

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Hunting ghosts: the iconic stellar stream(s) around NG5907 under scrutiny

Oliver Müller¹, Ana Vudragović², and Michal Bílek¹

¹ Observatoire Astronomique de Strasbourg (ObAS), Université de Strasbourg - CNRS, UMR 7550 Strasbourg, France
e-mail: oliver.muller@astro.unistra.fr

² Astronomical Observatory, Volgina 7, 11 060 Belgrade, Serbia

Received tba; accepted tba

ABSTRACT

Stellar streams are regarded as crucial objects to test galaxy formation models, with their morphology tracing the underlying potentials and their occurrence tracking the assembly history of the galaxies. The existence of one of the most iconic stellar streams, the double loop around NGC 5907, has recently been questioned by new observations with the Dragonfly telescope. This new work only finds parts of the stream, even though they reach a 1σ surface brightness limit of $30.3 \text{ mag arcsec}^{-2}$ in the g -band. Using 7.2 hours of Luminance L -band imaging with the Milanković 1.4 meter telescope, we have re-observed the putative double loop part to confirm or reject this assessment. We do not find signs of the double loop, but see only a single, knee-shaped stellar stream. Comparing our to the data by the Dragonfly team, we find the same features. Our observations reach a 1σ surface brightness limit of $29.7 \text{ mag arcsec}^{-2}$ in the g -band. These findings emphasize the need for independent confirmation of detections of very low-surface brightness features.

Key words. Galaxies: individual: NGC 5907; Galaxies: formation; Techniques: image processing; Galaxies: interactions; Galaxies: structure

1. Introduction

Over the last years, deep imaging of nearby galaxies have revealed a plethora of low-surface brightness features, such as dwarf galaxies, stellar streams, shells, and tidal debris. Such features unlock crucial information for galaxy formation and are regarded as tests for the current cosmological model (Λ CDM), in which galaxies are formed in a hierarchical fashion by accretion of smaller galaxies (Bullock & Johnston 2005, but see also Bílek et al. 2018, 2019). Some fossils of these ancient accretion events are expected to be detectable today, with the number of these ghosts and their phase-space correlation being a strong test for the Λ CDM model of galaxy formation (e.g., Ibata et al. 2002; Erkal et al. 2017; Bonaca & Hogg 2018; Pearson et al. 2019).

In the Local Group, it is known for a long time that streams wind around the Milky Way (e.g., Ibata et al. 1997; Belokurov et al. 2007) and the Andromeda galaxy (Martin et al. 2014; McConnachie et al. 2018), based on star count studies. With the Gaia mission, the number of streams detected around the Milky Way has exploded (Malhan et al. 2018; Ibata et al. 2019). Outside of our Local Group, the detection of resolved stellar streams is an almost impossible task with current instrumentation, with the stream around NGC 891 (Mouhcine et al. 2010) at 10 Mpc setting the record of what is achievable today. At larger distances, only integrated light observations are able to uncover these fossils. One of the most iconic stream discovered by integrated light observations is found around NGC 5907 at 14 Mpc (Shang et al. 1998), where Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008) uncovered a double looping structure, which was not visible in the Shang et al. (1998) data. Noteworthy, follow-ups of this stream with Subaru/Suprime Cam (Laine et al. 2016) detected only the parts which were already visible in Shang et al. (1998),

but not the double loop. The observation by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008) was done with a modest telescope of only 0.5 meter diameter in size and was conducted by dedicated amateur astronomers. Since then, many more stellar streams around other giant galaxies have been detected by this amateur astronomer team, see e.g. Martínez-Delgado et al. (2010).

The search for stellar streams is not only conducted by amateurs. Several professional teams have taken up the efforts to find streams and shells around nearby galaxies (e.g., Watkins et al. 2014, 2015; Duc et al. 2015; Bílek et al. 2016; Crnojević et al. 2016; van Dokkum et al. 2019). One of these teams, using the Dragonfly telescope (Danieli et al. 2019), has re-observed the iconic structure around NGC 5907 and to their surprise, found only part of the stream(s) reported by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008), with no trace of the double loop (van Dokkum et al. 2019). Furthermore, they found a mismatch in the positions of the detected parts of the stream compared to those provided by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008). This calls for an independent observation. To address this issue, we observed the putative double loop part of NGC 5907 with the newly commissioned Milanković 1.4 meter telescope (Samurović et al. 2018) located at the top of the Vidojevica mountain, Serbia. The results are presented in this letter.

2. Observations and data reduction

The galaxy NGC 5907 was observed on three consecutive nights (24 - 26 October 2019) with the 1.4 meter Milanković telescope mounted at the Astronomical Station Vidojevica (Serbia), using an Andor IKONL CCD camera. The observations were taken at an airmass between $1.66 < X < 2.97$. The dark current is




Fig. 1. The fully calibrated and stacked image of NGC 5907. The image was slightly enhanced with a Gaussian blur. The image is $18'.4 \times 20'.2$ in size. North is to the top, east to the left.

0.02 e-/sec. All images were taken in the luminance L -filter with 300 second exposures. The integrated exposure time reached was 7.2 hrs. We had photometric nights with an average seeing of $1''.4$. The galaxy was at an altitude of 40 degrees at the beginning and went down to 20 degrees at the end of observations each night. Utilizing the focal reducer delivers a square field-of-view with sides of $13'.3$. We applied a large dithering pattern randomized within a maximum offset of $4'$, which is crucial when digging deep into the low-surface brightness regime at the 28-

29 mag arcsec $^{-2}$ level (Slater et al. 2009; Mihos 2019) and beyond (Trujillo & Fliri 2016). Such a strategy provides a strong handle on the background subtraction, as well as a removal of systematics arising from the instruments and observations, i.e. from reflections or flat-fielding artefacts.

The calibration of the images follows the standard procedure. A master bias frame was created from ten single bias frames, using a median stack. A master dark frame was created from ten single dark frames, using again a median stack. These master

dark and bias frames were then subtracted from all individual flat fields and scientific exposures. A master flat field was made from 30 single twilight flat fields, which have been normalized by their median value. The stack was again made with a median. The resulting master flat field was flat to the 1-2 percent level and was then applied to all individual dark-subtracted scientific exposures.

For the surface brightness limits we aimed to reach, it is crucial to carefully model the background. Approaches of background modelling, like it is done in Source Extractor (Bertin & Arnouts 1996), are prone to removing low-surface brightness features as part of the sky. Therefore, we took a custom approach. On every previous calibrated scientific exposure, we ran a source detection using Source Extractor with a 1σ threshold, creating a segmentation map, which was then applied as a mask on the scientific exposures. Because Source Extractor will miss the faint outskirts of astronomical objects, we additionally dilated the mask with a 5σ gaussian kernel. The resulting masked image then only contains pixels corresponding to the background. The masked scientific exposures were then normalized by their median values, and stacked together. This stack will give a background model, which is free from astronomical sources due to the large dithering pattern we have applied. Because it is normalized, it can be scaled to the measured background values in the scientific exposures using the the global background value estimated by Source Extractor and ultimately removed, resulting in our final fully calibrated and background subtracted science frames. The final, fully calibrated and dithering image reached a field-of-view of 18.8×20.3 . The python pipeline can be found on gitlab¹.

The astrometry in the science frames was solved by astrometry.net (Lang et al. 2010). To create our final scientific image, we have stacked all science frames with IRAF's *imcombine* command, using a median stack and an average sigma clipping rejection algorithm.

The zero point of this stacked image was estimated using the Pan-STARRS DR2 star catalog (Magnier et al. 2016). We used DAOPHOT2 (Stetson 1987) aperture photometry to measure the instrumental *L*-band magnitudes of the stars. There are no *L*-band star catalogs yet available, therefore, we needed to transform the *L*-band to the more commonly used SDSS bands. Javanmardi et al. (2016) successfully performed a linear transformation between the *L*-band and the *r*-band and found only a minor dependence on the $g - r$ color (see their Figure 1). Therefore, we have calibrated our image to *g*-band standard stars using $g = c_0L + c_1$, based on 78 standard stars in a magnitude range between 17 and 22. The transformation is given with $c_0 = 1.03$ and $c_1 = 32.12$ mag. The magnitude system of Pan-STARRS is in AB.

For the parts of the image with 100% coverage, the surface brightness limit was measured from the standard deviation in 10×10 arcsec² boxes of empty pixels, meaning that they don't contain any (visible) stars. We estimate a 1σ surface brightness limit of 29.7 ± 0.04 mag arcsec⁻² in the *g*-band (corresponding to a 3σ limit of 28.4 ± 0.04 mag arcsec⁻²). The error has been estimated by the standard deviation of the measured surface brightness of 14 such boxes.

3. Low surface brightness features

In Figure 1 we present the fully stacked and calibrated image of the surroundings of NGC 5907, slightly enhanced with a Gaus-




Fig. 2. Comparison between our observations (top) and the relevant part of the Dragonfly image (bottom), kindly provided by the Dragonfly team.

sian blur. What low-surface brightness features does it reveal? We detect a narrow low-surface brightness feature stretching 10.5 (≈ 43 kpc at 14 Mpc) from the disk of the galaxy towards the east and then bending 4.2 (≈ 17 kpc at 14 Mpc) towards the north, where it gradually disappears. This morphology is reminiscent of stellar streams found in other galaxy group, e.g. around NGC 1052 (Müller et al. 2019).

In Figure 2 we compare the relevant part of our image with the Dragonfly *g*-band image taken by van Dokkum et al. (2019). The shape of the stream detected by us and by van Dokkum et al. (2019) are identical, which is also apparent when blinking the two images. So where should the double loop reside? In Figure 3 we indicate the contours of the double stream reported by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008). There are no hints of these structures in our image. We applied the same post-processing techniques as Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008), namely, a histogram equalization and a Gaussian blur. Along these regions, we measure a 1σ surface brightness limit of 29.7 mag arcsec⁻² *g*-band (i.e. a 3σ limit of 28.4 mag arcsec⁻²). However, we note that this is measured before the image is enhanced, giving a lower limit of what is detectable. In Figure 3 we also show the part of the image with a 100% coverage of exposures, corresponding to the deepest part of the full stack. The two putative streams are residing well within this area, so incompleteness of the data should play no role. In contrast, the part of the stream to the west (i.e. bottom right) of NGC 5907 is not detectable in our image, whereas it is

¹ gitlab.com/VoltarCH/milankovic-telescope-reduction-pipeline




Fig. 3. Left: The image enhanced with a Gaussian blur and a histogram equalization as discussed in Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008). The paths indicate the positions of the missing parts of the streams east of the galaxy, this is, the iconic part of the double loop system. The black box corresponds to the region where a 100% coverage has been achieved. Right: Weight map of the stack in a logarithmic representation. White corresponds to a 100% coverage, i.e. the area with 7.2 hour exposure in total, black to 0%.

visible in the Dragonfly images (see Figure 2). This part coincides with an incomplete area of the image, see also our weight map in Figure 3.

The faintest stars detected in our images are of the order of 25.8 to 26.0 mag in the g -band, which is several magnitudes deeper than the detection limit of e.g. SDSS. The magnitudes were estimated with simple aperture photometry on several hand-picked faint stars.

4. Discussion and conclusion

The recent paper by van Dokkum et al. (2019) has stirred a controversy which has been hotly debated at conferences and on social media. To shed light on the discussion, we have independently taken deep data using a 1.4 meter telescope to assess whether there is a double loop structure as found by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008) or rather a simple knee-shaped stream as found by van Dokkum et al. (2019). Our imaging is consistent with the latter, with no signs of a double loop.

We cannot assess whether there was a problem with the data reduction by Martínez-Delgado et al. (2008), because the data is unfortunately not available. Therefore, we can only rely on re-observations of the system. An argument raised in favor of the existence of a double loop is the fact that many amateur astronomers have repeatedly detected it. However, the data reduction procedures adopted for the amateur images are not always transparent. The fact that now two completely independent professional teams could not confirm the double loop puts some doubts on at least some of the previously found very low-surface brightness features. The limiting surface brightness of amateur images is rather difficult to assess. Both our data and the data by van Dokkum et al. (2019) have applied large dithering patterns, which indicates that the handling of the data could be one of the culprits causing the disagreement. In this respect it is also strik-

ing that in the deep Subaru/Suprime Cam data by Laine et al. (2016) no double loop feature was visible, even though it was not discussed in their work. It seems that professionally handled data always yields a single stream, while data processed by amateur astronomers uncovers more features². As a benchmark test the faintest stars in the different images could be compared. In our images, we reach faint stars up to $g = 26.0$ mag.

Furthermore, there is a puzzle concerning the exposure time. For example, the re-observation of NGC 5907 by the astro-photographer Stefen Binnewies, using a 0.6 meter telescope and 24×600 s exposures, i.e. 4 hours in total in the L -band, clearly shows part of the double loop. It is highly unlikely that our 86×300 s exposures, i.e. 7.2 hours in total in the same band, while having a larger collecting area of more than a factor of 5, is unable to detect the double loop³. Even more surprising is that the brighter parts of the missing double loop appear as bright in the astro-photographer's images⁴ as the here detected parts of the stream. If the apparent surface brightnesses are similar, then we should be able to detect both features too, which we apparently do not. This again points towards a problem that the brightness in their post-processing is not preserved.

Having discussed all this, is there still a way to reconcile all observations? A difference between professional and amateur systems could be the spectral sensitivities of the CCDs and the transmission curves of the filters. In this case, different features would appear more or less prominent, e.g. if the emission is coming from [OII] at 372.7 nm, which is just outside of the

² Even though not all amateur astronomers recover the two distinct features of the double loop.

³ However, a comparison between the exposure times of different telescopes is strictly speaking only valid if the CCD sensitivity, the pixel size, and the observation site are taken into account.

⁴ see their stacked and enhanced image on <http://www.capella-observatory.com/ImageHTMLs/Galaxies/NGC5907Prim.htm>

typical SDSS g -band transmission curve. However, this would mean that by digging deeper or changing the filters – e.g. by employing SDSS u -band – we should eventually be able to see the double loop if it is there.

To summarize this letter, we have acquired deep, high quality data with a 1.4 meter telescope, reaching a depth of 29.7 mag arcsec⁻² in the g -band, and find no signs of the iconic double loop around NGC 5907. Rather, we find a single knee-shaped stream as independently found by the Dragonfly team. These results emphasize the need for an independent confirmation of the reliability of the detected low-surface brightness features by the usage of different telescopes, carefully designed observing strategies, and consistent scientific processing techniques.

This work used following scientific software: Astrometry.net (Lang et al. 2010), the DAOPHOT2 suite (Stetson 1987), and IRAF (Tody 1993); as well as following python3 packages: Astropy (Astropy Collaboration et al. 2013), ccdproc (Craig et al. 2015), and sep (Barbary 2016), which is a python implementation of Source Extractor (Bertin & Arnouts 1996).

Acknowledgements. We thank the referee for the constructive report, which helped to clarify and improve the manuscript. O.M. is grateful to the Swiss National Science Foundation for financial support. The authors thank Pieter van Dokkum for fruitful discussions about the observations and providing the Dragonfly data shown in Figure 2. The authors also thank Marina Rejkuba and Rodrigo Ibata for valuable comments. This work was supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia (MESTDRS) through project no. 176021, “Visible and Invisible Matter in Nearby Galaxies: Theory and Observations”. We acknowledge the financial support by the European Commission through project BELISSIMA (BELgrade Initiative for Space Science, Instrumentation and Modelling in Astrophysics, call FP7-REGPOT-2010-5, contract No. 256772), which was used to procure the Milanković 1.4 meter telescope with the support from the MESTDRS. We thank the technical operators at the Astronomical Station Vidojevica (ASV), Miodrag Sekulić and Petar Kostić for their excellent work.

References

- Astropy Collaboration, Robitaille, T. P., Tollerud, E. J., et al. 2013, *aap*, 558, A33
 Barbary, K. 2016, *The Journal of Open Source Software*, 1, 58
 Belokurov, V., Evans, N. W., Irwin, M. J., et al. 2007, *ApJ*, 658, 337
 Bertin, E. & Arnouts, S. 1996, *A&AS*, 117, 393
 Bílek, M., Cuillandre, J. C., Gwyn, S., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 588, A77
 Bílek, M., Thies, I., Kroupa, P., & Famaey, B. 2018, *A&A*, 614, A59
 Bílek, M., Thies, I., Kroupa, P., & Famaey, B. 2019, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1908.07537
 Bonaca, A. & Hogg, D. W. 2018, *ApJ*, 867, 101
 Bullock, J. S. & Johnston, K. V. 2005, *ApJ*, 635, 931
 Craig, M. W., Crawford, S. M., Deil, C., et al. 2015, *ccdproc: CCD data reduction software*
 Crnojević, D., Sand, D. J., Spekkens, K., et al. 2016, *ApJ*, 823, 19
 Danieli, S., Lokhorst, D., Zhang, J., et al. 2019, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1910.14045
 Duc, P.-A., Cuillandre, J.-C., Karabal, E., et al. 2015, *MNRAS*, 446, 120
 Erkal, D., Koposov, S. E., & Belokurov, V. 2017, *MNRAS*, 470, 60
 Ibata, R. A., Lewis, G. F., Irwin, M. J., & Quinn, T. 2002, *MNRAS*, 332, 915
 Ibata, R. A., Malhan, K., & Martin, N. F. 2019, *ApJ*, 872, 152
 Ibata, R. A., Wyse, R. F. G., Gilmore, G., Irwin, M. J., & Suntzeff, N. B. 1997, *AJ*, 113, 634
 Javanmardi, B., Martinez-Delgado, D., Kroupa, P., et al. 2016, *A&A*, 588, A89
 Laine, S., Grillmair, C. J., Capak, P., et al. 2016, *AJ*, 152, 72
 Lang, D., Hogg, D. W., Mierle, K., Blanton, M., & Roweis, S. 2010, *AJ*, 139, 1782
 Magnier, E. A., Schlafly, E. F., Finkbeiner, D. P., et al. 2016, *arXiv e-prints* [arXiv:1612.05242]
 Malhan, K., Ibata, R. A., & Martin, N. F. 2018, *MNRAS*, 481, 3442
 Martin, N. F., Ibata, R. A., Rich, R. M., et al. 2014, *ApJ*, 787, 19
 Martínez-Delgado, D., Gabany, R. J., Crawford, K., et al. 2010, *AJ*, 140, 962
 Martínez-Delgado, D., Peñarrubia, J., Gabany, R. J., et al. 2008, *ApJ*, 689, 184
 McConnachie, A. W., Ibata, R., Martin, N., et al. 2018, *ApJ*, 868, 55
 Mihos, J. C. 2019, *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:1909.09456
 Mouhcine, M., Ibata, R., & Rejkuba, M. 2010, *ApJ*, 714, L12
 Müller, O., Rich, R. M., Román, J., et al. 2019, *A&A*, 624, L6
 Pearson, S., Starkenburg, T. K., Johnston, K. V., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 883, 87

- Samurović, S., Djurasević, G., Cvetković, Z., Pavlović, R., & Vince, O. 2018, *Publications de l’Observatoire Astronomique de Beograd*, 98, 333
 Shang, Z., Zheng, Z., Brinks, E., et al. 1998, *ApJ*, 504, L23
 Slater, C. T., Harding, P., & Mihos, J. C. 2009, *PASP*, 121, 1267
 Stetson, P. B. 1987, *PASP*, 99, 191
 Tody, D. 1993, in *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series*, Vol. 52, *Astronomical Data Analysis Software and Systems II*, ed. R. J. Hanisch, R. J. V. Brissenden, & J. Barnes, 173
 Trujillo, I. & Fliri, J. 2016, *ApJ*, 823, 123
 van Dokkum, P., Gilhuly, C., Bonaca, A., et al. 2019, *ApJ*, 883, L32
 Watkins, A. E., Mihos, J. C., & Harding, P. 2015, *ApJ*, 800, L3
 Watkins, A. E., Mihos, J. C., Harding, P., & Feldmeier, J. J. 2014, *ApJ*, 791, 38