An environmental dependence of the physical and structural properties in the Hydra cluster galaxies
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ABSTRACT

The nearby Hydra cluster (~50 Mpc) is an ideal laboratory to understand, in detail, the influence of the environment on the morphology and quenching of galaxies in dense environments. We study the Hydra cluster galaxies in the inner regions (1 R200) of the cluster using data from the Southern Photometric Local Universe Survey, which uses 12 narrow and broad-band filters in the visible region of the spectrum. We analyse structural (Sérsic index, effective radius) and physical (colours, stellar masses, and star formation rates) properties. Based on this analysis, we find that ~88 per cent of the Hydra cluster galaxies are quenched. Using the Dressler–Schechter test approach, we also find that the cluster shows possible substructures. Our analysis of the phase-space diagram together with density-based spatial clustering algorithm indicates that Hydra shows an additional substructure that appears to be in front of the cluster centre, which is still falling into it. Our results, thus, suggest that the Hydra cluster might not be relaxed. We analyse the median Sérsic index as a function of wavelength and find that for red [(u − r) ≥ 2.3] and early-type galaxies it displays a slight increase towards redder filters (13 and 18 per cent, for red and early type, respectively), whereas for blue + green [(u − r)<2.3] galaxies it remains constant. Late-type galaxies show a small decrease of the median Sérsic index towards redder filters. Also, the Sérsic index of galaxies, and thus their structural properties, do not significantly vary as a function of clustercentric distance and density within the cluster; and this is the case regardless of the filter.
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1 INTRODUCTION

One of the many remarkable and still open questions in extragalactic astronomy is: How do galaxies evolve with/within environment?

Several studies have addressed this issue, generally based on pioneer works, which determined a relation between the environment in which galaxies reside and their physical properties (Oemler 1974; Davis & Geller 1976; Butcher & Oemler 1978; Dressler 1980; Postman & Geller 1984). In particular Dressler (1980) detected an increase in the fraction of elliptical and S0 galaxies (early-type galaxies, ETGs) as a function of increasing the environmental density, while the opposite is observed for spiral galaxies (late-type
galaxies, LTGs; Gunn & Gott 1972; Whitmore & Gilmore 1991; Poggianti et al. 2001; Boselli et al. 2005; Fasano et al. 2015). This indicates that the environment is playing a crucial role on the morphology and stellar production of galaxies and is one of the main mechanisms often associated to the star formation (SF) quenching on the Local Universe. In addition, internal process such as mass quenching, which is driven by gas outflows produced by stellar winds and supernovae feedback (Larson 1974; Dekel & Silk 1986; Efstathiou 2000; Cantalupo 2010; Peng et al. 2010b) or due to active galactic nuclei (AGN) activity (Croton et al. 2006; Fabian 2012; Cicone et al. 2014) also has its influence. In the case of AGN activity, will be specially relevant for massive galaxies ($M_\odot \gtrsim 10^{10}$; Peng et al. 2010b; Cora et al. 2019).

Environmental effects are drastically enhanced in clusters due to the tremendous gravitational potential. Fast and aggressive encounters between satellite galaxies become recurring. This process, known as harassment, is capable to destroy the discs of the satellites affected, becoming specially relevant in the inner parts of clusters (Moore, Lake & Katz 1998; Moore et al. 1999; Duc & Bournaud 2008; Smith et al. 2015). On the other hand, interaction between the galaxy and the intracluster medium can strip the gas component of galaxies. This phenomena is called ram-pressure or strangulation (Gunn & Gott 1972; Abadi, Moore & Bower 1999; Balogh & Morris 2000; Quilis, Moore & Bower 2000; Vollmer et al. 2004; Jaffé et al. 2015; Peng, Maiolino & Cochrane 2015), depending the strength of the stripping. Within a cluster, the galaxies inhabiting the core are usually the most massive ones, and most of them being quenched at early times. LTGs within clusters, are often found among the satellites at the outskirts (Dressler et al. 1997; Fasano et al. 2000; Postman et al. 2005; Desai et al. 2007). In general, LTGs are the less-massive components and are strongly susceptible to the influence of the processes aforementioned.

More recently using data from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; Abazajian et al. 2009), Liu et al. (2019) compared the fractions of ETGs and LTGs, and the fraction of main-sequence galaxies and quenched galaxies (QG) relative to different environments (voids, sheets, filaments, and clusters), finding that the star-forming properties of galaxies changed more dramatically than their structural properties. This means that a galaxy will stop forming stars before any morphological change can take place. They also found that the morphological transformation and quenching for low-mass galaxies can be two independent processes, suggesting that the interruption of the SF is determined by the halo mass while the morphological transformation is more correlated with the stellar mass.

While to date the environment plays a big role on the process of SF suppression, some recent studies have shown that the environment starts being relevant only at $z < 0.5$ (Hatfield & Jarvis 2017), when the galaxies have already gotten close enough to trigger the ram-pressure stripping, originating a fast quenching process to be added to an existent but slower one, dominated by strangulation (Rodríguez-Muñoz et al. 2019). These two processes start to be important when the galaxy falls into the cluster, i.e. when it crosses the virial radius of a massive cluster (Wetzel, Tinker & Conroy 2012), which is a key area to understand the processes regulating the evolution of the galaxy cluster. However, to date there are still lacking deeper studies of morphological and physical properties of galaxies in clusters, from an homogeneous multiwavelength point of view (to mention some Liu et al. 2011 and Yan et al. 2014), which is the main goal of this manuscript.

In this work, we aim to explore the structural (Sérsic index, effective radius), physical [stellar masses, star formation rates (SFR) and colours, etc.], and kinematical properties of galaxies in the Hydra cluster to understand the history and evolution of its galaxies and further extend the knowledge about the effects of the environment over the galaxies. This cluster is a nearby structure located at a distance of $\sim 50$ Mpc (Misgeld et al. 2011; Arnaboldi et al. 2012) and for which galaxies can be spatially well resolved, making it an ideal laboratory to fulfill our objectives. Hydra is a medium-mass compact cluster (Arnaboldi et al. 2012) with a large fraction of ETGs and at least 50 ultracompact dwarf galaxies (Misgeld & Hilker 2011; Misgeld et al. 2011). It is classified as a type III structure (Bautz & Morgan 1970), which means it has no dominant central member, although there are two bright galaxies near to the centre: NGC 3311, a cD galaxy with radial velocity of 3825 km s$^{-1}$, and NGC 3309, an E3 galaxy with radial velocity of 4009 km s$^{-1}$ (Ventimiglia, Arnaboldi & Gerhard 2011 and references therein). Based on X-ray data, Ventimiglia et al. (2011) have shown evidences that Hydra is a prototype of a dynamically relaxed cluster, showing an isothermal intracluster medium for the most part of the cluster region, indicating that it has not been going through any big merging process during the last few Gyr (Furusho et al. 2001; Ventimiglia et al. 2011). Given that the cluster virial and X-ray masses are $(5.80 \pm 0.56) \times 10^{14}$ M$_{\odot}$ and $(9.8 \pm 1.3) \times 10^{13}$ M$_{\odot}$, respectively, and the global projected velocity dispersion is $660 \pm 52$ km s$^{-1}$ (Babyk & Vavilova 2013) within the centre of the cluster located at ~8.6 kpc northeast of NGC 3311 (Barbosa et al. 2018), we will use this galaxy as the central component for practical purposes.

We perform our study from a multiwavelength point of view, using the wide field (~2 deg$^2$) data of the Southern Photometric Local Universe Survey (S-PLUS; Mendes de Oliveira et al. 2019) and investigate the cluster within 1R$_{200}$, the radius at which the mean density is two hundred times the critical density of the Universe. The S-PLUS provides a significant improvement in the understanding of the spectral energy distribution (SED) of galaxies at optical wavelengths due to its 12-bands filter system (five broad and seven narrow bands), which is a great improvement over most previous studies using up to eight filters to perform a multiband fitting. This is the first time that morphological analysis using 12 bands in the visible spectra is presented and the wide field of view of S-PLUS allows us to investigate in great detail any possible variation in the structural parameters and physical properties as a function of wavelength, cluster-centric distances and density.

This manuscript is presented as follows: in Section 2 we describe the data and how we construct the catalogue of Hydra Cluster galaxies, while in Section 3 we present the methodology used to estimate the structural and physical parameters. In Sections 4 and 5, we present and discuss the results to finally summarise and conclude our work in Section 6. Throughout this study, we adopt a flat cosmology with $H_0 = 70$ km s$^{-1}$ Mpc$^{-1}$, $\Omega_M = 0.3$, and $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.7$ (Spergel et al. 2003).

### 2 DATA AND GALAXIES CATALOGUE

Observations of the Hydra cluster were taken as part of the S-PLUS using the T80Cam installed at the 80 cm T80-South telescope located at Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, Chile. The T80Cam has a detector with $9232 \times 9216$ 10-μm-pixels with an effective field of view of 2 deg$^2$ and scale-plate of 0.55 arcsec pixel$^{-1}$. S-PLUS uses the Javalambre 12-band filter system composed of five broad filters ($u$, $g$, $r$, $i$, and $z$) and seven narrow-band ones ($J0378$, $J0395$, $J0410$, $J0430$, $J0515$, $J0660$, and $J0861$) strategically positioned in regions of the electromagnetic spectrum that have important stellar features such as [O II], Hα, Hδ,
of its capabilities can be found in Mendes de Oliveira et al. (2019) (Sampedro et al., in preparation), first results and full assessment of its central region. Colour composition using the images of the Hydra central region. Figure 1. Table 1. S-PLUS filter system and exposure times for Hydra pointings.

| Filter name | λ_{eff} (Å) | Δλ (Å) | Exp. time (s) | Comment |
|-------------|-------------|--------|---------------|---------|
| uJAVA       | 3536        | 352    | 681           |        |
| J0378       | 3770        | 151    | 660           | [O II]  |
| J0395       | 3940        | 103    | 354           | Ca H+K |
| J0410       | 4094        | 201    | 177           | Hβ     |
| J0430       | 4292        | 201    | 171           | G band |
| gSDSS       | 4751        | 1545   | 99            | SDSS-like g |
| J0515       | 5133        | 207    | 183           | Mgb Triplet |
| rSDSS       | 6258        | 1465   | 120           | SDSS-like r |
| J0660       | 6614        | 147    | 870           | Hα     |
| iSDSS       | 7690        | 1506   | 138           | SDSS-like i |
| J0861       | 8611        | 408    | 240           | Ca Triplet |
| zSDSS       | 8831        | 1182   | 168           | SDSS-like z |

Table 2. Central position J2000 of the four S-PLUS fields used in this work.

| FIELD | RA° (J2000) | Dec.° (J2000) |
|-------|-------------|---------------|
|       | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  |
|       | 157.90 | 159.47 | 159.30 | 157.70 |
|       | -26.69 | -26.69 | -28.08 | -28.08 |

Mgb, and Ca triplets (see Table 1 for more information). The S-PLUS filter system was built specifically for stellar classification, yet given its spectral richness, it can also be used to analyse the physical properties of galaxies and planetary nebulae. The survey also provides photometric redshifts for galaxies brighter than 20 mag (in r band) and z < 0.5 (see Molino et al. 2019). The observational strategy was defined to increase depth and reduce noise (the Petrosian magnitude limit is J0395 = 20.11 – the shallower band – to as deep as g = 21.79 with S/N ≥ 3), while dithering is used to overcome problems with bad pixels (Mendes de Oliveira et al. 2019). A detailed description of the survey including filter system, calibration method (Sampedro et al., in preparation), first results and full assessment of its capabilities can be found in Mendes de Oliveira et al. (2019) where the survey is described.

In this work, we use four S-PLUS fields, covering an area of 1.4 Mpc radius, centred on the Hydra cluster, whose central region is shown in Fig. 1. Table 2 lists the central coordinates of each field.

2.1 Kinematical view of Hydra cluster galaxies

We select all galaxies that are gravitationally bound to the cluster and inside 1 R_{200}. First, we select all galaxies with peculiar velocities lower than the cluster escape velocity, which is calculated in the line-of-sight relative to the cluster recessional velocity, as defined by equation (1; see Harrison 1974; Jaffe et al. 2015):

\[ v_{pec} = c \frac{z - z_{cl}}{1 + z_{cl}}, \]  

where \( z_{cl} = 0.012 \) (Babyk & Vavilova 2013) is the cluster redshift, \( z \) is the redshift of each galaxy obtained from the NASA/IPAC Extragalactic Database\(^1\), and \( c \) is the speed of light. The cluster escape velocity \( (v_{esc}) \), in km s\(^{-1}\), is calculated using the equation (2; equation 1 in Diaferio 1999):

\[ v_{esc} \simeq 927 \left( \frac{M_{200}}{10^{14} h^{-1} M_\odot} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{R_{200}}{h^{-1} \text{Mpc}} \right)^{-1/2}. \]  

The determination of the cluster escape velocity depends on the \( M_{200} \) (mass within the \( R_{200} \)), \( R_{200} \), which in turn are determined by the velocity dispersion (\( \sigma \)), and \( h = H_0/100 \) km s\(^{-1}\) Mpc\(^{-1}\). To obtain \( \sigma \) we use only galaxies with radial velocities ranging from 1800 to 6000 km s\(^{-1}\), suggested by Ventimiglia et al. (2011). We found a biweight velocity dispersion of 690 ± 28 km s\(^{-1}\) as defined by equation (3):

\[ \sigma_{Bi} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{|v_i|<1} (1 - u_i^2) \delta (v_i - \overline{v})^2}{D(D-1)}}, \]  

where \( v_i \) is the peculiar velocity and \( \overline{v} \) is its average, as described in Beers, Flynn & Gebhardt (1990) and Ruel et al. (2014), and \( N \) is the number of members. \( D \) is given by equation (4).

\[ D = \sum_{|v_i|<1} (1 - u_i^2) (1 - 5u_i^2), \]  

where \( u_i \) is defined as shown by equation (5).

\[ u_i = \frac{v_i - \overline{v}}{9 \text{MAD}(v_i)}, \]  

and MAD(\( v_i \)) is the median absolute iation of the velocities. The biweight velocity dispersion uncertainty is calculated as given by equation (6):

\[ \Delta \sigma_{Bi} = \frac{C_{Bi} \sigma_{Bi}}{\sqrt{N-1}}, \]  

where \( C_{Bi} = 0.92 \). After measuring \( \sigma \) (690 ± 28 km s\(^{-1}\) in our case), we can use it to determine \( M_{200} \) and \( R_{200} \) following Leonard & King (2010). They use a singular isothermal sphere model profile, assume spherical symmetry, and that the 3D velocity dispersion can be described from the line-of-sight 1D velocity dispersion (Gonzalez et al. 2018). The relationship found by Leonard & King (2010) between \( \sigma \), \( M_{200} \) and \( R_{200} \) is as follows:

\[ M_{200} = \frac{2\sigma^3}{\sqrt{50GH}}, \]  

\[ R_{200} = \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{50H}}, \]  

where \( G \) and \( H \) are the gravitational and Hubble constants, respectively. We find a \( M_{200} = 3.1 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{14} M_\odot \) and \( R_{200} = 1.4 \pm 0.1 \) Mpc. We also calculate \( M_{200} \) using the relation between

\(^1\)https://ned.ipac.caltech.edu/
velocity dispersion and $M_{200}$, as obtained by Munari et al. (2013) for simulated galaxy clusters, and described by equation (9):

$$ \frac{\sigma_{D1}}{\text{km s}^{-1}} = A_{1D} \left( \frac{h(z)M_{200}}{10^{15} M_\odot} \right)^{\alpha}, \quad (9) $$

The values of $A_{1D}$ and $\alpha$ for the equation (9) are found in Munari et al. (2013). The velocity dispersion in the simulation is determined using dark matter (DM) particles, subhaloes (SUB), and galaxies (GAL). The three cases consider the contribution of AGN feedback. Using equation (9), we obtained the following $M_{200}$ masses, in units of $10^{14} M_\odot$, for DM, SUB, and GAL, respectively, $3.5 \pm 0.4$, $3.1 \pm 0.3$, and $3.3 \pm 0.3$, which are in agreement with $M_{200}$ estimated using equation (7), as well as other reported values (e.g. $M_{200} = 3.8 \times 10^{14}$ from Comerford & Natarajan 2007).

Using the calculated $M_{200} = 3.1 \pm 0.4 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$ and $R_{200} = 1.4 \pm 0.1$ Mpc, we obtain $v_{esc} = 1379$ km s$^{-1}$ from equation (2), which gives us a sample of $193$ galaxies satisfying the criteria to be members of the Hydra cluster within $1 R_{200}$. To check our consistency, we use another method to select Hydra members by applying a $3\sigma$-clipping to the recessional velocity distribution of the galaxies. For this, we reject galaxies with recessional velocities larger than $3 \sigma$ that results in a sample of $223$ objects located within $1 R_{200}$.

Although both methods provide numbers of cluster members within the same order of magnitude, ensuring that our choice will not affect the results of this paper, we will use the sample selected by the first method to ease further comparisons with other studies.

### 2.2 Final complete sample of Hydra galaxies

In order to produce a complete galaxy sample in Hydra, we performed a cross-match between different spectroscopic surveys in the Hydra area from Richter (1987), Stein (1996), and Jones et al. (2004). All these spectroscopic studies are complete for galaxies brighter than $\sim 16$ mag in the $r$ band. Therefore, in this study we only include the selected galaxies in Section 2.1 that are brighter than $16$ mag in the $r$ band to ensure a complete sample of galaxies analysed. Given this, all galaxies analysed here have large S/N, between $24$ and $145$ (in the $r$ band) with a mean value of $55$.

We note that some of the galaxies of our sample were not well fitted by MegaMorph (see Section 3.1) due to either foreground stars contamination or to its proximity to the CCD edge. After removing these objects, we obtain a final sample of 81 galaxies brighter than $16$ ($r$ band), within $1 R_{200}$, and with peculiar velocities lower than $v_{esc} = 1379$ km s$^{-1}$. We use these galaxies to analyse the behaviour of the morphological parameters, for example, Sérsic index. Figs 2 and 3 show the distribution of recessional velocities and a colour–magnitude diagram (CMD), respectively, for the selected 81 galaxy members. We note, in Fig. 3, that most galaxies are located in the red sequence, and there is a clear relation between the Sérsic index and the galaxy’s colour, redder galaxies have a higher Sérsic index.

### 3 METHODOLOGY

#### 3.1 Morphological parameters

The morphological classification of galaxies can be done by visual inspection (e.g. Lintott et al. 2008; Kartaltepe et al. 2015; Simmons et al. 2017). It is, however, extremely costly on human resources to perform over millions of galaxies that are available within modern surveys. For this volume, we must rely on the computational power we have available and use a different approach to obtain the structural parameters of galaxies, such as Sérsic index ($n$), effective radius ($R_e$), bulge-to-total Flux ($B/T$), Gini coefficient, and the second-order moment of the brightest 20% cent of the galaxy (Lotz, Primack & Madau 2004). All these parameters can be used to classify galaxies morphologically, specially considering that morphological analyses can be done from the infrared to the ultraviolet regions of spectra (Gil de Paz et al. 2007; Lotz et al. 2008; Wright et al. 2010; Dobrycheva et al. 2017). Indeed, the Sérsic profile describes how the intensity of a galaxy varies with radius, providing information regarding the morphology of the galaxy (Sérsic 1963). This is the approach we adopt in this work, whose motivation is two folded: on one side, automatic classification allows us to consider a morphological analyses from the infrared to the ultraviolet regions of spectra done in a consistent way. On the other hand, it will allow us to readily compare our results with future S-PLUS and J-PLUS data, which will deliver multiband data for millions of galaxies (Mendes de Oliveira et al. 2019), as well as with other work, that have also performed automatic classification.

With the purpose of estimating the Sérsic index ($n$), effective radius ($R_e$), and the magnitudes ($m$) for the members of the Hydra Cluster in all S-PLUS bands, we used the code MEGAMORPH-GALAPAGOS2 (Bamford et al. 2011; Häußler et al. 2013; Vika et al. 2013). This code performs a multiwavelength 2D fitting using the algorithm ($R_e$), bulge-to-total Flux ($B/T$), Gini coefficient, and the second-order moment of the brightest 20% cent of the galaxy (Lotz, Primack & Madau 2004). All these parameters can be used to classify galaxies morphologically, specially considering that morphological analyses can be done from the infrared to the ultraviolet regions of spectra (Gil de Paz et al. 2007; Lotz et al. 2008; Wright et al. 2010; Dobrycheva et al. 2017). Indeed, the Sérsic profile describes how the intensity of a galaxy varies with radius, providing information regarding the morphology of the galaxy (Sérsic 1963). This is the approach we adopt in this work, whose motivation is two folded: on one side, automatic classification allows us to consider a morphological analyses from the infrared to the ultraviolet regions of spectra done in a consistent way. On the other hand, it will allow us to readily compare our results with future S-PLUS and J-PLUS data, which will deliver multiband data for millions of galaxies (Mendes de Oliveira et al. 2019), as well as with other work, that have also performed automatic classification.

With the purpose of estimating the Sérsic index ($n$), effective radius ($R_e$), and the magnitudes ($m$) for the members of the Hydra Cluster in all S-PLUS bands, we used the code MEGAMORPH-GALAPAGOS2 (Bamford et al. 2011; Häußler et al. 2013; Vika et al. 2013). This code performs a multiwavelength 2D fitting using the algorithm
GAFFITM (Peng et al. 2002, 2010a; Vika et al. 2013). GALFITM extracts structural components from galaxy images by modelling the surface-brightness with different profiles: Nuker law (Lauer et al. 1995), the Sersic profile, exponential disc, Gaussian or Moffat functions (Moffat 1969). The main advantage of a simultaneous multiwavelength fitting is an increasing in the accuracy of the estimated parameters (Vika et al. 2013). In addition, AGGAMMORPH allows us to fit all galaxies in a given field simultaneously, which is of great convenience. We note that AGGAMORPH was used to perform a multiband fitting in several previous studies (Häußler et al. 2013; Vika et al. 2013, 2014, 2015; Vulcani et al. 2014; Kennedy et al. 2015; Dimauro et al. 2018). In addition, it was tested with simulated galaxies (Häußler et al. 2013). Thus, it is a well-tested code. The galaxies analysed here have large S/N, between 24 and 145 (in the r band) with a mean value of 55, and good imaging quality, since all images were taken under photometric conditions; thus we trust that the output parameters provided by MegaMorph are reliable. Nevertheless, as a sanity check, we tested how well GALFITM recovers the galaxy parameters for our particular data set of S-PLUS. We present this test in the Appendix B, where we generate simulated galaxies with the same features, S/N, filters and background levels as those in the S-PLUS fields of Hydra, and find that GALFITM can retrieve the input galaxy’s parameters with high reliability, within a percentage error of ~4 per cent (see Appendix B for more details).

In this work, the centre of each galaxy was determined by SOURCEEXTRACTOR using a deep detection image, generated for each field as a weighted combination of the g, r, i, and z broadband images. Then, for each galaxy, we fit a single Sersic profile simultaneously for images in all filters, by fixing for each filter the central position measured on the detection image. Each parameter to be measured is modeled as a function of wavelength and the degrees of freedom afforded to model each of these parameters is determined by a set of Chebyshev polynomials. This analysis provided us structural parameters, such as the Sersic index and effective radius (modelled as quadratic functions of wavelength) as well as b/a and position angle (modelled as linear functions of wavelength) Häußler et al. (2013). The Sersic profile, which is modeled for each galaxy, is define in equation (10).

\[ I(r) = I_e \left( \frac{r}{R_e} \right)^n \left[ 1 - \left( \frac{r}{R_e} \right)^{1/n} \right]^{(1 - 1/n)} \],

where \( I_e \) is the intensity, \( R_e \) and \( I_e \) are the effective radius and intensity inside an \( R_e \), respectively. \( n \) is the Sersic index, also known as the concentration parameter, and \( b_n \) is a function of \( n \) that satisfies \( \Gamma(2n) = 2\gamma(2n, b_n) \). In cases where the galaxy profile is more concentrated, \( n \) presents higher values. For instance, with \( n = 4 \) we obtain the well-known de Vaucouleurs profile and it corresponds to the typical profile of an elliptical galaxy. For \( n = 1 \), we have a typical profile of an exponential disc; and if \( n < 1 \) this is probably due to the presence of a bar (Peng et al. 2010a).

In order to determine the best fit, GALFITM uses a Levenberg–Marquardt technique, which finds the optimum model by minimising the chi^2. In Fig. 4, we present the GALFITM output for the galaxy ESO 437- G 004, as an example, where observed images, models, and residuals (observed minus models) are shown in top, middle, and bottom panels, respectively. We can easily see the spiral arms and substructures in the residual images of this example.

Magnitudes and Sersic index for the 81 analysed galaxies are available in Tables A1 and A2 (see Appendix B for a complete version of these tables). All magnitudes used in this work have been corrected for Galactic extinction, using a Cardelli, Clayton & Mathis (1989) law and the maps from Schlegel, Finkbeiner & Davis (1998).

### 3.2 Estimation of stellar masses

#### 3.2.1 Stellar mass from colours

The stellar mass is one of the main properties of a galaxy and it is well correlated with its luminosity (Faber & Gallagher 1979). Different types of galaxies increase their stellar masses at different rates, starburst galaxies form stars at higher rates than main-sequence galaxies (Papovich et al. 2005), Bell et al. (2003), using a large sample of 22,679 galaxies observed with the Two Micron All Sky Survey (Skrutskie et al. 2006) and the SDSS, calculated stellar mass-to-light ratio \( M_*/L \) as a function of the colour \((g - i)\) assuming a Salpeter initial mass function (IMF, Salpeter 1955). In this work, we use the i-band luminosities, along with the colour \((g - i)\), to estimate the stellar mass following the definitions given by Bell et al. (2003), which are shown in the equations (11):

\[ \log M_*/L_i = -0.152 + 0.518 \times (g - i) \],

where \( M_*/L_i \) is the stellar mass-to-light ratio and \( (g - i) \) is the colour of the galaxy.

We found a median uncertainty of 0.06 dex for the estimated stellar masses of our Hydra galaxies. Using a sample of galaxies from the
3.2.2 Stellar mass using LePHARE

Another way to estimate the stellar mass of a galaxy is using a SED or spectral fitting code (Bruzual A. & Charlot 1993; Cid Fernandes et al. 2005; da Cunha et al. 2012). These codes use models to fit the SED, allowing us to determine the ages and metallicities of the stellar populations. Then, it is possible to obtain several physical parameters of the galaxy, including its stellar mass.

Following this approach, we perform an SED fitting for the galaxies detected inside of the S-PLUS field containing the centre of the Hydra cluster (only one field for a consistency check). The SED fitting process was done using the code PHotometric Analysis for Redshift Estimate (LePHARE Arnouts et al. 1999; Ilbert et al. 2006) and the stellar population libraries of Bruzual & Charlot (2003) with a Chabrier (2003) IMF. The models have three metallicities 0.2 Z☉, 0.4 Z☉, and 1 Z☉ with age ranging from 0.01 to 13.5 Gyr.

In Fig. 5, we compare the resulting masses obtained by the SED fitting method with respect to the masses derived from luminosities and colours (as described in Section 3.2.1). The red dots are the stellar masses estimated using the colour relation (g − i) from Bell et al. (2003). We have scaled the Bell mass–luminosity relation by 0.093 dex to take into account the use of Salpeter IMF rather than a Chabrier IMF, as described in Taylor et al. (2011). The blue dots are the stellar masses estimated using the colour relation (g − i) from Taylor et al. (2011). The stellar masses estimated using Bell et al. (2003) are on average 0.22 dex larger than those estimated via Taylor et al. (2011).

When the stellar masses derived from the SED fitting are compared with those derived from the colour relations we find, on average, a percentage error of 1.2 and 2.0 for the masses estimated using the Taylor et al. (2011) and Bell et al. (2003) relations, respectively. In both cases, a linear regression of the stellar masses obtained from the two methods provides a good fit, with a coefficient of determination R² = 0.97, indicating a good linear correlation between the data. The coefficient of determination is defined as R² = 1 - (SSres/SStot), where SSres is the sum of residual errors and SStot is the total errors. Its value ranges from 0 to 1, where 1 corresponds to the maximum correlation.

Given that the two colour relations show a good correlation with the masses estimated using a SED fitting, and considering that the masses estimated using colours is less time consuming, we therefore use the stellar masses for all the S-PLUS fields obtained from the colour relation by Taylor et al. (2011), which shows the smallest percentage error.

We show the stellar mass function (SMF) of the Hydra galaxies analysed in this work as a grey histogram in Fig. 6. The SMF is dominated by ETGs and QGs, as defined in the following sections. Our sample is complete for stellar masses ≥3.3 × 10⁹ M☉, which was determined from the colour relation using the faintest magnitude (16 mag in the r band) and the reddest colour of our sample of galaxies. We can see from Fig. 6 that there are virtually no ETGs and QGs [non-star-forming galaxies (NSFG)] in the lower mass end of the SMF. The stellar masses are listed in Table A3 of the Appendix.

3.3 The star formation rate estimation

To further extend our understanding of the galaxies inside the Hydra Cluster and the influence of the environment over the evolutionary path of the members, we estimate the SFR and the specific star formation rate (sSFR) for the galaxies of our sample. For this task we use the J0660 narrow band filter, which is centred around the rest-frame wavelength of Hα. We note that there are several advantages in using photometric data to determine Hα emission in galaxies.
First, the use of S-PLUS data allow us to perform an homogeneous analysis on the H\alpha emission of galaxies in Hydra, where all the data were observed under similar conditions. In addition, imaging surveys are not biased by the orientation of the slits, as in the case of spectroscopic studies. Furthermore, the S-PLUS will cover a huge area in the sky, and in the near future the photometric redshifts will be available, increasing the number of objects belonging to Hydra for which we will have S-PLUS data. In this way, the same criteria will be used to select and analyse galaxies providing homogeneous data with S-PLUS.

We select the emission line galaxy candidates in our sample based on two criteria: one regarding the equivalent width and the other regarding a given colour excess for the objects (known as 3\Sigma cut). For the galaxies to be considered as line emitters, the H\alpha equivalent width (EW\_0660) should be greater than 12 Å. This is following Vilella-Rojo et al. (2015), who determine that J-PLUS cannot resolve, with a precision of 3\sigma, EW\_0660 < 12 Å. In this work, we use the same criteria that S-PLUS and J-PLUS use with telescopes, with the same filters systems, thus we can utilize the same criteria to analyse the galaxies if the objects have the similar photometric conditions.

We use the equation (13) to determine the galaxies’s EW\_0660:

\[ EW_{0660} = \Delta_{0660} (Q - 1) \frac{Q - 1}{1 - Q} \epsilon, \]

where \( \epsilon \equiv \Delta_{0660}/\Delta_y \) and \( m_r - m_{0660} = 2.5 \log Q \). The \( m_r \) and \( m_{0660} \) are the apparent magnitudes.

Emission line galaxies are objects with colour excess greater than zero \((r - J0660 > 0)\). However, to quantify the colour excess when compared to a random scatter expected for a source with zero colour, we use a 3\Sigma cut (Sobral et al. 2012). We use equation (14) to define the 3\Sigma curve (Khostovan et al. 2020) for our second selection criterion

\[ \Sigma = 1 - \frac{10^{-0.4(m_r - m_{0660})}}{10^{2r - m_{0660}} \sqrt{\sigma^2_{0660} + \sigma^2_{r}}}, \]

where \( \sigma_{0660} \) and \( \sigma_r \) are the rms error. SOURCEEXTRACTOR (Bertin & Arnouts 1996) was used in this case to obtain the galaxy magnitudes, and their errors, for each Hydra’s field, with an AUTO aperture around the source. ZP is the photometric zero-point for \( m_J \) and their errors, for each Hydra’s field, with an AUTO aperture.

**Figure 7.** \( m_{0660} \) excess as a function of \( m_{0660} \) magnitude. The blue line represent the \( \Sigma \) cut of 3. The magenta horizontal line present the EW\_0660 cut of 12 Å. The grey points represent all \( m_r - m_{0660} \) detected sources. The red points are the sources that can be considered to have a narrow-band excess in the field.

The analysis described above allow us to determine a sensitivity of the \( F_{Halpha} \) is \( 1 \times 10^{-13} \) erg s\(^{-1}\) cm\(^{-2}\), which corresponds to a surface brightness of 21 mag arcsec\(^{-2}\). We use the H\alpha flux to determine the H\alpha luminosity, and then the classical relation proposed by Kennicutt (1998) was used to estimate the SFR. The SFRs obtained from this relation must be corrected for dust attenuation. A common correction arises from the assumption of an extinction A(H\alpha) = 1 mag, as proposed by Kennicutt (1992). However, this correction overestimates the SFR for galaxies with low H\alpha luminosities (H\alpha luminosity of \( \lesssim 10^{40.5} \) ergs s\(^{-1}\), Ly et al. 2012), which is the case for some galaxies analyzed in this work. For these reasons, we choose to use the relation between the intrinsic and observed SFR (corrected by the obscuration), which is presented in Hopkins et al. (2001) and updated by Ly et al. (2007). The relation is shown in equation (16):

\[ \log SFR_{obs}(H\alpha) = \log SFR_{int} - 2.360 \times \log \left( \frac{0.797 \log(SFR_{int}) + 3.786}{2.86} \right), \]

where SFR\_int and SFR\_obs are the intrinsic and observed SFR, respectively.

Finally, sSFR was estimated using SFR and the stellar masses derived in Section 3.2.1. Table A3 in the appendix lists the sSFR (column 6). An sSFR threshold is defined empirically to separate star-forming galaxies (SFGs) from the NSFGs (Weinmann et al. 2010). We consider a galaxy as star forming if its sSFR > \( 10^{-11} \) yr\(^{-1}\) otherwise it will be classified as quiescent following the threshold commonly used in the literature (see e.g. Wetzel et al. 2012, 2013, 2014). We note, however, that some other studies use different thresholds for the sSFR at different redshifts to separate SFG from NSFG, as, for example, Lagana & Ulmer 2018 and Koyama et al. 2013. Based on these definitions, we found that the Hydra cluster has 88 per cent of the galaxies already quenched.

**4 Results**

In this section, we present the morphological classification of Hydra galaxies as early and LTGs using n and colours. We then analyse the spatial distribution of the different types of galaxies in terms of their physical and structural parameters as well as their behaviour with...
Figure 8. Results of the morphological fitting, performed with MegaMorph-GALAPAGOS2. The x-axis shows the S´ersic index in the r band and the y-axis displays the galaxies’ (u − r) colour. Colours represent the stellar mass of each galaxy, as indicated by the colour bar. The vertical and horizontal lines are in $n_r = 2.5$ and $(u − r) = 2.3$, respectively.

Figure 9. Same as Fig. 8, but colour-coded by the $\log(\text{sSFR})$. The grey dots are NSFG.

respect to the cluster central distance and with the cluster density. We also present the $n$ behaviour as a function of the 12 S-PLUS filters. In addition, we analyse the phase-space diagram and we explore the presence of substructures in Hydra cluster.

4.1 Early-type and late-type galaxies classification

Based on the physical properties of the stellar populations of ETGs and LTGs, it is straightforward to separate between these two populations using a CMD (Bell et al. 2004). ETGs have in general much older and redder stellar populations, which allocate this population in a very well-determined position of the diagram separated from the bluer and star-forming LTGs (Lee et al. 2007). Using SDSS data, Vika et al. (2015) combined $n_r$ and the colour cut $(u − r) = 2.3$ to separate these two galaxy classes (see also Park & Choi 2005 for different values of the colour cut). Vika et al. (2015) classified the galaxies with $(u − r) ≥ 2.3$ and $n_r ≥ 2.5$ as ETGs and galaxies with $(u − r) < 2.3$ and $n_r < 2.5$ as LTGs. Following these parameters to classify our sample, $\sim 54$ per cent of the galaxies (44 objects) are ETGs, whereas $\sim 23$ per cent (19 galaxies) are LTGs.

In Figs 8 and 9, we present the $n_r$ versus the $(u − r)$ colour for the whole sample used in this study, where symbols in the figures are colour-coded by stellar mass and sSFR, respectively. As expected, ETGs (top right region on each plot) are more massive than LTGs (bottom left region). In Fig. 9, we show that LTGs are forming stars at a level of $-10.0 < \log(\text{sSFR}) < -8.8$, whereas all the ETGs are quenched. It is interesting to note that there is a population of blue + green galaxies $(u − r) < 2.3)$ in Hydra cluster that do not present $H\alpha$ emission at the detection level. The SMF of SFGs and NSFGs is shown in the Fig. 6, as the cyan and orange histograms, respectively. We find that the SFGs are less massive than the NSFGs, where the NSFG have basically the same behaviour of the global SMF, since only 10 galaxies of the sample are SFGs. There is a mix of populations in the top left in the Figs 8 and 9, which represents a $\sim 17$ per cent of our sample.

4.2 Spatial distribution: structural and physical parameters

In this section, we analyse how the morphological and physical parameters change with respect to the distance to the cluster centre as well as a function of the projected local density. For each galaxy, we estimate the projected local density defined as $\Sigma_10 = 10/A_{10}$, where $A_{10} = \pi R_{200}^2(\text{Mpc})$ is the area of the circle that contains the nearest 10 galaxies and $R_{200}$ is the radio of the circle, as described by Fasano et al. (2015). Each galaxy is in the centre of the circle.

The top panel of Fig. 10 shows the spatial distribution of ETGs and LTGs classified in subsection 4.1. The red and blue dots are the ETGs and LTGs, respectively, and the grey dots are the mix of galaxies that do not meet the ETG or LTG definition requirements (first and fourth quadrants in Fig. 8). The size of each circle is proportional...
studied a sample of galaxy clusters from the EAGLE hydrodynamical simulation. They classified SFGs as we do in this work, i.e. galaxies with log(sSFR) > −11, and found that a cluster as massive as Hydra (M_{200} > 3 \times 10^{14} M_\odot) has ~90 per cent of the galaxies quenched, in agreement with our findings.

We show in Fig. 12 the distribution of SFGs and NSFGs as a function of projected local density. No SFGs are found in the highest and lowest density bins. The NSFGs dominate at all densities, however after ~log(\Sigma_{10}) > 1.2 the fraction of NSFG increases towards denser regions, while the fraction of SFG decreases in the same direction. The error bars in Figs 10, 11, and 12 are binomial uncertainties with a 68 per cent confidence.

### 4.3 Behaviour of n as a function of the 12 S-PLUS filters

The light emitted by a galaxy at different wavelengths has information from different physical phenomena. As an example, stellar populations of different ages and metallicities have emission peaks in different regions of the spectrum. In addition, other contributions such as emission from H II regions, AGN, and planetary nebulae can also be found in a galaxy spectrum. In the case of S-PLUS, each filter is placed in optical strategic regions. Thus, within this context, it is interesting to measure how n changes with respect to each S-PLUS filter, clustercentric distance and density. In order to investigate it, we separate the Hydra galaxies into four groups: (i) ETG, (ii) LTG, (iii) green, and (iv) blue + green to facilitate comparisons with other studies.

Galaxies with (u − r) ≥ 2.3 are red (58 galaxies) and galaxies with (u − r) < 2.3 are blue + green (23 galaxies). ETGs and LTGs follow the definition provided in Section 4.1. Fig. 13 shows how the median Sérsic index (n) changes as a function of wavelength. The n for red galaxies shows a larger value (13 per cent) towards redder filters. The n for blue + green galaxies remains constant across all filters. For ETGs, n increases with wavelength (18 per cent), whereas for LTGs it decreases up to the J0515-band, and after that increases its value up to z-band. The LTGs present a net decrease, from filter u to z, of 7 per cent. The n values and their uncertainties per filter, estimated by adding the individual uncertainties in quadrature and dividing by the number of galaxies, for ETGs, LTGs, red and blue + green galaxies are in Table 3.

Figs 14 and 15 show how n, for each S-PLUS filter, changes with density [quantified by log(\Sigma_{10})] for red and blue + green galaxies, respectively. The n for red galaxies (Fig. 14), shows an increase up to log (\Sigma_{10}) = 1.6, and then decreases for denser regions. For the blue galaxies (Fig. 15), the number of galaxies per density bin.

![Figure 12. SF and NSF–density relation. Top panel: fraction of SFG and NSFG in blue and red, respectively. Bottom panel: Histograms with the number of galaxies per density bin.](https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/500/1/1323/5941516)
are the standard error of the median. + represent LTGs and blue + galaxies in Hydra, and we apply the Dressler–Schectman test without considering any cut in magnitudes. There is a total of 193 section the galaxies selected in Section 2.1, i.e. all the galaxies that could lose important information. Therefore, we decide to use in this distances from the cluster centre. For blue + green galaxies, Fig. 17 shows that, beyond ~0.4R200, galaxies show lower \( \bar{n} \) values, for all filters, at farther distances from the cluster centre. For blue + green galaxies, Fig. 17 shows that \( \bar{n} \) decreases, for all filters, up to ~0.4R200, after that it remains constant with distance within the uncertainties. These results will be discussed in Section 5.

4.4 Substructures in the Hydra cluster and the phase-space diagram

The environment in which a galaxy is embedded may play an important role in determining its morphological (e.g. the \( n \)) and physical (e.g. the sSFR) parameters. The presence of substructures in a cluster can influence the parameters mentioned above. To check if this is the case in Hydra, we need to determine whether there are possible substructures within the cluster. The substructures generally have galaxies of different brightness, thus if we only use galaxies brighter than 16 (u-band) to check for the presence of substructure, we could lose important information. Therefore, we decide to use in this section the galaxies selected in Section 2.1, i.e. all the galaxies that have peculiar velocities lower than the escape velocity of the cluster, without considering any cut in magnitudes. There is a total of 193 such galaxies in Hydra, and we apply the Dressler–Schectman test (DST; Dressler & Shectman 1988) on those galaxies to search for the existence of possible substructures. The DST estimates a \( \Delta \) statistic for the cluster by comparing the kinematics of neighbouring galaxies with respect to the kinematics of the cluster. This comparison is done for each galaxy taking into account the mean velocity (\( \bar{v} \)) and velocity dispersion (\( \sigma \)) of each cluster. For red + green galaxies, Fig. 17 shows that \( \bar{n} \) decreases, for all filters, up to ~0.4R200, after that it remains constant with distance within the uncertainties. These results will be discussed in Section 5.

![Figure 13](image-url) Median Sérsic index \( \bar{n} \) as a function of the 12 S-PLUS filters. The red symbols represent ETGs and red \([u - r] \geq 2.3\) galaxies, blue symbols represent LTGs and blue + green \([u - r] < 2.3\) galaxies. The error bars are the standard error of the median \(1.25 \sigma / \sqrt{N}\), where \(N\) is the number of objects. The magenta, green, and cyan symbols are the red \([u - r] \geq 2.1\), green \([1.6 > (u - r) < 2.1]\), and blue \([u - r] \leq 1.6\) galaxies in Vulcani et al. (2014); see Section 5 for more details.

![Figure 14](image-url) Sérsic index–density relation for red galaxies. The top panel shows the \( \bar{n} \), for each S-PLUS filter, with respect to the cluster density. The bottom panel shows a histogram with the number of galaxies per density bin.

![Figure 15](image-url) Same as Fig. 14, but for the blue + green galaxies.

| GALAXIES | \( \bar{n} \) | \( \sigma_{\bar{n}} \) | \( \bar{\delta} \) | \( \bar{\sigma} \) |
|----------|------------|------------|-------------|-------------|
| ETG      | 3.31 ± 0.03| 3.52 ± 0.02| 3.56 ± 0.02| 3.57 ± 0.01| 3.62 ± 0.01| 3.69 ± 0.01| 3.87 ± 0.01| 3.91 ± 0.01| 4.02 ± 0.01| 4.05 ± 0.01| 4.06 ± 0.01|
| LTG      | 1.74 ± 0.02| 1.66 ± 0.01| 1.60 ± 0.01| 1.54 ± 0.01| 1.46 ± 0.01| 1.32 ± 0.01| 1.27 ± 0.01| 1.45 ± 0.01| 1.47 ± 0.01| 1.56 ± 0.01| 1.62 ± 0.01| 1.62 ± 0.01|
| RED      | 3.21 ± 0.03| 3.22 ± 0.02| 3.22 ± 0.02| 3.24 ± 0.01| 3.23 ± 0.01| 3.33 ± 0.01| 3.41 ± 0.01| 3.58 ± 0.01| 3.62 ± 0.01| 3.72 ± 0.01| 3.72 ± 0.01| 3.70 ± 0.01|
| BLUE + GREEN | 1.80 ± 0.02| 1.72 ± 0.02| 1.73 ± 0.01| 1.74 ± 0.01| 1.72 ± 0.01| 1.70 ± 0.01| 1.67 ± 0.01| 1.68 ± 0.01| 1.71 ± 0.01| 1.74 ± 0.01| 1.75 ± 0.01| 1.72 ± 0.01|
For simplicity random substructures are enclosed by open circles in Fig. We find the presence of three substructures within $R_{200}$, one of them in agreement with the possibility of a substructure found with the DST. Each galaxy that belongs to the structure found by DBSCAN is enclosed by open circles in Fig.18. The galaxies that belong to the same structure found by DST are enclosed by a black open square in Fig. 20.

In order to further look into the possibility of substructures, we use a density-based spatial clustering (DBSCAN; Ester et al. 1996) algorithm. DBSCAN takes as input the positions of the objects and the minimum number of objects with a maximum distance between them to be considered as a group/substructure. We adopt a maximum distance of 140 kpc and a minimum of three galaxies to consider a substructure (Sohn et al. 2015; Olave-Rojas et al. 2018). Using the 193 galaxies, DBSCAN finds the presence of three substructures within $R_{200}$, one of them in agreement with the possibility of a substructure found with the DST. Each galaxy that belongs to the substructure found by DBSCAN is enclosed by open circles in Fig. 18. The galaxies that belong to the same structure found by DST are enclosed by the cyan open circles; this substructure has seven galaxies, and two of them are SFGs.

Having determined the possible existence of substructures in Hydra, the phase-space diagram (Jaffé et al. 2015), which relates the distance to the cluster centre with the kinematical quantity $\Delta v/\sigma$, could help us to understand the dynamic state of Hydra. We show the phase-space diagram of Hydra in Fig. 19, where we use the 81 galaxies that have $m_r < 16$. The $x$-axis is the projected distance from the cluster centre normalised by $R_{200}$ and the $y$-axis is the peculiar line-of-sight velocity of each galaxy with respect to the cluster recessional velocity, normalised by the velocity dispersion of the cluster. The escape velocity is indicated by the dashed line.

We also note that, using the normality-test Stein (1997) found that Hydra does not present any substructure, by applying the same DST but in an area of 45 arcmin radius (i.e half the area we use here), which includes 76 galaxies. To understand this discrepancy we applied the DST in the same area as Stein (1997) using 136 galaxies, and found $\Delta N_{\text{total}} = 1.0$, which is inconclusive in terms of substructures. Therefore, we detect possible new substructures in an unexplored area of Hydra.

In Fig. 20, we highlight the possible substructures detected in Hydra, where we show the distribution of the cluster’s galaxies where the size of each circle is proportional to $e^\delta$, i.e. bigger dots indicate that the galaxy is in a possible substructure. The galaxies are colour-coded by their peculiar velocity. The galaxies that belong to the different structures identified by DBSCAN are enclosed by the open circles of different colours.

The $\Delta$ statistic is then defined as the cumulative deviation; $\Delta = \sum^\infty_i \delta_i$. If $\Delta/N_{\text{total}} > 1$ it means that probably there is a substructure in the cluster (White et al. 2015). For the Hydra cluster considering an area of $\sim95$ arcmin of radius and with 193 members, we found a $\Delta/N_{\text{total}} = 1.25$. To confirm that this result is significantly different from a random distribution, and validate the possible existence of substructures in Hydra, we calibrate the $\Delta$ statistic by randomly shuffling the velocities using a Monte Carlo simulation. We perform $1 \times 10^5$ iterations; for each of those we calculated the $\Delta$ statistic, which we call for simplicity random $\Delta$. We then count the number of configurations for which the random $\Delta$ is greater than the original $\Delta$. $N(\Delta, \text{randoms} > \Delta)$, normalised by the number of iterations $N(\Delta, \text{randoms})$, that is

$$P = \frac{N(\Delta, \text{randoms} > \Delta)}{N(\Delta, \text{randoms})}. \quad (18)$$

If the fraction $P$ is lower than 0.1, we can conclude that the original $\Delta$ value is not obtained from a random distribution (White et al. 2015). We find $P = 0.016$, which confirms a possible presence of substructures in the Hydra cluster.

In Fig. 18, we highlight the possible substructures detected in Hydra, where we show the distribution of the cluster’s galaxies where the size of each circle is proportional to $e^\delta$. Larger circles indicate a higher probability for a galaxy be part of a substructure. Each galaxy is colour-coded by their peculiar velocities with respect to the cluster’s redshift. We found possible substructures in the outer regions of the cluster as well as in the central part; these possible substructures are enclosed by a black open square in Fig. 20.

We note that Stein (1997) found that Hydra does not present any substructure, by applying the same DST but in an area of 45 arcmin radius (i.e half the area we use here), which includes 76 galaxies. To understand this discrepancy we applied the DST in the same area as Stein (1997) using 136 galaxies, and found $\Delta N_{\text{total}} = 1.0$, which is inconclusive in terms of substructures. Therefore, we detect possible new substructures in an unexplored area of Hydra.

2We also note that, using the normality-test Stein (1997) found that Hydra presents substructures with 1 per cent of significance level, see Beers, Flynn & Gebhardt (1990) for more details.

Figure 16. Sérsic index–radius relation for red galaxies. The top panel shows the $n_i$ for each S-PLUS filter, with respect to the cluster density. The bottom panel shows a histogram with the number of galaxies per ($R/R_{200}$) bin.

Figure 17. Same as Fig. 16, here for the blue + green galaxies.

Figure 18. Spatial distribution of Hydra galaxies. The size of each circle is proportional to $e^\delta$, i.e. bigger dots indicate that the galaxy is in a possible substructure. The galaxies are colour-coded by their peculiar velocity. The galaxies that belong to the different structures identified by DBSCAN are enclosed by the open circles of different colours.
and it is obtained based on a Navarro, Frenk & White DM profile (Navarro, Frenk & White 1996), see Jaffé et al. (2015) for more details. Figs. 19 and 20 show the same diagram colour-coded by \( n_r \) and \( \log (sSFR) \), respectively, where the circle sizes are proportional to \( \delta \). We can see that there are galaxies both with higher and lower \( n_r \) in possible substructures (the bigger circles). Also, it is clear that some galaxies located in substructures are star forming. We can see from Fig. 20 that galaxies with larger \( \delta \) are located beyond 0.6\( R_{200} \), and also some galaxies are closer to the cluster central region. Galaxies with \( \delta \geq 3\sigma_\delta \) (the standard deviation of \( \delta \) distribution) have the largest probability to belonging to a substructure (Girardi et al. 1997; Olave-Rojas et al. 2018). Fig 20 shows, enclosed by a black open square, the 12 galaxies that have \( \delta \geq 3\sigma_\delta \). Four of these galaxies are near to the cluster centre and 8 are beyond 0.6\( R_{200} \). Two of the 12 galaxies are SFGs and 8 have \( n_r \geq 2.5 \).

### 5 DISCUSSION

We discuss in this section the results that we found in this work, interpret, and compare them with previous studies. Also, we discuss few caveats and cautions that should be taken into account when interpreting some of the results presented here.

We find that \( \bar{n} \) for ETGs, as well as red galaxies, displays a slight increase towards redder filters (13 per cent of its value for red galaxies and 18 per cent for ETGs, see Fig. 13). This result is in agreement with previous studies (La Barbera et al. 2010; Kelvin et al. 2012; Vulcani et al. 2014). For LTGs, we find that \( \bar{n} \) decreases, from filter \( u \) to \( z \), by 7 per cent. However, other studies both in cluster and in field galaxies have found that \( n \) increases as a function of wavelength for LTGs (La Barbera et al. 2010; Kelvin et al. 2012; Vulcani et al. 2014; Psychogios et al. 2019). This behaviour may be due to higher SF in these galaxies, which is more concentrated in the inner regions. To better compare with Vulcani et al. (2014), hereafter V14 we have included their data points in Fig. 13. V14 used the filters \( u, g, r, i, \) and \( z \) from SDSS, and modelled field galaxies with a single Sérsic profile. We note, first, that their sample contains field galaxies and, second, that their colour cuts to separate galaxies as red, blue and green are slightly different than the one used in this work. Nevertheless, the green + blue and LTGs, from Hydra, show similar values of \( \bar{n} \), within the uncertainties, with respect to the green galaxies in V14 for most filters. The \( \bar{n} \) value for the \( u \) filter is higher for Hydra. For the red galaxies and filters \( u, g, \) and \( r \) our work and that of V14 show similar values of \( \bar{n} \). However, galaxies in Hydra show a higher value in the filters \( i \) and \( z \) when compared to the field galaxies in V14. Overall galaxies in Hydra exhibit a higher value of \( \bar{n} \) when compared to the blue galaxies of V14. This result is interesting and in agreement with Psychogios et al. (2019), who found that cluster galaxies always have a higher value of \( \bar{n} \), regardless of the filter, when compared to field galaxies. Thus, bearing in mind that a comparison with other studies is not so simple, due to the differences in separating galaxies as ETGs, LTGs, red, green, and blue, which likely contribute to differences in the results, there may be actual differences between the \( \bar{n} \) values as a function of filter between cluster and field galaxies. We will explore this further in a future work.

The \( \bar{n} \) value for blue + green galaxies remains constant as a function of wavelength. We find that it appears to have a higher value for the bluest filters with respect to the clustercentric distance (Fig. 17). However, considering the uncertainties, we find no significant change in \( \bar{n} \) as a function of distance or wavelength. We can see the same behaviour with respect to the density [\( \log (\Sigma_{200}) \)], where \( \bar{n} \) remains constant, considering the uncertainties (Fig. 15). The \( \bar{n} \) for red galaxies is always greater than 2.5, and for blue + green galaxies is generally lower than 2. A similar result was presented in Psychogios et al. (2019) using 5 filters (\( u, B, V, J, \) and \( K \)). They found that the Sérsic index remains nearly constant as a function of wavelength, for galaxies that belong to a cluster.

Examining the Hydra’s SMF, we find that the ETGs and NSFGs are more massive and dominate the higher mass end of the global SMF (see Fig. 6), as expected for a cluster. The lower mass galaxies are mostly LTGs and SFGs and dominate the lower mass end of the SMF. These results are in agreement with previous studies (e.g. Blanton & Moustakas 2009; Vulcani et al. 2011; Etherington et al. 2017; van der Burg et al. 2020). For example, Vulcani et al. (2011) analysed a sample of 21 nearby clusters (0.04 < \( z \) < 0.07), finding that the global SMF is dominated by ETGs (Elliptical and S0 galaxies), while the number of LTGs declines towards the high-mass end of the SMF. In the local Universe, the high-mass end of the SMF is dominated by ETGs both in low and high-dense environments (Blanton &
The galaxies in the green valley have very low levels of ongoing SF, and red galaxies that have lower sSFRs than actively SFGs of the same mass. There is an intermediate zone between the red sequence and the blue cloud, called green valley. These galaxies have typical colours between $1.8 \lesssim (u - r) \lesssim 2.3$ (Schawinski et al. 2014). In Hydra, we find that galaxies with colours $1.8 \lesssim (u - r) < 2.3$ do not present Hα emission. These objects could be transitional galaxies that have lower sSFRs than actively SFGs of the same mass. The galaxies in the green valley have very low levels of ongoing SF, and the sSFR, as expected (see Figs 8 and 9).

In this work, we separate galaxies as blue + green $(u - r < 2.3)$ and red $(u - r \geq 2.3)$. There is an intermediate zone between the red sequence and the blue cloud, called green valley. These galaxies have typical colours between $1.8 \lesssim (u - r) \lesssim 2.3$ (Schawinski et al. 2014). In Hydra, we find that galaxies with colours $1.8 \lesssim (u - r) < 2.3$ do not present Hα emission. These objects could be transitional galaxies that have lower sSFRs than actively SFGs of the same mass. The galaxies in the green valley have very low levels of ongoing SF, and the sSFR, as expected (see Figs 8 and 9).

As it is well known, the morphology and SFR of galaxies are correlated, and the environment likely plays an important role in the evolutionary changes of these parameters (Fasano et al. 2015; Pallero et al. 2019; Paulino-Afonso et al. 2019). In this work, we study the behaviour of sSFR with respect to the cluster-centric distance and density. We find that $\sim 88$ per cent of the Hydra galaxies are quenched, based on their Hα emission. However, 23 per cent of Hydra galaxies are LTGs, according to our morphological and physical classification. This suggests that, as advocated by Liu et al. (2019), the galactic physical properties (e.g. SFR) of galaxies in a cluster change faster than their structural properties.

The DST we performed in the previous section indicates that Hydra presents substructures with a $\Delta/N_{\text{total}} = 1.25$. This value is not too high in comparison with other clusters (see as example Olave-Rojas et al. 2018). We also confirm the presence of substructures using the DBSCAN algorithm. Interestingly, previous studies have shown that Hydra has an approximately homogeneous X-ray distribution. This observed feature suggests that the cluster has not suffered merging processes recently, and probably is a relaxed system (Fitchett & Merritt 1988; Furusho et al. 2001; Hayakawa et al. 2004; Łokas et al. 2006). It was also found in other work that Hydra does not present a Gaussian velocity distribution (Fitchett & Merritt 1988). Combining the previous information with our findings of substructures in Hydra, we conclude that Hydra is disturbed/perturbed, but not significantly and thus it is very close to become a virialized system.

S-PLUS will observe a huge area around Hydra Cluster, which we will use to study the behaviour of the galaxies in a less dense environment, but still under the influence of the cluster (beyond 1R200). In a upcoming work, we will also study the morphological and physical parameters of the bulge and the disc components of Hydra galaxies, separately. In the case of the substructures in the Hydra cluster, deeper images will allow us to see if the substructures can be correlated to intracluster light. In addition, these observations will be compared with state-of-the-art hydrodynamical simulations such as ILLUSTRIS-TNG (Nelson et al. 2018) and C-EAGLE (Barnes et al. 2018) in order to understand the evolutionary processes responsible of the observed properties of the Hydra cluster galaxies.

6 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This is the first of a series of papers exploring the evolution of galaxies in dense environments. We used the Hydra Cluster as a laboratory to study galaxy evolution, more specifically to explore the structural and physical properties of galaxies with respect to the environment. The analysis done in this work is based on S-PLUS data, a survey that has 12 filters in the visible range of the spectrum and a camera with a field of view of $\sim 2$ deg$^2$. The area studied here involves four S-PLUS fields, covering approximately a region of 1.4 Mpc radius centred on the Hydra cluster. We analyse the derived structural and physical parameters of a selected sample of 81 Hydra galaxies. All of them are brighter than 16 mag (r-band) and are part of the cluster.

Our main findings are as follows:

1. There is a clear correlation between $n_*$ and the galaxy stellar mass. Higher values of $n_*$ are found for larger stellar masses. The sSFR has the opposite behaviour, the higher the $n_*$, the lower is the sSFR, as expected (see Figs 8 and 9).

2. There is a larger fraction of NSFGs [galaxies with log (sSFR) $\leq -11$], than SFGs [galaxies with log (sSFR) $>-11$] across all R200 and all cluster densities. We find that $\sim 88$ per cent of Hydra galaxies can be classified as NSFG.

3. The $n_*$ changes with the colour of the galaxies. The $n_*$ for red and ETGs present an increase of 13 and 18 per cent, respectively, towards redder wavelengths. The LTGs shows a decrease in $n_*$ (7 per cent), from $u$ to z band, while the $n_*$ for blue + green galaxies remains constant. Beyond $\sim 0.3 R_{200}$ red galaxies show lower $n_*$ values, for all filters, declining as a function of distance from the cluster centre. The $n_*$ for blue + green galaxies remains constant for all filters.

4. We find that the Hydra cluster presents possible substructures, as determined from a DST. The DBSCAN algorithm found a substructure with exactly the same galaxies as one of the substructures detected by the DST. Two of the galaxies that are in that likely substructure are SFG, and lie in front of the cluster centre, based on the phase-space diagram. We speculate that these galaxies are falling now in to the cluster. However, given that there are few substructure, we conclude that the Hydra cluster is, although perturbed, close to virialization.
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In this Appendix, we present an example of the tables with the photometric information of each galaxy as well as their parameters determined in this work. Details about how these parameters were determined are found in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3. Full versions of these tables can be downloaded from the online version of the paper.

### APPENDIX A: DATA TABLES

#### Table A1. Magnitudes estimated in this work using MegaMorph project.

| ID  | u    | J0378 | J0395 | J0410 | J0430 | g   | J0515 | r   | J0660 | i   | J0861 | z   |
|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| 1   | 15.41±0.01 | 15.05±0.02 | 14.81±0.02 | 14.62±0.01 | 14.43±0.01 | 14.12±0.01 | 13.91±0.1 | 13.45±0.1 | 13.19±0.01 | 13.09±0.01 | 12.93±0.02 | 12.87±0.01 |

#### Table A2. Sérsic index estimated in this work using MegaMorph project.

| ID  | u    | J0378 | J0395 | J0410 | J0430 | g   | J0515 | r   | J0660 | i   | J0861 | z   |
|-----|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|-----|
| 1   | 1.36±0.02 | 1.23±0.02 | 1.17±0.02 | 1.12±0.01 | 1.07±0.01 | 0.97±0.02 | 0.94±0.01 | 0.93±0.01 | 0.99±0.01 | 1.10±0.01 | 1.15±0.01 | 1.13±0.01 |
Table A3. Physical parameters of the galaxies. Column 1 is the ID of each galaxy, columns 2 and 3 are the right ascension and declination, respectively. The stellar mass calculated with the colour \((g - i)\) presented in Taylor et al. (2011) is in column 4. The luminosity and sSFR are in the columns 5 and 6, respectively. A full version of this table, for all galaxies, is available as supporting information in the online version of this manuscript.

| ID   | RA°    | Dec.°  | \(\log (M_*/M_\odot)\) | \(L_{H\alpha}/10^{39}\) erg s\(^{-1}\) | \(\log (sSFR\text{ yr}^{-1})\) |
|------|--------|--------|--------------------------|----------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1    | 159.67 | −28.57 | 10.01 ± 0.05             | 64.48 ± 7.34                          | −10.01 ± 0.06                |

APPENDIX B: SIMULATED GALAXIES

In order to prove the goodness of GALFIT on retrieving structural parameters and physical information, we generated a set of five simulated galaxies to be modelled by GALFIT. The simulated galaxies were generated in each of all SPLUS-filters, using the same range of observational parameters as in the observations (S/N, filters, and background level). We use a star-forming SED (SF) and a quiescent SED (Q) to model a realistic wavelength dependance of the flux. On this exercise, we fix the Sérsic index over all wavelength, letting free the total flux. GALFIT allows us to recover the Sérsic index and effective radius with an uncertainty \(\sim 4\) per cent with respect to the value used in the construction of the simulated galaxy. In addition, we perform a linear regression, comparing the magnitudes of the simulated galaxies with respect to the magnitudes found by GALFIT. We find a coefficient of determination of \(\sim 1\). These results confirm that the parameters recovered by the GALFIT models are reliable. Table B1 lists the magnitudes in all 12 S-PLUS filters, \(n_r, R_e\), and the SED used in the five simulated galaxies (Input simulation) and those recovered by GALFIT (GALFIT output). Figs B1, B2, B3, B4, and B5, show the five modelled galaxies. On these figures, top panels show the simulated galaxies, middle panels show the GALFIT models, and bottom panels show the residuals, derived from the subtraction between the top and middle panels.

Table B1. Magnitudes for five simulated galaxies (Input Model) and its magnitudes recovered by GALFIT (GALFIT output).

| Galaxy  | \(u\) | \(J0378\) | \(J0395\) | \(J0410\) | \(J0430\) | \(g\) | \(J0515\) | \(r\) | \(J0660\) | \(i\) | \(J0861\) | \(z\) | \(n_r\) | \(R_e\) (arcsec) | SED |
|---------|------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|----------|------|------|-----------------|-----|
| 1 Input simulation | 13.75 | 13.53    | 13.34    | 13.08    | 12.59    | 12.17| 11.90    | 11.52| 11.45    | 11.20| 11.04    | 11.00| 2.00| 10.00          | Q   |
| 1 GALFIT output   | 13.74 | 13.52    | 13.33    | 13.07    | 12.58    | 12.16| 11.89    | 11.50| 11.44    | 11.19| 11.03    | 11.00| 1.98| 10.02          |     |
| 2 Input simulation | 13.75 | 13.53    | 13.34    | 13.08    | 12.59    | 12.17| 11.90    | 11.52| 11.45    | 11.20| 11.04    | 11.00| 4.00| 10.00          | Q   |
| 2 GALFIT output   | 13.69 | 13.47    | 13.28    | 13.02    | 13.53    | 12.11| 11.84    | 11.46| 11.39    | 11.14| 10.98    | 10.94| 3.87| 9.96           |     |
| 3 Input simulation | 14.41 | 14.30    | 14.11    | 13.57    | 13.28    | 13.20| 13.14    | 13.08| 13.08    | 13.04| 13.01    | 13.00| 4.00| 20.00          | SF  |
| 3 GALFIT output   | 14.34 | 14.24    | 14.05    | 13.50    | 13.21    | 13.13| 13.08    | 13.02| 13.02    | 12.98| 12.94    | 12.93| 3.85| 19.65          |     |
| 4 Input simulation | 14.41 | 14.30    | 14.11    | 13.57    | 13.28    | 13.20| 13.14    | 13.08| 13.08    | 13.04| 13.01    | 13.00| 5.00| 10.00          | SF  |
| 4 GALFIT output   | 14.33 | 14.22    | 14.03    | 13.48    | 13.19    | 13.11| 13.05    | 13.00| 13.00    | 12.96| 12.92    | 12.92| 4.82| 9.68           |     |
| 5 Input simulation | 14.41 | 14.30    | 14.11    | 13.57    | 13.28    | 13.20| 13.14    | 13.08| 13.08    | 13.04| 13.01    | 13.00| 1.00| 20.00          | SF  |
| 5 GALFIT output   | 14.42 | 14.31    | 14.11    | 13.56    | 13.27    | 13.19| 13.13    | 13.08| 13.07    | 13.04| 13.00    | 12.99| 0.99| 20.01          |     |

Figure B1. Simulated galaxy 1 (top panels), the GALFIT models (middle panels), and the residual image (observed minus modelled – bottom panels).
Figure B2. Simulated galaxy 2 (top panels), the GALFIT models (middle panels), and the residual image (observed minus modelled – bottom panels).

Figure B3. Simulated galaxy 3 (top panels), the GALFIT models (middle panels), and the residual image (observed minus modelled – bottom panels).

Figure B4. Simulated galaxy 4 (top panels), the GALFIT models (middle panels), and the residual image (observed minus modelled – bottom panels).

Figure B5. Simulated galaxy 5 (top panels), the GALFIT models (middle panels), and the residual image (observed minus modelled – bottom panels).