

THE ANGULAR POWER SPECTRUM OF THE FOUR-YEAR *COBE* DATA

MAX TEGMARK

Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Föhringer Ring 6, D-80805 München, Germany; max@mppmu.mpg.de

Received 1996 January 16; accepted 1996 February 27

ABSTRACT

The angular power spectrum C_ℓ is extracted from the 4 yr *COBE* Differential Microwave Radiometer (DMR) data with a 20° Galactic cut, using the narrowest window functions possible. The average power in eight multipole bands is also computed and plotted together with a compilation of power spectrum measurements from other experiments. The *COBE* results are found to be consistent with an $n = 1$ power spectrum with the normalization $Q_{\text{rms,ps}} = 18 \mu\text{K}$ reported by the *COBE* DMR team. Certain nonstandard cosmologies, such as “small universe” models with nontrivial spatial topology, predict power spectra that are not smooth functions. Rather, they contain bumps and wiggles that may not have been detected by other data analysis techniques such as the Hauser-Peebles method, the band-power method, and orthogonalized spherical harmonics, since these methods all give broader window functions that can smear such features out beyond recognition. On the large angular scales probed by *COBE*, the universe thus appears to be kind to us, presenting a power spectrum that is a simple smooth function.

Subject heading: cosmic microwave background

1. INTRODUCTION

Since their discovery (Smoot et al. 1992), fluctuations in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation have emerged as possibly one of the most promising ways of measuring key cosmological parameters such as the Hubble constant h , the density parameter Ω , the baryon fraction Ω_b , the cosmological constant Λ , etc. As the angular power spectrum of the CMB, usually denoted C_ℓ , depends on about a dozen cosmological parameters (see, e.g., White, Scott, & Silk 1994, Bond 1996, Hu 1995, Steinhardt 1995, or Tegmark 1996b for recent reviews), accurate determination of this power spectrum by future experiments could be used to measure all these parameters simultaneously, with accuracies of a few percent or better (Jungman et al. 1996). Although we are still years away from attaining this goal, which would require mapping the CMB at high resolution over a large fraction of the sky, our knowledge of the power spectrum has been growing steadily over the last few years. The first year of the *COBE* Differential Microwave Radiometer (DMR) data (Smoot et al. 1992) indicated that the power spectrum was approximately scale invariant ($n \sim 1$) on the large angular scales ($\ell \lesssim 30$) to which *COBE* is sensitive, and this conclusion has been confirmed by the FIRS and Tenerife experiments (Ganga et al. 1994; Hancock et al. 1994). Ground- and balloon-based experiments have produced numerous measurements of the fluctuations on degree scales ($\ell \sim 50\text{--}300$), and although the situation is still far from clear, there is now some evidence that the power spectrum is larger in this ℓ -range than on *COBE* scales (e.g., Scott, Silk, & White 1995; Kogut & Hinshaw 1996; Netterfield et al. 1996).

Our knowledge of the power spectrum for $\ell \gtrsim 30$ is still quite limited, since the small patches of sky surveyed at high resolution so far give a large sample variance. On the largest angular scales, however, the situation is much better, since *COBE* has mapped the entire sky. Indeed, the signal-to-noise ratio in the 4 yr *COBE* data (Bennett et al. 1996) is so good that the error bars on the C_ℓ estimates for $\ell \lesssim 10$ are now entirely dominated by cosmic variance. This means that (apart from reducing possible systematic errors and correcting for

residual foreground contamination), these are the best estimates that mankind will ever be able to make of the large-scale power.

In view of this experimental progress, it is clearly worthwhile to estimate the power spectrum from the 4 yr *COBE* data as accurately as possible. This is the purpose of the present Letter.

1.1. Power Spectrum Estimation with Incomplete Sky Coverage

Pioneering work on the problem of power spectrum estimation from experimental data (Peebles 1973; Hauser & Peebles 1973) has recently been extended and applied to the 4 yr *COBE* data (Wright et al. 1996, hereafter W96). When estimating power spectra, it is customary to place both vertical and horizontal error bars on the data points, as in, e.g., Figure 2. The former represent the uncertainty due to noise and sample variance, and the latter reflect the fact that an estimate of C_ℓ inadvertently also receives contributions from other multipole moments. In other words, the estimate of C_ℓ is in fact a weighted average of a band of multipoles. The weights are referred to as the *window function*, and for the estimate of C_ℓ to be a good one, we clearly want the window function to be centered on ℓ with an rms width $\Delta\ell$ that is as small as possible. As is well known, incomplete sky coverage destroys the orthogonality of the spherical harmonics and makes it impossible to attain perfect spectral resolution, $\Delta\ell = 0$. For typical ground- and balloon-based experiments probing degree scales, the relative spectral blurring $\Delta\ell/\ell$ tends to be of order unity, which makes it difficult to resolve details such as the number of Doppler peaks. A much better method is that used in W96, where the relative spectral resolution $\Delta\ell/\ell$ is brought down to the order of 25% by using spherical harmonics. In Tegmark (1996a, hereafter T96), a method was presented for reducing these horizontal error bars still further, down to their theoretical minimum, which for a 20° Galactic cut was seen to be $\Delta\ell \sim 1$.

1.2. The Importance of High Spectral Resolution

Just as high spectral resolution is crucial in, for instance, absorption-line studies (since it prevents interesting features from getting smeared out), it is also important when measuring the CMB power spectrum. The reason is that we cannot a priori assume that the power spectrum will be a simple smooth function. Indeed, there are nonstandard cosmologies, such as “small universe” models with nontrivial spatial topology, that predict power spectra which on average have an $n \sim 1$ slope but contain bumps and wiggles that can only be resolved with a high spectral resolution (Stevens, Scott, & Silk 1993; de Oliveira-Costa & Smoot 1995). In addition, lowering the spectral resolution degrades information: broad window functions make the estimates of nearby multipoles highly correlated, so that the resulting power spectrum plot will contain fewer independent data points than one may naively expect.

The remainder of this Letter is organized as follows. In § 2, the 4 yr *COBE* data set is analyzed. In § 3, the results are discussed and compared with those obtained with other methods such as the orthogonalized spherical harmonic method of Górski (1994, hereafter G94) and the signal-to-noise eigenmode methods of Bond (1995, hereafter B95) and Bunn & Sugiyama (1995, hereafter BS95).

2. RESULTS

2.1. The Method

How to extract the angular power spectrum from a CMB map with maximum spectral resolution has been described in detail in T96. We will apply this method to the 4 yr data here exactly as it was applied to the 2 yr *COBE* data in T96. Below we give merely a brief review of how the method works, referring the interested reader to T96 for technical details.

A simple estimate of the multipole C_ℓ is obtained by taking a linear combination of all pixels, squaring it, and subtracting off the expected noise contribution. The weights in the linear combination are conveniently plotted as a sky map in the same way that we plot the data, and we usually refer to the set of weights as a *weight function*. It is easy to show that the expectation value of such an estimate is a linear combination of all the true multipoles. The coefficients in this linear combination are called the *window function*, a function of ℓ (see the examples in Fig. 4). In other words, given any weight function, there is a corresponding window function. The window function turns out to be simply the square of the spherical harmonic coefficients of the weight function, summed over m .

In the Hauser-Peebles method, the weight functions are chosen to be the spherical harmonics, but set equal to zero inside the Galaxy cut and appropriately rescaled. A number of other weight functions have been employed in CMB analyses, for instance the orthogonalized spherical harmonics of G94 and the signal-to-noise eigenfunctions of B95 and BS95 (these functions were tailor-made for the problem of efficient parameter estimation with likelihood analysis, not for power spectrum estimation). The method of T96 simply employs those weight functions that give the *narrowest window functions possible*, and it is shown that these functions can be found by solving a certain eigenvalue problem numerically. In the simplest version of the method (the version we use here—it has $\gamma = 0$ as in T96), these functions are completely indepen-




FIG. 1.—Power spectrum observed by *COBE*. The observed multipoles $D_\ell = \ell(\ell + 1)C_\ell$ are plotted with 1σ error bars. The vertical error bars include both pixel noise and cosmic variance, and the horizontal bars show the width of the window functions used. If the true power spectrum is given by $n = 1$ and $Q_{\text{rms,ps}} = 18.4 \mu\text{K}$ (heavy horizontal line), then the shaded region gives the 1σ error bars and the dark-shaded region shows the contribution from cosmic variance.

dent of any prior assumptions about the power spectrum, and are hence determined by the geometry of the Galaxy cut alone.

What are these weight functions like? A sample weight function is plotted in T96 together with the corresponding spherical harmonic, and it is seen that they look quite similar far away from the Galactic cut. The main difference is that the optimal weight functions approach zero smoothly at the edge, whereas a truncated spherical harmonic does not. As is discussed in further detail in T96, this absence of sharp edges in the weight functions is a key feature of the method, since sharp edges cause “ringing” in Fourier space (in the multipole domain), which corresponds to an unnecessarily wide window function.

To reduce error bars, a multipole is estimated as a weighted average of estimates of the above-mentioned simple type, just as in the Hauser-Peebles method where C_ℓ is estimated by an average of the square amplitudes of the $(2\ell + 1)$ different spherical harmonic coefficients.

2.2. The Data

The 53 and 90 GHz channels (A and B) of the *COBE* DMR 4 yr data were combined into a single sky map by the standard minimum-variance weighting, pixel by pixel. We use the data set that was pixelized in Galactic coordinates. After removing all pixels less than 20° away from the Galactic plane, 4016 pixels remain. As has become standard, we make no attempts to subtract Galactic contamination outside the cut.

The resulting power spectrum is shown in Figure 1. A brute force likelihood analysis of the 4 yr data set (Hinshaw et al. 1996) gives a best-fit normalization of $Q_{\text{rms,ps}} = 18.4 \mu\text{K}$ for a simple $n = 1$ model,¹ corresponding to the heavy horizontal line in the figure. If this model were correct, we would expect approximately 68% of the data points to fall within the shaded

¹ By this we mean an $n = 1$ model including only the Sachs-Wolfe effect, so that $C_\ell \propto 1/(\ell + 1)$. Note that the slow rise toward the first Doppler peak in an $n = 1$ CDM model gives a best-fit Sachs-Wolfe spectrum with $n \sim 1.15$, whereas $n = 1$ models with spatial curvature or cosmological constant can give best-fit Sachs-Wolfe spectra with $n < 1$.




FIG. 2.—Power spectrum measurements. The observed multipoles $D_\ell = \ell(\ell + 1)C_\ell$ are plotted for a selection of experiments. Both vertical and horizontal bars have the same meaning as in Fig. 1. The COBE data are those of Fig. 1, averaged over 8 multipole bands, and the rest are from the Saskatoon experiment (Netterfield et al. 1996), and from the compilation of Scott et al. (1995).

1 σ error region. As can be seen, the height of this region (the size of the vertical error bars) is dominated by cosmic variance for low ℓ and by noise for large ℓ . At the cost of increasing $\Delta\ell$, the variance can of course be reduced further by grouping multipoles together in bands and averaging them with minimum-variance weighting, as shown in Figures 2 and 3 and in Table 1. We have followed W96 and chosen the eight multipole bands 2, 3, 4, 5–6, 7–9, 10–13, 14–19, and 20–30.

2.3. The Window Functions

The horizontal bars in Figure 1 are seen to be fairly independent of ℓ , just as expected—as discussed in detail in T96, the angular size of the two sky patches surviving the Galaxy cut is $\Delta\theta \sim 1$ radian, and we expect $\Delta\ell \sim 1/\Delta\theta \sim 1$. A




FIG. 3.—Power spectrum models. The data points from Fig. 2 with the narrowest window functions (COBE and Saskatoon) are compared with the predictions from four variants of the standard CDM model from Sugiyama (1995), all with $n = 1$ and $\Omega_b = 0.05$. From top to bottom at $\ell = 200$, they are a flat model with $\Lambda = 0.7$, a model with $h = 0.3$, the standard $h = 0.5$ model, and a model with a reionization optical depth $\tau \sim 2$.

TABLE 1

THE COBE POWER SPECTRUM $\delta T = [\ell(\ell + 1)C_\ell/2\pi]^{1/2}$ IN μK

Band	$\langle\ell\rangle$	$\Delta\ell$	δT	-1σ	$+1\sigma$
1.....	2.31	0.89	9.6	0.0	22.6
2.....	3.45	1.06	25.4	15.7	32.3
3.....	4.38	1.26	27.5	20.7	32.9
4.....	5.87	1.43	28.1	24.0	31.7
5.....	8.34	1.62	25.9	22.1	29.3
6.....	11.9	1.82	22.3	17.8	26.1
7.....	17.0	2.26	30.4	25.3	34.7
8.....	25.6	3.49	31.8	0.0	48.6

typical window function is shown in Figure 4 and exhibits the following features that are common to all our window functions.

1. For even ℓ , the window function vanishes for all odd multipoles, and vice versa. This happens because the Galactic cut is symmetric about the Galactic plane, and thus preserves the orthogonality between even and odd spherical harmonics, since they have opposite parity.
2. The window function is for all practical purposes zero for multipoles below $\ell - 2$ and above $\ell + 2$.
3. The central value is typically about 3 times as high as the two sidelobes.

The multipole $D_\ell \equiv \ell(\ell + 1)C_\ell$ is thus typically estimated by something like $0.6D_\ell + 0.2D_{\ell-2} + 0.2D_{\ell+2}$. This corresponds to all data points in Figure 1 being uncorrelated, with the exception that points separated by $\Delta\ell = 2$ have a correlation of order 55% and points separated by $\Delta\ell = 4$ have a correlation of order 9%. Note that neighboring points are completely uncorrelated.

3. DISCUSSION

We have computed the angular power spectrum of the 4 year COBE DMR data using the maximum resolution method of T96. The signal-to-noise ratio in the data is now so high that the error bars for $\ell \lesssim 10$ are entirely dominated by cosmic variance. This means that, apart from future corrections due to better modeling of foregrounds and systematics,




FIG. 4.—Window functions before and after optimization. Two window functions for estimation of the multipole $\ell = 20$, $m = 0$ are shown. The upper one is that of the spherical harmonic method (W96), which exhibits a strong leakage from lower multipoles such as the quadrupole. The lower one is the one resulting from the optimal method.

this is close to the best measurement of the low multipoles that mankind will ever be able to make, since cosmic variance could only be reduced by measurements in a different horizon volume.

The power spectrum in Figure 1 is seen to be consistent with an $n = 1$, $Q_{\text{rms, ps}} = 18.4 \mu\text{K}$ model. This model is close to the best-fit models found in the various two-parameter Bayesian likelihood analyses (e.g., Hinshaw et al. 1996; Górski et al. 1996; W96), which we can interpret as the best-fit straight line through the data points in Figure 1 being close to the horizontal heavy line. As has frequently been pointed out (see, e.g., White & Bunn 1995), Bayesian methods by their very nature can only make *relative* statements of merit about different models, and never address the question of whether the best-fit model itself is in fact inconsistent with the data. As an absurd example, the best-fit straight line to a parabola on the interval $[-1, 1]$ is horizontal, even though this is a terrible fit to the data. It is thus quite reassuring that the power spectrum in Figure 1 not only has the right average normalization and slope, but that each and every one of the multipoles appears to be consistent with this standard best-fit model.²

3.1. Comparison with Other Results

A number of other linear techniques for CMB analysis have recently been applied to the *COBE* data. Both the orthogonalized spherical harmonics method (G94), the Karhunen-Loève (KL) signal-to-noise eigenmode method (B95; BS95), and the brute force method (Tegmark & Bunn 1995; Hinshaw et al. 1996) were devised to solve a different problem than the one addressed here. If one is willing to parameterize the power spectrum by a small number of parameters—for instance, a spectral index and an amplitude—then these methods provide an efficient way of estimating these parameters via a likelihood analysis. Why cannot the basis functions of these methods be used to estimate the angular power spectrum C_ℓ directly, as they are after all orthogonal over the Galaxy-cut sky? The answer is that these basis functions are orthogonal to *each other*, whereas in our context, we want them to be as orthogonal as possible not to each other but to the *spherical harmonics*. This is illustrated in Figure 4, which contrasts $\ell = 20$ window functions of the optimal method and the generalized Hauser-Peebles method (W96; de Oliveira-Costa & Smoot 1995). We want the window function to be centered

² Kogut et al. (1996) find that correcting for Galactic foreground emission increases the value of the CMB quadrupole, making it consistent with the best-fit power spectrum.

on $\ell = 20$ and be as narrow as possible, so the lower one is clearly preferable. The upper weight function is seen to couple strongly to many of the lower multipoles and picks up a contribution from the quadrupole that is even greater than that from $\ell = 20$. This, of course, renders it inappropriate for estimating the power at $\ell = 20$. Analogous window functions can readily be computed for the orthogonalized spherical harmonics of G94 or the signal-to-noise eigenmodes of B95 and BS95. They are also broader than the optimal one in Figure 4—the optimal weight functions, of course, give narrower window functions than other basis functions *by definition*, since they were defined as those functions that give the narrowest window functions possible.

It should be emphasized that generating such window functions for the basis functions of G94, B95, and BS95 would be quite an unfair criticism of these methods, since this would be grading them with respect to a property that they were not designed to have. These authors have never claimed that their basis functions were optimal for multipole estimation, merely (and rightly so) that they were virtually optimal for parameter fitting with a likelihood analysis.

The power spectrum of Figure 1 is also consistent with that extracted in W96 using the Hauser-Peebles method. At low ℓ , the individual multipole estimates agree well with each other. As ℓ increases, the spectral resolution $\Delta\ell$ of the Hauser-Peebles method grows approximately linearly (see T96), whereas the resolution in Figure 1 is seen to more or less remain constant. Thus, the data points in W96 begin to differ from those in Figure 1 at larger ℓ , since the former are no longer probing individual multipoles but weighted averages of a broad range.

In summary, the 4 yr *COBE* data have measured the power spectrum for $\ell \lesssim 15$ with an accuracy approaching the cosmic variance limit. As the next generation of CMB experiments extend this success to smaller angular scales, the CMB may turn out to be one of the most potent arbiters between cosmological models.

The author wishes to thank Angélica de Oliveira-Costa, Krystof Górski, Ned Wright, and an anonymous referee for helpful comments on the manuscript. This work was partially supported by European Union contract CHRX-CT93-0120 and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft grant SFB-375. The *COBE* data sets were developed by the NASA Goddard Space Flight Center under the guidance of the *COBE* Science Working Group and were provided by the NSSDC.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, C. L., et al. 1996, ApJ, 464, L1
 Bond, J. R. 1995, in *Cosmology and Large-Scale Structure*, ed. R. Schaeffer (Amsterdam: Elsevier)
 ———, 1996, Phys. Rev. Lett., 74, 4369 (B95)
 Bunn, E. F., & Sugiyama, N. 1995, ApJ, 446, 49 (BS95)
 de Oliveira-Costa, A., & Smoot, G. F. 1995, ApJ, 448, 477
 Ganga, K., Page, L., Cheng, E., & Meyer, S. 1994, ApJ, 432, L15
 Górski, K. M. 1994, ApJ, 430, L85 (G94)
 Górski, K. M., Banday, A. J., Bennett, C. L., Hinshaw, G., Kogut, A., Smoot, G. F., & Wright, E. L. 1996, ApJ, 464, L11
 Hancock, S., et al. 1994, Nature, 367, 333
 Hauser, M. G., & Peebles, P. J. E. 1973, ApJ, 185, 757
 Hinshaw, G., Banday, A. J., Bennett, C. L., Górski, K. M., Kogut, A., Smoot, G. F., & Wright, E. L. 1996, ApJ, 464, L17
 Hu, W. 1995, in *The Universe at High-z*, ed. E. Martínez-González & J. L. Sanz (Springer), in press
 Jungman, G., Kamionkowski, M., Kosowsky, A., & Spergel, D. N. 1996, preprint astro-ph/9512139
 Kogut, A., Hinshaw, G., Banday, A. J., Bennett, C. L., Górski, K. M., Smoot, G. F., & Wright, E. L. 1996, ApJ, 464, L5
 Kogut, A., & Hinshaw, G. 1996, ApJ, 464, L39
 Netterfield, C. B., Devlin, M. J., Jarosik, N., Page, L., & Wollack, E. J. 1996, ApJ, submitted
 Peebles, P. J. E. 1973, ApJ, 185, 413
 Scott, D., Silk, J., & White, M. 1995, Science, 268, 829
 Smoot, G. F., et al. 1992, ApJ, 396, L1
 Steinhardt, P. S. 1995, preprint astro-ph/9502024
 Stevens, D., Scott, D., & Silk, J. 1993, Phys. Rev. Lett., 71, 20
 Sugiyama, N. 1995, ApJS, 100, 281
 Tegmark, M. 1996a, MNRAS, 280, 299 (T96)
 ———, 1996b, in *Proc. Enrico Fermi, Course CXXXII, Varenna*, ed. S. Bonometto & J. Primack (Amsterdam: IOS)
 Tegmark, M., & Bunn, E. F. 1995, ApJ, 455, 1
 White, M., & Bunn, E. F. 1995, ApJ, 450, 477
 White, M., Scott, D., & Silk, J. 1994, ARA&A, 32, 319
 Wright, E. L., Bennett, C. L., Górski, K., Hinshaw, G., & Smoot, G. F. 1996, ApJ Lett., 464, L21