Signal extraction for sky-averaged 21-cm experiments

Geraint Harker
LUNAR / University of Colorado
Collaborators: Jack Burns, Jonathan Pritchard, Judd Bowman and the DARE instrument verification team.

The global 21-cm signal





Pritchard & Loeb (2010)

Global 21-cm experiments

- DARE
- EDGES
- CoRE/CoRE2
- BIGHORNS
- LEDA (LWA)



- Operates over the lunar farside
- Escapes RFI
- Whole sky available; beam covers ≈1/8 of the sky
- No ionospheric distortion or contribution to the spectrum.

Basic parameters of the DARE experiment



DARE antenna power pattern at 75 MHz



Foregrounds



Spectrally smooth...



de Oliveira-Costa et al. (2008)

... but spatially variable

Interferometric and sky-averaged 21-cm foregrounds: similarities

- Foregrounds dominate over signal by orders of magnitude, wherever you look in the sky.
- Use the different spectral structure of the foregrounds and 21-cm signal to distinguish them: there are good reasons to think that many of the foregrounds are spectrally smooth.
- The spatial correlation of signal and foregrounds are also different, though this is less often exploited.
- The foregrounds and the instrument are coupled together strongly: can't remove the foregrounds without understanding both (c.f. simultaneous fitting of signal and instrument in e.g. FIRAS analysis).



Petrovic & Oh (2011)



Pritchard & Loeb (2008)

Interferometric and sky-averaged 21-cm foregrounds: differences

- Averaged over a big enough area of sky, the global signal is the same wherever you look whereas the foregrounds vary (could help with subtraction, as suggested by Shaver et al. 1999).
- Point sources are dealt with very differently
  - Carefully subtracted for interferometer experiments
  - Averaged over and treated as a diffuse foreground for global signal experiments
- The signal is a lot smoother in the sky-averaged case, and the foregrounds are effectively much larger (especially for ‘cosmic dawn’ / ‘dark ages’ work), so stronger assumptions need to be made about the foregrounds (and calibration of the frequency response becomes even more crucial: we want a stable environment!).
- Easier to beat down the noise below the level of the signal for the global signal.
- Nothing to cross-correlate the global signal with?
- RFI for the global signal could be even more awkward: can’t be localised, may require a more complicated receiver design, etc., though a single antenna experiment could in principle be much simpler and cheaper.

Recovering the shape of the global 21-cm signal from simulated DARE data

Developed parametrized models of the signal and foregrounds in eight directions:

- Galaxy and diffuse extragalactic sources
- Sun
- Moon (emission and reflections)
- Instrument

→

- Simulate data
- Fit the parameters and derive errors with a Markov Chain Monte Carlo code

The Markov Chain Monte Carlo technique



The path taken by part of the Markov Chain through a two-dimensional slice of parameter space. The parameter space has 73 dimensions in our model.



A Markov Chain Monte Carlo simulation allows us to draw unbiased, random samples from the posterior probability distribution of the parameters we're trying to find.

Parameter group	No. of parameters
21-cm signal	3x2 = 6
Diffuse foregrounds	4x8 = 32
Sun	8 + 3 = 11
Moon	2
Instrument	22
Total	**73**

Instrument frequency response and simulated spectra

$$T_{\mathrm{ant}}(\nu) = T_{\mathrm{a}} + |\Gamma(\nu)|^2 T_{\mathrm{b}} + 2T_{\mathrm{c}}|\Gamma(\nu)|\cos\left[\beta(\nu) + \phi_{\mathrm{c}}\right] + T_{\mathrm{sky}}(\nu)\left[1 - |\Gamma(\nu)|^2\right]$$

Take $T_c = \varepsilon T_b = \varepsilon T_a$





MCMC results: positions of turning points and shape of signal (3000 hrs)



MCMC results: 1000 and 10000 hours



Applying MCMC to EDGES data

How does this analysis pipeline work with real data? Can we improve constraints on the epoch of reionization data?



c.f. simulated DARE data



Applying MCMC to EDGES data

c.f. EoR signal, ~20-30 mK



Applying MCMC to EDGES data





Coming up: code development and the DARE prototype system

- Increase the power and flexibility of the MCMC code:
  - Incorporate existing code base developed by other groups.



Multinest: Feroz, Hobson, Bridges, 2008/9

  - Find a way to start from high-resolution, time-ordered satellite data rather than assuming we begin with preprocessed data.
  - Include a wider range of 21-cm models: do *model selection* rather than simply parameter estimation.

Coming up: code development and the DARE prototype system



- Applying the MCMC code to data from the DARE prototype system will be a good test of the code and will also require further development:
  - Incorporating the effects of environmental changes, solar bursts etc. will require the use of the time-ordered data
  - Can we also incorporate effects such as the ionosphere into the MCMC modelling?
  - Are tight constraints on the 21-cm signal possible using this or EDGES? Can we prove it?

Summary

- Although foreground subtraction for sky-averaged experiments shares some features with interferometric experiments, it is different enough that we need different techniques.
- The foregrounds, signal and instrumental properties probably need to be measured simultaneously from the science data.
- Different spectral and spatial properties of the foregrounds must be used: to exploit this, DARE will be able to gather data from 8 independent regions on the sky.
- Promising results for DARE with 3000 hours of data, but we get useful constraints with 1000 hours or less.
- The MCMC method presented here is applicable (with some modifications) to ground-based experiments, which if nothing else provide useful and stringent tests on the performance of the foreground fitting.

Correlation matrix