Contaminated Cosmology: Measuring w with Photometrically Classified Supernovae from Pan-STARRS

David Jones

with Dan Scolnic, Adam Riess, Richard Kessler, Armin Rest, Bob Kirshner, Carolyn Ortega, and many others

Dark Energy with Pan-STARRS

- 1.8 meter telescope diameter
- 1.4 gigapixel camera
- 3 degree field of view
- Observed 70 square degree patch ~nightly for 4 years
- Transient science goals:
  - Supernovae (core-collapse and thermonuclear)
  - AGN
  - Stellar flares
  - Gamma ray burst afterglows
- But most transients do not have spectra!

Photometric SNe from Pan-STARRS

- Obtaining SN spectra during the survey is hard; getting host galaxy spectra after the survey has ended is easy.
- Measured redshifts for 60% of the 5,000 likely SNe in Pan-STARRS with MMT, WIYN, AAT.
- Our survey will finish after a few more nights on MMT this fall.

Not Just SNe Ia…

Approx. regions of parameter space for different transients (boxes) from Kulkarni+07, Nugent+15, Foley+13

Photometric SNe from Pan-STARRS

- Our Hubble (density) diagram, with and without shape, color, and uncertainty cuts.

A Contaminated Hubble Diagram

- How important is understanding CC SN contamination?
  - change in w of 5% corresponds to a difference of 0.02 mag from $0 < z < 0.5$
  - Assume SN Ia scatter = 0.15 mag and contaminating CC SNe are 1 mag fainter than SNe Ia. Then, 5% error in w = 2% contamination at low z.
  - That's just 20 PS1 SNe
  - If CC SNe are even fainter than SNe Ia, the problem is worse!

Do we understand CC SN Contamination?

- Simulations from SNANA disagree with our data!

Templates could be biased or incomplete

Li+11 LF in grey, Pan-STARRS simulations in green, SNANA templates from SDSS in red

Overcoming CC SN Contamination with BEAMS

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.

- The BEAMS posterior is proportional to the product of individual SN likelihoods and priors on free parameters:

$$P(\theta|D) \propto P(\theta) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_i.$$

- Likelihood uses a Gaussian distribution for SNe Ia and CC SNe

Prior Probabilities

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \mathrm{P_i(Ia)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,Ia} - \mu_{Ia}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}\right)$$

SN Ia Gaussian

$$+\mathrm{P_i(CC)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,CC} - \mu_{CC}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}\right).$$

CC SN Gaussian

- Uses prior probabilities from the Nearest Neighbor (NN) classifier (Sako+14)

BEAMS Applied to Simulations

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe

BEAMS Applied to Simulations - $\Delta w = 0.003 +/- 0.002$

Conclusions

- Pan-STARRS can measure dark energy with nearly 1,100 cosmologically useful SNe. This is the largest current SN Ia sample.
- We see more bright CC SNe than expected.
- BEAMS can measure w in an unbiased way with only a small increase in uncertainty relative to a pure SN Ia sample.
- An early look at the real data:

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe

BEAMS Method

Making a cut of P(Ia) > 0.9

Do we understand CC SN Contamination?

- Simulations from SNANA disagree with our data!
- Simulated SN Ib/c and II are not bright enough

Do we understand CC SN Contamination?

- Simulations from SNANA disagree with our data!
- Simulated SN Ib/c and II are not bright enough

Do we understand CC SN Contamination?

- Simulations from SNANA disagree with our data!

The Current State of SN Ia Cosmology

- Three reasons we need to measure w better:
  - A w that varies from -1 to -2 is still w/i 95% confidence interval.
  - H_0 measurements could favor phantom dark energy (w < -1)
  - Do we understand the systematics?
- We can improve statistics and systematics with SNe from Pan-STARRS!

Allowed parameters from Betoule et al. (2014)

The Current State of SN Ia Cosmology

- Three reasons we need to measure w better:
  - A w that varies from -1 to -2 is still w/i 95% confidence interval.
  - H_0 measurements could favor phantom dark energy (w < -1)
  - Do we understand the systematics?
- We can improve statistics and systematics with SNe from Pan-STARRS!

Allowed parameters from Betoule et al. (2014)

The Current State of SN Ia Cosmology

- Three reasons we need to measure w better:
  - A w that varies from -1 to -2 is still w/i 95% confidence interval.
  - H_0 measurements could favor phantom dark energy (w < -1)
  - Do we understand the systematics?
- We can improve statistics and systematics with SNe from Pan-STARRS!

local H_0 vs. Planck (-0.18±0.05 mag)

Allowed parameters from Betoule et al. (2014)

Riess+2016

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.

- The BEAMS posterior is proportional to the product of individual SN likelihoods and priors on free parameters:

$$P(\theta|D) \propto P(\theta) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_i.$$

- Likelihood uses a Gaussian distribution for SNe Ia and CC SNe

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \mathrm{P_i(Ia)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,Ia} - \mu_{Ia}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}\right)$$

SN Ia Gaussian

$$+\mathrm{P_i(CC)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,CC} - \mu_{CC}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}\right).$$

CC SN Gaussian

See also: Falck et al. (2010), Hlozek et al. (2012), Rubin et al. (2015)

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.

- The BEAMS posterior is proportional to the product of individual SN likelihoods and priors on free parameters:

$$P(\theta|D) \propto P(\theta) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_i.$$

- Likelihood uses a Gaussian distribution for SNe Ia and CC SNe

measurements from the data

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \mathrm{P_i(Ia)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,Ia} - \mu_{Ia}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}\right)$$

SN Ia Gaussian

$$+\mathrm{P_i(CC)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,CC} - \mu_{CC}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}\right).$$

CC SN Gaussian

- Uses prior probabilities from the Nearest Neighbor (NN) classifier (Sako+14)

- BEAMS estimates free (redshift dependent) parameters

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.

- The BEAMS posterior is proportional to the product of individual SN likelihoods and priors on free parameters:

$$P(\theta|D) \propto P(\theta) \times \prod_{i=1}^{N} \mathcal{L}_i.$$

- Likelihood uses a Gaussian distribution for SNe Ia and CC SNe

free parameters

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \mathrm{P_i(Ia)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,Ia} - \mu_{Ia}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,Ia}^2 + \sigma_{Ia}^2)}\right)$$

SN Ia Gaussian

$$+\mathrm{P_i(CC)} \times \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\mu_{i,CC} - \mu_{CC}(z_i))^2}{2(\sigma_{i,CC}^2 + \sigma_{CC}(z_i)^2)}\right).$$

CC SN Gaussian

- Uses prior probabilities from the Nearest Neighbor (NN) classifier (Sako+14)

- BEAMS estimates free (redshift dependent) parameters

Intro to Dark Energy

- Responsible for the accelerated expansion of the universe (Riess+98, Perlmutter+99)
- Makes up 70% of the universe
- From the expansion history of the universe, can measure the equation of state, w
- If dark energy is a cosmological constant, w = -1
- Betoule et al. (2014) used SN Ia+CMB+BAO to measure w to <6% uncertainty.

Image source: Annenberg Learner

BEAMS Applied to Simulations

- Simulations from SNANA disagree with our data!

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe

	Simulations		
	bias	bias/σ_{stat}	$\Delta\sigma_{\mathrm{stat}}$
w	**-0.004±0.002**	-0.1	0.001 (1%)

	Data		
	bias	bias/σ_{stat}	$\Delta\sigma_{\mathrm{stat}}$
w	**-0.047±0.013**	0.5	0.015 (17%)

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe
- We tested BEAMS on 25 samples of 100 SNe drawn from our data, comparing to PS1 cosmological results from Rest+14

	Simulations		
	bias	bias/σ_{stat}	$\Delta\sigma_{\mathrm{stat}}$
μ	-0.008±0.003	-0.1	0.002 (3%)

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe
- We tested BEAMS on 25 samples of 100 SNe drawn from our data, comparing to PS1 cosmological results from Rest+14

	Simulations		
	bias	bias/σ_{stat}	$\Delta\sigma_{\text{stat}}$
μ	-0.008±0.003	-0.1	0.002 (3%)
α	0.005±0.000	1.0	0.000 (3%)
β	0.096±0.006	1.5	0.008 (12%)

Two more BEAMS free parameters

$$\mu_i = m^*_{B,i} + \alpha \times X_{1,i} - \beta \times C_i - M$$

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe
- We tested BEAMS on 25 samples of 100 SNe drawn from our data, comparing to PS1 cosmological results from Rest+14

Simulations

	bias	bias/σ_{stat}	$\Delta\sigma_{\mathrm{stat}}$
μ	-0.008±0.003	-0.1	0.002 (3%)
α	0.005±0.000	1.0	0.000 (3%)
β	0.096±0.006	1.5	0.008 (12%)
w	**-0.004±0.002**	-0.1	0.001 (1%)

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We tested BEAMS on 25 simulations of 1,000 SNe
- We tested BEAMS on 25 samples of 100 SNe drawn from our data, comparing to PS1 cosmological results from Rest+14

Real data: difference between BEAMS and Rest+14

	Data		
	bias	bias/σ_{stat}	$\Delta\sigma_{\mathrm{stat}}$
μ	-0.023±0.021	-0.4	0.025 (29%)
α	-0.006±0.001	-0.6	0.002 (17%)
β	0.108±0.019	0.9	0.045 (37%)
w	**-0.047±0.013**	0.5	0.015 (17%)

Photometric SNe from Pan-STARRS

- Our Hubble (density) diagram, with and without shape, color, and uncertainty cuts.

Type Ia SNe as Cosmological Probes

- Type Ia Supernovae are formed by the detonation of a white dwarf when it reaches the Chandrasekhar mass.

- Intrinsically brighter SN Ia have broader light curves and can measure distances to ~6% accuracy.

- Betoule et al. (2014) used SN Ia+CMB+BAO to measure w to <6% uncertainty.

The Supernova Cosmology Project

The Current State of SN Ia Cosmology

Three reasons we need to measure w better:

- A w that varies from -1 to -2 is still w/i 95% confidence interval.
- H_0 measurements could favor phantom dark energy ($w < -1$)
- Do we understand the systematics?

The Current State of SN Ia Cosmology

- Three reasons we need to measure w better:
  - A w that varies from -1 to -2 is still w/i 95% confidence interval.
  - H_0 measurements could favor phantom dark energy (w < -1)
  - Do we understand the systematics?
- We can improve statistics and systematics with SNe from Pan-STARRS!

local H_0 vs. Planck (-0.18±0.05 mag)

Allowed parameters from Betoule et al. (2014)

The Current State of SN Ia Cosmology

Three reasons we need to measure w better:

- A w that varies from -1 to -2 is still w/i 95% confidence interval.
- H_0 measurements could favor phantom dark energy ($w < -1$)
- Do we understand the systematics?

We can improve statistics and systematics with SNe from Pan-STARRS!

Allowed parameters from Betoule et al. (2014)

local H_0 vs. Planck (-0.18±0.05 mag)

Photometric SNe from Pan-STARRS

- A rough estimate of objects with late time spectroscopy from Pan-STARRS:

Are these results robust?

- Let's try a few different P(Ia) priors:
  - SALT2 Fit Prob.
  - PSNID (Sako+11)
  - GalSNID (Foley & Mandel 2013; Jones+16 in prep.)

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- SNANA software (Kessler+2010):
  - Data-based Monte Carlo simulations (not pixel level detail)
- We simulated:
  - Sky noise
  - Zeropoints
  - Detection efficiency
  - Host galaxy noise
  - Incorrect Redshifts (~2.5%)
  - CC SNe from 43 II-P, II-L, IIn, Ib and Ic templates

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- SNANA software (Kessler+2010):
  - Data-based Monte Carlo simulations (not pixel level detail)
- We simulated:
  - Sky noise
  - Zeropoints
  - Detection efficiency
  - Host galaxy noise
  - Incorrect Redshifts (~2.5%)
  - CC SNe from 43 II-P, II-L, IIn, Ib and Ic templates

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- SNANA software (Kessler+2010):
  - Data-based Monte Carlo simulations (not pixel level detail)
- We simulated:
  - Sky noise
  - Zeropoints
  - Detection efficiency
  - Host galaxy noise
  - Incorrect Redshifts (~2.5%)
  - CC SNe from 43 II-P, II-L, IIn, Ib and Ic templates

How well do we really understand CC SNe?

Core-Collapse SNe: Two Flawed Assumptions

Do our templates represent the population?

Core-Collapse SNe: Two Flawed Assumptions

Are CC SN luminosity Functions Gaussian?

From Li+2011

“Empirical” Distributions of CC SNe

- We ran PSNID on our real and simulated data to see if the distributions of likely Type II and Type Ib/c SNe lined up - they didn’t.
- CC SNe must be ~1 mag brighter with ~30-50% less dispersion to match our data.

SNe Ib/c (green)

Abs. B Mag

SNe II (blue)

Abs. B Mag

“Empirical” Distributions of CC SNe

- A few thoughts/ideas:
  - Simulated CC SNe agree pretty well with our data before cuts but not after.
  - We have a relatively sparse sampling of CC SNe - do CC SNe with a smaller range of shapes and colors have lower scatter?
  - Are Ia-like CC SNe intrinsically brighter?
  - We know II-P SNe with shorter plateau phases (likely smaller SALT2 X_1) are brighter. Could something similar be happening for SN Ib/c?

No cuts; these agree better?

cuts

Hubble residual

Are these results robust?

- Let's try a few different P(Ia) priors:
  - SALT2 Fit Prob.
  - PSNID (Sako+11)
  - GalSNID (Foley & Mandel 2013; Jones+16 in prep.)
- And a two different CC SN models:
  - Two Gaussians
  - Skewed Gaussian

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- Some results from simulations:

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- Does BEAMS bias w?

Cosmological Parameters from 1,000 Sim. SNe

Different CC SN Models

	Δw	$\Delta\sigma_w$
one Gaussian*	-0.005 (-0.1σ)	**0.001 (1%)**
two Gaussians*	-0.003 (-0.1σ)	0.003 (6%)
skewed Gaussian*	**-0.001 (-0.0σ)**	0.002 (3%)

Different P(Ia) Priors

	Δw	$\Delta\sigma_w$
NN	-0.005 (-0.1σ)	**0.001 (1%)**
PSNID	**0.004 (0.1σ)**	0.001 (2%)
SALT2 Fit Prob.	-0.017 (-0.4σ)	0.002 (4%)
GalSNID	-0.022 (-0.5σ)	0.003 (6%)
Half[c]	-0.024 (-0.5σ)	0.003 (5%)

Baseline Model

Very small bias in w, negligible increase in uncertainty

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.

BEAMS Applied to Simulations

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- The effect of different CC SN models:

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- We can use Bayesian Estimation Applied to Multiple Species (BEAMS; Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek 2007) to fit CC SNe and SNe Ia simultaneously.
- Let's try a few P(Ia) priors:
  - SALT2 Fit Prob.
  - PSNID (Sako+11)
  - GalSNID (Foley & Mandel 2013; Jones+16 in prep.)
  - Nearest Neighbor (Sako+14)

Photometric SNe from Pan-STARRS

- Our Hubble diagram, with and without shape, color, and uncertainty cuts.

The Next Step: Moving to a Photometric Sample

- We can lower calibration systematics *and* improve statistics by using a large number of SNe from as few surveys as possible
- If we don't need to get a spectrum for every SN, that makes this easier…

Uncertainty:	Err. on w
Calibration:	0.045
SN Color Model:	0.023
Host Galaxy Dependence:	0.015
MW Extinction:	0.013
Selection Bias:	0.012
Coherent Flows:	0.007
Photometric:	?????
Total:	**0.056**

PS1 systematic uncertainties on w from Scolnic et al. (2014)

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- Does BEAMS bias w?

BEAMS Cosmological Parameters using Different Priors; 1000 Simulated PS1 SNe

	SNe alone			Planck Ω_M prior			SNe alone		
P(Ia) Method	w	Δw	$\Delta\sigma_w$	w	Δw	$\Delta\sigma_w$	Ω_M	$\Delta\Omega_M$	$\Delta\sigma_{\Omega_M}$
No CC SNe	-0.980±0.111	...	...	-1.042±0.050	...	...	0.265±0.047	...	...
Fit Prob.	-0.983±0.121	-0.003 (0.0σ)	0.010 (9%)	-1.029±0.052	0.013 (0.1σ)	0.002 (4%)	0.273±0.051	0.008 (0.2σ)	0.004 (9%)
GalSNID	-1.070±0.146	-0.090 (0.8σ)	0.035 (32%)	-1.052±0.054	-0.010 (0.1σ)	0.004 (8%)	0.301±0.056	0.036 (0.8σ)	0.009 (19%)
Toy Model	-0.974±0.115	0.006 (0.1σ)	0.004 (4%)	-1.017±0.049	0.025 (0.2σ)	-0.001 (2%)	0.272±0.050	0.007 (0.2σ)	0.003 (6%)
PSNID	-1.055±0.137	-0.075 (0.7σ)	0.026 (23%)	-1.025±0.053	0.017 (0.3σ)	0.003 (6%)	0.308±0.055	0.043 (0.9σ)	0.01 (22%)

We don't see any bias

Using mass prior, only small increase in uncertainty on w

When we look with 10,000 sim. SNe, we still don't see any bias

Photometric SNe from Pan-STARRS

- Obtaining SN spectra during the survey is hard, but getting host galaxy spectra after the survey has ended is easy!
- We got redshifts for 60% of the 5,000 likely SNe in Pan-STARRS with multi-object spectroscopy from MMT, WIYN and the AAT.

PS1 Cosmology with BEAMS

- Methodology from Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek (2007), Rubin et al. (2015)

- Can model SNe Ia and a contaminating distribution using two gaussians with the likelihood function:

$$P(D_j|\theta, b, \Sigma, \tau_j = B) = \mathcal{L}_{B,j}(\theta, b, \Sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\Sigma} e^{-((\mu_j - m(\theta) - b)^2/2\Sigma^2)}$$

- Giving the posterior:

$$P(\theta|D) \propto \sum_{b,\Sigma} P(\theta)P(b)P(\Sigma) \prod_{j=1}^{N} \{\mathcal{L}_{A,j}(\theta)P_j + \mathcal{L}_{B,j}(\theta, b, \Sigma) \times (1 - P_j)\}.$$

These prior probabilities are from SN classification

- How well does it work? Very well in theory. In practice we're not sure yet…

Optimal (black line) vs simulated uncertainties (colored points) from Kunz, Bassett & Hlozek (2007)

1,000 Simulated SNe
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
C
−4
−2
0
2
4
X_1
436 PS1 Spec. SNe
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
−0.2
−0.4
−0.6
C
−4
−2
0
2
4
X_1
Ia
CC

Bin	$P(D_i\|\mathrm{Ia})$	$P(D_i\|\mathrm{Ibc})$	$P(D_i\|\mathrm{II})$
Cross-Correlation Template			
absorption	$0.502^{+0.047}_{-0.048}$	$0.256^{+0.061}_{-0.061}$	$0.286^{+0.034}_{-0.034}$
ellipt+A stars	$0.431^{+0.043}_{-0.043}$	$0.598^{+0.086}_{-0.085}$	$0.609^{+0.049}_{-0.049}$
late-type	$0.029^{+0.010}_{-0.009}$	$0.037^{+0.025}_{-0.024}$	$0.030^{+0.011}_{-0.011}$
emission	$0.029^{+0.010}_{-0.009}$	$0.098^{+0.037}_{-0.036}$	$0.071^{+0.015}_{-0.015}$
Host Galaxy R			
0.0 – 1.0	$0.232^{+0.022}_{-0.021}$	$0.148^{+0.037}_{-0.037}$	$0.186^{+0.026}_{-0.026}$
1.0 – 2.0	$0.261^{+0.021}_{-0.022}$	$0.457^{+0.074}_{-0.074}$	$0.378^{+0.035}_{-0.035}$
2.0 – 3.0	$0.194^{+0.020}_{-0.020}$	$0.173^{+0.050}_{-0.049}$	$0.189^{+0.026}_{-0.026}$
3.0 – 4.0	$0.094^{+0.014}_{-0.014}$	$0.099^{+0.037}_{-0.037}$	$0.103^{+0.020}_{-0.019}$
4.0 – 5.0	$0.054^{+0.010}_{-0.010}$	$0.049^{+0.024}_{-0.025}$	$0.064^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$
Hα Equivalent W1dth			
<-5.0	$0.040^{+0.009}_{-0.009}$	$0.000^{+0.000}_{-0.000}$	$0.006^{+0.003}_{-0.003}$
-5.0 – 0.0	$0.217^{+0.022}_{-0.022}$	$0.072^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	$0.088^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$
0.0 – 5.0	$0.159^{+0.017}_{-0.018}$	$0.237^{+0.051}_{-0.052}$	$0.202^{+0.023}_{-0.022}$
5.0 – 10.0	$0.097^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.124^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	$0.153^{+0.019}_{-0.020}$
>10.0	$0.356^{+0.029}_{-0.029}$	$0.557^{+0.072}_{-0.072}$	$0.528^{+0.039}_{-0.040}$
Hβ Equivalent Width			
<-5.0	$0.078^{+0.014}_{-0.013}$	$0.010^{+0.010}_{-0.011}$	$0.009^{+0.006}_{-0.005}$
-5.0 – 0.0	$0.419^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	$0.299^{+0.052}_{-0.052}$	$0.310^{+0.029}_{-0.028}$
0.0 – 5.0	$0.341^{+0.026}_{-0.027}$	$0.423^{+0.062}_{-0.062}$	$0.432^{+0.034}_{-0.034}$
5.0 – 10.0	$0.078^{+0.014}_{-0.013}$	$0.113^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	$0.139^{+0.020}_{-0.020}$
>10.0	$0.084^{+0.013}_{-0.014}$	$0.155^{+0.042}_{-0.041}$	$0.108^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$
OIII Equivalent Width			
<-5.0	$0.073^{+0.013}_{-0.013}$	$0.031^{+0.021}_{-0.021}$	$0.014^{+0.005}_{-0.006}$
-5.0 – 0.0	$0.195^{+0.020}_{-0.020}$	$0.155^{+0.042}_{-0.041}$	$0.102^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$
0.0 – 5.0	$0.525^{+0.033}_{-0.034}$	$0.608^{+0.082}_{-0.083}$	$0.631^{+0.043}_{-0.042}$
5.0 – 10.0	$0.086^{+0.013}_{-0.014}$	$0.093^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	$0.082^{+0.014}_{-0.015}$
>10.0	$0.115^{+0.015}_{-0.016}$	$0.113^{+0.031}_{-0.031}$	$0.168^{+0.023}_{-0.022}$
OII Equivalent Width			
<-5.0	$0.162^{+0.023}_{-0.022}$	$0.107^{+0.036}_{-0.036}$	$0.143^{+0.027}_{-0.027}$
-5.0 – 0.0	$0.103^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$	$0.036^{+0.018}_{-0.018}$	$0.062^{+0.017}_{-0.018}$
0.0 – 5.0	$0.290^{+0.028}_{-0.028}$	$0.125^{+0.054}_{-0.054}$	$0.179^{+0.027}_{-0.026}$
5.0 – 10.0	$0.114^{+0.017}_{-0.017}$	$0.125^{+0.054}_{-0.054}$	$0.062^{+0.017}_{-0.018}$
>10.0	$0.242^{+0.025}_{-0.025}$	$0.250^{+0.071}_{-0.071}$	$0.272^{+0.035}_{-0.036}$

Type Ia SNe as Cosmological Probes

- Type Ia Supernovae are formed by the detonation of a white dwarf when it reaches the Chandrasekhar mass.

A white dwarf accretes mass from a giant star

Two white dwarfs merge through the emission of gravitational radiation

1. Basic Error Cuts: Shape and Time of Max.

Sample cuts

	All SNe	Rest+14
Total	3135	147
Final	1068	103
– Not Fit by SALT2 (minimal cuts)	753	6
– $\sigma(pk\mathrm{MJD}) > 2$	266	1
– $\sigma(X_1) > 1$	529	3
– $\lvert X_1 \rvert > 3.0$	100	2
– $\lvert C \rvert > 0.3$	226	2
– $X_1^2/3^2 + C^2/0.3^2 < 1$	46	1
– Fit prob. < 0.001	118	0

Light curves that have been cut

2. Shape, Color, and Fit Prob. Cuts

Light curves that have been cut

2. Shape, Color, and Fit Prob. Cuts

Sample cuts

	All SNe	Rest+14
Total	3135	147
Final	1068	103
– Not Fit by SALT2 (minimal cuts)	753	6
– $\sigma(pk\mathrm{MJD}) > 2$	266	1
– $\sigma(X_1) > 1$	529	3
– $\lvert X_1 \rvert > 3.0$	100	2
– $\lvert C \rvert > 0.3$	226	2
– $X_1^2/3^2 + C^2/0.3^2 < 1$	46	1
– Fit prob. < 0.001	118	0

Light curves that have been cut

2. Shape, Color, and Fit Prob. Cuts

Light curves that remain after cuts

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- Which SN types could resolve the data/simulation discrepancy? Let's try a few:

Example LC

Example Spectrum

Subtype Distance Modulus (blue)

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- Which SN types could resolve the data/simulation discrepancy?

Legend for right panel:

- data
- All Sim. SNe
- Subtype
- Sim. SNe Ia

Example LC

Example Spectrum

Subtype Distance Modulus (blue)

Li et al. (2011)

91bg
IaHV
IaN
91T
Ic
Ib
II−P
IIb
II−L
IaN
IaHV
91T
91bg
Ic
Ib
Ibc pec
II−P
II−L
IIb
IIn
Number of SNe
Absolute Magnitude
Absolute Magnitude
Absolute Magnitude

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- What about SN types that aren't included in SNANA:
  - Iax - likely too faint, fast decliners
  - SLSNe - rare, bright, and with faint hosts
  - Ibc-pec - likely too faint as well
  - Ia-91T - already included in SALT2 model
  - IIb?
  - Ia-91bg?
- We need more spectral templates!

Ia-91bg and IIb models we've added to SNANA

SN 2008bo spectrum from Modjaz+14

Simulating the Pan-STARRS Sample

- What about SN types that aren't included in SNANA:
  - Iax - likely too faint, fast decliners
  - SLSNe - rare, bright, and with faint hosts
  - Ibc-pec - likely too faint as well
  - Ia-91T - already included in SALT2 model
  - IIb?
  - Ia-91bg?
- We need more spectral templates!

These could be important?

91bg model

IIb model (2008bo)

Ia-91bg and IIb models we've added to SNANA

SN 2008bo spectrum from Modjaz+14