Multipole invariants and non-Gaussianity

K ate Land and Joao M agueijo?

Theoretical Physics G roup, Im perial College, Prince Consort Road, London SW 7 2BZ, UK

ABSTRACT

W e propose a fram ework for separating the information contained in the CMB multipoles, a_{im} , into its algebraically independent components. Thus we cleanly separate information pertaining to the power spectrum, non-Gaussianity and preferred axis e ects. The formalism builds upon the recently proposed multipole vectors (Copi, Huterer & Starkm an 2003; Schwarz & al2004; Katz & W eeks 2004), and we elucidate a few features regarding these vectors, namely their lack of statistical independence for a Gaussian random process. In a few cases we explicitly relate our proposed invariants to components of the n-point correlation function (power spectrum, bispectrum). W e nd the invariants' distributions using a mixture of analytical and num ericalm ethods. W e also evaluate them for the co-added W MAP rst yearm ap.

Keywords: cosm icm icrowave background -Gaussianity tests - statistical isotropy.

1 IN TRODUCTION

The rem arkable quality of the W M AP data (Bennett & al 2003) has led us to a new era in observational cosm ology. Yet, various claims for \unexpected" non-G aussian signals cast a shadow on the purity of the data (Copi, Huterer & Starkm an 2003; Eriksen & al2004b; Coles & al2003; Cruz & al2003; Hansen & al2004; Hansen, Banday & Gorski 2004; Vielva & al2003; Kom atsu, Spergel & W andelt 2003; Park 2003; Larson & W andelt 2004; M ukherjee & W ang 2004; Eriksen & al2004a; Schwarz & al2004; O liveira-Costa & al 2004). G iven that there is no plausible theoretical explanation for these signals, a natural worry is that the m aps are not, after all, fully free from system atics errors or galactic contam ination.

M ost notably several groups have reported evidence for a preferred axis being selected by large-angle uctuations, either in the form ofmultipole planarity (O liveira-Costa & al 2004; Copi, Huterer & Starkm an 2003; Schwarz & al 2004; Coles & al 2003), North-South asym metries in the power spectrum, three-point function, or bispectrum (Eriksen & al 2004a; Hansen, Banday & Gorski 2004; Land & Magueijo 2004), as well as using other methods (Eriksen & al 2004b; Hansen & al 2004).

In assessing these asymmetries it is important to distinguish issues of non-Gaussianity (which should be rotationally invariant) from those of an isotropy (existence of a preferred axis). Apart from a subtlety in the de nition of statistical ensemble (Ferreira & Magueijo 1997) these issues should be clearly separated. Unfortunately no system atic approach for extracting all the independent invariants under rotations from a given set of multipoles, a_m , has been proposed. The formalism of Copi, Huterer & Starkman (2003) does not produce invariants. The invariant n-point correlation function (M agueijo 1995; Ferreira, M agueijo & Gorski 1998; M agueijo 2000; M agueijo & M edeiros 2003), on the other hand, is aw kw and to apply and often contains redundant information.

In this letter we remedy this de ciency in the current form alism .

2 STATEM ENT OF THE PROBLEM

M ultipoles are irreducible representations of SO (3), so their $2^+ 1$ degrees of freedom should split into $2^- 2$ invariants and 3 rotational degrees of freedom. Ideally we would like to process the fa_m g for a given multipole ' into the power spectrum C (the G aussian degree of freedom), $2^- 3$ invariant m easures of non-G aussianity, and a system of axes (assessing isotropy). In addition one should build 3 invariants permultipole pair, for example the Euler angles relating the two sets of multipole axes. The latter encode inter-scale correlations.

No one has ever accomplished this project for general , but see M agueijo (1995) for a Quadrupole solution. Multipoles are equivalent to symmetric traceless tensors of rank . The problem is then to extract the independent invariant contractions of these tensors plus a system of axes { a generalisation of the concept of eigenvalues and eigenvectors. Typically the invariants produced by this form alism are related to the n point correlation function (bispectrum, trispectrum, etc.) The form alism becomes very com -

[?] E-m ailkate.land@ im perial.ac.uk, jm agueijp@ ic.ac.uk

2 K ate Land and Joao M agueijo

plicated very quickly, and no system atic breakdown of independent n point correlation function components has ever been achieved.

A ltematively one m ay extract from the fa_{im} g a length scale and 'independent unit vectors (the multipole vectors) as proposed by Schwarz & al (2004), and discussed further by K atz & W eeks (2004). This approach is considerably sim – pler and unsuprisingly it has been taken further. How ever we see a (correctable) problem with this approach. The multipole vectors are not rotationally invariant, and so they m ix up the issues of isotropy and non-G aussinity. W e propose to correct this shortcom ing by taking an appropriate number of independent inner products between these vectors. These are the sought-after invariants, and in som e sim ple cases we relate them to the n point correlation function. W e will also extract from the multipole vectors a system of axes, encoding the multipole directional inform ation. It is these axis that are to be used when testing isotropy.

3 THE EXAMPLE OF THE QUADRUPOLE

W e start by considering the quadrupole, which as shown in M agueijo (1995) m ay be written as

$$T_2 = Q_{ij} x^i x^j \tag{1}$$

where Q_{ij} is a sym metric traceless matrix and xⁱ are cartesian coordinates on the unit sphere. From this matrix one may extract three eigenvectors and two independent com binations of invariant eigenvalues i. These are essentially the power spectrum C₂ (related to the sum of the squares of i) and the bispectrum B₂₂₂ (related to the determ inant of the matrix, or the product of i).

In contrast, following the formalism of K atz & W eeks (2004) one writes

$$T_{2} = A_{2} L_{i}^{1} L_{j}^{2} - \frac{1}{3} I_{j}^{1} L_{i}^{1} - L_{i}^{2} x^{i} x^{j}$$
(2)

where A is a scale and $fL_1^i;L_1^ig$ are two units vectors, encoding the inform ation on non-G aussianity and anisotropy.

The vectors $fL_i^1; L_i^2g$ are not invariant, but one can construct an invariant by taking $X = L^1$ \hat{L} . As pointed out to us by Starkm an & Schwarz (2004), one may easily check that the eigenvectors of Q are

$$V^{1} = L^{1} + L^{2}$$
(3)

$$V^{2} = L^{1} L^{2}$$
(4)

$$V^{3} = L^{1} L^{2}$$
(5)

These have corresponding eigenvalues A (X + 3)=6, A (X = 3)=6, and A X = 3, respectively. Using results in M agueijo (1995) one may therefore prove that the power spectrum and bispectrum are:

$$C_2 = \frac{A_2^2}{6} (X^2 + 3)$$
 (6)

$$B_{222} = \frac{A_2^3 X}{2^2 3^3} (9 X^2)$$
(7)

so that the norm alised bispectrum is

$$I_{2} = \frac{B_{222}}{C_{2}^{\frac{3}{2}}} = \frac{X(9 - X^{2})}{(X^{2} + 3)^{3-2}}$$
(8)



F igure 1. The average distribution of the m odulus of the 2 3 dot products X _{ij} (with the two anchor vectors chosen at random) for multipoles 2 10. The dotted line corresponds to the analytical expression found for the quadrupole. We have also plotted the invariant values for the W M AP rst year data, with the anchor vectors chosen at random (short lines along the bottom of each panel).

These form ulae bridge the two form alism s.

It was proved in M agueijo (1995) that for a G aussian process C_2 , I_2 and the eigenvectors are independent random variables, and that I_2 is uniform by distributed in the range [1;1] (and C_2 has a $\frac{2}{5}$ distribution). We thus can prove that X is statistically independent from C_2 (but not from A) and from the eigenvectors. By directly evaluating the Jacobian of the transform ation we nd that its distribution is

$$P(X) = 27 \frac{1 X^{2}}{(X^{2} + 3)^{5=2}}$$
(9)

that is, it is not uniform .We have con m ed this result with M onte-C arbo simulations (see Fig. 1, top left panel).

This elucidates an interesting feature of multipole vectors. Even though they are algebraically independent (in the sense that they contain no redundant inform ation given a concrete quadrupole realization) they are not statistically independent. If vectors L^1 and L^2 were statistically isotropic (which they are) and statistically independent, then X would be uniform ly distributed. As (9) shows this is not the case; hence vectors L^1 and L^2 are statistically correlated. Speci cally they prefer being orthogonal to being aligned.

4 THE GENERAL PROCEDURE

For a general multipole we have `vectors and we could take as invariants all possible inner products between them . This



F igure 2. The distribution of the m odulus of the dot products for multipoles '= 2 10, with anchor vectors L^1 and L^2 chosen as the m ost orthogonal pair of multipole vectors. The solid lines are for dot products X_{1i} and X_{2i}, and the dotted line shows the X₁₂ distribution. The W MAP results are also plotted (short lines along the bottom, dashed line the X₁₂ result).

would clearly lead to much redundant inform ation, in contradiction with the requirements laid down in Section 2.A possible way out is to select two $\anchor"$ vectors L^1 and $L^{\,2}$, consider their dot product X $_{12}$ = $\,L^{\,1}\,-\,\dot{L}$, and then for 3 6 i 6 'the two products X $_{1i}$ = L^{1} ' $\overset{i}{L}$ and X $_{2i}$ = L^{2} Ľ. W e thus obtain 2 ' 3 algebraically independent invariants. In Fig. 1 we plot their distribution for 26 '6 10 after the order and direction () of the 'vectors has been random ised. The anchor vectors L^1 and L^2 are therefore selected at random, so that all X ij invariants for a given multipole have the same distribution.We checked that the invariants X are uncorrelated. A swe can see this distribution is 'dependent, and the tendency for multipole vectors to seek orthogonal directions is less pronounced for higher multipoles. We have also plotted these invariants as com puted for the W MAP coadded masked rst year map (details in Land & Magueijo (2004)). No evidence for non-Gaussianity is found, but we defer a closer scrutiny to a future publication.

The proposed procedure provides an interesting Gaussianity test. In particular it can be easily applied to extract all the relevant inform ation for high '; in contrast isolating such inform ation from the n-point correlation function is most cum bersom e. However the suggested algorithm suffers from the drawback that the anchor vectors L^1 and L^2 are selected at random , and so the procedure is not reproducible.

W e m ay correct this by imposing a criterium for their selection, for example L^1 and L^2 m ay be taken as the m ost orthogonal among the given `vectors.W e m ay then form

Multipole invariants and non-Gaussianity 3

the \eigenvectors" (three orthogonal vectors):

$$V^{1} = L^{1} + L^{2}$$
(10)

$$V^2 = L^1 \quad L^2 \tag{11}$$

$$V^{3} = L^{1} L^{2}$$

$$(12)$$

as the natural variables for encoding the multipole directionality. For invariants we may take the power spectrum and the 2 ° 3 quantities:

$$X_{12} = L^1 \quad L^2 \tag{13}$$

 $X_{1i} = L^{1} \quad \dot{L}$ (14)

$$X_{2i} = L^2 \dot{L}$$
(15)

(for 36 i6 '). These encode all the relevant non-G aussian degrees of freedom .

The transform ation from a_{im} into these variables is invertible (up to discrete uncertainties related to branch choice) and provides a solution to our problem, as phrased in Section 2. The proposed variables for a given multipole 'are the power spectrum C · (G aussian degree of freedom), the 2' 3 inner products X (non-redundant non-G aussian invariants), and the orthogonal vectors $fV^1; V^2; V^3g$ (m easures of an isotropy). The procedure reduces to the one found for the quadrupole when '= 2. W ithin this fram ework the inter-' correlations are m easured by the Euler angles relating the system s of axes $fV^1; V^2; V^3g$ associated with each pair ofmultipoles. These should be uniform by distributed for a G aussian distribution or indeed for any theory in which the various ' are uncorrelated.

In Fig.2 we plot distributions for the X invariants with anchor vectors L^1 and L^2 de ned as the most orthogonal. W e have used 12,500 realizations to make these histogram s. P (X₁₂) peaks around zero. The other X distributions are the sam e.W e also plotted the invariants for the W M A P rst year data, again nding no evidence for non-G aussianity. W e have checked that the eigenvectors, Vⁱ, are uniform ly distributed.

Notice that the invariants X cannot be independent variables, since their ranges of variation are interconnected. This is to be compared with the lack of independence among the various vectors L^i , as demonstrated in the previous Section.

Naturally we could have de ned the two anchor vectors L^1 and L^2 in di erent ways, for example the two most aligned vectors. The invariant X₁₂ would then be peaked around one. W e plot the counterpart of Fig. 2 with this alternative de nition in Fig. 3.

5 BRIDGING THE TWO FORMALISMS

For higher multipoles, relating the proposed form alism and the n point correlation function, as done in Section 3 for the quadrupole, becomes very involved. For instance, for the octopole the counterpart of (1) and (2) is:

$$T_{3} = Q_{ijk} x^{i} x^{j} x^{k} = A_{3} L_{i}^{1} L_{j}^{2} L_{k}^{3} - \frac{1}{3} _{ij} R_{k} x^{i} x^{j} x^{k}$$
(16)

where one should note that terms in fi; j;kg are sym-metrized. The remainder R_k is:

$$R_{k} = \frac{3}{5}L^{(1)} L^{(1)}_{k}$$
(17)



F igure 3. The distribution of the m odulus of dot products for multipoles = 2 10, with anchor vectors L^1 and L^2 chosen as the m ost aligned pair of multipole vectors. The solid lines are for dot products X₁₁ and X₂₁, and the dotted line shows the X₁₂ distribution. The W M AP results are also plotted (short lines along the bottom, dashed line the X₁₂ result).

A gain,
$$Tr(Q^2) = C_3$$
, and therefore one can show that:
 $C_3 = \frac{A_3^2}{6}(9 + 7S_2 + 6S_2)$ (18)

where

$$S_{1} = (L^{1} \quad \vec{L})^{2} + (L^{2} \quad \vec{L})^{2} + (L^{3} \quad \vec{L})^{2}$$
(19)

$$S_2 = (L^1 \ L) \ (L^2 \ L) \ (L^3 \ L)$$
 (20)

For higher multipoles

$$Q_{i_{1}:::i_{1}} = A \cdot L_{i_{1}}^{(1}:::L_{i_{1}}^{')} - \frac{3}{5} (i_{1}i_{2} (L^{(1)} - L_{i_{3}}^{3}):::L_{i_{1}}^{')}$$
(21)

The components of the n-point correlation function may be obtained from the various contractions of Q. They are clearly a function of the dot product of the various multipole vectors. However, the form ulae become progressively more complex to derive. W ith the introduction of our alternative procedure we suggest that these complicated form ulae are not necessary. The X variables provide a better basis for describing the data.

6 CONCLUSIONS

H arm onic (Fourier) space is the natural arena for comparing theory and observation for G aussian theories. In several past studies it was also found to be a useful ground for testing the hypothesis of G aussianity. In this paper we showed further that the degrees of freedom in the spherical harm onic components fa'm g can be simply separated into a set of algebraically independent invariants { the power spectrum and a set of 2' 3 non-G aussian statistics { and a set of axes encoding the multipole directionality. The Euler angles relating sets of axes associated with pairs of multipoles m easure inter-'correlations. This provides an elegant answer to a long unsolved problem { how to process the inform ation contained in a given map into its relevant non-redundant degrees of freedom.

Even though we have computed some of the proposed invariants for the W MAP rst yearm ap, we defer to a future publication a more system atic application of this fram ework to real data. We stress that the form alism is easily applicable for high `multipoles. This is to be contrasted with the n-point correlation function. Even though it is trivial to evaluate the bispectrum at high `(Land & Magueij 2004) it becomes very dicult to distill all the non-redundant inform ation contained in a given multipole in terms of su ciently high order components of the correlation function. The proposed form alism is farm ore e cient.

ACKNOW LEDGEMENTS

W e would like to thank D om inik Schwarz, G lenn Starkm an and Je W eeks for discussion and help with this project. The results in this paper have been derived using the HEALP ix¹ package (G orski, H ivon & W andelt 1998), as well as the publicly available codes described in C opi, H uterer & Starkm an $(2003)^2$. This work was perform ed on COSMOS, the UK national cosm ology supercom puter.

REFERENCES

Bennett C L. et al, 2003a, A strophys. J. Suppl, 148, 1 Coles P. et al., 2003, astro-ph/0310252 Copi C.J., Huterer D., Starkman G.D., 2003, astroph/0310511. Cruz M .et al, 2004, astro-ph/0405341 Eriksen H.K. et al., 2004a, Astrophys. J, 605, 14 Eriksen H K. et al., 2004b, astro-ph/0401276 Ferreira P., Maqueiro J., 1997, PhysRev, D 56, 4578 Ferreira P., Magueijo J., Gorski K., 1998, Astrophys. J, 503, 1 GorskiK M , Hivon E , W andelt B . 1998, astro-ph/9812350 Hansen F.K. et al., 2004, astro-ph/0402396 Hansen F.K., Banday A.J., Gorski K.M., 2004, astroph/0404206 Katz G., W eeks J., 2004, astro-ph/0405631 Kom atsu E., Spergel D N., W andelt B D., 2003, astroph/0305189 Land K ., M aqueip J., 2004, astro-ph/0405519 Larson D L., W andelt B D., 2004, astro-ph/0404037 Magueijo J., 1995, Phys. Lett, B342, 32. Erratum -ibid, B 352, 499. M agueijo J., 2000, A strophys. J. Lett, 528, 57 Maqueip J., Medeiros J., 2004, MNRAS 351, L1-4 M ukherjee P , W ang Y , 2004, astro-ph/0402602 de O liveira-Costa A . et al., 2004, P hys. R ev, D 69, 063516

Park C., 2004, MNRAS, 349, 313

¹ http://www.eso.org/science/healpix/index.html

² http://www.phys.cwn.edu/projects/mpvectors/

Multipole invariants and non-Gaussianity 5

Schwarz D. et al., 2004, astro-ph/0403353 Starkm an G., Schwarz D., A private communication, M ay 27 2004. Vielva P. et al., 2003, astro-ph/0310273

This paper has been typeset from a $T_{\rm E}X$ / ${\rm \mathbb{B}}T_{\rm E}X$ le prepared by the author.