

Modeling the Covariance Matrix for the Power Spectra Before and After the BAO Reconstruction (Postprint)

Authors: Ruiyang Zhao, Kazuya Koyama, Yuting Wang and Gong-Bo Zhao

Date: 2025-01-07T00:00:00+00:00

Abstract

The baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) reconstruction plays a crucial role in cosmological analysis for spectroscopic galaxy surveys because it can make the density field effectively more linear and more Gaussian. The combination of the power spectra before and after the BAO reconstruction helps break degeneracies among parameters, then improves the constraints on cosmological parameters. It is therefore important to estimate the covariance matrix between pre- and post-reconstructed power spectra. In this work, we use perturbation theory to estimate the covariance matrix of the related power spectra multipoles, and check the accuracy of the derived covariance model using a large suite of dark matter halo catalogs at $z = 0.5$. We find that the diagonal part of the auto covariance is well described by the Gaussian prediction, while the cross covariance deviates from the Gaussian prediction quickly when $k > 0.1 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$. Additionally, we find the non-Gaussian effect in the non-diagonal part of the cross covariance is comparable to, or even stronger than, the pre-reconstruction covariance. By adding the non-Gaussian contribution, we obtain good agreement between analytical and numerical covariance matrices in the non-diagonal part up to $k = 0.15 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$. The agreement in the diagonal part is also improved, but still under-predicts the correlation in the cross covariance block.

Full Text

Preamble

Research in Astronomy and Astrophysics, 24:125015 (19pp), 2024 December © 2024 National Astronomical Observatories, CAS and IOP Publishing Ltd. All rights, including for text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies, are reserved. Printed in China. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1674-4527/ad8ba1>

Modeling the Covariance Matrix for the Power Spectra Before and After the BAO Reconstruction

Ruiyang Zhao^{1,2,3}, Kazuya Koyama³, Yuting Wang^{1,4}, and Gong-Bo Zhao^{1,2,4,5}

¹ National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100101, China; gbzhao@nao.cas.cn ² School of Astronomy and Space Science, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China ³ Institute of Cosmology & Gravitation, University of Portsmouth, Dennis Sciama Building, Portsmouth, PO1 3FX, UK ⁴ Institute for Frontiers in Astronomy and Astrophysics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing 102206, China ⁵ Chinese Academy of Sciences South America Center for Astronomy (CASSACA), National Astronomical Observatories of China, Beijing 100101, China

Received 2024 October 17; revised 2024 October 23; accepted 2024 October 24; published 2024 December 5

Abstract

The baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) reconstruction plays a crucial role in cosmological analysis for spectroscopic galaxy surveys because it can make the density field effectively more linear and more Gaussian. The combination of the power spectra before and after the BAO reconstruction helps break degeneracies among parameters and improves the constraints on cosmological parameters. It is therefore important to estimate the covariance matrix between pre- and post-reconstructed power spectra. In this work, we use perturbation theory to estimate the covariance matrix of the related power spectra multipoles and check the accuracy of the derived covariance model using a large suite of dark matter halo catalogs at $z = 0.5$. We find that the diagonal part of the auto covariance is well described by the Gaussian prediction, while the cross covariance deviates from the Gaussian prediction quickly when $k > 0.1 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$. Additionally, we find the non-Gaussian effect in the non-diagonal part of the cross covariance is comparable to, or even stronger than, the pre-reconstruction covariance. By adding the non-Gaussian contribution, we obtain good agreement between analytical and numerical covariance matrices in the non-diagonal part up to $k = 0.15 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$. The agreement in the diagonal part is also improved, but still under-predicts the correlation in the cross covariance block.

Key words: (cosmology:) large-scale structure of universe – cosmology: theory – (cosmology:) cosmological parameters

1. Introduction

The large-scale structure of the Universe carries rich information about cosmic expansion, structure growth, and primordial physics, which leaves imprints on patterns of the three-dimensional (3D) distribution of galaxies such as the baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO; Cole et al. 2005; Eisenstein et al. 2005) and

the redshift space distortions (RSD; Kaiser 1987; Peacock et al. 2001), as measured by current and future spectroscopic surveys including the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI; DESI Collaboration et al. 2016), Euclid (Laurijs et al. 2011), Subaru Prime Focus Spectrograph (PFS; Takada et al. 2014), Nancy Grace Roman Space Telescope (Roman; Wang et al. 2022), MegaMapper (Schlegel et al. 2022), and so forth. Given the large number of galaxies, observational data are usually compressed and analyzed at the 2-point statistics level such as the 2-point correlation function and the power spectrum. The 2-point statistics capture the leading-order information of the galaxy density field and have been well modeled in theory (e.g., Crocce & Scoccimarro 2006; Taruya et al. 2010; Baumann et al. 2012; Carrasco et al. 2012; Vlah et al. 2015; Maus et al. 2024a) and measured and analyzed over the last decades (e.g., Beutler et al. 2011; Alam et al. 2017; D’Amico et al. 2020; Ivanov et al. 2020; Alam et al. 2021; Adame et al. 2024a, 2024b).

To fully exploit the information from galaxy surveys, there have been attempts to measure and model higher-order statistics (Gil-Marín et al. 2017; Desjacques et al. 2018; Pearson & Samushia 2018; Eggemeier et al. 2019; Sugiyama et al. 2019; Gualdi et al. 2021; Philcox et al. 2021, 2022; Novell-Masot et al. 2023; Spaar & Zhang 2023; Sugiyama et al. 2023; Wang et al. 2023; Behera et al. 2024; Chen et al. 2024a; D’Amico et al. 2024; Hahn et al. 2024; Leonard et al. 2024). These analyses are, however, much more challenging compared to the 2-point statistics because of the high dimensionality of the observable.

The reconstruction technique (Eisenstein et al. 2007) was proposed to improve the BAO measurement by undoing the large-scale bulk flow which blurred the BAO feature. Although it was originally designed to improve the BAO signal, reconstruction, which is in effect a field-level operation, utilizes higher-order information (Schmittfull et al. 2015) to restore the linear modes that are contaminated by nonlinear gravitational evolution. Therefore, cosmological information such as RSD (Zhu et al. 2018; Hikage et al. 2020a), primordial non-Gaussianity (Shirasaki et al. 2021; Flöss & Meerburg 2024), and the neutrino mass (Zang & Zhu 2024) can in principle be better constrained by analyzing the post-reconstruction sample compared to the pre-reconstruction one when stopped at the same order of n -point statistics. Over the past few years, theoretical studies of the reconstructed field have been mainly focusing on modeling the signal (see White 2015; Seo et al. 2016; Hikage et al. 2017, 2020a; Chen et al. 2019; Ota et al. 2021; Chen et al. 2024b; Sugiyama 2024a, 2024b, 2024c).

Recently, Wang et al. (2024b, 2024a) show that the combination of pre- and post-reconstructed BAO or power spectra breaks degeneracies among parameters and significantly improves the constraints on cosmological parameters. In this case, it is also important to understand the covariance matrix between pre- and post-reconstructed power spectra because it is nearly singular at small k .

The standard way to estimate the covariance matrix is based on numerical simulations. There are, however, a few disadvantages. First, the finite number of simulations introduces noise into the numerical covariance matrix. The matrix

is likely to be ill-formed when observables are highly correlated. Moreover, the noise in the inverse covariance matrix estimation has to be accounted for (Hartlap et al. 2007) and propagated to model parameters (Percival et al. 2014, 2022), weakening the final cosmological constraints. Second, limited by computational resources, running a large number of full N-body simulations is usually not feasible and one has to rely on fast approximated mocks (e.g., Feng et al. 2016; Kitauro et al. 2016; Zhao et al. 2021). Although they are usually well calibrated at the 2-point statistics level, it is not entirely clear how well they are able to match the higher-order statistics (Philcox & Ereza 2024). On the other hand, perturbation theory provides a clean way to understand all related effects in the covariance matrix calculation (Meiksin & White 1999; Scoccimarro et al. 1999; Bertolini et al. 2016; Chan & Blot 2017; Mohammed et al. 2017; Sugiyama et al. 2020; Wadekar & Scoccimarro 2020). It also provides the ability to perform a quick cross-check with the numerical covariance matrix (Wadekar et al. 2020).

This paper extends the results in Hikage et al. (2020b) to include galaxy bias and discreteness effects based on perturbation theory and computes the analytic covariance matrix. In addition, we also model the cross covariance matrix between pre- and post-reconstruction power spectra. We compare the analytic covariance against numerical ones computed from 15,000 Quijote simulations (Villaescusa-Navarro et al. 2020).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the analytic covariance matrix model. In Section 3, we compare our analytic covariance matrix model to the numerical one computed from 15,000 Quijote simulations. The conclusions and discussions are summarized in Section 4.

2.1. Density Fluctuations and Correlators

Following the counts-in-cells formalism in Feldman et al. (1994), Smith (2009), and Sugiyama (2024c), we can divide the simulation box into infinitesimal cells with volume δV . The number of galaxies in the i -th cell, or the galaxy occupation number $n_{g,i}$, is either 0 or 1, satisfying $n_{g,i} = \bar{n}_g \delta V$ and $n_{g,i}^2 = n_{g,i}$. The galaxy number density in the simulation box is then expressed as $n_g(x) = \sum_i n_{g,i} \delta_D(x - x_i)$, with δ_D the Dirac delta function and x_i the position of the i -th cell. The expectation value of $n_g(x)$ is $n_g(x) = \bar{n}_g$, with \bar{n}_g the mean galaxy number density. Assuming galaxies are distributed following a Poisson point process, the occupation numbers in different cells ($i \neq j \neq k \neq l$) are only correlated through the underlying continuous galaxy density field:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle n_{g,i} n_{g,j} \rangle_c &= \bar{n}_g^2 \delta V^2 \{gg\}(x_i, x_j) & \langle n_{g,i} n_{g,j} n_{g,k} \rangle_c &= \bar{n}_g^3 \delta V^3 \\ \{ggg\}(x_i, x_j, x_k) & & \langle n_{g,i} n_{g,j} n_{g,k} n_{g,l} \rangle_c &= \bar{n}_g^4 \delta V^4 \\ \{gggg\}(x_i, x_j, x_k, x_l) & & & \end{aligned}$$

where we use notation \dots_c to represent the cumulant average, and we have defined the two-, three-, and four-point galaxy correlation functions $\{gg\}$, $\{ggg\}$, and $\{gggg\}$, respectively.

In Fourier space, the galaxy number density becomes $n_g(\mathbf{k}) = \sum_i n_{g,i} e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}_i}$. For convenience in later calculations, we can define $\delta_{g,i} = n_{g,i}/\bar{n}_g - 1$. The summation of $\delta_{g,i}$ satisfies $\sum_i \delta_{g,i} = 0$, where V is the volume of the simulation box, and δ_K is the Kronecker delta symbol, which is equal to 1 when $\mathbf{k} = 0$ and vanishes otherwise. Here the arrow indicates that we take the continuous limit. The 2-point correlation of $\delta_{g,i}$ is:

$$\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta_{g,j}(\mathbf{k}_2) = (1 + P_{gg}(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)) e^{-i(\mathbf{k}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{k}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x}_j)} \delta_{K(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2)}$$

where P_{gg} is the power spectrum, and we use the notation $\mathbf{k}_{\{12\}} = \mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2$. Similarly, higher-order correlations of $\delta_{g,i}$ are related to the bispectrum and trispectrum, respectively.

2.2. The Shot Noise Effect

Correlation of occupation numbers in the same cell is called the discreteness effect or the shot noise effect. It can be evaluated using Equation (1), or equivalently $n_{g,i}^2 = n_{g,i}$. We will use the superscript N to represent correlators with the shot noise effect, i.e., $\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_2)^N$. The following expression is also useful in later calculations:

$$\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_2)^N = \delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_2)^N - \delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_1)\delta_{g,i}(\mathbf{k}_2)$$

Here the superscript $N_{\{12\}}$ indicates that the correlation between the first and second density field in the same cell is removed, i.e., the shot noise effect is partially removed in this correlator. Their explicit expressions are given in the Appendix.

2.3. The BAO Reconstruction

In the standard Zeldovich reconstruction, the density field after reconstruction n^* reads:

$$n^*(\mathbf{x}) = n_d(\mathbf{x}) - \alpha n_s(\mathbf{x})$$

where α is the ratio of the total number of galaxies to randoms, n_d is the displaced data number density, and n_s is the displaced random number density. They are obtained by moving particles in the galaxy catalog n_g and an initially unclustered catalog consisting of random particles n_r according to the shift field $s(\mathbf{x})$.

The shift field in Fourier space can be explicitly written as:

$$s(\mathbf{k}) = i(\mathbf{k}/k^2) R(\mathbf{k}) \delta_g(\mathbf{k})$$

Here δ_g is the galaxy overdensity field while kernel R determines the reconstruction detail:

$$R(\mathbf{k}) = (b_{fid} f_{fid} (\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})^2) / (1 + (k^2 \Sigma_s^2)/2)$$

where f_{fid} is the fiducial growth rate, b_{fid} is the fiducial linear galaxy bias, \hat{r} is the line-of-sight direction, and Σ is the smoothing kernel, whose functional form is given by $\Sigma(k) = \exp(-k^2 \Sigma_s^2/4)$ with Σ_s the smoothing scale.

The continuity equation implies $n_d(x) = n_g(x - s(x))$ and $n_s(x) = n_r(x - s(x))$. In Fourier space, they become $n_d(k) = \int d^3p n_g(p) e^{-ip \cdot s(k-p)}$. Expanding the exponential term, we can then relate the reconstructed overdensity field δ_* with the galaxy and random overdensity fields (Shirasaki et al. 2021):

$$\delta_*(k) = \int d^3p [R(p)\delta_g(p)\delta_g(k-p) - \alpha R(p)\delta_r(p)\delta_r(k-p)] + \text{higher order terms}$$

where we use the notation defined as $\delta_r(k) = n_r(k)/\bar{n}_r - 1$, and the contribution from δ_r has been neglected in the final expression. This is because the contribution from δ_r is generally $\alpha^{-1}/50$ times smaller compared to that from δ_g . For example, in the shot noise dominated region we have $P\{gg\} \approx P\{gr\}/\alpha$. The last line defines the n -th order symmetrized reconstruction kernel. The first three terms are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(k) &= R(k) \\ R_2(k_1, k_2) &= \frac{1}{2}[R(k_1) + R(k_2)] - R(k_{\{12\}}) \\ R_3(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= [R(k_1) + R(k_2) + R(k_3) - R(k_{\{12\}}) - R(k_{\{13\}}) - R(k_{\{23\}}) + R(k_{\{123\}})] \end{aligned}$$

Analogous to the galaxy number density, the discrete form of random number density is described by $n_r(x) = \sum_i n_{r,i} \delta_D(x - x_i)$, where the random occupation number $n_{r,i}$ satisfies $n_{r,i} = \bar{n}_r \delta V$ and $n_{r,i}^2 = n_{r,i}$. In addition, since the generation of random catalogs is independent of galaxies, galaxies and randoms are never in the same cell, i.e., $n_{g,i} n_{r,j} = 0$. The fields n_d , n_s , and n^* can then be expressed in discrete forms:

$$\begin{aligned} n_d(k) &= \sum_i n_{g,i} e^{-ik \cdot (x_i + s_i)} \\ n_s(k) &= \sum_i n_{r,i} e^{-ik \cdot (x_i + s_i)} \\ n_*(k) &= \sum_i [n_{g,i} - \alpha n_{r,i}] e^{-ik \cdot (x_i + s_i)} \end{aligned}$$

with s_i the shift field evaluated at the position of the i -th cell. Using this notation, counterparts and cross-correlations between pre- and post-reconstruction density fields can be very similarly defined.

2.4. The Shot Noise Effect After Reconstruction

Contrary to the pre-reconstruction case, the shot noise effect, even if Poissonian, cannot be removed by subtracting the self-pair contribution. Sugiyama (2024c) developed a method to compute the shot noise effect by counting self-pairs in the galaxy density field. We will follow this approach and derive the impact on the bispectrum and trispectrum.

We only need to expand δ_* up to the 3rd order as we are only interested in the tree-level bispectrum and trispectrum:

$$\delta_{-}^{*}(\mathbf{k}) = d^3 p R_{-1}(p) \delta_{-g}(p) \delta_{-g}(k-p) + d^3 p_1 d^3 p_2 R_{-2}(p_1, p_2) \delta_{-g}(p_1) \delta_{-g}(p_2) \delta_{-g}(k-p_{12}) + \dots$$

The calculation is then very similar to the pre-reconstruction galaxy bispectrum and trispectrum, except that we need to differentiate between shot noise included and excluded correlators when connecting internal legs in the diagram. For example, the first line of Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper] shows the diagram of B_{-}^{**} , where internal legs represent δg while external legs represent δ . Filled circles signify galaxy correlators without the shot noise effect, while empty circles include the shot noise.

Therefore, the post-reconstruction bispectrum is given by:

$$B_{-}^{***}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3) = 2 P_{-}\{gg\}(\mathbf{k}_1) P_{-}\{gg\}(\mathbf{k}_2) R_{-1}(\mathbf{k}_1) R_{-1}(\mathbf{k}_2) R_{-2}(-\mathbf{k}_1, -\mathbf{k}_2) + 2 P_{-}\{gg\}(\mathbf{k}_1) P_{-}\{gg\}(\mathbf{k}_2) R_{-1}(\mathbf{k}_1) R_{-1}(\mathbf{k}_2) R_{-2}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) + \text{cyc.}$$

This expression recovers Equation (22) in Shirasaki et al. (2021) if we rewrite R_2 in terms of the perturbation kernel Z_2 after reconstruction. The post-reconstruction power spectrum, bispectrum, and trispectrum are defined as follows:

$$P_{-}(\mathbf{k}) = P_{-}\{gg\}(\mathbf{k}) + \text{shot noise terms } B_{-}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3) = \text{tree-level expression} + \text{shot noise terms } T_{-}^{****}(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2, \mathbf{k}_3, \mathbf{k}_4) = \text{tree-level expression} + \text{shot noise terms}$$

The cross-correlation can be similarly obtained as:

$$\delta g(\mathbf{k}_1) \delta(\mathbf{k}_2) = P_{-g}(\mathbf{k}_1) \delta_{-D}(\mathbf{k}_{12})$$

The cross-correlation trispectrum with the full shot noise effect is given by:

$$T_{-g}^{***} = 11 \text{ perm. [2 cyc. terms]} + 11 \text{ perm. [3 cyc. terms]} + \dots + 2 \text{ cyc. terms}$$

Note that the above equations only hold perturbatively, and one should expand $P_{-}\{gg\}$, $B_{-}\{ggg\}$, and $T_{-}\{gggg\}$ at the tree level. Although in this work we only assume Poissonian shot noise, the full stochastic term (Perko et al. 2016) can in principle be plugged into the above equations or re-parameterized. We refer the readers to Ebina & White (2024a) for a relevant discussion.

2.5. The Gaussian Covariance

The pre- and post-reconstruction power spectrum estimators for an individual mode are given by:

$$P_{-}\{gg\}(\mathbf{k}) = (1/N_g) |\sum_i \delta g_{,i} e^{-ik \cdot x_i}|^2 - \text{shot noise } P^{***}(\mathbf{k}) = (1/N_g) |\sum_i \delta_{-}^{*,i} e^{-ik \cdot x_i}|^2 - \text{shot noise}$$

where N_g is the total number of galaxies. These two estimators are shot noise subtracted and can be expressed in terms of $\delta g_{,i}$ and $\delta_{-}^{*,i}$.

2.6. The Non-Gaussian Covariance

The non-Gaussian covariance for pre-reconstruction is given by Wadekar & Scocimarro (2020) and Sugiyama et al. (2020). The post-reconstruction covariance has the same structure as the pre-reconstruction one:

$$C_{****} = C_{\{\text{Gaussian}\}} + C_{\{\text{non}\}\text{-Gaussian}}$$

Let us now consider the non-Gaussian covariance between pre- and post-reconstruction power spectra:

$$C_{g^*} = (P_{\{gg\}} - P_{\{gg\}})(P_{***} - P_{***})$$

The cross power spectrum estimator between pre- and post-reconstruction density fields is written as:

$$P_g(k) = (1/N_g) \sum_i \delta_{g,i} e^{-ik \cdot x_i} \sum_j \delta_{g,j} e^{ik \cdot x_j}$$

Here we do not subtract the shot noise. The pre-reconstruction covariance is then given by:

$$C_{\{gg\}} = (P_{\{gg\}}(k_1) - P_{\{gg\}}(k_1))(P_{\{gg\}}(k_2) - P_{\{gg\}}(k_2))$$

Since terms like $\delta_{g,i}(k_1)\delta_{g,i}(k_2)$ cannot be expressed in terms of δg and δ^* , we instead expand the summation as follows (see Equations (17), (18) and (19) in Sugiyama et al. 2020):

$$C_{\{gg\}} = (1/N_g^2) \sum_{\{i \neq j \neq k \neq l\}} + \sum_{\{i=j \neq k \neq l\}} + \sum_{\{i \neq j=k \neq l\}} + \sum_{\{i \neq j=k=l\}} + \dots$$

The first term is the Gaussian contribution. The last line defines the Gaussian and non-Gaussian contributions. The Gaussian contribution evaluates as:

$$C_{\{\text{Gaussian}\}} = (2/N_g^2) P_{\{gg\}}(k_1)^2 \delta_{\{k_1 k_2\}}$$

Using Equation (13) and the definitions above, the post-reconstruction and the cross covariance between pre- and post-reconstruction are similarly given. The second term expands as:

$$\sum_{\{i=j \neq k \neq l\}} = (1/N_g^2) \sum_i \sum_{\{k \neq l\}} |\delta_{g,i}|^2 \delta_{g,k} \delta_{g,l}$$

and the last term is given by:

$$\sum_{\{i=j=k \neq l\}} = (1/N_g^2) \sum_i \sum_l \delta_{g,i}^3 \delta_{g,l}$$

Therefore, we obtain the full expression for the non-Gaussian covariance. Using the fact that at tree level $\delta_{g,i}^3 = 0$ and substituting the appropriate equations, the final expression is written as:

$$C_{\{\text{non}\}\text{-Gaussian}} = d^3 p T_{\{gggg\}}(k_1, -k_1, k_2, -k_2) + d^3 p T_{\{gggg\}}(k_1, -k_2, k_2, -k_1) + \dots$$

The last two lines vanish in the case when there are no modes larger than the periodic simulation box we are considering.

2.7. Numerical Implementation

In previous sections, we derived the covariance matrix of power spectrum estimators for a single mode. In the analysis, we will use the binned power spectrum projected in the Legendre basis, i.e., the power spectrum multipoles:

$$P(k) = (2l+1)/N_k \sum_{\{k \text{ bin}\}} P(k) P_l(\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})$$

where k takes discrete values with the unit of fundamental frequency $k_f = 2\pi/L$, and P_l is the l -th order Legendre polynomial. The symbol \sum_k represents the average of k -modes inside a spherical shell with wavenumber $|k| \in [k - \Delta k/2, k + \Delta k/2)$ and Δk the width of k -bins. This definition can be expressed in terms of a top-hat function Ξ_k :

$$\Xi_k(p) = 1 \text{ if } |p| \in [k - \Delta k/2, k + \Delta k/2), 0 \text{ otherwise}$$

with N_k the number of modes inside the spherical shell $N_k = \sum_p \Xi_k(p)$. Ξ_k is an even function and has the following properties:

$$\sum_p \Xi_k(p) = N_k \quad \sum_p \Xi_k(p) g(p) = N_k g(k)$$

where g is an arbitrary function, and the second equality assumes isotropy for k_1 and k_2 . The two-argument Kronecker symbol $\delta_{\{k_1 k_2\}}$ is equal to 1 when $k_1 = k_2$ and vanishes otherwise.

The Gaussian covariance matrix of power spectrum multipoles becomes:

$$C_{\{k_1 k_2\}}^{\wedge G}(k_1, k_2) = (2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)/N_{\{k_1\}}N_{\{k_2\}} \sum_{\{p_1\}} \sum_{\{p_2\}} \Xi_{\{k_1\}}(p_1) \Xi_{\{k_2\}}(p_2) P_{l_1}(\hat{p}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) P_{l_2}(\hat{p}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) C_{\{\text{Gaussian}\}}(p_1, p_2)$$

for the pre-, post-, and cross-correlation covariance matrix, respectively. The non-Gaussian part is given by:

$$C_{\{k_1 k_2\}}^{\wedge NG}(k_1, k_2) = (2l_1+1)(2l_2+1)/N_{\{k_1\}}N_{\{k_2\}} \sum_{\{p_1\}} \sum_{\{p_2\}} \Xi_{\{k_1\}}(p_1) \Xi_{\{k_2\}}(p_2) P_{l_1}(\hat{p}_1 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) P_{l_2}(\hat{p}_2 \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) C_{\{\text{non-Gaussian}\}}(p_1, p_2)$$

Although the above two equations accurately capture the binning effect in the power spectrum measurement, we will adopt the continuous limit and the thin shell approximation to reduce the computational cost, i.e., $\sum_p \rightarrow \int d^3p / (2\pi)^3$ and $\Xi_k(p) \rightarrow \delta_D(|p| - k)$. Therefore the Gaussian covariance matrix is given by:

$$C_{\{k_1 k_2\}}^{\wedge G}(k_1, k_2) = (2l_1+1)(2l_2+1) \delta_{\{k_1 k_2\}} \int d\Omega_{\{\hat{p}\}} P_{l_1}(\hat{p} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}}) P_{l_2}(\hat{p} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{r}})$$

In the calculation, we use the non-perturbative $P(k)$ constructed by averaging over simulations. We note that we do not remove the binning effect for simplicity.

According to the rotational symmetry, the non-Gaussian part reduces to a 3D integration:

$$C_{\{1\ 2\}}^{\{NG\}}(k_1, k_2) = \int d^3p F_{\{1\}}(p, k_1) F_{\{2\}}(p, k_2) T(p, k_1-p, -k_2, k_2-p)$$

where $F_{\{1\}}$ are kernel functions and T is the trispectrum.

3. Comparison with Simulations

To test the analytic covariance derived in the last section, we measure the numerical covariance matrix of power spectrum multipoles from 15,000 Quijote halo catalogs at redshift $z = 0.5$. Each simulation evolves 512^3 particles inside a periodic box of $1\ h^{-1}$ Gpc length with the initial condition set by 2LPT at $z = 127$ and the fiducial cosmology $\{\Omega_m, \Omega_b, h, n_s, \sigma_8, M_\odot\} = \{0.3175, 0.049, 0.6711, 0.9624, 0.834, 0\}$. Dark matter halos are identified using the FoF algorithm (Davis et al. 1985). In this work, we only consider halos with a mass range of $10^{13} \cdot 10^{14} \cdot h^{-1} M_\odot$, leading to the mean halo number density $\bar{n}_h = 3.5 \times 10^{-4} (h^{-1} \text{Mpc})^{-3}$. The linear bias is found to be $b_1 = 1.85$, obtained by running fits to the power spectrum multipoles with the Velociteptors EPT code (Chen et al. 2021; Maus et al. 2024b).

We use the public codes `pyrecon` and `pypower` to perform the density field reconstruction and power spectrum measurement (Hand et al. 2017), respectively. The reconstruction algorithm is summarized as the following steps:

1. Interpolate halo particles on a 1000^3 mesh with a box size of $1000\ h^{-1}$ Mpc using the Cloud-In-Cell (CIC) scheme, then compute the overdensity and transform to Fourier space.
2. Smooth the overdensity field using the kernel defined in Equation (21) with $\Sigma_s = 10, 15,$ and $20\ h^{-1}$ Mpc.
3. Assuming a fiducial value for the linear bias $b_{\{fid\}} = b_1$ and the growth rate $f_{\{fid\}} = f_{\{true\}} = 0.7628$ or $f_{\{fid\}} = 0$, estimate the shift field on the grid by solving Equation (19).
4. Displace halo particles with the estimated shift field interpolated at the particle position with the CIC scheme to obtain the displaced data catalog.
5. Generate a random catalog with the number of randoms 50 times the number of halos. Random particles are then displaced in the same manner as halos to obtain the displaced random catalog.

The baseline reconstruction setting we use is $b_{\{fid\}} = b_1$, $\Sigma_s = 15\ h^{-1}$ Mpc, and $f_{\{fid\}} = 0.7628$. The density field is then obtained by assigning particles on a 1000^3 mesh using the Triangular Shaped Cloud (TSC) scheme with the window function correction applied (Jing 2005). When painting particles on the mesh, we additionally use two interlaced grids (Sefusatti et al. 2016) shifted by $1/3$ and $2/3$ mesh cell size, respectively, to reduce the aliasing effect. Then, the pre-, post-, and cross-power spectrum multipoles are estimated following Equations (49), (50), (52), and (72). In our analysis, we consider power spectrum measured between $k_{\{min\}} = 0.01\ h\ \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ and $k_{\{max\}} = 0.35\ h\ \text{Mpc}^{-1}$ with the k -bin size set by $\Delta k = 0.01\ h\ \text{Mpc}^{-1}$. The measurements are shown in Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper].

The derivations presented in the last section have assumed \bar{n}_g is a fixed number in the denominator. This is, however, not true because the number of halos varies between different realizations. So, we have two choices in the power spectrum estimation. One choice is to normalize the estimator using the number density measured in each realization, or the “local number density.” Another choice is to use the ensemble averaged number density, or the “global number density.” We found these two choices lead to almost the same mean power spectra but different numerical covariances especially at small scales, with the “local number density” case showing smaller correlations in both the diagonal elements and the non-diagonal parts. This effect is very similar to the local average effect as pointed out by de Putter et al. (2012), but their physical origins are different. The latter is caused by the matter fluctuations at the survey scale, while in our case, the difference in the halo number density is caused by different initial conditions. On the other hand, comparing the analytic covariance with the “global number density” case is also not very consistent on the theory side, because it means the overdensity we defined can have fluctuations at the box scale.

In any case, we will present both the “local number density” and the “global number density” measurements when comparing the theory prediction to simulations. The variation of number densities additionally leads to the variation of shot noise, but this effect has already been included in the derivation (see discussions in Smith 2009; Chan & Blot 2017; Wadekar & Scoccimarro 2020; Sugiyama et al. 2020).

The full covariance is represented by $C_{\{i_1 i_2\}}^{\{i_1 i_2\}}(k_1, k_2)$, where i_1 and i_2 label either the pre- or post-reconstruction power spectrum. We will use the symbol $C_{\{ii\}}^{\{ii\}}(k)$ to denote the diagonal part, i.e., $i_1 = i_2 = i$ and $k_1 = k_2 = k$.

Figure 3 [Figure 3: see original paper] compares the diagonal part of covariance matrices between numerical covariances and analytic covariances using the baseline reconstruction setting. The 1σ error band is estimated by bootstrapping. As shown in the plot, the departure from the Gaussian prediction is around 5% up to $k = 0.35 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$ for the auto-correlation covariance. The post-reconstruction covariance agrees with the Gaussian prediction better compared to the pre-reconstruction. This is expected because reconstruction undoes the nonlinear gravitational evolution, so that the induced correlations between measured power spectra are suppressed (Hikage et al. 2020b). However, the cross-correlation between pre- and post-reconstruction power spectra is much stronger compared to the Gaussian prediction, and the deviation exceeds 15% when k goes beyond 0.25 h Mpc^{-1} . Adding the non-Gaussian contribution to the analytic covariance improves the agreement between the theoretical prediction and the numerical covariance especially in the auto-correlation covariance, while the theory still under-predicts the cross-correlation covariance.

To compare non-diagonal elements, we use the symbol $r_{\{i_1 i_2\}}^{\{i_1 i_2\}}(k_1, k_2)$ to represent the covariance matrix normalized by the Gaussian prediction:

$$r_{\{1\ 2\}}^{\{i_1 i_2\}}(k_1, k_2) = C_{\{1\ 2\}}^{\{i_1 i_2\}}(k_1, k_2) / \sqrt{[C_{\{1\ 1\}}^{\{i_1 i_1\}}(k_1, k_1) C_{\{2\ 2\}}^{\{i_2 i_2\}}(k_2, k_2)]}$$

Figures 4–8 [FIGURE:4, FIGURE:5, FIGURE:6, FIGURE:7, FIGURE:8] show $r_{\{1\ 2\}}^{\{i_1 i_2\}}(k_1, k_2)$ at $k_2 = 0.045, 0.095, 0.145, 0.195, 0.245$ h Mpc⁻¹, respectively. In each plot, we also display the non-Gaussian analytic covariance with the shot noise contribution set to zero. Overall, the agreement between the theory prediction and the numerical covariance is reasonably good. Even when $k > 0.15$ h Mpc⁻¹, the theory prediction still captures the shape of correlations between different k -bins. The non-Gaussian effect in the cross covariance is comparable to, or even stronger than, the pre-reconstruction covariance. According to the theoretical calculation, we conclude that this enhancement is due to the shot noise effect.

We also notice there are a few features appearing in the analytic covariance but not present in the numerical covariance. For example, the post block in Figure 8 shows peculiar enhancements at small k . It is likely caused by the second line in Equation (44), which diverges in the squeezed limit when $k_3 \rightarrow 0$ because $R_2(k_2, k_3) \rightarrow \text{constant}$ while $P_{\{gg\}}(k_3) \rightarrow \infty$. In addition, at small scales, the theory strongly over-predicts the correlation when k_1 approaches k_2 in the cross-correlation covariance. This may be attributed to the IR-effect as pointed out by Sugiyama (2024a), i.e., the cross-power spectra and its shot noise should damp exponentially due to the lack of IR-cancellation. However, deriving the full IR-resummation equation for the cross-correlation trispectrum is beyond the scope of this paper, and we leave it for future work.

We then study the change of numeric and analytic covariances by varying the smoothing scale and the fiducial growth rate. Results are shown in Figures 9 and 10 [FIGURE:9, FIGURE:10]. Changing $f_{\{fid\}}$ mainly changes the quadrupole contribution, and increasing the smoothing scale increases the correlations in the post-reconstruction power spectra while decreasing the correlations in the pre- and post-reconstruction cross covariance. This is because the post-reconstruction power spectrum recovers the pre-reconstruction power spectrum when $\Sigma_s \rightarrow \infty$, so that $C_{\{gg\}}^{**}$ reduces to $C_{\{gggg\}}$. The theory prediction is still in good agreement with the numeric covariance, and the theory matches the numerical covariance better when using a larger smoothing scale or a zero $f_{\{fid\}}$.

4. Conclusion and Discussions

The reconstruction technique provides a useful tool to improve the measurement of the BAO signal and makes the standard ruler more robust by undoing the nonlinear gravitational evolution. This field-level operation brings back information beyond the 2-point statistics but also complicates the analysis especially when combining with the pre-reconstruction statistics. This is because both the signal and the covariance are affected by higher-order statistics.

In this work, we build a theory model of the covariance matrix for the power

spectra before and after the BAO reconstruction based on recent theoretical progress in reconstruction modeling (Sugiyama 2024a, 2024b, 2024c). We check the accuracy of our model against 15,000 halo mocks at redshift $z = 0.5$. We show that the diagonal part of the covariance matrix is well described by the Gaussian prediction, with a maximum deviation of 5% for the pre- and post-reconstruction auto covariance. However, the cross covariance between pre- and post-reconstruction power spectra deviates from the Gaussian prediction quickly when $k > 0.1 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$ and achieves 15% at $k = 0.25 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$. In addition, the non-Gaussian effect in the cross covariance is comparable to, or even stronger than, the pre-reconstruction covariance. We find that adding the non-Gaussian covariance predicted by perturbation theory leads to better agreement with numerical covariance up to $k \approx 0.15 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$, and the shot noise effect has a very large contribution at small scales. When $k > 0.15 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1}$, theory prediction still captures the shape of correlations between different k -bins, but over-predicts the correlation near the diagonal elements in the cross covariance. We also test the model with different smoothing scales and different fiducial growth rates when doing the reconstruction, and we find similar agreements with the numerical covariance.

In future work, we plan to extend the model to account for the IR-resummation effect. It will also be interesting to extend the calculation to multiple galaxy populations (Ebina & White 2024b; Mergulhão et al. 2024; Zhao et al. 2024) and correlation functions (Philcox et al. 2020; Rashkovetskyi et al. 2023), and compare the covariance matrix performance at the parameter level (Alves et al. 2024; Forero-Sanchez et al. 2024; Rashkovetskyi et al. 2024). The impact of the survey window function (Wadekar & Scoccimarro 2020), the local average effect (de Putter et al. 2012), the super-survey effect (Takada & Hu 2013), and fiber collision effects (Pinon et al. 2024) on covariance matrices are also interesting topics. This work provides a useful reference for future extensions.

Acknowledgments

R.Z. thanks Nathan Findlay for the inspiration of using n_* to represent the post-reconstruction field. R.Z., Y.W., and G.B.Z. are supported by National Key R&D Program of China No. 2023YFA1607803, National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC, grant No. 11925303), and by the CAS Project for Young Scientists in Basic Research (No. YSBR-092). R.Z. is also supported by the Chinese Scholarship Council (CSC) and the University of Portsmouth. K.K. is supported by the STFC grant ST/W001225/1. Y.W. is also supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC, grant Nos. 12273048 and 12422301), by National Key R&D Program of China No. 2022YFF0503404, by the Youth Innovation Promotion Association CAS, and by the Nebula Talents Program of NAOC. G.B.Z. is also supported by science research grants from the China Manned Space Project with No. CMS-CSST-2021-B01, and the New Cornerstone Science Foundation through the XPLOERER prize. Numerical computations were done on the Sciama High Performance Compute (HPC) cluster

which is supported by the ICG, SEPNet and the University of Portsmouth. For the purpose of open access, the authors have applied a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising.

Appendix

Perturbation Theory Before Reconstruction

The galaxy density field in redshift space can be expanded perturbatively:

$$\delta g(k) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} Z_n(k_1, \dots, k_n) \delta_L(k_1) \dots \delta_L(k_n)$$

where we have adopted the EdS-approximation, with δ_L the linear matter density field evaluated at the observation redshift and Z_n the n -th order perturbation kernel. In this work, we use the “descendants” bias basis defined in Perko et al. (2016) and assume $b_1 = \text{constant}$, with all other bias parameters set to 0. The tree-level bispectrum and trispectrum are given by Goroff et al. (1986):

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\{ggg\}}(k_1, k_2, k_3) &= 2 P_L(k_1)P_L(k_2) Z_1(k_1)Z_1(k_2)Z_2(k_1, k_2) + \text{cyc.} \\ T_{\{gggg\}}(k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4) &= 3 P_L(k_1)P_L(k_2)P_L(k_3) Z_1(k_1)Z_1(k_2)Z_1(k_3)Z_3(k_1, \\ & k_2, k_3) + 11 \text{ perm.} \end{aligned}$$

The full power spectrum, bispectrum, and trispectrum with the shot noise effect are given by Sugiyama et al. (2020) and Sugiyama (2024b). We have copied these expressions in the following sections.

ORCID iDs

Ruiyang Zhao <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7284-7265>

References

- Alves, O., et al. 2024, Analytical covariance matrices of DESI galaxy power spectra, in preparation Baumann, D., Nicolis, A., Senatore, L., & Zaldarriaga, M. 2012, JCAP, 07, 051 Behera, J., Rezaie, M., Samushia, L., & Ereza, J. 2024, MNRAS, 531, 3326 Bertolini, D., Schutz, K., Solon, M. P., Walsh, J. R., & Zurek, K. M. 2016, PhRvD, 93, 123505 Beutler, F., Blake, C., Colless, M., et al. 2011, MNRAS, 416, 3017 Carrasco, J. J. M., Hertzberg, M. P., & Senatore, L. 2012, JHEP, 09, 082 Chan, K. C., & Blot, L. 2017, PhRvD, 96, 023528 Chen, S.-F., Vlah, Z., Castorina, E., & White, M. 2021, JCAP, 03, 100 Chen, S.-F., Vlah, Z., & White, M. 2019, JCAP, 09, 017 Chen, S.-F., Vlah, Z., & White, M. 2024a, arXiv:2406.00103 Chen, S.-F., Howlett, C., White, M., et al. 2024b, arXiv:2402.14070 Cole, S., Percival, W. J., Peacock, J. A., et al. 2005, MNRAS, 362, 505 Crocce, M., & Scoccimarro, R. 2006, PhRvD, 73, 063519 D’Amico, G., Donath, Y., Lewandowski, M., Senatore, L., & Zhang, P. 2024, JCAP, 05, 059 D’Amico, G., Gleyzes, J., Kokron, N., et al. 2020, JCAP, 05, 005 Davis, M., Efstathiou, G., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 1985, ApJ, 292, 371 de Putter, R., Wagner, C., Mena, O., Verde, L., & Percival, W. 2012, JCAP, 04, 019

DESI Collaboration, Aghamousa, A., Aguilar, J., et al. 2016, arXiv:1611.00036
Desjacques, V., Jeong, D., & Schmidt, F. 2018, JCAP, 12, 035 Ebina, H., &
White, M. 2024a, arXiv:2409.17133 Ebina, H., & White, M. 2024b, JCAP, 06,
052 Eggemeier, A., Scoccimarro, R., & Smith, R. E. 2019, PhRvD, 99, 123514
Eisenstein, D. J., Seo, H.-j., & White, M. J. 2007, ApJ, 664, 660 Eisenstein, D.
J., Zehavi, I., Hogg, D. W., et al. 2005, ApJ, 633, 560 Feldman, H. A., Kaiser,
N., & Peacock, J. A. 1994, ApJ, 426, 23 Feng, Y., Chu, M.-Y., Seljak, U., &
McDonald, P. 2016, MNRAS, 463, 2273 Flöss, T., & Meerburg, P. D. 2024,
JCAP, 02, 031 Forero-Sanchez, et al. 2024, Analytical and EZmock covariance
validation for the DESI 2024 results, in preparation Gil-Marín, H., Percival, W.
J., Verde, L., et al. 2017, MNRAS, 465, 1757 Goroff, M. H., Grinstein, B., Rey,
S. J., & Wise, M. B. 1986, ApJ, 311, 6 Gualdi, D., Gil-Marín, H. E., & Verde, L.
2021, JCAP, 07, 008 Hahn, C., Eickenberg, M., Ho, S., et al. 2024, PhRvD, 109,
083534 Hand, N., Li, Y., Slepian, Z., & Seljak, U. 2017, JCAP, 07, 002 Hartlap,
J., Simon, P., & Schneider, P. 2007, A&A, 464, 399 Hikage, C., Koyama, K., &
Heavens, A. 2017, PhRvD, 96, 043513 Hikage, C., Koyama, K., & Takahashi,
R. 2020a, PhRvD, 101, 043510 Hikage, C., Takahashi, R., & Koyama, K. 2020b,
PhRvD, 102, 083514 Ivanov, M. M., Simonović, M., & Zaldarriaga, M. 2020,
JCAP, 05, 042 Jing, Y. P. 2005, ApJ, 620, 559 Kaiser, N. 1987, MNRAS, 227,
1 Kitaura, F.-S., Rodríguez-Torres, S., Chuang, C.-H., et al. 2016, MNRAS,
456, 4156 Laureijs, R., Amiaux, J., Arduini, S., et al. 2011, arXiv:1110.3193
Leonard, W. O., Slepian, Z., & Hou, J. 2024, arXiv:2402.15510 Maus, M., Chen,
S., White, M., et al. 2024b, arXiv:2404.07312 Maus, M., Lai, Y., Noriega, H.
E., et al. 2024a, arXiv:2404.07272 Meiksin, A., & White, M. J. 1999, MNRAS,
308, 1179 Mergulhão, T., Rubira, H., & Voivodic, R. 2024, JCAP, 01, 008 Mo-
ammed, I., Seljak, U., & Vlah, Z. 2017, MNRAS, 466, 780 Novell-Masot, S.,
Gualdi, D., Gil-Marín, H., & Verde, L. 2023, JCAP, 11, 044 Ota, A., Seo, H.-J.,
Saito, S., & Beutler, F. 2021, PhRvD, 104, 123508 Peacock, J. A., Cole, S., Nor-
berg, P., et al. 2001, Nature, 410, 169 Pearson, D. W., & Samushia, L. 2018,
MNRAS, 478, 4500 Percival, W. J., Friedrich, O., Sellentin, E., & Heavens,
A. 2022, MNRAS, 510, 3207 Percival, W. J., Ross, A. J., Sánchez, A. G., et
al. 2014, MNRAS, 439, 2531 Perko, A., Senatore, L., Jennings, E., & Wechsler,
R. H. 2016, arXiv:1610.09321 Philcox, O. H. E., Eisenstein, D. J., O’Connell,
R., & Wiegand, A. 2020, MNRAS, 491, 3290 Adame, A. G., Aguilar, J., DESI
Collaboration, et al. 2024a, arXiv:2404.03000 Adame, A. G., DESI Collabora-
tion, Aguilar, J., et al. 2024b, arXiv:2404.03002 Alam, S., Ata, M., Bailey, S.,
et al. 2017, MNRAS, 470, 2617 Alam, S., Aubert, M., Avila, S., et al. 2021,
PhRvD, 103, 083533 Philcox, O. H. E., & Ereza, J. 2024, arXiv:2401.09523
Philcox, O. H. E., Hou, J., & Slepian, Z. 2021, arXiv:2108.01670 Philcox, O.
H. E., Ivanov, M. M., Cabass, G., et al. 2022, PhRvD, 106, 043530 Pinon, M.,
de Mattia, A., McDonald, P., et al. 2024, arXiv:2406.04804 Rashkovetskyi, M.,
Eisenstein, D. J., Aguilar, J. N., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 524, 3894 Rashkovetskyi,
M., Forero-Sánchez, D., de Mattia, A., et al. 2024, arXiv:2404.03001 Schlegel,
D. J., Kollmeier, J. A., Aldering, G., et al. 2022, arXiv:2209.04322 Schmitt-
full, M., Feng, Y., Beutler, F., Sherwin, B., & Chu, M. Y. 2015, PhRvD, 92,
123522 Scoccimarro, R., Zaldarriaga, M., & Hui, L. 1999, ApJ, 527, 1 Sefusatti,

E., Crocce, M., Scoccimarro, R., & Couchman, H. 2016, MNRAS, 460, 3624
Seo, H.-J., Beutler, F., Ross, A. J., & Saito, S. 2016, MNRAS, 460, 2453
Shirasaki, M., Sugiyama, N. S., Takahashi, R., & Kitaura, F.-S. 2021, PhRvD, 103, 023506
Smith, R. E. 2009, MNRAS, 400, 851
Spaar, S., & Zhang, P. 2023, arXiv:2312.15164
Sugiyama, N. 2024a, PhRvD, 110, 063528
Sugiyama, N. 2024b, arXiv:2403.18262
Sugiyama, N. 2024c, arXiv:2406.01001
Sugiyama, N. S., Saito, S., Beutler, F., & Seo, H.-J. 2019, MNRAS, 484, 364
Sugiyama, N. S., Saito, S., Beutler, F., & Seo, H.-J. 2020, MNRAS, 497, 1684
Sugiyama, N. S., Yamauchi, D., Kobayashi, T., et al. 2023, MNRAS, 524, 1651
Takada, M., & Hu, W. 2013, PhRvD, 87, 123504
Takada, M., Ellis, R. S., Chiba, M., et al. 2014, PASJ, 66, R1
Taruya, A., Nishimichi, T., & Saito, S. 2010, PhRvD, 82, 063522
Villaescusa-Navarro, F., Hahn, C., Massara, E., et al. 2020, ApJS, 250, 2
Vlah, Z., White, M., & Aviles, A. 2015, JCAP, 09, 014
Wadekar, D., Ivanov, M. M., & Scoccimarro, R. 2020, PhRvD, 102, 123521
Wadekar, D., & Scoccimarro, R. 2020, PhRvD, 102, 123517
Wang, M. S., Beutler, F., & Sugiyama, N. S. 2023, JOSS, 8, 5571
Wang, Y., Zhai, Z., Alavi, A., et al. 2022, ApJ, 928, 1
Wang, Y., Zhao, R., Zhai, Z., et al. 2024a, ApJ, 966, 35
Wang, Y., Zhao, G., Koyama, K., et al. 2024b, CmPhy, 7, 130
White, M. 2015, MNRAS, 450, 3822
Zang, S.-H., & Zhu, H.-M. 2024, ApJ, 961, 160
Zhao, C., Chuang, C.-H., Bautista, J., et al. 2021, MNRAS, 503, 1149
Zhao, R., Mu, X., Gsponer, R., et al. 2024, MNRAS, 532, 783
Zhu, H.-M., Yu, Y., & Pen, U.-L. 2018, PhRvD, 97, 043502

Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.

Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.