Mass loss of galaxies in galaxy clusters

Graeme Candlish

Instituto de Física y Astronomía, Universidad de Valparaíso, Valparaíso, Chile

Gravitational interactions in groups and clusters

- Galaxy-galaxy interactions:
 - Mergers (Toomre & Toomre 1972; Di Matteo

et al. 2007; Angulo et al. 2009)

• Harassment (Moore et al. 1998, 1999;

Gnedin et al. 2003)



Gravitational interactions in groups and clusters

- Galaxy-cluster interactions:
 - Truncation of dark matter halos (Limousin et al. 2009; Gao et al. 2004; Warnick et. al. 2008)
 - Induce central starbursts (Byrd & Valtonen, 2001)
 - Trigger bar instabilities, enhanced spiral structure (Lokas et al. 2016;

Semczuk et al. 2017)



Tidal mass loss in combined group/cluster environments

- Approximately 25%-45% of cluster galaxies are accreted within groups. (McGee et. al. 2009, De Lucia et. al. 2012)
- Increasing evidence for *pre-processing* of cluster galaxies (Mihos 2004, Haines et. al. 2015, Jaff et. al. 2016)

- Choque, Smith, Candlish, et al., submitted to MNRAS
- Cosmological simulation (Warnick & Knebe 2006), halos used to analyse group/group-member mass loss.



Nelvy Choque

- "Group": contains at least one bound halo within 2*R*_{vir}
- "Group member": within halo and contains no subhalos.
- Group member halos classified as:
 - Survivor: persists until z = 0.
 - Escaper: unbound from host halo.
 - Destroyed: mass drops below resolution limit.



frame title



Tidal mass loss in combined group/cluster environments



Group mass loss not significantly different between subsamples.

Subhalos close to group virial radius more easily stripped.



Rhee, Smith, ..., Jaffé, Candlish, et. al., submitted to MNRAS Spatial res 760 pc/h, mass res $8 \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$ for DM, physics as for Dubois et al. (2012, Horizon-AGN) See also: Oman et al. (2013), Haines et al. (2015), Oman & Hudson (2016), Jaffé et al. (2015, 2016)

Phase-space analysis in the group and cluster environment





Phase-space analysis in the group and cluster environment



Weak dependence on both cluster mass and galaxy (subhalo) mass.

- Galaxy groups tend to release more tidally damaged subhalos into the cluster environment.
- Projected phase-space diagrams: reconstruction of galaxy orbital histories thanks to approximate separation of populations.
- Almost linear relationship between tidal mass loss and time in cluster \Rightarrow distinct mass loss regions.

Choque, Smith, Candlish et al., submitted to MNRAS Rhee, Smith, ..., Candlish et al., submitted to ApJ

- Data from AHF halo finder applied to zoom cosmological simulations (Warnick & Knebe 2006).
- Eight clusters, roughly Virgo mass $(1 3 \times 10^{14} h^{-1} M_{\odot})$.
- Force resolution of \sim 0.2 kpc/h, mass resolution of \sim 1.6 \times 10⁸ $h^{-1} M_{\odot}$.
- Lowest mass of halo considered is $\sim 3 imes 10^9 M_{\odot}$ (20 particles)

- Cosmological zoom simulations in RAMSES.
- Force resolution of 760 pc/h, mass resolution of $8 \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$ for DM.
- Hydrodynamics: cooling, star formation, AGN, SN feedback (following Dubois et. al. (2012), Horizon-AGN simulations)

- Minimum halo mass of $3 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ corresponds to stellar mass of $\sim 10^7 M_{\odot}$ (by halo abundance matching).
- Fractional tidal mass loss: $f_{ML} = 1 \frac{M_{now}}{M_{peak}}$
- Pre-processing stronger for more recent infallers: median $f_{ext}/f_{ML} = 0.27$ (total sample), median $f_{ext}/f_{ML} = 0.15$ ($t_{inf} > 6$ Gyr).

Further details: phase-space analysis



Further details: phase-space analysis



