Pico

Commander updates 02.09.2021 Ragnhild Aurlien and the Oslo group

Results from 91.91 simulations

- Fitting the same mathematical model in Commander3 as is used to produce the simulations
- Fitting 3 parameters only amplitudes
 - CMB (*A_{cmb}*)
 - One dust model (A_{dust})
 - Synchrotron model (A_{sync})
 - Keeping spectral indexes fixed to PYSM input $(T_{dust}, \beta_{dust}, \beta_{synch})$
- Fitting all parameters will make the results worse

Chisquare from 91.91 simulations





Smoothed to a 1 degree beam

 χ^2

3

Resulting CMB map 91.91





Smoothed to a 1 degree beam

Power spectrum from Clems simulations



5

Analysis of Unnis simulations from March

Simulations generated by Unni Fuskeland

- All frequency maps are smoothed with a 1 degree beam and downgraded to nside 256 before white noise is added
- Foreground model PySM d1s1 (model 90.91)
- 10 different CMB and white noise realisations
 - With both r = 0 and r = 0.003
- Run Commander1 fitting 6 parameters
 - CMB (*A*_{cmb})
 - One dust model ($A_{dust}, T_{dust}, \beta_{dust}$)
 - Synchrotron model (A_{sync}, β_{synch})

Resulting CMB map using Unnis simulations



Smoothed to a 5 degree beam

-0,643 -0,500

0,500 0,644

CMB powerspectrum

- Run with r = 0.003
- Power spectrum from output CMB map from Commander1
- Unmasked CMB map (fullsky)



Powerspectrum after infilling

- CMB realization with r = 0.003
- CMB map from Commander masked with a 15% mask based on the dust amplitude map
- 80 different inpainted (Wiener filtering) realizations
 - After 20 iterations for burn in
- Average and input spectra also plotted



r-estimation

- Estimated using Blackwell Rao estimation based on the 80 inpainted CMB realizations for each of the 10 sets of simulations
- Estimated based on *l* from 2 to 12



Next step

- Finish analysis for r = 0
- Make 90.92 simulations and run these as well
- Paper writing while commander1 runs