Orbital Param eters of Infalling Dark Matter Substructures

A.J.Benson

Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom (e-mail: abenson@astro.ox.ac.uk)

20 M arch 2024

ABSTRACT

We present distributions of the orbital parameters of dark matter substructures at the time of merging into their host hab. A courate know ledge of the orbits of dark matter substructures is a crucial input to studies which aim to assess the elects of the cluster environment on galaxies, the heating of galaxy disks and many other topics. O rbits are measured for satellites in a large number of N-body simulations. We focus on the distribution of radial and tangential velocities, but consider also distributions of orbital eccentricity and sem im a jor axis. We show that the distribution of radial and tangential velocities has a simple form and provide a tting form ula for this distribution. We also search for possible correlations between the infall directions of pairs of satellites, nding evidence for positive correlation at sm all angular separations as expected if some infall occurs along laments. We also nd (weak) evidence for correlations between the direction of the infall and infall velocity and the spin of the host halo.

Keywords: cosmology: theory - dark matter - galaxies: halos

1 IN TRODUCTION

In currently favoured cosm obgical models, dark matter halos grow via the merging together of smaller systems, leading to an ever-growing hierarchy of halos. Recent numerical simulations have demonstrated that the remnants of preexisting dark matter halos which merged to become part of a larger system (the \host") can survive for signi cant periods of time within the larger system (Moore et al. 1999; K lypin et al. 1998). These subhalos orbit around in the potential of the host gradually losing mass via tidal forces and spiralling in to ever smaller radii due to dynamical friction. These substructures (or at least some subset of them) are presumably the abodes of satellite galaxies, such as those found in the Local G roup, and of the majority of cluster galaxies.

This substructure has attracted a great deal of interest since its discovery. O bservational tests for its presence, though not yet conclusive, are in good agreem ent with the theoretical expectations (M etcalf & M adau 2001; C hiba 2002; D alal & K ochanek 2002). There has been m uch work conducted in which the distribution and properties of substructures, their e ects on galaxy disks and so on were exam ined (G higna et al. 1998; Torm en, D iaferio & Syer 1998; van den B osch et al. 1999; Zhang et al. 2002; B enson et al. 2004; G ao et al. 2004; D iem and, M oore & Stadel 2004). W hile the orbital param eters of substructures have been m easured in the past thism easurem ent has often been at the end point of the substructure evolution (i.e. at the present day) when signi cant dynam ical evolution in the orbital param eters is expected (e.g. G higna et al. 1998). Exceptions to this are the works of Torm en (1997), V itvitska et al. (2002) and Khochfar & Burkert (2004). Torm en (1997) and Khochfar & Burkert (2004) both identi ed progenitors of halos in their N-body simulations and measured the orbital param eters of them, while V itvitska et al. (2002) searched for pairs of halos about to merge and measured the orbital param eters of these. These works have typically made use of rather sm all sam ples of orbits and (perhaps consequently) have been unable to fully characterise the two dimensional distribution of orbital param eters needed to construct realistic orbits.

The distribution of initial orbital parameters of substructure halos at the time of merging into the host system is a particularly interesting property as it represents the initial conditions which determ ine the later evolution of the substructure within the host. The e ectiveness of many processes invoked to explain the morphological transform ation of galaxies in clusters (e.g. ram pressure stripping, tidal m ass loss, galaxy harassm ent, etc.) depend crucially on the nature of the galaxy orbit (see, for example, Moore, Lake & Katz 1998; Abadi, Bower & Navarro 2000). The distribution of orbits will also determ ine the rate of galaxy m ergers and therefore the degree of heating and rate of m orphological transform ation experienced by galaxy disks. Taking a m ore practical point of view, recent sem i-analytic m odels of satellite halo orbits (Benson et al. 2002; Taylor & Babul 2004) have been able to follow the orbital evolution of satellites quite accurately, but these models are only as good as

2 A.J.Benson

their initial conditions which, until now, have been known only rather poorly.

In this work, we quantify the distribution of orbital param eters for dark m atter halos at the point of m erging with theirhost (i.e. we proceed in a sim ilarway as did V itvitska et al. 2002). W em easure this distribution in a large num ber of N-body simulations to attain high statistical precision and to facilitate checks of our techniques and tests for variations of the distribution of orbital parameters with variables such as redshift, halo m ass etc. W hile we will present distributions of orbital eccentricity and sem i-m a praxis, our focus is on distributions of radial and tangential velocities, which we nd are more practical when dealing with orbits in nonspherical systems in which dynamical friction is at work^{\perp}. W e also exam ine the distribution of infalling substructures as a function of position on the virial sphere, and explore correlations between orbital properties and the spin of the host halo.

Our aim is to provide a precise and accurate m easurem ent of the distribution of orbital properties of substructures at the time of merging, and to provide ts to this distribution so that it may be used in further studies. This distribution could, in principle, depend on m any quantities, such as the masses of the merging halos, redshift, cosm ologicalparam eters etc. Furtherm ore, the six param eters describing each orbit (e.g. the position and velocity of the satellite at the time of merging, or any equivalent parameter set) m ay well be correlated with each other, such that we should really examine a six-dimensional phase-space distribution function. W ith the currently available N-body simulations we will lim it ourselves to exploring a two-dimensional function, typically that of radial and tangential velocities (effectively assuming that infalling satellites are uniformly distributed on a sphere around the halo centre and that their tangential velocities have no preferred direction), although wew ill explore correlations between these quantities and the host halo. We note also that the situation could in principle be m ore complicated still. W e are aim ing to quantify P (x), where x are the orbital parameters and P is the distribution of these averaged over all m erging events. H ow ever, after one m erger with param eters x1 the relevant distribution function for the next m erger m ay be di erent, P (x j_{x_1}). An example might be infall of halos along a lam ent. K now ing that one halo fell in from a particular direction, it becomes more likely that the next halo will fall in from a similar direction. W e will explore one aspect of this possibility by m easuring the distribution of angles between pairs of infalling satellites.

The remainder of this paper is arranged as follows. In x^2 we describe our analysis technique while in x^3 we present our results. We give our conclusions in x^4 .

2 ANALYSIS

2.1 N-body Simulations

To measure satellite orbital parameters we make use of a large number of N-body simulations carried out by the VIRGO Consortium and which are publicly available (see Jenkins et al. 1998; Kau mann et al. 1999.; Jenkins et al. 2001 for further details), together with one other simulation used for testing various aspects of our methodology. These span a range of cosm ologies and redshifts. Details of the sim – ulations used are given in Table 1. All of the outputs from these simulations are analysed, but in practise only those at redshifts z < 2 provide statistically useful measurements of orbital parameter distributions.

2.2 Group Finding

In order to nd merging dark matter halos in the simulations we must rst identify all dark matter halos. To locate dark matter halos in the N-body simulations we employ two standard group nders, the friends-of-friends (FOF; Davis et al. 1985) and spherical overdensity (SO; Lacey & Cole 1994) algorithm s. We will compare results for halos found using these two techniques to test for any dependence on the group nding algorithm used.

Each algorithm has one tunable parameter, the linking length, r_{link}, for the FOF algorithm and the mean density contrast inside the sphere, , for the SO algorithm .B oth can be related to the mean density of dark matter halos (once a specic halo density pro le has been chosen in the case of the FOF algorithm). We apply each algorithm twice, once assuming a mean overdensity for halos of = 18 2 177:7 (equivalent to $r_{link} = 0.20r$, assuming an isotherm al halo pro le^2 , where r is the mean inter-particle spacing in the simulation), as expected from the spherical collapse model in a critical density cosm ology (e.g. Peebles 1980), and once using the mean overdensity expected from the spherical collapse m odel for the speci c cosm ology and redshift in question (Lacey & Cole 1993; Eke, Cole & Frenk 1996). We will refer to these two alternatives as \ xed " and \variable " respectively, and will compare results from the two.

Once halos have been located by either algorithm we apply a procedure to remove unbound halos from the resulting catalogue. Our technique is described fully by Benson et al. (2001) and involves repeatedly removing the least bound particle from an unbound halo until the halo either becomes bound, or falls below the minimum mass required to be included in our catalogue.

 2 It is well known that cold dark matter halos are not well approxim ated by isotherm all spheres. However, if we instead adopt an NFW density prole (Navarro, Frenk & White 1997) for our halos the appropriate value of $r_{\rm link}$ ranges between 0.22r and 0.26r for halos with concentrations in the range 5 to 15. As such, a somewhat larger value of $r_{\rm link}$ may be appropriate. Nevertheless, we will retain the convention of assuming isotherm al halos here and resign a study of the most appropriate linking length to use to future work.

¹ Since the orbital param eters are constantly changing for such orbits, the eccentricity and peri-centric distance no longer have the advantage of being constant along the orbit. The orbital velocities are more closely related to the quantities required by sem i-analytic orbital models so we prefer to use them. The two pairs of orbital param eters (eccentricity+ sem i-m a pr axis and radial+ tangential velocity) are, of course, equivalent.

Table 1. The names, parameters and output redshifts of the N-body simulations used in our analysis. The rst two columns give the name of the simulation set and the cosm ological model respectively. Columns 3 lists the number of particles in each simulation, while columns 4 and 5 list the cosm ological parameters $_0$ and $_0$ appropriate to each simulation. Column 6 species the length of the simulation cube, while column 7 species the mass of each particle in the simulation. Column 8 gives the softening length used in the simulation. Finally, column 9 lists the redshifts at which outputs from the simulation are available.

S in ulation	M odel	Particles	0	0	L=h ¹ M pc	m _p =h	¹ M	l _{soft} h ¹ kpc	Redshifts
GIF	CDM	256 ³	0:3	0 : 7	141:3	1:4	1010	20	50, uniform in ln (a) from $z = 50$ to $z = 0$
GIF	OCDM	256 ³	0:3	0:0	141:3	1:4	10 ¹⁰	30	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
GIF	SCDM	256 ³	1:0	0:0	84 : 5	1:0	10 ¹⁰	36	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
GIF	СDМ	256 ³	1:0	0:0	84:5	1:0	10 ¹⁰	36	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
G IF —ii	СDМ	256 ³	1:0	0:0	84:5	1:0	10 ¹⁰	36	0.0
V irgo	CDM	256 ³	0:3	0 : 7	239:5	6 : 86	10 ¹⁰	25	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
V irgo	OCDM	256 ³	0:3	0:0	239:5	6 : 85	10 ¹⁰	30	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
V irgo	SCDM	256 ³	1:0	0:0	239:5	2:27	10 ¹¹	36	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
V irgo	СDМ	256 ³	1:0	0:0	239:5	2:27	10 ¹¹	36	0.0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0
VLS	CDM	512 ³	0:3	0 : 7	479 : 0	6 : 86	10 ¹⁰	30	0.0, 0.5, 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0

2.3 De ning the Halo Centre

To measure orbital properties of infalling satellites we need to de ne a centre (both in position and velocity) for each halo in order to have a suitable origin for our coordinate system. The simplest option is to determ ine the centre of m ass and the m ass weighted m ean velocity of the halo and take these as the origin. We call this \COM centring". Because of its simplicity we will exam ine results based upon this approach. However, while a simple centre of mass estim ate of the halo centre is reasonable if halos are sm ooth, spherical systems, in reality it has many failings (particularly when applied to FOF halos). The FOF algorithm often links together halos that are about to merge by a low density \bridge" of particles. This will skew the centre of m ass of the halo away from what perhaps should be considered the centre (e.g. the position corresponding to the centre of mass of the main component of the merging system). Because of this limitation we will adopt a second approach in which we de ne the centre of a halo as being the position of the particle with the lowest gravitational energy (counting only interactions with other particles in the halo). This will naturally pick out a particle in the densest region and, given two halos joined by a low-density bridge should pick out a particle in them ore massive of the two halos. How ever, we cannot take the velocity of this particle as being representative of the velocity of the halo, since its motion will consist of the mean halo motion plus a component due to the halo's internal velocity dispersion. Unfortunately, just as in position space, halos in velocity space can show bimodal distributions (as happens when a halo is linked to a nearby halo which is infalling). This can bias the mass weighted mean velocity estimate of the origin away from the \correct" value. To circum vent this problem we adopt a similar approach in velocity space as in position space. N am ely, we estim ate an \energy", , for each particle, i, us-_{i€i} 1=jvi ing i = v_j with the sum taken over all particles in the halo, and then locate the particle with the low est energy. This should lie close to the true m ean m otion of the halo. W e call this method M BP centring".

It is worth noting that the velocity origin can dier signi cantly between the two de nitions we adopt. Fig. 1 shows the centre of a particular halo from the z = 0 output of the G F CDM simulation in both position and velocity space. Each frame has its origin on the most-bound particle, as marked by the dashed lines, while the dotted lines indicate the centre of mass or mass-weighted mean velocity. In this example, the centre of mass almost coincides with the most bound particle (som ew hat fortuitously as nearby halos on either side, linked in by the FOF algorithm, are cancelling each other out). In velocity space how ever, we see that the velocity origin is shifted by over 500km /s from the more realistic velocity origin. This could seriously a ect our estimates of orbital parameters.

2.4 Satellite O rbital P aram eters

From our catalogue of dark matter halos in each simulation we search for pairs of halos which are about to merge. From here on, all velocities are measured in units of the virial circular velocity of the host halo, V_{vir} , and all radii in units of virial radius of the host halo, rvir, as we expect these to be characteristic scales of the system s^3 . We search for halos within a distance from the host centre between r = 1r, and which have an inward directed velocity, v (i.e. r < 0where r is the vector from the centre of the host to the centre of the potential satellite halo). We choose r = 0.2. Note that we allow for the possibility of halos with r < 1 since the non-spherical shape of real halos can perm it a halo to remain separate from the host even when r < 1. It should be noted that this radial selection biases us against nding m ergers between halos of com parable m ass (since in this case it is unlikely that the satellite will rem ain as an isolated halo once its centre is within 1+ r). For present purposes this bias is unim portant, and so we retain the above criterion for sim plicity. This bias could how ever, be easily circum vented by adopting a radial selection based upon the sum of the host and satellite virial radii instead. From the halos selected in this way, we com pute the radial and tangential com ponents

³ W e convert the com oving coordinates of the N-body simulation to physical coordinates and add on the Hubble ow to the peculiar velocities taken from the N-body simulations. Halo virial radii and velocities are determ ined from their masses assuming the halo to have the mean density appropriate to a just-collapsed spherical top-hat overdensity.



Figure 1. The results of using the COM and MBP algorithms to de ne the origin of the coordinate system in a dark matter halo identied in the z = 0 output of the GIF CDM simulation. The upper row shows three projections of the spatial distribution of particles. The intersection of the dashed lines indicates the origin according to the MBP algorithm, while that of the dotted line indicates the origin according to the COM algorithm. The lower row shows projections of the same halo in velocity space. D ashed and dotted lines are as in the upper row.

ofvelocity.W e also store the three dim ensional position and angular mom entum of the merging satellite.

Since we are interested in the orbital parameters of satellites as they cross the virial radius of a larger halo we correct our orbital param eters (which are measured at some radius close to, but not equal to, the virial radius). To do this we treat the two halos as point masses, and simply determine the point at which the satellite's orbit rst crosses the virial radius of the larger halo. W e store the position, velocity and angular momentum of the satellite at this point. This approach is an approximation for two reasons. Firstly, as the host halo is not a point mass, the mass interior to the substructure's orbit will change along that orbit. In practise this e ect is quite sm all, leading to only a 5% error in the orbital velocities. (Note also that the density pro le is not spherically sym m etric, which will lead to further errors.) Secondly, we neglect the e ects of dynam ical friction on the orbital param eters. A simple estim ate based upon Chandrasekhar's methods indicates that this would lead to an error in our orbital velocities of around 10% for a substructure to host m ass ratio of 0.08 (which is typical of the systems found in our simulations), scaling approximately in proportion to this ratio. All of these problems could be largely overcome by solving the equations of motion for the substructure in a realistic host potential including a dynamical friction term. This will be the focus of future work.

Some fraction of substructures are found to be on unbound orbits. This presents no problem for our analysisb, we can of course still measure the orbital param eters of such substructures, and so we retain these objects in our calculations. The fate of such substructures will be discussed below. Some substructures are found with r < 1 already inside the virial radius by our de nition. These substructures are propagated backwards along their orbit to nd their orbital param eters at the time of crossing r = 1 (as with all orbits, no account ism ade for any mass bas which m ight have occurred from these halos, nor for the e ects of dynam ical friction). Finally, we nd some halos whose orbits do not cross the virial radius of the host. Such halos are agged as being \bad" and are treated separately from other halos (see x3.1.2).

W e m ust also account for the fact that our selection of halos with 1 r < r < 1+ r leads to a bias against nding radial orbits as they will spend less time in this region than m ore circular orbits. To correct for this we simply determ ine, from the measured orbital parameters of the satellite, the time, t, it takes to traverse the region $r = 1+ r to r_{m in}$. Here $r_{m in}$ is the m inimum radius at which the satellite halo would have been identieed by the group nder. W hen constructing distributions of orbital parameters we then weight by t= t where t is the cosm ic time between the current N-body simulation output and the previous one (or t= 0 in the case of the highest redshift output).

The determ ination of $r_{\rm m \ in}$ depends on the group nder used. With the SO group nder it is relatively easy to determ ine $r_{\rm m \ in}$. Under the SO algorithm each halo is assigned a radius (the radius containing a mean overdensity of some specied value). Once all halos have been found any halo whose centre lies within the radius, $r_{\rm SO}$, of a larger halo is merged with that larger halo and removed from the list of individual halos. (Note that the radius of the larger halo is not changed by this merging.) Thus, $r_{\rm m \ in}$ is simply $r_{\rm SO}$, or 1 r, whichever is larger.

For the FOF group nder things are a little m ore com plicated as the halos found are not spherical. The satellite halo would no longer have been found as an isolated object by the group nding algorithm once any one of its particles came within a distance r_{link} of a particle in the larger halo. We therefore search for the st point along the orbit of the satellite at which any one of its particles com es within r_{link} of a particle in the larger halo. We de ne $r_{m in}$ to be the orbital radius at this point, or 1 r, whichever is larger. The advantage of this approach is that it works even for the non-spherical halos found by the FOF algorithm . Its disadvantage is that it treats the orbit as that of two point m asses and also ignores any internal evolution of the satellite or host halos during the time it takes the satellite to move along its orbit. This latter is not a problem providing the two halos are in internal equilibrium and not rotating since then, although the individual particles in the halos move, their distribution at any time provides a fair sample of the m ass distribution of the halo at any later time. Of course, in reality the halos will not be in equilibrium (although we expect them to be close to it). In particular, the FOF algorithm is known to make \dum bbell-shaped" halos by linking together two halos by a low density bridge. These are certainly not equilibrium systems in the sense used here. They are also those in which the two-body orbit approxim ation is likely to be worst. W e consider this to be a lim itation of the FOF algorithm, and do not explore more complicated ways of dealing with this problem here.

It should be noted that, with our method for locating merging halos, some host halosmay be experiencing mergers with multiple substructures at any given time. In fact, we nd that about 25% of all of our merger events at z = 0 involve two or more substructures accreting onto the same host halo. For the largest clusters we nd up to around twenty ongoing mergers in some cases. We nd very few mergers with low mass ratios (e.g. less than 4:1). As such, the inclusion or not of hosts currently underdoing major mergers does not a ect our results signi cantly.

3 RESULTS

W e exam ine the orbital param eter distributions for each individual output of each simulation. We will also combine results together where possible to improve the statistical precision. All results will make use of the FOF halo nding algorithm, MBP halo centring and the variable method for setting $r_{\rm link}$ / unless otherwise stated.

Figure 2 shows an example of the distribution of orbitalparam eters that we measure. The distribution of radial and tangential velocities (upper left and right-hand panels respectively) have quite simple, and perhaps unsurprising, 1 with a dispersion of order form s, being peaked at V unity. The infall angle, de ned as the (negative of the) angle between the infalling substructure's radius and velocity vectors (i.e. = $\cos^1 r \quad v=jr=jr$), is shown in the lowerleft hand panel. This distribution will be investigated further in x3.3. Finally, the lower right-hand panel shows the two-dimensional distribution of radial and tangential orbital velocities. It is clear that there is a signi cant correlation between these two param eters. A nother interesting feature of this distribution is that a signi cant fraction of orbits drawn from this distribution are initially unbound. The energy of orbits, in our units, is given by

$$E = 1 + \frac{1}{2f_2} V_r^2 + \frac{(2 f_2)^2}{f_2^2} V^2 ; \qquad (1)$$

where $f_2 = 1 + M_2 = M_1$. Note that $f_2 = M_2 =$ where = M₁M₂= (M₁ + M₂) is the usual reduced m ass. The dotted line in Fig. 2 shows the line E = 0 for the case $f_2 = 1$ (i.e. M₁ M₂). Points to the upper right of this line correspond to unbound orbits. For the particular distribution shown about 18% of all orbits are unbound. We choose to retain these orbits for two reasons:

(i) W hen using the measured distribution to select initial orbits for satellites, unbound orbits can easily be discarded if desired.

(ii) D ue to the e ects of dynam ical friction, an orbit that starts out unbound will not necessarily stay that way.

To exam ine the importance of this second point we employ the sem i-analytic model of Benson et al. (2004) which follow s the cosm ological grow th of dark m atter halos (and their associated galaxies) including a detailed treatment of the orbital evolution of satellite halos. In Benson et al. (2004) the initial orbits of merging satellites were determ ined by setting the energy of each orbit equal to that of a circular orbit at half the virial radius and choosing a circularity (i.e. the angular m om entum of the satellite in units of that of a circular orbit with the same energy) from a uniform distribution between 0.1 and 1.0. These choices were motivated by the results of G higna et al. (1998). Here, we instead use the measured distribution of orbital velocities, including unbound orbits, to set the initial velocity of satelites, and choose their initial position at random on a sphere with radius equal to the virial radius of their host. From this cosm ologically representative sample of halos and orbits, we identify those which start out unbound. Of these, som e fraction will lose su cient energy through dynam ical friction that they become bound by the endpoint of their evolution (i.e. by z = 0) while others will fail to do so and will instead leave their host halo with positive energy. We



F igure 2.D istributions of orbital param eters m easured in the VLS plus VIRGO CDM z = 0 output. Upper left and righthand panels show distributions of radial and tangential velocities respectively. The lower left-hand panel shows the distribution of infall angles, while the lower right-hand panel shows the two-dimensional distribution of radial and tangential velocities. C ontours are drawn at $d^2f=dV_rdV = 0.01, 0.1, 0.5, 1.0$ and 1.4 from lightest to heaviest lines. The division between bound and unbound orbits in this panel is shown by the dotted line.

nd that approximately 2% of all initially unbound orbits (equivalent to 0.3% of all orbits) fail to become bound and so escape their halo. As such, these \lost" satellites are only a sm all fraction of the total.

O ur results are in good agreem ent with previous work. Figure 3 shows a comparison of the distribution of tangential velocities with that found by V itvitska et al. (2002; our V is equivalent to their $L = L_{vir}$). Although the two distributions di er as judged by a ² test, the discrepancy is due to two points and plausibly re ects our ignorance of the true errors and the di erences in the simulations (e.g. softening, m ethod of force calculation etc.) used in this work and that of V itvitska et al. (2002).

3.1 Tests of the D istributions

F instly, we exam ine which, if any of our measured distributions are consistent with each other. This will allow us to determ ine which distributions we can realistically average together in order to improve the statistical precision of our m easurem ents.

3.1.1 Calibration of ²

We adopt a simple 2 test to determ ine if two of our m easured two-dimensional velocity distributions are consistent with each other. It should be noted that the errors which we determ ine for our distributions are likely to be an underestimate they account for the nite number of mergers in each bin, but ignore such contributions as errors in



F igure 3. The distribution of tangential velocities for orbits. C incles show results for the VLS plus VIRGO CDM simulations z = 0 output from this work, while crosses (o set horizontally slightly for clarity) show the results of V itvitska et al. (2002).

our determ inations of orbital velocities etc. G iven this, and the fact that our errors may not be norm ally distributed, we would ideally like a calibration of the ² test. To achieve this we com pare distributions from our G IF and G IF-ii CDM $z = 0 \sin u$ lations. Com paring both the FOF and SO results, with halo centres de ned using both centre of mass and most bound algorithm swe nd values of ² per degree of freedom which scatter around unity, with a mean of 1.05. A lthough we would ideally like many more independent simulations to test our errors this gives us con dence that the errors are a good approximation to the true uncertainty on each data point.

3.1.2 Distribution W ith and W ithout \Bad" O rbits

A small fraction of the orbits that we nd are agged as being \bad" in the sense that they do not pass through one or both of the radial lim its which we use for computing the weight to assign to each orbit. This may represent cases in which a halo form ed within the outer radial lim it (and so never passed through it), or, more likely, a lim itation of the simple, two-body orbit neglecting dynam ical friction that we use to approximate the motion of the halos. The best quess at a suitable weight for these orbits is to use their instantaneous radial velocity to determ ine the time taken to cross between the two radial lim its. However, we nd that the resulting distributions of orbital param eters for bad orbits dier signicantly (as judged by the ² test) from those of good orbits. Therefore, we adopt the approach of excising all bad orbits from our distributions. Ideally, we should dealwith these better by solving for the orbit correctly (i.e. including extended m asses and dynam ical friction) to see if they really dom erge and thereby assigning a realistic weight.

3.1.3 Number of particles per halo

Our halo nding algorithms retain only halos consisting of ten particles or more. To test whether particle num ber has any e ect on the measured distribution of orbit parameters we com pare m easurem ents of the orbit distribution in the VLS and VIRGO simulations with the equivalent GIF simulations, keeping halos with 10 or more particles in the VIRGO and VLS simulations and adopting an equivalent mass cut in the G IF simulations (49 or more particles per halo in the CDM and OCDM simulations and 227 or more particles in the SCDM and CDM simulations), such that the minimum mass of halos in each simulation is the same (this avoids any consequences of possible mass-dependent trends in the orbits).

We nd no evidence of any signi cant di erence between the velocity distributions constructed from halos with 10 or more particles and those with 5{20 times more particles from the GIF simulations. The measured values of per degree of freedom are scattered around unity and

are consistent with being drawn from a ² distribution (as judged by a K-S test).

W hile we would ideally like m ore extensive tests of the e ects of particle num ber⁴ we are con dent that by using halos containing ten or more particles we are obtaining an accurate m easure of the distributions.

3.1.4 Radial search lim its

W ealso wish to test whether our in posed lim its on the radial separation of halos a ects the distributions. To do this we use the independent G \mathbb{F} and G \mathbb{F} -ii CDM z = 0 outputs. Velocity distributions are constructed from both simulation outputs using radial search limits between r = 0.01 and r = 0.20 in steps of 0.01.W e then compute the ² statistic comparing the G \mathbb{F} simulation with r = 0.20 to the G \mathbb{F} is simulations with r < 0.2, and vice versa. We nd that the ² values stay reasonably constant as the radial search lim it is decreased, and certainly show no signs of becoming signi cantly larger than unity. As such, we conclude that the r = 0.2 search limit is su ciently small to allow an accurate determ ination of the velocity distributions.

3.2 Trends

Having established that the techniques em ployed in this paper are able to accurately determ ine the distribution of orbital velocities for infalling satellites we proceed to search for any dependence of those distributions on the masses of the halos, redshift and cosm ology. W hen testing for such dependence we adopt the approach of varying only one variable at a time, with the hope of isolating the cause of any trend we discover. W hile this is crucial to developing an understanding of the trends it signi cantly lim its the number of com parisons that we can make.



Figure 4.D istributions of radial (upper panel) and tangential (lower panel) velocities for the G IF and V IRGO SCDM z = 0outputs.

3.2.1 Mass Dependence

Since our distributions are constructed by combining the orbits of all the halos, irrespective of mass, in a given sim ulation output it is crucial that we rst test for the presence of any trends with m ass. To test for m ass-dependent trends we compare the G IF simulations with the VIRGO and VLS simulations. These have identical cosm ological parameters, and we use halos with 10 or more particles in each simulation. The only di erence then is the particle m ass and the corresponding m ass function of dark m atter halos.

We nd evidence for mass-dependence in the distributions of orbital param eters. Figure 4 shows distributions of radial and tangential velocities for G IF and V IRGO SCDM models at z = 0. There is a clear di erence between the two, with the VIRGO simulation showing larger radial and lower tangential velocities on average. Unfortunately, our samples of m ergers remain too sm all to provide an accurate determ ination of the nature of the m ass dependent trends.

3.2.2 Redshift and cosm ology

We next explore trends with redshift by comparing the results of outputs from the same simulation at dierent epochs. Speci cally we compute ² for pairs of outputs which dier by at least 50% in 1 + z to ensure that the sam ples are independent.W e nd strong evidence for di erences between these samples. However, as the mass function of dark matter halos is a function of redshift, we cannot disentangle any redshift-dependent trend from the known m ass-dependent trends. The current sim ulations do not possess enough halos to allow us to select a sub-sam ple ofm ergers by mass at each redshift in order to elim inate this problem .W e also nd signi cant di erences between m odels with di erent cosm ological param eters, but again cannot disentangle any possible m ass-dependent trends. To fully address

⁴ Ideally we would like a set of simulations identical in all respects apart from the number of particles used. This would perm it direct com parisons of the orbital param eters of individual merging events to be m ade.



F igure 5.D istributions of radial (upper panel) and tangential (lower panel) velocities for the VIRGO OCDM and SCDM z = 0:10 outputs.

these issues will require a set of custom N-body simulations designed to allow us to explore changes in the orbital param eter distributions in a controlled manner. (For exam ple, the current simulations have a variety of softening lengths, which may a ect our results. A dedicated set of N-body sim ulations could explore the e ects of this parameter on the distributions recovered.)

3.2.3 Group Finding Algorithm

We test for possible dependence on the group nding algorithm by comparing distributions of orbital velocities from the VLS CDM simulation with halos found using the FOF group nder, to those from the VIRGO CDM simulation with halos found using the SO group nder. We nd no evidence for any system atic di erence between the distributions based upon these two group nders, and so use the FOF algorithm throughout the remainder of this work.

3.2.4 Linking Length

We test for possible dependence on the linking length by comparing distributions of orbital velocities from the VLS CDM simulation with halos found using the xed (varying), to those from the VIRGO CDM simulation with halos found using the varying (xed) . The distributions are found to be form ally inconsistent with one another. Figure 5 shows a comparison. With the current statistical precision it is di cult to determ ine the exact nature of the di erence between xed and varying distributions. We will thus not explore this further, and will continue to use the varying method.



F igure 6.D is tributions of radial (upper panel) and tangential (low er panel) velocities for the VLS and VIRGO CDM z = 0 outputs.

3.2.5 Halo Centring Algorithm

W e test for possible dependence on the halo centring algorithm by comparing distributions of orbital velocities from the VLS and VIRGO CDM simulations with halos found using each algorithm (COM and MBP). The distributions are again found to be form ally inconsistent with one another. In Figure 6 we show a comparison for the z = 0simulation outputs. The di erences between the two distributions are clearly visible. We nd that the COM algorithm typically produces distributions of radial and tangential velocities which peak at lower values than the MBP algorithm . Aswedem onstrated in Fig. 1, the COM algorithm can easily nd an unrealistic origin in both position and velocity space. Figure 6 shows that this problem can signi cantly a ect the resulting distribution of orbital parameters. We prefer to use the more robust MBP algorithm, and do so throughout the rem ainder of this paper.

3.3 Fitting Functions

The results presented in this work are potentially of great value to any study involving the evolution of the substructure population of cold dark matter halos. To facilitate their use in this way we provide a simple tting function which describes the two-dimensional distribution of orbital velocities. Through simple variable transform ations this function also describes the distributions of substructure energies, angular momenta, eccentricities etc.

We nd that our measured two-dimensional distributions of orbital velocities can be reasonably well twith the following thing function:

f(v _r ;v) =	$a_1v exp$	ą (v	a,) ²	$b_{\rm r}$ (v)fv_r	bֲ(v)g²	;(2)
where							
b1 (v)	=	a₃ exp	a, (v	a _s) ² ;		(3)



F igure 7.D istributions of orbital param eters m easured in the VLS plus VIRGO CDM z = 0 outputs are shown by crosses. Upper left and right-hand panels show distributions of radial and tangential velocities respectively. The low er left-hand panel show s the distribution of infall angles, while the low er right-hand panel show s the two-dimensional distribution of radial and tangential velocities (solid contours). D ashed lines show the tting function, while histogram s show this function averaged over the same bins as used to measure the distributions. The dotted line in the low er left-hand panel indicates the distribution of infall angles that would occur if correlations between V_r and V were ignored.

$$b_2 (v) = a_6 \exp a_7 (v a_8)^2$$
: (4)
(5)

Note that this has a form similar to a two-dimensional M axwell-Boltzm ann distribution for the tangential velocity and a G aussian for the radial velocity, as m ight be expected from the results of V itvitska et al. (2002). However, the m ean and dispersion of the radial velocity distribution are a function of the tangential velocity, as is necessary to account for the correlation between these two velocities found in our distributions.

We have t this function to distributions of orbits taken from the combined VLS and VIRGO CDM simulations (the VLS simulation is the only one which provides su cient signal to noise to make thing worthwhile). Figures 7 through 9 show distributions of orbital velocities together with the thing function, while Table 2 lists the parameter values used in the ts.

3.4 Other quantities

O ther quantities which characterise the satellite orbits are easily derived from the two velocities V_r and V. For convenience, we list below expressions for several other orbital parameters in terms of these velocities.

Speci c energy:



Figure 8.AsFigure 7 but for z = 0.5.



Figure 9.AsFigure 7 but for z = 1:0.

$$E = 1 + \frac{1}{2f_2} V_r^2 + \frac{(2 f_2)^2}{f_2^2} V^2 ; \qquad (6)$$

Speci c angular m om entum :

$$= V$$
 (7)

E ccentricity:

J

$$e = \frac{V^2}{f_2} - 1 \frac{f_2}{V^2} + \frac{V_r}{V}^2$$
(8)

C ircularity:

$$= V - \frac{2f_2 - V_r^2 - V^2}{2f_2 - 1}$$
(9)

9

10 A.J.Benson

Table 2. Parameters of the tting function given in eqn. (2). Each column lists parameters which best t distribution of orbital parameters in the combined VLS and VIRGO CDM simulations at the speci ed redshift.

		R ed sh ift	
Param eter	0:0	0:5	1:0
a ₁	3.90	4.46	6.38
a ₂	2.49	2.98	2.30
a ₃	10.2	11.0	18.8
a4	0.684	1.11	0.506
a5	0.354	0.494	-0.0934
a6	1.08	1.16	1.05
a7	0.510	0.261	0.267
a ₈	0.206	-0.279	-0.154
ag	0.315	0.331	0.157

Sem i-m a jor axis:

$$a = \frac{f_2}{2f_2 \quad V_r^2 \quad V^2}$$
(10)

Pericentric distance:

$$r_{\text{peri}} = 4 \frac{f_2}{V^2} + 1 \frac{f_2}{V^2} + \frac{V_r}{V_t}^2 5$$
(11)

A pocentric distance:

$$r_{apo} = 4 \frac{f_2}{V^2} \qquad 1 \frac{f_2}{V^2} + \frac{V_r}{V_t}^2 \qquad (12)$$

3.4.1 Eccentricity and sem i-m a jor axis

W e have presented results for radial and tangential velocities, but of course can just as easily exam ine invariant param eters of the orbits, such as eccentricity and sem im a jor axis. Figure 10 shows distributions of these two param eters from the VLS CDM z = 0 output, together with the distributions in plied by our thing function. Our distribution of eccentricities is qualitatively, but not quantitatively, in agreem ent with that presented in the rst version of the preprint (i.e. astro-ph/0309611 version 1, hereafter K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1) by K hochfar & Burkert (2004), with m ost orbits being close to parabolic (e = 1). W e nd that alm ost half of all orbits have e = 1 0:1, a som ewhat sm aller fraction than the 70% given by K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1.

In fact, as we show in Fig. 11 our results are signi – cantly di erent from those of K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1. C om paring results from this work with those of K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1 we nd that our results, though peaked around e = 1, are more broadly distributed. K hochfar & Burkert (2004) use a di erent approach to nding m erging halos than we do⁵ and this could potentially in-

uence the results obtained. W e have im plem ented K hochfar & Burkert's (2004) methods on the GIF CDM simulations to test for any system atic e ects caused by the difference in methods. We have checked that our implementation produces eccentricities identical to theirs (K hoch far, private communication). Khochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1 did not add on the Hubble ow velocity to the motions of halos (K hochfar, private com m unication). U sing the K hochfar & Burkert (2004) m ethods we obtained the distributions shown by lled triangles and open squares in Fig. 11. (Filled triangles have no Hubble ow added to halo motions, while open squares do have the Hubble ow added.) We nd that we are able to reproduce the results of K hoch far & Burkert when using only halo peculiar velocities in our calculations, and are able to reproduce our own results when the Hubble ow is included.

As a second check, we have taken the distribution of orbital circularities found by Torm en (1997), who used techniques similar to K hochfar & Burkert (2004), and converted these into eccentricities using eqns. (8) and (9) (assuming $f_2 = 1$). Correcting for the fact that orbits with e > 1 are not included in the distribution of Torm en (1997) we nd an eccentricity distribution as shown by the crosses in Fig. 11.

W e conclude that these two di erent approaches to determ ining distributions of halo orbital param eters produce consistent results, providing they attempt to measure the same quantities. The di erences between the distributions of eccentricities reported here and by Khochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1 can be traced to the choice of whether to include the Hubble ow in particle velocities (as we did), or to use peculiar velocities, as did Khochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1⁶.

3.4.2 Correlations between pairs of infalls

W e can test for correlations between the infall directions of pairs of satellites m erging into the sam e halo. Figure 12 shows the distribution of angles between the radius vectors of pairs of satellites m erging into the sam e host halo.⁷ N ote

⁷ In this and subsequent gures exploring angles between pairs of satellites or satellites and the host halo spin we do not include our usual weights when constructing the distributions. Our weights re ect the fact that, due to the snapshot sam pling provided by the N-body simulations) we do not see all m ergers, but only those which occur within a short time after the snapshot. W hen constructing velocity (or eccentricity, sem i-m a praxis etc.) distributions, the weighting used corrects for the unobserved population of m ergers. To m ake the sam e correction when considering the infall angles here we must supplement the weight with an assumption about the angular distribution of the unobserved m ergers. W e m ake the sim ple assumption that the unobserved m ergers have the sam e angular distribution as those which we do observe. A s such, the resulting angular distribution is found from the observed m ergers without any weights. Note that this

⁵ B rie y, they locate the progenitors of a given halo at a slightly earlier redshift. T hey then m easure the orbital properties of these progenitors, providing they are separated by m ore than the sum of their virial radii. To ensure that the apparently m erging halos

are not m erely undergoing an unbound \setminus y-by" they also check that the centres of the halos have not m oved further apart by a later redshift.

⁶ A s a result of discussions regarding these di erences, K hochfar & Burkert have revised their calculations to include the H ubble ow (see the published K hochfar & Burkert 2004 or version 2 of the preprint). Their results are then in good agreement with those found in this work, as shown by the stars in Fig. 11.



F igure 10.D istributions of eccentricity (left-hand panel) and sem i-m a jor axis (right-hand panel) for the VLS plus V IRGO CDM z = 0 outputs are shown by the crosses with errorbars. The solid lines indicate the distribution resulting from the tting form ula of eqn. 2. The vertical dashed line the left-hand panel indicates parabolic orbits, and so the division between bound (< 1) and unbound (> 1) orbits. In the right hand panel, negative values of a correspond to unbound orbits. In this case the sem i-m a jor axis of the hyperbolic orbit is jaj.

that we have sum med the results from all simulation outputs to obtain this distribution. This is permissible as our aim here is to search for any deviation from uncorrelated infall directions. As such, it does not matter if the di erent outputs are correlated in di erent ways we would still see a di erence from the null hypothesis of no correlations. The distribution appears to di er signi cantly from that expected if there were no correlations between infall directions. This correlation between infall directions is qualitatively as expected if mergers tend to occur along laments, i.e. there is an enhancem ent in the num ber of mergers at sm all angles.

<30 , with a corresponding suppression of ${\tt m}$ ergers with angles around 90 .

3.4.3 Spin alignments

F inally, we can exam ine correlations between the infall direction and velocity of satellites and the spin angular momentum vector of the host halo. Figure 13 shows the resulting distributions. We nd marginal evidence for deviations from a uniform distribution on the sphere. In particular, there is a suggestion that merging satellites have a tendency to have velocities norm alto the spin axis of their host halo.

To assess the validity of these results will require a better calibration of our errors. For example, the direction of the spin vector may be poorly determ ined for low mass halos, a contribution to the errors that we do not take into account. (A lthough this e ect should presumably weaken any correlations, im plying that the true correlations are stronger than those we measure.)

assumption m ay be incorrect | for example, if the angular distribution correlates with infall velocity | but is at least simple.

4 DISCUSSION

W e have described m ethods for determ ining the orbital param eters of dark m atter halos at the point of m erging with a larger system. P revious studies of the orbital properties of m erging halos have typically considered the orbits after m erging with the host halo, in which case the orbits will have changed due to dynam ical friction. O ther studies (Torm en 1997; K hochfar & Burkert 2004) used techniques which are restricted to simulations with closely spaced outputs if they are to be accurate. Furtherm ore, we have analysed a substantially larger num ber of orbits than has been previously possible to obtain in proved statistical precision. T his allow s us to characterise in detail the two-dim ensional distribution of infall velocities.

O ur analysis pays particular attention to carefully identifying halos and their centres. We end that is is important to accurately identify the centre of the halo in both position and velocity space, and adopt a similar minimum \energy" de nition for both of these. We have demonstrated that our results are unbiased by e ects of particle num ber or radial search limit. In this work, we have focused on the twodimensional distribution of radial and tangential velocities which we show has a relatively simple form. A tting formula that describes this distribution is presented and should prove immensely valuable in future studies of satellite orbits.

O ur m ethods could be improved upon in several ways. A set of simulations run with m easurements of orbital parameters in m ind would allow a better determination of the accuracy of our error estimates. M ore and larger simulations would also improve the statistical accuracy of our m easurements and permit us to quantify the trends with, for example, m ass that are apparent in the distributions. Finally, a m ore detailed treatment of the evolution of the satellite



F igure 13. The distribution of angles between the infall direction (left-hand panel) and infall velocity (right-hand panel) of satellites and the angular m om entum of the host halo. Points show results measured by sum m ing m erger events from all simulation outputs while histogram s show the expectation when no correlations are present.



F igure 11. The distribution of orbital eccentricities. The quantity shown is the fraction of orbits in each eccentricity bin (i.e. following the form at of Figure 1 of K hochfar & Burkert 2004). Filled circles indicate the results of K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1, while crosses show the results of Torm en (1997). Open circles are results from this work combining all redshifts from the G IF CDM simulation using the M BP halo centring algorithm. Filled triangles show our im plem entation of K hochfar & Burkert's (2004) m ethods when no H ubble ow is added to the velocities of particles in the N-body simulations, while open squares show the sam e with the H ubble ow added. Stars indicate the results of K hochfar & Burkert (2004) which represent the sam e calculation as K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1 revised to include the H ubble ow .



F igure 12. The distribution of angles between the infall directions of pairs of satellites m erging onto the same host halo. Points show the distribution m easured by sum m ing results from all sim – ulation outputs while the histogram indicates the expectation for uncorrelated infall directions.

orbits (including the e ects of an extended, non-spherical host halo and dynam ical friction) would rem ove sources of system atic error in our measurem ents. All of these factors will be the subject of a future paper.

W e have presented evidence for the presence of trends with m ass (and, perhaps, with redshift and cosm ological param eters) in this distribution, although we are currently unable to accurately characterize these trends. Larger sam ples of N-body halo m ergers will allow us to both characterise these m ass trends and to select sub-samples with a narrow range in m ass to perm it trends with redshift and cosm ological parameters to be exam ined.

We have also explored the distribution of eccentricities and sem imajor axes. We nd that the eccentricity distribution is peaked around parabolic orbits (e = 1). This is qualitatively in agreement with the work of K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1. However, we nd quantitative disagreements with their distribution of eccentricities. This disagreement has been traced to the fact that the Hubble ow was included in our calculations, while it was not included in those of K hochfar & Burkert (2004) v.1. Once Hubble ow is included, as in the nalversion of K hochfar & Burkert (2004), the results of the two studies are in excellent agreement. O ur distributions of eccentricities and tangential velocities are also in good agreement with those from Torm en (1997) and V itvitska et al. (2002) respectively.

F inally, we searched for correlations between the infall directions of pairs of satellites and between the infall positions and velocities of satellites and the angular momentum of their host halo. We not evidence that satellites infalling onto a given host tend to arrive from similar directions, com – patible with the hypothesis that (at least some) infall occurs along laments. We not marginal evidence that infall directions and direction of motion are aligned with the spin-axis of the host halo, although a more thorough study would be required to both con m and interpret this possible correlation.

The evolution of sub-structures in cold dark m atter halos is currently a topic of great interest. The tools provided in this work should prove of great value in further such studies while the techniques described should perm it more accurate estim ates of orbital parameter distributions (including dependences on halo mass, spin, redshift, cosmology etc.) to be constructed.

ACKNOW LEDGEMENTS

A JB acknow ledges valuable discussions with Carlos Frenk, Joel Prim ack and T. J. Cox and thanks Sadegh Khochfar for providing data for Figure 11 in electronic form and for extensive discussions regarding eccentricity distributions. A JB also acknow ledges support from a Royal Society University R esearch Fellow ship. The simulations in this paper were carried out by the Virgo Supercom puting Consortium using com puters based at Com puting Centre of the Max-Planck Society in Garching and at the Edinburgh Parallel Com puting Centre. The data are publicly available at www.mpa-garching.mpg.de/NumCos.

REFERENCES

- AbadiM .G ., Bower R .G ., Navarro J.F ., 2000, M NRAS, 314, 759
- Benson A.J., Frenk C.S., Baugh C.M., Cole S., Lacey C.G., 2001, MNRAS, 327, 1041
- Benson A. J., Lacey C. G., Baugh C. M., Cole S., Frenk C. S., 2002, MNRAS, 333, 156
- Benson A. J., Lacey C. G., Frenk C. S., Baugh C. M., Cole S., 2004, MNRAS, 351, 1215

Chiba M ., 2002, ApJ, 565, 17

- DalalN.,Kochanek C.S.,2002,ApJ,572,25
- Davis M ., E fstathiou G ., Frenk C . S ., W hite S.D . M ., 1985, A pJ, 293, 371
- D iem and J., M oore B., Stadel J., 2004, M NRAS in press (astroph/0402160)
- EkeV.R., ColeS., FrenkC.S., 1996, MNRAS, 282, 263
- Font A . S., N avarro J. F., Stadel J., Q uinn T., 2001, ApJ, 563, L1
- G ao L., W hite S.D.M., Jenkins A., Stoehr F., Springel V., 2004, subm itted to M N R A S (astro-ph/0404589)
- G higna S., M oore B., G overnato F., Lake G., Quinn T., Stadel J., 1998, M N R A S, 300, 146
- Jenkins A., Frenk C. S., Pearce F. R., Thomas P. A., Colberg J. M., W hite S. D. M., Couchman H. M. P., Peacock J. A., Efstathiou G., Nelson A. H., 1998, ApJ, 499, 20
- Jenkins A ., Frenk C . S ., W hite S.D . M ., Colberg J.M ., Cole S ., Evrard A .E ., Couchm an H .M .P ., Yoshida N ., 2001, M NRAS, 321, 372
- Kau mann G., Colberg J.M., Diaferio A., W hite S.D.M., 1999, MNRAS, 303, 188
- Khochfar S., Burkert A., 2004, MNRAS submitted (astroph/0309611)
- K lypin A., G ottlober S., K ravtsov A.V., K hokhlov A.M., ApJ, 516, 530
- Lacey C.G., Cole S., 1993, MNRAS, 262, 627
- Lacey C.G., Cole S., 1994, MNRAS, 271, 676
- M etcalf R . B ., M adau P ., 2001, A pJ, 563, 9
- M oore B ., Lake G ., K atz N ., 1998, A pJ, 495, 139
- M oore B , G higna S , G overnato F , Lake G , Q uinn T , Stadel J , Tozzi P , 1999, A pJ, 524, 19
- Navarro J.F., Frenk C.S., W hite S.D.M., 1997, ApJ, 490, 493
- Peebles P.J.E., 1980, The Large Scale Structure of the Universe, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ
- Taylor J.E., BabulA., 2001, MNRAS, 348, 811
- Torm en G ., 1997, M N R A S, 290, 411
- Torm en G., Diaferio A., Syer D., 1998, MNRAS, 299, 728
- van den Bosch F.C., Lew is G.F., Lake G., Stadel J., 1999, ApJ, 515, 50
- Vitvitska M., Klypin A.A., Kravtsov A.V., Wechsler R.H., Primack J.R., Bullock J.S., 2002, ApJ, 581, 799

Zhang B., W yse R.F., Stiavelli M., Silk J., 2002, MNRAS, 332, 647