How good are X-ray mass estimates?



E.Churazov, W.Forman, I.Zhuravleva, N.Lyskova, O.Gerhard, C.Jones, A.Vikhlinin, S.Tremaine, K.Dolag, L.Oser, T.Naab

How bad are X-ray mass estimates?



•

What we see in X-rays?

Are the objects we see in Xrays special?

What we need for mass determination?

What to compare with?

What can go wrong?

This is environmentally friendly talk:

50% of objects, data and slides are recycled from talks by Andy Fabian,

Bill Forman, Ortwin Gerhard and Thorsten Naab

What we see in X-





Optically thin thermal bremsstrahlung + lines $I(E) \propto g n^2 T^{1/2} / E e^{-E/kT}$ phot/s/cm³/keV



X-ray emitting material is pushed away by relativistic plasma
X-ray spectrum = thermal emission of optically thin plasma

Diffuse thermal gas, filling the gravitational potential well. In a static potential the gas settles down in few sound crossing times. Solving hydrostatic equilibrium equation gives you mass.



Revnivtsev+,200



Massive objects like



Ga**s**:**T**density, temperature,

Stars: density, dispersion,



How good is X-ray mass (compared to what)? Simulations?



Oser et al, 2010





~Linear in log/lin

EC+,2010

How good is X-ray mass (compared to what)? Simulations?



Mass profiles are approximately isothermal (s,o)

Let us now extract n,T (P) from simulations



Density distribution in radial shells (in simulations)



lg(n)

Zhuravleva+, 2011

Median n,T in radial shells (in simulations)





RMS~8%, Bias ~5-8% (traceable to residual gas motions)



Isothermal potential + Power law I(R) + $\mathcal{P}(r) = \mathbf{v}_c^2 \ln r$ independent on $I(R) \propto R^{-\alpha}$ V R $\sigma_{iso}^2(R) = v_c^2 \frac{1}{1+\alpha}$ $\sigma_{circ}^{2}(R) = \frac{1}{2} v_{c}^{2} \frac{\alpha}{1+\alpha}$ For a=2 no dependence on $\sigma_{rad}^2(R) = \frac{1}{2} v_c^2 \frac{1}{\alpha^2 - 1}$ (Gerhard, 1993)

Relax the assumptionLocal
$$\sigma/vc$$
 $I(R) = R - \alpha$ $\sigma_{iso}^2(R) = v_c^2 \frac{1}{1 + \alpha + \gamma}$ relation $\sigma_{iso}^2(R) = v_c^2 \frac{1}{1 + \alpha + \gamma}$ [isotropi $\sigma_{circ}^2(R) = \frac{1}{2} v_c^2 \frac{\alpha}{1 + \alpha + \gamma}$ [circula $\sigma_{rad}^2(R) = \frac{1}{2} v_c^2 \frac{1}{(\alpha + \gamma)^2 + \frac{d^2 \ln[\sigma^2 I(R)]}{d(\ln R)^2} - 1}$ [radia $\alpha = -\frac{d \ln I(R)}{d \ln R};$ $\gamma = -\frac{d \ln \sigma_p^2}{d \ln R}$ $I(R) \propto R^{-2}$ EC+,



Lyskova+, 2011



Trivial analysis of optical data gives RMS~6% [in simulations] We can use optical + X-rays analystis_{a+, 2011}

What can go wrong with Xrays? P, ρ, μ

Annoying:

Deviations from spherical symmetry

Multi-temperature plasma =>

n,T Abundance determination => n Interesting TMXBs contribution => T Turbulent gas motions Magnetic fields **Cosmic Rays** u – He abundance

Annoying problems (error budget)

Table 3. Relative changes in circular speed with respect to the reference value $v_{c,X}$ given in Table 2 when changes are made to the analysis procedure (see §2.4).

Galaxy	Δ_{abund}	Err.	Δ_{LMXB} %	Err.	$\Delta_{\rm NS}$ %	Err.	$\Delta_{r_1 \times 2} $ %	Err.	$\Delta_{\mathbf{r}_2/2} \ \%$	Err.
ngc1399	4.23	0.80	-2.01	0.44	2.36	0.64	1.40	0.94	1.22	0.39
ngc1407	0.76	5.67	-1.61	2.37	8.25	2.88	5.66	1.74	1.05	2.22
ngc4472	2.43	2.17	-0.98	0.79	-2.31	1.16	-0.42	0.76	-3.71	0.70
ngc4486	3.88	0.40	-5.69	0.37	-4.58	0.39	1.44	0.26	-1.00	0.31
ngc4649	-2.48	1.14	0.36	0.41	2.67	0.62	3.30	0.43	0.08	0.39
ngc5846	1.53	2.61	-1.82	1.02	-2.57	1.50	-1.68	0.81	-5.14	1.21
Mean	1.73		-1.96		0.64		1.62		-1.25	
RMS	2.82		2.69		4.35		2.89		2.70	

Name	changes in the analysis	Section
Δ_{abund} Δ_{LMXB} Δ_{NS} Δ_{r1} Δ_{r2}	free metal abundance a power law is added difference between North and South $r_1 \times 2$ $r_2/2$	(§2.1) (§2.3) (§2.2) (§2) (§2) (§2)

RMS~7% [good objects]

More Interesting Part : Nonthermal pressupe GM ρdr $P = nkT + P_{CR} + \frac{B^{-}}{8\pi} + P_{turb}$ Thermal Non-thermal pressure (invisible) pressure (easy to





Stars: gravity only

Gas: gravity, magnetic fields, cosmic rays, turbulent motions

Cosmic rays + magnetic fields + turbulent motions



Extra (non-thermal) energy makes the gas distribution broader! Comparison of optical and X-ray mass is a proxy for non-thermal







hot!

Conclusio

NS In X-rays we see gas in very massive ellipticals (groups, clusters)

Collisional nature => local, isotropic pressure => H.E.

Massive ellipticals have approximately isothermal potential Scatter and bias in measuring Vc from H.E. ~ 5-8% [sim] Bias is traceable to gas motions [sim]

Typical uncertainty in X-ray derived Vc is ~7% Bias in Vc is ~10 % [non-thermal pressure] Bias in Vc is partly correctable [with extra measurements]

10% [smaller for a
Mean Vc, x vs Vc, true (in simulations)













If anisotropy is know => local estimate works at all radii If anisotropy is not know => use R where I~R-2





Measuring cosmic rays, magnetic fields and turbulence separately

Cosmic rays: limits on the gamma-ray $\stackrel{\text{flux}}{p+p} \to \pi^0 \to 2\gamma$ $p + p \rightarrow \pi^{+,-} \rightarrow e^{+,-} \Rightarrow IC_{\Gamma}$ $\frac{E_{CR}}{1.02 - 0.1}$ Ackermann+, FERM Τ 2010

(provided cosmic ray protons are mixed with

Measuring cosmic rays, magnetic fields and turbulence separately

Magnetic fields: Faraday rotation





(provided magnetic field and thermal plasma are mixed; correlation length)

Are CC and NCC Clusters different?

Perseus cluster (cool core)



Coma cluster (no cool core)



Gravitating potentials for Coma and Perseus



Cool Core vs Non Cool Core Clusters



35 CC + 15 NCC, z->0, R500 -> 1000 kpc



S.Tsygankov, I.Zhuravleva +

What we see

What can be wrong?

Physical Turbulent gas motion Relativistic particles Non-stationary

Analysis: Bias in n_e, T_e, P What to compare with?

Сравнение оценок массы из рентгеновских и

оптических данных



Сильченко, Моисеев

Mopt= M





NGC1399



 $\varphi_X(r) \approx 0.93 \varphi_{opt}(r) + C$ $U_{CR} + \frac{B^2}{8\pi} + U_{turb} = 0.07 U_{thermal}$



Using galaxies instead of stars



Arithmetic with Energy and Power



[Turbulence only]



Easy with ASTRO-H; Mitsuda RGS - J.Sanders, #75 Res.Scat. - I.Zhuravleva, #35



Deprojected n, T for Coma and Perseus





XMM/RGS, broadening < 200 km/s [1D]

Gas motion in ICM: observational signatures

E.Churazov, I.Zhuravleva, N.Lyskova, P.Arevalo, K.Dolag, A.Vikhlinin, W.Forman, C.Jones, S.Sazonov, R.Sunyaev

Coma X-ray image and residuals from symmetric



Gas is not at rest!

We want to "measure" hot ICM velocity field How to measure?

How we characterize the velocity field and observables?

Using simulations to calibrate observables

Any differential gas motions Gaussian isotropic

 $\sqrt{\left\langle V_z^2 \right\rangle_l - \left\langle V_z \right\rangle_l^2}$ $n_e^2 dl$ $\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{z}} \rangle_{I}$



Observables: ne, emission measure weighted vz, σ

Projected velocity dispersion \approx Structure Function $S(\Delta x) = \langle (v(x + \Delta x) - v(x))^2 \rangle$

Projected σ, km/s



At a given projected radius R an interval ~R contributes to σ

 $\sigma 2 \approx structure function$

$$\sigma^2 = \int P_{3D} \left[1 - W^2(k_z) \right] dk_z dk_x dk_y$$



Zhuravleva,

Less direct ways of measuring ICM Kinetleszteffect V>, DV Benson+03 Osborne+11

- Resonant scattering
- Polarization due to resonant scattering
- Faraday Rotation
- Ha filaments
- Pressure fluctuations
- SB fluctuations

of measu	iring ICM
V>, ΔV	Benson+03 Osborne+11
V, PS(V)	Werner+09, Hayshi+09, Zhuravleva+11
/, ΔV	Zhuravleva+10
°S(B)->V	Vogt+03, Bonafede+10
/	Fabian+03
?S(P)->V	Schuecker+04
S(ne)	



100%Center: 0%polarizedOutskirts:Sazonov+ 2002: 20%
Transverse ICM velocities and polarization Quadrupole component can be induced by gas motions!

Motion along Motion transverse 1.0.5. l.0<u>,S.</u> Click to edit Master subtitle style Doppler No Doppler shift shift No Polarization 1) polarage gas motions reduce optical depth

Dut can cause nelemization in the eluster

Very indirect velocities.	ways of meas	uring ICM
Turbulent Diffusion of metals	D~VL	Rebusco+05
Cool Cores: Heating=Cooling	Heating~V3/L	
Correction to mass from hydrostatic equilibrium	V2	EC+08,10
Many m oom binat	tions provide	both



pressure (easy to

(invisible)





Stars: gravity only

Gas: gravity, magnetic fields, cosmic rays, turbulent motions.



V~few 100 km/s -> Power ERardEferizing ICM velocity field (3D simulations, RM maps, etc)

- Calculating Power Density Spectra for featureless continuum
- Calculating changetonictic

Calculating Power Density Spectrum for the data with holes (making Fourier transform of the velocity map)

- 1. Non-periodic
- 2. Missing data (points sources, gaps between



Fourier is tuned for periodic arrays without gaps

Smoothing of X-ray Raw image images Exposure map S(Im

S(Images)/S(E_map)



 $G_{\sigma_1} \circ I = \frac{G_{\sigma_1} \circ I}{G_{\sigma_1} \circ M}$



 $G_{\sigma_1} \circ I - G_{\sigma_2} \circ I$ = Mexican Hat

Modified Mexican Hat Filter for data with gaps

$$\widetilde{F} \circ I = \frac{G_{\sigma_1} \circ I}{G_{\sigma_1} \circ M} - \frac{G_{\sigma_2} \circ I}{G_{\sigma_2} \circ M}$$

(Arevalo et al, submitted, see also





Arevalo+,





Simulated 3D velocity



Zhuravlev

Pressure fluctuations in



K [1/kpc]

Schuecker et al. (20<mark>04) us do SB</mark>





Removing global Coma







Relating 3D and 2D power $I(x, y) \stackrel{\text{ctr}}{=} \delta(x, y, z) n_e^2(x, y, z) dz$ $P_{2D}(k) = \int P_{3D}(\sqrt{k^2 + k_z^2}) W(k_z) dk_z$ $W = P_1[n_e^2(z)]$ 10-2 $k >> \frac{1}{1} \Longrightarrow P_{2D} = aP_{3D}$ Amplitude $k \ll \frac{1}{1} \Longrightarrow P_{2D} = aP_{3D} \times k$ 10^{-3} 10-2 10^{-4} 10^{-1}

k, arcsec⁻¹





~5-10% density fluctuations include (4-400 kpc): potential perturbation (big Palaxies)

Conclusio

ICM velocities ~ few 100 km/s [except for mergers]

Direct V measurements -> structure function

Modified MH method provides robust

measure of V(k)

Relating 3D and 2D power $I(x, y) \stackrel{\text{spectric}}{=} \delta(x, y, z) n_e^2(x, y, z) dz$ $P_{2D}(k) = \int P_{3D}(\sqrt{k^2 + k_z^2}) W(k_z) dk_z$ $W = P_1[n_e^2(z)]$ 10-2 10-3 10-4

$$k >> \frac{1}{l_z} \Longrightarrow P_{2D} = aP_{3D}$$

$$k << \frac{1}{l_z} \Longrightarrow P_{2D} = a P_{3D} \times k$$





Arevalo et al

Heavy metal turbulent diffusion







If turbulent motions mix the gas and spread metals

$$D \sim \frac{1}{3} \mathrm{v}1$$



Rebusco et al (2005,2006)



HE masses vs total masses in






```
Численное моделирование
Прямые измерения скоростей и
уширение линий
Резонансное рассеяние
Поляризация
Кинетический SZ эффект
Влияние на массу
Потоки охлаждения
Турбулентная диффузия тяжелых
элементов
Флуктуации поверхностной яркости
```



Турбулентная диффузия тяжелых



Железо производится звездами центральной галактики

«Пик» железа в газе шире оптической галактики Если железо «размырается» турбулентной диффузией: $D \sim - vl$ <u>3</u>

Rebusco et al. 2005,2006

Потоки охлаждения в центрах

Время радиационного о**д пождени слаза й** возраста скоплений Потери газа компенсируются потоком механической энергии Ч.Д.



ЕЧ и др. 2000,2002

Поправка к гравитирующей массе из гидростатики $\frac{1}{\rho} \frac{dP}{dr} = -\frac{GM}{r^2}$

Тепловое давление

Нетепловое давление (включая микротурбулентность)



Флуктуации давления или поверхностной яркости



Schuecker et al. (2004)

Центральная часть скопления в созвездии Персея (70 миллионов фотонов)





2D->3D

Края, дыры?

Тепловой SZ

Рентге





deg

Сдвиг



Кин. SZ



 $\Delta E \propto E \int \frac{V}{c} n_e^2(z) dz \quad kSZ \propto \sigma_T \int \frac{V}{c} n_e(z) dz$





Wave number

Figure 1 A schematic representation of a power spectrum of either magnetic fluctuations or fluctuations of the total energy of solar wind fields.

Плавный континнуум (без особых деталей)

Вычисление спектра мощности для данных с дырками (например, спектр мощности поля скоростей)

- 1. Непериодическая функция
- 2. Дырки в данных (точечные источники и т.п.)



Стандартное преобразование Фурье «настроено» на периодический сигнал без дыр.



Неправильный наклон и нормировка



Построение спектра низкого разрешения с помощью Вайвлетов (Arevalo et al, submitted, see also Stutzki et al)



Большая

Маленькая

1. Свертка с МН фильтром разной ширины 2. Подсчет RMS = мощность на данном масштабе Построение спектра низкого разрешения с помощью Вайвлетов (Arevalo et al, submitted, see also Stutzki et al)



Сглаживание изображений Сырое изображение Карта экспозиции

Сглаженное изобр.



 $G_{\sigma_1} \circ I = \frac{G_{\sigma_1} \circ I}{G_{\sigma_1} \circ M}$

Что делать с краями и дырами?





Arevalo, EC, Zhuravleva, Hernandez, Revnivtsev, 2011



Arevalo, EC, Zhuravleva, Hernandez, Revnivtsev,



Ы

Есть еще 3 года для построения спекулятивных теорий (до ASTRO-H)

Несколько независимых методов измерения скоростей + численные расчеты

Простое решение технических проблем построения спектров мощности низкого разрешения

Pressure fluctuations in



Schuecker et al. (2004)







Removing global Coma







Relating 3D and 2D power $I(x, y) \stackrel{\text{ctr}}{=} \delta(x, y, z) n_e^2(x, y, z) dz$ $P_{2D}(k) = \int P_{3D}(\sqrt{k^2 + k_z^2}) W(k_z) dk_z$ $W = P_1[n_e^2(z)]$ 10-2 $k >> \frac{1}{1} \Longrightarrow P_{2D} = aP_{3D}$ Amplitude $k \ll \frac{1}{1} \Longrightarrow P_{2D} = aP_{3D} \times k$ 10^{-3} 10-2 10^{-4} 10^{-1}

k, arcsec⁻¹





~5-10% density fluctuations include (4-400 kpc): potential perturbation (big galaxies)

Stars: Jeans equation [stationary, spherical system] $\frac{1}{n_*} \frac{dn_*\sigma_r^2}{dr} + 2\frac{\beta}{r}\sigma_r^2 = -\nabla\varphi$ Gas: hydrostatic equilibrium [stationary, spherical system] $\frac{dP_X}{P_X} = -\nabla \varphi_X$ $\rho_{gas} dr$

or Schwarzschild's method $P_X = nkT$

 $\varphi_X(r) \approx \alpha \, \varphi_{true}(r), \qquad \alpha \leq 1$

Спектры мощности движений газа

в скоплениях галактик Е.Чуразов, И.Журавлева, Р.Сюняев, К.Долаг, С.Цыганков, К.Постнов, П.Аревало, Н.Лыскова, С.Комаров, Л.Иапичино Как измерять скорости газа? Как считать спектр

Иногам М. ОЩНОСТИ Вцов, Маркевич, Финогенов, Крицук, Sarazin, Norman, Bryan, Vazza, Nagai, Lau, Chandran, Brueggen, Scannapieco, Ruszkowski, Roediger, Heinz....

Изображения и энергетические спектры <u>с разреше</u>нием 150 эВ



Горячий межгалактический мБаз мы не знаем: знаем: Поле скоростей Плотность Температу Теплопроводно СТЬ рy Обилие Вязкость Магнитные поля Космические Движения газа - измерение массы, ускорение частиц, генерац 1я магн.
Изображение скопления и отклонения от симметричной



Газ обязан двигаться



Эволюция темной





Moore et al.

Карта температуры газа





5E-06 1E-05

 $\frac{\Delta T_r}{T_r} = 2 y = 2\tau_T \frac{kT_e}{m_e c^2}$

Кин. SZ







Сравнение оценок массы из рентгеновских и оптических



Сравнение оценок массы из рентгеновских и

оптических данных



Сильченко, Моисеев

Проблемы численных симуляций:

- 1) Разрешение
 - а) газ
 - б) бесстолкновительная темная материя
- ²⁾ Искусственная вязкость (SPH)
- 2) Стратификация атмосферы (много высот)
- 2) Физическая вязкость и теплопроводность
- 2) Магнитные поля

Taxwellan Hani' Hanaskan WURKACTI Kas MARUNTHARA

Формирование скопления: темная материя и газ



Темная материя и газ собираются из большого объема и остаются в скоплении (это не так для маломассивных систем)

Карта температуры



Main directions

- Hydro simulations
 - Numerical issues + Cosmology + ICM physics
- Physical processes leading to observational signatures
- Line shift and broadening, resonant scattering, polarization, kinetic SZ effect, surface brightness fluctuations metal distribution impact on mass
 - fluctuations, metal distribution, impact on mass
- ^q Tools to link observations/simulations/theory Power density spectra?
- Real observations

Gas motions: simulations

- ^q SPH vs AMR codes (to agree on the velocity field)
- What resolution is needed to model velocity field across the cluster
- g Impact of Cosmology/initial power spectrum
- ICM physics (viscosity, thermal conduction, magnetic fields)

 Test the relation between observables and true physical characteristics (3D velocity field, ICM microphys.)

3D velocity power

SPH (Dolag et al. 2005), ~ 70.106 particles; Mvir=1.6.1014 Msun, Rvir=1.43 Mpc



z=0.02 z=0.01 z=0

Does PS depend on considered volume of

Projected line-of-sight velocity in two



 $\sqrt{\left\langle V_z^2 \right\rangle_l - \left\langle V_z \right\rangle_l^2}$ $n_e^2 dl$ $\langle \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{z}} \rangle_{I}$



Observables: ne, emission measure weighted vz, σ

Projected velocity dispersion & Structure Function

Projected σ, km/s



 $\sigma 2 \approx structure function$

$$\sigma^2 = \int P_{3D} \left[1 - W^2(k_z) \right] dk_z dk_x dk_y$$



Resonant Scattering

X-ray resonant scattering in ICM



Optical depth **for** free-free

 $\frac{L_X}{4\pi R^2 \sigma T^4} \approx \frac{10^{45} \text{ erg/s}}{10^{77} \text{ erg/s}} \approx 10^{-32}$

Thomson optical depth $\tau_T = \sigma_T n_e R \approx 10^{-3} - 10^{-2}$

Clusters are optically thin in X-rays (in



$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{0} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi} h r_{e} c f_{ik}}{\Delta E_{D}}; \quad \Delta E_{D} = E_{0} \frac{\mathbf{v}}{c} = E_{0} \left[\frac{2kT}{Am_{p}c^{2}} \right]^{1/2}; \quad \boldsymbol{\tau}_{0} = n_{i} l \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{0}$$

- Abundant elements; He-like ions; maximal oscillator strength
- 2) Heavy elements have narrow lines (if no turbulent motions)
- 3) Product of density and size

Optical depth in



NGC4636; 0.6 keV

M87; 1-3 keV

Perseus; 3-7 keV

Ion	E, keV	f	w_2	τ , NGC 4636	τ , Virgo/M87	τ , Perseus
O VIII	0.65	0.28	0.5	1.2	0.34	0.19
Fe XVIII	0.87	0.57	0.32	1.3	0.0007	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-7}$
Fe XVII	0.83	2.73	1	8.8	0.0005	$2.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$
Fe XXIII	1.129	0.43	1	0.016	1.03	0.16
Fe XXIV	1.168	0.245	0.5	0.002	1.12	0.73
Fe XXV	6.7	0.78	1	0.0002	1.44	2.77

For Solar corona:

Elwert 1956, Acton 1978, Rugge & McKenzie

Gilfanov+,

Resonant scattering in clusters

Gilfanov+, 1987; Krolik & Raymond, 1988; Molendi+, 1998; Shigeyama 1998; Akimoto+, 1999; Kaastra+, 1999; Churazov+, 2001; Mathews+, 2001; Bohringer+, 2001; Sakelliou+ 2002; Xu+, 2002; Sazonov+,2002a; Sazonov+, 2002b; Kahn+, 2003; Churazov+, 2004; Gastaldello & Molendi, 2004; Sanders+, 2004; Sanders & Fabian, 2006; Molnar+, 2006; Werner+, 2009; Hayashi+, 2009; Zhuravleva+, 2010a,b;

See our recent review on RS: EC+, 2010







Gas Velocities



FeXXV; 6.7 keV line; T=5 keV

Radiative width: 0.3 eV

Thermal width: 3 eV

Turbulence (300 km/s): 7





.

- > 400 km/s

EC+, 2004; Gastaldello & Molendi,



NGC 4636

NeX

12

0.04

0.03

0.02

0.01

0

10

Counts/s/A

NGC4636 - bright, cool system Fe XVII lines; compact fore suitable for RGS FeXVII 0.75 0.5 M 0.25 2 FeXVII OVIII Lα OVIII LB Flux ratio c FeXVIII FeXVIII FeXIX FeXVIII 1 0.5 10 1 14 16 18 20 Radius, kpc wavelength (Å)

15 Å line is suppressed => velocity < 100 km/s Xu+, Werner+, Hayashi+



Optical depth strongly depends on the character of motions Zhuravleva et al, 2010b



Polarization No Polarization

Hamilton, 1947; [Chandrasekhar 1950]

He-like ions; 1s2 (1S0) - 1s2p

Polarization Rayleigh phase function + Quadrupole = Polarization 33 27 20 13 -10001001 -500 500

100% polarized Sazonov+ 2002: Phyravleva+

Transverse ICM velocities and polarization Quadrupole component can be induced by gas motions!

Motion transverse

Click to edit Master subtitle style

1.0<u>,5.</u>

Motion along

1.0.5.

Doppler	No Doppler
shift	shift
No	Polarization
nalorization	

polonization gas motions reduce optical depth 2) But can cause polarization in the cluster core

Angular diameter-redshift relation

[SZ+X-rays (e.g. Silk & White, 78)]

- 1) Background QSO
- Polarization, Line shape
 Single observation in X-

Krolik & Rysmond 88; Sazonov et al. 02; Molnar et al.

Scattering in Warm-Hot IGM n<10⁻

$$EW \approx 90 \frac{Z}{Z_{Sun}} \text{ keV}$$



 $n < 10^{-5} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$

 $T \approx 10^6 \text{ K}$



EC+

+

AGN echo in X-ray







Scattered flux in line (few 105 years after the outburst) Equivalent width of resonant lines relativencev+,

Conclusio

ns

- ^s Surface brightness decrement (line ratios) - now
- ^s Line profile near future
- [§] Polarization future

- Selocity diagnostics (including transverse component)
- S Distances
- § WHIM

What is next? +High energy resolution: line profiles: ASTRO-H V

+Polarimetry: only due to scattering;

IXO po	Parameter	Value
continu	Mirrors*QE	1000 cm2
	FOV	20'x20'
	Energy resolution	100 eV
	Modulation	0.5


NON-THERMAL PRESSURE SUPPORT

Major components of a galaxy clyster Hot Dark



few	15	80	
%	%	%	
Optic	X-rays, CMB	Indire	
al	(SZ)	ct	

More components

Cosmic



Magnetic



Turbulen

ce

0 % Radio (electrons) Hard X-rays (electrons) 0 % Faraday rotation 0 % Lines (2014)





Bullet Cluster: Turbulence Shocks -> CR, magnetic fields

M87/Virgo: Bubbles of CR, magnetic fields Drive turbulence in ICM

Cosmic rays + magnetic fields + turbulent motions



Extra (non-thermal) energy per thermal

Measuring masses (clusters and early-type galaxies)

1) Hot ICM + Hydrostatic Equilibrium

 Kinematics of stars, GC, PNe and galaxies

If bias in M => Wrong cosmological parameters If M is known => measure non-thermal



pressure (easy to

(invisible)

Stars: Jeans equation [stationary, spherical system] $\frac{1}{n_*} \frac{dn_*\sigma_r^2}{dr} + 2\frac{\beta}{r}\sigma_r^2 = -\nabla\varphi$ Gas: hydrostatic equilibrium [stationary, spherical system] $\frac{dP_X}{P_X} = -\nabla \varphi_X$ $\rho_{gas} dr$

or Schwarzschild's method $P_X = nkT$

 $\varphi_X(r) \approx \alpha \, \varphi_{true}(r), \qquad \alpha \leq 1$







Non-thermal pressure and AGN/ICM interaction?

Observations:

In nearby clusters and groups central SMBH provides enough mechanical energy to offset ICM cooling losses

Simulations:

Fraction of the SMBH rest mass (if released at appropriate

time) can stop star formation in galaxies Minimal model: same physical mechanism

AGN supplies to ICM: cosmic rays, magnetic fields and

generates turbulence



Blanto

n







What AGN does to ICM? (outflow of rel. Inflation offasma) bubbles

Shocks around bubbles

Entrainment of low entropy



Most efficient way to capture mechanical energy flow from AGN

- Put all energy into relativistic plasma
- 2) Subsonically inflate a bubble
- 3) Let it rise few scale-heights

100% efficient,



AGN supplies energy to ICM which offsets cooling

If Heating=Cooling

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{Measuring the} \\ \textbf{\underline{trbulence}} \\ \hline E_{nt} \\ \hline E_{thermal} \\ \end{array} \approx 0.1 - 0.3; \quad t_{dis} = \frac{E_{nt}}{L_{cool}} \\ \hline \textbf{If turbulence dominates} \quad t_{dis} \approx \frac{1}{L_{ool}} \\ \end{array}$$

=>

 \mathbf{V}

To be measured by

Conclusio

NS 10-30% of total pressure in the ICM is nonthermal

(estimates to be improved soon)

Simple recipe for potential comparison is available, (although it does not replace full dynamic models)

Broadly consistent with AGN/ICM coupling scheme

Backup slides....



Thermal emission of the









EW~90

Table 2. The best fit parameters for a single-temperature, optically thin plasma model fitted to the *XMM-Newton* RGS spectra extracted from 0.5' wide regions centred on the cores of the galaxies. For NGC 4636 we also show the results from fits to spectra extracted from two 2.25' wide regions surrounding the core (see Fig. 2). The 13.8–15.5 Å part of the spectrum, where the strongest Fe xvII and Fe xvIII resonance lines are present was initially excluded from the fits. Fluxes are given in the 0.3–2.0 keV band. The emission measure is defined as $Y = \int n_e n_H dV$. The scale factor *s* is the ratio of the observed LSF width to the expected LSF for a flat abundance distribution. Abundances are quoted with respect to the proto-solar values of Lodders (2003). The last three rows list the best fit line ratios in the full spectral band (after the Fe xvII ion was set to zero in the model and replaced by gaussian lines), the theoretical line ratios predicted for an optically thin plasma, and the derived level of suppression of the 15.01 Å line, $(I/I_0)_{15.01\text{ Å}}$.

galaxy	NGC 4636 core	NGC 4636 outer reg.	NGC 5813	NGC 1404	NGC 4649	NGC 4472
flux $(10^{-12} \text{ erg cm}^{-2})$	1.75 ± 0.08	2.57 ± 0.17	1.47 ± 0.12	1.08 ± 0.11	1.63 ± 0.10	1.44 ± 0.08
$Y (10^{64} \text{ cm}^{-3})$	0.47 ± 0.02	0.46 ± 0.03	1.01 ± 0.10	0.50 ± 0.05	0.31 ± 0.03	0.34 ± 0.02
kT (keV)	0.606 ± 0.006	0.695 ± 0.004	0.645 ± 0.008	0.608 ± 0.009	0.774 ± 0.007	0.781 ± 0.006
S	0.40 ± 0.04	1.02 ± 0.04	0.87 ± 0.11	0.97 ± 0.22	0.69 ± 0.21	0.79 ± 0.12
Ν	1.3 ± 0.3	1.5 ± 0.4	2.0 ± 0.8	2.3 ± 0.8	1.3 ± 0.7	1.3 ± 0.5
0	0.44 ± 0.05	0.61 ± 0.06	0.53 ± 0.09	0.58 ± 0.10	0.61 ± 0.15	0.53 ± 0.07
Ne	0.31 ± 0.08	0.39 ± 0.18	0.33 ± 0.19	0.81 ± 0.22	1.31 ± 0.35	1.18 ± 0.22
Fe	0.52 ± 0.03	0.92 ± 0.06	0.75 ± 0.09	0.67 ± 0.08	0.87 ± 0.18	0.83 ± 0.08
$[(I_{\lambda 17.05} + I_{\lambda 17.10})/I_{\lambda 15.01}]_{observed}$	2.04 ± 0.21	1.28 ± 0.13	1.99 ± 0.34	1.98 ± 0.29	1.25 ± 0.28	2.24 ± 0.34
$[(I_{\lambda 17.05} + I_{\lambda 17.10})/I_{\lambda 15.01}]_{\text{predicted}}$	1.31	1.31	1.30	1.31	1.27	1.27
$I_{15.01}/I_{0\ 15.01}$	0.64 ± 0.07	1.02 ± 0.10	0.65 ± 0.11	0.66 ± 0.10	1.02 ± 0.23	0.57 ± 0.09

3D - 2D

Non-thermal pressure in the ICM

E.Churazov, W.Forman, C.Jones, A.Vikhlinin, S.Tremaine, I.Zhuravleva

H.Bohringer, N.Werner, A.Simionescu, S.Sazonov, R.Sunyaev, K.Dolao, S. Teveenkov, O. Genhand, P.Dec, K.Gebhandt, M. Bruescen





Virial theorem in isothermal potential $\varphi(\underset{v_c}{\text{spherical, stationary system}})$



$$v_c^2 = 3\sigma_p^2$$
 Anisotropy de works
only for a dis

Anisotropy does not matter. But works

only for a distant galaxy, which is entirely within the spectrograph Next step beyond virial theorem: Isothermal potential + Isotropic orbits $\frac{1}{n_*} \frac{dn_*\sigma_r^2}{dr} + 2\frac{\beta}{r}\sigma_r^2 = -\frac{d\varphi}{dr}$

$$\varphi = \mathbf{v}_c^2 \ln r, \quad \beta = 0 \Rightarrow \frac{1}{n_*} \frac{dn_* \sigma_r^2}{dr} = -\mathbf{v}_c^2 \frac{1}{r}$$

$$n_*(r)\sigma_r^2(r) = v_c^2 \int_r^\infty \frac{dx}{x} n_*(x)$$

$$\sigma_p^2(R) = \frac{R v_c^2}{I(R)} \int_R^\infty \frac{dx}{x^2} I(x)$$



Isothermal potential + Power law surface <u>brightness I(R)</u>



Measuring cosmic rays, magnetic fields and turbulence separately

Cosmic rays: limits on the gamma-ray $\stackrel{\text{flux}}{p+p} \to \pi^0 \to 2\gamma$ $p + p \rightarrow \pi^{+,-} \rightarrow e^{+,-} \Rightarrow IC_{\Gamma}$ $\frac{E_{CR}}{1.02 - 0.1}$ Ackermann+, FERM Τ 2010

(provided cosmic ray protons are mixed with

Measuring cosmic rays, magnetic fields and turbulence separately

Magnetic fields: Faraday rotation





(provided magnetic field and thermal plasma are mixed; correlation length)
Measuring cosmic rays, magnetic fields and turbulence separately

Micro-

Resonances: Gering: broader lines -> smaller optical depth (EC+,04; Xu+,02; Werner+,10: few % - 25% of thermal energy)



Measuring cosmic rays, magnetic fields and turbulence together

Cosmic rays, magnetic fields, micro-turbulence increase energy per particle.

If the gas is in hydrostatic equilibrium => non-thermal component makes the good (m) but in point in the mass/potential

$$1 - \alpha = \frac{P_{CR} + P_{mag} + P_{turb}}{nkT}$$

True potential comes from lensing or stellar kinematics



Are potentials of early-type galaxies isothermal?

Optical: Yes [e.g. Ortwin et al. 2001]

ing, and nearly round elliptical galaxies, we have investigated the dynamical family relations and dark halo properties of ellipticals. Our results include: (i) The circular velocity curves (CVCs) of elliptical galaxies are flat to within $\simeq 10\%$ for $R \ge 0.2R_e$. (ii) Most ellipticals are moderately radially anisotropic; their dynamical structure is surprisingly uniform. (iii) Elliptical galaxies follow a Tully-Fisher (TF) rela-

Lensing: Yes [Koopmans, Treu, Gavazzi et

fields from COSMOS in the same manner, interring that the residual systematic uncertainty in the tangential shear is less than 0.3%. A joint strong- and weak-lensing analysis shows that the average *total* mass density profile is consistent with isothermal (i.e., $\rho \propto r^{-2}$) over two decades in radius (3–300 h^{-1} kpc, approximately 1–100 effective radii). This finding extends by over an order of magnitude in radius previous results, based on strong lensing and/or stellar

X-rays: Yes, within limited range of radii

Potential is approximately isothermal $\varphi(r) = v_c^2 \ln r$

What is the simplest way to estimate circular velocity from the optical data? Full dynamic models are expensive, we want simpler methoRinay be less accurate).

$$\sigma_{p}(R)$$

Goal: to be insensitive to (unknown) anisotropy of orbits.

Consider three limiting paragraphic modial



EC+,

How quickly the energy deposited by the AGN $t_{dis} \stackrel{is}{\approx} \stackrel{dissipated}{\lesssim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{5}{\sim} \stackrel{is}{\sim} \stackrel{dissipated}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\approx} \stackrel{5}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{5}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{5}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{5}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{is}{\sim} \stackrel{dissipated}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{the}{\sim} \stackrel{in}{\sim} \stackrel{i$

AGN supplies to ICM: cosmic rays, magnetic fields and

generates turbulence If Heating=Cooling



Radio, 90cm, Owen et



AGN => shocks, bubbles, gas motions...



20 cm Biretta





плазмы

Abell

UGC 9752 = IC

