On the peculiar momentum of baryons after reionization
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ABSTRACT

The peculiar motion of ionized baryons is known to introduce temperature anisotropies in the cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation by means of the kinetic Sunyaev–Zel’dovich (\textsc{kSZ}) effect. In this work, we present an all-sky computation of angular power spectrum of the temperature anisotropies introduced by \textsc{kSZ} momentum of all baryons in the Universe during and after reionization. In an attempt to study the bulk flows of the missing baryons not yet detected, we separately address the contribution from all baryons in the intergalactic medium (IGM) and those baryons located in collapsed structures like groups and clusters of galaxies. In the first case, our approach provides a complete all-sky computation of the \textsc{kSZ} effect in the second order of cosmological perturbation theory [also known as the Ostriker–Vishniac (OV) effect]. Most of the power of the OV effect is generated during reionization, although it has a non-negligible tail at low redshifts, when the bulk of the \textsc{kSZ} peculiar momentum of the halo (cluster + group) population arises. If gas outside haloes is comoving with clusters as the theory predicts, then the signature of the bulk flows of the missing baryons should be recovered by a cross-correlation analysis of future CMB data sets with \textsc{kSZ} estimates in clusters of galaxies. For an Atacama Cosmology Telescope (ACT) or South Pole Telescope (SPT) type of CMB experiment, all-sky \textsc{kSZ} estimates of all clusters above \(2 \times 10^{14} \, h^{-1} M_\odot\) should provide a detection of dark flows with signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) of \(\sim 23\) (S/N \(\sim 5–11\) for 2000–10 000 deg\(^2\)). Improving \textsc{kSZ} estimates with data from Large Scale Structure surveys should enable a deeper confrontation of the theoretical predictions for bulk flows with observations. The combination of future CMB and optical data should shed light on the dark flows of the nearby, so far undetected, diffuse baryons.
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1 INTRODUCTION

The standard cosmological model predicts the statistical properties and evolution of the large-scale matter distribution. Initially small inhomogeneities in the matter density field grow under gravity in an expanding universe, giving rise to a cosmic web made of filaments, sheets and superclusters of galaxies that we see today. Large, comoving flows of matter fall on to deep potential wells under gravity, with typical speeds of \(\sim 150 \, \text{km} \, \text{s}^{-1}\) in the standard \(\Lambda\) cold dark matter (\textsc{_lcdm}) cosmological model (Hinshaw et al. 2009). These peculiar velocities (peculiar with respect to the Hubble flow induced by the universal expansion) cannot be easily measured. Indeed, despite recent claims pending for confirmation (e.g. Kashlinsky et al. 2008; Watkins, Feldman & Hudson 2009), there is no conclusive observational evidence for such bulk flows in the present Universe. Nevertheless, the cosmic microwave background (CMB) radiation has provided an accurate measurement of these bulk flows when the Universe was 380 000 years old (\(z \simeq 1050\)). Before most of the electrons recombined with the protons and the CMB could propagate freely, the electron plasma and the CMB radiation were in thermal equilibrium since the Thomson scattering kept both fluids coupled. The free electrons Thomson scattered CMB photons, leaving Doppler imprint according to their relative velocities caused by the oscillation of the plasma–photon fluid in the gravitational potential wells (Sunyaev & Zeldovich 1970; Hu & Sugiyama 1995). Since energy and density fluctuations were very small at that epoch, the linear theory is able to describe very accurately the anisotropy pattern that was introduced by Thompson scattering on the CMB, and this has been confirmed by observations (e.g. Mauskopf et al. 2000; Miller et al. 2002; Grainge et al. 2003; Hinshaw et al. 2009).
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At redshift \( z \sim 10 \), the first stars began to ionize hydrogen in the
intergalactic medium (IGM), and therefore CMB photons interacted
again with the free electrons via the Thomson scattering. In
this scenario, electron peculiar velocities introduced new temperature
anisotropies on the CMB. Likewise, due to the anisotropic nature
of the Thomson scattering, the CMB was also linearly polarized
on the large angular scales, as also confirmed by the Wilkinson
Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) experiment (Hinshaw et al.
2009). These epochs describe the last scenario where all baryons
have been observed: at more recent epochs, the amount of baryon
matter that we are able to detect is at the most half of what is
observed during both recombination and reionization (Fukugita &
Peebles 2004). This constitutes the missing baryon problem.

In this work, and just as in Hernández-Monteagudo & Sunyaev
(2008), we investigate bulk flows and the missing baryons util-
izing the Thomson scatters between CMB photons and free
electrons at low redshift. This mechanism is referred to as the
kinetic Sunyaev–Zel’dovich (kSZ) effect (Sunyaev & Zeldovich
1972), if it occurs in galaxy clusters, but it is called the Ostriker–
Vishniac (OV) effect (Ostriker & Vishniac 1986) in the context of
cosmological second-order perturbation theory (for which the elec-
tron density and velocity are continuous fields). We shall follow
this terminology, although on some occasions we may use either
when referring to both effects for simplicity. We shall restrict our-
sever to the impact of the Thomson scattering on the intensity
or temperature anisotropies of the CMB, since the effect on the
CMB polarization is already studied in Hernández-Monteagudo &
Sunyaev (2008). Unlike in Hernández-Monteagudo et al. (2006a),
we shall not consider the spectral distortions that the hot fraction
of the missing baryons introduce in the CMB blackbody spectrum.
Previously, efforts have been made in the computation of the OV ef-
effect (Ostriker & Vishniac 1986; Dodelson & Jubas 1995; Hu 2000;
Castro 2003), some of them in the context of the non-Gaussian
signal they give rise to. In some recent works, the kSZ effect in
haloes has been used as a probe for Dark Energy (Bhattacharya &
Kosowsky 2008a), while Moodley et al. (2009) have used the gas
in groups to probe the missing baryons, and Lee (2009) studies the
prospects of constraining patchy reionization. Here, we present the
first full-sky projection of the temperature anisotropies induced by
peculiar momenta of ionized baryons during and after reionization
up to the present: if applied to the smooth electron distribution our
calculations provide a full description of the OV effect, while when
applied to the halo distribution they describe the contribution of
galaxy group/cluster correlation on the kSZ effect. The formalism
also permits the computation of the cross-correlation between the
OV and the kSZ effects. At the same time, our computations pro-
vide the linear approximation under which the electron density is
approximated by its average value (the so-called Doppler term). We
can then compare our code with standard linear theory Boltzmann
codes such as CMBFAST (Seljak & Zaldarriaga 1996) or CMB (Lewis,
Challinor & Lasenby 2000), as well as normalize our predictions
to the linear fluctuation amplitudes measured by WMAP. Finally,
we analyze our results in the context of future CMB and Large
Scale Structure (LSS) observations, and provide predictions for the
detectability of bulk flows and missing baryons in the light of those
future data sets. This paper is structured as follows. In Section 2,
we describe the line of sight projection of the baryon peculiar mo-
momentum, and this is discussed in Section 3 in the context of its
application to the halo population. The amplitude of the resulting
power spectra is given in Section 4, and their interpretation in terms
of bulk flow/missing baryon detection is provided in Section 5. We
discuss our main results in Section 6 and conclude in Section 7.

2 THE SECOND-ORDER KSZ EFFECT
(OV EFFECT)

The computation of the OV/kSZ effect requires the projection along
the line of sight of the product of electron peculiar velocity and
density. If we consider the spatial variations of the electron density,
then this product becomes a second-order quantity in cosmological
perturbation theory provided that peculiar velocities are very small
(\( v/c \ll 1 \)). That is, the CMB temperature anisotropies introduced
by the peculiar motion of the scatterers reads

\[
\frac{\delta T}{T_0}(\vec{n}) = \int d\eta \ e^{-\tau_\eta} a(\eta) \sigma_T \delta_e (1 + \delta_e) \left( -\frac{v \cdot \vec{n}}{c} \right),
\]

with \( \tau_\eta \) the Thomson optical depth

\[
\tau_\eta = \int d\eta \ a(\eta) \sigma_T n_e(\eta),
\]

\( a(\eta) = 1/(1 + z(\eta)) \) the cosmological scalefactor, \( \sigma_T \) the Thomson
cross-section and \( n_e(\eta) = \bar{n}_e(1 + \delta_e) \) the electron number density in
terms of its average value (\( \bar{n}_e \)) and its spatial fluctuations (\( \delta_e \)).
The symbol \( \eta \) denotes conformal time or, equivalently, comoving
distance. In Hernández-Monteagudo et al. (2006b) (hereafter HVJS)
a full-sky description of the kSZ effect generated by the low-redshift
galaxy cluster population was provided. However, as noted later by
Gordon, Land & Slosar (2007), those computations observed only
the diagonal part of the Fourier peculiar velocity tensor \( (v^j_v v^j_v) \)
(where \( k \) and \( q \) are Fourier wave vectors and \( i \) and \( j \) refer to one of the three spatial components of the peculiar velocity vectors),
neglecting all non-diagonal components. In Appendix A, we present
a full-sky computation considering all terms in this tensor, and find
that the complete treatment introduces small changes to the results
given in HVJS. We briefly compare the results of both this work and
HVJS at the end of this section. The results given here are formally
elaborated in Appendix A, and here we present a summary.

In brief, the second-order statistic for the electron momentum
(\( p_e \propto n_e v_e \)) is proportional to the quantity \( \langle n_{e1} v_{e1} n_{e2} v_{e2} \rangle \),
and this is the \( vv \) term. Furthermore, it is possible that \( n_e \) is driven by Poissonian
statistics, in which case \( \langle n_{e1} v_{e1} n_{e2} v_{e2} \rangle \propto n_e \langle v_{e1} v_{e2} \rangle \) (Poisson term).
If, however, \( n_{e1} \) is correlated to the velocity field, then one must use the
cumulant expansion theorem, and three new terms arise, of
which one is positive, another one is zero and the third one is neg-
itive. In all cases, the correlation function \( C(\vec{n}_1, \vec{n}_2) \) for each term
can be written as Fourier integrals over some wave vector \( k \) of func-
tions with an angular dependence of either the type \( (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{n}) (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{n}) \)
or \( (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{n}) \). This is a general property of isotropic vector fields, as
already noted in Scannapieco (2000) and Castro (2003). Those con-
tributions with \( (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{n}) (\vec{k} \cdot \vec{n}) \) type dependence will give negligible
contribution at small scales, i.e. the corresponding angular power
spectrum multipoles \( C_\ell \) will go to zero as the multipole \( \ell \) grows.
This is the range observed by the Limber approximation (Limber
1953). In this limit, only the contributions with the \( (\vec{n} \cdot \vec{n}) \) type
angular dependence will survive. Let us consider the above more
carefully in a case-by-case basis.

2.1 The linear terms

If the electron density is constant, then the kSZ/OV effect is lin-
ear and the corresponding power spectrum will contribute to the

total with a term that we shall name as \( vv \), although it is also com-
monly known as the Doppler term. As shown in equation (A14),
the amplitude of the $vv$ term is given by
\[ C_{l,v} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int \frac{dk}{k^2} P_m(k) \frac{k^2}{q^2} \times \left[ \frac{(l+1)^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv} T_{l+1}^{vv} - \frac{(l+1)^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv} T_{l+1}^{vv} \right] \]
\[ - \frac{(l+1)^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv} T_{l+1}^{vv} + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv} T_{l+1}^{vv} \right] \] (3)
In this equation, the terms $T_{l}^{vv}$ correspond to the projection on multipole $l$ of the line of sight integrals of the redshift-dependent source term that includes the growth factor of the peculiar velocities $D_l(z)$ and the average Thomson visibility function $\tau_\text{T} \exp(-\tau_\text{T})$ [with $\tau_\text{T} = \sigma T \int_a \alpha(z)$ the Thomson opacity, dependent on the Thomson cross-section, the average electron density ($n_e$) and the scalefactor $a(z)$]. The label $i$ refers to different lines of sight $\alpha_i$, $i = 1, 2$. The linear peculiar velocity growth factor $D_v$ can be expressed in terms of the line of sight integrals of the redshift-dependent source term
\[ D_v = H(z) \frac{dP_v}{dz} \right|_{z} \], (4)
and $D_\text{(z)}$ is expressed in terms of the integral
\[ D_\text{(z)} \propto H(z) \int_\infty^z \frac{dz'}{a(z')H(z')} \right|_{z} \], (5)
with $H(z)$ the Hubble function and $D_v$ normalized to $D_v(z = 0) = 1$.
The spatial clustering properties of the peculiar velocity field are encoded in the integral of the velocity power spectrum, which is proportional to $P(k)/k^2$ [$P(k)$ is linear matter power spectrum]. Provided that all lines of sight are statistically equivalent and for high $l$ there exists an asymptotic value for the spherical Bessel functions $j_m(x)$, it is easy to find that at the small scales the $vv$ term vanishes, i.e.
\[ \lim_{l \to \infty} C_{l,v} = 0 \] (6)
This term is linear, and is therefore present in standard Boltzmann codes like CMBFAST or CAMB.

In the case of halo-induced kSZ effect, the discrete nature of haloes introduces a different type of anisotropy. The actual amplitude of the kSZ effect is proportional to the number of haloes present along the line of sight; therefore kSZ fluctuations obey Poisson statistics in this case. The variance of the number of objects is proportional to its mean, and so the angular power spectrum is also linear in the average number density. The Poisson term has two contributions, $C_{l,v}^{\text{p}}$, and $C_{l,v}^{\text{PB}}$. The first one is (see equation A32)
\[ C_{l,v}^{\text{p}} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int \frac{d^2k}{k^2} J_\text{l(k)} \left[ \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{\text{p}} T_{l+1}^{\text{p}} + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{\text{p}} T_{l+1}^{\text{p}} \right] \], (7)
and it does not vanish on the small scales when both lines of sight are statistically equivalent, although it will drop to zero in the angular range that goes well beyond the typical halo profile (haloes are assumed to have no substructure).
The function $J_\text{l(k)}$ is an angular integral involving the window functions from the Fourier transform of the halo density and velocity profile and the matter power spectrum. Since we are not interested in the clusters’ substructure, the halo window functions (both in density and in velocity) were approximated by Gaussians of the width of the virial radius of the halo. The terms $T_{l}^{\text{p}}$ express the multipole integral along the line of sight, the visibility function and the velocity growth. They are proportional to $\sqrt{m}$ ($m$ is the halo number density), so that their product is linear in the halo density, as Poisson statistics require. On the other hand, the term $C_{l,v}^{\text{PB}}$ reads (equation A35)
\[ C_{l,v}^{\text{PB}} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int \frac{d^2k}{k^2} J_\text{l(k)} \left[ \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} \right] \]
\[ - \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} T_{l+1}^{\text{PB}} \right] \] (8)
This term vanishes again at high $l$,
\[ \lim_{l \to \infty} C_{l,v}^{\text{PB}} = 0 \] (9)
so in this multipole regime $C_{l}^{\text{v} \rightarrow \text{d}} \rightarrow C_{l}^{\text{p}} \text{A}$. The function $J_\text{l(k)}$ is another $k$-dependent function similar to $J_\text{i(k)}$.

### 2.2 The second-order terms
Both the $vv$ (Doppler) and the Poisson terms above are linear, and hence their angular power spectra are proportional to the linear scalar power spectrum (although we prefer to write them in terms of the linear matter power spectrum). Second-order terms involve the product of density and peculiar velocity, and thus the resulting angular power spectra contain terms that can be interpreted as convolutions of the initial scalar power spectrum. In the Appendix, we demonstrate that three different terms of this nature arise, namely the $v_1d_1 \rightarrow v_2d_2$ term, the $v_1v_2 \rightarrow d_1d_2$ term and the $v_1d_1 - v_2d_2$ term. (The integer subscript here denotes one of the two lines of sight.) The first one turns out to give zero contribution, so for simplicity we shall refer to the latter two as the $vv \rightarrow dd$ and $vd \rightarrow vd$ terms, respectively.

The $vv \rightarrow dd$ term comes from two contributions,
\[ C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd} = C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd} + C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd} \] (10)
The $C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd}$ term reads (equation A47)
\[ C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int \frac{d^2k}{k^2} A(k) \left[ \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} - \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} \right] \]
\[ + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} - \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} \] (11)
and, as the $vv$ term above, it vanishes on the small scales. Equation (A50) provides the expression for $C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd}$:
\[ C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int \frac{d^2k}{k^2} B(k) \left[ \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} - \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} \right] \]
\[ + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} - \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} T_{l+1}^{vv \rightarrow dd} \] (12)
which dominates the contribution to $C_{l,v}^{vv \rightarrow dd}$ at high multipoles. Contrary to $J_\text{i(k)}$, $J_\text{J(k)}$ above, the functions $A(k)$ and $B(k)$ are angular integrals involving the convolution of two matter power spectra, apart from the window functions from Fourier transforms of the halo profile. The terms $T_{l,i}^{vv \rightarrow dd}$ provide the line of sight integral...
on multipole $l$ of the visibility function, the matter bias factor (matter bias factor is set to unity unless when we are considering haloes) and the growth factors of density and velocities, respectively.

The term $C_{\ell}^{\nu - \nu}$ is very similar to $C_{\ell}^{\nu - d\nu}$: it is built upon two different contributions,

$$C_{\ell}^{\nu - \nu} = C_{\ell, A}^{\nu - \nu} + C_{\ell, B}^{\nu - \nu},$$

and the first one also vanishes on the small scales, as can be see from this expression when we go to large $l$ (see equation A58):

$$C_{\ell, A}^{\nu - \nu} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int k^2 dk \ C(k) \times \left[ T_{l, 1+1}^{\nu - \nu} \left( \frac{(l+1)^2}{2l+1} T_{l+1, 2}^{\nu - \nu} - \frac{l(l+1)}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l-1, 2}^{\nu - \nu} \right) + T_{l-1, 1}^{\nu - \nu} \left( -\frac{l(l+1)}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l-1, 2}^{\nu - \nu} + \frac{l^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l-2, 2}^{\nu - \nu} \right) \right].$$

The second contribution is given by (equation A60)

$$C_{\ell, B}^{\nu - \nu} = \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int k^2 dk \ (-D(k)) \times \left[ T_{l, 1+1}^{\nu - \nu} \frac{l+1}{2l+1} T_{l+1, 2}^{\nu - \nu} + T_{l-1, 1}^{\nu - \nu} \frac{l^2}{2l+1} T_{l-2, 2}^{\nu - \nu} \right].$$

The functions $C(k)$ and $D(k)$ are again angular integrals which contain the convolution of two power spectra and window functions associated with the size of the regions where peculiar velocities are measured. There is a direct correspondence of the Poisson, $\nu\nu, d\nu - d\nu$ and $dd - d\nu$ terms in this work and in HVJS (let us note here that our $d\nu - d\nu$ term here was called $d\nu - v\nu$ in HVJS). A comparison of Fig. 3 of this work and fig. 4 of HVJS shows that the Doppler ($\nu\nu$ term) displays the same decaying behaviour in both cases, although in the full computation it drops faster with increasing $l$. The $v\nu - d\nu$ term is negative, but smaller in amplitude than the $\nu\nu - dd$ term, in both works as well. Shapes of each of these two and the Poisson term are also very close, although not so much for the amplitudes. Despite the different units (here we use $\mu K$ in an attempt to shrink the $Y$-axis), it is clear that the full computation provides lower amplitudes which cannot be explained only on the grounds of a larger value of $\sigma_8$ in HVJS ($\sigma_8 = 0.88$ in HVJS versus $\sigma_8 = 0.817$ here). The Poisson term indeed benefits from this higher normalization, and its difference in both works is a factor of $\sim 5$ (when using $\mu K$ units), which is close to the ratio that arises when comparing the $dd - \nu\nu$ and $d\nu - d\nu$ terms. However, the comparison of the amplitude of the $\nu\nu$ terms in both works provides a disparity larger than a factor of $\sim 5$: in the full computation this term not only plumbs for increasing $l$ much more rapidly, but also has a lower amplitude at $l \geq 2$. This indicates that the approach taken in HVJS seems to have a larger impact on $(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1)(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2)$ type terms.

### 3 Gas in Haloes Versus gas in the IGM

Before we show the amplitudes of the OV/kSZ power spectra presented in the previous section, we compare the effect of the Thomson scattering as it arises in collapsed haloes to the OV effect generated in the IGM. It is relevant to understand under which conditions would collapsed gas in haloes contribute more in terms of CMB angular anisotropies than the gas in the IGM. In both scenarios, the
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**Figure 1.** Top: opacities in a WMAP V universe due to a smooth distribution of electrons (solid line), all haloes more massive than $5 \times 10^8 h^{-1} M_\odot$ (dotted line) and all haloes more massive than $5 \times 10^{10} h^{-1} M_\odot$ (dashed line). Bottom: thin lines refer to the $M > 5 \times 10^8 h^{-1} M_\odot$ halo population and thick lines to $M > 5 \times 10^{10} h^{-1} M_\odot$. Dotted lines: bias factor evolution versus redshift. Solid lines: volume fraction filled by each halo population. Dashed lines: product of volume fraction times electron overdensity (with respect to background).

Thomson scattering introduces anisotropies according to

$$\frac{\delta T}{T_0}(\hat{r}) = \int d\eta \ \tau_T \left( -\frac{\nu \cdot \hat{r}}{c} \right),$$

where we have approximated the Thomson visibility function $A = \tau_T \exp(-\tau_T)$ by the opacity, $\Lambda \approx \tau_T$, since $\tau_T$ is $\sim 0.09$ in the redshift regime of interest (Hinshaw et al. 2009).

Because we assume that the peculiar velocity of gas with respect to the CMB is very similar for both gas in IGM and haloes, the comparison of the OV and kSZ effects must then be focused on the optical depths, i.e. in the line of sight integral of $\tau_T$ in each case. As shown in equation (18) of HVJS (after approximating the ST mass function constant on small scales), the effective opacity generated in haloes at a given epoch is given by

$$\langle \tau_T \rangle_{\text{halo}}(z) = \int \frac{dM}{d\mu} \ \tau_{T, \text{halo}}(M, z) V(M, z),$$

where $d\mu/dM$ is the halo mass function [we choose Sheth & Tormen(ST, 1999)], $V(M, z)$ is the proper volume occupied by gas in those haloes and $\tau_{T, \text{halo}}(M, z)$ is the opacity generated by a halo of mass $M$ at redshift $z$. The effect is, in the end, sensitive to the total number of electrons in a given halo population, and can be expressed by the average halo optical depth times the volume fraction of haloes.

The halo population opacity can be compared directly to the opacity associated with the smooth distribution of all electrons. The top panel of Fig. 1 displays the opacity in three scenarios: (i) a smooth distribution of electrons (solid line), (ii) electrons within...
all haloes of mass greater than $5 \times 10^{13} h^{-1} M_\odot$ (dashed line) and (iii) electrons within all haloes of mass greater than $5 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$ (dotted line). The most massive halo population provides a very low opacity due to the small amount of cosmological volume it takes. The latter halo population contains almost all the electrons in the Universe, and therefore its opacity is very close to the one in Case (i).\(^2\)

We have ignored the effect of the bias until now. Dark matter haloes can either be biased or be anti-biased tracers of the underlying matter distribution, and we need to include the bias factor when we compute the angular anisotropies. In the bottom panel of Fig. 1, the bias factors for the two halo populations considered ($M > 5 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$ and $M > 5 \times 10^{13} h^{-1} M_\odot$) are shown by the dotted thin and dotted thick lines, respectively. These bias factors were computed by using the expressions of Mo & White (1996), and integrating them with the ST mass function:

$$b(z) \equiv \left[ \frac{dM}{dM} \left( \frac{dn}{dM} b(M, z) \right) \right] \left/ \int \frac{dM}{dM} \frac{dn}{dM}. \right.$$  

(18)

Although at high redshifts, bias factors grow above unity, the volume fraction occupied by the halo population is very low: this is shown by bottom solid lines (thin line for $M > 5 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$ and thick line for $M > 5 \times 10^{13} h^{-1} M_\odot$). The volume fraction is so low that it cannot be compensated by gas overdensity within haloes: the product of gas overdensity and the volume fraction is below unity at all redshifts [as shown by the thin ($M > 5 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$) and thick ($M > 5 \times 10^{13} h^{-1} M_\odot$) dashed lines]. The thin solid green line shows the level of unity.

According to these results, it seems that the anisotropy due to haloes will always be below the level of anisotropy induced by a smooth and continuous distribution of electrons. There are, however, two caveats: (i) haloes might show bias in their peculiar velocities, although this is unlikely to change the picture by more than 30–40 per cent (Peel 2006), (ii) on the small scales, haloes follow Poissonian statistics, and this will add a considerable amount of anisotropy, as we shall see below. These results differ from previous works (e.g. Hu 2000; Castro 2003) where the power spectrum for kSZ effect in non-linear structures had been computed. In previous works, the matter power spectrum was simply replaced by the non-linear power spectrum, but no changes were introduced in the related opacity. No attention was paid to the Poisson term either, which, in the case of haloes, turns out to be dominant. This difference must be motivated by the fact that they were computing the combined effect of both linear and non-linear density perturbations at high redshift. Here, we try to separate the OV contribution from the one generated in haloes, and the contribution to the latter arises mostly at low ($z < 2$) redshift.

4 THE POWER SPECTRUM OF THE OV/KSZ EFFECT

4.1 Normalization to WMAP observations

The WMAP satellite has provided all-sky measurements of the temperature and polarization anisotropies of the CMB (Hinshaw et al. 2009). This fluctuation field is so small that it should provide a normalization for the linear level of departure from perfect anisotropy (higher-order contributions should be negligible).

\(^2\) According to the halo model, all mass in the Universe must be found in collapsed haloes.

On the large scales, the theory predicts that the CMB temperature anisotropies must be caused mainly by two physical phenomena: gravitational redshift/blueshift of CMB photons due to the passage through different (and eventually evolving) gravitational potentials and the Thomson scattering induced by free electrons during and after reionization. This theory predicts the relative weight of these two contributions, and WMAP measurements constitute accurate measurements of the combined effect of these two contributions. Therefore, if the theory is correct, by using WMAP observations it is possible to estimate the amplitude of each of the two contributions dominating at the large angular scales. In particular, WMAP data can be used to normalize the level of anisotropies generated by the Thomson scattering during and after reionization.

In Fig. 2, the black solid line displays the Doppler ($vv$) term which accounts for the Thomson scattering contribution to the low CMB anisotropy (see equation 3). This has been produced by feeding the cosmological parameter set given for WMAP V+SNALL+BAO\(^3\) to a modified version of CMBFAST. (See http://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/product/map/dr3/parameters_info.cfm for details on this model.) This code provides both the total amplitude of the angular power spectrum and the $C_{\ell}^{vv}$ term. The total power spectrum was normalized to fit WMAPV observations, and the $vv$ term was scaled accordingly. As shown by the solid line in Fig. 2, the maximum of the $vv$ angular band power spectrum is reached at $\ell \sim 20–30$, with an amplitude close to $\sim 22(\mu K)^2$. Note that here power spectrum amplitudes are given in terms of quantity $D_\ell \equiv (\ell + 1)C_{\ell}/(2\pi)$. The filled red circles display the result of our computation of equation (3): the accurate computation of this term is particularly difficult, since at large $\ell$ it drops to zero as the vanishing difference of several integrals. Small numerical errors in the computation of these integrals introduce some scatter with respect to the CMBFAST prediction, but only at moderate and high $\ell$s. For $\ell < 100$, the accuracy of our code is better than 8 per cent, and we should expect a similar or better level of accuracy for all other terms which do not vanish as the $vv$ (Doppler) term (we remark that all other terms become dominated at high $\ell$s by at least a non-vanishing contribution). Note that this

\(^3\) See http://lambda.gsfc.nasa.gov/product/map/dr3/params
comparison allows us to normalize the output of our code not only for the linear predictions, but also for the second-order predictions of $vv - dd$ and $vd - vd$. Therefore, with the exception of the percent level uncertainty of our integrals, all sources of uncertainties are associated with the modelling of the mass function, the bias factor and the halo profile description.

4.2 Results

The amplitude of the OV/kSZ power spectra in different scenarios is displayed in Fig. 3. Note that $D_l^{1/2} \equiv \sqrt{l(l+1)C_l/(2\pi)}$. The left-hand panel considers all electrons in a diffuse and continuous phase, and should be a fair description of the electron distribution during reionization. This case adopts the opacity displayed by the thick solid line in the top panel of Fig. 1, for which the anisotropy is mostly generated at $z \sim 6$–10. The $vv$ term we use to calibrate the amplitude of the fluctuations peaks at $\sim 4$–5 $\mu$K for $l \sim 10$–20, but then drops rapidly for $l \gtrsim 100$. In contrast, the sum of the $vv - dd$ and $vd - vd$ terms (which corresponds to what is commonly understood as the OV effect) becomes dominant at $l \sim 200$, and shows a rather flat pattern on the small scales. The OV term crosses the linear power spectrum generated during recombination at $l \sim 4000$, with an amplitude between 1 and 2 $\mu$K. Provided that there is no way to spectrally distinguish the power due to OV effect during reionization from the power originated at the last scattering surface, the crossover of the OV effect over the linear power spectrum is particularly significant, since it provides a direct observable of the reionization epoch. Its amplitude is within the nominal sensitivity of third-generation CMB experiments like ACT (Fowler & ACT Collaboration 2006) or SPT (Ruhl et al. 2004).

Indeed, the amplitude of the OV effect is considerably higher than the amplitude corresponding to the $vv - dd$ and $vd - vd$ terms generated by haloes. It is well above the anisotropy level generated by the galaxy cluster population which experiments like ACT and SPT are targeting ($M > 2 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_\odot$, middle panel in Fig. 3). Even for $M > 5 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_\odot$, the second-order kSZ terms lie about one order of magnitude below the OV contribution at $l \sim 3000$ (which translates into two order of magnitudes in the power spectrum). This proves that most of the power of the OV effect is actually generated at high redshifts, since the OV contribution from low redshifts is well sampled by the kSZ effect corresponding to masses $M > 5 \times 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$ (note that the opacities of the OV and the kSZ effect for this halo population are very similar at low $z$, say, at $z \sim 1$; see Fig. 1). The difference in the amplitudes of the OV and halo kSZ effect contributions can therefore be assigned to $z > 1$.

However, by looking at the right-hand panel of Fig. 3, it becomes clear that in order to distinguish the high-$z$ OV contribution from the low-$z$ kSZ halo contribution, one must take into account the Poisson term. This can be achieved by masking out all massive, clearly detected haloes: after removing the Poisson contribution from clusters above $2 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_\odot$, the Poisson term shown in the right-hand panel of Fig. 3 drops by $\sim 40$ per cent, which, according to our computations, should be below the OV level. We must note that the halo peculiar velocities assumed here are close to the linear limit (we have introduced only a mild bias of 30 per cent), but reality might be very different due to the presence of thermal, non-linear velocities which would boost the kSZ amplitudes in haloes. However, to this point, there is very little observational evidence for these non-linear component (as well as for the linear one).

5 PROSPECTS FOR DETECTING BULK FLOWS/MISSING BARYONS IN FUTURE CMB DATA

Of all kSZ terms shown in Fig. 3, one of the easiest to observe is the Poisson term at $l \sim 2000$–3000. Its amplitude is almost as high as the combination of the $vv - dd$ and $vd - vd$ terms from the OV effect, and, more importantly, it is associated with massive haloes that can be identified at other frequencies. Nevertheless, one must note that measuring the kSZ Poisson term at positions of galaxy clusters does not properly test the theoretical predictions of the model on the bulk flows. This term is sensitive to the average velocity dispersion of those objects (which is likely to be contaminated by non-linear contributions) but tells nothing about the spatial correlations of the peculiar velocity field.

In the context of the standard model, it was shown in HVJS that typical correlation lengths for bulk flows are about 20–40 $h^{-1}$ Mpc
in comoving units. This means that all electrons within a sphere of radius from 20 to 40 $h^{-1}$ Mpc share a similar peculiar velocity. If this is an accurate description of reality, then one can use the kSZ effect detected in the most massive haloes as a template for the peculiar velocity field in their surroundings. This idea was used in Hernández-Monteagudo & Sunyaev (2008) to track the missing baryons by kSZ–E polarization mode cross-correlation, and can also be applied in this context. Let us assume that future high-resolution CMB experiments provide accurate measurements of the kSZ effect in haloes more massive than, say, $2 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$, so that a template of the kSZ effect on the sky (hereafter $M_{sz}$) can be built. If this template is then cross-correlated with the CMB sky (hereafter $T_{CMB}$), then signal does come not only from the known clusters, but also from the surrounding gas. Fundamental sources of noise for this cross-correlation are, to the first order, the primordial CMB fluctuations and the instrumental noise (which usually becomes relevant on the scales of the point spread function). This cross-correlation can be picked-up via a matched filter (MF) approach (Górski et al. 1996),

$$\alpha = \frac{T'_{CMB} C^{-1} M_{sz}}{M_{sz} C^{-1} M_{sz}},$$

(19)

where the CMB signal is assumed to intrinsically contain some kSZ component proportional to the kSZ template, i.e. $\alpha M_{sz}$. The above expression is derived after finding the value of $\alpha$ that minimizes the $\chi^2$ statistic

$$\chi^2 = (T'_{CMB} - \alpha M_{sz}) C^{-1} (T_{CMB} - \alpha M_{sz}),$$

(20)

and the formal error of $\alpha$ is given by

$$\sigma_{\alpha} = \frac{1}{M_{sz} C^{-1} M_{sz}}.$$  

(21)

It is being assumed that the part of the total signal $T_{CMB}$ that is not proportional to the kSZ template $M_{sz}$ (i.e. the noise) is Gaussian distributed. The covariance matrix $C$ contains the noise sources (namely primordial CMB and instrumental noise, where the CMB component must also observe the OV signal generated shortly after reionization). The signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) of this cross-correlation is given by

$$\frac{S}{N} = \frac{T'_{CMB} C^{-1} M_{sz}}{\sqrt{M_{sz} C^{-1} M_{sz}}}.$$  

(22)

If the kSZ template is written in multipole space, then the last equation on the S/N can be written for each multipole $l$. On this basis, the covariance matrix $C$ is diagonal for white instrumental noise $N_l$. \((C_{f,f'} = (C_{f,f'}^{CMB} + N_l)\delta_{f,f'})\), and equation (22) reads

$$\frac{S}{N_l} = \frac{(2l+1) \left( C_{l,i,ksz}^{h} + C_{l,i,ksz}^{OV} \right) \left( C_{l,i,ksz}^{CMB} + N_l \right)^{-1}}{\sqrt{(2l+1) C_{l,i,ksz}^{h} \left( C_{l,i,ksz}^{CMB} + N_l \right)^{-1}}}.$$  

(23)

For non-full-sky coverage ($f_{sky} < 1$), there are not $(2l+1)$ degrees of freedom per multipole $l$, but roughly $(2l+1)/f_{sky}$ in this case, the last equation should be multiplied by $f_{sky}^{l+1}$. The term $C_{l,i,ksz}^{h}$ accounts for the halo–halo kSZ auto-correlation (i.e. the Poisson, $vv, vd, dv$ and $dd$ and $vd$ and $vd$ terms), whereas $C_{l,i,ksz}^{OV}$ expresses the cross-correlation between the kSZ effect induced in haloes and the OV effect generated by the distribution of cluster objects on the large scales (i.e. mostly outside haloes). This cross power spectrum can be easily computed by introducing, in our angular cross-correlation function $C_{\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2}$, the halo visibility function in the los integrals $I_{\hat{n}}$ along direction $\hat{n}_1$, and the OV effect visibility function along direction $\hat{n}_2$. (This change of visibility functions includes some other changes in the bias factors and Fourier window functions, as explicated right before Section A.1 of the Appendix.) The cross power spectrum is shown by red circles in Fig. 4. It is worth to stress that in this case there is no contribution from the Poisson term, since this term appears exclusively for the halo auto-correlation. If we are searching for the kSZ effect signal of the gas outside haloes, one should mask the known clusters, which is equivalent to dropping the $C_{l,i,ksz}^{h}$ term in the numerator of equation (23). This approach will obviously yield smaller S/N than when considering the gas within clusters.

The result of adding all the S/N below a given multipole $l$ is shown in Fig. 5. Black lines refer to an ACT-SPT like all-sky CMB experiment with a sensitivity level of $\sim 1$ μK per resolution element of $\sim$1 arcmin. The red coloured lines display results for (all sky, $f_{sky} = 1$) Planck High Frequency Instrument (HFI) 217 GHz channel (see Table 1). If kSZ clusters are not masked, then the cross-correlation test yields a very high S/N, as displayed by the dashed lines. Instead, if known kSZ clusters are masked and only the signal coming from the diffuse baryons is considered, then the S/N drops to a level that only an ACT-SPT type CMB experiment would be able to detect, since it mostly comes from the small angular scales. This is shown by the solid lines, which depict the ideal case of full-sky coverage ($f_{sky} = 1$). In contrast, filled triangles and squares refer to an ACT-SPT type experiment covering 2000 and 10000 deg$^2$, respectively. We see that these scenarios lie in the limit of detectability.

The last case (displayed by solid lines for $f_{sky} = 1$) describes the situation in which kSZ measurements in galaxy clusters are used to build the kSZ template and search for the baryons in the IGM, outside the haloes. The requirements on the sky coverage, angular resolution and instrumental sensitivity are demanding if a kSZ detection of the missing baryons is to be provided. Most of the OV effect is generated at moderately high redshifts, so if the cluster sample does not extend deep enough, then the S/N of the recovery of the OV effect of the gas surrounding clusters drops accordingly.
Figure 5. S/N achieved by cross-correlating a kSZ/peculiar velocity template with an all-sky CMB map. The kSZ template is built with estimates of peculiar motions in all clusters more massive than $2 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$. Dashed line refers to the case in which clusters are included in the cross-correlation analysis, whereas solid lines display the case where known haloes are masked on the CMB maps, so that only gas outside clusters contributes to the cross-correlation. The black line refers to an ACT-like experiment and the red line refers to an experiment with the sensitivity and angular resolution of Planck 217 GHz channel. Filled triangles (squares) refer to an ACT-like experiment covering 10 000 (2000) deg$^2$. The three panels refer to different survey depths: $z_{\text{max}} = 0.7$ (left), $z_{\text{max}} = 0.9$ (middle), and all $z$ (right).

Table 1. Specifications for the two types of CMB experiments considered.

| Experiment type | FWHM (arcmin) | Noise level per FWHM ($\mu$K) |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------------------------|
| ACT-SPT         | 1             | 1                             |
| Planck          | 5.5           | 4.8                           |

(different survey depths are considered in different panels of Fig. 5).

Note that we do not expect to find massive clusters at high (say $z > 4$) redshifts.

If kSZ effect measurements in haloes are not available, it has been suggested by Ho, Dedio & Spergel (2009) that kSZ templates may be built from the large-scale matter distribution. Present reconstruction algorithms, like e.g. Algorithm of Reconstruction of Galaxy-traced Overdensities (ARGO) (Kitaura & Enßlin 2008), seem to reconstruct peculiar velocities accurately in scales of interest. This velocity field reconstruction could be an additional way to obtain the kSZ templates, and to detect the kSZ effect in clusters. In this case, the S/N is much higher (dashed lines), and there is no need to have deep surveys: most of the S/N of the angular cross-correlation is coming from the Poisson term. This term does not depend critically on depth, but simply relies on the discrete nature of haloes. However, since the kSZ template would be a prediction of the model based upon the large-scale structure observations, this exercise would still provide a test for the cosmological theory of bulk flows.

6 DISCUSSION

Our formalism allows us to consistently study the OV/kSZ temperature anisotropies introduced by both the gas collapsed in haloes and the gas present in the IGM, regardless of the redshift range of relevance in each case. Our computations differ from previous ones in mainly two aspects: (i) ours are full-sky calculations, where no flat sky/Limber approximation has been invoked and therefore predictions apply to all multipole range, and (ii) the kSZ computations take into account the fact that haloes above a given mass threshold host only a fraction of the total mass, and hence the amplitude of the kSZ effect they give rise to is limited. Indeed, even after accounting for the enhanced clustering of the massive halo population, we find that the kSZ effect generated by groups and clusters is below the OV anisotropies produced during and shortly after reionization. Only the Poisson term induced by the halo population reaches an amplitude that is comparable to the OV $w_w - dd$ term, although it should be possible to partially remove it by masking out the most massive haloes. By excising all haloes above $2 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$, the Poisson term should drop by $\sim 40$ per cent (in the linear units of Fig. 3). Distinguishing these two contributions may be a relevant issue, since the kSZ effect is mostly generated at low redshifts ($z < 3–4$), whereas the OV effect is one of the very few existing probes of the reionization epoch ($z \in [5, 12]$). This gives significance to the crossover of the total OV power (red filled circles in the left-hand panel of Fig. 3) above the intrinsic linear CMB power spectrum at $\ell \sim 4000$. We remark that this OV computation is merely second-order perturbation theory, and since the linear level of perturbations has been normalized via, for example, WMAP observations, there are no free parameters for our (second-order) OV predictions. Nevertheless, our computations do not observe patchy reionization, that is the extra amount of anisotropy introduced by a non-fully ionized IGM at $z > 10$. Zahn et al. (2005) claim that this phase of reionization should introduce fluctuations comparable in amplitude to the OV effect, and this would provide further relevance to the study of the anisotropies in these angular scales. Still, in the context of patchy reionization, Santos et al. (2003) provide a different computation of the impact of this episode on the high $l$ CMB power spectrum, finding that it can be about one order of magnitude larger than the standard OV effect [in ($\mu$K)$^2$ units]. This fact has its relevance when searching for the diffuse baryons, since this signal is merely noise contributing to the multipole range where most of the S/N in Fig. 5 is arising. We have tested how our S/N estimates change for different levels of patchy reionization: if patchy reionization is at the same level than the OV effect as computed in this work, then the values of S/N decrease by less than 10 per cent. However, if, as motivated by Santos et al. (2003), we assume that patchy reionization introduces...
new anisotropy power that is 10 times higher than the OV effect, then S/N values drop by ~43 per cent. This leads us to the conclusion that the particular history of reionization may compromise the recovery of the kSZ signal from the missing baryons.

This work is also motivated by the search of the missing baryons via their peculiar motions with respect to the CMB. If predictions from linear theory are correct, the baryons should be comoving on scales of 20–40 h⁻¹ Mpc, and hence the kSZ pattern generated in clusters and groups of galaxies should be very similar to that generated by the surrounding gas, and can be used to probe the latter. However, it is not clear yet to what extent kSZ measurements in future CMB surveys like ACT or SPT will be contaminated by the intrinsic CMB and point source emission. In the ideal scenario in which errors in the kSZ estimates are unimportant for all clusters more massive than 2 × 10¹⁴ h⁻¹ M⊙, it is clear that the signature of missing baryons can be unveiled if the linear theory predictions on bulk flows are correct. One can consider to combine them with peculiar velocity field reconstructions obtained from LSS surveys, in which accuracy would be required at relatively large scales (10–20 h⁻¹ Mpc). It should be noted that estimates of the kSZ effect would be needed for each bulk flow, and this can be achieved by combining kSZ/peculiar velocity estimates from different haloes belonging to the same filament/supercluster.

Our predictions have uncertainties only in the kSZ case, since the OV computation is plain second-order perturbation theory. We have assumed a ST mass function for the halo abundance versus mass and redshift. We also model their physical size and their gas profile, and, more importantly, we have adopted the Mo & White prescription for their clustering bias. When comparing our results with previous works, we find that our kSZ power spectra are at the level of Schäfer et al. (2006) both in shape and in amplitude: when imposing the same mass threshold (M > 5 × 10¹³ h⁻¹ M⊙), our kSZ power spectrum is within a factor of 2, despite our different choice for σ₈ (0.817 versus 0.9). Further, we are introducing an effective bias for the halo velocities of 1.3, while it is not clear to us how close are halo peculiar velocities compared to linear theory expectations in the simulation they used. When comparing to the simulations of da Silva et al. (2001), we again find agreement within a factor of 2 [in units of (μK)²], and in this case they not only use σ₈ = 0.9 but also use significantly different choices for Ωₘ (0.35) and Ωₐ (0.65). As Schäfer et al. (2006) pointed out, there may be a significant amount of extra kSZ power at smaller scales due to the presence of sub-structure within the haloes (Springel, White & Hernquist 2001). This could partially be avoided by smoothing the signal within the halo solid angle, although part of this excess could be associated with a thermal (non-linear) component of halo velocities. The addition of all this extra power could have an impact on the S/N estimations of Fig. 5, which increase significantly at high h. A lower mass for the kSZ estimation would then be required in order to achieve the same S/N limit. However, despite all these sources of uncertainty, we conclude that future kSZ and LSS surveys should shed some light on the problematic missing baryons and bulk flows in the late Universe.

7 CONCLUSIONS

We have revisited the problem of the secondary anisotropies in the CMB introduced by the peculiar motion of baryons during and after reionization. We have addressed this problem in the context of the search for the missing baryons and the measurements of bulk flows at low redshifts. We have paid particular attention on distinguishing the different sources of anisotropy, according to their redshift, in an attempt to isolate the kSZ/OV effect generated by gas in filaments and superclusters at low redshift from its counterpart arising during reionization. For this purpose, we present the first all-sky projection of the peculiar momentum of baryons from reionization to the present epoch. We consider two different scenarios: the OV effect generated by a smooth distribution of all electrons and the kSZ effect generated by only those baryons located in collapsed structures.

The former provides the largest amplitude, and contributes mostly during reionization (z > 6). Since it corresponds to second order in perturbation theory, WMAP observations at the linear level already provide a normalization. Once those observations fix the set of cosmological parameters, the predictions at the second order should also be fixed: the OV effect should cross over the intrinsic linear CMB temperature angular power spectrum at / τ = 4000, with an amplitude close to 1.5 μK (for a sudden reionization scenario at zreio = 10.8 and τ = 0.084). The amplitude of the OV effect should be above the angular anisotropy level induced by the kSZ effect in the halo population. The discrete character of haloes (and the Poisson statistics associated with it) gives rise to angular fluctuations that constitute the main contaminant (in terms of kSZ/OV effects) to the signal generated during reionization. By masking out all haloes more massive than 2 × 10¹⁴ h⁻¹ M⊙, this Poisson term should drop to a level of ~30 per cent of the OV amplitude, leaving room for the OV effect to provide some insight on the reionization epoch.

The terms accounting for the velocity–velocity and velocity–density correlation of the halo population are well below the Poisson-induced anisotropy level, but are relevant since those terms express the correlation of velocities of haloes with the velocities of the surrounding gas. We propose using kSZ effect estimates in haloes (to be obtained by ACT- or SPT-type experiments) in order to build peculiar velocity templates to be cross-correlated to future CMB data. If the gas surrounding haloes is comoving with them as the theory predicts, then a signal should arise from this test even after masking the contribution from the haloes on the CMB maps. An ACT- or SPT-like CMB experiment covering 10⁰₀₀₀ (2000) deg² should achieve a S/N of 11 (5). The detection of this cross-correlation would provide evidence for the presence of missing baryons in the late universe and confirm the predictions of the theory of cosmological bulk flows. In case there are no quality kSZ effect estimates at the halo angular positions, then, following Ho et al. (2009), it would also be possible to build peculiar velocity templates from future deep LSS surveys. These would provide an estimate of the density field that can be inverted (within our cosmological frame) into a peculiar velocity template. By cross-correlating this template with future CMB maps, one should be able to detect the kSZ effect and bulk flows at high significance, if our understanding of cosmological bulk flows is correct. In summary, cross-correlation studies of future CMB and kSZ/LSS data are becoming a promising tool in the characterization of bulk flows and missing baryons in the low-redshift universe.
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APPENDIX A: THE TWO-POINT ANGULAR OV/KSZ CORRELATION FUNCTION

This Appendix outlines the computation of the full angular power spectrum of the projected peculiar momentum of baryons. It completes the appendixes B and C of HVJS in the sense that it considers the full peculiar velocity tensor \((\mathbf{v}_j, \mathbf{v}_q)\) (and not only its diagonal part, as equation B1 of HVJS implies).

We follow the approach of HVJS for integrating kSZ temperature anisotropies along the line of sight. For a given population of haloes, the kSZ effect introduced along the direction \(\hat{n}\) reads

\[
\frac{\delta T}{T_0} = \int \frac{d\mathbf{r}}{dM} W_{\text{gas}}(r - x) n_{c,j} \left( - \frac{\mathbf{v}_j \cdot \hat{n}}{c} \right) \int dr a(r) \sigma_T \int dM W_{\text{gas}}(r - x) n_c(M, r) \left( - \frac{\mathbf{v}(r) \cdot \hat{n}}{c} \right) \frac{dn}{dM}(x). \tag{A1}
\]

The sum over \(j\) indicates sum over haloes whose central electron density is given by \(n_{c,j}\) and gas spatial profile by \(W_{\text{gas}}\). The coordinate \(r\) is in comoving units and can be regarded as our look-back time coordinate and argument of the scalefactor \(a(r) = 1/(1 + z(r))\). The sum over \(j\) can be converted in an integral by introducing the halo mass function \(dn/dM\). For notational simplicity, we shall implicitly integrate halo properties over the halo mass, dropping the mass dependence and renaming the halo number density as \(n_h(x)\). This transforms the integral in a convolution of the quantity

\[
\xi(x) = n_h(x) \left( - \frac{\mathbf{v}(x) \cdot \hat{n}}{c} \right) = n_h(x) \beta(x) \tag{A2}
\]

with the profile \(W_{\text{gas}}(x)\):

\[
\frac{\delta T}{T_0} = \int dr a(r) \sigma_T n_{c,h}(r) \left( \mathbf{W}_{\text{gas}} \bullet \xi \right) (r) = \int dr a(r) \sigma_T n_{c,h}(r) \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} W_{\text{gas},k} e^{-ikr}. \tag{A3}
\]

The average central halo electron density is denoted by \(n_{c,h}\). The two-point angular correlation function can then easily be written as

\[
C(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \int dr_1 a(r_1) \sigma_T n_{c,h}(r_1) \int dr_2 a(r_2) \sigma_T n_{c,h}(r_2) \left( \frac{dk_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dk_2}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-ik_1 \cdot r_1 + ik_2 \cdot r_2} W_{\text{gas},k_1} W_{\text{gas},k_2} \langle \xi_{k_1} \xi_{k_2}^* \rangle. \tag{A4}
\]

The ensemble can be expressed in terms of the Fourier modes of the density and peculiar velocity field. Provided that \(\xi(x)\) is the product of two quantities in real space, its Fourier counterpart equals

\[
\xi_k = \int \frac{dq}{(2\pi)^2} \beta_q n_{h,k-q}. \tag{A5}
\]

Therefore, the ensemble average \(\langle \xi_k \xi_{k'}^* \rangle\) in equation (A4) becomes

\[
\langle \xi_k \xi_{k'}^* \rangle = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{dq_2}{(2\pi)^2} \langle \beta_{q_1} n_{h,k_1-q_1} \beta_{q_2} n_{h,k_2-q_2} \rangle. \tag{A6}
\]

One must separately address the different contributions on which this power spectrum can be decomposed, and this is the subject of the rest of the Appendix.

In the rest of the Appendix, computations will be referred to a halo population. However, these same computations may be referred to a continuous and smooth distribution of electrons if certain changes are introduced in the equations. These changes involve: (i) the gas profile
functions $W_{\text{gas}, k}$, the Fourier window functions associated with the peculiar velocity and density of haloes ($W_{v, k}$, $W_{\delta, k}$, to be introduced below) and the central halo electron densities $n_{e, h}$ must be dropped; (ii) the halo number density $n_h$ must be substituted by the electron number density field $n_{e, \cdot}$; and (iii) the halo clustering and velocity biases ($h, b_v$, to be introduced below) must be set to unity. This continuous description of the electron field should be accurate when estimating the projection of the peculiar momentum of all baryons: the amount of collapsed baryons at high redshift is a very small fraction of the total, and even at present, less than a quarter of the total amount of baryons are found in collapsed haloes more massive than $2 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$. Regardless of the amount of collapsed baryons, at scales larger than ~10–20 $h^{-1}$ Mpc, the matter density should closely follow the statistics of a moderately inhomogeneous Gaussian field.

A1 The $vv$ or Doppler term

Let us first consider the case where the electron density or the halo number density are constant. This considerably simplifies equation (A6), since $n_{e, h-q} = n_e \delta_0 (k - q)$ (with $\delta_0$ denoting the Dirac delta):

$$\langle \xi(k_1, k_2) \rangle_{vw} = \delta_0 n_e^2 (2\pi)^3 \delta^3 (k_1 - k_2) D_{v, 1} D_{v, 2} \frac{P_m(k_1)}{k_1^2} (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1) (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2) W_{v, k}(r_1) W_{v, k}(r_2).$$

(A7)

The factors $D_{v, i}$ denote the peculiar velocity time-dependent growth factors along the $i$th line of sight. We are using the vorticity-free linear theory expression for the Fourier modes of the peculiar velocity, $\xi_k = i D_{v, 1} k W_{v, k} \delta_k / k$, with $\hat{k}$ the unit vector along $k$. We assign to velocities a Fourier window function $W_{v, k}$ that smooths the contribution from scales smaller than a halo if we are referring to a halo’s peculiar velocity. In practice, we set it equal to the gas window function $W_{\text{gas}, k}$, which in general depends on the halo’s mass and age. The particular choice of the velocity window function is not critical, since most of the anisotropy is coming from large scales. The matter power spectrum at present is denoted by $P_m(k)$. After introducing this in equation (A4), one obtains

$$C(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \int dr_1 a(r_1) \sigma_\gamma n_{e, an}(r_1) \int dr_2 a(r_2) \sigma_\gamma n_{e, an}(r_2) \frac{dk}{2\pi^2} D_{v, 1} D_{v, 2} e^{-i(k \cdot r_2)} P_m(k) \times W_{v, k}(r_1) W_{v, k}(r_2) W_{\text{gas}, k}(r_1) W_{\text{gas}, k}(r_2) (\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}),$$

which, after expanding the plane wave on spherical Bessel functions

$$e^{-i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{r}} = \sum_{l} (-i)^l (2l+1) P_l(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}) j_l(kr),$$

and defining $\tau_i = a(r) \sigma_\gamma n_{e, i} \hat{k}$, reads like

$$C(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l, l'} \int \frac{dk}{2\pi^2} \int dr_1 \tau_i \hat{n}_1 D_{v, 1} W_{v, k}(r_1) W_{\text{gas}, k}(r_1) j_l(kr_1) \int dr_2 \tau_l \hat{n}_2 D_{v, 2} W_{v, k}(r_2) W_{\text{gas}, k}(r_2) j_l(kr_2) \times \frac{P_m(k)}{k^2} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_l(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) (2l + 1)(2l' + 1)(-i)^{l-l'}. \quad$$

(A9)

We next define the line of sight integrals

$$\mathcal{T}^{ll'}_{l1} = \int dr_1 \tau_i \hat{n}_1 D_{v, 1} W_{v, k}(r_1) W_{\text{gas}, k}(r_1) j_l(kr_1),$$

(A10)

and apply the recurrence relation

$$\mu P_l(\mu) = \frac{1}{2l + 1} \left( l P_{l+1}(\mu) + (l + 1) P_{l-1}(\mu) \right).$$

Finally, we perform the integral over the angles of $\mathbf{k}$. We choose $\hat{n}_1$ as the polar axis for $\mathbf{k}$, so we need to remove the dependence of Legendre polynomials on $\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}$. We use the Legendre function addition theorem, which states that

$$P_l(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) = P_l(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1) P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) + 2 \sum_{m=1}^{l} \frac{(l-m)!}{(l+m)!} \cos m \phi_k P_m(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1) P_m(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2).$$

(A12)

The azimuthal angle of $\mathbf{k}$ (here denoted as $\phi_k$) does not appear anywhere else in the integral, and therefore none of the terms in the sum proportional to $\cos m \phi_k$ contributes to it. These manipulations yield

$$C(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) C^{ll'}_{l} = \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int dk^2 \frac{P_m(k)}{k^2} \times \left( \frac{l + 1}{2l + 1} \right)^2 T_{l+1, l+1}^{ll'} T_{l+1, l+1}^{ll'} - \left( \frac{l + 1}{2l + 1} \right)^2 T_{l-1, l+1}^{ll'} T_{l-1, l+1}^{ll'} + \frac{l^2}{(2l + 1)^2} T_{l+1, l+1}^{ll'} T_{l+1, l+1}^{ll'}.$$ 

(A14)

Note that in the limit of high $l$ and $T_{l+1, l+1}^{ll'} \equiv T_{l+1, l+1}^{ll'}$, the angular power spectrum multipoles vanish:

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} C^{ll'}_{l} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int dk^2 \frac{P_m(k)}{k^2} (T^{ll'}_{l+1})^2 \times \left( \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \right) = 0.$$ 

(A15)

For this reason, it will be required to compute the integrals $T^{ll'}_{l+1}$ with high accuracy, or the $C^{ll'}_{l}$'s will not drop to zero at high $l$s as this limit requires.
A2 The Poisson term

This term observes the Poisson statistics of the number of haloes along the line of sight. In this case, the power spectrum of $\xi_k$ reads like

$$\langle \xi_k \xi_{k'}^* \rangle = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \delta(\mathbf{k}_1, \mathbf{k}_2) \delta(\mathbf{q}_1, \mathbf{q}_2) \rangle \rho_0^2 \left( \mathbf{k}_1 - \mathbf{q}_1 + \mathbf{q}_2 \right)^2 P_{\text{poisson}}(k_1 - q_1) \left( k_2 + q_2 \right)^2 P_{\text{poisson}}(k_2 + q_2)$$

$$\times W_{q_1} W_{q_2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{q_1} \right)^3 \delta(q_1 - k_1 - q_2) D_{\Delta c} D_{\Delta v} \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2 \rangle W_{q_1} W_{q_2} \left( \frac{2\pi}{q_2} \right)^3 \delta(q_2 - k_2 - q_1) \left( k_1 - q_1 \right)^2 P_{\text{poisson}}(k_1 - q_1) \left( k_2 + q_2 \right)^2 P_{\text{poisson}}(k_2 + q_2)$$

(A16)

The Poisson halo power spectrum is given by $P_{\text{poisson}}(k) = 1/\bar{n}$, i.e. the inverse of the average halo number density. The Fourier density distribution $W_{q_1}$ again limit the contribution of the halo power spectrum from scales much smaller than the halo size. They were approximated by Gaussians with characteristic width $\sigma$ equal to the halo virial radius. With this, the angular correlation function becomes

$$C(\hat{q}_1, \hat{q}_2) = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 d\mathbf{r}_2 d\mathbf{r}_{n_1} d\mathbf{r}_{n_2} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i k \cdot (\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2)} \left| W_{|q_1, q_2|} \right|^2 \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} D_{\Delta c} D_{\Delta v} \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2 \rangle |W_{q_1}|^2 \left| W_{q_2} \right|^2.$$ (A17)

Let us next focus on the integral over $q_1$, which shall be denoted by $\mathcal{K}$:

$$\mathcal{K} = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \left| W_{q_1} \right|^2 \left| W_{q_2} \right|^2 \left( \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \right)$$

(A18)

Let us take the polar axis for $q_1$ to be along $\hat{k}$. In order to perform the angular integrals of the dot products present in equation (A18), we have to switch these products ($\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1$, $\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2$) for others of the type ($\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}$) times other dot products independent of $\hat{q}$. For that, we again make use of the Legendre function addition theorem:

$$\langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 \rangle = \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{\hat{k}} \rangle + \cos \phi_1 P_1^1(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_1^1(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{\hat{k}})$$

(A19)

$$\langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2 \rangle = \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle + \cos \phi_2 P_1^1(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_1^1(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{\hat{k}}).$$

(A20)

The angles $\phi_1$, $\phi_2$ refer to the angles between the planes containing the vector pairs ($\hat{k}, \hat{q}_1$) and ($\hat{k}, \hat{n}_1$, and ($\hat{k}, \hat{q}_2$) and ($\hat{k}, \hat{n}_2$), respectively. In this reference system where the polar axis is given by $\hat{k}$, the vectors $\hat{q}_1$, $\hat{n}_1$, and $\hat{n}_2$ have each an azimuthal angle on the plane normal to $\hat{k}$. We shall take the origin for this angle such that the azimuthal angle of $\hat{n}_1$ is zero, and write $\phi_2 = \phi_1 + \delta \phi_2$. According to the last two equations, the product ($\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1$)(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2$) reads

$$\langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2 \rangle = \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle + \left[ P_1^1(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) \cos \phi_1 P_1^1(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) \right]^2 \left[ \cos \phi_1 P_1^1(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) \cos \phi_2 P_1^1(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) + \cos \phi_2 P_1^1(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_1^1(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) + \cos \phi_1 P_1^1(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_1^1(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) \right].$$

(A21)

The last two terms proportional to $\cos \phi_1$ will give no contribution once the integration on the azimuthal angle of $\phi (\hat{q}_1)$ is done, and therefore can be neglected. Since $\phi_2 = \phi_1 + \delta \phi_2$, then $\cos \phi_2 = \cos \phi_1 \cos \delta \phi_2 - \sin \phi_1 \sin \delta \phi_2$. The product of $\cos \phi_1 \cos \phi_2$ will therefore give rise to a term proportional to $\cos \phi_1 \sin \phi_1$ that again gives zero contribution to the integral over the azimuthal angle of $\phi (\hat{q}_1)$. Thus, effectively, we are left with the term proportional to $\cos^2 \phi_1$:

$$\langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2 \rangle = \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle + \left[ P_1^1(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) \cos \phi_1 \right]^2 \left[ \cos \phi_1 \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle - \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \right].$$

(A23)

This expression can be plugged into equation (A18):

$$\mathcal{K} = \frac{\mu_{q_1}^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi_1 \int_{-1}^{1} d\mu_{q_1} \left| W_{q_1} \right|^2 \left| W_{q_2} \right|^2 \left( \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \right)$$

$$\times \left[ \cos^2 \phi_1 \left( \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \right) \left( \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \right) \right] \left[ \mu_{q_1}^2 - \left( \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \right)^2 \cos^2 \phi_1 \right].$$

(A24)

where $\mu_{q_1} = \langle \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle$. We next assume that, on average, haloes are spherically symmetric, so that $W_{q_1} = W_{q_2}$ and $W_{q_1} = W_{q_2}$. This simplifies the last equation,

$$\mathcal{K} = \left[ J_1(k) \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2 \rangle - J_2(k) \langle \hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k} \rangle \right]$$

(A25)

with $J_1(k)$ defined as

$$J_1(k) \equiv \int \frac{dq_1 dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{\mu_{q_1}^2} \int_{-1}^{1} d\mu_{q_1} \left| W_{q_1} \right|^2 \left| W_{q_2} \right|^2 \left( \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \right),$$

(A26)

and $J_2(k)$ as

$$J_2(k) \equiv \int \frac{dq_1 dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} \int_{-1}^{1} d\mu_{q_1} \left| W_{q_1} \right|^2 \left| W_{q_2} \right|^2 \left( \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \right) \left[ \mu_{q_1}^2 - \left( \frac{P_m(q_1)}{q_1^2} \right)^2 \cos^2 \phi_1 \right].$$

(A27)
This also simplifies the expression for the angular correlation function (equation A17):

\[
C(n_1, n_2) = \int dr_1 \cdot t_1 \int dr_2 \cdot t_2 \cdot n_{h,1} \cdot D_{v,1} \cdot D_{v,2} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-ik(r_1-r_2)} |W_{\text{sv,}k}|^2 [J_1(k)(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) + (\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k})J_2(k)].
\] (A28)

Let us split it into two contributions according to their angular dependence. The first contribution \(C^P_1(n_1, n_2)\) contains the term \((\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k})\) and the second one \([C^P_2(n_1, n_2)]\) contains \((\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k})\). The procedure now is very similar to that used for the \(uv\) term. We first expand the plane wave as in equation (A9), and define the line of sight integrals \(I^P_{l,l}\) as

\[
I^P_{l,l} = \int dr_1 \cdot t_1 \sqrt{n_{h,l}} W^l_{\text{sv,}k} D_{v,l}(kr).
\] (A29)

A2.1 The \(C^P_1(n_1, n_2)\) part

The contribution from \(C^P_1(n_1, n_2)\) then reads

\[
C^P_1(n_1, n_2) = \sum_{l,l'} (2l + 1)(2l' + 1) (-i)^{l-l'} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} J_1(k) I^P_{l,l'} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l'}(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2).
\] (A30)

The addition theorem applied on \(P_l(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k})\) and the integral on the azimuthal angle (that removes terms of the type \(\cos m\phi_k\)) leave the last expression as

\[
C^P_1(n_1, n_2) = \sum_{l,l'} (2l + 1)(2l' + 1) (-i)^{l-l'} \int k^2dk \mu_k \frac{I^P_{l,l'}}{(2\pi)^2} J_1(k) I^P_{l,l'} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l'}(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l'}(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2).
\] (A31)

Finally, the recurrence relation (A12) yields the final expression for \(C^P_1(n_1, n_2)\), after integrating in \(\mu_k\):

\[
C^P_1(n_1, n_2) = \sum_{l,l'} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) C^P_{l,l'} = \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int k^2dk J_1(k) \left( \frac{l + 1}{2l + 1} I^P_{l,l'} I^P_{l',l} + \frac{1}{2l + 1} I^P_{l',l} I^P_{l',l'} \right).
\] (A32)

In this case, this contribution does not vanish at high \(l\):

\[
\lim_{l \to \infty} C^P_{l,l'} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int k^2dk J_1(k) I^P_{l,l'}^2.
\] (A33)

A2.2 The \(C^P_2(n_1, n_2)\) part

This contribution is written like

\[
C^P_2(n_1, n_2) = - \sum_{l,l'} (2l + 1)(2l' + 1) (-i)^{l-l'} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} J_1(k) I^P_{l,l'} I^P_{l,l'} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l'}(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2).
\] (A34)

which, after using the Legendre polynomial recurrence relation (equation A12) and integrating on the angles, yields

\[
C^P_2(n_1, n_2) = - \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) C^P_{l,l} = - \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) \left( \frac{2}{\pi} \right) \int k^2dk J_1(k) \left( \frac{l + 1}{2l + 1} I^P_{l,l} I^P_{l',l} - \frac{1}{2l + 1} I^P_{l',l} I^P_{l,l} \right).
\] (A35)

As it was the case for the \(uv\) term (which showed an identical dependence on \(n_1, n_2\)), this contribution will vanish at high \(l\) if \(I^P_{l,l} = I^P_{l',l}\).

\[
\lim_{l \to \infty} C^P_{l,l} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int dk k^2 J_1(k) I^P_{l,l}^2 \times \left( \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \right) = 0.
\] (A36)

Therefore, we find that \(\lim_{l \to \infty} C^P_2 = 0\).

We have concluded the computation of the linear terms, and we next address the computation of the second-order terms. In this section, the electron density will be assumed to trace the dark matter density field. This means that, when looking at the kSZ effect generated in haloes, the number density of haloes will trace the local, large-scale, dark matter density field in such a way that fluctuations in the halo number density will be a biased mapping of the fluctuation of dark matter density [and this bias factor was approximated by that of Mo & White (1996)]. That is, \(n_{h,k} = bD_k \delta_k W_{h,k}\), with \(b\) the bias factor, \(n_{h,k}\) the \(k\) Fourier mode for the halo number density distribution, \(\delta_k\) the Fourier mode of the dark matter density contrast at present and \(D_k\) its linear growth factor. When considering the OV effect generated by the IGM on the large scales, this assumption is expressed as \(n_{o,k} = \bar{n}_o(r)D_o \delta_k\) with \(\bar{n}_o(r)\) the background electron number density.
A3 The $v_1d_1 - v_2d_2$ term

This term observes the contribution of the configuration

$$\langle \hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2 \rangle_{v_1d_1 - v_2d_2} = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \hat{\beta}_q, n_{h,k_1-q_1} \rangle \langle \hat{\beta}_q^*, n_{h,k_2-q_2}^* \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A37)

As we show next, this contribution vanishes. For a real field $A(x)$, we have that $A_{\hat{k}} = A_{\hat{k}}^*$, so the last equation can be rewritten as

$$\langle \hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2 \rangle_{v_1d_1 - v_2d_2} = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(k_1) P_a(q_1) (q_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1) (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(k_2) P_a(q_2) (q_2 \cdot \hat{n}_2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A38)

If we choose $\hat{n}_i$ as the polar angle for $q_i$ ($i = 1, 2$), then $\mu_i \equiv (\hat{q}_i \cdot \hat{n}_i)$, and we end up with an integral of the type

$$\int q_i^2 \frac{dq_i}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{P_a(q)}{q_i} \int_{-1}^{1} d\mu_i \mu_i = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A39)

Therefore, this term provides no contribution and will be ignored hereafter.

A4 The $vv - dd$ term

We next compute the contribution of the configuration

$$\langle \hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2 \rangle_{vv - dd} = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \hat{\beta}_q, \hat{\beta}_q^* \rangle \langle n_{h,k_1-q_1}, n_{h,k_2-q_2} \rangle$$

within the two-point angular correlation function

$$C^{vv-dd}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \left( a(r_1) \sigma_{\text{gas}, b}(r_1) \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \right) \frac{dk_1}{(2\pi)^3} c^{-ik_1 \cdot r + ik_2 \cdot r} W_{\text{gas}, k_1} W_{\text{gas}, k_2} \langle \hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2 \rangle_{vv-dd}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A41)

The ensemble averages of equation (A40) yield

$$\langle \xi_{kk} \rangle_{vv - dd} = \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_2}{(2\pi)^3} (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(q_1 - q_2) D_{v_1} D_{v_2} \frac{P_a(q_1)}{q_i^2} W_{c,q_1} W_{c,q_2} \frac{P_a(q_2)}{q_i^2} W_{c,q_1} W_{c,q_2} (\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1) (\hat{q}_2 \cdot \hat{n}_2) \times (2\pi)^3 \delta^{(3)}(k_1 - q_1 - k_2 - q_2) D_{v_1} D_{v_2} D_{b_1} D_{b_2} P_a(k_1 - q_1) W_{k_1 - q_1} W_{k_2 - q_2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A42)

The presence of these Dirac deltas significantly simplifies equation (A41):

$$C^{vv-dd}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} e^{-i(k_1 \cdot r + k_2 \cdot r)} \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \left( t_1 W_{\text{gas}, k_1} \hat{n}_{b_1} D_{v_1} D_{v_2} b_1 \right) \int d\mathbf{r}_2 \left( t_2 W_{\text{gas}, k_2} \hat{n}_{b_2} D_{v_1} D_{v_2} b_2 \right) \times \int \frac{dq_i}{(2\pi)^3} P_a(q_i) |W_{c,q_i}|^2 P_a(k - q_i) W_{k,q_i} |W_{k_1 - q_1}|^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A43)

There are functions inside the integral over $q_i$ which depend upon $k - q_i$. Just as for the Poisson term, this suggests using $\hat{k}$ as the polar axis for the angular integration of $q_i$, $\mu_i \equiv (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}_i)$. Thus, we have to apply the Legendre function addition theorem and follow the same procedure as in equations (A19–A23). After introducing the usual expansion of the plane waves, this gives

$$C^{vv-dd}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l,l'} (-i)^{l-l'} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} T^{vv-dd}_{l,l'} P_l(\hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_l(\hat{\nu}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) \int \frac{dq_i}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{P_a(q_i)}{q_i} |W_{c,q_i}|^2 P_a(k - q_i) W_{k,q_i} |W_{k_1 - q_1}|^2 \times \left( \hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k} \right)^{l-l'} (\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{\nu}_1) (\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{\nu}_2) \left( \cos \phi_1 P_l^1(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}_1) \right)^2 \left( \hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 - (\hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) \right),$$

where the $T^{vv-dd}_{l,l'} = \int d\mathbf{r}_1 \int (kr_1) t_{b_1} W_{\text{gas}, k_i} D_{v_1} D_{v_2} D_{b_1}$. The usual line of sight integrals. The integration on the azimuthal angle of $q_1$ cannot be done trivially, but it is reduced to its polar axis. These angular integrations introduce two $k$-dependent functions, $A(k)$ and $B(k)$:

$$C^{vv-dd}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l,l'} (-i)^{l-l'} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} T^{vv-dd}_{l,l'} P_l(\hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_l(\hat{\nu}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) \int \frac{dq_i}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{P_a(q_i)}{q_i} |W_{c,q_i}|^2 P_a(k - q_i) W_{k,q_i} |W_{k_1 - q_1}|^2 \times \left( 2\pi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ (\hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{\nu}_2) (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}_1) - \frac{1}{2} P_l^1(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}_1) \right] \left( \hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1 - (\hat{\nu}_1 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) \right),$$

$$\times \left( 2\pi \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[ (\hat{\nu}_2 \cdot \hat{\nu}_2) (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}_1) - \frac{1}{2} P_l^1(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{q}_1) \right] \left( \hat{\nu}_2 \cdot \hat{n}_2 - (\hat{\nu}_2 \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A44)

These two functions will give rise to two different contributions for the $vv - dd$ term, $C^{vv-dd}_A(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$ and $C^{vv-dd}_B(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$. 
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A4.1 The $C_{A}^{\nu\nu-dd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2})$ contribution

As already done for the $\nu \cdot \nu$ term and one of the two contributions for the Poisson term, we first apply the Legendre polynomial recurrence relation (equation A12) in order to express all the dependence on $\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{1}$ and $\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{2}$ as arguments of Legendre polynomials:

$$C_{A}^{\nu\nu-dd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2}) = \sum_{l} \frac{(-i)^{l}}{l^2} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} T_{l}^{\nu\nu-dd} \frac{T_{l}^{\nu\nu-dd}}{2} \left[ l P_{l-1}(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{k}) + (l + 1) P_{l+1}(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{k}) \right] \left[ l P_{l-1}(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{k}) + (l + 1) P_{l+1}(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{k}) \right] A(k).$$

(A46)

The next step uses the Legendre function addition theorem (equation A13) to rewrite Legendre polynomials whose argument is $\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{j}$ in terms of Legendre functions of arguments $\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{1}$ and $\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{2}$. The integral on the azimuthal angle of $\hat{k}$ removes all terms proportional to $\cos m\phi_{k}$, so in practice we simply substitute the Legendre polynomials $P_{l}(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{j})$ by the product $P_{l}(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{1})P_{l}(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_{2})$. The polar angular integral of $\hat{k}$ does the rest:

$$C_{A}^{\nu\nu-dd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2}) = \sum_{l} 2l + 1 \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^2} P_{l}(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l}(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{k}) \left[ \frac{(l+1)^2}{(2l+1)^2} T_{l+1}^{dd} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2(2l+1)^2} T_{l}^{dd} \right] A(k).$$

(A47)

As for every term with the angular dependence of the type $(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{k})(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{k})$, its contribution vanishes in the limit of $l \to \infty$ and $T_{l}^{dd} \equiv T_{l}^{dd}$:

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} C_{A}^{\nu\nu-dd} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int dk k^2 A(k) T_{l}^{dd} = 0.$$

(A48)

A4.2 The $C_{B}^{\nu\nu-dd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2})$ contribution

In this case, we again have to use the addition theorem of equation (A13) to obtain

$$C_{B}^{\nu\nu-dd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2}) = \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_{l}(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l}(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{k}) \left[ \frac{28l^2}{2l+1} B(k) + \frac{T_{l+1}^{dd} T_{l+1}^{dd}}{2l+1} P_{l}(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{n}_{2}) A(k) \right].$$

(A49)

where $\delta_{ij}$ represents the Kronecker delta ($\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and $\delta_{ij} = 0$ otherwise). Finally, an application of the relation (A12) gives

$$C_{B}^{\nu\nu-dd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2}) = \sum_{l} \frac{2l + 1}{4\pi} P_{l}(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{k}) P_{l}(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{k}) \frac{2}{\pi} \int k^2 dk B(k) \left[ \frac{T_{l+1}^{dd} T_{l+1}^{dd}}{2l+1} + \frac{T_{l}^{dd} T_{l}^{dd}}{2l+1} \right].$$

(A50)

Hence, this term gives most of the contribution of $C_{B}^{\nu\nu-dd}$ at high $l$:

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} C_{B}^{\nu\nu-dd} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int dk k^2 B(k) T_{l}^{dd} = 0.$$

(A51)

A5 The $vd - vd$ term

In this final section, we compute the contribution coming from the configuration

$$\langle \xi_{k_{1}} n_{l}^{a} \rangle = \int \frac{dq_{1}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_{2}}{(2\pi)^3} \langle \beta_{a} n_{l}^{a} \rangle (\eta_{a}, \eta_{b}, \eta_{c}, \eta_{d})$$

within the two-point angular correlation function

$$C^{vd-vd}(\hat{n}_{1}, \hat{n}_{2}) = \int d\varphi_{q_{1}} d\varphi_{q_{2}}\left< \varphi_{q_{1}} \varphi_{q_{2}} \right> \int d\varphi r_{1} d\varphi r_{2} e^{-i(k_{1}-q_{1})(\hat{n}_{1} \cdot \hat{r}_{1})} e^{-i(k_{2}-q_{2})(\hat{n}_{2} \cdot \hat{r}_{2})} W_{\hat{n}_{1} \hat{k}_{1}} W_{\hat{n}_{2} \hat{k}_{2}} \langle \xi_{k_{1}} \xi_{k_{2}} \rangle^{vd-vd} .$$

(A53)

This time, the computation of the ensemble averages of equation (A52) is slightly more complex. We first obtain, after cancelling the integral on $k_{2}$ by using one of the Dirac deltas,

$$\langle \xi_{k_{1}} \xi_{k_{2}} \rangle^{vd-vd} = \int \frac{dq_{1}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{dq_{2}}{(2\pi)^3} \delta^{D}(q_{1} + k_{1} - q_{2} - k_{2}) \langle \beta_{a} n_{l}^{a} \rangle (\eta_{a}, \eta_{b}, \eta_{c}, \eta_{d}) P_{m}(q_{1}) \frac{P_{m}(k_{1} - q_{1})}{q_{1}}$$

$$\times \langle \hat{n}_{1} \hat{k} \rangle \langle \hat{q}_{1} \rangle \langle \hat{n}_{1} \hat{q}_{1} \rangle W_{\hat{n}_{1} \hat{k}_{1}} W_{\hat{n}_{1} \hat{k}_{1}} P_{m}(k_{1} - q_{1}) \frac{P_{m}(k_{1} - q_{1})}{q_{1}} .$$

(A54)
Again, we have an integral on $q_1$ of functions whose argument is $k_1 - q_1$. This means that we have to translate all arguments of the type $(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1)$ and $(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2)$ on to the quantities $(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_1)$ and $(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_2)$ and choose $\hat{k}_1$ as the polar axis for the $q_1$ integration. By using equations (A19, A20) and neglecting the terms proportional to $\cos \phi_1$, $\cos \phi_2$ (which give no contribution after the integration on the azimuthal angle of $q_1$), one readily finds

\[
(\xi_k, \xi_k)_{v \rightarrow d} = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(k_1 - k_2) \int \frac{dq_1}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{\alpha}_{n_1} \bar{\alpha}_{n_2} \bar{b}_{l_1} \bar{b}_{l_2} D_{l_1} D_{l_2} D_{l_1,2} W_{s_1} W_{s_2} W_{s_{l_1,2}} W_{s_{l_1,2},q_1} W_{s_{l_1,2},q_1} \frac{P_{n}(q_1) P_{n}(k_1 - q_1)}{|k_1 - q_1|}
\]

\[\times \left[ k_1(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_1) (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_2)(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_1) - q_1 \left( (\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_1) \hat{l}_1 (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_2) + \cos \phi_1 \cos \phi_2 |P_1^1(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_1) P_1^1(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_2)| \right) \right].\]

(A55)

As we did for the Poisson term, we now express cos $\phi_2$ in terms of $\phi_1$ and $\delta \phi_2$, $\equiv \phi_2 - \phi_1$ and make use of the relation $\cos \delta \phi_2 P_1^1(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1) P_1^1(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) = (\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) - (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_1)(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2)$. After integrating in the azimuthal angle of $q_1$, this leads to

\[
(\xi_k, \xi_k)_{v \rightarrow d} = (2\pi)^3 \delta^3(k_1 - k_2) \int \frac{q_1^2 dq_1 dq_{\mu q_1}}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{\alpha}_{n_1} \bar{\alpha}_{n_2} \bar{b}_{l_1} \bar{b}_{l_2} D_{l_1} D_{l_2} D_{l_1,2} W_{s_1} W_{s_2} W_{s_{l_1,2}} W_{s_{l_1,2},q_1} W_{s_{l_1,2},q_1} \frac{P_{n}(q_1) P_{n}(k_1 - q_1)}{|k_1 - q_1|}
\]

\[\times \left[ k_1(\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_1) (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_2)(\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_1) - q_1 \left( (\hat{q}_1 \cdot \hat{k}_1) \hat{l}_1 (\hat{k}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_2) + \frac{1}{2} P_1^1(\mu_{\mu q_1}) \right) \right] \]

We plug this expression into equation (A53) after expanding the plane wave on to spherical Bessel functions and defining $\tau_i \equiv a(r_i) \epsilon_{e,i}(r_i)$ and the line of sight integral $T_{l_1,i} \equiv T^v_{l_1,i} = \int d\tau_i (k_i r_i) \tau_i W_{\mu q_1} \bar{\alpha}_{n_1} \bar{\alpha}_{n_2} D_{l_1,2}$. We obtain

\[
C_{v \rightarrow d}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l, l'} (-i)^{l-l'} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} T_{l_1,i} T_{l_2,i} T^v_{l_1,i} T^v_{l_2,i} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_l(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) \int \frac{q_1^2 dq_{\mu q_1}}{(2\pi)^3} \bar{\alpha}_{n_1} \bar{\alpha}_{n_2} (2\pi)^3 \frac{P_{n}(q_1) P_{n}(k_1 - q_1)}{|k_1 - q_1|^2}
\]

\[\times \left[ (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1)(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2) (k_1 \mu_{\mu q_1} - q_1 \mu q_1 + q_1 \mu_{\mu q_1})^2 - \frac{q_1^2}{2} P_1^1(\mu_{\mu q_1}) \right] (2l+1)(2l'+1)
\]

\[= \sum_{l, l'} (-i)^{l-l'} \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^3} T_{l_1,i} T_{l_2,i} T^v_{l_1,i} T^v_{l_2,i} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{k}) P_l(\hat{n}_2 \cdot \hat{k}) \left( (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1)(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2) \right) (2\pi)^3 \frac{P_{n}(q_1) P_{n}(k_1 - q_1)}{|k_1 - q_1|^2}
\]

\[\times \left[ (\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1)(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2) (k_1 \mu_{\mu q_1} - q_1 \mu q_1 + q_1 \mu_{\mu q_1})^2 - \frac{q_1^2}{2} P_1^1(\mu_{\mu q_1}) \right] (2l+1)(2l'+1).
\]

(A57)

The two functions $C(l)$ and $D(l)$ introduce two different angular dependences of the correlation function $[(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1)(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2)$ and $(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2)$, respectively], and give rise to two different contributions to the total $v \rightarrow d$ correlation function, that will be denoted by $C_A^{v \rightarrow d}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$ and $C_B^{v \rightarrow d}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$, respectively.

### A5.1 The $C_{A_{v \rightarrow d}}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$ contribution

As usual, we first use equation (A12) to remove the factors of the type $x P_1(x)$ and then apply the Legendre function addition theorem to switch arguments of $(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2)$ into arguments of $(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1)$ and $(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2)$. All terms proportional to $\cos m \phi_k$ give no contribution, so under the integral sign we are allowed to replace $P_l(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_2)$ by $P_l(\hat{k} \cdot \hat{n}_1) P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2)$. This results in

\[
C_A^{v \rightarrow d}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l} \frac{2l+1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_1) C_{l,i}^{v \rightarrow d} = \sum_{l} \frac{2l+1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{l}_1)
\]

\[\times \frac{2}{\pi} \int k^2 dk C(k) \left[ T_{l+1,1} T_{l+1,2} (l+1)^2 T_{l+1,1} (2l+1)^2 \right] + \left[ T_{l-1,1} T_{l-1,2} - \frac{l(l+1)}{(2l+1)^2} \right] \left[ T_{l+1,1} T_{l+1,2} - \frac{l(l+1)}{(2l+1)^2} \right].
\]

(A58)

Again, in the limit of high $l$ and $T_{l,i} \equiv T_{l_1,i}$, we have that

\[
\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} C_{l,i}^{v \rightarrow d} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int k^2 dk C(k) \left[ T_{l+1,1} T_{l+1,2} (2l+1)^2 \right] \left[ \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \right] = 0.
\]

(A59)

### A5.2 The $C_{B_{v \rightarrow d}}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$ contribution

This case is again identical to the $C_{A_{v \rightarrow d}}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2)$ contribution. The final result is

\[
C_B^{v \rightarrow d}(\hat{n}_1, \hat{n}_2) = \sum_{l} \frac{2l+1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) C_{l,B}^{v \rightarrow d}
\]

\[= \sum_{l} \frac{2l+1}{4\pi} P_l(\hat{n}_1 \cdot \hat{n}_2) \frac{2}{\pi} \int k^2 dk \left( T_{l+1,1} T_{l+1,2} + T_{l-1,1} T_{l-1,2} \right) \left[ \frac{l}{2l+1} + \frac{l}{2l+1} \right].
\]

(A60)
This term gives most of the contribution of $C_l^{vd-vd}$ at high $l$s, and it is negative. It is always below the $vv - dd$ term, but it reduces the (positive) amplitude of that term.

$$\lim_{l \to \infty} C_{l, B}^{vd-vd} = \frac{2}{\pi} \int dk \, k^2 \left( -D(k) \right) (I_l^{vv-dd})^2 = \lim_{l \to \infty} C_l^{vd-vd}. \quad (A61)$$

This paper has been typeset from a \TeX/LaTeX file prepared by the author.