### First Upper Limits from HERA on the 21 cm Power Spectrum

Josh Dillon UC Berkeley Overdensity of Hydrogen

#### $\delta T_{21\,\mathrm{cm}} \propto (1+\delta)$

21 cm Brightness Temperature

Alvarez, Kaehler, Abel

Neutral

Fraction

 $x_{\mathrm{HI}}$ 

 $T_{\rm CMB}$ 

 $T_s$ 

Spin

Temperature

## The first generation of telescopes got us started on measuring the 21 cm power spectrum.





AND BETTY

GORDON

FOUNDATIO

# So how does HERA measure the 21 cm power spectrum?

Step 1: Calibration

#### The key problem in 21 cm cosmology is maintaining the separability of signal and foregrounds.

Synchrotron Foregrounds

Intensity

21cm Signal

4 - 5 orders of magnitude

### Individual antenna response must be precisely calibrated. $V_{ij}^{obs}(\nu) = g_i(\nu)g_j^*(\nu)V_{ij}^{true}(\nu)$

**Baseline** 

### HERA was designed to be calibrated using the internal consistency of redundant baselines.

### $V_{ij}^{\text{obs}}(\nu) = g_i(\nu)g_j^*(\nu)V_{ij}^{\text{true}}(\nu)$

All without an explicit sky or instrument model!

Liu et al. (2010)

# Example raw HERA data for a single redundant baseline:



# Imposing the redundancy constraint helps solve for all gains.



### Step 2: Reflection and Cross-Talk Systematics

![](_page_12_Figure_0.jpeg)

And as soon as we Fourier transform our data, we run into a problem: high delay (k<sub>1</sub>) systematics on every baseline!

12

14

![](_page_12_Picture_2.jpeg)

Kern, Parsons, Dillon, et al. (2019ab)

#### To understand this effect, we have to examine the temporal structure of the foregrounds and the systematics—how fast they "fringe."

![](_page_13_Figure_1.jpeg)

Kern, Parsons, **Dillon**, et al. (2019ab)

With our techniques for relatively lossless systematics removal, we're getting very close to the thermal noise limit.

![](_page_14_Figure_1.jpeg)

HERA Collaboration (2021)

### Step 3: Power Spectrum and Error Estimation

Working outside the foreground-dominated region, we get our power spectrum upper limit.

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

HERA Collaboration (2021)

## Our first (and world-leading!) limit with just 18 nights and a very conservative analysis.

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

HERA Collaboration (2021)

### Step 4: Validation with End-to-End Simulations

![](_page_19_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_19_Picture_1.jpeg)

We simulated the most important real-world effects to test how well we could nitigate them.  $Re(\widetilde{V}) \, \left[ \mathrm{Jy} \; \mathrm{Hz} 
ight]$ 

Aguirre et al. (2021)

## The simulation is really starting to reflect the complexity of real data.

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

### We're able to extract a simulated signal and quantify our biases, which raise our limits by ~10%.

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

Aguirre et al. (2021)

### Step 5: Astrophysical and Cosmological Interpretation

# We can already largely rule out an IGM unheated by X-rays at z = 7.9, though this is not at all surprising.

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Picture_2.jpeg)

HERA Collaboration (in prep.)

![](_page_24_Figure_0.jpeg)

HERA Collaboration (in prep.)

### What's next?

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

~12 good nights from our commissioning run of HERA Phase 2 with the new wideband feeds.

94 nights from HERA Phase 1 spanning nearly 24 hours in LST.

![](_page_25_Picture_4.jpeg)

#### We'll have way more sensitivity with a full season (~100 nights) and the full array, and should easily rule EDGES in or out.

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

# Which means we can precisely measure the ionization history of the universe.

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### We'll eliminate **T** as a CMB nuisance parameter, improving A<sub>s</sub> errors by a factor of **4**.

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

Liu et al. (2016)

## And, maybe increase the significance of a detection of non-zero $\Sigma m_v$ with CMB-S4.

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

Liu et al. (2016)

In Summary...

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Figure_0.jpeg)