Cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering

W ill J. Percival

Institute of Cosm ology and G ravitation, University of Portsm outh, Portsm outh, P01 2EG.will.percival@port.ac.uk

1 Abstract

In thism anuscript I review them athem atics and physics that underpins recent work using the clustering of galaxies to derive cosm ologicalm odel constraints. I start by describing the basic concepts, and gradually move on to some of the com plexities involved in analysing galaxy redshift surveys, focusing on the 2dF G alaxy R edshift Survey (2dFGRS) and the Sloan D igital Sky survey (SDSS). D i culties within such an analysis, particularly dealing with redshift space distortions and galaxy bias are highlighted. I then describe current observations of the CMB uctuation power spectrum, and consider the importance of m easurem ents of the clustering of galaxies in light of recent experim ents. F inally, I provide an exam ple joint analysis of the latest CMB and large-scale structure data, leading to a set of param eter constraints.

2 introduction

The basic techniques required to analyse galaxy clustering were introduced in the 70s [48], and have been subsequently re ned to m atch data sets of increasing quality and size. In this manuscript I have tried to summarise the current state of this eld. O by buy, such an attempt can never be complete or unique in every detail, although it is still worthwhile as it is always useful to have more than one source of information. An excellent alternative view – point was recently provided by H am ilton [25, 26], which covers some of the same material, and provides a more detailed review of some of the statistical methods that are used. A dditionally it is worth directing the interested reader to a number of good text books that cover this topic [11, 15, 37, 41]. In addition to a description of the basic mathematics and physics behind a clustering analysis I have attempted to provide a discussion of some of the fundam ental and practical di culties involved. The cosm obgical goal of such an analysis

is consider in the nalpart of this manuscript, where the combination of cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering and the CMB is discussed, and an example multi-parameter t to recent data is considered.

3 Basics

Our rst step is to de ne the dim ensionless overdensity

$$(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{(\mathbf{x})}{\mathbf{x}}; \tag{1}$$

where is the expected m ean density, which is independent of position because of statistical hom ogeneity.

The autocorrelation function of the overdensity eld (usually just referred to as the correlation function) is de ned as

$$(x_1; x_2)$$
 h (x_1) (x_2) i: (2)

From statistical hom ogeneity and isotropy, we have that

$$(x_1; x_2) = (x_1 \quad x_2);$$
 (3)

$$= (jx_1 x_2 j):$$
 (4)

To help to understand the correlation function, suppose that we have two sm all regions V_1 and V_2 separated by a distance r. Then the expected number of pairs of galaxies with one galaxy in V_1 and the other in V_2 is given by

$$m_{pair}i = n^2 [1 + (r)] V_1 V_2;$$
 (5)

where n is the mean number of galaxies per unit volume. We see that (r) measures the excess clustering of galaxies at a separation r. If (r) = 0, the galaxies are unclustered (random ly distributed) on this scale { the number of pairs is just the expected number of galaxies in V_1 times the expected number in V_2 . (r) > 0 corresponds to strong clustering, and (r) < 0 to anti-clustering. Estimation of (r) from a sample of galaxies will be discussed in Section 6.1.

It is often convenient to consider perturbations in Fourier space. In cosm ology the following Fourier transform convention is most commonly used

$$(\mathbf{r})e^{\mathbf{j}\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}}d^{3}\mathbf{r}$$
(6)

$$(\mathbf{r}) = (\mathbf{k}) e^{j\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} \frac{d^{3}\mathbf{k}}{(2)^{3}} :$$
 (7)

The power spectrum is de ned as

Cosm ological constraints from galaxy clustering 3

$$P(k_1;k_2) = \frac{1}{(2)^3}h(k_1)(k_2)i:$$
(8)

Statistical hom ogeneity and isotropy gives that

$$P(k_1;k_2) = D(k_1 k_2)P(k_1);$$
(9)

where $_{\rm D}$ is the D irac delta function. The power spectrum is sometimes presented in dimensionless form

$${}^{2}(\mathbf{k}) = \frac{\mathbf{k}^{3}}{2^{2}} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{k}):$$
 (10)

The correlation function and power spectrum form a Fourier pair

$$P(k) (r)e^{ik r}d^{3}r$$
(11)

(r) = P (k)e
$$^{ik:r} \frac{d^3k}{(2)^3}$$
; (12)

so they provide the same inform ation. The choice of which to use is therefore som ewhat arbitrary (see [25] for a further discussion of this).

The extension of the 2-pt statistics, the power spectrum and the correlation function, to higher orders is straightforward with Eq.5 becoming

$$h_{tuple}i = n^{n} 1 + {}^{(n)} V_{1}$$
, :V (13)

However, the central limit theorem implies that a density distribution is asymptotically G aussian in the limit where the density results from the average of m any independent processes. The overdensity eld has zero m ean by de nition, so is completely characterised by either the correlation function or the power spectrum. Consequently, in this regime, measuring either the correlation function or the power spectrum provides a statistically complete description of the eld.

4 m atter perturbations

There are three physical stages in the creation and evolution of perturbations in the matter distribution. First, prim ordial perturbation are produced in an in ationary epoch. Second, the di erent form s of matter within the Universe a ect these prim ordial perturbations. Third, gravitational collapse leads to the growth of these uctuations. In this section we will discuss the form of the perturbations on scales where gravitational collapse can be described by a linear change in the overdensity. The gravitational collapse of perturbations will be considered in Section 5.





Fig.1.Plots showing the linear power spectrum (solid lines) for a variety of di erent cosm ological param eters. Only the shapes of the power spectra are com pared, and the amplitudes are matched to the same large scale value. Our base model has $_{M}h = 0.2$, $n_{s} = 1$, $b_{b} = M = 0$ and $a_{M} = 0$. Deviations from this base m odel are given in each panel. As can be seen m any of the shape distortions from changing di erent parameters are similar, which can cause degeneracies between these param eters when thing models to observations.

4.1 why are there matter perturbations?

A period of \faster than light" expansion in the very early Universe solves a num ber of problem s with standard cosm ology. In particular, it allows distant regions that appear causally disconnected to have been connected in the past and therefore explains the atness of the CMB. Additionally it drives the energy density of the Universe close to the critical value and, most in portantly for our discussion of perturbations, it provides a mechanism for producing seed perturbations as quantum uctuations in the matter density are increased to

4

5

signi cant levels. For a detailed exam ination of the creation of uctuations see [36]. For now, we will just comment that the most basic in ationary models give a spectrum of uctuations P (k) / k^n with n 1.

4.2 the e ect of dark m atter

The growth of dark matter uctuations is intimately linked to the Jeans scale. Perturbations smaller than the Jeans scale do not collapse due to pressure support { for collision-less dark matter this is support from internal random velocities. Perturbations larger than the Jeans scale grow through gravity at the same rate, independent of scale. In a Universe with just dark matter and radiation, the Jeans scale grows to the size of the horizon at matter-radiation equality, and then reduces to zero when the matter dom inates. We therefore see that the horizon scale at matter-radiation equality will be imprinted in the distribution of uctuations { this scale marks a turn-over in the grow th rate of uctuations. What this means in practice is that there is a cut-o in the power spectrum on small scales, dependent on $_{\rm M}$ h, with a stronger cut-o predicted for low er $_{\rm M}$ h values. This is demonstrated in Fig. 1.

4.3 the e ect of baryons

At early epochs baryons are coupled to the photons and, if we consider a single uctuation, a spherical shell of gas and photons is driven away from the perturbation by a sound wave. W hen the photons and gas decouple, a spherical shell of baryons is left around a central concentration of dark m atter. As the perturbation evolves through gravity, the density proles of the baryons and dark m atter grow together, and the perturbation is left with a small increase in density at a location corresponding to the sound horizon at the end of the C om pton drag epoch [2, 3]. This real-space \shell" is equivalent to oscillations in the power spectrum. In addition to these acoustic oscillations, uctuations smaller than the Jeans scale, which tracks the sound horizon until decoupling, do not grow, while large uctuations are una ected and continue to grow. The presence of baryons therefore also leads to a reduction in the amplitude of small scale uctuations. For more information and tting form use for the di erent processes a good starting point is [17].

4.4 the e ect of neutrinos

The same principal of gravitational collapse versus pressure support can be applied in the case of massive neutrinos. Initially the neutrinos are relativistic and their Jeans scale grows with the horizon. As their tem perature decreases their momenta drop, they become non-relativistic, and the Jeans scale decreases { they can subsequently fall into perturbations. Massive neutrinos are interesting because even at low redshifts the Jeans scale is cosm ologically relevant. Consequently the linear power spectrum (the uctuation distribution

excluding the non-linear collapse of perturbations) is not frozen shortly after m atter-radiation equality. Instead its form is still changing at low redshifts. A dditionally, the growth rate depends on the scale - it is suppressed until neutrinos collapse into perturbations, simply because the perturbations have lower am plitude. The e ect of neutrino m ass on the present day linear power spectrum is shown in Fig. 1. Note that in this plot the relative am plitudes of the power spectra have been rem oved - it is just the shape that is com pared. The am plitude would also depend on the com bined neutrino m ass.

5 the evolution of perturbations

Having discussed the form of the linear perturbations, we will now consider how perturbations evolve through gravity in the matter and dark energy dom inated regimes. To do this, we will use the spherical top-hat collapse model, where we compare a sphere of background material with radius a, with one of radius a_p which contains the same mass, but has a hom ogeneous change in overdensity. The ease with which the behaviour can be modeled follows from Birkho 's theorem, which states that a spherically symmetric gravitational eld in empty space is static and is always described by the Schwarzchild metric [8]. This gives that the behaviour of the hom ogeneous sphere of uniform density and the background can be modeled using the same equations. For simplicity we initially only consider the sphere of background material.

The sphere of background material behaves according to the standard Friedmann and cosm ology equations

$$E^{2}(a) = \frac{1}{a^{2}} \left(\frac{da}{dH_{0}t} \right)^{2} = M^{3} + K^{3} + K^$$

$$\frac{1}{a}\frac{d^{2}a}{dt^{2}} = \frac{H_{0}^{2}h}{2} M_{M}a^{3} + [1 + 3w(a)]_{X}a^{f(a)}$$
(15)

These equations have been written in a form allowing for a general timedependent equation of state for the dark energy p = w (a) . Conservation of energy for the dark energy component provides the form of f (a)

$$f(a) = \frac{3}{\ln a} \int_{0}^{2} \frac{1}{\ln a} [1 + w(a^{0})] d\ln a^{0}:$$
(16)

The dark matter and dark energy densities evolve according to

$$_{M}(a) = \frac{M a^{3}}{E^{2}(a)}; \quad _{X}(a) = \frac{X a^{f(a)}}{E^{2}(a)}; \quad (17)$$

Tracks showing the evolution of $_{M}$ (a) and $_{X}$ (a) are presented in Fig.2 for h = 0.7 and constant dark energy equation of state w = 1.0 f particular

Cosmological constraints from galaxy clustering

7



F ig. 2. P lot showing the evolution of the matter and vacuum energy densities for a selection of cosm ologies (grey lines) with constant dark energy equation of state parameter w = 1. The critical models that border the dimension of evolution are shown by the black lines. The dotted line highlights x = 0.

interest are solutions which predict recollapse, but that have $_X > 0.P$ rovided that $_M >> _X$, the perturbation will collapse before the dark energy dominates. For a cosm obgy with $_M$ 0:3 and $_X$ 0:7, these solutions correspond to overdense spheres that will collapse and form structure.

For the perturbation, the cosm ology equation can be written

$$\frac{1}{a_{p}}\frac{d^{2}a_{p}}{dt^{2}} = \frac{H_{0}^{2}}{2}^{h} M_{p}a_{p}^{3} + [1 + 3w(a)] X_{0}a^{f(a)}; \qquad (18)$$

where it is worth noting that the dark energy component is dependent on a rather than a_p . This does not matter for -cosm ologies as f(a) = 0, and the a dependence in this term is removed. For other dark energy models, this dependence follows if the dark energy does not cluster on the scales of interest. For such cosm ological models, we cannot write down a Friedmann equation for the perturbation because energy is not conserved [63]. We also have to be more careful using virialisation arguments to analyse the behaviour of perturbations [47].

To rst order, the overdensity of the perturbation $\ = \ a^3 = a_p^3 \ 1$ evolves according to

$$\frac{d^2}{d(H_0t)^2} + \frac{2}{a} \frac{da}{d(H_0t)} \frac{d}{d(H_0t)} = \frac{3}{2} M a^3 = 0;$$
(19)

which is known as the linear growth equation.



F ig. 3. P lot show ing the evolution of the scale factor of perturbations with di erent initial overdensities. A standard cosm ology with $_{\rm M}$ = 0:3, $_{\rm X}$ = 0:7, h = 0:7, w = 1 is assumed. The dashed lines show the linear extrapolation of the perturbation scales for the two least overdense perturbations.

The evolution of the scale factor of the perturbations is given by the solid lines in Fig.3, compared with the background evolution for a cosm ology with $_{\rm M}$ = 0:3, $_{\rm X}$ = 0:7, h = 0:6, w = 1. These data were calculated by numerically solving Eq.18. For comparison, the dashed lines were calculated by extrapolating the initial perturbation scales using the linear growth factor, calculated from Eq.19. D ashed lines are only plotted for the two least overdense perturbations. In comparison, the most overdense perturbations are predicted to collapse to singularities. However, in practice inhom ogeneities, and the non-circular shape of actual perturbations will mean that the object virialises with nite extent.

The evolution of perturbations has a profound a ect on the present day power spectrum of the matter uctuations on small scales. On the largest

9

scales, the overdensities are small and linear theory (Eq. 19) holds. This increases the amplitude of the uctuations, but does not change the shape of the power spectrum, as the perturbation all grow at the same rate (except if neutrinos are cosm ologically relevant { see Section 4.4). However, on the smallest scales, overdensities are large and collapse to virialised structures (e.g. cluster of galaxies). The e ect on the power spectrum is most easily quanti ed using num erical simulations, and power spectra calculated from thing form ulae derived from such simulations [56] are plotted in Fig. 4.



F ig. 4. P lots comparing non-linear (solid lines) and linear power spectra (dotted lines) at a series of redshifts from z = 0 to z = 5. In the left panel the raw dimensionless power spectra are plotted while in the right panel the ratio between non-linear and linear predictions is shown. As can be seen, on large scales linear growth simply increases the amplitude of the power spectrum, while on sm all scales we also see an increase in power on intermediate scales { it is this power that is transferred to sm all scales. Non-linear power spectra were calculated from the tting form ulae of [56] with $_{\rm M} = 0.3$, h = 0.7, $n_{\rm s} = 1$, and $_{\rm b} = _{\rm m} = 0.15$.

6 galaxy survey analysis

6.1 estim ating the correlation function

First suppose that we have a single population of objects form ing a Poisson sampling of the eld that we wish to constrain. This is too simple an assum ption for the analysis of modern galaxy redshift surveys, but it will form a starting point for the development of the analysis tools required.

First we de ne the (unweighted) galaxy density eld

$$n_{g}(\mathbf{r}) \qquad \sum_{D} (\mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}_{i}): \qquad (20)$$

The de nition of the correlation function then gives

The nalterm in this equation relates to the shot noise, and only occurs for zero separation so can be easily dealt with.

In order to estimate the correlation function, we can consider a series of bins in galaxy separation and make use of Eq. 21. Suppose that we have created a (much larger) random distribution of points that form a Poisson sampling of the volume occupied by the galaxies, then

$$1 + = \frac{hD D i}{hR R i} (1 +); \qquad (22)$$

where D D is the number of galaxy-galaxy pairs within our bin in galaxy separation divided by the maximum possible number of galaxy-galaxy pairs (ie. for n galaxies the maximum number of distinct pairs is n (n 1)=2). Similarly RR is the norm alised number of random -random pairs, and we can also de ne D R as the norm alised number of galaxy-random pairs.

If the true mean density of galaxies n (r) is estimated from the sample itself (as is alm ost always the case), we must include a factor (1 +) that corrects for the systematic oset induced. is the mean of the two-point correlation function over the sampling geometry [34]. Given only a single clustered sample it is obviously dicult to determ ine , and the integral constraint (as it is known) remains a serious drawback to the determ ination of the correlation function from small samples of galaxies.

Because the galaxy and random catalogues are uncorrelated, hD R i = hRRi, and we can consider a number of alternatives to Eq. 22. In particular

$$1 + = 1 + \frac{(D R)^2}{hRRi} (1 +); \qquad (23)$$

has been shown to have good statistical properties [34].

6.2 estim ating the power spectrum

In this section we consider estimating the power spectrum by simply taking a Fourier transform of the overdensity ed [5, 21, 45]. As for our estimation of the correlation function, suppose that we have quantimed the volume occupied by the galaxies by creating a large random catalogue matching the spatial distribution of the galaxies, but with no clustering (containing times as many objects). The (unnormalised) overdensity eld is

$$F(r) = n_{q}(r) \quad n_{r}(r) = ;$$
 (24)

where n_g is given by Eq.20, and n_r is similarly de ned for the random catalogue.

Cosm ological constraints from galaxy clustering 11

Taking the Fourier transform of this eld, and calculating the power gives

$$\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{k})\mathbf{\hat{f}} = \frac{Z}{(2)^{3}} \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{k}^{0}) \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{p}(\mathbf{k}) \mathbf{\hat{f}} \mathbf{k}^{0} \mathbf{k}^{0} \mathbf{\hat{f}} + (1 + \frac{1}{2})^{2} \mathbf{d}^{3} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{r});$$
(25)

where G (k) if the Fourier transform of the window function, de ned by

G (k)
$$n(r)e^{ik r}d^3r;$$
 (26)

and the nalterm in Eq. 25 gives the shot noise. In contrast to the correlation function, there is a shot noise contribution at every scale. The integral constraint has reduced to subtracting a single D irac delta function from the centre of the unconvolved power – as before this allows for the fact that we do not know the m ean density of galaxies.

6.3 com plications

There are two complications which constitute the main hindrance to using clustering in galaxy surveys to constrain cosm ology. They are redshift space distortions { system atic deviations in measured redshift in addition to the Hubble ow, and galaxy bias { the fact that galaxies do not form a Poisson sam pling of the underlying matter distribution. D enoting the measurement of a quantity in redshift space (galaxy distances calculated from redshifts) by a superscript ^s and in real space (true galaxy distances) by ^r, we can write the measured power spectrum P_{gal}^{s} as

$$\frac{P_{gal}^{s}}{P_{mass}} = \frac{P_{gal}^{s}}{P_{gal}^{r}} = \frac{P_{gal}^{r}}{P_{gal}^{r}} = \frac{P_{gal}^{r}}{P_{mass}};$$
(27)

The rst of these terms corresponds to redshift space distortions, while the second corresponds to galaxy bias.

redshift space distortions

There are two key mechanisms that system atically distort galaxy redshifts from their Hubble ow values. First, structures are continually growing through gravity, and galaxies fall into larger structures. The infall velocity adds to the redshift, making the distance estimates using the Hubble ow wrong. This means that clusters of galaxies appear thinner along the lineof-sight, causing an increase in the measured power. In the distant observer approximation, the apparent amplitude of the linear density disturbance can be readily calculated [31], leading to a change in the power corresponding to

$$P_{gal}^{s} = P_{gal}^{r} (1 + 2)^{2};$$
 (28)

where $= M_{M}^{0.6}$ =b, b is an assumed linear bias for the galaxies, and is the cosine between the velocity vector and the line-of-sight. In the small angle approximation, we average over a uniform distribution for giving

$$P_{gal}^{s} = P_{gal}^{r} 1 + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{5}^{2}$$
 : (29)

For large redshift surveys of the nearby Universe, the sm all angle approxim ation breaks down, although a linear result can be obtained using a spherical expansion of the survey (see Section 6.5).

W hen objects collapse and virialise they attain a distribution with some velocity dispersion. These random velocities smear out the collapsed object along the line of sight in redshift space, leading to the existence of linear structures pointing towards the observer. These structures, known as \ ngers-of-god" can be corrected by m atching with a group catalogue and applying a correction to the galaxy eld before analysis [60]. A lternatively, if the pairwise distribution of velocity di erences is approximated by an exponential distribution, then

$$P_{gal}^{s} = P_{gal}^{r} (1 + k^{2} \frac{2}{p} = 2)^{1};$$
 (30)

where $_{p}$ 400 km s¹ is the pairw is velocity dispersion [28].

galaxy bias

By the simple phrase \galaxy bias" astronom ers quantify the \m essy" astrophysics of galaxy form ation. It is common to assume a local linear bias with $_{gal} = b_{mass}$, which leads to a simple relation between power spectra $P_{gal}^{r} = b^2 P_{mass}$. If this bias is independent of the scale probed, then there is nothing to worry about { the galaxy and m atter power spectra have the same shape. How ever, it is wellknown that galaxies of di erent types have di erent clustering strengths { two recent analyses are [53, 64].

O ne sim ple way of understanding galaxy bias is to use the \hab m odel", which has become popular over the last 5 years [54, 42, 13]. First, consider the distribution of the underlying m atter { the power spectrum was shown in F ig. 4. There are two distinct regimes: on large scales, linear growth holds, while on sm all scales the dark m atter has form ed into halos: it has either undergone collapse and has virialised, or is on the way to virialisation.G alaxies pinpoint certain locations within the dark m atter halos, according to an occupation distribution for each galaxy type. This forms a natural environment in which to m odel galaxy bias, with galaxies of di erent lum inosities and types have di erent occupation distributions depending on the physics of their form ation.

For 2-pt statistics, then there are two possibilities for pairs of galaxies. We could have chosen a pair where both galaxies lie in the same halo { this is most likely on small scales. A lternatively, the galaxies m ight be in di erent halos { this is most likely on large scales. On large scales, the halos them selves

are biased compared with the matter and we can use the peak-background split model [9, 40, 55] to estimate the increase in clustering strength. This limiting large scale value o ers a route to determ ine the masses of the virialised structures in which particular galaxies live.

G iven a linear bias model for each type of galaxy in the sample to be analysed, it is possible to multiply the contribution of each galaxy to the estimate of the overdensity eld by the inverse of an expected bias [45]. Provided the bias model is correct (and possibly altered for each scale observed), then this removes any systematic o set in the recovered power spectrum caused by galaxy bias. The problem is that we need to have an accurate model of the galaxy bias in order to remove it.

6.4 weights

The procedure described in Section 6.2 can be extended to include weights for each galaxy in order to optim ise the analysis [21]. Under the assumptions that the wavelength of interest 2 =k is small compared with the survey scale (i.e. the window is negligible), and that the uctuations are Gaussian, then the optim alweight applied to galaxy i is

$$w_{i} = \frac{1}{1 + n(r_{i})\hat{P}(k)}; \qquad (31)$$

where n (r_i) is the m ean galaxy density at the location of galaxy i.At locations where the m ean galaxy density is low, galaxies are weighted equally. W here the galaxy density is high, we weight by volume. It is worth noting that the optim al weights also depend on an estimate of the power spectrum to be m easured, and therefore depend on the scale of interest. How ever, in practice this dependence is su ciently weak that very little information is lost by assuming a constant $\hat{P}(k)$.

It is possible to include galaxy bias when determ ining weights and optimising the analysis in order to recover the most signal. Given a bias for each galaxy b_i (which can be dependent on any galaxy properties and the scale of interest), then the optim alweighting is [45].

$$w_{i} = \frac{b_{i}^{2}}{1 + \frac{P_{i}}{1 + \frac{1}{1 +$$

which up-weights the most biased galaxies that contain the strongest cosmological signal.

6.5 spherical bases

In Section 6.2 we described them ost simple analysism ethod for a 3-dim ensional galaxy survey { decom posing into a 3D Fourier basis. How ever, as we discussed

in Section 6.3 redshift-space distortions com plicate the situation, and cannot easily be dealt with using a Fourier basis. By decom posing into a basis that is separable in radial and angular directions, we can more easily correct such distortions. A pictorial com parison of the Fourier basis with a radial-angular separable basis is presented in Fig. 5.



Fig. 5. Comparison of 3D Fourier basis split into 2D and 1D components (right) with basis of Spherical H arm onics (with l = 2 and m = 0; 1 { top left) and Spherical Bessel functions (bottom left).

In this section we provide an overview of a form alism to do this based on work by [29, 58, 46]. For alternative form alisms see [20, 26, 60]. In comparison with the Fourier decomposition (Eq. 6), we decompose into a 3D basis of Spherical H arm onics Y_{lm} and spherical B essel functions j_l

$$(x) = \frac{r}{2} \sum_{lm}^{2} X_{lm} (k) j_{l} (kx) Y_{lm} (;) kdk:$$
(33)

Because of the choice of bases, the transform ation $_{lm}$ (k) \$ k (k) is unitary so we retain the bene t of working with the Fourier power spectrum

$$h_{lm}(k)_{l^0m} \circ (k^0) i = P(k)_D(k k^0)_D(l l^0)_D(m m^0):$$
 (34)

As in Section 6.2, we have simplied the analysis by not including any galaxy weights, although these can be introduced into the form alism . A dditionally, it is easier to work with a xed boundary condition – usually that uctuations

vanish at som e large radius so that we are only concerned with radialm odes that have

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}x} j_{\mathrm{L}}(\mathbf{k}x) = 0; \qquad (35)$$

so that the decom position becom es

$$(x) = \sum_{\substack{lm \ in \ n}}^{X} c_{ln \ lm \ n} j_{l} (k_{ln} x) Y_{lm} (;);$$
 (36)

where c_{ln} is a norm alising constant.

In order to analyse the transform ed m odes, we need a m odel for h $_{lm n} _{l^0m^0n^0}i$. F irst we dealwith the survey volume by introducing a convolution

$$\hat{M}_{m n} = \frac{X}{\sum_{1^{0}m \circ_{n} \circ}} M \sum_{1^{m} n}^{1^{0}m \circ_{n} \circ} \sum_{1^{0}m \circ_{n} \circ}; \qquad (37)$$

where

$$M_{lm n}^{l^{0}m^{0}n^{0}} = c_{ln} c_{l^{0}n^{0}} d^{3}x (x) j_{l} (k_{ln} x) j_{l^{0}} (k_{l^{0}n^{0}} x) Y_{lm} (;)Y_{l^{0}m^{0}} (;):$$
(38)

We can include the e ect of linear redshift space distortions by a transform

$$\underline{j}_{l}(k_{ln} x^{s}) ' \underline{j}_{l}(k_{ln} x^{r}) + x_{lin} \frac{d}{dx^{r}} \underline{j}_{l}(k_{ln} x^{r}); \qquad (39)$$

where

$$x_{lin} = \sum_{lm n}^{X} \frac{1}{k_{ln}^2} c_{ln} m_n \frac{dj_l (k_{ln} x^r)}{dx^r} Y_{lm} (;):$$
(40)

Here $= M_{M}^{0.6}$ =b. The bias b corrects for the fact that while we measure the galaxy power spectrum, the redshift space distortions depend on the mass. We can also introduce a further convolution to correct for the small-scale ngers-of-god e ect

$$\sum_{1^{0_{m}} \circ_{n} \circ} = \sum_{1^{0_{m}} \circ_{n} \circ \circ}^{X} S_{1^{0_{m}} \circ_{n} \circ}^{1^{0_{m}} \circ_{n} \circ} 1^{0_{m}} \circ_{n} \circ ; \qquad (41)$$

where

$$Z Z$$

$$S_{1^{0}m^{0}n^{0}}^{1^{0}m^{0}n^{0}} = C_{1^{0}n^{0}}C_{1^{0}n^{0}}^{1^{0}n^{0}} B_{1^{0}1^{0}}^{1^{0}m^{0}} p(\mathbf{r} \mathbf{y})_{1^{0}} (\mathbf{k}_{1^{0}n^{0}}\mathbf{r})_{1^{0}} (\mathbf{k}_{1^{0}n^{0}}\mathbf{y}) \mathbf{r} d\mathbf{r} \mathbf{y} d\mathbf{y};$$
(42)

and p(r y) is the 1-dimensional scattering probability for the velocity dispersion. It is also possible to include bias and evolution corrections in the analysis method [46].

For a given cosm obgicalm odel, we can use the above form alism to calculate the covariance matrix h $_{\rm Im\ n}$ $_{\rm l^0m\ ^0n^{\,0}i}$ for N $\,$ m odes, and then calculate the

Likelihood of a given cosm ologicalm odel assuming that $\hat{}_{\rm lm\ n}$ has a G aussian distribution

$$L\left[\lim_{m \to \infty} j_{n} \text{ odel}\right] = \frac{1}{(2)^{N-2} j_{n} j_{n-2}} \exp - \frac{1}{2} \lim_{m \to \infty} C^{-1} \lim_{m \to \infty} j_{n-2}$$
(43)

where C is the matrix of $h_{mn} n_{0m} \circ n \circ i$.

7 practicalities

7.1 brief description of redshift surveys

The 2dF G alaxy Redshift Survey (2dFGRS), which is now complete, covers approximately 1800 square degrees distributed between two broad strips, one across the South G alactic pole and the other close to the N orth G alactic P ole, plus a set of 99 random 2 degree elds spread over the full southern galactic cap. The nalcatalogue contains reliable redshifts for 221414 galaxies selected to an extinction-corrected m agnitude lim it of approximately $b_{\rm J} = 19:45$ [12].

In contrast, the Sban D igital Sky Survey (SD SS) is an ongoing photom etric and spectroscopic survey. The SD SS includes two spectroscopic galaxy surveys: the main galaxy sample which is complete to a reddening-corrected P etrosian r m agnitude brighter than 17:77, and a deeper sample of lum inous red galaxy sample selected based on both colour and m agnitude [18]. The SD SS has regular public data releases: the 4th data release in 2005 included 480000 independent galaxy spectra [1]. W hen completed, the SD SS will have obtained spectra for 10^6 galaxies.

7.2 angularm ask

Both the recent 2dF galaxy redshift (2dFGRS) and the ongoing Sban D igital Sky Survey (SDSS) adopted an adaptive tiling system in order to target photom etrically selected galaxies for spectroscopic follow-up. The circular tiles within which spectra could be taken in a single pointing of the telescope were adaptively tted over the survey region, with regions of high galaxy density being covered by two orm ore tiles. A region of such tiling is shown in Fig. 6. This procedure divides the survey into segments, each with a di erent com – pleteness – the ratio of good quality spectra to galaxies targeted. It is usually assumed that this com pleteness is uniform across each of the segments form ed by overlapping tiles. U nderstanding this com pleteness is a m a pr consideration when perform ing a large-scale structure analysis of either of these surveys. N ote that the distribution of segments depends on all ad pining targeted tiles, not just those that have been observed.

As well as understanding the completeness, we also need to consider the e ect of the weather - spectra taken under bad observing conditions will tend to preferentially give redshifts for nearby rather than distant galaxies.We also





F ig. 6. Section in the SD SS DR4 angular mask showing the positions of galaxies with measured redshifts (black dots), the positions of the plates from which the spectra were obtained (large black circles) and the segments within the mask that have di erent completenesses (coloured regions).

need to worry about bad elds - regions near bright stars where photom etric data is of poor quality. For the SD SS, there are hard lim its for the spectro-scopic region depending on how much photom etric data was available when the targeting algorithm was run. All of these e ects are well known and can be included in an analysis.

7.3 radial distribution

In addition to the angular distribution of galaxies, we also need to be able to model the radial distribution { in the form alism introduced in Section 6.2, we need this inform ation in order to create the random catalogue. Perhaps the best way of doing this is to model the true lum inosity function of the distribution of observed galaxies, and then apply a magnitude cut-o. This was the procedure adopted in [10]. However, the reduction in the amplitude of the recovered power spectrum caused by thing to the redshift distribution is sm all and it is common to simply to a functional form to the distribution. In Fig. 7 we present the distribution of galaxy redshifts in the SD SS DR4 sample compared with a tof the form [4]



F ig. 7. Redshift distribution of spectroscopically observed galaxies within the SD SS DR4 with apparent R m agnitude less than 17.5 and 17.77 (solid circles). For com – parison we show the best t model given by Eq. 44 for each distribution (solid lines).

$$f(z) = z^{g} \exp \frac{\frac{z}{z_{c}}}{z_{c}};$$
 (44)

where g_r b and z_c are free parameters that have been tted to the data.

8 results from recent surveys

8.1 results

In Table 1 we sum marise recent cosm obgical constraints derived from the 2dFGRS and SDSS. In order to provide a fair test of di erent analyses, we have only presented best-t param eters and errors for $_{\rm M}$ h, xing the other important param eters. Degeneracies between parameters, caused by the sim-ilarity between power spectrum shapes shown in Fig. 1 m ean that, it is only the most recent analyses of the largest sam ples that can simultaneously constrain 2 orm ore of these parameters. In Table 1 we also presented the num ber of galaxy redshifts used in each analysis.

Table 1. Sum mary of recent cosm ological constraints from 2dFGRS and SDSS galaxy redshift surveys. To try to provide a fair comparison, we only present the best-tvalue and quoted error for $_{\rm M}$ h assuming that all other cosm ological parameters are xed ($n_{\rm S} = 1$, h = 0.72, $_{\rm b} = _{\rm M} = 0.17$, $= _{\rm M} = 0.0$), and marginalise over the norm alisation.

survey	reference	galaxy redshifts	m ethod	Ν	1 h
2dFGRS	[43]	166490	Fourier	0206	0:023
2dFGRS	[46]	142756	Spherical H arm on ics	0:215	0:035
2dFGRS	[10]	221414	Fourier	0:172	0:014
SD SS	[49]	205484	K L analysis	0:207	0:030
SD SS	[60]	205443	Spherical H arm on ics	0:225	0:040
SD SS LRG	[19]	46748	correlation function	0:185	0:015

The power spectra recovered from these analyses are compared in Fig.8. We have corrected each for survey window function e ects using the best-t m odel power spectrum. The amplitudes have also been matched, so this plot m erely shows the shapes of the spectra. It is clear that the general shape of the galaxy power spectrum is now wellknown, and the turn-over is detected at high signi cance. The exact position of the turn-over is how ever, m ore poorly known and by exam ining the nal column of Table 1, we see that there are discrepancies between recent analyses at the 2 level.

9 com bination with CM B data

In this section we consider recent CM B observations and see how the com plem entarity between CM B and large scale structure constraints can break degeneracies inherent in these data. The m a jor steps required in a joint analysis are described, leading up to Section 9.5, in which we present the constraints from an example t to recent data.

9.1 cosm ological m odels

Before we start looking at constraining cosm obgicalm odels using CMB and galaxy P (k) data, it is worth brie y introducing the set of commonly used cosm obgicalparam eters (for further discussion see the recent review by [33]). It is standard to assume G aussian, adiabatic uctuations, and we will not discuss alternatives here. It is possible to param eterise the cosm obgicalm odel using a num ber of related sets of param eters. It is vital in any analysis that the m odel that is being tted to the data is fully specified { including param eters and assumed priors. M any param eters have values that sim plify the theory from which the models are calculated (e.g. the assumption that the total density in the Universe is equal to the critical density). W hether the data



 \log_{10} k / h Mpc⁻¹

F ig. 8. P lot com paring galaxy power spectra calculated by di erent analysis techniques for di erent surveys. The redshift-space power spectrum calculated by [10] (solid circles with 1- errors shown by the shaded region) are compared with other m easurements of the 2dFGRS power spectrum shape by [43] { open circles, [46] { solid stars, [59] { open stars. W here appropriate the data have been corrected to rem ove e ects of the survey volum e, by calculating the e ect on a model power spectrum with $_{\rm M}$ h = 0:168, $_{\rm b}$ = $_{\rm M}$ = 0:0, h = 0:72 & n_s = 1. A zero-baryon m odel was chosen in order to avoid adding features into the power spectra. All of the data are renorm alized to m atch the power spectrum of [10]. The open triangles show the uncorrelated SD SS real space P (k) estim ate of [60], calculated using their h odeling m ethod' with no FOG compression (their Table 3). These data have been corrected for the SD SS window as described above for the 2dFGRS data. The solid line shows a model linear power spectrum with $_{\rm M}$ h = 0:168, $_{\rm b}$ = $_{\rm M}$ = 0:168, $_{\rm b}$ = $_{\rm M}$ = 0:168, $_{\rm b}$ = $_{\rm M}$ = 0:17, h = 0:72, n_s = 1 and norm alization m atched to the 2dFGRS power spectrum .

justify dropping one of these assumptions is an interesting B ayesian question [38], which is outside the remit of the overview presented here, and we will simply introduce the parameters commonly used and possible assumptions about their values.

First, we need to know the geometry of the Universe, parameterised by total energy density tot, or the curvature $_{\rm K}$, with the \sim pli ed" value being that the energy density is equal to the critical value ($_{tot} = 1, _{K} = 0$). We also need to know the constituents of the energy density, which we param eterise by the dark matter density $_{\rm c}$, baryon density $_{\rm b}$, and neutrino . Although it is commonly assumed that the combined neutridensity nos mass has negligible cosmological e ect. The combined matter density M = c + b + bcould also be de ned as a parameter, replacing one of the other density measurements. We also need to specify the dark energy properties, particularly the equation of state w (a), which is commonly assumed to be constant w(a) = 1, so this eld is equivalent to . The perturbations after in ation are specified by the scalar spectral index n_s , with $n_s = 1$ being the most simple assumption. Possible running of this spectral index is parameterised by $= dn_s = dk$ if included. A possible tensor contribution param eterised by the tensor spectral index nt, and tensor-to-scalar ratio r is sometimes explicitly included. The evolution to present day is param eterised by the Hubble constant h, and for the CMB the optical depth to last-scattering surface . Finally, three parameters that are often ignored and m arginalised over are the galaxy bias b(k) (offen assumed to be constant) and the CMB beam B and calibration C errors.

9.2 the M C M C technique

Large multi-parameter likelihood calculations are computationally expensive using grid-based techniques. Consequently, the Markov-Chain Monte-Carlo (MCMC) technique is commonly used for such analyses. While there is publically available code to calculate cosm ological model constraints [35], the basic method is extremely simple and relatively straightforward to code.

The M CM C m ethod provides a mechanism to generate a random sequence of parameter values whose distribution m atches the posterior probability distribution of a B ayesian analysis. Chains are sequentially calculated using the M etropolis algorithm [39]: given a chain at position x, a candidate point x^0 is chosen at random from a proposal distribution f $(x^0\dot{x})$. This point is always accepted, and the chain m oves to point x^0 , if the new position has a higher likelihood. If the new position x^0 is less likely than x, then x^0 is accepted, and the chain m oves to point x^0 with probability given by the ratio of the likelihood of x^0 and the likelihood of x. In the lim it of an in nite number of steps, the chains will reach a converged distribution where the distribution of chain links are representative of the likelihood hyper-surface, given any symmm etric proposal distribution f $(x^0\dot{x}) = f(x\dot{x}^0)$ (the E rgodic theorem : see, for example, [51]).

It is common to implement dynamic optimisation of the sampling of the likelihood surface (see [24] for examples). Again, it is simple to assume a multivariate G aussian proposal function, centered on the current chain position. Given such a proposal distribution, and an estimate of the covariance matrix for the likelihood surface at each step, the optimial approach for a G aussian likelihood would proceed as follows.

A long each principal direction corresponding to an eigenvector of the covariance m atrix, the variance² of the multi-variate G aussian proposal function should be set to be a xed multiple of the corresponding eigenvalue of the covariance matrix. To see the reasoning behind this, consider translating from the original 17 param eters to the set of param eters given by the decom position along the principal directions of the covariance m atrix each divided by the standard deviation in that direction. In this basis, the likelihood function is isotropic and the parameters are uncorrelated. Clearly an optimized proposal function will be the same in each direction, and we have adjusted the proposal function to have precisely this property. There is just a single param eter left to optim ize { we are free to multiply the width of the proposal function by a constant in all directions. But we know that the optim al fraction of candidate positions that are accepted should be 0.25 [23], so we can adjust the normalization of the proposal width to give this acceptance fraction. Note that the dynam ic changing of the proposal function width violates the sym m etry of the proposal distribution $f(x^{0}\dot{x})$ assumed in the M etropolis algorithm . However, this is not a problem if we only use sections of the chains where variations between estimates of the covariance matrix are small.

The remaining issue is convergence { how do we know when we have su ciently long chains that we have adequately sam pled the posterior probability. A number of tests are available [22, 62], although it's always a good idea to perform a number of sanity checks as well { for example, do we get the same result from di erent chains started a widely separated locations in parameter space?

9.3 introduction to the CMB

O ver the past few years there has been a dram atic in provement in the resolution and accuracy of measurements of uctuations in the temperature of the CMB radiation. The discovery of features, in particular, the rst accustic peak, in the power spectrum of the CMB temperature has led to a new data-rich era in cosmology [7, 27]. More recently a signi cant leap forward was made with the release of the rst year data from the W MAP satellite [6, 30]. The relative positions and heights of the acoustic peaks encode information about the values of the fundamental cosmological parameters, as discussed for the matter power spectrum in Section 4. For a at cosmological model with $n_s = 1$, $_M = 0.3$, h = 0.7 and $_bh^2 = 0.02$ the CMB and matter power spectrum was converted to comoving scales by considering the



F ig. 9. P lot com paring large scale structure (low er panel) and CMB (upper panel) power spectra. The angular CMB power spectrum was converted to com oving scales using the com oving distance to the last scattering surface. The matter power spectrum (solid { linear, dashed { non-linear, present day), has been ratioed to a sm ooth m odel with zero baryons in order to highlight the baryonic features. D otted lines show the positions of the peaks in the CMB spectrum.

com oving scale of the uctuations at the last scattering surface. In Fig. 9, the matter power spectrum has been ratioed to a smooth zero baryon model in in order to highlight features { even so, the baryon oscillations are signicantly more visible in the CMB uctuation spectrum. The vertical dotted lines in this plot are located at the peaks in the CMB spectrum and highlight the phase o set between the two spectra. The CMB peaks are =2 out of phase with the matter peaks because they occur where the velocity is maximum, rather than the density at the last scattering surface { this is known as the velocity overshoot. A dditionally there is a projection e ect { the observed CMB spectrum is the 2D projection of 3D uctuations, and so is convolved with an asymmetric function: the projection can increase, but not decrease the wavelength of a given uctuation.

A compilation of recent CMB data is presented in Fig. 10. Here we have plotted both the temperature-temperature (TT) auto-power spectrum and the temperature-E-mode polarisation (TE) cross-power spectrum. The most signi cant current data set is, of course, the W MAP data shown by the solid circles in this gure. However, additional information is provided on small

23



F ig.10.Upperpanel: The 1-yrW MAP TT power spectrum (black circles) is plotted with the CBI (red triangles), VSA (green squares) and ACBAR (blue stars) data at higher l.Lower panel: The 1-yrW MAP TE power spectrum (black circles). In both panels the solid black line shows the best tm odel calculated from tting the CMB data.

scales by a number of other experiments. In Fig. 10, we plot data from the CBI [50], VSA [14], and ACBAR [32] experiments.

Likelihood surfaces from a multi-parameter t to these CMB data are shown in Fig.11. For this t, 7 parameters were allowed to vary: $_{\rm c}h^2$, $_{\rm b}h^2$, h, , n_s, $_8$, and h^2 .0 ther cosm obgical parameters were set at their \m odel sim pli cation" values as discussed in Section 9.1. In particular, we have assumed a at cosm obgicalm odel with $_{\rm tot} = 1$ and that the tensor contribution to the CMB is negligible. In choosing this set of 7 parameters, and using the standard MCMC technique we have im plicitly assumed uniform priors for each. The constraints on the 7 tted parameters are given in Table 2.

9.4 param eter degeneracies in the CM B data

By exam ining Fig. 11 we see that the CMB data alone do not constrain all of the fundam ental cosm ological param eters considered to high precision. D egeneracies exist between certain com binations of param eters which lead to



Fig.11.2D projections of the 7D likelihood surface resulting from a tto the CMB data plotted in Fig.10. The shading represents areas with 2 L = 2.3;6.0;9.2 corresponding to 1, 2 and 3 con dence intervals for multi-parameter G aussian random variables. There are two primary degeneracies – between $_{\rm c}h^2$ and h and between $n_{\rm s}$, and $_{\rm b}h^2$, which are discussed further in Section 9.4.



Fig. 12. As Fig. 10, but now showing 3 di erent models: the dashed line shows the best t model in all panels { the model plotted in Fig. 10. The solid lines in the top-left panel were calculated with h = 0.1, top-right $_{\rm c} 0.1$, bottom -left + 0.3 and = 0, and bottom -right $n_{\rm s} 0.2$.

Table 2. Sum mary of cosm ological parameter constraints calculated by tting a 7-parameter cosm ological model to the CMB data plotted in Fig. 10 and to the combination of these data with the measurement of the 2dFGRS power spectrum [10] { see text for details. Data are given with 1 error, except for h^2 which is presented as a 1 upper limit.

param eter	СМВ со	nstraint	CMB+2dFGF	RS con <i>s</i> ti	aint
$_{c}h^{2}$	0:107	0:015	0:106	0:006	
_b h ²	0:0238	0:0021	0:0235	0:00166	
h	0:725	0:096	0:718	0:036	
	< 0:204	0:117	< 0:195	0:085	
ns	1:00	0:064	0 : 987	0:046	
8	0:703	0:125	0 : 696	0:085	
h^2	< 0:0	0700	< 0:	:006	

CMB uctuation spectra that cannot be distinguished by current data [16]. To help to explain how these degeneracies arise, CMB models with di erent cosm ological parameters are plotted in Fig. 12.

Constraining models to be at does not fully break the geom etrical degeneracy present when considering models with varying tot, and a degeneracy between the dark matter density $_{\rm c}$ and the Hubble parameter h remains. Fig. 12 shows that both $_{\rm c}$ and h a ect the location of the rst acoustic peak. A simple argument can be used to show that models with the same value of $_{\rm m}$ h^{3:4} predict the same apparent angle subtended by the light horizon and therefore the same e location for the rst acoustic peak in the TT power spectrum [44]. The degeneracy in Fig. 11 roughly follows this prediction.

There is another degeneracy that that can be seen in Fig.11 between $n_{\rm s}$, and $_{\rm b}h^2$. From Fig.12, we see that the e ect of the optical depth $\,$ on the shape of the TT power spectrum occurs predom inantly at low multipoles. By adjusting the tilt of the prim ordial spectrum $(n_{\rm s})$, the low-'power spectrum can be approximately corrected for the change in $\,$, and the high-'end can be adjusted by changing the baryon density. This degeneracy is weakly broken by the TE data which provide an additional constraint on $\,$.

9.5 results from the combination of LSS and CM B data

The CMB degeneracy between $_{\rm c}$ and h can be broken by including additional constraints from the power spectrum of galaxy clustering. There have been a number of studies using both CMB and large-scale structure data to set cosm ological constraints, with a sem inal paper coming from the WMAP collaboration [57]. Recently new small-scale CMB data and large-scale structure analyses have increased the accuracy to which the cosm ological parameters are known. [61, 52].

In Fig. 13, we provide a likelihood plot as in Fig 11, but now including the cosm ological constraints from the nal2dFGRS power spectrum [10]. For



Fig. 13. As Fig 11, but now including extra constraints from the 2dFGRS analysis of [10]. These constraints helps to break the prim ary degeneracies discussed in Section 9.4.

this analysis, a constant bias was assumed and we tted the galaxy power spectrum over the range $0.02 < k < 0.15 h M pc^{-1}$. The derived parameter constraints for the 7 parameters varied are compared with the constraints from tting the CMB data only in Table 2. The physical neutrino density

 h^2 is unconstrained within the prior interval (physically, it must be >~0) , so we only provide an upper lim it.

A Table of parameter constraints, such as that presented in Table 2 represents the end point of our story. We have introduced the major steps required to utilize a galaxy survey to provide cosm obgical param eter constraints, and have ended up with an example of a set of constraints for a particular model.

References

- 1. A delm an-M cC arthy J.K ., et al., 2005, astro-ph/0507711
- 2. Bashinsky S., Bertschinger E., 2001, PhysRevLett., 87, 081301
- 3. Bashinsky S., Bertschinger E., 2002, PhysRevD, 65, 123008
- 4. Baugh C., Efstathiou G., 1993, MNRAS, 265, 145
- 5. Baum gart D J., Fry JN., 1991, ApJ, 375, 25
- 6. Bennett C L., et al, 2003, ApJS, 148, 1
- 7. de Bemardis P., et al., 2000, Nature, 404, 955
- 8. Birkho G., 1923, Relativity and Modern Physics, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- 9. Cole S., Kaiser N., 1989, MNRAS, 237, 1127
- 10. Cole S., et al., 2005, MNRAS, 362, 505
- 11. Coles P., Lucchin F., 1995, Cosmology, The Origin and Evolution of Cosm ic Structure, W iley
- 12. Colless M ., et al., 2003, astro-ph/0306581
- 13. Cooray A., Sheth, R., 2002, Physics Reports, 372, 1
- 14. Dickinson C., et al., 2004, MNRAS, 353, 732
- 15. D odelson S., 2003, M odern C osm ology, A cadem ic P ress
- 16. Efstathiou G., Bond J.R., 1999, MNRAS, 304, 75
- 17. Eisenstein D.J., Hu W., 1998, ApJ, 496, 605
- 18. Eisenstein D J., et al., 2001, AJ, 122, 2267
- 19. Eisenstein D.J., et al., 2005, ApJ, 633, 560
- 20. Fisher K B , Scharf C A , Lahav O , 1994, M N R A S, 266, 219
- 21. Feldm an H A ., K aiser N ., Peacock J A ., 1994, M N R A S, 426, 23
- 22. Gelm an A., Rubin D., 1992, Statistical Science 7.457
- 23. Gelm an A., Roberts G. O., Gilks W. R., 1996, in eds Bernardo J. M., Berger J. O., Dawid A., Smith A., Bayesian Statistics 5, 599, OUP
- 24. Gilks W R., Richardson S., Spiegelhalter D.J., Markov chain monte carlo in practice, 1996, Chapman & Hall
- 25. Ham ilton A J.S., 2005, \Data analysis in Cosmology", ed. V Matrinez, Springer-Verlag lecture notes in Physics, astro-ph/0503603
- 26. Ham ilton A J.S., 2005, \Data analysis in Cosmology", ed. V Matrinez, Springer-Verlag lecture notes in Physics, astro-ph/0503604
- 27. Hanany S., et al., 2000, ApJ, 545, L5.
- 28. Hawkins E., et al, 2003, MNRAS, 346, 78
- 29. Heavens A F., Taylor A N., 1995, MNRAS, 275, 483
- 30. Hinshaw G., et al., 2003, ApJS, 148, 135
- 31. Kaiser N., 1987, MNRAS, 227, 1
- 32. Kuo C L., et al, 2004, ApJ, 600, 32
- 33. Lahav O., Liddle A.R., 2006, Phys. Lett. B 592, 1 (2004) and 2005 partial update for the 2006 edition available at the PDG W W W pages at http://pdg.blgov/, astro-ph/0601168
- 34. Landy SD., Szalay A.S., 1993, ApJ, 412, 64
- 35. Lew is A ., Bridle S., 2002, Phys. Rev. D, 66, 103511

- 30 W illJ.Percival
- 36. Liddle A R., Lyth D H., Physics Reports, 231, 1, astro-ph/9303019
- 37. Liddle A.R., Lyth D.H., 2000, Cosm obgical In ation and Large-Scale Structure, C ambridge University Press
- 38. Liddle A R ., 2004, M N R A S, 351, L 49
- 39. Metropolis N., Rosenbluth A.W., Rosenbluth M. N., Teller A. H., Teller E., 1953, Journal of Chemical Physics, 21, 1087
- 40. MOHJ., White SDM., 1996, MNRAS, 282, 347
- 41. Peacock JA., 1999, Cosm ological Physics, Cambridge University Press
- 42. Peacock JA , Sm ith R E , 2000, M NRAS, 318, 1144
- 43. PercivalW J., et al., 2001, MNRAS, 327, 1297
- 44. PercivalW J., et al., 2002, MNRAS, 337, 1068
- 45. PercivalW J., Verde L., Peacock JA., 2004, MNRAS, 347, 645
- 46. PercivalW J., et al., 2004, MNRAS, 353, 1201
- 47. PercivalW J., 2005, A&A, 443, 819
- 48. Peebles PJE., 1973, ApJS, 185, 413
- 49. Pope A.C., et al, 2004, ApJ, 607, 655
- 50. Readhead A C S., et al., 2004, ApJ, 609, 498
- 51. Roberts G D , 1996, in eds G iks W R , Richardson S , Spiegelhalter D J , M arkov chain m onte carlo in practice, Chapman & Hall
- 52. Sanchez A.G., et al., 2006, MNRAS accepted, astro-ph/0507583
- 53. Seaborne M D., et al., 1999, MNRAS, 309, 89
- 54. Seljak U., 2000, MNRAS, 318, 203
- 55. Sheth R K ., Torm en G ., 1999, M N R A S, 308, 119
- 56. Sm ith R E ., et al., 2003, M N R A S, 341, 1311
- 57. SpergelD N., et al, 2003, ApJS, 148, 175
- 58. Tadros H ., et al, 1999, M NRAS, 305, 527
- 59. Tegm ark M ., H am ilton A J.S., X u Y ., 2002, M N R A S, 335, 887
- 60. Tegm ark M ., et al., 2004, ApJ, 606, 702
- 61. Tegm ark M .et al, 2004b, Phys. Rev.D, 69, 103501
- 62. Verde L., et al., 2003, ApJS, 148, 195
- 63. W ang L., Steidhardt P.J., 1998, ApJ, 508, 483
- 64. W ild, V., et al, 2005, MNRAS, 356, 247