Constraining dark energy with SN e Ia and large-scale structure

SaulPerlm utter¹, M ichaelS. Turner^{2;3} and M artin W hite⁴

¹ Institute for Nuclear and Particle Astrophysics, E.O. Law rence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720

²Departments of Astronomy & Astrophysics and of Physics, Enrico Ferm i Institute, The University of Chicago, Chicago,

IL 60637-1433

³N A SA /Ferm ilab A strophysics Center, Ferm i N ational A coelerator Laboratory, B atavia, IL 60510-0500

⁴D epartm ents of A stronom y and of P hysics,

University of Illinois at Urbana-Cham paign, Urbana, IL 61801

(April 14, 2024)

M easurements of the distances to SN e Ia have produced strong evidence that the expansion of the U niverse is accelerating, in plying the existence of a nearly uniform component of dark energy with negative pressure. We show that constraints to this mysterious component based upon large-scale structure nicely complement the SN Ia data, and that together they require x = 2 (0:6;0:7) and $w_X < 0.6$ (95% cl), for the favored at Universe. O ther cosm ological data support this conclusion. The simplest explanation, a cosm ological constant, is consistent with this, while some of the other possibilities are not.

I. IN TRODUCTION

Two groups [1,2] have presented strong evidence that the expansion of the Universe is speeding up, rather than slowing down. It comes in the form of distance measurements to some fly supernovae of type Ia (SN e Ia), with redshifts between 0 and 1. The results are fully consistent with the existence of a cosm ological constant (vacuum energy) whose contribution to the energy density is around 70% of the critical density (0.7). O therm easurements indicate that matter alone contributes $_{\rm M} = 0.4$ 0.1 [3]. Taken together, matter and vacuum energy account for an amount close to the critical density, consistent with measurements of the anisotropy of the cosm ic microwave background (CMB) [4].

In spite of the apparent success of the cosm obgical constant explanation, other possibilities have been suggested for the \dark energy." This is in part because of the checkered history of the cosm obgical constant: It was advocated by E instein to construct a static universe and discarded after the discovery of the expansion; it was revived by H oyle and B ondi and G old to solve an age crisis, later resolved by a sm aller H ubble constant, and it was put forth to explain the abundance of quasars at z 2, now known to be due to galactic evolution. Further, all attem pts to com pute the value of the cosm obgical constant, which in m odern terms corresponds to the energy associated with the quantum vacuum, have been wildly unsuccessful [5]. Finally, the presence of a cosm obgical constant m akes the present epoch special: at earlier tim es m atter (or radiation) dom inated the energy density and at later tim es vacuum energy will dom inate (the \why now?" problem).

The key features of an alternative form for the dark energy are: bulk pressure that is signi cantly negative, w < 1=3, where w = p, and the inability to clumpe ectively. The rst property is needed to ensure accelerated expansion and to avoid interfering with a long matter-dominated era during which structure forms; the second property is needed so that the dark energy escapes detection in gravitationally bound systems such as clusters of galaxies. Candidates for the dark energy include [6]: a frustrated network of topological defects (such as strings or walls), here $w = \frac{n}{3}$ (n is the dimension of the defect) [7] and an evolving scalar eld, where $= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{2} + V$ () and $p = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{2} - V$ () (referred to by some as quintessence) [8,9].

The SN Ia data alone do not yet discrim inate well against these di erent possibilities [1,10]. As shown in Fig. 1, the maximum likelihood region in the $_{\rm M}$ {w plane runs roughly diagonally: less negative pressure is permitted if the fraction of critical density contributed by dark energy is larger. Following earlier work [6], this led us to consider other cosm ological constraints: large-scale structure, anisotropy of the CMB, the age of the Universe, gravitational lensing, and measurements of the Hubble constant and of the matter density. As we shall show, some of the additional constraints, especially large-scale structure, com plement the SN Ia constraint, and serve to sharpen the limits to $_{\rm M}$ and w; others primarily illustrate the consistency of these measurements with the SN Ia result. In the end, we nd $_{\rm X}$ 2 (0:6;0:7) and w < 0:6 (95% cl).

II.M ETHOD

O ur underlying cosm obgical paradigm is a at, cold dark m atter m odel with a dark-energy component, though as we will discuss later our results are m ore general. We restrict ourselves to at m odels both because they are preferred by the CMB anisotropy data and a at Universe is strongly favored by in ation. We restrict ourselves to cold dark m atter m odels because of the success of the cold dark m atter paradigm and the lack of a viable alternative. For our space of m odels we construct m arginalized likelihood functions based upon SN e Ia, large-scale structure, and other cosm obgical measurem ents, as described below.

O ur model parameter space includes the usual cosm ological parameters ($_{M}$, $_{B}h^{2}$, and h) and the amplitude and spectral index of the spectrum of G aussian curvature uctuations ($_{8}$ and n). For the dark-energy component, we choose to focus on the dynamical scalar- eld models, because the frustrated defect models are at best marginally consistent with the SN Ia data alone [1,10].

In the dynamical scalar- eld models the equation of state w = varies with time. However for most of our purposes, only one additional free parameter needs to be specified, an e ective" equation of state. We choose w_e to be that value w which, if the Universe had w constant, would reproduce the conform allage today. We choose this de nition because the CMB anisotropy spectrum and the COBE norm alization of the matter power spectrum remain constant (to within 5{10%) for different scalar eld models with the same w_e [11]. For the models under consideration w_e is closely approximated by [12]

$$Z \qquad Z \qquad Z \qquad (1)$$

$$w_e \qquad da \quad (a)w (a) = da \quad (a): \qquad (1)$$

and, since it is simpler to compute, we have used w_e throughout. Obviously, our results also apply to constant w models (e.g., frustrated defects), by taking $w = w_e$.

W hile w_e neatly parameterizes the scalar-eld models from the standpoint of large-scale structure and the CMB anisotropy, it does not do as well when it comes to the SN Ia data. Recall that w_e as de ned in Eq. (1) receives a contribution from a wide range of redshifts. The SN Ia data however are sensitive mostly to z 1=2. Since w becomes less negative with time in the models we are considering, the SN Ia data \see" a less negative w than the CMB by a model dependent amount. We shall return to this point later.

W e norm alize ourm odels to the COBE 4-year data [13] using the m ethod of Ref. [14]. Beyond the COBE m easurements, the sm all-scale anisotropy of the m icrow are background tells us that the Universe is close to being spatially at (position of the rst acoustic peak) and that $_{\rm M}$ is less than one and/or the baryon density is high (height of

the rst acoustic peak). We have not included a detailed to the current data (see e.g. Ref. [4]), but rather in pose atness. The additional facts that m ight be gleaned from present CMB measurements, $_{\rm M}$ < 1 and high baryon density, are in fact m uch more strongly imposed by the large-scale structure data and the Burles { Tytler deuterium measurement.

We require that the power-spectrum shape t the redshift-survey data as com piled by Ref. [15] (excluding the 4 sm allest scale points which are most sensitive to the e ects of bias and nonlinear e ects). On sm aller scales we require that all of our models reproduce the observed abundance of rich clusters of galaxies. This is accomplished by requiring $_{8} = (0.55 \quad 0.1)_{M}^{0.5}$, where $_{8}$ is the rm sm ass uctuation in spheres of 8 h 1 M pc computed in linear theory [16]. The baryon density is xed at the central value indicated by the Burles{Tytler deuterium measurements, $_{B}$ h² = 0.019 0.001 [17]. We assume that clusters are a fair sam ple of the matter in the Universe so that the cluster baryon fraction $f_{B} = (0.07 \quad 0.007)$ h $^{3=2}$ relects the universal ratio of baryons to matter ($_{B} = _{M}$). We marginalize over the spectral index and Hubble constant, assuming G aussian priors with n = 0.95 0.05, which encom passes most in ationary models, and h = 0.65 0.05, which is consistent with current measurements.

There are three other cosm ological constraints that we did not im pose: the age of the Universe, $t_0 = (14 \ 2)$ G yr [18]; direct m easurements of the matter density, $_{\rm M} = 0.4 \ 0.1$, and the frequency of multiply in aged quasars. While important, these constraints serve to prove consistency, rather than to provide complementary information. For example, the SN Ia data together with our Hubble constant constraint lead to an almost identical age constraint [1,2]. The lensing constraint, recently studied in detail for dynamical scalar- eld models [19], excludes the region of large $_X$ and very negative w (at 95% cl, below the line $w_e = 0.55 \ 1.8 \ M$), which is disfavored by the SN Ia data. The matter density determined by direct measurements, $_{\rm M} = 0.4 \ 0.1$, is consistent with that imposed by the LSS and Hubble constant constraints.



FIG.1. Contours of likelihood, from 0.5 to 2, in the $_{\rm M}$ {w_e plane. Left: The thin solid lines are the constraints from LSS and the CMB. The heavy lines are the SN Ia constraints (using the Fit C supernovae of Ref. [1]) for constant w models (solid curves) and for a scalar- eld model with an exponential potential (broken curves; quadratic and quartic potentials have very sim ilar SN Ia constraints). Note that the SN Ia contours for dynam ical scalar- eld models and constant w models are slightly o set (see text). Right: The likelihood contours from all of our cosm ological constraints for constant w models (solid) and dynam ical scalar- eld models (broken).

As can be seen in Fig. 1, our large-scale structure and CMB constraints neatly complement the SN Ia data. LSS tightly constrains $_{\rm M}$, but is less restrictive along the w_e axis. This is easy to understand: in order to t the power spectrum data, a COBE-normalized CDM model must have \shape parameter" = $_{\rm M}$ h 0.25 (with a slight dependence on n). Together with the constraint h = 0.65 0.05 (and our f_B constraint) this leads to $_{\rm M}$ 0.35. As discussed in Ref. [6], the $_8$ constraint can discriminate against w_e; how ever, allowing the spectral index to di er signi cantly from unity diminishes its power to do so.

Note that the SN Ia likelihood contours for the dynam ical scalar-eld model and the constant-w models are not the same while the LSS contours are identical. W ith the Fit C supernovae of Ref. [1] and the dynam ical scalar-eld models considered here (quadratic, quartic and exponential scalar potentials), the contours are displaced by about 0.1 in w_e : the 95% clupper limit to w_e for the constant w models is 0:62, while for the quartic, quadratic and exponential potentials for V () it is 0:75, 0:76 and 0:73 respectively. The reason for this shift is simple: the w dependence of LSS is almost completely contained in the distance to the last-scattering surface and w_e is constructed to hold that constant. On the other hand, the w dependence of the SN Ia results is more heavily weighted by the recent value of w; said another way, there is a di erent e ective w for the SN Ia data. This fact could ultim ately prove to be very important in discrim inating between di erent models.

A dditionally there are a class of dynamical scalar- eld models that have attracted much interest recently [9,20]. For these potentials (here we consider V () = c = p and V () = $c[p^{1} - 1]$), and a wide range of initial conditions the scalar- eld settles into a \tracking solution" that depends only upon one parameter (here c) and the evolution of the cosm ic scale factor, suggesting that they might help to address the \why now?" problem.

For our purposes, the most interesting fact is that each tracker potential picks out a curve in $_{M}$ w_e space. Typically the lower values of $_{M}$ go with the most negative values of w_e and vice versa (see Fig. 2) This fact puts the tracker solutions in jeopardy, as shown in the same gure. For the tracker models shown here (p = 2;4 and exponential), the 95% cl intervals for the SN Ia and LSS data barely overlap. The situation is even worse for larger values of p. A similar problem was noted in Ref. [21].

Finally, we comment on the robustness of our results. While we have restricted ourselves to at models, as preferred by the CMB data, our constraints do not depend strongly on this assumption. This is because the LSS constraints are insensitive to the atness assumption, and curvature, which corresponds to a $w_e = \frac{1}{3}$ component, is strongly disfavored by the SN Ia results. We have not explicitly allowed for the possibility that in ation-produced gravity waves account for a signi cant part of the CMB anisotropy on large-angular scales (i.e., T=S > 0:1), which would have the e ect of decreasing the overall amplitude of the COBE norm alized power spectrum. In fact, allowing for gravity waves would not change our results, as this degree of freedom is implicitly accounted for by a combination of n, the norm alization freedom in the power spectrum and the uncertainty in the COBE norm alization.

O urm odel space does not explore m ore radical possibilities, for example, that neutrinos contribute signi cantly to the mass density or a nonpower-law or isocurvature spectrum of density perturbations [22]. Even allowing for these possibilities (or others) would not change our results signi cantly if one still adopted the mass density constraint, $_{\rm M}$ = 0:4 0:1. As discussed earlier, it is almost as powerful as the CDM -based LSS constraint.



FIG.2. Upper panel: The relationship between w_e and $_M$ for a selection of tracker potentials. Lower panels: the CMB and LSS likelihoods from Fig.1 as a function of $_M$ (dotted) and the SN Ia likelihood (solid { normalized to unity at the peak). As can be seen clearly, tracker models have di culty simultaneously accome modating the SN Ia and LSS constraints.

IV.CONCLUSIONS

The evidence provided by SN e Ia that the Universe is accelerating rather than slowing solves one mystery { the discrepancy between direct measurements of the matter density and measurements of the spatial curvature based upon CMB anisotropy { and introduces another { the nature of the dark energy that together with matter accounts for the critical density. SN e Ia alone do not yet strongly constrain the nature of the dark energy.

In this Letter we have shown that consideration of other in portant cosm ological data both com plan ent and reinforce the SN Ia results. In particular, as illustrated in Fig. 1, consideration of large-scale structure leads to a constraint that nicely com plan ents the SN Ia constraint and strengthens the conclusions that one can draw. O ther cosm ological constraints { age of the Universe, frequency of gravitational lensing and direct m easures of the matter density { provide information that is consistent with the SN Ia constraint (lensing and age) and the LSS constraint (matter density), and thereby reinforces the self consistency of the whole picture of a at Universe with cold dark matter and dark energy.

Finally, what have we learned about the properties of the dark-energy component? The suite of cosm ological constraints that we have applied indicate that $_{\rm X}$ 2 (0:6;0:7) and w_e < 0:6 (95% cl), with the most likely value of

 w_e close to 1 (see Fig.1). The frustrated network of light cosm ic string ($w_e = \frac{1}{3}$) is strongly disfavored, and a network of frustrated walls ($w_e = \frac{2}{3}$) is only slightly more acceptable. A loo in the disfavored category are tracker models with V () = c= ^p and p = 2;4;6;8; . Dynam ical scalar- eld models can be made acceptable provided w is tuned to be more negative than 0:7. The current data de nitely prefer the most econom ical, if not the most perplexing, solution: E instein's cosm ological constant.

ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the DoE (at Chicago, Ferm ilab, and Law rence Berkeley National Laboratory) and by the NASA (at Ferm ilab by grant NAG 5-7092). MW is supported by the NSF.

- S. Perlm utter et al, LBL-42230 (1998) (astro-ph/9812473); S. Perlm utter et al, A strophys. J., in press (1999) (astro-ph/9812133).
- [2] B. Schmidt et al, A strophys. J. 507, 46 (1998). A.G. Riess, et al., A stron. J., in press (astro-ph/9805200)
- [3] See e.g., A. Dekelet al, in Critical Diabgues in Cosmology, ed. N. Turok (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1997); and M.S. Turner, Pub. A stron. Soc. Pac., in press (1999) (astro-ph/9811454) and references therein.
- [4] G.Efstathiou et al, astro-ph/9812226.
- [5] S.W einberg, Rev.M od. Phys. 61, 1 (1989).
- [6] M S.Tumer and M.W hite, Phys. Rev. D 56, R 4439 (1997).
- [7] A.Vilenkin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 1016 (1984); D. Spergel and U.-L. Pen, A strophys. J. 491, L67 (1997).
- [8] M. Bronstein, Phys. Zeit. Sow jet Union 3, 73 (1933); M. Ozer and M. O. Taha, Nucl. Phys. B 287 776 (1987); K. Freese et al., ibid 287 797 (1987); L.F. Bloom eld-Torres and I.W aga, Mon. Not. R. astron. Soc. 279, 712 (1996); J. Friem an et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 2077 (1995); K. Coble et al, Phys. Rev. D 55, 1851 (1996); R. Caldwell et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1582 (1998).
- [9] B.Ratra and P.J.E. Peebles, Phys. Rev. D 37, 3406 (1988).
- [10] P.Gamavich et al, Astrophys. J. 509, 74 (1998).
- [11] M.W hite, Astrophys. J. 506, 495 (1998).
- [12] G.Huey et al, astro-ph/9804285.
- [13] C L. Bennett et al., A strophys. J. 454, L1 (1996).
- [14] E.Bunn and M.W hite, A strophys. J. 480, 6 (1997).
- [15] J.Peacock and S.Dodds, Mon.Not.R.astron.Soc. 267, 1020 (1994).
- [16] See e.g., S.D.M. White, G.Efstathiou, and C.S.Frenk, Mon.Not.R.astron.Soc. 262, 1023 (1993); V.R.Eke, S.Cole, C.S.Frenk, and P.Henry, ibid, 298, 1145 (1998); P.T.P.Viana and A.R.Liddle, ibid, in press (1999) (astro-ph/9803244).
- [17] S.Burles and D.Tytler, A strophys. J. 499, 699 (1998); ibid 507, 732 (1998).
- [18] B.Chaboyer et al, A strophys. J. 494, 96 (1998).
- [19] I.W aga and A P M R.M iceli, astro-ph/9811460.
- [20] I.Zlatev, L.W ang, and P.J. Steinhardt, astro-ph/9807002
- [21] P.J. Steinhardt, L.W ang, and I.Z latev, astro-ph/9812313
- [22] PJE.Peebles, astro-ph/9805194 and 9805212.