Strong gravitational lensing: Why no central black holes?
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Abstract. We investigate how central black holes (BHs) in galactic dark halos could affect strong gravitational lensing. The distribution of integral lensing probability with image separations are calculated for quasars of redshift 1.5 by foreground dark matter halos. The mass density of dark halos is taken to be the Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW) profile such that, when the mass of a halo is less than $10^{14}M_\odot$, its central black holes or a bulge is included as a point mass. The relationship between the masses $M_\bullet$ of supermassive black holes and the total gravitational mass $M_{DM}$ of their host galaxy is adopted from the most recent literature. Only a flat ΛCDM model is considered here. It is shown that, while a single black hole for each galaxy contributes considerable but not sufficient lensing probabilities at small image separations compared with those without black holes, the bulges (which are about 100–1000 times larger in mass than a typical black hole) would definitely contribute enough probability at small image separations, although it gives too high probabilities at large separation angles compared with lensing observations.
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1. Introduction

Cold Dark Matter (CDM) has become the standard theory of cosmological structure formation. The ΛCDM variant of CDM with $\Omega_m = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda \approx 0.3$ appears to be in good agreement with the available data on large scales (Primack 2002). On smaller (sub-galactic) scales, there seem to be various discrepancies, such: N-body CDM simulations which give cuspy halos with divergent profiles towards the center (Navarro, Frenk and White 1996, 1997, NFW hereafter); bar stability in high surface brightness spiral galaxies which also demands low-density cores; CDM models which yield an excess of small scale structures; formation of disk galaxy angular momentum, which is much too small in galaxy simulations. Issues that have arisen on smaller scales have prompted people to propose a wide variety of alternatives to CDM, such as warm dark matter (WDM) and self-interacting dark matter (SIDM). Now that problems arise from galaxy-size halos and centers of all dark matter halos, high-resolution simulations and observations are the final criterion. Recent highest-resolution simulations appear to be consistent with NFW (Klypin 2002, Power et al. 2002) until scales smaller than about 1 kpc. Meanwhile, a large set of high-resolution optical rotation curves has recently been analyzed for low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies. One can also conclude that the NFW profile is a good fit down to about 1 kpc. Although further simulations and observations, including measurement of CO rotation curves (Bolatto et al., 2002), may help to clarify the nature of the dark matter, it now appears that WDM and SIDM are both probably ruled out, while the small-scale predictions of ΛCDM may be in better agreement with the latest data than appeared to be the case as recently as a year ago.

In addition to direct simulations and observations, gravitational lensing provides another powerful probe of mass distribution in the universe. Since mass within small scales only deflect light rays slightly, it is difficult to extract mass information from a single lensing event, and thus statistical gravitational lensing is needed even for “strong” gravitational lensing of small halos (Turner, Ostriker & Gott 1984, Narayan & White 1988, Cen et al. 1994, Kochanek 1994, Wambsganss et al. 1994, Wambsganss, Cen, & Ostriker 1998, Porciani & Madau 2000, Keeton & Madau 2001, Li & Ostriker 2002) first used the semi-analytical approach to analyze gravitational lensing of remote quasars by foreground dark halos in various cold dark matter cosmologies. The mass function of dark halos they used is alternatively given by singular isothermal sphere (SIS), the NFW profile, or the generalized NFW profile. They found that none of these models can completely explain the current observations: the SIS models predict too many large splitting lenses, while the NFW models predict too few small splitting lenses, so they proposed that there must be at least two populations of halos in the universe: small mass halos with
a steep inner density slope and large mass halos with a shallow inner density slope. The author conclude that a combination of SIS and NFW halos can reasonably reproduce the current observations. Similarly, Sarbu et al. (2001) investigated the statistics of gravitational lenses in flat, low-density cosmological models with different cosmic equations of state \( \omega \). It was found that COBE-normalized models with \( \omega > -0.4 \) produce too few arcsecond-scale lenses in comparison with the JVAS/CLASS radio survey, a result that is consistent with other observational constraints on \( \omega \).

When attention is attracted to alternatives of CDM dark matter density profile at small scales, another kind of dark matter — supermassive black holes in the centers of most galactic halos is forgotten or ignored in this case, although the idea of detecting supermassive compact objects by their gravitational lensing effects was proposed very early (Press & Gunn 1973; Wilkinson et al. 2001), and the lensing effects of Schwarzschild black holes in the strong field regime have been discussed in detail (e.g., Virbhadra & Ellis 2000; Frittelli, Kling & Newman 2000; Bozza et al. 2001). On the other hand, cosmological voids can form directly after the collapse of extremely large wavelength perturbations into low-density black holes or cosmological black holes; such black holes can also be detected through their weak and strong lensing effects (Storinialo 2001). The observational evidence presented so far suggests the ubiquity of BHs in the nuclei of all bright galaxies, regardless of their activity, and BH masses correlate with masses and luminosities of the host spheroids and, more tightly, with stellar velocity dispersions (Magorrian et al. 1998; Ferrarese & Merritt 2000; Ravindranath et al. 2001; Merritt & Ferrarese 2001b; Wandel 2002; Sarzi et al. 2002). Most recent high-resolution observational data gives \( M_\bullet / M_{\text{bulge}} \approx 10^{-3} \) (Merritt & Ferrarese 2001b). Ferrarese (2002) further gave the relation between masses \( M_\bullet \) of supermassive black holes and the total gravitational mass of the dark matter halo in which they presumably formed

\[
\frac{M_\bullet}{10^8 M_\odot} \approx 0.046 \left( \frac{M_{\text{DM}}}{10^{12} M_\odot} \right)^{1.57}. \tag{1}
\]

In this paper, we investigate the contributions of galactic central black holes to lensing probabilities at small image separations. Since \( \Lambda \)CDM cosmology and NFW profile are in good agreement with the available data of structure formation on almost all scales as mentioned above, we only chose these two models respectively as cosmology and mass density function in our calculations. We model the lenses as a population of dark matter halos with an improved version of the Press-Schechter (1974, PS) mass distribution function, and central BHs are considered for galaxy-size halos.

The paper is organized as follows: the lensing equation is given in Sect. 2, lensing probabilities are calculated in Sect. 3, and discussion and conclusions are provided in Sect. 4.

### 2. Lensing equation

The NFW profile is

\[
\rho_{\text{NFW}} = \frac{\rho_s r_s^2}{r (r + r_s)^2} \tag{2}
\]

where \( \rho_s \) and \( r_s \) are constants. We can define the mass of a halo to be the mass within \( r_{200} \) (which is the radius of a sphere around a dark halo within which the average mass density is 200 times the critical mean mass density of the universe),

\[
M_{\text{DM}} = \frac{4 \pi}{c^2} \int_0^{r_{200}} \rho r^2 dr = 4 \pi \rho_s r_s^3 f(c_1), \tag{3}
\]

with \( c_1 = r_{200}/r_s \) the concentration parameter, the value of which is chosen to be \( 7/(1+z) \) (Bartelmann et al. 1998).

And

\[
f(c_1) = \int_0^{c_1} \frac{x^2 dx}{x(1 + x)^2} = \ln(1 + c_1) - \frac{c_1}{1 + c_1}. \tag{4}
\]

In flat \( \Lambda \)CDM cosmology, the constants \( \rho_s \) and \( r_s \) can then be expressed as (Li & Ostriker 2002),

\[
\rho_s = \frac{\rho_{\text{crit}}}{3} \left[ \Omega_m (1 + z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda \right] \frac{200 c_1}{3} f(c_1), \tag{5}
\]

\[
r_s = \frac{1.626}{c_1} \frac{M_{15}^{1/3}}{[\Omega_m (1 + z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda]^{1/3}} h^{-1} \text{Mpc}. \tag{6}
\]

where \( \rho_{\text{crit}} \) is the present value of the critical mass density of the universe, and \( M_{15} \) is the reduced mass of a halo defined as \( M_{15} = M_{\text{DM}}/(10^{15} h^{-1} M_\odot) \).

The surface mass density for NFW profile is

\[
\Sigma_{\text{NFW}}(x) = 2 \rho_s r_s \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\ln \left[ \frac{x}{\sqrt{1-x^2} - \ln(1 - \sqrt{1-x^2})} \right], & (x > 1), \\
\frac{1}{7} \arcsin(1/x) + \sqrt{x^2 - 1} - \pi/2, & (x = 1), \\
(2x^2 - 1)^{-1/2}, & (0 < x < 1).
\end{array} \right. \tag{7}
\]

Where \( x = |\mathbf{x}| \) and \( \mathbf{x} = \xi/r_s, \xi \) is the position vector in the lens plane. The galactic central black holes are assumed to be point masses, and we consider first there is only a single black hole with mass \( M_\bullet \) for each galaxy. So the surface mass density for galactic halos each with a single central black hole can be written as

\[
\Sigma_{\text{galaxy}}(\mathbf{x}) = M_\bullet \delta^2(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma_{\text{NFW}}(\mathbf{x}), \tag{8}
\]

where \( \delta^2(\mathbf{x}) \) is the two dimensional Dirac-delta function. The lensing equation with galactic central black holes considered then is

\[
y = x - \mu_s f_{\text{BH}} + g(x), \tag{9}
\]

where \( y = |\mathbf{y}|, n = \mathbf{y} D_S^A / D_L^A \) is the position vector in the source plane, in which \( D_S^A \) and \( D_L^A \) are angular-diameter distances from the observer to the source and to the lens respectively. And

\[
\mu_s = \frac{4 \rho_s r_s}{\Sigma_{\text{crit}}}, \tag{10}
\]
where $\Sigma_{\text{cr}} = (c^2/4\pi G)(D_S^A/D_L^A D_{LS}^A)$ is the so-called critical surface mass density, in which $D_{LS}^A$ is the angular-diameter distance from the lens to the source. And

$$g(x) = \ln \frac{x}{2} + \begin{cases} \frac{\arctan \sqrt{x^2-1}}{\sqrt{x^2-1}} & (x > 1), \\ 1 & (x = 1), \\ \frac{\arctanh \sqrt{1-x}}{\sqrt{1-x}} & (0 < x < 1). \end{cases}$$

(11)

In Eq.(11), the term $f_{\text{BH}}$ stands for the contribution of a black hole, and by using Eq.(10) and Eq.(11), it has the form

$$f_{\text{BH}} = 2.78 \times 10^{-4} f(c_1) M_{15}^{0.57}.$$  

(12)

Since there is always more than one black holes in a bulge, and thus the bulge itself can act like a black hole, we can treat a bulge as a point mass in this paper as an extreme case. The mass of a black hole correlates linearly with that of its host bulge as $M_*/M_{\text{bulge}} \approx 10^{-3}$, so we can simply multiply the term $f_{\text{BH}}$ by $10^3$ to stand for the contribution of a bulge. However, some light rays from the source will definitely travel across the bulge, so there must exist a kind of "effective" black hole with mass larger than a single "real" black hole but less than the bulge. In order to investigate the tendency of image separations contributed by different point mass, we can multiply $f_{\text{BH}}$ by, for example, $10^2$, etc.

The lensing equations for three cases are plotted in Fig. 1 according to Eq.(9), where we have extended $x$ and $y$ to their opposite values because of symmetry. The full line, dashed line and dotted line, respectively, represent the NFW lens with $f_{\text{BH}} = 0$, ‘NFW+BH’ lens with $f_{\text{BH}} = 2.78 \times 10^{-4} f(c_1) M_{15}^{0.57}$, and ‘NFW+bulge’ with $f_{\text{BH}} = 2.78 \times 10^{-2} f(c_1) M_{15}^{0.57}$, in which $\mu_s = 0.49$ and $f(c_1) = 0.91$.

We find that, as point masses, both a single central black hole and a bulge can more often produce small separation images than the case when no central black holes are considered. This result will be further confirmed by the lensing probability given in next section.

3. Lensing probability

We choose the most generally accepted values of the parameters for flat $\Lambda$CDM cosmology, for which, with usual symbols, the matter density parameter, vacuum energy density parameter and Hubble constant are respectively: $\Omega_m = 0.3$, $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$, $h = 0.75$.

The quasars of redshift $z_s = 1.5$ are lensed by foreground CDM halos of galaxy clusters and galaxies, the lensing probability with image separations larger than $\Delta \theta$ is (Schneider, Ehlers, & Falco 1992)

$$P(\Delta \theta) = \int_0^{z_s} \frac{dD_L(z)}{dz} d\bar{z} \int_0^{\infty} \tilde{n}(M, z) \sigma(M, z) dM.$$  

(13)

Where $D_L(z)$ is proper distance from the observer to the lens located at redshift $z$.

$$D_L(z) = \frac{c}{H_0} \int_0^z \frac{dz}{(1+z)\sqrt{\Omega_m (1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda}}.$$  

(14)

Fig. 1. Lensing equations: dashed line stands for a NFW lens with no central black holes; solid line stands for a lens with a NFW density profile plus a single central black hole; dotted line stands for a lens of NFW plus a bulge (treated as a point mass, an effective black hole).

Here $c$ is the speed of light in vacuum and $H_0$ is the current Hubble constant. The physical number density $\tilde{n}(M, z)$ of virialized dark halos of masses between $M$ and $M + dM$ is related to the comoving number density $n(M, z)$ by $\tilde{n}(M, z) = n(M, z)(1 + z)^3$; the latter was originally given by Press & Schechter (1974), and the improved version is

$$n(M, z) dM = \frac{\rho_0}{M} f(M, z) dM,$$  

(15)

where $\rho_0$ is the current mean mass density of the universe, and

$$f(M, z) = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \delta_c(z) \frac{d \ln \Delta}{d \ln M} \exp \left[ -\frac{\delta_c^2(z)}{2\Delta^2} \right].$$  

(16)

is PS mass function. In Eq.(16) above, $\Delta^2(M)$ is the present variance of the fluctuations in a sphere containing a mean mass $M$,

$$\Delta^2(M) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int_0^\infty P(k) W^2(kr_M) k^2 dk,$$  

(17)
where $P(k)$ is the power spectrum of density fluctuations, $W(kr_M)$ is the Fourier transformation of a top-hat window function

$$W(kr_M) = 3 \left[ \frac{\sin(kr_M)}{(kr_M)^3} - \frac{\cos(kr_M)}{(kr_M)^2} \right],$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)$$

and

$$r_M = \left( \frac{3M}{4\pi\rho_0} \right)^{1/3}. \hspace{1cm} (19)$$

In Eq. (16), $\delta_c(z)$ is the overdensity threshold for spherical collapse by redshift $z$ (Navarro, Frenk, & White 1997):

$$\delta_c(z) = 1.68 \frac{D(z)}{D(z)}, \hspace{1cm} (20)$$

where $D(z)$ is the linear growth function of density perturbation (Carroll, & Press 1992)

$$D(z) = \frac{g(\Omega(z))}{g(\Omega_m)(1 + z)}, \hspace{1cm} (21)$$

in which

$$g(x) = \frac{5}{2} x \left( \frac{1}{70} + \frac{209x}{140} - \frac{x^2}{140} + x^{4/3} \right)^{-1}, \hspace{1cm} (22)$$

and

$$\Omega(z) = \frac{\Omega_m(1 + z)^3}{1 - \Omega_m + \Omega_m(1 + z)^3}. \hspace{1cm} (23)$$

We use the fitting formulae for CDM power spectrum $P(k)$ given by Eisenstein & Hu (1999)

$$P(k) = A_k T^2(k), \hspace{1cm} (24)$$

where $A$ is the amplitude normalized to $\sigma_8 = \Delta(r_M = 8h^{-1}\text{Mpc}) = 0.95$, and

$$T = \frac{L}{L + C q_{\text{eff}}}, \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

with

$$L \equiv \ln(e + 1.84q_{\text{eff}}), \hspace{1cm} (26)$$

$$q_{\text{eff}} = \frac{k}{\Omega_m h^2 \text{Mpc}^{-1}}, \hspace{1cm} (27)$$

$$C \equiv 14.4 + \frac{325}{1 + 60.5 q_{\text{eff}}}. \hspace{1cm} (28)$$

We need to know the cross-sections in Eq. (13). Since we are interested in the lensing probabilities with image separations larger than a certain value $\Delta \theta$ (ranging from $0 \sim 10$ arcseconds, for example), the cross-section is defined under the condition that the multiple images can be created. For the lenses with NFW profile, one can see from Fig. 7 that multiple images can be produced only if $|y| \leq y_{cr}$, where $y_{cr}$ is the maximum value of $y$ when $x < 0$, which is determined by $dy/dx = 0$ when $f_{BH} = 0$ in Eq. (1). For galaxy-size halos, the mass of which is confined to be less than $10^{14}M_{\odot}$ through out this paper, a central black hole or a bulge as a point mass is considered (see Eq. (1)). In this case, multiple images will always exist: when the source is close to the point caustic, i.e., when $y$ is small, there are three images, two of which are within the Einstein circle and the third one the outside which Einstein circle; when $y$ is larger enough, there are two images, the weaker one is close to the center of the Einstein circle and the brighter one locates outside of the Einstein circle. So another condition is needed to define the cross-section, for which we use the brightness ratio between the brighter and weaker images just mentioned, and it is enough to set the ratio to be 10.

The brightness ratio $r$ for the two images is just the ratio of the corresponding absolute values of magnifications (Schneider, Ehlers, & Falco 1992),

$$r = \frac{|\mu_+|}{|\mu_-|}, \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

where

$$\mu_+(y(x)) = \left( \frac{y}{dx} \right)_{x > 0}, \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

$$\mu_-(y(x)) = \left( \frac{y}{dx} \right)_{x < 0}. \hspace{1cm} (31)$$

Once the source position $y_{cr}$ is determined by $|\mu_+(y_{cr})| = 10|\mu_-(y_{cr})|$, the cross-section can be calculated, both with and without central black holes, as

$$\sigma(M, z) = \pi y_{cr}^2 r_{\text{sep}}^2 \theta(M - M_{\text{min}}), \hspace{1cm} (33)$$

where $\theta(x)$ is a step function, and $M_{\text{min}}$ is determined by lower limit of image separation

$$\Delta \theta = \frac{r x_{\text{cr}} \Delta x_{\text{cr}}}{D_L} \approx \frac{2x_0 r s}{D_L^2}. \hspace{1cm} (34)$$

and Eq. (3) as

$$M_{\text{min}} = 8.927 \times 10^{-8} M_{15} (\Omega_m(1 + z)^3 + \Omega_A) \left( \frac{c D_L^2 \Delta \theta}{x_0} \right)^3. \hspace{1cm} (35)$$

In Eq. (34), we have approximated the image separation $\Delta x$ to be $2r_0$, where $x_0$ is the positive zero position of function $y(x)$, both when $f_{BH} = 0$ (for NFW lens only) and $f_{BH} \neq 0$ (for galactic, NFW+BH/bulge lenses) in Eq. (10), since image separation is insensitive to the source position $y$ (Li & Ostriker, 2002). We plot the lensing probability with image separations larger than $\Delta \theta$ in Fig. 7. In order to show the tendency of contributions to the lensing probability for different fraction of the bulge mass (the so called ‘effective’ black hole), we take the term $f_{BH}$ in Eq. (10) to be $f_{BH} = 2.78 \times 10^{-4} f(c_1) M_{15}^{0.57}$, $f_{BH} = 2.78 \times (5.0 \times 10^{-2}) f(c_1) M_{15}^{0.57}$ and $f_{BH} = 2.78 \times 10^{-2} f(c_1) M_{15}^{0.57}$; they are represented by the first three lines from top down, respectively. When central black holes or bulges are included and treated as point masses, the mass of their host halos is confined to be less than $10^{14}M_{\odot}$, because Eq. (1) strictly applies in the range $10^8 < M_{h} < 2 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ and $10^{14}M_{\odot}$ is the upper-limit of galaxy mass (Ferrarese 2002).
4. Discussion and conclusions

Our numerical results for lensing probability with image separations larger than $\Delta \theta$: the full line is for lenses of NFW density profile with no central black holes for halos at all scales, dotted line shows the case when a single central black hole for each galaxy-size halo is included. Other three lines show the cases when collectors of central black holes in the bulge are treated as an effective black hole. The dashed, dot-dash and dash-dot-dot-dot line, from top downwards, show respectively, the mass of the effective black hole at 1000, 500 and 100 times that of a single ‘real’ black hole.

However, we can attribute sufficient lens events at small image separations to galactic central black holes or the bulge. On the one hand, since this paper focuses on whether galactic central black holes would contribute considerably to the lensing probability, we have not considered the effect of magnification bias, which would increase the final result provided here at all image separations. On the other hand, we have used an improved version of the PS halo mass function but not the ‘best’ version.
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