# Solving small-scale clustering problems in approximate lightcone mocks

Alex Smith<sup>1,2,3</sup>\*, Shaun Cole<sup>1</sup>, Cameron Grove<sup>1</sup>, Peder Norberg<sup>1,4</sup>, and Pauline Zarrouk<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institute for Computational Cosmology, Department of Physics, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE, UK

<sup>5</sup> Sorbonne Université, Université Paris Diderot, CNRS/IN2P3, Laboratoire de Physique Nucléaire et de Hautes Energies, LPNHE, 4 place Jussieu, F-75252 Paris, France

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

# ABSTRACT

Realistic lightcone mocks are important in the clustering analyses of large galaxy surveys. For simulations where only the snapshots are available, it is common to create approximate lightcones by joining together the snapshots in spherical shells. We assess the two-point clustering measurements of central galaxies in approximate lightcones built from the Millennium-XXL simulation, which are constructed using different numbers of snapshots. The monopole and quadrupole of the real-space correlation function is strongly boosted on small scales below  $1 h^{-1}$ Mpc, due to some galaxies being duplicated at the boundaries between snapshots in the lightcone. When more snapshots are used, the total number of duplicated galaxies is approximately constant, but they are pushed to smaller separations. The effect of this in redshift space is small, as long as the snapshots are cut into shells in real space. Randomly removing duplicated galaxies is able to reduce the excess clustering signal. Including satellite galaxies will reduce the impact of the duplicates, since many small-scale pairs come from satellites in the same halo. Galaxies that are missing from the lightcone at the boundaries can be added to the lightcone by having a small overlap between each shell. This effect will impact analyses that use very small-scale clustering measurements, and when using mocks to test the impact of fibre collisions.

Key words: large-scale structure of Universe - catalogues - galaxies: statistics

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The use of realistic mock galaxy catalogues is an essential requirement in the clustering analysis of galaxies in large galaxy surveys. In order to make redshift space distortion (RSD; Kaiser 1987) and Baryon Acoustic Oscillation (BAO; e.g. Cole et al. 2005; Eisenstein et al. 2005) measurements from the two-point clustering statistics, the theoretical models must be validated on mock catalogues, where the underlying cosmology is known. Additionally, the use of mocks allows the systematics affecting these measurements to be quantified, and for the development of methods to mitigate them (e.g. Smith et al. 2019; Sugiyama et al. 2020; DeRose et al. 2021). These allow us to place constraints on theories of dark energy, and theories of modified gravity (e.g. Guzzo et al. 2008).

Current and future galaxy surveys, such as the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI; DESI Collaboration et al. 2016a,b; Abareshi et al. 2022), Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST; Ivezić et al. 2019), Roman Space Telescope (Spergel et al. 2015), and Euclid (Laureijs et al. 2011), will map many millions of galaxies. In order to reach the required high precision BAO and RSD measurements, it is essential that the mock catalogues used are as accurate as possible.

Mock galaxy catalogues are constructed using the outputs of Nbody simulations. Due to the large volumes required, dark-matteronly simulations are typically used, which are then populated with galaxies. There are several methods which are commonly used to add galaxies to the dark matter haloes, such as the halo occupation distribution (HOD; e.g. Smith et al. 2017; Alam et al. 2020; Smith et al. 2020; Alam et al. 2021b; Rossi et al. 2021), where the probability a halo contains central and satellite galaxies depends on the halo mass. Subhalo abundance matching (SHAM; e.g. Rodríguez-Torres et al. 2016; Safonova et al. 2021) ranks the subhaloes in the simulation based on a property (e.g. circular velocity), placing the brightest galaxies in the most massive subhaloes (with scatter). Semi-analytic models (SAM; e.g. Cole et al. 2000; Benson & Bower 2010) describe the physics of galaxy formation and evolution, using analytic techniques.

To emulate an observed dataset, it is necessary to create lightcone mocks, where the galaxy properties evolve with the distance to the observer. Distant haloes or galaxies in the lightcone are output at early times in the simulation, and nearby galaxies at late times. Ideally, a direct lightcone output of the simulation would be used, where particles are output on the fly at the time at which they cross the observer's lightcone. For some simulations, lightcone outputs are available, such as the Hubble volume simulation (Evrard et al. 2002), the Euclid flagship simulation (Potter et al. 2017), and the DESI AbacusSummit simulations (Maksimova et al. 2021; Hadzhiyska et al. 2022), which are designed to meet the requirements of the new generation of large-scale structure surveys. However, for many simulations, the positions of particles and haloes are only output in

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> IRFU, CEA, Université Paris-Saclay, F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Institute for Astronomy, University of Edinburgh, Royal Observatory, Blackford Hill, Edinburgh EH9 3HJ, UK

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Centre for Extragalactic Astronomy, Department of Physics, Durham University, South Road, Durham DH1 3LE. UK

 <sup>\*</sup> E-mail: alex.smith@ed.ac.uk

the cubic box, at certain discrete time snapshots. In this case, the simulation snapshots must be used to build approximate lightcones. Creating approximate lightcones from the simulation snapshots also provides more flexibility, allowing the observer position to be chosen after the simulation has been run, e.g. in an analogue of the Local Group. Multiple lightcones can also be created with observers at different locations in the box. Creating lightcones on-the-fly is a very specialised use of a simulation, increasing the I/O and storage requirements, when simulation boxes are used for most applications. Additionally, lightcones currently available do not cover the full sky (e.g. the AbacusSummit lightcones cover 1 octant), so the snapshots can be used to create mocks that cover a larger footprint.

The simplest way to create a mock with galaxies positioned on the sky, cut to the survey geometry, is to use a single simulation snapshot, at the median redshift of the galaxy sample being considered. In the final analysis of the extended Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (eBOSS; Dawson et al. 2016; Alam et al. 2021a), this is what was done to create mocks for the different galaxy tracers (Smith et al. 2020; Alam et al. 2021b; Rossi et al. 2021). These mocks were used in the eBOSS mock challenges, to validate the theoretical models used in the two-point clustering analyses. While this was good enough for the precision of eBOSS, these mocks lacked evolution over the redshift ranges of the tracers. To include this evolution, multiple snapshots can be used to build a lightcone.

There are two ways in which multiple snapshots can be combined to make a lightcone, each with their own advantages and disadvantages. Firstly, haloes can be interpolated between snapshots in order to build a lightcone (e.g. Merson et al. 2013; Smith et al. 2017; Izquierdo-Villalba et al. 2019). Interpolation has also been used to make LSST mocks in Korytov et al. (2019). This requires the use of halo merger trees to easily identify the descendants and progenitors of a halo. However, halo interpolation is not perfect, and there are additional complications, such as halo mergers which take place between snapshots. Different methods for interpolating haloes are compared in Smith et al. (2022). Halo merger trees require a lot of computational effort to produce, and are not always available. Particle IDs are required to be able to track the same halo at different times. For some large simulations, halo IDs are not tracked in order to maximise the number of dark matter particles (e.g. Potter et al. 2017), so merger trees cannot be produced.

The second method that can be used to build lightcones is to join together the snapshots in spherical shells. This is straightforward to implement for any simulation, requiring less computational effort than interpolation, but has the disadvantage that there are discontinuities at the boundaries between shells. Galaxies or haloes that cross the lightcone close to a boundary can be duplicated, appearing at both sides, or conversely they can never appear at all (e.g. Kitzbichler & White 2007).

The method of joining snapshots in spherical shells has been applied to many simulations to create lightcones and mocks for a wide range of applications. It is commonly used to create lightcones for studies of weak lensing, e.g. in the 'onion shell' MICE simulations (Fosalba et al. 2008, 2015), and in the lensing lightcones of Giocoli et al. (2016, 2017). A comparison of codes used to create lensing simulations can be found in Hilbert et al. (2020). Lightcones have also been created in spherical shells in lensing studies of the cosmic microwave background (e.g. Carbone et al. 2008; Sgier et al. 2021), and in studies of anisotropies in the gamma-ray background (e.g. Zavala et al. 2010; Fornasa et al. 2013). Other applications include mocks of active galactic nuclei (e.g. Comparat et al. 2019) and lightcones of galaxy clusters (e.g. Zandanel et al. 2018). Lightcones have been used in the BOSS survey to predict the HOD and clustering of the CMASS galaxies (Rodríguez-Torres et al. 2016), and have been created for the Dark Energy Survey (DES; Avila et al. 2018). Mocks for the upcoming Roman Space Telescope have been made in Wang et al. (2022). This method is also being used to create galaxy light-cones for the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) and the DESI Bright Galaxy Survey (Dong-Páez et al. 2022).

While the issue of repeated or missing galaxies in the lightcones has been known about for some time, it is not accounted for in many of the lightcones that have been created. One way to correct for this is to linearly interpolate the galaxies that are close to the interface (Kitzbichler & White 2007). In this paper, we quantify the effect of duplicated galaxies on the two-point clustering statistics of lightcone mocks that are constructed in spherical shells. We compare lightcones constructed using different numbers of snapshots, and assess the impact of duplicated galaxies on the small-scale clustering. We propose a method to correct the issue of duplicated galaxies, which is simple to implement for any simulation, and does not require halo merger trees and interpolation.

This paper is organised as follows. The simulations and lightcone construction is described in Section 2. In Section 3, we compare lightcone mocks made with different numbers of snapshots, and assess the impact of duplicated galaxies on the small-scale clustering measurements. Our conclusions are summarised in Section 4.

#### **2 LIGHTCONES**

In this paper, we create all-sky lightcones from the Millennium-XXL (MXXL) simulation. Galaxies are added to the simulation using the HOD methodology of Smith et al. (2017) and Smith et al. (2022).

### 2.1 MXXL simulation

The MXXL simulation (Angulo et al. 2012) is a dark-matter-only Nbody simulation in a cubic box of side length 3  $h^{-1}$ Gpc and particle mass 6.17 × 10<sup>9</sup>  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. The simulation was run in a WMAP1 cosmology (Spergel et al. 2003), with  $\Omega_{\rm m} = 0.25$ ,  $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.75$ ,  $\sigma_8 = 0.9$ , h = 0.73 and  $n_s = 1$ .

Haloes in the simulation were first found using a friends-of-friends (FOF) algorithm (Davis et al. 1985), with linking length b = 0.2. Bound substructures within each FOF group were then identified using the SUBFIND algorithm (Springel et al. 2001).

Halo catalogues are output at a total of 64 simulation snapshots. There are 23 snapshots at z < 1, which are approximately evenly spaced in expansion factor, *a*.

#### 2.2 Populating snapshots with galaxies

The MXXL simulation snapshots are populated with galaxies using the HOD methodology of Smith et al. (2017) and Smith et al. (2022), where each galaxy is assigned an *r*-band magnitude. Here we briefly summarize this method. A set of nested HODs for different absolute magnitude thresholds is used, which are measured from the SDSS survey (Zehavi et al. 2011). For a given magnitude threshold, the HOD is modelled as a smoothed step function for central galaxies, and a power law for satellites. The smoothing of the step function that represents the central galaxy HOD is performed using a pseudo-Gaussian spline kernel function rather than a simple Gaussian in order to prevent unphysical crossing of the HODs.

Central galaxies are placed at the centre of a halo, while satellites are randomly positioned following a NFW profile (Navarro et al. 1997). The centrals are also assigned the same velocity as the halo,

Redshift	1 Snapshot	3 Snapshots	5 Snapshots	9 Snapshots
0			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
0.0199		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$
0.0414			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
0.0644				$\checkmark$
0.0892		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
0.1159				$\checkmark$
0.1444	$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
0.1749		$\checkmark$		$\checkmark$
0.2075			$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$

**Table 1.** MXXL simulation snapshots used in the construction of the lightcone mocks, built with a total of 1, 3, 5 and 9 snapshots. The redshift of the 1-snapshot mock is closest to the median redshift of the galaxy sample we use.

with a random virial velocity for the satellites, relative to the central. This is drawn from a Gaussian distribution in each dimension, with the velocity dispersion of the halo.

The HODs we use are evolved with redshift in order to match an evolving target luminosity function, from measurements from the SDSS and GAMA surveys (Blanton et al. 2003; Loveday et al. 2012). When applied to a single snapshot, the mock that is produced will match exactly the target luminosity function at the redshift of the snapshot.

## 2.3 Creating lightcones

After populating the snapshots with galaxies, we create 4 full-sky lightcones by joining together the snapshots in spherical shells. This is done using 1, 3, 5 and 9 snapshots, where the snapshots used in each lightcone are summarised in Table 1. The joins between snapshots occur at the redshift exactly half way between the snapshot redshifts. For the lightcone created using a single snapshot, we use the snapshot which is the closest to the median redshift of the volume limited galaxy sample we examine in this work (see Section 2.5). Since the MXXL simulation is large, no periodic replications of the box are required.

When cutting each snapshot into spherical shells, there is a choice of whether this is done based on the real-space position of each galaxy, or based on the positions in redshift space. We therefore create two versions of each lightcone, to assess the impact of this choice on the galaxy clustering statistics.

When the lightcone is constructed from a single snapshot, the galaxy luminosity function is constant with redshift. For the other lightcones, there are sudden jumps in the luminosity function at the boundaries between snapshots. To make sure that all mocks have the same luminosity function, which smoothly evolves with redshift, we apply an abundance matching rescaling to the absolute magnitudes, as in Dong-Páez et al. (2022). The magnitude of a galaxy in a shell,  $M_r$ , can be converted to a corresponding cumulative number density, *n*, using the target luminosity function at the snapshot redshift,  $z_{\text{snap}}$ . The target luminosity function at the redshift of the galaxy in the lightcone, *z*, is then used to convert the cumulative number density back a magnitude at redshift *z*.

#### 2.4 Duplicated galaxies

In the lightcones built from multiple snapshots, it is possible for some galaxies to appear twice in the lightcone, or to never appear at all. This happens when a galaxy crosses the interface between two shells, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In the diagram on the left, the blue and red shaded regions indicate two shells in the lightcone, which are cut from neighbouring snapshots i and i + 1, at output times  $t_i$  and  $t_{i+1}$ . The points show the positions of galaxies at these two times. For the galaxy shown by the solid points, its position vector in the initial snapshot,  $\vec{x}_i$ , falls within the shell cut from snapshot *i*, so the galaxy appears in the lightcone. At time  $t_{i+1}$ , the galaxy has moved towards the observer, and its new position vector,  $\vec{x}_{i+1}$ , is inside the shell from snapshot i + 1. This galaxy appears twice in the lightcone, at each side of the boundary between shells. The opposite happens for the galaxy shown by the open circles. Its position at  $t_i$ falls outside of the first shell. The galaxy then moves away from the observer, and its new position at  $t_{i+1}$  is also outside of the second shell. This galaxy never appears in the lightcone. In reality, both galaxies should appear once in the lightcone. We can see from this figure that galaxies are only duplicated if they cross the boundary while travelling towards the observer, and missing galaxies always travel away from the observer. For the galaxies that appear twice, their pair separation is simply the distance travelled between the two snapshots.

The space-time diagram on the right of Fig. 1 illustrates the same two cases, with position on the x-axis and time on the y-axis. The galaxy that is moving towards the observer and appears twice in the lightcone is shown by the solid circles. Within each snapshot, the position of the galaxy is kept constant, which is indicated by the vertical lines. A galaxy in the shell from snapshot *i* will appear in the lightcone at a time between  $(t_{i-1} + t_i)/2 < t < (t_i + t_{i+1})/2$ , but its position is fixed at  $\vec{x}_i$ . At the boundary, the galaxy jumps instantaneously to its new position,  $\vec{x}_{i+1}$ , travelling faster than the speed of light. In this example, the galaxy crosses the lightcone in snapshot *i*, then jumps back over the lightcone, crossing a second time in snapshot i + 1. If the galaxy was interpolated, it would follow a smooth trajectory, indicated by the dashed line, crossing the lightcone once. Similarly, the open circles show the galaxy that never appears, since it instantaneously jumps over the lightcone at the interface where the shells are joined together.

#### 2.5 Galaxy sample

We cut the mock to a volume limited sample of z < 0.2 and  $M_r < -20$ , where the number density of galaxies is constant with redshift. The wide redshift range is covered by a total of 9 snapshots, allowing us to investigate the effect of making lightcones from different numbers of shells. We also cut to central galaxies only, and do not consider the satellites. On small scales, most galaxy pairs are from satellite galaxies on the clustering measurements. We focus on the central galaxies, where these effects will be strongest.

In this paper we focus on a volume limited galaxy sample, but we have checked that our results and conclusions remain unchanged for an apparent magnitude threshold galaxy sample.

## **3** COMPARING LIGHTCONES WITH DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF SNAPSHOTS

In this section we compare the lightcones constructed from different numbers of snapshots. Section 3.1 compares the two-point clustering statistics, where the snapshots are carved into shells based on the realspace or redshift-space galaxy positions. Section 3.2 quantifies the distances that galaxies travel between snapshots, which sets the scales at which the clustering measurements are affected by duplicated



**Figure 1.** *Left*: Diagram depicting galaxy positions in a two-dimensional slice through a lightcone, illustrating how the same galaxy can appear twice, or never appear. The blue and red shaded regions are shells cut from two neighbouring snapshots, i and i + 1, respectively. The circles show the positions of galaxies at the two snapshot output times, which cross the boundary. The galaxy indicated by the filled circle moves towards the observer, appearing in both shells. The galaxy indicated by the open circle moves away from the observer, appearing in neither. *Right*: A depiction of the same two cases in a space-time diagram, where time is shown along the vertical axis, the red and blue horizontal lines are the times corresponding the two simulation snapshots, and the diagonal lines represent the observer's lightcone. Within each snapshot, the position of each galaxy is kept fixed (vertical coloured lines), with an instantaneous jump between snapshots. Consequently, the galaxy depicted by the solid symbol, which is moving towards the observer, crosses the observer's past lightcone twice, while the one depicted by the open symbol does not cross it at all. If the galaxy trajectories had instead been interpolated (dashed lines) they would have each crossed the lightcone once. In this figure, the galaxy velocities have been greatly exaggerated. In reality, the dashed lines would be close to vertical and only galaxies very close to the lightcone at the interface between shells would be subject to these problems.

galaxies. We assess the impact of removing duplicated galaxies on the two-point clustering statistics in Section 3.3.

#### 3.1 Galaxy clustering

We measure the correlation function,  $\xi(s, \mu)$ , from the lightcones, where  $\mu$  is the cosine of the angle between the line-of-sight direction, and pair separation vector. This is then decomposed into Legendre multipoles,

$$\xi_l(s) = \frac{2l+1}{2} \int_{-1}^{1} \xi(s,\mu) P_l(\mu) d\mu, \tag{1}$$

where  $P_l(\mu)$  is the  $l^{\text{th}}$  order Legendre polynomial. In redshift space, the first two even multipoles are the monopole,  $\xi_0(s)$ , and quadrupole,  $\xi_2(s)$ , which are non-zero in linear theory. In real space, the monopole is equivalent to the real-space correlation function,  $\xi(r)$ , while the quadrupole is on average zero.

Fig. 2 shows the two-point correlation function in real space of the 4 lightcones, where the snapshots are cut into shells based on the real-space position of each galaxy. The monopole and quadrupole are shown in the upper panel, where the blue shaded region indicates the jackknife error from 100 jackknife regions. In real space, the quadrupole should be zero, and the signal measured in the mocks comes from cosmic variance in the finite volume. Since all 4 mocks are constructed from the same simulation, with the observer positioned at the same location, they all share the same large scale structure, so the correlation function measurements have the same shape. The middle panel shows the difference in  $\xi_0(r)$ , relative to the mock built from a single snapshot, which is scaled by a factor of rto highlight any differences on large scales. We use the 1-snapshot lightcone as the reference and differences from this are artifacts due to duplicated galaxies. Since the snapshot used is at the median red-

comparing simulations with the same initial conditions (see equation 14 of Grove et al. 2021). This error is calculated for all pairs of lightcones, and the average is plotted. On large scales, this noise is much smaller than the uncertainty due to cosmic variance, which is estimated with the standard jackknife error. On large scales, all 4 lightcones show good agreement in the monopole, and they remain in good agreement down to ~ 1  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. Below this, the mocks built from multiple snapshots peel off, since their clustering is boosted by pairs of galaxies which are duplicated at the interfaces between shells. The scale at which this occurs is the smallest for the mock with 9 snapshots, but for this lightcone, the effect on the monopole is also the strongest. The bottom panel shows the differences in  $\xi_2(r)$ . As with the monopole, all the mocks are in good agreement on large scales, but there is a non-zero signal below 1  $h^{-1}$ Mpc for the lightcones built from multiple snapshots, which again is the strongest and pushed to the smallest scales for the lightcone that uses all 9 snapshots. The increase in the quadrupole indicates that the pair separation of duplicated galaxies is preferentially directed along the line of sight. This is because galaxies that travel along the observer's line of sight are more likely to cross a boundary between snapshots, and appear twice in the lightcone.

shift of the galaxy sample, the clustering measurements are a good

approximation of a true lightcone. The grey shaded region is the jackknife error in  $r\Delta\xi_0$ , which provides an estimate of the noise when

The left panel of Fig. 3 shows the clustering in redshift space. Here, the snapshots were cut into shells using their redshift-space positions. Including the effect of velocities smooths out the effect of duplicated galaxies on the monopole. The clustering is still boosted for the lightcone with 9 snapshots, but the increase in the clustering is smaller than in real space. However, this difference extends to larger scales, around 4  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. A large effect is still seen in the quadrupole, which is also shifted to larger scales compared to in



**Figure 2.** Correlation function multipoles in real space, scaled by  $r^2$ , for the lightcones built from 1 snapshot (blue), 3 snapshots (orange), 5 snapshots (green) and 9 snapshots (red). The snapshots are cut into shells based on the galaxy positions in real space. The upper panel shows the monopole (solid lines) and quadrupole (dashed), transitioning from a logarithmic scale to a linear scale on the *x*-axis at 20  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. The blue shaded region is the jackknife error, calculated using 100 jackknife samples. The grey shaded region indicates the jackknife error in  $r\Delta\xi$ , averaged over all pairs of mocks. The middle and lower panels show the differences in the monopole and quadrupole, respectively, compared to the mock built from a single snapshot, and scaled by *r*.

real space. A clear monotonic trend can be seen, where the strength of the quadrupole increases as more snapshots are included. Above  $\sim 10 \ h^{-1}$ Mpc, all the lightcones remain in good agreement.

When making the lightcones in redshift space, the shells were previously cut based on the redshift-space position of the galaxies in each snapshot. Alternatively, the cuts can be done based on the positions in real space, with the effect of velocities added to the mocks afterwards. The redshift-space clustering is shown in the right panel of Fig. 3 for the lightcones where the cuts were applied in real space. The effect of applying the velocities at the end greatly reduces the effect that duplicated galaxies have on the clustering. For the monopole, the clustering measurements for all the lightcones are in good agreement down to very small scales of  $\sim 0.2 h^{-1}$ Mpc. Below this, a small boost in the clustering can only be seen for the mock made of 9 snapshots. There is still an excess in the quadrupole at scales of  $\sim 1 h^{-1}$ Mpc, which is strongest for the 9-snapshot lightcone, but this is much smaller than when the snapshots were joined in redshift space.

## 3.2 Distance separation of duplicated galaxies

On small scales, the two-point clustering statistics are boosted due to galaxies that appear twice in the lightcone, at each side of the interface where two snapshots are joined together. The separation between the galaxies in each duplicated pair is simply the distance that the galaxy travelled in the time between the two snapshots. Therefore, the distribution of these distances will provide insight into how the clustering measurements are affected by the number of snapshots used to build the lightcones.

Fig. 4 shows the normalised distribution of distances that a central galaxy (i.e. a halo) travels between each of the simulation snapshots used to make the lightcone. This distribution is calculated from the full snapshots, using all central galaxies brighter than the magnitude threshold of  $M_r < -20$ , allowing the distributions to be measured smoothly. The distance that each galaxy travels is calculated by multiplying its velocity by the time interval,  $\Delta t$ , between the adjacent snapshots used to build the lightcone. The amplitude of the distribution is then scaled by a factor of  $r_{\rm com}^2$ , where  $r_{\rm com}$  is the comoving distance from the observer to the boundary in the lightcone, to take into account the differences in area (boundaries at high redshift cover a larger area, and hence there will be more galaxies that are duplicated).

The upper panel of Fig. 4 shows the distribution of the distances that galaxies travel between pairs of snapshots (i.e. the separations between duplicated galaxies) for the 5-snapshot lightcone. The coloured curves show this distribution for each consecutive pair of snapshots, where the redshift at each boundary in the lightcone is indicated in the legend. The black curve is the total distribution (the sum of these). All the curves have been normalised to that the area under the sum (the black curve) is 1.

For the 5-snapshot lightcone, the total distribution peaks at ~  $0.25 h^{-1}$ Mpc. Most duplicated pairs come from the highest redshift interface, at z = 0.176, since it covers a larger area in the lightcone. The number of duplicates is smaller at low redshifts, and the peak of the distribution also shifts to smaller scales. This is because the simulation snapshots are not evenly spaced, while the streaming velocities of haloes only evolve weakly with redshift. At low redshifts, the snapshots are spaced closer together, so there is less time in which the galaxies are able to travel.

The lower panel of Fig. 4 shows the total distributions (the sum of the coloured curves in the upper panel), comparing the lightcones that were made using 3, 5 and 9 snapshots. When only 3 snapshots are used, the total number of duplicated galaxies is small, but the distribution peaks at ~ 0.4  $h^{-1}$ Mpc, with a long tail extending to to 1  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. As the number of snapshots used is increased, the peak of the distribution shifts to smaller scales, since the  $\Delta t$  between snapshots at each boundary is smaller. When all 9 snapshots are used, the peak shifts down to ~ 0.15  $h^{-1}$ Mpc, with almost no pairs with separation above 0.5  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. The total number of duplicated galaxies stays approximately constant when different numbers of snapshots are used. This is because if the number of interfaces is doubled, half as many galaxies cross at each one (since the  $\Delta t$  between snapshots halves, so each galaxy travels half the distance).

These observations are consistent with the clustering measurements in real space in Fig. 2. The scale at which the distributions peak (~ 0.4  $h^{-1}$ Mpc and ~ 0.25  $h^{-1}$ Mpc for 3 and 5 snapshots, respectively), is also where we see the largest difference in the monopole, compared to the single-snapshot lightcone. For the 9-snapshot lightcone, most duplicated pairs have separation less than ~ 0.4  $h^{-1}$ Mpc, which is the same scale where the monopole peels upwards.



Figure 3. As Fig. 2, showing the correlation function multipoles in redshift space. The lightcones are constructed by cutting the snapshots in shells in redshift space (left) and in real space (right).

## 3.3 Removing duplicated galaxies

We now test the effect of removing the duplicated galaxies in the lightcone on the two-point clustering measurements. Removing these galaxies will lower the excess clustering signal on small scales, but it is not guaranteed that this will produce the correct clustering. This is because for every duplicated galaxy, there is also a galaxy that does not exist in the lightcone (see Fig. 1), which could potentially also have an effect on the measured clustering statistics.

We test the effect of removing the duplicated galaxies on the clustering measurements using the lightcone built from 9 snapshots. Pairs of central galaxies in the sample with real-space separation  $r < 0.3 h^{-1}$ Mpc are identified, and one galaxy in each pair is randomly removed. Due to halo exclusion effects, there should be no pairs of central galaxies with these small separations, and all pairs are due to galaxies being duplicated in the lightcone.<sup>1</sup>

The ratio of the n(z) of the galaxy sample is shown in Fig. 5, showing the fraction of galaxies that are removed, for the lightcone built from 9 snapshots. We denote the redshifts in real and redshift space as  $z_{cos}$  (cosmological redshift) and  $z_{obs}$  (observed redshift), respectively. When the shells in the lightcone are cut based on the real-space galaxy positions, the reduction in the real-space  $n(z_{cos})$ can only be seen in very narrow bins at the redshift of each boundary (the black curve). In redshift space, the dips in  $n(z_{obs})$  are broadened by the effect of velocities. The effect is the strongest when the shells are cut based on the redshift-space positions of galaxies (in blue), where the dips in  $n(z_{cos})$  are much deeper and broader than in real space. If the snapshots are instead cut into shells based on the real-space galaxy positions, with the velocities applied afterwards, the effect is much smaller (in red). In this case, the dips are also blue-shifted to lower redshifts than the boundaries in the lightcone, since the velocity of the duplicated galaxies is always towards the observer (see Fig. 1).

After randomly removing one member of each pair, we re-calculate the galaxy clustering. The random catalogue is generated by randomly sampling redshifts from the galaxies in the lightcone, and assigning random right ascension and declination coordinates that are uniformly distributed on the sky. A new random catalogue is generated after removing the duplicated galaxies, in order to take into account the small change in the n(z).<sup>2</sup>

The small-scale clustering is shown in Fig. 6, for the lightcones with different numbers of snapshots. These measurements are the same as shown in Fig. 2, but without rescaling  $\xi$  by any factors of r to better see the differences between the curves on small scales. For the 9-snapshot mock, we show the clustering with and without duplicated galaxies included (in red and purple, respectively). The monopole is shown in the top left panel, with the difference in the bottom left, relative to the mock constructed from a single snapshot. Below ~ 0.3  $h^{-1}$ Mpc, the monopole approaches  $\xi_0 = -1$  for

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We identified all close pairs in the lightcone, but this could be made faster by only considering galaxies close to the boundary.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>$  We have checked that if the original random catalogue is used, the effect on the clustering measurements is small.



**Figure 4.** *Top*: Normalised distribution of the distances, r, travelled by central galaxies at the boundaries between shells, for the lightcone constructed from 5 snapshots. The coloured curves show the distributions at the 4 boundaries, as indicated in the legend. The black curve is the total distribution (the sum of the coloured curves). The coloured curves are normalised so that the area under the black curve is 1. *Bottom*: Total distributions (sum of the coloured curve), 5 snapshots (solid curve, which is the same as in the upper panel) and 3 snapshots (dashed curve).

the mock built from 1 snapshot, showing that there are almost no pairs on these scales, due to halo exclusion effects. As more snapshots are included, the clustering gets stronger and stronger on small scales, and is strongest for the mock built using all 9 snapshots. When the duplicated galaxies are removed, this reduces the clustering signal below  $0.3 h^{-1}$ Mpc, bringing the monopole into agreement with the single-snapshot lightcone. The right panel of Fig. 6 shows the quadrupole. On small scales, there is a non-zero signal due to the duplicated pairs, which is the strongest for the mock with 9 snapshots. Removing the duplicates also removes this clustering signal, bringing it consistent with zero.

The clustering in redshift space is shown in the top of Fig. 7. This is for a lightcone where the snapshots were cut into shells based on the position of each galaxy in redshift space, including the effect of velocities. For the monopole in the left-hand panel, we see a similar trend as in real space, where the clustering on small scales is strongest for the lightcone with 9 snapshots, but by a smaller amount than in real space. Removing duplicates reduces the clustering, bringing it into better agreement with the single snapshot. The same is seen in the quadrupole in the right panel.

The bottom of Fig. 7 shows the clustering in redshift space again, but for the lightcones where the snapshots were cut into shells in real space, and the effect of velocities was applied after making the lightcone. As was also seen in Section 3.1, the clustering of



**Figure 5.** Ratio of the n(z) of the galaxy sample, before and after the removal of duplicated galaxies, showing the fraction of galaxies that are removed. The black line is the ratio of the  $n(z_{cos})$  (i.e. in real space) from the lightcone with shells cut in real space. The blue and red lines show the ratios of the  $n(z_{obs})$  (i.e. in redshift space), from the lightcones with shells cut in redshift and real space, respectively. The smaller panel shows the dip in the n(z) ratios at z = 0.1, but zoomed in on the x-axis.

the 9-snapshot lightcone is in much better agreement with the 1snapshot mock, compared to in real space, or compared to when the lightcones were constructed in redshift space. The boost in the monopole is only seen on very small scales (~ 0.1  $h^{-1}$ Mpc). The quadrupole also shows better agreement, but with a small excess on scales below ~ 1  $h^{-1}$ Mpc. As seen in the other mocks, removing the duplicated galaxies reduces the excess clustering signals, bringing the measurements into better agreement with the lightcone constructed from a single snapshot.

#### **4 CONCLUSIONS**

In the analysis of large galaxy surveys, it is essential to rely on realistic mock catalogues in order to validate theoretical models, and understand how the measurements are affected by systematics. As current and future galaxy surveys get larger, it is increasingly important to make the mocks as accurate as possible, creating lightcones that include redshift evolution. Ideally, lightcone mocks would be constructed from the lightcone output of a N-body simulation, but for many simulations, only snapshots outputs in the cubic box are available at discrete times. A common method of making approximate lightcones from the snapshots outputs is to join them in spherical shells. Making lightcones this way is computationally easy to do, but has the issue that there are discontinuities at the boundaries where two snapshots are joined. It is possible for a galaxy to appear twice, and be repeated at either side of one of the interfaces, or to not appear in the lightcone at all.

We test the accuracy of lightcone mocks constructed from snapshots using 4 all-sky lightcones constructed from the MXXL simu-



**Figure 6.** *Left*: Real-space monopole on small scales, for mocks built from 1 snapshot (blue), 3 snapshots (orange), 5 snapshots (green), 9 snapshots (red), and 9 snapshots with duplicated galaxies removed (purple). The upper panel shows the monopole, while the lower panel is the difference relative to the mock built from a single snapshot. The blue shaded region in the jackknife error, using 100 jackknife regions, and the grey shaded region is the jackknife error in  $\Delta \xi$ . *Right*: Like the left plot, but showing the correlation function quadrupole.

lation. The galaxies in these lightcones are assigned *r*-band magnitudes, to match the evolving luminosity function measured from the SDSS and GAMA surveys. The lightcones we use are created using 1, 3, 5 and 9 snapshots, where the snapshots are cut in shells in either real space or redshift space. We measure the two-point clustering statistics of central galaxies in a volume limited sample with z < 0.2 and absolute magnitude  $M_r > -20$ .

There is a boost in the monopole on small scales, due to galaxies which are duplicated at the boundaries between snapshots. In real space, this effect is larger as more snapshots are included, but is also shifted to smaller scales. In redshift space, this effect is smoothed out by including the velocities. It is the smallest in the case that the snapshot are cut into shells in real space, with the effect of velocities applied afterwards. Similar effects are also seen in the quadrupole on small scales, which is also boosted by the inclusion of duplicated galaxies. The clustering is boosted on physical scales  $\leq 1 h^{-1}$ Mpc, and this scale depends on the distance that galaxies travel between the two snapshots.

We test the effect of randomly removing duplicated galaxies in the 9-snapshot lightcone on the two-point clustering measurements. This is done by identifying all pairs with a real-space separation  $r < 0.3 h^{-1}$ Mpc, and randomly removing one galaxy in each pair. On these scales there are no genuine pairs, due to halo exclusion effects. Both in real space and redshift space, this is able to reduce the excess small-scale clustering signal.

In this paper, we focus on central galaxies only, where the effect of duplicated galaxies is the strongest. Including satellites will reduce this, since the 1-halo term dominates on small scales, and most pairs come from satellites within the same halo. However, there will also be some satellites that are duplicated at the boundaries in the lightcone. The impact of including satellites depends a lot on the galaxy sample, e.g. LRGs contain very few satellites. For the galaxy sample used in this paper, which has a 28% satellite fraction, we have checked the impact of including satellites in real space. While the effect is smaller than when only centrals are used, there is still some excess small-scale clustering which is at a level greater than  $1\sigma$ . When satellites are included, the same method can be used as before to identify duplicated central galaxies, but the randomly removed central galaxy would also have its satellites removed.

To summarise, in order to create lightcone mocks by joining snapshots in spherical shells, we propose using all available snapshots, joining them together in shells based on the real-space positions of galaxies. Galaxies that appear twice in the lightcone can be removed by identifying close pairs of centrals galaxies at the boundaries. However this does not take into account the galaxies that are missing in the lightcone. If each shell in the lightcone is made slightly wider, so that there is a small overlap in the volume at each boundary, the missing galaxies would be included in the lightcone. This would have the effect of increasing the number of spurious duplicates, but the same method we have employed can be used to remove them.

This only affects very small scale clustering statistics, below ~  $1 h^{-1}$ Mpc. Large scales are unaffected, so for many applications of lightcone mocks, such as a BAO analysis, no correction is necessary. However for other applications where the small-scale clustering is important, such as a joint cosmology and HOD analysis, the results could potentially be affected by this systematic. Other applications, such as assessing the impact of fibre collisions, will also be affected by the spurious pairs of repeated galaxies.



Figure 7. As Fig. 6, but showing the small-scale clustering in redshift space, where the spherical shells were joined in redshift space (top panels), and where the shells were joined in real space (bottom panels)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ST/S002502/1, Durham University and STFC operations grant ST/R000832/1. DiRAC is part of the National e-Infrastructure.

AS would like to thank Francisco Prada, Anatoly Klypin and Shadab Alam for helpful discussions. This work used the DiRAC@Durham facility managed by the Institute for Computational Cosmology on behalf of the STFC DiRAC HPC Facility (www.dirac.ac.uk). The equipment was funded by BEIS capital funding via STFC capital grants ST/K00042X/1, ST/P002293/1, ST/R002371/1 and

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The lightcone mocks underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

### REFERENCES

Abareshi B., et al., 2022, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2205.10939 Alam S., Peacock J. A., Kraljic K., Ross A. J., Comparat J., 2020, MNRAS, 497, 581 Alam S., et al., 2021a, Phys. Rev. D, 103, 083533 Alam S., et al., 2021b, MNRAS, 504, 4667 Angulo R. E., Springel V., White S. D. M., Jenkins A., Baugh C. M., Frenk C. S., 2012, MNRAS, 426, 2046 Avila S., et al., 2018, MNRAS, 479, 94 Benson A. J., Bower R., 2010, MNRAS, 405, 1573 Blanton M. R., et al., 2003, ApJ, 592, 819 Carbone C., Springel V., Baccigalupi C., Bartelmann M., Matarrese S., 2008, MNRAS, 388, 1618 Cole S., Lacey C. G., Baugh C. M., Frenk C. S., 2000, MNRAS, 319, 168 Cole S., et al., 2005, MNRAS, 362, 505 Comparat J., et al., 2019, MNRAS, 487, 2005 DESI Collaboration et al., 2016a, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1611.00036 DESI Collaboration et al., 2016b, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1611.00037 Davis M., Efstathiou G., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., 1985, ApJ, 292, 371 Dawson K. S., et al., 2016, AJ, 151, 44 DeRose J., et al., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2105.13547 Dong-Páez C. A., et al., 2022, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2208.00540 Eisenstein D. J., et al., 2005, ApJ, 633, 560 Evrard A. E., et al., 2002, ApJ, 573, 7 Fornasa M., et al., 2013, MNRAS, 429, 1529 Fosalba P., Gaztañaga E., Castander F. J., Manera M., 2008, MNRAS, 391, 435 Fosalba P., Gaztañaga E., Castander F. J., Crocce M., 2015, MNRAS, 447, 1319 Giocoli C., et al., 2016, MNRAS, 461, 209 Giocoli C., et al., 2017, MNRAS, 470, 3574 Grove C., et al., 2021, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2112.09138 Guzzo L., et al., 2008, Nature, 451, 541 Hadzhiyska B., Garrison L. H., Eisenstein D., Bose S., 2022, MNRAS, 509, 2194 Hilbert S., et al., 2020, MNRAS, 493, 305 Ivezić Ž., et al., 2019, ApJ, 873, 111 Izquierdo-Villalba D., et al., 2019, A&A, 631, A82 Kaiser N., 1987, MNRAS, 227, 1 Kitzbichler M. G., White S. D. M., 2007, MNRAS, 376, 2 Korytov D., et al., 2019, ApJS, 245, 26 Laureijs R., et al., 2011, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1110.3193 Loveday J., et al., 2012, MNRAS, 420, 1239 Maksimova N. A., Garrison L. H., Eisenstein D. J., Hadzhiyska B., Bose S., Satterthwaite T. P., 2021, MNRAS, 508, 4017 Merson A. I., et al., 2013, MNRAS, 429, 556 Navarro J. F., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., 1997, ApJ, 490, 493 Potter D., Stadel J., Teyssier R., 2017, Computational Astrophysics and Cosmology, 4, 2Rodríguez-Torres S. A., et al., 2016, MNRAS, 460, 1173 Rossi G., et al., 2021, MNRAS, 505, 377 Safonova S., Norberg P., Cole S., 2021, MNRAS, 505, 325 Sgier R., Fluri J., Herbel J., Réfrégier A., Amara A., Kacprzak T., Nicola A., 2021, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys., 2021, 047 Smith A., Cole S., Baugh C., Zheng Z., Angulo R., Norberg P., Zehavi I., 2017, MNRAS, 470, 4646 Smith A., et al., 2019, MNRAS, 484, 1285 Smith A., et al., 2020, MNRAS, 499, 269 Smith A., Cole S., Grove C., Norberg P., Zarrouk P., 2022, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2207.04902 Spergel D. N., et al., 2003, ApJS, 148, 175 Spergel D., et al., 2015, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1503.03757 Springel V., White S. D. M., Tormen G., Kauffmann G., 2001, MNRAS, 328, 726

 Sugiyama S., Takada M., Kobayashi Y., Miyatake H., Shirasaki M., Nishimichi T., Park Y., 2020, Phys. Rev. D, 102, 083520
 Wang Y., et al., 2022, ApJ, 928, 1 Zandanel F., Fornasa M., Prada F., Reiprich T. H., Pacaud F., Klypin A., 2018, MNRAS, 480, 987
Zavala J., Springel V., Boylan-Kolchin M., 2010, MNRAS, 405, 593
Zehavi I., et al., 2011, ApJ, 736, 59

This paper has been typeset from a TFX/LATFX file prepared by the author.