MNRAS **000**, 1–10 (2019) Preprint 18 February 2022 Compiled using MNRAS LATEX style file v3.0

Globular Clusters in Coma Cluster Ultra Diffuse Galaxies (UDGs): Evidence for Two Types of UDG?

Duncan A. Forbes,[1]★ Adebusola Alabi,[2] Aaron J. Romanowsky,[2,3] Jean P. Brodie[2] and Nobuo Arimoto[4,5]

[1] *Centre for Astrophysics & Supercomputing, Swinburne University, Hawthorn VIC 3122, Australia*
[2] *University of California Observatories, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA*
[3] *Department of Physics and Astronomy, San José State University, San Jose, CA 95192, USA*
[4] *National Astronomical Observatory of Japan, Mitaka, Tokyo 181-8588, Japan*
[5] *Astronomy Program, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Seoul National University, 599 Gwanak-ro, Gwanak-gu, Seoul, 151-742, Korea*

arXiv:2001.10031v1 [astro-ph.GA] 27 Jan 2020

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

Ultra diffuse galaxies (UDGs) reveal extreme properties. Here we compile the largest study to date of 85 globular cluster (GC) systems around UDGs in the Coma cluster, using new deep ground-based imaging of the known UDGs and existing imaging from the Hubble Space Telescope of their GC systems. We find that the richness of GC systems in UDGs generally exceeds that found in normal dwarf galaxies of the same stellar mass. These GC-rich UDGs imply halos more massive than expected from the standard stellar mass-halo mass relation. The presence of such overly massive halos presents a significant challenge to the latest simulations of UDGs in cluster environments. In some exceptional cases, the mass in the GC system is a significant fraction of the stellar content of the host galaxy. We find that rich GC systems tend to be hosted in UDGs of lower luminosity, smaller size and fainter surface brightness. Similar trends are seen for normal dwarf galaxies in the Coma cluster. A toy model is presented in which the GC-rich UDGs are assumed to be 'failed' galaxies within massive halos that have largely old, metal-poor, alpha-element enhanced stellar populations. On the other hand, GC-poor UDGs are more akin to normal, low surface brightness dwarfs that occupy less massive dark matter halos. Additional data on the stellar populations of UDGs with GC systems will help to further refine and test this simplistic model.

Key words: galaxies: evolution – galaxies: haloes – galaxies: starclusters

1 INTRODUCTION

Since their discovery in 2015 (van Dokkum et al. 2015), UDGs have been the subject of much interest – both observational and theoretical. As a working definition, UDGs have sizes $R_e > 1.5$ kpc and surface brightnesses $\mu_0 > 23.5$ mag/sq. arcsec in the R band. They also have red colours distinguishing them from blue, star forming low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies that have been known for some years. The excitement around UDGs is largely due to the result that UDGs deviate strongly from normal galaxy scaling relations. In particular, they are not only 'large' in size for their luminosity, but those measured are outliers in their dark matter content. Several UDGs are thought to be 'overmassive' containing ~ 10× more dark matter than normal dwarfs within their half-light radius (Beasley et al. (2016); van Dokkum et al. (2016); Toloba et al. (2018); Martín-Navarro et al. (2019)). This finding would present a major theoretical puzzle since these UDGs are inferred to reside in near MW-mass halos, which in the standard picture of galaxy formation have *maximal* star formation efficiency, not *minimal*.

Evidence is mounting that UDGs may come in (at least) two different types. Key to this is the observation that some UDGs contain only a few globular clusters (GCs), while others are GC-rich (van Dokkum et al. (2017); Amorisco et al. (2018); Lim et al. (2018)). As the mass of a GC system is known to be an indicator of halo mass, e.g. Spitler & Forbes

★ E-mail: dforbes@swin.edu.au

© 2019 The Authors

(2009), this suggests both normal and massive halo UDGs exist.

These characteristics may be associated with 'puffed-up dwarf' and 'failed galaxy' scenarios, respectively (for a discussion of UDG origins see Jiang et al. (2019)). Recent simulations such as Di Cintio et al. (2019), Liao et al. (2019b), Sales et al. (2019) have successfully reproduced many of the properties of UDGs as puffed-up dwarfs. However, these simulations do not model the GC systems of UDGs nor do they predict any to have very massive halos. Although the non-detection of X-ray emitting halos around UDGs suggests that those with very massive halos may be in the minority (Kovacs et al. 2019), such UDGs present an important challenge to galaxy formation models that needs to be understood. In the model of Amorisco & Loeb (2016), UDGs are the high-spin tail of otherwise normal dwarf galaxies. The non-rotation of the best studied UDG, DF44 in the Coma cluster by van Dokkum et al. (2019), suggests that this cannot be the full explanation.

To date, all published measurements of the dynamical mass of UDGs have been carried out on those UDGs with relatively large GC systems. Indeed such measures often use the motions of the GCs to determine the enclosed dynamical mass.

Nearby 'traditional' dwarf galaxies (i.e. dIrr, dE, dSph) also reveal a large range in the number of GCs per unit starlight, e.g. Forbes et al. (2018a); Georgiev et al. (2010). Their host galaxies also have similar stellar masses to UDGs. However, Lim et al. (2018) found that UDGs have, on average, higher GC specific frequencies (i.e. the number of GCs per unit galaxy luminosity) than normal early-type dwarf galaxies. They also found a weak trend for higher GC specific frequencies in those UDGs located closer to the Coma cluster centre. They claimed to find trends between GC specific frequency and UDG size and surface brightness, although both these trends are extremely weak and need larger samples to be confirmed. In their sample, Amorisco et al. (2018) identified nine Coma cluster UDGs to be particularly GC-rich. Contrary to the findings of Lim et al. (2018) they found these GC-rich UDGs to have, on average, smaller sizes. They did not examine trends with surface brightness or cluster-centric distance.

Here we combine the GC studies of Coma cluster UDGs by Lim et al. (2018) and Amorisco et al. (2018) with that of van Dokkum et al. (2017), and new deep photometry of their host galaxies by Alabi et al. (2019, in prep). We include the galaxies with sizes $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc from Amorisco et al. (2018) to probe the interface between *bona fide* UDGs (with $R_e > 1.5$ kpc) and their smaller counterparts. Hereafter, we refer to these 'small UDGs' as low surface brightness (LSB) dwarfs. This gives us the largest sample to date of UDGs with with measured GC counts (mostly from imaging with HST/ACS). We look for trends between GC systems and their host galaxies. In particular, we examine galaxy stellar and halo mass, absolute magnitude, size, colour and surface brightness. We also present a toy model in which UDG properties range from GC-rich failed galaxies to GC-poor puffed-up dwarf galaxies. In this work we assume a distance of 100 Mpc to the Coma cluster.

2 UDG HOST GALAXY PROPERTIES

Low surface brightness galaxies in the Coma cluster were cataloged by Yagi et al. (2016). This catalog was created from deep Subaru imaging in the R band. They selected galaxies with half-light radii (R_e) greater than 0.7 kpc and mean surface brightnesses within the half-light radius of $24 < \mu_e < 27$ R mag. per sq. arcsec.

Traditionally, GC systems have been compared to the total V band luminosity of their host galaxy (a quantity called the GC specific frequency). Although V band magnitudes exist in the literature for some Coma UDGs, a homogeneous V band photometric study has not been available until now.

Using new deep V band Subaru imaging covering 4.2 sq. degrees of the Coma cluster, Alabi et al. (2019, in prep) identifies galaxies in common with the R band catalog of Yagi et al. (2016) supplemented by those from the van Dokkum et al. (2015) Dragonfly catalog. The new catalog reaches a depth of 27.1 mag per sq. arcsec in the R band and detects several new UDG candidates. All UDGs meet the UDG selection criteria, e.g $R_e > 1.5$ kpc and $\mu_0 > 23.5$ R mag sq. arcsec. Alabi et al. fits a single Sersic profile to each galaxy in both the V and R bands, measuring their R_e, Sersic index (n), total magnitude, mean surface brightness within 1 R_e ($< \mu >_e$) and V–R colour within a matched 1 R_e aperture. Measurements of the half-light radii, R band magnitudes and surface brightnesses show good agreement with the Yagi catalog (Alabi et al. 2019, in prep). The measurement uncertainties, based on repeated measurements of galaxies that appear in multiple frames, are around ± 0.13 kpc in half-light radius, ± 0.21 mag. per sq. arcsec in surface brightness, ± 0.19 mag in magnitude, and ± 0.24 mag in V–R colour for the UDGs. In this work we use preliminary photometry from Alabi et al. (2019, in prep.) but we do not expect the final published photometry to affect our conclusions.

We exclude UDGs known to lie outside of the Coma cluster, i.e. DF3 (Yagi214) (Kadowaki et al. 2017) and Yagi771 (Alabi et al. 2018). We also note DF42, DF44 and DFX2 may belong to a small group of galaxies currently infalling into the Coma cluster (van Dokkum et al. 2019) but we keep them in this study.

As previously noted, the catalog of Yagi et al. (2016) and the GC study of Amorisco et al. (2018) included galaxies with sizes smaller than the traditional definition of a UDG (i.e. $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc). These 'small UDGs' provide a useful comparison with *bona fide* UDGs and we refer to them as LSB dwarfs.

In Fig. 1 we show the size–magnitude and colour–magnitude relations for our sample of Coma UDGs with observed GC systems (see section 4 for details). We also show, with different symbols, the Coma LSB dwarfs. The V–R colour of UDGs reveals only a weak trend with magnitude. This is partly a consequence of the limited sensitivity of V–R colour to metallicity and the small luminosity range of UDGs. We note that van Dokkum et al. (2015) measured a mean g–i colour of 0.8 ± 0.1 for their sample of Dragonfly UDGs. The trend of size with magnitude is partly due to surface brightness limits (which form diagonal lines in a size-magnitude plot). Here the bright surface brightness limit is set by the definition of UDGs, whereas a lower limit to surface brightness is set by the depth of the catalog used.




Figure 1. Size and colour-magnitude relations for Coma UDGs with observed GC systems. Red symbols are UDGs with Dragonfly IDs from the sample of van Dokkum et al. (2017) and cyan symbols are non-Dragonfly UDGs from Yagi et al. (2016). Open symbols are LSB dwarfs with sizes $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc. Typical measurement uncertainties are shown in the lower right of each panel. The traditional size limit for UDGs is $R_e > 1.5$ kpc (shown by a dotted line).




Figure 2. Comparison of GC numbers from different studies. The plot shows the studies of A18 = Amorisco et al. (2018) and L18 = Lim et al. (2018) to those of vD17 = van Dokkum et al. (2017) for UDGs in common. The dashed line is a 1:1 relation. Within the errors, the three studies are in reasonable agreement.

The Coma LSB dwarfs tend to be less luminous on average than *bona fide* UDGs but with similar V–R colours.

3 UDG STELLAR MASSES

Only about a dozen higher surface brightness Coma UDGs have measured spectroscopic stellar population properties (Ferré-Mateu et al. (2018); Ruiz-Lara et al. (2018); Gu et al. (2018); Chilingarian et al. (2019)). These studies generally found intermediate-to-old ages and low metallicities. The V band mass-to-light ratio for such stellar populations is around $M/L_V = 1$ for a Kroupa IMF. The IMF in UDGs is currently unconstrained; using a Salpeter IMF would systematically increase the derived masses by ∼0.2 dex. Here we convert M_V for UDGs (and LSB dwarfs) into stellar masses assuming $M/L_V = 1$ (while noting there may be a factor of two variation in this quantity for individual galaxies) and a V band solar luminosity of +4.83.

4 UDG GC SYSTEMS

In this work we use three literature studies of GC systems around Coma cluster UDGs. In each of these works, globular cluster detection is carried out using HST/ACS imaging, with the majority from the Coma Treasury Survey (Carter et al. 2008). Primarily, we take GC counts from the study of van Dokkum et al. (2017). For objects not covered by van Dokkum et al., we take GC counts from Lim et al. (2018). Finally, this is supplemented by GC counts from Amorisco et al. (2018). The former two studies used the original size definition of a UDG, i.e. $R_e > 1.5$ kpc. Here we supplement this sample with LSB dwarfs with sizes $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc from Amorisco et al. (2018). We note that the Amorisco et al. (2018) study used a mixture model to perform a statistical correction and estimate the 10th, 50th and 90th percentiles of GC counts associated with each galaxy. Here we assume that their posteriors have a Gaussian distribution to estimate mean values and 1σ errors, similar to those quoted by the two other studies.

In Fig. 2 we compare the results of GC counts in UDGs from Lim et al. (2018) and Amorisco et al. (2018) with the study of van Dokkum et al. (2017). Both the Lim et al. (2018) and Amorisco et al. (2018) samples show reasonable agreement within the errors (see also figure 2 of Lim et al. (2018)). The rms spread in the data between the different studies is around ±15 in GC number.

As noted above, we take GC measurements in the following priority order: van Dokkum et al. (2017) Lim et al. (2018), and finally Amorisco et al. (2018). This gives a sample of 76 Coma cluster UDGs and LSBs (UDGs with sizes $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc) with GC measurements. Nine UDGs from the study of Lim et al. (2018) lie outside of the field-of-view of the Subaru imaging used by Alabi et al. (2019). For these nine we take GC counts, M_V, R_e and V band $< \mu >_e$ directly from Lim et al. (2018); colours are not available. We assume $M/L_V = 1$ to calculate host galaxy stellar masses and V–R = 0.3 to convert from V to R band surface brightness. This gives a total sample of 85 galaxies with GC counts – the largest sample studied to date. We note that several galaxies in the sample are deemed to have no GCs (i.e. they are consistent with zero GC counts after a statistical background subtraction). In the Appendices we list the GC number counts for our combined sample of Coma cluster UDGs, i.e. Table A1 for Dragonfly IDs (van Dokkum et al. 2017), Table A2 for Yagi only IDs (Yagi et al. 2016) and the additional 9 UDGs from Lim et al. (2018) in Table A3.

5 DWARF GALAXY COMPARISON SAMPLES

To help interpret the GC systems of UDGs we employ several comparison samples. As well as the LSB dwarfs mentioned above, we include local dwarf galaxies and Coma early-type dwarf galaxies with observed GC systems. Local dwarfs are relevant as UDGs may have formed their GCs in low density environments before falling into clusters, e.g. Alabi et al. (2018). If UDGs are simply puffed-up dwarfs, then it is relevant to compare them to a sample of Coma early-type dwarf galaxies.

The local dwarf sample consists of GC systems for 14 Local Group dwarfs (including a re-assembled Sgr dwarf galaxy) and 29 Local Volume dwarfs in low density environments from Forbes et al. (2018a). This therefore includes early (dE and dSph) and late-type (dIrr and Im) dwarfs. Many of them are satellites of a more massive galaxy, which may have modified their dark matter halos and GC systems. For each galaxy we take the quoted number of old GCs, the total mass of the GC system (which is the sum of the individual masses), the host galaxy absolute magnitude and the host galaxy stellar mass.

The other comparison sample is based on the study of Lim et al. (2018) who measured the GC content of 50 early-type dwarfs in the core of the Coma cluster from HST/ACS imaging. As they reside mostly in the core, such dwarfs tend to be older and redder than typical Coma dwarfs (Smith et al. 2009). Here we take the GC counts, host galaxy absolute magnitudes from Lim et al. and again assume $M/L_V = 1$ to derive host galaxy stellar masses.

6 RESULTS

In the subsections 6.1–6.3 we examine trends between the stellar mass of the host UDG and the number of associated GCs including the directly related quantities of GC system mass and galaxy halo mass. In the latter subsections 6.4–6.7 we normalise the GC counts by the V band luminosity of the host galaxy (called GC specific frequency, S_N). Given that we apply a constant mass-to-light ratio this is equivalent to normalising by stellar mass. We examine trends between S_N and host galaxy properties. We also include other dwarf galaxy comparison samples when data is available.

6.1 GC System Numbers

We begin by examining the number of GCs versus host galaxy stellar mass for UDGs, and contrast them with Coma and local dwarf galaxies.

Fig. 3 shows that although some UDGs overlap with the other dwarf galaxy samples, many UDGs reveal considerably more GCs than Coma dwarfs or local dwarfs. Indeed, over half of the UDGs have more GCs per unit galaxy mass than those of the highest dwarf galaxies. The UDG with the highest GC number (76) is DF44 (van Dokkum et al. 2017). We also note that the three Coma early-type dwarfs with particularly rich GC systems also have large error bars, i.e. $N_{GC} = 23.5 \pm 11.6$, 29.9 ± 14.9 and 42.3 ± 13.6. Some of the LSB dwarfs have high GC counts but only the very highest mass local dwarfs with log stellar mass > 9 reveal high GC counts, e.g. NGC 1427A with its 38 reported GCs.




Figure 3. Number of globular clusters versus host galaxy stellar mass. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares, Coma LSB dwarfs by open squares, Coma early-type dwarfs by green circles and local dwarfs by blue circles. Some Coma galaxies have no GCs after background subtraction. For local dwarfs only those with GC systems are shown. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the left hand side. The UDG with the highest GC number (76) is DF44.

Half a dozen UDGs have no discernible GC system after a statistical background subtraction. Such systems have zero or negative GC counts quoted in the original studies. The host galaxies of such GC-free systems cover the full range of UDG stellar masses. In the subsequent analysis, we found no clear galaxy property that correlated with the lack of GCs and we do not consider them further. For the local dwarf comparison sample, we only include populated GC systems, which range from 1 GC per host galaxy to several tens of GCs for the highest mass dwarfs, and do not consider GC-free galaxies.

6.2 GC System Masses

It is also interesting to compare the total mass in a GC system to the stellar mass of the host galaxy. Unfortunately, little is known about the luminosity (or mass) function of the GC systems associated with UDGs. For the GC-rich UDGs DF44, DFX1 (van Dokkum et al. 2017) and DF17 (Peng & Lim 2016) the bright end of the GC luminosity function appears to be similar to that of the 'universal' GCLF (van Dokkum et al. 2017). These UDGs may have GC systems similar to those of the Milky Way and local giant galaxies. If the typical GC luminosity is $M_V \sim -7.4$ then the typical mean GC mass is $\sim 10^5 M_\odot$. Here we use this as the typical mean mass for a GC in all UDGs but note that the actual mean GC mass is unknown. We also adopt this mean GC mass for Coma LSB dwarfs and Coma early-type galaxies. Local dwarf galaxies reveal a wide range in their mean GC mass. Here we take the mass of the GC system directly from Forbes et al. (2018a), who summed the observed individual GC masses. We note that some GC-poor local dwarfs have a mean GC mass closer to $10^4 M_\odot$.




Figure 4. Mass in globular cluster system versus host galaxy stellar mass. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares, Coma LSB dwarfs by open squares, Coma early-type dwarfs by green circles and local dwarfs by blue circles. We assume a mean GC mass of $10^5 M_\odot$ for the UDGs and the Coma dwarfs. For the local dwarfs individual GC masses are summed. Dashed lines represent GC system to galaxy stellar mass ratios. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the right hand side. Some UDGs (and LSBs) have a GC system mass that is a significant fraction of the host galaxy stellar mass.

In Fig. 4 we show the total GC system mass vs total stellar mass of the host galaxy. As well as Coma UDGs we include the Coma LSB and early-type dwarfs, and the local dwarfs samples. Each sample reveals a wide range of GC system mass-to-galaxy stellar mass ratios, from a fraction of a percent to around 10%. On average UDGs reveal higher GC system mass-to-galaxy mass ratios than early-type or local dwarfs, and at times the GC system mass approaches a significant fraction of the total stellar mass of the host UDG. We remind the reader that this diagram depends on the assumption that the mean GC mass in UDGs, LSB dwarfs and early-type dwarfs has the 'universal value' of $10^5 M_\odot$, but also note that similar general trends are seen when simply GC number is used (see Fig. 3).

6.3 Halo Masses

Near-linear empirical relations have been found between the total halo mass of the host galaxy and both the number of GCs (Burkert & Forbes 2019) and the total mass of the GC system (Spitler & Forbes 2009) for normal galaxies. Perhaps the best studied Coma UDG is that of DF44. As shown in Burkert & Forbes (2019), its halo mass based on radially extended kinematics and its halo mass based on its GC count are in excellent agreement. Nevertheless, we emphasise to the reader that here we make the assumption that this relation is valid for all Coma galaxies, including UDGs. Thus we use eq. 1 of Burkert & Forbes (2019) to convert our GC number counts into total (pre-infall) halo masses for UDGs and LSB dwarfs (and noting that the relation begins to break down for log halo masses < 10). The resulting halo masses are shown in Fig. 5. We also show the stellar mass–halo mass (SMHM) relation of Rodríguez-Puebla et al. (2017) extrapolated to lower masses after correcting for the sign error in eq. 66 (Rodriguez-Puebla, priv. comm). This work employed a semi-empirical approach to subhalo abundance matching. It agrees well with weak lensing apporoaches. The scatter about this relation at L* is ~0.2 dex but is somewhat larger at the lower stellar masses typical of UDGs. Both the Coma LSB and early-type dwarfs tend to scatter about the relation while the local dwarfs tend to lie below with lower halo masses (many are satellites and may experience tidal stripping of their halos). For the UDGs, 65% have systematically higher halo masses than expected compared to the upper limit of the relation. This may point to two types of UDG, i.e. those with normal (dwarf-like) halo masses and those with abnormally massive halos. The latter being rich in GCs.

The tendency for many Coma UDGs to have higher halo masses than the SMHM relation is in stark contrast to the latest simulations for UDGs. In Tremmel et al. (2019) UDGs in a Virgo cluster-like potential lie on the SMHM relation prior to infall. And after infall they scatter to *lower* halo masses due to stripping of their dark matter halos. Similarly, in the Auriga simulations of Milky Way-like halos by Liao et al. (2019a), all of their UDGs have dwarf-like halos with none being failed masive halo galaxies. Their highest log halo mass is 10.5. While these simulations appear to successfully reproduce many properties of UDGs as puffed-up dwarfs, they fail to reproduce the population of massive halo UDGs. GCs may hold the key, so that a full understanding of all UDGs may not be available until realistic GC systems are included in simulations.

6.4 GC Specific Frequency vs Absolute Magnitude

The traditional method of comparing the GC system richness of different galaxies is via GC specific frequency which normalises the GC number by the host galaxy luminosity in the V band, i.e. $S_N = N\ 10^{0.4(M_V+15)}$. Lim et al. (2018) showed that Coma UDGs have, on average, higher S_N values than dwarf galaxies of comparable host galaxy luminosity.

In Fig. 6 we show S_N vs host galaxy absolute magnitude for the Coma UDGs and dwarf comparison samples. The well-known trend of increasing S_N with decreasing luminosity for low mass galaxies can be seen (at higher masses than shown, S_N increases with increasing luminosity forming a U-shaped distribution; Forbes (2005)). The UDGs follow the general trend seen for the other dwarf galaxies however, along with the LSB dwarfs, they reach significantly higher specific frequencies for a given host galaxy luminosity. These are the same UDGs as the overly massive halo UDGs identified in section 6.3. Similar trends were seen by Lim et al. (2018).

Figures 3 to 6 all suggest that some UDGs have GC systems that are similar in richness to those of other dwarf galaxies. However, in the Coma cluster a significant fraction (i.e up to 2/3) of our UDGs reveal GC systems that are much richer than those seen in dwarf galaxies of comparable luminosity or stellar mass. The distribution appears to be continuous without an obvious demarcation (which could be masked by large uncertainties) between the relatively GC-poor and GC-rich UDGs.




Figure 5. Halo mass vs stellar mass. The halo mass is derived from the scaling between GC system number and halo mass (see text for details). The solid line shows the extrapolated stellar mass–halo mass relation for normal galaxies of Rodríguez-Puebla et al. (2017). The dashed lines show the typical scatter of ± 0.2 dex found at higher masses. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares and red triangles (if they lie above the relation upper limit). Coma LSB dwarfs are shown by open squares, Coma early-type dwarfs by green circles and local dwarfs by blue circles. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the left hand side. Some 65% of Coma UDGs lie above the upper limit of the relation to higher halo masses.




Figure 6. Globular cluster system log specific frequency versus host UDG galaxy absolute magnitude. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares and red triangles (if they have overly massive halos). Coma LSB dwarfs are shown by open squares, Coma early-type dwarfs by green circles and local dwarfs by blue circles. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the left side. While following the general trend, Coma UDGs tend to have higher S_N values than comparable dwarf galaxies.

In order to better understand why some UDGs are exceptional in terms of their GC richness (and by extension halo mass), we next explore whether S_N depends on other host UDG properties, i.e. size, colour or surface brightness.

6.5 GC Specific Fequency vs Size

Using a sample of UDGs, Lim et al. (2018) claimed a weak trend between S_N and host galaxy half-light radius R_e for the more luminous UDGs in their sample and no trend for the least luminous UDGs. Including LSB dwarfs with sizes $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc, Amorisco et al. (2018) hinted at the opposite trend with the most GC-rich galaxies having smaller sizes on average.

In Fig. 7 we show GC specific frequency vs half-light radius for Coma UDGs, LSBs and early-type dwarfs. Examining the UDGs with massive and normal halos separately, we find no trend for the normal halo UDGs and only a weak inverse trend (at the 2σ level) for the massive halo UDGs to have higher GC specific frequencies in smaller UDGs. We thus support the general trend found by Amorisco et al. (2018), albeit not at a statistically significant level and for massive halo UDGs only.




Figure 7. Globular cluster system log specific frequency versus host UDG galaxy half-light radius. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares and red triangles (if they have overly massive halos). LSB dwarfs are shown by open squares and early-type dwarfs by green circles. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the left side. There is a weak inverse trend between GC specific frequency and the size of the host galaxy for massive halo UDGs.

6.6 GC Specific Frequency vs Colour

In Fig. 8 we show the specific frequency vs host galaxy colour for our UDG sample. Examining the UDGs with massive and normal halos separately, we find no trend for the massive halo UDGs. However, the normal halo UDGs reveal a strong trend. A linear best-fit to the data gives:
$\log S_N = 0.61(\pm0.19)$ V-R + $0.77(\pm0.07)$

Thus we find the redder normal halo UDGs reveal higher GC specific frequencies on average, whereas the Coma LSB dwarfs reveal no clear trend with host galaxy colour.




Figure 8. Globular cluster system specific frequency versus host galaxy V–R colour. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares and red triangles (if they have overly massive halos). Coma LSB dwarfs are shown by open squares. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the left side. There is a trend between GC specific frequency and host galaxy V–R colour for UDGs with normal halos.




Figure 9. Globular cluster system specific frequency versus host galaxy mean R band surface brightness. Coma UDGs are shown by red squares and red triangles (if they have overly massive halos). Coma LSB dwarfs are shown by open squares. The typical uncertainty for Coma UDGs is shown on the right side. There is a trend between GC specific frequency and host galaxy surface brightness for UDGs with both normal and massive halos.

Although we do not find UDG V–R colour to be a strong characteristic of GC specific frequency for the massive halo UDGs, future work should re-examine this issue using a more sensitive baseline colour, e.g. combining optical and near-IR filters. We also note that our sample of cluster UDGs lacks the very blue UDGs commonly found in the field.

6.7 GC Specific Frequency vs Surface Brightness

Lim et al. (2018) found a weak trend between S_N and host galaxy surface brightness, with higher S_N associated with fainter surface brightnesses.

In Fig. 9 we show S_N vs host galaxy surface brightness for Coma UDGs, LSB and early-type dwarf samples. Examining the UDGs with massive and normal halos separately, we find strong trends for both the massive halo and normal halo UDGs. Linear best-fits to the data give:
$\log S_N = 0.31(\pm0.06)\ \mu_e - 1.8(\pm1.6)$,
$\log S_N = 0.34(\pm0.08)\ \mu_e - 7.9(\pm2.1)$
for massive and normal halo UDGs respectively. These trends are in the same sense as found by Lim et al. (2018), i.e. for fainter surface brightness UDGs to host richer GC systems.

7 DISCUSSION

We have investigated the GC systems of Coma UDGs, in comparison with other dwarf galaxy samples, using two measures of GC richness. In the first approach we examined the number of GCs associated with each UDG, and directly related quantity of GC system mass. We find that several Coma UDGs have extremely rich GC systems, relative to other Coma dwarf galaxies, and that their GC systems may contain a significant fraction (e.g. ~10%) of their total stellar mass. Assuming that the relation between GC number and halo mass holds for UDGs, the majority have overly massive halos. In particular, we find 65% of Coma UDGs to be more massive than expected compared to the stellar mass-halo mass relation for normal galaxies. These massive halo UDG may be considered 'failed galaxies', i.e. they lie in substantial dark matter halos but have failed to form many stars. These massive halo UDGs represent a key challenge for contemporary galaxy formation simulations. The remaining 35% are consistent with lower mass, or dwarf-like, halos.

Our second approach examined the traditional GC specific frequency (S_N), which normalises the GC number by the V band luminosity of the host galaxy. We found that the highest S_N Coma UDGs have the inter-related properties of having low luminosities, small sizes, and faint surface brightnesses. For the normal halo UDGs there is also a trend with host galaxy V–R colour, i.e. the UDGs with redder colours tend to host richer GC systems.

The origin(s) of UDGs remains a matter of considerable debate. On the one hand, theoretical models have shown that very diffuse dwarfs can arise through internal feedback and/or tidal effects (Di Cintio et al. (2017); Yozin & Bekki (2015); Carleton et al. (2019); Jiang et al. (2019); Liao et al. (2019b); Martin et al. (2019)). On the other hand, some UDGs exhibit peculiar properties that challenge these models, such as their extreme chemical abundance and high dynamical mass within the half-light radius (e.g. Martín-Navarro et al. (2019); Beasley et al. (2016); Toloba et al. (2018); van Dokkum et al. (2019)). In this work we have highlighted other properties which challenge these models, namely the high mass halos inferred for those UDGs with rich GC systems.

A possible bridge between these different perspectives is that there exist two basic types of UDG, with similar sizes

and luminosities, but distinct origins. The range in stellar population properties of UDGs found to date lends support to this idea. We suggest that the first type consists of ordinary but very low surface brightness large-sized dwarfs. It is these 'puffed up' dwarfs that have been successfully reproduced by some recent simulations and they largely form a continuum with other normal dwarf galaxies. The second type is an exotic class of failed galaxy whose halo masses are not reproduced by any current galaxy simulation.

Failed galaxies can identified in deep imaging by their rich GC systems, and should have stars with GC-like stellar populations, i.e. old ages, low metallicities, and enhanced alpha-element abundances. They should also be more dark matter dominated than normal dwarfs of a similar luminosity, having missed out on ~10 Gyr of evolution converting gas into stars. The main limitation in testing this concept is a minimal overlap so far between the sample of UDGs with well-studied GC systems, and those with measurements of their internal dynamics and stellar populations.

A number of recent works have suggested that star formation at early epochs is dominated by GCs, e.g. Elmegreen (2018); Boylan-Kolchin (2018). In the failed galaxy scenario, we would expect high S_N to be associated with old, metal-poor UDGs with enhanced [Mg/Fe] (and a high velocity dispersion indicating a massive halo). Conversely, low S_N values would be associated with younger ages, higher metallicities, lower [Mg/Fe] (and a low stellar velocity dispersion indicating a dwarf-like dark matter halo).

In the following we propose a simple mixture model for the two classes of UDG. In this approach UDG properties vary smoothly from one class to another. We start by calibrating our simple toy model using the current literature of stellar populations in Coma cluster UDGs. We collect age, total metallicity [Z/H] and alpha element abundance [Mg/Fe] when available from the works of Ferré-Mateu et al. (2018) which includes 7 UDGs, Gu et al. (2018) which gives ages and Iron metallicity [Fe/H] (we assume [Z/H] = [Fe/H] + 0.3) for 3 UDGs, and Ruiz-Lara et al. (2018) which includes data for 5 UDGs (we note that their quoted uncertainties on [Z/H] seem unrealistically small, and we assume ±0.4 for their [Mg/Fe] values). Age and [Fe/H] measurements for 2 Coma UDGs are taken from Chilingarian et al. (2019) (they also give stellar populations for 6 LSB galaxies that do not meet the standard UDG definition of size and surface brightness, which we do not include here).

In Fig. 10 we show the stellar population data for Coma UDGs in terms of [Z/H] and [Mg/Fe] vs age. The plot also shows our simple toy model. We assume GC-like parameters for the stellar populations of a failed galaxy, i.e. [Z/H] = –2.2 and [Mg/Fe] = +0.8 for an age = 10 Gyr. This assumes that the failed galaxy formed its stars rapidly at early times with low metallicity. We also assume that a normal dwarf galaxy has [Z/H] = –0.3, [Mg/Fe] = 0.0 and an age of 4 Gyr (see Smith et al. (2009) for a study of Coma dwarf galaxies). The model curves represent a smooth transition from a pure failed galaxy to a fully normal dwarf galaxy. The comparison with the data is by no means perfect, but it provides a reasonable representation on average and it can be refined as more data are published.

We further assume in our toy model that a pure failed galaxy UDG forms a significant number of metal-poor GCs, along with its field stars, at early times. We note that when




Figure 10. Age–metallicity and age-[Mg/Fe] relations for Coma UDGs with measured stellar populations. The data shown come from three literature studies of Coma UDGs. The typical uncertainty in age is around ±3 Gyr (see Table 1). The red line shows a simple toy model to represent the data (see text for details).

the colours of GCs have been measured, they are similar to those of the underlying field stars in the host UDG, e.g. Beasley et al. (2016). Thus a pure failed galaxy, with no subsequent field star formation, would have a very large GC-to-stellar mass ratio, i.e. a very large S_N value. Here we assume S_N = 50, which is near the upper limit observed for Coma UDGs.

It is interesting to compare this GC specific frequency with that of the halo of our own Milky Way galaxy (given that UDGs appear to lack clear bulge or disk components). Indeed the formation of metal-poor GCs at early times may be a universal process (Forbes et al. 2018b). Similar to the failed galaxy scenario for UDGs, the halo of our Galaxy formed at early times and is dominated by old metal-poor stars.

To first order, the Milky Way contains around 100 metal-poor GCs today. The total stellar mass of the Galactic halo is $5.5(\pm1.5)\times10^8$ $M_\odot$ (Bland-Hawthorn & Gerhard 2016). Assuming M/L_V = 1.4 gives a halo luminosity of 3.9×10^8 $L_\odot$ or M_V = –16.65. The resulting GC specific frequency for the Milky Way halo today (with N_{GC} = 100) is S_N = 22. However, the Galactic environment has destroyed many low-mass GCs over time. If we take the 3% of all halo stars (or 1.65×10^7 $M_\odot$) that have signatures of being formed in GCs (Martell et al. 2011) and assume this all comes from disrupted GCs with an average GC mass of 10^5 $M_\odot$, then the halo GC population rises to 265 and S_N = 58. Thus the GC specific frequency of the Milky Way's halo is comparable to those of the GC-rich UDGs in the Coma cluster.

For normal dwarfs we assume, on average, S_N = 1 (normal dwarfs range from many to no GCs; see Fig. 3). In reality, both normal dwarfs and failed galaxies would have a stochastic variation in S_N values. To summarise, a failed galaxy is assigned an age of 10 Gyr, [Z/H] = –2.2, [Mg/Fe] = +0.8 and S_N = 50, while a normal dwarf galaxy has an age of 4 Gyr, [Z/H] = –0.3, [Mg/Fe] = 0.0 and S_N =1. Our




Figure 11. [Mg/Fe], age and [Fe/H] variation with specific frequency. The data shown come from three literature studies of Coma UDGs (see text for details). The red line shows the same simple toy model for UDGs from Fig. 10 (assuming high S_N UDGs are failed galaxies with GC-like stellar populations and low S_N are normal dwarf galaxies). The typical uncertainity in S_N is ±10 (see Table 1).

Table 1. Coma Ultra Diffuse Galaxies with GCs and measured stellar population properties.

UDG	S_N	Age	[Fe/H]	[Mg/Fe]	Ref.
DF7	16±10	7.9±3.1	-1.0±0.4	–	G18
DF17	21±9	9.1±4.7	-0.8±0.5	–	G18
DF26	9±9	7.9±1.8	-1.5±0.8	0.64±0.25	FM18
DF44	40±9	8.9±3.8	-1.3±0.4	–	G18

toy model transitions these properties smoothly from one extreme galaxy to the other.

Unfortunately, only four UDGs have both their stellar populations and GC systems studied to date. We list their stellar population and GC counts (and uncertainty on the counts) in Table 1. These UDGs are all old and metal-poor, with relatively high S_N values. Only one UDG (DF26) has a published alpha element abundance ratio from Ferré-Mateu et al. (2018). The literature values from Table 1, and our toy model, are shown in Fig. 11. Again a comparison between the data and our toy model is not perfect but neither can it be ruled out with confidence. The highest S_N galaxy is DF44. This UDG has been well-studied and has a massive halo of ~10^{11} $M_\odot$ (van Dokkum et al. 2019), making it a good candidate for a failed galaxy.

We note that the GC counts for DF26 may be particularly uncertain as it is located near the cluster core and GCs may have been tidally stripped away leaving an abnormally GC-poor galaxy. Measurements of [Mg/Fe] in more UDGs potentially provides a strong point of discrimination with those of normal dwarfs. Future studies should concentrate on obtaining the stellar populations for UDGs, particularly the [Mg/Fe] ratio, in order to better test and refine this model.

In this work we focused on UDGs in the Coma cluster, finding many to be GC-rich and by inference occupying overly massive halos. While some UDGs in the Virgo cluster are also known to be GC-rich, e.g. Beasley et al. (2016) and Toloba et al. (2018)), UDGs in the Fornax cluster/group appear to have more modest GC systems (Prole et al. 2019). In the latter study they measured a typical GC specific frequency of S_N ~ 10 for their dozen Fornax UDGs, with none of them reaching the high S_N levels found in some Coma UDGs. In our toy model, we would predict these low S_N Fornax UDGs to have stars with intermediate ages, [Fe/H] ~ –1 and near solar [Mg/Fe] values.

8 CONCLUSIONS

Using an enlarged sample and deeper imaging of UDGs in the Coma cluster we study their globular cluster (GC) systems. We find that Coma UDGs are on average overabundant in GCs compared to Coma early-type dwarfs and local dwarfs of a comparable host galaxy stellar mass. However, Coma LSB dwarfs (with sizes $0.7 < R_e < 1.5$ kpc) are similarly over-abundant in GCs. In some extreme cases, the mass contained in the GC system is around 10% of the total stellar mass of its host UDG. Coma UDGs can have specific frequencies up to S_N ~ 100. The distribution of GC specific frequency, and of GC number counts, appears to be rather continuous (although the measured uncertainties are large, potentially masking the presence of clear GC-rich and GC-poor subclasses).

Like normal dwarf galaxies in Coma, UDGs reveal a trend for higher GC specific frequencies to be found in lower mass hosts. Higher GC specific frequencies are also found in lower surface brightness UDGs and in redder normal halo UDGs. There is a weak trend for higher GC specific frequencies in smaller sized massive halo UDGs.

From the scaling of GC system numbers to halo mass, we infer that around 2/3 of our Coma UDGs have massive halos indicative of failed galaxies. Such high halo masses (~ 10^{11} $M_\odot$) are not reproduced by current galaxy simulations, which have had some success in finding UDGs with dwarf-like halos.

We present a simple mixture model as a first step to help interpret the large fraction of Coma UDGs with extraordinarily rich GC systems (which imply massive halos and high GC specific frequencies). We propose that such GC-rich UDGs formed both their GCs and field stars rapidly at early times. Thus the stellar populations of both GCs and field stars would be metal-poor with enhanced alpha element ratios and with very old ages. If these UDGs failed to form any additional field stars (e.g. due to mass loss, gas stripping etc) without disrupting their GC systems, it would lead to very high GC specific frequencies, as observed. This 'failed galaxy' scenario may thus explain the GC-rich, dark matter-dominated UDGs. The GC-poor UDGs would be more akin to normal dwarf galaxies that have been puffed-up to larger sizes by internal feedback processes or tidal interactions. Future observational studies should concentrate on obtaining additional stellar population (especially alpha elements) and dynamical properties for UDGs with extreme (high and low) GC numbers, in order to better test and refine this model.

Future simulations of UDGs need to incorporate realistic GC systems.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DAF thanks the ARC for financial support via DP160101608. JPB and AJR acknowledge financial support from AST-1616598, AST-1518294 and AST-1616710. AJR was supported by the Research Corporation for Science Advancement as a Cottrell Scholar. We thank J. Gannon for useful comments. NA is supported by the Brain Pool Program, which is funded by the Ministry of Science and ICT through the National Research Foundation of Korea (2018H1D3A2000902). We thank the referee for several useful comments.

REFERENCES

Alabi A., et al., 2018, MNRAS, 479, 3308
Amorisco N. C., Loeb A., 2016, MNRAS, 459, L51
Amorisco N. C., Monachesi A., Agnello A., White S. D. M., 2018, MNRAS, 475, 4235
Beasley M. A., Romanowsky A. J., Pota V., Navarro I. M., Martinez Delgado D., Neyer F., Deich A. L., 2016, ApJ, 819, L20
Bland-Hawthorn J., Gerhard O., 2016, ARA&A, 54, 529
Boylan-Kolchin M., 2018, MNRAS, 479, 332
Burkert A., Forbes D., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1901.00900
Carleton T., Errani R., Cooper M., Kaplinghat M., Peñarrubia J., Guo Y., 2019, MNRAS, 485, 382
Carter D., et al., 2008, ApJS, 176, 424
Chilingarian I. V., Afanasiev A. V., Grishin K. A., Fabricant D., Moran S., 2019, ApJ, 884, 79
Di Cintio A., Brook C. B., Dutton A. A., Macciò A. V., Obreja A., Dekel A., 2017, MNRAS, 466, L1
Di Cintio A., Brook C. B., Macciò A. V., Dutton A. A., Cardona-Barrero S., 2019, MNRAS, 486, 2535
Elmegreen B. G., 2018, ApJ, 869, 119
Ferré-Mateu A., et al., 2018, MNRAS, 479, 4891
Forbes D. A., 2005, ApJ, 635, L137
Forbes D. A., Read J. I., Gieles M., Collins M. L. M., 2018a, MNRAS,
Forbes D. A., et al., 2018b, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series A, 474, 20170616
Georgiev I. Y., Puzia T. H., Goudfrooij P., Hilker M., 2010, MNRAS, 406, 1967
Gu M., et al., 2018, ApJ, 859, 37
Jiang F., Dekel A., Freundlich J., Romanowsky A. J., Dutton A. A., Macciò A. V., Di Cintio A., 2019, MNRAS,
Kadowaki J., Zaritsky D., Donnerstein R. L., 2017, ApJ, 838, L21
Kovacs O. E., Bogdan A., Canning R. E. A., 2019, arXiv e-prints,
Liao S., et al., 2019a, arXiv e-prints,
Liao S., et al., 2019b, MNRAS, 490, 5182
Lim S., Peng E. W., Côté P., Sales L. V., den Brok M., Blakeslee J. P., Guhathakurta P., 2018, ApJ, 862, 82
Martell S. L., Smolinski J. P., Beers T. C., Grebel E. K., 2011, A&A, 534, A136
Martín-Navarro I., et al., 2019, MNRAS, 484, 3425
Martin G., et al., 2019, MNRAS, 485, 796
Peng E. W., Lim S., 2016, ApJ, 822, L31
Prole D. J., et al., 2019, MNRAS, 484, 4865
Rodríguez-Puebla A., Primack J. R., Avila-Reese V., Faber S. M., 2017, MNRAS, 470, 651
Ruiz-Lara T., et al., 2018, MNRAS, 478, 2034
Sales L. V., Navarro J. F., Penafiel L., Peng E. W., Lim S., Hernquist L., 2019, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:1909.01347
Smith R. J., Lucey J. R., Hudson M. J., Allanson S. P., Bridges T. J., Hornschemeier A. E., Marzke R. O., Miller N. A., 2009, MNRAS, 392, 1265
Spitler L. R., Forbes D. A., 2009, MNRAS, 392, L1
Toloba E., et al., 2018, ApJ, 856, L31
Tremmel M., Wright A. C., Brooks A. M., Munshi F., Nagai D., Quinn T. R., 2019, arXiv e-prints,
Yagi M., Koda J., Komiyama Y., Yamanoi H., 2016, ApJS, 225, 11
Yozin C., Bekki K., 2015, MNRAS, 452, 937
van Dokkum P. G., Abraham R., Merritt A., Zhang J., Geha M., Conroy C., 2015, ApJ, 798, L45
van Dokkum P., et al., 2016, ApJ, 828, L6
van Dokkum P., et al., 2017, ApJ, 844, L11
van Dokkum P., et al., 2019, ApJ, 880, 91

Table A1. The number of globular clusters in Coma cluster ultra diffuse galaxies with both Yagi and Dragonfly IDs.

ID1	ID2	M_V	N_{GC}	±
yagi13	DFX1	-15.72	63	17
yagi851	DF9	-13.98	14.1	13.7
yagi194	DF8	-14.82	42.6	23.9
yagi680	DF7	-15.95	39.1	23.8
yagi853	DF6	-14.54	31.4	22.6
yagi8	DF46	-14.47	0	15.7
yagi11	DF44	-15.70	76	18
yagi14	DF42	-14.64	9	7
yagi501	DF41	-15.14	-1.9	14.3
yagi507	DF40	-14.95	-7.1	10.3
yagi581	DF39	-14.82	11.2	17.6
yagi762	DF36	-14.27	25.4	15.7
yagi37	DF35	-14.07	6.6	14.4
yagi782	DF32	-14.88	5.1	13.1
yagi739	DF31	-14.38	27.2	17
yagi577	DF29	-15.07	45.1	21.5
yagi93	DF26	-15.89	20	20.7
yagi285	DF25	-14.61	10.7	24.3
yagi364	DF23	-14.89	38.5	19.2
yagi86	DF20	-13.53	-0.1	9.9
yagi484	DF2	-14.70	0	7.8
yagi347	DF18	-13.77	10.6	19.1
yagi165	DF17	-15.17	25	11
yagi660	DF15	-14.78	15.2	22.6
yagi653	DF14	-14.38	54.6	24.2
yagi163	DF13	-14.34	11.3	10.5
yagi416	DF12	-14.16	23.5	17.4
yagi459	DF10	-15.05	1.9	10.9
yagi486	DF1	-14.74	18.6	13.9

APPENDIX A: GLOBULAR CLUSTER NUMBERS

Here we list ultra diffuse galaxies in the Coma cluster GCs used in this work. Tables A1 lists those with Dargonfly IDs and Table A2 with Yagi IDs. Table A3 lists UDGs from Lim et al. (2018) that are covered by the photometry of Alabi et al. (2019, in prep.).

This paper has been typeset from a TEX/LATEX file prepared by the author.

Table A2. The number of globular clusters in Coma cluster ultra diffuse galaxies with only Yagi IDs.

ID1	ID2	M_V	N_{GC}	±
yagi534	–	-14.22	28	11
yagi436	–	-14.07	34	13
yagi425	–	-13.82	24	11
yagi424	–	-12.61	17	9
yagi419	–	-14.94	23	11
yagi386	–	-14.86	3	8
yagi367	–	-14.02	31	12
yagi122	–	-13.83	0	4
yagi121	–	-14.62	25	11
yagi112	–	-14.38	15	9
yagi99	–	-13.25	35.5	27.34
yagi91	–	-12.08	1.7	1.25
yagi89	–	-13.71	11.3	8.44
yagi85	–	-13.20	1.8	1.25
yagi438	–	-12.85	4.05	3.01
yagi437	–	-13.06	5.2	3.75
yagi435	–	-11.78	3.45	2.54
yagi433	–	-12.55	52.95	14.18
yagi432	–	-13.25	25.1	12.73
yagi427	–	-12.15	1.25	0.9
yagi423	–	-13.20	19.7	9.22
yagi415	–	-12.10	5.05	3.79
yagi412	–	-12.84	8.35	5.74
yagi410	–	-13.16	2.6	1.8
yagi409	–	-14.51	5.25	3.71
yagi408	–	-11.85	3.25	2.46
yagi407	–	-15.02	8.7	6.25
yagi402	–	-13.01	4.05	2.93
yagi395	–	-12.38	2.45	1.84
yagi391	–	-11.56	2.05	1.52
yagi387	–	-13.97	13.5	8.83
yagi380	–	-12.39	2.65	1.91
yagi374	–	-13.06	5.25	3.79
yagi373	–	-14.29	3.05	2.07
yagi372	–	-13.71	5.35	3.87
yagi331	–	-14.03	2.55	1.76
yagi238	–	-13.32	3.15	2.23
yagi236	–	-12.44	11.25	7.3
yagi118	–	-12.15	1.65	1.21
yagi115	–	-11.91	10	7.58
yagi114	–	-14.23	3.65	2.54
yagi113	–	-11.80	1.95	1.45
yagi108	–	-11.46	1.15	0.82
yagi107	–	-12.35	2.75	2.07
yagi105	–	-11.73	1.55	1.13
yagi104	–	-13.45	20.4	8.28
yagi102	–	-12.59	13	6.25

Table A3. The number of globular clusters in Coma cluster ultra diffuse galaxies with photometry from Lim et al. (2018).

ID1	ID2	M_V	N_{GC}	±
–	DF4	-14.5	-18	36.8
Yagi176	DF11	-15.0	9.4	12.7
–	DF19	-14.7	28.8	23.4
–	DF22	-14.0	15	11.3
–	DF30	-15.4	28.2	18.4
Yagi774	DF34	-13.8	-2.7	12.4
–	DF47	-14.8	2.4	16.9
yagi358	–	-14.8	28	5.3
yagi370	–	-13.9	17	6.4