COSMICS: Cosmological Initial Conditions and Microwave Anisotropy Codes

Edmund Bertschinger
Department of Physics, MIT
Cambridge, MA 02139
bertschinger@mit.edu

February 1, 2008

Abstract

COSMICS is a package of fortran programs useful for computing transfer functions and microwave background anisotropy for cosmological models, and for generating gaussian random initial conditions for nonlinear structure formation simulations of such models. Four programs are provided: linger_con and linger_syn integrate the linearized equations of general relativity, matter, and radiation in conformal Newtonian and synchronous gauge, respectively; deltat integrates the photon transfer functions computed by the linger codes to produce photon anisotropy power spectra; and grafic tabulates normalized matter power spectra and produces constrained or unconstrained samples of the matter density field.

Version 1.0 of COSMICS is available at http://arcturus.mit.edu/cosmics/. The current release gives fortran-77 programs that run on workstations and vectorized supercomputers. Unix makefiles are included that make it simple to build and test the package. A future release will include portable parallel versions of the linger codes using standard message-passing libraries.

1 Introduction

Theories of cosmic structure formation cannot be tested experimentally; they must be simulated instead. Numerical simulations of cosmic evolution require three ingredients: assumptions about the cosmological model and the matter and radiation content of the universe (e.g., a flat model with cold dark matter, baryons, and a cosmological constant); a model for the initial fluctuations (e.g., nearly scale-invariant fluctuations produced by an early episode of inflation); and computer programs (and computers!) for integrating

the equations of motion. The first two ingredients are at the discretion of the simulator; the last one can be met, however, by a standard package (computer not included).

COSMICS has been developed to provide some of the needed tools to the cosmology simulation community. It does not include programs for simulating the complex nonlinear physics of structure formation; rather, it generates accurate results of linear evolution. For the microwave background, excluding the Sunyaev-Zel'dovich effect and other minor nonlinear corrections, this is sufficient for direct comparison with observations. For the matter distribution, on the other hand, the results of COSMICS provide input to nonlinear evolution codes.

COSMICS is distributed over the world-wide web as a compressed tar file. The package consists of 4 applications, a self-test, documentation (of which this is part), and Unix makefiles.

A typical procedure for running COSMICS is the following. First, one runs linger (either linger_con or linger_syn, depending on details discussed below) to produce the data needed for matter transfer functions or microwave background (CMB) anisotropy. Then one runs grafic to output the normalized matter power spectrum and, if desired, to generate unconstrained or constrained (using the Hoffman-Ribak algorithm) gaussian random density fields on a lattice (density, velocity, and particle displacements). Grafic may obtain the matter transfer function from Linger or from an analytical fit, or it may use no transfer function at all, resulting in scale-free fields. The normalization of the matter powe spectrum in grafic may be specified either in terms of the microwave background quadrupole moment $Q_{\rm rms-PS}$ or the rms mass fluctuation σ_8 ; given one, the program computes the other. Finally, if one is interested in accurate calculations of the CMB angular power spectrum, linger can be run at high resolution and the results then processed by deltat. If one desires the angular spectrum to high degree l, linger runs are computationally demanding, requiring tens of Cray C90 hours for $l \leq 2000$. The expense comes because linger does the full calculation without significant approximations, unlike most other codes in use today. Most workers will not require this accuracy; if they do, they may contact the author to see whether their desired model has already been computed. A future release of linger will include plinger [1, 2], a parallel implementation using message-passing that runs on a variety of distributed-memory supercomputers. A shared-memory version also exists for the Cray C90.

COSMICS is available for academic use. COSMICS users should notify me by email to bertschinger@mit.edu, so that I can keep you informed of upgrades and bug fixes. Scientific publications using COSMICS should acknowledge the author and the NSF under grant AST-9318185, which funded the development of COSMICS.

1.1 Building COSMICS

COSMICS is easy to use. First, get the compressed tar file cosmics.tar.Z from

http://arcturus.mit.edu/cosmics/

or by anonymous ftp to arcturus.mit.edu in directory Software (be sure to set binary mode for the transfer). Put it in a directory with at least 10 MB of free space, then unpack it with

uncompress cosmics.tar.Z; tar xf cosmics.tar

Go to the main directory, read the README file, and build the package with make. (First try make with no arguments, then select the desired target.) The makefiles are verified to work on a range of platforms and operating systems (see the file Ported), but it is possible that make will fail on your machine. If it does, try make generic. If that fails, read Ported and try building COSMICS manually. Then send me email with a full description of what went wrong. If you are sufficiently skilled with Unix to solve the make problem yourself, or you succeed in porting COSMICS to another machine, I would also appreciate email so that I can incorporate these improvements into a future release. I will provide support for the ongoing use of this package.

After the COSMICS codes are compiled, you can run a test with make test. This is a rather complete and lengthy test, requiring 27 MFlops-hours (overnight on a typical workstation). I could design a much shorter test, but the main purpose is to acquaint you with some of the features of COSMICS with realistic computations. If you wish, you may try linger_con, linger_syn, or grafic out of the box — simply run the executables in subdirectory bin and answer the requests for input parameters interactively. After that (or before), read this document to better understand the input and output, and what the COSMICS programs are doing.

You can remove unwanted object files with make clean in any of the directories; doing this in the top directory will clean out all of the subdirectories. It will not remove the compiled binaries in subdirectory bin, or the files in test_results; these may be removed with make realclean.

2 LINGER: Linear General Relativity

Linger integrates the coupled, linearized, Einstein, Boltzmann, and fluid equations governing the evolution of scalar metric perturbations and photons (both polarizations), neutrinos (both massless and, optionally, massive), baryons, and cold dark matter in a perturbed flat Robertson-Walker universe. In other words, it computes the linear evolution of fluctuations generated in the early universe through the radiation-dominated era and recombination, down to a small redshift input by the user. The results are useful both for calculations of the CMB anisotropy (with deltat) and the linear power spectrum of matter fluctuations (with grafic). Linger provides the link between the

primeval fluctuations in the early universe and those at late times (e.g., the present). The linger codes are described in a preprint by Ma and Bertschinger [3].

Many other groups have written codes to integrate these equations (or a subset of them): [4]–[18]; see [19] for a recent summary. However, we believe that our treatment is the most accurate to date in its treatment of the physics and the numerical integrations. Our physics model includes an accurate treatment of hydrogen recombination and the decoupling of photons and baryons based on [20] with the addition of helium; helium recombination using the Saha equation (this is adequate given the high electron densities); a full treatment of Thomson scattering including two photon polarizations and the full angular dependences of the scattering cross section and distribution functions (see [21] for a complete presentation of the theory); full computation of the gravitational sources from all relevant particle species including all relativistic shear stresses of photons and neutrinos; and full integration down to the final redshift without use of any free-streaming approximation. Our numerical methods include a multipole expansion of the angular distribution of photons and massless neutrinos to sufficiently high degree to accurately represent them (up to l = 10000 for late times and high spatial wavenumbers, when computing CMB anisotropy; up to l = 100 when computing matter transfer functions); accurate sampling (with 128 points) of the momentum distribution of massive neutrinos (and computation of the angular multipoles up to l = 50); and sufficiently fine sampling in the spatial wavenumber k to give accurate matter transfer functions and CMB anisotropy without any additional smoothing.

The aim of linger is to produce results that are accurate to about 0.1%. This accuracy is, admittedly, somewhat artificial, since nonlinear effects or other physics that is neglected by linger may produce larger differences. (Research into this question is currently a focus of activity for theoreticians investigating CMB anisotropy.) However, I believe that it is still worthwhile to solve the linear problem with such high precision. Of course, all of this effort has a cost in the need for substantial computing resources. We discuss the requirements in section 2.1. The user who wishes to can easily change linger to be faster and less accurate, by reducing the maximum multipole expansion orders lmax0 and lmaxnu set in fortran-77 parameter statements in the code (though be sure to search for occurrences in several subroutines).

The primary restrictions of the current release of linger are: (1) it assumes the unperturbed spacetime is flat, thereby excluding open or closed models, and (2) only scalar (i.e., density) perturbations are included (excluding vector and tensor perturbations, also known as gravitomagnetism and gravitational radiation). The second restriction is not a serious limitation for computations of the matter fluctuation spectrum, although it can lead to an underestimate of the large angular scale CMB anisotropy in some cosmological models. The first restriction, on the other hand, is more serious given the interest among astronomers in testing open universe models (despite the fact that such models lack a natural primeval fluctuation spectrum). However, linger does allow for a cosmological

constant, so that Ω in matter may be less than unity.

Linger comes in two versions, corresponding to two different gauge choices for coordinates in the perturbed spacetime: synchronous gauge (linger_syn) and longitudinal or conformal Newtonian gauge (linger_con). The latter case is equivalent to the so-called gauge-invariant formalism. (For a discussion of these and other gauges, see refs. [22]–[25]). Although physically equivalent, the output of the two codes is different. Roughly speaking, the synchronous case corresponds to using Lagrangian spatial coordinates that are fixed with respect to the cold dark matter, while the conformal Newtonian case corresponds to using Eulerian coordinates that (at late times) are (nearly) fixed with respect to the microwave background. See [3] for the transformation between the two sets of variables.

The two varieties of linger are useful for different types of initial conditions. Isentropic (often inappropriately called adiabatic) initial conditions, the type most naturally produced by cosmic inflation, may be evolved equally well numerically in either gauge. Many workers prefer the conformal Newtonian gauge because the coordinates are minimally deformed so that gauge variables are close to the quantities measured by Newtonian observers. Isocurvature fluctuations, which may be produced by first-order phase transitions in the early universe, should be evolved in synchronous gauge because they require fine-tuning in conformal Newtonian and other gauges [22].

Although the data output by the two versions of linger differ because of the gauges used, these differences do not affect their use because physical observables are gauge-invariant. Linger output is used in COSMICS for two purposes: computing the CMB angular power spectrum (in deltat) and computing and using the matter power spectrum (in grafic). In the former case, the angular power spectrum C_l is gauge-invariant for l > 1. The monopole (l = 0) is unobservable, while the dipole (l = 1) reflects the local motion of our galaxy and is gauge-dependent simply because the coordinates of one gauge move relative to those of another. In synchronous gauge there is a very large C_1 (compared with the higher multipole moments) simply because the CMB radiation has a large velocity ($\sim 500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) relative to the rest frame defined by the matter — the cold dark matter is, by definition, at rest in synchronous coordinates. In conformal Newtonian gauge, on the other hand, the dipole moment is very small (comparable with the higher multipoles) while the matter velocity is now nonzero.

The matter power spectrum used in grafic is computed from the gauge-invariant potential ϕ of conformal Newtonian gauge using the Poisson equation:

$$\nabla^2 \phi = -k^2 \phi = 4\pi G \bar{\rho} a^2 \epsilon_m , \qquad (1)$$

where k is the spatial wavenumber and a is the cosmic expansion scale factor. (This equation assumes that space curvature is negligible; in section 4.1.2 below it is generalized to the case of open models.) On scales small compared with the Hubble distance,

 ϕ equals the Newtonian gravitational potential and ϵ_m is the net matter density fluctuation; on larger scales they are the natural generalized gauge-invariant variables defined by Bardeen [22]. Linger_con outputs ϕ ; in linger_syn we output the synchronous gauge metric variables plus the variable giving the exact transformation to ϕ . So, either linger code may be used, with no difference whatsoever for grafic, which automatically determines the correct variables. (The careful user should try both and compare them as a test of speed and numerical precision.)

2.1 Linger Usage

After building the COSMICS package using make in the main cosmics directory, the user should try running linger_con and linger_syn interactively to gain familiarity with the input and output (the executables are in subdirectory bin).

2.1.1 Linger Input

Linger_con expects the following input:

Omega_b, Omega_c, Omega_v, Omega_nu

HO, Tcmb, Y_He, N_nu(massive)

Bflag [1 if full Boltzmann for CMB, 0 if lmax=100 for matter transfer functions] kmax, nk, zend [if Bflag=1] or kmin, kmax, nk, zend [if Bflag=0]

Note that the fourth line of input requires 3 or 4 numbers depending on whether Bflag is set to 1 or 0.

Linger_syn expects the same input, except that one more parameter is required at the end (the fifth line of input):

ICflag = 1,2,3,4 for isentropic or 3 kinds of isocurvature fluctuations

These input parameters are mostly self-explanatory. The Omega's are the current (redshift zero) cosmic density parameter in baryons, cold dark matter, vacuum energy (cosmological constant), and massive neutrinos, respectively. Currently, linger is restricted to a flat background spacetime, or $\Omega_b + \Omega_c + \Omega_v + \Omega_v = 1$. (Photons and massless neutrinos also contribute to the energy density today, but their effect is accounted for by a tiny shift in the Hubble constant from the value input by the user: $H_{0,\text{true}} = H_0 \left(1 + \rho_r/\rho_m\right)^{1/2}$, where ρ_r is the present energy density of radiation (known accurately through T_{cmb}) and ρ_m is the present energy density of nonrelativistic matter. The shift in H_0 is of no consequence except for those users who wish to include relativistic particles in their accounting of Ω and who are concerned with differences in Ω and H_0 at the level of .01%. Linger uses the correct equations internally given its redefinition of H_0 .)

The next set of parameters are the Hubble constant H_0 in km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹, the microwave background temperature $T_{\rm cmb}$ in Kelvin, the helium mass fraction of baryons $Y_{\rm He}$, and the number of flavors of massive neutrinos N_{ν} . Standard parameters are suggested by linger. Note that linger fixes the total number of neutrino flavors to be 3, so the number of massless flavors is $3 - N_{\nu}$. If $N_{\nu} > 1$, linger assumes that all massive flavors have identical mass. Those who prefer a different pattern of neutrino masses should find the modifications to linger to be straightforward.

Bflag is an important parameter directing linger to run either in an expensive mode with full resolution of the angular power spectra of photons and massless neutrinos, and with linearly spaced sampling in spatial wavenumber k (Bflag = 1), or in a cheap mode with lower angular resolution and logarithmically spaced sampling in k (Bflag = 0). The first mode is used for fully accurate CMB anisotropy calculations (for deltat); the second one is for matter transfer functions (for grafic). The minimum and maximum spatial wavenumbers are k_{\min} and k_{\max} , both measured in Mpc⁻¹. (Linger uses Mpc for its units of length and time, not h^{-1} Mpc.) In the full Boltzmann case (Bflag = 1), k_{\min} = $k_{\rm max}/nk$, where nk is the number of wavenumbers to compute. In the reduced Boltzmann case (Bflag=0), the nk wavenumbers are sampled logarithmically, starting at k_{\min} and ending at k_{max} . The reason for these choices is that the radiation transfer functions oscillate uniformly in k; sampling these oscillations is needed for accurate integration of the angular power spectrum without smoothing. (However, Hu et al describe a smoothing algorithm that works reasonably well with much coarser sampling [19]; perhaps a similar scheme might be incorporated into deltat for use with reduced-Boltzmann linger runs.) The matter transfer functions, on the other hand, vary smoothly with k, and do not depend appreciably on the high-order radiation multipole moments. Finally, $z_{\rm end}$ is the ending redshift of the computations. Linger outputs matter and radiation transfer function data at this final redshift, with the specified sampling in k.

The user with a typical workstation should not use Bflag = 1 except if $k_{\rm max} \leq 0.1$ and/or $z_{\rm end} > 0$. The computing time for each k-mode increases approximately linearly with k because of the need for the differential equation solver to sample the oscillations of the photon and massless neutrino perturbations, whose frequency is proportional to k. Thus, most of the time is spent computing the values near $k_{\rm max}$. For flat models with $\Omega_v = 0$, the CMB anisotropy computed using $z_{\rm end} > 0$ should agree rather well with that computed with $z_{\rm end} = 0$, aside from a compression of the angular wavenumber l because of the reduced distance to the cosmic photosphere. Experts can find other ways to further speed up the CMB calculation [19], albeit with a loss of accuracy.

The final parameter needed by linger_syn, ICflag, is used to set the type of initial conditions. For ICflag = 1, isentropic initial conditions are selected, normalized so that the primeval gauge-invariant potential $\psi(k) = -1$ for all k. Isentropic initial conditions correspond to primeval density fluctuations or, equivalently, spacetime curvature fluctuations. (ψ is one of the two scalar metric variables of conformal Newtonian gauge; a gauge

transformation is applied to determine the metric variables in synchronous gauge [3].) Exactly the same initial conditions are used by linger_con (which is, however, restricted to isentropic initial conditions). The reason for the minus sign in ψ is so that the density perturbations in the nonrelativistic components will be positive from the Poisson equation (1); the amplitude is set arbitrarily to 1 so that linger calculates transfer functions normalized by the primeval potential. (This is the only physically sensible choice for isentropic perturbations.)

For ICflag > 1, isocurvature initial conditions are selected. In this case, the space-time is initially unperturbed, but the ratios of various matter and radiation components varies spatially. ICflag = 2 is the CDM entropy mode, for which the cold dark matter is assumed to have spatial variations while the other components have much smaller variations of the opposite sign because the initial conditions are set when the universe is radiation-dominated [10]. ICflag = 3 is similar, except that here it is the baryons that vary initially, compensated for by the other components. Finally, ICflag = 4 assumes that there is an additional component of static seed masses such as primordial black holes; to a reasonable approximation this also describes models with cosmics strings or textures. In this case, the other matter and radiation components are essentially unperturbed initially, but the seeds provide a source term in the Einstein equations. In all three isocurvature cases, the initial conditions are set so that the density fluctuation in the spatially varying component is $\delta(k) = 1$ for all k.

Typical values of kmax, nk, zend for Bflag = 1 (full Boltzmann) runs are 0.5, 5000, 0. These parameters yield integration errors less than 0.15% in the photon anisotropy spectrum C_l up to $l_{\rm max} = 3000$. Such a run requires about 80 Cray C90 hours. If accurate results are desired for smaller $l_{\rm max}$, kmax and nk may be reduced proportionally (keeping the ratio fixed). Running linger for $l_{\rm max} = 1000$ requires only about 10 C90 hours.

For matter transfer function runs (Bflag = 0), linger should be run with input parameters set to kmin=1.e-5, kmax=10, nk=61 (or 121, for high accuracy), zend=0 or the desired starting redshift for a nonlinear simulation (grafic will automatically compute the appropriate starting redshift and adjust the fluctuations back in time if linger is run with zend = 0, so this is a safe choice). The range of k is set to ensure adequate sampling for computing the CMB quadrupole moment (requiring small k_{\min}) and of the matter transfer function at short wavelengths (requiring large k_{\max}). Grafic will extrapolate the transfer function beyond k_{\max} if necessary. It prints out a warning message when it does so; this may generally be ignored if $k_{\max} \gg 1.0 \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$ (so that the transfer function is well-approximated by a power law). With 61 points for k ranging from 10^{-5} to $10 \,\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$, linger_con requires about 20 Mflops-hours and linger_syn about 15.

2.1.2 Linger Output

Linger produces no standard output after the parameters are entered; all subsequent output goes to two disk files, linger.dat and lingerg.dat. The first one gives, as a function of k at redshift $z_{\rm end}$, the metric variables and the density, velocity divergence, and shear stress perturbations in all the components (except that no shear stress is output for CDM and baryons, since they are, at the final redshift, essentially perfect fluids with vanishing shear stress). Linger.dat is an ascii file with two header lines giving the input parameters, followed by nk lines giving the perturbation variables. It is written as follows:

```
write(10,'(4(1pe12.6,1x))') Omega_b,Omega_c,Omega_v,Omega_nu
write(10,'(3(1pe12.6,1x),3(i2,2x))') HO,Tcmb,Y_He,3-N_nu,N_nu,
& ICflag
do ik=1,nk
    write(10,'(i7,1x,19(1pe11.4,1x))') ik,ak,a,tau,psi,phi,
& deltac,deltab,deltag,deltar,deltan,thetac,thetab,thetag,
& thetar,thetan,shearg,shearr,shearn,econ
end do
```

ICflag is set to 0 for linger_con, allowing one to determine from the files which of the two codes was used for isentropic initial conditions. The other parameters are as follows: ak is the wavenumber in 1/Mpc, a = 1/zend - 1 is the final expansion scale factor, tau is the final conformal time in Mpc (conformal time is related to proper time by $d\tau = dt/a$), psi and phi are the metric perturbation variables (for linger_con; substitute ahdot and eta of [3] in case of linger_syn). The delta's give the density fluctuations in CDM (c), baryons (b), photons (g), massless neutrinos (r), and massive neutrinos (n). The theta's give the velocity divergence fluctuations in the same components (except in the case of linger_syn, where thetac is replaced with the gauge transformation variable phi-eta, so that the gauge-invariant variable phi of conformal Newtonian gauge may be computed from the metric perturbation variable eta of synchronous gauge). The shear's give the anisotropic stress variable σ of [3]; it is related to Π of Kodama and Sasaki [23] by $\sigma = 2\Pi P/3(\rho + P)$ for a component with mean density ρ and mean pressure P. Finally, econ is an energy conservation check computed using the 0-0 (energy constraint) Einstein equation; it gives a measure of the relative accuracy of the numerical results.

Lingerg.dat is an unformatted (binary) file containing the photon intensity and polarization transfer functions. It is written as follows:

```
write(11) Omega_b,Omega_c,Omega_v,Omega_nu,HO,Tcmb,Y_He,3-N_nu,N_nu,
& ICflag
write(11) Bflag
write(11) kmin,kmax,nk,zend,tau
do ik=1,nk
```

```
write(11) ik,ak,tau,lmax
write(11) (DeltaI_l(k),l=0,lmax)
write(11) (DeltaQ_l(k),l=0,lmax)
end do
```

Here, DeltaI_1 is the perturbation in the photon temperature for the lth multipole moment; DeltaQ_1 is the perturbation in the polarization. (These two quantities are 1/4 the perturbations in the I and Q Stokes parameters; the factor of 4 providing the conversion from intensity to temperature fluctuations.) See [3] for the exact definitions (though note that DeltaI_1 and DeltaQ_1 are written there as $\frac{1}{4}F_{\gamma l} = \Delta_l$ and $\frac{1}{4}G_{\gamma l}$, respectively).

Because lingerg.dat is unformatted, it cannot (usually) be read on machines different from the one where it was created. In a future release of COSMICS, routines will be provided giving the conversion of lingerg.dat to and from a portable binary scientific data format based on the NCSA HDF standard [26].

The results in linger.dat are used by grafic; the results in lingerg.dat are used by deltat. These codes are discussed next.

3 DELTAT: Evaluate CMB Anisotropy Spectrum

The photon temperature angular power spectrum is given by an integral over spatial wavenumbers as [3]

$$C_l = 4\pi \int d^3k \, P(k) \, \Delta_l^2(k,\tau) , \qquad (2)$$

where P(k) is the power spectrum of the primeval potential ψ for isentropic initial conditions, or of the fluctuating density component for isocurvature initial conditions, and $\Delta_l(k,\tau)$ is the total temperature fluctuation (summed over polarizations) at the conformal time τ corresponding to the ending redshift of linger. The angular power spectrum is related to the angular correlation function $C(\theta)$ (here θ is an angle, not $\nabla \cdot \vec{v}$!) by

$$C(\theta) = \sum_{l} \frac{2l+1}{4\pi} C_l P_l(\cos \theta) , \qquad (3)$$

where P_l is a Legendre polynomial. Deltat performs the numerical quadrature in equation (2) using Romberg integration of a continuous $\Delta_l(k)$ interpolated from the values stored in lingerg.dat using cubic splines. The radiation transfer functions undergo damped oscillations with slowly-varying amplitude and phase at fixed τ : $\Delta_l(k) = A_l(k)j_l(k\tau + \varphi_l(k))$ (j_l is a spherical Bessel function). It is difficult to determine or fit $A_l(k)$ and $\varphi_l(k)$, so instead we use the numerically computed values of $\Delta_l(k)$, interpolated with a spline. The point of this discussion is that $\Delta_l(k)$ oscillates rapidly, with a period of about $2\pi/\tau$; $\tau \approx 2c/H_0 = 6000 \, h^{-1}$ Mpc today. Thus, our interpolation method

requires sampling in k with $\Delta k \approx \tau^{-1}$ or better. Although this sampling requirement is stringent, the advantage of our method is that the spline provides an excellent fit and the Romberg integration provides an extremely precise numerical quadrature. Even with this precision, Deltat runs much more quickly than linger for a full Boltzmann run.

The user of deltat also needs to note that the integral in equation (2) must be carried to $k_{\text{max}} \approx 0.5 l_{\text{max}}/\tau$ to get all significant contributions (to a level of 0.15%); for higher k the radiation transfer functions are negligible. The user can experiment with these parameters.

Deltat is easy to run. Prompted by the program, the user must input the following: l_{max} and n; l_{save} ; and the lingerg.dat filename from linger (the name should be changed to avoid overwriting the file by later linger runs). The first parameter requested by deltat is simply the maximum l to compute C_l ; deltat uses the minimum of this value and the l_{max} for the radiation transfer functions in lingerg.dat. The parameter n is related to the logarithmic slope of the primeval power spectrum P(k) in equation (2): $P(k) \propto k^{n-4}$. The offset of 4 is due to the unfortunate usage in cosmology of n for the logarithmic slope of the power spectrum of the gauge-invariant total density fluctuation ϵ_m and not the physically relevant quantities. For the standard scale-invariant Harrison-Zel'dovich spectrum, n=1 for both isentropic and isocurvature fluctuations. The third numerical parameter, l_{save} , is simply a flag instructing the program to extract $\Delta_l(k)$ for $l=l_{\text{save}}$ from lingerg.dat and write it to an ascii file. The user could do this by writing a small program, but often it is useful to plot one of the radiation transfer functions as a sanity check when one is in no mood to write such a program.

The output of Deltat is equally simple: an ascii file deltat.dat containing 3 header lines (the same 2 as linger.dat, plus an extra header line giving n), followed by l and the net power $l(l+1)C_l$ in the left and right columns, respectively. Additionally, if $0 \le l_{\text{save}} \le l_{\text{max}}$, an ascii file deltal.dat is created containing one header line with l_{save} followed by k and $\Delta_l(k)$ in the left and right columns, respectively.

4 GRAFIC: Gaussian Random Field Initial Conditions

Grafic normalizes the power spectrum of matter density fluctuations (either derived from linger.dat, or from a standard parameter fit to the CDM transfer function [27]), and generates initial conditions needed for nonlinear cosmic structure formation simulations. It produces the density fluctuation field $\epsilon_m(\vec{x})$ (that is, $\delta\rho/\rho$) in comoving coordinates as a gaussian random field with the appropriate power spectrum.

Constraints may be imposed (such as the presence of a specified overdensity of the smoothed density field) by providing them in a subroutine; the Hoffman-Ribak algorithm [28] is used to correctly sample the constrained action. Our implementation method is

described in a paper giving a detailed presentation of the theory of constrained gaussian random fields [29]. The HR algorithm has also been implemented by Ganon and Hoffman [30]; their implementation is restricted to constraints that may be specified at lattice points (as opposed to the arbitrary linear constraints allowed by grafic), but it is faster than grafic for more than a few constraints. Note that grafic is an exact method, unlike the iterative heat bath algorithm developed earlier by the author [31], so that it is fast for up to tens of constraints. The main limitation is on the memory required to store the constraint matrix.

Grafic outputs both the density field and the initial positions and velocities of particles displaced from the lattice to produce that density field. The former object is useful for initializing cosmological gas dynamics solvers, while the latter quantities are needed for cosmological N-body simulations. They are related to each other using the Zel'dovich approximation [32]:

$$\vec{x}(\vec{q},\tau) = \vec{q} + D_{+}(\tau)\vec{d}(\vec{q}) , \quad \vec{v}(\vec{q},\tau) = \dot{D}_{+}(\tau)\vec{d}(\vec{q}) ; \quad \vec{\nabla} \cdot \vec{d} = -D_{+}^{-1}\epsilon_{m}(\vec{q},\tau) .$$
 (4)

Here \vec{q} is a Lagrangian coordinate corresponding to the unperturbed comoving position of a mass element; grafic takes these positions to be on a regular Cartesian lattice with periodic boundary conditions. The perturbed comoving positions are \vec{x} ; the perturbations to position grow in proportion with the cosmic growth factor $D_+(\tau)$, which depends on the cosmological model. The displacement field $\vec{d}(\vec{q})$ is obtained by calculating the inverse Laplacian of the linear density field using a fast fourier transform. The approximation comes in the third of equations (4), which neglects terms $O(\epsilon_m^2)$. Grafic automatically selects the output redshift high enough so that the maximum density fluctuation at any lattice point has amplitude 1; for 64³ or more points this means that the rms density perturbation is typically less than 0.2. The proper peculiar velocity \vec{v} follows straightforwardly. Grafic includes subroutines that compute $D_+(\tau)$, $\dot{D}_+(\tau)$, $a(\tau)$, etc., for general Friedmann-Robertson-Walker models with matter, vacuum energy, and curvature.

4.1 GRAFIC Usage

Grafic can be used as is if one is interested only in outputting the linear power spectrum of matter fluctuations and normalizing it to the CMB quadrupole and/or σ_8 . However, if one wants to output density, position, and velocity fields on a lattice, then one must specify the lattice size and spacing and the constraints, if any. This is done through an include file, grafic/grafic.inc, and a constraints subroutine, grafic/constr.f, that the user must edit before building grafic. There is a README file describing the process.

Grafic input is slightly complicated owing to its flexibility. It should be run interactively first for practice. The first item requested by grafic is a flag (Tflag) specifying

the type of matter transfer function to be used: Tflag = 1 to use the linger.dat previously computed by linger_con or linger_syn; Tflag = 2 to use instead an analytic transfer function fit to CDM models by Bardeen et al [27]; or Tflag = 3 if no transfer function should be applied at all to the underlying power-law spectrum. The latter case is appropriate for scale-free simulations. In the second case, it is straightforward to modify the power spectrum routine power.f if the user wishes to use some other analytical form for the matter transfer function.

4.1.1 GRAFIC Input 1: Using linger.dat for transfer functions

Each of the three cases has slightly different input after setting Tflag. We shall begin with Tflag = 1. In this case, the user inputs the name of the linger.dat filename produced by linger. (Its name should be changed to avoid overwriting by subsequent linger runs.) From the linger header information, grafic automatically determines the cosmological parameters. It then asks the user to enter the long-wave spectral index n (the same parameter used by deltat; n = 1 for the scale-invariant Harrison-Zel'dovich spectrum). Next, it requests the desired normalization at redshift zero (a = 1), either $Q_{\rm rms-PS}$ in μ K if the user wishes to use a COBE normalization, or σ_8 if the user prefers the conventional normalization on galaxy cluster scales. To distinguish them, a negative value should be used for σ_8 ; grafic then takes the absolute value. These normalization quantities are defined as follows:

$$Q_{\rm rms-PS} \equiv T_0 \left(\frac{5C_2}{4\pi}\right)^{1/2} , \quad \sigma_8 \equiv \int d^3k \, P_\epsilon(k) \left[3j_1(kR_8)/(kR_8)\right]^2 .$$
 (5)

Here, T_0 is the present-day microwave background temperature; C_2 is the l=2 component of the angular power spectrum computed by grafic using equation (2), with $\Delta_2(k) = \text{shearg}/2$ coming from the photon shear stress in linger.dat; $P_{\epsilon}(k)$ is the matter density fluctuation power spectrum, related to the primeval spectrum P(k) of equation (2) via the Poisson equation (1); j_1 is the spherical Bessel function; and $R_8 = 8$ h^{-1} Mpc is the standard radius for computing σ_8 . The term inside brackets in the integral for σ_8 is the window function for a spherical tophat, so that σ_8 is the rms density fluctuation in a sphere of radius R_8 . Whichever way the user chooses to normalize the power spectrum, grafic quickly computes the other quantity appropriate for this normalization from equation (5). See the file grafic/accuracy_considerations for comments about the accuracy of $Q_{\text{rms-PS}}$.

The normalization quantities are evaluated at a=1 ($\tau=\tau_0$). If linger was evolved to zend > 0 ($\tau<\tau_0$), grafic corrects $\Delta_2(k)$ and $\epsilon_m(k)$ using linear theory in a Friedmann universe (with matter and, possibly, vacuum energy, but negligible radiation):

$$\Delta_2(k,\tau_0) = \Delta_2(k,\tau) + 2 \int_{\tau}^{\tau_0} j_2(k(\tau_0 - \tau)) \dot{\phi}(k,\tau) d\tau , \quad \epsilon_m(k,\tau_0) = \frac{D_+(\tau_0)}{D_+(\tau)} \epsilon_m(k,\tau) . \quad (6)$$

In the integral for Δ_2 , $\dot{\phi}$ is computed using the evolution of the potential in a Friedmann universe, $\phi(k,\tau) \propto D_+(\tau)/a(\tau)$. These time-dependent quantities are computed accurately by grafic.

After the normalization is completed, grafic optionally will output to file power.dat the matter power spectrum $P_{\epsilon}(k)$ at a=1. The user is prompted to enter k_{\min} and k_{\max} for this output; if either one is zero or negative, grafic skips this output.

Next, grafic requests parameters used in constructing realizations of the density field and particle positions and velocities. The user must enter dx, epsilon, and etat. The first quantity is the lattice spacing in comoving Mpc; epsilon is the desired softening distance (in comoving Mpc) for subgrid-resolution simulation programs such as particle-particle/particle-mesh (p3m, not included in COSMICS, but part of a package of N-body solvers to be released by the author in the future); and etat is a parameter used by the author in p3m to select the code timestep. These parameters, among others, are output by grafic in header records for the particle output file. Users may wish to tailor the input of grafic here for their needs, so that they can write the output files in their own favorite formats.

Grafic then requests a 9-digit random number seed to initialize its pseudorandom number generator. The random number routines, in random8.f, are based on a subtract-with-borrow lagged Fibonacci generator with base $2^{32}-5$ and period 10^{414} [33], shuffled by a completely independent generator. Although relatively expensive, random8 produces psuedorandom numbers with a uniform distribution and no detectable serial correlations (despite many attempts by the author to find them when he got curious results due to bugs elsewhere!).

Finally, grafic requests the user to enter a flag ido, determining whether it will compute an unconstrained realization of a gaussian random field (ido = 1), the mean field of constraints (ido = 2, this is not a noise field at all, but rather the ensemble average of constrained noisy fields), or a realization of the constrained random field (ido = 3). The last two options require that the user set the constraints appropriately by editing constr.f.

4.1.2 GRAFIC Input 2: Using an analytical transfer function

If the user prefers to normalize the matter power spectrum for a physical model without linger output (this is useful for exploratory studies, or for nonflat models), Tflag = 2 is the appropriate choice. In this case, grafic cannot determine the desired cosmological parameters from linger.dat, so instead the user is immediately prompted for Ω_m , Ω_v , and H_0 (in km s⁻¹ Mpc⁻¹; ignore the message about $H_0 = 1$). This case is not limited to a flat $(\Omega_m + \Omega_v = 1)$ cosmology, since grafic uses linear theory results valid in any Friedmann universe, including open ones. (Closed universes are currently out of fashion; the correct treatment in this case is complicated slightly by the fact that the spatial

frequency becomes a discrete variable. Grafic is not set up for this.)

After the user enters the cosmological parameters, grafic requests the long-wave spectral index n and the normalization constant ($Q_{\rm rms-PS}$ or $-\sigma_8$), as discussed in section 4.1.1. (Grafic sets $T_0=2.726$ K; when linger dat is used, T_0 is read from the header.) At this point onwards, the input for grafic is the same as in the first case (sec. 4.1.1). However, there are some important issues to consider for an open universe, which is allowed here but not at present with linger.

Grafic computes the CMB normalization using the first of equations (6), except that τ is replaced by the conformal time at recombination (setting it at a=1200) and the Sachs-Wolfe terms are added for the intrinsic anisotropy at the cosmic photosphere in the instantaneous-recombination approximation [34]. Grafic also uses the correct ultraspherical Bessel function for an open universe. Also, in an open universe with curvature constant

$$K = H_0^2(\Omega_m + \Omega_v - 1) , \qquad (7)$$

the Poisson equation (1) is modified; ∇^2 is replaced by $\nabla^2 + 3K$ [25]. I define the spatial wavenumber k so that the eigenfunctions of the Laplacian have eigenvalues $-k^2 + K$; k then has the continuous spectrum $0 \le k < \infty$. Most other workers define k differently, so that it starts at $\sqrt{-K}$ rather than at 0. This is entirely a matter of convention. However, a power law spectrum with one choice obviously is not a power-law spectrum with the other one. Somewhat arbitrarily, grafic assumes $P(k) \propto k^{n-4}$ with k ranging from 0 to ∞ . Users interested in open models are invited to use their own preferred power spectra.

Grafic does the numerical integration of the quadrupole anisotropy by nested quadrature; $\Delta_2(k)$ requires an integral over τ for each k (cf. eq. 6), and $Q_{\rm rms-PS}$ then requires an integration over k (eq. 5). (In case 1 with linger.dat, if linger is not evolved to a=1, then a double quadrature is also used to correct the results to a=1.) This quadrature takes a few minutes on a typical workstation; a progress counter is output by grafic so that the user knows it is working. Romberg integration is used for the quadratures in grafic. A very small tolerance level is set, which the integrator sometimes cannot satisfy. It then prints out a message "Rombint failed to converge...." Do not worry about this unless the error that follows is larger than 10^{-4} .

For description of the other input, see section 4.1.1.

4.1.3 GRAFIC Input 3: Scale-free spectrum

If the user runs grafic with Tflag = 3, a transfer function is not used and neither is the normalization by $Q_{\rm rms-PS}$ and/or σ_8 . However, grafic still needs to know the cosmological model parameters, so it prompts the user to input Ω_m , Ω_v , and H_0 . In the scale-free case, one should set $H_0 = 1$. After these values are input, grafic requests the long-wave spectral index n; the difference with cases 1 and 2 is that now the present-day

linear spectrum of the potential is exactly $P \propto k^{n-4}$, with no correction by a transfer function. Grafic assumes that the spatial curvature scale is sufficiently large so that the corrections to the Laplacian mentioned in section 4.1.2 are negligible. (If they are not, then the user had better be performing the nonlinear calculations in a hyperbolic space!)

The normalization is simpler in the scale-free case than when a transfer function is used. Grafic sets the normalization at a=1 by the value of $k^3P_{\epsilon}(k)$ at the shortest wavelength accessible on a regular lattice, given by the Nyquist frequency $\pi/\Delta x$. Once this is set, grafic skips directly to the output stage, prompting the user for $d\mathbf{x} = \Delta x$ (this should be set to 1), the force softening length epsilon, and the p3m timestep parameter etat, as discussed at the end of section 4.1.1.

4.1.4 GRAFIC Output

The output produced by grafic is straightforward. The normalization values and statistics of the random density and displacement fields are printed on standard output, while there are two unformatted files giving the density and particle data, and (optionally) one formatted file giving the a=1 linear matter power spectrum used. If a large grid size is set in grafic.inc, it may be some time between the last input (ido, determining whether an unconstrained or constrained field is to be produced) and the output of the statistics. The statistics for the unconstrained field include ensemble-average values of the rms density contrast and displacement (mean sigma_delta, sigma_psi, the latter in units of comoving Mpc). The χ^2 statistic gives the sum of squares of the standard normal deviates (unit-variance, zero-mean gaussian random variables) generated for the random density field. It may be compared with its mean value, dof (which equals the number of grid points minus one; one degree of freedom is eliminated because the density fluctuation field has zero mean). Grafic also outputs a standardized deviation ν indicating by how much χ^2 deviates from its mean value. Note that ν for the unconstrained field is not related to the magnitude of any imposed constraint.

If the user applies constraints, statistics are printed out for each constraint next. First are the values of the constraint and a suitably defined χ^2 for the unconstrained field (for one constraint of standardized value ν_c , it is $2\nu_c^2$); the "sampled" and "desired" values differ because the constraint has not yet been imposed. Grafic indicates when it begins to compute a constrained realization. When it is finished, it prints the values of the constraints computed from the actual density field. They should match very precisely the constraints imposed by the user in subroutine constr.f.

The penultimate set of statistics printed by grafic are the rms and maximum density fluctuation and displacement, and χ^2 and the number of degrees of freedom, for the final random realization at expansion factor a=1 (before the fields are rescaled back to the linear regime). The rms values should be close (but not equal) to the ensemble-average values printed out earlier; the maximum values are, of course, several times larger. (A

5-standard deviation value is not uncommon on even a 32^3 grid.) If no constraints are imposed, χ^2 and dof given here agree with those for the unconstrained realization; otherwise χ^2 is reduced and dof is decreased by the number of constraints.

Finally, grafic outputs the expansion factor astart to which it rescales the density fluctuation, displacements, and velocities. Because the rescaling is done so that the maximum $\delta\rho/\rho=1$, astart is related to the reciprocal of the maximum $\delta\rho/\rho$ printed out for a=1. (In an Einstein-de Sitter universe astart exactly equals the reciprocal because linear density fluctuations grow in proportion to a; in other models the linear growth factor is computed to give the correct starting time.) The statistics for the density fluctuation and displacement fields are then extrapolated back to astart. Most users will be concerned only with this final set of statistics.

If the user gives the appropriate input, grafic produces an ascii file power.dat giving the linear matter power spectrum at a=1. The first line contains the spectral slope n and normalization constant input by the user; the latter is negative if the normalization is based on σ_8 and positive if it is set by $Q_{\rm rms-PS}$. After this header follow 201 lines of (k, P_{ϵ}) , with k logarithmically sampled from the minimum and maximum values entered by the user. Note: k has units of Mpc⁻¹ and the power spectrum has units of Mpc³. COSMICS does not use units of h^{-1} Mpc for length, nor does it use improperly defined power spectra. P(k) is a spectral density; it must be multiplied by a k-space volume element to give the power. Some experts define P so that the power is $(2\pi)^{-3}P(k)d^3k$; the absence of factors $(2\pi)^{-3}$ from equation (5) shows that COSMICS is based on the power being $P(k)d^3k$.

Grafic produces two unformatted (binary) files containing the density fluctuation field and deformed lattice positions and velocities at expansion factor astart. These files provide the input needed for nonlinear evolution codes. The first file, delta.dat, contains $\delta\rho/\rho$ on the lattice and is written as follows:

```
write(10) np1,np2,np3,dx,astart,omegam,omegav,H0
write(11) (((delta(i,j,k),i=1,np1),j=1,np2),k=1,np3)
```

(Actually, in the program it is written as a one-dimensional array, but that is equivalent to the three-dimensional array as shown above.) The lattice size is (np1,np2,np3); these numbers are set in grafic.inc before grafic is built.

The final file, p3m.dat, gives (\vec{x}, \vec{v}) on the lattice (see eq. 4) at expansion factor astart. The units of \vec{x} are comoving Mpc; those of \vec{v} are proper km s⁻¹. They are written as one-dimensional arrays because it is more natural to think of a particle list as being one-dimensional:

```
write(10) npart,np1,np2,np3,dx,epsilon,astart,omegam,omegav,H0,
& dt2,etat,nstep,ekin,egrav,egint,nrec
write(11) ((x(i,j),i=1,3),j=1,npart)
write(11) ((v(i,j),i=1,3),j=1,npart)
```

Most of the parameters in the two header lines have been discussed already (note that

dx and epsilon have units of comoving Mpc, and H0 has the natural units); of those that have not, the most important are npart = np1*np2*np3 (the number of particles) and nrec, which determines how many records are to be used for writing the positions and velocities. In most cases, the user will want to set nrec = 1 in grafic.inc, in which case x and v are written with one record each as shown above. However, for very large npart and computers with inefficient use of I/O buffers, it may be difficult or impossible to write 3*npart floating-point numbers as one record. In that case, increase nrec, and examine the code to see how to read the data back again. The parameters that we have not discussed are specific to the author's p3m code.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful for the assistance of my collaborators in putting together this package. Chung-Pei Ma wrote early versions of the linger codes, based on a crude synchronous-gauge code I had developed previously. Paul Bode parallelized the linger codes, tested them and fixed numerous problems, and he helped me prepare the makefiles. Rien van de Weygaert independently wrote a constrained gaussian random field code and guided my thinking about my own version. I also thank Paul Steinhardt and the COMBA collaboration for helpful suggestions, particularly regarding the importance of photon polarization for CMB anisotropy computations.

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant AST-9318185 to the Grand Challenge Cosmology Consortium [35], which provided the motivation for developing a portable package useful for other cosmologists.

References

- [1] Bode, P. , & Bertschinger, E. 1995, submitted to Supercomputing '95 (http://arcturus.mit.edu/SC95/)
- [2] Bode, P., & Bertschinger, E. 1995, poster paper presented at AAS Meeting # 186 (http://arcturus.mit.edu~bode/AAS186/)
- [3] Ma, C.-P., & Bertschinger, E. 1994, preprint astro-ph/9506072 (http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/astro-ph/9506072)
- [4] Peebles, P. J. E., & Yu, J. T. 1970, Astrophys. J., 162, 815
- [5] Wilson, M. L., & Silk, J. 1981, Astrophys. J., 243, 14
- [6] Bond, J. R., & Szalay, A. S. 1983, Astrophys. J., 276, 443

- [7] Vittorio, N., & Silk, J. 1984, Astrophys. J. (Lett.), 285, L39
- [8] Bond, J. R., & Efstathiou, G. 1984, Astrophys. J. (Lett.), 285, L47
- [9] Efstathiou, G., & Bond, J. R. 1986, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 218, 103
- [10] Bond, J. R., & Efstathiou, G. 1987, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 226, 655
- [11] Durrer, R. 1989, Astron. Astrophys., 208, 1
- [12] Holtzman, J. 1989, Astrophys. J. Suppl., 71, 1
- [13] Sugiyama, N., & Gouda, N. 1992, Prog. Theor. Phys., 88, 803
- [14] Xiang, S., & Kiang, T. 1992, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc., 259, 761
- [15] Crittenden, R., Davis, R., & Steinhardt, P. 1993, Astrophys. J. (Lett.), 417, L13
- [16] Dodelson, S., & Jubas, J. M. 1994, Astrophys. J. (Lett.), 70, 2224
- [17] Bond, J. R., et al. 1994, Phys. Rev. Lett., 72, 13
- [18] Stompor, R. 1994, Astron. Astrophys., 287, 693
- [19] Hu, W., Scott, D., Sugiyama, N., & White, M. 1995, preprint astro-ph/9505043
- [20] Peebles, P. J. E. 1968, Astrophys. J., 153, 1
- [21] Kosowsky, A. 1995, preprint astro-ph/9501045
- [22] Bardeen, J. M. 1980, Phys. Rev. D, 22, 1882
- [23] Kodama, H., & Sasaki, M. 1984, Prog. Theor. Phys., 78, 1
- [24] Mukhanov, V. F., Feldman, H. A., & Brandenberger, R. H. 1992, Phys. Rep., 215, 203
- [25] Bertschinger, E. 1995, Les Houches Summer School lectures, preprint astro-ph/9503125 (http://xxx.lanl.gov/abs/astro-ph/9503125)
- [26] NCSA HDF group 1995, Information server at http://hdf.ncsa.uiuc.edu:8001/
- [27] Bardeen, J. M., Bond, J. R., Kaiser, N., & Szalay, A. S. 1986, Astrophys. J., 304, 15
- [28] Hoffman, Y., & Ribak, E. 1997, Astrophys. J., 380, L5

- [29] van de Weygaert, R., & Bertschinger, E. 1995, preprint astro-ph/9506???
- [30] Ganon, G., & Hoffman, Y. 1993, Astrophys. J., 415, L5
- [31] Bertschinger, E. 1987, Astrophys. J., 323, L103
- [32] Zel'dovich, Ya. B. 1970, Astron. Astrophys. 5, 84
- [33] Marsaglia & Zaman 1991, Ann. Appl. Prob. 1, 462
- [34] Sachs, R. K., & Wolfe, A. M. 1967, Astrophys. J., 147, 73
- [35] http://zeus.ncsa.uiuc.edu:8080/GC3_Home_Page.html