# The environm ental dependence of galaxy clustering in the Sloan D igital Sky Survey

UmmiAbbas<sup>1</sup>? and RaviK.Sheth<sup>2</sup>?

<sup>1</sup>D epartm ent of P hysics & A stronom y, U niversity of P ittsburgh, P ittsburgh, PA 15260, U SA <sup>2</sup>D epartm ent of P hysics & A stronom y, U niversity of P ennsylvania, P hiladelphia, PA 19104, U SA

11 A pril 2024

# ABSTRACT

A generic prediction of hierarchical clustering models is that the mass function of dark haloes in dense regions in the Universe should be top-heavy. We provide a novel test of this prediction using a sample of galaxies drawn from the Sloan Digital Sky Survey. To perform the test, we compare measurements of galaxy clustering in dense and underdense regions. We nd that galaxies in dense regions cluster signi cantly m ore strongly than those in less dense regions. This is true over the entire 0.1 {30 M pc pair separation range for which we can make accurate measurements. We make similar m easurem ents in realistic m ock catalogs in which the only environm ental e ects are those which arise from the predicted correlation between halo mass and environm ent. We also provide an analytic halo-model based calculation of the eect. Both the mock catalogs and the analytic calculation provide rather good descriptions of the SDSS m easurem ents. Thus, our results provide strong support for hierarchicalm odels. They suggest that, unless care is taken to study galaxies at xed m ass, correlations between galaxy properties and the surrounding environm ent are alm ost entirely due to m ore fundam ental correlations between galaxy properties and host halo m ass, and between halo m ass and environm ent.

K ey words: methods:analytical-galaxies:formation-galaxies:haloes-dark matter - large scale structure of the universe

#### 1 IN TRODUCTION

The correlation between galaxy properties (m orphology, star form ation rates, lum inosity, color etc.) and the surrounding environment has been the subject of extensive studies in the last few decades: dense environm ents are preferentially occupied by elliptical, red, lum inous galaxies, whereas star formation rates are higher in less dense regions (D ressler 1980; Butcher & O em ler 1984; Norberg et al. 2001, 2002; Balogh et al. 2002; Gom ez et al. 2003; Hogg et al. 2004; Kau mann et al. 2004; Berlind et al. 2005; Croton et al. 2005). In hierarchical models, this behaviour is expected to be a consequence of the fact that galaxies are surrounded by dark m atter halos, and the properties of halos (m ass, form ation time, concentration, internal angular momentum, etc.) are correlated with their environm ents (M o & W hite 1996; Sheth & Torm en 1999, 2002, 2004; Lem son & Kau mann 1999; Gottloeber et al. 2001; A vila-Reese et al. 2005; G ao et al. 2005; Harker et al. 2006; W echsler et al. 2006).

Recently, we described how the clustering of galaxies can be used to test the assumption that the correlations between galaxy properties and their environments are entirely a consequence of the correlations between haloes and their environments (Abbas & Sheth 2005). This is a strong assumption which signicantly simplies interpretation of the observed luminosity dependence of galaxy clustering (e.g. Zehavi et al. 2005). It is also a standard assumption in current halo-model descriptions of galaxy clustering (see Cooray & Sheth 2002 for a review). The main goal of this paper is to perform this test.

This paper is arranged as follows: in Section 2 we show how galaxy clustering depends on environment in the SDSS (A delm an-M cC arthy et al. 2006). In particular, we measure the pair correlation function in redshift space,  $(sj_s)$ , for a range of environments  $_s$ , as well as the projected quantity, w<sub>p</sub> (r<sub>p</sub> j<sub>s</sub>); the latter is free of redshift-space distortions. These measurements are compared with similar measurements in carefully constructed mock catalogs, and from an analytic calculation based on the halo-model. In both the mocks and the analytic calculation, correlations between galaxy properties and environment are entirely a consequence of the correlation between galaxy properties and halo

# 2 U.Abbas and R.K.Sheth

m asses, and between halo m ass and environm ent.W e sum m arize our results in Section 3, where we also discuss som e im plications. An Appendix provides details of the analyticalm odel, which generalizes our earlier (real-space) work so that it can be used to model redshift space m easurem ents as well.

# 2 THE ENVIRONMENTAL DEPENDENCE OF CLUSTER ING

To measure the environmental dependence of clustering, we must decide on a measure of the environment. Abbas & Sheth (2005) showed that the precise choice of environment is not particularly important, in the sense that dierent choices lead to quantitative but not qualitative dierences. They used N<sub>R</sub>, the number of galaxies in a sphere of radius R centred on a galaxy, as a measure of that galaxy's environment, and presented results for R = 5 and 8h <sup>1</sup>M pc. Their analysis in redshift-space is complicated because the environmentale ect we would like to test is due to correlations between halo masses with the real-space density. Therefore, we must nd a de nition of density in redshift space.

Line-of-sight redshift-space distortions can make a sphere in real-space appear very di erent in redshift space. For instance, around a spherically symmetric cluster there are two main e ects: one is due to coherent infall around the center of the cluster, which appears as a squashing e ect along the line of sight in redshift space (Kaiser 1987). The second is the \ nger of G od " e ect which is due to the virial motions of galaxies within the cluster (de Lapparent et al. 1986). This shows up as an elongation of the cluster along the line of sight. The squashing e ect is relatively small, producing e ects of order unity or less, whereas the ngerof-god distortions are more dram atic elongations along the line of sight are typically about a factor of ten. Since clusters have radii of a M pc or so, ngers of god can extend up to about 10 M pc. Therefore, while counts in redshift space spheres of radii 5h<sup>-1</sup>M pc are not expected to faithfully trace the counts in the corresponding real-space spheres, counts in spheres of radii 8h  ${}^{1}Mpc$ , N $_{8}$  should be more similar. For this reason, in what follows we use N<sub>8</sub> as a measure of the environment of each galaxy. (If we wished to push to sm aller scales, we could identify all the ngers of god, and then \decom press" them , by rescaling the distances along the line-of-sight so that they have the sam e extent as across the line-of-sight e.g. Tegm ark et al. 2004. But perform ing such a \m anicure" is beyond the scope of the present work.)

W e use N  $_{8}$  to divide the galaxy population into three equal-sized subsam ples: the third with the largest values of N  $_{8}$  are de ned as being the dense subsam ple, and the third with the sm allest values of N  $_{8}$  are the underdense subsam - ple. W e then m easure the correlation functions in these two subsam ples.

O ur strategy is to m ake such m easurem ents in a volum e lim ited galaxy catalog, so that selection e ects are m inim ized.W e then compare with sim ilarm easurem ents in realistic m ock catalogs. Throughout, we show results for a at CDM m odel for which  $(_0;h;_8) = (0:3;0:7;0.9)$  at z = 0.

Here  $_0$  is the density in units of critical density today, the



F igure 1. Pie-diagram s of the SD SS subsamples: top and bottom panels show the distributions of objects classified as being in the least dense and the densest regions, in a slice of thickness 100 h  $^{1}$ M pc through the survey volume.

Hubble constant at the present time is  $H_0 = 100h$  km s<sup>1</sup> Mpc<sup>1</sup>, and  $_8$  describes the ms uctuations of the initial eld, evolved to the present time using linear theory, when sm oothed with a tophat liter of radius 8h<sup>-1</sup> Mpc.

## 2.1 The SDSS galaxy sam ple

W e perform our analysis on a volum e limited catalog extracted from the SDSS DR4 database (A delm an-M cC arthy et al. 2006). W e chose galaxies brighter than M  $_{\rm r}$  < 21, to m atch the analysis of Zehavi et al. (2005), whose results we use below. The resulting catalog contains about 75000 objects with accurate angular positions and redshifts, where the num ber density is 0.00117 (h  $^1$ M pc)  $^3$ .

As discussed above, we de ne the environm ent of each object using the redshift-space information. Figure 1 shows the spatial distribution of galaxies in a thin slice through the SD SS volume limited catalog. Top panel shows the objects classified as being in the least dense regions, and bottom panel are for the objects in the densest regions. The galaxies in dense regions are clearly strongly clustered on sm all scales, whereas those in the underdense regions populate the holes de ned by the spaces between the clusters that one sees in the dense sample.

The following sections quantify these di erences by m easuring the correlation functions in these subsamples. Uncertainties on our m easurem ents were estimated by jackknife resampling, in which the statistics were rem easured after om itting a random region, and repeated thirty times (approximately 1.5 times the total number of bins in separation for the results presented).

### 2.2 M ock galaxy sam ples

W e have generated realistic m ock galaxy sam ples as follows. W e start with the Very Large Simulation (VLS; Yoshida, Sheth & D iaferio 2001), kindly m ade available to the public by the V irgo consortium. It has  $512^3$  particles in a cubic box with sides L = 479h  $^1$ M pc. About 800,000 dark m atter halos, each containing at least 10 particles, were identied in this particle distribution using the Friends-off-riends

m ethod.W e use the simulation output for the mass, position and velocity of each dark matter halo.

W e use the results of Zehaviet al. (2005) to m otivate our choice for how mock galaxies should be distributed within each halo. Speci cally, to model a volum e limited galaxy catalog with objects more luminous than L, halos less massive than m<sub>L</sub> are assumed to contain no galaxies; m<sub>L</sub> depends on the galaxy population under consideration. G alaxies more massive than m<sub>L</sub>, contain one central galaxy, and may also contain satellite galaxies. The number of satellites is drawn from a Poisson distribution with mean hN s jn i, where

$$hN_{\rm s}jn = \frac{m}{m_{\rm l}} \qquad \text{if } m \quad m_{\rm L}: \qquad (1)$$

For SD SS galaxies more lum inous than M  $_{\rm r} < 21, m_{\rm L} = 10^{12:72} \, {\rm h}^{-1} {\rm M}^{-}, m_{1} = 23 m_{\rm L}$ , and, = 1:39 (Zehavi et al. 2005). (A Poisson distribution for the number of satellites is motivated by the work of K ravtsov et al. 2004). We then assume that the satellites in a halo are distributed around the halo center sim ilarly to the dark matter (e.g. N avarro et al. 1997).

To model redshift space e ects, we must model the velocity vector of each mock galaxy. We do so by assuming that  $v_{gal} = v_{halo} + v_{vir}$ , where  $v_{halo}$  is the halo motion provided by the simulation, and  $v_{vir}$  is obtained as follows. The central galaxy in a halo is assumed to be at rest with respect to the halo, so  $v_{vir} = 0$ . The virial motions of satellite galaxies are modelled by assuming that haloes are isotropic, virialized, and isotherm alwith M axwellian velocities around the halo center. The one-dimensional velocity dispersion is 1000 ( $r_{200}$  h=M pc)= 2, where  $r_{200}$  is the scale on which the enclosed m ass is 200 times the critical density: m = 200 crit (4  $r_{200}^3$ =3). Following results in Sheth & D iaferio (2001), we assume that this virial term is independent of local environment.

In the distant observer approximation, the position in redshift space is  $s = x + v_x = H_0$ , where x is the real-space coordinate in the x-direction,  $v_x$  is the x-component of the peculiar velocity, and s is the redshift-space distance in the x-direction. The y- and z- components of the position are unchanged. The isotherm al M axwellian assumption m eans that the virial motions add G aussian noise to the line-of-sight position of each satellite galaxy.

We then m easure N $_8$  for each galaxy by counting the total number of galaxies within 8h  $^1$ M pc.For the mock catalog, we can do this in both real-and redshift-space.Figure 2 compares these two estimates of the local density. They are not widely di erent, suggesting that the analysis in the Appendix will be useful.



F igure 2.C om parison of local density estim ates with in real (bottom) and redshift (top) space spheres of radius  $8h^{-1}M$  pc. The m edian (given by the squares) and quartile range of halo m ass corresponding to certain number of galaxies is shown (for clarity these points have been shifted upwards).

#### 2.3 Results

Figure 3 quanti es the spatial di erences seen in Figure 1; it shows the redshift space correlation functions in dense and underdense regions measured in the mock catalogs (upper panel) and in the SD SS volum e lim ited catalog (low erpanel). In both panels, (sjs) for the dense sample is signi cantly larger than it is in the underdense sam ple. On large scales, this is because dense regions host the most massive haloes which in turn contain many galaxies; on smaller scales, the fact that the halo density pro les depend on halo m ass also matters (Abbas & Sheth 2005). The in ection or break at the scale on which we de ne the environment (8h  $^{1}$  Mpc), which is seen in the clustering signal for underdense regions, arises because this scale is signi cantly larger than the virial radius of a typical halo. Let R denote the scale on which the environment is de ned. Then, pairs which come from di erent halos are of two types: those separated by scales sm aller than R are said to be in the same patch, whereas m ore widely separated pairs are in di erent patches. Abbas & Sheth (2005) called these the 2h 1p and 2h 2p contributions to the statistic. Now, by de nition, there are no 2p pairs with separations smaller than  $8h^{-1}$  Mpc, so 2h 1 on sm aller scales. In addition, underdense re-<sub>2h 2p</sub> = gions are those with sm all N  $_{\rm R}$  , so they have few pairs in the 2h 1p term by de nition. In the lim it in which there is only one halo in each underdense patch (i.e., the one surrounding the galaxy around which the patch was centered), there will be no 2h 1p pairs. In this lim it, the correlation function is the sum of the 1h term, which falls rapidly on scales larger than the virial radius (a few Mpc) and the 2h 2p term (which is only signi cant on scales larger than the patch radius). Therefore, in this limit, if R is signi cantly larger



F igure 3. Environm ental dependence of the galaxy correlation function in redshift space. Upper panel shows m easurem ents in the m ock catalog, and lower panel shows m easurem ents in the SD SS. In both cases, the galaxy catalog is volum e lim ited to M  $_{\rm r}$  <

21, and the environm ent of a galaxy was de ned by counting the number of galaxies within a redshift-space sphere of radius 8h <sup>1</sup>M pc centred on it. The squares and triangles in each panel show (sj<sub>s</sub>) for the galaxies in the densest 1/3 and least dense 1/3 of the sam ple. Solid curves show the analytic model for (sj<sub>s</sub>) that is developed in Appendix A. D ashed curves in the upper panel show the 1-halo (dom inates on sm all scales) and the sum of the 2h-1p and 2h-2p contributions (dom inate on interm ediate and large scales, respectively) to (sj<sub>s</sub>) of the less-dense sam ple. In the low er panel, the dashed curves show these contributions for the dense sam ple.

than the virial radius of a typical hab, there will be a dramatic feature in at scale R. As the number of 2h 1p pairs increases, this feature becomes less obvious. Indeed, in dense regions those which have larger N<sub>R</sub> and so have more 2h 1p pairs, there is little evidence of this feature.

The solid curves in the two panels show the analytic calculation outlined in the Appendix. They provide a reasonable description of the measurements in both panels. How ever, while the agreement is good on large scales, the curves underestimate the small-scale signal in dense regions. Since these smaller scales are the ones most a ected by nger-of-god distortions, it may be that the discrepancy is due to inadequacies in the analytic treatment of redshift-space effects (see Scoccim arro 2004 for a discussion of the sorts of e ects our analysis ignores).

To elim inate this source of uncertainty, we have also studied the projected quantity  $$\mathbbm Z$}$  ,

$$w_{p}(r_{p}j_{s}) = 2 d (r_{p}; j_{s});$$
 (2)

where  $r = \frac{F}{r_p^2 + 2}$ . We integrate up to  $= 35 h^{-1} M pc$ , which is large enough to include most correlated pairs. Figure 4 shows the results, both in the mock catalog (top panel) and in the SD SS (bottom panel). Now, the agreement with



F igure 4. Sim ilar to F igure 3, but now for the projected galaxy correlation function. The upper panel shows m easurem ents in the m ock catalog, and the lower panel is for the SD SS. Sym bols and line-styles are the sam e as for F igure 3.

the analytical model is very good, suggesting that our analytic treatment of redshift-space distortions is inadequate. Once again, the in ection at the scale of the patch size for the underdense sample is caused due to the transition from one type of 2-halo term to the other.

Both for  $(sj_s)$  and  $w_p(r_pj_s)$  the dierences between the two environments are dramatic they are measured with high statistical signi cance. Nevertheless, the analytic model, which only incorporates those correlations with environment which arise from the correlation between halo mass and environment, provides an excellent description of the measurements. This leaves little room for other environmentale ects.

#### 3 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

O ne of the luxuries of the latest generation of large-scale sky surveys is that they contain su ciently m any objects that one can study subsamples of galaxies divided up in various ways. Here, we have focused on the clustering of galaxies in a volume limited sample drawn from the SD SS, and studied how the clustering of these galaxies depends on environm ent. W e nd that galaxies in dense regions are considerably m ore strongly clustered than those in less dense regions (F igures 3 and 4).

This is perhaps not so surprising after all, a dense region is one in which many galaxies are crowded together. W hat is more surprising is that this dependence on environm ent is very well reproduced by num erical (Section 2.2) and analytic (A ppendix A) models in which the entire e ect is due to the fact that galaxy properties correlate with the masses of their parent halos, and massive halos preferentially populate dense regions. Hierarchical models make quantitative predictions for this correlation between halo m ass and environm ent, and so the agreem ent between our models and the m easurem ents provides strong support for such models. In this respect, our results are consistent with those of M o et al. (2004), K au m ann et al. (2004), B erlind et al. (2005), B lanton et al. (2006) and Skibba et al. (2006); this is reassuring, since our m ethods are very di erent.

O ur test of environm ental e ects is particularly interesting in view of recent work showing that, at xed mass, habes in dense regions form earlier (Sheth & Torm en 2004), and that this e ect is stronger for low mass habes (G ao et al. 2005; H arker et al. 2006; W echsler et al. 2006). Such a correlation is not part of our analytic m odel, nor is it included in our mock catalogs. P resum ably, the good agreem ent with the SD SS m easurem ents is due to the fact that we have concentrated on lum inous galaxies, and these populate them ore m assive habes. It will be interesting to see if this agreem ent persists at low er lum inosities.

The agreem ent between our models and the measurements has an important consequence: Unless care is taken to study a population at xed halo mass, our results indicate that observed correlations between gastrophysical effects (e.g. ram pressure stripping, strangulation, harrassment) and environment are dom inated by the fact that these e ects also correlate with halo mass, and halo mass correlates with environment.

Larger sam ples will allow us to study if these trends persist to fainter, presum ably less massive galaxies. And more distant sam ples will allow us to study if these trends evolve.

#### ACKNOW LEDGM ENTS

We thank Ram in Skibba for many helpful discussions, Cameron McBride and Je Gardner for the NTropy code which was used to measure the correlation functions and projected statistics in the simulations and data, Andrew Connolly and Ryan Scranton for providing the SDSS data samples used in this paper, and the Virgo consortium for making their simulations available to the public. We also thank the referee for suggesting changes that helped to im – prove the paper.

Funding for the Sloan D igital Sky Survey (SD SS) has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the U.S. D epartment of Energy, the Japanese M onbukagakusho, and the M ax P lanck Society. The SD SS W eb site is http://www.sdss.org/.

The SDSS is managed by the Astrophysical Research Consortium (ARC) for the Participating Institutions. The Participating Institutions are The University of Chicago, Fem ilab, the Institute for A dvanced Study, the Japan Participation G roup, The Johns H opkins University, the K orean Scientist G roup, Los A lam os N ational Laboratory, the M ax-P lanck-Institute for A stronom y (M PIA), the M ax-P lanck-Institute for A strophysics (M PA), New M exico State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Portsm outh, P rinceton University, the United States N aval O bservatory, and the University of W ashington.

#### REFERENCES

Abbas U ., Sheth R K ., 2005, M N R A S, 364, 1327

- A delm an M cC arthy J.K . et al., 2006, A pJS, 162, 38
- A vila-Reese V ., Colin P , G ottleeber S , F inn aniC ., M aulbetsch C ., 2005, A pJ, 634, 51
- Balogh M L., Bower R G., Sm ail I., Ziegler B L., Davies R L., Gaztelu A., Fritz A., 2002, M N R A S, 337, 256
- Berlind A A , Blanton M R , Hogg D W , W einberg D H , Dave R , E isenstein D J, K atz N , 2005, A pJ, 629, 625
- Blanton M R., Eisenstein D.J., Hogg D W., Zehavi I., 2004, ApJ, 645, 977
- Butcher H ., O em ler A ., 1984, ApJ, 285, 426
- C roton D J., et al., 2005, M NRAS, 356, 1155
- Cooray A ., Sheth R .K ., 2002, Phys. Rep., 372, 1
- Davis M ., Peebles P J E ., 1983, A pJ, 267, 465
- de Lapparent V., Geller M.J., Huchra J.P., 1986, ApJ, 302, L1
- D ressler A ., 1980, A pJ, 236, 351
- GaoL., SpringelV., W hite S.D.M., 2005, MNRAS, 363, L66
- Gom ez P L. et al, 2003, ApJ, 584, 210
- Gottleber S., K lypin A., K ravtsov A.V., 2001, ApJ, 546, 223
- H arker G , C ole S, H elly J, Frenk C , Jenkins A , 2005, M N R A S, 367, 1039
- Hogg D .W .et al., 2004, ApJ, 601, L29
- Kaiser N., 1987, MNRAS, 227, 1
- Kau mann G.et al, 2004, MNRAS, 353, 713
- K ravtsov A "Berlind A A "Wechsler R H "K lypin A A "Gottloeber S., A llgood D B., Primack JR., 2004, ApJ, 609, 35
- Lem son G ., K au m ann G ., 1999, M N R A S, 302, 111
- M o H J., W hite S D M ., 1996, M N R A S, 282, 347
- M o H . J., Yang X ., van den Bosch F . C ., Jing Y . P ., 2004, M N -RAS, 349, 205
- Navarro JF., Frenk C.S., W hite SD M., 1997, ApJ, 490, 493
- Norberg P. et al., 2001, MNRAS, 328,64
- Norberg P. et al., 2002, MNRAS, 332,827
- Scoccim arro R ., 2004, PhR vD , 70.3007
- Seljak U., 2001, MNRAS, 325, 1359
- Sheth R.K., 1996, MNRAS, 279, 1310
- Sheth R K., 1998, M N R A S, 300, 105
- Sheth R K ., D iaferio A ., 2001, M N R A S, 322, 901
- Sheth R K , Torm en G , 1999, M  $\rm N\,R\,A\,S$  , 308, 119
- Sheth R K ., Torm en G ., 2002, M N R A S, 329, 61
- Sheth R K ., Torm en G ., 2004, M N R A S, 350, 1385
- Skibba R ., Sheth R K ., Connolly A J ., Scranton R ., 2006, M N -RAS, 368, 68
- Tegm ark M ., et al., 2004, ApJ, 606, 702
- W echsler R H ., Zentner A R ., Bullock J.S., K ravtsov A V ., 2005, A pJ subm itted (astro-ph/0512416)
- W hite M ., 2001, M N R A S, 321, 1
- Yoshida N., Sheth R.K., Diaferio A., 2001, MNRAS, 328, 669
- Zehavi I. et al., 2005, ApJ, 630, 1

## APPENDIX A: THE ANALYTICAL MODEL

This Appendix discusses how the halo model calculation of environm ental e ects on clustering can be extended to include redshift-space e ects. Our strategy is to combine the halo-model description of redshift space e ects (W hite 2001; Seljak 2001) with the halo model description of environm ental e ects provided by Abbas & Sheth (2005).

In redshift space, two e ects modify the real space expressions derived by Abbas & Sheth (2005). One of these is a boost of power on large scales due to the instream - ing of matter into overdense regions (K aiser 1987); this affects the 2-halo term s. U sing density conservation to linear order and making the distant observer approximation, the

redshift-space galaxy density perturbation can be written as

$$rs_{g} = g + v^{2}$$
 (A1)

where =  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} \quad \hat{\mathbf{k}}, \ _{g}$  is the real space galaxy density perturbation and  $\ _{v}$  is the velocity divergence. This is related to the density perturbation  $\ _{dm}$  via  $\ _{v} = \ f \ _{dm}$ , where f() d log =d log a ' <sup>0:6</sup>, and a is the scale factor.

The other e ect is the suppression of power due to the virial motions within haloes; this a ects the 1-halo term (Sheth 1996). The assumption of isotropic, isothermal, M axwellian motions within halos means that the e ect can be modeled as a convolution with a G aussian. In particular, the density contrast in redshift space is

$$r_{g}^{rs} = g e^{(k_{g})^{2} = 2}$$
: (A 2)

Scoccin arro (2004) discusses why these descriptions (equations A 1 and A 2) of redshift-space distortions are rather cnude. For our purposes, they represent reasonable rst approximations to a more sophisticated model.

Let n (M ;V) denote the number density of patches of m ass M and volume V, and let N (m M;V) be the average number of m haloes in regions of volume V which contain m ass M. The isotropized redshift space power spectrum is obtained by averaging  $\left( \begin{array}{c} rs \\ g \end{array} \right)^2$  over ,m and M. In particular, the 1-halo term can be written as,

$$P_{1h}^{gal}(kj) = \frac{\sum_{M_{max}} Z_{M}}{M_{min}} dM n (M; V) dm N (m M; V) \frac{[h2N_{s}jn iu (kjn) <_{1} (k) + hN_{s}jn i^{2} ju (kjn) f^{2} <_{2} (k)]}{n^{2}};$$
(A 3)

where

$$<_{p} ( = k [p=2]^{1=2}) = \frac{p}{2} \frac{\text{erf}()}{2}$$
 (A 4)

for p = 1;2, and  $n_{gal}$  is the number density of galaxies surrounded by regions containing at least N  $_{m in}$  other galaxies:

$$n_{gal} = \frac{Z_{M_{max}(N_{max})}}{dM n (M ; V)}$$

$$M_{min} (N_{min}) Z_{M} (A 5)$$

$$dm N (m M ; V) hN_{gal} jn i:$$
0

Here,  $hN_{gal}jn i = 1 + hN_s jn i$  is the average num ber of galaxies occupying a halo of massm (in our model, it is zero below som e m<sub>L</sub>; c.f. equation 1). In practice,  $M_{min}$  ( $N_{min}$ ) is obtained by varying  $N_{min}$  until the value of this expression m atches the observed num ber density.

The two-halo term is more complex as it now has two types of contributions: pairs which are in the same patch (2h-lp), and pairs in di erent patches (2h-2p). The 2h-lp term can only be important on intermediate scales (i.e., those which are larger than the diam eter of a typical halo but sm aller than the diam eter of a patch). The 2h-2p term is

$$P_{2h}^{gal}{}_{2p} = (F_g^2 + \frac{2}{3}F_vF_g + \frac{1}{5}F_v^2)P_{Lin}(kR_p); \quad (A 6)$$

where

7.

$$F_{v} = f \qquad dM \ n \ (M \ ;V) B \ (M \ ;V) Z_{M}^{M_{min}} Gm \ N \ (m \ M \ ;V) B \ (M \ ;V) F_{g} = \qquad dM \ n \ (M \ ;V) B \ (M \ ;V) M_{max} GM \ n \ (M \ ;V) B \ (M \ ;V) M_{M_{min}} C_{M}^{M_{min}} C_{M} M \ N \ (m \ M \ ;V) B \ (M \ ;V) M_{gal} in \ i C_{M} C_{M}$$

 $P_{Lin}$  (k  $\Re_p$ ) denotes the power spectrum associated with setting the linear theory correlation function to 1 on scales smaller than the diam eter of a patch  $2R_p$ . This truncation has little e ect on small  $kR_p$  1, where  $P_{Lin}$  (k  $\Re_p$ )  $P_{Lin}$  (k). And the factor B (M;V) describes the bias associated with the clustering of the patches; it depends on the abundance of such patches (see Abbas & Sheth 2005 for details).

Sim ilarly, the 2h-1p term can be written as

$$P_{2h_{1p}}^{gal}(kj) = \frac{\sum_{M_{max}}}{M_{min}} dM n (M; V) (F_{g}^{02} + \frac{2}{3}F_{v}^{0}F_{g}^{0} + \frac{1}{5}F_{v}^{02}) \\ H_{Lin}(k) P_{Lin}(k; R_{P});$$
(A.8)

where  $P_{L in}(k) = P_{L in}(k \Re_p)$  denotes the power spectrum associated with setting the linear theory correlation function to zero on scales larger than the diam eter of a patch  $2R_p$ , and

$$F_{v}^{0} = f \qquad \text{dm N (m } M ; V) \xrightarrow{m} <_{1} (k )b(m) u(kjn)$$

$$F_{g}^{0} = \sum_{0}^{M} dm N (m M ; V) \frac{hN_{gal}jn i}{n_{gal}} <_{1} (k )b(m) u(kjn):$$
(A 9)

Here b(m) is the bias factor of habes of mass m (from Sheth & Torm en 1999). The correlation function, (s), is obtained by taking the Fourier transform of the power spectrum P (k).