Are the halo occupation predictions consistent with large scale clustering of galaxies in simulations?

> Arnau Pujol, Enrique Gaztañaga arXiv:1306.5761 ICTP, Trieste, October 9th, 2013



Institut de Ciències de l'Espai (IEEC-CSIC





Outline

- Introduction and goals
- Millennium Simulation
- Bias and HOD
- Reconstructions of galaxy bias
- Halo vs galaxy bias
- Subhalo occupation
- Conclusions

Introduction Millennium Simulation

SDSS



Introduction Millennium Simulation





HOD model

$$N(M) = N_c(M) + N_s(M)$$
$$N_c(M) = \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + erf\left(\frac{\log M - \log M_{min}}{\sigma_{\log M}}\right) \right]$$
$$N_s = N_c(M) \times \left(\frac{M - M_0}{M_1}\right)^{\alpha}$$

Zheng et al. 2005

$$\xi_{gal}(r) = \xi_{gal}^{1\text{halo}}(r) + b_{gal}^2 \xi_{dm}^{\text{Lin}}(r)$$



Fig. 7. Example of a measured $w(\theta)$ (all galaxies in the redshift range 0.4 < z < 0.6 and for $Mg - 5 \log h < -19.8$), as well as the best-fitting model, as described in sec. 4. Left: $w(\theta)$ measurement and model. Right: N(M), showing the central term N_{cent} and the satellite term N_s .

All galaxies 0.2 < z < 0.4< z < 0.6 0.4 16 16 < z < 0.80.6 < z < 1.0 log[M_h/(h⁻¹M_o)] log[M_h/(h⁻¹M_o)] 15 ▼ 1.0 < z < 1.2 14 14 13 12 $\mathsf{M}_{\mathsf{min}}$ 11 11 10 10 -20 -22 -18-16 $M_{q}-5\log(h)$



Coupon et al. 2012

 M_1 and M_{min} vs galaxy luminosity thresholds for all (left) and red (right) galaxies.

Coupon et al. 2012

Semi-Analytical models



Cole et al. 2000

Semi-Analytical models



galaxy bias Guo et al. 2011 model



Cole et al. 2000

Semi-Analytical models



Cole et al. 2000

galaxy bias Guo et al. 2011 model



Millennium Simulation (Springel et al. 2005)

ΛCDM with:

$$\Omega_m = 0.25$$
 $n = 1$
 $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.75$ $\sigma_8 = 0.9$
 $h = 0.73$



Normalized mass function of haloes, main haloes and subhaloes

$$V = (500h^{-1}Mpc)^3$$
$$m_p = 8.6 \times 10^8 M_{\odot}$$

• haloes: FOF with linking lenth b=0.2

• subhaloes: SUBFIND algorithm (Springel et al. 2001)

• main haloes: largest SUBFIND object in FOF

Millennium Simulation (Springel et al. 2005)

ΛCDM with:

$$\Omega_m = 0.25$$
 $n = 1$
 $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.75$ $\sigma_8 = 0.9$
 $h = 0.73$

- BDLT07: Bertone et al. 2007 (MPA)
- B06: Bower et al. 2006 (Durham)
- DLB07: De Lucia & Blaizot 2007 (MPA)
- •GII: Guo et al. 2011 (MPA)
- F08: Font et al. 2008 (Durham)

$$V = (500h^{-1}Mpc)^3$$
$$m_p = 8.6 \times 10^8 M_{\odot}$$



Luminosity function of SAMs

Bias and HOD Halo and galaxy bias







G11

-18 M_r -5logh -16

-20

-22

z=0

z = 1

z = 0.5

-14

$$b_{g,h}(r) = \sqrt{\frac{\xi_{g,h}(r)}{\xi_m(r)}}$$

fitted as constant at $r = [20 - 30]h^{-1}Mpc$

Bias and HOD HOD



Number of galaxies per halo of mass M_h at different M_r thresholds (solid) vs SDSS DR-7 (dashed)

$$b_g(L) = \int dM b_h(M) n(M) \frac{N_g(L, M)}{n_g(L)}$$

Bias and HOD HOD



Number of galaxies per halo of mass M_h at different M_r thresholds (solid) vs SDSS DR-7 (dashed)



Bias and HOD HOD



Number of galaxies per halo of mass M_h at different M_r thresholds (solid) vs SDSS DR-7 (dashed)

$$b_g(L) = \int dM b_h(M) n(M) \frac{N_g(L,M)}{n_g(L)}$$



Reconstructions of galaxy bias



Rec. from main haloes



$$b_g(L) = \int dM b_h(M) n(M) \frac{N_g(L, M)}{n_g(L)}$$

• Underprediction of galaxy bias

• haloes (FOFs) make better reconstructions than main haloes (gravitationally bound haloes).









Galaxy bias for different halo (right) and main halo (left) mass bins. Solid lines represent galaxy bias of those galaxies in the haloes (right) or main haloes (left) of the corresponding range in mass. The horizontal coloured zones refer to the ranges of halo or main halo bias $\pm 1\sigma$

Galaxy bias in halo mass bins







Galaxy bias in main halo mass bins Galaxy bias in halo mass bins $\begin{array}{c} 1.72 - 6.88] \times 10^{10} M_{\odot} \ [1.10 - 4.40] \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} \ [1.76 - 7.05] \times 10^{13} M_{\odot} \\ \hline \\ [6.88 - 27.5] \times 10^{10} M_{\textcircled{0}} \ [4.40 - 17.6] \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} \ [7.05 - 28.2] \times 10^{13} M_{\odot} \end{array}$ **2.5** $[1.72-6.88] \times 10^{10} M_{\odot} [1.10-4.40] \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} [1.76-7.05] \times 10^{13} M_{\odot}$ 2 5 $[6.88 - 27.5] imes 10^{10} M_{\odot} \ [4.40 - 17.6] imes 10^{12} M_{\odot} \ [7.05 - 28.2] imes 10^{13} M_{\odot}$ $[2.75{-}11.0] imes{10}^{11}_{ au}M_{\odot}$ $[2.75-11.0] \times 10^{11} M$ 2.0 2.0 (T) q(7) 9 1.5 1.0 1.0 0.5L 21 -20 -17-19-18-160.5 -14-20 -18-16-12 M_r -5logh $M_r - 5 \log h$

$$b_g(L) = \int dM b_h(M) n(M) \frac{N_g(L, M)}{n_g(L)}$$

Galaxy bias in main halo mass bins Galaxy bias in halo mass bins $\begin{array}{c|c} [1.72-6.88] \times 10^{10} M_{\odot} & [1.10-4.40] \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} & [1.76-7.05] \times 10^{13} M_{\odot} \\ \hline [6.88-27.5] \times 10^{10} M_{\bigodot} & [4.40-17.6] \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} & [7.05-28.2] \times 10^{13} M_{\odot} \end{array}$ **2.5** $[1.72-6.88] \times 10^{10} M_{\odot} [1.10-4.40] \times 10^{12} M_{\odot} [1.76-7.05] \times 10^{13} M_{\odot}$ 2 5 $[6.88 - 27.5] imes 10^{10} M_{\odot} \ [4.40 - 17.6] imes 10^{12} M_{\odot} \ [7.05 - 28.2] imes 10^{13} M_{\odot}$ $[2.75{-}11.0] imes{10}^{11}_{ au}M_{\odot}$ $[2.75-11.0] \times 10^{11} M$ 2.0 2.0 (T)(7) 9 1.5 1.0 1.0 0.5L 21 -20 -19 -16 -17 18 0.5 -14-20 -18-16 $M_r - 5 \log h$ -12 $M_r - 5 \log h$ $dMb_h(M)n(M)\frac{N_g(L,M)}{n_g(L)}$

Subhalo occupation



main halo bias for different subhalo occupations

halo bias for different subhalo occupations

Strong subhalo abundance dependence of halo bias for fixed mass. For a fixed mass bin, haloes (or main haloes) with more subhaloes (and more galaxies) have more clustering. Correlation between halo occupation and halo bias for fixed mass.

Conclusions

• HOD underestimates the bias of galaxies. This results in a systematic error for bias or for mass estimation.

 haloes (FOFs) make better reconstructions than main haloes (gravitationally bound haloes).

• Strong subhalo abundance dependence of halo bias for fixed mass. For a fixed mass bin, haloes (or main haloes) with more subhaloes (and more galaxies) have more clustering. Correlation between halo occupation and halo bias for fixed mass.

• HOD predictions not compatible with SAMs at $M \lesssim 10^{11} M_{\odot}$

• Care must be taken when inferring dark matter halo information from galaxy clustering in observations using HOD

Pujol & Gaztañaga 2013, arXiv: 1306.5761