

The power spectrum in a strongly inhomogeneous Universe

Francesco Sylos Labini^(1,2) and Luca Amendola⁽³⁾

⁽¹⁾ Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Bologna, Italy

⁽²⁾ Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma “La Sapienza”

P.le A. Moro 2, I-00185 Roma, Italy.

⁽³⁾ Osservatorio Astronomico di Roma, Viale del Parco Mellini 84, I-00136 Roma, Italy

Abstract

A crucial issue in cosmology is the determination of the fluctuation power spectrum. The standard picture of the matter clustering, the Cold Dark Matter model (and its variant), assumes that, on scales smaller than a certain “flattening scale” λ_f , the power spectrum increases with the scale, while on much larger scales it decreases so to match the tiny fluctuations observed in the microwave background. The standard picture also assumes that, once a statistically homogeneous sample is reached, the power spectrum amplitude is fixed, and any major variation should be attributed to luminosity segregation. However, the determination of λ_f and of the absolute amplitude, if any, is still matter of debate. In particular, there is no consensus on whether the turnaround has been detected or not, and on the actual importance of the luminosity segregation effect. We show that, due to the finiteness of the sample the standard analysis of self-similar (fractal) distributions yields a turnaround for scales close to the survey scale, and a systematic amplitude shift with the survey scale. We point out that both features, bending and scaling, are in agreement with recent determination of the power spectrum, in particular with the CfA2 spectrum. We remark that the standard power spectrum is not a well defined statistical tool to characterize the galaxy distribution when a homogeneity scale has not been reached. In order to perform an analysis that does not imply any a priori assumption one should study the PS of the density, rather than the PS of the density contrast.

Subject headings: galaxies: clustering – galaxies: distances and redshifts

1 Introduction

Identifying the scale at which our Universe becomes homogeneous, if any, is a crucial task of contemporary cosmology. There's no doubt that the assumption of homogeneity worked pretty well so far; the theoretical expectations concerning the primordial nucleosynthesis and the microwave background, for instance, are nicely confirmed by most, if not all, observations, and it would be an extremely difficult job to invent a radically alternative model able to share the same level of experimental support. However, when we come to consider the homogeneity of the luminous matter at the present, the situation becomes much less clear. (We refer the reader to Baryshev *et al.*1994 for a review of the recent experimental data and for a discussion of some ideas on alternative cosmological models.) Essentially all the currently elaborated models of galaxy formation assume large scale homogeneity and predict that the galaxy power spectrum (PS), that is the power spectrum of the density contrast, decreases both toward small scales and toward large scales, with a turnaround somewhere in the middle, at a scale λ_f that can be taken as separating “small” from “large” scales. This picture assumes the existence of a homogeneity scale $\lambda_h > \lambda_f$, defined as the scale at which the average density becomes constant. Then, because of the assumption of homogeneity, the power spectrum amplitude should be independent of the survey scale, any residual variation being attributed to luminosity bias (or to the fact that the survey scale has not yet reached the homogeneity scale). Most variations on the theme, as the inclusion of hot dark matter, or a cosmological constant, and so on, simply push λ_f somewhat to larger values, but do not qualitatively change the scenario. However, the crucial clue to this picture, the firm determination of the scale λ_f , is still missing, although some surveys do indeed produce a turnaround scale around $100 h^{-1} Mpc$ (Baugh & Efstathiou 1992; Feldman *et al.*1994). Recently, the CfA2 survey analyzed by Park *et al.*(1994; PVGH) (and confirmed by SSRS2 - Da Costa *et al.*(1994, DVGHP)), showed a $n = -2$ slope up to $\sim 30 h^{-1} Mpc$, a milder $n \approx -1$ slope up to $200 h^{-1} Mpc$, and some tentative indication of flattening on even larger scales. They also find that deeper subsamples have higher power amplitude, i.e. that the amplitude scales with the sample depth.

In this paper we argue that both features, bending and scaling, are a manifestation of the finiteness of the survey volume, and that they cannot be interpreted as the convergence to homogeneity, nor to a power spectrum flattening. The systematic effect of the survey finite size is in fact to suppress power at large scale, mimicking a real flattening. Clearly, this effect occurs whenever galaxies have a large correlation scale, with respect to the survey, and it has often been studied in the context of standard scenarios (Itoh *et al.*1992; Colombi *et al.*1994). We push this argument further, by showing that even a fractal distribution of matter, i.e. a distribution which never reaches homogeneity, shows a sharp flattening. Such a flattening is partially corrected, but not quite eliminated, when the correction proposed by Peacock & Nicholson (1991) is applied to the data. We show also how the amplitude of the power spectrum depends on the survey

different scales to the galaxy density contrast $\delta\rho/\rho$. It is clear that the density contrast, and all the quantities based on it, is meaningful only when one can define a constant density, i.e. reliably identify the sample density with the average density of all the Universe. When this is not true, and we argue that is indeed an incorrect assumption in all the cases investigated so far, a false interpretation of the results may occur, since both the shape and the amplitude of the power spectrum depend on the survey size. Indeed, in the case of fractal structures the average density is not a well defined quantity, because it depends on the sample depth, as Coleman & Pietronero (1992, hereafter CP92) have shown for the CfA1 redshift survey (see also Borgani 1995). We stress that a sample that contains a portion of a fractal distribution is a statistically fair sample, even being not homogeneous. While we focus here on the power spectrum it is clear that in a general discussion of fractal versus homogeneity one should consider many other observational effects. To this aim we refer the reader to CP92, Baryshev et al., 1994, and Sylos Labini et al., 1995.

In Sec. 2 we recall the basic formulas of the SPS analysis (Peebles 1980), and we apply them to the case of a fractal distribution. Then we show that an analysis independent of the average density is better suited to the description of the clustering when the distribution is not homogeneous; in the case of a fractal, this scale-independent power spectrum does not display any flattening, and its amplitude does not scale with the sample size. Of course it gives the same results of the SPS at the scales where the distribution is homogeneous. In Sec. 3 we show that the results of the CfA2 analysis are in agreement with our predictions in the case of a fractal distribution. Our conclusion, sketched in the final section, is that this analysis supports the fractal nature of the CfA2 sample up to the survey scale, pushing the spectrum turnaround, and consequently the homogeneity scale, longward of $200 h^{-1}Mpc$.

2 The power spectrum of a fractal distribution

Let us recall the basic notation of the power spectrum analysis. Following Peebles (1980) we imagine that the Universe is periodic in a volume V_u , with V_u much larger than the (assumed) maximum correlation length. The survey volume $V \in V_u$ contains N galaxies at positions $\vec{r}_i$, and the galaxy density contrast is $\delta(\vec{r}) = [n(\vec{r})/\hat{n}] - 1$ where it is assumed that exists a well defined constant density $\hat{n}$, obtained averaging over a sufficiently large scale. The density function can be described by a sum of delta functions: $n(\vec{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \delta^{(3)}(\vec{r} - \vec{r}_i)$. Expanding the density contrast in its Fourier components we have

$$\delta_{\vec{k}} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j \in V} e^{i\vec{k}\vec{r}_j} - W(\vec{k}), \quad (2.1)$$

where $W(\vec{k}) = V^{-1} \int d\vec{r} W(\vec{r}) e^{i\vec{k}\vec{r}}$ is the Fourier transform of the survey window $W(\vec{r})$, defined to be unity inside the survey region, and zero outside. If $\xi(\vec{r})$ is the correlation function of the galaxies, $(\xi(\vec{r}) = \langle n(\vec{r})n(0) \rangle / \hat{n}^2 - 1)$ the true PS $P(\vec{k})$ is defined as

be simplified to

$$P(k) = 4\pi \int \xi(r) \frac{\sin(kr)}{kr} r^2 dr. \quad (2.2)$$

The variance of $\delta_{\vec{k}}$ is (Peebles 1980) $\langle |\delta_{\vec{k}}|^2 \rangle = N^{-1} + V^{-1} \tilde{P}(\vec{k})$. The first term is the usual additional shot noise term while the second is the true PS convolved with a window function that describe the geometry of the sample

$$\tilde{P}(\vec{k}) = \frac{V}{(2\pi)^3} \int \langle |\delta_{\vec{k}}|^2 \rangle |W(\vec{k} - \vec{k}')|^2 d^3 \vec{k}'. \quad (2.3)$$

We apply now this standard analysis to a fractal distribution. In a self-similar system the number of points inside a certain radius r scales according to the mass-length relation (Mandelbrot 1982) $N(r) = Br^D$, with $D < 3$ (the case $D = 3$ corresponds to the homogenous distribution) and the constant B is related to the lower cut-offs. The average density for a spherical sample of radius R_s is therefore $\hat{n} = N(R_s)/V(R_s) = (3/4\pi)BR_s^{-(3-D)}$. It is simple to calculate the expression of the $\xi(r)$ in this case (CP92)

$$\xi(r) = [(3 - \gamma)/3](r/R_s)^{-\gamma} - 1, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\gamma = 3 - D$. Notice that the volume integral of $\xi(r)$ over the sphere is bound to vanish, since $\hat{n}$ is calculated from the data themselves. This implies “anticorrelation” for r close to R_s . On scales larger than R_s the $\xi(r)$ cannot be calculated without making assumptions on the distribution outside the sampling volume (in particular, assumption of homogeneity), which is just what we want to avoid. When the survey volume is not spherical, the scale R_s is of the order of the largest sphere completely contained inside the survey. Since in a fractal the average density depends on the scale, quantities like $\xi(r)$ are also scale dependent. From the Eq. (2.4) it follows that for a fractal: i) the so-called correlation length r_0 (defined as $\xi(r_0) = 1$) is a linear function of the (spherical) sample size R_s : $r_0 = [(3 - \gamma)/6]^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} R_s$. A linear dependence of r_0 on the sample size R_s has indeed been found in the whole CfA(1) sample (CP92); ii) $\xi(r)$ is power law only for $[(3 - \gamma)/3](r/R_s)^{-\gamma} \gg 1$, hence for $r \leq r_0$; for larger distances there is a clear deviation from a power law behaviour. Both the amplitude and the shape of $\xi(r)$ are therefore scale-dependent in the case of a fractal distribution. It is clear that the same kind of finite size effects are also present when computing the SPS.

The SPS for a model described by Eq. (2.4) inside a sphere of radius R_s is

$$P(k) = \int_0^{R_s} 4\pi \frac{\sin(kr)}{kr} \left[\frac{3 - \gamma}{3} \left(\frac{r}{R_s} \right)^{-\gamma} - 1 \right] r^2 dr = \frac{a(k, R_s) R_s^{3-D}}{k^D} - \frac{b(k, R_s)}{k^3}. \quad (2.5)$$

Notice that the integral has to be evaluated inside R_s because we want to compare $P(k)$ with its *estimation* in a finite size spherical survey of scale R_s . In the general case, we must deconvolve the window contribution from $P(k)$; R_s is then a characteristic window scale. Eq. (2.5) shows the two scale-dependent features of the PS. First, the amplitude of the PS depends on the sample size. Secondly, the shape of the PS is determined

dimension of the distribution in real space, while the second one arises only because of the finiteness of the sample.

In the case of $D = 2$ in eq.2.5 one has: $a = \frac{4\pi}{3}(2 + \cos(kR_s))$, and $b = 4\pi \sin(kR_s)$. The PS is then a power-law with exponent -2 at high wavenumbers, it flattens at low wavenumbers and reaches a maximum at $k \approx 4.3/R_s$, i.e. at a scale $\lambda \approx 1.45R_s$. The scale at which the transition occurs is thus related to the sample depth. In a real survey, things are complicated by the window function, so that the flattening (and the turnaround) scale can only be determined numerically. We study this behaviour in detail in Sec. 3.

As we have seen, the analysis of a distribution on scales at which homogeneity is not reached must avoid the normalization through the mean density, if the goal is to produce results which are not related to the sample size, and thus misleading. To this aim, now we consider the scale-independent PS (SIPS) of the density $\rho(\vec{r})$, a quantity that does not involve the computation of the average density, and thus gives an unambiguous information of the statistical properties of the system. We first introduce the density correlation function $G(\vec{r}) = \langle \rho(\vec{x} + \vec{r})\rho(\vec{x}) \rangle = Ar^{-(3-D)}$, where the last equality holds in the case of a fractal distribution with dimension D , and where A is a constant determined by the lower cut-offs of the distribution (CP92). Defining the SIPS as the Fourier conjugate of the correlation function $G(r)$, one obtains that in a finite spherical volume $\Pi(k) \sim A'k^{-D}$, (where $A' = 4\pi(1 - \cos(kR_s))$ if $D = 2$) so that the SIPS is a single power law extending all over the system size, without amplitude scaling with the sample size (except for $kR_s \ll 1$). In analogy to the procedure above, we consider the Fourier transform of the density $\rho_{\vec{k}} = V^{-1} \sum_{j \in V} e^{-i\vec{k}\vec{x}_j}$, and its variance $\langle |\rho_{\vec{k}}|^2 \rangle = V^{-1}\tilde{\Pi}(\vec{k}) + N^{-1}$, where $\tilde{\Pi}(\vec{k})$ is the same as in Eq. (2.3), with $\langle |\rho_{\vec{k}}|^2 \rangle$ instead of $\langle |\delta_{\vec{k}}|^2 \rangle$.

3 Tests on artificial distributions

To study in detail the finite size effects in the determinations of the PS we have performed some tests on artificial distributions with a priori assigned properties. We distribute the sample in a cubic volume V_u . We determine $P(k)$ ($\Pi(k)$) defined as the directionally averaged $P(\vec{k})$ ($\Pi(\vec{k})$). In practice the spatial coverage for any survey is incomplete in solid angle and /or in depth; this requires the introduction of a window function $W(\vec{x})$ that is unity inside the survey region and vanishes outside. Following PVGH, the estimate of the noise-subtracted PS given in Eq. (2.3) for a strongly peaked window function is

$$P(\vec{k}) = \left(\langle |\delta_k|^2 \rangle - \frac{1}{N} \right) \left(\sum_{\vec{k}} |W_{\vec{k}}|^2 \right)^{-1} (1 - |W_{\vec{k}}|^2)^{-1}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\hat{\delta}_k$ and $W(\vec{x})$ are defined in Sec. 2. For the lowest wavenumbers the power spectrum estimator (3.1) is not acceptable, because then the window filter flattens sensibly (see e.g. PVGH). The factor $(1 - |W_{\vec{k}}|^2)^{-1}$ has been introduced by Peacock & Nicholson (1991) as a correction to the noise-subtraction of the sample density.

the power spectrum is flat on very large scales, which is just the feature we are testing for. PVGH actually correct their results by comparing them to the power spectra of N -body simulations; their conclusion is that the power spectrum correction is a procedure reliable for wavelengths smaller than $\sim 200h^{-1}Mpc$. We show below that all the features of CfA2, and most importantly the flattening and the amplitude scaling, are easily accounted for by a distribution which is fractal up to the sample size.

We have generated $D \approx 2$ fractal distributions with the random β -model algorithm (Benzi et al. 1984). Then we have constructed artificial volume limited catalogs with roughly the same geometry of the CfA2 survey. We have computed the quantity $P(k)$ from Eq. (3.1) averaging over 50 random observers (located on one of the particles) for each realization. In Fig. 1 it is shown the $P(k)$ vs. the scale $2\pi/k$ with and without the correction factor, for some different survey scales R_s , together with the angle-averaged window power spectrum $|W_k|^2$. The slope of the PS at high wavenumbers is $\approx -D$ in agreement with Eq.2.5. As anticipated, the flattening at low wavenumbers is here completely spurious, i.e. it is due to the finite volume effects on the statistical analysis performed. In fact, comparing the PS at the various sample scales, one can see that the flattening of the PS occurs always near the boundary of the sample. The turnaround scale roughly follows the relation $\lambda = 1.5R_s$ found in Sec. 2. Notice that the PS starts flattening before the window spectrum flattens; as in PVGH, the change in slope occurs for $|W_k|^2 < 0.2$, value that they assumed as preliminary condition for the estimator (3.1) to be valid. The amplitude of the power spectrum scales according to eq.2.5 In Fig. 2 it is shown the behaviour of $\Pi(k)$ computed from Eq. (3.1) with $\langle |\rho_k|^2 \rangle$ in place of $\langle |\delta_k|^2 \rangle$ and without the Peacock-Nicholson correction: as predicted in the previous section, its amplitude does not scale with the sample size and it is characterized by a single power law behaviour, up to very large scales (where the two terms in the factor A' of $\Pi(k)$ are comparable). Finally, in Fig. 3 we compare directly the PS of our artificial catalogs with the PS of the CfA2 subsamples obtained generating two volume limited subsamples at 130 and 101 $h^{-1}Mpc$ (PVGH). The physical scale has been computed matching the CfA2-101 galaxy average density. Both the shapes and the amplitudes are compatible with a fractal distribution. As it can be seen, for CfA2-101 the agreement is excellent; for CfA2-130 the two curves are compatible inside the errors.

4 Discussion and conclusions

We have analyzed the PS of the galaxy density contrast in artificial fractal distributions with the same technique used for real redshift surveys (Peacock & Nicholson 1991; Fisher et al. 1993; PVGH; DVGHP). As we have shown, the standard analysis on a pure fractal would lead to the conclusions that the fractal distribution has a spectrum approximated by two power laws, that a turnaround occurs on the largest scales, and that the amplitude scales with the sample depth; these conclusions are clearly dependent on the size of the sample, and have nothing to do with the real distribution. The fact that recent

or not a pure fractal can explain the observational data. Let us remark that the scaling effect is particularly important in evaluating the matter/galaxy bias factor. Keeping the matter power spectrum fixed, the galaxy PS scaling as $\sim R_s^{3-D}$ implies indeed a scaling of the bias factor $b \sim R_s^{(3-D)/2}$.

Let us summarize the results of PVGH, by confronting them with the analysis of the PS for a fractal distribution: i) for $k \geq 0.25$ ($\lambda \leq 25h^{-1}$ Mpc) the PS in a volume limited sample is very close to a power law with slope $n = -2.1$. In our view, this is the behaviour at high wavenumbers connected with the real fractal dimension. ii) For $0.05 \leq k \leq 0.2$ ($120h^{-1}Mpc > \lambda > 30h^{-1}Mpc$) and the spectrum is less steep, with a slope about -1.1 . This bending is, in our view, solely due to the finite size of the sample. iii) The amplitude of the volume limited subsample CfA2-130 PS is $\sim 40\%$ larger than for CfA2-101. This linear scaling of the amplitude can be understood again considering that the sample is fractal with $D = 2$. The last point deserves some more remarks. It is worthful to notice that this trend is qualitatively confirmed by the results of Peacock & Nicholson (1991), who find a higher PS amplitude for a deep radio-galaxy survey, and of Fisher *et al.*(1993) who find a lower amplitude for the shallow IRAS 1.2Jy survey. The same behaviour has been found in the analysis of the $\xi(r)$: r_0 scales linearly with the sample depth according to Eq.2.4 (CP92). The authors (PVGH) explain this fact considering the dependence of galaxy clustering on luminosity: brighter galaxies correlate more than fainter ones. They support this interpretation observing that brighter galaxies tend to avoid underdense regions; they also analyze separately two subsets of the same volume-limited sample of CfA2, one with the brighter half of galaxies, the other with the fainter one, and find in some cases a correlation between luminosity and amplitude. It is certainly possible that both mechanisms, the luminosity segregation and the intrinsic self-similarity of the distribution, are correct, and each one explains part of the scaling. However, PVGH do *not* detect such a luminosity segregation for the two largest subsamples, CfA101 and CfA130, to which we are comparing our analysis here. It seems therefore that the amplitude scaling at these scales can be entirely attributed to the fractal scaling. Another piece of evidence against the dominant role of the luminosity segregation has been put forward in Baryshev *et al.*(1994). In this paper two volume limited subsamples with the same absolute magnitude limit, $M \geq -20$, but with different depth, CfA1-80 (limited at $v \leq 8000\text{km sec}^{-1}$) and CfA2-130, have been compared. If the hypothesis of luminosity segregation holds then one should find that there is not difference between the amplitude of the correlation function (and of the PS) computed in these subsamples, as they contain galaxies with the same average absolute magnitude. On the contrary one finds that the amplitude scales as predicted by Eq. 2.4. Our conclusion is then that the fractal nature of the galaxy distribution can explain, to the scales surveyed so far, the shift of the amplitude with sample depth of the PS and of $\xi(r)$.

Finally we stress that the fractal dimension of the galaxy clustering rises from $D \sim 1.4$ for CfA1 to $D \sim 2$ for CfA2, in agreement with the result of other independent surveys:

Labini 1994).

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank L. Pietronero for very useful discussions.

References

- [1] Baryshev, Yu. V., Sylos Labini, F., Montuori, M., Pietronero, L. 1994, *Vistas in Astronomy* **38**, Part 4, in press.
- [2] Baugh C.M. & Efstathiou G. 1994, Mon.Not.R.astr.Soc, 267, 323.
- [3] Benzi,R., Paladin, G., Parisi, G.,Vulpiani, A. 1984, J.Phys. A. 17, 3251.
- [4] Borgani S. 1995, Phys. Rep. 252, 1.
- [5] Coleman, P. H. & Pietronero, L. 1992, Phys. Rep. 213, 311.
- [6] Colombi S., Bouchet F.R., & Schaeffer R. 1994, Astron. Astrophys. 281, 301.
- [7] Da Costa et al. 1994, Astrophys.J.424, L1 (DPVGH).
- [8] Davis, M., Peebles, P. J. E. 1983, Astrophys.J.267,465
- [9] Fisher et al. 1993, Astrophys.J.402, 42
- [10] Guzzo, L., Iovino, A., Chincarini, G., Giovanelli, R., Haynes,M. 1992, Astrophys.J.382, L5.
- [11] Itoh M., Sugimotohara T. & Suto Y. 1992, PASJ 44, 481.
- [12] Mandelbrot, B. B. 1982, The fractal geometry of Nature, (New York: W. H. Freeman).
- [13] Park, C., Vogeley, M.S., Geller, M.,& Huchra, J. 1994 Astrophys.J.431, 569 (PVGH)
- [14] Peacock, J.A., Nicholson, D. 1991, Mon.Not.R.astr.Soc235, 307
- [15] Peebles, P. J. E. 1980, The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press)
- [16] Pietronero, L., Sylos Labini, F. 1995, in *Birth of the Universe and fundamental physics*, F. Occhionero ed., (Berlin: Springer Verlag) in press
- [17] Sylos Labini, F., M. Montuori, Pietronero, L. 1995 preprint

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 Top panel: Power spectrum for a fractal distribution with dimension $D \approx 2$ *vs.* the scale $2\pi/k$ without the correction factor (smaller symbols) and with the correction factor (larger symbols). The error bars, shown for clarity only on one sample, represent the scatter among the different observers of the same fractal. The three set of points refer, from top to bottom, to artificial fractal samples of 75 (open triangles), 50 (filled squares), 32.5 (crosses) and 25 (open squares) $h^{-1}Mpc$. The straight line shows the slope $D = 2$. The flattening and the turnaround at high wavenumbers is spurious. In the bottom panel the three window functions are shown.

Fig. 2 The scale-independent power spectrum for the same fractal and the same four scales as in Fig. 1. Now the spectrum is a single power law, up to the very few largest scales as expected. The reference line has a slope $D = 2$. The amplitude of the spectrum is now constant inside the errors.

Fig. 3 Comparison of power spectra of fractal distribution (triangles) with the CfA2 survey (squares). In the top panel, we plot the PS of the subsample CfA2-130 (PVGH) along with the PS of our artificial fractal distribution (without the error bars for clarity). In the bottom panel, we plot CfA2-101 (PVGH) and a subsample of the same fractal as above, with a correspondingly scaled depth.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9504084v2>

This figure "fig1-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9504084v2>

This figure "fig1-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9504084v2>

This figure "fig1-4.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/astro-ph/9504084v2>