




Studying the Beginning of the Universe from the Bottom of the World

Clem Pryke – Astro Colloquium, Durham – May 29 2024

Modern cosmology in a nutshell:




Edwin Hubble

1) The universe is expanding.
(Hubble, 1920s)

2) It was once hot and dense, like the inside of the Sun.

(Alpher, Gamow, Herman, 1940s)

3) We can see the (redshifted) glow!
The *Cosmic Microwave Background*
(Penzias & Wilson, 1964)




Bob Wilson & Arno Penzias
1978 Nobel Prize

⇒ acceptance of the “HOT BIG BANG”

Cosmic Microwave Background Surface of Last Scattering


All sky temperature map
projected on a sphere



We are at the center


CMB temperature map is a sample of the density structure on a spherical shell cut through the 380,000 year old Universe
Perturbations were one part in 10,000 at that time – and Gaussian!

Power Spectrum (Blob size histogram)




(Plot from Planck 2018: I
arxiv/1807.06205)

Power Spectrum (Blob size histogram)




Triumphant/Embarrassing Contemporary Cosmology

CMB and other data fits GR based LCDM model *beautifully* – but it demands that 96% of the Universe is invisible to us




And it implies that the future is runaway expansion...



Also it doesn't explain horizon/flatness etc...


The Horizon Problem



How did points A and B “know” to be at the same temperature in the distant past when they had never been in causal contact?

(They still aren’t today!)

Inflation solves the Flatness Problem



Inflation...

If you take some curved space and blow it up enough pretty soon it is no longer curved on a local scale – where “local scale” here means our entire observable Universe!

History of the Universe

Inflation posits a pre-phase of exponential expansion




Alan Guth



Andrei Linde

Radius of the Visible Universe



What Does Inflation Do For Us?

Solves the horizon problem:
Why is the CMB nearly uniform?
How do apparently causally disconnected regions of space get set to the same temperature?



A volume much larger than our entire observable universe today was once a causally connected sub atomic speck.

Solves the flatness problem:
Why is the net spatial curvature so close to zero?



Any initial spatial curvature is diluted away to undetectability by the hyper expansion.

Explains the initial perturbations:
Why Gaussian with close to flat power law spectrum? ($n_s \approx 1$)



Equal amounts of perturbations are injected by quantum fluctuations at each step in the exponential expansion.

Solves the monopole problem:
Why do we not observe magnetic monopoles in the Universe today?



Monopoles are diluted away to undetectability.

What Does Inflation Do For Us?

Solves the horizon problem:
Why is the CMB nearly uniform?
How do apparently causally disconnected regions of space get set to the same temperature?

Solves the flatness problem:
Why is the net spatial curvature so close to zero?

Explains the initial perturbations:
Why Gaussian with close to flat power law spectrum? ($n_s \approx 1$)

Solves the monopole problem:
Why do we not observe magnetic monopoles in the Universe today?

These *simplest possible initial conditions* are the starting point of the beautiful simulations of the development of large scale structure which Durham is famous for

the hyper expansion.

Equal amounts of perturbations are injected by quantum fluctuations at each step in the exponential expansion.

Monopoles are diluted away to undetectability.

Inflation is controversial

Inflationary Paradigm after Planck 2013

Alan H. Guth,¹ David I. Kaiser,¹ and Yasunori Nomura²

¹*Center for Theoretical Physics, Laboratory for Nuclear Science, and Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

²*Berkeley Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics and Theoretical Physics Group, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA*

(Dated: December 29, 2013, revised January 13, 2014)

[arxiv/1312.7619](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.7619)



Inflationary schism after Planck2013

Anna Ijjas,^{1,2} Paul J. Steinhardt,³ and Abraham Loeb⁴

¹*Max-Planck-Institute for Gravitational Physics (Albert-Einstein-Institute), 14476 Potsdam, Germany*

²*Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA*


³*Department of Physics and Princeton Center for Theoretical Science, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA*

⁴*Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA*
(Dated: March 14, 2014)


[arxiv/1402.6980](https://arxiv.org/abs/1402.6980)




History of the Universe




History of the Universe




History of the Universe




History of the Universe



History of the Universe



History of the Universe



CMB Polarization, B-modes and r


- The CMB is partially polarized (due to local radiation quadrupoles at last scattering)
- Any polarization pattern can be decomposed into E-modes (gradient modes) and B-modes (curl modes)
- Basic LCDM makes only E-modes at last scattering – although lensing deflections in flight produce a bit of a B-mode
- Primordial gravitational waves produce both E-modes and B-modes – but best to look for the B-modes since most distinct there
- Theory gives us a good template shape for the gravitational wave signal – but it does *not* tell us the amplitude
- The amplitude is parameterized by a single number r
- A wide range of inflation theories exist – the simplest are already ruled out – more complex ones can produce r which is undetectably small
- The experimental mission is to obtain the best possible sensitivity to r
- If we can detect r we determine the energy scale of inflation – if not we can rule out additional inflationary models

CMB Polarization, B-modes and r

- The CMB is partially polarized (due to local radiation quadrupoles at last scattering)
- Any polarization pattern can be decomposed into E-modes (gradient modes) and B-modes (curl modes)
- Basic LCDM makes only E-modes at last scattering – although lensing deflections in flight produce a bit of a B-mode
- Primordial gravitational waves produce both E-modes and B-modes – but best to look for the B-modes since most distinct there
- Theory gives us a good template shape for the gravitational wave signal – but it does *not* tell us the amplitude
- The amplitude is parameterized by a single number r
- A wide range of inflation theories ruled out – more complex ones small
- The experimental mission is to
- If we can detect r we determine we can rule out additional inflation

Warning: It's a bit like the search for proton decay – a well motivated physics target to look for, but theories can be adjusted to make the amplitude arbitrarily small...

CMB Polarization power spectra






BICEP/Keck Basic Experimental Strategy




- Small aperture telescopes (cheap, fast, low systematics)
- Target the 2 degree peak of the PGW B-mode
- Integrate continuously from South Pole
- Observe order 1% patch of sky (smaller is actually better!)
- Scan and pair difference modulation

Unfortunately we are in a galaxy




The interstellar space within our galaxy contains cold dust grains which glow thermally in microwaves, and relativistic electrons which emit synchrotron radiation

Polarized Foreground Contamination from Our Galaxy




(Plot from Dunkley et al
arxiv/0811.3915)

Polarized Foreground Contamination from Our Galaxy





The BICEP Telescopes




- 3rd generation BICEP receivers increased optical throughput 10x
- Modular focal plane with 2500 detectors at 95 GHz
- Larger optical elements, but better IR rejection

Mass-produced Superconducting Detectors



Planar antenna array



Transition edge sensor

Slot antennas



Microstrip filters


BICEP/Keck Band Passes

The dry South Pole atmosphere provides excellent observing conditions most of the year.


The approx. 30% fractional bandpasses fit within atmospheric transmission windows straddled by oxygen and water lines.

In these windows, the atmosphere is quite transparent to microwaves.

The detector passbands are defined by a filter printed directly onto the focal plane wafers.




Journey to the South Pole



Minneapolis -> California -> New Zealand -> McMurdo -> South Pole

Antarctic Continent



Larger than the US – Ice sheet 3000 meters thick!



Christchurch New Zealand – Clothing Warehouse



Big Program!



Arrival in Antarctica



McMurdo – base on the coast



On to the Pole – over the Transantarctic Mountains




Unloading at Pole



The Actual South Pole



Nothing Out There!



Why do this at the Pole?

South Pole CMB telescopes



- High and *dry* – excellent atmospheric transmission
- On Earth's rotational axis - One day/night cycle per year
 - Long night makes for great quality data
- Good support infrastructure – power, cargo, data comm
- Food and accommodation provided
- Even Tuesday night bingo...

Stage 2

Stage 3



BICEP2
(2010-2012)

Keck Array
(2012-2019)




BICEP3
(2016-present)

BICEP Array
(2020-present)





Telescope and Mount




Focal Plane




Beams on Sky





Bolometer readouts as the telescope scans back and forth




The physical temperature of the detectors tracks the intensity of the incoming radiation from little “spots” on the sky.

This plot is unpolarized – we are seeing “clouds” blowing across the scan region.

Raw Data - Excellent Weather


Time 50 mins



- Cover the whole field in ~40 such scansets then start over at new boresight rotation
- Scanning modulates the CMB signal to freqs < 4 Hz



Raw Data - Worse Weather

Time 50 mins




➤ Scanning over lumpy atmosphere
→ “clouds”

➤ Pair difference still clean
→ atmosphere is unpolarized





BK18 95GHz Maps


95 GHz T Signal





95 GHz T Noise




95 GHz Q Signal




95 GHz Q Noise



95 GHz U Signal



95 GHz U Noise




RA (degree)



Dec (degree)

BK18
150GHz
Maps


150 GHz T Signal





150 GHz T Noise




150 GHz Q Signal




150 GHz Q Noise



150 GHz U Signal



150 GHz U Noise




Dec (degree)



RA (degree)

BK18 220GHz Maps


220 GHz T Signal





220 GHz T Noise




220 GHz Q Signal




220 GHz Q Noise



220 GHz U Signal



220 GHz U Noise



Dec (degree)


RA (degree)

BK18 auto/cross spectra between:
 BICEP3 95GHz,
 BICEP2/Keck 150GHz,
 Keck 220GHz,
 and Planck 353GHz

Black lines are
 LCDM
 Red lines are
 LCDM+dust

Blue panels are
 BB
 spectra


Green
 panels are
 EE
 spectra




Multicomponent parametric likelihood analysis

Take the joint likelihood of all the spectra simultaneously vs. model for BB that is the Λ CDM lensing expectation + 7 parameter foreground model + r

foreground model = dust + synchrotron






$r_{.05} < 0.09$

BKP


arxiv/1502.00612



$r_{.05} < 0.07$

BK14


arxiv/1510.09217



$r_{.05} < 0.06$

BK15

arxiv/1810.05216




$r_{.05} < 0.035$

BK18

arxiv/2110.00483

Per bandpower CMB component extraction



What limits BK18?

- ❖ BK18 mainline simulations with dust and lensing give $\sigma(r)=0.009$
- ❖ Running without foreground parameters on simulations where the dust amplitude is set to zero gives $\sigma(r)=0.007$

The above is as it should be - we have correctly tuned the relative sensitivity of the 95/150/220 bands such that we don't suffer much penalty due to the presence of foregrounds.


- ❖ Running on simulations which contain no lensing gives $\sigma(r)=0.004$

The sample variance of the achromatic lensing foreground is a major limiting factor - we need delensing via high resolution measurements.

- ❖ Running without foreground parameters on simulations which have neither dust or lensing gives $\sigma(r)=0.002$


Stage 2

Stage 3




Stage 2

Stage 3





Stage 2


Stage 3




Delensing with SPT-3G data



High resolution maps





Can be used to reconstruct the lensing deflection map...



...which can then be used to calculate the lensing signal enabling a deeper search for inflationary gravitational waves

Latest Generation Experiment "BICEP Array"





WALLS LOH DO

DO NOT STEP

DO NOT STEP



BICEP Array 2019-20 initial deployment



Three-month window during the Antarctic summer to perform:

- Keck Array demolition
- BA mount installation
- BA1 receiver assembly
- Full system integration



60,000 lbs of cargo, equivalent to 3 dedicated LC-130 Hercules flights to the South Pole.




30+ personnel:


- 2/3 scientists
- 1/3 contractors



2020-onwards BA1 (30/40GHz) Instrument Operating



Camera insert




192/300 TES detectors at 30/40 GHz.


Integrated in 12 shielded modules, each with a low-pass mesh filters.

Time-Domain multiplexed readout.



2023-onwards BA2 (150GHz) Instrument Operating




BA 40 GHz T Signal





BA 40 GHz T noise




BA 40 GHz Q Signal




BA 40 GHz Q noise



BA 40 GHz U Signal



BA 40 GHz U noise



RA (degree)

Dec (degree)


BA1
40GHz
Maps

Prelim
analysis
of 3 years
of data


BA2 150GHz Maps

Prelim
analysis
of 1 year
of data


BA2 150 GHz T Signal




BA2 150 GHz T Noise




BA2 150 GHz Q Signal




BA2 150 GHz Q Noise



BA2 150 GHz U Signal




BA2 150 GHz U Noise




BICEP3 95GHz Maps

Prelim
analysis
of 8 years
of data


B3 95 GHz T Signal




B3 95 GHz T Noise




B3 95 GHz Q Signal




B3 95 GHz Q Noise




B3 95 GHz U Signal



B3 95 GHz U Noise



Prelim analysis
adding first year
30/40GHz – still
does not detect
synchrotron – just
pushes the upper
limit further down



Summary

- The CMB tells us in exquisite detail the state which the universe was in when it made the transition from opaque plasma to neutral gas.
- With this knowledge we can extrapolate forward/backward in time – LCDM – it all works great! But does not explain what set the initial conditions. (They were simple!)
- The theory of “Inflation” explains – our entire observable Universe came from a single sub-atomic spec in an ultra brief burst of hyper expansion
 - If this actually happened it will have injected a background of gravitational waves
 - We may be able to detect the imprint of these by measuring the polarization pattern of the Cosmic Microwave Background – if we can build a sensitive enough telescope
 - BICEP/Keck sets the world’s best upper limit to date ($r < 0.036$) ruling out multiple previously popular classes of inflationary models (monomial and natural)
 - And the search goes on with bigger and better experiments... (BICEP Array & SO projecting ~3x better, CMB-S4 6x better than that)

Backup Slides



Stage IV CMB experiment: CMB-S4


- CMB-S4: a next generation ground-based program building on CMB stage 2 & 3 projects to pursue inflation, neutrino properties, dark energy and new discoveries.
- Targeting to deploy O(500,000) detectors spanning 30 - 300 GHz using multiple telescopes and sites to map most of the sky to provide sensitivity to cross critical science thresholds.
- Multi-agency effort (DOE & NSF). Complementary with balloon and space-based instruments.
- Broad participation of the US CMB community, including the existing NSF CMB groups, DOE National Labs and the High Energy Physics community.
- U.S. led program; international partnerships expected.





Recommended by P5 & NRC Antarctic reports




A science driven program combining the deep CMB experience of the university groups with the expertise and resources at the national labs.











Add to the mix: Planck at 7 frequencies and WMAP at 2 frequencies




Polarized galactic
synchrotron
dominates
at low frequencies

23 GHz



33 GHz



From arxiv 1212.5225

Polarized thermal
emission ($\sim 20\text{K}$) from
galactic **dust** aligned in
magnetic fields
dominates
at high frequencies

From arxiv 1502.01582

Dust/Sync Spatial Power Laws?




Fig 2 of arxiv/1801.04945 – Planck dust analysis





Fig 2 of arxiv/1802.01145. – S-PASS sync analysis

- Averaged over large regions of sky it is an empirical fact that dust and sync have roughly power law angular power spectra
- Not enough signal-to-noise in Planck data to investigate fluctuations about this behavior for small sky patches


Does it matter that dust is not a Gaussian random field?

- The error bars we put on power spectrum plots assume the sky pattern is a Gaussian random fields
- Nominally our Hamimeche and Lewis (HL) based likelihood does as well(?)
- To empirically test if it matters we make some sims where the dust sky pattern is extremely non-Gaussian – make it a single point source at some random location on the field
- Then run these lensed-LCDM+dust+noise realizations through the analysis pipeline as usual...
- In a power spectrum sense such dust realizations have only a single (amplitude) degree of freedom – so in a sense the exact opposite of Gaussian (maximal degrees of freedom)

Simulated 150GHz lensed-LCDM+"dust"+noise Q Map




Maximum Likelihood Search Results on lensed-LCDM+dust+noise Simulations Standard Gaussian dust realizations




Each panel is a model parameter – numbers above are mean and sigma over sim realizations
Vertical red lines are mean value over realizations, black is sim input value (and green is real data value)

Maximum Likelihood Search Results on lensed-LCDM+dust+noise Simulations Special “point source dust” realizations

no increase in bias
or fluctuation of r



Each panel is a model parameter – numbers above are mean and sigma over sim realizations
Vertical red lines are mean value over realizations, black is sim input value (and green is real data value)







CR

SCOTT

CLEM PRYKE





What limits BK18?

- ❖ BK18 mainline simulations with dust and lensing give $\sigma(r)=0.009$
- ❖ Running without foreground parameters on simulations where the dust amplitude is set to zero gives $\sigma(r)=0.007$


The above is as it should be - we have correctly tuned the relative sensitivity of the 95/150/220 bands such that we don't suffer much penalty due to the presence of foregrounds.

- ❖ Running on simulations which contain no lensing gives $\sigma(r)=0.004$


The sample variance of the achromatic lensing foreground is a major limiting factor - we need delensing via high resolution measurements.

- ❖ Running without foreground parameters on simulations which have neither dust or lensing gives $\sigma(r)=0.002$


BK15 $ell=80$ bandpower noise/signal



BK18 $ell=80$ bandpower noise/signal




Take all possible auto- and cross spectra between the BICEP/Keck, WMAP, and Planck bands (78 of them)




CMB polarization

Density Wave




E-Mode Polarization Pattern




Temperature Pattern Seen by Electrons


Gravitational Wave





B-Mode Polarization Pattern



BK23 Noise levels




Is there a cleaner small field than the BICEP/Keck field?



- ❖ The Planck 353GHz Q/U maps hit their noise floor in the cleanest regions
 - From this data it is not really possible to tell if there are cleaner small regions than the BICEP/Keck field
- ❖ When we attempt to reproduce the Planck PIPXXX analysis we find that the apparent cleaner regions shift around depending on the data split selected
- ❖ The BK patch is currently the only low dust field where we actually know the dust level!

Slides summarizing BK-VIII: Measurement of Gravitational Lensing from Large-scale B-mode Polarization

Measurement of Gravitational Lensing



- Gravitational lensing converts some of the E mode into B mode

Zaldarriaga & Seljak (1998)

$$B_{\vec{\ell}} = \int d\vec{L} w_{\vec{\ell},\vec{L}} E_{\vec{L}} \kappa_{\vec{\ell}-\vec{L}}$$


Lensing convergence

- Lensing B mode behaves as 5uK' white noise at large angular scales

(e.g. Lewis & Challinor 2006)

- Despite our modest angular resolution (0.5deg), the excellent sensitivity ($\sim 3\mu\text{K}'$) of our maps makes it possible to directly reconstruct lensing signals using only information at larger angular scales ($\ell \leq 700$).

Measurement of Gravitational Lensing



From arxiv 1606.01968


- κ map is reconstructed from BK14 Q/U map at 150GHz
- κ map is used for computing auto spectrum and also correlated with that of Planck, finding that they are consistent

Measured amplitude is in good agreement with the BB results, and we can start to constrain alternative B-mode sources!

(cosmic string, magnetic field, axion, modified gravity,...)

**Slides summarizing BK-IX: New Bounds on Anisotropies of
CMB Polarization Rotation and Implications for Axion-Like
Particles and Primordial Magnetic Fields**

Cosmological origins of anisotropies of polarization rotation



• Axion-like particles

String theory generally predicts presence of axion-like particles coupled with electromagnetic fields

(e.g. Pospelov+'09, Caldwell+'11)

$$\text{Lagrangian} \supset \frac{\phi}{2f_a} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}$$

Coupling constant

This coupling leads to spatial variation of polarization angle rotation

$$\text{rotation angle} \longrightarrow \alpha(n) = \frac{\Delta\phi(n)}{f_a} \longleftarrow \text{Changes in phi during photon propagation}$$

• Primordial magnetic fields

Lead to the polarization rotation by the Faraday rotation

(e.g. Kosowsky&Loeb'96, Harari+'97)

Total rotation angle

$$\alpha(n) = \frac{3c^2}{16\pi e^2} v^{-2} \int \dot{\tau} \vec{B} \cdot d\vec{l}$$

Magnetic field


Measurement of the anisotropic polarization rotation is a unique probe of the early universe and provides important implications for high energy physics!

Measurement of the polarization rotation spectrum

● Analysis Method

Anisotropic pol. rotation leads to mode-coupling between E and B modes as similar to lensing. Thus we can apply the same analysis method as in the lensing case but using different weight function to optimally reconstruct rotation angle

● Measured spectrum



- The spectrum is consistent with null (even if we change the analysis choices)


- The reconstructed spectra measured from our 14 jackknife maps are also consistent with null

- Instrumental relative pol. rotation $< 1\%$ of the 1 sigma statistical error

From arxiv 1705.02523

Comparison w/ previous works & cosmological implications

- Improved constraints on inflationary pol. rotation spectrum



If sources of the pol. rotation are originated from inflation, the expected rotation spectrum has the following scale-invariant shape

$$\frac{L(L+1)}{2\pi} C_L^{\alpha\alpha} = A_{CB} \times 10^{-4}$$

Compared to previous attempts, we improve the constraints on this inflationary rotation spectrum by an order of magnitude.

$$A_{CB} \leq 0.33 \text{ at } 95\%$$

From arxiv 1705.02523

- Implications**

The above results lead to constraints on


- Coupling constant of the Chern-Simons term $f_a \geq 1.7 \times 10^2 \frac{H_I}{2\pi}$
 an order of magnitude better than Pospelov et al. (2009) PRL

- Strength of the scale-invariant PMF smoothed over 1Mpc $B_{1Mpc} \leq 30\text{nG}$.


Delensing slides

How to make the lensing template:


Combine SPT/Planck/BK Q/U maps



The usual BK maps





At the moment doing *map space* un-deflect operation



Natural extension: don't "delens" maps and take spectra - instead add a "lensing template" virtual band to the stack of multi-frequency input maps. So long as we can calculate expectation values for the auto and cross spectra it fits right in.

Perfect lensing template in multicomponent analysis matches performance from sims that do not include CMB lensing, $\sigma(r) \sim 0.018$ for BK14.



If we have a perfect lensing template then “delensing” works perfectly - the ML r values are identical between unlensed and delensed sims on a *realization-by-realization* basis. (red points)

Current delensing efforts

Analysis now includes simulations of more realistic lensing template, using Planck CIB map as Φ tracer and SPT+Planck+BK E modes.

Similar to Manzotti et al SPT delensing paper, but using Planck CIB instead of Herschel for sky coverage.

Expect $\sim 10\%$ improvement in $\sigma(r)$

Limited by Φ map, not E modes

Future delensing with BICEP Array + SPT-3G will reconstruct Φ from high resolution CMB maps.

- Need to characterize internal delensing biases
- Expect to achieve $> 60\%$ reduction in lensing BB power