The Sociology of Dark Energy

Ofer Lahav University College London











1

Outline

- A brief history of Dark Energy and LCDM: from Newton & Einstein to the accelerating universe
- Is it just Lambda (w=-1)? LHS or RHS? 10¹²⁰ too small?
- When to stop? does cost-benefit analysis make sense?
- Do we communicate too much, towards one model?
- How many large surveys should one join?
- AI and Cosmology: evolution or revolution?

References: OL (2000), DES book (2021), Calder & OL (2008. 2010), OL& Massimi (2014), OL & Silk (2021), OL (2023), Offer & OL (2023)

The contents and expansion of the Universe What accelerates the Universe?



The mystery of Dark Energy

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu}$$

The weak field limit of GR: $a = -GM/r^2 + \Lambda/3 r$



"I have now explained the TWO principle cases of attraction...which is very remarkable." Isaac Newton, Principia (1687)

"Introducing A - the blunder of my life..." Albert Einstein (1920s)

"I am a detective in search for a criminal - Л." Arthur Eddington (1920s)



$$w = p/\rho c^2$$
 .

 $ho \propto a^{-3(1+w)}$

 $w = -1 \rightarrow$

The Dark Energy Equation of State



from DES+Planck+BAO+SNIa the equation of state $w= -1.031_{-0.027}^{+0.030.}$ is consistent with Λ (arXiv:2105.135490)

Λ

OL, arXiv:2009.10177

Key Probes of Dark Energy: expansion and growth of structure



Standard Candles and Rulers



JWST image

Clusters

Weak Lensing





So, what is Lambda/Dark Energy?

- Systematics mimic DE?
- Lambda-CDM, EoS P/rho= w = -1.00?
- Dynamical scalar field w(z)?
- Why 120 orders of magnitudes smaller than expected?
- Signatures of modified gravity?
- Inhomogeneous Universe?
- Multi-verse & Anthropic Principle?
- An unknown unknown??



- Even if he blamed himself for the **'blunder of his life'**, this is probably **the first paper on relativistic cosmology**.
- This is the first paper to propose a cosmological constant A, now the focus of projects of billions of Euros/\$\$\$, with hundreds of scientists spending a significant part of their career on this problem.
- The paper was motivated by a problem on boundary conditions, rather than by the need for a static universe.
- Einstein put ∧ on the **left hand side**, as part of the curvature term (this might still be correct...)
- He 'overlooked' to predict the expansion/contraction of the universe without Λ.
- He 'overlooked' to notice that the static solution is unstable, so a universe with ∧ would also expand/contract.
- He 'overlooked' to see ∧ as a free parameter, which could also lead to an accelerating universe.

"Dark Energy Foundations"

- Is there a fundamental reason for w=-1 (Lambda)?
- Is Lambda on the LHS or RHS of Einstein's equation?
- Is there a physical case for w<-1?</p>
- What is the case for a time-dependent w(z) ?
- When should we stop measuring w? (note 'precision' vs 'accuracy', cf. curvature)
- Does **Anthropic reasoning** make sense?
- Is a higher level theory to be discovered, connecting GR to Quantum Mechanics and Thermodynamics? Will it take another 100 years ?
- What is the discovery potential for non-DE science?

"The Dark Energy Road Map"

- The community has been fortunate to have so many DE projects funded. This is a golden age for research in cosmology.
 - Is this the **peak funding** for DE science?
 - How to use **resources** wisely?
- Collaborations are getting bigger and more ambitious: projects take about 20 years, with hundreds of collaborators

(2dF ~30, DES ~400, Euclid ~1200 people)

- what is the impact on careers of junior scientists?
- AI and knowledge transfer
- Large galaxy surveys the 'LHC of Cosmology' !



When to Stop?



Current observations from e.g.
 DES+Planck+BAO+SNIa

w = -1.03 + -0.03

Should we still measure it more precisely?

 It depends if there is an alternative viable theory (e.g. for w=-0.99 or -1.01, or a time-evolving DE?)

OL & Silk (Nature Astronomy, arXiv:2109.08190)

Possible outcomes of ongoing and future surveys



Back to Lambda

'Accuracy' vs 'Precision'

A new paradigm shift?

Back to fundamental Physics

Anthropic Principle?

Back to systematics/Astrophysics

Then fundamental Physics

Paradigm shifts: a new entity or a new theory?

Phenomenon	New Entity	New theory
Uranus' orbit	Neptune	(Bessel's specific gravity ruled out)
Mercury's orbit	(Hypothetical planet Vulcan ruled out)	General Relativity
Beta decay	Neutrino	(violation of angular momentum ruled out)
Galaxy flat rotation curves	Dark Matter?	Modified Newtonian Dynamics?
Accelerating universe (SN Ia and other data)	Dark Energy?	Modified General Relativity?

OL & Michela Massimi (A&G 2014) Lucy Calder & OL (Physics World 2010)

Health checks of LCDM "Tensions"

- Systematic errors in data, or new Physics?
- * Hubble Constant tension (~4 sigma)
- $H_0 = 73.2 \pm 1.0 \text{ km/sec/Mpc}$ (Riess et al. 2021)
- $H_0 = 67.4 \pm 0.5$ (Planck 2018)
- A new approach: Gravitational Wave sirens
- $H_0 = 68.6 \pm 11$ (Bright;+ pv, Nicolaou et al. 2020)
- $H_0 = 72.0 \pm 10$ (Dark + Bright; Palmese et al. 2020)
- * Clumpiness σ_8 (WL smoother than CMB)

(~2 sigma)



The tale of two surveys: Dark Energy Survey (DES) &

Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI)



- Modern instruments on old twin 4m telescopes: DES/DECaIN
 (imaging) on Blanco (Chile) and DESI (spectroscopy) on the Mayall (Kitt Peak)
- DES Fermilab-led; DESI LBL-led & international partners
- UCL built both optical correctors
- ◆ DES completed 6 seasons in 2019 →
 300M galaxy images and thousands of SN
- DESI started observations in 2020
 23M (so far, out of 35M) galaxy+qso spectra





Big Data in Astronomy



Survey	Data per night/day	Galaxies	Cost	Scientists
DES	1 TeraB	~300 Million (all observed)	~\$70M	~400
DESI	40 GigaB	~35 Million (23M observed)	~\$70M	~600
Rubin-LSST	15 TeraB	~Billions	~\$1.0B	~1000
Euclid	850 GigaB	~Billions	~\$1.5B	~1500
SKA	1 PetaB	~Billions	~\$1.3B	~1000

How many surveys should one join?

Cost-Benefit Analysis?

- CBA attempted e.g. for LHC.
- In Observational Cosmology, difficult to estimate the cost, and even harder to quantify the benefits.
- But it generates great spinoffs (e.g. GPS, WiFi, ,WWW), it prepares for hi-tech careers and it appeals to the popular imagination and curiosity.
- Stage-III experiments give dW=3% for \$100M, Stage–IV would gove dW below 1% for \$1B.
- How much would you pay for the next generation?



Cross talk: Artificial Intelligence, Physics, Humans



<u>OL, arXiv:2302.04324</u> (IAU Symp 368)

Astro Papers on the arXiv with "Deep Learning" in the Title





"Shallow" Learning

"Deep" Learning

Shallow learning is actually quite deep, as based on human knowledge!

UCL Centre for Doctoral Training (CDT) in Data Intensive Science (DIS)

> 72 CDT PhD students in 7 years, 15 theses completed



[±]UCL CDT DIS

UCL CDT in Data Intensive Science

http://www.hep.ucl.ac.uk/cdt-dis/









≜UCL









Summary

- 3 decades of LCDM: still supported by most current observations, including DES Y3++
- Important to test LCDM further (e.g. local dynamics, CMB Cold Spot, gravitational redshift wavest, gravitational waves, parameter 'tension')
- Timeline: past (APM, 2dF & SDSS,WMAP, Planck, ...), present (BOSS, DESI, HSC, ...), future (Rubin-LSST, DESI, Euclid, Roman-WFIRST, SKA,...) - a golden age for cosmology
- What are the prospects for a new paradigm shift, beyond LCDM, eg w(z) or ModGrav ?
- AI for cosmology: now essential, but waiting for a 'killer application'!