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Abstract

We obtained Keck/DEIMOS spectra of 556 individual red giant branch stars in four spectroscopic fields spanning 13−31 projected kpc along the northeast (NE) shelf of M31. We present the first detection of a complete wedge pattern in the space of projected M31-centric radial distance versus line-of-sight velocity for this feature, which includes the returning stream component of the shelf. This wedge pattern agrees with expectations of a tidal shell formed in a radial merger and provides strong evidence in favor of predictions of Giant Stellar Stream (GSS) formation models in which the NE shelf originates from the second orbital wrap of the tidal debris. The observed concentric wedge patterns of the NE, west (W), and southeast (SE) shelves corroborate this interpretation independently of the models. We do not detect a kinematical signature in the NE shelf region corresponding to an intact progenitor core, favoring GSS formation models in which the progenitor is completely disrupted. The shelf’s photometric metallicity ([Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}}$) distribution implies that it is dominated by tidal material, as opposed to the phase-mixed stellar halo or the disk. The metallicity distribution ([Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}} = -0.42 \pm 0.01$) also matches the GSS, and consequently the W and SE shelves, further supporting a direct physical association between the tidal features.
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1. Introduction

In the hierarchical assembly paradigm, galaxy mergers play an essential role in driving the formation and growth of galaxies (e.g., White & Rees 1978). The tidal relics of these merger events encode a wealth of information concerning the accretion history of the host galaxy (e.g., Bullock & Johnston 2005; Johnston et al. 2008), particularly in the form of stellar streams and shells (Hernquist & Quinn 1988; Johnston et al. 2001; Hendel & Johnston 2015). The dynamics of streams and shells can also serve as powerful probes of the host galaxy gravitational potential (Merrifield & Kuijken 1998; Ebrová et al. 2012; Sanderson & Helmi 2013; Law & Majewski 2010; Fardal et al. 2013). The Milky Way (MW) provides ample evidence for ongoing tidal disruption in the form of the Sagittarius stream (Ibata et al. 2001b), a plethora of smaller streams (Helmi 2020 and references therein), and potentially shell-like overdensities (Belokurov et al. 2007; Juric et al. 2008) that may originate from a radial merger (Simion et al. 2018, 2019; Donlon et al. 2019, 2020; Naidu et al. 2021). Deep, wide-field imaging surveys of massive galaxies beyond the Local Group have revealed rich collections of large-scale tidal features (including shells) surrounding both spirals and ellipticals (e.g., Tal et al. 2009; Martínez-Delgado et al. 2010; Martínez-Delgado et al. 2021; Atkinson et al. 2013; Kado-Fong et al. 2018). However, since these low surface brightness features are intrinsically difficult to detect for large samples of external galaxies, many studies have focused on the resolved stellar populations of features in individual nearby galaxies (e.g., Mouchine et al. 2010; Ibata et al. 2014; Okamoto et al. 2015; Cmokević et al. 2016; Martínez-Delgado et al. 2021). Studies of kinematical tracers probing tidal debris are even more challenging and have thus been limited to a handful of external galaxies (e.g., Romanowsky et al. 2012; Foster et al. 2014).

Due to its proximity ($d_{M31} = 773$ kpc; Conn et al. 2016), the Andromeda galaxy (M31) presents a rare opportunity for detailed photometric and spectroscopic studies of resolved stars in tidal structures. M31 possesses a metal-rich Giant Stellar Stream (GSS; Ibata et al. 2001a) in the southern portion of its stellar halo and a diffuse shell-like overdensity in the northeast (NE) with red colors similar to the GSS (Ferguson et al. 2002).
Fardal et al. (2007) detected a second shelf in the west (W) using the Ferguson et al. imaging, and Gilbert et al. (2007) identified a third faint shelf in the southeast (SE) via spectroscopy. The chemical similarity of red giant branch (RGB) stars in the W and SE shelves to the GSS (Gilbert et al. 2007; Fardal et al. 2012) and the striking consistency between various stellar populations in the NE, W, and SE shelves and the GSS (Brown et al. 2006, 2008; Ferguson et al. 2005; Richardson et al. 2008; Tanaka et al. 2010; Bernard et al. 2015) support the hypothesis that these structures form a related system of tidal debris. The luminosity functions of planetary nebulae (PNe) in M31 additionally support a common origin for the NE shelf and GSS, while constraints for the W shelf are limited but suggest that it is distinct from the disk (Bhattacharya et al. 2019, 2021). However, kinematical and chemical information in the NE shelf is necessary to finally confirm the putative association between the shelves and the GSS.

Orbital models for the formation of the GSS in a minor merger ($M_\ast \sim (1–5) \times 10^7 M_\odot$) predict that the shelves correspond to tidal debris from the distinct progenitor of the GSS (Fardal et al. 2006, 2007, 2008, 2013; Mori & Rich 2008; Sadoun et al. 2014; Miki et al. 2016; Kirihara et al. 2014, 2017). In these models, the NE shelf is composed of material from the second pericentric passage of the disrupting progenitor and the forward continuation of the GSS. The models place the central material of the progenitor in the NE shelf region and allow for the presence of an intact GSS progenitor core based on its initial central density (e.g., Fardal et al. 2013; Kirihara et al. 2017), although no such structure has yet been detected (see Davidge 2012; Dorman et al. 2012). Major merger models ($M_\ast \sim 10^{10} M_\odot$) can similarly form tidal structures resembling the GSS and shelves (Hammer et al. 2011; D’Souza & Bell 2018) but have not yet been shown to reproduce the shelves at the level of detail provided by minor merger models.

Despite not explicitly fitting for the detailed properties of the shelves, the Fardal et al. minor merger models have predicted the existence of the SE shelf (Fardal et al. 2007; Gilbert et al. 2007) and show excellent agreement with the kinematics of RGB stars in the W shelf (Fardal et al. 2012). These successes appear to be natural consequences of the constraints placed on the merger scenario using spatial and kinematical observations of the GSS (McConnachie et al. 2003; Ibata et al. 2004; Gilbert et al. 2009) and stellar surface density maps of M31 (Ibata et al. 2001a; Ferguson et al. 2002; Irwin et al. 2005), where the orbital trajectory of the progenitor is only loosely required to pass through the location of the NE shelf. Moreover, Fardal et al. (2013) demonstrated that the predicted kinematical signature for the NE shelf partially overlaps with a small sample of PNe that form an apparent stream near the shelf (Merrett et al. 2003, 2006).

Detailed kinematics for a large sample of RGB stars in the NE shelf could conclusively establish that it is indeed a tidal shelf, place stringent constraints on GSS merger scenarios, identify whether an intact GSS progenitor core exists, and probe M31’s gravitational potential at the location of the shelf. Furthermore, the NE shelf metallicity distribution could be used to infer the properties of the progenitor, as the shelf region is predicted to contain its metal-rich central debris (Mori & Rich 2008; Fardal et al. 2008; Miki et al. 2016; Kirihara et al. 2017). The observed metallicity gradient(s) in the GSS (Ibata et al. 2007; Gilbert et al. 2009; Conn et al. 2016; Cohen et al. 2018; Escala et al. 2021) could be combined with the metallicity distributions of the NE, W, and SE shelves to connect chemical variations on the sky to the intrinsic properties of the progenitor (Fardal et al. 2008; Miki et al. 2016; Kirihara et al. 2017; Milošević et al. 2022). This metallicity mapping may be crucial for distinguishing between major and minor merger scenarios for the formation of the GSS and shelves (see the discussions of Gilbert et al. 2019; Escala et al. 2021).

In this work, we present the first analysis of the metallicity and kinematics of RGB stars in the NE shelf of M31. This contribution is part of the Spectroscopic and Photometric Landscape of Andromeda’s Stellar Halo survey (SPLASH; Guhathakurta et al. 2005; Gilbert et al. 2006), which has produced tens of thousands of Keck/DEIMOS spectra along lines of sight to M31’s halo, disk, and dwarf galaxies (e.g., Kalirai et al. 2010; Dorman et al. 2012, 2015; Gilbert et al. 2012, 2014; Tollerud et al. 2012). In Section 2, we introduce spectroscopic and photometric data for the NE shelf. We investigate the kinematics, metallicity, and projected phase-space distribution of the NE shelf in Section 3. We perform detailed comparisons of the shelf’s observed properties to $N$-body models in Section 4 and the GSS and W and SE shelves as observed by SPLASH in Section 5. Lastly, we discuss results for the NE shelf in the context of the literature in Section 6, before summarizing in Section 7.

2. Data

2.1. Observations and Data Reduction

We observed five slit masks targeting M31’s NE shelf with the DEIMOS instrument on Keck II as part of the SPLASH survey. We utilized the 1200 line mm$^{-1}$ grating, which has a spectral dispersion of 0.33 Å pixel$^{-1}$, with the OG550 order-blocking filter and a central wavelength of 7800 Å for our science configuration. The spectroscopic fields were observed in fall 2011 with ~1 hr exposures. Table 1 summarizes the observations. Figure 1 shows the locations of the NE shelf fields on the sky in M31-centric coordinates, overlaid on a star count map of RGB candidates from the Pan-Andromeda Archaeological Survey (PAndAS; McConnachie et al. 2018). The naming convention for the NE shelf fields indicates the order in which the masks were designed, rather than their radial distance from M31. We included reference DEIMOS fields from the Elemental Abundances in M31 survey (Gilbert et al. 2019; Escala et al. 2020a, 2020b) and fields previously observed as part of the SPLASH survey (Kalirai et al. 2006; Gilbert et al. 2007, 2009; Fardal et al. 2012) targeting the SE shelf, W shelf, and GSS. Figure 1 also indicates the edges of the NE and W shelves defined by Fardal et al. (2007) via applying the Sobel operator to the Irwin et al. (2005) star map.

We extracted and reduced 1D spectra from the 2D images using a modified version of the spec2d software (Cooper et al. 2012; Newman et al. 2013) for stellar sources (Simon & Geha 2007). The 1D spectra were then cross-correlated against empirical templates of hot stars to shift them into the rest frame and measure radial velocities. We corrected the velocity measurements for slit miscentering using the A band (Sohn et al. 2007) and transformed them into the heliocentric frame. As described by Howley et al. (2013), the total velocity uncertainty is determined by scaling the cross-correlation-based
Gilbert et al. 2007, 2009; Fardal et al. 2012. Spectroscopic DEIMOS correspond to 50 projected kpc. The approximate size and orientation of each boxes; Gilbert et al. 2019; Escala et al. 2020a, 2020b.

Shelf (represents M31 shelves defined by Fardal et al. 2006; Kalirai et al. 2006; NE1 19.6 00:50:04.96 Table1, Section2.1. RGB stars at the distance of M31 and then adding in quadrature error with a value determined from duplicate measurements of error with a value determined from duplicate measurements of RGB stars at the distance of M31 and then adding in quadrature with a systematic velocity error of 2.2 km s$^{-1}$ computed by Simon & Geha (2007). The total velocity uncertainty does not include statistical errors on the A-band correction.

Using the visual inspection software zspec (D. Madgwick, DEEP2 survey), each spectrum was assigned a quality code ($Q$) for its radial velocity measurement. We restrict our analysis to objects with successful radial velocity measurements that match two or more strong spectral features ($Q = 4$) or a combination of one strong spectral feature and additional marginal features ($Q = 3$; Guhathakurta et al. 2006). The median total velocity uncertainty for stars with successful velocity measurements is 5.3 km s$^{-1}$. We excluded some targets with successful velocity measurements from the subsequent analysis because of missing spectral data at red wavelengths, which is necessary to evaluate membership (Section 3.1).
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Table 1

| Slit Mask | $R_{proj}$ (kpc) | R.A. | Decl. | Mask P.A. (deg E of N) | Obs. Date (UT) | I$_{exp}$ (minutes) | Air Mass | No. Targets$^a$ | No. RV$^b$ | No. M31$^c$ |
|-----------|------------------|------|-------|-------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------|----------------|------------|------------|
| NE1       | 19.6             | 00:50:04.96 | +41:39:53.3 | 30          | 2011 Nov 23 | 50.0             | 1.10    | 190            | 138        | 123        |
| NE2       | 25.7             | 00:51:52:11 | +42:02:22.3 | 30          | 2011 Nov 23 | 55.0             | 1.26    | 186            | 117        | 79         |
| NE3       | 14.5             | 00:48:17:03 | +41:26:33.6 | 30          | 2011 Nov 24 | 51.7             | 1.27    | 214            | 154        | 135        |
| NE4       | 29.2             | 00:52:52:20 | +42:15:44.8 | 30          | 2011 Nov 24 | 60.0             | 1.08    | 182            | 124        | 91         |
| NE6       | 21.8             | 00:50:27:03 | +41:56:32.8 | 40          | 2011 Nov 24 | 51.7             | 1.23    | 200            | 149        | 128        |

Notes.

$^a$ Number of targets on the slit mask with successfully extracted 1D spectra.

$^b$ Number of targets with successful radial velocity measurements (Section 2.1).

$^c$ Number of targets classified as M31 RGB stars (Section 3.1).

Figure 1. Location of the spectroscopic fields targeting the NE Shelf (red open boxes; Table 1, 2.2. Photometry

We sourced photometry from MegaCam images obtained in the $g'$, $i'$ bands using the 3.6 m Canada–France–Hawaii Telescope (CFHT). The images were reduced with the CFHT MegaPipe pipeline (Gwyn 2008), and the $g'$, $i'$ magnitudes were transformed to Johnson–Cousins $V, I$ using observations of Landolt photometric standard stars (Kalirai et al. 2006). When designing slit masks, we identified RGB candidates based on only the $I$-band magnitude to avoid introducing bias into the target selection. This still yields low MW contamination (Section 3.1) in the NE shelf region owing to the high density of M31 stars relative to the foreground below the tip of the RGB at $I_0 \sim 20.5$.

Figure 2 shows the dereddened $V_0$, $I_0$ color–magnitude diagram (CMD) for all stars with successful radial velocity measurements (Section 2.1) in the NE shelf fields (Table 1). We corrected the photometry for the effects of dust extinction by assuming field-specific interstellar reddening values from the maps of Schlegel et al. (1998) and applying the corrections defined by Schlafly & Finkbeiner (2011). We also show PARSEC isochrones (Marigo et al. 2017) for reference,
assumingly an age of 12 Gyr, \( \alpha/Fe = 0 \), and \( m - M = 24.47 \) (\( D = 785 \) kpc) for consistency with previous studies in the SPLASH collaboration. Based on this grid of theoretical isochrones, we determined \([Fe/H]_{\text{phot}}\) via interpolation given the color and magnitude of each star (Escala et al. 2020a). The median statistical uncertainty on \([Fe/H]_{\text{phot}}\), which is based on propagation of photometric uncertainties, is 0.05.

We note that the absolute \([Fe/H]_{\text{phot}}\) scale depends on the assumed isochrone age, \( \alpha \)-enhancement, and distance, although we are primarily concerned with relative metallicities in this work. Assuming 8 Gyr ages, in closer agreement with the mean stellar age of the NE shelf (Ferguson et al. 2005; Brown et al. 2006; Richardson et al. 2008), instead of the standard 12 Gyr ages adopted in SPLASH, yields a median \([Fe/H]_{\text{phot}}\) increase of 0.08. In general, the net effect of assuming higher \( \alpha/Fe \) is to decrease \([Fe/H]_{\text{phot}}\) although PARSEC isochrones are available for only solar \( \alpha/Fe \). As for distance, the NE shelf is located \( 16 \pm 20 \) kpc in front of M31 (Richardson et al. 2008), whereas a reasonable estimate of the uncertainty on M31’s distance modulus is 0.05 (Dalcanton et al. 2012). Thus, the line-of-sight distance to the NE shelf is likely \( 769^{+25}_{-23} \) kpc, where adopting this central value increases the median \([Fe/H]_{\text{phot}}\) by 0.02.

### 3. Properties of the Northeast Shelf

#### 3.1. Membership

In prior studies of M31’s stellar halo, we employed likelihood-based methods (Gilbert et al. 2006; Escala et al. 2020b) to separate M31 RGB stars from the MW foreground using diagnostic measurements such as radial velocity (\( v_{\text{helio}} \)), NaI \( \lambda 8190 \) doublet equivalent width (\( EW_{\text{NaI}} \)), photometric metallicity (\( [Fe/H]_{\text{phot}} \)), and calcium-triplet-based metallicity (\( [Fe/H]_{\text{CaT}} \)). In particular, the technique of Escala et al. (2020b) relies on Bayesian inference to assign each target star a probability of M31 membership based on the observed properties of over 1000 M31 and MW stars securely identified in SPLASH (Gilbert et al. 2006, 2012). As a consequence, these methods were calibrated to the properties of the stellar halo in M31’s southeast quadrant, where known M31 substructure is not present at MW-like heliocentric velocities (\( v_{\text{helio}} \geq -150 \) km s\(^{-1}\); Gilbert et al. 2018). However, these approaches to membership determination overestimate the degree of MW contamination for the NE shelf fields when using radial velocity as a diagnostic.

For context, Figure 3 shows the heliocentric radial velocity distributions for stars in the NE shelf fields with successful velocity measurements, including both M31 RGB stars and intervening MW dwarf stars. In the innermost field NE3, the Escala et al. model assigns a low probability of M31 membership to a prominent kinematical feature at \( v_{\text{helio}} \sim -120 \) km s\(^{-1}\) (Figure 3) when including radial velocity as a diagnostic. However, this feature likely corresponds to the NE shelf based on its position and velocity (Section 3.4). When selecting stars in NE3 that have velocities consistent with this feature (\( -190 \) km s\(^{-1} \leq v_{\text{helio}} < -100 \) km s\(^{-1}\)), we found that their \( EW_{\text{NaI}} \) and \( [Fe/H]_{\text{CaT}} \) measurements and CMD positions are consistent with those of stars in the NE shelf fields with M31-like velocities (\( v_{\text{helio}} \leq -200 \) km s\(^{-1}\); Figure 4). Thus, the likelihood-based M31 membership models are not uniformly applicable to the NE shelf fields when using radial velocity criteria owing to the distinct kinematical structure of the NE shelf.

We adopted a binary membership determination in which we classified stars with clear spectral signatures of strong NaI \( \lambda 8190 \) absorption or \( v_{\text{helio}} > -100 \) km s\(^{-1}\) \( (v_{\text{helio}} > -150 \) km s\(^{-1}\)) for \( R_{\text{proj}} < 20 \) kpc \( (R_{\text{proj}} > 20 \) kpc) as belonging to the MW foreground. We relied on visual inspection of the NaI doublet as opposed to \( EW_{\text{NaI}} \) measurements owing to the low signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) of the spectra. We do not detect stars with strong NaI absorption at M31-like velocities (Figure 4) given that MW contaminants in this velocity range are likely blue main-sequence turn-off stars in the MW’s stellar halo.
We show stars (uncertainties $\delta$ are due to the low spectral $S$ of the NaI triplet-based metallicity assuming a normal distribution. In the outermost velocity cut should largely eliminate MW contamination, For example, the median $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{CaT}}$ and $\text{EW}_\text{Na}$ of M31 (MW) stars are $-0.54$ ($-1.74$) and $1.7$ ($3.1$) $\text{Å}$ based on measurements with uncertainties $\delta[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{CaT}} < 0.8$ and $\delta\text{EW}_\text{Na} < 2$ $\text{Å}$, respectively, which are consistent with known properties of M31 (MW) stars along the line of sight to M31 (Gilbert et al. 2006; Escala et al. 2020b). Table 1 provides the number of M31 RGB stars identified in each field.

### 3.2. Empirical Modeling of the Velocity Distributions

The observed velocity distributions (Figure 3) clearly demonstrate that kinematical substructure is present across the spectroscopic fields. Such substructure is presumably associated with the tidal debris that constitutes the NE shelf. Thus, we performed empirically motivated modeling of the velocity distribution to identify probable substructure components directly from the data. This is in contrast to the $N$-body modeling used to predict the velocity structure of the NE shelf in Section 4. We provide a catalog of individual velocity measurements for M31 RGB stars (Section 3.1) in the NE shelf fields in the form of Table 2.

#### 3.2.1. Number of Kinematical Components

We confirmed that each field contains kinematical substructure by testing whether the velocity distributions for M31 RGB stars are consistent with a pure stellar halo component. We assumed that the stellar halo in the NE shelf region can be described by the kinematically unbiased parameterization found by Gilbert et al. (2018) for M31’s southeast quadrant via modeling the line-of-sight velocity distribution of over 5000 stars in radial bins spanning 9–175 projected kpc. We transformed the mean halo velocities in a given radial bin from the Galactocentric to the heliocentric frame based on the median R.A. and decl. of all stars in each NE shelf field. We performed an Anderson–Darling test with $10^3$ Monte Carlo trials to compare the observed velocity distribution of each field to the accompanying Gaussian stellar halo model. In each iteration, we randomly drew samples from the model according to the number of M31 members in each field (Table 1) and calculated the test statistic for a perturbation of the line-of-sight velocities assuming Gaussian measurement errors. We found that the velocity distribution for each field—including NE2 and NE4 despite the apparent lack of multiple velocity peaks—is

---

$\delta$ Similar to EW$_\text{Na}$, an equivalent width measurement for the calcium triplet is physically meaningful for MW stars, but they are useful as population diagnostics.

The change in velocity cut with projected radius is a consequence of the shifting of the shelf velocity distribution relative to the constant MW foreground (Figure 3). The velocity cut includes the majority of stars in the NE3 velocity peak while excluding the majority of stars at MW-like velocities in this field. We characterized the MW velocity distribution over the NE shelf region as probed by our selection function by utilizing an expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm to fit a three-component Gaussian mixture (Pedregosa et al. 2012) to the combined velocity distribution of the three outermost fields. We found $v_{\text{MW}} = -62.6$ km s$^{-1}$, $\sigma_{v,\text{MW}} = 39.6$ km s$^{-1}$, indicating that a velocity cut at $-100$ km s$^{-1}$ removes 82.8% of stars at MW-like velocities when assuming a normal distribution. In the outermost fields, the velocity cut should largely eliminate MW contamination, where Gilbert et al. (2007) found that MW dwarf stars along the line of sight to M31 are primarily limited to $v_{\text{helio}} > -150$ km s$^{-1}$.

Figure 4 shows $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{phot}}$, $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{CaT}}$, and $\text{EW}_\text{Na}$ versus $v_{\text{helio}}$ for stars classified as belonging to M31 and the MW in the NE shelf fields. The $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{phot}}$ derivation (Section 2.2) assumes that stars are at the distance of M31 and the $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{CaT}}$ calibration is appropriate only for RGB stars; therefore, both are inaccurate for MW stars. We emphasize that we did not use selections on $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{phot}}$, $[\text{Fe/H}]_{\text{CaT}}$, or $\text{EW}_\text{Na}$ measurements to determine membership. Instead, Figure 4 illustrates that a binary membership classification based solely on $v_{\text{helio}}$ and apparent Na1 absorption captures statistical differences between the observed properties of M31 and MW stellar populations, despite favoring completeness over lower contamination.
highly inconsistent with a single kinematically hot stellar halo component.

To determine the number of kinematical components in each field, we used an EM algorithm to fit Gaussian mixtures (Pedregosa et al. 2012) to the observed velocity distribution of M31 RGB stars. For each $N$-component model, we computed the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) for $10^3$ perturbations of the velocities according to their errors. We found that $N$-components = (2, 1, 3, 1, 2) minimizes the BIC for fields (NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5). However, the EM algorithm has no knowledge of the structural properties of the substructure-dominated NE shelf region and likely disregards the dynamically hot stellar halo that must be present at some level in each field. We therefore incremented the number of components by 1 to account for a kinematically hot halo-like component in each field except NE3.

As demonstrated by Figure 5, NE3 has a more complex velocity distribution, which makes the separation of substructure from a background halo-like component less straightforward. We evaluated whether NE3 contains three or four kinematical components when including a halo-like component (i.e., whether the field has two or three kinematically cold components (KCCs)) by modeling its velocity distribution using the procedure detailed in Section 3.2.2. We calculated a distribution of BICs using the models described by every 100th sampled parameter combination from the converged portion of the flattened Markov chain assuming three and four components. Based on this, we concluded that a three-component model composed of two substructure components and a halo-like component provides a better representation of the data for this field.

### 3.2.2. Sampling the Posterior Probability Distributions

We modeled the observed velocity distribution in each field as a Gaussian mixture composed of KCCs that correspond to the NE shelf (see Section 3.2.3 for a discussion on the disk) and a kinematically hot halo-like component with fixed mean and dispersion but variable fractional contribution. We refer to the kinematically hot component as "halo-like" to emphasize that it may be composed of both a classical stellar halo (i.e., in situ and phase-mixed accreted stars) and high velocity dispersion tidal debris constituting part of the shell. The log likelihood of this model is given by

$$\ln \mathcal{L} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \left( \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_k \mathcal{N}(v_i | \mu_k, \tau_k^{-1}) \right),$$

where $i$ is the index representing an RGB star, $v_i$ is its heliocentric radial velocity, and $N$ is the number of RGB stars. $K$ is the total number of components (including the kinematically hot component), $k$ is the index for a given component, and $\mu_k$, $\tau_k = \sigma_k^2$, and $f_k$ are the mean, inverse variance, and fractional contribution of each component. Note that the fractional contribution of the halo-like component is not a free parameter and is instead constrained by the KCCs.

We sampled from the posterior distribution of the velocity model (Equation (1)) for each field using an affine-invariant Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) ensemble sampler (emcee; Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013) with $10^3$ walkers and $10^4$ steps. We limited the range of our model parameters to samples drawn from $-600$ km s$^{-1} < \mu_k < -100$ km s$^{-1}$, $5$ km s$^{-1} < \sigma_k < 150$ km s$^{-1}$, and $0 < f < 1$, and required that $\mu_k < \mu_{k+1}$ and $\sum f_k = 1$ for KCCs. We implemented uniform priors on $\mu_k$ over the allowed range for maximal flexibility given the previously unstudied nature of the NE shelf velocity distribution for RGB stars. We assumed Gamma priors on $\sigma_k$ with $\alpha = 2.25$ and $\beta = 506.25$ to penalize small values of $\sigma_k$ while enabling a lower-probability extended tail toward high values of $\sigma_k$. We constructed the marginalized posterior distributions from the latter 50% of the samples, where Table 3 summarizes the model parameters calculated from the 16th, 50th, and 84th percentiles of the posterior distributions.

Figure 5 shows the heliocentric velocity distributions for RGB stars in each field compared to its adopted velocity model. We also indicate the separate kinematically hot and cold components constituting the model in the figure. As previously discussed, the interior field NE3 has the most complicated velocity distribution, which is composed of a cold feature at $v_{\text{helio}} \sim -120$ km s$^{-1}$ that is likely the upper envelope of the NE shelf (Sections 3.4 and 4), a significant halo-like component, and a third component of unclear origin (see Section 3.2.3). The fields at intermediate projected radii, NE1 and NE6, consist of two NE shelf components corresponding to the envelopes of the tidal shell (Sections 3.4 and 4). The outermost fields, NE2 and NE4, are dominated by NE shelf substructure, where relatively insignificant halo-like components are favored by the model.

Based on the model for each field, we assigned each star a probability of belonging to substructure ($p_{\text{sub}}$) given its heliocentric velocity. This probability is computed from the likelihood ratio between the KCC model(s) and halo-like component model. We emphasize that stars with lower values of $p_{\text{sub}}$ may in fact belong to NE shelf substructure; $p_{\text{sub}}$ should be interpreted as a measure of confidence that a star is associated with tidal debris based on velocity information alone.

### Table 2

| Object  | R.A. (J2000) | Decl. (J2000) | $V_0$ | $\Delta V_0$ | $I_0$ | $\Delta I_0$ | $v_{\text{helio}}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $\Delta v_{\text{helio}}$ (km s$^{-1}$) |
|---------|-------------|--------------|-------|--------------|-------|--------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 133576  | 00:52:36.06 | +42:08:14.3  | 23.17 | 0.03         | 20.72 | 0.03         | -343.9                         | 3.6                             |
| 137751  | 00:52:36.80 | +42:08:57.0  | 23.81 | 0.02         | 21.17 | 0.02         | -346.0                         | 4.0                             |
| 137777  | 00:52:36.80 | +42:09:04.3  | 23.75 | 0.04         | 22.17 | 0.03         | -210.1                         | 8.9                             |
| 140180  | 00:52:25.13 | +42:09:28.9  | 23.44 | 0.05         | 21.60 | 0.04         | -306.0                         | 5.5                             |
| 140853  | 00:52:28.23 | +42:09:37.8  | 22.62 | 0.04         | 21.45 | 0.05         | -270.6                         | 6.6                             |

Note: The columns correspond to object name, R.A., decl., extinction-corrected $(V, I)$ photometric magnitudes and errors, and heliocentric velocity and the associated total measurement uncertainty. The velocity uncertainty is determined from the scaled cross-correlation-based error (Howley et al. 2013) and a systematic error component (Simion & Geha 2007) but does not include statistical uncertainties on the A-band correction (Section 2.1).

(This table is available in its entirety in machine-readable form.)
respectively. We note that the line-of-sight velocity dispersion

\[ \sigma_{\text{line-of-sight}} \]

of the NE3 galaxy is 14.4 km s\(^{-1}\), NE1 is 19.6 km s\(^{-1}\), NE6 is 21.7 km s\(^{-1}\), NE2 is 25.2 km s\(^{-1}\), and NE4 is 29.2 km s\(^{-1}\). We also show the median velocity of the disk predicted for each field, assuming its presence (black arrows; Section 3.2.3).

Figure 5. Heliocentric radial velocity distributions for M31 RGB stars (gray histograms; Section 3.1) in the NE shelf fields. We show the empirical velocity model derived for each field from the 50th percentile values of the marginalized posterior probability distributions (black curve; Section 3.1). The KCCs corresponding predominantly to NE shelf substructure (gray dotted and dashed red lines). We also show the median velocity of the disk predicted for each field.

Table 3

| Field | \( R_{\text{proj}} \) (kpc) | \( \mu_{\text{halo}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) | \( \sigma_{\text{halo}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) | \( \sigma_{\text{KCC}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) | \( f_{\text{KCC}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) | \( \mu_{\text{KCC}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) | \( \sigma_{\text{KCC}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) | \( f_{\text{KCC}} \) (km s\(^{-1}\)) |
|-------|----------------|----------|----------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------------|
| NE3   | 14.4           | -319.4   | 98.1     | -224.3 \( \pm \) 123.0 | 40.0 \( \pm \) 14.4 | 0.24 \( \pm \) 0.11 | -121.7 \( \pm \) 46.1 | 14.0 \( \pm \) 2.9 |
| NE1   | 19.6           | -319.0   | 98.1     | -383.7 \( \pm \) 112.2 | 26.4 \( \pm \) 7.0 | 0.20 \( \pm \) 0.11 | -204.2 \( \pm \) 110.3 | 45.9 \( \pm \) 7.7 |
| NE6   | 21.7           | -319.1   | 98.1     | -398.6 \( \pm \) 143.4 | 16.6 \( \pm \) 4.5 | 0.18 \( \pm \) 0.10 | -209.9 \( \pm \) 3.1 | 14.5 \( \pm \) 2.4 |
| NE2   | 25.2           | -316.2   | 98.0     | -310.5 \( \pm \) 73.3 | 55.4 \( \pm \) 17.6 | 0.92 \( \pm \) 0.04 | ...         | ...             |
| NE4   | 29.2           | -316.0   | 98.0     | -300.6 \( \pm \) 46.2 | 42.8 \( \pm \) 8.3 | 0.79 \( \pm \) 0.10 | ...         | ...             |

Note. The parameters describing the model components are mean velocity (\( \mu \)), velocity dispersion (\( \sigma \)), and normalised fractional contribution (\( f \)). We constructed each model from halo-like (Gilbert et al. 2018) and KCCs corresponding predominantly to NE shelf substructure (Section 3.2). The parameter values are the 50th percentiles of the marginalized posterior probability distributions, where the errors are calculated from the 16th and 84th percentiles.

3.2.3. Potential Contamination from M31’s Disk

We assessed whether a significant contribution from M31’s disk is expected in the NE shelf velocity distribution owing to its complex kinematic structure (Figure 5) and the proximity of the fields to the disk (Figure 1). Using a simple model for the perfectly circular rotation of an inclined disk (Guhathakurta et al. 1988) with inclination angle \( i = 77^\circ \) and position angle P.A. = 38\(^\circ\), we calculated the predicted line-of-sight velocities for a disk feature over the R.A., decl. range (corresponding to \( R_{\text{disk}} = 28-42 \) kpc) spanned by our fields. Based on a rotation curve derived from H\( \text{I} \) kinematics out to \( R_{\text{disk}} = 38 \) kpc and corrected for the inclination of the disk (Chemin et al. 2009), the expected disk rotation velocity in the NE shelf fields is \( \sim 250 \) km s\(^{-1}\).

When using the simple model, this translates to line-of-sight velocities of \( v_{\text{disk, med}} = -242.2, -227.9, -202.7, -206.6, \) and \( -193.0 \) km s\(^{-1}\) in fields NE3, NE1, NE6, NE2, and NE4, respectively. We note that the line-of-sight velocity dispersion of the disk is \( \sim 50-60 \) km s\(^{-1}\) as found by Dorman et al. (2012) using a similar velocity modeling methodology (Section 3.2) over a comparable radial range to the NE shelf fields. Moreover, the rotation velocity of RGB stars lags the H\( \text{I} \) disk by \( 63 \) km s\(^{-1}\) (Quirk et al. 2019), such that adjusting for this asymmetric drift would decrease \( v_{\text{disk, med}} \) by \( \sim 15-30 \) km s\(^{-1}\).

In contrast to fields NE2 and NE4, fields NE1, NE3, and NE6 show evidence of KCCs near \( v_{\text{disk, med}} \) (Figure 5; Table 3). However, the majority of stars in the KCC at disk-like velocities in NE6 likely belong to the NE shelf given that its position in projected phase space corresponds to the upper envelope of the shell pattern (Sections 3.4 and 4). The KCC in NE3 at \( v_{\text{helio}} \sim -220 \) km s\(^{-1}\) could feasibly originate from the disk, whereas the KCC at \( v_{\text{helio}} \sim -200 \) km s\(^{-1}\) in NE1 may be contaminated by the disk. We further explore these features in comparison to predictions of \( N \)-body models in Section 4.

3.3. Photometric Metallicity Distribution

We investigated the photometric metallicity distribution functions (MDFs) of RGB stars along the line of sight to the NE shelf to probe its chemical composition. We used photometric metallicities instead of spectroscopic calcium-triplet-based metallicities (e.g., Figure 4) because they are more robust at the low S/N characteristic of spectra in M31: [Fe/H]\_CaT measurements are subject to larger random uncertainties than [Fe/H]\_phot measurements and are unavailable for a nonnegligible number of stars. Moreover, we are concerned with relative metallicity.
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in Figure 6, we show the photometric MDFs for all stars in the NE shelf fields (including MW contaminants; black solid open histogram), stars classified as M31 members (gray dashed open histogram; Section 3.1), and stars that probably belong to the NE shelf (p_{sub} > 0.5; Section 3.2.2). We assumed 12 Gyr PARSEC isochrones (Marigo et al. 2017) to determine [Fe/H]_{phot} (Section 2.2). The median [Fe/H]_{phot} for each sample is shown as arrows, where [Fe/H]_{phot,med} = -0.41 is robust with respect to sample selection, indicating that the NE shelf is the dominant feature in the data (Section 3.3).

differences between NE shelf stars and other stellar populations, as opposed to absolute metallicities. We determined [Fe/H]_{phot} assuming 12 Gyr PARSEC isochrones (Marigo et al. 2017) and m − M = 24.47 following Section 2.2.

In Figure 6, we show the photometric MDFs for all stars in the NE shelf fields (including MW contaminants), stars classified as M31 members (Section 3.1), and stars that probably belong to the NE shelf (p_{sub} > 0.5; Section 3.2.2). The unweighted median (mean) [Fe/H]_{phot} for each sample is −0.43 (−0.54), −0.42 (−0.54), and −0.41 (−0.53), respectively. If we instead assume 10 Gyr or 8 Gyr isochrones, which approximately correspond to the mean stellar age of M31’s phase-mixed stellar halo (Brown et al. 2006, 2007, 2008) and the GSS (Brown et al. 2006; Tanaka et al. 2010), we obtain a median (mean) [Fe/H]_{phot} for the NE shelf that is 0.03 (0.04) or 0.08 (0.09) more metal-rich. The relative invariance of the median (mean) [Fe/H]_{phot} value with respect to the sample selection indicates that NE shelf tidal debris is the dominant feature in the data. That is, the majority of stars with successful velocity measurements are indeed M31 RGB stars (Section 3.1), although the value of [Fe/H]_{phot} is not physically meaningful for MW foreground stars, and the majority of RGB stars indeed belong to the NE shelf and not the phase-mixed stellar halo.

In addition, the general shape of the MDF remains relatively constant between each sample, where the MDF is skewed toward the peak at [Fe/H]_{phot} ∼ −0.4, followed by a sharp decline for [Fe/H]_{phot} ≥ −0.2 and an extended low-metallicity tail. The fact that the metal-poor ([Fe/H]_{phot} ≤ −1.3) population declines when selecting only for NE shelf stars (p_{sub} > 0.5; Figure 6) suggests that the majority of these stars belong to M31’s stellar halo rather than the shelf. Adopting a stricter threshold for NE shelf membership (p_{sub} > 0.75) does not significantly alter the location or shape of the MDF, so we retain the more inclusive criterion to maximize the sample size of NE shelf stars.

The most pronounced change in the MDFs in Figure 6 is that a distinct peak at [Fe/H]_{phot} ∼ −0.7 emerges in the NE shelf sample. This feature is robust because the bin sizes for each MDF are twice the median statistical photometric uncertainty (0.05; Section 2.2). This peak may originate from our choice to designate stars that probably belong to kinematical substructure (p_{sub} > 0.5) as NE shelf stars, when in reality some of these stars could belong to other dynamically cold structures such as M31’s disk (Sections 3.2.3, 4.1). Interestingly, this peak metallicity roughly corresponds to the median [Fe/H]_{phot} of M31’s disk edge in the Pan-chromatic Hubble Andromeda Treasury (PHAT; Dalcanton et al. 2012; Williams et al. 2014) when assuming 13 Gyr isochrones (Gregersen et al. 2015).

We further explored the [Fe/H]_{phot} distribution of the NE shelf by considering the relationship to radial velocity and projected M31-centric radius. Figure 7 shows \nuhelio versus [Fe/H]_{phot} for each NE shelf field ordered as a function of R_{proj}, where we highlighted the 2\sigma radial velocity range associated with each detected kinematical substructure component (Table 3; Figure 5). We calculated the average metallicity and metallicity dispersion for each KCC weighted by the kinematically based probability of belonging to the given KCC (Table 4). We note that the metallicity difference between kinematical components is likely larger than indicated by Table 4 because of the probabilistic nature of the component assignment. We found that the median [Fe/H]_{phot} in NE3 is ∼0.15 more metal-poor than the relatively uniform metallicity of the other fields, possibly due to its more dominant halo-like population and/or larger disk contribution. The halo-like population across all fields is similar in metallicity to the combined NE shelf population. This raises the possibility that this kinematically hot component may correspond to tidal debris with a high velocity dispersion, or similarly that the stellar halo in this region is heavily polluted by NE shelf substructure. We compare the metallicity distribution of the NE shelf to M31’s phase-mixed stellar halo in Section 5.2.

Moreover, Figure 7 demonstrates that the aforementioned stars with [Fe/H]_{phot} ∼ −0.7 are visible in the secondary KCC of NE1 and possibly the primary KCC of NE3. These stars therefore have metallicities and velocities (Section 3.2.3) broadly consistent with M31’s disk, implying that a low level of disk contamination may be present in the data. However, the [Fe/H]_{phot} distribution for stars that probably belong to KCCs (i.e., either the NE shelf or the disk) still appears to be dominated by the NE shelf, where removing stars with −0.65 < [Fe/H]_{phot} > −0.85 increases the median (mean) [Fe/H]_{phot} by merely 0.04 (0.04). The clump of stars at [Fe/H]_{phot} ∼ −1.0 in the secondary KCC of NE6 could also be associated with the disk, where removing this grouping increases the median (mean) [Fe/H]_{phot} by an additional 0.02 (0.04).

3.4. Projected Phase-space Distribution

Prior studies (e.g., Fardal et al. 2007, 2013; Sadoun et al. 2014; Miki et al. 2016; Kirihara et al. 2017) have proposed that the NE shelf may have formed from a radial merger—a merger with low angular momentum that consequently produces shell-like tidal structures (Hernquist & Quinn 1988; Merrifield & Kuijken 1998; Sanderson & Helmi 2013). These tidal structures create a “caustic surface” when viewed in radial (r, \nu_r) phase space, where this
surface contains material with similar orbital energy that originates from the progenitor disrupted by the radial merger. Due to the near symmetry of this type of event, the resulting signature in projected \( R, v_{\text{los}} \) phase space near the spatial edge of the shell depends only on the enclosed mass of the host galaxy and the shell radius (Merrifield & Kuijken 1998; Ebrová et al. 2012; Sanderson & Helmi 2013). In this section, we provide an overview of the observed features of the projected phase-space distribution for the NE shelf (Section 3.4.1) before using the observed distribution to assess the ability of analytical models to constrain M31’s gravitational potential at the shelf location (Section 3.4.2).

### 3.4.1. Observed Features of the NE Shelf

Figure 8 shows the line-of-sight velocity \( (v_{\text{helio}}) \) of stars in the NE shelf fields, shifted according to M31’s systemic velocity \( (v_{\text{M31}} = -300 \text{ km s}^{-1}) \), versus projected M31-centric radius \( (R_{\text{proj}}) \). In this space, M31 RGB stars clearly show a “wedge” pattern characteristic of a shell formed in a radial merger: the \( v_{\text{helio}} \) range decreases with increasing \( R_{\text{proj}} \) as stars in the shell approach apocenter, where \( v_{\text{helio}} \sim v_{\text{M31}} \sim 0 \text{ km s}^{-1} \). Given that the velocity dispersion of the NE shelf in the outermost field \( \sigma_v \sim 43 \text{ km s}^{-1} \) (Table 3; Figure 5), the data may not capture the full radial extent of the shell feature (see Figure 10).\(^{12}\)

The magnitude difference between red clump stars in the NE shelf and GSS indicates that it is located in front of the latter feature given their similar CMD morphologies (Ferguson et al. 2005; Richardson et al. 2008) and consequently that the NE shelf is located in front of M31 when combined with line-of-sight distance measurements (McConnachie et al. 2003). Thus, the upper envelope \( (v_{\text{helio}} \sim v_{\text{M31}} \sim 0 \text{ km s}^{-1}) \) of the caustic corresponds to tidally stripped stars moving toward M31, whereas the lower envelope corresponds to stars moving away from M31. In the field with the innermost robust detection of both envelopes of the wedge (NE1; Figure 5), the positive

\[^{12}\text{The simulations do not predict a distinct “tip” of the wedge pattern in projected phase space for the NE shelf (Figure 10), which suggests that the NE shelf may not have a well-defined spatial edge regardless of the spatial coverage of the spectroscopic data.}\]
(negative) envelope has $v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} \sim +95.8_{-10.5}^{+11.9}$ km s$^{-1}$ (Table 3), indicating that the wedge shape is roughly symmetric. That is, the inbound stars are moving at approximately the same speed as the outbound stars.

In addition, the right panel of Figure 8 highlights M31 RGB stars that probably belong to kinematical substructure (Section 3.2.2) dominated by the NE shelf (Section 3.3). The upper envelope appears to have a higher density of stars than the lower envelope (see also Figure 5), where the lower envelope only becomes statistically distinguishable from the background kinematically hot population at $R_{\text{proj}} \sim 19$ kpc in NE1. However, the clustering of stars close to the expected velocity of the lower envelope in NE3 ($v_{\text{helio}} \lesssim -400$ km s$^{-1}$; Figure 5) that have [Fe/H]$_{\text{host}}$ consistent with the NE shelf (Figure 7) implies that the lower envelope may be present at low levels in the data.

3.4.2. Constraints on the Gravitational Potential of M31

As first shown by Merrifield & Kuijken (1998, hereafter MK98), the observed line-of-sight velocities of stars in a tidal shell could in principle constrain the radial component of the gravitational potential ($g_r$) of the host galaxy at the shell radius ($r_s$). Thus, we utilized our measurements of M31-centric line-of-sight velocity ($v_{\text{los}}$) for RGB stars in the NE shelf region as a test of such analytical models. The absolute maximum velocity of the wedge as a function of projected galactocentric radius $R$ is given by the following expression:

$$v_{\text{los}}^\text{MK} = \frac{g_r}{r_s} (r_s - R).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

MK98 derived Equation (2) assuming that a tidal shell is composed of stars on monoenergetic orbits in a plane tangential to the line of sight, where stars in the shell have low angular momentum such that the 3D shell velocity ($v_s$) is zero. We adopted Equation (2) to describe the shape of the NE shelf wedge pattern instead of the formulation by Sanderson & Helmi (2013, hereafter SH13),

$$v_{\text{SH}} = \frac{\sqrt{r_s^2 + 2R_r - 3R^2 (\sqrt{g(r_s)(r_s - R)} + v_x)}}{r_s + R},$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

which lifts the monoenergetic and low angular momentum assumptions. This is because the simpler MK model converges on a reliable solution, in contrast to the SH model, when applied to the data. The reason for this is likely that the tip of the wedge pattern, which places the strongest constraints on $v_x$, is not included in the NE shelf data (Section 3.4.1), in conjunction with the fact that $v_x$ is intrinsically difficult to constrain with typical values of $\lesssim 30$ km s$^{-1}$ (SH13).

In order to estimate $g_r$, we therefore fit Equation (2) to the upper envelope of the NE shelf wedge pattern. We used the upper, as opposed to the lower, envelope owing to projection effects (SH13) that result in a minor asymmetry in which the positive edge has a greater maximum apparent speed for the innermost field (Figure 8), besides which the detection of the lower envelope in this field is uncertain (Section 3.4.1). We used the kinematical parameters from Table 3 to define the upper envelope using the following equation for each NE shelf field:

$$v_{\text{los}} = \mu_{v,\text{KCC2}} + 2\sigma_{v,\text{KCC2}} - v_{\text{M31}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where we calculated $\delta v_{\text{los}}$ using standard error propagation by assuming symmetric average uncertainties on $\mu_{v,\text{KCC2}}$ and $\sigma_{v,\text{KCC2}}$. We assessed the possibility of disk contamination in
KCC2 of NE1 by conservatively removing all stars with [Fe/H]_{phot} in the range expected for the majority of disk stars (Section 3.3) and found that the upper envelope location was unchanged.

Thus, we used the nonlinear least-squares Python algorithm curve_fit (Virtanen et al. 2020) to obtain $g_z = 3.04 \pm 0.80$ km s$^{-1}$ Myr$^{-1}$ and $r_z = 36.6 \pm 2.7$ kpc from the observed shape of the NE shelf wedge. The right panel of Figure 8 shows the data points corresponding to the upper edge of the feature and its best-fit model. Assuming a spherical potential, we can transform these constraints into an upper limit on M31’s enclosed mass ($M_{\text{enc}}$) at the shell radius,

$$M_{\text{enc}}(r < r_z) = \frac{g_z r_z^2}{G},$$  

(5)

where we found that $M_{\text{enc}}(r < 36.6 \text{ kpc}) = (9.26 \pm 2.78) \times 10^{11} M_\odot$ based on the NE shelf data.

We note that these parameter estimates should be treated with caution given the assumptions involved in the derivation of Equation (2). SH13 used the Fardal et al. (2007) GSS merger simulations to compare the value of $g_z$ derived from the projected phase-space distributions of predicted caustics to the true values in the simulation. They found that the MK model overestimated the value of $g_z$ by a factor of $\sim 2$–$3$, whereas the more sophisticated SH13 model produced more accurate estimates. Thus, the empirically derived value of $g_z$ should be interpreted as an upper limit. We compare this value to literature measurements of M31’s enclosed mass in Section 6.1.

4. N-body Models for the Formation of the Northeast Shelf

We compared observations of RGB stars in the NE shelf to predictions of N-body models for the GSS merger event to test scenarios for the shelf’s formation. We utilized resimulations of models from Fardal et al. (2007, hereafter F07) and Fardal et al. (2012, hereafter F12), which were constructed using a static bulge–disk–halo model for M31’s gravitational potential (Geehan et al. 2006) and a spherical Plummer model for a satellite progenitor consisting of only a stellar component (Fardal et al. 2006). A particle realization for the M31 host component was incorporated following the conclusion of the dynamical evolution of the N-body satellite model. In the F07 (F12) model, complete (partial) disruption of a satellite with stellar mass $M_\odot = 2.2 \times 10^9 M_\odot$ ($3.1 \times 10^9 M_\odot$) occurs 0.84 Gyr (0.97 Gyr) ago within a M31 host with stellar mass $M_\odot = 1.1 \times 10^{11} M_\odot$ and virial mass $M_{200} = 1.7 \times 10^{12} M_\odot$ for each simulation.

For the F07 and F12 models, respectively, the orbit of the progenitor was fitted to reproduce the observed properties of the GSS, not those of the NE, W, or SE shelves. Despite this, the models have shown good agreement with kinematics of RGB stars in the NE and W shelves (Gilbert et al. 2007; Fardal et al. 2012) and promising overlap with PN kinematics for a small sample in the NE shelf region (Merrett et al. 2003, 2006; Fardal et al. 2007, 2013). Figure 9 shows the satellite debris distribution on the sky for the F07 model, where the distribution for the F12 model is similar.

4.1. Predicted Projected Phase-space Distributions

To assess whether this agreement extends to the kinematics of RGB stars in the NE shelf over a larger spatial extent, we compared the predicted projected phase-space distributions to the observations in Figure 10. We also show PN observations identified as a possible continuation of the GSS by Merrett et al. (2003, 2006). We initially selected the NE shelf region in the simulations using the criteria $X_{\text{M31}} > 0.2^\circ$ and $-1.5^\circ < Y_{\text{M31}} < 0.5^\circ$, where $X_{\text{M31}}$ and $Y_{\text{M31}}$ are defined along the NE major axis (P.A. = 38° E of N) and NW minor axis in the tangent plane. We first chose to inspect the NE shelf over a larger spatial area than spanned by the spectroscopic fields for better statistical representations of the models. Additionally, we separated the N-body model particles into M31 host and GSS-related satellite debris components in Figure 10.

For models with (F12) and without (F07) an intact satellite progenitor core, the projected phase-space distribution of the tidal debris clearly provides a qualitative match to the NE shelf data. This not only supports the empirically motivated conclusion that the NE shelf is indeed a tidal shelf (Section 3.4.1) but also provides compelling evidence in favor of a GSS-related origin. For the first time, we present a complete detection of the characteristic wedge pattern in the sense that it includes the returning stream component (i.e., the positive-velocity upper envelope) of the NE shelf. However, Figure 10 supports the notion that the NE shelf observations do not resolve the tip of the wedge pattern (Section 3.4.1) predicted to reside at $R_{\text{proj}} \gtrsim 35$ kpc, where the tip is required to provide constraints on the 3D shell velocity (Section 3.4.2). Figure 10 also corroborates the fact that the predicted negative-velocity caustic at

13 Merrett et al. (2003) flagged PNs as stream candidates based on their location in M31’s eastern hemisphere and their status as velocity outliers in a survey dominated by M31’s disk. Although the PNs are located near the lower envelope of the NE shelf in Figure 10, they are not necessarily associated with the tidal shell (Section 5.1).
$R_{\text{proj}} \sim 15 \text{kpc}$ does not appear to be detected in the data (Section 3.2). In general, the modeled upper envelopes of the wedge pattern appear to provide better fits to the data than the lower envelopes.

In order to explore predictions more equivalent to the observations, we restricted the NE shelf selection region in the models to an area similar to the spatial coverage of the spectroscopic fields in Figure 11. We found that the modeled
disk contribution is substantially lower at the location of the NE shelf fields (in contrast to the broad selection region used in Figure 10). In the model with (without) an intact core, the host component constitutes 16.3% (41.1%) of the total particles, indicating that the expected satellite debris density is higher for the intact core model (Section 4.2). The M31 host model predicts a nonnegligible disk component at $v_{\text{helio}}-v_{\text{M31}} \sim +30, +55,$ and $+70 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ that overlaps with the primary, secondary, and secondary KCCs in NE3, NE1, and NE6, respectively, all of which are suspected of being contaminated by the disk (Sections 3.2.3, 3.3). The contamination from the host decreases with projected radius, where the specific fractional contributions depend on the satellite model assumptions. Furthermore, the relative fraction of host versus satellite debris material is highly dependent on model assumptions regarding M31’s mass and structural components.

### 4.2. Remnant Core or Complete Disruption of the Satellite Progenitor?

We evaluated whether the model with (F12) or without (F07) an intact satellite progenitor core provides a better fit to the observations. Figure 10 and 11 show that the primary difference between the projected phase-space distributions of models with and without an intact core is a relative enhancement of structure (see Fardal et al. 2013) at $v_{\text{helio}}-v_{\text{M31}} \lesssim 0 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ and an associated dearth of material approaching the tip of the wedge pattern. From an initial inspection, the model without an intact core appears to provide a better match to the data, given the lack of obvious clumping in the interior of the observed wedge pattern (excepting perhaps the third component of unclear origin in NE3; Section 3.2).

We further demonstrate that the F07 model is preferred over the F12 model in Figure 12, where we show the predicted versus observed line-of-sight velocity distributions for the NE shelf. The observed distribution is constructed from all RGB stars in the NE shelf fields, given evidence that the population is dominated by tidal debris (Section 3.3). The model distributions are constructed using only the satellite debris component at the data location (used in Figure 11). In each case, we represent the velocity distributions using Gaussian kernel density estimation with $\sigma = 15 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. We show the predicted velocity distributions for the satellite debris components of the models with (red dotted lines) and without (red dashed lines) an intact core over the radial range spanned by each spectroscopic field. We also show the 1σ confidence intervals (gray shaded regions) from the velocity measurement uncertainty on the observed distributions (solid black lines). Neither model is able to reproduce the velocity distributions in detail, although the model without an intact core is a better match (Section 4.2).

![Figure 12. Line-of-sight velocity distributions predicted for the NE shelf at the field locations (Figure 11) by N-body models for the formation of the GSS (Fardal et al. 2007, 2012) compared to observations of M31 RGB stars in the NE shelf (see Figure 5). We represent the velocity distributions using Gaussian kernel density estimation with $\sigma = 15 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. We show the predicted velocity distributions for the satellite debris components of the models with (red dotted lines) and without (red dashed lines) an intact core over the radial range spanned by each spectroscopic field. We also show the 1σ confidence intervals (gray shaded regions) from the velocity measurement uncertainty on the observed distributions (solid black lines). Neither model is able to reproduce the velocity distributions in detail, although the model without an intact core is a better match (Section 4.2).](image-url)
fields. Including the host component does not alter these conclusions for either model.

In summary, the best available observational evidence favors a scenario in which the satellite progenitor that produced the NE shelf has completely disrupted, or at least is not present in, the NE shelf region probed in this work, although comparison with a larger suite of N-body models is necessary for confirmation. If the intact core of the progenitor does exist, it could instead be embedded in the disk at \( v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} \approx -49 \pm 67 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \) compared to typical disk velocities of \( v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} \approx +80 \pm 40 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \) at predicted core positions (Fardal et al. 2013). In the SPLASH survey of M31’s disk, Dorman et al. (2012) tentatively detected NE shelf tidal debris as a forward continuation of the GSS at \( v_{\text{helio}} < -500 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \) but did not find evidence of a velocity signature resembling that of an intact core. We further explore the possibility that the progenitor core is present in the SPLASH disk data in Section 5.1. We also discuss literature models for the NE shelf’s formation in the context of our observations in Section 6.2.

5. Comparison to the Disk, West and Southeast Shelves, and the Giant Stellar Stream

5.1. Projected Phase-space Distributions

We compared the projected phase-space distribution of the NE shelf to the W and SE shelves and the GSS to explore the relationship between the likely associated tidal features. Figure 13 shows M31-centric heliocentric velocity versus projected M31-centric radius for the NE shelf (this work), the GSS (Gilbert et al. 2009, hereafter G09), and the W (F12) and SE (Gilbert et al. 2007, hereafter G07) shelves, in addition to the stream PN candidates from Merritt et al. (2003, 2006). We also compared the NE shelf to M31’s disk as surveyed by SPLASH (Dorman et al. 2012, 2015) given that the intact core of the GSS progenitor may be embedded in the disk (Section 4.2).

For each feature, we show only stars that are more likely to belong to M31 than the MW foreground. For the GSS and SE shelves, M31 membership was evaluated using the likelihood-based method of Gilbert et al. (2006) as part of the SPLASH survey of M31’s halo. In contrast to F12, we utilized the Bayesian technique by Escala et al. (2020b) to identify M31 stars (Section 3.1) in the W shelf, where this approach produces similar results to the original Gilbert et al. method. We excluded the innermost W shelf field (Figure 1) from our analysis owing to contamination by NGC 205 (F12). For stars in the SPLASH disk region, membership was determined from CMD position and the absorption strength of the NaI doublet (I. Escala et al. 2022, in preparation). We note that we do not distinguish between RGB stars belonging to substructure (i.e., the disk and/or tidal debris) and the phase-mixed halo in Figure 13.

The right panel of Figure 13 suggests that the NE, W, and SE shelves form a sequence of tidal shelves at successively lower energy. This fits with the prediction that they correspond to GSS progenitor tidal debris approaching its second, third, and fourth pericentric passage, respectively (e.g., F07; Fardal et al. 2013). The NE shelf is the outermost shell, extending to \( r_{\text{proj}} \gtrsim 31 \ \text{kpc} \) and spanning \( \lesssim 400 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \), whereas the W and SE shelves are contained within \( r_{\text{proj}} \approx 25 \) and \( \approx 18 \ \text{kpc} \), respectively, and \( v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} \approx 100 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \). For reference, we show the projected radial range of the NE shelf edge inferred from imaging by F07, where the geometrical orientation of the shell relative to the line of sight causes this apparent variation in \( r_{\text{proj}} \). Regardless of whether GSS formation models can match detailed observations in the shelves (Section 4), their concentric wedge patterns provide compelling evidence for a shared origin in the tidal disruption of a single satellite galaxy.

The left panel of Figure 13 shows the NE shelf compared to the GSS and the disk region. The GSS fields include a secondary kinematical component known as the KCC that is likely physically associated with the GSS based on their tight correlation in \( r_{\text{proj}} \) versus \( v_{\text{helio}} \) space (Figure 13) and chemical similarities (Kalirai et al. 2006; Gilbert et al. 2009, 2019). Additionally, the potential forward continuation of the GSS speculated to be the NE shelf by Dorman et al. (2012) (Section 4.2) is visible in the disk data at \( v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} < -200 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \) and \( r_{\text{proj}} \lesssim 15 \ \text{kpc} \). However, this group of stars does not seem to be consistent with an inward extension of the lower envelope of the NE shelf wedge pattern as probed by our data. This is similarly the case for stream PN candidates at \( v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} < -200 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \), which instead appear to be consistent with an inward extension of the GSS. The PN at more positive velocities may not be associated with tidal debris. In contrast, the lower envelope of the NE shelf overlaps in phase space with the KCC.

In a minor merger scenario for the formation of the GSS, the KCC could originate from an extension of the shelves (G09). The W shelf is the most promising candidate because its extent is not well constrained owing to obscuration by M31’s southwestern disk. Moreover, GSS formation models predict negligible contributions from the NE and SE shelves along the GSS (F07, F12). For the KCC to originate from a symmetric extension of the NE shelf, it would minimally require that the positive-velocity caustic of the shell was depopulated at the KCC location. Additional GSS formation models will be necessary to evaluate this possible origin for the KCC.

Figure 13 also shows the predicted velocity range of an intact GSS progenitor core, \( v_{\text{helio}} - v_{\text{M31}} = -49 \pm 67 \ \text{km s}^{-1} \) (Fardal et al. 2013), compared to the expanded SPLASH disk data set (i.e., including spectroscopic fields published by Dorman et al. 2015). As in the case of the NE shelf (Section 4.2), we do not find evidence for the presence of an intact core in the SPLASH data based on current theoretical predictions. The apparent clumps of stars at \( r_{\text{proj}} \sim 5-8 \ \text{kpc} \) within the predicted velocity range are probably associated with the disk, which approaches more halo-like velocities in this radial range (Dorman et al. 2012). Such clumps in velocity space also do not correspond to any spatial concentrations that would resemble a core. Moreover, the most likely locations for the core position are nearer to the NE shelf, not within the inner 5-8 kpc of the disk, although this

---

14 We restricted the SPLASH disk sample to spectroscopic targets selected from PHAT photometry (Dukanton et al. 2012) as opposed to CFHT photometry (see Dorman et al. 2012).

15 We constructed samples from spectroscopic fields (Figure 1) (F07, H13a, and a3 for the GSS (Guhathakura et al. 2006; Kalirai et al. 2006; Gilbert et al. 2009) and H11, F11e, and F123 for the SE shelf (Kalirai et al. 2006; Gilbert et al. 2007). We classified stars with likelihoods \( (L_i) \) > 0 when including radial velocity as a diagnostic (Gilbert et al. 2006) as M31 members.

16 Unlike the NE shelf (Section 3.1), likelihood-based methods calibrated to the SE quadrant of M31’s halo (Gilbert et al. 2006; Escala et al. 2020b) can be reliably applied to the W shelf when including radial velocity as a diagnostic. The W shelf velocity distribution does not significantly overlap with the MW foreground, and the stellar surface density (and expected MW contamination) of the halo in the NW quadrant is similar to the SE.
radial range is not excluded by the models (Fardal et al. 2013). We note that Davidge (2012) identified an overdensity at $R_{\text{proj}} \sim 3.5$ kpc that is a plausible candidate for the GSS core, but this is outside the innermost extent of the SPLASH survey region. Existing imaging surveys have not detected an intact progenitor core within the SPLASH survey footprint.

5.2 Photometric Metallicity Distributions

We assessed whether the [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}}$ distributions of M31’s giant stream and shell system support the prediction that each feature originates from the disruption of a single progenitor. Figure 14 shows MDFs for the NE, W, and SE shelves compared to the GSS and the phase-mixed (“smooth”) component of the stellar halo. We assembled the smooth halo sample from M31 members in SPLASH halo fields spanning 12–33 kpc (Gilbert et al. 2012, 2014).\textsuperscript{17} We measured [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}}$ homogeneously for each sample following Section 2.2. In order to separate tidal debris from smooth halo stars, we calculated substructure probabilities ($p_{\text{sub}}$; e.g., Section 3.2.2) for all RGB stars (Section 5.1) along the line of sight to each sample. For the GSS, SE shelf, and smooth halo, we employed Gilbert et al. (2018; G18)’s velocity distribution models to determine $p_{\text{sub}}$, whereas we performed our own modeling of the velocity distribution for the W shelf (Appendix).

\textsuperscript{17}This radial range spans the following spectroscopic fields: H11, f115, f116, f207, f155, H13a, f130, a0, and a3.

We defined the tidal debris MDFs using stars that are more likely to belong to substructure than to the kinematically hot halo-like population ($p_{\text{sub}} > 0.5$). We adopted this more inclusive threshold for substructure membership (as opposed to $p_{\text{sub}} > 0.75$) to maximize the sample size for the SE shelf, where its velocity signature at the base of its wedge pattern ($v_{\text{helio}} \sim 300$ km s$^{-1}$, $\sigma_v \sim 55$ km s$^{-1}$, G07, G18) makes it difficult to disentangle from the halo. The SE and W shelf MDFs are the most likely to suffer from halo contamination, where the maximum values of $p_{\text{sub}}$ are $\sim$82% and $\sim$89%, respectively, whereas the GSS and NE shelf achieve maximum values of $\sim$95%. We used $p_{\text{sub}} < 0.2$ to conservatively define the smooth halo MDF.

Figure 14 demonstrates that the peak metallicities ([Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}} \sim -0.40$; Table 5) and shapes of the MDFs are similar between the shelves and the GSS, whereas they are distinct from the smooth halo MDF ([Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}} \sim -0.6$). The median (mean) [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}}$ of the W shelf is more metal-poor than the GSS and the other shelves, but this discrepancy likely results from increased contamination by comparatively metal-poor halo stars at [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}} \lesssim -0.7$. Based on an iterative analysis in which substructure probabilities were calculated using both chemical and kinematical information, F12 amplified differences between the tidal debris and phase-mixed halo populations in the W shelf region to show that the [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}} \gtrsim -0.7$ metallicity range is dominated by the W shelf. Previous analyses of the [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}}$ distributions of the W and SE shelves (F12, G07) found agreement with the GSS, supporting a common origin scenario for these tidal features. Escala et al.
distinct from the smooth halo. The median feature following Section 2.2. References for the original data: halo (Similar to Table 4, except comparing the NE shelf to likely associated Note. W shelf − GSS − [Fe/H]_{phot} for each sample is shown as arrows (Figure 5). The NE shelf has the same metallicity as the GSS and the SE shelf and is distinct from the smooth halo. The median [Fe/H]_{phot} of the W shelf MDF is lower owing to contamination by metal-poor halo stars but shares a similar MDF peak.

| Feature            | $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]_{\text{phot,med}}$ | $[\langle \text{Fe}/\text{H}\rangle_{\text{phot}}]$ | $\sigma([\text{Fe}/\text{H}]_{\text{phot}})$ |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Smooth halo        | $-0.63^{+0.01}_{-0.03}$               | $-0.75 \pm 0.03$                            | $0.53 \pm 0.02$                            |
| GSS                | $-0.43^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$               | $-0.56 \pm 0.02$                            | $0.45 \pm 0.02$                            |
| NE shelf           | $-0.42 \pm 0.01$                     | $-0.53 \pm 0.02$                            | $0.39 \pm 0.02$                            |
| W shelf            | $-0.55 \pm 0.04$                     | $-0.67^{+0.02}_{-0.03}$                     | $0.43 \pm 0.02$                            |
| SE shelf           | $-0.44^{+0.02}_{-0.01}$               | $-0.50 \pm 0.02$                            | $0.39 \pm 0.02$                            |

Note. Similar to Table 4 except comparing the NE shelf to likely associated tidal features and the smooth halo. We measured $[\langle \text{Fe}/\text{H}\rangle_{\text{phot}}]$ homogeneously for each feature following Section 2.2. References for the original data: halo (Gilbert et al. 2014), GSS (Gilbert et al. 2009), W shelf (Fardal et al. 2012), SE shelf (Gilbert et al. 2007).

Also found agreement between spectral-synthesis-based measurements of $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$ and $[\alpha/\text{Fe}]$ in the SE shelf and GSS as part of the Elemental Abundances in M31 survey.

Figure 14 further shows that the metallicity distribution of the NE shelf broadly agrees with the GSS, and by extension the W and SE shelves. We tested the hypothesis that the NE shelf and GSS MDFs share a common origin using a $p_{\text{rand}}$-weighted Anderson–Darling test with 10^3 bootstrap resamplings, finding that it could not be rejected below a 5% significance level. This conclusion is not affected by the selection criterion for NE shelf and GSS stars (i.e., by halo contamination) given that these regions are heavily polluted by tidal debris (Section 3.3; G09). Thus, the chemical similarity between the NE shelf and the GSS/other shelves provides evidence in favor of a direct physical association between the tidal features, especially given the independent corroboration by the projected phase-space distributions (Section 5.1).

6. Discussion

6.1. The Enclosed Mass of M31

We compared the estimate of M31’s enclosed mass from NE shell kinematics (Section 3.4.2), $M_{\text{enc}} = (9.26 \pm 2.78) \times 10^{11} M_\odot$, at a shell radius $r_s = 36.6 \pm 2.7$ kpc, to recent literature measurements of M31’s virial mass (see, e.g., Evans & Wilkinson 2000; Klypin et al. 2002, for earlier measurements) from various kinematic tracers. From M31’s satellite galaxies, Watkins et al. (2010), Tollerud et al. (2012), and Patel et al. (2017) measured consistent virial masses in the 1σ range of $M_{200} = (0.9–1.8) \times 10^{12} M_\odot$. An analysis using globular cluster kinematics by Veljanoski et al. (2013) found agreement with values of $M_{200} = (1.0 – 1.7) \times 10^{12} M_\odot$. Additionally, applying the timing argument to measure the masses of the MW and M31 simultaneously yields $M_{200\text{M31}} = (1.5 \pm 0.4) \times 10^{12} M_\odot$ when combined with previous observational estimates of M31’s virial mass (van der Marel & Guhathakurta 2008; van der Marel et al. 2012). The Bayesian sampling approach of Fardal et al. (2013) to infer M31’s virial mass from GSS merger models is also in accord with other measurements, where they found $\log_{10}(M_{200}/M_\odot) = 12.23 \pm 0.10$.

Due to the general agreement between measurements of M31’s virial mass and the fact that Fardal et al. (2013) similarly used tidal debris to obtain their measurement, we focused on comparisons to their analysis to place our mass estimate in context. We converted Fardal et al.’s value into an estimate of the enclosed halo mass at the NE shell radius according to their assumed Navarro–Frenk–White (NFW) profile, finding $M_{\text{enc, halo}}(r = r_s) = (3.48 \pm 0.49) \times 10^{11} M_\odot$. To obtain the total enclosed mass including baryons, we incorporated the mass of the bulge associated with the NFW profile ($M_b = 3.40 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$) and the mass of the disk at the NE shell radius projected onto the disk plane. Given the total mass of the disk in the simulations ($M_{\text{disk}} = 7.34 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$), its scale length ($R_d = 5.40$ kpc), and assuming $R_s = 40$ kpc (the maximum value of $R_{\text{disk}}$ in the field at the tip of the wedge pattern, NE4), $M_s(r = r_s) = 7.29 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$. The enclosed mass at the NE shell radius deduced from Fardal et al. (2013) is therefore $M_{\text{enc}}(r = r_s) = (4.55 \pm 0.49) \times 10^{11} M_\odot$.

This calculation validates the interpretation of the MK-based approximation (Equation (2)) of the enclosed mass as a likely overestimate (Section 3.4.2; F07, SH13) by a factor of $2.04 \pm 2.82$. Future work could simultaneously leverage measurements from the NE, W, and SE shelves—in combination with either N-body models or more sophisticated numerical implementations of the shell equations—to improve constraints on M31’s enclosed mass from shell kinematics.
6.2. Implications for GSS Merger Scenarios

We discuss the implications of the projected phase-space and metallicity distributions of the NE shelf for aspects of GSS merger scenarios not considered in Sections 4 and 5. As previously established, the NE shelf metallicity distribution can place unique constraints on GSS formation models that track metallicity because the metal-rich central debris of the progenitor most likely pollutes this region (Fardal et al. 2008; Miki et al. 2016; Kirihara et al. 2017). For example, Miki et al. (2016) predicted that an observed negative metallicity gradient in the GSS (Ibata et al. 2007; Gilbert et al. 2009; Conn et al. 2016; Cohen et al. 2018; Escala et al. 2021) should result in higher metallicity for the NE shelf than other GSS-related tidal structures, whereas the W shelf and GSS metallicity should be comparable (as found by F12). In contrast, the NE shelf metallicity distribution appears to be consistent with that of the W shelf and GSS (Section 5.2) rather than being more metal-rich. However, more detailed explorations of the NE shelf MDF (Section 3.3) may reveal subtle variations on the sky that could be mapped to model predictions.

Regarding the projected phase-space distribution of the NE shelf, Fardal et al. (2013) found that N-body models with high values of satellite progenitor mass and central density corresponded to the presence of a large intact core in the NE shelf region. The lack of an apparent core in the NE shelf (Section 4.2) or the neighboring disk (Section 5.1) therefore supports a lower central density and mass for the progenitor such that it completely disrupts in the case of a minor merger. In a major merger, the progenitor core has been suggested to be fully disrupted (Hammer et al. 2018) or intact in the form of M32 (D’Souza & Bell 2018), although the latter possibility is in direct contradiction to the positions and velocities of central orbits consistent with the shelves in the Fardal et al. models.

Both minor and major merger models have found that observational constraints from the GSS (and the disk for major mergers) allow for more variation in the NE shelf location than other shelves (Fardal et al. 2013; Hammer et al. 2018). In the Hammer et al. simulations, the NE shelf often appears smaller on the sky than observed, highlighting the need for major merger models to explore whether they can reproduce M31’s shell system in detail. In any given scenario, the impact of significant internal rotation in the progenitor on the distribution of tidal debris in the shelves similarly warrants further examination (e.g., Fardal et al. 2008; Kirihara et al. 2017; D’Souza & Bell 2018), where in this work we have only performed comparisons to models with spheroidal progenitors (Section 4). Thus, the combination of new observational constraints for the NE shelf presented in this work and existing constraints from prior studies of the W and SE shelves (G07, F12) have great potential for refining future GSS merger models.

7. Summary

We have measured radial velocities and photometric metallicities from Keck/DEIMOS spectra of 556 RGB stars spanning 13–31 projected kpc along the line of sight to M31’s NE shelf. We have performed the first detailed kinematical and chemical characterization of RGB stars in the NE shelf and have presented the first complete detection of a “wedge” pattern in projected phase space (i.e., that includes the returning stream component of the shelf; Section 3.4.1). This study presents conclusive evidence that (1) the NE shelf is indeed a tidal shell as inferred from prior studies and (2) the NE shelf forms a multiple shell system together with the W and SE shelves (Section 5.1). We have also found the following:

1. The photometric MDF of RGB stars along the line of sight to the NE shelf (median [Fe/H]$_{\text{phot}} = −0.42 ± 0.01$) is likely dominated by tidal debris as opposed to M31’s disk or phase-mixed component of M31’s stellar halo, although there is evidence for a low level of disk contamination (Section 3.3).

2. The MDF of the NE shelf is consistent with the GSS and W and SE shelves, supporting a direct physical association between the tidal features (Section 5.2).

3. The projected phase-space distribution of the NE shelf exhibits broad agreement with GSS formation models in which the NE shelf is the second orbital wrap of the progenitor (F07, F12; Section 4.1), thereby providing support for this origin in a minor merger scenario.

4. There is currently no evidence for a kinematical signature in the NE shelf region (Section 4.2) or in the neighboring disk (Section 5.1) corresponding to an intact GSS progenitor core, thereby favoring formation models in which the progenitor is completely disrupted (Section 6.2).

5. Regardless of the degree to which the model predictions and observations of the NE shelf agree (Section 4), the simplicity of a common origin scenario for explaining the concentric wedge patterns of the NE, W, and SE shelves independently provides proof in its favor (Section 5.1).
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Appendix

Empirical Modeling of the W Shelf Velocity Distribution

In Section 5.2, we compared the photometric MDFs of the NE shelf to those of the GSS, SE shelf, and W shelf. This
comparison requires the identification of RGB stars that probably belong to substructure in order to select a relatively clean sample of stars associated with the various tidal debris features. Although the observed velocity distributions of the GSS and SE shelf have been previously modeled empirically (Gilbert et al. 2018) similar to the NE shelf (Section 3.2), this is not the case for the W shelf. In order to calculate an MDF for the W shelf, F12 instead used their N-body model for the GSS merger to evaluate the likelihood that an RGB star belonged to GSS tidal debris versus their M31 host model constructed from a disk and halo component (Section 4). Thus, we empirically modeled the velocity distribution of the W shelf using a Gaussian mixture following Section 3.2.

We separated the W shelf fields into radial zones analogous to those used by F12, where we discarded the innermost field (F12’s Zone 1) from the analysis owing to contamination from NGC 205. We incorporated the outermost field (F12’s Zone 5) into our Zone 4 given that this field primarily contains phase-mixed halo stars and therefore does not affect the mean and dispersion of the W shelf component over this radial range. The net effect of constructing the Zone 4 model additionally using stars in Zone 5 is to decrease $f_{KCC}$ and slightly decrease $P_{sub}$ for stars in both zones. This effect is negligible in practice owing to the $P_{sub}$ threshold adopted in Section 5.2.

We assumed $N_{comp} = (2, 1, 1)$ substructure components for Zones (2, 3, 4) in addition to a kinematically hot halo-like component adopted from Gilbert et al. (2018) for each zone (Section 3.2.1). We note that the contribution of M31’s disk to the velocity distribution of the W shelf fields is expected to be negligible (F12). Table 6 presents the empirical velocity distribution model parameters for each radial zone, and Figure 15 shows the observed velocity distributions of each radial zone compared to its model. Given these models, we computed the probability that each RGB star in the W shelf fields belongs to substructure (Section 3.2.2) for use in determining the MDF of the W shelf.

**ORCID iDs**

Ivanna Escala †https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9933-9551
Karoline M. Gilbert †https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0394-8377
Mark Fardal †https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4207-3788
 Puragra Guhathakurta †https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8867-4234
Robyn E. Sanderson †https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3939-3297
Jason S. Kalirai †https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9690-4159

---

**Table 6**

| Field | $R_{proj}$ (kpc) | $\mu_{halo}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $\sigma_{halo}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $\sigma_{KCC1}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $\mu_{KCC1}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $f_{KCC1}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $\mu_{KCC2}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $\sigma_{KCC2}$ (km s$^{-1}$) | $f_{KCC2}$ (km s$^{-1}$) |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Zone 2 | 18.1            | $-324.8$        | 98.1            | 295.5$^{+26.8}_{-16.9}$ | 24.4$^{+14.0}_{-9.4}$ | 0.20$^{+0.13}_{-0.10}$ | $-213.6^{+2.9}_{-3.4}$ | 16.3$^{+5.1}_{-3.8}$ | 0.33$^{+0.09}_{-0.09}$ |
| Zone 3 | 21.2            | $-325.3$        | 98.1            | 282.9$^{+4.9}_{-4.2}$ | 30.0$^{+4.5}_{-4.0}$ | 0.58$^{+0.08}_{-0.08}$ | ...               | ...               | ...               |
| Zone 4 | 24.3            | $-323.3$        | 98.0            | 312.2$^{+2.4}_{-2.4}$ | 13.3$^{+2.7}_{-2.1}$ | 0.48$^{+0.07}_{-0.07}$ | ...               | ...               | ...               |

**Note.** Same as Table 3, except for the W shelf.
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