





Planck unveils the Sunyaev-Zeldovich effect



Planck all-sky Compton parameter map: power spectrum and higher order statistics

Based on Planck 2013 results XXI, arXv:1303.5081

J.F. Macías-Pérez

LPSC Grenoble

on behalf of the Planck Collaboration





- -Reconstruction and characterization of the *Planck* y-map
- -Power spectrum analysis
- -High order statistics
 - -1D-PDF analysis
 - Bispectrum
- -Cosmological implications

- planck
- Adapted component separation algorithms:

NILC and MILCA [Remazeilles et al 2011/2012; Hurier et al 2010/2012]

- constraints on electromagnetic spectra: preserve tSZ effect and remove CMB
- simultaneous spatial (pixel domain) and spectral (multipole domain) localisation
- Use HFI channels from 100 to 857 GHz
 - \Rightarrow the 857 used only for ell < 300
- Common resolution of 10 arcmin
- -Validation on FFP6 simulations

-Same algorithms as for the PIP (for example COMA and cluster merger analysis - Barbara's talk!

Planck Compton parameter map I





Planck Compton parameter map II



Use two independent methods to detect clusters on the y-map:

SEXtractor + MMF and MHW + SEXtractor

[Melin et al 2006; Lopez-Caniego et al 2006; Gonzalez-Nuevo et al 2006; Bertin & Arnouts 1996]

➡ number of detected clusters and measured flux consistent with Planck SZ catalogue





- Apply same component separation algorithms to the FFP6 simulations
- Compute cross-power spectrum of the FIRST and LAST maps

[Tristram et al 2005]

Main foreground contributions

- ➡ Galactic thermal dust at large angular scales - mask galactic emission on 50% of the sky
- cosmic infrared background and point sources at small angular scales - use physically motivated model + mask strong sources
- NILC y-map is less contaminated by foregrounds but slightly noisier than MILCA



Three component model : tSZ + clustered CIB + Point sources $C_I = C_I^{tSZ} + A^{CIB} \times C_I^{CIB} + A^{PS} \times (C_I^{RS} + C_I^{IRS})$



• **tSZ**: 2-halo model; *Tinker et al 2008* mass function; *Arnaud et al 2010* pressure profile; 20% mass bias - same as for cluster number count analysis (Marian's talk)

[Taburet et al 2009,2010,2011]

• clustered **CIB**: best-fit frequency auto and cross-power spectra for the 6 HFI bands (Guilaine's talk) - 5% uncertainties on cross correlation coefficients accounted for

• **Point sources**: number count models for the radio (Tucci et al 2011) and infrared (Bethermin et al 2012) sources - same as for CIB analysis (Guilaine's talk)

We assume Gaussian priors for A^{PS} and A^{CIB} (1±0.5)

Planck tSZ power spectrum



First tSZ power spectrum measurement on angular scales from 3 degrees to 10 arcmin



Cluster number counts best-fit model and re-scaled CMB tSZ temp are consistent the measured tSZ power spectrum; a power law is also a good fit to the data.

Power spectrum analysis IV: resolved clusters



- Simulate detected clusters
- •Mask all *Planck* detected point sources from 100-857 GHz
- •A significant fraction of the observed signal is due to resolved clusters of galaxies
- •Clear indication of signal from unresolved clusters and diffuse structures



Power spectrum: cosmological implications



$$\sigma_8(\Omega_m)^{3.2/8.1}$$
= 0.784 ± 0.016 (68% C.L.)

Physical model dependent:

mass function, pressure profile, mass bias, gas physics, ...

Use a signal-to-noise filter in harmonic space to enhance tSZ signal



After filtering tSZ effect dominates:

- -1D-PDF shows a positive tail consistent with tSZ effect
- skewness is not significantly affected by foreground emission
- unnormalized skewness scales as σ_8^{10-11} so $\sigma_8 = 0.779 \pm 0.015$ (68% C.L.)

Bispectrum analysis



Compute bispectrum for various configurations



-the bispectrum of the y-map is dominated by the tSZ signal [Lacasa et al 2012]

- -Planck provides first measurement of the tSZ effect bispectrum
- -clear indications of unresolved clusters and diffuse tSZ emission
- -bispectrum amplitude scales as σ_8^{10-12} and so $\sigma_8 = 0.74 \pm 0.04$ (68% C.L.)

Conclusions



-Planck has obtained the first all-sky y-map

-cluster properties in the y-map are consistent with those in the *Planck* SZ catalogue

-tSZ power spectrum has been measured on angular scales from 3 degrees to 10 arcmin

 power spectrum and high-order statistics of the y-map are consistent with tSZ origin for the signal

-power spectrum and high order statistic analyses set consistent and tight constraints on the matter content of the universe

-constraints on σ_8 are consistent with cluster number counts

- but at the 2.7 σ level with respect to the *Planck* CMB analysis: uncertainties on physics of clusters need to be accounted for

The scientific results that we present today are a product of the Planck Collaboration, including individuals from more than 100 scientific institutes in Europe, the USA and Canada





Planck is a project of the European Space Agency, with instruments provided by two scientific Consortia funded by ESA member states (in particular the lead countries: France and Italy) with contributions from NASA (USA), and telescope reflectors provided in a collaboration between ESA and a scientific Consortium led and funded by Denmark.



planck

Backup slides

Halo model for the tSZ effect power spectrum

100

 $C_{l^{tSZ}} = C_{l^{1halo}} + C_{l^{2halo}}$

$$C_{\ell}^{\text{1halo}} = \int_{0}^{z_{\text{max}}} dz \frac{dV_{c}}{dz d\Omega} \int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)|^{2} \qquad C_{\ell}^{\text{2halos}} = \int_{0}^{z_{\text{max}}} dz \frac{dV_{c}}{dz d\Omega} \times \text{Arnaud et al 2010} \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)\right)^{2} P(k, z) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)| B(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{min}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{max}}}^{M_{\text{max}}} dM \frac{dn(M, z)}{dM} |\tilde{y}_{\ell}(M, z)|^{2} P(k, z)|^{2} P(k, z) \right) \\ \left(\int_{M_{\text{max}}}^{M_{\text{max$$

17

Scaling relations



From Marian's talk:

- From 71 clusters in the sample with good XMM data
- Scaling Y_{SZ} re-extracted with Xray size&position vs M^{YX}

$$E^{-\beta}(z) \left[\frac{D_{\rm A}^2(z) \, \bar{Y}_{500}}{10^{-4} \, \rm Mpc^2} \right] = Y_* \left[\frac{h}{0.7} \right]^{-2+\alpha} \left[\frac{(1-b) \, M_{500}}{6 \times 10^{14} \, \rm M_{sol}} \right]^{\alpha}$$

lognormal scatter on Y

 Ratio between our scaling and numerical simulation scalings from litterature

$$\longrightarrow$$
 $(1-b) = 0.8 in [0.7 - 1.0]$



JF. Macias-Perez on behalf of the Planck Collaboration **Power spectrum analysis II: foreground and masks**





 Mask 50% of the sky using the 857
GHz map to avoid thermal dust emission contamination

• Mask all *Planck* detected point sources from 100-857 GHz

•As radio sources show up as negative spikes we cross check there are not resolved sources left in the y-map after masking

y-map characterisation: detecting clusters





Use two independent methods to detect clusters on the y-map:

SEXtractor + MMF and MHW + SEXtractor [Melin et al 2006; Lopez-Caniego et al 2006; Gonzalez-Nuevo et al 2006; Bertin & Arnouts 1996]

number of detected clusters and measured flux consistent with *Planck* SZ catalogue

JF. Macias-Perez on behalf of the Planck Collaboration

Planck Compton parameter map II

NILC tSZ map

MILCA tSZ map

