

Relativistic approach to the kinematics of large-scale peculiar motions

Eleni Tsaprazi^{1,2*} and Christos G. Tsagas^{1,3}

¹Section of Astrophysics, Astronomy and Mechanics, Department of Physics
Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece

²Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, CNRS
Institut d'Astrophysique de Paris (IAP), 98bis Boulevard Arago, Paris 75014, France

³DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences, University of Cambridge
Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK

Abstract

We consider the linear kinematics of large-scale peculiar motions in a perturbed Friedmann universe. In so doing, we take the view point of the “real” observers that move along with the peculiar flow and therefore introduce a 4-velocity “tilt”, relative to the smooth Hubble expansion. Using relativistic cosmological perturbation theory we study the linear evolution of the peculiar velocity field itself, as well as the expansion/contraction, the shear and the rotation of the bulk motion. Our analytic solutions show growth rates considerably stronger than those predicted by the earlier treatments, all of which were Newtonian or quasi-Newtonian in nature. In particular, large-scale peculiar velocities are found to grow as a^2 , in terms of the scale factor, as opposed to the Newtonian $a^{1/2}$ -law. The reason for this considerable change can be traced down to the different way the two theories treat cosmological perturbations and more specifically the sources of the peculiar-velocity perturbations. The faster growth rates reported in this work suggest that large (cosmological) scale peculiar velocity fields can grow to phenomenologically relevant values, even when they start negligibly small at recombination. Alternatively, one could say that the results of the relativistic study favour bulk peculiar motions larger and faster than previously anticipated.

1 Introduction

Large-scale peculiar motions, also referred to as “bulk flows”, are an established observational fact, confirmed by many surveys extending out to scales of several hundred Mpc. Peculiar velocities are predicted by all structure formation scenarios, as the direct and unavoidable outcome of the ever increasing inhomogeneity and anisotropy of the post-recombination universe. The subject has a fairly long research history that goes back several decades. Nevertheless, essentially all the available treatments of the peculiar-velocity evolution are Newtonian, or quasi-Newtonian, in nature (see [1] and [2] respectively) and they are all conducted in the rest-frame of the smooth

* *Current address:* The Oscar Klein Centre, Department of Physics, Albanova University Center, Stockholm University, SE - 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden.

Hubble expansion. The latter is defined as the coordinate system where the dipole of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) spectrum vanishes. However, even at the linear level, there are subtle differences between the Newtonian and the relativistic treatments, given the very different way the two theories approach issues as fundamental as the time-vs-space relation and the nature of gravity itself. Moreover, no real observer in the universe follows the CMB frame, but we all move relative to it. Our Local Group of galaxies, for example, “drifts” with respect to the smooth Hubble flow at approximately 600 km/sec. For these reasons, the present work looks into the question of large-scale peculiar velocities and of their evolution by employing relativistic cosmological perturbation theory and by adopting the view point of an observer living in a typical galaxy (like our Milky Way) and moving relative to the Hubble flow. Put another way, all our calculations are done in a coordinate system moving with respect to the CMB frame. Our aim is to identify possible differences between the two approaches and thus provide a better theoretical understanding of the peculiar-motion kinematics, especially in view of the anticipated data from the upcoming bulk-flow surveys. Note that the linear nature of our analysis implies that our scales of interest are large enough to neglect all nonlinear effects, which in practice means scales in excess of 100 Mpc.

We begin our study in § 2, with a brief introduction to the analysis of peculiar velocities within the framework of relativistic cosmology. In so doing, we assume a perturbed Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) universe filled with a pressureless fluid that can be baryonic, or low-energy cold dark matter (CDM), or both. We also adopt the 1+3 covariant approach to relativity and cosmology (see [3] for recent extensive reviews) and allow for two families of observers. These are the “fictitious” ideal observers that follow the CMB-frame and their real counterparts moving relative to it. The latter represent typical observers in our universe, which makes their coordinate system the natural frame to use in “realistic” cosmological studies.

In addition to the peculiar velocity field itself, we investigate the full spectrum of the peculiar kinematics, namely the volume expansion/contraction, the shear and the rotation of the bulk motion. We first establish the linear sources of cosmological peculiar motions in § 3. As expected, we find that such flows are triggered by the growing inhomogeneity of the post-recombination universe. Our analysis also provides the full set of differential equations monitoring the peculiar velocity field, its expansion/contraction-rate its shear distortion and its rotation after decoupling. However, only the homogeneous parts of these formulae accept analytic (power-law) solutions. These show increase, both in absolute terms and relative to the background Hubble expansion (see § 4). More specifically, the peculiar velocity (\tilde{v}) is found to grow as $\tilde{v} \propto a^2$, where $a = a(t)$ is the cosmological scale-factor. This implies that the strength of the peculiar flow relative to the universal expansion, described by the ratio \tilde{v}/v_H – with v_H representing the Hubble velocity on the corresponding length, grows as $\tilde{v}/v_H \propto a^{5/2}$. At the same time, the expansion/contraction-rate ($\tilde{\vartheta}$) of the bulk flow shows a scale-dependent growth, which reaches its maximum ($\tilde{\vartheta} \propto a$) on super-Hubble scales and tends to a constant (i.e. $\tilde{\vartheta} \rightarrow \text{constant}$) inside the horizon. Finally, the peculiar shear and the peculiar vorticity ($\tilde{\zeta}$ and $\tilde{\omega}$ respectively) are found to grow as $\tilde{\zeta}, \tilde{\omega} \propto a$.

To the best of our knowledge, the growth rates given above are considerably stronger than those previously reported in the theoretical literature. The Newtonian/quasi-Newtonian treatments, in particular, lead to $v \propto a^{1/2}$ in the CMB frame [1, 2], which implies $v/v_H \propto a$ after decoupling. The same result was also recently obtained by applying the Newtonian version of the 1+3 formalism to the bulk-flow frame [4]. Technically speaking, the differences between

the relativistic and the Newtonian results stem from the different way the two theories treat cosmological perturbations and in particular the linear sources of the peculiar velocities (see § 3.1 and 4.1 here, as well as [4] for a comparison of the two approaches).

Isolating and solving only the homogenous parts of the relativistic differential equations means that the resulting solutions are expected to hold on relatively large scales, where the inhomogeneous components (consisting of spatial gradients and their time derivatives) should be negligible. Therefore, further study (most likely numerical) is necessary to establish the threshold below which the aforementioned inhomogeneous parts are no longer negligible. With this in mind, one should probably apply our power-law solutions on lengths near and beyond the Hubble horizon. It may turn out that the relativistic solutions reduce to their Newtonian counterparts deep inside the Hubble horizon, but additional effort is required to establish whether this happens and the associated transition scale. At this stage, it is fair to say that the relativistic analysis seems to favour bulk peculiar flows larger and faster than previously anticipated. Alternatively, one could interpret our results as a sign that the observed large-scale peculiar velocity fields could have started at recombination considerably weaker than it is generally expected.

2 The peculiar velocity field

In relativity neither time nor space retain their absolute Newtonian notion. As a result, observers moving with respect to each other have their own measure of time and space and they generally experience different versions of what one might call “reality”.

2.1 The 4-velocity “tilt”

Consider two families of observers with (timelike) 4-velocities u_a and \tilde{u}_a respectively. Let us also assume that the latter family has peculiar velocity \tilde{v}_a relative to the former. The three aforementioned velocity fields are then related by the familiar Lorentz boost

$$\tilde{u}_a = \tilde{\gamma}(u_a + \tilde{v}_a), \quad (1)$$

where $u_a u^a = -1 = \tilde{u}_a \tilde{u}^a$, $u_a \tilde{v}^a = 0$, $\tilde{\gamma} = 1/\sqrt{1 - \tilde{v}^2}$ and $\tilde{v}^2 = \tilde{v}_a \tilde{v}^a < 1$ (see Fig. 1).¹ The “tilt” between the two 4-velocity vectors is determined by the (hyperbolic) angle β , defined by $\cosh \beta = -\tilde{u}_a u^a = \tilde{\gamma}$. The latter ensures that $\beta = \ln(\tilde{\gamma} + \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}^2 - 1})$, with $\beta > 0$ since $\tilde{\gamma} > 1$ (see [5] for further discussion and additional technical details).

Note that, when dealing with large-scale bulk peculiar motions, the local and the mean velocities of the flow (\tilde{v} and \tilde{V} respectively) are typically related via the integral $\tilde{V} = (3/4\pi r^3) \int_{x < r} \tilde{v} dx^3$, where $\tilde{v}^2 = \tilde{v}_a \tilde{v}^a$ and r is the (effective) radius of the bulk flow.

2.2 The 1+3 threading

Introducing two 4-velocities means that there are two temporal directions (along u_a and \tilde{u}_a) and two 3-dimensional spatial sections (orthogonal to u_a and \tilde{u}_a respectively). Projecting onto these

¹Throughout this manuscript Latin indices run from 0 to 3, while Greek ones take values from 1 to 3.




Figure 1: Observers (O_1 and O_2) living inside the bulk flow domain (D) and moving with (individual/local) peculiar velocity \tilde{v}_a relative to the Hubble expansion. The 4-velocities u_a and \tilde{u}_a define the Hubble frame and the frame of the peculiar motion respectively (see Eq. (1)).

3-spaces is achieved by using the symmetric projection tensors

$$h_{ab} = g_{ab} + u_a u_b \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}_{ab} = g_{ab} + \tilde{u}_a \tilde{u}_b, \quad (2)$$

with $h_{ab}u^a = 0 = \tilde{h}_{ab}\tilde{u}^b$ and $h_a^a = 3 = \tilde{h}_a^a$ [3]. Note that, when there is no vorticity, these two projectors also act as the metric tensors of their associated 3-dimensional hypersurfaces.

We may now proceed to define temporal and spatial differentiation relative to the two timelike coordinate systems introduced in § 2.1 before. In particular, the time-derivatives in the u_a and the \tilde{u}_a frames are denoted by

$$\dot{} = u^a \nabla_a \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{}' = \tilde{u}^a \nabla_a, \quad (3)$$

respectively. The corresponding spatial gradients, on the other hand, are

$$D_a = h_a^b \nabla_b \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{D}_a = \tilde{h}_a^b \nabla_b. \quad (4)$$

Using the above, one can decompose any spacetime variable, operator and equation into their timelike and spacelike components (relative to the u_a or the \tilde{u}_a field), thus achieving an 1+3 threading of the host spacetime into time and space [3].

2.3 Kinematic decomposition

The irreducible kinematic variables of the two 4-velocity fields emerge after decomposing their gradients. More specifically, we have [3]

$$\nabla_b u_a = \frac{1}{3} \Theta h_{ab} + \sigma_{ab} + \omega_{ab} - A_a u_b. \quad (5)$$

In the above $\Theta = D^a u_a$, $\sigma_{ab} = D_{(b} u_{a)}$, $\omega_{ab} = D_{[b} u_{a]}$ and $A_a = \dot{u}_a$ are respectively the expansion/contraction scalar, the shear tensor, the vorticity tensor and the 4-acceleration vector of

the u_a -field.² Positive values for Θ mean expansion, while in the opposite case we have contraction. Nonzero shear implies changes in the shape (under constant volume) of the associated fluid element and non-vanishing vorticity ensures rotation. Finally, a nonzero 4-acceleration indicates the presence of non-gravitational forces. In an exactly analogous way we may write

$$\nabla_b \tilde{u}_a = \frac{1}{3} \tilde{\Theta} \tilde{h}_{ab} + \tilde{\sigma}_{ab} + \tilde{\omega}_{ab} - \tilde{A}_a \tilde{u}_b, \quad (6)$$

for the gradient of the \tilde{u}_a -field. Note that, in cosmological studies, the volume scalar defines the scale factor of the universe by means of $\dot{a}/a = \Theta/3$. Also, the shear, the vorticity and the 4-acceleration are all spacelike, namely $\sigma_{ab}u^b = 0 = \omega_{ab}u^b = A_a u^a$ by construction, with exactly analogous constraints applying to their “tilded” counterparts (i.e. $\tilde{\sigma}_{ab}\tilde{u}^b = 0 = \tilde{\omega}_{ab}\tilde{u}^b = \tilde{A}_a \tilde{u}^a$).

No realistic fluid-flow is absolutely rigid, but instead it is expected to expand or contract, to change shape and to rotate, even by small amounts. It is therefore plausible to argue that large-scale bulk peculiar motions should behave in a similar manner. The expansion/contraction-rate, the shear distortion and the rotation of the \tilde{u}_a -field, technically speaking the irreducible variables of the peculiar kinematics, are obtained by splitting its spatial gradient. More specifically, taking the view point of the tilded observer, we have [6]

$$\tilde{D}_b \tilde{v}_a = \frac{1}{3} \tilde{\vartheta} \tilde{h}_{ab} + \tilde{\zeta}_{ab} + \tilde{\omega}_{ab}, \quad (7)$$

with $\tilde{\vartheta} = \tilde{D}^a \tilde{v}_a$, $\tilde{\zeta}_{ab} = \tilde{D}_{[b} \tilde{v}_{a]}$ and $\tilde{\omega}_{ab} = \tilde{D}_{[b} \tilde{v}_{a]}$ representing the peculiar expansion/contraction, the peculiar shear and the peculiar vorticity respectively.³

2.4 Linear relations between the two frames

So far we have not imposed any constraints on the peculiar velocity, which means that our definitions and our formulae hold for arbitrarily fast relative motions in a general spacetime. Hereafter, we will only consider non-relativistic drift velocities with $\tilde{v}^2 \ll 1$ and

$$\tilde{u}_a \simeq u_a + \tilde{v}_a, \quad (8)$$

since $\tilde{\gamma} \simeq 1$.⁴ Treating the peculiar velocity field as a perturbation, we assume that the host spacetime is an almost-FRW universe. Finally, we identify the u_a -field with the coordinate

²We will use round brackets for symmetrisation, square for antisymmetrisation and angled for the symmetric and trace-free part of second-rank tensors. Consequently, $\sigma_{ab} = D_{(b} u_{a)} = D_{(b} u_{a)} - (D^c u_c/3)h_{ab}$ by default.

³The scalar $\tilde{\vartheta}$ monitors the volume expansion/contraction of the bulk motion. When $\tilde{\vartheta} > 0$ the peculiar flow expands and in the opposite case it contracts. The peculiar shear tensor follows changes in the shape of the bulk flow, say from spherical to ellipsoidal, while the vorticity tensor contains information about its rotation. At the linear level we have $|\tilde{\vartheta}|/\Theta \ll 1$, $\tilde{\zeta}/\Theta \ll 1$ and $\tilde{\omega}/\Theta \ll 1$ by default, with $2\tilde{\zeta}^2 = \tilde{\zeta}_{ab}\tilde{\zeta}^{ab}$ and $2\tilde{\omega}^2 = \tilde{\omega}_{ab}\tilde{\omega}^{ab}$.

⁴In typical Newtonian studies, peculiar velocities are defined by introducing physical and comoving coordinates (r^α and x^α respectively, with $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$) and related by $r^\alpha = ax^\alpha$. The time derivative of the latter equation leads to $v^\alpha = v_H^\alpha + v_p^\alpha$, where $v^\alpha = \dot{r}^\alpha$ is the physical (total) velocity, $v_H^\alpha = Hr^\alpha$ is the Hubble velocity and $v_p^\alpha = a\dot{x}^\alpha$ is the peculiar velocity. The above given relation between the three velocity fields is the Newtonian analogue of Eqs. (1) and (8). Having said that, we remind the reader that the 4-velocities \tilde{u}_a and u_a are both timelike vectors, whereas their Newtonian counterparts are all purely spatial.

system of the Hubble flow and place the tilded observers in a typical galaxy like our Milky Way.⁵ Then, the kinematic variables defined in § 2.3 are related by the linear expressions [2]

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Theta} &= \Theta + \tilde{\vartheta}, & \tilde{\sigma}_{ab} &= \sigma_{ab} + \tilde{\zeta}_{ab}, & (9) \\ \tilde{\omega}_{ab} &= \omega_{ab} + \tilde{\varpi}_{ab} & \text{and} & & \tilde{A}_a &= A_a + \tilde{v}'_a + \frac{1}{3}\Theta\tilde{v}_a, & (10) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{v}'_a = \tilde{u}^b \nabla_b \tilde{v}_a$ is the time derivative of the peculiar velocity in the tilded frame (not to be confused with the “peculiar gravitational acceleration” of the Newtonian treatments). Similarly, the dynamical variables measured in the two frames are related by

$$\tilde{\rho} = \rho, \quad \tilde{p} = p, \quad \tilde{q}_a = q_a - (\rho + p)\tilde{v}_a \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\pi}_{ab} = \pi_{ab}, \quad (11)$$

to first approximation [2]. Here, ρ is the energy density, p is the isotropic pressure, q_a is the energy flux and π_{ab} is the viscosity of the matter as measured in the u_a -frame, while their tilded counterparts are associated with the \tilde{u}_a -field.

In what follows we will use the above linear relations to study the kinematic evolution of large-scale peculiar motions in a perturbed Friedmann universe. Of particular importance for our purposes are relations (10b) and (11c). The former implies that, even when A_a vanishes in the CMB frame, the tilded observers measure an (effective) nonzero 4-acceleration solely because of their peculiar motion. In an analogous way, Eq. (11c) ensures that there is an effective nonzero energy-flux vector in the tilded frame, as a result of its relative motion alone (i.e. $\tilde{q}_a \neq 0$, although q_a may vanish in the coordinate system of the smooth Hubble flow).

3 Linear sources of peculiar flows

Large-scale peculiar motions are treated as a result of the increasing inhomogeneity and anisotropy of our universe, triggered by the ongoing structure-formation process. The latter starts in earnest after recombination, once the baryons have decoupled from the background radiation.

3.1 Peculiar velocities

Let us assume an almost-FRW cosmology filled with pressure-free matter. This can be baryonic, or low-energy CDM, or a mixture of both. The absence of pressure means that we can set $A_a = 0$ in the Hubble frame. Then relation (10d), which also serves as the linear propagation equation of the peculiar velocity in the bulk-flow frame, recasts as

$$\tilde{v}'_a = -H\tilde{v}_a + \tilde{A}_a, \quad (12)$$

with $H = \Theta/3$ being the Hubble parameter in the CMB frame. Therefore, at the linear level, the sole source of peculiar velocities is the 4-acceleration. This makes \tilde{A}_a the key to the subsequent evolution of the \tilde{v}_a -field. It also means that the way the 4-acceleration is treated is crucial. In the Newtonian analogue of Eq. (12), the role of the 4-acceleration is played by the gradient of

⁵Although relativity postulates the absence of preferred coordinate systems, the universal expansion naturally selects the CMB frame as the reference system relative to which peculiar velocities should be defined and measured.

the gravitational potential (e.g. see [1, 4]). Similarly, the quasi-Newtonian approach introduces an effective gravitational potential to account for the effects of the 4-acceleration [2]. The latter, however, pre-assumes that the perturbed spacetime is both irrotational and shear-free. Moreover, the necessary propagation formula of \tilde{A}_a was obtained after introducing an ansatz for the time evolution of the aforementioned potential [2]. Here, we will not do so. Instead, by turning to relativistic cosmological perturbation theory, we will obtain analytical expressions for both the 4-acceleration vector and its time-derivative. More specifically, written in the rest-frame of the peculiar motion, the linear evolution formula of the density inhomogeneities ($\tilde{\Delta}_a$) reads [3, 7]

$$\tilde{\Delta}'_a = -\tilde{Z}_a - 3aH\tilde{A}_a - \frac{a}{\rho}\tilde{D}_a\tilde{D}^b\tilde{q}_b, \quad (13)$$

given that there is a nonzero 4-acceleration and an effective energy flux in the bulk-flow frame (see § 2.4 earlier). Note that $\tilde{\Delta}_a = (a/\rho)\tilde{D}_a\rho$ and $\tilde{Z}_a = a\tilde{D}_a\tilde{\Theta}$ to first approximation, representing inhomogeneities in the matter distribution and in the universal expansion respectively [3]. In a Newtonian perturbative study, Eq. (13) reduces to $\tilde{\Delta}'_\alpha = -\tilde{Z}_\alpha$, though now $\tilde{\Delta}_\alpha = (a/\rho)\partial_\alpha\rho$ and $\tilde{Z}_\alpha = a\partial_\alpha\tilde{\Theta}$, with $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ [8]. The absence of the acceleration term from the Newtonian expression, makes Eq. (13) the key “relativistic correction” and the practical reason for the differences between the relativistic and the Newtonian/quasi-Newtonian results (see [4] for a comparison).

Solving (13) for \tilde{A}_a , substituting the resulting expression into the right-hand side of Eq. (12) and keeping in mind that $\tilde{q}_a = -\rho\tilde{v}_a$ (recall that $q_a = 0$ – see (11c) earlier), we arrive at

$$\tilde{v}'_a = -H\tilde{v}_a + \frac{1}{3H}\tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta} - \frac{1}{3aH}\left(\tilde{\Delta}'_a + \tilde{Z}_a\right), \quad (14)$$

since $\tilde{\vartheta} = \tilde{D}^a\tilde{v}_a$. The latter vanishes in the absence of drift motions, leaving $\tilde{\Delta}'_a$ and \tilde{Z}_a as the sole sources of peculiar velocities at the linear perturbative level. Therefore, the \tilde{v}_a -field is induced by the increasing inhomogeneity of the post-recombination universe and more specifically by temporal variations in the distribution of the density-gradients and by spatial variations in the universal expansion (described by $\tilde{\Delta}'_a$ and \tilde{Z}_a respectively).

3.2 Peculiar expansion/contraction, shear and rotation

All the information regarding the irreducible kinematics of the peculiar motion, namely the generation and evolution of the peculiar expansion/contraction, shear and rotation (see decomposition (7) in § 2.3), is encoded in the $\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a$ -gradient and in its time-derivatives. The linear sources of these kinematic quantities, in particular, follow from the first time-derivative of $\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a$. This is obtained by taking the spatial gradient of Eq. (14) and then applying the linear commutation law $\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}'_a = (\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a)' + H\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a$ between the temporal and the spatial derivatives of first-order vectors (e.g. see [2] for a list of such formulae). The resulting linear expression reads

$$\left(\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a\right)' = -2H\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a + \frac{1}{3H}\tilde{D}_b\tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta} - \frac{1}{3a^2H}\left(\tilde{\Delta}'_{ab} + \tilde{Z}_{ab}\right), \quad (15)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}_{ab} = a\tilde{D}_b\tilde{\Delta}_a$ and $\tilde{Z}_{ab} = a\tilde{D}_b\tilde{Z}_a$ by construction.⁶ The trace of the above leads to the linear evolution formulae of the peculiar expansion/contraction

$$\tilde{\vartheta}' = -2H\tilde{\vartheta} + \frac{1}{3H}\tilde{D}^2\tilde{\vartheta} - \frac{1}{3a^2H}\left(\tilde{\Delta}' + \tilde{Z}\right), \quad (16)$$

with $\tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\Delta}_a{}^a$ and $\tilde{Z} = \tilde{Z}_a{}^a$. Therefore, time-varying overdensities/underdensities in the matter distribution, together with scalar inhomogeneities in the universal expansion (described by $\tilde{\Delta}'$ and \tilde{Z} respectively), can force a bulk flow to expand or contract locally. In other words, nonzero values of $\tilde{\Delta}'$ and/or \tilde{Z} will generally induce $\tilde{\vartheta}$, even when the latter is zero initially.

Isolating the symmetric and trace-free component of (15), we obtain the linear propagation equation of the peculiar shear, namely

$$\zeta'_{ab} = -2H\zeta_{ab} + \frac{1}{3H}\tilde{D}_{\langle b}\tilde{D}_{a\rangle}\tilde{\vartheta} - \frac{1}{3a^2H}\left(\tilde{\Delta}'_{\langle ab\rangle} + \tilde{Z}_{\langle ab\rangle}\right). \quad (17)$$

The above implies that $\tilde{\Delta}'_{\langle ab\rangle}$, $\tilde{Z}_{\langle ab\rangle}$ and $\tilde{D}_{\langle b}\tilde{D}_{a\rangle}\tilde{\vartheta}$ are the linear sources of shear-like perturbations in the \tilde{v}_a -field. The former represents evolving shape-distortions in the density inhomogeneity, while the last two monitor anisotropic gradients in the (global) universal expansion and in the (local) peculiar expansion/contraction respectively.

Finally, the evolution of the peculiar vorticity follows from the skew part of Eq. (15). To first approximation, the latter reads

$$\tilde{\omega}'_{ab} = -2H\tilde{\omega}_{ab} - \frac{1}{3a^2H}\left(\tilde{\Delta}'_{[ab]} + \tilde{Z}_{[ab]}\right), \quad (18)$$

given that $\tilde{D}_{[b}\tilde{D}_{a]}\tilde{\vartheta} = \tilde{\vartheta}'\tilde{\omega}_{ab}$ is a second-order quantity (e.g. see [2]). Accordingly, time-varying vortices in the matter density and rotational inhomogeneities in the background expansion (described by $\tilde{\Delta}'_{[ab]}$ and $\tilde{Z}_{[ab]}$ respectively) serve as linear sources of local peculiar rotation.

It is probably worth noticing that the last term on the right-hand side of Eq. (18) stems from Frobenius' theorem (e.g. see [9]), which ensures that rotating spacetimes do not possess integrable 3-dimensional hypersurfaces. Alternatively, one could say that the 4-velocity field is not hypersurface orthogonal in the presence of rotation. As a result, the (covariant) spatial gradients of scalars do not commute in rotating spaces, which in turn guarantees that $\tilde{\Delta}_{[ab]}$, $\tilde{Z}_{[ab]} \neq 0$. The interested reader is referred to [10] for further discussion and for an application of the Frobenius theorem to the relativistic study of cosmological perturbations.

4 Linear evolution of peculiar flows

Our study treats the source of peculiar motion, namely the 4-acceleration, analytically, without making any a priori assumptions about its nature and evolution (see § 3.1 earlier). So, in what follows, we will provide the linear propagation formula of the 4-acceleration vector.

⁶The spacelike vector $\tilde{\Delta}_a$ contains collective information on the density inhomogeneity, which can be decoded by taking the spatial gradient $\tilde{\Delta}_{ab} = a\tilde{D}_b\tilde{\Delta}_a$ and then splitting it into its irreducible parts as $\tilde{\Delta}_{ab} = (\tilde{\Delta}/3)\tilde{h}_{ab} + \tilde{\Delta}_{\langle ab\rangle} + \tilde{\Delta}_{[ab]}$, where $\tilde{\Delta} = \tilde{\Delta}_a{}^a$. This scalar describes overdensities or underdensities in the distribution of the matter. The symmetric and trace-free tensor $\tilde{\Delta}_{\langle ab\rangle}$ monitors changes in the shape of the inhomogeneity (under constant volume), while its antisymmetric counterpart $\tilde{\Delta}_{[ab]}$ is associated with vortices in the density distribution. It goes without saying that an exactly analogous decomposition applies to the 3-gradient \tilde{Z}_{ab} [3].

4.1 The key differential equations

Expression (12) requires an evolution formula for the 4-acceleration to close the system of the differential equations. Taking the time derivative of Eq. (13), recalling that $\dot{H} = -H^2[1 + (\Omega/2)]$ in the FRW background (with $\Omega = \kappa\rho/3H^2$ being the associated density parameter) and using the linear commutation law $(\tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta})' = \tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta}' - H\tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta}$ between the temporal and the spatial derivatives of first-order scalars [2], provides the propagation formula

$$\tilde{A}'_a = \frac{1}{2} H\Omega (\tilde{v}'_a + H\tilde{v}_a) + \frac{1}{3H} \tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta}' - \frac{1}{3aH} (\tilde{\Delta}''_a + \tilde{Z}'_a), \quad (19)$$

which monitors the linear evolution of the 4-acceleration relative to the bulk-flow frame. We have therefore obtained analytic linear expressions for both the 4-acceleration and its time derivative (given by Eqs. (13) and (19) respectively), while avoiding the restrictions of the quasi-Newtonian analysis (see § 3.1 previously).

The system of (12) and (19) determines the linear evolution of the peculiar velocity field in a perturbed FRW universe with nonzero background curvature. In particular, the time-derivative of Eq. (12) combines with Eq. (19) giving

$$\tilde{v}''_a = -H \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\Omega\right) \tilde{v}'_a + H^2 (1 + \Omega) \tilde{v}_a + \frac{1}{3H} \tilde{D}_a\tilde{\vartheta}' - \frac{1}{3aH} (\tilde{\Delta}''_a + \tilde{Z}'_a). \quad (20)$$

In addition, employing the linear commutation laws $\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}'_a = (\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a)' + H\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a$ and $\tilde{D}_v\tilde{v}''_a = (\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a)'' + 2H(\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a)' - (H^2\Omega/2)\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a$, the linearised spatial gradient of the above reads

$$(\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a)'' = -3H \left(1 - \frac{1}{6}\Omega\right) (\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a)' + 2H^2\Omega\tilde{D}_b\tilde{v}_a + \frac{1}{3H} \tilde{D}_b\tilde{D}_b\tilde{\vartheta}' - \frac{1}{3a^2H} (\tilde{\Delta}''_{ab} + \tilde{Z}'_{ab}). \quad (21)$$

The last two differential equations govern the linear kinematics of large-scale peculiar motions in an almost-FRW universe with nonzero background curvature and filled with pressureless (baryonic or/and CDM) matter, as seen by observers “living” inside the aforementioned bulk peculiar flows.

4.2 Peculiar velocity

To this point, we have considered a perturbed Friedmann universe without imposing any constraints on its spatial curvature. Hereafter, we will confine to an Einstein-de Sitter background by setting $\Omega = 1$ and $H = 2/3t$. Then, isolating the homogeneous component of (20), that is ignoring the effects of the higher-order derivatives seen in the last two terms, we have

$$9t^2\tilde{v}''_a + 3t\tilde{v}'_a - 8\tilde{v}_a = 0, \quad (22)$$

on all scales where the inhomogeneous part of Eq. (20) is subdominant. The above accepts the power-law solution

$$\tilde{v} = C_1 t^{4/3} + C_2 t^{-2/3} = C_3 a^2 + C_4 a^{-1}, \quad (23)$$

which shows increase as $\tilde{v} \propto t^{4/3} \propto a^2$ (since $a \propto t^{2/3}$ after equipartition) for linear peculiar-velocity perturbations.⁷ Keeping only the growing mode, we deduce that $\tilde{v}/v_H \propto t^{5/3} \propto a^{5/2}$ after decoupling, with $v_H \propto a^{-1/2}$ giving the evolution of the Hubble velocity during the same period. These growth rates are significantly stronger than those reported in previous studies. Indeed, the Newtonian and quasi-Newtonian approaches give $v \propto t^{1/3} \propto a^{1/2}$ (e.g. see [1, 2] as well as [4]), which implies $v/v_H \propto t^{2/3} \propto a$ (on an $\Omega = 1$ background). On these grounds, the relativistic analysis presented here seems to favour bulk motions larger and faster than it is generally expected. An alternative interpretation of our results is that the observed peculiar velocities could have started considerably weaker than anticipated.

Before closing this section, we should remind the reader that the analytic results given above have been obtained by isolating and solving only the homogeneous component of Eq. (20). This means that solution (23) holds on scales where the inhomogeneous part is subdominant and therefore negligible. The fact that the aforementioned inhomogeneous component is comprised of spatial gradients (by their first and second time-derivatives in particular), suggests that its effects should be confined to relatively small scales only. Nevertheless, the associated threshold has not been established yet and additional work is needed to determine it. This means that, although one could readily apply solution (23) to relatively large wavelengths (near and beyond the Hubble radius for instance), they should be cautious before doing so on scales deep inside the horizon. There, the relativistic solution could reduce to its Newtonian counterpart. However, additional work (almost certainly numerical) is necessary to establish whether this scenario holds and also the associated transition threshold.

4.3 Peculiar expansion/contraction

Let us go back to Eq. (21), which governs the linear evolution of the peculiar-velocity gradients. Assuming again a spatially flat FRW background, the trace of (21) gives

$$\tilde{\vartheta}'' = -\frac{5H}{2}\tilde{\vartheta}' + 2H^2\tilde{\vartheta} + \frac{1}{3H}\tilde{D}^2\tilde{\vartheta}' - \frac{1}{3a^2H}(\tilde{\Delta}'' + \tilde{Z}'). \quad (25)$$

Keeping only the homogeneous part of the above and applying a simple Fourier decomposition to the perturbation, leads to the following differential equation for the n -th harmonic mode⁸

$$\tilde{\vartheta}''_{(n)} = -\frac{5}{3t} \left[1 + \frac{2}{15} \left(\frac{\lambda_H}{\lambda_n} \right)^2 \right] \tilde{\vartheta}'_{(n)} + \frac{8}{9t^2} \tilde{\vartheta}_{(n)}. \quad (26)$$

⁷Evaluating the integration constants and using the cosmological redshift parameter (z) solution (23) reads

$$\tilde{v} = \frac{1}{3} (\tilde{v}_0 + \tilde{v}'_0 H_0^{-1}) \left(\frac{1+z_0}{1+z} \right)^2 + \frac{1}{3} (2\tilde{v}_0 - \tilde{v}'_0 H_0^{-1}) \left(\frac{1+z}{1+z_0} \right), \quad (24)$$

where the zero suffix marks the initial time. The above provides the peculiar velocity at any redshift $z < z_0$, when one knows the initial conditions (i.e. \tilde{v}_0 and \tilde{v}'_0). These are typically set at decoupling (i.e. at $z_0 \sim 10^3$), with the high isotropy of the CMB suggesting that $v/v_H < 10^{-5}$ then. According to (24), essentially all the contribution to the residual peculiar velocity comes from higher redshifts, with $1 < z < z_0$. Therefore, allowing for a late-time accelerated epoch (typically starting at $z < 1$), should for all practical purposes leave our results unaffected.

⁸We introduce the familiar harmonic splitting $\tilde{\vartheta} = \sum_n \tilde{\vartheta}_{(n)} \mathcal{Q}^{(n)}$, where $\tilde{D}_a \tilde{\vartheta}_{(n)} = 0$ and $\mathcal{Q}^{(n)}$ are standard scalar harmonic functions with $\tilde{\mathcal{Q}}^{(n)} = 0$ and $\tilde{D}^2 \mathcal{Q}^{(n)} = -(n/a)^2 \mathcal{Q}^{(n)}$ (e.g. see [3]).

Here, $\lambda_H = 1/H$ is the Hubble radius and $\lambda_n = a/n$ is the physical scale of the perturbation (i.e. of the bulk flow), with n being the associated (comoving) wavenumber. On super-Hubble lengths, where $\lambda_H/\lambda_n \ll 1$, Eq. (26) reduces to

$$9t^2\tilde{\vartheta}'' + 15t\tilde{\vartheta}' - 8\tilde{\vartheta} = 0, \quad (27)$$

with a solution of the form

$$\tilde{\vartheta} = \mathcal{C}_1 t^{2/3} + \mathcal{C}_2 t^{-4/3} = \mathcal{C}_3 a + \mathcal{C}_4 a^{-2}. \quad (28)$$

Therefore, throughout the dust epoch, $\tilde{\vartheta}$ grows proportionally to the dimensions of the expanding universe, as long as the perturbation remains outside the Hubble scale. At horizon crossing, namely when $\lambda_H/\lambda_n = 1$, the solution of Eq. (26),

$$\tilde{\vartheta} = \mathcal{C}_1 t^{2(\sqrt{22}-2)/9} + \mathcal{C}_2 t^{-2(\sqrt{22}+2)/9} = \mathcal{C}_3 a^{(\sqrt{22}-2)/3} + \mathcal{C}_4 a^{-(\sqrt{22}+2)/3}, \quad (29)$$

shows a slight decrease in the growth-rate of $\tilde{\vartheta}$. The slowing-down effect enhances as we move down to progressively smaller lengths, with $\tilde{\vartheta}$ tending to a constant well inside the horizon.⁹

The above results imply that, after matter-radiation equality, the relative-strength ratio $\tilde{\vartheta}/H$ grows as $\tilde{\vartheta}/H \propto t^{5/3} \propto a^{5/2}$ on super-Hubble lengths. Well inside the horizon, on the other hand, we find that $\tilde{\vartheta}/H \propto t \propto a^{3/2}$. The divergence of the peculiar velocity field is typically related to the density contrast of the matter inhomogeneities (e.g. see [1]). In particular, the ratio $\tilde{\vartheta}/H$ essentially equals the density perturbation. On these grounds, peculiar velocity perturbations that cross inside the horizon at decoupling, with $\tilde{\vartheta}/H \simeq 10^{-5}$ at that time, could reach values as high as $\tilde{\vartheta}/H \sim 10^{-1/2}$ today. Finally, we should note that our growth rates are again significantly stronger than the Newtonian ones, according to which $\vartheta/H \propto t^{2/3} \propto a$ (e.g. see [1] as well as [4]).

4.4 Peculiar shear and vorticity

Taking the symmetric and traceless part of (21), we obtain the evolution formula of the peculiar shear. The skew component of the same relation, on the other hand, determines the propagation of the peculiar vorticity. More specifically, on an Einstein-de Sitter background, we have

$$\zeta''_{ab} = -\frac{5}{2} H \zeta'_{ab} + 2H^2 \zeta_{ab} + \frac{1}{3H} \tilde{D}_{\langle b} \tilde{D}_{a \rangle} \tilde{\vartheta}' - \frac{1}{3a^2 H} \left(\tilde{\Delta}''_{\langle ab \rangle} + \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}'_{\langle ab \rangle} \right) \quad (31)$$

and

$$\tilde{\omega}''_{ab} = -\frac{5}{2} H \tilde{\omega}'_{ab} + 2H^2 \tilde{\omega}_{ab} - \frac{1}{3a^2 H} \left(\tilde{\Delta}''_{[ab]} + \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}'_{[ab]} \right), \quad (32)$$

⁹One can demonstrate the scale-dependence in the evolution of the peculiar expansion/contraction scalar by setting $\lambda_H/\lambda_n = \alpha$ and then expressing the solution of Eq. (26) in terms of the α -parameter as

$$\tilde{\vartheta} = \mathcal{C}_1 t^{\beta_1} + \mathcal{C}_2 t^{\beta_2} = \mathcal{C}_3 a^{3\beta_1/2} + \mathcal{C}_4 a^{3\beta_2/2}, \quad (30)$$

with $\beta_{1,2} = -[\alpha^2 + 3 \mp \sqrt{\alpha^4 + 6\alpha^2 + 81}]/9$. Then, well outside the horizon, where $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, we find that $\beta_1 \simeq 2/3$ and $\beta_2 \simeq -4/3$, thus recovering solution (28). Scales deep inside the Hubble radius, on the other hand, have $1/\alpha \rightarrow 0$. There, a simple (linear) Taylor expansion of the exponents gives $\beta_{1,2} \simeq -[\alpha^2 + 3 \mp \alpha^2(1 + 3/\alpha^2)]/9$, namely $\beta_1 \simeq 0$ and $\beta_2 \simeq -2\alpha^2/9$. In other words, on sufficiently small scales the value $\tilde{\vartheta}$ tends to a constant.

respectively. When pressureless (baryonic or/and CDM) matter dominates, we have $a \propto t^{2/3}$ and $H = 2/3t$. In such a case, the homogeneous component of Eq. (31) recasts as

$$9t^2\tilde{\zeta}_{ab}'' + 15t\tilde{\zeta}_{ab}' - 8\tilde{\zeta}_{ab} = 0 \quad (33)$$

and accepts the power-law solution

$$\tilde{\zeta} = \mathcal{C}_1 t^{2/3} + \mathcal{C}_2 t^{-4/3} = \mathcal{C}_3 a + \mathcal{C}_4 a^{-2}, \quad (34)$$

on relatively large scales where the inhomogeneous part of (31) is subdominant (see also the arguments made in the last paragraph of § 4.2). On these wavelengths, the peculiar shear grows proportionally to the dimensions of the post-recombination host universe. The same is also true for the peculiar vorticity, since (after equipartition) the homogeneous component of (32) accepts a power-law solution identical to (33). Therefore, on scales where the higher-order derivatives seen in the last term of (32) are negligible, the peculiar vorticity also grows as $\tilde{\omega} \propto t^{2/3} \propto a$.¹⁰

These results imply that, after decoupling, the relative strength of the peculiar shear and that of the peculiar vorticity grows as $\tilde{\zeta}/H, \tilde{\omega}/H \propto t^{5/3} \propto a^{5/2}$. Therefore, on large enough scales (possibly near and outside the Hubble horizon), where the inhomogeneous parts of Eqs. (31) and (32) are subdominant, bulk peculiar motions could start with negligibly small amounts of shear and vorticity and still reach cosmologically relevant magnitudes. Although further work is needed to establish the threshold below which the aforementioned inhomogeneous components are no longer negligible, it is probably unsafe to treat the large-scale bulk flows as shear-free and/or irrotational.

5 Discussion

Studies of cosmological peculiar motions have a research history that goes back several decades. Nevertheless, the great majority of the available theoretical work is essentially Newtonian in nature, despite the fact that the scales involved are a good fraction of the Hubble horizon. Moreover, all the aforementioned studies are performed in the CMB frame, although no real observer in the universe follows the smooth Hubble flow and despite the subtlety of the relative-motion effects. With these in mind, we have attempted a relativistic treatment of peculiar velocities in a “tilted” almost-FRW universe (with pressureless baryons or/and CDM) and conducted our analysis in the rest-frame of a typical galaxy (like our Milky Way), that moves relative to the universal expansion. Our main aim was to provide a better theoretical understanding of the bulk-motion kinematics. Further motivation came from an apparent disagreement between the current bulk-flow surveys, with some reporting larger magnitudes and scales for the peculiar velocity fields than others (see [11] and also [12] for representative though incomplete lists).

Even at the linear level, the kinematics and the dynamics of the universe appear different in the coordinate system of the bulk peculiar flow than in the frame of the Hubble expansion, simply because of relative motion effects. For instance, although the cosmic medium may look

¹⁰To the best of our knowledge, the only Newtonian treatment of the peculiar shear and the peculiar vorticity is the one recently given in [4]. There, it was found that $\tilde{\zeta}/H \propto t^{2/3} \propto a$ and also that $\tilde{\omega}/H \propto t^{-1/3} \propto a^{-1/2}$ after equipartition.

like a perfect fluid in the CMB frame, it will appear imperfect to the real observers solely due to their motion with respect to the smooth universal expansion [2]. Taking these fairly well known relativistic effects into account and employing linear (relativistic) cosmological perturbation theory, enabled us to obtain analytical expressions for the linear sources of peculiar velocities. This allowed us to go a step further than the quasi-Newtonian approach, where an effective gravitational potential and an evolution ansatz were introduced to address the issue.

The linear analysis confirmed that peculiar motions are the result of the ongoing structure formation process, and more specifically of the increasing inhomogeneity of the post-recombination universe. Our study also provided the first (to the best of our knowledge) relativistic insight to the evolution of the full peculiar kinematics. Technically speaking, this was achieved through a set of four differential equations, monitoring the linear propagation of the peculiar velocity itself, as well as those of the associated irreducible (local) kinematic quantities. The latter are the expansion/contraction, the shear and the rotation of the bulk flow. Solving the aforementioned differential formulae analytically, we found substantial growth for all aspects of the peculiar motion. Moreover, the strength of the peculiar-velocity field, relative to the background Hubble expansion of the post-recombination universe, was found to increase in time as well. In particular, peculiar velocities were found to grow as $\tilde{v} \propto a^2$, a rate considerably stronger than the one reported in previous Newtonian studies (where $v \propto a^{1/2}$). Stronger than the Newtonian rates were also obtained for the peculiar expansion/contraction, as well as for the peculiar shear and for the peculiar vorticity.

On theoretical grounds, the general disagreement between the relativistic and the Newtonian results reflects the different way the two theories treat issues as fundamental as time, space and the nature of gravity. Seen from a more technical point of view, the reason is the different way the two approaches treat cosmological perturbations and more specifically the sources of the peculiar-velocity perturbations. Put another way, expression (13) is purely relativistic and varies considerably from its Newtonian analogue (see § 3.1, 4.1 here and also [4] for details).

We should finally remind the reader that we have obtained our power-law solutions by confining to the homogeneous parts of the associated differential equations. This means that the aforementioned analytic results apply on scales where the inhomogeneous components are negligible. We expect these scales to be relatively large, namely a substantial fraction of the Hubble radius and/or larger. It sounds plausible that the relativistic solutions could reduce to their Newtonian counterparts on wavelengths well inside the horizon. Nevertheless, additional work (most likely numerical) is needed to establish whether this is true and the associated transition scale, especially in view of the upcoming and more refined bulk-flow surveys. At this stage, our relativistic analysis does suggest that the linear growth rates of the large-scale peculiar-velocity fields can be considerably stronger than those predicted by the Newtonian studies. On these grounds, one should not be surprised to measure bulk flows larger and faster than it is generally expected.

Acknowledgements: ET was supported by a CNRS internship fellowship at the Institut d’Astrophysique de Paris (IAP), during the later stages of this work. CGT wishes to acknowledge support from a visiting fellowship by Clare Hall College and visitor support by DAMTP at the University of Cambridge, where part of this work was conducted. He also acknowledges partial support from the Hellenic Foundation for Research and Innovation (HFRI).

References

- [1] P.J.E. Peebles, *The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1980); A. Nusser, A. Dekel, E. Bertschinger and G.R. Blumenthal, *Astrophys. J.* **379**, 6 (1991); T. Padmanabhan, *Structure Formation in the Universe* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [2] R. Maartens, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 124006 (1998); G.F.R. Ellis, H. van Elst and R. Maartens, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **18**, 5115 (2001).
- [3] C.G. Tsagas, A. Challinor and R. Maartens, *Phys. Rep.* **465**, 61 (2008); G.F.R. Ellis, R. Maartens and M.A.H. MacCallum, *Relativistic Cosmology* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012).
- [4] C.G. Tsagas and K. Filippou, [arXiv:2003.01186].
- [5] A.R. King and G.F.R. Ellis, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **31**, 209, (1973).
- [6] G.F.R. Ellis and C.G. Tsagas, *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 124015 (2002); C.G. Tsagas and M.I. Kadiltzoglou, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 083501 (2013).
- [7] C.G. Tsagas and M.I. Kadiltzoglou, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 043515 (2015).
- [8] G.F.R. Ellis, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **243**, 509 (1990).
- [9] R.M. Wald, *General Relativity* (Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1984); E. Poisson, *A Relativist's Toolkit* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004).
- [10] G.F.R. Ellis, M. Bruni and J. Hwang, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 1035 (1990).
- [11] R. Watkins, H.A. Feldman and M.J. Hudson, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **392**, 743 (2009); A. Kashlinsky, F. Atrio-Barandela, D. Kocevski and H. Ebeling, *Astrophys. J.* **686**, L49 (2009); G. Lavaux, R.B. Tully, R. Mohayaee, S. Colombi, *Astrophys. J.* **709**, 483 (2010); J. Colin, R. Mohayaee, S. Sarkar and A. Shafieloo, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **414**, 264 (2011); C. Magoulas et al, *IAU Symposium* **308**, 336 (2016); A. Salehi, M. Yarahmadi and S. Fathi, [arXiv:2001.01743].
- [12] A. Nusser and M. Davis, *Astrophys. J.* **736**, 93 (2011); S.J. Osborne, D.S.Y. Mak, S.E. Church and E. Pierpaoli, *Astrophys. J.* **737**, 98 (2011); E. Branchini, M. Davis and A. Nusser, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **424**, 472 (2012); S.J. Turnbull et al, *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **420**, 447 (2012); Ma Y.-Z. and Pan J., *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **437**, 1996 (2014).