Can we trust Type Ia Supernovae as cosmological tools?

Critical analysis and alternative processing of SCP Supernovae data

Clémentine Hauret & Pierre Magain Institute of Astrophysics and Geophysics, University of Liège, Belgium Université de Liège



Scan me for a short presentation video and more informations about this work!

Why should we care?

Current processing to standardize Type Ia Supernovae data produces a significant bias in favour of a particular cosmological model, the flat ACDM model. To reduce this bias, we develop an alternative, model-independent, methodology.

Type la Supernovae as standard candles

Type Ia Supernovae (SNIa) are not perfect standard candles. Thus, to be able to use them as cosmological tools, one has to stan**dardise** them on the basis of their light curve and host galaxy characteristics. Mathematically speaking, one can compute SNIa 'standard candle' **absolute magnitude**, i.e. corrected peak absolute blue magnitude, by



$M_{\text{B,corr}} = M_{\text{B}} - \alpha x_1 + \beta c + \delta P(M_{\text{galaxy}} < 10^{10} \text{ M}_{\odot})$

where $M_{\rm B}$ is the absolute blue magnitude of the SNIa. x_1 , c and P are respectively measurements of SNIa light curve decline rate [Phillips, 1993], SNIa color at maximum [Riess et al., 1996; Tripp, 1998] and probability that the SNIa host galaxy is less massive than 10¹⁰ M_{$_{\odot}} [Kelly et al., 2010; Lampeitl et al., 2010; Conley et al., 2011]. <math>M_{_{\rm B}}$, α , β and δ are thus parameters that must be deter-</sub> mined in order to transform SNIa into genuine standard candles.

Currently : Simultaneous fit

Since 1999, the $M_{\rm B}$, α , β and δ parameters are **not independently calibrated** but are simultaneously fitted with the cosmological model when constructing Hubble diagrams. The data are thus **biased** in favour of the assumed cosmology, i.e. a **flat ACDM model**.

Alternative : Independent calibration

To reduce the bias within SNIa data, the correlation between $M_{\text{B,corr}}$, x_1 , c and P is first calibrated on nearby SNIa in the Hubble flow. This model-independent calibration is then used for SNIa at all redshifts.

Statistical analysis : Evidence of bias through data binning

The bias in SNIa data can be highlighted by a study of the data correlations, illustrated here by analysing the effects of **averaging** the data in a varying number of redshift bins. We use SNIa observations from the Union 2.1 compilation [SCP ; Suzuki et al., 2012] and group them in redshift bins. We then fit SCP best flat ACDM model ($\Omega_{m0} = 0.27 \& H_0 = 70 \text{ km/s/Mpc}$) on these binned data.

1.4	4		46	
	Expect	ed χ^2_{red}	T-	





Cosmological analysis : Evidence of bias through cosmological fits

To quantify the bias in SNIa observations, we fit **different cosmological models** (open, flat and closed) on unbinned SCP data. These models are characterised by three parameters : the present density parameters for matter $\Omega_{m,0}$ and for dark energy $\Omega_{\Lambda,0}$ as well as the Hubble constant H₀, independently optimised for each fit.





$\Omega_{\rm m0} = 0.27 \& \Omega_{\Lambda 0} = 0.73$

References

Phillips, M.M. 1993, ApJ, 413, L105 – *Riess, A.G., Press, W.H. & Kishner, R.P. 1996,* ApJ, 473, 88 – Tripp, R. 1998, A&A, 325, 871 – Kelly, P.L., Hicken, M., Burke, D.L., Mandel, K.S. & Kishner, R.P. 2010, ApJ, 715, 743 – Lampeitl, H., Smith, M., Nichol, R.C., et al. 2010, ApJ, 722, 566 – Conley, A., Guy, J., Sullivan, M., et al. 2011, ApJ, 192, 1 – Suzuki, N., Rubin, D., Lindman, C., et al. 2012, ApJ, 746, 85 – Planck Col*laboration, 2015, ArXiv e-prints [arxiv:1502.01589]*



Confidence regions for different open, flat and closed ACDM cosmological model fits on recalibrated SCP data.



Contact

Clémentine Hauret PhD Student & Assistant Teacher

University of Liège Institute of Astrophysics and Geophysics – OrCA Group 0032 476 38 24 31 – clementine hauret@ulg.ac.be

Scan me to visit my personal web page and have an easy access to my contact details



► on the best cosmological model SCP best model excluded at 1σ

► on **parameters** of the assumed cosmology New best flat model $(\Omega_{m,0} = 0.29)$ compatible with Planck results [Planck Collaboration, 2015]