

Cosmological parameters derived from the final Planck data release (PR4)

M. Tristram

PLANCK NPIPE Team

Cosmological parameters derived from the final *Planck* data release (PR4)

M. Tristram[1], A. J. Banday[2], M. Douspis[3], X. Garrido[1], K. M. Górski[4,5], S. Henrot-Versillé[1], L. T. Hergt[6], S. Ilić[1,7], R. Keskitalo[8,9], G. Lagache[10], C. R. Lawrence[4], B. Partridge[11], and D. Scott[6]

1 Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS/IN2P3, IJCLab, 91405 Orsay, France
2 IRAP, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, CNES, UPS, (Toulouse), France
3 Université Paris-Saclay, CNRS, Institut d'Astrophysique Spatiale, 91405, Orsay, France
4 Jet Propulsion Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, California, U.S.A.
5 Warsaw University Observatory, Aleje Ujazdowskie 4, 00-478 Warszawa, Poland
6 Department of Physics & Astronomy, University of British Columbia, 6224 Agricultural Road, Vancouver, British Columbia, V6T 1Z1, Canada
7 Centre National d'Etudes Spatiales – Centre Spatial de Toulouse, 18 Avenue Edouard Belin, 31401 Toulouse Cedex 9, France
8 Computational Cosmology Center, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, California, 94720, U.S.A.
9 Space Sciences Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, California, 94720, U.S.A.
10 Aix Marseille Université, CNRS, CNES, LAM, Marseille, France
11 Department of Astronomy, Haverford College, Haverford, Pennsylvania, 19041, U.S.A.

November 21, 2023

[Tristram et al. A&A (2023)]
astro-ph/2309.10034

PLANCK PR4 data

- about 10% more data

  ➡ **improved sensitivity in Temperature and Polarization**

- PLANCK detectors were sensitive to **one polarization direction** and PLANCK scanning strategy did not allow for polarization reconstruction for each detector independently

  ➡ need to **combine detectors** with different polarization orientation

- Any flux **mismatch** between detectors create spurious polarization signal through well known **I-to-P leakage**.

  In particular : ADC non-linearity, bandpass mismatch, calibration mismatch, …



[Planck Collaboration Int. LVII (2020)]

PLANCK Release 4
NPIPE processing

[Planck Collaboration Int. LVII (2020)]

- **Processing applied consistently over the whole 9 PLANCK frequencies (from 30 GHz to 857 GHz)** NEW

- **NPIPE map-making includes templates for**
  - systematic effects
    (time transfer-function, ADC non-linearities, Far Side Lobes, bandpass-mismatch)
  - sky-asynchronous signals (orbital dipole, zodiacal light)

- **Provide frequency maps**
  - **cleaner**: less residuals (compared to PR3) at the price of a non-zero transfer function at large scale in polarization
  - **more accurate**: less noise (compared to PR3)
  - no residuals from template resolution mismatch (as visible in PR3)

- **Provide independent split-maps** NEW
  - PR3: time-split (half-mission or half-ring) ➡ correlated
  - PR4: detector-split (detset) ➡ independent

- **Provide low-resolution maps with pixel-pixel noise covariance estimates across all PLANCK frequencies** NEW

Planck Release 4

CMB polarized maps

[Planck Collaboration Int. LVII (2020)]

PR2
(2015)

PR3
(2018)

PR4
(2020)



Commander CMB Q and U maps
(large scale, 5° smoothing)

PLANCK Release 4

NPIPE simulations

[Planck Collaboration Int. LVII (2020)]

a realistic simulation set is essential to properly assess uncertainties especially at large angular scales

- **600 consistent simulations (frequency and split maps) - 36 TB**

NEW

- **Inputs**
  - including instrumental noise (consistent with data-split differences)
  - including models for systematics (ADC non-linearity)
  - random CMB with 4pi beam convolution
  - foreground sky model based on Commander PLANCK solution



- **Allow for**
  1. accurate effective description of the noise and **covariance** of the maps (including noise, instrumental systematics, foreground residuals)
  2. estimation of the **transfer function** of the PLANCK processing

PLANCK PR4 likelihoods

[Tristram+ (2023)]

Planck likelihoods are splits in **two parts** due to different **statistical assomptions**

large scales (low ℓ)

- **lowT: Commander**
  [Planck Collaboration V 2020]

Bayesian posterior Gibbs sampling that combines astrophysical component separation and likelihood estimation

- **lowE(B): Lollipop**
  [Tristram et al. 2022]

Hamimeche&Lewis likelihood based on cross-spectra between CMB clean maps on 50% of the sky

ℓ = 2-30

small scales (high ℓ)

- **Hillipop: TT, TE, EE, TTTEEE**
  [Tristram et al. 2023]

Gaussian likelihood based on cross-spectra from frequency maps on 75% of the sky, including models for the foreground residuals

ℓ = 30-2500

Lollipop

PR4 power-spectra



xQML

[https://gitlab.in2p3.fr/xQML]

Lollipop

Tensor-to-scalar ratio & Reionization

Reionization optical depth (scattering of photons by free electrons)

$$\tau = 0.0580 \pm 0.0062$$



Galaxies become more efficient producers of ionizing photons at higher redshifts and fainter magnitudes

Faintest galaxies (MUV > –15) dominate the ionizing emissivity

[Tristram et al. A&A 647, A128 (2021)]
[Tristram et al. PRD 105, 083524 (2022)]

$r_{0.05} < 0.042$	BICEP2/Keck 2018	1% of the sky
$r_{0.05} < 0.069$	Planck EB (2020)	50% of the sky

[Tristram et al. PRD 105, 083524 (2022)]

$r_{0.05} < 0.032$ (Planck + BK18)



Hillipop

PR4 power-spectra

[Tristram+ (2023)]

2 maps per frequencies at 100, 143 and 217 GHz
15 cross-spectra at 6 cross-frequencies





xpol

[https://gitlab.in2p3.fr/tristram/xpol]

Hillipop

PR4 TT-TE-EE likelihood

[Tristram+ (2023)]

An accurate masking

- our Galaxy
- point sources
- nearby extended galaxies (e.g. M31)



An accurate foreground model

- Galactic dust
- cosmic infrared background (CIB)
- thermal (tSZ) and kinetic (kSZ) Sunyaev-Zeldovich components
- Poisson-distributed point sources from radio and infrared star-forming galaxies
- the correlation between CIB and the tSZ effect (tSZ×CIB)

Hillipop

PR4 CMB power-spectra







ΛCDM cosmology
model

- **6 parameters**
  - 3 for the primordial matter spectra

$$\mathcal{P}_s(k) = A_s \left(\frac{k}{k_0} \right)^{n_s - 1}$$

  - 1 expansion rate H_0 (in practice sound horizon θ_s)
  - 2 parameters for densities $\Omega_b h^2$ $\Omega_c h^2$
  - reionization τ

- **hypothesis**
  - flat Universe $\Omega_k = 0$
  - No running $dn_s/d\ln k = 0$
  - no tensor $r = 0$
  - 3 neutrinos $N_{\rm eff} = 3.044$
  - standard neutrinos with low mass $\sum m_\nu = 0.06$ eV

ΛCDM cosmology
parameters

[Tristram+ (2023)]



ΛCDM cosmology
TT, TE, EE

[Tristram+ (2023)]



ΛCDM cosmology

Comparison with PR3 and CamSpec

[Planck 2018 Results. VI. (2020)]
[Rosenberg, Gratton, Efstathiou, MNRAS, 517, 4620 (2022)]
[Tristram+ (2023)]

- **Good consistency between the PR4 and PR3 power spectra**, which translates to very good agreement on cosmological parameters as well.
- Lower noise of the NPIPE maps + improvement in polarization signal provides **tighter parameter constraints**, with more than **10% improvement** for ΛCDM parameters in TTTEEE



improvement wrt Planck 2018

Parameter	$\Delta\sigma$
$\Omega_b h^2$	-13.7 %
$\Omega_c h^2$	-15.2 %
$100\theta_*$	-16.1 %
$\log(10^{10}A_s)$	-12.0 %
n_s	-11.0 %
τ	-21.4 %
H_0	-13.7 %
σ_8	-11.5 %
S_8	-14.2 %
Ω_m	-16.1 %

ΛCDM cosmology
growth of structures



- **DES**

  $S_8 = 0.782 \pm 0.019$ (DES-Y3)

- **Planck**

  $S_8 = 0.834 \pm 0.016$ (PR3 TTTEEE)

  $S_8 = 0.819 \pm 0.014$ (PR4 TTTEEE)

reduced from 2.1σ to 1.5σ

ΛCDM extensions
A_{lens}

[Tristram+ (2023)]



$$A_{\text{lens}} = 1.039 \pm 0.052 \quad \text{(TTTEEE)}$$
$$A_{\text{lens}} = 1.037 \pm 0.037 \quad \text{(TTTEEE+lensing)}$$

no tension

ΛCDM extensions

curvature Ω_K

[Tristram+ (2023)]



$$\Omega_K = -0.012 \pm 0.010 \quad \text{(TTTEEE)}$$
$$\Omega_K = 0.0000 \pm 0.0016 \quad \text{(TTTEEE+lensing+BAO)}$$

ΛCDM extensions

Sum of neutrino masses, Σm_ν

[Tristram+ (2023)]



$\sum m_\nu < 0.26$ (95% CL, TTTEEE, PR3)

better sensitivity but
looser constraint due to A_{lens} closer to 1

$\sum m_\nu < 0.39$ (95% CL, TTTEEE)
$\sum m_\nu < 0.26$ (95% CL, TTTEEE+lensing)
$\sum m_\nu < 0.11$ (95% CL, TTTEEE+lensing+BAO)

normal hierarchy (NH)



inverted hierarchy (IH)





ΛCDM extensions

Dark Energy

[courtesy Stéphane Ilic]



DESI BAO + CMB(PR3-Plik)

$$w_0 = -0.45^{+0.34}_{-0.21}$$

$$w_a = -1.79^{+0.48}_{-1.0}$$

DESI BAO + CMB(PR4-Hillipop)

$$w_0 = -0.51^{+0.32}_{-0.29}$$

$$w_a = -1.49^{+0.78}_{-0.89}$$

reduced w_0 tension from 2.6σ to 1.7σ

Conclusions: use PR4 !

- **PR4 final PLANCK maps**
  - **cleaner** (less systematics)
  - **more sensitive** (less noisy)
  - split-maps not correlated



- **NPIPE sims**
  - consistent with the data
  - **allow for TF and variance estimation**
  - include uncertainties from systematics (both instrumental and astrophysical)



- **CMB likelihoods (Lollipop & Hillipop)**
  - Cosmology consistent with the PR3 and with CamSpec
  - about **10% improvement** in most of ΛCDM parameters
  - **give the tightest constraints from Planck CMB today**
  - **no deviation from standard ΛCDM**

$$A_{\rm lens} = 1.039 \pm 0.052$$
$$\Omega_K = -0.012 \pm 0.010$$

AVAILABLE FOR COBAYA AND MONTEPYTHON

https://github.com/planck-npipe

Science with PR4…

- **ΛCDM with CMB**
  - [Tristram et al., A&A (2023)] *Cosmological parameters derived from the final Planck data release (PR4)*
  - [Rosenberg et al., MNRAS 517 4620 (2022)] *CMB power spectra and cosmological parameters from Planck PR4 with CamSpec*
- **Lensing**
  - [Carron, Mirmelstein, Lewis, JCAP 2022 039 (2022)] *CMB lensing from Planck PR4 maps*
- **Cosmic Birefringence**
  - [Diego-Palazuelos et al., PRL 128 091302 (2022)] *Cosmic Birefringence from Planck Public Release 4*
- **Inflation**
  - [Galloni et al., PRD submitted, 2405.04455 (2024)] *constraints on tensor perturbations from cosmological data: a comparative analysis from Bayesian and frequentist perspectives*
  - [Campeti et al., JCAP 2022 039 (2022)] *New constraints on axion-gauge field dynamics during inflation from Planck and BICEP/Keck data sets*
  - [Galloni et al., JCAP 2023 062 (2022)] *Updated constraints on amplitude and tilt of the tensor primordial spectrum*
  - [Tristram et al., PRD 105 083524 (2022)] *Improved limits on the tensor-to-scalar ratio using BICEP and Planck*
- **Sunyaev-Zeldovich**
  - [Tanimura et al., MNRAS 509 300 (2022)] *Constraining cosmology with a new all-sky y-map from the Planck PR4 data*
  - [Chandran, Remazeilles, Barreiro, MNRAS 526 4 (2023)] *An updated and improved tSZ y-map from Planck PR4 data*
- **Cross-correlation**
  - [Carron, Lewis, Fabbian, PRD 106 103507 (2022)] *Planck ISW-lensing likelihood and the CMB temperature*

and many others…