# M odeling non-linear e ects in the redshift space two-point correlation function and its im plications for the pairw ise velocity dispersion

B isw a jit P andey? and Som nath B haradw a jy D epartm ent of P hysics and M eteorology

and C entre for T heoretical Studies IIT K haragpur P in: 721 302 , India

20 M arch 2024

#### ABSTRACT

The anisotropies in the galaxy two-point correlation function measured from redshift surveys exhibits deviations from the predictions of the linear theory of redshift space distortion on scales as large as 20 h<sup>1</sup> M pc where we expect linear theory to hold in real space. Any attempt at analyzing the anisotropies in the redshift correlation function and determ ining the linear distortion parameter requires these deviations to be correctly m odeled and taken into account. These deviations are usually attributed to galaxy random motions and these are incorporated in the analysis through a phenom enological model where the linear redshift correlation is convolved with the random pairwise velocity distribution function along the line of sight. We show that a substantial part of the deviations arise from non-linear e ects in the mapping from real to redshift space caused by the coherent ows. Models which incorporate this e ect provide an equally good t to N-body results as compared to the phenom enological model which has only the e ect of random motions. We nd that the pairwise velocity dispersion predicted by all the models that we have considered are in excess of the values determ ined directly from the N-body simulations. This indicates a shortcom ing in our understanding of the statistical properties of peculiar velocities and their relation to redshift distortion.

Keywords: galaxies: statistics { cosm ology: theory { large scale structure of Universe

#### 1 IN TRODUCTION

G alaxy redshifts are not perfectly described by pure Hubble's law. Density uctuations induce peculiar velocities relative to the general Hubble expansion. The peculiar velocities perturb galaxy redshifts which in turn a ects their inferred distances and this leads to a system atic distortion in the clustering pattern of galaxies in redshift space. The peculiar velocities cause the two-point correlation function in redshift space s (s) to be anisotropic i.e. it depends separately on the component of the pair separation s parallel ( $s_k$ ) and perpendicular ( $s_2$ ) to the observer's line of sight f. There are two characteristic e ects of peculiar velocities .0 n large scales structures are compressed along the line of sight due to coherent ows into over dense regions and out of under dense regions, thereby am plifying s ( $s_k$ ; $s_2$ ). On small scales s ( $s_k$ ; $s_2$ ) is suppressed due to the structures being elongated along the line of sight by random motions in virialized clusters.

K aiser (1987) rst quanti ed the correlation anisotropy that results from large-scale peculiar ows in term s of the power spectrum of galaxy clustering. U sing linear theory and the plane parallel approximation he showed that the power spectrum in redshift space  $P_s(k)$  and it's real space counterpart  $P_r(k)$  are related as

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>?</sup> Em ail: pandey@ cts.iitkgp.emet.in

y Em ail: som nathb@ iitkgp.ac.in

# 2 B.Pandey and S.Bharadwaj

# $P_{s}(k) = (1 + \frac{2}{k})^{2} P_{r}(k)$ (1)

where k is the cosine of the angle between k and the line of sight f, and  $\binom{0.6}{m}=b$  is the linear distortion parameter. Here m is the cosm ic mass density parameter and b is the linear bias parameter which diers from unity if the galaxies represent a biased sample of the underlying dark matter distribution. It may be noted that the factor  $\binom{0.6}{m}$  relates peculiar velocities to density density uctuations (Peebles 1980). This is slightly modiled in the presence of a cosm ological constant (Lahav et al. 1991) and it is more accurate to use = f(m) = b where  $f(m) = \binom{0.6}{m} + \frac{1}{70} [1 - \frac{1}{2} m (1 + m)]$ : The important point is that the anisotropies observed in P<sub>s</sub>(k) can be used to determ ine the value of , and thereby place interesting constraints on the density parameter m and the bias b. This has been the single most important motivation for a substantial amount of the research which has been carried out in trying to understand and quantify the nature of redshift space distortions.

Ham ilton (1992) translated Kaiser's linear form ula from Fourier to real space. He showed that it is most convenient to parameterize the anisotropy of  $s (s_k; s_2)$  in terms of spherical harm onics as

$$^{s}(s_{k};s_{2}) = \overset{X^{k}}{\underset{1}{}^{1=0}} (s)P_{1}()$$
(2)

where  $s = s_k^2 + s_r^2$ ,  $s_k = s_k = s_r$ ,  $P_1()$  are the Legendre polynom ials and 1(s) are the di erent angular moments of the redshift space two-point correlation function. Only the rst three even angular moments, namely the monopole 0(s), the quadrupole 2(s) and the hexadecapole 4(s) are non-zero and these can be expressed in terms of the real space galaxy two-point correlation (r) and its moments which are de ned as

$$_{n}(s) = \frac{n+1}{s^{n+1}} \int_{0}^{L_{s}} (y)y^{n} dy:$$
(3)

through

$$_{0}(s) = (1 + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{5})^{2} (s)$$
(4)

$${}_{2}(s) = \left(\frac{4}{3} + \frac{4}{7}\right)^{2} (s) {}_{2}(s)$$

$${}_{4}(s) = \frac{8}{35}\right)^{2} \left[ (s) + \frac{5}{2} {}_{2}(s) - \frac{7}{2} {}_{4}(s) \right]$$
(6)

The linear analysis predicts a negative quadrupole (i.e.  $_2$  (s) < 0) arising from the squashing of large scale structures along the line of sight.

H am ilton proposed that the observed redshift space correlation function be decomposed into spherical harm onics, and the ratio

$$Q(s) = \frac{R_{s}^{2}(s)}{\frac{3}{s^{3}} \left( 0 - 0 \right) \left( s^{0} \right) \left( s^{0} - 0 \right) \left( s \right)} = -\frac{\frac{4}{3} + \frac{4}{7} \left( \frac{2}{7} + \frac{2}{7} + \frac{2}{7} \right)}{1 + \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{5} \left( \frac{2}{7} + \frac{2}{7} + \frac{2}{7} \right)}$$
(7)

which is expected to have a constant value (shown in [:::] in eq. 7) be used to determ ine the value of . A lternatively, if the real space correlation function has a power law behaviour (r) / r, the ratio  $_2(s) = _0(s)$  is also expected to be a constant, and this can be used to determ ine the value of .

Investigations using N-body simulations to study the redshift space two-point correlation (eg. Suto & Suginohara 1991, Fisher et al. 1994, Brainerd et al. 1994, Brom ley, W arren & Zurek 1997) nd deviations from the linear predictions out to scales as large as  $20 h^{-1}$  M pc and even larger where linear theory is known to be valid in real space. Such deviations are also seen in the redshift space two-point correlations determ ined from di erent redshift surveys (eg. Landy, Szalay & Broadhurst 1998 (LCRS), Peacock et al. 2001 (2dFGRS), Hawkins et al. 2002 (2dFGRS)). In addition to the squashing predicted by the linear analysis, the two-point correlation function exhibits an elongation along the line of sight at scales as large as  $20 h^{-1}$  M pc. This causes the quadrupole m on ent to rem ain positive even at scales where one would expect linear theory to hold in real space. The values of Q (s) which are expected to be constant (eq. 7) do not atten out to scales as large as  $20 h^{-1}$  M pc in N-body simulations, nor is the attening observed at these scales in the redshift space at length-scales where linear theory is known to be valid in real space.

The most popular approach is to attribute the deviations from the linear predictions to the e ects of the random peculiar velocities of galaxies located in virialized clusters and other highly non-linear regions. This e ect is incorporated through a phenom enological model (eg. D avis & Peebles 1983, Fisher et al. 1994, Peacock & D odds 1994, Heavens & Taylor 1995, M arzke et al. 1995, B allinger, Peacock & Heavens 1996, Tadros & E fstathiou 1996, B rom ley, W arren & Zurek 1997, R atcli e et al. 1998) which assume s that at large scales the deviations from linear theory can be incorporated by convolving the linear redshift space correlation function  $\int_{L}^{S}$  with the line of sight component of the random, isotropic pairw ise velocity distribution function f(). The resulting non-linear redshift space two-point correlation function is given by

$$s'(s_k; s_2) = \int_{L}^{s} (s_k + s_2) f(t) dt$$

-

where the distribution function f() is norm alized to  $1 \\ 1$  f() d = 1. The authors who have invoked thism odel have generally adopted either a G aussian or else an exponential pairwise velocity distribution function. In both cases, the distribution function has only one unknown quantity  $\frac{2}{R}$  which is the velocity dispersion of the random component of the pairwise peculiar velocity of the galaxies. In this model, the observations of the anisotropies in <sup>s</sup> can be used to jointly determ ine the value of R. This has recently been accomplished for the 2dFGRS where they nd = 0.49 0.09 and R = 506 52 km s<sup>-1</sup> (H aw kins et al. 2002).

An alternative approach is to attribute the deviations from the linear predictions in <sup>s</sup> to non-linear e ects arising from the coherent ows. Taylor & Ham ilton (1996), Fisher & Nusser (1998) and Hatton & Cole (1998) have used the Zel'dovich approximation to analytically study the behaviour of the redshift-space power spectrum in the translinear regime. They nd that the results from the Zel'dovich approximation are in reasonable agreement with the predictions of N-body simulations, indicating that the coherent owsmay be making a signi cant contributions to the non-linear e ects observed in the redshift space two-point correlation function.

In a di erent approach to studying the deviations in  ${}^{s}$  from the linear predictions at scales where linear theory is known to be valid in real space, B haradwaj (2001) has considered the non-linear elects introduced by the mapping from real space to redshift space. Under the assumption that linear theory is valid in real space and that the density uctuations are a G aussian random led,  ${}^{s}$  has been calculated taking into account all the non-linear elects that arise due to the mapping from real to redshift space. It may be noted that the original calculation of K aiser (1987) and H am ilton (1992) treats the mapping from real to redshift space to linear order only.

In sum mary, at large scales where linear theory is known to be valid in real space, the commonly used phenom enological m odel for <sup>s</sup> attributes all the deviations from the linear predictions to the e ects of random m otions on the m apping from real to redshift space. On the other hand, Bharadwaj (2001) calculated <sup>s</sup> incorporating all the non-linear e ects which arise in the mapping from real to redshift space assuming that they are caused only by the coherent ows. In all probability, the deviations from the linear predictions found in <sup>s</sup> in the N-body simulations and in actual redshift surveys is a consequence of non-linear e ects in the mapping from real space to redshift space arising from both these e ects namely, random motions and coherent ows. In this paper we consider models for the redshift space distortions which combine both these e ects, We compare the predictions of these models with the commonly used phenomenological model which has only the non-linear e ects from random motions.We also compare all these models with N-body simulations and investigate which model best ts the N-body results. The di erent m odels are presented in Section 2 and the results of the com parison with N-body simulations are presented in Section 3. The galaxy pairwise velocity dispersion is a quantity which crops up in any discussion of the e ects of redshift space distortions on the two-point correlation function. This quantity is very interesting in its own right and it has received a considerable am ount of attention (Davis & Peebles 1983, Bean et al. 1983, Mo, Jing & Borner 1993, Brainerd et al. 1994, Som erville, Primack & Nolthenius 1997, Bharadwaj 1997, Mo, Jing & Borner 1997, Landy, Szalay & Broadhurst 1998, Ratcli e et al. 1998, Strauss, Ostriker & Cen 1998, Jing & Borner 1998, Jing & Borner 2001, Bharadwa j 2001, Sheth et al. 2001, Del Popolo 2001). This quantity has been observationally determined for dierent redshift surveys(eg. Jing, Mo & Borner 1998, LCRS; Zehaviet al. 2002, SDSS; Hawkins et al. 2002, 2dFGRS). The models we use for the redshift space distortion also make de nite predictions for the pair-wise velocity dispersion. In Section 4 we calculate the pair-wise velocity dispersion predicted by the di erent models and compare these with the pair-wise velocity dispersion determ ined directly from the N-body simulations.

In Section 5 we discuss our results and present conclusions.

W e would also like to point out that the models which we have considered for  $^{\circ}$  are very similar in spirit to those considered by M atsubara (1994), Regos & Szalay (1995) and Fisher (1995).

# 2 MODELING <sup>s</sup>

The two-point statistics of the galaxy distribution in real space is completely quanti ed by the phase space distribution function  $_2(r;v_1;v_2)$  which gives the probability density of nding a galaxy pair at a separation r, one member of the pair having peculiar velocity  $v_1$  and the other  $v_2$ . The redshift space two-point phase space distribution function  $\frac{s}{2}(s;v_1;v_2)$  is related to its real space counterpart through

$$s_{2}^{s}(s;v_{1};v_{2}) = s_{2}(s_{1}fU;v_{1};v_{2})$$

(9)

where we have assumed the plane parallel approximation, and the units are chosen such that  $H_0 = 1$ . Here  $U = \hat{n}$  ( $y = v_1$ ) is the line of sight component of the relative peculiar velocity of the galaxy pair. Integrating out the peculiar velocities gives us the redshift space two-point correlation function

(8)

# 4 B.Pandey and S.Bharadwaj

Ζ

$$1 + {}^{s}(s) = {}^{s}_{2}(s;v_{1};v_{2}) d^{3}v_{1} d^{3}v_{2}$$
(10)

We next introduce the key assumption in the model, the assumption being that the peculiar velocity v of any galaxy can be written as a sum of two parts  $v = v_c + v_R$ , where  $v_c$  arises from large-scale coherent ows into overdense regions and out of underdense regions, and  $v_R$  is a random part arising from galaxy motions in virialized clusters and other non-linear regions. The large-scale coherent ows are correlated with the density uctuations which produce the ows, and the two are assumed to be related through linear theory. The two-point statistics of the coherent ow is quanti ed through the distribution function  ${}_{2c}$  ( $r; v_{1c}; v_{2c}$ ) which is de ned in exactly the same way as  ${}_2$  the only di erence being that  ${}_{2c}$  refers to only the part of the peculiar velocities which arises from the coherent ows. The statistical properties of the random part of the peculiar velocity can be written as  ${}_{2R}$  ( $v_{1R}; v_{2R}$ ) =  $g([v_{1R}]_k)g([v_{1R}]_k)$  :::: $g([v_{2R}]_k)$  where  $[v_{1R}]_k; [v_{1R}]_k$  etc. refer to the di erent C artesian components of  $v_{1R}$  and  $v_{2R}$ , and  $g(v_R)$  is the distribution function for a single component of the random part of a galaxy's peculiar velocity. The joint distribution of  $v_1 = v_{1c} + v_{1R}$  and  $v_2 = v_{2c} + v_{2R}$  can be expressed in terms of the distribution functions for  $v_{1c}; v_{2c}$  and  $v_{1R}; v_{2R}$  as

Ζ

Ζ

$$2 (\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{v}_1; \mathbf{v}_2) = d^3 \mathbf{v}_{1R} d^3 \mathbf{v}_{2R} 2c (\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{v}_1 \ \mathbf{v}_{1R}; \mathbf{v}_2 \ \mathbf{v}_{2R}) 2r (\mathbf{v}_{1R}; \mathbf{v}_{2R})$$
(11)

U sing this in equations (9) and (10) to calculate the redshift space two-point correlation function we have

where  $u_1$  and  $u_2$  are the line of sight components of  $v_{1R}$  and  $v_{2R}$  respectively. The term in the square brackets [::] in equation (12) can, on comparison with equations (9) and (10), be identified as the redshift space two-point correlation function if only the elects of the coherent ows are taken into account

$$1 + {}^{s}_{c}(s) = {}^{3}v_{1}{}^{3}v_{2} {}_{2c}(s {}^{n}U;v_{1};v_{2})$$
(13)  
and  ${}^{s}$  can be expressed as  
 $Z$   
 ${}^{s}(s) = {}^{d}u_{1}{}^{d}u_{2} {}^{s}_{c}(s {}^{n}(u_{2} {}^{u}u_{1}))g(u_{1})g(u_{2}):$ (14)

To sum marize, we start from the assumption that the galaxy peculiar velocities have two parts, one from the coherent ows and the other from random motions. We show that the redshift space correlation function s is c, which has only the e ect of the coherent ows, convolved along the line of sight with the one-dimensional distribution function of the random part of

The fact that only the relative peculiar velocity  $v = u_2$   $u_1$  between the two galaxies appears in equation (14) allows us to simplify it a little further. Equation (14) can be expressed it in terms of the self-convolution of  $g(v_R)$ 

the galaxy's peculiar velocity, there being two convolutions, one for each galaxy in the pair.

$$f(v) = g(v \ u)g(u)du$$
: (15)

The function f (v) may be interpreted as the distribution function for the line of sight component of the random part of the relative peculiar velocity  $v = u_2$   $u_1$  which is also called the pairwise velocity. Using this, we nally obtain s in terms of c

as  

$$Z^{s}(s_{k};s_{2}) = dv_{c}^{s}(s_{k} + v;s_{2}) f(v)$$
(16)

We now shift our attention to  $c^{s}$ , the redshift space two-point correlation function if only the coherent ows are taken into account. A sm entioned earlier, we assume that we are working at large scales where linear theory holds in real space and the density uctuations are a Gaussian random eld. Expanding  $_{2c}$  (s fiU; $v_1$ ; $v_2$ ) in equation (13) in a Taylor series in the relative peculiar velocity U of the coherent ow we have

$$1 + {}_{C}^{s}(s) = \frac{X^{i}}{n!} \frac{(1)^{n}}{n!} \frac{\theta}{\theta s_{k}} d^{3}v_{1}d^{3}v_{2}U^{n} {}_{2C}(s;v_{1};v_{2})$$
(17)

Retaining only the term s to order n = 2 we have

$${}_{L}^{s}(s_{2};s_{k}) = (s) \quad \frac{\theta}{\theta s_{k}} V_{P}(s_{2};s_{k}) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta s_{k}^{2}} {}_{P}^{2}(s_{2};s_{k})$$
(18)

Table I.

M odel	s C	f (v)
A	s L	$\frac{p \frac{1}{2}}{R} \exp \frac{p \frac{1}{2} j v j}{R}$
В	s LL	$\frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{R} \exp \left( \frac{p}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{R} \right)$
С	s LL	$\frac{1}{\frac{2}{R}} \exp \frac{2jvj}{R} \frac{-R}{2} + jvj$
D	s LL	$\frac{p}{\frac{1}{2_R}} \exp - \frac{v^2}{2_R^2}$

Ζ

where is the galaxy two-point correlation function in real space,  $V_P$  is the line of sight component of the mean relative velocity between the galaxy pair (also called mean pairwise velocity)

$$V_{P}(s_{2};s_{k}) = d^{3}v_{1}d^{3}v_{2}U_{2C}(s;v_{1};v_{2})$$
(19)

$$= \frac{2}{3}s_k _2$$
 (s) (20)

and  $\frac{2}{p}$  is the mean square of the line of sight component of the relative peculiar velocity (also called the pairwise velocity dispersion) 7.

$${}^{2}_{P}(s_{2};s_{k}) = d^{3}v_{1}d^{3}v_{2}U^{2}_{2C}(s_{2};v_{1};v_{2})$$
(21)

$$= \frac{2}{3} \frac{s^2}{3} (s) - \frac{s^2}{3} (s) + \frac{(s^2 - 3s^2_k)}{15} (s)$$
(22)

Equation (18), combined with equations (20) and (22), is exactly the same as the linear redshift space two-point correlation function calculated by H am ilton (1992). Decomposing the angular dependence of equation (18) into Legendre polynomials one recovers exactly the same angular moments as equation (3), (4) and (5), and the odd moments and all even moments beyond l = 4 are zero. U sing  $L^{s}$  as given by equation (18) in equation (16) corresponds to the phenom enological model discussed earlier for the non-linear elects in  $L^{s}$ , and this is one of the models which we shall be considering in the paper.

Going back to equation (17) for  $c^{s}$ , it is possible to exactly sum up the whole series keeping all powers of U (B haradwaj 2001). All the non-linear e ects which arise due to the mapping from real space to redshift space are taken into account in this calculation, and the resulting redshift space two-point correlation function is given by

$$1 + {}^{s}_{LL}(s_{?};s_{k}) = {}^{c}_{ds_{k}^{\circ}}G(s_{k}^{\circ}; {}^{p}(s_{?};s_{k} + s_{k}^{\circ})) \qquad (23)$$

$${}^{"}_{r}(s_{?};s_{k} + s_{k}^{\circ}) + 1 - {}^{s}_{k}{}^{v}_{P}(s_{?};s_{k} + s_{k}^{\circ}) - {}^{t}_{2} - {}^{v}_{P}(s_{?};s_{k} + s_{k}^{\circ}) - {}^{v}_{2} - {}^{v}_{2}$$

where we use

G (x;a) = 
$$p \frac{1}{2a} \exp\left[\frac{x^2}{2a^2}\right]$$
 (24)

to represent a norm alized G aussian distribution.

We now have two dimensional distribution  $s_{L}^{s}$  or  $s_{LL}^{s}$ , which we can use for  $s_{C}^{s}$  in equation (16) to calculate the full redshift space two-point correlation function  $s_{C}^{s}$ . The function  $s_{C}^{s}$  has only the elect of the coherent ow s and it has to be convolved with f (v), the one dimensional distribution function for the random part of the pairwise velocity, to calculate  $s_{C}^{s}$ . In this paper we have tried out four dimensional distribution correspond to for dimensional for  $s_{C}^{s}$  and f (v). These are listed in Table I.

To highlight the salient features of the four models, M odel A uses  $_{L}^{s}$  for  $_{C}^{s}$  and an exponential for f (v). This is the phenom enological model discussed earlier. This model has been used extensively by dienent people when analyzing both N-body simulations and actual redshift surveys. M odels B, C and D all use  $_{LL}^{s}$ . The dienence between these models is in the choice of f (v). M odel B uses an exponential form for f (v) and model D a Gaussian. M odel C corresponds to a situation where the one dimensional distribution function for the random part of the galaxy peculiar velocity g(u) is assumed to be

#### 6 B. Pandey and S. Bharadwaj

an exponential. The function f (v) is now the convolution of two exponentials. All the models for f (v) have only one free parameter,  $\frac{2}{R}$  which may be interpreted as the pairwise velocity dispersion of the random part of the peculiar velocity. In the next section we test the predictions of these models against the results of N-body simulations.

3 RESULTS FOR <sup>S</sup>

In this section we calculate <sup>s</sup> for the four models discussed earlier and compare the results against the predictions of N-body simulations.

3.1 The N-body Sim ulations.

We have used a Particle-Mesh (PM) N-body code to simulate the present distribution of dark matter in a comoving region  $[1792h^{-1}Mpc]^3$ . The simulations were run using 256<sup>3</sup> grid points at 0.7h^{-1}Mpc spacing with 128<sup>3</sup> particles for a CDM  $\cos m$  ological model with  $m_0 = 0.3$ , 0 = 0.7 and h = 0.7. We have used a COBE normalized power spectrum with the shape parameter = 0.2 for which  $_8 = 1.03$ .

The low resolution N-body simulation used here is adequate for studying the deviations from the predictions of linear theory in redshift space on scales where the real space density uctuations are well described by linear theory. We have restricted our analysis to scales larger than 5h<sup>1</sup> Mpc, though strictly speaking we would expect linear theory to be valid at scales larger than som ething like 8 h <sup>1</sup> M pc. To test that our low resolution simulations are not m issing out any crucial feature either in real space or in redshift space, we have com pared the results of our N-body simulations with the Virgo simulations (Jenkins et al. 1998) which have a higher resolution and a slightly di erent normalization with  $_{8}$  = 0.9. We nd that on the length-scales studied here, the results of our simulation are consistent with the Virgo simulation both in real and redshift space. We show the results from the Virgo sinulation alongside with those from our N-body sinulation. Our N-body simulation was run for ve independent realizations of the initial conditions.

A ssum ing that galaxies trace mass, 10<sup>5</sup> dark matter particles were chosen at random from the simulation volume and the entire analysis was carried out using these. The particle distribution in real space was taken over to redshift space in the plane parallel approxim ation. We determ ined the two-point correlation function for the particle distribution both in real and in redshift space. The angular dependence of the redshift space two-point correlation function was decomposed into Legendre polynom ials, and the anisotropy in <sup>s</sup> quanti ed through the ratios  $_{2}(s) = _{0}(s)$  and  $_{4}(s) = _{0}(s)$ . We also estimated the ratio Q (s) (eq. 7) which is somewhat di erent from  $_2$  (s) =  $_0$  (s) in the sense that it uses an integrated clustering measure instead of  $_{0}$  (s). This has the advantage that in the linear theory of redshift distortion the value of Q (s) is expected to be a constant intespective of the shape of the real space correlation (s). Our simulations have  $m_0 = 0.3$  and b = 1 which corresponds to = 0:49, and we expect Q (s) = 0:57.

The average and the 1 errorbars for  $_{0}$ ,  $_{2}=_{0}$ ,  $_{Q}$  and  $_{4}=_{0}$  were calculated using the verealizations of our N-body simulations and the results are shown in Figures 1 to 4 respectively. The points to note are

(a.) The results of our simulation are consistent with those of the Virgo simulation which are also shown in the gures (b.) We see substantial deviations from the predictions of linear theory in redshift space on scales where it is known to hold in real space. This is best seen in the behaviour of Q (s) which is supposed to be a constant with value 0.57. We nd that the value of Q is much below this even at scales as large as 20 h <sup>1</sup>M pc. The values of Q increases gradually toward the linear prediction all the way to length-scales as large as  $30 + 40 h^{-1}$  M pc where it nally appears to saturate at the linear prediction. (c.) The errorbars increas with increasing pair separation and they are quite large beyond 25 h<sup>-1</sup> M pc. W e have tried using a larger number of particles to estimate <sup>s</sup> but this does not reduce the errorbars leading to the conclusion that the we are lim ited by the cosm ic-variance arising from the nite size of our simulation and not by Poisson noise. Larger simulations will be required to make more accurate predictions for the nature of the redshift space anisotropies.

#### 3.2 Fitting the models to N-body simulations

All the models require the real space quantities (s),  $V_p(s_2; s_k)$  and  $\frac{2}{p}(s_2; s_k)$  as inputs to calculate s in redshift space. We use , the real space correlation function averaged over ve realizations of the N-body simulation, and its moments to calculate  $V_p(s_2; s_k)$  and  $\frac{2}{p}(s_2; s_k)$  using equations (20) and (22) respectively. Again, calculating <sup>s</sup> using any of our models requires us to specify and R. We have used = 0:49 which is the value corresponding to the simulation parameters, and we treat R as a free parameter which we vary to obtain the best t to the N-body results. For each model we tted the model predictions for  $_2(s) = _0(s)$  and Q (s) to the N-body results using a  $^2$  m in in ization with <sub>R</sub> as the tting parameter. There are good reason to believe that linear theory will not hold for  $s < 8h^{-1}M$  pc and the t was restricted to the region 8 s 40 h <sup>1</sup> M pc. To check if the m odels also work on length-scales which are m ildly non-linear in real space, we have also carried out the tting over the range 5 s  $40 \text{ h}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$ .

# Modeling non-linear e ects in redshift space 7

1 000 10 11.									
M odel	<sub>R</sub> (km =sec)			2 m in =		R	2 m in =		
	8	S	40 h	$^1{\rm M}~{\rm pc}$		5	s	40 h <sup>1</sup> M pc	
A			684		0 <b>:</b> 055			760	0:51
В			564		0:054			540	0:19
С			520		0:050			452	0:86
D			489		0:114			367	2:20

Table II

We nd that for both  $_2(s)=_0(s)$  and Q(s), the value of  $^2$  is minimized at nearly the same value of  $_R$ , and so we quote the values only for Q(s). The best t values of  $_R$  and the corresponding values of  $^2_{min}$  per degree of freedom are listed in Table II. The model predictions at the value of  $_R$  which gives the best t in the interval 8 s 40 h  $^1$  M pc are shown along with the results of our N-body simulations in gures 1 to 4.

We nd that all the models give a very good t to the monopole (Figure 1), and the best t predictions of the di erent m odels are indistinguishable from one another. Considering next the anisotropies in  $^{\circ}$  (Figures 2 and 3) over the length-scales s 40 h  $^{1}$  M pc, we nd that all the models give a reasonably good t. ModelC has the sm allest best t  $^{2}$  = , and M odels 8 B, A and D follow in order of increasing  $^2=$  . The values are < 1 for all the m odels, indicating that all of them give acceptable ts. It should be noted that the best tvalues of  $_{\rm R}$  vary considerably across the di erent models, and M odel A predicts a value considerably larger than the other m odels. Shifting our attention to the ts over the length-scales 5 s  $40 \, h^{-1} \, \text{Mpc}$ we nd that modelB gives the lowest value of the best t  $^2$  = , followed by M odels A, C and D. All the models, except model D, have best t<sup>2</sup> = below unity and hence give acceptable ts. Interestingly, the acceptable models A, B and C seem to work better than one would expect given the fact that the length-scales  $5h^{-1}M$  pc would be mildly non-linear in real space. M odel D shows considerable deviations from the N-body results at length-scales 5 s  $8h^{-1}M$  pc. Here again, the best t values of  $_{R}$  show considerable variations across the models. Also, for the same model, the best t  $_{R}$  changes considerably when the tting is done over length-scales 5 s 40 h<sup>1</sup> Mpc instead of 8 s 40 h<sup>1</sup> Mpc. This is particularly noticeable for M odel D where best t  $_{\rm R}$  decreases by 25% when the ting is extended to sm aller length-scales. This change is 10% for M odels A and C, and 5% for M odel B. It should also be noted that for M odel A, the best t R increases when the tting is extended to sm aller length-scales, whereas the e ect is opposite in all the other m odels.

We now turn our attention to the hexadecapole ratio  $_{4}=_{0}$  (Figure 4). Here again, for all the models we use the values of  $_{R}$  for which the model predictions for Q (s) give the best to the N-body results. The ratio  $_{4}=_{0}$  calculated with these values of  $_{R}$  are shown in Figure 4.We indication the range 10 22 h  $^{1}$ M pc the predictions of all the models fall below the N-body results, These deviations are within the 1 encoders and larger simulations are required before we can be really sure of the statistical significance of this elect. We have also tried this way are quite dimensions those obtained by thing  $_{2}=_{0}$  and Q (s) and we do not report these values here. This discrepancy may be indicating the inability of these models to adequately describe the hexadecapole  $_{4}$ , but further studies using larger N-body simulations with smaller encoders are required to reach a de nite conclusion.

#### 4 THE PAIRW ISE VELOCITY DISPERSIONS

The pairwise velocity dispersion is an important statistical quantity which sheds light on the clustering of matter in the universe. There are several approaches to determ ine the pairwise velocity dispersion on small scales from observations, for example, using the cosm ic virial theorem (Peebles 1980, Suto & Suginohara 1991, Del Popolo 2001) or by modeling the distortions in the redshift-space correlation function (eg. Davis, Geller & Huchra 1983, Davis & Peebles 1983, Bean et al. 1983, Mo,Jing & Borner 1993, Jing, Mo & Borner 1998, Jing & Borner 1998, Landy, Szalay & Broadhurst 1998, Ratcli e et al. 1998, Zehaviet al. 2002, Hawkins et al. 2002).

Our interest lies in the fact that the models which we have used to t  $s^{s}$  also make de nite predictions for the pairwise velocity dispersion at large scales where we expect linear theory to hold. The pairwise velocity dispersion  $2 \atop_{ij}^{2}$ , a symmetric rank two tensor, is de ned as the second moment of the relative velocities of galaxy pairs and its value can be calculated from the distribution function  $2 (r; v_1; v_2)$  as Z

$$\sum_{ij}^{2} (\mathbf{r}) = (v_2 \quad v_1)_i (v_2 \quad v_1)_{j-2} (\mathbf{r}; v_1; v_2) d^3 v_1 d^3 v_2 = [1 + (\mathbf{r})]$$
(25)

where i; j refer to di erent C artesian components. O ur work is restricted to large scales where linear theory holds in real space and we use 1 + (r) = 1. The most general form for  $\frac{2}{ij}(r)$  which is consistent with statistical hom ogeneity and isotropy is



F igure 1. This shows the monopole  $\frac{s}{0}$  as determined from our N-body simulations and the Virgo simulation. The normalization of the power spectrum used in the Virgo simulation is slightly di erent from the one used by us (Section 3.1), and the results from the Virgo simulation have been appropriately scaled to compensate for this. The gure also shows the predictions of the four models considered here for the value of  $_{\rm R}$  (Table II) which gives the best t to Q (s) in the interval 8 s 40 h  $^{1}$ M pc. The outcome of our simulations, the Virgo simulation and the best t predictions of all four models are indistinguishable from one another.



F igure 2. This shows the ratio 2 = 0 as determ ined from our N-body simulations and the V irgo simulation. It also shows the predictions of the four models considered here for the value of R which gives the best t in the interval 8 s 40 h <sup>1</sup>M pc (Table II).

$${}^{2}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}) = {}^{2}_{?}(\mathbf{r})_{ij} + [{}^{2}_{k}(\mathbf{r}) {}^{2}_{?}(\mathbf{r})](\mathbf{r}_{i}\mathbf{r}_{j}=\mathbf{r}^{2}):$$
(26)

Here  $\frac{2}{7}$  (r) is the pairwise velocity dispersion for the velocity component perpendicular to the pair separation r and  $\frac{2}{k}$  (r) is the dispersion for the velocity component parallel to r. The behaviour of  $\frac{2}{ij}$  (r) is completely specified through these two components  $\frac{2}{7}$  (r) and  $\frac{2}{k}$  (r). We next recollect the fundamental assumption underlying all the models which we have considered in the previous section is, the peculiar velocity of any galaxy has two parts, one arising from coherent ows and another from random motions. Under this assumption the two-point distribution function  $_2$  is the convolution of two distribution functions (eq.11) one describing the two-point statistics of the coherent ow and another for the random motions. U sing this in (equation 25) to calculate  $\frac{2}{ij}$  (r) gives us

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2} (\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (\mathbf{r}) + \sum_{k=1}^{2} (27)$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^{2} (\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{k=1}^{2} (\mathbf{r}) + \sum_{k=1}^{2} (28)$$

$$(28)$$

for all the models. Here  $\frac{2}{R}$  is the isotropic contribution from random motions, and  $\frac{2}{kC}$  (r) and  $\frac{2}{2C}$  (r) are the contributions from coherent ows.

Proceeding in exactly the same way as when using the models to t<sup>s</sup>, we assume that the coherent ows are related to the density uctuations through linear theory ie.  $\frac{2}{2}_{C} = \frac{2}{2}_{L}$  and  $\frac{2}{kC} = \frac{2}{kL}$ . This allows us to express  $\frac{2}{kC}$  (r) and  $\frac{2}{2}_{C}$  (r) in terms of the moments of the real space two-point correlation function (B haradwaj 2001) as

# Modeling non-linear e ects in redshift space 9



F igure 3. This shows Q (s) as determined from our N-body simulations and the V irgo simulations. It also shows the predictions of the four models considered here for the value of  $_{\rm R}$  which gives the best t in the interval 8 s 40 h  $^{1}$ M pc (Table II). The horizontal line at Q (s) = 0.57 is the constant value predicted by the linear theory of redshift distortions.



F igure 4. This shows the ratio  $\frac{4}{5} = \frac{5}{0}$  as determ ined from our N-body simulations and the V irgo simulations. It also shows the predictions of the four models considered here. It should be noted that model predictions are for the value of R which gives the best t to Q (r) and not  $\frac{4}{4} = \frac{5}{0}$  in the interval 8 s 40 h <sup>1</sup>M pc (Table II).

$${}^{2}_{kL}(\mathbf{r}) = {}^{2}\mathbf{r}^{2}\left[\frac{1}{3}_{1}(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{2}{15}_{4}(\mathbf{r})\right]$$

$${}^{2}_{2L}(\mathbf{r}) = {}^{2}\mathbf{r}^{2}\left[\frac{1}{3}_{1}(\mathbf{r}) - \frac{1}{2}_{2}(\mathbf{r}) + \frac{1}{15}_{4}(\mathbf{r})\right]:$$
(30)

In calculating  $\frac{2}{2L}$  and  $\frac{2}{2L}$  we have used the average real space two-point correlation function and its moments determined from our N-body simulations. In addition to  $\frac{2}{kL}$  and  $\frac{2}{2L}$ , all the models considered in this paper also need the value of R as an input to calculate  $\frac{2}{k}$  and  $\frac{2}{2}$ . In Section 3, for each model we have determined the best t value of R (Table II) for which the model predictions for Q (s) best m atch the N-body results in the range 8 s 40 h <sup>1</sup> M pc. We have used these values of

 $_{R}$  to calculate the pairw ise velocity dispersion predicted by each of these models. The two independent components of the pairw ise velocity dispersion ( $_{k}^{2}$  and  $_{?}^{2}$ ) were also determ ined directly from N-body simulations and the results are shown in Figure 5 and 6.

We nd that  $_{k}$  and  $_{?}$  determined from our N-body simulations decreases with increasing r at length-scales r 15h <sup>1</sup>M pc, after which it is more or less constant with possibly a very slow variation with r.O urN-body results are consistent with the high resolution simulations of Jenkins et al. (1998). It is in portant to note that the variation of  $^{2}_{ij}(r)$  with r plays an important role in redshift space distortions. For example, at linear order (eq.18) the redshift space two-point correlation function  $^{s}$  (s<sub>?</sub>; s<sub>k</sub>) depends explicitly on  $\frac{\theta^{2}}{\theta s_{k}^{2}} \frac{2}{p}$  (s<sub>?</sub>; s<sub>k</sub>) which is the second derivative of the line of sight component of the pairwise velocity dispersion. All the terms involving  $^{2}$  in the expressions for the di erent angular moments of  $^{s}$  (eqs. 4, 5



F igure 5. This shows  $_{k}$  as determined from our N-body simulation, along with the predictions of linear theory (eq. 29) and all the models considered in Sections 3. The models di er from the linear predictions in that they also have a contribution from random motions added in quadrature to the linear predictions (eq. 27).



Figure 6. This shows  $_{?}$  as determined from our N-body simulation, along with the predictions of linear theory (eq. 30) and all the models considered in Sections 3. The models di er from the linear predictions in that they also have an contribution from random motions added in quadrature to the linear predictions (eq. 28).

and 6) arise from this. The spatial variation of  $^{2}_{ij}(r)$  also plays an important role in determining <sup>s</sup> in equation (23) where all the non-linear elects of the mapping from real to redshift space are taken into account.

Turning our attention to the model predictions, we rst consider  $_{k}$  and  $_{?}$  calculated using only linear theory (eqs. 29 and 30) with the real space correlations (r) and its moments determined from N-body simulations. As inputs. We nd that these fall short of the values of  $_{k}$  and  $_{?}$  determined directly from N-body simulations. Also, the r dependence of  $_{k}$  and  $_{?}$  are quite diment, with the N-body results decreasing and the linear predictions increasing with increasing r. At length-scales r 25 h <sup>1</sup> M pc, the curves showing linear theory and the N-body results are approximately parallel, with the linear predictions being approximately 50 km = s below the N-body results.

The model predictions di er from the linear theory predictions in that they have a contribution from random motions  $_{\rm R}$  added in quadrature to the linear predictions (eqs. 27 and 28). One might hope that the contribution from random motions will compensate for the shortfall in the linear predictions relative to the N-body simulations, and the predictions of the two will match at least at length-scales r 25 h  $^1$  M pc where the two curves are parallel. The problem is that all the models predict di erent values for  $_{\rm R}$ , and the predicted values are too large. Model A which has the highest value of  $_{\rm R}$  fares the worst with the predicted  $_{\rm k}$  and  $_{\rm c}$  being much larger than the N-body results. The predictions of Models B, C and D are slightly closer to the N-body results, but they are all still very signi cantly higher than the N-body results. In sum mary  $_{\rm k}$  and  $_{\rm c}$  predicted by all the models are signi cantly in excess of the values determ ined directly from N-body sin ulations. This indicates that there is a gap in our understanding of what is really going on.

The possibility of using the pairw ise velocity dispersion as a tool for distinguishing between di erent cosm ological models

# Modeling non-linear e ects in redshift space 11

has been controversial and this has been hotly debated in the literature (eg. 0 striker & Suto 1990, Cen & O striker 1992, Couchm an & Carlberg 1992, Gelb & Bertschinger 1994, Zurek et al. 1994, Brainerd & Villum sen 1994, Brainerd et al. 1994, Som erville, Prim ack & Nolthenius 1997). An important fact that we should remem ber while measuring the pairwise velocity dispersion from N-body simulations is that it is a pair weighted statistic and is heavily weighted by the densest regions present in the sample. These regions naturally have the highest velocity dispersion and this tends to push up the estimate. The statistic is strongly dependent on the presence or absence of rich clusters within the sample (eg. Mo, Jing & Borner 1993, Marzke et al. 1995, Mo, Jing & Borner 1997, Som erville, Prim ack & Nolthenius 1997, Guzzo et al. 1997, Hatton & Cole 1999). It has also been con rm ed by several authors (eg. Sandage 1986, Brown & Peebles 1987, Willick et al. 1997, Strauss,O striker & Cen (1998)) that the velocity eld is very cold outside the clusters. We note that these elects are not very crucial in our work. This is because we have used exactly the same set of particles drawn from our N-body simulations to determ ine both <sup>s</sup> and <sup>2</sup><sub>ij</sub>, and we have been testing if the models which make reasonably good predictions for <sup>s</sup> are also successful in correctly predicting <sup>2</sup><sub>ij</sub>. We would expect this to be true because the peculiar velocities which are quantiled by the pairwise velocity dispersion are also the cause of the redshift space distortions. Surprisingly, we nd that the model predictions for <sup>2</sup><sub>ij</sub> are signi cantly in excess of <sup>2</sup><sub>ij</sub> determined directly from the simulations.

#### 5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.

The galaxy two-point correlation function determ ined from redshift surveys shows signi cant deviations from the predictions of the linear theory of redshift space distortion even on scales as large as 20  $30 \, h^{-1}$ M pc where linear theory is expected to be valid on real space. Any attempt to determ ine from redshift surveys requires that these deviations be properly modeled and taken into account. M odeling redshift space distortions basically requires a joint model for galaxy peculiar velocities and their correlations with the galaxy clustering pattern. Such models test our understanding of the gravitational instability process by which the large scale structures are believed to have form ed.

We have considered four dierent models (details in Section 2) for the redshift space two-point correlation function <sup>s</sup>. All the models are based on the assumption that galaxy peculiar velocities may be decomposed into two parts, one arising from coherent ows and another from random motions. It is also assumed that in real space the coherent ows are well described by the linear theory of density perturbation. Deviations from the predictions of the linear theory of redshift space distortion arise from two distinct causes which a ect the mapping from real to redshift space (a.) non-linear elects due to the coherent ows s (b.) the random motions. Among the four models, Model A does not incorporate the non-linear elects due to the coherent ows. It combines the predictions of the linear theory of redshift space (a.) Non-linear elects due to the coherent of the random motions which is modeled through an exponential distribution function for the pairwise velocity. This is the popular phenom enological model which has been widely applied to the analysis of galaxy redshift surveys (eg. Hawkins et al. 2002). Models B, C and D all take into account non-linear elects arising from the coherent ows (Bharadwaj2001), and they dier from one another in the choice of the distribution function for the random part of the pairwise velocity.

All the models have only one free parameter,  $_{\rm R}$  which is the one dimensional random pairwise velocity dispersion. For each model we have determined the value of  $_{\rm R}$  for which the model predictions best t the quadrupole anisotropy of <sup>s</sup> determined from N-body simulations. We nd that Model C gives the lowest value of the best t <sup>2</sup>= over the range of length-scales 8 s 40 h <sup>1</sup> M pc where we expect linear theory to be valid in real space. In this model the distribution function for the random part of a galaxy's peculiar velocity is modeled as an exponential function. It may be noted that the other three models also give acceptable ts to the N-body results.

We nd that three of the models (A, B and C) also give acceptable ts over length-scales 5 s  $40h^{-1}M$  pc which includes a small region where perturbations are expected to be mildly non-linear. M odel D where the distribution function f (v) for the random part of pairw ise velocity is a G aussian fails to give an acceptable t.M odel B where f (v) is an exponential gives the lowest value of best t  $^2$  = . It may be noted that though the best t value of  $^2$  = form odel A, the commonly used phenom enological m odel, is around three times larger than that for M odel B, it is not possible to draw a strong statistical conclusion as to which m odel is superior. This is because  $^2$  = < 1 for M odels A, B and C and they all provide acceptable ts. The present work is limited by the large statistical error-bars in the quantities determined at large scales from N-body simulations. These errors arise from the limited volume of the simulations (cosm is variance). It should be possible to achieve lower 1 error-bars using larger simulations whereby we could distinguish between these models at a higher level of statistical signi cance. We propose to carry this out in the future.

Interestingly, the best tvalue of  $_{\rm R}$  shows substantial variations across them odels. The best tvalue of  $_{\rm R}$  is substantially smaller in the models which incorporate the non-linear elects of the coherent ows (B, C and D) as compared to M odel A which does not include these elects. This indicates that there are significant nonlinear elects in the mapping from real to redshift space arising from the coherent ows. The commonly used phenomenological model does not incorporate these elects and in this model all deviations from the linear predictions are attributed to random motions. This leads to the pairwise velocity dispersion of the random motion ( $_{\rm R}$ ) being overestim ated. For eaxample, Hawkins et al. (2002) have used M odel A

# 12 B.Pandey and S.Bharadwaj

to t the redshift space two-point correlation function of the 2dFGRS to obtain the best t value  $_{R}$  = 506 52 km =s. The ndings of this paper show that M odels B and C would be equally successful in thing the same observation, and the best t value of  $_{R}$  would be different for each of these m odels. This raises questions as to the interpretation of  $_{R}$  determined by this method.

A lthough the models are all reasonably successful in thing the quadrupole anisotropies of  $^{s}$ , the model predictions for the pairwise velocity dispersion are much larger than the values determined directly from N-body simulations. Surprisingly, the predictions of linear theory which has a contribution from only the coherent ows and not the random motions are much closer to the N-body results as compared to the model predictions. At large scales the predictions of linear theory, all the models and the N-body results are all very similar. The linear theory predictions are slightly below the N-body results, and one would expect that it would be possible to recover the N-body results by combining the linear theory predictions with the contribution from random motions. Unfortunately, all the models appear to be overestimating the contribution from random motions and the model predictions are significantly in excess of the N-body results. A lso, the predictions of M odel A fare the worst in comparison to the other models. A possible explanation why equations (27) and (28) overpredicts the pairwise velocity dispersion is that the linear component of the peculiar velocity also makes a contribution to the random motions. It is possible that this is already present in  $_{\rm R}$ , and it contributes more than its due share to the pairwise velocity dispersion.

In the linear theory of redshift space distortions the hexadecapole anisotropy arises from the line of sight component of the pairw ise velocity dispersion. The fact that none of the fourm odels considered here give a very good to the hexadecapole is probably related to the fact that the models also do not predict the correct pairw ise velocity dispersion.

W e note that the assumption that galaxy peculiar velocities can be decomposed into two parts, one coherent and another random is consistent with the halo model. The random part may be attributed to motions inside the halo and the coherent part to the overall motion of the halo. Seljak (2001), W hite (2001) and K ang et al. (2002) have calculated the galaxy power spectrum in redshift space using the halo model. Sheth & D iaferio (2001) have calculated the pairwise velocity dispersion using the halo model.

In conclusion we note that the nonlinear e ects in the mapping from real to redshift space introduced by the coherent ows are important. Models which incorporate these e ects provide an equally good to the quadrupole anisotropies of <sup>s</sup> as compared to models which are based on the linear theory of redshift distortion. Unfortunately, none of these models make correct predictions for the pairwise velocity dispersion. This indicates that there is a gap in our understanding of the statistical properties of the peculiar velocities and their e ect on the redshift space two-point correlation function.

#### ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

BP is supported by a junior research fellow ship of the Council of Scienti c and Industrial Research (CSIR), India.SB would like to thank Jasjeet Bagla for a helpful discussion on the analysis of N-body simulations.SB would also like to acknow ledge nancial support from the Govt. of India, Department of Science and Technology (SP/S2/K-05/2001).Both authors would like to thank Jatush V Sheth for his help in analyzing the V irgo simulations.

The V irgo simulations used in this paper were carried out by the V irgo Supercom puting Consortium using computers based at Computing Centre of the M ax-P lanck Society in G arching and at the E dinburgh Parallel Computing Centre. The data are publicly available at www mpa-garching mpg de/N um C os

#### REFERENCES

Bharadwaj S., 2001, MNRAS, 327, 577 Bharadwaj S., 1997, ApJ, 477, 1 Bean, A. J., Efstathiou G. P., Ellis R. S., Peterson B. A., Shanks T., 1983, MNRAS, 205, 605 Brainerd, T. G., Brom ley B. C., Warren M. S., Zurek W. H., 1996, ApJ, 464, L103 Brainerd, T. G., & Villum sen J.V., 1994, ApJ, 436, 528 Brom ley B. C., Warren M. S., Zurek W. H., 1997, ApJ, 475, 414 Ballinger, W. E., Peacock, J.A. and Heavens, A. F., 1996, MNRAS, 282, 877 Brown, M. E., & Peebles, P. J.E., 1987, ApJ, 317, 588 Cen, R. & Ostriker, J.P., 1992, ApJ, 399, L113 Couchman, H. M. P., & Carlberg, R. G., 1992, ApJ, 389, 453 Davis, M. & Peebles, P. J.E. 1983, ApJ, 267, 465 Davis, M., Geller, M. J., & Huchra, J., 1978, ApJ, 221, 1 Del Popolo, A., 2001, MNRAS, 326, 667 Fisher, K. B., Davis M., Strauss M. A., Yahil A., Huchra J. P., 1994, MNRAS, 267, 927 Fisher, K. B., 1995, ApJ, 448, 494 Fisher, K.B. & Nusser A. 1996, MNRAS, 279L, 1 Gelb, JM ., & Bertschinger, E ., 1994, ApJ, 436, 491 Guzzo, L., Strauss, M. A., Fisher, K. B. Giovanelli, R., & Haynes, M. P., 1997, ApJ, 489, 37 Ham ilton, A.J.S.1992, ApJ, 385, L5 Hatton, S.& Cole, S. 1998, MNRAS, 296, 10 Hatton, S.& Cole, S. 1999, MNRAS, 310, 1137 Hawkins et al., 2003, MNRAS, 346,78 Heavens, A.F. and Taylor, A.N., 1995, MNRAS, 275, 483 Jenkins et al., 1998, ApJ, 499, 20 Jing, Y P., Mo, H.J., Bomer, G., 1998, ApJ, 494, 1 Jing, Y.P., Borner, G., 1998, ApJ, 503, 502 Jing, Y P., Bomer, G., 2001, ApJ, 547, 545 Kaiser, N. 1987, MNRAS, 227, 1 Kang, X., Jing, Y.P., Mo, H.J., Bomer, G. 2002, MNRAS, 336,892 Lahav O., Lile, P.B., Primack, J.R. and Rees, M., 1991, MNRAS, 251, 128 Landy, S.D., Szalay, A.S., Broadhurst, T., 1998, ApJ, 494, L133 Matsubara, T., 1004, ApJ, 424, 30 Mo, H.J., Jing, Y.P. & Bomer, G., 1993, MNRAS, 264, 825 Mo, H.J., Jing, Y.P. & Bomer, G., 1997, MNRAS, 286, 979 Marzke, R.O., Geller, M.J., da Costa, L.N. and Huchra, J.P., 1995, AJ, 110, 477 O striker, J.P., & Suto Y., 1990A pJ, 348, 378 Peacock, J.A. & Dodds, S.J., 1994, MNRAS, 267, 1020 Peacok, O. et al. 2001, Nature, 410, 169 Peebles, P.J.E. 1990, The Large-Scale Structure of the Universe, (Princeton: Princeton University Press) Ratclie, A., Shanks, T., Parker, Q.A. and Fong, R., 1998, MNRAS, 296, 191 Regos, E. & Szalay, A. S. 1995, MNRAS, 272, 447 Seljak, U., 2001, MNRAS, 325, 1359 Sheth, R.K. & Diaferio, A. 2001, MNRAS, 322, 901 Sheth, R.K. and Hui, L. and Diaferio, A. and Scoccim arro, R., ,2001, MNRAS, 325, 1288 Sandage,A.,1986,ApJ,307,1 Scoccim arro, R., 2004, astro-ph/0407214 Suto, Y., Suginohara, T., 1991, ApJL, 370, L15 Suto, Y., Jing, Y.P., 1997, ApJS, 110, 167 Strauss, M. A., Ostriker, J.P., Renyue, C., 1998, ApJ, 494, 20 Som erville, R.S. and Primack, J. and Nolthenius, R., ApJ, 1997, 479, 606 Som erville, R.S., Davis, M., & Primack, J.R., 1997, ApJ, 479, 616 Taylor, A.N. & Ham ilton, A.J.S. 1996, MNRAS, 282, 767 Tadros, H. and Efstathiou, G., 1996, MNRAS, 282, 1381 Verde, L. et al., 2002, MNRAS, 335, 432 W hite, M .,2001, M NRAS, 321,1 W illick, JA., Strauss, MA., Dekel, A., & Kollat, T., 1997, ApJ, 486, 629 Zehavi, I. et al, 2002, ApJ, 571, 172 Zurek, W H ., Quinn, P J., Salm on, JK ., & W arren, M S., 1994, ApJ, 431, 559