

A study of the scaling relation $M_{\bullet} \propto R_e \sigma^3$ for supermassive black holes and an update of the corresponding theoretical model

T. Beltramonte¹ • E. Benedetto^{1,2} • A. Feoli¹ • A.L. Iannella¹

Abstract In this paper we want to compare the theoretical predictions of a law proposed by Feoli and Mancini, with the most recent experimental data about galaxies and Supermassive black holes. The physical principle behind this law is the transformation of the angular momentum of the interstellar material, which falls into the black hole, into the angular momentum of the radiation emitted in this process. Despite the simplicity of the model, this law shows an excellent agreement with the experimental data for early - type galaxies while a new approach is proposed for spirals.

Keywords supermassive black holes; early-type galaxies; spiral galaxies; radiative efficiency

1 Introduction

Thanks to the very high angular resolution of modern telescopes, it is increasingly evident that nearby galaxies (< 100 Mpc) have a supermassive black hole (SMBHs; $M_{\bullet} > 10^6 M_{\odot}$) at their center (Ferrarese & Ford 2005; Kormendy & Richstone 1995; Richstone et al. 1998). Equally evident is the existence of a strong correlation between the mass of these SMBHs and the properties of the galaxies that host them (Aller & Richstone, 2007; Beifiori et al. 2009; Feoli & Mele 2005), (Feoli & Mancini 2009; Graham 2007; Gültekin et al. 2009a; Häring & Rix 2004; Hu 2008; Kisaka et al. 2008; Magorrian et al. 1998; Mancini & Feoli 2012; Marconi & Hunt 2003; Tremaine et al. 2002). For this reason, it is clear that there is a link between the process of accretion of SMBHs and the formation and evolution of their galaxies (Begelman & Nath, 2005; Burkert & Silk 2001; Cavaliere & Vittorini 2002; Croton et al. 2006; Granato et al. 2004; Haiman et al. 2004; Hopkins et al. 2007a; King 2003; Murray et al. 2005; Pipino et al. 2009a,b; Sazonov et al. 2005; Silk & Rees 1998; Sijacki et al. 2007; Wyithe & Loeb 2003). Furthermore, numerical simulations and semi-analytical models seem to reveal that the environment, in which these galaxies live, can greatly influence the growth and activity of SMBHs (Booth & Schaye 2009; Ciotti et al. 2009; Degraf et al. 2011; Di Matteo et al. 2005; Fanidakis et al. 2011; Feoli et al. 2011; Hopkins et al. 2008; Shin et al. 2010, 2012).

Over the past twenty years, the astrophysicists have found a large number of scaling laws, in which the mass of the central SMBH correlates with different properties of the host spheroidal component, such as the bulge luminosity, mass, effective radius, central potential, dynamical mass, concentration, Sersic index, binding energy, kinetic energy of random motions, X-ray luminosity, momentum parameter, etc. (Ferrarese & Merritt 2009; Feoli & Mele 2007; Gerhard et al. 2000; Graham & Driver 2005; Gültekin et al. 2009b; Hopkins et al. 2007b; Laor 2001; Merritt & Ferrarese 2001; Soker & Meiron 2011; Wandel 2002). Recently, a possible relation between M_{\bullet} and the number of globular clusters has also been hypothesized (Burkert & Tremaine 2010; Snyder et al. 2011). Instead, with regard to the correlation with the halo of dark matter, there is still a wide debate (Baes et al., 2003; Bellovary et al. 2011; Ferrarese 2002; Feoli & Mancini 2011; Kormendy & Bender 2011; Volonteri et al. 2011).

In this paper, starting from the conservation of the angular momentum, we want to analyze another scaling law that was inspired by the numerical results of

T. Beltramonte

E. Benedetto

A. Feoli

A.L. Iannella

¹Department of Engineering, University of Sannio, Piazza Roma 21, 82100 Benevento, Italy

²Department of Computer Science, University of Salerno, Via Giovanni Paolo II, 132, 84084 Fisciano (Sa), Italy

(Hopkins et al. 2007a), but it is based on a theoretical framework (Feoli & Mancini 2011) : the $M_\bullet - R_e \sigma^3$ law where R_e and σ are the effective radius and the velocity dispersion of the bulge, respectively. This law seems to have an excellent agreement with experimental data and it could be a basic law for galaxies and their SMBHs.

2 The Sample

One of the largest database of Black Hole masses is certainly the one created by van den Bosch (van den Bosch 2016) who has collected data for 230 galaxies. In order to obtain a fit with a reliable accuracy, we have preferred to exclude the masses of Black Holes measured with a relative error on $\log(M_\bullet)$ greater than or equal to 1. In this way, we obtained a sample of 181 galaxies. The galaxies that have been neglected are listed in Appendix A. We have also removed from the sample NGC4486b, because this galaxy “deviates strongly from every correlation involving its black hole mass” (Saglia et al. 2016), and NGC404 because its mass is too low for a supermassive black hole $M_\bullet < 10^6 M_\odot$. We have studied the remaining sample of 179 objects with a particular attention for the behavior of spiral galaxies in the context of our relation. In general, they have a rotation velocity which is greater than the velocity dispersion (but NGC 4388 is a typical counterexample having $V/\sigma = 0.6$) and our theoretical model works well for low values of angular momentum, so we have verified in a first approach (Feoli & Iannella 2019) that the fit of the experimental data improves if we exclude from the sample all the spiral galaxies. In order to face the problem, in this paper the sample has been divided into two subsamples, one with all the 66 spiral galaxies listed in Appendix A and the other including the remaining 113 early-type galaxies that have been studied separately. Our aim is to motivate the experimental necessity to update our theoretical model for spirals and to propose the suitable corrections.

3 The Theoretical Model

Let us remember that the core of Feoli-Mancini’s model (Feoli & Mancini 2011) is the transformation of the angular momentum of the matter falling into the black hole, into the angular momentum of the radiation emitted during the process. In this scenario we have a flux of gas with an internal speed $V_{in} = \sigma$ and a supermassive black hole of mass M_\bullet that grows emitting jets of radiation. Therefore, to describe the system, we need both

a suitable velocity field of the gas falling into the black hole and the conservation of the angular momentum. We start by stating that the velocity of the gas V_{part} in the galactic bulge is linked to the stellar velocity dispersion σ in such a way that the radial component is $V_{in} = \sigma$ (Soker & Meiron 2011; Soker 2009) and the transverse component is the rotational velocity V_{rot} of the gas. Furthermore, if we assume that each emitted photon has a velocity c in the same direction as the incoming gas particle V_{part} and it forms an angle α with the accretion line and with the radial component of gas velocity V_{in} (for details and for a useful figure you can read Feoli (2014)), we get $V_{rot}/V_{in} = \tan(\alpha)$. Looking for an estimate of the angular momentum for the galactic bulge, we obtain the conservation equation:

$$M_{acc} R_e V_{rot} = M_{acc} R_e V_{in} \tan(\alpha) = c M_{rad} R_A \sin(\alpha) \quad (1)$$

where R_A is the accretion radius of the SMBH, which can be estimated through the Bondi-Hoyle-Lyttleton (BHL) theory (Bondi & Hoyle 1944; Hoyle & Lyttleton 1939), that predicts a value

$$R_A = 2GM_\bullet / V_{in}^2 \quad (2)$$

where G is the gravitational constant. It is interesting to note that in this case with $V_{in} = \sigma$, the BHL radius coincides with the so called radius of influence of the Black Hole.

a) Case $\sigma \gg V_{rot}$

As Bondi-Hoyle-Lyttleton theory (BHL) is a realistic model in the case of radial growth with low transverse velocity, it is possible to consider $\tan(\alpha) \simeq 0$ getting $\tan(\alpha) \simeq \sin(\alpha)$. Finally, substituting (2) in (1), the mass of the black hole M_\bullet can be written in this form:

$$M_\bullet = \frac{R_e \sigma^3}{2\epsilon c G} \quad (3)$$

where

$$\epsilon = M_{rad}/M_{acc} \quad (4)$$

is the captured mass to radiative energy conversion efficiency. By considering the logarithm of the equation (3), we get

$$\log\left(\frac{M_\bullet}{M_\odot}\right) = \log\left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\right) + \log\left(\frac{R_e \sigma^3}{c G M_\odot}\right) \quad (5)$$

In order to test our theoretical model, we need to get from the experimental data the corresponding best fit line

$$y = b + mx \quad (6)$$

where

$$y = \log \left(\frac{M_\bullet}{M_\odot} \right) \quad (7)$$

and

$$x = \log \left(\frac{R_e \sigma^3}{c G M_\odot} \right) \quad (8)$$

Finally, we have to compare the parameters (m and b) with the theoretical predictions that are $m = 1$ and

$$b = \log \left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \right). \quad (9)$$

However, this approach, contained in previous papers, is valid only for early-type galaxies that have a low rotation velocity, and it will be evident from the statistical elaboration of data. Therefore, we propose a corrected version of the model that we expect to be valid for spirals.

b) Case $\sigma \ll V_{rot}$

We suppose that V_{part} has practically the same direction of V_{rot} hence we can consider now

$$\begin{cases} \vec{R}_A \perp \vec{V}_{rot} \\ \vec{R}_A \perp \vec{c} \\ \vec{R}_e \perp \vec{V}_{rot} \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

and the conservation of angular momentum becomes

$$M_{acc} V_{rot} R_e = c M_{rad} R_A \quad (11)$$

For the rotation velocity, we can choose the newtonian one

$$V_{rot} = \sqrt{\frac{G M_G}{R_e}} \quad (12)$$

(where M_G is the bulge mass), and for the accretion radius, the black hole radius of influence

$$R_A = 2 G M_\bullet / \sigma^2. \quad (13)$$

Substituting (13) and (12) in (11) we obtain

$$\sqrt{\frac{G M_G}{R_e}} R_e = \epsilon c \frac{2 G M_\bullet}{\sigma^2} \quad (14)$$

By dividing and multiplying by $\sqrt{M_\bullet}$ and squaring, we have

$$M_\bullet = \left(\frac{M_G \sigma}{M_\bullet c} \right) \frac{1}{4 \epsilon^2} \left(\frac{R_e \sigma^3}{c G} \right) \quad (15)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \log(M_\bullet) = & - \left[\log(M_\bullet) - \log \left(\frac{M_G \sigma}{c} \right) \right] - \log(4 \epsilon^2) + \\ & + \log \left(\frac{R_e \sigma^3}{c G} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

But Soker and Meiron Soker & Meiron (2011) have found a relation

$$\log(M_\bullet) = d + p \log \left(\frac{M_G \sigma}{c} \right) \quad (17)$$

hence, in the simplest case of $p \simeq 1$, we can write the equation (16) in the form

$$\log(M_\bullet) = -d - 2 \log(2\epsilon) + \log \left(\frac{R_e \sigma^3}{c G} \right) \quad (18)$$

and we have to study for spiral galaxies a relation

$$\log(M_\bullet) = \beta + \alpha \log \left(\frac{R_e \sigma^3}{c G} \right) \quad (19)$$

expecting for the parameters the values $\alpha = 1$ and

$$\beta = -d - 2 \log(2\epsilon) \quad (20)$$

4 Fit Results

In order to fit the equation (5) with the data sets, we use three methods: the first is FITEXY, a linear regression routine (Press et al. 1992), that minimizes the χ^2

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(y_i - b - m x_i)^2}{(\Delta y_i)^2 + m^2 (\Delta x_i)^2}. \quad (21)$$

To obtain the most efficient and unbiased estimate of the slope, it is necessary to consider the residual variance in the fitting method, also known as intrinsic scatter ε_0 , which is that part of the variance that cannot be attributed to specific causes (Novak et al. 2006). When the reduced $\chi_r^2 = \chi^2 / (N - 2)$ of the fit is not equal to 1, we can use MPFITEXY, an evolution of the routine FITEXY (Tremaine et al. 2002), that automatically normalizes χ_r^2 including ε_0 in the equation (21):

$$\chi_r^2 = \frac{1}{N - 2} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{(y_i - b - m x_i)^2}{(\Delta y_i)^2 + \varepsilon_0^2 + m^2 (\Delta x_i)^2}. \quad (22)$$

The second fitting method is the Bayesian linear regression routine LINMIX_ERR (Kelly 2007) that allows

Table 1 Fit Results of three different Subsamples of Galaxies.

$y = b + mx$	LINMIX_ERR			MPFITEXY		
	Subsample of 179	Subsample of 113	Subsample of 66	Subsample of 179	Subsample of 113	Subsample of 66
m	1.12 ± 0.07	1.00 ± 0.07	1.23 ± 0.21	1.13 ± 0.07	1.01 ± 0.06	1.23 ± 0.17
b	-0.045 ± 0.53	0.98 ± 0.51	-1.21 ± 1.47	-0.15 ± 0.50	0.93 ± 0.47	-1.20 ± 1.22
ε_0	0.59 ± 0.04	0.47 ± 0.04	0.62 ± 0.07	0.57	0.45	0.59
R	0.765	0.825	0.640	—	—	—

m and b are the slope and the intercept of the linear relation respectively,
 ε_0 is the intrinsic scatter of the relationship and R the linear correlation coefficient

to determine the slope, the normalization, and the intrinsic scatter of the relation

$$\log(M_\bullet) = b + m \log(x) + \varepsilon_0. \quad (23)$$

This routine approximates the distribution of the independent variable as a mixture of Gaussians, bypassing the assumption of a uniform prior distribution on the independent variable, which is used in the derivation of χ^2 -FITEXY minimization routine. Since a direct computation of the posterior distribution is too computationally intensive, random draws from the posterior distribution are obtained using a Markov Chain Monte Carlo method (Kelly 2007). We have analyzed the three samples of 179, 113 and 66 galaxies respectively, and we have obtained with MPFITEXY and with LINMIX_ERR the values shown in table 1. We have also included in the table the Pearson linear correlation coefficient calculated with the formula

$$R = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})(y_i - \bar{y})}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (x_i - \bar{x})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2}}. \quad (24)$$

Finally, a third method was used to construct Fig. 1, in which the 179 experimental points are shown; the colors distinguish spiral galaxies from early-type galaxies, and the two straight lines indicate the best fit obtained imposing a slope equal to one for the two subsamples fitted separately. To calculate the b intercepts of the subsamples of 113 and 66 objects, we have used the exact formulas of the least squares method (Feoli & Mele 2007), in the case $m = 1$:

$$b = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{y_i - x_i}{(\Delta x_i)^2 + (\Delta y_i)^2} \right)}{\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta x_i)^2 + (\Delta y_i)^2} \right)} \quad (25)$$

$$(\Delta b)^2 = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{(\Delta x_i)^2 + (\Delta y_i)^2} \right)} \quad (26)$$

The results are:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{early-type galaxies} &\rightarrow b = 1.10 \pm 0.02; \\ \text{spiral galaxies} &\rightarrow b = 0.55 \pm 0.03. \end{aligned}$$

The gap between the two sets of galaxies is evident, hence the necessity to use for them two different theoretical equations. Furthermore, the linear correlation coefficient and the intrinsic scatter (Table 1) indicate a stronger relation without spiral galaxies, so the model works better with early-type galaxies as we expected. For the sample of 179 objects and the sample of 113, the slope of the best fit line is about 1, as predicted by the theory, and the value is stable enough to be considered a good result for our test of the theoretical model. For the subsample of only spirals, the slope reaches the value of 1.23, starting a little “tilt” with respect to the unity, probably due to a slope $p \neq 1$ in the relation (17). Actually, if $p \neq 1$, the slope of the $M_\bullet \propto R_e \sigma^3$ relation from (15) becomes $p(2p - 1)^{-1}$. Another possible explanation is the estimation of errors, because the least-squares fit, done using the linear regression routine of Mathematica, without taking into account the errors on the single measurements, gives just $m = 1.05 \pm 0.16$.

Finally, the intercept parameter cannot be considered very stable, because it changes with small variations of the subsample considered for the fit, even if the value found for the 113 early type galaxies is in the range predicted by the theory.

5 Predictions

There are cases in which predicting the mass of a black hole is arduous, sometimes there seems to be no agreement between theoretical models and experimental data, as in the case of NGC1600. We considered this particular case as reported in Thomas et al. (2016), because they declare: “The M_\bullet in NGC1600 is ... three to nine times more than the percentage predicted from the known scaling relation of black hole and galaxy




Fig. 1 The whole sample of 179 objects in the $\log(M_{\bullet}/M_{\odot})$ vs. $\log(R_e \sigma^3 / c G M_{\odot})$ plane. Red points are spiral galaxies, green points are early-type galaxies and, imposing a slope $m = 1$, the two best fit lines for spiral and early - type galaxies have an intercept $b = 0.55$ (yellow line) and $b = 1.10$ (blue line) respectively.




Fig. 2 The subsample of 113 early - type galaxies inserted in a diagram with lines of different values of the efficiency, according with the equations of the theoretical model. The line with $\epsilon = 0.059$ is the best fit line obtained with MPFITEXY, while the line with $\epsilon = 0.42$ represents the maximum of radiative efficiency for a Kerr rotating Black Hole.

bulge mass” and “the black hole in NGC1600 is ten times more massive than would be expected given the galaxy’s velocity dispersion” (Extended Data Figure 1). Hence, according to Thomas et al. (2016), the value for NGC1600

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = 10.23 \pm 0.04 \quad (27)$$

cannot be predicted from the $M_{\bullet} - M_{bulge}$ and $M_{\bullet} - \sigma$ relations, but, in principle, it could be predicted by our relation. In Appendix B we have explicitly calculated the black hole mass using our relation obtaining:

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = 9.41 \pm 0.84, \quad (28)$$

and using the $M_{\bullet} - \sigma$ estimated with the same sample obtaining

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = 9.26 \pm 0.92, \quad (29)$$

It is clear that our report foresees the experimental data in the range of errors, unlike Thomas et al. (2016), so the relation can be a useful tool to predict black hole masses in difficult cases.

Furthermore, in Feoli (2014), a classification of black holes based on the value of the parameter ϵ has been proposed. This coefficient describes the efficiency of the black hole in the conversion of the matter captured into emitted radiation. From (3) we get

$$\epsilon = \frac{R_e \sigma^3}{2M_{\bullet} c G} \quad (30)$$

and we can classify supermassive black holes following this scheme:

Type 1 SMBH when $0.1 < \epsilon < 1.0$ (high efficiency),

Type 2 SMBH when $0.01 < \epsilon < 0.1$ (normal efficiency),

Type 3 SMBH when $0.001 < \epsilon < 0.01$ (low efficiency).

Thanks to the efficiency lines of Fig. 2, we have divided Feoli & Iannella (2019) the 113, experimental points of early-type galaxies in this way: 30 (26.5%) belong to the first type, 75 (66.4%) to the second and 8 (7.1%) to the third one, even if the error bars on the single variables make a classification for the galaxies placed on the border line between two different zones of the diagram difficult.

From the fit of the experimental data for early - type galaxies and from the prediction of the equation (9), the average value expected for the efficiency is $\epsilon = 0.059$ according to MPFITEXY and $\epsilon = 0.052$ according to LINMIX_ERR, which are in agreement with the theoretical models. Our parameter ϵ is in fact related to the

radiative efficiency η defined as $\eta = L/\dot{M}_{acc}c^2$ where $L = \dot{M}_{rad}c^2$ is the radiated luminosity. Actually, deriving the equation (4) with respect to time,

$$\dot{M}_{rad} = \epsilon \dot{M}_{acc} + \epsilon \dot{M}_{acc} \quad (31)$$

and dividing for \dot{M}_{acc} , we have

$$\frac{\dot{M}_{rad}}{\dot{M}_{acc}} = \eta = \epsilon \frac{\dot{M}_{acc}}{\dot{M}_{acc}} + \epsilon \quad (32)$$

If ϵ can be considered constant during the interval of time of our astrophysics observations (very small with respect to the black hole life), its derivative vanishes and $\epsilon = \eta$. From the value of the last stable orbit one can derive the maximum of radiative efficiency. For a static Schwarzschild Black Hole $\eta = 0.057$ was found, while for a Kerr rotating Black Hole the limit is $\eta = 0.42$ (Narayan 2005). As the most part of supermassive black holes rotates, we have drawn in fig. 2 the corresponding line and it is evident that only three galaxies overcome this border J0437+2456, NGC2960 (probable spirals), NGC4371, but they are inside the upper limit $\epsilon = 1$, while one galaxy is just on the last border, the Seyfert UGC1841, for which probably the model does not work.

An analogue classification for spiral galaxies is more complicated. It is necessary either to know the bulge mass of each galaxy and to use directly the equation (15), or to choose a suitable best fit of the relation (17), for example the one published in Feoli & Mancini (2011)

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = (0.73 \pm 0.19) + (1.01 \pm 0.03) \log\left(\frac{M_G \sigma}{c}\right) \quad (33)$$

from which to extract the value of the intercept d that appears in the equation (20). Of course this second way is affected by a greater error in the estimate of ϵ , but it allows to draw the four lines of Fig.2 for $\epsilon = 1, 0.1, 0.01, 0.001$ also on the corresponding figure for spiral galaxies (Fig.3). Using the relation (33) we can divide the black holes of spiral galaxies into three types counting 43 objects (65%) of the first type, 23 (35%) of the second and zero of the third one. It means that on average the supermassive black holes of spirals are more efficient with respect to the ones of early - type galaxies. Even if all the 66 points in fig. 3 are well inside the line of $\epsilon = 1$, we have analyzed the behavior near the $\epsilon = 0.42$ line that has become a border zone between two dashed lines (Fig. 3) that represents the uncertainty on the intercept ± 0.19 in the relation (33). The result is that only one object is outside (NGC 4945) and other five galaxies are inside the border zone: Circinus, NGC1386, NGC3079, NGC5248 and NGC5495.




Fig. 3 The subsample of 66 objects inserted in a diagram with lines of different values of the efficiency, according with the equations of the theoretical model for spirals. The border for Kerr Black holes $\epsilon = 0.42$ is also shown using $d = 0.73$ together with the two dashed lines given by the error on d of ± 0.19 (see equations (17), (20) and (33) in the text).

6 Conclusions

Using the data collected by van den Bosch (van den Bosch 2016) we have tested the $M_{\bullet} \propto R_e \sigma^3$ scaling relation. Our fit shows that surely this correlation exists, even if it is weak for the sample of only spirals. Anyway the correlation can be used to predict the black hole mass in difficult cases, such as NGC1600.

Furthermore, we have found that our old very simple theoretical model (Feoli & Mancini 2011) is consistent with the sample of data for early - type galaxies both for the slope and the intercept of the best fit line and can be used to derive useful predictions about the efficiency of supermassive black holes. On the other side, it is necessary an update for the case of a velocity rotation greater than the dispersion velocity. We have proposed a new theoretical approach and we have checked whether it works with a subsample of 66 spiral galaxies. The results are encouraging but not definitive. On average, the efficiency of Black Holes in spirals is greater than the one of early - type galaxies, but also the number of galaxies on the limit of maximum efficiency, with the risk that the model does not work is not negligible (6 over 66 objects). It means that the model for spirals must be further verified with another larger sample.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Franco Caprio for his help with the software and Remco C. E. van den Bosch for his database.

This research was partially supported by FAR fund of the University of Sannio.

References

- Aller, M. C., Richstone, D. O.: *Astrophys. J.*, **665**, 120 (2007)
- Baes, M., Buyle, P., Hau, G. K. T., Dejonghe, H.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **341**, L44 (2003)
- Begelman, M. C., Nath, B. B.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **361**, 1387 (2005)
- Beifiori, A., Sarzi, M., Corsini, E. M., Dalla Bont, E., Pizzella, A., Coccatto, L., Bertola, F.: *Astrophys. J.*, **692**, 856 (2009)
- Bellovary, J., Volonteri, M., Governato, F., Shen, S., Quinn, T., Wadsley, J.: *Astrophys. J.*, **742**, 13 (2011)
- Bondi, H., Hoyle, F.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **104**, 273 (1944)
- Booth, C. M., Schaye, J.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **398**, 53 (2009)
- Burkert, A., Silk, J.: *Astrophys. J.*, **554**, L151 (2001)
- Burkert, A., Tremaine, S.: *Astrophys. J.*, **720**, 516 (2010)
- Cavaliere, A., Vittorini, V.: *Astrophys. J.*, **570**, 114 (2002)
- Ciotti, L., Ostriker, J. P., Proga, D.: *Astrophys. J.*, **699**, 89 (2009)
- Croton, D. J., Springel, V., White, S. D. M., De Lucia, G., Frenk, C. S., Gao, L., Jenkins, A., Kauffmann, G., Navarro, J. F., Yoshida, N.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **365**, 11 (2006)
- Degraf, C., Di Matteo, T., Springel, V.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **413**, 1383 (2011)
- Di Matteo, T., Springel, V., Hernquist, L.: *Nature*, **433**, 604 (2005)
- Fanidakis, N., Baugh, C. M., Benson, A. J., Bower, R.G., Cole, S., Done, C., Frenk, C.S.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **410**, 53 (2011)
- Feoli, A., Mele, D.: *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. D*, **14**, 1861 (2005)
- Feoli, A., Mele, D.: *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. D*, **16**, 1261 (2007)
- Feoli, A., Mancini, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **703**, 1502 (2009)
- Feoli, A., Mancini, L.: *Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. D*, **20**, 2305 (2011)
- Feoli, A., Mancini, L., Marulli, F., van den Bergh, S.: *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, **43**, 1007 (2011)
- Feoli, A.: *Astron. Notes*, **335**, 193 (2014)
- Feoli, A., Iannella, A.L.: “An experimental test of the relation $M_{\bullet} \propto R_e \sigma^3$ and of the corresponding model to estimate the efficiency of a supermassive black hole, Proceeding of 2019 IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Aerospace, 570 (2019)
- Ferrarese, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **578**, 90 (2002)
- Ferrarese, L., Ford, H. C.: *Space Sci. Rev.*, **116**, 523 (2005)
- Ferrarese, L., Merritt, D.: *Astrophys. J.*, **539**, L9 (2000)
- Gebhardt, K., Bender, R., Bower, G., Dressler, A., Faber, S.M., Filippenko, A.V., Green, R., Grillmair, C., Ho, L.C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T.R., Magorrian, J., Pinkney, J., Richstone, D., Tremaine, S.: *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, **539**, 13 (2000)
- Graham, A. W., Driver, S. P.: *Proc. Astron. Soc. Aust.*, **22**, 118 (2005)
- Graham, A.: *Astrophys. J.*, **680**, 143 (2008)
- Graham, A. W., Onken, C. A., Athanassoula, E., Combes, F.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **412**, 2211 (2011)
- Granato, G. L., De Zotti, G., Silva, L., Bressan, A., Danese, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **600**, 580 (2004)
- Gültekin, K., Richstone, D.O., Gebhardt, K., Lauer, T.R., Tremaine, S., Aller, M.C., Bender, R., Dressler, A., Faber, S.M., Filippenko, A.V., Green, R., Ho, L.C., Kormendy, J., Magorrian, J., Pinkney, J., Siopis, C.: *Astrophys. J.*, **698**, 198 (2009)
- Gültekin, K., Cackett, E. M., Miller, J. M., Di Matteo, T., Markoff, S., Richstone, D.O.: *Astrophys. J.*, **706**, 404 (2009)
- Haiman, Z., Ciotti, L., Ostriker, J.P.: *Astrophys. J.*, **606**, 204 (2004)
- Häring, N., Rix, H.: *Astrophys. J. Lett.*, **604**, L89 (2004)
- Hopkins, P.F., Hernquist, L., Cox, T.J., Robertson, B., Krause, E.: *Astrophys. J.*, **669**, 45 (2007)
- Hopkins, P.F., Hernquist, L., Cox, T.J., Robertson, B., Krause, E.: *Astrophys. J.*, **669**, 67 (2007)
- Hopkins, P.F., Hernquist, L., Cox, T.J., Kereš, D.: *Astrophys. J. Suppl. Ser.*, **175**, 356 (2008)
- Hoyle, F., Lyttleton, R.A.: *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, **35**, 405 (1939)
- Hu, J.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **386**, 2242 (2008)
- Kelly, B.C.: *Astrophys. J.*, **665**, 1489 (2007)
- King, A.R.: *Astrophys. J.*, **596**, L27 (2003)
- Kisaka, S., Kojima, Y., Otani, Y.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **390**, 814 (2008)
- Kormendy, J., Richstone, D.: *Annu. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.*, **33**, 581 (1995)
- Kormendy, J., Bender, R.: *Nature*, **469**, 377 (2011)
- Laor, A.: *Astrophys. J.*, **553**, 677 (2001)
- Magorrian, J., Tremaine, S., Richstone, D., Bender, R., Bower, G., Dressler, A., Faber, S.M., Gebhardt, K., Green, R., Grillmair, C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T.: *Astron. J.*, **115**, 2285 (1998)
- Mancini, L., Feoli, A.: *Astron. Astrophys.*, **537**, A48 (2012)
- Marconi, A., Hunt, L.K.: *Astrophys. J.*, **589**, L21 (2003)
- Merritt, D., Ferrarese, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **547**, 140 (2001)
- Murray, N., Quataert, E., Thompson, T.A.: *Astrophys. J.*, **618**, 569 (2005)
- Narayan, R.: *New Journal of Physics*, **7**, 199 (2005)
- Novak, G. S., Faber, S. M., Dekel, A.: *Astrophys. J.*, **637**, 96 (2006)
- Pipino, A., Silk, J., Matteucci, F.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **392**, 475 (2009a)
- Pipino, A., Kaviraj, S., Bildfell, C.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **395**, 462 (2009b)
- Press W.H., Teukolsky S.A., Vetterling W.T., Flannery B.P.: “Numerical recipes in C: the art of scientific computing”, 2nd ed. (Cambridge University Press New York, NY, USA), 666 (1992)
- Richstone, D., Ajhar, E. A., Bender, R., Bower, G., Dressler, A., Faber, S.M., Filippenko, A.V., Gebhardt, K., Green, R., Ho, L.C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T., Magorrian, J., Tremaine, S.: *Nature*, **395**, A14 (1998)
- Saglia, R.P., Opitsch, M., Erwin, P., Thomas, J., Beifiori, A., Fabricius, M., Mazzalay, X., Nowak, N., Rusli, S.P., Bender, R.: *Astrophys. J.*, **818**, 47 (2016)
- Sazonov, S.Yu., Ostriker, J.P., Ciotti, L., Sunyaev, R.A.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **358**, 168 (2005)
- Shin, M.-S., Ostriker, J.P., & Ciotti, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **711**, 268 (2010)
- Shin, M.-S., Ostriker, J.P., & Ciotti, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **745**, 13 (2012)

-
- Silk, J., Rees, M.J.: *Astron. Astrophys.*, **331**, L1 (1998)
- Sijacki, D., Springel, V., Di Matteo, T., Hernquist, L.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **380**, 877 (2007)
- Snyder, G. F., Hopkins, P. F., Hernquist, L.: *Astrophys. J.*, **728**, L24 (2011)
- Soker, N.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **398**, 41 (2009)
- Soker, N., Meiron, Y.: *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.*, **411**, 1803 (2011)
- Thomas, J., Ma, C.-P., McConnell, N.J., Greene, J.E., Blakeslee, J.P., Janishet, R.: *Nature*, **532**, 340 (2016)
- Tremaine, S., Gebhardt, K., Bender, R., Bower, G. Dressler, A., Faber, S.M., Filippenko, A.V., Green, R., Grillmair, C., Ho, L.C., Kormendy, J., Lauer, T.R., Magorrian, J., Pinkney, J., Richstone, D.: *Astrophys. J.*, **574**, 740 (2002)
- van den Bosch, R.C.E.: *Astrophys. J.*, **831**, 134 (2016)
- Volonteri, M., Natarajan, P., Gultekin, K.: *Astrophys. J.*, **737**, 50 (2011)
- Wandel, A. X: *Astrophys. J.*, **565**, 762 (2011)
- Wyithe, J.S.B., Loeb, A.: *Astrophys. J.*, **595**, 614 (2003)

A List of galaxies

The galaxies discarded because the black hole mass is known with a relative error on $\log(M_{\bullet}) \geq 1$ are the following

NGC0205, NGC0289, NGC0428, NGC0598, NGC1042, NGC1428, NGC1493, NGC2685, NGC2778, NGC2903, NGC2964, NGC3021, NGC3310, NGC3351, NGC3423, NGC3621, NGC3642, NGC3675, NGC3945, NGC3982, NGC4088, NGC4150, NGC4212, NGC4245, NGC4314, NGC4321, NGC4382, NGC4435, NGC4450, NGC4579, NGC4800, NGC5347, NGC5427, NGC5457, NGC5643, NGC5879, NGC5921, NGC6300, NGC6503, NGC6951, NGC7418, NGC7424, UGC1214, UGC1395, UGC9799, Henize2-10, IC0342, IC3639, Mrk1216.

The spiral galaxies enclosed in the subsample of 66 objects are the following:

Ark120, Circinus, ESO558-009, Fairall9, IC1481, IC2560, Mrk0079, Mrk0202, Mrk0590, Mrk0817, NGC0193, NGC0613, NGC1097, NGC1271, NGC1275, NGC1320, NGC1358, NGC1386, NGC1398, NGC1667, NGC1961, NGC2179, NGC2273, NGC2748, NGC3031, NGC3079, NGC3227, NGC3368, NGC3393, NGC3627, NGC3706, NGC3783, NGC3953, NGC3992, NGC4051, NGC4151, NGC4253, NGC4258, NGC4303, NGC4388, NGC4429, NGC4501, NGC4507, NGC4548, NGC4593, NGC4594, NGC4698, NGC4748, NGC4945, NGC5005, NGC5055, NGC5248, NGC5495, NGC5548, NGC5695, NGC5728, NGC5765B, NGC6240(S), NGC6323, NGC6500, NGC6814, NGC7331, NGC7582, NGC7682, UGC3789, UGC6093.

B Prediction of Black Hole mass

Following Graham et al. (2011) we consider the linear equation

$$y = (b \pm \delta b)(x \pm \delta x) + (a \pm \delta a) \quad (\text{B1})$$

with an error on y equal to

$$\delta y = \sqrt{\left(\frac{dy}{db}\right)^2 (\delta b)^2 + \left(\frac{dy}{da}\right)^2 (\delta a)^2 + \left(\frac{dy}{dx}\right)^2 (\delta x)^2} = \sqrt{x^2 (\delta b)^2 + (\delta a)^2 + b^2 (\delta x)^2} \quad (\text{B2})$$

If we have an intrinsic scatter ϵ in the y -direction, uncertainty on y is

$$\delta y = \sqrt{x^2 (\delta b)^2 + (\delta a)^2 + b^2 (\delta x)^2 + \epsilon^2} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Considering the $M_{\bullet} - \sigma$ relation for our sample of 113 early-type galaxies,

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = (-3.080 \pm 0.574) + (4.996 \pm 0.248) \log(\sigma) \quad (\text{B4})$$

with $\epsilon = 0.365$, we have that $x = \log(\sigma)$, and therefore considering the data of NGC1660 in the data base of van den Bosch (2016) and following Graham et al. (2011) we can calculate

$$(\delta \log(M_{\bullet}))^2 = (6.1009)(0.0615) + 0.32947 + 24.96(0.0004) + 0.133 = 0.84745 \quad (\text{B5})$$

hence

$$\delta \log(M_{\bullet}) = 0.92057 \quad (\text{B6})$$

and

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = 9.26 \pm 0.92 \quad (\text{B7})$$

On the contrary using our best fit line obtained with MPFITEXY (Table 1)

$$\log\left(\frac{M_{\bullet}}{M_{\odot}}\right) = (0.93 \pm 0.468) + (1.0117 \pm 0.0628) \log\left(\frac{R\sigma^3}{GcM_{\odot}}\right) \quad (\text{B8})$$

with

$$\epsilon = 0.448 \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = 0.93 + (8.378)(1.0117) = 9.406 \quad (\text{B10})$$

while

$$(\delta \log(M_{\bullet}))^2 = (8.378)^2(0.0628)^2 + (0.468)^2 + (1.0117)^2(0.11)^2 + (0.448)^2 = 0.7088 \quad (\text{B11})$$

hence

$$\delta \log(M_{\bullet}) = 0.8419 \quad (\text{B12})$$

and

$$\log(M_{\bullet}) = 9.41 \pm 0.84 \quad (\text{B13})$$