup>, P. Martini<sup>h</sup>, P.E. Nugent<sup>t</sup>, S. Perlmutter<sup>a,n</sup>, B.M. Peterson<sup>h</sup>, A.G. Riess<sup>u</sup>, D. Rubin<sup>a</sup>, M. Sako<sup>v</sup>, N.V. Suntzeff<sup>w</sup>, N. Suzuki<sup>a,g</sup>, R.C. Thomas<sup>t</sup>, W.M. Wood-Vasey<sup>x</sup>, S.E. Woosley<sup>y</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Physics Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>c</sup> Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, SLAC National Accelerator Laboratory, 2575 Sand Hill Road, Menlo Park, CA 94025, USA

<sup>d</sup> Department of Physics, Stanford University, 382 Via Pueblo Mall, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

<sup>e</sup> Institute of Cosmology and Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Dennis Sciama Building, Burnaby Road, Portsmouth PO1 3FX, UK

<sup>f</sup>Astronomy Department, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1002 W. Green Street, Urbana, IL 61801, USA

<sup>g</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT 84112, USA

h Department of Astronomy and Center for Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics, The Ohio State University, 140 West 18th Avenue Columbus, OH 43210, USA

<sup>1</sup>Harvard University, Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, 60 Garden St., Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

<sup>j</sup> Particle Physics Division, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, P.O. Box 500, Batavia, IL 60510, USA

<sup>k</sup> Carnegie Observatories, 813 Santa Barbara Street, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA

<sup>1</sup>McWilliams Center for Cosmology, Department of Physics, Carnegie Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Ave, Pittsburgh, PA 15213, USA

<sup>m</sup> Enrico Fermi Institute, Department of Physics, and Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

<sup>n</sup> Physics Department, University of California, Berkeley, 366 LeConte Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

° Nuclear Science Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>p</sup> Scientific Computing Division, Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory, P.O. Box 500, Batavia, IL 60510, USA

<sup>q</sup> Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of Chicago, 5640 South Ellis Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637, USA

<sup>r</sup> Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 S. Cass Avenue, Lemont, IL 60439, USA

<sup>s</sup> Space Sciences Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>t</sup> Computational Research Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

<sup>u</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 North Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21218, USA

<sup>v</sup> Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pennsylvania, 209 South 33rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

<sup>w</sup> George P. and Cynthia Woods Mitchell Institute for Fundamental Physics and Astronomy, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Texas A&M University, College Station,

TX 77843, USA

\* Pittsburgh Particle Physics, Astrophysics, and Cosmology Center (Pitt-PACC), University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260, USA

<sup>y</sup> Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

#### ARTICLE INFO

#### ABSTRACT

Article history: Received 7 November 2013 Received in revised form 7 May 2014 Accepted 16 May 2014 Available online 29 May 2014

*Keywords:* Cosmology Distance scale Dark energy This document presents the results from the Distances subgroup of the Cosmic Frontier Community Planning Study (Snowmass 2013). We summarize the current state of the field as well as future prospects and challenges. In addition to the established probes using Type Ia supernovae and baryon acoustic oscillations, we also consider prospective methods based on clusters, active galactic nuclei, gravitational wave sirens and strong lensing time delays.

© 2014 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

#### 1. Executive summary

A basic paradigm of physics is that if one measures the distance to an object as a function of time, one can determine its velocity and acceleration. Add dynamics and one can find the forces, either from F = ma or  $G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi T_{\mu\nu}$ , and from these one can determine the

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 510 486 4621. *E-mail address:* agkim@lbl.gov (A.G. Kim).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Physics Department, Yale University, P.O. Box 208121, New Haven, CT 06520, USA

nature of the underlying matter. Already distance measurements have shown that the cosmological constant, long disowned as being no more than theoretically allowable, is in fact a necessity. What remains to be seen is whether the Universe is pervaded by a uniform and never-changing energy density, an energy density that varies in time and perhaps position, or whether describing the Universe as a whole by General Relativity fails. Whatever future experiments reveal, the simple plot of the distance scale of the Universe as a function of time will be one of the primary icons of physical science. As the Copernican picture of the solar system removed our privileged perspective at the center of the Universe, the cosmological distance plot shows that the baryons, the matter that composes our physical essence, represent a minority fraction of the energy content of the Universe.

The data for this plot so far come primarily from measurements of Type Ia supernovae (SNe Ia) and baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) and these will be the sources of streams of data in coming years. The Dark Energy Survey (DES) and Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (LSST) will provide an essentially limitless supply of supernova, thousands, then hundreds of thousands. The challenge is to make measurements thoroughly enough to mitigate systematic uncertainties, especially those that are functions of redshift. Detailed studies of nearby supernovae are beginning to provide clues for how to do this. Much would be gained if observations could be made from space, but some of the gain could be achieved if we could make ground-based observations that avoid the atmospheric lines in the near infrared.

The subtle pattern of anisotropy in the cosmic microwave background, just one part in  $10^5$ , is just the two dimensional boundary of a three-dimensional feature, the fluctuations in matter density throughout space. The counterpart of the oscillations in the CMB power spectrum is a peak in the correlation between the densities at points separated by 150 Mpc, left behind by baryon acoustic oscillations in the early Universe. This very large meter stick can be observed at redshifts out as far as z = 1.6 using galaxies as traces of matter density, and even out to z = 3 using light from quasars. The current experiment, the Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (BOSS) [1], is likely to report a distance measurement soon at 1% accuracy and ultimately will provide two or perhaps three. The successor BAO experiment, Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI), should provide more than a dozen independent distance measurements.

If our basic understanding is correct, the supernova and BAO measurements should be in absolute agreement. The distance-versus-time curve of the Universe is so fundamental that exploring it with completely different techniques is essential. A basic disagreement would challenge our current picture, just as the discovery of the accelerating Universe upset the earlier picture. Provided the measurements agree, we can go on to see that they are consistent with expectations for a Universe containing 30% matter and 70% nearly-constant energy density. Finally, we will ask whether the nearly constant part is really constant. How well can data exclude a cosmological constant?

To measure progress in determining the expansion history of the Universe a simple quantitative characterization was proposed by the 2006 Dark Energy Task Force. The equation of state of the dark energy,  $w = p/\rho$ , which is -1 for the cosmological constant can be expanded as  $w = w_0 + (1 - a)w_a$ , where a = 1/(1 + z) is the size-scale of the Universe relative to its size today, when a = 1 and z = 0. The DETF figure-of-merit is simply the reciprocal of the area of the error ellipse in the  $w_0 - w_a$  plane, suitably normalized. This figure-of-merit is calculated using input from projections from the full Planck survey and from existing or projected results from the various dark energy experiments.

The cosmic expansion history is a fundamental element of the physics of our Universe. Ideally we would map it accurately at all redshifts. Within a cosmological model such as cold dark matter plus dynamical dark energy, the precision on the dark energy equation of state  $w(z) = w_0 + w_a z/(1 + z)$  starts to plateau for measurements beyond  $z \approx 1.5 - 2$ . However, even within a cosmological constant model the dark energy contributes nearly 10% of the cosmic energy density at z = 2 and alters the deceleration parameter by 25%. Surprises could certainly await as we probe to these redshifts and beyond. Thus next generation experiments aim to map cosmic distances to  $z \approx 2$ , as outlined in the Rocky III report, while keeping in mind potential techniques to improve our understanding further.

Anticipated progress in direct distance measurements is shown in Fig. 1. Today, 580 SNe Ia lead to 1% precision measurements at the lowest redshifts, with uncertainties climbing to roughly 5% over the redshift interval 1 < z < 1.5. DES will lower uncertainties in the 2015–2020 timeframe, while LSST and WFIRST will have a larger impact in the longer-term. Measurements of the BAO feature in the Lyman- $\alpha$  forest with BOSS confirm deceleration at z = 2.4. In the next 5 years, eBOSS will provide three new 1–2% precision measurements over the interval 0.6 < z < 2, while the combination of Prime Focus Spectrograph (PFS) and Hobby-Eberly Telescope Dark Energy Experiment (HETDEX) will offer nine measurements at ~ 2% precision at fairly uniform spacing over the interval 0.8 < z < 3.5. More generally, the future experiments DESI, WFIRST, and Euclid are expected to fill in the entire expansion history of the Universe from deceleration to acceleration.

While supernovae and BAO are established techniques, other distance probes could provide independent reduction of statistical uncertainty, check of systematic bias, and different sensitivity to dark energy parameters. Galaxy clusters, gravitational lensing time delays, reverberation mapping of AGNs, and gravitational wave sirens have been identified as having the potential to be developed into competitive probes in the future, and could drive the field in the post-LSST era.

## 2. Galaxy redshift surveys: baryon acoustic oscillations and Alcock–Paczynski effect

#### 2.1. Executive summary

Sound waves propagating in the first 400,000 years after the Big Bang imprint a characteristic scale in the clustering of matter in the Universe. The baryon acoustic oscillations produce a reasonably sharp peak in the correlation function of galaxies and other cosmic tracers at a comoving scale of 150 Mpc [2–9]. The length scale of this feature can be accurately predicted from the simple physics of the early Universe and the measurements of the CMB anisotropies. Using this standard ruler, we can measure the angular diameter distance and the Hubble parameter as functions of redshift [10–18]. The method was extensively described in the recent Weinberg et al. review [19].

The BAO method has several important advantages. First, the simplicity of the physics and the very large physical scale involved make the method highly robust. Current theory suggests that the measurements at z < 3 can be made to the cosmic variance limit without being limited by systematic uncertainties. Second, the method affords a high level of statistical precision, particularly at z > 0.5. Third, the method allows a direct probe of H(z), further increasing the leverage at z > 1. Fourth, the method allows a direct connection to the angular acoustic scale of the CMB, placing strong constraints on the spatial curvature of the Universe.

The primary challenge of the BAO method is the need for large redshift surveys. Surveys to z = 2 aimed at extracting most of the BAO information require of order 50 million galaxies. At z > 2, it is likely that Lyman- $\alpha$  forest methods are more advantageous (e.g. [20]). The BOSS experiment is presently measuring the BAO from 1/4 of the sky at z < 0.7, as well as conducting first

Download English Version:

# https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1770667

Download Persian Version:

https://daneshyari.com/article/1770667

Daneshyari.com