# KINEMATICS AT THE EDGE OF THE GALACTIC BULGE: EVIDENCE FOR CYLINDRICAL ROTATION

Christian D. Howard<sup>1</sup>, R. Michael Rich, Will Clarkson, Ryan Mallery<sup>1</sup> Department of Physics and Astronom y, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1547

John Kormendy

D epartm ent of A stronom y, U niversity of Texas at A ustin, 1 U niversity Station C 1400, A ustin, TX 78712-0259, U SA

Roberto De Propris Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory, Casilla 603, La Serena, Chile

Annie C. Robin

Observatoire de Besancon, Institut Utinam, CNRS-UMR 6213, Universite de Franche-Comte, BP1615, 25010 Besancon, France

Roger Fux

O bservatoire de Geneve, U niversite de Geneve, 51 Ch. des M aillettes, 1290 Sauverny, Switzerland

David B.Reitzel

G ri th Observatory, 2800 East Observatory Road, Los Angeles, CA 90027

HongSheng Zhao

SUPA, School of Physics and Astronom y, University of St Andrews, KY169SS, UK

Konrad Kuijken

Leiden Observatory, Leiden University, PO Box 9513, 2300RA Leiden, The Netherlands

A ndreas K och Departm ent of Physics and A stronom y, U niversity of Leicester, LE 1 7R H, U K Received 2009 M ay 2; accepted 2009 A ugust 6; published 2009 A ugust 24

#### ABSTRACT

We present new results from BRAVA, a large-scale radial velocity survey of the G alactic bulge, using M giant stars selected from the Two M icron All Sky Survey catalog as targets for the Cerro Tololo Inter-Am erican O bærvatory 4m Hydra multi-object spectrograph. The purpose of this survey is to construct a new generation of self-consistent barm odels that conform to these observations. We report the dynam ics for elds at the edge of the G alactic bulge at latitudes b = 8 and compare to the dynam ics at b = 4. We not that the rotation curve V (r) is the same eat b = 8 as at b = 4. That is, the G alactic boxy bulge rotates cylindrically, as do boxy bulges of other galaxies. The sum m ed line of sight velocity distribution at b = 8 is G aussian, and the binned longitude-velocity plot shows no evidence for either a (disk) population with cold dynam ics or for a (classical bulge) population with hot dynam ics. The observed kinem atics are well modeled by an edge-on N-body bar, in agreem ent with published structural evidence. O ur kinem atic observations indicate that the G alactic bulge is a prototypical product of secular evolution in galaxy disks, in contrast with stellar population results that are most easily understood ifm a pr m ergers were the dom inant form ation process.

Subject headings: Galaxy: bulge { Galaxy: kinem atics and dynam ics { stars: late-type { techniques: radial velocities

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The central bulge of the M iky W ay is our nearest example of a spheroidal population, with M 31 100 times as distant. The G alactic bulge stellar population by far is the nearest bulge population that can be studied in starby-star detail. Being close enough to perm it the study of radial velocity, properm otion, and composition for individual stars, as well as turno age for the population, the bulge/bar population o ers us an unprecedented opportunity to test dynam ical and form ation m odels for bulge system s. This is a unique perspective unavailable in the study of extraga lactic bulges, which can only be exam ined from their integrated light, and may change the

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  V isiting A stronom ers, C erro Tololo Inter-Am erican O bservatory (CTIO).CTIO is operated by AURA, Inc. under contract to the N ational Science Foundation.

way we think about the formation of these structures. The Bulge Radial Velocity Assay (BRAVA) exploits this unique opportunity with a large scale radial velocity survey of the G alactic bulge/bar population.

The boxy m orphology of the central bulge is easily seen in the image of the Galaxy produced by the COBE satellite (W eiland et al. 1994; D wek et al. 1995; A rendt et al. 1998) and subsequent m odels have solidied the interpretation that we view an edge-on bar (e.g. Zhao et al. 1996; Hafner et al. 2000). Exploiting our proximity, we know that the bulge/bar is old (> 10 G yr) from the modeling of its main-sequence turno (Ortolani et al. 1995; Kuijken & Rich 2002; Zoccali et al. 2003; Picaud & Robin 2004; Clarkson et al. 2008). Observations of individual stars at high resolution yields evidence of enhancement (McW illiam & Rich 1994; Fulbright, McW illiam, & Rich 2007; Lecureur et al. 2007) that is modeled to imply a short form ation timescale of < 1 Gyr (Ballero et al. 2007). And while there are hints of an interm ediate age population in the bulge at lower Galactic latitudes (van Loon et al. 2003) the bulk of the bulge lacks a convincingly dem onstrated interm ediate age evolved stellar com ponent (Frogel & W hitford 1987). These studies reinforce the widely accepted paradigm that the bulge population was form ed both rapidly and early.

Combes & Sanders (1981) were the rst to suggest that galaxy bars heat them selves in the vertical direction and look boxy when seen edge-on. A dditional observations and modeling have con rm ed the general picture that boxy and peanut bulges are not spheroidal merger rem nants (hereafter "classical bulges") but are in fact edge-on bars (e. g., Combes et al. 1990; A thanassoula & M isiriotis 2002; A thanassoula 2005; see K orm endy & K ennicutt 2004 for a review). How ever, in our G alaxy, it is di cult to reconcile the early and rapid star form ation in plied by m easurem ents of bulge star ages and

-elem ent overabundances with the protracted star form ation that might be expected for a secularly growing bar (K orm endy & K ennicutt 2004, see Section 8.1). Freem an (2008) emphasizes that \in the bar-buckling instability scenario for generating boxy bulges, ... the bulge structure m ay be younger than its stars, which would originally have been part of the inner disk." So the old age and rapid star form ation history im plied by observations of the G alaxy's boxy bulge may not be a problem for our interpretation that this boxy structure was built out of the disk.

Further tests of whether the G alaxy's boxy bulge really is a edge-on bar would therefore be valuable. C lassical bulges are observed to rotate m ore slow by at increasing height above the disk plane, whereas boxy bulges in other galaxies rotate cylindrically, with V (r) essentially independent of height above the disk plane (e. g., K om endy & Illingworth 1982; Jarvis 1990; Shaw 1993; Falcon-Barroso et al. 2004; see K om endy & K ennicutt 2004 for a review). Supporting the above interpretation, N body m odels of bars also rotate cylindrically when view ed edge-on (C om bes et al. 1990; Fux 1997, 1999; Zhao et al. 1996; A than assoula & M isiriotis 2002; A than assoula 2005). To test our interpretation, we ask: does the boxy bulge of our G alaxy rotate cylindrically or not?

There is also presently some debate as to whether the bar continues to dom inate the population at 1 kpc from the bulge. Zoccali et al. (2008) suggest that the em er-



Fig.1.] Observed BRAVA elds up to 2007 August overplotted on the COBE 2 m in age (Launhardt et al. 2002). G reen circles represent elds observed in 2005, red circles are elds observed in 2006, and blue circles are elds observed in 2007A (b = 4) and 2007B (b = 8). The yellow circle is our calibration eld, observed with the same ber con guration every year. Circle sizes correspond to the  $40^{\circ}$  eld of view of the instrum ent. The black square is a eld observed over multiple years. For a distance of 8 kpc, 1 corresponds to 140 pc.

gence of a metal poor classical bulge population at higher G alactic latitudes might explain why an abundance gradient is observed in the bulge, as a secularly evolved bar should not have an abundance gradient. Further, the bar has been solidly demonstrated at b = 4 (e.g. Stanek et al. 1997) but is not convincingly detected more distant from the plane. A large sample radial velocity survey at b = 8 o ers a sensitive test of whether a classical bulge population is present.

Until recently, we have lacked a kinem atic survey of the bulge large enough to seriously test these bar and bulge dynam icalm odels, and thus in uence ideas about bulge evolution. The kinem atic studies of bulge red giant branch (RGB) stars from BRAVA (Howard et al. 2008) at b= 4 and bulge red-clum p giants (Rangwala et al. 2009), show remarkable agreem ent in the dispersion and rotation curve. M easurem ents of the kinem atics of the b= 8 strip are especially important, since it gives us an opportunity to investigate whether the bulge rotates cylindrically. Here we report results from a continuing survey based on red giants, BRAVA, which com prise the bulk of the 2:4 m light of the bulge. Early results from this ongoing survey are given in Rich et al. (2007b) and Howard et al. (2008), which report on the 2005-2007A observations. This Letter reports on the 2007B observations of the b = 8 m a jor-axis strip.

#### 2. OBSERVATIONS AND SPECTROSCOPY

We report on 12 new bulge elds observed in 2007B, sampling the major axis of the bulge in two degree intervals at b = 8 (Figure 1). We obtained radial velocities for 100 red giants per eld. We used the Hydra multi-object spectograph at C erro Tololo Inter-A merican O bservatory (CTID); the observational setup and target selection were as described in Howard et al. (2008). Because sources that satisfy our selection criteria are rare at b = 8, we extended our selection limit by 0.5 m ag

in K com pared to our selection region for the 2005-2007A data (see Figure 9 of Howard et al. 2008). A though we are observing fainter stars in 2007B than in 2005-2007A, our selection region is still brighter than the \red-clum p" region and samples the same bulge RGB population. The 2007B radialvelocity standards (HD 203638, HD 207076, and HD 218541) return individual stellar velocities that agree to better than 2 km s $^1$ , on average. A nalvelocity was obtained by taking the error-weighted average of the separate velocity measurements. One eld was observed in all three years (2005, 2006, and 2007B) at (1;b) = (6; 4), with the same ber con guration (i.e., the same stars in that eld were observed each year). Sky conditions during the 2007B night when this eld was observed gave less-than-ideal results that are not indicative of the 2007B data in general. Velocity m easurements show a larger m s scatter in velocity di erences  $(7 \text{ km s}^{1})$  as compared to 2005/2006 data, with an average o set of  $2 \text{ km} \text{ s}^1$  for all stars in that eld. Since the o set is less than the rm s scatter, we consider the 2005/2006/2007B data sets to be in good agreem ent and adopt 7 km s<sup>1</sup> as our error estim ate for individual stellar velocities for all of the data obtained in 2007B.

#### 2.1. Color/M agnitude bias

0 bservations of the bulge at b =8 have the potential to probe the bulge/halo boundary. W e exam ine these b = 8 separately from the higher latitude elds presented in Howard et al. (2008). To investigate the possibility of color and/or m agnitude bias in our sam ple, the bulge RGB stars from the b = 8elds are summed and yield an apparent Gaussian distribution,  $w \pm h < V_{GC} > = 9:1 2:7 \text{ km s}^1 \text{ and } = 94:4$ 1:9 km s<sup>1</sup> (Figure 2). The longitude-velocity (1-v) plots for both the b = 4 (see Figure 20 of H ow ard et al. 2008) and b = 8 (Figure 3) major-axis strips show roughly trapezoidal \envelopes" that show no hints of contam inating hot (spheroid), or cold (disk), components. In order to determ ine if there are color/m agnitude biases in our sample, we divide the sample by color and m agnitude (see Howard et al 2008 for details) and employ the two-sided Kolm ogorov-Sm imov (KS) test. As with the 2005-2007A data (Howard et al. 2008), we can state that the 2007B color/m agnitude-segregated populations are drawn from the same distribution, rejecting the null hypothesis with 96% con dence. At b = 8, we are at the point where the bulge density begins to drop sharply; our aim is to search for subpopulations in these regions, and the signature of the inner halo (C.D.Howard et al. 2009, in preparation).

## 3. EVIDENCE OF CYLINDRICAL ROTATION

We now discuss the Galactic boxy bulge's kinem atics at 560 and 1120 pc below the disk plane. Figure 4 shows the dispersion prole and rotation curve for the majoraxis strips at b = 4 and 8. Despite the more sparse sampling at b = 8, it is clear that the rotation curve here is indistinguishable from that at b = 4. We therefore con m that the Galaxy's bulge rotates cylindrically. This is further strong evidence that it is an edge-on bar. It is di cult to conclusively argue whether the rotation curve attens like that observed at b = 4, how ever, the inclusion of data obtained at this latitude



Fig. 2. | H istogram of all bulge RGB star velocities from the elds at b = 8 (1200 stars), in galactocentric velocity ( $V_{GC}$ ). As with the 2005-2007A data, the co-added sample is consistent with a single kinematic population that is norm ally distributed and that has negligible skew and kurtosis. B in size is 25 km s<sup>1</sup>.



Fig.3.| Longitude-velocity (I-v) plot for the 2007B bulge sample at b = 8; the data are binned to 1 in longitude and 10 km s<sup>1</sup> in galactocentric velocity. There is no evidence for either a cold, rapidly rotating disk, or for a dynam ically hot, m ore slow ly rotating (m ore classical bulge-like) population. The velocity dispersion drops from that at 4 and is also lower than the halo. We conclude that the dynam ical bar population is predom inant at b = 8.

in 2008 will be able to determ ine if this is the case (C . D . How ard et al. 2009, in preparation).

#### 3.1. ModelComparison

A useful com parison of model and data involves the disentangling of the di erent stellar com ponents of the model, i.e., spheroid versus disk/bar com ponents, and com paring their kinem atics to our observations. We com pare our data to an N-body bar model (Fux 1999). The model is constructed from a composite three-dimensional sym metry-free N-body and hydrodynamics code which follows the constituent particles at a higher resolution than previous models and includes a gas component which reproduces the CO and HI distributions in the (l,b,V) space (Fux, 1999). It includes 1:5  $10^5$  particles of gas, 1:3  $10^6$  particles in the stellar disk/bar, 6  $10^5$  particles in a nucleus-spheroid (representing a spheroidal nucleus and a stellar spheroid outside the



Fig. 4. Velocity dispersion pro le (top) and rotation curve (bottom) for the b = 4 and 8 strips. The velocity dispersion drops as expected, while the rotation curve is the same of for both latitudes, consistent with cylindrical rotation. The b = 8 data are also consistent with solid-body rotation, and at rst inspection does not appear to show the attening observed at b = 4. More observations are needed to con rm this nding.

bar region), and  $1:7 \quad 10^6$  of dark halo particles. In Figure 5, we compare the BRAVA data to the disk/bar and nucleus-spheroid components of the model named t10t2066' described in Fux (1999).

A some moves further in latitude from the G alactic disk plane, it is evident that the nucleus-spheroid component of the model is hotter and contributes a large velocity dispersion. Despite this, the BRAVA data show remarkable agreement with the disk/bar component of the model, with a relatively at dispersion prole at 70 km s<sup>1</sup> contrasting with the spheroid dispersion of 120 km s<sup>1</sup>. Despite the poorer sampling of elds in 2007B, the data show good agreement with the rotation curve as well, and suggest that the turnover seen in the rotation curve at b = 4 is not evident at b = 8 . Of course, this cannot be con med until the rest of the b = 8 major-axis strip data are included.

### 4. CONCLUSIONS

Following the rst successfulm odels of the boxy morphology of the 2:4 m light (Blitz & Spergel 1991) the case for the deprojected bar has become more convincing (e.g., Bissantz & Gerhard 2002 m odels of the COBE light) and is reinforced by distances of red-clum p stars (e.g., Stanek et al. 1997; Babusiaux & Gilm ore 2005). The boxy outer isophotes and our measurement of cylindrical rotation at b = 8 are also consistent with a bar viewed edge-on; this is one proposed class of pseudobulge asde ned by Kommendy & Kennicutt (2004). We em phasize that the rotation curve is strikingly inconsistent with a slow ly rotating, dynam ically hot, classical bulge population. The excellent agreem ent of the disk/bar com ponent of the Fux (1999) N-body model with the BRAVA data further supports our interpretation of the Galactic pseudobulge as an edge-on bar. W e assert that the G alactic bulge form ation scenario does not adhere to the hierarchical clustering paradigm (which views the bulge as a m erger rem nant) but rather represents the secular evolution of isolated disks.

A range of N-body models suggest that the timescale



Fig. 5. Upper: results for the b = 4 m a jor-axis strip including dispersion (top) and rotation eld (bottom), compared with Fux (1999) m odel components. Lower: the b = 8 m a jor-axis strip dispersions (top) and m ean eld velocity (bottom), compared with Fux (1999) m odel components. The di erence in velocity dispersion between the spheroidal and disk/bar components is striking, and shows that BRAVA data are well m odeled by an N-body bar. The rotation speed does not drop with increasing distance from the plane (cylindrical rotation); such cylindrical rotation is a signature of a boxy bulge.

to grow a bar from a massive disk is very short, as few as 2-4 orbital times (Combes et al. 1990; Raha et al. 1991; Sellwood & W ilkinson 1993, Fux 1997, 1999). In our Galaxy, this corresponds to 10<sup>8</sup> yr at 1 kpc radius. Note that other acceleration mechanisms (e.g. vertical resonances; Pfenniger & Norm an 1990) appear to work on longer timescales | at least 10 orbital times to achieve vertical thickening. The observed enhancements measured for pseudobulge giants (M cW illiam & Rich 1994; Rich & Origlia 2005, 2007a; Zoccali et al. 2007; Fulbright et al. 2007) would appear to require massive star supernovae, with enrichment proceeding on

 $10^8$  yr tim escales (B allero et al. 2007). O ne m ay caution that much larger sam ples of composition m easurements, across the entire pseudobulge, are required before the chemical composition becomes a very strong constraint on formation scenarios. However, present sam – ples of bulge giants are now large enough to permit us to conclude that enhancement is a characteristic of pseudobulge stars.

## 4.1. Discussion

If the Galactic \bulge" is a pseudobulge that secularly evolved via dynam ical processes, it is di cult to understand how a metallicity gradient, as reported by Zoccali. et al. (2008), could arise. Proctor et al. (2000) nd a strong abundance gradient in NGC 4565, which is an edge-on spiral with a boxy bulge. The Milky W ay falls near NGC 4565 on the ( $V_{max}$  / ) versus plot (Howard et al. 2008, Rich et al. 2007b), and the boxy bulge of NGC 4565 also shows cylindrical rotation (Korm endy & Illingworth 1982). An abundance gradient in our boxy pseudobulge might arise if there were an old metal-poor spheroid component spatially coincident with the bar. We argue that Figures 2 and 3 all but rule out a dynam ically hot subcomponent that one might assign to such a metal-poor spheroid or classical bulge. A minor m ergerm ight also leave an abundance gradient but would be expected to have left a dynam ically cold component behind or possibly large population of evolved interm ediate age stars (e.g., carbon stars or lum inous M giants as are seen in the LMC bar) if the ingested system had an age range. No such stellar population is known in the boxy pseudobulge at high G alactic latitudes, and large num bers of carbon stars, for example, would have been easily detected. An abundance gradient m ight also arise if the barwere in printed rapidly during the violent starforming phase of the bulge; the relative con nement of m etal-rich stars to the plane would argue for som e dissipative process accompanying enrichment. Soto, Rich, & Kuijken (2007) nd that the bar is most strongly evident in the proper-motion dynamics of the metal-rich population, although the kinem atics of stars in our b = 8 elds suggest that virtually all stars in our sam ple belong to the bar.

We remain puzzled as to how the boxy pseudobulge could have evolved on a rapid dynam ical timescale, yet also have an abundance gradient. If the stars are form ed and are in a massive disk once the buck ling process starts, it is di cult to understand how any abundance gradient can be imprinted on the resulting bulge, since the N-body m odels accelerate points undistinguished by any physical property. We believe that our data are now strong enough that one has great di culty proposing a boxy pseudobulge that transitions into a metal-poor classical bulge at b 8 : the required dynam ically hot, slow ly rotating, population is not observed. W hile such a transition would help to explain the gradient, our BRAVA selection criteria at b = 8 should include such stars; the dynamics of the population are remarkably uniform and leave little room for this hypothetical population. We must conclude, then, that the old population at b =8 is dom inated by the same box/peanut pseudobulge population observed at G alactic latitudes closer to the disk plane. Even if two types of bulges (both \classical" and \box/peanut") coexist in these low latitude elds, it remains problematic as to how there can exist an abundance gradient with such uniform kinem atics, but dissipation during the chem ical enrichm ent process o ers an interesting route toward a solution. The BRAVA survey, however, is noting no indication that a classical bulge population sets in 1 kpc below the plane.

C D H. and R M R. acknow ledge support from the National Science Foundation, AST -0909479. J.K orm endy acknow ledges support from the National Science Foundation under grant AST-0607490. C D H. acknow ledges support from a C T IO travelgrant in support of doctoral thesis observations at CTIO. The authors thank the support sta at CTIO.RMR. and AR. acknow ledge the hospitality of the K avli Institute for T heoretical physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara, where som e of our discussions took place. This publication makes use of data products from the Two Micron All Sky Survey, which is a joint project of the University of M assachusetts and the Infrared P rocessing and A nalysis Center/California Institute of Technology, funded by the National A eronautics and Space A dm inistration and the National Science Foundation.

Facilities: CTIO

## REFERENCES

- A rendt, R.G., et al. 1998, ApJ, 508, 74
- A thanassoula, E., & M isiriotis, A. 2002, MNRAS, 330, 35
- Athanassoula, E. 2005, MNRAS, 358, 1477
- Babusiaux, C., & G ilm ore, G. 2005, M NRAS, 358, 1309
- Ballero, S.K., Matteucci, F., Origlia, L., & Rich, R.M. 2007, A&A, 467, 123
- Bissantz, N., & Gerhard, O. 2002, MNRAS, 330, 591
- Blitz, L., & Spergel, D.N. 1991, ApJ, 379, 631
- Clarkson, W., et al. 2008, ApJ, 684, 1110
- Combes, F., & Sanders, R.H. 1981, A&A, 96, 164
- Combes, F., Debbasch, F., Friedli, D., & Pfenniger, D. 1990, A&A, 233, 82
- Dwek,E.et al.1995 ApJ, 445, 716
- Falcon-Barroso, J., et al. 2004, Astron. Nachr., 325, 92
- Freem an, K.C. 2008, IAU Sym posium, 245, Form ation and
- Evolution of G alaxy Bulges, ed. Bureau, M., A thanassoula, E., & Barbuy, B. (C am bridge: C am bridge U niversity P ress), 3
- Frogel, J.A., & Whitford, A.E. 1987, ApJ, 320, 199
- Fulbright, J.P., M cW illiam, A., & R ich, R.M. 2007, ApJ, 661, 1152
- Fux, R. 1997, A & A, 327, 983
- Fux, R. 1999, A & A, 345, 787
- Hafner, R., Evans, N.W., Dehnen, W., & Binney, J.2000, MNRAS, 314, 433

- Howard, C.D., Rich, R.M., Reitzel, D.B., Koch, A., De Propris, R., & Zhao, H.2008, ApJ, 688, 1060
- Jarvis, B.1990, in D ynam ics and Interactions of G alaxies, ed.R. W ielen (New York: Springer), 416
- Korm endy, J., & Illingworth, G. 1982, ApJ, 256, 460
- Korm endy, J., & Kennicutt, R.C., Jr. 2004, ARA & A, 42, 603
- Kuijken, K., & Rich, R.M. 2002, AJ, 124, 2054
- Launhardt, R., Zylka, R., & M ezger, P.G. 2002, A & A, 384, 112
- Lecureur, A., Hill, V., Zoccali, M., Barbuy, B., Gomez, A.,
- M inniti, D., O rtolani, S., & Renzini, A. 2007, A & A, 465, 799 M dW illiam, A., & Rich, R.M. 1994, A pJS, 91, 749
- Ortolani, S., Renzini, A., Gilm ozzi, R., Marconi, G., Barbuy, B.,
- Bica, E., & Rich, R.M. 1995, Nature, 377, 701
- Pfenniger, D., & Norman, C. 1990, ApJ, 363, 391
- Picaud, S., & Robin, A.C. 2004, A & A, 428, 891
- Proctor, R.N., Sansom, A.E., & Reid, I.N. 2000, MNRAS, 311, 37
- Raha, N., Sellwood, J.A., James, R.A., & Kahn, F.D. 1991, Nature, 352, 411
- Rangwala, N., W illiam s, T.B., & Stanek, K.Z.2009, ApJ, 691, 1387
- Rich, R.M., Reitzel, D.B., Howard, C.D., & Zhao, H.2007a, ApJ, 658, L29
- Rich, R.M., & Origlia, L. 2005, ApJ, 634, 1293
- Rich, R.M., Origlia, L., & Valenti, E. 2007b, ApJ, 665, L119

- Sellwood, J.A., & W ilkinson, A. 1993, Reports of Progress in Physics, 56, 173
- Shaw, M .1993, A & A , 280, 33
- Shaw, M., W ilkinson, A., & Carter, D. 1993, A&A, 268, 511
- Stanek, K.Z., U dalski, A., Szym anski, M., K aluzny, J., K ubiak, M., M ateo, M., & Krzem inski, W. 1997, ApJ, 477, 163
- Soto, M., Rich, R.M., & Kuijken, K. 2007, ApJ, 665, L31
- van Loon, J.T., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 338, 857

W eiland, J.L., et al. 1994, ApJ, 425, L81

- Zhao, H., Rich, R.M., & Spergel, D.N. 1996, MNRAS, 282, 175
- Zoccali, M ., et al. 2003, A & A , 399, 931
- Zoccali, M., et al. 2007, IAU Symposium, 241, 73
- Zoccali, M., Hill, V., Lecureur, A., Barbuy, B., Renzini, A.,
- M inniti, D., Gomez, A., & Ortolani, S. 2008, A&A, 486, 177