Nonlinear aspects in galaxy clustering in modified gravity

> Filippo Vernizzi IPhT - CEA, CNRS, Paris-Saclay

> > with Euclid TH-WG WP7 and other collaborators

24 June 2021 Atelier Action Dark Energy 2021

Global picture





Global picture





Standard perturbation theory + EFT of LSS



Long-wavelength DM fluctuations computed perturbatively + finite number of unknown coefficients (counterterms) parameterising the effect of short-wavelength physics on long-wavelength one, whose k-dependence is dictated by symmetries

Standard perturbation theory + EFT of LSS

Dark matter described by continuity and Euler eqs. + Poisson eq.

$$\begin{split} \dot{\delta} &+ \frac{1}{a} \partial_i \left((1+\delta) v^i \right) = 0 , \\ \dot{v}^i &+ H v^i + \frac{1}{a} v^j \partial_j v^i + \frac{1}{a} \partial_i \Phi = -\frac{1}{a} \frac{1}{\rho_m} \partial_j \tau^{ij}_{\text{short}} , \\ \frac{1}{a^2} \partial^2 \Phi &= \frac{3}{2} H^2 \Omega_m \delta \quad \ddot{\delta}(\vec{k}) + H(t) \dot{\delta}(\vec{k}) + \Omega_m H(t)^2 \delta(\vec{k}) \sim \int d^3 k_1 \alpha (\vec{k}_{\text{pulk}} \vec{k}_{\text{pulk}}) \delta(\vec{k} - \vec{k}_1) \\ \text{Carrasco, Hertzberg, Senatore 12} \end{split}$$

Power spectrum
$$\langle \delta(\vec{k})\delta(\vec{k}')\rangle = (2\pi)^3 \delta_D(\vec{k}+\vec{k}')P(k)$$

$$\delta(\vec{k}) = \delta^{(1)}(\vec{k}) + \delta^{(2)}(\vec{k}) + \delta^{(3)}(\vec{k}) + \dots$$

One-loop solution

 $P_{22}(k) =$

Integrals

$$P_{13}(k) = 6P_{11}(k) \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} P_{11}(q) F_3(\vec{k}, \vec{q}, -\vec{q}) \qquad P_{13}^{ct}(k) = c_\delta^2 \frac{k^2}{k_{\rm NL}^2} P_{11}(k)$$

Global picture





Galaxy biasing

Long-wavelength fluctuations of galaxies are described as biased tracers of the long-wavelength fluctuations of DM + DM counterterms.



Controlled expansion (in perturbation theory and in derivatives)

$$\delta_g(x,t) = \sum_n \int dt' K_n(t,t') \,\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_n(x_{\rm fl},t')$$
$$= \sum_{n,m} b_{n,m}(t) \,\mathcal{O}_{n,m}(x,t)$$

For the one-loop power spectrum we need

$$\delta_g = b_1 \delta + \frac{b_2}{2} \delta^2 + b_{\mathcal{G}_2} \mathcal{G}_2 + b_{\nabla^2 \delta} \nabla^2 \delta , \qquad \mathcal{G}_2 \equiv \left(\frac{\partial_i \partial_j}{\nabla^2} \delta\right)^2 - \delta^2$$

Global picture





Redshift-Space Distortions

Galaxies are measured in redshift space but we can relate the density in redshift space and real space by mass conservation

Kaiser '87

$$1 + \delta_s(\vec{x}_s) = \left[1 + \delta(\vec{x}(\vec{x}_s))\right] \left| \frac{\partial \vec{x}_s}{\partial \vec{x}} \right|_{\vec{x}(\vec{x}_s)}^{-1}$$
$$\vec{x}_s = \vec{x} + \frac{\vec{v} \cdot \hat{z}}{H_0} \hat{z}$$

One-loop power spectrum

$$\begin{split} P_g(k,\mu) &= Z_1(\mu)^2 P_{11}(k) \\ &+ 2 \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \, Z_2(\boldsymbol{q},\boldsymbol{k}-\boldsymbol{q},\mu)^2 P_{11}(|\boldsymbol{k}-\boldsymbol{q}|) P_{11}(q) \\ &+ 6 Z_1(\mu) P_{11}(k) \int \frac{d^3 q}{(2\pi)^3} \, Z_3(\boldsymbol{q},-\boldsymbol{q},\boldsymbol{k},\mu) P_{11}(q) \\ &+ 2 Z_1(\mu) P_{11}(k) \left(c_{\rm ct} \frac{k^2}{k_{\rm M}^2} + c_{r,1} \mu^2 \frac{k^2}{k_{\rm M}^2} + c_{r,2} \mu^4 \frac{k^2}{k_{\rm M}^2} \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}_g} \left(c_{\epsilon,1} + c_{\epsilon,2} \frac{k^2}{k_{\rm M}^2} + c_{\epsilon,3} f \mu^2 \frac{k^2}{k_{\rm M}^2} \right). \end{split}$$

D'Amico et al. 1909.05271 (see also Ivanov et al. 1909.05277)



Fast loop evaluation

Scan parameter space with MCMC: need to compute loop-integrals quickly

$$P_{22}(k) = 2 \int \frac{d^3q}{(2\pi)^3} P_{11}(q) P_{11}(|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|) \left[F_2(\vec{q}, \vec{k} - \vec{q}) \right]^2$$

$$F_2(\vec{q}, \vec{k} - \vec{q}) = \frac{5}{14} + \frac{3k^2}{28q^2} + \frac{3k^2}{28|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|^2} - \frac{5q^2}{28|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|^2} - \frac{5|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|^2}{28q^2} + \frac{k^4}{14|\vec{k} - \vec{q}|^2q^2}$$

Bottleneck is the power spectrum shape. Solution FFTLog: decompose it as Fourier series of log(k)

Cosmology dependent

Simonovic et al. 1708.08130

Precomputed Feynman loop-integrals of a massless QFT (cosmology independent)

Loop-integrals become matrix multiplications

 P_{lin}

Controlled accuracy



Smooth and clustering dark energy

Dark matter described by continuity and Euler equations + Poisson eq.

$$\begin{split} \dot{\delta} &+ \frac{1}{a} \partial_i \left((1+\delta) v^i \right) = 0 \ , \\ \dot{v}^i &+ H v^i + \frac{1}{a} v^j \partial_j v^i + \frac{1}{a} \partial_i \Phi = -\frac{1}{a} \frac{1}{\rho_m} \partial_j \tau^{ij}_{\rm short} \ , \end{split} \qquad \mbox{EFT stress-energy tensor} \\ \frac{1}{a^2} \partial^2 \Phi &= \frac{3}{2} H^2 \Omega_m \delta \end{split}$$

Smooth dark energy component: $c_s^2 \simeq 1$, $w \ge -1$ no DE perturbation, same PT.

Clustering dark energy component: $c_s^2 \ll 1$, $w \neq -1$ comoving fluids, same PT.

$$\begin{split} \dot{\delta}_m &+ \frac{1}{a} \partial_i \left((1 + \delta_m) v^i \right) = 0 , \\ \dot{\delta}_Q &- 3w H \delta_Q + \frac{1}{a} \partial_i \left((1 + w + \delta_Q) v^i \right) = 0 , \\ \frac{1}{a^2} \partial^2 \Phi &= \frac{3}{2} H^2 \Omega_m \left(\delta_m + \frac{\Omega_Q}{\Omega_m} \delta_Q \right) \end{split}$$
 Sefusatti, FV et al. 1101.1026

Perturbation theory, biasing and RSD essentially the same (except exact time dependence vs Einstein-de-Sitter approximation)

MG: Scale independent models



Scale independent models: nDGP, Galileons, Horndeski, beyond Horndeski, etc.

D'Amico, Huang, Mancarella, FV 1609.01272

MG: Scale independent models

Scale independent models: nDGP, Galileons, Horndeski, beyond Horndeski, etc.

 $m_{\phi} \ll k_{\rm f.m.}/a$

Ex: braiding (kinetic mixing) ${\cal L} \supset \dot{\Psi} \dot{\pi} \ , \ \partial \Psi \partial \pi$

Same equations for the dark matter fluid (continuity + Euler). **Poisson equation modified:**

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Time-dependent gravitational constant}} \\ k^2 \Phi &= 4\pi G_{\text{eff}} \delta + \int \frac{d^3 k_1 d^3 k_2}{(2\pi)^6} \delta(\vec{k} - \vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2) M_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) \Phi(\vec{k}_1) \Phi(\vec{k}_2) \\ &+ \int \frac{d^3 k_1 d^3 k_2 d^3 k_3}{(2\pi)^9} \delta(\vec{k} - \vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2 - \vec{k}_3) M_3(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3) \Phi(\vec{k}_1) \Phi(\vec{k}_2) \Phi(\vec{k}_3) \\ & \mathbf{NEW PT nonlinear couplings} \\ G_{\text{eff}} &= G_{\text{eff}}(a) \\ M_2(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2) &= \mu_2(a) \left(k_1^2 k_2^2 - (\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_2)^2 \right) \\ M_3(\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \vec{k}_3) &= \dots \end{aligned}$$

MG: Scale independent models



EFT of Dark Energy





EFT of Dark Energy



Symmetries

Structure of PT kernels dictated by **symmetries** (e.g. translation, rotations, Bose, mass and momentum conservation, etc.) D'Amico et al., in preparation



$$\delta_{\mathbf{k}}^{(n)}(\eta) \equiv \frac{1}{n!} \int \frac{d^3 q_1}{(2\pi)^3} \cdots \frac{d^3 q_n}{(2\pi)^3} (2\pi)^3 \delta_D\left(\mathbf{k} - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{q}_i\right) F^{(n)}(\mathbf{q}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{q}_n; \eta) \varphi_{\mathbf{q}_1}(\eta) \cdots \varphi_{\mathbf{q}_n}(\eta),$$

Time-dependent translation symmetry (Equivalence Principle)

$$\begin{split} \tilde{x}^{i} &= x^{i} + n^{i}(t) , \quad \tilde{t} = t , \\ \tilde{\varphi}_{a}(\tilde{x}^{j}, t) &= \varphi_{a}(x^{j}, t) + h^{i}_{\varphi_{a}}(t)\tilde{x}^{i} , \\ \tilde{\delta}(\tilde{x}^{j}, t) &= \delta(x^{j}, t) , \\ \tilde{v}^{i}(\tilde{x}^{j}, t) &= v^{i}(x^{j}, t) + a\dot{n}^{i}(t) , \end{split}$$

Same symmetries for tracers (excluding mass and momentum conservation): **same PT structure for bias and RSD**

Horndeski vs beyond Horndeski

Horndeski theories: time-dependent translation symmetry (EP)

PT kernels, bias, RSD enjoy the same structure as Standard Perturbation Theory. Example:

$$F_2(\vec{k}, \vec{q}) = (1 + c_0)\frac{17}{21} + \frac{\mu}{2}\left(\frac{k}{q} + \frac{q}{k}\right) + (1 + c_2)\left(\mu^2 - \frac{1}{3}\right) , \qquad \mu \equiv \hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}$$

Fixed by symmetries

Beyond Horndeski theories: time-dependent translation symmetry (EP)

New features in PT kernels, bias, RSD, loops...

Hirano et al. 1801.07885; Crisostomi, Lewandowski, FV 1909.07366

$$F_{2}(\vec{k},\vec{q}) = (1+c_{0})\frac{17}{21} + (1+c_{1})\frac{\mu}{2}\left(\frac{k}{q} + \frac{q}{k}\right) + (1+c_{2})\left(\mu^{2} - \frac{1}{3}\right), \qquad \mu \equiv \hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}$$
Anomalous dipole
$$0.00 - 0.05 - 0.05 - 0.05 - 0.05 - 0.05 - 0.03 - 0.03 - 0.03 - 0.09 - 0.05 - 0.15 - 0.05 -$$

MG: Scale dependent models

Scale dependent models: f(R), chameleon, etc. $m_\phi\gtrsim k_{
m f.m.}/a$

Growth depends on scale:

$$\frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}D(k,\tau) + \mathcal{H}\frac{d}{d\tau}D(k,\tau) - \frac{3}{2}\Omega_m(a)\mathcal{H}^2\left[1 + \alpha(\tau)\frac{k^2}{k^2 + a^2m^2(\tau)}\right]D(k,\tau) = 0$$

Two regimes:



10-1

k [h/Mpc]

10-2

100

Captured by higher-order operators?

 $\nabla^2 \delta$, $\nabla^4 \delta$,...

f(R): One-loop galaxy PS

PT kernels are non-standard but can be computed straightforwardly:

$$F_{2}(\mathbf{k}_{1},\mathbf{k}_{2}) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{14}\mathcal{A} + \frac{\mathbf{k}_{1}\cdot\mathbf{k}_{2}}{2k_{1}k_{2}}\left(\frac{k_{2}}{k_{1}} + \frac{k_{1}}{k_{2}}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{14}\mathcal{B}\right)\frac{(\mathbf{k}_{1}\cdot\mathbf{k}_{2})^{2}}{k_{1}^{2}k_{2}^{2}}$$
$$\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{k}_{1},\mathbf{k}_{2},t) = \frac{7D_{\mathcal{A}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}_{1},\mathbf{k}_{2},t)}{3D_{+}(k_{1},t)D_{+}(k_{2},t)}, \qquad \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{k}_{1},\mathbf{k}_{2},t) = \frac{7D_{\mathcal{B}}^{(2)}(\mathbf{k}_{1},\mathbf{k}_{2},t)}{3D_{+}(k_{1},t)D_{+}(k_{2},t)},$$

Full calculation on one-loop PS in redshift space with EFT counterterms:

Aviles et al. 2012.05077



Conclusions and challenges

LCDM, smooth and clustering DE

- Galaxy clustering in the mildly nonlinear regime modelled by perturbation theory + finite number of free parameters, with controlled accuracy.
- Challenge: Going beyond one loop (two loops). Slower calculations, more EFT parameters, etc. Higher accuracy required.

Scale independent MG model:

- Above standard methods (with new PT kernels) can be applied to Horndeski/EFT of DE models.
 Symmetries are the same!
- New phenomenology (yet to explore fully) in broken time-dep. translation symmetry (beyond Horndeski).
- Challenge: Many DE/MG (time-dependent) parameters. How to parametrise them? Degeneracies with EFT of LSS parameters.

Scale dependent MG model:

- Above methods can be extended to scale-dep. models. Work in progress.
- Challenge: How to include scale-dependence in loop integrals in a fast way (FFTLog)?
- Challenge: How to include scale-dependence in bias expansion? Are higher-order bias term sufficient? How scale dependence affect EFT of LSS parameters and their scale-dependence?