# **Cosmology in the post-reionization Universe with LIM**

Matteo Viel - SISSA (Trieste, Italy)

5/10/25 - LIM 25 (Annecy, France)



# Promises of the post-reionization Universe

- Ideal place to test structure formation
- ... and cosmological models in and beyond ACDM (Universe being more linear)
- Large volume to be probed
- ... but LIM is sensitive to small scale (astro) physics (intrinsically no threshold)



Clustering of LSS tracers (>Mpc) is coupled to the astrophysics of line intensity (~O(pc))

Bernal & Kovetz 2022

# Promises of the post-reionization Universe



Long lever arm in terms of scales/redshifts will in turn allow to break degeneracies between astro and cosmo parameters with:

- cross-correlations of different tracers
- new estimators (e.g. VID, bispectrum, Machine Learning)

It is an "active phase" of structure formation processes (see Rachel's talk)

# **Promises of the post-reionization Universe**



Long lever arm in terms of scales/redshifts will in turn allow to break degeneracies between astro and cosmo parameters with:

- cross-correlations of different tracers
- new estimators (e.g. VID, bispectrum, Machine Learning)

It is an "active phase" of structure formation processes (see Rachel's talk)

- > What is Dark Matter?
- Is evolving Dark Energy real?
- Can we measure neutrino masses?
- Can we probe the matter power spectrum down to the smallest scales?
- Can we test inflation?
- Is there new physics like Primordial Magnetic Fields?
- Can we constrain galaxy formation? [highly complementary to JWST observations]

- > What is Dark Matter?
- Is evolving Dark Energy real?
- Can we measure neutrino masses?
- Can we probe the matter power spectrum down to the smallest scales?
- Can we test inflation?
- Is there new physics like Primordial Magnetic Fields?
- Can we constrain galaxy formation? [highly complementary to JWST observations]

Signature in clustering, decay, annihilation BAOs Neutrino free-streaming at large/medium scales DM acoustic oscillations, suppression of power

Non Gaussianity Increase of power at small scales

High redshift Universe is becoming a very interesting place to constrain galaxy formation models [tail of reionization]

### Modelling LIM power to linear order

Matteo Viel

$$P_{21 \text{ cm}}(k, \mu, z) = \bar{T}_b(z)^2 [(b_{\text{H I}}(z) + f(z)\mu^2)^2 P_{\text{m}}(k, z) + P_{\text{SN}}(z)],$$
Linear power (cosmology)
  
Brightness HI temperature or other lines
$$\bar{T}_b(z) = 189h\left(\frac{H_0(1+z)^2}{H(z)}\right)\Omega_{\text{HI}}(z) \text{ mK}$$
Amount of HI
$$\Omega_{\text{HI}}(z) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} n(M, z)M_{\text{HI}}(M, z)dM$$

HI bias

Amount of HI

Shot-Noise power spectrum

Brightness HI temperature or other lines  
Amount of HI  
HI bias  
Shot-Noise power spectrum  
New physics from P(k) or n(M)  

$$\bar{T}_b(z) = 189h\left(\frac{\Pi_0(1+z)}{H(z)}\right)\Omega_{\rm HI}(z) \,{\rm mK}$$
  
 $\Omega_{\rm HI}(z) = 189h\left(\frac{\Pi_0(1+z)}{H(z)}\right)\Omega_{\rm HI}(z) \,{\rm mK}$   
 $\Omega_{\rm HI}(z) = \frac{1}{\rho_c^0}\int_0^{\infty} n(M,z)M_{\rm HI}(M,z)dM$   
 $P_{\rm SN}(z) = \frac{1}{(\rho_c^0\Omega_{\rm HI}(z))^2}\int_0^{\infty} n(M,z)M_{\rm HI}^2(M,z)dM$ 

Halo mass function (cosmology)

Amount of HI in each DM halo (astrophysics)

# Modelling of the LIM power with the halo model

Matteo Viel

- Halo models important for reaching small scales
- Can be easily extended to any IM line
- Profile must be specified
- M<sub>HI</sub> and Ω<sub>HI</sub> from sims or from observed HI mass function or DLAs

$$\begin{split} P_{\rm HI}(k,z) &= P_{\rm HI,1h}(k) + P_{\rm HI,2h}(k) \qquad P_{\rm HI}^{\rm SN}(z) = \lim_{k \to 0} P_{\rm 1h,HI}(k,z) :\\ P_{\rm HI,1h}(k,z) &= \frac{1}{(\rho_{\rm c}^0 \Omega_{\rm HI}(z))^2} \int_0^\infty dMn(M,z) M_{\rm HI}^2(M,z) \left| u_{\rm HI}(k|M,z) \right|^2 \\ P_{\rm HI,2h}(k,z) &= \frac{P_{\rm lin}(k,z)}{(\rho_{\rm c}^0 \Omega_{\rm HI}(z))^2} \left[ \int_0^\infty dMn(M,z) b(M,z) M_{\rm HI}(M,z) \left| u_{\rm HI}(k|M,z) \right| \right]^2 \end{split}$$

COSMOLOGY

# Modelling of the LIM power with the halo model

Matteo Viel

- Halo models important for reaching small scales
- Can be easily extended to any IM line
- Profile must be specified
- M<sub>HI</sub> and Ω<sub>HI</sub> from sims or from observed HI mass function or DLAs

$$\begin{split} P_{\rm HI}(k,z) &= P_{\rm HI,1h}(k) + P_{\rm HI,2h}(k) \qquad P_{\rm HI}^{\rm SN}(z) = \lim_{k \to 0} P_{\rm 1h,HI}(k,z) :\\ P_{\rm HI,1h}(k,z) &= \frac{1}{(\rho_{\rm c}^0 \Omega_{\rm HI}(z))^2} \int_0^\infty dM n(M,z) M_{\rm HI}^2(M,z) \left| u_{\rm HI}(k|M,z) \right|^2 \\ P_{\rm HI,2h}(k,z) &= \frac{P_{\rm lin}(k,z)}{(\rho_{\rm c}^0 \Omega_{\rm HI}(z))^2} \left[ \int_0^\infty dM n(M,z) b(M,z) M_{\rm HI}(M,z) |u_{\rm HI}(k|M,z)| \right]^2 \end{split}$$

COSMOLOGY

#### ASTROPHYSICS OF THE HALOES

$$M_{\rm HI}(M,z) = \alpha f_{\rm H,c} M \left(\frac{M}{10^{11} h^{-1} M_{\odot}}\right)^{\beta} \exp\left[-\left(\frac{v_{c0}}{v_c(M,z)}\right)^3\right] \qquad \rho_{\rm HI}(r;M,z) = \rho_0 \exp(-r/r_{\rm s,HI})$$

#### Physically-rich modelling: involves a set of parameters that are calibrated on sims to fit observations

Padmanabhan+16,+17; Bernal, Breyesse, Gil-Marin, Kovetz 19; Villaescusa—Navarro et al. 2018, Padmanabhan 2024 (review)

### New modelling of LIM power with the halo model



- Alcock-Paczynski parameters and BAO wiggles
- State-of-the-art treatment of (non) Poisson shot noise
- ➢ Bias of the different lines [CII] and CO
- ➢ EFT inspired perturbation theory at 1-loop
- Comparison with large scale/high res. (DM only) mocks

# New modelling of LIM power with the halo model



- Alcock-Paczynski parameters and BAO wiggles
- State-of-the-art treatment of (non) Poisson shot noise
- Bias of the different lines [CII] and CO
- ➢ EFT inspired perturbation theory at 1-loop
- Comparison with large scale/high res. (DM only) mocks
- Range of validity k~1 h/Mpc at z=1 (5% agreement)

Different treatment of non linearities in matter and bias



Moradinezhad Dizgah, Nikakthar, Keating, Castorina 22

# Learning LIM with diffusion models



# Evolving Dark Energy - I



Berti, Bellini, Bonvin, Kuntz, Viel, Zumalacarregui arxiv:2503.13198

Matteo Viel

# Evolving Dark Energy - II

- Testing GR and DE with LIM (Horndeski, Bransk-Dicke, early dark energy models)
- Fisher matrix analysis for CO and [CII] on P(k) including modelling of the interlopers; scatter in L(M); shot noise; instrumental noise
- Effectively a linear model, which is sensitive to geometry and dynamics



*CPL parameterization* 

Moradinezhad Dizgah, Bellini, & Keating 2024 (also Berti, MV+21 for 21cm)

### **Beyond P(k): Voxel Intensity Distribution**

$$\mathcal{COSMOLOGY} \qquad \mathcal{T}^{2}(k) \equiv \frac{P_{\text{nCDM}}(k)}{P_{\text{CDM}}(k)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k \leq k_{\text{cut}} \\ \left(\frac{k}{k_{\text{cut}}}\right)^{-n} & \text{if } k > k_{\text{cut}} \end{cases}$$

astrophysics

$$\frac{L_{\rm CO}}{L_{\odot}}(M) = 4.9 \times 10^{-5} \frac{C}{(M/M_*)^A + (M/M_*)^B}$$

$$\mathcal{P}(T) = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_N(T) \mathcal{P}(N)$$

- Pheno model that captures axion + cold DM
- COMAP-Y5 experiment (z=2.9)
- Monopole of the power spectrum + Voxel intensity distribution (VID) – this is important to capture non gaussian nature of signal



Breysse, Kovetz+17, Sato-Polito & Bernal 22, Sabla, Bernal, Sato-Polito, Kamionkowski 24

# **Beyond P(k): Voxel Intensity Distribution**

$$COSMOLOGY \qquad \mathcal{T}^{2}(k) \equiv \frac{P_{\rm nCDM}(k)}{P_{\rm CDM}(k)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k \leq k_{\rm cut} \\ \left(\frac{k}{k_{\rm cut}}\right)^{-n} & \text{if } k > k_{\rm cut} \end{cases}$$

astrophysics

S 
$$\frac{L_{\rm CO}}{L_{\odot}}(M) = 4.9 \times 10^{-5} \frac{C}{(M/M_*)^A + (M/M_*)^B}$$

$$\mathcal{P}(T) = \sum_{N=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{P}_N(T) \mathcal{P}(N)$$

- Pheno model that captures axion + cold DM
- COMAP-Y5 experiment (z=2.9)
- Monopole of the power spectrum + Voxel intensity distribution (VID) – this is important to capture non gaussian nature of signal



Breysse, Kovetz+17, Sato-Polito & Bernal 22, Sabla, Bernal, Sato-Polito, Kamionkowski 24

### How is HI distributed in cold DM haloes?

Matteo Viel



Feedback/star formation is shaping the properties of HI... ...unfortunately this above cannot be directly observed

*Villaescusa-Navarro+ 2018* 

# How is HI distributed in non-cold DM haloes at z=0?



Zhang, Garaldi, Despali, Viel 2025 in prep.

# How is HI distributed in non-cold DM haloes at z=3?



Zhang, Garaldi, Despali, Viel 2025 in prep.

#### How does HI is distributed in DM haloes?



- Modeling of HI halo important also for halo models - Surely affected by feedback but maybe also sensitive to DM nature?
- Large scatter in the HI density profile (correlates with environmental properties)
- Rationale behind: we are tracing the cold gas at high-z, i.e. building blocks of star formation

# The relics of reionization



# The relics of reionization





- > 21cm power spectrum typically boosted
- > And bispectrum (which follows  $x_{HI}$ ) shows distinctive features
- New window of opportunity for the bispectrum after EoR (Leon Noble's talk later)

#### Is the small scale HI distribution important?



# Is the small scale HI distribution important?



- N-body (all HI is in the center of the halo) vs. full hydro HI power spectrum (effectively there is a 1-halo term). Normalization is quite different but shape is reasonable.
- Kaiser effect (boosts power at large scales) vs. Finger of Gods (suppresses power at small scales <u>but not so small</u>). Behaviour in matter field and HI field is different....!

#### **Cross correlating HI and galaxies**



...further progress: interfacing this "small-scale" accurate and physical information with large scale methods for extensive mock productions

And machine learning techniques...

And higher order statistics...

Spinelli+2020 - Noble, Majumdar, MV+ 25 in prep.

### Modelling the 21cm power: SKA-mid



- Beam is killing small/medium scales modes
- Modelling non-linearities is thus not so crucial (due to beam)
- But non-linear scales are indeed informative

### Modelling the 21cm power: SKA-mid



- Beam is killing small/medium scales modes
- Modelling non-linearities is thus not so crucial (due to beam)
- But non-linear scales are informative (to some extent)
- Compared to Planck only improvement of a factor 4 on the error on  $H_0$ ,  $Ω_c$





# Modelling the 21cm cross-power: SKA-mid X DESI/Euclid

$$P_{\rm g}(z,k,\mu) = \left( b_{\rm g}(z) + f(z)\,\mu^2 \right)^2 P_{\rm m}(z,k) + \frac{1}{\bar{n}_{\rm g}(z)}$$

- Cross-correlation with spectroscopic samples
- Nuisance parameters to bracket instrumental and astrophysical uncertainties
- Very constraining (similar to auto-correlation)



Parameter	$\hat{P}_0 + \hat{P}_2$	$\hat{P}_{21,g}^{\mathrm{DESI}}$	$\hat{P}_{21,g}^{\text{DESI}}$ + nuis.	$\hat{P}^{ ext{Euclid}}_{ ext{21,g}}$	$\hat{P}_{21,g}^{\text{Euclid}}$ + nuis.	$\hat{P}_{21,g}^{\text{DESI}} + \hat{P}_{21,g}^{\text{Euclid}} + \text{nuis.}$	$\hat{P}_0 + \hat{P}_2 + \hat{P}_{21,g}^{\text{DESI}} + \hat{P}_{21,g}^{\text{Euclid}} + \text{nuis.}$
$H_0$	0.25%	0.69%	1.96%	0.49%	1.07%	0.87%	0.33%

- Poor angular resolution, will smooth BAO feature
- > But in the k parallel direction, frequency resolution is very high  $\rightarrow$  radial BAO
- > 1D power is reduced in amplitude compared to 3D but wiggles are prominent



Villaescusa-Navarro, Alonso, MV 2017

- Poor angular resolution, will smooth BAO feature
- ▶ But in the k parallel direction, frequency resolution is very high  $\rightarrow$  radial BAO
- > 1D power is reduced in amplitude compared to 3D but wiggles are prominent



Villaescusa-Navarro, Alonso, MV 2017

- SKA estimate: H(z) measured at sub-percent level up to z=2.5
- Made with mask, and foregrounds removal
- And realistic treatment of instrument noise



- $\blacktriangleright$  SKA estimate: H(z) measured at sub-percent level up to z=2.5
- > Made with mask, and foregrounds removal
- And realistic treatment of instrument noise





Villaescusa-Navarro, Alonso, MV 2017

#### **Reconstruction of the BAO peak with pixels**



non-

to

#### **Reconstruction of the BAO peak with pixels**

1.0

0.8 0.6

0.4

0.2

0.0 -0.2

-0.4

-0.6

-0.8

5

6

(%)

 $\overline{1}$ 

g

10 11

Matteo Viel

Errors on  $\alpha$  decreases by 40% after  $\geq$ reconstructon, and this depends on the angular resolution

Halo maps in real-space

• • Rec

9

8

1.0

0.8

0.6

0.4 0.2

0.0

-0.2

-0.4

-0.6

-0.8

No Rec

6

7

 $\sigma \, [h^{-1}\,\mathrm{Mpc}]$ 

5

 $(\alpha - 1) \ (\%)$ 



Obuljen, Villaescusa-Navarro, Castorina, MV 2017

# Post-reionization cosmology with IM experiments



# **BAO with LIM experiments**



Moradinezhad Dizgah, Nikakthar, Keating, Castorina 22



# Post-reionization cosmology: neutrino masses from CO

- Realistic Fisher-matrix based forecasts for CO and [CII] in a wide redshift range z=[0,12]
- Crucial different degeneracies pattern for LIM w.r.t. CMB data
- ➢ Especially true in the extended Mv − CPL model
- Very promising: 40% of the sky, with 10<sup>8</sup> spectrometer hours and no removal of interlopers could provide σ(N<sub>eff</sub>)~0.023 and σ(M<sub>v</sub>)~13 meV





#### Post-reionization cosmology: neutrino masses

Matteo Viel



Obuljen, Castorina, Villaescusa-Navarro, MV 2018

Prior on the CMB optical depth somehow fixes large scale amplitude inferred from the CMB... and helps measuring neutrino free streaming

#### Post-reionization cosmology: neutrino masses - II

Matteo Viel

 $10^{-1}$ 

 $10^{0}$ 

 $10^{0}$ 



Autieri, Berti, Spinelli, Haridasu, MV (2025)

# Post-reionization cosmology: neutrino masses - III



Note the different degeneracies



- Cross-correlation data alone cannot constrain neutrino masses.
- When combined with CMB data, gives constraints competitive to the ones obtained with auto-power.

Likelihoods	$\Sigma m_{\nu}^{\rm fid} = 0.06{\rm eV}$	$\Sigma m_{\nu}^{\rm fid} = 0.1{\rm eV}$			
$\hat{P}_0 + \hat{P}_2$	< 0.287	< 0.317			
+ nuisances	< 0.425	< 0.452			
Planck 2018					
$+$ $\hat{P}_0+\hat{P}_2$	< 0.105	$0.098 \pm 0.022$			
+ nuisances	< 0.126	< 0.151			
Planck 2018					
$+ \ \hat{P}^{ ext{DESI}}_{21, ext{g}}$	< 0.116	$0.099\substack{+0.020\\-0.033}$			
+ nuisances	< 0.155	< 0.177			
Planck 2018					
$+ \ \hat{P}^{ m Euclid}_{21,{ m g}}$	< 0.117	$0.100\substack{+0.021\\-0.032}$			
+ nuisances	< 0.156	< 0.180			

Autieri, Berti, Spinelli, Haridasu, MV (2025, arXiv:2504.18625)

Increase of power in total matter power Spectrum due to Lorentz force affecting Baryons' clustering



From the forest: B ~ 0.2 nG "hint"

 $B_i = N_{ ext{vox}} \int_{T_i}^{T_i + \Delta T_i} \mathcal{P}_{ ext{tot}} \left(T
ight) dT,$ 

Impact on VID



COMAP EoR survey + other instruments at z=2-3

From CO: IM B ~ 0.006 nG can be probed

Adi, Libanore, Crutz, Kovetz 2024

*Pavicevic, Irsic, MV*+ (2025) *arXiv*: 2501.06299

- Post-reionization Universe: a new place to test structure (and galaxy) formation and probe fundamental physics
- Access to relatively small scales  $k \sim 1 h$ /Mpc at high redshift (cool scientific cases)
- > 1D radial BAO will constrain geometry
- Power spectrum will constrain growth (and thus neutrino masses)
- If auto-correlation is difficult, then cross-correlation will boost the signal and break degeneracies
- New statistics/methods
- Realistic mocks' production: there is a lot to learn

Axions

Matteo Viel

#### Axion as a fraction of DM

Detecting DM decay as a line interloper



Impact on matter power spectrum



Energy injection – estimate from COMAP+HERA+CHIME+HIRAX

Bernal, Caputo, Kamionkowski 21

#### Bauer+20