

Probing Quintessence using BAO imprint on the cross-correlation of weak lensing and post-reionization HI 21 cm signal

Chandrachud B.V. Dash,^{1*} Tapomoy Guha Sarkar,^{1†}

¹*Birla Institute of Technology & Science, Pilani, Rajasthan India*

ABSTRACT

In this work we investigate the possibility of constraining a thawing Quintessence scalar field model for dark energy. We propose using the imprint of baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) on the cross-correlation of post-reionization 21-cm signal and galaxy weak lensing convergence field to tomographically measure the angular diameter distance $D_A(z)$ and the Hubble parameter $H(z)$. The projected errors in these quantities are then used to constrain the Quintessence model parameters. We find that independent 600hrs radio interferometric observation at four observing frequencies 916MHz, 650 MHz, 520 MHz and 430MHz with a SKA-1-Mid like radio telescope in cross-correlation with a deep weak lensing survey covering half the sky may measure the binned D_A and H at a few percent level of sensitivity. The Monte Carlo analysis for a power law thawing Quintessence model gives the $1 - \sigma$ marginalized bounds on the initial slope λ_i , dark energy density parameter $\Omega_{\phi 0}$ and the shape of the potential Γ at 8.63%, 10.08% and 9.75% respectively. The constraints improve to 7.66%, 4.39% and 5.86% respectively when a joint analysis with SN and other probes is performed.

Key words: Dark energy, 21-cm cosmology, Weak lensing, Cross-correlation

1 INTRODUCTION

Several decades of independent observations (Perlmutter et al. 1997; Riess et al. 1998; Bamba et al. 2012) confirm that our Universe is currently in an accelerated expansion phase. The cause of such cosmic acceleration is attributed to the so called “Dark energy”, (Sahni & Starobinsky 2000; Peebles & Ratra 2003; Copeland et al. 2006; Amendola & Tsujikawa 2010) a fluid that violates the strong energy condition. Einstein’s cosmological constant (Λ) with an effective fluid equation of state (EoS) $P/\rho = w(z) = -1$ provides the simplest explanation for the cosmic acceleration. While, several cosmological observations are consistent with the concordance Λ CDM model, there are several inconsistencies from both theoretical considerations (like smallness of Λ , the ‘fine tuning problem’), and observations (like the low redshift measurements of H_0 (Riess et al. 2016)). This has led to many significant efforts in developing alternate scenarios to model dark energy and thereby explaining the cosmic acceleration without requiring a cosmological constant.

Generally speaking there are two ways to tackle the problem. One approach involves modifying the gravity theory itself on large scales (Amendola & Tsujikawa 2010). $f(R)$ modification to the Einstein action (Khouri & Weltman 2004; Starobinsky 2007; Hu & Sawicki 2007; Nojiri & Odintsov 2007) belongs to this approach of modeling cosmic acceleration. In a second approach the matter sector of Einstein’s field equation is modified by considering a dark energy fluid with some nontrivial dynamics. In both the approaches one may find an effective dark energy EoS which dynamically varies as a function of redshift and in principle can be distinguished from the cosmological constant (Λ). There are many models for dark energy that predict a dynamical equation of state. For example, in the quintessence models, dark energy arises from a time dependent scalar field, ϕ (Ratra & Peebles 1988; Caldwell et al. 1998; Steinhardt et al. 1999; Zlatev et al. 1999; Scherrer & Sen 2008). However these models still require fine tuning for consistency with observations. A wide variety of phenomenological potentials have been

* E-mail: cb.vaswar@gmail.com

† E-mail: tapomoy1@gmail.com

explored for quintessence field to achieve $w \approx -1$. In all these models, the minimally coupled scalar field is expected to slowly roll in the present epoch. However, other than a few restricted class of potentials, it is difficult to prevent corrections from various symmetry breaking mechanisms which tends to spoil the slow roll condition (Panda et al. 2011).

Weak gravitational lensing by intervening large scale structure distorts the images of distant background galaxies. This is attributed to the deflection of light by the fluctuating gravitational field created by the intervening mass distribution and is quantified using shear and convergence of photon geodesics. The statistical properties of these distortion fields are quantified using the shear/convergence power spectrum. These imprint the power spectrum of the intervening matter field, as well as cosmological evolution and thereby carries the signatures of structure formation. Dark energy affects the growth of cosmic structures and geometric distances, which crucially affects the power spectrum of the lensing distortion fields. Thus, weak lensing has become one of the important cosmological probes. Several weak lensing experiments are either on-going or are upcoming, such as the Dark Energy Survey (Abbott et al. 2016), the Hyper Suprime-Cam survey (Aihara et al. 2018), the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope (Ivezić et al. 2008), the WideField Infrared Survey Telescope (Wright et al. 2010; Spergel et al. 2015), and the Euclid (Laureijs et al. 2011).

The 3D tomographic imaging of the neutral hydrogen (HI) distribution is one of the promising tool to understand large scale structure formation and nature of dark energy (Bharadwaj & Sethi 2001; Wyithe & Loeb 2009). The dominant part of the low density hydrogen gets completely ionized by the end of reionization around $z \sim 6$ (Gallerani et al. 2006). However, a small fraction of HI survives the complex processes of reionization and is believed to remain housed in the over-dense regions of IGM. These clumpy HI clouds remain neutral amidst the radiation field of background ionizing sources as they are self shielded and are the dominant source of the 21-cm radiation in post-reionization epoch. Intensity mapping of such redshifted 21-cm radiation aims to map out the large scale HI distribution without resolving the individual DLA sources and promises to be a powerful probe of large scale structure and background cosmological evolution (Wyithe et al. 2007; Chang et al. 2008; Bharadwaj et al. 2009; Mao et al. 2008). Several radio telescopes like the GMRT¹ OWFA², MEERKAT³, MWA⁴, CHIME⁵, and SKA⁶ are in the pursuit of detecting the cosmological 21-cm signal for a tomographic imaging (Mao et al. 2008).

We consider the cross-correlation of HI 21-cm signal with the galaxy weak lensing convergence field. It is known that (Fonseca et al. 2017) cross-correlations of individual tracers of IGM often offer crucial advantages over auto-correlations. The systematic noise that arises in the individual surveys is pose less threat in the cross-correlation signal as they appear in the variance. Further, the foregrounds and contaminants of individual surveys are, in most cases, uncorrelated and hence do not bias the cross-correlation signal (Sarkar 2010; Vallinotto et al. 2009). The cross-correlation of the post-reionization HI 21 cm signal has been extensively studied (Sarkar et al. 2009; Guha Sarkar et al. 2010; Sarkar 2010; Sarkar et al. 2019; Dash & Guha Sarkar 2021).

The acoustic waves in the primordial baryon-photon plasma are frozen once recombination takes place at $z \sim 1000$. The sound horizon at the epoch of recombination provides a standard ruler which can be then used to calibrate cosmological distances. Baryons imprint the cosmological power spectrum through a distinctive oscillatory signature (White 2005; Eisenstein & Hu 1998). The BAO imprint on the 21-cm signal has been studied (Sarkar & Bharadwaj 2013, 2011). The baryon acoustic oscillation (BAO) is an important probe of cosmology (Eisenstein et al. 2005; Percival et al. 2007; Anderson et al. 2012; Shoji et al. 2009; Sarkar & Bharadwaj 2013) as it allows us to measure the angular diameter distance $D_A(z)$ and the Hubble parameter $H(z)$ using the the transverse and the longitudinal oscillatory features respectively thereby allowing us to put stringent constraints on dark energy models. We propose the BAO imprint on the cross-correlation of 21-cm signal and weak lensing convergence as a probe of Quintessence dark energy.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section-2 we discuss the cross-correlation of weak lensing shear/convergence and HI excess brightness temperature. We also discuss the BAO imprint and estimation of errors on the BAO parameters namely the expansion rate $H(z)$, angular diameter distance $D_A(z)$ and the dilation factor $D_V(z)$ from the tomographic measurement of cross-correlation power spectrum using Fisher formalism. In Section-3 we discuss the background and structure formation in quintessence dark energy models and constrain the model parameters using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulation. We discuss our results and other pertinent observational issues in the concluding section.

2 THE CROSS-CORRELATION SIGNAL

Weak gravitational lensing (Bartelmann & Schneider 2001) by intervening large scale structure distorts the images of distant background galaxies. This is caused by the deflection of light by the fluctuating gravitational field created by the intervening

¹ <http://gmrt.ncra.tifr.res.in/>

² <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.00621>

³ <http://www.ska.ac.za/meerkat/>

⁴ <https://www.mwatelescope.org/>

⁵ <http://chime.phas.ubc.ca/>

⁶ <https://www.skatelescope.org/>

mass distribution (Takada & Jain 2004). Weak lensing is a powerful cosmological probe as galaxy shear is sensitive to both spacetime geometry and growth of structures. The Weak-lensing convergence field on the sky is given by a weighted line of sight integral (Waerbeke & Mellier 2003) of the matter overdensity field δ as

$$\kappa(\vec{\theta}) = \int_0^{\chi_s} \mathcal{A}_\kappa(\chi) \delta(\chi \vec{\theta}, \chi) d\chi \quad (1)$$

where χ_s is the maximum distance to which the sources are distributed and the cosmology-dependent function $\mathcal{A}_\kappa(\chi)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{A}_\kappa(\chi) = \frac{3}{2} \Omega_{m0} H_0^2 \frac{\chi}{a(\chi)} \int_0^{\chi_s} n_s(z) \frac{dz}{d\chi'} \frac{\chi' - \chi}{\chi'} d\chi' \quad (2)$$

where χ denotes the comoving distance and $a(\chi)$, the cosmological scale factor. The redshift selection function of source galaxies, $n_s(z)$ tends to zero at both low and high redshifts. It is typically modeled as a peaked function (Takada & Jain 2004), parametrized by (α, β, z_0) of the form

$$n_s(z) = N_0 z^\alpha e^{-\left(\frac{z}{z_0}\right)^\beta} \quad (3)$$

and satisfies the normalization condition

$$\int_0^\infty dz n_s(z) dz = \bar{n}_g \quad (4)$$

where \bar{n}_g is the the average number density of galaxies per unit steradian.

On large scales the redshifted HI 21-cm signal from post reionization epoch ($z < 6$) known to be biased tracers of the underlying dark matter distribution Bagla et al. (2010); Guha Sarkar et al. (2012); Sarkar et al. (2016). We use δ_T to denote the redshifted 21-cm brightness temperature fluctuations. The post reionization HI signal has been studied extensively (Wyithe & Loeb 2009; Bharadwaj & Sethi 2001; Bharadwaj et al. 2001; Wyithe & Loeb 2007; Loeb & Wyithe 2008; Visbal et al. 2009; Bharadwaj & Pandey 2003; Padmanabhan et al. 2015; Bharadwaj & Srikant 2004). We follow the general formalism for the cross-correlation of the 21-cm signal with other cosmological fields given in (Dash & Guha Sarkar (2021)). Usually for the investigations involving the 21-cm signal the the radial information is retained for tomographic study. The weak-lensing signal, on the contrary consists of a line of sight integral whereby the redshift information is lost. We consider an average over the 21-cm signals from redshift slices and thus lose the individual redshift information but improve the signal to noise ratio when cross-correlating with the weak-lensing field.

We define a brightness temperature field on the sky by integrating $\delta_T(\chi \hat{\mathbf{n}}, \chi)$ along the radial direction as

$$T(\hat{n}) = \frac{1}{\chi_2 - \chi_1} \sum_{\chi_1}^{\chi_2} \delta_T(\chi \hat{\mathbf{n}}, \chi) \Delta\chi \quad (5)$$

where χ_1 and χ_2 are the comoving distances corresponding to the redshift slices of the 21-cm observation over which the signal is averaged.

Radio interferometric observations of the redshifted 21-cm signal directly measures the complex Visibilities which are the Fourier components of the intensity distribution on the sky. The radio telescope typically has a finite beam which allows us to use the ‘flat-sky’ approximation. Ideally the fields κ and δ_T are expanded in the basis of spherical harmonics. For convenience, we use a simplified expression for the angular power spectrum by considering the flat sky approximation whereby we can use the Fourier basis. Using this simplifying assumption, we may approximately write the cross-correlation angular power spectrum as (Dash & Guha Sarkar 2021)

$$C_\ell^{T\kappa} = \frac{1}{\pi(\chi_2 - \chi_1)} \sum_{\chi_1}^{\chi_2} \frac{\Delta\chi}{\chi^2} \mathcal{A}_T(\chi) \mathcal{A}_\kappa(\chi) D_+^2(\chi) \int_0^\infty dk_\parallel \left[1 + \beta_T(\chi) \frac{k_\parallel^2}{k^2} \right] P(k)$$

where $k = \sqrt{k_\parallel^2 + \left(\frac{\ell}{\chi}\right)^2}$, D_+ is the growing mode of density fluctuations, and $\beta_T = f/b_T$ is the redshift distortion factor - the ratio of the logarithmic growth rate f and the bias function and $b_T(k, z)$. The redshift dependent function \mathcal{A}_T is given by (Bharadwaj & Ali 2005; Datta et al. 2007; Guha Sarkar et al. 2012)

$$\mathcal{A}_T = 4.0 \text{ mK } b_T \bar{x}_{\text{HI}} (1+z)^2 \left(\frac{\Omega_{b0} h^2}{0.02} \right) \left(\frac{0.7}{h} \right) \left(\frac{H_0}{H(z)} \right) \quad (6)$$

The quantity $b_T(k, z)$ is the bias function defined as ratio of HI-21cm power spectrum to dark matter power spectrum $b_T^2 = P_{HI}(z)/P(z)$. In the post-reionization epoch $z < 6$, the neutral hydrogen fraction remains with a value $\bar{x}_{\text{HI}} = 2.45 \times 10^{-2}$ (adopted from Noterdaeme et al. (2009); Zafar et al. (2013)). The clustering of the post-reionization HI is quantified using b_T . On sub-Jean’s length, the bias is scale dependent (Fang et al. 1993). However, on large scales the bias is known to be scale-independent. The scales above which the bias is linear, is however sensitive to the redshift. Post-reionization HI bias is studied extensively using N-body simulations (Bagla et al. 2010; Guha Sarkar et al. 2012; Sarkar et al. 2016; Carucci et al. 2017). These simulations demonstrate that the large scale linear bias increases with redshift for $1 < z < 4$ (Marín et al. 2010).

We have adopted the fitting formula for the bias $b_T(k, z)$ as a function of both redshift z and scale k (Guha Sarkar et al. 2012; Sarkar et al. 2016) of the post-reionization signal as

$$b_T(k, z) = \sum_{m=0}^4 \sum_{n=0}^2 c(m, n) k^m z^n \quad (7)$$

The coefficients $c(m, n)$ in the fit function are adopted from Sarkar et al. (2016).

The angular power spectrum for two redshifts is known to decorrelate very fast in the radial direction (Bharadwaj & Pandey 2003). We consider the summation in Eq (5) to extend over redshift slices whose separation is more than the typical decorrelation length. This ensures that in the computation of noise for each term in the summation may be thought of as an independent measurement and the mutual covariances between the slices may be ignored.

2.1 The Baryon acoustic oscillation in the angular power spectrum

The sound horizon at the epoch of recombination is given by

$$s(z_d) = \int_0^{a_r} \frac{c_s da}{a^2 H(a)} \quad (8)$$

where a_r is the scale factor at the epoch of recombination (redshift z_d) and c_s is the sound speed given by $c_s(a) = c/\sqrt{3(1+3\rho_b/4\rho_\gamma)}$ where ρ_b and ρ_γ denotes the baryonic and photon densities respectively. The WMAP 5-year data constrains the value of z_d and $s(z_d)$ to be $z_d = 1020.5 \pm 1.6$ and $s(z_d) = 153.3 \pm 2.0$ Mpc (Komatsu et al. 2009). We shall use these as the fiducial values in our subsequent analysis. The standard ruler ‘ s ’ defines a transverse angular scale and a redshift interval in the radial direction as

$$\theta_s(z) = \frac{s(z_d)}{(1+z)D_A(z)} \quad \delta z_s = \frac{s(z_d)H(z)}{c} \quad (9)$$

Measurement of θ_s and δz_s , allows the independent determination of $D_A(z)$ and $H(z)$. The BAO feature comes from the baryonic part of $P(k)$. Hence we isolate the BAO power spectrum from cold dark matter power spectrum through $P_b(k) = P(k) - P_c(k)$. The baryonic power spectrum can be written as (Hu & Sugiyama 1996; Seo & Eisenstein 2007)

$$P_b(k) = A \frac{\sin x}{x} e^{-(k \sum_s)^{1.4}} e^{-k^2 \sum_{nl}^2 / 2} \quad (10)$$

where A is a normalization, $\sum_s = 1/k_{silc}$ and $\sum_{nl} = 1/k_{nl}$ denotes the inverse scale of ‘Silk-damping’ and ‘non-linearity’ respectively. In our analysis we have used $k_{nl} = (3.07h^{-1} \text{Mpc})^{-1}$ and $k_{silc} = (8.38h^{-1} \text{Mpc})^{-1}$ from Seo & Eisenstein (2007) and $x = \sqrt{k_\perp^2 s_\perp^2 + k_\parallel^2 s_\parallel^2}$. We also use the combined effective distance $D_V(z)$ defined as (Eisenstein et al. 2005)

$$D_V(z) \equiv \left[(1+z)^2 D_A^2(z) \frac{cz}{H(z)} \right]^{1/3} \quad (11)$$

The changes in D_A and $H(z)$ are reflected as changes in the values of s_\perp and s_\parallel respectively, and the errors in s_\perp and s_\parallel corresponds to fractional errors in D_A and $H(z)$ respectively. We use $p_1 = \ln(s_\perp^{-1})$ and $p_2 = \ln(s_\parallel)$ as parameters in our analysis. The Fisher matrix is given by

$$F_{ij} = \sum_\ell \frac{1}{\sigma_{T\kappa}^2} \frac{1}{\pi(\chi_2 - \chi_1)} \sum_{\chi_1}^{\chi_2} \frac{\Delta\chi}{\chi^2} \mathcal{A}_T(\chi) \mathcal{A}_\chi(\chi) D_+^2(\chi) \int_0^\infty dk_\parallel \left[1 + \beta_T(\chi) \frac{k_\parallel^2}{k^2} \right] \frac{\partial P_b(k)}{\partial p_i} \frac{\partial P_b(k)}{\partial p_j} \quad (12)$$

$$= \sum_\ell \frac{1}{\sigma_{T\kappa}^2} \frac{\mathcal{A}_T(\chi) \mathcal{A}_\chi(\chi)}{\pi(\chi_2 - \chi_1)} \frac{\Delta\chi}{\chi^2} D_+^2(\chi) \int_0^\infty dk_\parallel \left[1 + \beta_T \frac{k_\parallel^2}{k^2} \right] \left(\cos x - \frac{\sin x}{x} \right) f_i f_j A e^{-(k \sum_s)^{1.4}} e^{-k^2 \sum_{nl}^2 / 2} \quad (13)$$

where $f_1 = k_\parallel^2/k^2 - 1$, $f_2 = k_\parallel^2/k^2$ and $k^2 = k_\parallel^2 + \ell^2/\chi^2$. The variance $\sigma_{T\kappa}$ is given by

$$\sigma_{T\kappa} = \sqrt{\frac{(C_\ell^\kappa + N_\ell^\kappa)(C_\ell^T + N_\ell^T)}{(2\ell + 1)f_{sky}}} \quad (14)$$

where C_ℓ^κ and C_ℓ^T are the convergence and 21-cm auto-correlation angular power spectra respectively and N_ℓ^κ and N_ℓ^T are the corresponding noise power spectra.

The auto-correlation power spectra are given by (Dash & Guha Sarkar (2021))

$$C_\ell^T = \frac{1}{\pi(\chi_2 - \chi_1)^2} \sum_{\chi_1}^{\chi_2} \frac{\Delta\chi}{\chi^2} \mathcal{A}_T(\chi)^2 D_+^2(\chi) \int_0^\infty dk_\parallel \left[1 + \beta_T(\chi) \frac{k_\parallel^2}{k^2} \right]^2 P(k) \quad (15)$$

$$C_\ell^\kappa = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^{\chi_s} \frac{d\chi}{\chi^2} \mathcal{A}_\kappa(\chi)^2 D_+^2(\chi) \int_0^\infty dk_\parallel P(k) \quad (16)$$

The noise is the convergence power spectrum is dominated by Poisson noise. Thus $N_\ell^\kappa = \sigma_\epsilon^2/\bar{n}_g$ where σ_ϵ is the galaxy-intrinsic




Figure 1. This shows the BAO imprint on the transverse cross correlation angular power spectrum C_{ℓ}^{KT} . To highlight the BAO we have divided by the no-wiggles power spectrum $C_{\ell}^{KT, no-wiggles}$ which corresponds to the power spectrum without the baryonic feature. This is shown for three redshifts $z = 1.0, 1.5, 2.0$.




Figure 2. The figure shows the projected $1 - \sigma$ error bars on $H(z)$, $D_A(z)$ and $D_V(z)$ at 4 redshift bins where the galaxy lensing and HI-21cm cross correlation signal is being observed. The fiducial cosmology is chosen to be LCDM.

rms shear (Hu 1999). The source galaxy distribution is modeled using $(\alpha, \beta, z_0) = (1.28, 0.97, 0.41)$ which we have adopted from Chang et al. (2013). For the survey under consideration, we have taken $\sigma_{\epsilon} = 0.4$ (Takada & Jain 2004). We use a visibility correlation approach to estimate the noise power spectrum N_{ℓ}^T for the 21-cm signal (Geil et al. 2011; Villaescusa-Navarro et al. 2014; Sarkar & Datta 2015).

$$N_{\ell}^T = \left(\frac{T_{sys}^2 \lambda^2}{A_e} \right)^2 \frac{B}{T_o N_b(U, \nu)} \quad (17)$$

where T_{sys} is the system temperature, B is the total frequency bandwidth, $U = \ell/2\pi$, T_o is the total observation time, and λ is the observed wavelength corresponding to the observed frequency ν of the 21 cm signal. The quantity A_e is the effective collecting area of an individual antenna which can be written $A_e = \epsilon\pi(D_d/2)^2$, where ϵ is the antenna efficiency and D_d is the diameter of the dish. The $N_b(U, \nu)$ is the number density of baseline U and can be expressed as

$$N_b(U, \nu) = \frac{N_{ant}(N_{ant} - 1)}{2} \rho_{2D}(U, \nu) \Delta U \quad (18)$$

where N_{ant} is the total number of antenna in the radio array and $\rho_{2D}(U, \nu)$ is the normalized baseline distribution function which follows the normalization condition $\int d^2U \rho_{2D}(U, \nu) = 1$. The system temperature T_{sys} can be written as a sum of contributions from sky and the instrument as

$$T_{sys} = T_{inst} + T_{sky} \quad (19)$$

where

$$T_{sky} = 60K \left(\frac{\nu}{300\text{MHz}} \right)^{-2.5} \quad (20)$$

We consider a radio telescope with an operational frequency range of 400 – 950 MHz. We consider 200 dish antennae in a radio interferometer roughly mimicking SKA1-Mid. The telescope parameters are summarized in table (1). The full frequency range is divided into 4 bins centered on 916 MHz, 650 MHz, 520 MHz and 430MHz and 32 MHz bandwidth each. To calculate the normalized baseline distribution function we have assumed that baselines are distributed such that the antenna distribution falls off as $1/r^2$. We also assume that there is no baseline coverage below 30m. We have also assumed $\Delta U = A_e/\lambda^2$.

The BAO feature manifests itself as oscillations in the linear matter power spectrum (Eisenstein & Hu 1998). The first BAO peak has the largest amplitude and is a $\sim 10\%$ feature in the matter power spectrum $P(k)$ at $k \approx 0.045\text{Mpc}^{-1}$. Figure

N_{ant}	Freq. range	Efficiency	D_d	T_o
200	400 – 950 MHz	0.7	15m	600hrs

Table 1. Table showing the parameters of the radio interferometer used for making error projections

Redshift(z)	$(\delta H/H)\%$	$(\delta D_A/D_A)\%$	$(\delta D_V/D_V)\%$
0.55	4.09	2.02	2.24
1.16	6.23	2.30	2.79
1.74	10.90	4.035	4.62
2.28	17.00	6.40	6.97

Table 2. Percentage $1 - \sigma$ errors on D_A , $H(z)$ and D_V .

(1) shows the BAO feature in the cross-correlation angular power spectrum $C_\ell^{T\kappa}$. The BAO, here, seen projected onto a plane appears as a series of oscillations in $C_\ell^{T\kappa}$, The positions of the peaks scales as $\ell \sim k/\chi$. The amplitude of the first oscillation in $C_\ell^{T\kappa}$ is the maximum as is about 1% in contrast to the $\sim 10\%$ feature seen in $P(k)$. This reduction in amplitude arises due to the projection to a plane whereby several 3D Fourier modes which do not have the BAO feature also contribute to the ℓ where the BAO peak is seen. For $z = 1.0$ the first peak occurs at $\ell \sim 170$ and it has a full width of $\Delta\ell \sim 75$. If the redshift is changed, the position ℓ and width $\Delta\ell$ of the peak both scale as χ .

We have made error estimates by considering four redshift bins, corresponding to four 32MHz bandwidth radio observations of the 21 cm signal at four observing central frequencies. The total observing time of 2400 hrs is divided into four 600 hrs observations at each each frequency.

Figure (2) shows the projected errors on $H(z)$ and $D_A(z)$ for the fiducial LCDM cosmology. We find that $D_A(z)$ can be measured at a higher level of precision compared to $D_V(z)$ and $H(z)$. This is because the weak lensing kernel is sensitive to $D_A(z)$ and the integration over $\chi(z)$ in the lensing signal leads to stronger constraints on it. The percentage $1 - \sigma$ errors are summarized in table (2). We find that $H(z)$ is quite poorly constrained specially at higher redshifts.

3 QUINTESSENCE COSMOLOGY

We investigate spatially flat, homogeneous, and isotropic cosmological models filled with three non-interacting components: dark matter, baryons and a scalar field ϕ , minimally coupled with gravity. The Lagrangian density for the quintessence field is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = \frac{1}{2}(\partial^\mu \phi \partial_\nu \phi) - V(\phi) \quad (21)$$

where $V(\phi)$ is the quintessence potential. The KG equation for quintessence field obtained by varying action w.r.t the ϕ is

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V_{,\phi} = 0 \quad (22)$$

where $V_{,\phi}$ differentiation w.r.t ϕ and the Friedmann equation for H is given by

$$H^2 = \frac{1}{3}(\rho_m + \rho_b + \rho_\phi) \quad (23)$$

In order to study the dynamics of background quintessence model, let us define the following dimensionless quantities (Scherrer & Sen 2008; Amendola & Tsujikawa 2010)

$$x = \frac{\phi'}{\sqrt{6}}, \quad y = \frac{\sqrt{V}}{\sqrt{3}H}, \quad \lambda = -\frac{V_{,\phi}}{V}, \quad \Gamma = V \frac{V_{,\phi\phi}}{V_{,\phi}^2}, \quad b = \frac{\sqrt{\rho_b}}{\sqrt{3}H} \quad (24)$$

where we use units $8\pi G = c = 1$ and the prime ($'$) denotes the derivative w.r.t the number of e-folding $N = \log(a)$. Using the above quantities we can define the density parameter (Ω_ϕ) and the EoS ($w_\phi = p_\phi/\rho_\phi$) to the scalar field as follows

$$\Omega_\phi = x^2 + y^2, \quad \gamma = 1 + w_\phi = \frac{2x^2}{x^2 + y^2} \quad (25)$$

The dynamics of background cosmological evolution is obtained by solving a autonomous system of first order equations (Scherrer & Sen 2008; Amendola & Tsujikawa 2010).

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma' &= 3\gamma(\gamma - 2) + \sqrt{3\gamma\Omega_\phi}(2 - \gamma)\lambda, \\ \Omega_\phi' &= 3(1 - \gamma)\Omega_\phi(1 - \Omega_\phi), \\ \lambda' &= \sqrt{3\gamma\Omega_\phi}\lambda^2(1 - \Gamma), \\ b' &= -\frac{3}{2}b\Omega_\phi(1 - \gamma) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$




Figure 3. The figure shows the EoS (w_ϕ) as a function of redshift z for different quintessence field models after solving the autonomous ODE in (26). We kept the initial slope of the field $\lambda_i = 0.7$ in all the cases.

In order to solve the above set of 1st order ODEs numerically, we fix the initial conditions for γ , Ω_ϕ , λ at the decoupling epoch. For thawing models, the scalar field is initially frozen due to large Hubble damping, and this fixes the initial condition $\gamma_i \approx 0$. The quantity Γ which quantifies the shape of the potential is a constant for power law potentials. The parameter λ_i is the initial slope of scalar field and measures the deviation of LCDM model. For smaller λ_i the EoS (w_ϕ) of scalar field remain close to cosmological constant, whereas larger values of λ_i lead to a significant deviation from LCDM. Assuming the contribution of scalar field to the total energy density is negligibly small in the early universe, we fix the present value of Ω_ϕ . Similarly, we fix the initial value of b (related to the density parameter for baryons) so that one gets right value of the $\Omega_{b0} = 0.049$ (Aghanim et al. 2020) at the present epoch. Figure (3) shows the dynamical evolution of the EoS of quintessence field for three models. We note that there is no departure from the LCDM at large redshifts but a prominent model sensitive departure for small redshifts. At $z \sim 0.5$ there is almost a $\sim 5\%$ departure of the EoS parameter w_ϕ from that of the non-dynamical cosmological constant. The departure of w_ϕ from its LCDM value of -1 , imprints on the growing mode of density perturbations by virtue of the changes that it brings to the Hubble parameter $H(z)$.

Growth of matter fluctuations in the linear regime provides a powerful complementary observation to put tighter constraints on cosmological parameters, and also break the possible degeneracy in diverse dark energy models. We have assumed spatially flat cosmology in our entire analysis and not constrained radiation density, as only dark matter and dark energy are dominant in the late universe. The full relativistic treatment of perturbations for Quintessence dark energy has been studied Hussain et al. (2016). Ignoring super-horizon effects, we note that on sub-horizon scales, ignoring the clustering of Quintessence field, the linearized equations governing the growth of matter fluctuations is given by the ODE (Amendola 2000, 2004)

$$D_+'' + \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{H}'(a)}{\mathcal{H}(a)}\right) D_+' - \frac{3}{2} \Omega_m(a) D_+ = 0. \quad (27)$$

Here, the prime denotes differentiation w.r.t to ‘ $\log a$ ’, \mathcal{H} is the conformal Hubble parameter defined as $\mathcal{H} = aH$ and δ_m is the linear density contrast for the dark matter. In order to solve the above ODE, we fix the initial conditions D_+ grows linearly with a and the first derivative of $\frac{dD_+}{da} = 1$ at early matter dominated epoch ($a = 0.001$). We now consider the BAO imprint on the cross-correlation angular power spectrum to make error predictions on Quintessence dark energy parameters which affects both background evolution and structure formation.

3.1 Statistical analysis and constraints on model parameters

We choose the following parameters ($h, \Gamma, \lambda_i, \Omega_{\phi 0}$) to quantify the Quintessence dark energy. We have used uniform priors for these parameters in the Quintessence model. The Hubble parameter at present ($z = 0$) in our subsequent calculations is assumed to be $H_0 = 100h \text{ km/s/Mpc}$, thus define the dimensionless parameter h . We perform a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analysis using the observational data to constraint the model parameters and evolution of cosmological quantities. The analysis is carried out using the Python implementation of MCMC sampler introduced by Foreman-Mackey et al. (2013). We take flat priors for these parameters with ranges of $h \in [0.5, 0.9]$, $\Gamma \in [-1.5, 1.5]$, $\lambda_i \in [0.5, 0.8]$, $\Omega_{\phi 0} \in [0.5, 0.8]$.

We first perform the MCMC analysis for the using the error bars obtained on the binned $H(z)$ and D_A from the proposed 21-cm weak lensing cross-correlation. The figure (4) shows the marginalized posterior distribution of the set of parameters and ($h, \Gamma, \lambda_i, \Omega_{\phi 0}$) the corresponding 2D confidence contours are obtained for the model $V(\phi) \sim \phi$. The results are summarized in table(3).

For a joint analysis, we employ three mainstream cosmological probes, namely cosmic chronometers (CC), Supernovae Ia (SN) and $f\sigma_8$. We have used the observational measurements of Hubble expansion rate as a function of redshift using cosmic chronometers (CC) as compiled by Gómez-Valent & Amendola (2018). The distance modulus measurement of type Ia




Figure 4. Marginalized posterior distribution of the set of parameters and $(\Omega_{\phi_i}, \Omega_{\phi_0}, \lambda_i, h)$ corresponding 2D confidence contours obtained from the MCMC analysis for the model $V(\phi) \sim \phi$. Left panel: utilizing the information from the fisher matrix only. Right panel: utilizing all the data sets mentioned in the discussion on the top of the fisher information.

Parameters	Ω_{ϕ_0}	Γ	λ_i	h
Constraints (BAO only)	$0.660^{0.064}_{-0.049}$	$0.091^{0.784}_{-1.080}$	$0.575^{0.067}_{-0.050}$	$0.723^{0.038}_{-0.036}$
Constraints (BAO+CC+f σ_8 +SN)	$0.616^{0.034}_{-0.020}$	$0.157^{0.895}_{-0.956}$	$0.548^{0.049}_{-0.036}$	$0.701^{0.016}_{-0.015}$

Table 3. The parameter values, obtained in the MCMC analysis combining all the data sets are tabulated along the $1 - \sigma$ uncertainty.

supernovae (SN), is adopted from the Joint Lightcone Analysis sample from Betoule et al. (2014). We also incorporated the linear growth rate data, namely the $f\sigma_8(z) (\equiv f(z)\sigma_8 D_m(z))$ from the measurements by various galaxy surveys as compiled by Nesseris et al. (2017). The posterior probability distributions of the parameters and the corresponding 2D confidence contours are shown in figure (4). The constraint obtained for different parameters are shown in table (3). The joint analysis gives improved constraints compared to the constraints obtained from the analysis of only our projected BAO results. These constraints are also competitive with other probes (Gupta et al. 2012; Sangwan et al. 2018; Yang et al. 2019).

4 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have explored the cross-correlation signal of weak galaxy lensing and HI 21-cm. From the tomographic study we estimated the projected errors on the $H(z)$, $D_A(z)$ and $D_V(z)$ over a redshift range $z \sim 0 - 3$. The quantities of interest namely $H(z)$ and $D_A(z)$ explicitly appears in the lensing kernel and also in the BAO feature of the power spectrum. The cross-angular spectrum involve a radial integral and hence loses the redshift information. We have obtained tomographic information by locating the 21-cm slice at different redshift bins before cross-correlating.

Several observational challenges come in the way of measuring the cosmological 21-cm signal. The 21-cm signal is buried deep under galactic and extra-galactic foregrounds (Ghosh et al. 2011). We have assumed that this key challenge is addressed. Even after significant foreground removal, the cosmological origin of the 21 cm signal can only be ascertained only through a cross-correlation (Guha Sarkar et al. 2010; Carucci et al. 2017; Sarkar et al. 2019). The foregrounds for the two individual probes are expected to be significantly uncorrelated and hence leads to negligible effects in the observing cross-correlation power spectrum. We have not considered systematic error which arises from photometric redshift (or so called photo-z) errors which may significantly degrade the cosmological information in the context of lensing auto-correlation (Takada & Jain 2009).

The BAO estimates of $H(z)$, $D_A(z)$ allows us to probe dark energy models. We have considered the quintessence scalar field as a potential dark energy candidate and studied the background dynamics as well as the growth perturbation in linear regime in such a paradigm. A Bayesian parameter estimation using our BAO estimates indicate the possibility of good

constraints on scalar field models. The constraints also improve when joint analysis with other probes is undertaken and reaches precision levels competitive with the existing literature.

References

- Abbott T., Abdalla F. B., Aleksić J., Allam S., Amara A., Bacon D., Balbinot E., Banerji M., Bechtol K., Benoit-Lévy A., et al., 2016, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 460, 1270
- Aghanim N., Akrami Y., Ashdown M., Aumont J., Baccigalupi C., Ballardini M., Banday A. J., Barreiro R. B., Bartolo N., et al. 2020, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 641, 6
- Aihara H., Arimoto N., Armstrong R., Arnouts S., Bahcall N. A., Bickerton S., Bosch J., Bundy K., Capak P. L., Chan J. H., et al., 2018, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Japan*, 70, S4
- Amendola L., 2000, *Physical Review D*, 62, 043511
- Amendola L., 2004, *Physical Review D*, 69, 103524
- Amendola L., Tsujikawa S., 2010, *Dark Energy: Theory and Observations*. Cambridge University Press
- Anderson L., Aubourg E., et.al B., 2012, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 427, 3435
- Bagla J. S., Khandai N., Datta K. K., 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 407, 567–580
- Bamba K., Capozziello S., Nojiri S., Odintsov S. D., 2012, *Astrophysics and Space Science*, 342, 155
- Bartelmann M., Schneider P., 2001, *Physics Reports*, 340, 291–472
- Betoule M., Kessler R., Guy J., Mosser J., Hardin D., Biswas R., Astier P., El-Hage P., König M., Kuhlmann S., et al., 2014, *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 568, A22
- Bharadwaj S., Ali S. S., 2005, *MNRAS*, 356, 1519
- Bharadwaj S., Nath B. B., Sethi S. K., 2001, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy*, 22, 21
- Bharadwaj S., Pandey S. K., 2003, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy*, 24, 23
- Bharadwaj S., Sethi S. K., 2001, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy*, 22, 293
- Bharadwaj S., Sethi S. K., Saini T. D., 2009, *Physical Rev D*, 79, 083538
- Bharadwaj S., Srikant P. S., 2004, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy*, 25, 67
- Caldwell R. R., Dave R., Steinhardt P. J., 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80, 1582
- Carucci I. P., Villaescusa-Navarro F., Viel M., 2017, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2017, 001–001
- Chang C., Jarvis M., Jain B., Kahn S., Kirkby D., Connolly A., Krughoff S., Peng E.-H., Peterson J., 2013, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 434, 2121
- Chang T., Pen U., Peterson J. B., McDonald P., 2008, *Physical Review Letters*, 100, 091303
- Copeland E. J., Sami M., Tsujikawa S., 2006, *International Journal of Modern Physics D*, 15, 1753
- Dash C. B., Guha Sarkar T., 2021, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2021, 016
- Datta K. K., Choudhury T. R., Bharadwaj S., 2007, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 378, 119
- Eisenstein D. J., Hu W., 1998, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 496, 605
- Eisenstein D. J., Zehavi I., Hogg D. W., Scocimarro R., Blanton M. R., Nichol R. C., Scranton R., Seo H., Tegmark M., Zheng Z., et al. 2005, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 633, 560–574
- Fang L. Z., Bi H., Xiang S., Boerner G., 1993, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 413, 477
- Fonseca J., Maartens R., Santos M. G., 2017, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 466, 2780
- Foreman-Mackey D., Hogg D. W., Lang D., Goodman J., 2013, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 125, 306
- Gallerani S., Choudhury T. R., Ferrara A., 2006, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 370, 1401–1421
- Geil P. M., Gaensler B., Wyithe J. S. B., 2011, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 418, 516
- Ghosh A., Bharadwaj S., Ali S. S., Chengalur J. N., 2011, *MNRAS*, 418, 2584
- Gómez-Valent A., Amendola L., 2018, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2018, 051
- Guha Sarkar T., Bharadwaj S., Choudhury T. R., Datta K. K., 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 410, 1130–1134
- Guha Sarkar T., Mitra S., Majumdar S., Choudhury T. R., 2012, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 421, 3570–3578
- Gupta G., Majumdar S., Sen A. A., 2012, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 420, 1309
- Hu W., 1999, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 522, L21–L24
- Hu W., Sawicki I., 2007, *Physical Review D*, 76
- Hu W., Sugiyama N., 1996, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 471, 542
- Hussain A., Thakur S., Guha Sarkar T., Sen A. A., 2016, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 463, 3492
- Ivezić Ž., Axelrod T., Brandt W., Burke D., Claver C., Connolly A., Cook K., Gee P., Gilmore D., Jacoby S., et al., 2008, *Serbian Astronomical Journal*, pp 1–13

- Khoury J., Weltman A., 2004, *Physical Review D*, 69
- Komatsu E., Dunkley J., Nolte M. R., Bennett C. L., Gold B., Hinshaw G., Jarosik N., Larson D., Limon M., Page L., et al. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 180, 330–376
- Laureijs R., Amiaux J., Arduini S., Augeres J.-L., Brinchmann J., Cole R., Cropper M., Dabin C., Duvet L., Ealet A., et al., 2011, arXiv preprint arXiv:1110.3193
- Loeb A., Wyithe J. S. B., 2008, *Physical Review Letters*, 100, 161301
- Mao Y., Tegmark M., McQuinn M., Zaldarriaga M., Zahn O., 2008, *Physical Review D*, 78
- Mao Y., Tegmark M., McQuinn M., Zaldarriaga M., Zahn O., 2008, *Physical Rev D*, 78, 023529
- Marín F. A., Gnedin N. Y., Seo H.-J., Vallinotto A., 2010, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 718, 972–980
- Nesseris S., Pantazis G., Perivolaropoulos L., 2017, *Physical Review D*, 96, 023542
- Nojiri S., Odintsov S. D., 2007, *International Journal of Geometric Methods in Modern Physics*, 4, 115
- Noterdaeme P., Petitjean P., Ledoux C., Srianand R., 2009, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 505, 1087–1098
- Padmanabhan H., Choudhury T. R., Refregier A., 2015, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 447, 3745
- Panda S., Sumitomo Y., Trivedi S. P., 2011, *Physical Review D*, 83, 083506
- Peebles P. J. E., Ratra B., 2003, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 75, 559
- Percival W. J., Cole S., Eisenstein D. J., Nichol R. C., Peacock J. A., Pope A. C., Szalay A. S., 2007, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 381, 1053–1066
- Perlmutter S., Gabi S., Goldhaber G., Goobar A., Groom D. E., Hook I. M., Kim A. G., Kim M. Y., Lee J. C., Pain R. e. a., 1997, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 483, 565–581
- Ratra B., Peebles P. J. E., 1988, *Phys. Rev. D*, 37, 3406
- Riess A. G., Filippenko A. V., Challis P., Clocchiatti A., Diercks A., Garnavich P. M., Gilliland R. L., Hogan C. J., Jha S., Kirshner R. P., et al., 1998, *The Astronomical Journal*, 116, 1009
- Riess A. G., Macri L. M., Hoffmann S. L., Scolnic D., Casertano S., Filippenko A. V., Tucker B. E., Reid M. J., Jones D. O., Silverman J. M., et al. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 826, 56
- Sahni V., Starobinsky A., 2000, *International Journal of Modern Physics D*, 9, 373
- Sangwan A., Tripathi A., Jassal H., 2018, arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09350
- Sarkar A., Pal A. K., Sarkar T. G., 2019, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2019, 058–058
- Sarkar D., Bharadwaj S., Anathpindika S., 2016, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 460, 4310–4319
- Sarkar T. G., 2010, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2010, 002–002
- Sarkar T. G., Bharadwaj S., 2011, arXiv preprint arXiv:1112.0745
- Sarkar T. G., Bharadwaj S., 2013, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2013, 023
- Sarkar T. G., Datta K. K., 2015, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2015, 001–001
- Sarkar T. G., Datta K. K., Bharadwaj S., 2009, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2009, 019–019
- Scherrer R. J., Sen A., 2008, *Physical Review D*, 77, 083515
- Seo H.-J., Eisenstein D. J., 2007, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 665, 14
- Shoji M., Jeong D., Komatsu E., 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 693, 1404
- Spergel D., Gehrels N., Baltay C., Bennett D., Breckinridge J., Donahue M., Dressler A., Gaudi B., Greene T., Guyon O., et al., 2015, arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.03757
- Starobinsky A. A., 2007, *JETP Letters*, 86, 157–163
- Steinhardt P. J., Wang L., Zlatev I., 1999, *Phys. Rev. D*, 59, 123504
- Takada M., Jain B., 2004, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 348, 897
- Takada M., Jain B., 2009, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 395, 2065–2086
- Vallinotto A., Das S., Spergel D. N., Viel M., 2009, *Physical Review Letters*, 103
- Villaescusa-Navarro F., Viel M., Datta K. K., Choudhury T. R., 2014, *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics*, 2014, 050
- Visbal E., Loeb A., Wyithe S., 2009, *Journal of Cosmology and Astro-Particle Physics*, 10, 30
- Waerbeke L. V., Mellier Y., , 2003, *Gravitational Lensing by Large Scale Structures: A Review*
- White M., 2005, *Astroparticle Physics*, 24, 334–344
- Wright E. L., Eisenhardt P. R., Mainzer A. K., Ressler M. E., Cutri R. M., Jarrett T., Kirkpatrick J. D., Padgett D., McMillan R. S., Skrutskie M., et al., 2010, *The Astronomical Journal*, 140, 1868
- Wyithe J. S. B., Loeb A., 2009, *MNRAS*, 397, 1926
- Wyithe S., Loeb A., 2007, ArXiv e-prints
- Wyithe S., Loeb A., Geil P., 2007, ArXiv e-prints
- Yang W., Shahalam M., Pal B., Pan S., Wang A., 2019, *Physical Review D*, 100, 023522
- Zafar T., Péroux C., Popping A., Milliard B., Deharveng J.-M., Frank S., 2013, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 556, A141
- Zlatev I., Wang L., Steinhardt P. J., 1999, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 82, 896