Weak Lensing with Planck

K. Benabed Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris - UPMC



Max Planck (1858-1927)



Planck (1993-23/10/2013)





Planck





Driving goal : The definitive Temperature anisotropies measurement

- Primary 1.5m
- 2 instruments
 - LFI : 3 bands, 22 radiometers
 - HFI : 6 bands, 50 bolometers
- 4 stage cooler down to 0.1K
 - Last stage is a He3/He4 dilution cooler
- Operated flawlessly since launch
 - HFI (and the dilution cooler) stopped Jan 2012
- ~5 independent surveys (nominal mission 2 surveys)



First Planck (almost) full sky CMB Temperature Map Released March 2013, along with 28 articles Data available : first year maps and map characterisation http://pla.esac.esa.int/pla/aio/planckProducts.html





Planck as a Matter tracer machine

- Planck is the first full sky mission capable of measuring secondary anisotropies & small scale foregrounds
 - Tracer of the large scale structure at lower redshift
- Dark matter and baryons
 - Weak lensing
 - ISW
 - SZ clusters
 - CIB

Planck map of the large scale structures



According to our reconstruction of the lensing effect 25sigma detection Almost full sky map of LSS at z~2







 Displacement is 0.3 arcmin scale. HFI beam is 5 arcmin at best





LENSING POWER SPECTRUM

More details: Lewis and Challinor (astro-ph/0601594).

Lensing

 $\hat{T}(\vec{\theta}) = T(\vec{\theta} + \vec{\nabla}\phi)$

It couple anisotropie: And it's coh

- Large-scale structure in the linear regime. Coherent over $\frac{300 \text{Mpc}}{7000 \text{Mpc}} \approx 2^{\circ}$. Deflection per "structure" of ~ 0.3' so RMS of $\langle |\nabla \phi|^2 \rangle^{1/2} \approx \sqrt{50} \times 0.3' = 2.4'$.
- Small power spectrum corrections from non-linearity; Gaussian still a good approximation.

 $\hat{T}(\vec{\theta}) = T(\vec{\theta} + \vec{\nabla}\phi) \approx T(\vec{\theta}) + \vec{\nabla}\phi \cdot \vec{\nabla}T(\vec{\theta}) + \dots$





A quadratic estimator to measure the specific NG signature.

$$\Delta \langle T_{\ell_1 m_1} T_{\ell_2 m_2} \rangle = \sum_{LM} \sum_{\ell_1 m_1, \ell_2 m_2} (-1)^M \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 & \ell_2 & L \\ m_1 & m_2 & -M \end{pmatrix} W^{\phi}_{\ell_1 \ell_2 L} \phi_{LM}, \quad W^{\phi}_{\ell_1 \ell_2 L} = -\sqrt{\frac{(2\ell_1 + 1)(2\ell_2 + 1)(2L + 1)}{4\pi}} \sqrt{L(L+1)\ell_1(\ell_1 + 1)} \times C^{TT}_{\ell_1} \left(\frac{1 + (-1)^{\ell_1 + \ell_2 + L}}{2}\right) \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 & \ell_2 & L \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} + (\ell_1 \leftrightarrow \ell_2). \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{\phi}_{LM}^{x} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{R}_{L}^{x\phi}} \left(\bar{x}_{LM} - \bar{x}_{LM}^{MF} \right).$$

 $\mathcal{R}_{L}^{x\phi,(1)(2)} = \frac{1}{(2L+1)} \sum_{\ell_{1}\ell_{2}} \frac{1}{2} W_{\ell_{1}\ell_{2}L}^{x} W_{\ell_{1}\ell_{2}L}^{\phi} F_{\ell_{1}}^{(1)} F_{\ell_{2}}^{(2)}.$

$$\bar{x}_{LM} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell_1 m_1, \ell_2 m_2} (-1)^M \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 & \ell_2 & L \\ m_1 & m_2 & -M \end{pmatrix} W^x_{\ell_1 \ell_2 L} \bar{T}^{(1)}_{\ell_1 m_1} \bar{T}^{(2)}_{\ell_2 m_2}.$$
$$\bar{x}_{LM}^{MF} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\ell_1 m_1, \ell_2 m_2} (-1)^M \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 & \ell_2 & L \\ m_1 & m_2 & -M \end{pmatrix} W^x_{\ell_1 \ell_2 L} \langle \bar{T}^{(1)}_{\ell_1 m_1} \bar{T}^{(2)}_{\ell_2 m_2} \rangle.$$
$$\bar{T}_{\ell m} = [S+N]^{-1} T_{\ell m} \approx [C_\ell^{TT} + C_\ell^{NN}]^{-1} T_{\ell m} = F_\ell T_{\ell m}$$

CMB lensing reconstruction HFi PLANCK $\hat{T}(\vec{\theta}) = T(\vec{\theta} + \vec{\nabla}\phi) \approx T(\vec{\theta}) + \vec{\nabla}\phi \cdot \vec{\nabla}T(\vec{\theta}) + \dots$ 10° A quadratic estimator to measure the specific NG signature. $W^{\phi}_{\ell_{1}\ell_{2}L} = -\sqrt{\frac{(2\ell_{1}+1)(2\ell_{2}+1)(2L+1)}{4\pi}}\sqrt{L(L+1)\ell_{1}(\ell_{1}+1)}$ $\Delta \langle T_{\ell_1 m_1} T_{\ell_2 m_2} \rangle = \sum_{LM} \sum_{\ell_1 m_1} \bigoplus_{m_2} \bigoplus_{m_2} \bigoplus_{m_2} \bigoplus_{m_2} \bigoplus_{m_2} \prod_{m_2} \overrightarrow{\nabla}_{M} \cdot \left[C_{L}^{-\frac{1}{\varphi_L}} T \quad \overrightarrow{\nabla} \left(C_{\ell}^{-\frac{1}{\varphi_2}} \bigoplus_{m_2} \prod_{m_2} \prod_{m_2} \sum_{m_2} \prod_{m_2} \prod$ $W^{\phi}(\boldsymbol{l}_1, \boldsymbol{l}_2) = C_{|\boldsymbol{L}|}^{TT} \boldsymbol{l}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{L} + C_{|\boldsymbol{L}|}^{TT} \boldsymbol{l}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{L}.$

- Take two temperature maps and inverse variance filter them. - Differentiate one and filter it by the temperature power spectrum $\Phi_{LM}^{*} = \frac{1}{R_{L}}$ - Multiply with the other inverse variance filtered map - Normalize to get unbiased estimator $R_{L}^{*\phi(1)(2)} = \frac{1}{(2L+1)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} W_{\ell_{1}\ell_{2}L}^{*} W_{\ell_{1}\ell_{2}L}^{(1)} F_{\ell_{1}}^{(2)}$

 $\bar{T}_{\ell m} = [S+N]^{-1} T_{\ell m} \approx [C_{\ell}^{TT} + C_{\ell}^{NN}]^{-1} T_{\ell m} = F_{\ell} T_{\ell m}$

Biases at the map level



Due to the response of the quadratic estimator to sources of statistical anisotropies in the data. Dominates the largest scales.

Can be removed on average by estimating a «mean-field» contribution from Monte Carlo.





On simulation





Reconstruction on a realistic Planck simulation.

Map noise - spectrum biases







$$\begin{split} \hat{C}_{L,x}^{\phi\phi} &= \frac{f_{\text{sky},2}^{-1}}{2L+1} \sum_{M} \left| \widetilde{\phi}_{LM}^{x} \right|^{2} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{N0}} \\ &- \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{N1}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{PS}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{MC}} \,, \end{split}$$

HFi planck



$$\hat{C}_{L,x}^{\phi\phi} = \frac{f_{\text{sky},2}^{-1}}{2L+1} \sum_{M} |\widetilde{\phi}_{LM}^{x}|^{2} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi}|_{\text{N0}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi}|_{\text{N1}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi}|_{\text{PS}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi}|_{\text{MC}},$$

Gaussian bias. Dealt with by MC. Close to the analytical value. Dominates the final error budget.



$$\begin{split} \hat{C}_{L,x}^{\phi\phi} &= \frac{f_{\mathrm{sky},2}^{-1}}{2L+1} \sum_{M} \left| \widetilde{\phi}_{LM}^{x} \right|^{2} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\mathrm{N0}} \\ &- \left| \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \right|_{\mathrm{N1}} - \left| \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \right|_{\mathrm{PS}} - \left| \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \right|_{\mathrm{MC}}, \end{split}$$

Gaussian bias. Dealt with by MC. Close to the analytical value. Dominates the final error budget.

Higher order bias. We further include cosmological uncertainty.





$$\begin{split} \hat{C}_{L,x}^{\phi\phi} &= \frac{f_{\mathrm{sky},2}^{-1}}{2L+1} \sum_{M} |\widetilde{\phi}_{LM}^{x}|^{2} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \big|_{\mathrm{N0}} \\ &- \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \big|_{\mathrm{N1}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \big|_{\mathrm{PS}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \big|_{\mathrm{MC}} \,, \end{split}$$

Gaussian bias. Dealt with by MC. Close to the analytical value. Dominates the final error budget.

Higher order bias. We further include cosmological uncertainty.

Point source trispectrum contribution. Measured on data

10⁻⁵ $[L(L+1)]^2 \, N_L^{\phi\phi}/2\pi$ $100 \mathrm{GHz}$ 143GHz 10⁻⁸ 217GHz MV 10^1 10² 10³ 2.0 $\frac{--C_L^{\phi\phi}}{---C_L^{\phi\phi}} + \Delta C_L^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{N1}$ $\times \hat{\phi} \phi^{\text{in}}$ + $\hat{\phi}\hat{\phi}$ 1.5 $[L(L+1)]^2 C_L^{\phi\phi} / 2\pi [\times 10^7]$ 0.1 0.1 0.0 $100\Delta C_L^{\phi\phi}/C_L^{\phi\phi}~[\%]$ 0

2 10

100

500

L

1000

2000

$$\begin{split} \hat{C}_{L,x}^{\phi\phi} &= \frac{f_{\text{sky},2}^{-1}}{2L+1} \sum_{M} \left| \widetilde{\phi}_{LM}^{x} \right|^{2} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{N0}} \\ &- \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{N1}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{PS}} - \Delta C_{L}^{\phi\phi} \Big|_{\text{MC}}, \end{split}$$

Gaussian bias. Dealt with by MC. Close to the analytical value.

Dominates the final error budget.

Higher order bias. We further include cosmological uncertainty.

Point source trispectrum contribution. Measured on data

Residual bias. Also account for small multiplicative bias. Dealt with lensed MC.



Best reconstruction

• fsky = 0.67

- MV combination between the 143GHz & 217GHz
- 857GHz used as a template for dust cleaning
- 30% Galactic mask + CO mask + point sources SNR5
- 5° apodization (for power spectrum estimation)





Robustness





Comparison to other surveys

2.0 MV $143 \mathrm{GHz}$ $egin{array}{rl} [L(L+1)]^2 \ \hat{C}_L^{\phi\phi}/2\pi \ [imes 10^7] \ egin{array}{rl} egin{array}{rl} 0 & egin{array}{rl} & egin{array}{rl} 1 & egin{array}{rl} & egin{array}{rl} 1 & egin{array}{rl} & e$ 1.5 $217 \mathrm{GHz}$ SPT (2012) ACT (2013)-0.5 100 500 1000 2000 $\begin{bmatrix} L(L+1) \end{bmatrix}_{-1}^{2} \Delta \hat{C}_{L}^{\phi\phi} / 2\pi [\times 10^{7}]$ 2 10 100 500 1000 2000

Cosmology



We are using the most significant (and cleanest) part of the data L=40-400. Lensing brings a 20% is h improvement on some of the vanilla LCDM parameters.

Cosmology - I

Constraining the reionization from Planck alone strengthen the Polarization result



Cosmology - II





Mild tension with neutrino masses TT wants more lensing TTTT wants less lensing

 $\sum m_{\nu} < 0.66 \,\mathrm{eV}, \quad (95\%; \, Planck + \mathrm{WP+highL}),$

 $\sum m_{\nu} < 0.85 \,\mathrm{eV}, \quad (95\%; Planck+lensing+WP+highL),$

Cross correlation







Number of object needed for a 5sigma cross correlation with CMB lensing on 20% of the sky as a function of redshift and redshift dispersion

ISW



Stacking the *Planck* CMB at the location of clusters and voids



ISW - Lensing correlation

Estimator		C-R	σ	NILC	σ	SEVEM	σ	SMICA	σ	MV	
Τφ	$\ell \ge 10$ $\ell > 2$	0.52 ± 0.33 0.52 ± 0.32	1.5 1.6	0.72 ± 0.30 0.75 ± 0.28	2.4 2.7	0.58 ± 0.31 0.62 ± 0.29	1.9 2.1	0.68 ± 0.30 0.70 ± 0.28	2.3 2.5	0.78 ± 0.32	2.4
KSW		0.75 ± 0.32	2.3	0.85 ± 0.32	2.7	0.68 ± 0.32	2.1	0.81 ± 0.31	2.6		
binned		0.80 ± 0.40	2.0	1.03 ± 0.37	2.8	0.83 ± 0.39	2.1	0.91 ± 0.37	2.5		
modal		0.68 ± 0.39	1.7	0.93 ± 0.37	2.5	0.60 ± 0.37	1.6	0.77 ± 0.37	2.1		



First detection 2.5sigma robust against foreground contamination and detection algorithm

Non-Gaussianity



		Independent			ISW-lensing subtracted			
	KSW	Binned	Modal		KSW	Binned	Modal	
SMICA								
Local	9.8 ± 5.8	9.2 ± 5.9	8.3 ± 5.9		2.7 ± 5.8	2.2 ± 5.9	1.6 ± 6.0	
Equilateral	-37 ± 75	-20 ± 73	-20 ± 77		-42 ± 75	-25 ± 73	-20 ± 77	
Orthogonal	-46 ± 39	-39 ± 41	-36 ± 41		-25 ± 39	-17 ± 41	-14 ± 42	
		1500	lo NG !		201		1500	
	(VVIVIA)	P9 ç onstra	Int : local f	NL=3/4	20)		2	
	la	000					000	

Planck lensing X planck CIB



1,5 1.2 $\nu = 100 \text{ GHz}$ (x 10 1.0 $\nu = 143 \text{ GHz} (x 100)$ $\nu = 217 \text{ GHz} (x 100)$ 1.0 1.0 0.8 $[\mu \mathrm{K.sr}]$ 0.8 0.5 0.6 0.6 0.0 0.4 $C_\ell^{\mathrm{T}\phi}$ 0.4 -0.50 2 0.2 3 -1.00.0 0.0 -1.5 -0.2 -0 2 100 500 1000 1500 2000 100 500 1000 1500 2000 500 1500 100 1000 2000 3.5 -353 GHz (x 100) $\nu = 545 \text{ GHz} (x 10)$ 2.0 $\nu = 857 \text{ GHz} (x 0.1)$ 3.0 $[\mu \rm K.sr]$ 1.5 2.5 З 2.0 1.0 1.5 $C_\ell^{\mathrm{T}\phi}$ 1.0 0.5 ю. 0.0 100 500 1000 1500 2000 100 500 1000 1500 2000 100 500 1000 1500 2000 P P P

Stacking of the extrema of the CIB field (and at random locations)

HEI PLANCK

Impressive visual correlation on degree scale

Cross correlation of the maps

Using the best 40% of the CIB & lensing from Planck

Boxes give statistical errors. Grey boxes are the 143-lensing X 143-cib correlation

Lines are the predictions from the Planck Early papers !



No particular effort here to optimize the model for the external survey There is an untapped astrophysical treasure in the Planck Lensing Map

Conclusion

- Planck trace late dark matter distribution
 - Lensing reconstruction on the whole sky

Reconstruction of the full sky dark matter distribution

- First determination of the ISW-lensing correlation
- Improvement of the cosmological parameters constraint
- Tension for neutrino masses

Great potential for cross-correlation with other surveys

- Where do we go from here
 - SPT/ACT/others will greatly improve the small scales
 - PRISM ?