The Evolution of Substructure in Galaxy, Group and Cluster Haloes III: Comparison with Simulations

Jam es E. Taylor¹? y and A rif B abul²

¹Denys W ilkinson Building, 1 Keble Road, Oxford OX1 3RH, United Kingdom ²Elliott Building, 3800 Finnerty Road, Victoria, BC, V 8P 1A1, Canada

20 M arch 2024

ABSTRACT

In a previous paper, we described a new method for including detailed information about substructure in sem i-analyticm odels of halo form ation based on m erger trees. In this paper, we compare the predictions of our model with results from self-consistent num erical simulations. We nd that in general the two methods agree extremely well, particularly once num ericale ects and selection e ects in the choice of habes are taken into account. As expected from the original analyses of the simulations, we see some evidence for arti cial overm erging in the innerm ost regions of the simulated haloes, either because substructure is being disrupted articially or because the group-nding algorithm sused to identify substructure are not detecting all the bound clum ps in the highest-density regions. Our analytic results suggest that greater m ass and force resolution m ay be required before num erical overm erging becom es negligible in all current applications. We discuss the implications of this result for observational and experin ental tests of halo substructure, such as the analysis of discrepant m agni cation ratios in strongly lensed systems, terrestrial experiments to detect dark matter particles directly, or indirect detection experim ents searching for positrons, gam m a-rays, neutrinos or other dark matter decay products.

K ey words: gravitational lensing { m ethods: num erical { galaxies: clusters: general { galaxies: form ation { galaxies: haloes { dark m atter.

1 IN TRODUCTION

There is now very strong evidence from observations of the m icrowave background (Spergel et al. 2003), galaxy redshift surveys (e.g. Tegm ark et al. 2004), weak lensing measurements (e.g. Rhodes et al. 2004), and modelling of the Lyman- forest (e.g. K im et al. 2004), that most of the matter in the universe is non-baryonic dark matter, and that the power spectrum of density uctuations in this com ponent extends to subgalactic scales, as expected in 'cold' dark matter (CDM) models. The implications of the CDM power spectrum for structure form ation are wellestablished. D ark m atter haloes, the dense regions that surround galaxies, groups and clusters, form from the bottom up, through the merging of progressively larger structures. This process of hierarchicalm erging has been studied extensively, and the overall properties of galaxy or cluster haloes form ed in this way are now fairly well determ ined.

To learn m ore about dark m atter, and to search for fea-

tures in the power spectrum that could reveal new phases in the evolution of the very early universe, we must push the theory of structure form ation to sm aller scales. M ost of our current understanding of the properties of dark matter on subgalactic scales com es from num erical simulations of structure form ation. These simulations have been used to determ ine the evolution of large-scale structure and the formation of CDM haloes on scales ranging from the current horizon (Kau mann et al. 1999) down to the local neighbourhood (e.g. M athis et al. 2002). Furtherm ore, by selectively re-simulating sections of a large volum e at higher resolution, recent studies have been able to 'zoom in' on single objects, resolving the substructure within individual haloes in exquisite detail (e.g. recent work by D e Lucia et al. 2004; Gill, Knebe, & Gibson 2004a; Gill et al. 2004b; Gao et al. 2004a, 2004b; Diem and et al. 2004c; Weller, Ostriker & Bode 2004; Reed et al. 2004)

There is a hard lim it, however, to the dynam ic range that can be achieved using this approach of selective resimulation.Structure form ation m ixes inform ation on m any di erent scales as haloes form. To m odel the form ation of a dark matter halo accurately, one needs to include the

e ects of very long-wavelength uctuations as well as the smaller uctuations that produce substructure. The minimum scale that can be included in any self-consistent simulation of the form ation of a present-day halo is determ ined by the requirem ent that the largest uctuations in the volum e studied still be in the linear regim e at the present day, and by the nite num erical resolution available com putationally. For the highest-resolution simulations that are currently feasible, this leads to a minimum mass scale for resolved substructure of around 10 4 {10 5 of the m ass of the m ain halo considered. To study halo substructure below this m ass lim it requires analytic or sem i-analytic extensions to the num erical results. It is precisely this sort of sm all-scale inform ation, how ever, that is required in m any current applications including galaxy dynam ics, strong lensing, direct or indirect dark matter detection, or tests of dark matter physics in general.

In earlier work (Taylor & Babul 2001, TB01 hereafter), we developed a model for dynamical evolution of satellites orbiting in the potential of larger system . This model includes simple treatments of dynamical friction, tidal mass loss and tidal disruption. It calculates satellite evolution over a m any short tim esteps, rather like a restricted N -body simulation, but uses only global properties of the satellite to determ ine its evolution, thus reducing the com putational expense considerably. More recently (Taylor & Babul 2004a, paper I hereafter), we have applied this model of satellite evolution to the m erging subcom ponents involved in the hierarchical form ation of galaxy, group or cluster haloes, creating a full sem i-analytic m odel of halo form ation. In a second paper (Taylor & Babul 2004b, paper II hereafter), we presented the basic predictions of this model, including distributions of subhalo mass, circular velocity, location and m erger epoch, and the correlations between these properties. W e found results sim ilar to those of recent num erical studies, as well as for a few system atic di erences.

In this paper, we com pare the predictions of the sem ianalytic model directly with the results of self-consistent num erical simulations of halo form ation. This com parison is particularly interesting, since the only free parameters in the sem i-analytic model were xed in paper I, either by m atching restricted simulations of individual subhaloes (to

x the param eters of the dynam ical m odel), or by assum ing self-sim ilarity in the merging process (to x the one free parameter in the pruning method). Thus we have no remaining parametric freedom when comparing our results to self-consistent simulations, making the comparison a meaningful one. O verall, we will show that there is reasonable agreem ent between the sem i-analytic and num erical results, particularly in regions where both are expected to be accurate, but also that there are system atic di erences between their predictions. These could re ect inaccuracies in the sem i-analytic model, but closer exam ination of the num erical results suggests that at least part of the discrepancy is due to arti cial num erical e ects in the simulations. The quantitative estimate of the magnitude of these e ects has interesting implications for the analysis of several recent observational results.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2, we summarise brie y the sem i-analytic model developed in paper I. In section 3, we describe the six simulated haloes used in our comparison, and analyse the general properties of their subhalo populations. In section 4, we compare the properties of individual subhaloes, as well as the cum ulative distributions of subhalo m ass or circular velocity, in sem i-analytic m odel and in the num erical simulations. In particular, we exam ine the evidence that the central regions of the simulated haloes are subject to articial overm erging. In section 5, we consider the implications of overm erging in two particular areas, the modelling of strongly-lensed systems, and the analysis of direct detection experiments. We sum marise our conclusions in section 6. Finally, we note that as in papers I and II, in this paper we will generally consider results for the form er Standard' CDM (SCDM) cosm ology with h = 0.5 and $_8 = 0.7$, because the simulations we com – pare to assumed this cosm ology. In general, ourm ain results depend only weakly on cosm ology, as discussed in paper II.

2 REVIEW OF THE SEM I-ANALYTIC MODEL

In paper I, we introduced a sem i-analytic m odel for studying the form ation of dark m atter haloes and the evolution of their substructure. In this section we will review brie y the m ain features of this m odel. The m odel is explained fully in T B 01 and paper I, and a m ore detailed sum m ary is given in paper II.

The sem i-analytic model consists of several components: a method for generating merger trees, an algorithm for bruning' these trees, to determ ine how many distinct satellites merge into the main system within the tree, an analytic model to describe the subsequent evolution of these satellites, and a model for the concurrent evolution of the main system. The halo merger histories are generated using the merger-tree algorithm of Som erville and K olatt (1999). Higher order branchings in these trees are then pruned, using the method described in paper I, to determ ine whether each branch merging with the main trunk contributes a single subhalo or a group of associated subhaloes to the main system. This produces a single list of subhaloes merging with the main system at various redshifts. Each subhalo from this

nallist is the placed on a random orbit starting at the virial radius of the main system, and evolved using the analytic model of satellite dynamics described in TB01, experiencing orbital decay due to dynamical friction, and heating and stripping due to tidal forces. Haloes which were associated with a given parent before pruning fall in together with the parent on similar orbits, as part of a kinem atic group.

The properties of the main system also change over time, its mass growing according to the merger tree and its concentration changing according to the relations in Eke, Navarro, & Steinmetz (2001, ENS01 hereafter). Although no baryonic component is included in the models presented here, one can easily be added, given a prescription for gas cooling and star form ation.W e assume, unless speci ed otherwise, that the main system has a Moore density pro le and a concentration or scale radius given by the relations in ENS01.0 ur ducial system, a 1:6 10^{12} M halo at z = 0 in a SCDM cosm ology, has a concentration $q_{\rm M} = 10.3$, a scale radius r_{s;M} = 30:5 kpc, a virial radius r_{vir,m} = 314:1 kpc, and a virial velocity (or circular velocity at the virial radius) $v_{virm} = 148 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. We note that this concentration is typical for a galaxy of this mass (EN S01); galaxy clusters would be about half as concentrated, this di erence should

be kept in m ind when comparing our results with simulations of m ore m assive system s. On the other hand, real galaxy haloes have large concentrations of baryonic m aterial at their centres, and through adiabatic contraction they m ay have become m ore concentrated than the system s considered here; this possible di erence should be kept in m ind when com paring with observations.

In all, the dynam icalm odel has two main free param eters { the Coulom b logarithm s which m odulates dynam ical friction, and the heating coe cient $_{\rm h}$ which modulates m ass loss. (A third param eter discussed in TB01, the disk logarithm d, is not used here since we are considering evolution in a single-component potential). The precise disruption criterion (say the fraction of the binding radius used to de ne fais), the form chosen for the density pro le of the satellites and the pro le of the main system, and various other model choices will also a ect som e of our results, though not very strongly. W e discuss the m odel-dependence of our results in paper II. Here we generally present results for the default param eter values discussed in paper I, specifically s = 2.4 (where the magnitude of dynamical friction scales as (M) = $_{\rm s}$ + ln (M $_{\rm h}$ =140 M $_{\rm s}$) if m < M =140, and $(M) = {}_{s}$ form M = 140, and ${}_{h} = 3:0$. The disruption criterion assumes either $f_{\rm d\,is}$ = 0:5 (model A) or $f_{\rm d\,is}$ = 0:1 (m odel B). G iven these param eter choices, the pruning param eters are xed iteratively as discussed in paper I.

3 NUMERICAL PREDICTIONS FOR HALO SUBSTRUCTURE

3.1 Review of the simulations

To test the accuracy of our model and compare it with fully num erical results, we will exam ine the properties of substructure in six di erent haloes extracted from highresolution simulations. The basic properties of these haloes are listed in table 1, along with the references in which the original simulations are described. The subhalo lists extracted from these simulations were supplied by their respective authors; in some cases they di er slightly from the data sets used in the references listed, as the simulations have been reanalysed subsequently. W e will start by exam ining these datasets in detail, to quantify how much scatter is expected in subhalo properties from one system to another.W e note that a much larger sam ple of CDM haloes, simulated at comparable or higher resolution, has recently becom e available (D e Lucia et al. 2004; D esai et al. 2004; Gill et al. 2004a, 2004b; Diem and et al. 2004c; Gao et al. 2004a, 2004b; W eller et al. 2004; R eed et al. 2004). W herever possible, we will also consider this more recent work.

The objects named Com a' and Virgo I' are a massive and an interm ediate-m ass cluster halo, respectively, extracted from the simulations of Moore et al. 1998 (M 98 hereafter). Virgo IIa' and Virgo IIb' are actually two di erent outputs from the same simulation of a Virgo-sized cluster, at redshifts 0 and 0.1 respectively. The cluster, described in G higna et al. 2000 (G 00), is a higher-resolution re-simulation of a system rst discussed in G higna et al. 1998 (G 98). Androm eda' and the M ilky W ay' (the Local G roup') are a close pair of galaxy-size haloes selected because of their resem blance to the two m ain system s in the real Local G roup.

The Evolution of Substructure III 3

They are described in M oore et al. 1999b (M 99b) and their substructure is analysed in M oore et al. 1999a (M 99a).

These simulations were all performed in a 'standard' CDM (= 1, h = 0:5, $_8 = 0:7$) cosm ology. For purposes of com parison, we have generated our sem i-analytic results assuming the same cosmology. The simulations cover a wide range of m ass, and also a range in m ass resolution and softening length, as indicated in table 1. They typically have severalm illion particles within the virial radius, and a softening length of less than 1 percent of the virial radius. A lthough these simulations were perform ed several years ago, this combination of mass and force resolution has only recently been surpassed m ore than a factor of $1.5\{2, and even$ then only in a very few simulations (e.g. Diem and et al. 2004c; G ao et al. 2004b). V irgo IIa and IIb have particularly high force resolution, as well as their high m ass resolution. Com a has com parable mass resolution but more softening, while Virgo I, Androm eda and the Milky W ay have lower m ass resolution, and are also m ore heavily softened.

The substructure in these simulations was identied using the group nder SK ID (Stadel 2001; available at http:// hpccastrowashingtonedu/tools).SKID identi esgroupsby nding local maxima in the density eld, linking them together with a friends-of-friends algorithm , and then rem oving unbound particles iteratively. It produces estimates of the structural properties of each bound group of particles, including its total m ass, its outer radius (the radius of the outerm ost bound particle), the radius at which its rotation curve peaks, and the value of the peak circular velocity. We have all of this inform ation for the subhaloes in the V irgo II and LocalG roup simulations, and more limited information for the st two simulations. Of the various properties measured by SK ID , we will assume that the total m ass M $_{\rm s}$ is slightly m ore reliable than the outer radius, since the latter depends on the position of the single outerm ost particle. We will also consider the peak velocity $v_{\rm p\,;s}$ of each subhalo, as an indicator of its density pro le and concentration.

W enote that the structural properties of individual subhaloes in simulations are subject to important numerical e ects. This has been demonstrated by carrying out idealised simulations of satellites in xed potentials, at much higher resolution than is possible in self-consistent simulations where haloes form naturally from cosm ological initial conditions (Hayashi et al. 2003, H 03 hereafter; K azantzidis et al. 2004). Even in a static potential, determ ining rotation curves for subhabes to an accuracy of 10 percent after a few orbits requires resolving them with more than 10⁵ particles initially (i.e. a few times 10⁴ after mass 5 loss { Kazantzidis et al. 2004). Given the steepness of the cum ulative velocity function, a 10 percent error in velocity can change the num ber of subhaloes at a given velocity by 30{40 percent, so even errors of this order should be taken into account. Force softening also has a direct e ect on sm all subhaloes, placing an upper lim it on their circular velocity when they are su ciently dense. Finally, the group-nding algorithms used to identify substructure in self-consistent simulations often depend explicitly on the local density of a subhalo's environm ent. Thus subhalo properties should be treated with caution even in high-resolution simulations.We will discuss these issues further in sections 4.1 and 4.2 below .

F inally, we need to normalise the properties of each set of num erical subhaloes, in order to compare them on



F igure 1. The cum ulative relative m ass functions for the two highest-resolution simulations, C om a (solid line) and V irgo II (dashed line; shown at z = 0.1). The dotted lines are power-laws with slopes -1.31 and -0.96. The top axis shows the equivalent subhalo m ass in a system with the ducial m ass 1:6 10^{12} M. The vertical lines indicate the 32-particle and 320-particle m assresolution lim its for each simulation.

the same footing. To do so, we divide the mass of each subhalo by M virm, the mass of its parent halo within its virial radius, and divide the peak velocity of the subhalo by vvirm, the circular velocity of its parent halo at the virial radius¹. W here necessary we can then scale these relative values to our sem i-analytic m odel values, multiplying them by $M = 1.6 \quad 10^{12} M$ and 148 km s^{-1} , respectively. W hen counting the num ber of subhaloes over som em ass or velocity threshold, we generally lim it ourselves to the region within the virial radius of the main halo, since the sem i-analytic results are incomplete beyond the virial radius, as they do not include subhaloes that have not yet fallen in past this point. This procedure produces relative distributions or scaled distributions that can easily be com pared with one-another and with the sem i-analytic results. Furtherm ore, we expect the properties of each system to be similar when scaled in this way, since structure form ation should be fairly close to scaleinvariant over the range of halo masses considered here.

3.2 Scatter in the num erical distributions

¹ In the case of the Local G roup' haloes, the m ass of the m ain halo was measured at z = 0, whereas our outputs are for z = 0.2. We have assumed that the halo m asses were 0.885 of their nal value at this redshift, based on the average accretion rate m easured in our m erger trees. The virial radius for an object of a given m ass is also sm aller at z > 0, since it is de ned in term s of a xed overdensity relative to the background.



Figure 2. Cumulative relative mass and velocity distributions from various simulations of haloes on cluster (top panels) and galaxy (bottom panels) scales. The top left-hand panels show the cum ulative m ass functions for V irgo I (dotted line) and V irgo IIa & IIb (solid and dashed lines), while the bottom left-hand panel shows the relative mass function for Androm eda (solid line) and the M ilky W ay (dotted line). The bottom axis shows m ass relative to the virial m ass, while the top axis shows the m ass scaled to our ducial halo. A line of slope is also shown on each plot. The vertical lines indicate the 32-particle and 320-particle m assresolution lim its for each simulation, and the right-hand panels show cum ulative distributions of peak circular velocity for V irgo IIa & IIb (top right) and for the Local G roup (bottom right), as well as lines of slope . The bottom axis gives the value relative to the virial velocity of the main halo, while the top axis gives the velocity scaled to our ducial system .

3.2.1 The shape of the mass function

Fig. 1 shows the cumulative relative mass functions for all subhabes within the virial radius of two systems, Com a (solid line) and Virgo IIb (dashed line). The full vertical lines indicate the mass for each simulation corresponding to 32 particles. In the original analysis of the simulations, this was generally chosen as the limit below which the results from the group nder became signi cantly incom plete, and the structural param eters of subhabes unreliable. In fact we expect resolution e ects to rem ain important at much larger masses. As discussed in Diemand et al. (2004a), the mean relaxation time for cuspy systems with density pro les sim ilar to those of subhaloes is less than a Hubble time when they are resolved with a few hundred or even a thousand particles. Furtherm ore, this calculation assum espresent-day densities (e.g. a half-m ass radius of 24 kpc for a system of mass 3:5 10⁹M, versus 20 kpc for an isolated halo of the same mass at z = 0 in our model). For systems which form ed at redshift z the relaxation tim e should be shorter by a factor $(1 + z)^{3=2}$. Thus we also include shorter lines show ing a 320-particle mass, below which most systems should be arti cially relaxed.

In each case, the cumulative mass function is roughly a power-law at interm ediate m asses. The slope of the m ass function di ers substantially between the two simulations, however { it is about 0:96 for Virgo IIb and 1:31 for Com a, as indicated by the dotted lines. A priori, it is not clear whether this di erence is due to intrinsic, halo-to-halo variation in the mass function, the di erent masses of the two systems, their redshifts or their di erent internal dynam ical states, or whether it is the result of di erent softening and m ass resolution. The latter seem s unlikely given the large di erence even for well-resolved $(10^3 \{10^4\})$ subhaloes. From the discussion in paper II, it seems likely that dynam ical age is an important factor. The progenitor of the Com a' halo form ed in isolation and was fully relaxed at z = 0 (M 98), while Virgo IIb, at a redshift of 0.1, contains m assive subsystems that have not yet been stripped or disrupted to the sam e degree.

W e also see in this gure that at low masses, the cumulative mass function deviates from a power-law well before the 32-particle lim it of the group- nder is reached, but som ewhere in the 100{300 particle range below which relaxation m ay be important. Here again, though, it is not clear how m uch of the curvature of the m ass function is real and how m uch is num erical. W e will discuss this further when we com pare these results to the sem i-analytic predictions.

3.2.2 Dependence on halo mass

We can test whether the mass function depends on halo mass in a simple way by comparing results for galaxy and cluster haloes. Fig. 2 shows the relative mass functions for all the simulations of V irgo-sized haloes (top left panel), as well as the mass functions for the two galaxy-sized haloes (bottom left panel). The top axis indicates the equivalent subhalo mass and circular velocity in our ducial system (i.e. for M virgm = 1:6 10^{12} M). The vertical lines indicate a 32-particle and a 320-particle lower mass limit in each simulation.

All ve scaled m ass functions are similar, although both the norm alisation and the slope vary by 20 percent. The variation in norm alisation depends on our convention for rescaling the distributions; if we were to count all the haloes within 1.5 r_{virgm}, for instance, then Androm eda would have m ore satellites than the M ilky W ay.W e will only count subhaloes within 1.0 r_{virgm}, how ever, as the sem i-analytic results are incom plete beyond this point, as explained previously.

The variation in slope is also hard to de ne precisely, since the mass functions deviate from a power-law at both large and small masses, either for physical reasons or for num ericalones. Still, there is a signi cant di erence between the two sets of mass functions. The thin solid lines show a rough t to the slope of the mass function at interm ediate mass, with the logarithm ic slope indicated on the plot. The trend in the slope going from galaxies to clusters is the opposite of the one in Fig. 1, in the sense that the less massive system s have steeperm ass functions, so it cannot be explained simply in term sofhalo mass. Instead it may re ect the dynam ical ages of the di erent system s, as discussed above and in paper II. In this case, the Local G roup haloes would be system atically older than V irgo, just as C om a is.

Sim ilar results have been reported recently for -CDM simulations. De Lucia et al. (2004), for instance, nd loga-

rithm ic slopes of 0:97 to 0:98 for the m ass function on cluster scales, and 1:11 to 1:13 on galaxy scales (although the quantity they t is dn (M)=d (log (M)) versus log (M), for power law distributions the slope of this quantity has the same numerical value as the logarithm ic slope of the cumulative distribution). The trend to steeper slopes for sm aller haloes is as in Fig. 2.

3.2.3 Shape of the cum ulative velocity distribution

The right-hand panels of F ig. 2 show the cumulative distributions of peak velocity, either relative to the virial velocity of the main system (bottom axis), or scaled by our ducial value of 148 km s⁻¹ (top axis). These are also well described by power-laws at interm ediate mass, as indicated by the thin solid lines. The logarithm is slope is indicated on the plot. For self-sim ilar haloes we expect v_p / M^{-1-3} and therefore = 3 ; in practice the slope seem s slightly steeper than this, perhaps indicating that the small subhaloes are more

concentrated than the large ones. The velocity distributions show stronger deviations from a power-law at small velocities than the mass functions do at low m asses; we will discuss a possible explanation for this in section 42.

F inally, we note that these m ass and velocity distributions are sim ilar to, and consistent with, others that have appeared in the literature (e.g. K lypin et al. 1999b; 0 kam oto & H abe 1999; Springel et al. 2001; G overnato et al. 2001; Stoehr et al. 2002; D e Lucia et al. 2004; D esai et al. 2004; G ill et al. 2004a; D iem and et al. 2004c; G ao et al. 2004b; W eller et al. 2004; R eed et al. 2004; N agai & K ravtsov 2004). In particular, CDM habes appear to have alm ost identical substructure, consistent with the results of paper II, and the intrinsic variation in the cum ulative distributions from one hab to another are sim ilar to those reported here.

4 COM PARISON BETW EEN NUMERICAL AND SEM I-ANALYTIC RESULTS

4.1 Cumulative distributions

W enow turn to the comparison between num erical and sem ianalytic results. W e will consider results for the dense inner regions of the halo and the lower-density outer regions separately, since numerical e ects may a ect the form er to a greater degree, as discussed in section 4.3 below . The righthand panel of Fig. 3 shows the cum ulative mass function, for all substructure between 0.5 and $1:0 r_{vir,m}$ from the centre or each halo. O ver this range of radii, our m odel reproduces the num erical results alm ost exactly, both in norm alisation and in scatter. For massive haloes, the cumulative distribution in the sem i-analytic haloes is very sim ilar to those in the high-resolution simulations. All three simulations lie below our average value, but the o set is a sm all (20 percent, or about equal to the halo-to-halo scatter, on average), so it may not be signi cant. There are several e ects such dynam ical age that could explain this o set, but we do not expect our prescription for m ass loss to be accurate to m uch better than 10{20 percent in any case, as discussed in paper I.

At smaller masses (M $_{\rm s}~<~10~^4M_{\rm virm}$), the sem i-analytic model predicts 30{40 percent more substructure



F igure 3. The cum ulative m ass function predicted by the sem ianalytic m odel, in the inner (left-hand panel) and outer (righthand panel) parts of the halo. The thick lines show the average result for a hundred SCDM m erger trees, for m odel B at z = 0. The thin solid lines show the 1- variance for this set. The thin lines are the norm alised cum ulative m ass functions m easured in the three highest-resolution sim ulations (dashed lines { V irgo IIa and IIb; dotted lines { Com a). The vertical dotted and dashed lines indicate the 32-particle and 320-particle resolution lim its of the num erical results. The solid vertical line indicates the resolution lim it of the sem i-analytic trees.

above a given m ass threshold. It seems likely that at least some of this o set is due to numerical e ects such as relaxation, since here we are below the lim it of a few hundred particles where the relaxation time becomes shorter than the Hubble time (D iem and et al. 2004a). O verall we conclude that in the outer part of the halo, where the properties of substructure are most robustly determined in the simulations, the two sets of results are in acceptable agreement.

On the other hand, in the region interior to 0:5 rvir;m (left-hand panel), the sem i-analytic mass function predicts roughly 2.5 times more substructure above a given mass threshold than is seen in the num erical simulations. In terms of the halo-to-halo scatter, all three num erical m ass functions lie 2 below the average value in the sem i-analytic trees. The cum ulative velocity functions (Fig. 4) show a sim ilar pattern. This suggests that the two methods disagree signi cantly about how quickly substructure is stripped or destroyed in the central regions of a halo. Unfortunately, it is not clear which result is more accurate. As seen in paper II, central subhaloes are generally older and they will have experienced more mass loss and tidal heating on average, having orbited many times in a strong and changing potential. Since m any of these central system s will be heavily stripped, the sem i-analytic predictions about their residual bound m ass be less accurate than for younger system s. O n the other hand, the simulations will also be less accurate for old system s and at sm all radii, due to the cum ulative e ects of relaxation and arti cial heating. M oreover, it is harder



F igure 4. The cum ulative peak circular velocity functions predicted by the sem i-analytic m odel. The left-hand panel shows results for haloes within half the virial radius; the right-hand panel shows results for haloes between 0.5 and $1 r_{\rm virm}$. The thick lines are the average result and 1- contours for a hundred SCDM m erger trees, for m odel B at z = 0. The thin lines are the normalised cum ulative velocity functions m easured in the V irgo IIa and IIb sim ulations.

for group nders to identify substructure correctly in dense regions (G ill et al. 2004a), and the subhab m asses and velocities they determ ine in these regions can be biased by the background density. Thus it may be that sem i-analytic predictions for substructure are in fact more accurate than simulations in the centres of halos (say within 0.3 $r_{vir,m}$).We will discuss this further in section 4.3.

4.2 Individual subhaloes and the role of softening

W e can also com pare the properties of individual habes directly. F ig. 5 shows a com parison of the sem i-analytic subhabes (left-hand plots) and the num erical subhabes (righthand plots), in terms of their mass and their peak circular velocity. The num erical results, from top to bottom, are from the M ilky W ay, Androm eda, V irgo IIb, and V irgo IIa habes. The m asses and velocities in the simulations have all been rescaled to the m ass and velocity of the parent halo in the sem i-analytic m odel, as explained in section 3.1, and in each pair of panels we have only plotted system s above the m ass-resolution lim it of the num erical data in the right-hand panel.

Overall, the distributions seem remarkably similar. Comparing them in detail, however, we note some minor di erences. The sem i-analytic model predicts the existence of low-mass, high-density (high-v_p) systems, for instance, which are not seen in the simulations. This is partly because the forces in the simulation are softened over a nite length r_s , such that the potential generated by a set of particles of mass M is limited to ' GM = r_s , placing a correspond-

The Evolution of Substructure III 7



Figure 5. The distribution of subhaloes as a function of their m ass and of their peak velocity, in the sem i-analytic m odelA (lefthand plots) and the simulations (right-hand plots). The num erical values have been scaled to the mass and circular velocity of the m ain halo (see text). The dashed lines indicate the regions of the plot excluded by softening.

ing lim it on v_p . The dashed lines in each of the left-hand panels indicate the locus of this $\lim it$, for the values of r_s listed in table 1. As expected, none of the num erical subhaloes lie above this line, whereas we might expect som e to in the low -resolution simulations (upper two panels). The high-resolution simulations (lower two panels) fall well short of this lim it, although they may be still subject to relaxation and other e ects.

W e also see that the num erical distributions generally extend to lower circular velocities at a given mass than the sem i-analytic distributions. This may be partly due to softening, but another explanation is shot noise in the particle distribution for these systems. Low mass haloes will have few particles interior to r_p, so subtracting a single particle from a halo can reduce its peak velocity substantially. This m ay explain the greater scatter in the lower left-hand corner of each of the num erical distributions.

We can model the e ect of softening explicitly by assum ing that the circular velocity is determ ined by the radial force, $v_c = rF_{T}$, and using the force softening to reduce v_c accordingly. The forces in these simulations were spline softened, that is the potential generated by each particle was calculated as $= s(r=r_s)$, where s, the softened potential, is a polynom ial P_1 (r=r_s) for 0 r r_s, a polynom ial P₂ (r=r_s) for r_s r 2r_s, and equal to the New tonian potential beyond this (where r_s is the softening length of the simulation). We can account for this by reducing the radial force accordingly; this reduces the peak velocity when r_{p} is close to the softening length rs. To simulate shot noise, we can assume that the number of particles within r_p varies random ly by N, thereby introducing a scatter into haloes where M (< rp) is close to mp, the particle mass. Fig. 6



scaled mass (M_{\odot})

Figure 6. As Fig. 5, but including some of the e ects of force softening and mass resolution in the sem i-analytic results (lefthand panels).

shows the distribution of velocities and masses, with both shot noise and softening taken into account.W e see that our modi ed distributions are now very close to those found in the simulations, particularly at low resolution.

F inally, we can re-exam ine the cum ulative velocity function with softening taken into account. Fig. 7 shows the cumulative (peak circular) velocity function for subhabes, with line styles as before. The sem i-analytic results have been softened as in Fig. 6, with a softening length corresponding to that used in the simulations shown. The upper panels are for the higher-resolution Virgo II simulations, in which the softening length was $r_s = 0.0005 r_{vir,m}$ (or 170 pc in our ducial system), while the lower are for the Local G roup simulations, in which the softening length was roughly $r_s = 0.005 r_{vir,m}$ (or 1.7 kpc in our ducial system). As before, the sem i-analytic predictions m atch the simulations reasonably well in the outer parts of the halo, but predict 2{3 times more substructure above a given velocity threshold in the inner parts. Com paring the upper and lower panels, we see that softening alone may account for most of the di erence between the high-resolution and lowresolution num erical results in the amplitude of the cum ulative velocity function below vs=vvirm 0:15. The m atch between the softened sem i-analytic predictions and the sim ulations is still not exact, how ever (e.g. the disagreem ent in the amplitude of the mass function at $r < 0.5 r_{virm}$), suggesting there may be other resolution e ects we have not considered.

Indeed, there are several well know sources of arti cial heating in N-body simulations that we have not accounted for so far. Internal relaxation will reduce the mass, circular velocity and potential of each subhalo arti cially, on a tim escale roughly proportional to the num ber of particles. For system s resolved with fewer than 300 particles, this tim escale is shorter than the H ubble tim e, as m entioned



F igure 7. A verage cum ulative peak circular velocity functions predicted by the sem i-analytic m odel, including the e ects of softening. M erger trees and line styles are as in F ig. 4. The softening length in the upper panels, $r_s = 0.0005 r_{virm}$, is comparable to that in the V irgo IIa and IIb simulations (dotted lines), while the lower panels show sim ilar results using a softening length of $0.005 r_{virm}$, along with the norm alised LocalG roup distributions (dotted lines).

previously, so only the youngest objects will be una ected by relaxation. The 'graininess' of the background potential will also heat system s articially, particularly at early times when the main halo is poorly resolved. These e ects have been studied extensively in the literature in the context of the overm erging problem ', as discussed in the next section.

4.3 Spatial distributions and the evidence for overm erging

4.3.1 Radial distributions com pared

The results of section 4.1 suggest that the simulations m ay underestim ate the am ount of substructure in the central regions of haloes. In early simulations, the dissolution of substructure within haloes, referred to as byern erging', rendered simulated system s almost completely smooth (see van K am pen 1995; M oore, K atz, & Lake 1996; or K lypin et al. 1999a for discussions of the problem).0 verm erging is known to occur to some degree even in high-resolution simulations (G higna et al. 2000), and should be strongest in the old, dense central regions of haloes (D iem and et al. 2004a). The results of section 4.1 suggest that it could still be im portant over a fairly large range of radii.

We can quantify the elects of overmerging by comparing the radial distribution of substructure in our model and in the simulations. The top three panels of Fig. 8 show the local density of subhaloes at a given radius, relative to the mean density within the virial radius, $n(r)=\overline{n_{vir,m}} = (N (< r)=dV(r))=(N_{vir}=V_{vir})$. The connected points with error bars show the results in three simulations, and the upper solid

lines show the predictions of sem i-analytic models A and B.W e saw in paper II that the radial distribution of subhaloes is biased by incom pleteness if we go below the mass resolution lim it of the merger tree. To avoid this bias, the sem i-analytic results shown in the left and middle panels include only systems with masses in excess of 5 10^7 M , while the num erical results are lim ited to an equivalent relative m ass range, M $_{s}=M_{vir,m} > 3$ 10 ⁵. The resolution lim it of the MW 'simulation is actually worse than this, so in the right-hand panel we cut both the num erical and the sem ianalytic results at $10^8 M$. The dashed line shows a M oore density pro le of concentration q = 5.4 (roughly appropriate for galaxy or cluster mass haloes), also norm alised to the m ean density within the virial radius. W e note that sim ilar num erical results have been presented recently by several authors (Gill et al. 2004a; Diem and et al. 2004c; Gao et a. 2004; Reed et al. 2004; Nagai & K ravtsov 2004).

The local density pro le has the disadvantage of being quite noisy in the central regions of the halo, and its overall appearance depends partly on the choice of radial bins. In the bottom panels, we therefore show the cumulative number of subhaloes within a given fraction of the virial radius, norm alised to the total number within the virial radius, since this quantity is monotonic and requires no binning. The mass cuts are the same as in the top panel, and the dashed lines show the mass of the main halo interior to a given radius, norm alised to the mass within the virial radius.

Both num erical and sem i-analytic models agree that subhaloes are antibiased with respect to the underlying density distribution, and both agree on the distribution in the outer parts of the halo, at $r > 0.3 r_{vir,m}$. In the central region, however, the sem i-analytic model predicts a substantial excess of subhaloes com pared to the simulations { n (r)= \overline{n}_{vir} 10 at 0.2 $r_{\text{vir},\text{m}}$, whereas 20 at 0:1 $r_{vir,m}$ and 7 and in V irgo IIa the values are 5 respectively. A s an indication that the sem i-analytic result is robust, we see that the excess depends only weakly on the disruption criterion used (the upper and lower sem i-analytic curves correspond to models B and A respectively). On the other hand, with increasing resolution (three panels, right to left) the num erical distributions gradually become more concentrated, approaching the sem i-analytic results in the highest-resolution case. Thus it seems likely either that overm erging is still in portant in the inner regions of the simulated haloes, or that the group nders used to generate the num erical datasets have m issed substructure in the central regions. W e w ill discuss this further in section 4.5.

O verm erging at the level we are suggesting should also reduce the am plitude of the cum ulative m ass function w ith in the virial radius, but the overalle ect w ill be sm all, because even in our sem i-analytic m odels, relatively few subhabes at found at sm all radii. Since the sem i-analytic m odel predicts that only 25{30 percent of all habes w ithin the virial radius are at radii of 0.2{0:3 r_{virm} or less, the change in the am plitude of the m ass function would only be 25{30, even if overm erging destroyed all objects in these regions. Thism ay explain why sim ulations have previously shown good convergence in the cum ulative distributions of subhabes w ithin the virial radius as a function of resolution (e.g. Springel et al. 2001; D iem and et al. 2004c; G ao et al. 2000b). These distributions are dom inated by subhabes relatively far from the



Figure 8. Top panels: The number density of subhaloes in three simulations (connected points with error bars), and in the sem ianalytic haloes (upper solid lines), for models A and B. To avoid incom pleteness, the sem i-analytic results include only system s with masses in excess of 5 10⁷ M (left and m iddle panels) $or 10^8 M$ (right panel), and the num erical results have been restricted to the sam e relative m ass range. In each case the density is relative to the mean number density within the virial radius. The dashed line shows the density pro le of the main halo, norm alised to the m ean density within the virial radius. Bottom panels: The cum ulative num ber of subhaloes vs. radius, norm alised to the number within the virial radius, for the same mass cuts as in the top panel. The dashed lines show the mass of the main halo interior to a given radius, norm alised to the mass within the virial radius.

centre of the potential, which are less in uenced by num erical e ects, and thus they will not be sensitive to central overm erging.

On the other hand, it seems more surprising that convergence studies have seen no major change in the radial distribution of substructure (D iem and et al. 2004c; N agai & K ravtsov 2004). This may be partly due to the obscuring effects of halo-to-halo scatter, halo concentration or binning, which make it di cult to identify statistically signi cant differences between two density distributions. It may also be that the convergence in the radial distribution of substructure is very slow; we will discuss this further in section 4.5.

4.3.2 Results for variant models

O verm erging of the m agnitude suggested by these results would have important implications in m any astrophysical situations, notably the interpretation of strong lensing observations and direct detection experiments. Thus, it is interesting to consider how strongly these results could be a ected by uncertainties in the sem i-analytic m odelling. We have compared number density proles for the variants of the m odel considered in paper II with our ducial results. W hile the proles change in predictable ways (e.g.m ore dy-



Figure 9. As Fig. 8, but for various cuts in subhalo properties. The left-hand panels show the results of ignoring all subhaloes stripped beyond som e fraction of their original mass (dotted lines); the right-hand panels show the results of ignoring all system s the form ed before a given epoch (dotted lines).

nam ical friction or less mass-loss produces more central substructure over a given mass threshold), the variation is generally comparable to the di erence between models A' and B' shown in Fig. 8.

On the other hand, it m ight be that our analytic m assloss m odel system atically underestim ates m ass loss in system s that have been heavily stripped. To get a sense of how large an e ect is required to reproduce the num erical results, we have calculated num ber density pro les excluding system s that retain only 2 percent, 5 percent, or 10 percent of their originalm ass. These are shown in the left-hand panels of F ig. 9 (dotted lines), along with the pro les from the three simulations (solid lines with points { note the m ass resolution lim it for the M ilky W ay results is higher) and the

ducial results for m odel B (upperm ost solid line). We see that even if we treat as disrupted all system s that have lost 90 percent of their m ass, we still produce m ore central substructure than the highest-resolution simulation, albeit only by a factor of 2 or so. The results of H ayashi et al. suggest that bound cores can survive in system s that have lost 99 percent of their m ass or m ore, so it seem s unlikely that our m ass-loss predictions are incorrect to a degree su cient to resolve the discrepancy with the num erical results.

We can also get a feel for the plausibility of substantial num erical overm erging by considering how long subhabes have orbited within the main system. The right-hand panels of F ig. 9 show number density proles excluding the oldest subhabes, those that rst form ed at redshifts of more than 6.0, 2.0 or 0.5 (dotted lines). A sexpected from the results of paper II, substructure is stratile ed with respect to its age, so the central substructure we predict in excess of that found in the simulations is mainly old { alm ost all of the central system s form ed before a redshift or 0.5, when the universe

was roughly half its present age, and most form ed before z = 2, when the universe was less than 20 percent of its present age. This material would have undergone many orbits in the dense central regions of the main system or its progenitors, so it seems very plausible that articial num erical heating could have caused it to disrupt prematurely. We will reform ulate this argument more precisely in the next section. Finally, we note that while the radial distributions of substructure do vary system atically from one halo to another if we bin haloes by their form ation epoch, as in paper II, the variation is generally small (com parable to the difference between models A and B).

4.4 Subhalo kinem atics

If overm enging is in portant, it will also a ect the distributions of other subhalo properties. Fig. 10 com pares the kinem atics and dynam ical state of subhaloes in the sem i-analytic and num erical models. The top two panels in each column show subhaloes from two di erent sem i-analytic haloes; the third panel show sall subhaloes from the second of these that form ed at $z_{m \ i}_{0} < 2$, and the bottom panel show s subhaloes from the V irgo IIa simulations. For the sem i-analytic results, open symbols represent systems that have lost more than 90 percent of their original mass, while the symbol shape indicates form ation epoch (triangles: $z_{m \ i}_{0} < 0.5$; squares $z_{m \ i}_{0} = 0.5$ {2.0; circles $z_{m \ i}_{0} > 2.0$). In each case, all subhaloes within the virial radius and over a mass limit of 10 ${}^{5}M_{virm}$ are included.

The left-hand column shows velocity versus orbital circularity. In paper I, we discussed the initial and nal circularity distributions in our model. As Fig. 10 shows, the nal circularity and velocity distributions for a sem i-analytic system and the V irgo IIa subhaloes are very sim ilar. G iven that the orbital properties of subhaloes in the sem i-analytic model are the result of a com plex superposition of several e ects, including the initial energy and angular momentum distributions, dynam ical friction, selective disruption and the grow th of the main halo, this agreem ent is very encouraging.

Them iddle column shows velocity versus position. Both in the sem i-analytic and in the numerical results, the distribution is bounded by the same well-de ned upper limit at any given radius. The line indicates that this boundary is roughly $v_{m ax}(r) = v_{vir,m} (r=r_{vir,m})^{1=3}$ down to $r=r_{vir,m} = 0.1$. The sem i-analytic model clearly predicts more substructure in the central regions, and thus a higher central velocity dispersion for the subhabes as a group.

F inally, the right-hand colum n shows orbital energy versus position. The overall distributions are very di erent, the sem i-analytic m odel predicting m any m ore very strongly bound subhaloes. M ost of these systems are very old, how - ever, and disappear if we restrict the sam ple to system s that form ed after z = 2 (third panel from the top). Thus we see the same e ect discussed in the previous section, namely that the older systems predicted in the sem i-analytic m odels are absent in the num erical results.

4.5 C om parison with sem i-analytic results: sum mary

In sum m ary, in this section we have used a set of highresolution simulations to estim ate the average properties of halo substructure, as well as the intrinsic scatter from one halo to the next, and the variation with halo m ass or concentration. C om paring these simulations with the predictions of our sem i-analytic m odel, we nd that while there is an overall similarity in the results, the level of agreem ent depends on the location, m ass and age of the subhaloes.

4.5.1 The outer halo

In the case of interm ediate or high-m ass subhabes in the outer regions of the hab, for which the num erical results are expected to be most reliable, the agreem ent between the two m ethods is excellent; the cum ulative m ass and velocity distributions of the three high-resolution simulations all lie within 1{2 times the hab-to-hab scatter of the average value predicted by the sem i-analytic m odel, and the overall di erence between the average sem i-analytic and num erical results is less than 20 percent.

Assuming this o set is signi cant, there are several effects that could introduce system atics at this level. Possible e ects in the sem i-analytic model include the various approximations in the dynamical component of the model, harassment between subhaloes (cf.paper II), or the preferential selection of haloes with older or younger form ation epochs. On the latter point, we note that the simulations discussed here generally selected relaxed systems from larger volumes to study at high resolution; thus they do not constitute an unbiased sample of the dark matter haloes in a given mass range. The V irgo simulations, for instance, were of a cluster that had acquired 80 percent of its nalm ass by a redshift of 0.75, which is unusual for an object in this mass range (G 98, Fig. 3). We can see from paper II, Fig. 14 that if we were to select out the oldest merger trees from our sets of sem i-analytic haloes, we would obtain an even closer match to the simulations.

Possible e ects in the num erical results include softening, shot noise, or problem s with the group nder, all of which change the interpretation of the results from a single output of the simulation, as well as some more serious problem s, notably two-body relaxation, which actually modify the dynam ics of simulated system s. The increased o set between the sem i-analytic and num erical results at sm all masses may indicate the greater in portance of these e ects in poorly-resolved system s. O verall, how ever, we conclude that for interm ediate or high-mass subhabes in the outer regions of the hab, the two methods are consistent with each other to good accuracy. We note that this agreement is achieved without adjusting any free parameters { the param eters in the sem i-analytic model have all been xed previously by other considerations, as discussed in paper I.

4.5.2 The inner halo

On the other hand, in the inner regions of the halo, where numerical e ects may be stronger, the sem i-analytic model predicts substantially more substructure than the simulations. Some of this di erence can be attributed to the same



F igure 10. K inem atics and orbital param eters for subhabes in two di erent sem i-analytic habes (m odel B; rst and second panels in each colum n), subhabes from the second of these that form ed after z = 2 (third panel), and subhabes in the V irgo IIa simulations (bottom panels). The left-hand colum n shows velocity vs. circularity; the m iddle colum n shows velocity vs. position, and the right-hand colum n shows orbital energy vs. position. For the sem i-analytic results, open symbols represent system s that have best m ore than 90 percent of their original m ass, while the symbol shape indicates form ation epoch (triangles: z_m ; $_0 < 0.5$; squares z_m ; $_0 = 0.5$ (2.0; circles z_m ; $_0 > 2.0$). In each case, all subhabes within the virial radius and over a m ass lim it of 10 ^{5}M virm are included.

num erical e ects m entioned above, but the net e ect is that the central regions of habes appear to su er from a fair am ount of overm erging.

The possibility of central overm erging and the spatial distribution of substructure in num erical simulations have been investigated by a number of authors in more recent simulations (G ill et al. 2004a; D iem and et al. 2004c; G ao et a. 2004; R eed et al. 2004; N agai & K ravtsov 2004). On the one hand, convergence studies using a given code and group nder nd little or no evidence for a rapid increase in the am ount of central substructure as the resolution in-creases (e.g.D iem and et al. 2004c; N agai & K ravtsov 2004).

This might seem a conclusive argument against overm erging, since increased resolution is the only way of testing for this possibility de nitively.

On the other hand, detailed studies of the convergence of a di erent feature of hab structure, the slope of the central density prole, have found that the size of the region attened by resolution e ects such as relaxation decreases very slow ly as the number of particles in the hab N increases, scaling as N $^{0:2}$ {N $^{0:3}$ (D iem and et al. 2004a). This sort of scaling would be expected if the size of the unresolved region depends the mean inter-particle separa-

tion, for instance, or on the maximum density allowed by softening.

Resolving substructure in a dense background environment represents a similar, but harder, numerical problem. Not only does nite resolution limit the density of structures that can be resolved, but subhaloes are intrinsically less stable than a central cusp, since they are subject to much stronger tidal forces. Thus we we should not expect to be able to resolve substructure at densities or on spatial scales where the central cusp of the main halo is attened by relaxation, and in general the size of the region where substructure is articially erased by relaxation should decrease no faster than N $^{1=3}$ as the number of particles N increases.

4.5.3 How large is the unresolved region?

W e can apply this argument more speci cally to the numerical results presented here. The M ilky W ay and V irgo IIa simulations agree in the distribution of substructure beyond

0.3 r_{vir} , but disagree within this radius. G iven that they di er in N by a factor of 5, we estimate that the V irgo IIa results are reliable to 0.17 r_{vir} . D iem and et al. (2004b, F ig. 7) present results for 4 galaxy haloes simulated with 1{4 m illion particles each. At 0.17 r_{vir} they nd n (r)= \overline{n}_{vir} ' 10, consistent with the sem i-analytic predictions and the V irgo IIa results, so this may well be the radius at which the num erical results have converged.

D iem and et al. (2004b, F ig. 2) also present even higher resolution results, for a cluster halo resolved with up to 14 m illion particles. By the same scaling argument, we would expect these to be reliable down to 0:11 r_{vir} , but in fact they still see substantially less substructure at this radius than is predicted by our model (n (r)= \overline{n}_{vir} ' 4{5, versus 15{20 in our model}). On the other hand, their results for this cluster di er by a factor of 2 with the results for their four galaxy habes (for which n (r)= \overline{n}_{vir} ' 10 at this radius). Thus it is unclear whether the shallower density pro le is characteristic of the cluster m ass scale as opposed to the galaxy m ass scale, whether it is simply due to intrinsic haloto-halo variation, or whether the num erical convergence is even slower than N ¹⁻³.

There are indications of the rst of these possibilities in the results of D e Lucia et al. (2004, Fig. 6) and G ao et al. (2004b, Fig. 11), who nd that subhaloes follow a more centrally concentrated distribution in galaxy haloes than in cluster halos. W ith regards to the second possibility, G ill et al. (2004b, Fig. 7) show that that the scatter in the number density pro le can be a factor of 2 or more in amplitude, although all 8 of their haloes have steep inner slopes in the radial distribution of substructure. In any case, if the third explanation were correct and the convergence rate scaled as N^{0:2}, we would expect convergent results only beyond 0:17 r_{vir} , so this could also explain the discrepancy.

F inally, we note that the algorithm used to locate and de ne substructure m ay have a large e ect in and of itself. W eller et al. (2004), for instance, nd quite di erent bound m assestim ates for subhaloes depending on the criterion used for associating particles with substructure, while G ill et al. (2004a), obtain substantially di erent results for the radial distributions of subhaloes by 'tracking' halo particles from one step to the next. In particular, they nd that in all 8 of their haloes, the radial density of subhaloes identi ed by tracking' continues to rise down to the smallest radii they consider, r' $0.07 r_{vir}$ (cf. their Fig. 7). W ith this technique, 10 percent of the substructure they identify is located within the inner $0.1\{0.2 r_{vir}, as in our sem i-analytic m odel,$ whereas for a group nderusing only inform ation from a single timestep, they nd the cumulative distribution reaches $10 percent at <math>0.3 r_{vir}$, as in the simulations considered here. A nalysing the same halo with di erent group nders, they nd that norm alised density at $0.1 r_{vir}$ varies by a factor of 4.

4.5.4 Relaxation times for central subhaloes

There is a second argument that suggests that simulations may still be missing substructure in their central regions. We expect strong correlations between the age of subhabes and their location within the main system (cf. paper II). Central subhabes are system atically older, and if we arti-

cially rem ove the oldest subhaloes from our sem i-analytic results, we achieve a much better m atch to the num erical results (cf. Figs. 9 and 10). C entral subhaloes typically form ed at or before z = 2; thus they were originally $3^3 = 27$ times denser than present-day system s of the same m ass, and have spent roughly 5 orbits or 11 G yr in the main system (paper II, Fig. 8), losing 75 percent of their original m ass in the process (paper II, Fig. 9).

On the one hand, the high-resolution simulations of H 03 and K azantzidis et al. (2004) indicate that low -density system s resolved with 10⁴ particles can easily survive this degree of mass loss without disintegrating. On the other hand, when system s of the density corresponding to z_m ; $z_m = 2$ are resolved with fewer than 5000 particles, their relaxation time is less than the Hubble time (Diem and et al. 2004). For system s of 32 particles, the nom inal resolution lim it of the num erical data sets, the relaxation tim e at this density is 100-200 M yr.W hile it is not clear how exactly quickly relaxation leads to the disruption of substructure, it seems unlikely that 32 particle system sm erging at $z = 2 \mod sur$ vive for the equivalent of 50 relaxation tim es w ithout being com pletely dissolved. This arti cial disruption due to internal relaxation would have little e ect on the overall properties of substructure averaged over the entire halo, since only a small fraction of all subhaloes are this old. On the other hand it would quickly reduce the central density of subhaloes, since the latter is dom inated by sm all objects that form ed at early tim es.

The preferential disruption of old subhaloes close to the centre of the main system has important implications for many of the observational tests of halo substructure. In section 5, we will consider two examples, the detection of substructure in multiply-lensed systems, and the direct detection of dark matter in terrestrial experiments.

5 IM PLICATIONS FOR OBSERVATIONAL TESTS OF SUBSTRUCTURE

5.1 Im plications for lensing

G ravitational lensing, the de ection of light from a background source by the gravitational potential of a foreground system, provides at least two ways of quantifying the am ount of dense substructure in the halo of the lensing system. The dark matter around individual galaxies system atically distorts the shapes of background galaxies within some projected separation. In rich clusters, these distortions can be averaged over a large number of galaxies at the same redshift, yielding maps of the projected mass density within the cluster, and statistical information about the subhabes around each clusterm ember (e.g. Natarajan, K neib & Sm ail 2002; G avazzi et al. 2004). The resulting mass maps cover a large fraction of the projected area of the cluster at high spatial resolution, but they are som ewhat model-dependent. In particular, they require the presence of visible galaxies to trace the dark matter substructure.

There is an alternate lensing method that promises to reveal completely dark substructure in the haloes of galaxies. It consists of comparing the amplication ratios of dienent components in multiply-lensed systems with models of the mass distribution in the lens. For particular lens geometries, discrepancies in the amplication ratios may indicate a deviation from a smooth potential on the scale of the image separation. This method for quantifying substructure received much attention recently, with claims that the projected mass fraction contained in substructure had been measured fairly reliably for a set of systems (Dalal & Kochanek 2001, 2002), and that lensing statistics might be allow the power spectrum to be constrained directly (Zentner & Bullock 2003).

In the light of subsequent work, these results now seem less certain. For many individual system s, various other effects including stellar microlensing (Schechter & W am bsganss 2002), scintillation, or biases in the lens modelling (Evans & W itt 2003) may be su cient to explain the anom alous ux ratios. An improved method uses observations at many di erent wavelengths to eliminate the microlensing contribution, taking advantage of the fact that m icrolensing and lensing by substructure should have di erent e ects on the broad-line and narrow-line regions of lensed AGN, due to their di erent spatial scales (Moustakas & Metcalf 2003; M etcalf et al. 2004). On the other hand, even this m ethod cannot prove that the sm all-scale structure is actually within a given halo, rather than simply being seen in projection (e.g. Chen, Kravtsov, & Keeton 2003; Metcalf 2004). In the longer term , ultra-high resolution im ages from very long baseline interferom etry (Inoue & Chiba 2003) or novel techniques with X-ray telescopes (e.g. Yonehara, Umemura, & Susa 2003) in space may produce more conclusive detections of halo substructure.

W hatever the status of the problem observationally, it is not clear that there is a robust theoretical prediction with which to com pare current observational results. Strong lensing probes the mass fraction in relatively low mass substructure ($10^5 M + 10^7 M$), in the central few kiloparsecs of galaxy haloes. This is well within the region where there is evidence for overm erging in the simulations. We can estimate the importance of overm erging by comparing the substructure in our sem i-analytic models with the substructure in the numerical simulations, as a function of projected distance from the centre of the halo. Fig. 11 shows the cum ulative mass functions (upper panel) and cum ulative mass fraction (low er panel) for subhaloes within some projected radius R_p, for model B (solid lines) and V irgo IIa (dashed



F igure 11. (Top panel) C um ulative m ass functions for subhaloes within som e projected radius R_p , for m odel B (solid lines) and V irgo IIa (dashed lines). (B ottom P anel) T he fraction of the projected m ass within R_p contained in subhaloes of m ass M or larger. T he num erical results are the average over three di erent projections. Vertical lines indicate the resolution lim it of them m erger tree (solid) and the 32 and 320-particle m ass lim its of the simulation.

lines). (The num erical results are the average over three orthogonal projections.)

A veraged over a large projected radius, the sem ianalytic and numerical results disagree by a factor of 2. At large masses, some of this o set may be due to the dynamical age of the simulated system, as discussed in paper II (cf.paper II, Fig. 15). At the low-mass end, relaxation or other resolution e ects may explain the o set, of it may be due to random, halo-to-halo variation.

M ore worrying, however, is the o set between the numerical and sem i-analytic results at small projected radii. W e noted in section 4.3 that in the central regions of the halo the density of subhabes is alm ost constant in the sim – ulations, but continues to rise in the sem i-analytic model. As a result, the projected mass fraction in substructure within the central 5 percent of virial radius (15 kpc, or roughly the optical radius for a system like the M ilky W ay) diers by an order of magnitude between the two methods. This dierence may be due to overmerging in the simulations, as discussed in section 4.3 and 4.5, or it could related the limitation, as discussed in G ill et al. (2004a).

It is premature to draw m conclusions on the true projected mass fraction from these results, for several reasons. First, the results shown here are for SCDM, since the simulations used for comparison with assumed this cosm ology. The slightly reduced amplitude of the cumulative mass function seen in LCDM habes (see paper II) could a ect the projected quantities to some degree. Furtherm ore, while our dynam ical model successfully reproduces the evolution of system s during early stages of m ass loss, it m ay be less accurate for the subhaloes in the centre of the m ain system, m any of which have lost 90 percent of their m ass orm ore (cf. paper II, Fig. 11). Based on Fig. 8, a radical change in the properties of system s stripped to this degree m ight reduce the central density of subhaloes by a factor of 2, although this would still exceed the density found in the simulations.

M ost importantly, however, the sem i-analytic m odel predicts large hab-to-hab scatter, which is correlated with the dynam ical state of haloes (cf. paper II, Fig. 15). Thus the comparison between sem i-analytic or numerical m odels and observed system s should account for possible selection e ects in the haloes considered. In particular, selecting observed system s on the basis of a particular galaxy m orphology (e.g. ellipticals) m ay correspond to picking haloes that are system atically m ore relaxed, and thus contain 2{ 3 tim es less substructure than average. Finally, neither the sem i-analytic nor the numerical results presented here include a galaxy in the potential of the m ain system, so both m ay overestim ate the am ount of dark m atter substructure in the central regions to som e degree.

D espite all these caveats, it is intriguing that our model predicts projected central mass fractions roughly ten times larger than those measured in high-resolution simulations, and that this in turn is close to the value inferred both in early observational estimates (D alal & K ochanek 2002) and in more recent detailed work (e.g. M etcalf et al. 2004). W e will attempt to make more robust estimates of the mass fraction in substructure and discuss the uncertainties in the sem i-analytic m odelling of central substructure in forthcom ing work.

5.2 Im plications for direct detection

Ultimately, the most convincing way to identify the dark m atterparticle will be to detect it directly in a terrestrial experim ent. There has been a concerted e ort for m any years to search for the mechanical e ects of collisions between dark matter particles and nuclei in calorim eters on Earth (see P retzl (2002) for a recent review). These experiments have gradually set more and more stringent limits on the dark matter cross-section, without producing a con med detection. Tentative evidence for a signal was announced by the DAMA collaboration (cf. Bernabei et al. 2000, 2003), which claim ed to see an annual modulation in their event rate, corresponding to the Earth's changing velocity with respect to the distribution of dark matter in the halo, as it orbits around the Sun. W ork of com parable sensitivity by other experiments (e.g. ZEPLIN I { Liubarsky et al. 2000; EDELW EISS { Benoit et al. 2002; CDMS { A kerib et al. 2004) has failed to reproduce this result, how ever, so it remains controversial (see Morgan, Green, & Spooner (2004) for a recent sum m ary of the situation).

A crucial factor in interpreting the DAMA result is the regularity of the phase-space distribution of dark matter particles in the solar neighbourhood. Local substructure could introduce additional modulations in the event rate, thereby reducing the sensitivity of experiments looking for an annual signal (M organ et al. 2004, and references therein). Previous work on the local phase-space distribution of dark matter based on numerical simulations (H elm i et al. 2003) found that substructure was rare in the solar neigh-



F igure 12.Cumulative m ass functions and contributions to the totalm ass within the solar volume $(6\{10 \text{ kpc})$. The dotted line is form odel A, the solid line is form odel B.

bourhood, so that the confusing e ects of coherent stream s should not be a problem for direct detection experiments. G iven the evidence for overmerging in the central regions of simulated haloes presented in section 4.3, however, this conclusion may need to be revised.

W e cannot easily com pare our sem i-analytic predictions with simulated substructure around the position of the Sun, as there is essentially no such substructure in the simulations { the chance of nding a subhalo at around 2 percent of the virial radius is vanishingly sm all. Instead, we will consider only the uncertainty in the properties of local substructure due to uncertainties in the sem i-analytic m odel, F ig. 12 shows the cumulative mass function of objects in the solar neighbourhood (top panel), and the cumulative contribution to the totalm ass in that volum e. The dotted line is for m odelA, and the solid line is form odelB.W e have de ned the solar neighbourhood as the region extending from 6 to 10 kpc within our haloes, that is 2{3 percent of the virial radius. The Virgo simulations have no substructure at all within an equivalent volume with respect to the virial radius, and even in the sem i-analytic haloes substructure in this region is rare. Nonetheless, we can get a sense of the m ass function by averaging over large num bers of trees.

We see that both the m ass function and the m ass fraction are very sensitive to details of the m odel. The norm alisation of m ass fraction in substructure changes by a factor of $1.5\{2, but m ost of this o set comes from the m ore m assive$ haloes, which are comparatively rare. There is also an appreciable change in the slope of the m ass function, how ever.This is worrying, as direct detection experiments would besensitive to irregularities on m uch smaller m ass scales thanconsidered here. If we extrapolate assuming m odel A', weestimate that roughly 1 percent of m ass in the solar neigh $bourhood would be in substructure of <math>10^6$ M or m ore, and that 10 percent would be in substructure of 10^3 M or m ore. Extrapolating naively in m odel B', on the other hand, m ost of the m ass of the halo could be locked up in fairly m assive subhaloes (M $_{\rm S}$ > 10⁴M). These estimates are very unreliable, but they illustrate the fact that on solarm ass scales (or spatial scales of roughly a parsec), the distribution of dark m atter could be extrem ely irregular indeed. If local distribution is genuinely this lum py, then the limits placed by current experiments m ay be weakened considerably. (G reen 2003; M organ et al. 2004). We will examine the nestructure of local dark m atter in detail in future work.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have com pared the properties of halo substructure predicted by a sem i-analytic model with the substructure identi ed in a set of self-consistent num erical sim ulations of halo formation. The sem i-analytic model com bines merger trees, an algorithm for treating higher-order substructure, and an analytic description of satellite dynam ics. W hile the original treatm ent of satellite dynam ics had several free param eters (TB01), in our full model of halo formation these were xed by comparison with the highresolution, restricted simulations of Velazquez and W hite (1999) and H 03, as described in paper I. Thus we have no remaining parametric freedom when comparing the predictions of the sem i-analytic model to the num erical results. Our model does make a number of assumptions and approximations, however, concerning the shape and spherical symmetry of the halo density prole, for instance, as well as halo concentrations and subhalo orbits. As discussed in paper II, we estim ate that modifying these assumptions would change our results at the 20{30 percent level.

Despite its uncertainties and simpli cations, without any adjustment of the parameters the sem i-analytic model does an excellent job of matching the numerical results in the outer regions of haloes, where the latter are the most robust. In particular, it matches the overall distribution of subhalo properties and the amplitude of the cumulative distributions of subhalo mass or peak velocity to within 10{20 percent. This is both the level of accuracy expected of our dynamical model, and is also comparable to the intrinsic scatter from one halo to the next, so we conclude that the two methods agree more or less exactly in this regime.

In contrast to this, in the central regions of haloes the sem i-analytic model predicts substantially more substructure than is seen in the sim ulations. The excess subhaloes are predicted to be ancient, dense systems which have orbited in the central part of the halo form ost of the age of the universe $(10\{12 \text{ Gyr}, \text{ or since a redshift of } z = 2)$. In the sem ianalytic model, these systems survive because the overall heating and disruption rates are lower than those measured in cosm ological simulations. W hether these ancient system s should survive in reality is unclear. The disagreem ent with sem i-analytic and num erical predictions could indicate that our dynam icalm odel for heating and m ass loss is system atically less accurate. This seem s unlikely, how ever, since the m odel is calibrated on the sim pler, higher-resolution sim ulations of Velazquez and W hite (1999) and H03, and since m any of the central subhaloes retain 20{30 percent of their original mass, and thus are at an evolutionary stage where

the analytic m ass-loss m odel m atches the restricted simulations quite closely.

O ne physical process recently proposed to explain the higher disruption rate seen in simulations is the increased e ciency ofm ass loss in system swith anisotropic (internal) velocity distributions (K azantzidis et al. 2004). O urm odel is calibrated using simulations of isotropic system s, so in principle anisotropy could a ect our results. In the exam ple they consider, how ever, K azantzidis et al. nd that both fairly strong anisotropy and substantial (80 {90 percent) m ass loss are required before the evolution of the satellite changes substantially. Further work should clarify the importance of this e ect.

The other possibility is that the sem i-analytic predictions are essentially correct, and that the simulations analysed in this work are a ected by residual overm erging, or by problems with the group nder used to analyse their structure. If overm erging is responsible for the patterns discussed in section 4, higher-resolution num erical work will be required to establish the true level of substructure in the centres of CDM haloes de nitively. In particular, based on the argum ents of section 4.5, the properties of substructure in current simulations may be unreliable within the central 10 percent of the virial radius (or 30 kpc for a system like the Milky Way), and it may take an increase of 100 or m ore in m ass resolution to get convergent results down to the equivalent of the solar radius. A sim ilar increase in resolution would be required to increase the relaxation time in a subhalo at the nom inal resolution lim it of current sim ulations ($10^{5} M_{virm}$), and that form ed at z = 2, until it was longer than the Hubble time. Thus while future numerical work can eventually resolve this issue de nitively, achieving the required m ass and force resolution will rem ain challenging for som e tim e.

W hatever the nal answer to the problem, we have illustrated through several exam ples that the survival of substructure in the innerm ost parts of habes is extrem ely im portant to the analysis of m any recent observational and experim ental results. A s it stands, our sem i-analytic m odel provides a robust and computationally e cient basis for studying a wide range of problem s related to hab structure and substructure, including the origin and evolution of galaxy m orphology, tidal disruption of dwarf galaxies and globular clusters, direct detection of dark m atter particles and the local phase-space density of dark m atter, indirect detection of dark m atter decay products such as gam m a-rays and positrons, and the analysis of strong-lensing system s. W e will explore these topics in future papers.

ACKNOW LEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to thank E.H ayashi, S.G higna, B.M oore, J.N avarro and T.Quinn for providing data from their sim – ulations for comparison with our model. We also wish to thank E.H ayashi, T.Kolatt, A.Kravtsov, J.Navarro, J. Silk, and S.W hite for helpfuldiscussions. JET gratefully acknow ledges the support of a postgraduate scholarship from the Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) during the initial stages of this work, and support from the Leverhulm e Trust and from the UK Particle Physics and A stronom y Research Council (PPARC) in

16 Taybr & Babul

the latter stages. A B gratefully acknow ledges support from NSERC through the Discovery and the Collaborative Research Opportunities (CRO) grant program s.

REFERENCES

- A kerib, D. S., et al. [The CDM S Collaboration] 2004, Phys. Rev. Lett., subm itted (astro-ph/0405033)
- Benoit, A. et al. [The EDELW EISS Collaboration] 2004, Phys. Rev.Lett.B, 545 43-49
- Bernabei, R. et al. [The DAM A Collaboration] 2000, Phys. Rev. Lett.B, 480, 23
- Bernabei, R. et al. [The DAMA Collaboration] 2003, Riv. Nuovo Cim., 26N 1, 1
- Chen, J., K ravtsov, A.V., & Keeton, C.R. 2003, ApJ, 592, 24
- Dalal, N. & Kochanek, C. S. 2002, ApJ, 572, 25
- DeLucia, G., Kau mann, G., Springel, V., White, S.D.M., Lanzoni, B., Stoehr, F., Torm en, G., & Yoshida, N. 2004, MN-RAS, 348, 333
- Desai, V., Dalcanton, J.J., Mayer, L., Reed, D., Quinn, T., & Governato, F. 2004, MNRAS, 351, 265
- Diem and, J., Moore, B., Stadel, J., & Kazantzidis, S. 2004, MN-RAS, 348, 977
- Diem and, J., Moore, B., & Stadel, J. 2004, MNRAS, 290
- Diem and, J., Moore, B., & Stadel, J. 2004, MNRAS, 352, 535
- D'Onghia, E., Lake, G. 2004, ApJ, in press (astro-ph/0309735)
- Eke, V.R., Navarro, J.F., & Steinmetz, M. 2001, ApJ, 554, 114 (ENS01)
- Evans, N.W. & W itt, H.J. 2003, MNRAS, 345, 1351
- Gao, L., De Lucia, G., W hite, S.D.M., & Jenkins, A. 2004, MNRAS, 352, L1
- Gao, L., White, S.D.M., Jenkins, A., Stoehr, F., & Springel, V. 2004, MNRAS, submitted (astro-ph/0404589)
- Gavazzi, R., Mellier, Y., Fort, B., Cuillandre, J.-C., & Dantel-Fort, M . 2004, AAp, 422, 407
- Ghigna, S., Moore, B., Governato, F., Lake, G., Quinn, T., & Stadel, J. 1998, M N R A S, 300, 146 (G 98)
- Ghigna, S., Moore, B., Governato, F., Lake, G., Quinn, T., & Stadel, J. 2000, ApJ, 544, 616 (G 00)
- Gill, S.P.D., Knebe, A., & Gibson, B.K. 2004a, MNRAS, 351, 399
- Gill, S.P.D., Knebe, A., Gibson, B.K., & Dopita, M.A. 2004b, MNRAS, 351, 410
- Governato F., Ghigna S., Moore B., 2001, in ASP Conf. Ser. 245: A strophysical A ges and T im es Scales, 469
- G reen, A.M. 2003, Phys. Rev. D, 68, 023004
- Hayashi, E., Navarro, J.F., Taylor, J.E., Stadel, J., & Quinn, T. 2003, ApJ, 584, 541 (H 03)
- Helm i, A., W hite, S.D. M., & Springel, V. 2003, MNRAS, 339, 834
- Inoue, K.T.& Chiba, M. 2003, ApJL, 591, L83
- Kau mann, G., Colberg, J.M., Diaferio, A., & White, S.D.M. 1999, M NRAS, 303, 188
- Kazantzidis, S., Mayer, L., Mastropietro, C., Diemand, J., Stadel, J., & Moore, B. 2004, ApJ, 608, 663
- Khochfar, S., & Burkert, A. 2003, MNRAS, submitted (astroph/0309611)
- Kim, T.-S., Viel, M., Haehnelt, M.G., Carswell, R.F., & Cristiani, S. 2004, M NRAS, 347, 355
- K lypin, A ., G ottlober, S ., K ravtsov, A . V ., & K hokhlov, A . M . 1999, ApJ, 516, 530
- K lypin, A., K ravtsov, A. V., Valenzuela, O., & Prada, F. 1999, ApJ, 522, 82
- Liubarsky, I., et al. 2000, Nucl. Phys. B, (Proc. Suppl.), 87, 64
- Mathis, H., Lemson, G., Springel, V., Kaumann, G., White, S.D.M., Eldar, A., & Dekel, A. 2002, MNRAS, 333, 739
- M etcalf, R.B. 2004, apJ, subm itted (astro-ph/0407298)

- Metcalf, R.B., Moustakas, L.A., Bunker, A.J., & Parry, I.R. 2004, ApJ, 607, 43
- Moore, B., Katz, N., & Lake, G. 1996, ApJ, 457, 455
- Moore, B., Katz, N., Lake, G., Dressler, A., & Oemler, A. 1996, Nature, 379, 613
- Moore, B., Governato, F., Quinn, T., Stadel, J., & Lake, G. 1998, ApJ, 499, L5 (M 98)
- Moore B., Ghigna S., Governato F., Lake G., Quinn T., Stadel J., & TozziP., 1999, ApJ, 524, L19 (M 99a)
- Moore, B., Quinn, T., Governato, F., Stadel, J., & Lake, G. 1999, MNRAS, 310, 1147 (M 99b)
- Morgan, B., Green, A.M., & Spooner, N.J.C. 2004, preprint (astro-ph/0408047)
- M oustakas, L.A. & M etcalf, R.B. 2003, M N R A S, 339, 607
- Nagai, D., Kravtsov, A. V. 2004, ApJ, submitted (astroph/0408273)
- Natara jan, P., Kneib, J., & Smail, I. 2002, ApJL, 580, L11
- O kam oto, T. & Habe, A. 1999, ApJ, 516, 591
- Pretzl, K. 2002, Space Science Reviews, 100, 209
- Reed, D., Gardner, J., Quinn, T., Stadel, J., Fardal, M., Lake, G., & Governato, F.2003, MNRAS, 346, 565
- Reed, D., Governato, F., Quinn, T., Gardner, J., Stadel, J., Lake, G.2004, MNRAS, submitted (astro-ph/0406034)
- Rhodes, J., Refregier, A., Collins, N. R., Gardner, J. P., Groth, E.J., & Hill, R.S. 2004, ApJ, 605, 29
- Schechter, P.L.& W am bsganss, J. 2002, ApJ, 580, 685
- Spergel, D.N. et al. 2003, ApJS, 148, 175
- Springel, V., W hite, S.D.M., Tormen, G., & Kau mann, G. 2001, MNRAS, 328, 726
- Stadel, J. 2001, Ph.D. thesis, University of W ashington
- Stochr, F., W hite, S.D.M., Tormen, G., & Springel, V. 2002, MNRAS, 335, L84
- Taylor, J.E. 2002, Ph.D. thesis, University of Victoria (http://wwwlib.umi.com/dissertations/fullcit/NO 62530)
- Taylor, J.E. & Babul, A. 2001, ApJ, 559, 716
- Taylor, J.E. & Babul, A. 2004, MNRAS, 348, 811
- Taylor, J.E. & Babul, A. 2004b, MNRAS, submitted (paper III)
- Taylor, J.E., & Navarro, J.F. 2001, ApJ, 563, 483
- Tegm ark, M ., et al. 2004, ApJ, 606, 702
- van Kampen, E. 1995, MNRAS, 273, 295
- Velazquez, H. & W hite, S.D. M. 1999, MNRAS, 304, 254
- W eller, J., O striker J. P., & Bode, P. 2004, M NRAS, submitted (astro-ph/0405445)
- Yonehara, A., Um em ura, M., & Susa, H. 2003, PASJ, 55, 1059 Zentner, A.R. & Bullock, J.S. 2003, ApJ, 598, 49

The Evolution of Substructure III 17

nam e	output red <i>s</i> hift	virialmass M _{vir;m} (M)	virial radius r _{virm} (kpc)	particle m ass m p (M)	softening r _s (kpc)	num ber of subhaloes r < r _{vir,m}	M _{vir;m} =m _p (m illions)	r _s =r _{vir;m} (%)	referen œs
C om a	0.0	2:37 10 ¹⁵	3580	8 : 6 10 ⁸	10.0	2302	2.76	0.28	M 98
Virgo I	0.0	4 : 1 10 ¹⁴	1995	8 : 6 10 ⁸	10.0	295	0.48	0.5	M 98
V irgo IIa	0.0	4 : 3 10 ¹⁴	2026	1 : 1 10 ⁸	1.0	1110	4.00	0.049	G 98 , G 00
V irgo IIb	0.1	3 : 98 10 ¹⁴	1795	1 : 1 10 ⁸	1.0	1052	3.71	0.056	G 98 , G 00
Androm eda	0.2	2 : 12 10 ¹²	288	2 10 ⁶	1.5	250	1.06	0.52	M 99a , M 99b
M ilky W ay	0.2	1 : 59 10 ¹²	261	2 10 ⁶	1.5	280	0.80	0.57	M 99a , M 99b

Table I: Num erical Simulations