Galaxy clustering constraints on deviations from Newtonian gravity at cosmological scales II: Perturbative and numerical analyses of power spectrum and bispectrum
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We explore observational constraints on possible deviations from Newtonian gravity by means of large-scale clustering of galaxies. We measure the power spectrum and the bispectrum of Sloan Digital Sky Survey galaxies and compare the result with predictions in an empirical model of modified gravity. Our model assumes an additional Yukawa-like term with two parameters that characterize the amplitude and the length scale of the modified gravity. The modified predictions are calculated using two methods: the second-order perturbation theory and direct N-body simulations. These methods allow us to study non-linear evolution of large-scale structure. Using the simulation results, we find that perturbation theory provides reliable estimates for the power spectrum and the bispectrum in the modified Newtonian model. We also construct mock galaxy catalogues from the simulations, and derive constraints on the amplitude and the length scale of deviations from Newtonian gravity. The resulting constraints from power spectrum are consistent with those obtained in our earlier work, indicating the validity of the previous empirical modeling of gravitational non-linearity in the modified Newtonian model. If linear biasing is adopted, the bispectrum of the SDSS galaxies yields constraints very similar to those from the power spectrum. If we allow for the non-linear biasing instead, we find that the ratio of the quadratic to linear biasing coefficients, \( b_2/b_1 \), should satisfy \( 0.4 < b_2/b_1 < 0.8 \) in the modified Newtonian model.

PACS numbers: 04.50.+h 98.65.-r 98.80.Es

I. INTRODUCTION

Recent measurements of cosmic microwave background radiation angular power spectrum \([2,3]\) strongly support the "standard" model of cosmology, in which the energy content of the universe is dominated by dark energy (very close to Einstein’s cosmological constant, \( \Lambda \)) and cold dark matter (CDM). Such CDM universes are also in good agreement with independent datasets of galaxy clustering \([4,5]\) and distant Type Ia supernovae \([6,7]\). Thus the basic framework for the theory of structure formation in the universe is firmly established. Nevertheless the nature and the physical origin of dark energy remain to be understood.

The apparent accelerating expansion of the universe is conventionally interpreted in terms of a source of repulsive force (dark energy), but can be explained by modifying Newton’s law of gravity on cosmological scales as well. The latter resolution has been seriously considered recently. For example, Dvali, Gabadadze and Porrati (DGP) \([8,9]\) propose that gravity leaking into extra dimensions drives the observed accelerating expansion. Other such models include modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND) \([10,11,12]\) and ghost condensation \([13,14]\). Intriguingly, all of these alternative models predict some deviation from conventional Newtonian gravity at cosmological scales.

Indeed, while the validity of Newtonian gravity is tested to high precision up to the scale of the solar system \((10^{-11} \text{ m})\), there have been no rigorous tests at sub-millimeter and over scales beyond the solar system \([16,17,18]\). It has been suggested that large-scale galaxy clustering can be used to constrain non-Newtonian models of gravity \([13]\). In principle, but it becomes feasible only recently with accurate measurements of galaxy clustering in large redshift surveys \([15,16]\).

In our earlier work \([21]\) (Paper I), we put quantitative constraints on deviations from Newtonian gravity at cosmological scales under the assumption that the deviation can be described in a simple parametric form \( g(\phi) \); we adopted an empirical Yukawa-like term for the modified gravity, and calculated the galaxy-galaxy power spectrum semi-analytically. (See also Ref. \([22]\) for similar argument.) By comparing the predicted power spectrum with that of SDSS galaxies \([4]\), we derived quantitative, although still conditional, constraints on deviations from Newton’s law of gravity.

In this paper, we improve our previous work by performing non-linear cosmological simulations and by exploiting a higher-order statistic, bispectrum. Since bispectrum is sensitive to clustering in the non-linear regime, it is expected to provide complementary constraints at mega-parsec scales to that obtained from power spectrum analysis. We use direct N-body simulations to test the accuracy of our semi-analytic calculations and to reinforce our conclusions.
The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Our model assumptions are described in Sec. II. We derive power spectrum and bispectrum from perturbation theory in modified Newtonian model in Sec. III and IV. We perform N-body simulations and construct mock samples of volume-limited SDSS galaxies for direct comparison with the observational data. Details of the simulations are described in Sec. VII. The results of perturbation theory and the simulations are discussed in Secs. VII and VIII. Finally, Sec. IX concludes the present analysis.

II. MODEL ASSUMPTIONS

In this section, we briefly summarize our model and a set of assumptions. Further details may be found in Paper I.

We consider a modified Newtonian model for which gravitational potential is given by

\[ \rho(r) = \frac{Z}{G_N \, d^3 p} \left( \frac{\varphi}{r} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{e^r} \right)^i \]

where \(G_N\) denotes (conventional) Newton's constant of gravity. The above model corresponds to Model II in Paper I, on which we focus throughout the following analysis. The deviation from the Newtonian gravity in this model is characterized by two parameters, and \(e\) is the dimensionless amplitude of the deviation and \(M\) is the characteristic length scale. Note that \(e\) is defined in the proper length, rather than in the comoving length.

It is important to note that, although we consider deviations from Newtonian gravity at megaparsec scales, we still assume that the general relativistic correction is valid on horizon scales and thus the cosmic expansion is described by the standard Friedmann equation. Strictly speaking, these assumptions may be in conflict with modified gravity models in general [22,23,24,25]. To account for the existing data such as SN Ia and CMB, however, the cosmic expansion law can hardly change in practice. This is why we adopt the conventional Friedmann equation even in this analysis. For the same reason, we use conventional matter transfer function as initial condition of dark matter adopting the background cosmology defined by the standard set of cosmological parameters, \(\Omega_m = 0.3, \Omega_b = 0.04, \Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.7\), and the Hubble constant at present \(H_0 = 70\) in units of \(100\) km s\(^{-1}\) Mpc\(^{-1}\). See Paper I for further discussion on this point.

In order to make a direct comparison between the clustering of SDSS galaxies and our model predictions, we need to assume a biasing relation for the distribution of galaxies and that of matter. For this purpose, we adopt a commonly adopted deterministic relation:

\[ k_{\text{galaxy}} = b_1 \, k + b_2 \frac{k^2}{k^*}, \]

where \(k_{\text{galaxy}}\) and \(k\) are fractional number density of galaxy and mass density, \(b_1\) and \(b_2\) are linear and fractional biasing parameters. We consider only linear bias (i.e., \(b_2 = 0\)) when we use power spectrum, whereas we consider both \(b_1\) and \(b_2\) for analyses using bispectrum. To derive constraints on \(b_1\) and \(b_2\), we treat them as a free parameter to adjust the overall clustering amplitude.

III. POWER SPECTRUM ANALYSIS

In Fourier space, the modified gravitational potential in Eq. (4) can be written as

\[ x(k) = 4 \, G_N \, a^2 \left( 1 + \frac{a}{b} \right)^2 \]

where \(x\) is in the comoving coordinate, \(k\) is the comoving wave-number, and \(a\) is the scale factor normalized unity at the present epoch.

For the potential of Eq. (3), the evolution equation for density perturbations is written as

\[ D_k^{(1)} = 0; \]

with

\[ D_k \frac{d^2}{dt^2} + 2H \frac{d}{dt} H_k^{(1)} \]

\[ H_k \frac{3}{2} \frac{d^2 H(a)}{da^2} = (a) 1 + \frac{a}{b} \frac{a^2}{k^2} \]

where \(H(a)\) is the Hubble parameter, and \(D_k^{(1)}\) denotes the linear term in density fluctuations [see Eq. (15)] below. Note that even the linear perturbation equation becomes dependent on \(k\) in the modified gravity model.

Next, the linear power spectrum \(P_L(k)\) at present is given by

\[ P_L(k; a = 1) = A T^2(k) k^5 \frac{H}{H_0} \]

where \(T(k)\) is the matter transfer function, and \(N\) is the spectral index of the primordial power spectrum which we set to be unity. We use the fitting formula of Eisenstein and Hu [27] for \(T(k)\). It should be emphasized here that we use the amplitudes of the top-hat mass fluctuations at \(8 h^{-1} \, \text{Mpc}\), equals 0.9 when \(a = 1\) and \(N = 1\). The actual value of \(N\) in our modified gravity models may be slightly different because of the factor \(T(k)\) (i.e., \(a = 1; a\) ) in Eq. (15). However, the difference in the overall amplitudes is unimportant because we have an additional freedom to adjust the predicted amplitudes via the biasing relation [Eq. (2)].
the growth factor \( g(\ ) \) and the tilt of linear power spectrum \( n_l(k) \) given in the case of Newonian models. We must make sure that the above mistake did not change the non-power spectra very much as long as the Peacock-D odds prescription is valid. In the present paper, we also confirm the validity of the Peacock-D odds approach in non-Newonian models using N-body simulations directly (see Sec. IV).

IV. PERTURBATION THEORY AND BISPECTRUM

In this section, we describe the second order perturbation theory and its application to bispectrum. The earlier formulation of cosmological perturbation in the Newonian model may be found in [23,31,32]. Bremer and Matarrese [33] developed a formulation of second order perturbation theory in non-Newonian models. We apply the method to the modified potential in Eq. (1).

The basic equations are given by

\[ a + \frac{1}{a} \dot{\phi}_1 v^i (1 + ) = 0; \quad (8) \]
\[ \dot{v}^i + \frac{1}{a} v^j \dot{\phi}_j v^i + \frac{1}{a^2} \ddot{v}_i = \frac{1}{a} \dot{\phi}_1; \quad (9) \]

where the over-dot denotes the derivative with respect to time, \( v^i = a \dot{\phi}_1 \) is the peculiar velocity, and \( \phi \) is the gravitational potential. We define velocity divergence:

\[ u(x; t) = \nabla \cdot v(x; t); \quad (10) \]

Equations (8) and (9) in Fourier space reduce to

\[ a + u_k = \frac{1}{Z(2)^3} \int d^3p \left[ F(k;p) u_p \right] \quad (11) \]
\[ F(k;p) = \frac{k^2}{p^2} \frac{p}{q} \quad (12) \]
\[ \chi_{i}^{(1)} \quad (13) \]

and

\[ u_k + Hu_k + aH_k = \frac{1}{Z(2)^3} \int d^3p G(k;p;\chi) u_p u_q; \quad (14) \]
\[ G(k;p;\chi) = \frac{k^2}{2p^2} \frac{p}{q}; \quad (15) \]

These equations can be solved recursively. Let us first decompose \( k \) and \( u_k \) perturbatively,

\[ k = \sum k_k + \frac{k}{k^2} + \frac{k}{k^2}; \quad (16) \]
\[ u_k = u_k^{(1)} + u_k^{(2)} + u_k^{(3)}; \quad (17) \]

Differentiating Eq. (11) and substituting to Eq. (14) to eliminate \( u_k \), we obtain

\[ D_{k}^{(n)} = \frac{A_{(n)}}{a} + \frac{H_{(n)}}{a} B_{(n)}; \quad (18) \]

where \( A_{(n)} \) and \( B_{(n)} \) are the source terms of the \( n \)-th order:

\[ A_{(n)} = \frac{1}{Z(2)^3} \int d^3p F(k;p) \chi_{i}^{(n-1)} + \left( \frac{2}{q} - \chi \right) \quad (19) \]
\[ B_{(n)} = \frac{1}{Z(2)^3} \int d^3p G(k;p;\chi) \chi_{i}^{(n-1)} \quad (20) \]

Consider first the lowest order, \( n = 1 \). Since \( A_{(1)} = B_{(1)} = 0 \), Eq. (18) reduces to

\[ D_{k}^{(1)} = 0; \quad (21) \]

which is equivalent to Eq. (4). We denote the growing mode of the solution of Eq. (21) by \( D_{k}^{(1)}(t) \). Note that, in non-Newonian models, the solution \( D_{k}^{(1)}(t) \) is generally dependent on scale \( k \), in contrast to the conventional Newonian case. The linear solution \( k_{i}^{(1)} \) is given by

\[ k_{i}^{(1)} = D_{k}^{(1)}(0) \quad (22) \]

where \( k_{i}^{(1)}(0) \) is the initial fractional density.

The corresponding linear solution for \( u_k \) is obtained from Eq. (11) as

\[ u_k^{(1)} = \frac{a_k^{(1)}}{a} = D_{k}^{(1)}(0); \quad (23) \]

Solutions at the next order, \( n = 2 \), are more complicated. Eq. (13) for \( n = 2 \) is written explicitly as
\[ D_k^{(2)} = \frac{1}{(2)^3} \int d^3p d^3q \frac{B}{2} (p + q) \left( \sum p(q) \right) \left( \sum q(p) \right) S_0(p; q; t) P_0(p; q; t) + S_1(p; q; t) P_1(p; q; t) + S_2(p; q; t) P_2(p; q; t) \]

\[ S_0(p; q; t) = \frac{H_p + H_q}{2} \left[ p^{(1)} d_q^{(1)} + \frac{2}{3} p^{(1)} d_q^{(1)} \right] \]

\[ S_1(p; q; t) = \frac{H_p q + H_q p}{2} \left[ q^{(1)} d_p^{(1)} + \frac{2}{3} q^{(1)} d_p^{(1)} \right] \]

\[ S_2(p; q; t) = \frac{2}{3} p^{(1)} d_q^{(1)} \]

where \( D_k \) is the Delta function and \( P_i(p; q; t) \) are the Legendre polynomials.

\[ P_0(p; q; t) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{p}{q} \right) \]

Equation (24) has an implicit solution of the form:

\[ \left( \frac{2}{9} \left( \frac{1}{z_i} \right)^2 + 1 \right) \]

where the functions \( T_i(p; q; t) \) satisfy

\[ D_{p+q} T_i(p; q; t) = S_i(p; q; t) \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2; \quad (31) \]

We note that expressions for the second-order solutions given in [33] contain some typographical errors which are corrected in our above expressions.

These results enable us to compute the bispectrum in the leading order. The bispectrum is described as

\[ h(k_1) (k_2) (k_3) = (2)^3 B \left( k_1, k_2, k_3 \right) \frac{D}{k_1 + k_2 + k_3}; \]

The leading-order terms of the left-hand side of the above equation are given by

\[ h(k_1) (k_2) (k_3) = h^{(2)}(k_1) \left( \begin{array}{c} k_2 \\ k_3 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} k_1 \\ k_2 \end{array} \right) + \text{cyclic}(1, 2, 3); \]

Therefore the bispectrum reduces to

\[ B(k_1, k_2, k_3) = 2D \left( k_1, k_2, k_3 \right) T_1(k_1, k_2, t) P_1(k_1, k_2) \]

\[ P_{b1}(k_1) P_{b1}(k_2) + \text{cyclic}(1, 2, 3); \]

where \( P_{b1}(k) = h_{b1}(k) \). In what follows, we write the bispectrum simply as \( B(k_1, k_2, k_3) \) adopting the condition of \( k_3 = k_1 - k_2 \) (Eq. [23]).

To compute the bispectrum, we solve Eq. (31) numerically for each pair of \( (p, q) \), together with the linear perturbation equation [23]. At such early epochs \( (z_1 = 1), D^{(2)}(z_1) \) is simply given by the growth rate in the Newtonian case (see Paper I). Similarly, \( T_1 \) are given by

\[ T_0(p; q; z_1) = \frac{17}{21} \left( \frac{1}{z_1} \right)^2; \]

\[ T_1(p; q; z_1) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{q}{p} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{p}{q} \left( \frac{1}{z_1} \right)^2; \]

\[ T_2(p; q; z_1) = \frac{4}{21} \left( \frac{1}{z_1} \right)^2; \]

V. Simulation and Observational Data

A. N-body Simulations

We use the cosmological N-body solver TPM-1.1 [34] in its PM-only mode. We run six realizations each for simulation box-sizes of \( l_{\text{box}} = 500 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}, \) and 1000 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ Mpc} with the following parameters: \( \Omega_0 = 0.3; \Omega_m = 0.7; \Omega_b = 0.2; \Omega_c = 0.2; \Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.2; \Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.2; \) and \( \Omega_0 = 1; \Omega_{\Lambda} = 0; \Omega_b = 0.1; \) and \( \Omega_0 = 0; \Omega_{\Lambda} = 1; \Omega_b = 0.1; \) with 30 Mpc. We use the tting formula for the matter transfer function, equation (28) (31) of the ref. [33], that ignores the baryon acoustic oscillation effect. We start the simulations at \( z = 50. \) All the simulations employ \( N_{\text{p}} = 128^3 \) particles.

To simulate structure formation in the non-Newtonian model, we need to modify the Green function of the Laplacian, \( \mathcal{G}. \) For a density \( \rho \) and de ned on a three-dimensional wave-number grid \( (p; q; r) \), the gravitational potential in real space is evaluated to be

\[ \mathcal{G}_{\text{PM}}(\rho; r) \exp \left[ \frac{2}{i (p + q + r) M} \right]; \]

\[ \text{PM} = 0 \]

where \( l_{\text{m}} n_i \) are position integers in real space with \( M \) being the number of grids per dimension (we follow the notation in Efstathiou et al. [33]).

The Green function in the original TPM code that as-
sum as the conventional Newtonian gravity is given by
\[ g^{\text{H}} = M^2 \sin^2 (p \cdot M) + \sin^2 (q \cdot M) + \sin^2 (r \cdot M) \quad \text{otherwise}; \]
\[ \text{Eq. (39)} \]
which is derived from the seven-point finite difference approximation.

Taking account of the scale dependence in Eq. (3), we correct the Green function for the modified Newtonian model:
\[ g^{\text{corr}} = g^{\text{H}} \left[ 1 + \frac{(\Delta)^2}{1 + (\Delta)^2} \right]; \quad \text{Eq. (40)} \]
Note that \( k \) in Eq. (40) needs to be given in the form, consistently with the Green function itself, as
\[ k(p, q, r) = \frac{M}{2} \left[ \sin^2 (p \cdot M) + \sin^2 (q \cdot M) + \sin^2 (r \cdot M) \right] \quad \text{Eq. (41)} \]
We use the above Green function, evolve the system from \( z = 50 \) to 0, and make mock galaxy samples in the manner described in the next subsection.

B. Observational data and mock samples

For definiteness, we choose a volume-limited sample of SDSS galaxies whose \( r \)-band magnitude is in the range of \((-21.0, -20.0\)) from those described in Hogg et al. [36]. The redshift range is \( 0.044 < z < 0.053 \), the survey volume, \( V_{\text{survey}} \), is \( 920 \times 10^{2} \) (\( \text{h}^{-1} \text{Mpc}^{3} \)), and the total number of galaxies is 44,636. We made sure that using the other volume-limited samples with different magnitude ranges [38] does not significantly affect the results of our analysis below.

We generate 24 mock catalogue from our \( N \)-body simulation data. The mock catalogue take into account various observational effects such as survey geometry, the number density, and redshift distortion (peculiar velocities of simulation particles are assigned to the mock galaxies) [39]. In order to account for the `true' survey geometry, we distribute random particles within the survey volume and correct for the boundary effect following the prescription of Feldman, Kaiser and Peacock [35]. We subtract fluctuations of the random particles which are within the survey volume, \( k_{\text{random}} = k_{\text{data}} - k_{\text{random}} \),
\[ \text{Eq. (42)} \]
While this prescription is fairly empirical and may not completely account for the effect of the survey geometry, it yields a robust estimate at scales of our main interest here, \( k = 0.1 \text{hMpc}^{-1} \). When we calculate the power spectrum and bispectrum for SDSS galaxies and the mock catalogue, we use the above `corrected' density, \( \tilde{k} \).

VI. CONSTRAINTS FROM POWER SPECTRUM

We first compare the power spectra used the Peacock-Dodds prescription and those from numerical simulations. In Fig. 4, we plot the mass power spectra in real space (left panels) and in redshift space (right panels). The predictions from perturbation theory agree well with the results of \( N \)-body simulations. Note that in the Newtonian case, the predicted power spectra with \( b_{0} = 1 \) are already in reasonable agreement with the observed power spectrum of SDSS galaxies. Our simulation results are also consistent with those of Stabena and Jain [38].

The panels on the right side in Fig. 4 show the power spectra of our mock galaxies. In each panel, the dotted line indicates the non-linear power spectrum in real space, which is the same in the corresponding left panel and shown for comparison. The redshift-space power spectrum of the SDSS volume-limited sample is shown by cross symbols. To include effects of redshift space distortion in our mock catalogue, we use the formula derived of M. Ambra, Jing and Suto [33] (equation (12) in their paper). On linear scales (\( k < 0.1 \text{hMpc}^{-1} \)), the Kaiser effect is clearly seen as an enhanced power with respect to the real space power spectrum. It is worth mentioning that the plotted power spectra show substantial variations on the largest scales (\( k < 0.03 \text{hMpc}^{-1} \)), which are presumably due to the cosmology of mock galaxy survey geometry.

To derive constraints on \( b_{0} \); using the calculated power spectra, we apply the \( \chi^{2} \) statistic. We treat the linear bias parameter \( b_{0} \) as a free parameter in order to adjust the overall amplitudes of the power spectra between the predictions/simulations and the SDSS data. This normalization allows us to use the shape of the power spectra to detect possible deviations from the Newtonian case.

We calculate \( \chi^{2} \) as
\[ \chi^{2} = \sum_{i} \frac{P_{\text{SDSS}}(k_{i}) - P_{\text{SDSS}}(k_{i})}{\sigma_{i}}^{2} \quad \text{Eq. (43)} \]
where \( P_{\text{SDSS}}(k_{i}) \) is the SDSS galaxy power spectrum. We use the predicted power spectra \( P(k) \) and the variance of the SDSS data, \( \sigma_{i} \), to calculate \( \chi^{2} \) in real space, while for the same analysis in redshift space, we use those power spectra with the variance of mock galaxy samples to represent the cosmic variance in redshift space.

We compute the relative confidence level of \( b_{0} \) with respect to their best-\( t \) values assuming that
\[ \chi^{2} ( b_{0} \text{mock in}) = \chi^{2} ( b_{0} \text{in}) - \chi^{2} ( \text{min in}) \quad \text{Eq. (44)} \]
follows the \( \chi^{2} \) distribution for 2 degrees of freedom. In Eq. (44), \( m \text{in} \), \( m \text{in} \), and \( b_{0} \text{in} \) denote their best-\( t \) values which globally minimize the value of \( \chi^{2} \), while \( b_{0} \text{mock in} \) is the value that minimizes the \( \chi^{2} \) for a given set of values of and .
Figure 1: The panels of the left side show the power spectra in real space. The adopted model parameters are (a) Newtonian ($\alpha = 0.0$), (b) $\alpha = +1.0$ and $\lambda = 5 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$, (c) $\alpha = -1.0$ and $\lambda = 5 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$. Dots with vertical and horizontal error-bars are the power spectrum of SDSS galaxies from Tegmark et al. $^2$. Dots with only vertical error-bars indicate results of N-body simulations. Dotted and solid lines are linear and non-linear power spectrum, respectively. We denote by $k$ the length scale of the mean inter-particle separation in our simulations, which is given by $k = 0.5 \frac{N^{1/3}}{L_{\text{box}}}$. The simulation results are reliable at $k < k$. In the right panels, we plot the power spectra for mock galaxies generated from our simulation. The parameters for (d), (e), (f) are the same as for (a), (b), (c), respectively. The dotted and solid lines in the right panels are non-linear power spectrum in real space (which are the same as solid lines in the left panels) and redshift space. $\sigma_v$ means the one-dimensional velocity dispersion calculated from simulation data. Cross symbols are the power spectra of the volume-limited sample of SDSS galaxies.

Figure 2 shows the contours of $\sigma^2$. The results from N-body simulations in real space are shown in panel (a) and (b). These differ only in the simulation box size, $500 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$ for (a) and $1000 h^{-1} \text{Mpc}$ for (b). Hence the range of $k$ used to derive constraints is slightly different. We also show the result from the real-space Peacock-Dodel prediction by thin dotted lines using the same range of $k$ consistently with the simulations. Clearly, the
The constraint is slightly less tight than those from perturbation theory and N-body simulations. This is mainly because we discard the data points at large scales \(k \geq 0.01 \text{hMpc}^{-1}\) where the deviations from the Newtonian case are most significant. Nevertheless models with \(\sigma > 1\) are still excluded at a 2-3 confidence level for \(10 \text{h}^{-1}\text{Mpc}\). For reference, we also plot the contours based on the real-space Peacock-D odds prediction by thin dotted lines.

VII. CONSTRAINTS FROM BISPECTRUM

We further derive constraints on the modified Newtonian model extending the analysis to the three-point statistics. Specifically we use (conventional) bispectrum, \(B(k_1; k_2)\), defined in Eq. (2), and reduced bispectra \(Q\) and \(p^{(3)}\) defined as

\[
Q(k_1; k_2) = \frac{B(k_1; k_2)}{P(k_1)P(k_2) + P(k_2)P(k_3) + P(k_3)P(k_1)}
\]

and

\[
p^{(3)}(k_1; k_2) = \frac{B(k_1; k_2)}{V_{\text{sam}}P(k_1)P(k_2)P(k_3)}
\]

where \(k_1, k_2, k_3\) are samples from \(V_{\text{sam}}\) is the sampling volume. The latter quantity \(p^{(3)}\) is the probability density function of phase sum for a density \(k\), \(k_1 + k_2 + k_3\), \(j = j_k \exp(\lambda k)\), studied in Matsuoka and Hikage et al. [38]. In this paper, we consider only isosceles triangles in \(k\)-space that satisfy the relation \(k_1 = k_2\) with angle \(\theta\) defined as

\[
\theta = \cos^{-1} \frac{k_1 k_2}{k_1 k_2}.
\]

In the following analysis, we use \(p^{(3)}\) to give constraints on the deviation from Newtonian gravity. This is because \(p^{(3)}\) consists only of Fourier-phase informations and thus their constraints have good common entanglement with those from \(P(k)\), which is of the square of the Fourier amplitudes.

A. Linear bias model with \(b_2 = 0\)

Let us consider the linear bias model \((b_2 = 0\) in Eq. (1)). Figure 3 plots the bispectra \(B\) and \(p^{(3)}\) in real space (left panels) and in redshift space (right panels) for \(L_{\text{box}} = 500 \text{h}^{-1}\text{Mpc}\) simulations. The survey volume is set to be \(L_{\text{box}}^3\) in Eq. (46). The bispectra at small \(\lambda\) are dominated by various nonlinear effects, whereas there are substantial uncertainties at large \(\lambda\) because of the small number of Fourier modes sampled. Given those, the agreement between predictions from perturbation theory (dashed lines) and N-body simulation data (solid circles with error-bars) is very satisfactory.
The right panels of Fig. 3 show the bispectra in redshift space. There, the results from our mock samples are shown by symbols with error bars. For comparison, we also show the results from perturbation theory in real space. In Fig. 3(d), Kaiser effect is clearly seen as an enhancement at small θ.

We further examine the dependence of the bispectra on . Figure 3 compares the bispectra for different values of . We have set = 0.5 (left panels) and = 0.5 (right panels).

Figure 4 shows the (k) for the volume-limited SDSS catalogue and for our mock samples at in the range of < 0.103hMpc⁻¹. They have a very similar shape, but their amplitude depends systematically on the value of , the degree of deviations from the Newtonian case.
Figure 4: Bispectra $B(k)$, $Q(k)$, and $p^{(3)}(k)$ from top to bottom as a function of $\alpha$ measured in real space; right: $\alpha = 0.5$, left: $\alpha = -0.5$. The dotted, dashed, and solid lines show the perturbation predictions in real space for $5h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, $10h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$, and $10h^{-1}\text{Mpc}$ (Newtonian), respectively, while symbols indicate the corresponding simulation results.

Figure 6 plots constraints on the ($\beta$, $\gamma$) plane derived from the second to the SDSS bispectrum using $p^{(3)}$ and assuming a linear bias ($b_2 = 0$). The constraints from the bispectrum are fairly consistent with, but slightly more stringent than, those from the power spectrum, which indicates the complementary role of the higher-order clustering statistics.

B. The effect of non-linear biasing

In reality, however, it may be more appropriate to analyze the higher-order clustering statistics adopting a non-linear biasing model. In the case of the bispectrum, it implies to introduce the quadratic biasing parameter $b_2$ [see Eq. (2)]. In this biasing model, the relation of $p^{(3)}$ for galax-
Previous papers \[33, 42\] suggest that a simple linear relation and \( p^{(3)} \) for mass reduces to

\[
p^{(3)}(k_1; k_2) = p^{(3)}(k_1; k_2) + \frac{b_2}{b_1} f(P_1; P_2; P_3); \tag{48}\]

\[
f(P_1; P_2; P_3) = \frac{P_1 P_2 + P_2 P_3 + P_1 P_4}{2 \sum_1 P_1 P_2 P_3}; \tag{49}\]

where \( P_i = P(k_i) \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \) \[33\].

\[\Delta \chi^2, p^{(3)}(k)\]

\[\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_3^2} \]

\[\text{mock} \quad 0.07 < k < 0.20 \text{[hMpc}^{-1}]\]

\[\text{Fig. 6: Constraints on the plane from the } p^{(3)} \text{ analysis assuming } b_2 = 0. \text{ The range of } k \text{ is from } 0.07 \text{ to } 0.20 \text{ hMpc}^{-1}. \text{ Solid, dashed, thick dotted lines indicate 1, 2 and 3 confidence levels. Thin dotted lines are the same as those in Fig. 2(a).}\]

\[\frac{\sigma}{\sigma_3} \]

\[\text{mock} \quad 0.07 < k < 0.20 \text{[hMpc}^{-1}]\]

\[\text{Fig. 7: (a) Constraints on and from the } p^{(3)} \text{ analysis treating } b_2 = b_1 \text{ as a free parameter. (b) The best-fit values of } b_2 = b_1 \text{ that gives minimum } \chi^2 \text{ for } p^{(3)}. \text{ Thin dotted lines are the same as those in Fig. 2(a).}\]
bias model in the Newtonian gravity model describes well the clustering of the volume limited sample of SDSS galaxies, i.e., $b_2 = b_0$ and $b_1 = 1$. We now repeat the similar analysis in the modified Newtonian model.

Figure 4(a) indicates constraints on the ($\beta$) plane by treating $b_2 = b_3$ as a free parameter, which should be compared with Figure 2(b) for $b_2 = 0$. The regions below the contours are excluded with a corresponding confidence level. Naturally the bispectrum alone does not constrain (\beta) significantly in this generalized model. While the $\beta = 0$ models are excluded with a 1% confidence level, the conclusion is not statistically significant. In turn, however, we can derive constraints on the value of $b_2 = b_3$ for the modified gravity model by combining the constraints from the power spectrum (independent of the value of $b_2 = b_3$). Figure 4(b) shows the contours of the best-fit value of $b_2 = b_3$ that gives the minimum $\chi^2$ for $p g(k)$ on the plane. Figure 4(b) suggests that $b_2 = b_3$ should satisfy $0.4 < b_2, b_3 < 0.3$, which is the 95% confidence level constraint on the quadratic biasing parameter in the modified Newtonian model.

VIII. SUMMARY

We have derived constraints on possible deviations from Newtonian gravity using the power spectrum and the bispectrum of Sloan Digital Sky Survey galaxies. Our model assumes an additional Yukawa-like term with two parameters that characterize the amplitude, $\omega$, and the length scale, $\lambda$, of the modified gravity. We have predicted the power spectrum and the bispectrum using two different methods, the perturbation theory and direct $N$-body simulations, and found that the good agreement in real space as long as the biasing between galaxies and mass is neglected. In order to take the biasing effect into consideration, we adopt a quadratic biasing model. By comparing with the mock catalogues constructed from our simulations, we have derived constraints on $\omega$ and $\lambda$.

This method allows us to compute the clustering statistics in redshift space and taking account of various observational effects such as survey geometry as well. The resulting constraints from power spectrum are consistent with those obtained in our earlier work, indicating the validity of the previous empirical cold dark matter (CDM) model. If linear biasing is adopted, the bispectrum of the SDSS galaxies yields constraints very similar to those from the power spectrum. If we allow for the nonlinear biasing instead, we find that the ratio of the quadratic to linear biasing coefficients, $b_2/b_3$, should satisfy $0.4 < b_2/b_3 < 0.3$ in the modified Newtonian model.

Future observations will exploit large ground-based telescopes to probe the matter density distribution by weak gravitational lensing. Combined with data from galaxy redshift surveys, lensing observations will provide invaluable information on galaxy bias. Then it will be possible to put more stringent constraints on deviations from Newtonian’s law of gravity at cosmological scales, using the methodology presented in this paper.
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