Modeling Subhalos and Satellites in Milky Way-like Systems

Ethan Nadler (Stanford/KIPAC)













Lovell et al. 2011



Modeling Milky Way Satellites



How do the MW satellite luminosity function, radial distribution, and size distribution constrain the low-mass galaxy-halo connection?



Physical Ingredient	Assumptions	Parameterization	Fixed for this analysis?
3.1 Host Halo Properties	Fixed by zoom-in simulations	None	Yes $(M = 10^{12.1 \pm 0.03} M_{\odot})$
3.2 Satellite Luminosities	Abundance match to GAMA survey	Non-parametric	Yes
	Extrapolate subhalo V_{peak} function	Faint-end slope α	No (α is free)
	Lognormal magnitude distribution	Constant scatter σ_M	No (σ_M is free)
	Subhalos below M_{peak} threshold are dark	Cut on $M_{\text{peak}} < \mathcal{M}_{\min}$	No (\mathcal{M}_{min} is free)
3.3 Satellite Locations	On-sky positions set by subhalos	None	Yes
	Distances set by scaled subhalo radii	$r_{\rm sat} = \chi r_{\rm sub}$	Yes ($\chi = 0.93$)
3.4 Satellite Sizes	Jiang et al. (2018) sizes at accretion	$r_{1/2} = A(c/10)^{\gamma} R_{\rm vir}$	Yes ($A = 0.02, \gamma = -0.7$
	Size reduction set by stripping	$r'_{1/2} = r_{1/2} (V_{\text{max}} / V_{\text{acc}})^{\beta}$	Yes $(\beta = 0)$
	Lognormal size distribution	Constant scatter σ_R	Yes ($\sigma_R = 0.01 \text{ dex}$)
3.5 Baryonic Effects	Nadler et al. (2018) disruption model	$p_{\text{disrupt}} \rightarrow p_{\text{disrupt}}^{1/\mathcal{B}}$	No (\mathcal{B} is free)
3.6 Orphan Satellites	Correspond to disrupted subhalos	None	Yes
	NFW host + dynamical friction	$\ln \Lambda = -\ln(m/M)$	Yes
	Stripping after pericentric passages	$\dot{m}_{\rm outgoing} \sim -\frac{m}{\tau_{\rm dyn}} \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{0.07}$	Yes
	Disruption probability set by stripping	$p_{\rm disrupt} = (1 - V_{\rm max}/V_{\rm acc})^{\mathcal{O}}$	$Yes (\mathcal{O} = 0.5)$

Nadler et al. in prep.





Model Building: Luminosities

- Abundance match to GAMA luminosity function (measured down to $M_r \sim -12$)
- Parameters: abundance matching slope, scatter, galaxy formation threshold



Model Building: Sizes



Does the tight relationship between galaxy size and halo size hold for ultra-



Baryonic Subhalo Disruption





Baryonic Subhalo Disruption











 $\lambda_i(heta)^{N_{\mathrm{obs},i}}$ Fit to observed properties (Poisson process): $P(\{M_V, r_{\odot}, r_{1/2}\}|\theta) = e^{-\langle N_{mock}(\theta) \rangle} \prod$





Fit to observed satellites (Poisson process): $P(\{M_V, r_{\odot}, r_{1/2}\}|\theta) = e^{-\langle N_{\text{mock}}(\theta) \rangle} \prod$ bins

Predictions for Future Surveys

DES Y3 Milky Way Satellites

Drlica-Wagner et al. 2015

with Keith Bechtol, Alex Drlica-Wagner, Sidney Mau, Risa Wechsler

DES Survey Selection Function

- Inject fake satellites into DES data; train algorithm to model detection efficiency
- Surface brightness, number of detected stars drive satellite detectability

DES Survey Selection Function

- Projections of detection probability in physical parameter space:

• Algorithm trained on satellite magnitude + size + distance remains accurate

 $\mathcal{M}_{\min} = 1.0 \times 10^8 M_{\odot}$

Halo 416

 $\mathcal{M}_{\rm min} = 1.0 \times 10^8 \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot}$

Halo 416

 $\mathcal{B}=1, \mathcal{O}=1$

Ľ

 $\mathcal{M}_{\min} = 1.0 \times 10^8 M_{\odot}$

 $\mathcal{B}=1, \ \mathcal{O}=1$

 $\mathcal{M}_{\min} = 1.0 \times 10^8 M_{\odot}$

Halo 416

- Fold cosmological model through DES footprint + survey selection function

Predicted luminosity function is sensitive to LMC position and accretion time

Interpreting Full-Sky Observations

 $SDSS + DES + Pan-STARRS + ... \longrightarrow full-sky satellite luminosity function$

There are significant modeling uncertainties: luminosity/size models, tidal stripping, baryonic effects, orphans, LMC/SMC, ...

Some data-driven questions:

- Are observed/predicted satellite distributions consistent with isotropy?
- Is there evidence for a distinct LMC/SMC satellite population?
- What can we infer about the properties of subhalos that host DES satellites?
- Are the orbits of simulated satellites consistent with results from GAIA?

Bonus Slides

Baryonic Subhalo Disruption

- Five subhalo features encode ~90% of disruption
- Predicted subhalo properties consistent with FIRE

Nadler et al. 2018

Peak Velocity Functions

Radial Distributions

Orbital Velocity Distributions

Radial Velocity Distributions

Applications and Extensions

Trained model (github/eonadler) predicts subhalo disruption probabilities Example: 45 MW zoom-ins with range of formation histories (Mao et al. 2015)

Predicted disruption is larger than halo-to-halo scatter!

Modeling Milky Way Analogs

- Ensemble of MW analog LFs measured by SAGA
- Generalize model for variable host halo mass

Example: DES Satellites