

Final Review

Orbital anisotropy

general mass estimator:

$$M(r) = \frac{r \sigma_r^2}{G} (\gamma_* + \gamma_\sigma - 2\beta)$$

$$\gamma_* = - \frac{d \ln n_*}{d \ln r} \quad \text{logarithmic slope of tracer density profile } n_*(r)$$

$$\gamma_\sigma = - \frac{d \ln \sigma_r^2}{d \ln r} \quad \text{logarithmic slope of } [3D, \text{ not line of sight}] \text{ radial velocity dispersion profile } \sigma^2(r)$$

$$\beta = 1 - \frac{\sigma_t^2}{\sigma_r^2} \quad \text{anisotropy parameter}$$

ratio of tangential vs radial motion

β can be a fun of radius
Measured kinetic energy in rotation vs. that in pressure support

Isotropy ($\beta=0$) implicitly assumed in most virial analyses

Luminosity function

Schechter fun:
$$\Phi(L) = \Phi_* e^{-L/L_*} \left(\frac{L}{L_*}\right)^\alpha$$

w/ characteristic density Φ_* , luminosity L_* , & limit and slope α

Integrated luminosity density
$$j = \Phi_* L_*^\alpha \Gamma(\alpha+2)$$

Λ CDM predicted mass fun has steep slope $\alpha \approx -1.9$
Observed luminosity " " shallower " $\alpha \approx -1.2$

This is the origin of the mis-named missing satellite problem - lots of low mass halos are predicted (not just as satellites) while relatively few low mass galaxies are observed

STAGES

ominator:

id:


to the left.

to the right.

T

12
12
24
36
48
60
72
84
96
108
120
132
144

Halo and stellar mass function (Bullock & Boylan-Kolchin)



Bullock JS, Boylan-Kolchin M. 2017. *Annual Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* 55:343-87

$$f_* = \frac{M_*}{M_{200}} \text{ varies with } M_*$$

Schechter form: $\Phi(M_*) = \Phi_*^* e^{-\left(\frac{M}{M_*^*}\right)} \left(\frac{M}{M_*^*}\right)^\alpha$

Φ_*^* characteristic density
 M_*^* characteristic mass
 α faint end slope

integrated mass density $\rho = \int M \Phi(M) dM = M_*^* \Phi_*^* \Gamma(\alpha+2)$ in comoving Γ for $\alpha > -2$


Stellar Mass-Halo Mass Relation from Abundance Matching

Behroozi et al (2013)
 Moster et al (2013)
 Kravstov et al (2019)

From “abundance matching”

Match the number density of simulated dark matter halos to that observed for galaxies as a fcn of mass

Note that a large range in stellar mass gets wedged into a narrow range in halo mass.



Gravitational Lensing

Flavors:	Strong lensing	- multiple lensed images of single source
	Weak lensing	- mild distortion of source
	Micro lensing	- temporary brightening due to unresolved strong lensing of source by object that passes in front of it

Threshold for strong lensing:

$$\Sigma > \Sigma_{\text{crit}} = \frac{c^2}{4\pi G} \frac{D_s}{D_L D_{LS}}$$

Bend angle

$$\alpha_d = \frac{4GM}{bc^2} = \frac{D_s}{D_{LS}} (\theta_l - \theta_s)$$

↖ true angle between
↖ apparent angle between
source & lens

Mass estimator ~~for weak lensing~~

e.g., within an arc in a cluster of galaxies

$$M(<\theta_0) = (1.1 \times 10^{14} M_\odot) \left(\frac{\theta_0}{30''}\right)^2 \left(\frac{D_L}{D_s}\right) \left(\frac{D_{LS}}{1 \text{ Gpc}}\right)$$

Micro lensing optical depth

$$\tau = 2\pi \frac{\sigma_v^2}{c^2} \frac{D_L D_s}{r D_s}$$

Micro lensing surveys exclude
MACHOs over the mass range

$$10^{-7} \lesssim M_M \lesssim 10 M_\odot$$

Not enough lensing events are observed towards the LMC to account for the dark matter. On the flip side, the lensing optical depth towards the bridge is rather high. Lensing objects are just ordinary stars if the disk is maximal.

12
12
24
36
48
60
72
84
96
108
120
32
44

Cosmology

Friedmann eqn

$$H = \frac{\dot{a}}{a} \quad \left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\right)^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3} \rho - \frac{kc^2}{a^2} + \frac{1}{3}\Lambda c^2$$

Hubble expansion
mass density
geometry
cosmological constant (aka dark energy)

Critical density

$$\rho_{crit} = \frac{3H^2}{8\pi G} \quad \Omega_m = \frac{\rho_m}{\rho_{crit}}$$

- $\Omega_m > 1$ eventually halts expansion & recollapses
- $\Omega_m \leq 1$ expands forever
- $\Lambda > 0$ eventually causes expansion to accelerate

As $t \rightarrow 0$ ($z \rightarrow \infty$) all solutions tend to $\Omega_m \rightarrow 1$

Cosmology needs non-baryonic dark matter because

1. $\Omega_m > \Omega_b$ from Big Bang Nucleosynthesis
2. Large Scale Structure formation
 - need growth factor of $\sim 10^5$ from CMB to now
 - gravity + baryons will only do ~ 1000 since $\delta v a = 1090$

In addition to the cosmological missing mass, we also have 2 distinct missing baryon problems:

1. Sum of known baryons $< \Omega_b$
2. Halo-by-halo missing baryon problem

$$\frac{M_b}{M_{tot}} < f_{b, cosmic} \quad \text{in bound objects like galaxies and groups of galaxies}$$

12
12
24
36
48
60
72
84
96
108
120
132
144

$$\Omega_m = \frac{\rho_m}{\rho_{crit}}$$

Measurements of the cosmic mass density

- Combine cluster M/L with luminosity density j of the universe obtained by integrating the galaxy luminosity function

$$\rho_m = j \left(\frac{M}{L} \right) \quad \Omega_m \approx 0.3$$

- Weak Lensing
 Measure shear caused by lensing over large scales
 $\Omega_m \approx 0.18$

- Peculiar Velocity Field / Redshift distortions
 Measure deviations from the Hubble flow ($\delta v/v$) caused by mass overdensities ($\delta\rho/\rho$)

$$\frac{\delta v}{v} \approx -\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\Omega_m}^{0.6} \frac{\delta\rho}{\rho} \quad \Omega_m \approx 0.25$$

- Power Spectrum $P(k)$ of galaxies at $z \approx 0$ $P(k) = \delta_k^2$
 Shape and amplitude of the large scale structure traced by galaxies depends on $\Gamma = \Omega_m h \approx 0.2$
 where $h = H_0/100$. In detail Γ also depends weakly on the baryon density Ω_b . $P(k) \sim k^n$ with $n \approx 1$

- Acoustic Power spectrum $C_\ell = \Delta T^2$ of Cosmic Microwave Background at $z = 1090$. Depends sensitively on all cosmic parameters, but basically

$$\Omega_m h^2 \approx 0.14$$

$$\Omega_m = 0.32$$

of which baryons are

$$\Omega_b h^2 = 0.022$$

$$\Omega_{com} h^2 = 0.12 \text{ to get 3rd peak right}$$

Really $\Omega_m h^3 \approx 0.096$ better approximates the degeneracy

WIMPs Weakly Interacting Massive Particle


Leading candidate for the non-baryonic dark matter

Usually presumed to be the lightest stable particle in the hypothetical super symmetric sector (SUSY) (e.g., the neutralino)

In SUSY, every normal (standard model) particle has a susy partner particle. Minimal SUSY, with the fewest new parameters, called MSSM. (Minimal Super Symmetric Model)

The WIMP miracle: the weak force interaction scale ($m_x \approx 100 \text{ GeV}$) is about right to leave a relic density that's about right to be the dark matter ($\Omega_x \approx 0.1 \pm \text{a few dex}$)

WIMP detection



Direct detection: WIMPs scatter off nuclei in underground labs

Indirect detection: WIMPs are their own anti-particle; can annihilate into standard model particles, creating a source of cosmic rays & γ -rays.

WIMP production: Particle colliders that achieve energies $> m_x c^2$ could create WIMPs which might be recognized as a deficit in detected debris mass-energy.

11	12
11	12
22	24
33	36
44	48
55	60
66	72
77	84
88	96
99	108
110	120
121	132
132	144

Relic density of particles determined by when they freeze out

number density x cross-section = expansion rate

Freeze out condition: $n\sigma \approx H$

HOT (relativistic)
e.g., neutrino

$T_\nu \gg m_\nu$ so number still around just depends on the photon density

$$\Omega_\nu h^2 = \frac{\sum m_\nu}{93 \text{ eV}}$$

current limits
 $0.06 \leq \sum m_\nu \leq 0.12$
neutrino oscillations structure formation

COLD (non-relativistic)
e.g., WIMP

$T_X \ll m_X$ particle-antiparticle pairs have time to annihilate, so

$$n \sim (m_X T)^{3/2} e^{-\frac{m_X}{T}} \quad \frac{\Omega_X}{0.2} \approx \frac{x_{fo}}{20} \left(\frac{10^{-8} \text{ GeV}^{-2}}{\sigma} \right) \quad 20 \lesssim x_{fo} < 50$$

annoying quantum factor

$$\sigma \sim \frac{g^4}{m_X^2}$$

where g is the coupling strength (e.g., the weak nuclear force)

Lee-Weinberg limit: $m_X > 2 \text{ GeV}$ to not over-produce cosmic mass density

Dark Matter Candidates beyond Λ CDM

→ common motivations: retain successes of Λ CDM on large scales; fix problems on small scales

WDM: Warm Dark Matter not too hot to suppress structure growth
maybe made of sterile neutrinos?

free-streaming scale:

$$M_{FS} = (4 \times 10^{15} M_{\odot}) \left(\frac{m_{\chi}}{30 \text{ eV}} \right)^{-2}$$

Cuts off power in fluctuations with $k < k_{FS}$

→ reduces number of subhalos; maybe helps cusp/core

SIDM: Self-Interacting Dark Matter

New force active only in the dark sector

DM particles scatter off each other, changing cusps into cores

Interaction strength needs to be different on galaxy & cluster scale
so perhaps is velocity-dependent

FDM: Fuzzy dark matter very light scalar particles 40^{-22} e

Compton wavelength on astrophysical scales

Forms soliton core, addressing cusp-core problem,
but tends to have DM density be too high

Superfluid DM: forms bosonic condensate that mimics MOND
inside galaxies; reverts to Λ CDM-like behavior on larger scales

Strange nuggets / Quark nuggets / Macros

Nuclear density objects (neutron star-like) made of
ordinary Standard Model particles: must form before β BN

Modified Gravity

Many have tried to modify gravity to eliminate the need for dark matter

Paul Atriedes: Many have tried and failed?

Rev. Mother: Many have tried and died

One can generically exclude length-scale-based modifications, as the discrepancy does not appear at a particular size. It does, however, appear at a characteristic acceleration, as hypothesized by MOND:

Basic tenets of MOND:

1. New scale with dimensions of acceleration, $a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-10} \text{ m s}^{-2}$
2. Normal Newtonian dynamics hold for $a \gg a_0$
3. Dynamics are scale invariant for $a \ll a_0$ such that $(\vec{F}, t) \rightarrow \lambda(\vec{F}, t)$

The effective force law for low accelerations $a \ll a_0$ tends towards the asymptotic limit $a \rightarrow \sqrt{g_N a_0}$ where g_N is the normal Newtonian acceleration.

The Newtonian and MOND regimes are bridged by a smooth interpolation function $\mu(x)$

$$g_N = \mu(x) a$$

$$\text{where } x = \frac{a}{a_0}$$

$$\text{e.g., } \mu = \frac{x}{1+x}$$

$$\text{subject to } \mu \rightarrow 1 \text{ for } x \gg 1$$

$$\mu \rightarrow x \text{ for } x \ll 1$$

This is the original algebraic MOND formulation

One could also write

$$a = v(y) g_N$$

$$\text{where } y = \frac{g_N}{a_0}$$

$$\text{subject to } v \rightarrow 1 \text{ for } g_N \gg a_0 (y \gg 1)$$

$$v \rightarrow y^{-1/2} \text{ for } g_N \ll a_0 (y \ll 1)$$

$$\text{e.g., } v(y) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-y}}$$

This is QUMOND

More general theories approximately reduce to one of these

11	12
11	12
22	24
33	36
44	48
55	60
66	72
77	84
88	96
99	108
110	120
121	132
132	144

MOND can be interpreted as a modification of either

Gravity

$$F = \frac{GMm}{r^2}$$

or

Inertia

$$F = ma$$

i.e., $M_{\text{grav}} \neq M_{\text{inert}}$!

The original idea was the latter, but it requires a non-local theory to conserve momentum and energy. A modification that conserves both is AQUAL

$$\vec{\nabla} \left(\mu \left(\frac{|\vec{\nabla} \Phi|}{a_0} \right) \vec{\nabla} \Phi \right) = 4\pi G \rho$$

This is a modification of gravity, but only Newtonian, not GR. Finding a satisfactory theory that is generally covariant remains an outstanding theoretical problem.

Nevertheless, the basic facts suffice to predict

- The BTFR
- the shape of rotation curves
- the Central Density Relation
- etc.: e.g., Buzzi's rule is implicit

MOND breaks the strong equivalence principle as it depends on the external field g_{ext} as well as the internal field g_{in}

Regime

Mass Estimator

$$g_{\text{in}} > a_0$$

$$M = \frac{RV^2}{G}$$

(Newtonian regime)

$$a_0 > g_{\text{in}} > g_{\text{ext}}$$

$$M = \frac{1}{a_0 G} V^4$$

~~Deep~~ (Deep MOND regime)

$$a_0 > g_{\text{ext}} > g_{\text{in}}$$

$$M = \frac{a_0}{g_{\text{ext}}} \frac{RV^2}{G}$$

(Quasi-Newtonian regime)

$$G_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \left(\frac{g_{\text{ext}}}{a_0} \right) G$$

If $g_{\text{ext}} > a_0 > g_{\text{in}}$, you're still in the Newtonian regime

This is called the External Field Effect (EFE)

ES

left.

right.

T

12
12
24
36
48
60
72
84
96
108
0 120
1 132
2 144