SUBSTRUCTURE IN THE COMA CLUSTER: GIANTS VERSUS DWARFS

SCOTT A. EDWARDS AND MATTHEW COLLESS¹

Research School of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Australian National University, Weston Creek, ACT 2611, Australia

TERRY J. BRIDGES

Anglo-Australian Observatory, P.O. Box 296, Epping, NSW 1710, Australia

DAVE CARTER

Liverpool John Moores University, Astrophysics Research Institute, Twelve Quays House, Egerton Wharf, Birkenhead, Wirral, CH41 1LD, UK

BAHRAM MOBASHER²

Space Telescope Science Institute, 3700 San Martin Drive, Baltimore, MD 21218

AND

BIANCA M. POGGIANTI

Osservatorio Astronomico di Padova, vicolo dell'Osservatorio 5, 35122 Padova, Italy

Received 2001 September 11; accepted 2001 November 5

ABSTRACT

The processes that form and shape galaxy clusters, such as infall, mergers, and dynamical relaxation, tend to generate distinguishable differences between the distributions of a cluster's giant and dwarf galaxies. Thus, the dynamics of dwarf galaxies in a cluster can provide valuable insights into its dynamical history. With this in mind, we look for differences between the spatial and velocity distributions of giant ($b < 18$) and dwarf ($b > 18$) galaxies in the Coma cluster. Our redshift sample contains new measurements from the 2dF and WYFFOS spectrographs, making it more complete at faint magnitudes than any previously studied sample of Coma galaxies. It includes 745 cluster members—452 giants and 293 dwarfs. We find that the line-of-sight velocity distribution of the giants is significantly non-Gaussian, but not that for the dwarfs. A battery of statistical tests of both the spatial and localized velocity distributions of the galaxies in our sample finds no strong evidence for differences between the giant and dwarf populations. These results rule out the cluster as a whole having moved significantly toward equipartition, and they are consistent with the cluster having formed via mergers between dynamically relaxed subclusters.

Subject headings: galaxies: clusters: individual (Coma) — galaxies: kinematics and dynamics

1. INTRODUCTION

Galaxy clusters provide us with valuable insights into the formation of large-scale structure in the universe, as well as being laboratories for studying galaxy formation and evolution. The Coma cluster is the most heavily studied of all galaxy clusters (see Biviano 1998 for an overview). Several lines of evidence, mostly based around the presence of substructure in the cluster, suggest that Coma has recently undergone mergers with smaller clusters. The first evidence for substructure was based on the spatial positions of galaxies on the sky (Fitchett & Webster 1987; Mellier et al. 1988; Escalera, Slezak, & Mazure 1992; Merritt & Tremblay 1994); more detailed evidence came from maps of the X-ray-emitting gas in the cluster obtained by *ROSAT* (Briel, Henry, & Böhringer 1992; White, Briel, & Henry 1993; Vikhlinin, Forman, & Jones 1994). Further evidence for a relatively recent merger history in Coma also comes from its anomalously low early-type dwarf-to-giant ratio (Secker & Harris 1996).

A deeper understanding of a cluster's mass distribution and dynamical history can come from the line-of-sight velocities of the cluster members, obtained from redshift measurements. Colless & Dunn (1996, hereafter CD96) made the first identification of statistically significant substructure in Coma's velocity distribution. (An earlier study

by Dressler & Shectman 1988 did not find evidence of significant velocity substructure.) CD96 were also able to develop a likely merger history for the cluster, involving three subclusters centered around each of the major cD galaxies: NGC 4874, NGC 4889, and NGC 4839. (Strictly, NGC 4889 is a D galaxy since it lacks the extended halo characterizing cD galaxies, but we will refer to all three central dominant galaxies as cDs for convenience.) Biviano et al. (1996, hereafter B96) carried out a similar analysis, although their interpretation of the results was slightly different. Notably, they argued that subclustering is only evident for the brighter ($b < 17$) galaxies, and that the distribution of fainter dwarf galaxies is much smoother and comprises the main body of the cluster.

These studies of the kinematics of Coma have suffered from a lack of statistically large numbers of dwarf galaxy redshifts in their samples. This is important, since the kinematics of the dwarfs may provide some essential clues toward the dynamics and formation of the cluster. For example, clusters achieve full dynamical relaxation in two stages. The first is through violent relaxation, which leaves all galaxies with the same velocity dispersion regardless of mass. The second is through dynamical friction, which acts on longer timescales than violent relaxation and results in equipartition of energy. This leaves the massive giants with a lower velocity dispersion than the dwarfs, so the evidence of equipartition can be detected by directly comparing the dwarf and giant distributions. The kinematics of the dwarfs might also reveal something about their origins. For example, some subset of the dwarfs may be preferentially

¹ Please direct correspondence to colless@mso.anu.edu.au.

² Also affiliated with the Space Sciences Department of the European Space Agency.

accreted at late times from the field (Donas, Milliard, & Laget 1995; Bravo-Alfaro et al. 2000; Gallagher, Conselice, & Wyse 2001), so that rather than being in virial equilibrium, they are falling into or through the cluster, either on their first approach (Caldwell et al. 1993; CD96) or having already passed once through the cluster core (Burns et al. 1994; Vollmer et al. 2001). Alternatively, some dwarfs may, in fact, belong to satellite populations bound to the cD galaxies in the clusters. In all these cases, the kinematics of the dwarfs provide a telltale signature. Recent studies that have searched for these signatures in the dwarf populations of clusters other than Coma include Stein, Jerjen, & Federspiel (1997) on Centaurus, Drinkwater, Gregg, & Colless (2001) on Fornax, and Conselice, Gallagher, & Wyse (2001) and Gallagher et al. (2001) on Virgo.

We have assembled a redshift sample that is more complete at faint magnitudes than any used previously. This was made possible by utilizing the ability of the 2dF (2° Field, see Lewis et al. 2002) and WYFFOS (Bridges 1998) multifiber spectrographs to measure many spectra at once over a wide field of view. This sample is described in § 2. In § 3, we describe how we used this sample to compare the velocity and spatial distributions of giant and dwarf galaxies. We find that the line-of-sight velocity distribution for the giants is non-Gaussian with greater than 99% significance, while the dwarf distribution is close to being a Gaussian. However, a battery of statistical tests failed to detect any other significant evidence for differences between the distributions of giants and dwarfs. In § 4, we show that the lack of detectable differences in the localized velocity distribution rules out the possibility of the entire cluster having proceeded significantly toward equipartition, which is consistent with the estimated timescales for dynamic friction to act in the cluster as a whole. However, we find that the number of available redshifts for dwarf galaxies in Coma is still not enough to distinguish more subtle differences between the giant and dwarf distributions that may have developed in the past due to mergers with smaller clusters.

2. DATA

The positions, b magnitudes, and $B-R$ colors of the galaxies in our sample were taken from the GMP catalog (Godwin, Metcalfe, & Peach 1983). Our redshifts, 1174 in total, comprise the set used by CD96 (a mixture of values taken from the literature and values measured with the Hydra spectrograph), plus 272 more recently measured redshifts from the 2dF spectrograph at the Anglo-Australian Telescope. An additional 123 redshifts were taken from the sample measured using the WYFFOS spectrograph on the William Herschel Telescope (Komiyama et al. 2002; Mobasher et al. 2001; Poggianti et al. 2001). Seventy-six of the galaxies observed with WYFFOS were also observed with 2dF, and the corresponding redshifts were averaged; the other 47 were not covered by the 2dF data. Due to these extra redshifts from 2dF and WYFFOS, our sample is more complete at faint magnitudes than the sample used by CD96.

Because of the low resolution of available images of the dwarf galaxies in Coma, it was not possible to identify them morphologically. Instead, we distinguish dwarfs from giants using a magnitude cutoff. The choice of a cutoff is arbitrary, as there is no obvious break in the properties of the galaxies in our sample as a function of magnitude. We chose an

absolute dividing magnitude of -17 , which is consistent with values used in earlier papers, e.g., Poggianti et al. (2001). At the distance of the Coma cluster, this corresponds to an apparent magnitude of $b = 18$ (assuming $H_0 \sim 70 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$). In order to determine the completeness of the giant and dwarf samples, we compare the number of galaxies in the redshift samples with the total number in the GMP catalogue (complete to $b = 20$), excluding those that fall outside the red edge of the cluster color-magnitude relation, which is described in § 3.3 and Figure 5. Galaxies bluer than the bottom edge of the color-magnitude band were left in the sample, since there is a reasonable chance that unusually blue galaxies may be cluster members that have only recently fallen into the cluster. As such, the completeness percentages quoted below are lower limits on the true completeness. The redshift data for the giant sample ($b < 18$) is 80% complete over the whole cluster, and 100% complete within $20'$ of the cluster center (which is approximately at the position of NGC 4874). The set of redshifts for galaxies with $b > 18$ is only 34% complete over the whole cluster but 55% complete in the central $20'$. To check for any spatial bias in these dwarf redshifts, we first noted that the limited sample $18 < b < 19$ is about 60% complete over the whole cluster and 85% complete in the central region. Thus, any bias present for this limited sample would be small, especially in the central region. We then compared this limited sample with the spatial distribution of galaxies fainter than $b = 19$. We found that redshift measurements for the $b > 19$ galaxies were restricted mainly to the central regions near the cD galaxies. This is an artifact of low completeness away from the center of the cluster—the $b > 19$ subsample is 39% complete in the central $20'$, but only 22% complete over the central $50'$. Thus, there is some bias toward the cluster center in the dwarf sample. However, all of the statistical tests discussed in this paper were duplicated using the upper magnitude-limited $18 < b < 19$ dwarf sample, and none of the results differed significantly from those obtained using the $b > 18$ sample (with no upper

FIG. 1.—Histograms of the line-of-sight velocity distribution for galaxies in the Coma cluster: (a) Giants ($b < 18$), (b) Dwarfs ($b > 18$).

magnitude limit). We concluded that the spatial bias in the dwarf redshift sample does not significantly affect our results. For the rest of the paper, the term *dwarf sample* is assumed to refer to galaxies with $b > 18$, with no enforced upper magnitude limit.

Galaxies with redshifts in the range $4000 < cz < 10,000$ km s⁻¹ were taken to be members of the cluster; others were assumed to be field galaxies and were excluded. Over the whole cluster, the resulting giant sample contains 452 galaxies and the dwarf sample contains 293 galaxies. In the following, we focus mostly on the region within 20' of the cluster center, as this was where our redshift sample was most complete. It should be pointed out that the most significant substructure found by CD96 was about 40' from the cluster center, the subcluster surrounding NGC 4839, which appears to be in the process of colliding with the rest of the cluster. We devote some attention to this region in the section on spatial substructure below.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Line-of-Sight Velocity Distributions

CD96 found that the line-of-sight velocity distribution for galaxies in Coma was non-Gaussian with a greater than 99% probability. However, their sample contained few dwarfs; it was roughly the same set of galaxies as our sample of giants. To investigate whether this non-Gaussianity is also apparent for the dwarfs, we plot histograms of the velocity distributions of the giants and the dwarfs separately in Figure 1. At a glance, the giant distribution seems to be non-Gaussian, and a Lilliefors test (a Kolmogorov-Smirnov [K-S] test which takes into account the fact that the mean and standard deviation are estimated from the data) confirms this impression, rejecting a Gaussian fit with a greater than 99% probability. The dwarf distribution, on the other hand, is only rejected as a Gaussian with less than 75% confidence. Thus, there is strong evi-

dence from the velocities alone for substructure in the giant distribution, but not for the dwarfs.

Despite this hint that the giant and dwarf distributions are different, a direct comparison between the two using a two-sample K-S test gives only a 45% chance that this is actually the case. It may be that there simply are not enough dwarf redshifts to be able to tell whether the dwarf velocities are drawn from the same distribution as the giants or whether they really do, in fact, follow a Gaussian. To check this, a sample of 293 giants (as many as the number of dwarfs) was selected at random from the giant distribution and tested for Gaussianity. This was repeated 1000 times. We found that 3% of the random samples generated in this way had a less than 75% chance of being non-Gaussian. Thus, there is a small, but not negligible, possibility that the dwarfs could be drawn from the same distribution as the giants and still not show any detectable signs of non-Gaussianity. We had to increase the number of sampled giants to about 330 for there to be a less than 1% chance of a sample having a less than 75% chance of being non-Gaussian. Thus, we would have to increase the number of dwarf redshifts in our sample before we could tell with any certainty if the line-of-sight velocity distributions really are different.

Given the arbitrary nature of our choice for a dividing magnitude between giants and dwarfs, it is worth investigating whether changing the dividing magnitude affects these results. If $b = 17$ is used instead of $b = 18$, the number of giants and dwarfs becomes 306 and 439, respectively. Note that there are now more dwarfs than giants. Despite this, the results of the Lilliefors tests and the two-sample K-S test are exactly the same as before: the giants are significantly non-Gaussian, but not the dwarfs, while a direct comparison finds only a 45% chance that the two distributions differ. We take this as an indication that our results are not sensitive to small changes in the choice of dividing magnitude. This also increases our confidence that the non-Gaussianity in the line-of-sight velocity distribution really is restricted to the giants, since in this case we cannot put the difference down to having less dwarf redshifts than giant redshifts. Finally, since B96 used a cutoff of $b = 17$ rather than 18 to divide the giants and dwarfs, this result tells us that we can meaningfully compare our results to theirs.

The velocity dispersion for the giants is $\sigma_{Gi} = (979 \pm 30)$ km s⁻¹ and for the dwarfs, $\sigma_{Dw} = (1096 \pm 45)$ km s⁻¹. The dwarf dispersion is larger than that of the giants at the 2.2 σ level. This is qualitatively consistent with the effects of equipartition, which involves the transfer of kinetic energy from massive galaxies to lighter ones. However, complete equipartition would generate a far bigger difference between the giant and dwarf dispersions. To demonstrate this, we performed a Monte Carlo simulation in which each galaxy was assigned a velocity drawn from a Gaussian with a dispersion proportional to $1/\sqrt{M}$, (where M is the mass of the galaxy in question), as expected for a cluster in equipartition. The mass of each galaxy is assumed to be proportional to its luminosity, and the mass-to-light ratio is assumed to be the same for all galaxies. After assigning each galaxy a velocity, all of the velocities were scaled so that the dispersion of the total sample (giants plus dwarfs) was the same as that for the real data, about 1000 km s⁻¹. The resulting dispersions for the giants and for the dwarfs (averaged over five simulations) were $\sigma_{Gi} = (482 \pm 16)$ km s⁻¹ and $\sigma_{Dw} = (1523 \pm 60)$, a much larger difference than is

FIG. 2.—Cumulative frequency of giants as a function of redshift (stepped line) superimposed on a cumulative Gaussian (smooth curve) that has the same mean and dispersion as the giants. Note that the largest gap between the two, which defines the K-S statistic, is at $cz \sim 6500$ km s⁻¹.

seen in the real data. We can conclude from this that the cluster as a whole can only have marginally begun to proceed towards equipartition.

There is some evidence that many dwarf ellipticals in clusters arise from the infall of late-type galaxies (Gallagher et al. 2001). The infall scenario predicts that the dwarf velocity distribution should be broader than that of the giants. This is because an infalling population is not virialized; the kinetic energy is roughly equal to the potential energy, rather than half the potential energy, so the velocities of infalling galaxies should be on average a factor of $\sqrt{2}$ larger than those of a virialized population. As noted above, the dwarf line-of-sight velocity distribution is indeed slightly broader than the giant distribution. However, as well as being wider, we would expect the distribution of an infalling population to be non-Gaussian (because it is not dynamically relaxed), and we see no evidence of that here. The fact that the dwarf distribution is close to Gaussian suggests that even if the dwarfs did form from infall in the past, they have since undergone some form of dynamical relaxation which has erased the kinematic signature of the infall. An alternative explanation is possible if infall occurs in bursts, rather than continuously: a superposition of many “infall burst” distributions of various dispersions and mean velocities could conceivably (although not necessarily) look Gaussian.

To investigate the cause of the non-Gaussianity of the giants’ velocity distribution, the cumulative frequency of giants as a function of cz was plotted along with a cumulative Gaussian with the same mean and dispersion (Fig. 2). We can see that the largest deviation from a Gaussian distribution occurs at $cz \sim 6500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. This corresponds to the position of the largest gap in the velocity histogram for the giants (Fig. 1). The gap is not evident in the dwarf distribution. Remarkably, the central velocity of this gap is close to the velocity of NGC 4889 ($cz = 6508 \text{ km s}^{-1}$). Also, a smaller gap around $cz = 7400 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ seems to correspond to the velocity of NGC 4839. This begs the question of whether or not these gaps are directly caused by the cD galaxies, via mergers or other less obvious dynamical effects. We can gain some insight into this question by looking at the spatial positions of galaxies at different redshifts, as described in the next section.

3.2. Localized Velocity Structure

Figure 3 is a plot of the smoothed galaxy distribution as a function of projected distance, D , along the northeast-southwest axis in the sky and of the line-of-sight velocity, cz , for the giants (a) and for the dwarfs (b). Distance is defined in terms of $\Delta R.A.$ and $\Delta \text{decl.}$ by $D = (\Delta R.A. + \Delta \text{decl.})/\sqrt{2}$, with northeast being positive and $D = 0$ at the cluster center. The northeast-southwest axis is a natural choice because it is the axis on which the three cD galaxies are the most separated, and it seems to correspond roughly to the direction along which the NGC 4839 subcluster is approaching the main body of Coma (CD96). The smoothed density plot in Figure 3 was generated by convolving the actual galaxy distribution with a two-dimensional Gaussian kernel. The smoothing algorithm was adaptive, meaning that the width of the Gaussian was varied depending on the local density of galaxies. The base values for the dispersions of the Gaussian kernel were $\sigma_D = 5'$ and $\sigma_{cz} = 200 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and these were scaled for each grid point by a factor proportional to $1/\sqrt{\text{den}}$, where “den” is

FIG. 3.—Smoothed density of galaxies as a function of line-of-sight velocity (cz) and distance (D) along the northeast-southwest axis of the cluster (where northeast is positive). Panel (a) is the distribution of giants, and panel (b) is the distribution of dwarfs. In each case, density is smoothed using an adaptive two-dimensional Gaussian kernel with base dispersions $\sigma_D = 5'$ and $\sigma_{cz} = 200 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. Small crosses mark the positions of the galaxies; three large crosses represent the three dominant galaxies (from left to right), NGC 4889, NGC 4874, and NGC 4839.

the density of galaxies at that grid point. Thus, the kernel narrows in high-density regions and broadens in low-density regions.

Recall that from the velocity distribution (Figs. 1 and 2), we expect to see gaps in the density of giant galaxies around $cz \sim 6500$ and 7400 km s^{-1} . There are indeed bands of noticeably reduced density at these redshifts, but they are

FIG. 4.—Six slices in velocity through the $\Delta R.A.-\Delta \text{decl.}-cz$ distribution: (a), (c), and (e) are the distribution of giants in the velocity ranges A, B, and C, respectively. Panels (b), (d), and (f) are the same, but for the dwarfs. The three ranges are A: $5400 < cz < 6600$, B: $6400 < cz < 7600$, and C: $7400 < cz < 8600$, where cz is in km s^{-1} . Each density plot was smoothed with an adaptive two-dimensional Gaussian kernel with base dispersions $\sigma_{\Delta R.A.} = \sigma_{\Delta \text{decl.}} = 3'$. Small crosses are the positions of the galaxies, and two large crosses are NGC 4889 (*left*) and NGC 4874 (*right*).

not strongly localized. The only identifiable holes are at $D = \pm 20'$. If the velocity gaps were really caused by the cD galaxies, we would expect to see some correlation between the spatial positions of these galaxies and the gaps, but this does not appear to be the case.

When comparing these two plots by eye, there seem to be obvious differences between them, such as the peak in the

density of giants at ($D \sim 0'$, $cz \sim 8000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$), which does not occur in the dwarf distribution. However, these differences may well just be statistical fluctuations. We used three different tests to calculate the significance of any differences between the giant and dwarf distributions: a two-dimensional χ^2 test, a two-dimensional K-S test, and a Monte Carlo resampling test. Details concerning the first

two can be found in Press et al. (1992). The Monte Carlo test works by running through all of the galaxies in the sample and reassigning each to either the dwarf group or the giant group at random, where the probability of being a dwarf is just the ratio of the number of dwarfs to total number of galaxies in the real sample. A large number of these reassigned samples (~ 1000) are generated, and for each the binned statistic *Diff* is calculated. *Diff* is defined by

$$Diff = \sum_i \left(\frac{D_i}{D_i + G_i} - P \right)^2 \quad (1)$$

where D_i and G_i are the numbers of dwarfs and giants in bin i and $P = D_{\text{tot}}/(D_{\text{tot}} + G_{\text{tot}})$ is the probability that any given galaxy is a dwarf. We then compare the value of *Diff* for the real sample with the range calculated for the Monte Carlo reassigned samples to obtain an estimate of the likelihood that the dwarfs and giants are from different distributions. Note that the *Diff* statistic is very similar to the χ^2 statistic; the difference is that for *Diff*, each term in the sum is not weighted by the total number of galaxies in that bin, so the result is less sensitive to small differences in highly populated bins than would be the case for χ^2 .

Each test was applied firstly to all the galaxies with $-50' < D < 50'$ and $5000 < cz < 9000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (henceforth referred to as the *large* range), and then again to just the galaxies with $-20' < D < 20'$ and $6000 < cz < 8000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (henceforth referred to as the *central* range). When calculating the χ^2 and Monte Carlo statistics, any bins with fewer than 5 galaxies total (giants and dwarfs) were neglected. The number of bins was chosen to be the maximum for which the number of neglected bins did not exceed 25% of the total. This turned out to be a 6×6 -bin grid for the large range and a 5×5 grid for the central range. The results for each test when applied to the D versus cz distribution, quoted as the probability that the giant and dwarf distributions differ, are given in Table 1. In summary, these tests give no better than a $\sim 85\%$ chance that the two

TABLE 1
RESULTS FOR D VS. cz

Range	χ^2 (%)	K-S (%)	Monte Carlo (%)
Large range	81	71	81
Central range.....	15	85	28

distributions are different, which is not enough to make any strong claims that statistically significant differences exist.

Another way to investigate how velocity substructure correlates with spatial position is to plot the galaxy densities on the sky for restricted redshift ranges. We have done this for three different (but slightly overlapping) ranges: $5400 < cz < 6600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, $6400 < cz < 7600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, and $7400 < cz < 8600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The motivation for choosing these three ranges is related to conflicting claims made by CD96 and B96 regarding which velocity structures are associated with which of the cD galaxies. Both papers agree that the peak in galaxy density around ($D \sim 0'$, $cz \sim 7000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) is associated with NGC 4874. However, they do not agree about which galaxies are associated with NGC 4889. CD96 identify the galaxies around ($D \sim 5'$, $cz \sim 8000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) with NGC 4889, whereas B96 assume the relevant cluster to be that around ($D \sim 5'$, $cz \sim 6000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$).

The projected density plots for the three velocity ranges (referred to henceforth as A, B, and C, respectively) for both giants and dwarfs are shown in Figure 4. The densities for these plots were smoothed using an adaptive Gaussian kernel with base dispersions $\sigma_{\text{R.A.}} = \sigma_{\text{decl.}} = 3'$. The densities in each of the three giant plots are set to the same scale; that is, they are all normalized to the maximum value in region B. The same is true independently for the three dwarf plots. (In other words, they have the same shading scale as each other, but different to the giant plots.) $\Delta \text{R.A.}$ and $\Delta \text{decl.}$ are restricted to the range $\pm 20'$ to focus attention to the area around NGC 4874 and NGC 4889. In

FIG. 5.—(a) $B-R$ color plotted against magnitude b for all galaxies within the redshift range ($4000 < cz < 10,000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$) and thus deemed to be members of the cluster. Solid lines delineate the band within which most of the points fall. (b) Same plot for all galaxies, regardless of redshift. Any galaxies without measured redshifts and which fall outside the cluster color-magnitude relation determined from (a) are assumed to be field galaxies and are neglected.

velocity range A, centered around $cz = 6000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, both the giants and the dwarfs exhibit density maxima located roughly at the positions of NGC 4874 and 4889, although offset by up to $10'$. In velocity range B, the density maxima near NGC 4889 have vanished, but a peak near NGC 4874 is obvious for both giants and dwarfs (although the peak in dwarf density is slightly less well defined than for the giants). Finally, in velocity range C, we still see for the giants a peak halfway between NGC 4874 and NGC 4889, whereas for the dwarfs, there is no major peak near either of the two supergiant galaxies. Based on these figures, it is hard to make a clear identification of any one clump in velocity space with NGC 4889. The lack of dwarfs near NGC 4889 in region C seems to point to the galaxies with velocities around $cz \sim 6000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ (region A) being associated with NGC 4889, consistent with the assumption made by B96, but this is by no means conclusive.

B96 also argue that significant subclustering is only evident for the brighter (giant) galaxies and not the fainter (dwarf) galaxies. To test this, we used the χ^2 , K-S, and Monte Carlo tests to check for statistically significant differences between the spatial distributions of giants and dwarfs in each of the velocity ranges plotted in Figure 4. For the χ^2 and Monte Carlo tests, we used a 4×4 grid of bins, and we neglected any bins containing fewer than 3 galaxies in total. The results (quoted as the percentage chance of the two distributions being different) are given in Table 2. These results clearly show no evidence of significant differences between the spatial distribution of giants and dwarfs in any of the three redshift ranges. In fact, the distributions of giants and dwarfs seem to be unusually *similar* compared to what we would expect if each galaxy was assigned to be a giant or a dwarf at random, especially in range B. Based on these results, then, there is no evidence that subclustering is restricted to just the giant galaxies. This is not to say that such a difference does not exist, merely that, if it does, our statistical tests cannot detect it with the number of redshifts available to us. The issue of what differences our tests are, in principle, capable of detecting is discussed further in § 4.

3.3. Spatial Substructure

The final test we carried out was to compare the spatial distribution of giant and dwarf galaxies, ignoring redshift entirely. The giant and dwarf samples were expanded to include all the galaxies in Coma, without determined redshifts. Since redshift cannot be used to determine whether these galaxies are part of the cluster or not, we used the color-magnitude relationship instead. If the $b-r$ color is plotted against magnitude b for galaxies in the cluster, the points generally fall on a distinct band, as can be seen in Figure 5a. Galaxies that did not have determined redshifts and lay outside this band on the color-magnitude plot (Fig. 5b) were assumed to be field galaxies and were not included

in the sample. The resulting expanded giant sample has 529 galaxies, and the expanded dwarf sample has 1041 galaxies.

The smoothed density plots of the spatial distribution of the two expanded samples are shown in Figure 6. The results look something like the picture of Coma put forward by B96: the distribution of giants shows two distinct peaks around the two central supergiants, NGC 4889 and NGC 4874, while the dwarf distribution has a peak between the two supergiants at a position corresponding to a secondary

FIG. 6.—Density plots of spatial position for giants (a) and dwarfs (b). Galaxy samples used here include all galaxies with $4000 < cz < 10,000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$, plus galaxies without redshifts but within the cluster color-magnitude relation (see Fig. 5). Smoothing is done with an adaptive two-dimensional Gaussian kernel with base dispersions $\sigma_{\Delta R.A.} = \sigma_{\Delta Dec.} = 5'$. As before, small crosses mark the positions of the galaxies and large crosses mark NGC 4889, NGC 4874, and NGC 4839 (from left to right).

TABLE 2
RESULTS FOR VELOCITY SLICES

Range	χ^2 (%)	K-S (%)	Monte Carlo (%)
A ($5400 < cz < 6600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$).....	64	17	36
B ($6400 < cz < 7600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$).....	22	19	10
C ($7400 < cz < 8600 \text{ km s}^{-1}$).....	27	84	24

TABLE 3
RESULTS FOR PROJECTED POSITION ON THE SKY

Range	χ^2 (%)	K-S (%)	Monte Carlo (%)
Large range	71	92	83
Central range	59	35	86
Around NGC 4839	57	55	34

peak in the *ROSAT* X-ray map. (There is also another large peak about 10' west and 5' south of NGC 4874, which does not appear to correspond to the position of any major central dominant galaxy.) Once again, we applied the three statistical tests to the two distributions to find out whether these apparent differences are significant. Three ranges were tested: a large range ($-50' < \Delta R.A. < 50'$, $-50' < \Delta \text{decl.} < 50'$); a smaller central range ($-20' < \Delta R.A. < 20'$, $-20' < \Delta \text{decl.} < 20'$); and a range surrounding NGC 4839, where CD96 found the most significant subclustering ($-50' < \Delta R.A. < -10'$, $-50' < \Delta \text{decl.} < -10'$). The two binned tests (the Monte Carlo and the χ^2) used a 7×7 grid and a cutoff of 10 galaxies per bin for the large region, a 5×5 grid and a cutoff of eight galaxies per bin for the central region, and a 4×4 grid and cutoff of five galaxies per bin for the region around NGC 4839. These values were chosen based on the size of each region and the density of galaxies there. The results of the statistical tests—once again in terms of the percentage chance of difference—are given in Table 3. None of the significance levels produced by any of the tests is high enough to be held up as strong evidence for a statistically significant difference. It could be argued that the grid size used in the binned tests was too large to pick up the features described by B96 (namely, the difference in position of the peaks in the giant density and the dwarf density). To check this, we have repeated the tests using twice as many bins in the central region and a cutoff of three galaxies per bin, and the results are approximately the same as before; no greater than a 90% chance of the two distributions being different. The same is true if we restrict attention to an even smaller central region of ($-5' < \Delta R.A. < 10'$, $-5' < \Delta \text{decl.} < 10'$), which just encloses the density peaks for both giants and dwarfs.

4. DISCUSSION

B96 concluded that the dwarf distribution was significantly more uniform than the giant distribution. They offered as an explanation the possibility that the original subclusters that make up Coma had time to proceed toward equipartition before they merged, spreading out the dwarfs in both position and velocity space. Our results for the line-of-sight velocity distributions of the giants and dwarfs are consistent with the findings of B96, in that there is significant substructure (and thus non-Gaussianity) present in the giant distribution but not the dwarf distribution. However, we find no evidence for differences between the localized velocity distributions or the spatial distributions of the giants and dwarfs, which contradicts B96. The primary reason why our conclusions differ is that B96 made no direct statistical comparisons between the giant and dwarf distributions. Although to the eye there do appear to be differences, our tests show that there is still a significant probability of the giants and dwarfs belonging to the same

distribution. Nonetheless, it is worth investigating whether it is plausible that the original subclusters could have been in equipartition, as B96 proposed.

The main processes by which energy can be transferred from massive galaxies to lighter ones in clusters are two-body relaxation and dynamical friction. The typical timescale for two-body relaxation in a cluster the size of Coma is $t_{\text{tb}} \gtrsim 3 \times 10^{11}$ yr (Sarazin 1986), much greater than a Hubble time, so we can expect that dynamical friction will be the dominant process driving the cluster toward equipartition. If we assume that the core of the cluster is an isothermal sphere, the timescale t_{fr} for dynamical friction to significantly alter the momentum of a galaxy with mass M is given by (Binney & Tremaine 1987)

$$t_{\text{fr}} = \frac{66 \text{ Gyr}}{\ln \Lambda} \left(\frac{r_i}{0.5 \text{ Mpc}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\sigma}{1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}} \right) \left(\frac{10^{12} M_{\odot}}{M} \right), \quad (2)$$

where Λ is the ratio of the largest possible impact parameter to the smallest, r_i is the initial radius of the galaxy's orbit, and σ is the velocity dispersion of the cluster. Typically, $\ln \Lambda \sim 3$ (Sarazin 1986); for Coma, $r_i \simeq 0.5$ Mpc, and $\sigma \simeq 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. When these values are substituted into equation (2), we find that $t_{\text{fr}} \simeq 22$ Gyr for a galaxy of $10^{12} M_{\odot}$ (a typical mass for a "giant" galaxy). A galaxy would have to be more massive than $2.2 \times 10^{13} M_{\odot}$ to have a dynamic friction timescale less than 1 Gyr. According to Vikhlinin et al. (1994), the masses of the two largest galaxies in the cluster, NGC 4874 and NGC 4889, are both approximately $1 \times 10^{13} M_{\odot}$, so not even they should have had time to settle into the center of the cluster potential. This is consistent with the observation that the galaxy velocities do not show the signature of equipartition and that the velocities of the main cD galaxies are displaced from the mean velocity of the surrounding galaxies.

Is it plausible that the subclusters conjectured to be merging with Coma would have had time to approach equipartition? A rough criterion for judging this is to require t_{fr} to be less than 1 Gyr for at least the most massive galaxies in a subcluster. The velocity dispersion of a cluster scales roughly as the square-root of its mass, so a subcluster with around 0.1 times the mass of Coma should have a velocity dispersion of $\sqrt{0.1} \times$ the dispersion of Coma, or about 300 km s^{-1} . Then r_i for such a subcluster only needs to be a factor of 3 smaller than that of Coma to bring t_{fr} below 1 Gyr for a $10^{12} M_{\odot}$ galaxy. These values of σ and r_i are well within the ranges that have actually been observed in small clusters (Adami et al. 1998), so there is a good chance that any subclusters that have merged with Coma would have been at least partially in equipartition.

The next question is this: If Coma is really composed of subclusters that are (or were) in equipartition, are our statistical tests capable of detecting it? We checked this by carrying out some Monte Carlo simulations. The first set, described above in § 3.1, reassigned velocities to each of the galaxies in a way consistent with the *entire cluster* being in equipartition. The positions of the galaxies were left unchanged. The resulting velocity distributions showed a marked difference between giants and dwarfs, much larger than the difference seen in the real data. We also tested the D versus cz distributions from the simulated data in exactly the same way as was done for the real data. The result (for the large range) was always a greater than 99.9% probability of the giant and dwarf distributions being different. (The

results in the central range were a bit less consistent, with $\sim \frac{1}{2}$ of the simulations resulting in a greater than 99% significance level.) So we can be fairly confident that if the entire cluster was in equipartition, we would be able to detect it. The fact that we do not is consistent with our expectation that Coma, as a whole, is too large to have approached equipartition.

The second set of simulations was done to mimic two equipartitioned subclusters (centered around NGC 4889 and NGC 4839, respectively) in the process of merging with a main cluster body centered on NGC 4874. This is approximately the merger scenario proposed by CD96. A certain fraction of the galaxies within $25'$ of NGC 4889 and NGC 4839 were randomly assigned as being “bound”; the fraction was chosen so that the number of galaxies bound to each of NGC 4889 and NGC 4839 comprised 10% of the total cluster population. The galaxies of these two bound populations were assigned velocities consistent with equipartition, with a dispersion scaled to 300 km s^{-1} and a mean velocity equal to that of the relevant cD galaxy. We use 300 km s^{-1} for the dispersion of the bound groups because these groups have about 10% of the mass of the entire cluster, and we expect the dispersion to scale as the square root of the mass, $\sqrt{0.1} \simeq 0.32$, so the bound group dispersion should be roughly $1/3$ that of the entire cluster. The remaining 80% of the cluster population was assumed *not* to be in equipartition (due to the combined effects of earlier mergers, violent relaxation, and infall). These galaxies were assigned velocities taken at random from a single Gaussian with a dispersion of 1000 km s^{-1} and a mean equal to the velocity of NGC 4874.

One thousand of these merger velocity distributions were simulated. For each, the line-of-sight velocity distributions for giants and dwarfs had very similar dispersions ($\sim 1000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$), just like in the real data. Direct comparisons between the giant and dwarf velocity distributions using a K-S test failed to turn up a significant difference. Remarkably, though, for 37% of the simulated distributions, the velocities of the giants were non-Gaussian with a greater than 99% certainty. Conversely, only 1.4% of the dwarf distributions were significantly non-Gaussian. The reason for this is that the effect of equipartition in the bound groups is to reduce the dispersion of giant velocities and spread out the dwarf velocities, so there tend to be distinct peaks in the giant line-of-sight velocity distribution around the velocities of NGC 4889 and NGC 4839, but not in the dwarf distribution. Thus, it is plausible that this sort of merger scenario could account for the non-Gaussianity of the real giant distribution and the contrasting Gaussianity of the real dwarf distribution.

The D versus cz distributions of the simulated data were also compared, using the two-dimensional K-S two-sample test. The giant and dwarf distributions were found to have, on average, an 85% chance of being different; only 2.3% of the simulated distributions were found to have a greater than 99% chance of being different. Thus, the statistical tests fail to detect the signature of equipartition in the subclusters with a high level of confidence, just as they did with the real data.

We would expect that, in principle at least, increasing the number of redshifts in our sample would boost our chances of detecting evidence of differences between the giants and dwarfs. However, there are only so many galaxies there to be measured. We estimate that roughly 670 of the dwarf

galaxies listed in the GMP catalog, which is complete to $b = 20$, are actually cluster members. The reasoning behind this is that about 52% of the galaxies with measured redshifts (and bluer than the top edge of the cluster color-magnitude relation) are actually cluster members, so roughly the same percentage of the total number of dwarfs in the GMP catalog (again, bluer than the top edge of the cluster color-magnitude relation) are likely to be cluster members. If we had redshifts for all 670 of these dwarfs, would we then be able to detect significant differences between the giants and the dwarfs? To answer this question, we ran a final set of merger-mimicking simulations, this time including all the giants and 670 dwarfs, drawn at random from the catalogue. The chances of detecting differences did improve slightly with the increased sample size, but still not enough to be statistically significant. The two-dimensional K-S two-sample test found that on average there was an 87% chance that the giant and dwarf D versus cz distributions were different; only 5% of the simulated distributions were found to have a greater than 99% chance of being different. This suggests that even if we measured redshifts for every dwarf in the cluster brighter than $b = 20$, we would still not have a high chance of detecting evidence of equipartitioned subclusters in the D versus cz distributions.

Even though this toy model of a merger scenario is contrived, it demonstrates that Coma *could* indeed consist of equipartitioned subclusters. Indeed, the subcluster equipartitioning seems to generate the sort of non-Gaussianity in the giants (but not the dwarfs) that we see in the real data. However, it does not generate differences between the giant and dwarf distributions that are strong enough to detect with our direct statistical comparisons, even if we measured the redshifts of all dwarf cluster members down to $b = 20$.

5. CONCLUSION

The distribution of line-of-sight velocities for giant galaxies (those with $b < 18$) in the Coma cluster shows strong evidence of non-Gaussianity, caused primarily by a large gap in velocities around $cz = 6500 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. This gap, and others in the distribution, seems to correspond to the velocities of the cD galaxies NGC 4489 and NGC 4839, but it is still a mystery whether or not the cD galaxies are directly responsible for causing the gaps. Unlike that for the giants, the distribution of velocities for a sample of dwarf galaxies ($b > 18$) exhibits no significant non-Gaussianity and no significant gaps. However, tests directly comparing the localized velocity substructure and spatial substructure in the giant and dwarf distributions show no strong evidence for significant differences between the two populations. Our results rule out the cluster as a whole having moved significantly toward equipartition. On the other hand, they are consistent with the possibility that Coma formed from the merger of subclusters that were in equipartition; indeed, our simulations suggest that such a scenario can explain the non-Gaussianity of the giant line-of-sight velocity distribution and the contrasting Gaussianity of the dwarfs. We also find that such a merger scenario may not generate a strong enough difference between the giant and dwarf distributions to be able to detect by direct statistical comparison, even if the redshifts of all cluster members brighter than $b = 20$ were measured, so more sensitive tests must be developed to put stronger constraints on Coma’s merger history.

REFERENCES

- Adami, C., Mazure, A., Biviano, A., Katgert, P., & Rhee G. 1998, *A&A*, 331, 493
- Binney, J., & Tremaine, S. 1987, *Galactic Dynamics* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press)
- Biviano, A. 1998, in *Untangling Coma Berenices: A New Vision of an Old Cluster*, ed. A. Mazure, F. Casoli, F. Durret, & D. Gerbal (Singapore: World Scientific), 1
- Biviano, A., et al. 1996, *A&A*, 311, 95
- Bravo-Alfaro, H., Cayatte, V., van Gorkom, J. H., & Balkowski C. 2000, *AJ*, 119, 580
- Bridges, T. J. 1998, in *ASP Conf. Ser. 152, Fiber Optics in Astronomy III*, ed. S. Arribas, E. Mediavilla, & F. Watson (San Francisco: ASP), 104
- Briel, U. G., Henry, J. P., & Böhringer, H. 1992, *A&A*, 259, L31
- Burns, J. O., Roettiger, K., Ledlow, M., & Klypin, A. 1994, *ApJ*, 427, L87
- Caldwell, N., Rose, J. A., Sharples, R. M., Ellis, R. S., & Bower, R. G. 1993, *AJ*, 106, 473
- Colless, M. M., & Dunn, A. M. 1996, *ApJ*, 458, 435
- Conselice, C. J., Gallagher, J. S., & Wyse, R. F. G. 2001, *ApJ*, 559, 791
- Donas, J., Milliard, B., & Laget, M. 1995, *A&A*, 303, 661
- Dressler, A., & Shectman S. 1988, *AJ*, 95, 985
- Drinkwater, M. J., Gregg, M. D., & Colless, M. M. 2001, *ApJ*, 548, L139
- Escalera, E., Slezak, E., & Mazure, A. 1992, *A&A*, 264, 379
- Fitchett, M.J., & Webster, R. 1987, *ApJ*, 317, 653
- Gallagher, J. S., Conselice, C. J., & Wyse, R. F. G. 2001, in *Dwarf Galaxies and their Environment*, ed. K. S. de Boer, R.-J. & U. Klein (Aachen: Shaker Verlag), in press
- Godwin, J. G., Metcalfe, N., & Peach, J. V. 1983, *MNRAS*, 202, 113
- Komiyama, Y., et al. 2002, *ApJ*, submitted
- Lewis, I. J., et al. 2002, *MNRAS*, submitted
- Mellier, Y., Mathez, G., Mazure, A., Chauvineau, B., & Proust, D. 1988, *A&A*, 199, 67
- Merritt, D., & Tremblay, B. 1994, *AJ*, 108, 514
- Mobasher, B., et al. 2001, *ApJS*, 137, 279
- Poggianti, B. M., et al. 2001, *ApJ*, 562, 689
- Press, W. H., et al. 1992, *Numerical Recipes in C* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press)
- Sarazin, C. L. 1986, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 58, 1
- Secker, J., & Harris, W. E. 1996, *ApJ*, 469, 623
- Stein, P., Jerjen, H., & Federspiel, M. 1997, *A&A*, 327, 952
- Vikhlinin, A., Forman, W., & Jones, C. 1994, *ApJ*, 435, 162
- Vollmer, B., Braine, J., Balkowski, C., Cayatte, V., & Duschl, W. J. 2001, *A&A*, 374, 824
- White, S. D. M., Briel, U. G., & Henry, J. P. 1993, *MNRAS*, 261, L8