Calibrating the BHB Star Distance Scale and the Halo Kinematic Distance to the Galactic Centre

Nikita D. Utkin,^{1,2,3*} Andrei K. Dambis,¹

¹ Sternberg Astronomical Institute, M.V.Lomonosov Moscow State University, Universitetskii pr. 13, Moscow, 119991 Russia

² Faculty of Physics, Moscow State University, Leninskie Gory 1, bld. 2, Moscow, 119234 Russia

³ Astro Space Center, Lebedev Physical Institute, Russian Academy of Sciences, 84/32 Profsoyuznaya st., Moscow, GSP-7, 117997, Russia

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

We report the first determination of the distance to the Galactic centre based on the kinematics of halo objects. We apply the statistical-parallax technique to the sample of ~ 2500 Blue Horizontal Branch (BHB) stars compiled by Xue et al. (2011) to simultaneously constrain the correction factor to the photometric distances of BHB stars as reported by those authors and the distance to the Galactic centre to find $R = 8.2 \pm 0.6$ kpc. We also find that the average velocity of our BHB star sample in the direction of Galactic rotation, $V_0 = -240 \pm 4$ km/s, is greater by about 20 km/s in absolute value than the corresponding velocity for halo RR Lyrae type stars ($V_0 = -222 \pm 4$ km/s) in the Galactocentric distance interval from 6 to 18 kpc, whereas the total (σV) and radial (σr) velocity dispersion of the of the BHB sample are smaller by about 40–45 km/s than the corresponding parameters of the velocity dispersion ellipsoid of halo RR Lyrae type variables. The velocity dispersion tensor of halo BHB stars proved to be markedly less anisotropic than the corresponding tensor for RR Lyrae type variables: the corresponding anisotropy parameter values are equal to $\beta_{BHB} = 0.51 \pm 0.02$ and $\beta_{RR} = 0.71 \pm 0.03$, respectively.

Key words: The Galaxy, stellar halo

1 INTRODUCTION

The distance of the Sun to the nearest (our own) galaxy - i.e., the Galactic centre, R_0 , is a fundamental scale factor determining such physical parameters of the Milky Way as its mass and luminosity, as well as the mass distribution within it and hence the size and shape of orbits of various Galactic objects (de Grijs and Bono 2016). As the above authors point out, R_0 estimates fall into three main categories - direct distance determinations, centroid-based determinations, and, finally, kinematic-based Galactic-centre distance determinations. The latter mostly derive from the kinematics of Population-I (i.e., Galactic-disk) objects like Cepheids, open clusters, supergiant stars, and masers (Bobylev 2013; Zhu and Shen 2013; Reid et al. 2014; Bobylev and Bajkova 2014a,b; Rastorguev et al. 2017) as the distance to the kinematic centre of the velocity field incorporating circular rotation and spiral-wave perturbations. Population-II kinematics-based Galactic centre distance determinations usually involve the determination of the solar velocity with respect to some Population-II tracer sample and comparing it with some adopted angular-velocity value at the solar Galactocentric distance (Klinichev et al. 2018).

The aim of this paper is to simultaneously determine both the distance from the Sun to the kinematic centre of the halo velocity field and the distance-scale correction factor by applying the maximum-likelihood version of the statistical-parallax technique to a sample of ~ 2500 purportedly clean Galactic-halo blue horizontal-branch (BHB) stars with full 6D data (sky positions, relative distances, proper motions, and radial velocities). This is the first determination of the distance to the Galactic centre based on the assumption that velocity dispersion tensors at all halo points are aligned along the local direction toward the Galactic centre and have the same shape and size. This determination has become possible owing to the unprecedented accuracy of proper motions provided by the second data release of Gaia astrometric space mission (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2016, 2018) and the fact that inside 25-30 kpc the velocity distribution of halo stars is highly lobe-shaped and radially anisotropic, being dominated by the so-called "Gaia Sausage" component found from the analysis of the kinematics of BHB stars and RR Lyrae type variables (Lancaster et al. 2018; Iorio and Belokurov 2019) (if the velocity dispersion ellipsoid were spherical and had the same size irrespectively of the Galactocentric distance it would hardly matter where to "put" the Galactic centre and this parameter would remain practically impossible to constrain by the solution).

The layout of the paper is as follows. Section 2 describes the data employed and the cuts applied to it. Section 3 briefly describes the method employed. The next two sections describe the method

^{*} E-mail: nikitautkin@bk.ru

employed and the results obtained and, finally, Section 6 provides the conclusions.

2 DATA

Like Lancaster et al. (2018), we use the catalogue of 4,985 BHB stars compiled by Xue et al. (2011) based on SDSS DR8 (Aihara et al. 2011) data as our initial sample of halo kinematic tracers. The spectra employed by Xue et al. (2011) to identify BHB stars and determine their parameters were acquired within the framework of SEGUE program, which was a subsurvey of SDSS-II project whose data were distributed as part of SDSS DR8. The radial velocities of the stars were determined via SEGUE Stellar Parameter Pipeline, which was used to process the calibrated spectra generated by the standard SDSS spectroscopic reduction pipeline (Stoughton et al. 2002). Particular parameters of Balmer-line profiles needed to distinguish BHB stars from other stars of similar temperature - blue stragglers and main-sequence stars — were computed by Xue et al. (2011) directly from SDSS spectra. These include two parameters of the H δ line — its width $D_{0.2}$ at 20% below the local continuum and its flux f_m relative to the continuum, and the parameters b and c of the Sérsic profile, $y = 1.0 - a \exp \left[- \left(\frac{|\lambda - \lambda_0|}{b}\right)^c \right]$ of the H γ line (Xue et al. 2008; Sirko, et al. 2004). We further supplement these data with Gaia DR2 (Gaia Collaboration et al. 2016, 2018) proper motions to obtain an initial list of 4537 BHB stars with complete 6D phase-space information. Furthermore, to prevent eventual biases in the shape of the velocity ellipsoid, we decontaminate our sample by removing stars that might belong to the well-known Sagittarius (Sgr) stream. We do it by eliminating the objects that fall within its sky region as defined by Deason et al. (2011) (see Fermani and Schönrich (2013a)). We do not use a more elaborate approach involving the use of kinematic data for identifying stream members (Antoja et al. 2020; Ibata et al. 2020) because our statistical-parallax method operates with the likelihood function in the velocity space and tampering with the kinematic data may produce extra biases that we are just trying to avoid. The simple approach of masking the stream in the sky is less likely to produce extra bias. We defer a more detailed analysis with explicitly incorporating the Sagittarius stream into our kinematical model to a future study to be based on a more extensive tracer sample. We further exclude all objects within 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane to prevent contamination by thick-disk stars with their markedly different kinematics (much lower velocity dispersion components and fast rotation (Layden et al. 1996; Dambis 2009; Dambis et al. 2013)). The 5 kpc cutoff should be sufficient to provide a clean halo sample given that the scaleheight of the thick disk in the Milky Way is of about 0.9 kpc (Jurić, et al. 2008). Finally, we exclude all stars with total Galactic rest-frame velocities higher than 600 km/s since they should be either escaping from our Galaxy or have erroneous data. The final sample has a size of 2582 stars. In their catalogue Xue et al. (2011) provide sky positions, distance estimates, radial velocities, and radial-velocity errors for all stars of the sample, but give no individual distance errors. However, they point out that the quoted relative distance estimates are typically accurate to within 5%, and it is this error that we adopt for all stars in our subsequent kinematical analysis. These distances, however, are computed without taking into account the BHB absolute magnitude dependence on metallicity. To see how this dependence may affect our results, we also computed a solution using the distances based on the absolute-magnitude calibration proposed

by Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) and expressed as a function of $(q - r)_0$ and [Fe/H]. To this end, we further complete the data by adding the SPPP [Fe/H] estimates drawn from SDSS database (Yanny, et al. 2009). Fig. 1 compares the original distances from the catalogue of Xue et al. (2011) with the distances based on the calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b). The two distance sets can be seen to agree quite well once the scaling factor is adjusted $(D_{Fermani,Schonrich}/D_{Xue} = (1.0288 \pm 0.0008)$, with a scatter of 0.043). As we will see below, this is very close to the ratio of the scaling factors delivered by the statistical-parallax method (1.024). Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) do not provide an estimate for individual errors of their distances, but the discussion in that paper suggests that the fractional accuracy of their distances should be at least better than \pm 0.09 (9%) corresponding to the absolutemagnitude error of $\epsilon_{Mq} = 0.18$. Fig. 2a shows the distribution of SDSS q-band magnitudes of the BHB stars of our sample. Fig. 2b shows the distribution of radial-velocity errors, σ_{Vr} , Figs. 2c and 2d show the distributions of the errors of the proper-motion components in right ascension $(\sigma_{PM_{\alpha}})$ and declination $(\sigma_{PM_{\delta}})$, respectively, and Fig. 2e shows the distribution of the metallicity values [Fe/H].

3 DETERMINING THE VELOCITY FIELD PARAMETERS, THE DISTANCE-SCALE CORRECTION FACTOR, AND THE SOLAR GALACTOCENTRIC DISTANCE

Our tool of choice for inferring the kinematic properties and the distance-scale correction factor for the sample of stars is the method of statistical parallax in its maximum-likelihood version suggested by Murray (1996) and first used in practise by Strugnell, Reid & Murray (1986); Hawley et al. (1986). The underlying idea is to maximise the likelihood of observing the combined kinematic observables of all sample stars (radial velocities and proper motions) and their photometric distances by choosing the "right" combination of the kinematic parameters (the parameters of the bulk velocity field of the sample - in the simplest case just the three components of the bulk velocity - and the components of the velocity dispersion tensor. A detailed description of the method can be found in the original book by Murray (1996) and in the papers by Hawley et al. (1986) and Rastorguev et al. (2017). However, maximum-likelihood estimators can be biased - e.g., in the simplest case the variance estimator is known to be biased downward if the population mean is unknown (Liu 1996). To reveal such biases, we generated for each solution 100 simulated data sets with stars fixed at the same sky positions as the stars of the actual sample and with the radial velocities and proper-motion components generated randomly (with the 1-d Gaussian distribution for radial velocities and 2-d Gaussian distribution for proper motions) in accordance with the inferred velocity-field parameters (in the simplest case just the components of the bulk mean velocity) and the components the velocity dispersion tensor plus the normally distributed radial-velocity and proper-motion errors. We also "scattered" the initial input star distances D_i by adding normally distributed errors with zero mean and with variance equal to $0.05 D_i$ and multiplying the resulting distance values by the distance-scale correction factor P inferred from the corresponding solution for the real data set. We then found the corresponding maximum-likelihood solutions for every such simulated set and computed the mean values



Figure 1. Comparison of the original BHB distances from Xue et al. (2011) with the distances computed using the calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b). The straight line corresponds to the average scaling factor of $D_{Fermani,Schonrich}/D_{Xue} = 1.0288$.

for all desired parameters, the differences between these mean values and the corresponding "true" (input) values - those given by the solution of the real set, and the standard deviations of these differences. These differences provide an estimate of the eventual bias of the real-data solution, and the standard deviations give us the estimates of the errors of the corresponding parameters, which we compare with the parameter errors given by the real-data solution. . Like in the case of our recent analysis of the kinematics of the RR Lyrae population (Utkin et al. 2018), we assume that the halo is non-rotating (while still determining the tangential velocity component that reflects the total angular momentum). We address the possible rotation of our halo sample in Section 4.3. Generally, for the entire sample we aim to determine the following quantities: (1) the velocity components of the sample relative to the Sun $(U_0, V_0,$ W_0) in the Galactocentric Cartesian coordinate system: U_0 in the direction toward the Galactic centre, V_0 in the direction of Galactic

rotation, and W_0 in the direction toward the North Galactic Pole; (2) the velocity dispersion components $(\sigma_r, \sigma_\theta, \sigma_\phi)$ in the Galactocentric spherical coordinate system assuming that the principal axes of the velocity ellipsoid are aligned with the local directions to the Galactic centre, Galactic rotation and that of the θ coordinate (we address the possible deviation from this alignment in Section 4.2); (3) the distance-scale correction factor P such that the true distance r_t is related to the adopted distance r as $r_t = r/P$, and (4) the solar Galactocentric distance R_0 .

We use the procedure adopted by Hawley et al. (1986) to estimate the standard errors in the inferred parameters. To this end, we determine the error function $S = -2 \ln(LF)$ and find the uncertainties in the final parameters by numerically computing its second derivatives at the inferred minimum, S_0 . To this end, we fix the particular parameter at its value at the minimum, $X_i(min)$, add a small term d_i so that $X_i = X_i(min) + d_i$ and then allow other pa-



Figure 2. Diagnostic diagrams for the BHB sample employed: distribution of SDSS *g*-band magnitudes (a) and radial-velocity errors σ_{Vr} (b); errors of the proper-motion components $\sigma_{PM_{\alpha}}$ (c) and $\sigma_{PM_{\delta}}$ (d) in right ascension and declination, respectively, and the distribution of metallicities [Fe/H] (e).

Values	opt	min	max	uncertainty	units
U_0	-7.5	-9.3	-5.7	1.8	
V_0	-240.2	-244.6	-236.4	4.1	
W_0	-5.4	-7.3	-3.5	1.9	
					km/s
σ_r	112.4	110.8	114.1	1.7	
σ_{ϕ}	77.6	76.0	79.6	1.8	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.6	78.0	81.2	1.6	
σV	158.1	155.4	161.1	2.9	
β	0.508	0.487	0.525	0.020	
Р	1.051	1.032	1.068	0.017	
R_0	8.23	7.82	9.00	0.59	kpc

 Table 1. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample with initial distances from Xue et al. (2011).

rameters to converge to a new minimum, S1. We finally estimate the variance in the inferred X_i as

$$\sigma_i^2 = d_i^2 / (S_i - S_0) \tag{1}$$

We also compute the total velocity dispersion, $\sigma V = \sqrt{\sigma_r^2 + \sigma_{\phi}^2 + \sigma_{\theta}^2}$ and the anisotropy parameter β defined as:

$$\beta = 1 - \frac{\sigma_{\theta}^2 + \sigma_{\phi}^2}{2\sigma_r^2}.$$
 (2)

To have a more detailed picture of the kinematics of our BHB star sample, we take advantage of the large number of objects involved and analyse the variations of the velocity-field parameters with Galactocentric distance. To this end, we subdivide the filtered sample into 2-kpc wide Galactocentric-distance bins spanning the interval from 3 to 23 kpc plus three broader bins for more distant stars (23 to 27 kpc, 27 to 35 kpc, and 35 to 60 kpc). To make the single-bin solutions more stable, we fix the velocity components of the sample relative to the Sun (U_0 , V_0 , W_0) at their values determined for the entire sample and assume that the velocity ellipsoid is two-axial, i.e., the two axes perpendicular to the direction toward the Galactic centre are equal, and infer only the velocity dispersion along Galacticentric radius, σ_r , and anisotropy parameter β rather than estimating all three axes (σ_r , σ_θ , σ_ϕ) of the ellipsoid.

4 RESULTS

4.1 Bulk solution

Table 1 gives the results obtained by applying the maximumlikelihood statistical-parallax method to the entire decontaminated subsample of 2582 blue horizontal branch stars. Column 1 gives the names of the inferred parameters; column 2, their inferred optimum values; columns 3 and 4, the corresponding minimum and maximum values obtained by cross-sectioning the likelihoodfunction profile near its global minimum by the hyperplane LF = $LF_0 + 1$, where LF_0 is the minimum of the likelihood function as described above; column 5, the uncertainty, and column 6, the corresponding unit of measure.

Table 2 summarises the results obtained by applying the maximum-likelihood statistical-parallax method to 100 data sets

Table 2. The summary of the results obtained for 100 simulated data sets based on the values given by the real-data solution in Table 1. Here "Mean" is the mean value of parameter *Param* averaged over the maximum-likelihood solutions for 100 simulated data sets; "True" is the input value *Param*₀ given by the real-data solution in Table 1; Difference is the difference $< Param > - Param_0$; scatter is the standard deviation of $< Param > - Param_0$ (σ ($< Param > - Param_0$), and the $\frac{S}{U}$ is the ratio of the scatter to the uncertainty of the corresponding parameter given by the real-data solution (Column 5 of Table 1).

Values	Mean	"True"	Difference	Scatter	units	$\frac{S}{U}$
U_0	-7.8	-7.5	-0.3 ± 0.2	1.6		0.9
V_0	-239.8	-240.2	$+0.5 \pm 0.4$	4.1		1.0
W_0	-5.3	-5.4	$+0.1 \pm 0.2$	2.0		1.1
					km/s	
σ_r	112.5	112.4	$+0.1 \pm 0.2$	1.8		1.0
σ_{ϕ}	77.4	77.6	-0.2 ± 0.2	1.7		1.0
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.5	79.6	-0.1 ± 0.2	1.8		1.1
σV	158.0	158.1	-0.1 ± 0.2	2.3		0.8
β	0.513	0.511	$+0.002 \pm 0.002$	0.022		1.1
Р	1.054	1.051	$+0.003 \pm 0.002$	0.017		1.0
R_0	8.15	8.23	-0.08 ± 0.06	0.63	kpc	1.1

simulated based on the parameter values obtained for decontaminated BHB star sample with initial star distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011). Column 1 gives the names of the inferred parameters; column 2, the mean values of these parameters averaged over 100 solutions for simulated data sets; column 3, difference between this mean value and the input ("true") value, which "measures" the eventual bias in the estimated of the corresponding parameter; column 4, the standard deviation of these differences, which serves as an estimate of the standard error of the corresponding parameter; and column 5, the ratio of this standard deviation to the standard error of the corresponding parameter given by the real-data solution (Table 1), and column 6, the units of measure. As is evident from this table, the bias is not significant in all cases and the solution error estimates recover very well the scatter of the parameter values obtained by solving simulated sets and therefore we apply no bias corrections to our solutions.

Our estimate for the solar Galactocentric distance, $R_0 = 8.2 \pm 0.6$ kpc agrees well with most of the recent determinations of this parameter. Thus the most precise and accurate R_0 determination based on the 16-year orbit of the star S2 around the massive black hole Sgr A* measured astrometrically and spectroscopically for 27 years by the Gravity collaboration/ Galactic centre is $R_0 = 8.178 \pm 0.013 \pm 0.022$ kpc (Abuter et al. 2019). In their comprehensive review, Bland-Hawthorn and Gerhard (2016) derive $R_0 = 8.2 \pm 0.1$ kpc as their best estimate. The authors of more recent reviews, e.g., Camarillo et al. (2018); Valleé (2017) found the median of recent R_0 estimates to be of about $R_0 = 8.0 \pm 0.3$ kpc and $R_0 = 8.0 \pm 0.2$ kpc, respectively, and an analysis of the kinematics of Galactic masers by Rastorguev et al. (2017) yields $R_0 = 8.24 \pm 0.12$ kpc. A recent analysis of the photometry of type-II Cepheids in the Galactic bulge yields $R_0 = 8.46 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.11$ kpc (Braga et al. 2018), whereas the near-IR photometry of the RR Lyrae star population near the Galactic center yields $R_0 = 8.05 \pm 0.02$ kpc (Contreras et al. 2018), and an estimate based on globular-cluster kinematics yields $R_0 = 7.6 \pm 0.7$ kpc (Klinichev et al. 2018). Our estimate of the mean velocity component in the direction of Galactic rotation, $V_0 = -239 \pm 4$ km/s, which can be viewed as the corresponding

Table 3. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b).

Values	opt	min	max	uncertainty	units
U_0	-8.1	-9.9	-6.3	1.8	
V_0	-239.0	-242.9	-235.3	3.7	
W_0	-6.1	-8.0	-4.2	1.9	
					km/s
σ_r	112.6	111.0	114.3	1.7	
σ_{ϕ}	77.8	76.2	79.7	1.8	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.8	78.2	81.4	1.6	
σV	158.4	155.7	161.4	2.9	
β	0.511	0.490	0.528	0.019	
Р	1.084	1.066	1.102	0.018	
R_0	8.09	7.70	8.66	0.48	kpc

velocity component of the reflex solar motion with respect to the Galactic rest frame, also agrees with other recent estimates of this quantity (e.g., $V_0 = -231.4 \pm 1.6$ km/s from our analysis of the motions of halo RR Lyrae type variables (Utkin et al. 2018), $V_0 = -231 \pm 19$ km/s from an analysis of the motions of metal-poor globular clusters (Klinichev et al. 2018), $V_0 = -254 \pm 7$ km/s from an analysis of Galactic maser motions).

Interestingly, our estimate of the correction factor to the BHB distance scale , $P = 1.051 \pm 0.017$, implies that the BHB star distances given by Xue et al. (2011) should be reduced by a factor of 1.051 rather than increased by a factor of 1.06 \pm 0.03 found in our analysis published a decade ago (Dambis 2010) based on a smaller BHB star sample of Xue et al. (2008) combined with SDSS proper motions (Abazajian et al. 2009). We, naturally, believe the current estimate, which is based on a more extensive sample and much more accurate Gaia DR2 proper motions, to be more reliable.

To test whether our results are sensitive to the metallicity dependence of the BHB star magnitudes, we repeated our computations with the BHB star distances computed using the M_g absolutemagnitude calibration proposed by Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) (their equation (5)). We provide the results obtained with the same cuts (all stars within the Sgr stream region, all stars within less than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane, and all stars with Galactic rest-frame velocities higher than 600 km/s excluded) — now 2607 objects — in Table 3.

As is evident from Table 3, the main kinematical parameters and R_0 estimate remain practically the same as in the case of the (metallicity independent) calibration used by Xue et al. (2011).

Table 4 summarises the results obtained by applying the maximum-likelihood statistical-parallax method to 100 data sets simulated based on the parameter values obtained for decontaminated BHB star sample with initial star distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b). The layout of this table is identical to that of Table 2. As is evident from Tables 2 and 4, the bias is not significant in all cases and therefore we apply no bias corrections to our solutions. Furthermore, the solution error estimates agree quite well with the scatter of the parameter values obtained by solving simulated sets.

Table 4. The summary of the results obtained for 100 simulated data sets based on the values given by the real-data solution in Table 3. Here "Mean" is the mean value of parameter *Param* averaged over the maximum-likelihood solutions for 100 simulated data sets; "True" is the input value *Param*₀ given by the real-data solution in Table 3; Difference is the difference $< Param > - Param_0$; scatter is the standard deviation of $< Param > - Param_0$ ($\sigma(< Param > - Param_0$), and the $\frac{S}{U}$ is the ratio of the scatter to the uncertainty of the corresponding parameter given by the real-data solution (Column 5 of Table 3).

Values	Mean	"True"	Difference	Scatter	units	$\frac{S}{U}$
U_0	-7.8	-8.1	$+0.3 \pm 0.2$	2.0		1.1
V_0	-238.7	-239.0	$+0.3 \pm 0.4$	4.2		1.1
W_0	-6.2	-6.1	-0.1 ± 0.2	1.7		0.9
					km/s	
σ_r	112.8	112.6	$+0.2\pm0.2$	1.6		1.0
σ_{ϕ}	77.6	77.8	-0.2 ± 0.2	1.7		1.0
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.9	79.8	$+0.1 \pm 0.2$	1.9		1.2
σV	158.0	158.1	-0.1 ± 0.2	2.3		0.8
β	0.512	0.510	$+0.002 \pm 0.002$	0.022		1.1
Р	1.087	1.084	$+0.003 \pm 0.002$	0.020		1.1
R_0	8.10	8.09	$+0.01 \pm 0.07$	0.68	kpc	1.4

4.2 Deviation from Galactocentric alignment of the velocity ellipsoid

Most of the studies find the velocity ellipsoid of halo stars to be close-to-spherically aligned (Smith, Evans & An 2009; Bond et al. 2010; Evans, Sanders, Williams, An, Lynden-Bell & Dehnen 2016; Wegg, Gerhard & Bieth 2019; Everall, et al. 2019) — as we assume in our analysis. To explore the effect of the deviation from spherical alignment, we use the following parametrisation of the spatial dependence of the tilt α (the tangent of the tilt angle) of the longest axis of the velocity ellipsoid with respect to the Galactic midplane proposed by Binney et al. (2014) and Büdenbender, van de Ven & Watkins (2015):

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 \arctan|z|/R,\tag{3}$$

where $\alpha = 1.0$ and $\alpha = 0.0$ correspond to strictly radial and cylindrical alignment, respectively. We computed a solution with α_0 = const treated as an extra free parameter. The results are summarised in Tables 5 and 6.

We can see that allowing for deviation from spherical alignment of the velocity ellipsoid has practically no effect on all the inferred parameters except R_0 , which increases by ~ 0.4 –0.5 kpc, i.e., by about one standard deviation. Interestingly, our estimate of the parameter α_0 is marginally greater than unity (by two standard deviations), in contrast to the results of all other studies, which yield values between 0.0 and 1.0 (mostly close to $\alpha_0 = 1.0$). Given that all other parameters remain practically intact we set $\alpha_0 = 1.0$ in all our subsequent computations (i.e., assume spherical alignment of the velocity ellipsoid).

4.3 Rotation of the sample

We now test our assumption that the decontaminated BHB star sample is nonrotating. To this end, we introduce the linear rotation velocity V_{rot} , which we assume to be independent of the distance from the rotation axis (flat rotation curve):

$$V_x = V_x(0) - (V_{rot}/R_G)y$$

Table 5. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with the initial distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011) with velocity-ellipsoid alignment parameter α_0 treated as an extra free parameter.

Values	opt	uncertainty	units
U_0	-7.3	1.8	
V_0	-240.6	3.9	
W_0	-5.5	1.9	
			km/s
σ_r	112.5	1.6	
σ_{ϕ}	77.9	1.9	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	78.9	1.6	
σV	157.9	1.7	
β	0.515	0.023	
$lpha_0$	1.172	0.080	
Р	1.052	0.018	
R_0	8.70	0.74	kpc

Table 6. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with the initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) with velocity-ellipsoid alignment parameter α_0 treated as an extra free parameter.

Values	opt	uncertainty	units
U_0	-7.9	1.8	
V_0	-239.1	4.1	
W_0	-6.2	1.9	
			km/s
σ_r	112.7	1.7	
σ_{ϕ}	78.0	2.0	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.0	1.6	
σV	158.2	1.6	
β	0.515	0.022	
α_0	1.174	0.087	
Р	1.087	0.025	
R_0	8.49	0.76	kpc

$$V_y = V_y(0) + (V_{rot}/R_G)x,$$
 (4)

where R_G is the distance of the star from the Galactic rotation axis. The results are summarised in Tables 7 and 8.

We conclude that overall rotation of the sample is negligible and statistically insignificant ($V_{rot} \sim 2 \pm 2$ km/s) and we therefore ignore it in subsequent computations. Our estimate for the overall halo rotation velocity agrees well with the estimates obtained by Bajkova et al. (2020) (1 ± 4 km/s) and Klinichev et al. (2018) (-17 ± 17 km/s) based on the kinematics of globular clusters, and is slightly inconsistent with the estimate by Deason et al. (2017) (14 ± 2 ± 10 km/s) based on the kinematic data for RR Lyrae, blue horizontal branch stars, and K giant stars with pre-Gaia-DR2 proper motions, and is at variance with the estimate of Tian et al. (2019) ((+27⁺⁴₋₅ km/s)) based on the kinematics of a sample of metal-poor K-type giants. However, the latter tracers can be contaminated by thick-disk stars of the same type. Our result also agrees with the halo rotation estimate by Kafle et al. (2017) (-

Table 7. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with the initial distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011) with the fixed overall rotation velocity V_{rot} (flat rotation) treated as an extra free parameter.

Values	opt	uncertainty	units
U_0	-7.1	1.9	
V_0	-240.6	4.2	
W_0	-5.5	1.9	
			km/s
σ_r	112.3	1.7	
σ_{ϕ}	77.4	1.7	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.5	1.6	
σV	157.9	1.7	
β	0.512	0.024	
V_{rot}	1.6	2.1	
Р	1.053	0.020	
R_0	8.18	0.41	kpc

Table 8. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with the initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) with fixed overall rotation velocity V_{rot} (flat rotation) treated as an extra free parameter.

Values	opt	uncertainty	units
U_0	-7.6	1.9	
V_0	-239.5	3.9	
W_0	-6.1	1.9	
			km/s
σ_r	112.6	1.6	
σ_{ϕ}	77.7	1.7	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.7	1.6	
σV	158.3	1.7	
β	0.511	0.024	
V_{rot}	1.8	2.1	
Р	1.086	0.019	
R_0	8.05	0.40	kpc

 7 ± 8 km/s) based on metal-poor K-type giants, but is at variance with another estimate obtained in the same study (26 ± 4 km/s) based on main-sequence turnoff stars.

4.4 Systematic error in SDSS radial velocities

Possible systematics in SDSS radial-velocity errors may also affect the inferred kinematic parameters as well as distance-scale correction factor and R_0 . To test the extent of this effect, we incorporate a systematic shift in radial velocities ΔV_r (in the sense V_r (true) = V_r (SDSS) + ΔV_r) into our model and compute the corresponding solution. The results are summarised in Tables 9 and 10.

As is evident from a comparison of Tables 9 and 10 with Tables 1 and 3, the radial-velocity offset is slightly significant (at the 2σ level) in the sense that SDSSradial velocities are, on the average, smaller by ~ 5 km/s, and this offset has only a marginal effect on other inferred parameters decreasing slightly the R_0 estimate,

Table 9. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with the initial distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011) with systematic radial-velocity offset ΔV_r (in the sense V_r (true) = V_r (SDSS) + ΔV_r) treated as an extra free parameter.

Values	opt	uncertainty	units
U_0	-6.5	1.9	
V_0	-237.3	4.2	
W_0	-2.9	1.9	
			km/s
σ_r	112.0	1.7	
σ_{ϕ}	76.8	1.7	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	78.9	1.6	
σV	157.1	1.7	
β	0.517	0.024	
ΔV_r	+5.2	2.6	
Р	1.063	0.017	
R_0	8.04	0.56	kpc

Table 10. The velocity-field parameters for the entire decontaminated BHB star sample leaving only objects farther than 5 kpc from the Galactic midplane with the initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) with systematic radial-velocity offset ΔV_r (in the sense V_r (true) = V_r (SDSS) + ΔV_r) treated as an extra free parameter.

Values	opt	uncertainty	units
U_0	-7.1	1.8	
V_0	-236.0	4.1	
W_0	-3.6	2.2	
			km/s
σ_r	112.2	1.7	
σ_{ϕ}	77.0	1.0	
$\sigma_{ heta}$	79.1	1.6	
σV	157.4	1.7	
β	0.516	0.025	
ΔV_r	+5.3	2.6	
Р	1.097	0.020	
R_0	7.91	0.48	kpc

which still remains quite consistent with most of the recent determinations.

4.5 Systematic error in proper motions

To assess the errors due to systematic errors in Gaia DR2 proper motions, we added to Gaia DR2 proper motions the corrections proposed by Lindegren et al. (2018) for bright stars (G < 12.0):

$$\Delta pm_{\alpha} = \omega_x \sin(\delta) \cos(\alpha) + \omega_y \sin(\delta) \cos(\alpha) - \omega_z \cos(\delta)$$
 (5)

and

$$\Delta pm_{\delta} = \omega_x sin(\alpha) + \omega_y cos(\alpha) \tag{6}$$

where $\omega_x = 0.086 \pm 0.025$ mas/yr, $\omega_y = 0.114 \pm 0.025$ mas/yr, and $\omega_z = 0.037 \pm 0.025$ mas/yr. These corrections by all means far exceed the actual systematic errors of Gaia DR2 proper motions for stars of our sample, which are much fainter (see the histogram in Fig. 2a) and most likely hardly need any systematic cor-

rections (Lindegren et al. 2018). The results obtained with these corrections applied differ from those computed with raw Gaia DR2 proper motions (Figs. (3) and (3)) by $\Delta U_0 = +2.3$ km/s, $\Delta V_0 = -$ 0.05 km/s, $\Delta W_0 = -1.5$ km/s, $\Delta \sigma_r = +0.4$ km/s, $\Delta \sigma_{\phi} = +0.8$ km/s, $\Delta \sigma_{\theta}$ = +0.8 km/s, $\Delta \sigma_{V}$ = +1.1 km/s, $\Delta \beta$ = -0.005, ΔP = +0.016, and $\Delta R_0 = +0.23$ kpc. Thus the average maximum extra rms errors are of about 1.6 km/s for bulk velocity parameters and 1.0 km/s for velocity-dispersion parameters increasing the uncertainties of the former by a factor of 1.1-1.3 and those of the latter by a factor of 1.1–1.2. The errors of the inferred parameters β , P, and R_0 increase by a maximum of a factor of 1.4, 1.3, and 1.1, respectively. However, the actual error increases must be much smaller (according to Lindegren et al. (2018), "For G = 13 to 16 there are very few comparison data but probably no correction is needed in that interval" and the same appears to be true at fainter magnitudes) and perhaps hardly noticeable.

4.6 Halo substructures

According to recent results, the kinematic behaviour of the stellar halo is to a significant extent influenced by some major accretion events (Ibata, Gilmore, & Irwin 1994; Helmi et al. 1999; Belokurov et al. 2018; Myeong et al. 2018; Koppelman et al. 2019; Belokurov et al. 2020; Naidu et al. 2020). However, this substructure should not have had an important effect on our results. Given the data provided by Naidu et al. (2020), the structures Aleph, insitu halo, and high- α disk can make up for a maximum of 3.5% of our sample because of the respective metallicity distributions. In any case, imposing a [Fe/H] < -1.0 cut totally eliminates these features changing the inferred parameter values by less than 0.4 σ $(-0.2, +1.5, -0.5, +0.4, -0.8, \text{ and } +0.7 \text{ km/s for } U_0, V_0, W_0, \sigma_r, \sigma_{\phi},$ and σ_{θ} , respectively, -0.004 for scale factor P, and -0.07 kpc for R_0). The total fraction of Thamnos, Wukong, Milky-Way Thick Disk, Arjuna, Sequoia, and l'Itoi, and Helmi stream features account for 9% of the halo population above 2 kpc, but are appreciably less represented at heights above 6 kpc. The major possible contaminant - the Sagittarius stream - is excluded via position masking. This leaves only the Gaia-Enceladus Sausage as the dominant feature in our sample plus a small fraction of unclassified halo-like debris, both with small L_z component of angular momentum, resulting in a radially dependent non-Gaussian velocity distribution. However, Popowski & Gould (1998) showed the statistical parallax method to be extremely robust against particular form the velocity distribution and its deviations from Gaussian and therefore we expect the main results reported here not not be substantially influenced by this factor.

4.7 Dependence of kinematic parameters on Galactocentric distance

We summarise the results obtained by applying the statisticalparallax method to the subsamples of the decontaminated sample limited by Galactocentric distance R_G in Tables 11, 12, and 13. Table 11 lists the kinematic parameters obtained with all average velocity components — U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 – fixed at their values inferred for the entire decontaminated sample (Table 1), whereas Table 12 gives the solutions obtained with V_0 treated as a free parameter, and Table 13 gives the solutions obtained with U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 treated as free parameters. In Table 11 column 1 (R_G bin) gives the interval of Galactocentric distances; column 2, the number of stars in the bin; column 3, the average Galactocentric distance, $\langle R_G \rangle$; column 4, the radial velocity dispersion component, σ_r with its standard error, column 5, the total velocity dispersion component, σV with its standard error. The last two columns (Columns 6 and 7) give the anisotropy parameter β and the distance-scale correction factor P, respectively, with their standard errors. In Table 12 column 1 (R_G bin) gives the interval of Galactocentric distances; column 2, the number of stars in the bin; column 3, the average Galactocentric distance, $< R_G >$; column 4, the radial velocity dispersion component, σ_r with its standard error, and column 5, the total velocity dispersion component, σV with its standard error. Column 7 gives the average velocity component V_0 in the direction of Galactic rotation, and columns 8 amd 9 give the anisotropy parameter β and the distance-scale correction factor P, respectively, with their standard errors. In Table 13 column 1 (R_G bin) gives the interval of Galactocentric distances; column 2, the number of stars in the bin; column 3, the average Galactocentric distance, $\langle R_G \rangle$; column 4, the radial velocity dispersion component, σ_r with its standard error, and column 5, the total velocity dispersion component, σV with its standard error. Columns 7, 8, and 9 give the average velocity components U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 in the direction toward the Galactic center, in the direction of Galactic rotation, and in the direction toward the North Galactic Pole, respectively. Columns 10 and 11 give the anisotropy parameter β and the distance-scale correction factor P, respectively, with their standard errors.

The results obtained by applying the statistical-parallax method to the subsamples of the decontaminated sample limited by Galactocentric distance R_G with initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b) are presented in Tables 14, 15, and 16. Table 14 lists the kinematic parameters obtained with all average velocity components — U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 – fixed at their values inferred for the entire decontaminated sample (Table 3), whereas Table 15 gives the solutions obtained with V_0 treated as a free parameter, and Table 16 gives the solutions obtained with U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 treated as free parameters. Their layout is identical to that of Tables 11, 12, and 13, respectively.

Fig. 3 shows the dependence of the radial (σ_r) and total (σV) velocity dispersions on Galactocentric distance and Fig. 4 shows the dependence of the anisotropy parameter β on Galactocentric distance. Fig. 5 shows the corresponding dependence for the inferred distance-scale correction factor *P*.

5 COMPARISON WITH THE KINEMATICS OF RR LYRAE TYPE VARIABLES

Despite their similar evolutionary status, BHB stars and RR Lyrae type variables of the Galactic halo exhibit somewhat, albeit slightly, different kinematics. Thus a comparison of the kinematics of these two populations in the Galactocentric distance interval from 6 to 18 kpc reveals the following interesting features. The average velocity component of BHB stars in the direction of Galactic rotation, V_0 , (typically, $V_0 = -241 \pm 4$ km/s) for BHB stars is slightly smaller in absolute value than the corresponding velocity for RR Lyrae type variables ($V_0 = -222 \pm 4$ km/s) Utkin et al. (2018). At the same time, the total velocity dispersion, σ_V of BHB stars in the same Galactocentric distance interval, $\sigma_V = 167 \pm 4$ km/s, is smaller

Calibrating the BHB Star Distance Scale 9

than the total velocity dispersion of RR Lyrae type stars in the same Galactocentric distance interval, $\sigma_V = 208 \pm 4$ km/s and the same is true of the velocity dispersion in the direction of the Galactic centre, $\sigma_V = 121 \pm 3$ km/s for BHB stars and $\sigma_V = 168 \pm 5$ km/s for RR Lyrae type variables. The anisotropy parameter, β , also differs for the two populations: $\beta = 0.55 \pm 0.03$ for BHB stars and $\beta = 0.71 \pm 0.03$ for RR Lyrae type variables. These are the comparisons of the mean values for the broad interval of Galactocentric distances. However, as is evident from Figs 6,7, and 4, which show the Galactocentric distance dependence of V_0 , σ_V , and β , respectively, for BHB stars (the open circles) and RR Lyrae type variables (the filled circles), the differences prove to be rather consistent over the entire range of Galactocentric distances considered. There appears to be no obvious explanation for these discrepancies and they are rather surprising given the similar evolutionary status of BHB stars and RR Lyrae type variables, the fact that both of them represent the halo population, and the same technique used to analyse them. The discrepancies might be due to inevitable contamination of both lists (some variables of other types may have been erroneously classified as RR Lyraes and blue stragglers may have infiltrated the BHB list) biasing differently the kinematical behaviour of the two samples. Another possible cause of the discrepancy may be different degree of the contamination of the two tracer lists by kinematic streams.

6 CONCLUSIONS

We investigated the kinematics of a clean sample of Galactic halo blue horizontal branch stars with full 6D phase-space data (three space coordinates and three velocity components) using the maximum-likelihood version of the statistical-parallax technique. The high accuracy of proper motions, radial velocities, and photometric distance estimates combined with the significantly elongated shape of the velocity dispersion tensor of halo BHB stars and the fact that its major axis points toward the Galactic centre allowed us for the first time to simultaneously determine not only the kinematic parameters of the sample and the photometric distance correction factor but also the solar Galactocentric distance R_0 from an analysis of the velocity field of halo objects. We found $R = 8.2 \pm 0.6$ kpc, which agrees with other recent estimates. We also find certain differences between the kinematics of BHB stars and RR Lyrae type variables in the same Galactocentric distance interval (6 to 18 kpc) despite the similar evolutionary status of the two populations: the velocity ellipsoid of BHB stars is appreciably less elongated and smaller in size (by about 20 km/s along its major axis) than the velocity ellipsoid of RR Lyrae type variables. The results obtained for our BHB sample are quite robust and stable against mild deviations from Galactocentric spherically symmetric alignment of the velocity ellipsoid. We find no significant rotation of the sample (rotation velocity does not exceed 2 km/s). Our kinematic analysis suggests marginal systematic error of SDSS radial velocities of about -5 km/s in the sense that SDSS radial velocities for our BHB stars are, on the average, underestimated by this amount.

Table 11. The velocity-field parameters for the Galactocentric-distance binned subsamples (initial distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011)) with U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 fixed at the values listed in Table 1.

R_G bin	Ν	$< R_G >$	σ_r km/s	σV km/s	β	Р
5–9	181	7.7	121.2 ± 6.9	171.3 ± 11.3	0.501 ± 0.062	1.134 ± 0.028
9-11	194	10.1	130.4 ± 6.9	$175.6\pm~9.9$	0.593 ± 0.048	1.040 ± 0.024
11-13	258	12.0	128.5 ± 5.8	$165.0\pm~8.4$	0.676 ± 0.033	1.076 ± 0.020
13-15	244	14.1	126.8 ± 5.9	$176.8\pm~9.6$	0.528 ± 0.051	1.047 ± 0.024
15-17	246	16.0	111.3 ± 5.1	$154.6\pm~7.8$	0.535 ± 0.051	1.046 ± 0.022
17-19	241	17.9	112.8 ± 5.3	$156.7\pm~8.3$	0.535 ± 0.052	1.023 ± 0.022
19-21	209	20.0	105.6 ± 5.3	$154.5\pm~8.8$	0.430 ± 0.070	1.028 ± 0.026
21-23	187	22.0	99.6 ± 5.3	$143.2\pm~9.6$	0.467 ± 0.069	1.032 ± 0.025
23-27	282	24.8	102.6 ± 4.4	$143.3\pm~7.1$	0.524 ± 0.051	1.050 ± 0.022
27-35	239	30.7	96.4 ± 4.6	$150.1\pm~8.9$	0.287 ± 0.090	1.019 ± 0.027
35-60	301	43.2	93.7 ± 4.0	$148.5\pm~9.8$	0.244 ± 0.108	1.014 ± 0.029

Table 12. The velocity-field parameters for the Galactocentric-distance binned subsamples (initial distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011)) with U_0 and W_0 fixed at the values listed in Table 1 and V_0 treated as a free parameter.

R_G bin	Ν	$< R_G >$	σ_r km/s	σV km/s	V ₀ km/s	β	Р
5-9 9-11 11-13 13-15 15-17 17-19	181 194 258 244 246 241	7.7 10.1 12.0 14.1 16.0 17.9	$121.4 \pm 7.1 \\ 132.3 \pm 7.2 \\ 128.7 \pm 5.9 \\ 128.3 \pm 6.1 \\ 110.7 \pm 5.2 \\ 114.4 \pm 5.4 \\ \end{cases}$	$171.6 \pm 11.6 \\ 178.7 \pm 11.2 \\ 165.4 \pm 8.1 \\ 180.9 \pm 9.7 \\ 152.7 \pm 8.5 \\ 163.6 \pm 9.5 \\ 163.6 \pm 9.5 \\ 163.6 \pm 9.5 \\ 100.000000000000000000000000000000000$	$\begin{array}{c} -241.4 \pm 10.1 \\ -252.5 \pm 9.8 \\ -242.4 \pm 7.7 \\ -254.5 \pm 10.4 \\ -233.6 \pm 9.2 \\ -265.7 \pm 11.5 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.501 \pm 0.062 \\ 0.588 \pm 0.049 \\ 0.674 \pm 0.034 \\ 0.506 \pm 0.056 \\ 0.549 \pm 0.052 \\ 0.478 \pm 0.064 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.131 \pm 0.041 \\ 1.009 \pm 0.034 \\ 1.070 \pm 0.030 \\ 1.004 \pm 0.039 \\ 1.070 \pm 0.041 \\ 0.940 \pm 0.041 \end{array}$
19–21 21–23 23–27 27–35 35–60	209 187 282 239 301	20.0 22.0 24.8 30.7 43.5	$\begin{array}{c} 105.5 \pm 5.3 \\ 99.7 \pm 5.3 \\ 102.6 \pm 4.4 \\ 96.3 \pm 4.6 \\ 93.5 \pm 4.0 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 150.5 \pm \ 9.8 \\ 144.8 \pm 10.4 \\ 143.1 \pm \ 7.8 \\ 149.3 \pm 10.2 \\ 144.8 \pm \ 9.4 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -227.5 \pm 12.2 \\ -245.9 \pm 13.6 \\ -239.6 \pm 11.3 \\ -237.9 \pm 13.1 \\ -229.7 \pm 13.3 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.483 \pm 0.078 \\ 0.446 \pm 0.088 \\ 0.527 \pm 0.065 \\ 0.298 \pm 0.107 \\ 0.301 \pm 0.122 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.080 \pm 0.059 \\ 1.010 \pm 0.058 \\ 1.053 \pm 0.052 \\ 1.029 \pm 0.061 \\ 1.058 \pm 0.069 \end{array}$

Table 13. The velocity-field parameters for the Galactocentric-distance binned subsamples (initial distances adopted from Xue et al. (2011)) with U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 treated as a free parameters.

R_G bin	Ν	$< R_G >$	σ_r km/s	σV km/s	U_0	V_0	W_0	β	Р
5–9	181	7.7	121.5 ± 7.3	172.1 ± 12.1	-0.4 ± 7.2	-244.2 ± 10.6	-15.0 ± 8.0	0.497 ± 0.062	1.122 ± 0.043
9-11	194	10.1	131.5 ± 7.1	177.2 ± 10.5	-14.0 ± 6.7	-250.1 ± 9.9	-11.3 ± 7.1	0.592 ± 0.049	1.021 ± 0.035
11-13	258	12.0	129.0 ± 6.0	$165.2\pm~7.9$	-7.9 ± 5.3	-241.4 ± 7.8	$+7.4\pm5.8$	0.680 ± 0.033	1.071 ± 0.030
13-15	244	14.1	128.8 ± 6.1	$181.4\pm~9.5$	$+1.5\pm6.4$	-255.7 ± 10.4	$+1.5\pm6.4$	0.508 ± 0.056	0.998 ± 0.039
15-17	246	16.0	110.5 ± 5.2	$152.6\pm~8.7$	-6.4 ± 5.4	-233.8 ± 9.3	$+0.5\pm5.7$	0.546 ± 0.053	1.069 ± 0.042
17-19	241	18.0	114.6 ± 5.4	$163.1\pm~9.4$	$+6.2\pm5.9$	-266.3 ± 11.4	$+1.0\pm6.2$	0.487 ± 0.063	0.937 ± 0.041
19-21	209	20.1	105.5 ± 5.3	$150.0\pm~9.5$	-7.5 ± 5.9	-226.3 ± 12.3	-1.2 ± 6.2	0.489 ± 0.078	1.086 ± 0.060
21-23	187	22.1	99.7 ± 5.3	$144.6\pm~9.3$	-9.7 ± 6.1	-246.1 ± 13.6	-10.1 ± 6.4	0.448 ± 0.087	1.010 ± 0.059
23-27	282	24.9	102.4 ± 4.4	143.4 ± 7.7	$+3.4\pm5.0$	-243.1 ± 11.1	-18.4 ± 5.2	0.519 ± 0.065	1.036 ± 0.051
27-35	239	30.5	96.1 ± 4.6	149.8 ± 10.4	-14.4 ± 6.1	-240.1 ± 13.6	-12.7 ± 6.3	0.285 ± 0.113	1.018 ± 0.063
35-60	301	44.5	93.0 ± 6.1	141.0 ± 11.9	-38.7 ± 6.3	-228.9 ± 14.0	$\textbf{-9.7}\pm6.1$	0.351 ± 0.122	1.070 ± 0.074

7 DATA AVAILABILITY

The data underlying this article were derived from sources in the public domain: VizieR at https://vizier.u-strasbg.fr/viz-bin/VizieR and SDSS at www.sdss.org.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We are grateful to the anonymous referee for their valuable comments, which helped us to improve the paper substantially. This work has made use of data from the European Space Agency (ESA) mission *Gaia* (https://www.cosmos.esa.int/gaia), processed by the *Gaia* Data Processing and Analysis Consortium (DPAC, https://www.cosmos.esa.int/web/gaia/dpac/consortium). Funding for the DPAC has been provided by national institutions,

R_G bin	Ν	$< R_G >$	σ_r km/s	σV km/s	eta	Р
5-9 9-11 11-13 13-15 15-17 17-19	181 194 258 244 246 241 200	7.7 10.1 12.0 14.1 16.0 17.9	$\begin{array}{c} 119.1 \pm 6.7 \\ 133.6 \pm 7.4 \\ 125.6 \pm 5.8 \\ 125.5 \pm 6.0 \\ 117.7 \pm 5.3 \\ 114.5 \pm 5.4 \\ 105.7 \pm 5.2 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 165.7 \pm 10.4 \\ 180.1 \pm 12.1 \\ 164.8 \pm 8.0 \\ 170.2 \pm 9.3 \\ 163.4 \pm 8.7 \\ 160.4 \pm 8.6 \\ 150.4 \pm 8.6 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.532 \pm 0.057 \\ 0.591 \pm 0.051 \\ 0.639 \pm 0.037 \\ 0.580 \pm 0.046 \\ 0.536 \pm 0.049 \\ 0.519 \pm 0.055 \\ 0.498 \pm 0.065 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.156 \pm 0.027 \\ 1.064 \pm 0.026 \\ 1.123 \pm 0.022 \\ 1.072 \pm 0.024 \\ 1.077 \pm 0.023 \\ 1.060 \pm 0.025 \\ 1.046 \pm 0.025 \end{array}$
19–21 21–23 23–27 27–35 35–60	209 187 282 239 301	20.0 22.0 24.8 30.7 43.2	$103.7 \pm 3.3 \\ 102.1 \pm 5.2 \\ 100.9 \pm 4.5 \\ 102.2 \pm 4.6 \\ 92.3 \pm 3.8 \\ 100.0 \pm 100.0 \\ 100.0 \pm$	$\begin{array}{c} 130.4 \pm 8.9 \\ 151.7 \pm 9.7 \\ 142.1 \pm 7.6 \\ 152.1 \pm 9.3 \\ 150.9 \pm 8.9 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0.488 \pm 0.003 \\ 0.396 \pm 0.077 \\ 0.508 \pm 0.054 \\ 0.392 \pm 0.072 \\ 0.163 \pm 0.112 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 1.040 \pm 0.023 \\ 1.083 \pm 0.028 \\ 1.074 \pm 0.022 \\ 1.062 \pm 0.026 \\ 1.064 \pm 0.030 \end{array}$

Table 14. The velocity-field parameters for the Galactocentric-distance binned subsamples (initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b)) with U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 fixed at the values listed in Table 1.

Table 15. The velocity-field parameters for the Galactocentric-distance binned subsamples (initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b)) with U_0 and W_0 fixed at the values listed in Table 1 and V_0 treated as a free parameter.

R_G bin	Ν	$< R_G >$	σ_r	σV	V_0	β	Р
			KIII/S	KIII/S	KIII/S		
5–9	185	7.7	118.8 ± 7.0	164.7 ± 11.3	-237.7 ± 9.6	0.539 ± 0.057	1.160 ± 0.041
9-11	179	10.1	134.8 ± 7.5	182.6 ± 11.6	-249.0 ± 10.2	0.583 ± 0.052	1.038 ± 0.037
11-13	255	12.0	125.8 ± 5.9	$165.3\pm~8.6$	-240.8 ± 7.9	0.637 ± 0.038	1.118 ± 0.033
13-15	231	14.1	127.6 ± 6.2	$174.7\pm~9.8$	-251.1 ± 9.9	0.563 ± 0.050	1.035 ± 0.038
15-17	261	16.0	117.9 ± 5.4	$164.0\pm~8.9$	-240.6 ± 9.6	0.533 ± 0.052	1.071 ± 0.042
17-19	231	17.9	115.4 ± 5.5	$164.7\pm~9.4$	$\textbf{-254.4} \pm 11.2$	0.481 ± 0.065	1.005 ± 0.045
19-21	207	20.0	105.6 ± 5.3	$152.0\pm~9.9$	-244.7 ± 13.3	0.464 ± 0.078	1.024 ± 0.057
21-23	201	22.0	102.0 ± 5.2	$148.1\pm~9.2$	-227.8 ± 13.1	0.446 ± 0.078	1.133 ± 0.067
23-27	271	24.8	101.0 ± 4.4	$145.2\pm~7.4$	-249.9 ± 11.6	0.467 ± 0.065	1.030 ± 0.051
27-35	263	30.7	102.0 ± 4.6	$149.8\pm~8.5$	-232.0 ± 12.5	0.422 ± 0.085	1.092 ± 0.063
35–60	301	43.5	92.2 ± 3.8	$148.2\pm~9.6$	-231.4 ± 12.6	0.209 ± 0.130	1.097 ± 0.067

Table 16. The velocity-field parameters for the Galactocentric-distance binned subsamples (initial distances computed using the metallicity-dependent calibration of Fermani and Schönrich (2013b)) with U_0 , V_0 , and W_0 treated as a free parameters.

R_G bin	Ν	$< R_G >$	σ_r km/s	σV km/s	U_0	V_0	W_0	β	Р
5–9	185	7.7	119.9 ± 7.2	166.4 ± 11.0	-0.9 ± 6.9	-241.6 ± 10.1	-14.6 ± 7.6	0.537 ± 0.057	1.146 ± 0.043
9-11	179	10.1	133.9 ± 7.5	180.9 ± 11.7	-15.1 ± 7.2	-247.4 ± 10.3	-18.1 ± 8.0	0.587 ± 0.052	1.049 ± 0.038
11-13	255	12.0	126.0 ± 5.9	$165.3\pm~8.3$	-8.5 ± 5.5	-240.9 ± 8.1	$+5.2\pm5.9$	0.639 ± 0.038	1.114 ± 0.033
13-15	231	14.1	127.2 ± 6.2	$173.9\pm~9.9$	-5.7 ± 6.2	-251.7 ± 10.0	$+2.7\pm6.6$	0.566 ± 0.050	1.029 ± 0.038
15-17	261	16.0	117.8 ± 5.4	164.2 ± 8.4	1.6 ± 5.7	-242.5 ± 9.6	-8.1 ± 5.9	0.528 ± 0.053	1.062 ± 0.041
17-19	231	18.0	114.9 ± 5.5	$163.9\pm~9.3$	-4.2 ± 6.0	$\textbf{-253.6} \pm 11.1$	$+6.0\pm6.3$	0.483 ± 0.065	1.009 ± 0.045
19-21	207	20.1	105.7 ± 5.3	$152.1\pm~9.7$	-2.4 ± 6.1	-245.2 ± 13.4	$+0.1 \pm 6.3$	0.465 ± 0.084	1.020 ± 0.058
21-23	201	22.1	102.2 ± 5.3	$148.9\pm~9.6$	$+2.4 \pm 6.1$	-230.5 ± 13.2	-10.8 ± 6.3	0.438 ± 0.089	1.117 ± 0.066
23-27	271	24.9	100.7 ± 4.5	$145.0\pm~8.1$	-5.0 ± 5.2	$\textbf{-251.3} \pm 11.4$	-19.0 ± 5.3	0.463 ± 0.072	1.024 ± 0.050
27-35	263	30.5	101.8 ± 4.6	$150.9\pm~9.8$	$\textbf{-11.5} \pm 5.7$	$\textbf{-235.4} \pm \textbf{12.9}$	-14.9 ± 6.0	0.401 ± 0.089	1.074 ± 0.064
35-60	301	44.5	92.4 ± 3.9	$144.2\pm~9.7$	-36.1 ± 6.1	-229.5 ± 13.4	-7.4 ± 6.0	0.282 ± 0.130	1.115 ± 0.074

in particular the institutions participating in the *Gaia* Multilateral Agreement.

This paper made use of SDSS data products. Funding for the SDSS and SDSS-II has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Japanese Monbukagakusho, the Max Planck Society, and the Higher Education Funding Council for England. The SDSS Web Site is http://www.sdss.org/. The SDSS is managed by the Astrophysical Research Consortium for the Participating Institutions are the American Museum of Natural History, Astrophysical Institute Potsdam, University of Basel, University of Cambridge, Case Western Reserve University, University of Chicago, Drexel University, Fermilab, the Institute for Advanced Study, the Japan Participation Group, Johns Hopkins University, the Joint Institute for Nuclear Astrophysics, the Kavli Institute for Particle Astrophysics and Cosmology, the Korean Scientist Group, the Chinese



Figure 3. Top panel: dependence of the radial (σ_r , shown with diamond signs) and total (σV , shown with asterisks) velocity dispersions on Galactocentric distance.



Figure 4. Dependence of the anisotropy parameter β on Galactocentric distance.

Academy of Sciences (LAMOST), Los Alamos National Laboratory, the Max- Planck-Institute for Astronomy (MPIA), the Max-Planck-Institute for Astrophysics (MPA), New Mexico State University, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Portsmouth, Princeton University, the United States Naval Observatory, and the University of Washington.

REFERENCES

- Abazajian, K. N. et al. 2009. ApJS, 182, 543
- Abuter, R., Amorim, A., Baubock, M. et al. 2019, A&A, 625
- Aihara, H. et al. 2011, ApJS, 193, 29
- Antoja T., Ramos P., Mateu C., Helmi A., Anders F., Jordi C., Carballo-Bello J. A., 2020, A&A, 635, L3
- Bajkova A. T., Carraro G., Korchagin V. I., Budanova N. O., Bobylev V. V., 2020, ApJ, 895, 69
- Belokurov V., Erkal D., Evans N. W., Koposov S. E., Deason A. J., 2018, MNRAS, 478, 611
- Belokurov V., Sanders J. L., Fattahi A., Smith M. C., Deason A. J., Evans N. W., Grand R. J. J., 2020, MNRA



Figure 5. Dependence of the distance-scale correction factor P on Galactocentric distance. The dots and asterisks correspond to the solutions obtained with V_0 treated as a free and fixed parameter, respectively (U_0 and W_0 fixed at their values from Table 1).



Figure 6. Dependence of the mean heliocentric velocity component V_0 of BHB stars (the open circles) and RR Lyrae type variables (the filled circles) on Galactocentric distance.

Bland-Hawthorn, J. and Gerhard, O. 2016, preprint, (arXiv:1602.07702)

- Bobylev, V. V. 2013, Astron. Lett., 39, 95
- Bobylev, V. V.; Bajkova, A. T. 2014, Astron. Lett., 40, 389
- Bobylev, V. V.; Bajkova, A. T. 2014, Astron. Lett., 40, 773

Bond N. A., et al., 2010, ApJ, 716, 1

Braga, V. F., Bhardwaj, A., Contreras Ramos, R., Minniti, D., Bono, G., de Grijs, R., Minniti, J. H., and Rejkuba, M. 2018, A&Ap, 619, 51

Binney J., et al., 2014, MNRAS, 439, 1231

Büdenbender A., van de Ven G., Watkins L. L., 2015, MNRAS, 452, 956

Camarillo, T., Mathur, V., Mitchell, T., and Ratra, B. 2018, PASP, 130,

024101

Contreras, R.R., Minniti, D., Gran, F. Zoccali, M., Alonso-Garcia, J., Huijse, P., Navarro, M.G., Rojas-Arriagada, A., Valenti, E. 2018, ApJ, 863, 79

Dambis, A. K. 2009, MNRAS, 396, 553

Dambis, A. K. 2010, Estimating the Kinematic Parameters and the Distance-Scale Zero Point for the Thin-Disk, Thick-Disk, and Halo Population Tracers via 3-D Velocity Data, in Variable Stars, the Galactic halo and Galaxy Formation, ed. C. Sterken, N. Samus, & L. Szabados (Sternberg Astronomical Institute of Moscow University), 177



Figure 7. Dependence of the total velocity dispersion σ_V of BHB stars (the open circles) and RR Lyrae type variables (the filled circles) on Galactocentric distance.



Figure 8. Dependence of the anisotropy parameter β of BHB stars (the open circles) and RR Lyrae type variables (the filled circles) on Galactocentric distance.

- Dambis, A. K., Berdnikov, L. N., Kniazev, A. Y., Kravtsov, V. V., Rastorguev, A. S., Sefako, R., Vozyakova, O. V. 2013, MNRAS, 435, 3206
- Deason, A. J., Belokurov, V., Evans, N. W., 2011, MNRAS, 411, 1480Deason A. J., Belokurov V., Koposov S. E., Gómez F. A., Grand R. J., Marinacci F., Pakmor R., 2017, MNRAS, 470, 1259
- Evans N. W., Sanders J. L., Williams A. A., An J., Lynden-Bell D., Dehnen W., 2016, MNRAS, 456, 4506
- Everall A., Evans N. W., Belokurov V., Schönrich R., 2019, MNRAS, 489, 910
- Fermani, F. and Schönrich, R. 2013, MNRAS, 423, 2402
- Fermani, F. and Schönrich, R. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 1294
- Gaia Collaboration et al., 2016, A&A, 595, 1

- Gaia Collaboration et al., 2018, A&A, 616, 1
- de Grijs, R., Bono, G. 2016, ApJS, 227, 5
- Hawley, S. L., Jefferys, W. H., Barnes, T. G., III, Lai, W. 1986, ApJ, 302, 626
- Helmi A., White S. D. M., de Zeeuw P. T., Zhao H., 1999, Natur, 402, 53
- Ibata R. A., Gilmore G., Irwin M. J., 1994, Natur, 370, 194
- Ibata R., Bellazzini M., Thomas G., Malhan K., Martin N., Famaey B., Siebert A., 2020, ApJL, 891, L19
- Iorio, G. and Belokurov, V. 2019, MNRAS, 482, 3868
- Jurić M., et al., 2008, ApJ, 673, 864
- Kafle, P. R., Sharma, S., Lewis, G. F., Bland-Hawthorn, J. 2019, MNRAS, 430, 2973

- Kafle P. R., Sharma S., Robotham A. S. G., Pradhan R. K., Guglielmo M., Davies L. J. M., Driver S. P., 2017, MNRAS, 470, 2959
- Klinichev, A. D., Glushkova, E. V., Dambis, A. K., Yalyalieva, L. N. 2018, Astron. Rep. 62, 986
- Koppelman H. H., Helmi A., Massari D., Price-Whelan A. M., Starkenburg T. K., 2019, A&A, 631, L9
- Lancaster, L., Koposov, S.E., Belokurov, V., Evans, N. W., Deason, A.J. 2018, preprint, (arXiv:1804.09181)
- Layden, A.C., Hanson, R.B., Hawley, S.L., Klemola, A.R., Hanley, Ch.J. 1996, AJ, 112, 2110
- Lindegren, L., Hernandez, J., Bombrun, A., et al. 2018, https://www.cosmos.esa.int/documents/29201/1770596/Lindegren_GaiaDR2_Astrometry_extended.pdf
- Liu, Xian. 2016, Methods and Applications of Longitudinal Data, Elsevier, Amsterdam, p. 99.
- Murray, C.A., 1983, Vectorial Astrometry, Adam Hilger, Bristol
- Myeong G. C., Evans N. W., Belokurov V., Sanders J. L., Koposov S. E., 2018, ApJL, 856, L26
- Naidu R. P., Conroy C., Bonaca A., Johnson B. D., Ting Y.-S., Caldwell N., Zaritsky D., et al., 2020, arXiv, arXiv:2006.08625
- Popowski P., Gould A., 1998, ApJ, 506, 259
- Rastorguev, A. S., Utkin, N. D., Zabolotskikh, M. V., Dambis, A. K., Bajkova, A. T., Bobylev, V. V., 2017, Astrophys. Bull., 72, 122
- Reid, M. J., Menten, K. M., Brunthaler, A. et al. 2014, ApJ, 783, 130
- Sirko E., et al., 2004, AJ, 127, 899
- Smith M. C., Evans N. W., An J. H., 2009, ApJ, 698, 1110
- Stoughton, C., Lupton, R. H., Bernardi, M., et al. 2002, AJ, 123, 485
- Strugnell P., Reid N., Murray C. A., 1986, MNRAS, 220, 413
- Tian H., Liu C., Xu Y., Xue X., 2019, ApJ, 871, 184
- Utkin, N.D., Dambis, A.K., Rastorguev, A.S., Klinchev, A.D., Ablimit, I., Zhao, G. 2018, Astron. Lett. 44, 688
- Valleé, J.P. 2017, Astrophys. Space Sci. 362, 79
- Wegg C., Gerhard O., Bieth M., 2019, MNRAS, 485. 3296
- Xue, X. X., Rix, H. W., Zhao, G., Re Fiorentin, P., Naab, T., Steinmetz, M., van den Bosch, F. C., Beers, T. C., Lee, Y. S., Bell, E. F., Rockosi, C., Yanny, B., Newberg, H., Wilhelm, R., Kang, X., Smith, M. C., Schneider, D. P. 2008, ApJ, 684, 1143
- Xue X.-X. et al. 2011, ApJ, 738, 79
- Yanny B., et al., 2009, AJ, 137, 4377
- Zhu Zi, Shen Ming. 2013, Proceedings of the International Astronomical Union, IAU Symposium, 289, 444

This paper has been typeset from a $T_{\!E\!}X/\!I\!\!\!\!\!\!\!^{A}T_{\!E\!}X$ file prepared by the author.