Virial scaling of galaxies in clusters: bright to faint is cool to hot
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ABSTRACT

By combining galaxy tracers from high-resolution N-body and hydrodynamical simulations, we present a consistent picture of the behaviour of galaxy velocities in massive clusters. In haloes above $\sim 10^{14} M_\odot$, the brightest satellite galaxies are slightly cooler compared to the dark matter, while fainter satellites are hotter. Within the virial radius of a cluster, the mean velocity dispersion based on the 100 brightest galaxies is a factor of $1.065 \pm 0.005$ (stat) $\pm 0.027$ (sys) higher than that of the dark matter (corresponding to a $\sim 10$–15 per cent bias in the dynamical mass estimate) while that based on only the five brightest galaxies is $0.868 \pm 0.039$ (stat) $\pm 0.035$ (sys). These trends are approximately independent of redshift. The velocity structure is sensitive to the modelling of galaxies in clusters, indicative of the complex interplay of tidal stripping, dynamical friction and merging. Velocity dispersions derived from instantaneous subhalo properties are larger than those employing either peak subhalo properties or hydrodynamical galaxy tracers. The latter two methods are consistent, implying that stacked spectroscopic analysis of cluster samples should, after correction for projection, show a trend towards slightly higher velocities when fainter galaxies are included, with an unbiased measure of dark matter velocity dispersion coming from approximately 30 galaxies per cluster. We show evidence that the velocity distribution function of bright galaxies near the cluster centre has a low-velocity tail due to strong dynamical friction.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Dynamical measurements of galaxy cluster masses – based on the line-of-sight galaxy velocities from spectroscopic observations – have a long history, using a broad range of methods, including the direct application of the virial theorem (e.g. Yahil & Vidal 1977; Danese, de Zotti & di Tullio 1980; Heisler, Tremaine & Bahcall 1985; Girardi et al. 1993; Lubin & Bahcall 1993; Carlberg et al. 1997), the caustic method measuring the escape velocity of galaxies (e.g. Diaferio & Geller 1997; Diaferio 1999) and Jeans analysis (e.g. Lokas & Mamon 2003; Mamon, Biviano & Boué 2013). Recent cluster surveys have enabled new studies of the relation between velocity dispersion and other cluster mass proxies, including optical richness (e.g. Becker et al. 2007; Andreon & Hurn 2010 based on SDSS), Sunyaev–Zel’dovich effect (e.g. Rines, Geller & Diaferio 2010 based on HeCS and Sifón et al. 2013 based on ACT) and X-ray luminosity or temperature (e.g. Zhang et al. 2011 based on HIFLUGCS and Rines et al. 2013 based on HeCS). With the current observational resources, most of these studies focus on a few tens of clusters with $\sim 100$ member galaxies for each cluster, i.e. $\sim 10,000$ spectra in total. These samples are often limited by statistics; upcoming deep, wide spectroscopic surveys such as Euclid (Laureijs et al. 2011), Subaru Prime Focus Spectrograph (Ellis et al. 2012), and BigBOSS1 will allow more detailed study of how dynamical masses relate to other mass proxies.

On the theoretical side, the virial scaling relation between halo mass and the velocity dispersion of dark matter (DM) has been established at high precision using simulation ensembles (Evrard et al. 2008). The dynamics of galaxies, however, may be different from that of the DM due to a number of physical processes, such as dynamical friction, tidal stripping and disruption, mergers and hydrodynamic drag by the gas in the cluster. This ‘velocity bias’ of galaxies with respect to DM has been explored with ever improving simulations and cluster galaxy models (e.g. Carlberg, Couchman
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& Thomas 1990; Carlberg 1994; Evrard, Summers & Davis 1994; Summers, Davis & Evrard 1995; Frenk et al. 1996; Colín, Klypin & Kravtsov 2000; Ghigna et al. 2000; Diemand, Moore & Stadel 2004; Gao et al. 2004; Gill et al. 2004; Faltenbacher & Diemand 2006; Lau, Nagai & Kravtsov 2010; Munari et al. 2013). However, discrepancies in the measured velocity bias exist among simulations with different numerical treatments and different galaxy tracers (see Section 3 for a review). A principal goal of this paper is to demonstrate the origin of these differences and to show that a consistent picture appears to be emerging when state-of-the-art galaxy tracers are used.

In this work, we focus on the velocity dispersion of galaxies in massive clusters, using the N-body simulation suite RHAPSODY and the hydrodynamical simulation MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER. We study the velocity bias using various galaxy tracers in both simulations and compare with results in the literature. Using the rich galaxy statistics from RHAPSODY, we quantify statistically the virial scaling relation obtained from different galaxy populations. We then compare the dynamical structure of galaxies in both simulations.

We note that the 3D effects presented in this work will be complicated by the projection effect in observations, which both increases scatter and introduces potential biases in cluster mass estimates (e.g. Biviano et al. 2006; Cohn et al. 2007; Wojtak et al. 2007; Mamon, Biviano & Murante 2010; White, Cohn & Smit 2010; Cohn 2012; Gifford & Miller 2013; Gifford, Miller & Kern 2013; Saro et al. 2013). Here, we focus on quantifying the theoretical uncertainty in the intrinsic velocity structure of clusters in order to pave the way for future studies that incorporate observational complications.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the simulation data and the galaxy tracers used in this work. Section 3 compares the velocity bias results in this work and in the literature and presents a converging picture. Section 4 discusses the virial scaling calibrated from galaxies. In Section 5, we explore in detail the velocity structure of cluster galaxies to better understand the physical processes causing velocity bias. In Section 6, we compare the velocity structures in N-body and hydrodynamical simulations. We conclude in Section 7.

## 2 SIMULATIONS

In this work, we use a suite of zoom-in DM simulations of galaxy clusters called RHAPSODY and a cosmological box from the hydrodynamical simulation MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER. The simulation parameters are summarized in Table 1. Although these two sets of simulations are based on slightly different cosmological parameters (see below), we expect that the impact on our results is negligible because Evrard et al. (2008) have demonstrated that the virial scaling is insensitive to cosmology.

### 2.1 Pure dark matter N-body simulation: RHAPSODY

The RHAPSODY simulation (Wu et al. 2013a) is a statistical sample of high-resolution N-body re-simulations of galaxy clusters, designed for studying the scatter of the observable–mass relation, a property essential for precision cosmology. The main sample includes 96 haloes at $z = 0$ with virial masses lying in a narrow range, $\log_{10}M_{\text{vir}} = 14.8 \pm 0.05$, re-simulated from a 1 $h^{-1}$ Gpc volume. The mass resolution is $1.3 \times 10^{8} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ (equivalent to 8192 particles in this volume), and the gravitational softening length is 3.3 $h^{-1}$ kpc. In addition to haloes at $z = 0$, we include 8142 most massive progenitors of them at 85 discrete redshifts up to $z = 2$ to calibrate the virial scaling relation.

The RHAPSODY simulation is based on the MUSIC code (Hahn & Abel 2011) to generate the multiscale initial condition, the public version of GADGET-2 (Springel 2005) to perform the gravitational evolution, the ROCKSTAR (Behroozi, Wechsler & Wu 2013a) phase-space halo finder to identify haloes and subhaloes, and the gravitationally consistent merger tree code (Behroozi et al. 2013b) to track the evolution history for haloes and subhaloes. The key properties of the main haloes and subhaloes in this sample have been presented in Wu et al. (2013a) and Wu et al. (2013b), respectively.

The cosmological parameters used in RHAPSODY are based on a flat $\Lambda$ cold dark matter cosmology: $\Omega_{M} = 0.25$, $\Omega_{b} = 0.04$, $h = 0.7$, $\sigma_{8} = 0.8$ and $n_{s} = 1$.

### 2.2 Hydrodynamical simulation: MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER

The MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER is a new suite of hydrodynamical simulations that aim for multiwavelength studies of galaxy clusters (Dolag et al., in preparation). This work is based on Box 3 of that suite, a cosmological volume with a side length $128 h^{-1}$ Mpc and $2 \times 576^{3}$ particles. The mass of DM particles is $6.9 \times 10^{8} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ and the mass of smoothed particle hydrodynamics (SPH) gas particles is $1.4 \times 10^{8} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$. The gravitational softening length is $5 h^{-1}$ kpc. This work uses the 46 haloes with $M_{\text{vir}} > 10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot}$ in this volume.

MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER uses the smoothed particle magnetohyrodynamics code p-GADGET3 (XXL), which includes star formation and chemical enrichment, active galactic nuclei (AGN) feedback, thermal conduction, passive magnetic fields and magnetic dissipation. The subhaloes and galaxies in this simulation are identified with L-SUBFIND, presented in Dolag et al. (2009). In brief, L-SUBFIND improves upon the original SUBFIND code (Springel et al. 2001) to apply to DM, stellar and gas particles. It identifies friends-of-friends structures based on DM particles, associates star and gas particles to the nearest DM particles and calculates the SPH kernel density for each species separately. The unbinding procedure takes into account the internal thermal energy of gas particles. The centres of subhaloes are chosen to be at the local minimum of the gravitational potential.

The cosmological parameters used in MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER are based on Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe 7 (Komatsu

Table 1. Simulations used in this work.

| Type         | Name               | Mass res. $(10^{8} h^{-1} M_{\odot})$ | Force res. $(h^{-1} \text{ kpc})$ | $N_{\text{halo}}$ @ $z = 0$ | $M_{\text{halo}}$ $(10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot})$ |
|--------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| N-body       | RHAPSODY           | 1.3                                  | 3.3                             | 96 (at $z = 0$)             | 6.3 ± 0.48                      |
|              |                    |                                      |                                 | 8142 (at $0 \leq z \leq 2$) | 2.85 ± 1.99                    |
| Hydro        | MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER | 6.9 (DM)                           | 5                               | 46 (at $z = 0$)             | >1                               |
|              | PATHFINDER         | 1.4 (gas)                            |                                 |                             |                                  |

2 http://www.mpa-garching.mpg.de/~kdolag/Simulations/
et al. 2011): $\Omega_M = 0.272$, $\Omega_b = 0.0456$, $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.728$, $h = 0.704$, $\sigma_8 = 0.809$ and $n_s = 0.963$.

2.3 Galaxy tracers in simulations

We consider a rank-ordered list of subhaloes in a halo as a proxy for a rank-ordered list of cluster galaxies. For the RHAPSODY simulation, subhaloes are ranked by their maximum circular velocity of DM, $v_{\text{max}} = \max[\sqrt{GM(<r)/r}]$, at two different epochs: an instantaneous value, $v_0$, which denotes the value of $v_{\text{max}}$ evaluated at $z = 0$; $v_{pk}$, the peak value of $v_{\text{max}}$ over its prior history. Ranking subhaloes by $v_{pk}$ is known to be superior to $v_0$ ranking when comparing to mass- or luminosity-selected samples of galaxies; for example, recent analysis by Reddick et al. (2013) has shown that the $v_{pk}$ prescription reproduces observed galaxy clustering in the local Universe with remarkable fidelity (also see, e.g., Nagai & Kravtsov 2005; Conroy, Wechsler & Kravtsov 2006; Wetzel et al. 2013).

For the MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER simulation, we employ both $v_0$ (derived from all mass components) and the stellar mass in subhaloes at $z = 0$ for ranking galaxies. Because cooling and star formation creates a more core-dominated subhalo structure in hydrodynamical simulations, we will see that using $v_0$ in MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER produces results consistent with those using the stellar mass, and also consistent with those using $v_{pk}$ in RHAPSODY.

Our notation and a summary of these galaxy tracers are given in Table 2.

### Table 2. Summary of galaxy tracer populations.

| Label       | Proxy of |
|-------------|----------|
| N-body-$v_0$ | Subhalo mass in N-body sims |
| N-body-$v_{pk}$ | Galaxy luminosity in N-body sims |
| Hydro-$v_0$  | Subhalo mass in hydro sims |
| Hydro-$M_{\text{star}}$ | Galaxy stellar mass in hydro sims |

3 VELOCITY BIAS: A CONVERGING PICTURE

The 3D velocity dispersion of a group of $N$ objects (DM particles or galaxies) in a system can be defined as

$$\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} ||v_i - \bar{v}||^2,$$

(1)

where $v_i$ denotes the 3D velocity of the $i$th object and $\bar{v}$ denotes the mean velocity of these $N$ objects.

This difference between the velocity dispersion of galaxies ($\sigma_{\text{gal}}$) and that of DM ($\sigma_{\text{DM}}$) can be quantified by velocity bias, defined as

$$b_v = \frac{\sigma_{\text{gal}}}{\sigma_{\text{DM}}}.$$

(2)

When we calculate $\sigma_{\text{DM}}$, we use all particles within $R_{\text{vir}}$ around the central halo, which also corresponds to the brightest cluster galaxy (BCG) in our modelling. When we calculate $\sigma_{\text{gal}}$, we use all galaxies except for the BCG within $R_{\text{vir}}$. Here $R_{\text{vir}}$ is the radius encompassing the overdensity $\Delta_{\text{vir}}$ calculated from a spherical collapse model (Gunn & Gott 1972). We employ the fitting function of Bryan & Norman (1998).

In each calculation, $\bar{v}$ corresponds to the mean velocity of the particular population in question rather than the bulk velocity of the halo or the velocity of the BCG. This choice gives the minimal velocity dispersion and is presumably the closest to reality.

3.1 Velocity bias of different galaxy tracers

Fig. 1 compares our results of velocity bias (left-hand panel) with results from the literature (right-hand panel). Let us first focus on the left-hand panel, which presents $b_v$ as a function of $N$, the number of brightest galaxies or most massive subhaloes used to measure $\sigma_{\text{gal}}$. The red/orange curve corresponds to N-body-$v_0$/N-body-$v_{pk}$, while the green/blue curve corresponds to Hydro-$v_0$/Hydro-$M_{\text{star}}$.

![Figure 1. Velocity bias based on various simulations and galaxy tracers. The curves are the results of this work, showing how velocity bias depends on the number of brightest galaxies used to estimate the velocity dispersion. Subhaloes in N-body simulations (red) show substantial velocity bias, while galaxies modelled from N-body and hydro simulations (orange and blue) have a smaller velocity bias. Using $v_{pk}$ as a luminosity proxy in the N-body simulation gives similar results as using $v_0$ and $M_{\text{star}}$ in the hydro simulation.](https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-abstract/436/1/460/973563)
We present the mean $b_v$ of the $z = 0$ sample and the error on the mean. The grey dashed curve corresponds to selecting $N$ random DM particles for measuring the velocity dispersion, reflecting the bias inherent to measuring $\sigma$ with finite $N$.

When the number of galaxies is low, the velocity bias is less than 1 and slightly below the value expected from randomly sampled particles (although $N$-body-$v_{0}$ and Hydro-$v_{0}$ are consistent with the random case). This indicates that the brightest galaxies tend to be slower than DM particles and suggests a strong influence of dynamical friction (see e.g. Goto 2005 for observational evidence). On the other hand, when the number of galaxies is high, the velocity bias becomes greater than 1. This can be explained by the inclusion of fainter galaxies/low-mass subhaloes into the sample. The slow faint galaxies tend to be tidally disrupted or merge with the BCG, so that the surviving galaxies tend to be a fast population, thus biasing the velocity dispersion. We will further investigate how velocity bias depends on galaxy luminosity in Section 5.

We note that using $N$-body-$v_{0}$ tends to overestimate $b_v$, indicating that by using $v_{0}$ the sample of kinematic tracers becomes biased since strongly stripped, early accreted subhaloes drop out of the sample. These drop outs tend to be slow, thus the velocity dispersion is increased. Comparing $v_{0}$ in both cases, we note that Hydro-$v_{0}$ has lower velocity bias, indicating that subhaloes are less prone to stripping and disruption in the hydro simulation than in the DM simulation. In fact, Hydro-$v_{0}$ behaves more similar to $N$-body-$v_{pk}$ at high $N$. Although the clusters in $N$-body and hydro simulations have different masses (as indicated in Table 1), we note that the results here are roughly independent of halo mass and redshift, which will be shown in Fig. 2. In Table 3, we compare $b_v$ from these four galaxy/subhalo populations.

### 3.2 Comparison with the results in the literature

The right-hand panel of Fig. 1 shows the comparison between our results and the following results from the literature: (1) Diemand et al. (2004, D04) and Faltenbacher & Diemand (2006, F06); (2) Lau et al. (2010) and (3) Munari et al. (2013). These results are representative of the diversity of the predictions from different simulations, which can usually be put into one of these four categories.

(i) **Subhaloes from dark matter $N$-body simulations** (marked as red). The velocities of ‘resolved’ subhaloes are used to compute the velocity dispersion, and subhaloes are selected based on their current mass or $v_{0}$ (like our $N$-body-$v_{0}$). These samples show $b_v > 1$, but the value of $b_v$ depends on the resolution of the simulation and the criterion of subhalo selection (e.g. Colin et al. 2000; Diemand et al. 2004; Faltenbacher & Diemand 2006). Increasing the resolution tends to reduce the velocity bias, indicating that the positive velocity bias can be a result of overmerging, which tends to remove slow and less massive subhaloes.

(ii) **Galaxies inferred from dark matter $N$-body simulations** (marked as orange). There are two common methods to predict the galaxy properties from DM $N$-body simulations. The first method is entirely based on resolved subhaloes and assigning galaxy luminosity based on the subhalo mass before accretion (like our $N$-body-$v_{pk}$). We find that $N$-body-$v_{pk}$ leads to smaller $b_v$ than $N$-body-$v_{0}$, indicating that the most massive subhaloes and the brightest galaxies in a cluster are two populations with different dynamical properties. The former population tends to exclude the highly stripped subhaloes, which have been accreted early and have slow velocities, and include the recently accreted subhaloes, which still have high $v_{0}$ and high orbital velocities (e.g. Gao et al. 2004). The second method is to apply semi-analytic models (SAMs) for galaxy formation and to track galaxies using their ‘most bound particles’ after their subhaloes are disrupted. In this case, $b_v$ is greatly reduced because a fraction of the galaxies, by construction, have the same velocities as DM particles. For example, Faltenbacher & Diemand (2006) have found such a trend between their two samples based on subhaloes and most bound particles (red and orange triangles; also see, e.g. Gao et al. 2004; Faltenbacher et al. 2005; Sales et al. 2007). While using this method, one should caution that SAMs do not always reproduce the observed galaxy number density profile at small radii (e.g. Budzynski et al. 2012).

(iii) **Subhaloes in hydrodynamical simulations** (marked as green). This is mainly used to compare with category (i) to illustrate the impact of baryonic physics. We use resolved subhaloes in the hydro simulation based on the mass proxy $v_{0}$ (Hydro-$v_{0}$), and its $b_v$ is lower than $N$-body-$v_{0}$ but similar to $N$-body-$v_{pk}$. This indicates that subhaloes in the hydro simulation are more resistant to stripping than their counterparts in $N$-body simulations, because of the star particles condensed in the centre of subhaloes. This result also implies that $v_{0}$ in the hydro simulation behaves similar to $v_{pk}$ in the DM simulation. However, simulations with different baryonic physics have reported various values. In the right-hand panel, we show various results from Lau et al. (2010) and Munari et al. (2013), which include simulations with ‘NR’ (non-radiative, open triangles), ‘CSF’ (cooling and star formation, circles) and ‘AGN’

### Table 3. Mean velocity bias of different galaxy tracer populations.

| Tracer          | $b_v$ for $N = 5$   | $b_v$ for $N = 100$ |
|-----------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| $N$-body-$v_0$  | 1.018 ± 0.013       | 1.119 ± 0.005       |
| $N$-body-$v_{pk}$ | 0.899 ± 0.012       | 1.038 ± 0.004       |
| Hydro-$v_0$     | 0.975 ± 0.018       | 1.066 ± 0.007       |
| Hydro-$M_{star}$| 0.949 ± 0.017       | 1.057 ± 0.006       |
| Random          | 0.978               | 0.999               |
(feedback from active galactic nuclei, squares). In general, ‘NR’ processes tend to give results very similar to pure DM simulations because these simulations tend to produce puffy subhaloes which are prone to stripping; ‘CSF’ can reduce the velocity bias because it can produce stellar cores; ‘AGN’ again brings up velocity bias because the core density is reduced. The results could still vary based on the implementation of the feedback. We note that these different feedback processes can also alter the density profile of the main halo and thus \(\sigma_{\text{DM}}\); for example, CSF tends to generate a high-density stellar core, while AGN tends to reduce the core density (e.g. Dubois et al. 2011; Martizzi et al. 2012).

(iv) Galaxies in hydrodynamical simulations (marked as blue). Hydrodynamical simulations with star formation prescriptions can directly predict the properties of galaxies. These galaxies have been consistently shown to have very small velocity bias. We note that \(b_v\) from Hydro-M\(_{\text{star}}\) is slightly smaller than that of Hydro-\(v_0\). We also show results from Lau et al. (2010, CSF) and Munari et al. (2013, CSF and AGN) as blue points. However, it is still computationally prohibitive to generate a statistical sample of high-resolution cluster galaxies with an adequate span of the range of plausible recipes for baryonic physics to minimize both the statistical and systematic errors.

Fig. 1 shows a convincing picture for the velocity bias obtained from simulations based on different techniques. Combining our measurements from \(N\)-body-\(v_{\text{pk}}\), Hydro-\(v_0\) and Hydro-M\(_{\text{star}}\), as well as the \(b_v\) values from SAM, CSF and AGN in the literature [i.e. the orange, blue and green points (excluding NR) and curves, from which we take the value at high \(N\)] leads to 1.065 \(\pm\) 0.005 (stat) \(\pm\) 0.027 (sys), where the statistical error is the error on the weighted mean, while the systematic error is the weighted sample variance among different measurements. The same calculation for \(N = 5\) gives 0.868 \(\pm\) 0.039 (stat) \(\pm\) 0.035 (sys).

While we were finalizing this manuscript we learned of the related work by Old, Gray & Pearce (2013). They use a semi-analytic treatment to trace galaxies and find values of \(b_v\) below unity at the bright end that are consistent with our findings. They also see \(b_v\) increasing for faint galaxies, but do not find values \(b_v\) above unity. There are subtle differences between their analysis methods and ours which may be driving the faint-end differences. We note that: (1) the hydrodynamical simulations used here, which one can argue are the most realistic of the methods under discussion, show \(b_v = 1.06\) at \(N = 100\) and (2) taking a conservative sum of our systematic and statistical errors our findings are consistent with \(b_v\) of unity at the \(\sim 2\sigma\) level.

### 3.3 Redshift evolution

Fig. 2 shows the velocity bias at four different redshifts from the RHAPSODY simulation, using \(v_{\text{pk}}\) as a luminosity proxy, as a function of the number of brightest galaxies used. For high \(N\), the results are independent of redshift. For low \(N\), \(b_v\) has a slight trend with redshift; the brightest galaxies at high redshift tend to be slower than those at high redshift. This is plausibly explained by the effect of dynamical friction. Since haloes at different redshifts also have different masses, our finding here implies that this relation is independent of mass. We have explicitly verified this statement.

Munari et al. (2013) have shown that the velocity bias decreases at high redshift, which is in apparent disagreement with our findings. This difference could result from the different galaxy population we use; while we compare the same number of galaxies per halo across all redshifts, Munari et al. (2013) set constant thresholds for the dark mass of subhaloes \((10^9 M_\odot)\) and the stellar mass of galaxies \((3 \times 10^9 M_\odot)\) across all redshifts. This constant threshold will lead to fewer galaxies per cluster at high redshift. Since fewer galaxies can result in lower \(b_v\), this constant threshold can result in a smaller \(b_v\) at high redshift.

### 4 Virial Scaling from Cluster Galaxies

Fig. 3 presents the virial scaling between cluster mass and \(\sigma_{\text{gal}}\) measured with 10/30/100 brightest galaxies (red/green/blue), compared with \(\sigma_{\text{DM}}\) (black). We use 85 time steps between \(z = 0\) and 2 from the RHAPSODY simulation and use \(v_{\text{pk}}\) as the luminosity proxy, assuming that different evolutionary stages of the same haloes can provide a fair sample of the dynamical states. We justify this assumption by examining whether the virial scaling \((\sigma_{\text{DM}}-M_{\text{vir}}\text{ relation})\) of this sample agrees with previous results from the volume-limited sample of Evrard et al. (2008). The three colour curves represent the fit of the virial scaling relation using the 10/30/100 brightest galaxies in each halo, and the values of fitting parameters are given in Table 4. When we use the 10 brightest galaxies (red curve), the normalization is lower by \(\approx 3\) per cent. On the other hand, with 100 galaxies, the normalization is higher by \(\approx 3\) per cent.
0.0527), indicating that using multiple snapshots for each halo can provide a fair sample of the dynamical state of haloes.3

We now compare the virial scaling measured from different galaxy samples. The colour lines show the best-fitting linear relation, and Table 4 lists the best-fitting parameters of the following parametrization:

\[
\ln \sigma_{\text{gal}} = \ln \sigma_{\text{gal},15} + \alpha \ln \left[ M_{\text{vir}} E(z) f_{\text{vir}}^{1/2}(z) \right].
\]  

(5)

Using the 10 brightest galaxies to calibrate the scaling relation biases the normalization low by 3 per cent. When we use the 30 brightest galaxies, the normalization agrees almost perfectly with the results using DM particles. When we increase the number to 100, the normalization is higher by 3 per cent. This trend of normalization with galaxy number agrees with the trend of velocity bias presented in Fig. 1.

We note that these different selections of galaxies tend to give the same slope as using DM particles, 0.33. This result is contrary to the findings of Munari et al. (2013), who have found a slope of 0.36 for the virial scaling from subhaloes and galaxies. Again, this discrepancy could result from the different subhalo/galaxy population we use. While we use a constant number of galaxies per cluster, Munari et al. (2013) set constant mass thresholds for subhaloes and galaxies. For less massive haloes, galaxies above these thresholds are rare and relatively massive compared with the host halo; thus, these galaxies are prone to the effect of dynamical friction and become slower. Therefore, a constant galaxy mass threshold can cause \( b_\sigma < 1 \) for less massive haloes, thus leading to a steeper slope.

Finally, we compare the scatter, \( \sqrt{\langle \delta_{\text{in}}^2 \rangle}^{1/2} \), of each fit. We have shown above that the virial scaling based on DM particles presents a 5 per cent intrinsic scatter. If we choose a small number of galaxies \( N_{\text{gal}} \) to calculate the velocity dispersion, there is an additional statistical error ('shot noise'), presented in the last column of Table 3. We note that for the \( N_{\text{gal}} \) we considered here (10/30/100), the total scatter (0.14/0.09/0.07) is consistent with the combination of intrinsic scatter (0.05) and shot noise (0.13/0.07/0.040). Our values also bracket the values quoted in Munari et al. (2013) (their fig. 6).

We note that a 3 per cent bias in velocity dispersion corresponds to a 9 per cent bias in dynamical mass, which can be a dangerous source of systematic error if one uses spectroscopic follow-up for mass calibration for photometric cluster surveys (e.g. Wu, Rozo & Wechsler 2010). In addition, an accurate calibration of the scatter of the mass–observable distribution is essential for accounting for the Eddington/Malmquist bias of the cluster abundance and for interpreting the observed massive, distant clusters (e.g. Mortonson, Hu & Huterer 2011).

### Table 4. Fitting parameters in Fig. 3. The scatter of each fit agrees with the intrinsic scatter combined with the shot noise.

| \( N_{\text{gal}} \) | \( \sigma_{\text{gal},15} \) | \( \alpha \) | \( \sqrt{\langle \delta_{\text{in}}^2 \rangle} \) | shot noise |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----|-----------------|-----------|
| 10              | 1641 ± 32       | 0.34 ± 0.01 | 0.142           | 0.134     |
| 30              | 1716 ± 33       | 0.33 ± 0.01 | 0.092           | 0.073     |
| 100             | 1746 ± 34       | 0.32 ± 0.01 | 0.072           | 0.039     |
| DM              | 1692 ± 33       | 0.33 ± 0.01 | 0.053           | NA        |

3 Recently, Diemer, Kravtsov & More (2013) have shown that this virial scaling relation is robust regardless of the accretion rate, indicating that haloes tend to be in local Jeans equilibrium.

## 5 VELOCITY STRUCTURE OF CLUSTER GALAXIES

### 5.1 Dependence of velocity bias on radius and luminosity: a stacking analysis

Two major physical processes that can produce velocity bias in collisionless systems are dynamical friction and tidal disruption. Dynamical friction tends to slow down galaxies and make them approach \( b_\sigma \sim 1 \) (e.g. Boylan-Kolchin, Ma & Quataert 2008). Tidal disruption tends to occur in high-density regions and remove slow galaxies (e.g. Wetzel & White 2010), thus increasing velocity bias. We would like to disentangle these processes by examining the velocity bias as a function of galaxy luminosity and the distance to the cluster centre. To this end, we use the rich statistics of cluster galaxies in RHAPSODY to study their velocity structures, focusing on how the galaxy velocity depends on luminosity (modelled by \( v_{\text{pk}} \)) and its distance to cluster centre. We use 32 outputs between \( 0 \leq z \leq 0.5 \) and assume that the relation between luminosity and \( v_{\text{pk}} \) has negligible evolution in this redshift range.

Our stacking process is as follows. For a galaxy with velocity \( v_{\text{gal}} \) in a halo of velocity dispersion \( \sigma_{\text{vir}} \), we define

\[
\psi = \frac{v_{\text{gal}} - v_{\text{cen}}}{\sigma_{\text{vir}}},
\]  

(6)

where \( v_{\text{cen}} \) is the velocity of the BCG and \( \sigma_{\text{vir}} \) is the DM velocity dispersion of the host halo. The stacked velocity bias is given by

\[
b^\psi_{\text{stack}} = \frac{1}{N - 1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} ||\psi_i - \bar{\psi}||^2,
\]  

(7)

where \( N \) is the number of galaxies and \( \bar{\psi} \) is the mean of \( \psi \) in this stack of galaxies. This is analogous to equation (1) but takes into account the different masses of host haloes by dividing galaxy velocities by \( \sigma_{\text{vir}} \). Under this definition, the stacked velocity bias is the dispersion of velocity ratio, rather than the ratio of velocity dispersion.

Fig. 4 presents the stacked velocity bias profile of galaxies, binned by the luminosity proxy \( v_{\text{pk}} \) (colour curves). The velocity dispersion profile of DM is presented as the black curve. Beyond 0.5\( R_{\text{vir}} \), galaxy velocity is roughly unbiased. The brightest galaxies (blue) have slightly lower velocity bias, indicating that the effect of dynamical friction is stronger for brighter/more massive galaxies. On the other hand, at smaller radii, the faintest sample (red) shows the largest velocity bias, while the brightest sample shows the least velocity bias. This can be explained by the tidal disruption of faint galaxies, which is stronger at smaller radii, where the density is high. We note that Ludlow et al. (2009) have shown that in Milky Way-size haloes, the radial velocity dispersion profile of subhaloes depends on subhalo mass; low-mass subhaloes have higher velocity bias than high-mass subhaloes. This trend is consistent with our findings.

Fig. 5 shows another aspect of the radial and luminosity dependence of velocity bias. Galaxies are put into logarithmically spaced radial bins (5 bins per decade), as indicated by the legend. To focus on the local velocity bias, in the stacking process, galaxies in a radial bin are compared with the DM in the same radial bin; that is,

\[
\psi(r) = \frac{v_{\text{gal}} - v_{\text{cen}}}{\sigma_{\text{DM}}(r)}.
\]  

(8)

The x-axis indicates the luminosity proxy \( v_{\text{pk}} \), while the y-axis indicates the stacked velocity bias in for a given radial bin.
Figure 4. Velocity dispersion profile for DM (black curve) and cluster galaxies (colour curves) in RHAPSODY. Galaxies are binned by the luminosity proxy \( v_{pk} \). Galaxies in all three bins have higher velocity dispersion than DM particles within \( 0.5R_{\text{vir}} \). The red curve, which corresponds to the faintest galaxies, has the highest velocity bias.

Figure 5. Velocity bias for galaxies in RHAPSODY as a function of luminosity proxy \( v_{pk} \), binned by radius (different curves). Galaxies in the inner region of clusters (red and orange) tend to have the highest velocity bias, which can be caused by strong tidal stripping and disruption in this region. Brighter galaxies (larger \( v_{pk} \) values) tend to be slower due to dynamical friction. For faint galaxies (low \( v_{pk} \)), the inner radial bins (red, orange and yellow) show significant velocity bias with a clear trend with radius. At small radii, faint galaxies experience stronger tidal stripping and are more easily disrupted, and the surviving subhaloes tend to be the fast ones and have high-velocity bias. In addition, bright galaxies (high \( v_{pk} \)) tend to be slower than faint galaxies because they have been slowed down more by dynamical friction. At large radii, the dependence on luminosity is weak, because galaxies are still infalling and have not experienced dynamical friction for long.

Figure 6. The VDF for different galaxy populations. Here we highlight \( 0.1 < r/R_{\text{vir}} < 0.32 \), and different colour curves present different luminosity bins (modelled by \( v_{pk} \)). Bright galaxies have a highly negatively skewed VDF, with a heavy tail of slow galaxies. This trend indicates that the velocity dispersion inferred from bright galaxies near the cluster centre tend to be lower. We note that this trend is largely diminished at larger radii (grey dashed curves correspond to \( 0.32 < r/R_{\text{vir}} < 1 \)).

5.2 Velocity distribution function of cluster galaxies

In addition to the velocity dispersion, we would like to quantify the full velocity distribution function (VDF) of cluster galaxies to improve our understanding of the velocity structure of different galaxy populations. Fig. 6 presents the VDF of cluster galaxies from stacking the RHAPSODY sample (\( 0 \leq z \leq 0.5 \)), using \( v' \) as the scaled velocity of each galaxy. Galaxies are binned by the luminosity proxy \( v_{pk} \).

We have found that most radial ranges give very similar VDFs (an example is shown by the grey dashed curves), except for the radial range of \( 0.1 < r/R_{\text{vir}} < 0.32 \) (colour curves). At this radial range, bright galaxies show a highly negatively skewed VDF, with the presence of a slow population, reflecting the strong effect of dynamical friction in this regime. We note that this VDF tail is not caused by the BCG, which is excluded in this analysis. This trend does not exist at larger radii; for comparison, the greycash curves show the radial range of \( 0.32 < r/R_{\text{vir}} < 1 \), where different luminosity bins show similar VDFs.

Although this slow and luminous galaxy population is identified using galaxy tracers in N-body simulations, we note that this population also exists in hydro simulations, in which gas can further slow down these galaxies. This prediction is also robust with increased resolution, because this galaxy population corresponds to well-resolved subhaloes in the current simulation.

Finally, we caution that this slow population could potentially bias the dynamical mass measurements. When following up a cluster using spectroscopy, one tends to start from the brightest galaxies closest to the centre to reduce the impact of interlopers. Our results indicate that this strategy could bias the dynamical mass low. In addition to cluster mass calibration, we note that the VDF is also an important input in the Jeans analysis (e.g. Mamon et al. 2013) and in the modelling of redshift-space distortions of small-scale galaxy clustering (e.g. Tinker 2007). Therefore, an accurate
characterization of the cluster galaxy VDF is essential for both cluster counting and galaxy clustering experiments.

6 COMPARING DARK MATTER AND HYDRODYNAMICAL SIMULATIONS

In this section, we discuss how the velocity structure of cluster galaxies could be altered by baryonic physics. We compare the DM simulation RHAPSODY (z = 0 sample) with the hydro simulation MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER introduced in Section 2 in Table 1.

Fig. 7 compares the velocity dispersion profile of galaxies and DM particles in the N-body (red) and hydro (blue) simulations. Let us first compare the DM particles (dotted curves). In the N-body simulation, the velocity dispersion decreases towards the centre, which is expected from the Navarro–Frenk–White profile and is consistent with results from previous N-body simulations (e.g. Cole & Lacey 1996; Colín et al. 2000; Navarro et al. 2010). On the other hand, in the hydro simulation, the velocity dispersion stays nearly constant towards the centre. This flat velocity dispersion profile has also been seen in the BCGs in the MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER simulation, as well as for elliptical galaxies in several hydro simulations, in Remus et al. (2013). Possible explanations of this difference include (1) change in the density profile and (2) change in the kinematics with the implementation of baryonic physics. When we investigate the density profile, we find that the hydro simulation does not produce an artificial high-density core (which has been seen in CSF simulations), because the simulation includes the AGN feedback and avoids the overcooling problem (see e.g. Teyssier et al. 2011; Martizzi et al. 2012 on the effect of AGN feedback on the density profile). Newman et al. (2013) have also shown that hydro simulations with AGN feedback can reproduce the observed cluster density profiles better than those without. Therefore, the near-isothermal core is not due to a significant deviation of density in the core. On the other hand, the AGN feedback may increase the kinetic energy of the DM particles near the cluster centre and make it close to isothermal. Early work without AGN feedback does not show such a nearly isothermal velocity dispersion profile (see e.g. Rasia, Tormen & Moscardini 2004 for non-radiative hydrodynamical simulations). This clearly presents a question that deserves further investigation in the future.

We now turn to the comparison of the velocity dispersion of cluster galaxies. The blue solid curve corresponds to galaxies in the hydro simulation with $M_{\text{star}} > 10^9 h^{-1} M_\odot$, and the red solid curve corresponds to galaxies in the N-body simulation with $v_{\text{pk}} > 100 \text{ km s}^{-1}$; this choice is based on abundance matching between $v_{\text{pk}}$ and $M_{\text{star}}$ using cosmological simulations (Behroozi, private communication). To avoid the effect of the different galaxy number density profiles between the N-body and hydro simulations, we add another selection in the N-body simulation: the red dashed curve corresponds to selecting the same number of galaxies as in the hydro simulation at each radius. At smaller radii ($r < 0.5 R_{\text{vir}}$), galaxies in the DM simulation tend to be faster than those in the hydro simulation, which can be attributed to stronger tidal disruption in N-body simulations. In addition, faint galaxies are dominant in number in our sample and are more susceptible to tidal disruption. Interestingly, in the innermost region ($r < 0.1 R_{\text{vir}}$), the hydro simulation has faster DM particles but slower subhaloes compared with the N-body simulation in this region. We note that the shaded region indicates the halo-to-halo scatter (68 per cent interval). Although the scatter is large, the mean is robustly determined given our sample size. Therefore, the difference in the mean is significant.

We can see that the velocity bias is smaller in hydro simulations, i.e. the velocity of galaxies follow that of DM more closely. This can be attributed to two effects. First, in hydro simulations, the gas can exert a dragging force on to the galaxies that slows them down (e.g. Puchwein et al. 2005). Secondly, in hydro simulations, the cores of subhaloes are denser because of cooling and subsequent star formation in the centre; therefore, these subhaloes tend to survive longer than those in pure DM simulations. These longer lived subhaloes are also the slow population, which contributes to an overall lower velocity dispersion.

The second effect discussed above is related to the issue that subhaloes in pure DM simulations are often incomplete due to ‘overmerging’ when compared with subhaloes in hydrodynamical simulations with star formation (e.g. Klypin et al. 1999; Weinberg et al. 2008; Dolag et al. 2009). In semi-analytic galaxy formation models, galaxies can be traced after subhaloes disappear, either due to this overmerging effect or just due to the finite resolution; these are generally known as ‘orphan galaxies’ (e.g. Gao et al. 2004). Whether this overmerging problem has been completely resolved by either hydro simulations or SAMs is still an open question. Future implementations of hydro simulations and galaxy tracer models will need to be critically compared with and constrained by observations, including the observed satellite content and radial profiles of galaxies in groups and clusters (e.g. Budzynski et al. 2012; Tinker et al. 2012; Newman et al. 2013; Reddick et al. 2013).

7 SUMMARY

Using N-body and hydrodynamical simulations of galaxy clusters, we have studied the velocity bias of different galaxy tracers and the virial scaling calibrated from galaxies. In particular, we have used the rich statistics of subhaloes in the RHAPSODY N-body simulation in parallel with galaxies identified in the MAGNETICUM PATHFINDER hydrodynamical simulation to study the velocity structure of cluster galaxies. Our findings can be summarized as follows.
(i) Galaxy populations inferred from either $N$-body simulations with $v_{pk}$ as a luminosity proxy or hydrodynamical simulations show that the brightest cluster galaxies tend to underestimate, and faint galaxies slightly overestimate, the DM velocity dispersion. Our results indicate that selecting $\sim 30$ brightest cluster galaxies provide an approximately unbiased velocity dispersion.

(ii) Ranking subhaloes by their instantaneous circular velocity, $v_0$, in $N$-body simulations leads to a larger velocity bias incompatible with the other galaxy tracers. We demonstrate consistencies of our results with results in the literature that employ different tracer methods.

(iii) Velocity bias tends to be higher for fainter galaxies at smaller cluster radii, indicating the stronger effect of tidal disruption, which removes slow galaxies efficiently in high-density regions. Brighter galaxies are in general cooler, and we have identified that the brightest galaxies near the centre of a cluster (not the BCG) present a particularly slowly population, which is plausibly consistent with dynamical friction.

(iv) Comparing the hydrodynamical and $N$-body simulations, we have found that galaxy tracers in the former are less kinematically biased with respect to the DM. At small cluster radii, the DM in the hydro simulation has higher velocity dispersion than that in the $N$-body simulation, while the galaxies in the hydro simulations have lower velocity dispersion.

Current and near-future observed cluster samples with dense spectroscopy will be able to test for the differential effect from bright to faint magnitudes expected from simulations. Stacked sample analysis, such as has been done recently by Skelboe et al. (2012) to detect spatial velocity anisotropy, offers an attractive method to boost signal-to-noise ratio. We remark that understanding the intrinsic dynamical properties of simulated galaxy tracers is important for using simulations to study observational complications such as projection effects and member galaxy selection (e.g. Gifford & Miller 2013; Gifford et al. 2013; Saro et al. 2013). In addition, the velocities of galaxies are essential for modelling the small-scale redshift-space distortions in galaxy redshift surveys. An accurate calibration of velocity bias will improve the usage of small-scale clustering information to constrain cosmological parameters (e.g., Wu & Huterer 2013; Zu & Weinberg 2013).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Dragan Huterer, Elena Rasia, Chris Miller and Dan Gifford for helpful discussions, and Peter Behroozi for providing the relationship between $M_{\text{star}}$ and $v_{pk}$ for the model used here. We also thank Eduardo Rozo, Erwin Lau, Raul Angulo, and the anonymous referee for helpful suggestions. HW acknowledges the support by the US Department of Energy under contract number DE-FG02-95ER40899. OH acknowledges support from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) through the Ambizione fellowship. KD acknowledges the support by the DFG Cluster of Excellence ‘Origin and Structure of the Universe’. This work received support from programme number HST-AR-12650.01-A, provided by NASA through a grant from the Space Telescope Science Institute, which is operated by the Association of Universities for Research in Astronomy, Inc., under NASA contract NAS5-26555. The RHAPSODY simulations were run using computational resources at SLAC and supported by the US Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-76SF00515 to SLAC.

REFERENCES

Andreon S., Hurn M. A., 2010, MNRAS, 404, 1922
Becker M. R. et al., 2007, ApJ, 669, 905
Behroozi P. S., Wechsler R. H., Wu H.-Y., 2013a, ApJ, 762, 109
Behroozi P. S., Wechsler R. H., Wu H.-Y., Busha M. T., Klypin A. P., Primack J. R., 2013b, ApJ, 763, 18
Biviano A., Murante G., Borgani S., Diaferio A., Dolag K., Girardi M., 2006, A&A, 456, 23
Boylan-Kolchin M., Ma C.-P., Quataert E., 2008, MNRAS, 383, 93
Bryan G. L., Norman M. L., 1998, ApJ, 495, 80
Budzynski J. M., Koposov S. E., McCarthy I. G., McGee S. L., Belokurov V., 2012, MNRAS, 423, 104
Carlberg R. G., 1994, ApJ, 433, 468
Carlberg R. G., Couchman H. M. P., Thomas P. A., 1990, ApJ, 352, L29
Carlberg R. G. et al., 1997, ApJ, 476, L7
Cohn J. D., 2012, MNRAS, 419, 1017
Cohn J. D., Evrard A. E., White M., Croton D., Ellingson E., 2007, MNRAS, 382, 1738
Cole S., Lacey C., 1996, MNRAS, 281, 716
Colin P., Klypin A. A., Kravtsov A. V., 2000, ApJ, 539, 561
Conroy C., Wechsler R. H., Kravtsov A. V., 2006, ApJ, 647, 201
Danese L., de Zotti G., di Tullio G., 1980, A&A, 82, 322
Diaferio A., 1999, MNRAS, 309, 610
Diaferio A., Geller M. J., 1997, ApJ, 481, 633
Diemand J., Moore B., Stadel J., 2004, MNRAS, 352, 353 (D04)
Diemer B., Kravtsov A. V., Moore S., 2013, preprint (arXiv:1306.3165)
Dolag K., Borgani S., Murante G., Springel V., 2009, MNRAS, 399, 497
Dubois Y., Devriendt J., Teyssier R., Slyz A., 2011, MNRAS, 417, 1853
Ellis R. et al., 2012, preprint (arXiv:1206.0737)
Evrard A. E., Summers F. J., Davis M., 1994, ApJ, 422, 11
Evrard A. E. et al., 2008, ApJ, 672, 122
Faltenbacher A., Diemand J., 2006, MNRAS, 369, 1698 (F06)
Faltenbacher A., Kravtsov A. V., Nagai D., Gottlöber S., 2005, MNRAS, 359, 139
Frenk C. S., Evrard A. E., White S. D. M., Summers F. J., 1996, ApJ, 472, 460
Gao L., De Lucia G., White S. D. M., Jenkins A., 2004, MNRAS, 352, L1
Ghigna S., Moore B., Governato F., Lake G., Quinn T., Stadel J., 2000, ApJ, 544, 616
Gifford D., Miller C., Kern N., 2013, ApJ, 773, 116
Gill S. P. D., Knebe A., Gibson B. K., Dopita M. A., 2004, MNRAS, 351, 410
Girardi M., Biviano A., Giuricin G., Mardirossian F., Mezzetti M., 1993, ApJ, 404, 38
Goto T., 2005, MNRAS, 359, 1415
Gunn J. E., Gott J. R., III, 1972, ApJ, 176, 1
Hahn O., Abel T., 2011, MNRAS, 415, 2101
Heisler J., Tremaine S., Bahcall J. N., 1985, ApJ, 298, 8
Klypin A., Gottlöber S., Kravtsov A. V., Khokhlov A. M., 1999, ApJ, 516, 530
Komatsu E. et al., 2011, ApJS, 192, 18
Lau E. T., Nagai D., Kravtsov A. V., 2010, ApJ, 708, 1419
Laureijs R. et al., 2013, preprint (arXiv:1110.3193)
Lokas E. L., Mamon G. A., 2003, MNRAS, 343, 401
Lubin L. M., Bahcall N. A., 1993, ApJ, 415, L17
Ludlow A. D., Navarro J. F., Springel V., Jenkins A., Frenk C. S., Helm A., 2009, ApJ, 692, 931
Mamon G. A., Biviano A., Murante G., 2010, A&A, 520, A30
Mamon G. A., Biviano A., Boué G., 2013, MNRAS, 429, 3079
Martizzi D., Teyssier R., Moore B., Wenzt T., 2012, MNRAS, 422, 3081
Mortonson M. J., Hu W., Huterer D., 2011, Phys. Rev. D, 83, 032015
Munari E., Biviano A., Borgani S., Murante G., Fabjan D., 2013, MNRAS, 430, 2638
Nagai D., Kravtsov A. V., 2005, ApJ, 618, 557
Navarro J. F. et al., 2010, MNRAS, 402, 21
Velocity bias

Newman A. B., Treu T., Ellis R. S., Sand D. J., Nipoti C., Richard J., Jullo E., 2013, ApJ, 765, 24
Old L., Gray M. E., Pearce F. R., 2013, MNRAS, 434, 2606
Puchwein E., Bartelmann M., Dolag K., Meneghetti M., 2005, A&A, 442, 405
Rasia E., Tormen G., Moscardini L., 2004, MNRAS, 351, 237
Reddick R. M., Wechsler R. H., Tinker J. L., Behroozi P. S., 2013, ApJ, 771, 30
Remus R.-S., Burkert A., Dolag K., Johansson P. H., Naab T., Oser L., Thomas J., 2013, ApJ, 766, 71
Rines K., Geller M. J., Diaferio A., 2010, ApJ, 715, L180
Rines K., Geller M. J., Diaferio A., Kurtz M. J., 2013, ApJ, 767, 15
Sales L. V., Navarro J. F., Lambas D. G., White S. D. M., Croton D. J., 2007, MNRAS, 382, 1901
Saro A., Mohr J. J., Bazin G., Dolag K., 2013, ApJ, 772, 47
Sifón C. et al., 2013, ApJ, 772, 25
Skielboe A., Wojtak R., Pedersen K., Rozo E., Rykoff E. S., 2012, ApJ, 758, L16
Springel V., 2005, MNRAS, 364, 1105
Springel V., White S. D. M., Tormen G., Kauffmann G., 2001, MNRAS, 328, 726
Summers F. J., Davis M., Evrard A. E., 1995, ApJ, 454, 1
Teyssier R., Moore B., Martizzi D., Dubois Y., Mayer L., 2011, MNRAS, 414, 195
Tinker J. L., 2007, MNRAS, 374, 477
Tinker J. L., George M. R., Leauthaud A., Bundy K., Finoguenov A., Massey R., Rhodes J., Wechsler R. H., 2012, ApJ, 755, L5
Weinberg D. H., Colombi S., Davé R., Katz N., 2008, ApJ, 678, 6
Wetzel A. R., White M., 2010, MNRAS, 403, 1072
Wetzel A. R., Tinker J. L., Conroy C., van den Bosch F. C., 2013, MNRAS, 432, 336
White M., Cohn J. D., Smit R., 2010, MNRAS, 408, 1818
Wojtak R., Lokas E. L., Mamon G. A., Gottlöber S., Prada F., Moles M., 2007, A&A, 466, 437
Wu H.-Y., Huterer D., 2013, MNRAS, 434, 2556
Wu H.-Y., Rozo E., Wechsler R. H., 2010, ApJ, 713, 1207
Wu H.-Y., Hahn O., Wechsler R. H., Mao Y.-Y., Behroozi P. S., 2013a, ApJ, 763, 70
Wu H.-Y., Hahn O., Wechsler R. H., Behroozi P. S., Mao Y.-Y., 2013b, ApJ, 767, 23
Yahil A., Vidal N. V., 1977, ApJ, 214, 347
Zhang Y.-Y., Andernach H., Caretta C. A., Reiprich T. H., Böhringer H., Puchwein E., Sijacki D., Girardi M., 2011, A&A, 526, A105
Zu Y., Weinberg D. H., 2013, MNRAS, 431, 3319

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