# **Deconstructing the Neutrino Mass Constraints from Galaxy Redshift Surveys**

Aoife Boyle<sup>\*</sup> & Eiichiro Komatsu

Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Garching bei München

Boyle & Komatsu, JCAP 2018, 03, 035 [arXiv: 1712.01857]

\*aoife@mpa-garching.mpg.de



Figure 1: Left: SDSS galaxy map (M. Blanton / SDSS); Centre: SDSS DR9 galaxy power spectrum [1]; Right: The derivative of the matter power spectrum with respect to  $M_{\nu}$ , with the change in the overall amplitude normalised. The reduction in the power on small scales caused by the free-streaming of massive neutrinos is clearly seen.

 $F_{\alpha\beta} = \frac{\partial P_{gg}}{\partial \theta_{\alpha}} C^{-1} \frac{\partial P_{gg}}{\partial \theta_{\beta}}$ 

*C* is the covariance matrix of observables, in our case, galaxy power spectra  $P_{qq}(z, \vec{k})$ .  $\theta$  are the model parameters, which define the chosen cosmological model. The final matrix F is the inverse covariance matrix for the model parameters.

We begin with the standard  $\Lambda CDM + M_{\nu}$  model, which assumes a flat Universe and a constant dark energy equation of state (EOS). We then check the effects of adding extensions to the model on our forecasted constraints.

$\theta$ : $\Lambda$ CDM + $M_{\nu}$		<u>θ: Extensions</u>	
$\theta_s^*$	Sound horizon size	$\Omega_k$	Curvature
$A_s$	Primordial power	$w_0$	Time-independent
	spectrum amplitude		dark energy EOS
$n_s$ *	Primordial power	$w_a$	Time-dependent dark
	spectrum tilt		energy EOS factor
$\omega_b^*$	Baryon density today		
$\omega_c$	Cold dark matter		
	density today		
au	Optical depth to the		
	CMB		
$M_{\nu}$	Neutrino mass		
*We include a very conservative CMB prior from Planck on these			

parameters.

We also marginalise over a linear galaxy bias parameter.

Galaxy surveys allow us to map the 3D distribution of galaxies. The statistical information on how these galaxies cluster is usually presented in the form of a galaxy power spectrum. Figure 1 shows such a map and power spectrum from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS). The galaxy power spectrum provides a wide range of constraining information. Two of the most popular probes are:

- Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAOs): Characteristic wiggles in the power spectrum (see the subplot of the power spectrum in Figure 1). The scales at which these wiggles occur are very well constrained from observations of the CMB. Using their apparent scale in the observed power spectrum, we can measure the distance to the redshift we are looking at. This in turn allows us to constrain the Universe's expansion rate as a function of redshift, H(z), which is sensitive to  $M_{\nu}$ .
- Redshift Space Distortions (RSDs): Anisotropies in the galaxy power spectrum that appear because of peculiar velocities along the line of sight, which alter the measured redshifts. These peculiar velocities can be caused by structure formation, and can therefore be used to constrain the rate of structure growth as a function of redshift, f(z,k), which is also sensitive to  $M_{\nu}$ .

BAOs and RSDs are two of the most popular probes of cosmological parameters that can be extracted from the galaxy power spectrum. However, the effects of massive neutrinos on the expansion rate (measured by BAOs) and the structure growth rate (measured by RSDs) are not unique. Therefore, the constraints extracted can depend heavily on the assumed cosmology. This is seen clearly in Figure 2. Is there a cosmology-insensitive probe of  $M_{\nu}$  contained in the galaxy power spectrum?

• Free-streaming effects: Massive neutrinos have one unique effect on the power spectrum that is not mimicked by changes in other cosmological parameters. Because massive neutrinos are relativistic at early times, they free-stream out of perturbations below a characteristic size, causing a suppression in the rate of structure growth on small scales (see the right panel of Figure 1). This effect is manifested in both the underlying matter power spectrum, which can be extracted from the galaxy power spectrum, and in the structure growth rate, as measured using RSDs. The relative level of suppression is proportional to  $M_{\nu}$ .

[1] L. Anderson *et al.*, 2012, MNRAS, 427, 3435, arXiv: 1203.6594.

## **Results** 1



**Figure 2:** A summary of our forecasts for Euclid combined with a very conservative CMB prior. The x-axes show the  $1\sigma$  neutrino mass constraints for the different cosmological models labelled on the y-axis. The first panel shows the forecasted constraints using the full observed galaxy power spectrum. The second and third panels show the constraints from BAOs and RSDs only, respectively. We see that all of these constraints are very model-dependent. The final panel shows the forecasted constraints using only the scale-dependence of clustering as measured in the shape of the underlying power spectrum and the structure growth rate measured from redshift space distortions. The constraints in this case are insensitive to changes in the cosmological assumptions.



Figure 3: The same as the first panel of Figure 2, but this time with the *x*-axis expanded scale reduced by a factor of 10. The various bars show the constraints with different priors on  $\tau$ . The longest bars correspond to Figure 2, with no prior on  $\tau$ . The cross-hatched bars show the same constraints if a prior on  $\tau$  from the Planck survey is assumed. The shortest bars show how the constraints would look if  $\tau$  was known perfectly. It is clear that  $\tau$  and  $M_{\nu}$  are heavily degenerate, and that improving constraints on  $\tau$  would provide significant gains. With the strong constraints predicted for Euclid, the weakness of the constraint on  $\tau$  becomes the limiting factor.

This degeneracy arises because  $\tau$  is heavily degenerate with  $A_s$ in the CMB data (the combination  $A_s \exp(-2\tau)$  is what is actually measured). Meanwhile,  $A_s$  and  $M_{\nu}$  are highly degenerate in the galaxy power spectrum, as both affect the amplitude. This leads to a strong degeneracy between  $M_{\nu}$  and  $\tau$  when the two are combined.

# **Conclusions and Future Work**

#### Conclusions

- The current and forecasted constraints on the neutrino mass from galaxy surveys are heavily dependent on the assumed cosmology.
- Isolating the signatures of neutrino free-streaming in the power spectrum and structure growth rate gives the most robust constraints, because this effect is difficult to mimic with changes in other cosmological parameters. These constraints are very competitive with BAO-only and RSDonly constraints.
- In the case of the combined constraints, the weak constraints on  $\tau$  become the limiting factor. This suggests that a more efficient way to reduce the error bars on  $M_{\nu}$  could be to invest in reionisation surveys and enhanced CMB polarisation measurements, rather than increasingly powerful galaxy surveys.

### **Future Work**

- The inclusion of more comprehensive CMB priors.
- The addition of lensing information. Lensing probes the matter power spectrum directly and is therefore particularly useful.
- An examination of the effects of a more complex treatment of galaxy bias.