Galactic Mass and Anisotropy Profile with Halo K-Giant and Blue Horizontal Branch Stars from LAMOST/SDSS and *Gaia*

Sarah A. Bird sarahbird@ctgu.edu.cn National Astronomical Observatory of China Chinese Academy of Sciences In collaboration with Xiang-Xiang Xue, Chao Liu, Juntai Shen, Chris Flynn, Chengqun Yang, Jie Wang, Meng Zhai, Ling Zhu, Gang Zhao, Haijun Tian



Milky Way Stellar Halo

Sarah A Bird

Self-introduction

Sarah Ann Bird

Education B.S. in Physics University of Missouri, USA, 2007 Ph.D. in Astronomy University of Turku, Finland, 2014 LAMOST Fellow Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, 2014-2015 PIFI Fellow Shanghai Astronomical Observatory, 2016-2018 Aliyun Fellow National Astronomical Observatories of China, Beijing, 2019-2020

CTGU Faculty, Yichang, China, 2021-present

Research Expertise Optical and spectroscopic observations Galactic kinematic-simulations using potential theory Galaxy halos Galaxy formation and evolution











- Mass:
 - Dark matter mass within < 200 kpc $\sim 10^{12} \ensuremath{M_{\odot}}$
 - Visible mass $\sim 10^{11} M_{\odot}$
- Visible mass:
 - Disk + bulge = 99%
 - Stellar halo = 1%
 - Stellar halo = $\sim 1\%$ globular clusters + 99% stars
- Halo stars: old, metal-poor, large random motions





Milky Way stellar halo

- Motivation to study the stellar halo:
 - Constrain galaxy formation
 - Properties of the old stellar populations
 - Find remnants of past mergers
 - Test cosmological models
 - Probe the dark matter halo





Galactic mass Figure from Callingham+19, also see Wang+20,15,Eadie&Harris16,19

- recent estimates using tracers: satellites, globular clusters, halo stars
- virial mass M_{200} is the enclosed mass within a spherical region with mean density equal to 200 times the critical density of the Universe
- range of mass estimates over a factor of four, covered by the figure is a 40% scatter!







Galactic mass Figure from Callingham+19, also see Wang+20,15,Eadie&Harris16,19

- ellipses mark most recent estimates using *Gaia* DR2, Hubble Space Telescope, or other high quality proper motions
- large scatter of mass estimates remains
- still an ongoing effort to minimize mass uncertainties





Spherical Jeans equation

• Jeans equation describes the motion of a collection of test particles in a spherical galactic potential $\frac{d\Phi}{dr}$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}r}(\nu\sigma_r^2) + \frac{2\beta}{r}\nu\sigma_r^2 = \nu\frac{\mathrm{d}\Phi}{\mathrm{d}r}$$

- $(\sigma_r, \sigma_{\theta}, \sigma_{\phi})$ velocity dispersion in spherical coordinates (radial, polar, azimuthal)
- anisotropy parameter $\beta = 1 \frac{\sigma_{\theta}^2 + \sigma_{\phi}^2}{2\sigma_{\epsilon}^2}$
- ν space density of particles
- assumes a virialized system



Stellar density profiles ν table from Xu+2018

Reference	Origin	Tracer	Sample size	Distance(kpc)	Model	Parameters
Iorio et al. (2017)	GAIA+2MASS	RR Lyrae	21600	R < 28	Triaxial	$n = 2.96, p = 1.27, q = f(r), q_0 = 0.57, q_{inf} = 0.84,$
						$r_0 = 12.2 \text{ kpc}$
Das et al. (2016)	SEGUE2	BHB		$r_{\rm GC} < 70$	BPL	$n_{\rm in} = 3.61, n_{\rm out} = 4.75, r_{\rm break} = 29.87, q = 0.72$
					SPL	$n = 4.65, q = f(r_{GC}), q_0 = 0.39, q_{inf} = 0.81, r_0 = 7.32 \text{ kpc}$
X15	SEGUE2	K giants	1757	$10 < r_{\rm GC} < 80$	BPL	$n_{\rm in} = 2.8, n_{\rm out} = 4.3, r_{\rm break} = 29, q = 0.77$
					Einasto	$n = 2.3, r_{\text{eff}} = 18, q = 0.77$
					SPL	$n = 4.4, q = f(r_{GC}), q_0 = 0.3, q_{inf} = 0.9, r_0 = 9 \text{ kpc}$
Pila-Diez et al. (2015)	CFHTS and INT	Near MSTO		$r_{\rm GC} < 60$	SPL	n = 4.3, q = 0.79
					Triaxial	$n = 4.28, q = 0.77, \omega = 0.87$
					BPL	$n_{\rm in} = 2.4, n_{\rm out} = 4.8, r_{\rm break} = 19, q = 0.77$
					BPL_q	$n_{\rm in} = 3.3, n_{\rm out} = 4.9, q_{\rm in} = 0.7, q_{\rm out} = 0.88$
Deason et al. (2011)	SDSS DR8	BS,BHB	$\sim \! 20000$	4 < D < 40	BPL	$n_{\rm in} = 2.3, n_{\rm out} = 4.6, r_{\rm break} = 27, q = 0.6$
Deason et al. (2014)	SDSS DR9	BS,BHB		$10 < D_{\rm BS} < 75$	BPL	$n_{\text{outer}} = 6 - 10, r_{\text{break}} = 50$
				$40 < D_{\rm BHB} < 100$		
Watkins et al. (2009)	Stripe82	RRly	417	$5 < r_{GC} < 117$	BPL	$n_{\rm in} = 2.4, n_{\rm out} = 4.5, r_{\rm break} = 25$
Sesar et al. (2011)	CFHTLS	near MSTO	27 544	D < 35	BPL	$n_{\rm in} = 2.62, n_{\rm out} = 3.8, r_{\rm break} = 28, q = 0.7$
Juric et al. (2008)	SDSS	MS		D < 20	SPL	n = -2.8, q = 0.64
Bell et al. (2008)	SDSS	MS	4 million	D < 40	SPL	2 < n < 4, 0.5 < q < 0.8
Siegel et al. (2002)	Kapteyn		70 000		SPL	n = 2.75, q = 0.6
Robin et al. (2000)	PB				SPL	n = 2.44, q = 0.76

Table 1. Incomplete list of recent stellar halo profile fits.

Notes. CFHTLS (Canada–France–Hawaii Telescope Legacy Survey); near MSTO (near main-sequence turnoff stars); INT (Isaac Newton Telescope); PB (pencil beams from different observations); and Kapteyn (seven Kapteyn selected areas).

stellar halo space density profiles are generally well fit by some form of a power law distribution

NAOC

 $\mathsf{Velocity}\ \mathsf{anisotropy}\ eta$ Binney 1980; Binney & Tremaine 2008

$$\beta = 1 - (\sigma_{\theta}^2 + \sigma_{\phi}^2) / (2\sigma_r^2)$$

- isotropic ($\beta = 0$)
- radial (0 < β < 1)
- tangential ($-\infty < \beta < 0$)
- estimate the mass of the Milky Way through the Jeans equation
- clues to galaxy formation from halo stars
 - orbits have long dynamical time scales
 - collisionless system
 - orbital shapes are relatively immune to adiabatic change of the gravitational potential





- β profile as seen by
 - Simulations: slowly rising radially e.g. Diemand+05, Abadi+06,

Sales+07, Rashkov+13, Loebman+18





- β profile as seen by
 - Simulations: slowly rising radially
 - Solar neighborhood: $0.5 < \beta < 0.7$ e.g. Chiba&Yoshii98,

Chiba&Beers2000, Smith+09, Bond+10





- β profile as seen by
 - Simulations: slowly rising radially
 - Solar neighborhood: $0.5 < \beta < 0.7$
 - Observations past 15 kpc: variety of differing results!!!
 - Direct: Cunningham+16,18
 - Indirect: Sommer-Larsen+94, Wilkinson&Evans99, Sirko+04, Thom+05, Kafle+12,14,17, Deason+12,13, King+15, Williams&Evans15





- β profile as seen by
 - Simulations: slowly rising radially
 - Solar neighborhood: $0.5 < \beta < 0.7$
 - Observations past 15 kpc: variety of differing results!!!
- Why has β been so difficult to measure past 15 kpc?
 - poor statistics due to small sample sizes
 - lack of measurements of tangential velocity dispersion





Useful tracers of halo star kinematics Figure: Sandage83



Surveys

- this study:
 - SDSS/SEGUE
 - LAMOST
 - Gaia
- more surveys: Subaru HSC and PFS, SDSS-V, GALAH, RAVE, Gaia-ESO, SkyMapper, DESI, WEAVE, HALO7D
- future surveys/ telescopes: WFIRST, Rubin-LSST, JWST, E-ELT, GMT, TMT









Selection criteria:

- SDSS/SEGUE+LAMOST DR5+Gaia DR2
- K giants
 - LAMOST: defined by ${\cal T}_{\rm eff}$ and $\log g$ $_{\rm Liu+14}$
 - SDSS/SEGUE: defined as in Xue+14
 - spectroscopic distances xue+14
- Blue horizontal branch (BHB) xue+08
 - limits in color and Balmer line profile
 - photometric distances
- LAMOST K giants: top
- SEGUE K giants: middle
- SDSS BHB: lower



Selection criteria:

- |Z|>2 kpc & $[{\rm Fe}/{
 m H}]<-1$
- (V_r, V_θ, V_ϕ) :
 - $V < 500 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}$
 - $\delta V < 150 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}$
- SDSS/SEGUE:
 - >5300 K giants
 - >3900 BHBs

• LAMOST DR5: >13,000 K giants







Selection criteria:

- |Z| > 2 kpc & [Fe/H] < −1
 (V_r, V_θ, V_φ):
 - $V < 500 \ {\rm km} \ {\rm s}^{-1}$
 - $\delta V < 150 \ {\rm km \ s^{-1}}$
- SDSS/SEGUE:
 - >5300 K giants
 - >3900 BHBs
- LAMOST DR5: >13,000 K giants
- LAMOST K giants: top
- SEGUE K giants: middle
- SDSS BHB: lower





Substructure removal $x_{ue+in prep.}$

Selection criteria:

- stellar halo substructure in integral-of- motion space using friends-of-friends
- 4 integrals of motion: E, Lx, Ly, Lz
- determine orbital parameters: e, a, (*l*_{orbit}, *b*_{orbit}), *l*_{apo}
- stream-members share similar orbits





Substructure removal xue+in prep.





Kinematic statistics vs $r_{\rm gc}$

- $\sigma_r > \sigma_{\theta}, \sigma_{\phi}$ at all $r_{\rm gc}$
- 3D velocity dispersion profiles dropping for r_{gc} < 20 kpc
- evidence of Sagittarius stream $r_{
 m gc} > 20~
 m kpc$
- median velocity uncertainty $\widetilde{\delta V_r}, \widetilde{\delta V_{\theta}}, \widetilde{\delta V_{\phi}}$: open markers
- mean rotational velocity < V_φ >: orange marker
- all stars: lines, diffuse halo: markers
- LAMOST/SDSS K giants: upper
- SDSS BHB stars: lower
- each marker is plot at the median r_{gc} distance of binned stars





Velocity anisotropy β

- highly radial within $r_{
 m gc} < 30 \
 m kpc$
- gently falls to lower radial values for $r_{\rm gc} > 30 \ \rm kpc$
- LAMOST/SDSS K giants: red
- SDSS BHB stars: blue
- each marker represents the median distance of binned stars





Velocity anisotropy and [Fe/H]

 β for LAMOST/SEGUE K giants compared with SDSS BHB's in common metallicity bins after stream removal:

- similar β profile
- similar β dependency on metallicity
- distance and metallicity determinations are in concordance





Stellar halo chemodynamics

- V_r and V_{ϕ} distribution at 10 15 kpc
- *Upper*: more metal rich and highly radial
- Lower: more metal poor and less radial
- Simulations best reproduce such observations after a large $(\sim 10^{11} M_{\odot})$ satalite merging early on (~ 10 Gyr ago) e.g. Brook+03, Belokurov+18, Fattahi+19





Chemodynamics

- V_r and V_{ϕ} distribution
- 10 15 kpc
- Upper: more metal rich and highly radial
- Lower: more metal poor and less radial
- What do you see?





Gaia-Sausage!

- evidence for a past merged satellite!!!
- V_r and V_{ϕ} distribution
- 10 15 kpc
- Upper: more metal rich and highly radial
- Lower: more metal poor and less radial
- Belokurov+18, Deason+18, Myeong+18





Last significant merger

- blob (Toomre diagram)
- Gaia-Enceladus

 (Greek mythology: a past giant now buried under a mountain)
- Kraken (Scandinavian folklore: elusive, giant, squid-like monster of the sea)
- Koppelman+18, Helmi+18, Kruijssen+18









Velocity anisotropy β and chemical abundances

- chemo-dynamically different stellar halo components
- newly discovered in combination with Gaia data
- results of merging satellite(s) (e.g. Gaia-Sausage, Sequoia, Gaia-Enceladus, Kraken, blob)
- see, e.g., Belokurov+18, Myeong+18abcd,19, Deason+18, Koppelman+18, Helmi+18, Mackereth+18, Kruijssen+18, Lancaster+19, Simion+19, Bird+19, Vasiliev19, Matsuno+19





Velocity anisotropy β and metallicity $_{\mbox{\tiny Previous Works}}$

• observations: e.g.

Chiba&Beers2000,

Carollo+07,

Carollo+10.

Hattori+13.

Kafle+13.17.

Belokurov+18.

Lancaster+19

 simulations: e.g. Brook+03, Amorisco+17,19 Loebman+18, Fattahi+19





 Equipped with high quality 3D velocity dispersion profiles, we can use the more full 3D spherical Jeans equation and bypass estimating or making assumptions about velocity anisotropy β:

$$M(< r) = -\frac{1}{G} \left(r^2 \frac{d\sigma_r^2}{dr} + r(\sigma_r^2(2+\alpha) - \sigma_\theta^2 - \sigma_\phi^2) \right)$$

- $(\sigma_r, \sigma_{\theta}, \sigma_{\phi})$ velocity dispersion in spherical coordinates (radial, polar, azimuthal)
- lpha power law assuming space density of particles $\propto r^{-lpha}$
- assumes a virialized system



Test Jeans with simulations

- 3D spherical Jeans enclosed mass estimate for Auriga Milky Way-type stellar halos Grand+17
- different metallicities with different kinematics and density
- 3D spherical Jeans mass estimate recovers the true mass profile
- before removing substructure
- departure from a virialized and spherical halo is small enough to allow successful use of the 3D spherical Jeans equation





$$M(< r) = -\frac{1}{G} \left(r^2 \frac{d\sigma_r^2}{dr} + r(\sigma_r^2(2+\alpha) - \sigma_\theta^2 - \sigma_\phi^2) \right)$$

- velocity components of Jeans equation for K giants and BHB stars
- data (markers), lines (fits)
- σ_r exponential fit (upper)
- σ_{θ} , σ_{ϕ} linear fits (upper)
- σ^2 (middle)
- $\frac{d\sigma_r^2}{dr}$ (lower)
- broken power law density profiles adapted from literature xue+15,Das & Binney 16, Ablimit+20
 - KG: $\alpha_{
 m in,out} = -3, -3.8$, $r_{
 m break} = 16~
 m kpc$
 - BHB: $\alpha_{\rm in,out} = -3.5, -4.8$, $r_{\rm break} = 20~{\rm kpc}$





Mass and circular velocity curves

- 3D spherical Jeans mass and v_{circ} for KG and BHB (red and blue markers)
- mass estimates from literature (cyan triangles, summarized in Wang+20)
- v_{circ} of 220 km s⁻¹ and Ablimit+20 (dotted and solid lines)
- best fit NFW profile dark matter mass
 - KG $M_{200} = 0.8^{+0.5}_{-0.1} \times 10^{12} \ {
 m M}_{\odot}$ (fitting error)
 - BHB $M_{200} = 1.2^{+0.4}_{-0.2} \times 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ (fitting error)





Virial mass comparison

- good agreement
- virial mass M₂₀₀ estimtes using similar methods involving tracer samples
- average mass is $\sim 1\times 10^{12}~M_\odot~{\rm with}$ a scatter of $\sim 30\%.$
- see Wang+20,15 for summary of mass estimates





Key Conclusions and Discoveries

- LAMOST/SDSS + Gaia DR2 yield over 22000 halo K-giant and BHB stars
- first presentation of **3D velocity profiles** for such a large and far-reaching halo star sample!
- β profile is constant up to distances exceeding r_{gc} = 20 kpc
- K giants and BHB's both share similar:
 - radially dominated stellar orbits
 - β dependence on [Fe/H]
- 3D spherical Jeans mass profile best fit with $M_{200} \sim 1 imes 10^{12} \ {
 m M}_{\odot}$





- compare observations to galaxies formed in cosmological simulations
- why do K giants and BHB stars show different velocity anisotropy β ?
- quantify the uncertainty introduced by combining the stars types vs separating them
- compare different methods for mass estimation

Thanks!!!

email: sarahbird@ctgu.edu.cn



Key Conclusions and Discoveries

- LAMOST/SDSS + Gaia DR2 yield over 22000 halo K-giant and BHB stars
- first presentation of **3D velocity profiles** for such a large and far-reaching halo star sample!
- β profile is constant up to distances exceeding $r_{\rm gc} = 20$ kpc
- K giants and BHB's both share similar:
 - radially dominated stellar orbits
 - β dependence on [Fe/H]
- 3D spherical Jeans mass profile best fit with $M_{200} \sim 1 imes 10^{12} \ {
 m M}_{\odot}$

email: sarahbird@ctgu.edu.cn





Publications during Aliyun Fellowship

- Bird, Sarah A.; Xue, Xiang-Xiang; Liu, Chao; Shen, Juntai; Flynn, Chris; & Yang, Chengqun; 2019, AJ, 157, 104
- Bird, Sarah A.; Xue, Xiang-Xiang; Liu, Chao; Shen, Juntai; Flynn, Chris; Yang, Chengqun; Zhao, Gang; Tian, Haijun; 2020, arXiv:2005.05980, under review for ApJ
- Bird, Sarah A.; Xue, Xiang-Xiang; Liu, Chao; Shen, Juntai; Flynn, Chris; Yang, Chengqun; Wang, Jie; Zhai, Meng; Zhu, Kai; Zhu, Ling; Zhao, Gang; & Tian, Haijun; in preparation for ApJ
- Ablimit, Iminhaji; Zhao, Gang; Flynn, Chris; Bird, Sarah A.; 2020, ApJ, 895, L12
- Ye, Xianhao; Zhao, Jingkun; Liu, Jiaming; Bird, Sarah A.; Liu, Chao; Liang, Xilong; Zhang, Jiajun; Zhao, Gang; 2021, AJ, 161, 8
- Erkal, Denis; Deason, Alis J.; Belokurov, Vasily; Xue, Xiang-Xiang; Koposov, Sergey E.; Bird, Sarah A.; Liu, Chao; Simion, Iulia T.; Yang, Chengqun; Zhang, Lan; Zhao, Gang; 2020, arXiv:2010.13789, under review for MNRAS
- Shen, Yu-Fu; Zhao, Gang; Bird, Sarah A., under review for ApJ
- Wu, Wenbo; Zhao, Gang; Xue, Xiang-Xiang; Bird, Sarah A.; Yang, Chengqun; in preparation for ApJ
- Liu, Gao-Chao; Huang, Yang; Tian, Haijun; Bird, Sarah A.; in preparation for ApJ