#### Systematic errors in weak lensing cosmology

ZHANG Pengjie Department of Astronomy & Tsung-Dao Lee Institute Shanghai Jiao Tong University

**April 16, 2020 Department of Astronomy, Tsinghua University** 

## Outline

- Weak lensing cosmology
- Systematic errors in weak lensing cosmology
   The intrinsic alignment
  - Self-calibrating the intrinsic alignment

#### Gravitational lensing



- Pre-GR (e.g. 1912, Einstein's note)
- 1915, GR field equation
- 1919, Solar eclipse
  The magic number 2

$$d\tau^2 = (1+2\Psi)dt^2 - (1+2\Phi)dX^2$$

1912 note. Also, 1915 letter to a friend.



#### LENS-LIKE ACTION OF A STAR BY THE DEVIATION OF LIGHT IN THE GRAVITATIONAL FIELD

Some time ago, R. W. Mandl paid me a visit and asked me to publish the results of a little calculation, which I had made at his request. This note complies with his wish.

The light coming from a star A traverses the gravitational field of another star B, whose radius is  $R_o$ . Let there be an observer at a distance D from B and at a distance x, small compared with D, from the ex-

1936, published paper on science.

## **Gravitational lensing**



#### Gravitational lensing depends on the lens mass, distances to the lens/source and the lens-source distance

## Strong lensing





1979, the double quasar Q0957+561 Dennis Walsh, Robert F. Carswell and Ray J. Weymann

## Weak lensing



$$A_{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial \theta_S^{\iota}}{\partial \theta^j} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \kappa - \gamma_1 & -\gamma_2 \\ -\gamma_2 & 1 - \kappa + \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

shear convergence  $A_{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial \theta_S^i}{\partial A^j} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \kappa - \gamma_1 & -\gamma_2 \\ -\gamma_2 & 1 - \kappa + \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix}$ shear  $\kappa \neq 0$  $\gamma_1 \neq 0$  $\gamma_2 \neq 0$ 

## Weak lensing

$$\frac{d^2 x^{\alpha}}{d\lambda^2} + \Gamma^{\alpha}_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^{\mu}}{d\lambda} \frac{dx^{\nu}}{d\lambda} = 0 \ .$$

$$d\tau^2 = (1+2\Psi)dt^2 + a^2(1+2\Phi)dX^2$$



Position after real position Gravitational potential Geometry  
ensing on the sky 
$$\int_{0}^{z_{S}} (\Psi - \Phi)_{,i} W(z_{L}, z_{S}) dz_{L}$$
  
 $= \theta_{S}^{i} + \int_{0}^{z_{S}} (2\Psi)_{,i} W(z_{L}, z_{S}) dz_{L}$ 

e.g. Modern cosmology by Scott Dodelson

$$A_{ij} \equiv \frac{\partial \theta_S^i}{\partial \theta^j} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \kappa - \gamma_1 & -\gamma_2 \\ -\gamma_2 & 1 - \kappa + \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix}$$
$$\kappa(\hat{n}) \propto \int \nabla^2 \Psi W(z_L, z_S) dz_L$$
$$\propto \int_0^{z_S} \delta_m(\hat{n}, z_L) W_L(z_L, z_S) dz_L$$

In the weak lensing regime, shear is fixed by convergence (leading order)

$$(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \to (\gamma_E = \kappa, \gamma_B = 0)$$

#### • DES Y1, 1708.01535



• DES Y1, 1708.01535  

$$w(\theta) = \langle \kappa_1 \kappa_2 \rangle \quad C(\ell) = \langle |\kappa(\ell)|^2 \rangle$$

(



#### Weak lensing with tomography: A major cosmological probe, with greatest potential!





Figure 14.3: The lensing power spectra constructed from galaxies split into three broad redshift bins: z < 0.7, 0.7 < z < 1.2, and 1.2 < z < 3. The solid curves are predictions for the fiducial ACDM model and include nonlinear evolution. The boxes show the expected measurement error due to the sample variance and intrinsic ellipticity errors (see text for details). The thin curves are the predictions for a dark energy model with w = -0.9. Clearly such a model can be distinguished at very high significance using information from all bins in  $\ell$  and z. Note that many more redshift bins are expected from LSST than shown here, leading to over a hundred measured auto- and cross-power spectra.



- Dark Energy Task force
- FoM: joint constraint on dark energy EoS  $w(a) = w_0 + w_a(1-a)$

## Approaches of weak lensing measurement

- Cosmic shear  $\leftarrow \gamma$
- **Cosmic magnification**  $\leftarrow \kappa$
- Lensing of cosmic backgrounds  $\leftarrow \kappa \;,\; \gamma$



#### Weak lensing measurements: cosmic shear

$$\epsilon_{1} \equiv \frac{q_{xx} - q_{yy}}{q_{xx} + q_{yy}}$$

$$\epsilon_{1} > 0 \epsilon_{2} = 0 \qquad \epsilon_{1} < 0 \epsilon_{2} = 0$$

$$\epsilon_{1} = 0 \epsilon_{2} < 0$$

$$\epsilon_{1} = 0 \epsilon_{2} < 0$$

$$\epsilon_{2} \equiv \frac{2q_{xy}}{q_{xx} + q_{yy}}$$

$$\epsilon_i \to \epsilon_i + 2\gamma_i$$

Larger, deeper, wider

- -2000:  $N_g = O(10^5)$
- 2000s: Ng=O(10<sup>7</sup>): CFHTLenS, SDSS, COSMOS, RCSLenS, etc.
- 2010s: N<sub>g</sub>=O(10<sup>8</sup>): KiDS, DES, HSC,
- 2020s: N<sub>g</sub>=O(10<sup>9</sup>): CSST, Euclid, LSST, WFIRST, +







FIG. 4. The measured shear correlation function  $\xi_+$  (top triangle) and  $\xi_-$  (bottom triangle) for the DES Y1 METACALIBRATION catalog. Results are scaled by the angular separation ( $\theta$ ) to emphasize features and differences relative to the best-fit model. The correlation functions are measured in four tomographic bins spanning the redshift ranges listed in Table I, with labels for each bin combination in the upper left corner of each panel. The assignment of galaxies to tomographic bins is discussed in Sec. II B. Scales which are not used in the fiducial analysis are shaded (see Sec. VII A). The best-fit ACDM theory line from the full tomographic analysis is shown as the solid line. We find a  $\chi^2$  of 227 for 211 degrees of freedom in the non-shaded regions.







• But 20 years after the first detections, cosmic shear surveys still can not detect dark energy independently

• In contrast, BAO (2005-) already confirmed the existence of dark energy independent of any other methods.

## **Precise ≠** accurate!



## Challenges to cosmic shear cosmology

- Systematic errors in observational measurement
  - Galaxy shape measurement (e.g. GREAT3 test)
  - Galaxy intrinsic alignment (e.g. Troxel et al. 2015 review)
  - Photo-z error (in particular outliers)
  - Other knowns and unknowns (e.g. LSST science book)
- Systematic errors in theoretical modeling
  - Baryon effects (non-gravitational processes such as gas cooling, SN and AGN feedback, etc.)
  - Nonlinear and non-Gaussian evolution
  - Second order corrections: source-lens clustering, Born deviation, lens-lens coupling, reduced shear, etc.

## One example: baryonic effect



Schneider+ 1910.11357

## Challenges to cosmic shear cosmology

- Systematic errors in observational measurement
  - Galaxy shape measurement (e.g. GREAT3 test)
  - Galaxy intrinsic alignment (e.g. Troxel et al. 2015 review)
    - ZPJ 2010a; 2010b; Meng+ 2018; Yao+ 2019,2020
  - Photo-z error (in particular outliers)
    - ZPJ+ 2010; Le Zhang+ 2016
  - Other knowns and unknowns (e.g. LSST science book)
- **Magnification:** ZPJ & Pen 2005, 2006; Yang & ZPJ 2011; Yang+ 2015; 2017; ZPJ+2018; ZPJ+ 2019
- Systematic errors in theoretical modeling
  - Baryon effects (non-gravitational processes such as gas cooling, SN and AGN feedback, etc.). Jing, ZPJ+ 2006
  - Nonlinear and non-Gaussian evolution
    - Yu+ 2011, 2012, 2016; Liu+ 2020; Chen+ 2020; Qin+ 2020
  - Second order corrections: source-lens clustering, Born deviation, lenslens coupling, reduced shear, etc. Yu+ 2015

## Galaxy intrinsic alignment

- Galaxy intrinsic alignment could mean
  - Galaxy number distribution aligned with something
  - Galaxy shape aligned with something. Spatially correlated





$$w^{\text{obs}} = \langle (\gamma^G(a) + \gamma^I(a))(\gamma^G(b) + \gamma^I(b)) \rangle$$
  
=  $GG + II + GI$ 

#### II/GI in simulations and theoretical models



- Linear alignment model
- Hirata & Seljak, 2004 With bias correction
- Xia+ 2017

$$\gamma^{I}_{(t,\times)} = -\frac{C_1}{4\pi G} (\nabla^2_x - \nabla^2_y, 2\nabla_x \nabla_y) S[\Psi_P]$$

## II and GI in observations



## **Intrinsic alignment**

- Depend on galaxy properties (types, color, luminosity, etc) and redshift
- May have different origins (early/late)
- Many models (each with multiple nuisance parameters)
- Significant bias in cosmological constraints



Kirk+ 2012

Yao+ 2017

#### Mitigating Intrinsic alignment in cosmic shear surveys

- Template fitting (adopted in most data analysis)
  - with model dependence
- Nulling in redshift space (Joachimi & Schneider 2008, 2009)
   but loss of information
- Self-calibrations to separate G and I model indepdently
  - ZPJ 2010a, Yao+ 2019, Yao+2020; ZPJ 2010b, Meng+ 2018
  - Flip over galaxy pair, compare density-shape correlation, separate G/I



Same photo-z bin

#### First application: KiDS450/KV450 Yao Ji(姚骥)+ 2019 15M, 450 deg^2, 0.1<z<0.9



# Application to DECaLS DR3 23M, 4200 deg^2 (g,r,z), $0.1 < z^P < 0.9$



#### **Application to DECaLS**



#### **Application to DECaLS**





#### Application to DECaLS: blue galaxies Null detection



#### **Application to DECaLS: compare with the nonlinear tidal alignment model**





#### Caveats

- Photo-z
- Selection/mock
- Covariance matrix
- More robust tests/discriminations of IA models

- DR8
- Cosmic shear optimized surveys

## Summary

- Weak lensing cosmology
- Systematic errors in weak lensing cosmology
  - The intrinsic alignment
  - Self-calibrating the intrinsic alignment
  - Detected IA in KiDS450/KV450 & DECaLS DR 3
  - Detected the redshift and color dependence
  - IA, an emerging tracer of LSS (stay tuned)