PaulL.Schechter

Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139

schech@achernar.mit.edu

Joachim Wambsganss

Universitat Potsdam, Institut fur Physik, Am Neuen Palais 10, 14467 Potsdam, Germany

jkw@astro.physik.uni-potsdam.de

and

Geraint F. Lew is

School of Physics, A 29, University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

gfl@physics.usyd.edu.au

ABSTRACT

It has been conjectured that the distribution of magnications of a point source microlensed by a random ly distributed population of intervening point masses is independent of its mass spectrum. We present gedanken experiments that cast doubt on this conjecture and numerical simulations that show it to be false.

Subject headings: Cosm ology: Dark M atter, Cosm ology: G ravitational Lensing, G alaxies: Q uasars

1. IN TRODUCTION

Every investigation of m icrolensing at high optical depth that has explored the e ect of multiple m icrolens m ass components has led to the conclusion that the m agni cation probability distribution is independent of the spectrum of m icrolens m asses. The recent e ort by W yithe & Turner (2001) is typical. W hile it was not their principal result, they comment in passing $\$... we con m the nding of W am bsganss (1992) and Lew is & Irw in (1995) that the magnication distribution is independent of the mass function."

This conjecture has important consequences regarding the more general applicability of microlensing studies that are limited to a single mass component. While galaxies have stars with a range of masses, restricting to a single component makes analytic calculations more tractable (e.g. Peacock 1986; Schneider 1987; Kofman, Kaiser, Lee, & Babul 1997) and greatly decreases the number of cases that must be simulated numerically (e.g. W am bsganss 1992; Lew is & Irw in 1995; W yithe & Turner 2001). If true, the conjecture simplies things considerably.

Both theoretical and experim ental lines of evidence lead to this conclusion, which has struck m any investigators as obvious. On the experim ental side, simulations like those carried out by W yithe & Turner (2001) and their predecessors produce m agni cation histogram s for di erent m ass distributions that appear to be indistinguishable for xed surface m ass density and shear.

On the theoretical side, the high magni cation tail of the magni cation probability distribution has been shown to be independent of the microlens mass spectrum (Schneider 1987). Moreover, W am beganss, W itt, & Schneider (1992) showed that the average number of positive parity microim ages depends only upon the surface mass density (or equivalently the convergence) and the shear. Since the scale free nature of gravity requires that the magni cation probability distribution for a point source be the same for microlensing by a single mass of any size, it would appear strange if a mixture of two masses (at constant convergence and shear) produced a di erent magni cation probability distribution.

There is, however, at least one argument against this apparently obvious conclusion, which we detail in $x \ 2$ below. It suggests that the magnication probability distribution does depend upon the mass spectrum. The argument suggests that the dependence would show up in a highly magnied negative parity macroim age { typically one of a close pair of images in a quadruply imaged quasar like PG 1115+080.

We have carried out lensing simulations of such an in age (at constant convergence and shear) for a variety of dierent cases. In Figure 1 we show simulations with two populations of point masses. The rst component is comprised of 1.000M objects referred to hereafter as \maximum icro-lenses." The second component is comprised of 0.005M objects referred to hereafter as \maximum ano-lenses." The designations and mass scale are arbitrary but are intended to convey the sense that the micro-lenses are very much smaller than the lensing galaxy and that the nano-lenses are very much smaller than the micro-lenses.

The eight panels of Figure 1 show magni cation histograms obtained by varying the mass fractions in the micro-lensing component, with the remaining fraction in the nano-lensing component. For the sake of comparison, we reproduce in each panel the result for a pure micro-lensing component. As the fraction contributed by micro-lenses decreases to 20% and 10% the histogram broadens out and develops a second peak. But as it decreases further to 0%, the magni cation distribution narrows and ends up looking like the 100% case (modulo nite source e ects and sample variance). Unless our simulations are faulty, the conjecture is false.

In x 2 we put forward a qualitative argument for the dependence of the microlensing probability distribution on the mass spectrum. In x 3 we give details of the numerical simulations that con rm the e ect. In x 4 we over a qualitative interpretation of our results. In x 5 we discuss some astrophysical consequences.

2. AN ARGUMENT FOR THE DEPENDENCE OF THE MAGNIFICATION PROBABILITY DISTRIBUTION ON THE MASS SPECTRUM

In Figure 2a we show the magni cation probability distribution for a simulation of a negative parity macroimage with convergence = 0.55 and shear = 0.55. In this simulation all of the mass is in micro-lenses of a single mass. In Figure 2b we again show the magni cation probability distribution for a simulation of a negative parity macroimage with convergence = 0.55 and shear = 0.55, but in this case 20% of the mass is in micro-lenses of a single mass sheet. The two histograms book quite di erent, with the rst showing a single peak and the second being signi cantly broader and show ing two peaks.¹

Now suppose that the smooth mass sheet of Figure 2b is divided into random ly distributed point masses that are very much smaller than the micro-lenses. We then have a micro-lensing component with $_{micro} = 0.11$ and a nano-lensing component with $_{nano} = 0.44$. If the hypothesis that the magnication distribution is independent of the mass spectrum

¹The bi- and even trim odality of magni cation histogram s has frequently been noted (Rauch, Mao, W am bsganss, & Paczynski1992; W am bsganss 1992; Lew is & Irw in 1995; Schechter & W am bsganss 2002). The peaks can be indexed by the num ber of \extra" positive parity m icro-im ages (Rauch, Mao, W am bsganss, & Paczynski1992; G ranot, Schechter, & W am bsganss 2003). The broadening of magni cation histogram s at interm ediate magni cations has likew ise known for some time (Seitz, W am bsganss, & Schneider 1994; Schechter & W am bsganss 2002).

were correct, the magnication probability distribution would look the same as that of Figure $2a^2$.

Finally, suppose we take our source to be extended rather than point-like. In particular, we imagine our source is much larger than the Einstein rings of our nano-lenses but much smaller than the Einstein rings of our micro-lenses. The nano-lenses should behave like a smooth component and the magni cation probability distribution should look like Figure 2b.

A Itematively, we can compute the magni cation probability distribution for our extended source by taking the magni cation map for a point source and convolving it with the surface brightness distribution of the extended source. Such a convolution will inevitably smooth the map out, increasing the values of low magni cation pixels and decreasing the values of high magni cation pixels. If the conjecture were correct and the magni cation histogram for a point source and macro- and nano-lensing components looked like F igure 2a, we would expect the magni cation probability distribution for an extended source to be narrower.

O ur two alternative schemes for computing the magnication histogram of an extended source lensed by a two component screen give dierent histograms, in one case broader and in the other case narrower than the histogram of Figure 2a. The histogram cannot simultaneously be both narrower and broader than that of Figure 2a. There is a bad link in one of the chains of argument, which we take to be the assumption that the magnication histogram for a point source is independent of the mass spectrum.

3. M ICROLENSING SIMULATIONS

The particular values for the convergence, shear, and relative fractions in the two m ass components used in the previous section were chosen (guided by the results of G ranot et. al. 2003) to maximize the di erence between Figures 2a and 2b. We have carried out microlensing simulations at the same convergence and shear, to look for di erences in the microlensing histogram with di erent proportions of components.

The simulations were done employing the inverse ray-shooting method (Kayser, Refsdal, & Stabell 1986; Schneider & Weiss 1987) as described in Wambsganss (1990, 1999). We used

²An anonym ous referee has argued that breaking up the sm ooth sheet into sm allclum ps can only broaden the m agni cation histogram and that the conjecture must therefore be incorrect. This is borne out by the simulations presented in the following section.

a square receiving eld of side length 20 E instein radii R_E (of the high mass component $m_{m \ icro}$)³. This area in the source plane was covered by 25 m illion pixels (5000²). We used values of tot = 0.55 and = 0.55 for surface mass density and external shear, corresponding to an (average) magni cation of j j = 10.0 (negative parity). The positions of the lenses were distributed random ly in a circle signi cantly larger than the shooting region. The total num ber of rays per fram e was typically about n_{rays} 10¹⁰, resulting in over 200 rays per pixelon average (the shooting region was larger than the receiving region so that a signi cant num ber of rays landed outside the latter).

We perform ed a series of simulations with changing mass components. For the rst series, we used two mass components with a mass ratio of $m_{m \ icro} = m_{nano} = 200$. For speci city we adopted $m_{m \ icro} = 1M$, appropriate to stars and $m_{nano} = 0.005M$, as might apply to very massive planets.

We started with three cases: in the rst case, 100% of the m ass was in m icro-lenses with m ass m $_{\rm m \ icro}$; in the second 50% of the m icro-lenses were replaced with sm ooth m atter; in the third case 50% of the m atter was in nano-lenses with m ass m $_{\rm nano}$ rather than in sm ooth m atter.

The magni cation maps for these simulations are displayed in Figure 3, with the lefthand panel presenting the full $20R_E$, whereas the right-hand panel focuses upon a $1R_E$ part of the map. For the smooth matter case (central panels) and the m_{nano} scenario (lowest panels), the location of the m_{micro} objects are the same.

In comparing the panels, it is apparent that the smooth m atter and m_{nano} simulations possess similar large scale structure in their magnication maps, structure which is somewhat dierent from the case where all the mass is in m_{micro} objects. On smaller scales, however, the magnication patterns for the smooth mass and m_{nano} cases are quite dierent, with the presence of the smaller mass nano-lenses breaking up the magnication structure into smaller scales.

The magni cation distributions for these simulations are presented in Figure 4. As discussed previously, the case where all the mass is in $m_{m \ icro}$ objects is unim odal, with the smooth matter case being bim odal. The case containing m_{nano} masses clearly di ers from the solely $m_{m \ icro}$ case, also appearing bim odal and similar in form to the smooth matter case, at odds with the conjecture.

 $^{{}^{3}}R_{E}$ is the E instein radius and is the natural scale length for gravitational microlensing. In the source plane, $R_{E} = {}^{p} \frac{1}{(4GM = c^{2})(D_{os}D_{ls}=D_{ol})}$, where M is the mass of the microlensing object, and D_{ij} is the angular diam eter distances between observer (o), lens (l) and source (s); c and G are the velocity of light and the gravitational constant, respectively.

An exam ination of the magni cation maps in Figure 3 illum inates the di erences between the magni cation distributions in Figure 4. Compared with the smooth matter map, them ap for 100% m_{micro} has a higher density of caustics and fewer regions of demagni cation (light-grey). These regions of the source plane produce no positive parity in ages. C rossing caustics produces extra positive parity in ages and additional magni cation. These regions dominate the magni cation histogram. In the smooth matter case, the magni cation map has been been dup,' revealing more extended regions with no positive parity in age and enhancing the low magni cation peak seen in the magni cation distribution. On large scales the magni cation distribution for the 50% m_{nano} case resembles that of the smooth matter case, again with larger regions without positive parity in ages. Thus its magni cation probability distribution looks more like that of the smooth matter case than that of the 100% m_{micro} case. Indeed the 50% m_{nano} case is even broader than the smooth case, due to the additional corrugation of the large scale map by the small scale lenses.

Further sin ulations were undertaken in an attempt to understand this di erence. A gain, we started with 100% m icro-lenses, m_{m icro}. Then we put 1% of the total mass in nano-lenses, m_{nano}, (re-)distributing them random ly over the lens plane. We increased the nano-lense mass fraction to 2%, 5%, 10%, and then proceeded in steps of 10% to 90%. We ended sym metrically with 95%, 98%, 99% and 100% nano-lenses, for a total 17 di erent cases. The num bers of lenses ranged from 25,000 (for 100% m_{m icro}) to 2,600,000 (for 100% m_{nano}).

A selection of the resulting two dimensionalm agni cation patterns is shown in Figure 5. The top six panels show the full simulation, while the bottom six panels show an expanded inset. Particularly notable is the similarity between the upper left panel (with all the mass in micro-lenses) and the lower right panel (the blow up of the map when all the mass is in nano-lenses). Simulations of this series were used to produce the histogram s in Figure 1.

For the nal series, we took 50% of the mass to be in micro-lenses, and 50% in nano-lenses, but let the masses of the nano-lenses vary with $m_{nano}=m_{micro} = 0.32;0:10;0:032;0:01;$ and 0:0032. As a bracketting cases we considered $m_{nano}=m_{micro} = 1$ and the 50% smooth case, corresponding to $m_{nano}=m_{micro}!$ 0, making seven cases altogether. The magni cation patterns for all but the smooth case are displayed in Figure 6. The magni cation distributions are seen in Figure 7.

This last series shows that the conjecture fails only gradually. The presence of the second component becomes signi cant (for our simulation) only when the nano-lens masses are one tenth those of the micro-lenses. By the time the nano-lenses are one hundredth those of the micro-lenses, the e ect is as large as we can measure. In hindsight this onset would have been more appreciable had we put 80% of the mass into nano-lenses (as in the third panel of Figure 1), but the qualitative e ects would have been the same.

Our lensing simulations have two limitations:

W ith the limited size of $L = 20R_E$, the magnication maps exhibit features that are correlated on scales uncom fortably close to the size of the simulation volume. An ensemble of simulations with the same parameters will exhibit di erences due to sample variance. We checked this for a few cases and found this sample variance to be small compared to the observed di erences needed to make our case. Moreover, in the series of simulations described above, we kept the positions of the stars xed to the extent possible, so that we could study the di erential changes from one case to the next, and to hence minimize the elects of sample variance.

The nite pixel size corresponds to a minimum source size, i.e. our results are not quite applicable to a point source. However, a size of $20R_E = 5000pix = 0.004R_E = pix$, is small enough for the e ects we want to study and explore. This nite size unavoidably cuts o the magnication distribution at very high magnications and leads to deviations from the power law behavior, but the low and intermediate magnication region we are interested in (see next section) is not strongly a ected by that.

D expite the inevitable limited dynamic range for such simulations, we have tried to choose parameters such that we can demonstrate the elect most convincingly.

4. IN TERPRETATION

In the previous section we simulated cuts through the $_{nano} = _{m icro}; m_{nano} = m_{m icro}$ plane at xed $_{tot}$ and . Somewhat counter-intuitively, we not that at xed m assuration $_{nano} = m_{m icro} = 1=200$ the magnication probability histogram is broader for comparable amounts of two very di erent m assess than it is for a single component of either one m ass or the other.

The scale invariance of gravity dem ands that, for a point source, the magni cation histogram s of single components of very di erent masses should be identical. But our experiments show that for two very di erent mass components the magni cation map looks very much like that of the higher mass component immersed in a perfectly smooth component. Only on small scales are there di erences. This can be seen in Figure 3.

Suppose one grants that the m agni cation probability distribution for two very disparate com ponents looks like that for a single com ponent and a sm ooth com ponent. The arguments set forth in (R auch, M ao, W am bsganss, & Paczynski 1992), Schechter and W am bsganss (2002) and G ranot et al. (2003) would come into play: the m agni cation histogram tends to be broadest when the elective m agni cation computed from the elective convergence and the elective shear is of order j j 3 4. A lternatively, the uctuations are largest when the number of extra positive parity in ages is roughly unity. In such cases one tends to get two peaks.

But the magni cation probability distribution for two disparate components is not exactly that of a single component and a smooth component. The low mass component produces additional structure in the magni cation map, further broadening the magni cation histogram, rounding o its peaks and lling in its valleys. There is evidence for this in Figures 2 and 3.

Once one substitutes the low mass component for a smooth component, the number of extra positive parity in ages increases from roughly unity to something signi cantly larger. While this tends to round of the two peaks, it does not narrow the magnication histogram. The arguments of Schechter & W am bsganss (2002) and G ranot et al. (2003) that the magnication histogram is broadest when there is, on average, one extra positive parity image does not hold for two disparate mass components. The reason is that the extra positive parity images cluster around the images produced by the single mass component, breaking them into pieces but only slightly changing the combined contribution to the ux.

5. A STROPHY SICAL CON SEQUENCES

In gravitational lensing, m agni cations depend upon second derivatives (with respect to position) of the time delay function (e.g. B landford & Narayan 1986). De ections depend upon inst derivatives. And time delays depend upon the function itself. The second derivatives are dimensionless, with the consequence that the magni cation of an image (unlike its de ection and time delay) contains no information about the mass of intervening lens.

In age position uctuations due to microlensing manifestly do contain information about the mass scale of the intervening microlenses (Lew is & Ibata 1998; Treyer & W am bsganss 2004, and references therein). Moreover the timescale over which brightness uctuations occur likew is contains information about the mass scale of the intervening microlenses (and on the distribution of microlens masses) if one knows the relative velocities of the microlenses and the source (W yithe & Turner 2001). But the amplitude of those brightness uctuations is independent of mass scale.

In the present paper we consider the dependence of brightness uctuations not on m ass scale, the rst m om ent of the m icrolens m ass distribution function, but on higher order dim ensionless m om ents of that m ass distribution. We have dem onstrated (through our simulations using two m ass components) that the m agni cation probability does depend upon those higherm om ents. W e have not, how ever, explored the full range of astrophysically interesting m ass distributions.

We have chosen to explore in detail the specic case of two mass components with tot = = 0.55, appropritate to one of two images in a highly magnied pair, as in the case of PG 1115+080 (Young et al. 1981) or SD SS0924+0219 (Inada et al. 2003). The argument of Section 2 led us to believe that the elects of using two mass components rather than a single mass component would be appreciable in this case. But what about other values of the convergence and shear? How much does the mass spectrum matter for images of a quasar which are not saddle-points, or not highly magnied?

A thorough treatment of this question would explore a substantial fraction of the ; plane, and would quantify with some statistic the dierences between a single mass component and a range of masses. Such a treatment lies beyond the scope of the present paper.

The fact that most previous investigators have failed to detect the e ects of a range of m icrolens m asses would argue that to rst order such e ects can be ignored. Even in the present case, where the convergence and shear have been chosen to m axim ize the e ects, they are not large. M ost m ass distributions tend to put m ost of the m ass at one or the other end of the m ass distribution. The present simulations would seem to indicate that only if appreciable m ass fractions are in components that di er by m ore than a factor often in m ass will the e ects of a range of m asses be substantial.

6. ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e gratefully acknow ledge helpful conversations with A rlie Petters. G FL and JW thank M .I.T .'s C enter for Space R esarch for its hospitality during a collaboratory visit during which m uch of this work was undertaken. G FL acknow ledges losing a bottle of whiskey to PLS for backing the wrong horse. PLS gratefully acknow ledges the whiskey. The work was supported in part by U S N SF grant A ST -020601.

REFERENCES

B landford, R. & Narayan, R. 1986, ApJ, 310, 568

Granot, J., Schechter, P.L., & W am bsganss, J. 2003, ApJ, 583, 575

Inada, N. et al. 2003, AJ, 126, 666

- Kayser, R., Refsdal, S., & Stabell, R. 1986, A&A, 166, 36
- Kofman, L., Kaiser, N., Lee, M. H., & Babul, A. 1997, ApJ, 489, 508 s
- Lew is, G.F.& Ibata, R.A. 1998, ApJ, 501, 478
- Lew is, G.F.& Irw in, M.J. 1995, MNRAS, 276, 103
- Peacock, J.A. 1986, MNRAS, 223, 113
- Rauch, K.P., Mao, S., Wambsganss, J., & Paczynski, B. 1992, ApJ, 386, 30
- Schechter, P.L.& W am bsganss, J. 2002, ApJ, 580, 685
- Schneider, P. 1987, ApJ, 319, 9
- Schneider, P. & Weiss, A. 1987, A & A, 171, 49
- Seitz, C., W am bsganss, J., & Schneider, P. 1994, A & A, 288, 19
- Treyer, M . & W am bsganss, J. 2004, A & A , 416, 19
- W am bsganss, J. 1990, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Munich, Report MPA 550
- W am bsganss, J. 1992, ApJ, 386, 19
- W am bsganss, J. 1999, Journ. Com p. Appl. M ath., 109, 353
- W am bsganss, J., W itt, H.J., & Schneider, P.1992, A&A, 258, 591
- Wythe, J.S.B. & Tumer, E.L. 2001, MNRAS, 320, 21
- Young, P., Deverill, R.S., Gunn, J.E., Westphal, J.A., & Kristian, J. 1981, ApJ, 244, 723

This preprint was prepared with the AAS IPT_EX m acros v5.0.



Fig. 1. Magni cation probability distributions for $_{tot} = = 0.55$. The percentage in each panel denoted the fraction of $_{tot}$ composed of 1M objects, the remainder being in 0.005M m asses. The dotted-line in each panel is the magni cation probability distribution for the case where the entire microlensing population is comprised of 1M object (presented in the upper left-hand panel).



Fig. 2. Magni cation probability distributions for $_{tot} = = 0.55$. On the left 100% of the matter is in m $_{m icro} = 1M$ objects. On the right 20% of the matter is in m $_{m icro} = 1M$ objects and 80% is in a smooth mass sheet.



Fig. 3. Magni cation maps for the case with $_{tot} = = 0.55$. The left-hand gures represent a region 20 R_E (for a solar mass star) on a side. The right-hand panel is a zoom of the lower left-hand 1 R_E. The top row maps were constructed with $_{tot}$ all in 1M masses, whereas the central panels consist of a microlensing population with 50% of $_{tot}$ in 1M objects and the rest in continuous matter. The lower panels are for 50% of $_{tot}$ in 1M objects and the remainder in 0.005M masses.



Fig. 4. The magni cation probability distributions for $_{tot} = = 0.55$. The thick curve presents the case where all the mass is in 1M objects, whereas the medium thickness curve is when 50% of $_{tot}$ is in 1M objects and the remainder is in continuous matter. For the thin curve, this continuous matter contribution has been replaced by objects with a mass of 0.005M .



Fig. 5. Magni cation maps for the case $_{tot} = 0.55$. In the top six panels, the proportion of microlenses with a particular mass is changed such that (from left-to-right and top-to-bottom) the percentage of $_{tot}$ in 0.005M objects is 0%, 20%, 60%, 90%, 98% & 100%; the remainder of $_{tot}$ is in 1M masses in each case. Each magni cation panel is $L = 20R_E$ in extent. The size panels at the bottom show zoom s of the lower left corners of the same sequence, respectively, sidelengths here are $L = 1R_E$ (de ned for a 1M -lens).



Fig. 6. The top six panels present the magni cation maps for the case $_{tot} = = 0.55$. In each, 50% of $_{tot}$ is comprised of 1M objects, while the remainder is composed of (top row, from left to right) 1M , 0.1M , 0.1M , (second row) = 0.01M , 0.01M and 0.001M. Each panel is 20 R_E in extent. The lower six panels present a zoom of the lower left-hand corner of the same magni cation maps (extend is L = 1 R_E).



Fig. 7. The six panels present the magni cation distributions for a scenario with $_{tot} = 0.55$, and the matter being split between evenly two mass components (50% m_{m icro}, 50% m_{nano}). The mass ratios are m_{m icro}=m_{nano} = 0.316;0:100;0:032;0:01;0:003 for the rst ve panels, and m_{nano} is assumed entirely smoothly distributed in the last panel. The dotted histogram is the respective panel for the case with 100% of the matter in m_{m icro}.