

Properties of Disks and Bulges of Spiral and Lenticular Galaxies in the Sloan Digital Sky Survey

N. Oham a^(a), S. Okamura^(b), M. Fukugita^(c,d), N. Yasuda^(d), O. Nakamura^(e)

^(a)Department of Astronomy, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan¹

^(b)Department of Astronomy and Research Center for the Early Universe, University of Tokyo, Hongo, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

^(c)Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540 USA

^(d)Institute for Cosmic Ray Research, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8582, Japan

^(e)Graduate School of Political Science, Waseda University, Shinjuku, Tokyo 169-8050, Japan

Abstract

A bulge-disk decomposition is made for 737 spiral and lenticular galaxies drawn from a SDSS galaxy sample for which morphological types are estimated. We carry out the bulge-disk decomposition using the growth curve fitting method. It is found that bulge properties, effective radius, effective surface brightness, and also absolute magnitude, change systematically with the morphological sequence; from early to late types, the size becomes somewhat larger, and surface brightness and luminosity fainter. In contrast disks are nearly universal, their properties remaining similar among disk galaxies irrespective of detailed morphologies from S0 to Sc. While these tendencies were often discussed in previous studies, the present study confirms them based on a large homogeneous magnitude-limited field galaxy sample with morphological types estimated. The systematic change of bulge-to-total luminosity ratio, B/T , along the morphological sequence is therefore not caused by disks but mostly by bulges. It is also shown that elliptical galaxies and bulges of spiral galaxies are unlikely to be in a single sequence. We infer the stellar mass density (in units of the critical mass density) to be $\rho = 0.0021$ for spheroids, i.e., elliptical galaxies plus bulges of spiral galaxies, and $\rho = 0.00081$ for disks.

¹present address: Hitachi Software Engineering, Co. Ltd.

1. Introduction

The galaxy consists of two distinct components, disks and bulges, and how they formed is an outstanding problem in the galaxy formation. The classical idea is that elliptical galaxies and bulges, which are altogether called spheroids, formed when infalling gas undergoes star formation during the initial collapse of the system, and disks formed from dissipational collapse of the rotating gas that is left-over after the initial free-fall collapse (e.g., Eggen et al. 1962; Sandage 1986). Until early 1970's it was widely taken that bulges and elliptical galaxies belong to a single population and that elliptical galaxies are spheroids that lack disks for some reasons. This was because the shape and photometric properties of bulges and ellipticals are quite similar.

However, lines of kinematical evidence against the single population hypothesis accumulated since late 1970's. Illingworth (1977) indicated that bright elliptical galaxies rotate slower than expected from their ellipticities if their velocity dispersion is isotropic. Kormendy and Illingworth (1982) found that bulges of S0 and spiral galaxies rotate more rapidly than bright elliptical galaxies, being consistent with rotationally flattened oblate spheroids with isotropic velocity dispersion. Davies et al. (1983) showed that faint elliptical galaxies also rotate rapidly than bright elliptical galaxies and that no significant difference is present between the kinematic properties of the bulges and elliptical galaxies with comparable brightness. Bender et al. (1988) discovered that the dichotomy of elliptical galaxies between slow rotators and rapid rotators is more clearly defined by the isophote shape than by luminosity; slow rotators always have boxy isophotes and often brighter than rapid rotators which always have disk-like isophotes.

Recently the more popular idea based on the hierarchical clustering scenario says that disk galaxies formed in the centre of dark matter halo as infalling gas collapses and spheroids are formed via violent mergers (Kauffmann et al. 1993; Baugh et al. 1996). There is also a different view that bulges formed as a result of secular evolution from the disk (Kormendy 1993; Athanassoula 2003; Debattista et al. 2004; Kormendy & Kenicutt 2004; Martinez-Valpuesta et al. 2006; Fisher & D'Erory 2008; Mendez-Abreu et al. 2008). Lenticular galaxies in between elliptical and spiral galaxies have attracted much attention as to their origins (e.g., Moran et al. 2007). To study the problems of the formation of spheroids and disks we must collect the statistics as to the properties of the two components and study their regularities, in particular how they vary across early to late types, for as many galaxies as possible. The galaxy sample extracted from Sloan Digital Sky Survey (York et al. 2000) based on CCD images provides us with a good data base for this purpose at low redshift.

A number of methods have been used for the bulge-disk decomposition. Traditional one-dimensional methods use a surface brightness profile which is extracted from two-dimensional

surface brightness distribution by a variety of methods (e.g., Komendy 1977; Kent 1985; Simien & de Vaucouleurs 1986; Kodaira et al. 1987). Two-dimensional methods (e.g., de Jong 1996a; Mollenho 2004) are more popularly used recently and a number of semi-automatic codes have been developed. They include *GM2D* (Marleau & Simard 1998; Simard et al. 2002), *GALFIT* (Peng et al. 2002), *BUDDA* (de Souza et al. 2004), *GASPHOT* (Pignatelli et al. 2006), and *GASP2D* (Mendez-Abreu et al. 2008). Some of them were developed to tackle specific problems for a specific sample of galaxies while others were intended to be used in more general applications. They differ from each other in many respects such as the number of components, fitting function for respective components, minimization algorithm, and the degree of automation.

In the profile decomposition of galaxies, we should keep in mind a caveat that we do not know how well a single fitting function represents the surface brightness distribution of the component of real galaxies. Thorough investigation of the accuracy and the robustness of these methods is yet to be made (e.g., Pignatelli et al. 2006). Existence of this many codes itself demonstrates the fact that the most suitable method and code do depend upon both the problem to be addressed and quality and/or quantity of the data to be analysed. Generally speaking, the two dimensional method, while it should give more accurate decomposition, requires accurate galaxy images with high signal to noise ratios, and is sensitive to the details of structures. It does not always successfully apply to a large scale sample where relatively small size images are available.

In this paper we investigate systematic behaviours of rudimentary properties, i.e., characteristic scales, characteristic brightnesses and absolute magnitudes, of bulge and disk components along the Hubble sequence by means of a one-dimensional method based not on the surface brightness profile but on the growth curve of galaxies using a large homogeneous sample. We admit that our decomposition may not be quite accurate galaxy by galaxy basis, but we believe it gives useful data and provides us with the information for galaxy science so far missing that should be associated with the SDSS data.

2. Galaxy sample

We take a sample of 1600 galaxies with $r < 15.9$ and measured redshift taken from the equatorial stripe $145:15 < \ell < 235:97$, $|b| < 1.26$ in the northern sky (229.7 sq. deg.), for which morphological classification was carried out by visual inspections. This is an earlier version of the sample in the catalogue given by Fukugita et al. (2007), which contains 2253 galaxies with $r < 16$ in the same region (1866 are given redshift).

Among the 1600 galaxies, 1044 are classified as S0 to Sc. From the 1044 we discard 239 galaxies too close to edge-on ($b/a < 0.3$), 14 galaxies that have bright stars or galaxies overlapped with the galaxy images, 15 galaxies with a lack of growth curve data for some outer parts, 3 galaxies with a lack of confident redshift. We also drop 20 galaxies that are not suitable for accurate photometry, either located close to the edge of the survey area or contain saturated pixels. The remaining 753 galaxies were subject to the bulge-disk decomposition and 737 yielded satisfactory results. The analysis in this paper is thus based on 737 S0-Sc galaxies. The sample we use here does not show any particular bias compared with the $r < 16$ morphologically-classified sample of Fukugita et al. (2007) except that there are some missing galaxies close to the faint end in our sample.

We use r -band images drawn from Data Release 3 of SDSS (Abazajian et al. 2005), which do not differ from images in the later data releases for galaxies that concern us. Galactic extinction were corrected according to Schlegel et al. (1998). The number of galaxies for each morphological type used in our analysis is presented in Table 1 together with other statistics that will be discussed in this paper.

We refer the reader to the other publications for descriptions of the SDSS related to our study: Gunn et al. (2006) for the telescope, Gunn et al. (1998) for the photometric camera, Fukugita et al. (1996) for the photometric system, Hogg et al. (2001) and Smith et al. (2002) for external photometric calibrations, Pier et al. (2003) for astrometric calibrations, and Strauss et al. (2002) for spectroscopic target selection for galaxies. We also refer to Abazajian et al. (2003; 2004) and Adelman-McCarthy et al. (2006; 2007; 2008) for other data releases from the SDSS, which discuss the successive improvement of the pipelines used to derive the basic catalogues. We use $h_{70} = H_0 = (70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1})$ unless mentioned.

3. Growth curve fitting and the bulge-disk decomposition

The growth curve is the flux integrated within a circular aperture in units of magnitudes as a function of the aperture. It has traditionally been used to estimate total magnitudes (e.g., de Vaucouleurs et al.; RC2). The growth curve should in principle contain the information on profiles of the bulge and the disk. The method used here is not new and the code was developed and tested in Okamura et al. (1999) using simulations and a sample of real galaxies available at that time. Several essential points relevant to the present study are summarized below.

We assume that galaxies are represented by two components, bulges and disks, and their

surface brightness I is described with the de Vaucouleurs law

$$\log(I=I_{e,B}) = -3.33 (r=r_{e,B})^{1/4} - 1 \quad (1)$$

for bulges and the exponential profile

$$\log(I=I_{e,D}) = -0.729 [(r=r_{e,D}) - 1] \quad (2)$$

for disks, where for the two respective components $r_{e,B}$ and $r_{e,D}$ are the effective radii within which half the total flux of each component is contained, and $I_{e,B}$ and $I_{e,D}$ are surface brightness at these effective radii.

Departures from the de Vaucouleurs profile (1) are often argued, in particular for late type spiral bulges (van Houten 1961; Andredakis et al. 1995; Courteau et al. 1996; Trujillo et al. 2001; Mollenho 2004; Aguerri et al. 2004, 2005; Mende-Abreu et al. 2008), that the profile of the bulges are somewhat steeper than the de Vaucouleurs profile and an arbitrary power of r is introduced in the exponent for a general profile (Sercic 1968). Fittings with a general Sercic profile, however, is not stable unless the image has high signal-to-noise ratio over sufficiently wide dynamic range, causing the degeneracy among parameters, especially between the scale length and the power index (see, e.g., Trujillo et al. 2001). Our study is based on the sample of images of relatively low (at least in terms of conventional bulge-disk decomposition) signal-to-noise ratio with a limited length scale, and it is hard to discern Sercic-type powers in the bulge component. Hence, we avoid introducing an extra parameter for the bulge profile that controls the power of r . Parameters derived from the fitting are different for different fitting functions used but they represent virtually the identical physical property if the function is not too far from the reality (see Appendix of Kormendy 1977; Fig. 1 of Graham 2001a). The systematic behavior of the parameters along the Hubble sequence, which we focus on in this study, depends only weakly on the specific choice of a particular fitting function.

We note that a two-dimensional fitting for the bulge with the Sercic profile shows that 2/3 of galaxies have $n = 4$, i.e., the de Vaucouleurs profile as the best fit solution (Tasca & White 2005), so that the error for the global mean arising from the assumption enforcing $n = 4$ is not too large.

Another issue of concern is the effect of bars. Our growth curve method is a one-dimensional method based on a series of circular apertures. Accordingly, information on the elliptical surface brightness distribution of a bar is 'degenerated' onto an equivalent circular surface brightness distribution of a 'hypothetical' bulge. This means that in case of a barred galaxy we regard the bar plus bulge as a single entity, which we call bulge here. This point is discussed further in section 4.

For the growth curve method to work properly, it is essential to include the effect of finite seeing, which we take to be double Gaussian that is the SDSS default and parametrise for our purpose its full width half maximum w_s as its ratio to the effective radius of the disk

$$= \log(r_{e,D}=w_s) : \quad (3)$$

The seeing parameters are catalogued for each galaxy in the SDSS data base.

For our application we prepare templates for 11 grid points for each of the three parameters, $B=T=0.1$, $\beta = \log(r_{e,B}=r_{e,D})$; $1.2 < \beta < 0.8$ and $0 < \beta < 2.0$. The ranges of the parameters are chosen so that the results are well covered in these ranges. We then compute

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=3}^N \frac{1}{w_i} \left[\ln(\log r_i) - m_{\text{tot}} - m - \log \frac{r_i}{r_e^T} \right]^2 + \frac{1}{4} \left[\log r_e - \log r_e^T \right]^2; \quad (4)$$

where the template was swept over all 1331 grids with the parameters $B=T$, β , together with two free parameters, m_{tot} and r_e searched to give the best fit to the growth curve data for each template. Here, m_{tot} is the total magnitude and r_e is the half light radius of the galaxy, while r_e^T is the half light radius of the assumed template. The weight factor is taken to be $w_i = \log r_i$. The last two terms are added to avoid a fake fit with a rather unrealistic template, to ensure that the best fit parameter for the effective radius is close to the one adopted as a template. We use the data at 13 apertures from 1.03 to 263 arcsec with approximately a geometric sequence by a factor of 1.5, measured by the photometric pipeline of SDSS (PHOTO in short, see Stoughton et al. 2002). We have removed the two innermost growth curve data points from PHOTO, those at $0.22''$ and $0.68''$, from the fitting, as they are substantially smaller than median seeing, $1.3''$, and strongly susceptible to seeing. w_s is known for each galaxy, so that $r_{e,D}$ and $r_{e,B}$ are obtained from β and β of the template that gives the best fit to growth curves. We apply the K correction to the image, though all galaxies have small redshift $z < 0.1$, taken from Fukugita et al. (1995) assuming bulges to have elliptical color and disks Sed color. Their K corrections are consistent with the mean of those calculated using individual spectra (Blanton et al. 2003), and anyway the redshifts are so low that errors are negligible.

Extensive simulations show that this growth curve method can be used to determine bulge and disk parameters and bulge-to-disk luminosity ratios provided that the point spread function is accurately known and signal-to-noise ratio is modest, say $S/N \geq 30$ (Okamura et al. 1999). It is shown that the accuracy of the derived parameters depends upon inclination, bulge-to-disk ratio, surface brightness, available image area, and also other factors, in addition to S/N . It is, therefore, in general difficult to quote a few numbers to represent the robustness of the method. Another example of similar presentation can be seen in Pignatelli

et al (2006), where the robustness is estimated as a function of the threshold area, instead of S/N , of galaxy images. The present sample is limited to galaxies with $r < 15.9$, which roughly corresponds to $S/N > 200$ (see Figure 2 of Okamura et al. 1999), and does not include highly inclined ($b/a < 0.3$) galaxies. Accordingly, we can expect a reasonable robustness for the present sample. Fit to each of the sample galaxies is visually examined.

For a verification of the fit, we show the difference between the Petrosian magnitude measured by the SDSS photometric pipeline and the total magnitude obtained from the present fit as a function of $B-T$ in Figure 1 (a), and the effective radius r_e with respect to the Petrosian half flux radius r_{p50} as a function of $B-T$ in Figure 1 (b), where the plotted radii from the fit are corrected for finite seeing to compare with the measured Petrosian radii. Note that we expect $m_P - m_{tot} = 0.221$ and 0.007 for the ideal de Vaucouleurs and exponential profiles that are located face on, which are indicated by horizontal lines in the figure. For inclined galaxies, these offsets are slightly ($\sim 5\%$) smaller. The data for magnitude offsets in Figure 1 (a) are located mostly in between 0 and 0.2 mag, with a trend for an increase to 0.2 mag towards a larger $B-T$ in agreement with our expectation.

For the effective radii, we expect $r_{p50}/r_e = 0.713$ for de Vaucouleurs galaxies and $r_{p50}/r_e = 0.993$ for exponential galaxies for the face-on case. Our data in Figure 1 (b) that are located mostly between 1 and 1.3 with relatively larger values for bulge dominated galaxies as expected. There are a small number of cases where deviations are significant. We have examined images of those cases and found that they happen occasionally for large-size late-type galaxies, for which PHOTO gives too small radii which do not seem to be correct. This is probably due to errors in the measurement by PHOTO which are caused by too marked contrasts with bright bulges. Those data points in Figure 1 (a), whose Petrosian magnitudes are somewhat too dim, also correspond to the deviants in (b) and the same reason is suspected. Together with the figure for total magnitudes our result means that the fit gives a reasonable value for both total flux and effective radius, and our assumption for galaxies that are represented by exponential plus de Vaucouleurs profiles works reasonably well.

We adopt the morphological type index $T = 0$ for E, $T = 1$ for S0, $T = 2$ for Sa, $T = 3$ for Sb, $T = 4$ for Sc and $T = 5$ for Sd, since the T index as detailed as that in the RC2 is not warranted for both our catalogue and purpose here. Galaxies of classes with half integer T are grouped into the neighbouring later class except for $T = 0.5$ (E/S0), which shows unclear sign of disks and is discarded in our decomposition analysis. The morphological index given in Fukugita et al. (2007) is based on visual inspections of g band images by several independent classifiers in reference to prototypes presented in Hubble Atlas of Galaxies (Sandage 1961). The mean index by the several classifiers is given in the catalogue, which we take in the

present work.

Our prime interest is to study the change of properties of bulge and disk against morphology, but our sample is large enough to attempt to study the change of properties of the bulge and the disk against luminosity. We make three subsamples $23 < M_r < 22$, $22 < M_r < 21$ and $21 < M_r < 20$, dividing the sample into three luminosity groups; they stand for nearly luminosity limited samples with varying distance limits.

4. Results

4.1. Bulge to Total Luminosity Ratio

Figure 2 presents the bulge to total luminosity ratios as a function of morphological type index T . The mean and dispersion are shown by error bars for each morphological type, where T runs from 1 for S0 (excluding E/S0) to 4 for Sc (including Sbc). In order to assess the effect of bars discussed in section 3, we examine all the galaxy images and classified them into barred and non-barred. Except for $T=1$ (S0), where only three barred galaxies are present, no systematic difference is found between barred and non-barred galaxies. This is probably due to the fact that the elliptical structure of bars disappears in the growth curve obtained in circular apertures as mentioned in section 3. Laurikainen et al. (2007) found some difference in $B=T$ versus Hubble type between early-type barred and non-barred spiral galaxies. However, their data are based on near infrared images and a direct comparison is inappropriate.

One can see a good correlation showing that an earlier type shows a larger $B=T$, 0.64 for S0, decreasing for late types to 0.19 for Sc. This agrees broadly with the results given by a number of authors, e.g., Kent (1985), Simien and de Vaucouleurs (1986), Kodaira et al. (1986), and others, although an accurate comparison needs a translation as to different color bands used by respective authors. The numbers for S0 and Sc, 0.64 and 0.19, are, for instance, compared with $0.75^{+0.1}_{-0.3}$ and $0.07^{+0.15}_{-0.05}$ of Kent (1985), who used Thuan-Gunn r band that is close to ours. The dispersion for $B=T$ in each class, approximately 0.2, denoted by error bars, however, is larger than the interclass differences. This also agrees with what is known from analyses made in the past: the scatter in each class is larger than the difference of the average among different classes. This means that, while $B=T$ is well correlated with morphological types, we cannot replace the morphological types for individual galaxies with $B=T$, although $B=T$ provides a convenient measure and is often used to classify morphological types (e.g., Tasca & White 2005) especially in theoretical modelling (e.g., Baugh et al. 1996). It is tempting to ask if this systematic variation of the

bulge to total luminosity ratio is ascribed to the property of the bulge or the disk, or both. This question is answered in the subsections that follow.

4.2. Properties of Bulges

The two key parameters that characterise the bulge are the effective radius $r_{e,B}$ and $\mu_{e,B}$ which is surface brightness at r_e . It was shown that these parameters for elliptical galaxies obey some $\mu_e - r_e$ relation (Kormendy 1977). We show in Figure 3 $\mu_{e,B}$ and $r_{e,B}$ for the bulge component with different symbols meaning different morphological types. Dotted lines indicate bulge luminosities being constant, $M_B = -16; -18; -20$, and -22 . The solid line shows the $\mu_e - r_e$ relation, or Kormendy's relation, for early-type galaxies derived from the SDSS galaxy sample, $\mu_e = 2.04 \log r_e + 18.7$ (Bernardi et al. 2003).² The region where most of 9000 'early-type galaxies' of SDSS sample³ is distributed is shown by the dashed ellipse. The derived slope looks shallower than that for the original Kormendy relation, $\mu_e = 3.02 \log r_e + 19.74$ (B band). The slope of the Kormendy relation varies with brightness of galaxies, steeper for fainter galaxies (Nigoche-Netro et al. 2008). The sample of Kormendy (1977) spans over $M_B = -20$ to -22 , while the SDSS sample extends from $M_R = -19$ to -24 .

It is clear that $(\mu_e; r_e)$ of bulges are distributed in a region much wider than the 'SDSS early-type galaxies' and as a whole they do not follow the relation for SDSS early-type galaxies. We note, however, that $(\mu_e; r_e)$ of bulges of S0 galaxies closely follow the relation for the SDSS early-type galaxies in the overlapped region (dotted ellipse). This is reasonable because the SDSS sample includes S0 galaxies (Bernardi et al. 2003).

Bulges of later-type spiral galaxies $(\mu_e; r_e)$ are distributed along lines that are significantly steeper, nearly along the line of constant luminosity, $I_e r_e^2 = \text{constant}$, or $\mu_e = 5 \log r_e + \text{constant}$, with a significantly scatter larger than S0 bulges. It is known that there

² The original $\mu_e - r_e$ relation given in Kormendy (1977) was based on μ_e , the surface brightness at r_e . Some later studies, however, use $\mu_{e,0}$, the mean surface brightness within r_e , which is by definition, brighter than μ_e . When comparing the Kormendy relations based on the different definition of the surface brightness parameter, care must be taken of the offset; for the $r^{-1.4}$ profile, $\mu_e - \mu_{e,0} = 1.39$. The line drawn in Fig. 3 is $\mu_e = 2.04 \log r_e + 20.09$.

³ The selection of early-type galaxies by Bernardi et al. (2003) is rather rudimentary to deal with a large sample. It contains not only E and S0 galaxies but also many Sa galaxies, when compared it with visually classified sample. The sample, however, is certainly rich in E and S0 galaxies, and we expect that statistical quantities derived from the sample give a reasonable approximation. We also note that the sample suffers from a significant incompleteness for early-type galaxies fainter than $M_r = -21$.

is a dichotomy in elliptical galaxies in terms of kinematical structure: slow rotators versus rapid rotators (e.g., Komendy and Illingworth 1982; Davies et al. 1983; Davies and Illingworth 1983). Slow rotators have boxy isophotes while rapid rotators have disk-like isophotes (Bender et al. 1988). This dichotomy is also closely related with luminosity; bright ellipticals are often slow rotators while faint ellipticals tend to be rapid rotators with the boundary at $M_B = -20.5$ mag. The $\langle I_e \rangle$ - r_e relation of rapid rotators is not well known since even the SDSS sample, by far the largest sample of early-type galaxies, contains only a small fraction of ellipticals fainter than $M_B = -20.5$ ($M_R = -22$). Whether or not the bulges of late-type spiral galaxies and rapidly rotating faint ellipticals follow a similar $\langle I_e \rangle$ - r_e relation is at present an open question.

If we consider the mean $(\langle I_e \rangle; r_e)$, we see a trend (see Figure 4) for different morphological classes: bulges for late-type spirals have surface brightness dimmer than that for early types, whereas the effective scale length of bulges differs little. The bulge surface brightness of Sc spirals is dimmer by 2 mag arcsec⁻² than that for S0 or Sa. Surface brightness of Sa bulges, however, is nearly the same as that for S0 bulges. The bulge luminosity for late-type spirals are also lower by 2 mag than that for S0's.

It is noted in passing that no systematic difference is found between barred and non-barred galaxies. When the plot is made separately, they are distributed over the same area in the $(\langle I_e \rangle; r_e)$ plane.

4.3. Properties of Disks

A similar figure for $(\langle I_e \rangle; r_e)$ is shown for disks in Figure 5. The data are apparently distributed more clustered in a narrower region than for bulges: a rough trend $I_e r_e^2$ constant is still visible, but the data are distributed in narrower ranges. The mean surface brightness is $\langle I_{eD} \rangle = 22.06$ mag arcsec⁻² with the dispersion 0.96 mag arcsec⁻². No systematic difference is found here either between barred and non-barred galaxies in their distribution in the $(\langle I_e \rangle; r_e)$ plane.

Figure 6 shows the mean and dispersion of $(\langle I_e \rangle; r_e)$ for each morphological type, indicating that the properties of disks change little against morphologies; at least the change is not systematic along the morphological sequence. The disk luminosity also differs little across S0 to Sc. For example, properties of disks for S0 and Sc galaxies differ very little: the difference among different morphology classes is much smaller than the scatter from galaxy to galaxy in one class. Surface brightness of S0 may be slightly fainter than that of later spiral galaxies but at most only by 0.5 mag arcsec⁻². The mean surface brightness $\langle I_e \rangle$ is located

from 21.5 to 22.5 mag arcsec² with no systematic trend visible against the morphological sequence. This fact may also be interpreted as indicating the universality of disks in general, and reinforces the universality found by Freeman (1970) based on a handful of spiral galaxies available in those days (see also de Jong 1996b).

It is interesting to note that the morphological type dependence, as we have seen with bulges, almost disappears for disks. Disks in both early- and late-type spiral galaxies, including S0's, are similar with nearly constant surface brightness and scale length independent of the disk galaxy morphology.

4.4. Summary: bulge and disk properties vs. morphological type

The most conspicuous fact is that the bulge to disk or bulge to total luminosity ratio depends on morphology of spiral galaxies. Late-type spiral galaxies are more disk dominated in agreement with widely accepted concept. We have found that the properties of disks, including luminosity, do vary little with morphology. This implies that the property that varies with morphology is the bulge; in fact bulge luminosity is the main variable that controls morphology. A large and conspicuous bulge means the galaxy being an early type. In contrast, the properties of disks are nearly universal and depend little on morphology.

These systematic behaviors of bulge and/or disk parameters were found in previous studies based on various samples of galaxies (e.g., Kodaira et al. 1986; de Jong 1996a; Graham 2001a,b; Mollenho & Heidt 2001; Trujillo et al. 2002; Aguerri et al. 2004; Laurikainen et al. 2007; Mendez-Abreu et al. 2008). The size of these samples ranges several tens to about two hundreds and some are limited to cluster members. Our study confirms the behaviors that have been referred to in the literature based on a much larger homogeneous magnitude-limited sample in the field. An accurate quantitative comparison needs translation as to different color bands as well as specific bias arising from different methods adopted by different authors.

The systematic behaviors found here and in some previous studies may imply that the formation of disks takes place independent of bulges. The infall of intergalactic gas, for example, takes place irrespective of bulge properties. Some self-regulating mechanisms are suspected to be at work in disk that limit the accumulation of too many stars per area of the disk.

We do not see any trend that later type disks have higher surface brightness. In particular surface brightness of S0 disks differs little from that of Sa disks, in contrast to the claim that Sa disks have surface brightness much brighter than S0 disks (Sandage 1986), as

expected in the monolithic collapse scenario. Surface brightness of Sa and that of Sc are also nearly identical on average. We see no signatures that Sb-Sc disks are less luminous than that of S0-Sa, which might be resulted if disk stars are transported to bulges by secular formation of bulges from disks in late type spiral systems (Kormendy 1993; Kormendy & Kennicutt 2004).

It is also interesting to note that surface brightness of S0 galactic disks differ little from that of other spiral galaxies. The majority of S0's disks are unlikely to be a result of stripping of spiral galaxies (Larson et al. 1980) or faded spiral galaxies (Bedregal et al. 2006): S0's, at least for their majority, are not a result from spiral galaxies that lost substantial disk ingredients.

4.5. Correlation between scale lengths

The evidence has been discussed that the disk scale length correlates with the bulge scale length and it is taken as evidence that suggests disk origin of bulges by secular evolution of disks (Courteau et al. 1996; Mendez-Abreu et al. 2008): galaxies with large size bulge may necessarily have large size disks. In our sample we have not seen any particular correlation between the two scale lengths. The correlation, if any, is weak.

The disk scale lengths are distributed dominantly between 2 to 10 kpc, and the bulge scale lengths between 0.2 to 6 kpc. The ratio $r_{e,B}/r_{e,D}$ is distributed in the range of 1–10 with very broad peaks whose center is around 0.3 (see Figure 7 for histograms for $r_{e,B}/r_{e,D}$). This might be taken as the evidence of correlations between the two scale lengths but in fact does not mean the presence of a particular correlation between the two scales: it is a result of a fact that the two scales are distributed independently in narrow ranges. We do not either observe close correlations between quantities characterizing bulges and disks, implying that disks formed independently of the details of bulges.

4.6. Properties of disks and bulges as luminosity varies

We carried out the same analysis with the three luminosity group samples. The trends we observed in this section for the total sample are still visible with the luminosity grouped samples and the overall trends differ little from that we have seen for the total sample. Three panels in Figure 8 give the change against total luminosity of galaxies.

First we see (Figure 8 (a)) that the change of the bulge-to-total flux ratio against the total luminosity. The change is only little, ~20%, even for S0 galaxies, where the bulge

largely controls the total luminosity. The change is hardly discernible for later type spiral galaxies. This result means that luminosities of both bulges and disks change as total luminosity changes in a similar way (and in a lesser degree for disks), so that the ratios stay nearly at constants.

Bulges of fainter galaxies are also fainter by the same amount, but the reason is not uniform (see Figure 8 (b)): in early type disk galaxies, S0 and Sa, this change arises more from the decrease of the size, fainter galaxies having smaller bulges, but in later types dimmer bulge magnitude is ascribed primarily to dimmer surface brightness rather than smaller bulge sizes, which remain a constant independent of luminosity.

Luminosities of disks change as the total luminosity changes in nearly the same way (less in earlier systems). The change of disk luminosity is mostly caused by the decrease of the size (effective radius) while surface brightness at the effective radius stays nearly unchanged: the change of μ_e is less than $0.3 \text{ mag arcsec}^{-2}$ for a 2 mag change of disk luminosity (the change of surface brightness takes place in the opposite direction). See Figure 8 (c).

5. Luminosity density

Nakamura et al. (2003) estimated that the luminosity densities of early and spiral type galaxies are

$$L_r(E + S0) = 0.43 \quad 10^8 h_{70} L \quad \text{Mpc}^3; \quad (5)$$

$$L_r(S) = 0.96 \quad 10^8 h_{70} L \quad \text{Mpc}^3; \quad (6)$$

These values and all the numbers up to and including eq. (10) should be multiplied by 1.29 for the global values to correct for the underdensity of galaxies in the northern equatorial stripes where the luminosity function (and also present work) was derived from. Assuming that the shape of the luminosity functions change little within rough classes of morphology according to Nakamura et al. (2003) and using their luminosity densities up to the normalisations, we infer that

$$L_r(S0; \text{bulge}) = 0.18 \quad 10^8 h_{70} L \quad \text{Mpc}^3; \quad (7)$$

$$L_r(S0; \text{disk}) = 0.10 \quad 10^8 h_{70} L \quad \text{Mpc}^3; \quad (8)$$

where $E : S0 + E / S0 = 0.36 : 0.64$ from Fukugita et al. (2007), and B/T of S0 is 0.64 from Fig. 2, and the luminosity fractions given in section 3 are assumed to be independent of luminosity and are used to compute the bulge and disk contributions. The luminosity density of elliptical galaxies is $L_r(E) = 0.15 \quad 10^8 h_{70} L \quad \text{Mpc}^3$.

For spiral galaxies Nakamura et al. give $L_r(S) = 0.70 \cdot 10^8 h_{70} L_{\odot} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$ for S0/a to Sb galaxies and $0.26 \cdot 10^8 h_{70} L_{\odot} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}$ for Sbc to Sd galaxies. Assuming the bulge to total luminosity ratios for Sd-Sdm (which contribute by only 13% to the luminosity density of Sbc-Sdm) being equal to that for Sc galaxies, we use 0.19 for B/T of Sbc to Sd galaxies. We also assume B/T of S0/a to Sb galaxies to be 0.43 as an approximate mean in the morphology range. These values enable us to infer the luminosity densities for spiral galaxies in the same way and we obtain

$$L_r(S + S0; \text{bulge}) = 0.53 \cdot 10^8 h_{70} L_{\odot} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}; \quad (9)$$

$$L_r(S + S0; \text{disk}) = 0.71 \cdot 10^8 h_{70} L_{\odot} \text{ Mpc}^{-3}; \quad (10)$$

Therefore contributions to the luminosity density from disk, bulge and elliptical galaxies are 0.51:0.38:0.11, respectively.

This result may be compared with 0.54:0.14:0.32 from Tasca and White (2004). The disagreement in the spheroidal contributions is ascribed to the fact that a significant amount of S0 galaxies are counted as pure bulge systems, i.e., elliptical galaxies, in Tasca and White. Intrinsically bright galaxies are very often regarded as pure bulge systems with nearly edge-on disks greatly under-represented in the application of G in 2D code. When spheroids include elliptical galaxies and bulges, the relative contributions to disk and spheroids 0.53:0.47 in our analysis agrees with the fraction given by Tasca and White.

If we use a result of stellar population synthesis (Bruzual & Charlot 2003) assuming two populations in the Universe | spheroids and disks | constrained with the mean colors of SDSS galaxies (Nagamine et al. 2006), we have the average stellar mass to light ratios, $hM_{\odot} = L_{\text{r},i} = 3.2$ for spheroids and 1.2 for disks, or correspondingly $hM_{\odot} = L_{\text{B},i} = 5.6$ and 1.2, respectively, if the more familiar B band is adopted. Using these mass to light ratios and including the fraction of 1.29 correction and $h_{70} = 1$ we estimate the stellar mass density

$$\rho_{\text{spheroids}, \text{star}} = 0.00207; \quad (11)$$

$$\rho_{\text{disk}, \text{star}} = 0.00081; \quad (12)$$

i.e., the total stellar mass density $\rho_{\text{star}} = 0.0029$ and the ratio of two mass densities $\rho_{\text{spheroid}, \text{star}} / \rho_{\text{disk}, \text{star}} = 2.6$. The latter is somewhat smaller than the ratio in Fukugita et al. (1998), who gave 3, but substantially larger than 0.77 by Benson et al. (2002) and 0.75 by Driver et al. (2007).

6. Conclusions

We have carried out bulge-disk decomposition for a modestly large sample of galaxies derived from a morphologically classified sample of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey with the use of growth curve fitting. We demonstrated that growth curve fitting method works as expected and studied properties of bulges and disks thus decomposed as functions of morphology and luminosity. We endorsed the well-known trend that the importance of bulge decreases systematically from early to late types, but we have shown that this is dominantly due to the variation of bulges as the morphological type changes. In contrast, we have shown that the properties of disks are nearly universal, and depend only weakly on morphology classes. We do not see any systematic trend of disks that changes with morphology of disk galaxies. In spite of a good correlation between the bulge to total luminosity ratio and the morphological type, the galaxy to galaxy scatter of the former is so large that one cannot replace the conventional morphology type with the luminosity ratio.

While we have a number of different scenarios for disk and bulge formation, definitive predictions that can be compared with our analysis are not readily available. However a number of predictions or likely results seem to be disfavoured. For example, the monolithic scenario that bulge formed from infall of gas and disk formed dissipational collapse of gas left-over the initial collapse favours brighter disks for later type morphologies. This is not supported by our data. The model that S0 forms as a result of stripping of spiral disks or spiral galaxies of faded disks are not favoured either, since disk properties of spirals galaxies are all similar including S0's. We do not observe any conspicuous change in disk properties between early and late type spiral galaxies, which would be expected if late type spiral bulges are a product of secular evolution from disks while earlier types are from major mergers. Furthermore we do not see correlation between bulge and disk properties. The universal disks that we have seen may be more consistent with the naive idea that disks are later additions by accretion of intergalactic material falling onto bulges where accretion took place independent of bulge properties but with some self-regulating mechanism that limits the column density of stars in the disk at work for disks.

We also noted that the properties ($\epsilon_e; r_e$) of bulges of spiral galaxies and bright elliptical galaxies are different as obeying different relations, which implies that bulges and bright elliptical galaxies are unlikely to be on a single sequence.

We thank Masayuki Tanaka for his help in the application of the rather old growth curve fitting code to the present SDSS sample, and Ivan Baldry for comments on the early version of the draft. This work was supported in Japan by Grant-in-Aid of the Ministry of Education. MF received support from the Monell Foundation at the Institute for Advanced

Study.

Funding for the SDSS and SDSS-II has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Japanese Monbukagakusho, the Max Planck Society, and the Higher Education Funding Council for England. The SDSS Web Site is <http://www.sdss.org/>. The SDSS is managed by the Astrophysical Research Consortium for the Participating Institutions. The Participating Institutions are the American Museum of Natural History, Astrophysical Institute Potsdam, University of Basel, Cambridge University, Case Western Reserve University, University of Chicago, Drexel University, Fermilab, the Institute for Advanced Study, the Japan Participation Group, Johns Hopkins University, the Joint Institute for Nuclear Astrophysics, the Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, the Korean Scientist Group, the Chinese Academy of Sciences (LAMOST), Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Max-Planck-Institute for Astronomy (MPIA), the Max-Planck-Institute for Astrophysics (MPA), New Mexico State University, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Portsmouth, Princeton University, the United States Naval Observatory, and the University of Washington.

Appendix A : Stellar population synthesis

The bulge disk decomposition enables us to infer color of galaxies with two population of stars, disk stars and bulge stars. We approximate them as delayed exponential model, i.e., star formation being given by $\Sigma = A(t = \tau) \exp(-t/\tau)$ (Searle et al 1973; Nagamine et al. 2006). We may adopt the parameters given by Nagamine et al. (2006) which gives global galaxy colors as our fiducial choice without a further adjustment: $\tau_d = 4.5 \text{ Gyr}$ for disk and $\tau_b = 1.5 \text{ Gyr}$ for bulge. Using our bulge to disk ratio, we calculate g_r and u_g colors of galaxies with various morphological types as shown in Figure 9. Here we take the stellar population synthesis of Bruzual and Charlot (2003). The figures also give the mean and variance estimated in the morphologically classified galaxy sample (Fukugita et al. 2007), showing reasonable agreement between the two.

This is an example of the significant use of the bulge disk decomposition. These figures mean that one can construct a qualitative model of galaxies consistent with the observation using the simple bulge disk decomposition given in this paper. With this model we can also calculate stellar mass to light ratio as

$$M/L_r = 1.18 + 2.01 (B - T); \quad (13)$$

where $B = T$ is the bulge fraction of luminosity given in Table 1, and Chabrier's initial mass function (Chabrier 2003) is used to calculate the stellar mass.

REFERENCES

- Abazajian, K., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 126, 2081
- Abazajian, K., et al. 2004, *AJ*, 128, 502
- Abazajian, K., et al. 2005, *AJ*, 129, 1755
- Adelman-McCarthy, J.K., et al. 2006, *ApJS*, 162, 38
- Adelman-McCarthy, J.K., et al. 2007, *ApJS*, 172, 634
- Adelman-McCarthy, J.K., et al. 2008, *ApJS*, 175, 297
- Andredakis, Y.C., Peletier, R.F., & Balcells, M. 1995, *MNRAS*, 275, 874
- Agueri, J.A.L., Iglesias-Paramo, J., Vilchez, J.M., Muñoz-Tunon, C. 2004, *AJ*, 127, 1344
- Agueri, J.A.L., Elias-Rosa, N., Corsini, E.M., Muñoz-Tunon, C. 2005, *A & A*, 434, 109
- Athanassoula, E. 2003, *MNRAS*, 341, 1179
- Baugh, C.M., Cole, S., & Frenk, C.S. 1996, *MNRAS*, 283, 1361
- Bedregal, A.G., Aragón-Salamanca, A., & Merrield, M.R. 2006, *MNRAS*, 373, 1125
- Bender, R. 1988, *A & A*, 193, L7
- Benson, A.J., Frenk, C.S., & Sharpley, R.M. 2002, *ApJ*, 574, 104
- Bernardi, M., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 1849
- Blanton, M.R., et al. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 2348
- Bruzual A., G., & Charlot, S. 1993, *ApJ*, 405, 538
- Chabrier, G. 2003, *PASP*, 115, 763
- Courteau, S., de Jong, R.S., & Broeils, A.H. 1996, *ApJ*, 457, L73
- Davies, R.L., Efsthathiou, G., Fall, S.M., Illingworth, G., & Schechter, P.L. 1983, *ApJ*, 266,

- Davies, R. L., & Illingworth, G. 1983, *ApJ*, 266, 516
- Debatista, V. P., Carollo, C. M., Mayer, L., & Moore, B. 2004, *ApJ*, 604, 93
- de Jong, R. S. 1996a, *A & A*, 313, 45
- de Jong, R. S. 1996b, *A & A S*, 118, 557
- de Souza, R. E., Gadotti, D. A., & dos Anjos, S. 2004, *ApJS*, 153, 411
- de Vaucouleurs, G., de Vaucouleurs, A., & Corwin, J. R. 1976, *Second reference catalogue of bright galaxies*, 1976, Austin: University of Texas Press. (RC2)
- Driver, S. P., Allen, P. D., Liske, J., & Graham, A. W. 2007, *ApJ*, 657, L85
- Eggen, O. J., Lynden-Bell, D., & Sandage, A. R. 1962, *ApJ*, 136, 753
- Fisher, D. B., & D'orcy, N. 2008, *AJ*, 136, 773
- Freeman, K. C. 1970, *ApJ*, 160, 811
- Fukugita, M., Hogan, C. J., & Peebles, P. J. E. 1998, *ApJ*, 503, 518
- Fukugita, M., Ichikawa, T., Gunn, J. E., Doi, M., Shimazaki, K., & Schneider, D. P. 1996, *AJ*, 111, 1748
- Fukugita, M., Shimazaki, K., & Ichikawa, T. 1995, *PASP*, 107, 945
- Fukugita, M., et al. 2007, *ArXiv eprints*, 704, arXiv:0704.1743 *AJ*, 134, 579 (OK?)
- Graham, A. W. 2001a, *MNRAS*, 326, 543
- Graham, A. W. 2001b, *AJ*, 121, 820
- Gunn, J. E., et al. 1998, *AJ*, 116, 3040
- Gunn, J. E., et al. 2006, *AJ*, 131, 2332
- Hogg, D. W., Finkbeiner, D. P., Schlegel, D. J., & Gunn, J. E. 2001, *AJ*, 122, 2129
- Illingworth, G. 1977, *ApJ*, 218, L43
- Kauffman, G., White, S. D. M., & Guiderdoni, B. 1993, *MNRAS*, 264, 201
- Kent, S. M. 1985, *ApJS*, 59, 115
- Kent, S. M. 1986, *AJ*, 91, 1301

- Kodaira, K., Watanabe, M., & Okamura, S. 1986, *ApJS*, 62, 703
- Kormendy, J. 1977, *ApJ*, 218, 333
- Kormendy, J. 1993, *Galactic Bulges*, *IAU Symp.*, 153, 209
- Kormendy, J. & Illingworth, G. 1982, *ApJ*, 256, 460
- Kormendy, J., & Kennicutt, R. C., Jr. 2004, *ARA & A*, 42, 603
- Larson, R. B., Tinsley, B. M., & Caldwell, C. N. 1980, *ApJ*, 237, 692
- Laurikainen, E., Salo, H., Buta, R., & Knapen, J. H. 2007, *MNRAS*, 381, 401
- Marleau, F. R. & Simard, L. 1998, *ApJ*, 507, 585
- Martinez-Valpuesta, I., Shlosman, I., & Heller, C. 2006, *ApJ*, 637, 214
- Mendez-Abreu, J., Aguerri, J. A. L., Corsini, E. M., & Simonneau, E. 2008, *A & A*, 478, 353
- Mollenho, C. 2004, *A & A*, 415, 63
- Mollenho, C. & Heidt, J. 2001, *A & A*, 368, 16
- Moran, S. M. 2007, *ApJ*, 665, 1067
- Nagamine, K., Ostriker, J. P., Fukugita, M., & Cen, R. 2006, *ApJ*, 653, 881
- Nakamura, O., Fukugita, M., Yasuda, N., Loveday, J., Brinkmann, J., Schneider, D. P., Shimasaku, K., & Subbarao, M. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 1682
- Nigoche-Netro, A., Ruelas-Mayorga, A., & Franco-Balderas, A. 2008, *A & A*, 491, 731
- Okamura, S., Yasuda, N., Shimasaku, K., Yagi, M., & Weinberg, D. H. 1999, *PASP*, 111, 31
- Peng, C. Y., Ho, L. C., Impey, C. D., & Rix, H.-W. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 266
- Pier, J. R., Munn, J. A., Hindsley, R. B., Hennessy, G. S., Kent, S. M., Lupton, R. H., & Ivezić, Z. 2003, *AJ*, 125, 1559
- Pignatelli, E., Fasano, G., & Cassata, P. 2006, *A & A*, 446, 373
- Sandage, A. 1961, *Hubble Atlas of Galaxies*, Washington: Carnegie Institution, 1961
- Sandage, A. 1986, *A & A*, 161, 89
- Schlegel, D. J., Finkbeiner, D. P., & Davis, M. 1998, *ApJ*, 500, 525

- Searle, L., Sargent, W. L. W., & Bagnuolo, W. G. 1973, *ApJ*, 179, 427
- Sersic, J. L. 1968, *Atlas de galaxias australes*, Observatorio Astronómico, Córdoba, Argentina, 1968
- Simard, L. et al. 2002, *ApJS*, 142, 1
- Simien, F., & de Vaucouleurs, G. 1986, *ApJ*, 302, 564
- Smith, J. A., et al. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 2121
- Stoughton, C., et al. 2002, *AJ*, 123, 485
- Strauss, M. A., et al. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 1810
- Tasca, L. A. M., & White, S. D. M. 2005, *ArXiv Astrophysics eprints*, arXiv:astro-ph/0507249
- Trujillo, I., Graham, A. W., & Caon, N. 2001, *MNRAS*, 326, 869
- Trujillo, I., Amsio Ramos, A., Rubino-Martin, J. A., Graham, A. Lister W., Aguerri, J. A. L., Cepa, J., Gutierrez, C. M. 2002, *MNRAS*, 333, 510
- van Houten, C. J. 1961, *Bull. Astron. Inst. Netherlands*, 16, 1
- York, D. G., et al. 2000, *AJ*, 120, 1579

Table 1. Properties of galaxies for our sample

Hubble type	S0		S0/a-Sa		Sab-Sb		Sbc-Sc	
T (ours)	1		2		3		4	
nrs. of galaxies	183		158		184		212	
B = T	0:64	0:19	0:49	0:24	0:29	0:20	0:19	0:14
$r_{e;B}$ (h_{70}^{-1} kpc)	2:95	2:30	2:56	2:81	2:76	2:56	3:02	2:82
$r_{e;B}$ (mag arcsec ²)	20:31	1:26	20:62	1:53	21:53	1:97	22:15	1:91
$r_{e;D}$ (h_{70}^{-1} kpc)	7:20	4:56	5:51	3:38	5:25	2:98	6:71	3:15
$r_{e;D}$ (mag arcsec ²)	22:56	1:14	22:04	1:01	21:67	0:71	21:96	0:65
$\log[r_{e;B} = r_{e;D}]$	0:45	0:33	0:44	0:42	0:39	0:48	0:45	0:43




Fig. 1. (a) $m_{\text{tot}} - m_{\text{P}}$ sets between m_{tot} obtained from our fitting and m_{P} the Petrosian magnitude estimated from the photometric pipeline of the SDSS, and (b) $r_{\text{e}} / r_{\text{P}50}$ sets between the effective radius r_{e} from our fit and the SDSS output of 50% Petrosian radius $r_{\text{P}50}$, both as a function of the bulge to total luminosity ratio. The dashed lines are sets expected for galaxies with the pure de Vaucouleurs and exponential profiles located face-on.




Fig. 2. | Bulge to total luminosity ratio B/T as a function of morphological types of disk galaxies. The crosses, open circles, and filled circles represent barred, non-barred, and total sample, respectively. Barred/non-barred classification was uncertain for 38 galaxies, which are not included in the plot.




Fig. 3. | Relation between the effective radius $r_{e,B}$ and surface brightness $\mu_{e,B}$ at the effective radius for bulges. Different symbols denote different morphologies of galaxies. The solid line is the $\mu_{e,B} - r_{e,B}$ relation for early-type galaxies from the SDSS (Bernardi et al. 2003), and the broken ellipse show the area where most of the nearly 9000 SDSS early-type galaxies are distributed. The dotted lines are the relations that give rise to fixed bulge luminosities, $M_{r,B} = -16; \dots -22$ mag.




Fig. 4. | Variation of the relation between the effective radius $r_{e,B}$ and surface brightness $\mu_{e,B}$ at the effective radius for bulges, as morphologies changes. The plot shows the mean and the dispersion of data shown in Figure 3. Different symbols denote different morphologies of galaxies, and dotted lines are the relations that give rise to fixed bulge luminosities, $M_{r,B} = -16, \dots, -22 \text{ mag}$.




Fig. 5. Same as Figure 3, but for disks, i.e., the effective radius $r_{e,D}$ vs. surface brightness $\mu_{e,D}$ at the effective radius. The dotted lines are the relations that give rise to fixed disk luminosities, $M_{r,D} = -16; \dots -22$ mag.




Fig. 6. Same as Figure 4, but for disks, i.e., the effective radius $r_{e,D}$ vs. surface brightness $\mu_{e,D}$ at the effective radius. The dotted lines are the relations that give rise to fixed disk luminosities, $M_{r,D} = -16; \dots; -22 \text{ mag}$.




Fig. 7. | Distribution of the ratio of scale lengths of bulges and disks for the four classes of morphologies. There are no data points beyond the scale displayed.




Fig. 8. (a) Bulge to total luminosity ratios for the four morphology types for the three luminosity groups. The error bars show dispersions, as for Figure 2. (b) the effective radius $r_{e,B}$ vs. surface brightness $\mu_{e,B}$ for bulges for the three luminosity groups (denoted by the size of symbols). The large size symbols stand for galaxies with $-23 < M < -22$, middle size symbols for $-22 < M < -21$ and small size symbols for $-21 < M < -20$. The dotted lines are the relations that give rise to fixed bulge luminosities, $M_{r,B} = 16; 18; 20; 22$ mag from left to right. (c) the same as (b) but for disks.




Fig. 9. $|g-r|$ color (left) and $u-g$ color (right) of galaxies in various morphological types. The curves are prediction based on the bulge disk decomposition given in this paper with the aid of the stellar population synthesis with a delayed exponential star formation model. The data with error bars (variance) are statistics from morphologically classified sample of SDSS galaxies.