# Where should we be looking post DESI/LSST

Anže Slosar

Chicago Future Surveys





#### Introduction

- Parameters will be constrained to some very high precision after CMB S4 + DESI + LSST, but there is more information
- Getting further is hard, both statistically and systematically
- So where should we be looking?
- Two basic ways in which experiments can be complementary:
  - observing the same fields and "cross-correlate"
  - ▶ observing independently, but with different parameter degeneracy directions ← this talk

## Sharing modes



### Parameter degeneracies

- Some degeneracies easy to understand, some are somewhat counter-intuitive.
- Perhaps easiest to take a "fake experiment" driven approach:
  - ▶ given Fisher matrix for CMB-S4 + X, generate cosmological models
  - for each model make prediction for *observables* for possible future observations
  - if the spread correlates with a parameter of interest, meauring that observable at the sufficient precision will lower that parameter error
- An example . . .

 $m_{\nu}, S_{4}$ 



#### Input Fisher matrices

- Got three Fisher matrices for CMB S4:
  - $\Lambda \text{CDM} + \sum m_{\nu}$  from Joel Meyers
  - ACDM  $+ \sum m_{
    u} + N_{
    m eff}$  from Joel Meyers
  - ► wACDM from Alessandro Manzotti
- ▶ S4 assumes "1  $\mu$ K-arcmin, 1 arcmin beam,  $f_{\rm sky} = 0.4$ , with Planck high-ell data on an additional 20% of the sky, and an error of .01 on tau from the low-ell Planck data"
- ▶ S4 utilizes primary  $C_{\ell}$  is temperature (to  $\ell = 3000$ ) and polarization (to  $\ell = 5000$ ) and 4-point lensing reconstruction
- DESI based off Pat McDonald's code, assumes whatever is the latest
- LSST based off Pat McDonald and is for LSS and WL only
- For each combination, I drew 1000 models, so extremes are reaching 3-sigma tails
- Last plots were done this morning, so scope for errors is above average...

 $m_{\nu}, S4$ 



 $m_{\nu}, S_4 + LSST$ 











 $m_{\nu}, S_{4}+DESI$ 



 $m_{\nu}, S_4 + LSST + DESI$ 











 $N_{\rm eff}, S_4$ 







 $N_{\rm eff}, S_4 + LSST$ 







 $N_{\rm eff}, S_4 + DESI$ 













 $N_{\rm eff}, S_4 + LSST + DESI$ 









w (no  $\nu$ !), S4+DESI







 $n_s, S_4 + DESI + LSST$ 











## Other parameters

- Inflationary n<sub>s</sub>, α<sub>s</sub>: small-scale measurements of linear power spetrum, e.g. from Lyman-α forest could help, but not in general
- non-Gaussianity: in cross-correlations, potentially huge opportunities of exploiting Dalal effect sans systematics, but no direct degeneracy breaking
- ► tensor modes: claims in the literature that 21-cm could do very well  $(r \sim 10^{-9} \text{ Book}, \text{ Kamionkowski and Schmidt})$

### Conclusions

- It is 2025, deep inside S4+DESI+LSST, you can do one thing before you die, what do you do?
- For  $m_{\nu}$ :
  - Measure  $\sigma_8$  to sub-percent precision or  $f\sigma_8$  to percent precision
  - Measure Hubble parameter to sub-percent precision
  - Measure low- $z D_a$  to sub-percent precision
  - $\blacktriangleright$  BAO parameters don't add much,  $\tau$  surprisingly doesn't add much
- For  $N_{\rm eff}$ :
  - Measure slope of the power spectrum to sub-percent precision
  - Measure BAO parameters at subpercent precision, H<sub>0</sub> would also help
  - $\tau$  helps marginally
- Basic survey observables, BAO and RSD, still seem to have a long way to go in terms of helping others achieve their dreams
- $f\sigma_8$  and  $\sigma_8$  about equally useful which is easier to measure?
- Power spectrum shape is really just one-parameter