



Polarized foregrounds Trygve Leithe Svalheim

BeyondPlanck online release conference, November 18-20, 2020

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776282

The hunt for B-modes

The goal: Primordial gravitational waves





Simulated stokesQ map for r = 0.01





Actual polarized sky





Parameterizing the sky

First step is creating the signal model

$$d_{j,t} = g_{j,t} \mathsf{P}_{tp,j} \left[\mathsf{B}_{pp',j}^{\text{symm}} \sum_{c} \mathsf{M}_{cj} (\beta_{p'}, \Delta_{\text{bp}}^{j}) a_{p'}^{c} + \mathsf{B}_{j}^{\text{asymm}} \left(s_{j}^{\text{orb}} + s_{j}^{\text{fsl}} \right) \right]$$





European Commission

Unfeasible to sample jointly with this number of parameters We employ





Accounting for the interplay between foregrounds and systematics by sampling jointly

$$g \leftarrow P(g \mid d, \qquad \xi_n, \Delta_{bp}, a, \beta, C_{\ell})$$

$$n_{corr} \leftarrow P(n_{corr} \mid d, g, \qquad \xi_n, \Delta_{bp}, a, \beta, C_{\ell})$$

$$\xi_n \leftarrow P(\xi_n \mid d, g, n_{corr}, \ \Delta_{bp}, a, \beta, C_{\ell})$$

$$\Delta_{bp} \leftarrow P(\Delta_{bp} \mid d, g, n_{corr}, \xi_n, \ a, \beta, C_{\ell})$$
This
$$\begin{cases} a \leftarrow P(a \mid d, g, n_{corr}, \xi_n, \Delta_{bp}, \ \beta, C_{\ell}) \\ \beta \leftarrow P(\beta \mid d, g, n_{corr}, \xi_n, \Delta_{bp}, a, C_{\ell}) \end{cases}$$

$$C_{\ell} \leftarrow P(C_{\ell} \mid d, g, n_{corr}, \xi_n, \Delta_{bp}, a, \beta, \ldots)$$



Amplitude sampling

European Commission

We want to sample the conditional distribution $P(a \mid d, \omega \setminus a)$ We define $m_{\nu} = A_{\nu}a + n_{\nu}$. where $A_{\nu} \equiv B_{\nu}M_{\mu}$ And find that under the assumption of gaussian noise

using Bayes' theorem, which results in multivariate gaussian.

One can show that we can draw a sample from this by solving $\left(S^{-1} + \sum_{\nu} A_{\nu}^{t} N_{\nu}^{-1} A_{\nu}\right) a = \sum_{\nu} A_{\nu}^{t} N_{\nu}^{-1} m_{\nu} + \sum_{\nu} A_{\nu}^{t} N_{\nu}^{-1/2} \eta_{\nu} + S^{-1/2} \eta_{0}$

for **a**, which we do using a conjugate gradient solver.



Standard Gibbs sampling step as before

$$P(\beta \mid \boldsymbol{d}, \boldsymbol{a}) \propto P(\boldsymbol{d} \mid \boldsymbol{a}, \beta) P(\beta)$$
$$\propto \left[\prod_{\nu} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\boldsymbol{d}_{\nu} - \mathsf{A}(\beta)\boldsymbol{a})^{t} \mathsf{N}_{\nu}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{d}_{\nu} - \mathsf{A}(\beta)\boldsymbol{a})} \right] P(\beta),$$

- The nonlinear relationship between beta and d
 Cannot use CG
- Use a Metropolis sampler
 - Draw a proposal for beta
 - Project to mapspace
 - □ Assess goodness-of-fit
 - accept or reject



Data selection

Planck LFI (30, 44, 70 Ghz) time ordered data Planck HFI 353 GHz WMAP Ka, Q and V

- Full covariance matrices for WMAP
 - Improves ability to identify noise on a band-to-band basis.
 - WMAP systematics contained to WMAP data.
- WMAP K band omitted
 - Too "good"

- WMAP W band omitted
 - □ Too "bad"
- Sparse dataset
 - Showcase of algorithm





Spectral index spatial variations

Spatial variations in spectral indices

- Sparse dataset
- Synchrotron Beta
 - Divide sky into disjoint regions sampled independently
- Thermal dust betaFullsky









Planck residual maps

$$(\boldsymbol{r}_{\nu} = \boldsymbol{d}_{\nu} - \boldsymbol{s}_{\nu})$$

Synchrotron reference (r_{30}) $\langle r_{44} \rangle$ (r30) (r44) 0 $\langle r_{70} \rangle$ (r_{70}) (r_{353}) U (r353) $_{\mu K}^{0}$ 0 µK 0 µK 0 µK -3 -3 **CMB** reference Thermal dust reference

How well do we fit our data as a function of frequency? Some residual signal is a good sign!



WMAP Residuals and imbalance templates

European Commission

T_{Kal} T_{Kal} (rKa (r_{Ka}) T_{O2}^{imb} (r_0) (r_0) T_{V2}^{imb} T_{V2}^{imb} 0 0 0 µK -1-10-100 10 10 μK μK μK

Residual maps show clear correlation with imbalance templates.

- Due to uncertainties, not all modes were properly weighted
- Not an issue for this analysis (Covariance matrices)



Dust amplitude



Synchrotron amplitude









Difference with K-BAND and NPIPE



- Differences too big to be fully explained by spectral index
- Difference to NPIPE

European Commission

- Uncertainties in the time-dependent gain models adopted by NPIPE and BP
- Well understood



Gain residual template from Gjerløw et al. (2020)



Spectral indices and its variations





Sampling regions





Synchrotron beta

- Sampled regions data driven
- Beta_spur = -3.15 +- 0.07
- Beta_plane = -3.12 +- 0.06
- No significant spatial variation
- Validation: Advantage of full marginalization over TOD parameters.
 - Uncertainty from TOD





Dust spectral index



- Within the range of "healthy" values
- □ Slightly steep

- Possibly steepening of dust-beta?
 - □ Similar effect has been seen in temperature analysis before
- □ Warrants further investigation
 - Perhaps too simple bandpass correction?



Summary

European Commission

 Constraints on synchrotron and dust polarized spectral indices
 No evidence towards spatial variations in the sampled regions
 First joint sampling of amplitudes and spectral indices to combine LFI in time domain with low resolution WMAP data.



Funding

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776282



"BeyondPlanck"

Ο

- COMPET-4 program
 - PI: Hans Kristian Eriksen
- Grant no.: 776282
- Period: Mar 2018 to Nov 2020

Collaborating projects:

- "bits2cosmology"
 - ERC Consolidator Grant
 - PI: Hans Kristian Eriksen
 - Grant no: 772 253
 - Period: April 2018 to March 2023

- "Cosmoglobe"
 - ERC Consolidator Grant
 - PI: Ingunn Wehus
 - Grant no: 819 478
 - \circ $\$ Period: $\$ June 2019 to May 2024



Questions?

European Commission

Beyond PLANCK

Commander









HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI





JPL











24

