Mass variance and cluster abundance in the context of a Gaussian + lognormal distribution model

A. L. B. Ribeiro¹, C. M. Coelho¹,², A. P. A. Andrade¹, and M. S. Dantas¹,³

¹ Laboratório de Astrofísica Teórica e Observacional, Departamento de Ciências Exatas e Tecnológicas, Universidade Estadual de Santa Cruz – 45650-000, Ilhéus, Brazil
e-mail: [albr;apaula]@uesc.br
² Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais, Divisão de Astrofísica – CP 515, 12245-970, São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil
e-mail: carla@das.inpe.br
³ Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas Espaciais, Laboratório Associado de Computação e Matemática Aplicada – CP 515, 12245-970, São José dos Campos, SP, Brazil
e-mail: msdantas@iac.inpe.br

Received 5 January 2006 / Accepted 5 February 2007

ABSTRACT

Context. We investigate the behavior of the mass variance and the mass function of galaxy clusters in a mixed distribution model.
Aims. Our aim is to find a relation between the mass variance at a $8 \, h^{-1}$ Mpc scale, $\sigma_8$, and the parameter controlling the Gaussian deviation in the model, $\alpha_0$, and to constrain the non-Gaussianity using observational data at cluster scales.
Methods. By assuming that the statistics of the density field is built as a weighted mixture of two components, a Gaussian + Lognormal distribution, we rewrite the mass variance expression and the mass function for galaxy clusters.
Results. We find a relation between the mass variance at a $8 \, h^{-1}$ Mpc scale, $\sigma_8$, and the scale parameter controlling the Gaussian deviation in the model, $\alpha_0$. This result, in conjunction with observational constraints on the mass variance and high-$z$ galaxy clustering, suggests a scenario where structures develop earlier in comparison to strictly Gaussian models, even for $\alpha_0 \leq 0.003$ Mpc. Our model also indicates that only well selected galaxy cluster samples at $z \geq 1$ can discriminate between Gaussian and non-Gaussian (mixed) distribution models.

Key words. cosmological parameters – galaxies: clusters: general

1. Introduction

Galaxy clusters are the largest virialized structures in the Universe. The study of their abundance as a function of redshift can impose important constraints on the linear amplitude of mass fluctuations (Bahcall & Fan 1998). To find the number of clusters in any given redshift interval, one needs to know their comoving density $n(z)$. This may be predicted using the semi-analytic formalism of Press & Schechter (1974). In this model (and most of its variants) the space density of a given type of object exponentially depends on the rms dispersion in mass, $\sigma_M$, and also on the growth factor for the linear perturbation, $D(z)$. In the case of rich galaxy clusters, the linearized Abell radius ($1.5 \, h^{-1}$ Mpc) is $\sim 8h^{-1}$ Mpc and, hence, $\sigma_M$ on this scale can be determined from the observational abundance of these objects, becoming the so-called $\sigma_M$ parameter. The exponential dependence in the PS formula comes from the underlying hypothesis of a Gaussian distribution for the density fluctuations field. Such a dependence can be more or less intense if this distribution is not Gaussian. Clusters correspond to rare peaks in the density field and, as a consequence, any positive skewness in the probability density function, with respect to the Gaussian distribution, yields more clusters at higher redshifts. Some authors show that the mere observation of a few clusters at high redshifts could indicate a small level of non-Gaussianity in the primordial density field (e.g. Ribeiro et al. 2000 – RWL, Robinson & Baker 2000; Matarrese et al. 2000; Willick 2000).

Recent observations suggest the existence of clusters or protoclusters at relatively high redshifts. Some examples are the high-$z$ quasar clustering evidence at $z \geq 4$ (Djorgovski 1999; Steidel et al. 1998, 2005); Ly-$\alpha$ and LBG objects in the range $2 \leq z \leq 5$ (Röttgering et al. 2004; Pentericci et al. 2000); X-ray clusters from Chandra + XMM-Newton survey presenting high correlation length at $z \approx 1$ (Rosati et al. 2004). All these observations have some difficulties for any hierarchical structure formation model based on a strictly Gaussian statistics. Nevertheless, any level of non-Gaussianity (if present) should respect the severe constraints on CMB scales from recent WMAP data (e.g. Komatsu et al. 2003); non-Gaussian traces have already been detected in WMAP-1 and WMAP-3 year data (e.g. Chiang et al. 2006; Cruz et al. 2006; Vielva et al. 2004). These results have stimulated the investigation of non-Gaussian contributions using several kinds of models (e.g. Lyth 2006; Seery & Lidsey 2006; Allen et al. 2006). Some authors consider the possibility that non-Gaussianity is a scale-dependent feature and thus models in this context could fit both CMB and high-$z$ galaxy clustering in the Universe (e.g. Andrade et al. 2004, 2005 – AWR04 and AWR05; Avelino & Liddle 2004; Mathis et al. 2004). In this work, continuing the studies of RWL, AWR04 and AWR05, we investigate the predictions of scale-dependent mixed non-Gaussian cosmological density fields for the space number density of massive galaxy clusters. Our aim is to use the current observational values of $\sigma_8$ in conjunction with high-$z$ galaxy
clustering data to constrain the level of non-Gaussianity in the density field.

2. Structure formation

In this section, we briefly review the basics of Gaussian random fields and the PS formalism for the mass function.

2.1. Smoothed Gaussian random field

In a linear approximation, the theory of structure formation describes the evolution of the density contrast

\[ \delta(x) = \frac{\rho(x) - \bar{\rho}}{\bar{\rho}}, \]

where \( \rho(x) \) is the density at the point \( x \) and \( \bar{\rho} \) is the cosmic mean density. The Fourier mode of the density contrast, \( \delta_k \), is given by

\[ \delta_k = \int \delta(x) e^{i k \cdot x} \, dx. \]

The density contrast is smoothed by a window function \( W(r) \) with a smoothing mass-scale \( M \),

\[ \delta_M(x) \equiv \int W(|x' - x|) \delta(x') \, dx' \]

or

\[ \delta_M(x) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \hat{W}(kR) \delta_k e^{-i k \cdot x} \, dk \]

where \( \hat{W}(kR) \) is the Fourier transform of the window function \( W(r) \), \( R \) is a scale related to the mass \( M \), and \( \vec{k} \equiv |k| \).

The density field variance with a smoothing mass-scale \( M \)

\[ \sigma^2_M \equiv \langle \delta^2_M \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \hat{W}^2(kR) P(k) k^2 \, dk \]

where we have defined the power spectrum \( P(k) \equiv \langle |\delta_k|^2 \rangle \). The use of a spherical Heaviside function

\[ W(r) = \frac{3}{4\pi R^3} \theta \left( 1 - \frac{r}{R} \right) \]

or

\[ \hat{W}(kR) = \frac{3}{(kR)^3} (\sin kR - kR \cos kR), \]

with comoving scale \( 8 \, h^{-1} \) Mpc, defines the usual measure of the linearly evolved power spectrum amplitude, \( \sigma_8 \), with corresponding mass \( M_8 = 1.785 (\Omega_m/0.3) \times 10^{14} \, h^{-1} \) \( M_\odot \), i.e., a typical galaxy cluster mass.

2.2. The mass function

To find the number of clusters of mass \( M \) in any given redshift interval, one needs to know their comoving density, \( n(M, z) \). This may be predicted using the semi-analytic formalism of Press & Schechter (1974), where the basic assumption is that the amplitude of the primordial density fluctuations can be described by a Gaussian distribution:

\[ P(\delta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \sigma_M}} \exp \left[ -\frac{\delta^2}{2\sigma^2_M} \right]. \]
4. Structure formation in the mixed model

In the mixed scenario, we suppose that the field has a probability density function of the form:

\[ P[\delta_k] \propto (1 - \alpha) f_1(\delta_k) + \alpha f_2(\delta_k). \]  

(12)

The first field is the Gaussian component and the effect of the second component is to modify the Gaussian field to have a positive tail. The parameter \( \alpha \) in (1) allows us to modulate the contribution of each component to the resultant field. Like the hybrid inflation models (Battey & Weller 1998; Battey et al. 1999), the mixture models consider the scenario in which structure is formed by both adiabatic density fluctuations produced during inflation and active isocurvature perturbations created by cosmic defects during a phase transition which marks the end of inflationary epoch.

Nevertheless, the mixed scenario just considers the correlation between the adiabatic and the isocurvature fields in the post-inflation Universe. So, the fluctuations in super-horizon scales (inflated during the exponential expansion) are strictly uncorrelated and the mixing effect acts only inside the Hubble horizon, on sub-degree scales. To allow for this condition and to keep a continuous mixed field, a scale dependent mixture parameter, \( \alpha \equiv \alpha(k) \) was defined. We assume the simplest choice of \( \alpha(k) \), a linear function of \( k \):

\[ \alpha(k) \equiv \alpha_0 k. \]  

(13)

4.1. The mixed power spectrum

To constrain the two component random field, we take \( \delta_k = P(k)v^2 \), where \( v \) is a random number with a distribution given by (12). So, we consider the primordial power spectrum of the mixed field in the form:

\[ P(k)^{\text{mix}} = M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k)P(k) \]  

(14)

where the \( P(k) \) is the primordial power-law spectrum and \( M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) \) is the mixture term, a functional of \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \), which accounts for the statistical effect of the new component:

\[ M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) \equiv \int \left[ (1 - \alpha_0) f_1(\nu) + \alpha_0 f_2(\nu) \right] \nu^2 \, \text{d}\nu. \]  

(15)

In the case of a pure Gaussian field, \( \alpha_0 = 0 \), \( M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) = 1 \), and the power spectrum is just the simple power-law spectrum, \( k^n \), where \( n \) is the spectral index predicted by inflationary models. In the case of a mixed field, correlations between both fields are estimated by the integral in Eq. (15), on mixture scales defined by Eq. (13). Introducing the Gaussian-lognormal mixture distribution in (15), we have the following integral for the mixture term

\[ M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) = \int \left[ (1 - \alpha_0) k^\nu \nu^\nu \right] + \frac{\alpha_0 k^\nu \nu^\nu \nu^\nu \nu^\nu} {\sqrt{2\pi}} \right] \nu^2 \, \text{d}\nu. \]  

(16)

Solving this integral we find

\[ M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) = 1 + \alpha_0 \left( \frac{\pi^2} {2} - 1 \right) > 1, \]  

(17)

and hence the contribution of \( M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) \) to the power spectrum is always positive. The overall effect, however, also depends on the mixed transfer function estimated according to

\[ T_{\text{mix}}^2(k) \equiv (1 - \alpha_0) k^2 T_{\text{adh}}^2(k) + 2(1 - \alpha_0\alpha_0)kT_{\text{adh}}(k) \times T_{\text{iso}}(k) + (\alpha_0 k^2) T_{\text{iso}}^2(k) \]  

(18)
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4.2. Mass variance in the mixed model

We estimate the mass variance as a function of \( \alpha_0 \) using

\[ \sigma^2_{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0) = \int \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \int W^2(k) P(k)^{\text{mix}} k^2 \, \text{d}k. \]  

(20)

Solving this integral for increasing values of \( \alpha_0 \), with the following set of parameters: \( \Omega_m = 0.27, \Omega_L = 0.73, h = 0.7 \) and

\[ T_{\text{adh}}(k) \text{ and } T_{\text{iso}}(k) \text{ are the transfer functions computed by CMBFAST (Seljak & Zaldarriaga 1996) for adiabatic and isocurvature seed initial conditions, respectively. Although an isocurvature transfer function is not a necessary condition for mixed models, we have assumed such a feature here in order to be consistent with our previous work (AWR04 and AWR05).}

To see the total influence of the second component, we compute the power spectrum of matter as

\[ P_{\text{mix}}(k) = 2\pi^2 \delta_h^2 \frac{k^6}{H_0^2} T_{\text{mix}}^2(k) M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) \]  

(19)

where \( \delta_h = 1.9 \times 10^{-5} \), \( H_0 = 100 h^{-1} \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1} \) (e.g. Dodelson 2003).

In Fig. 1, we compare the mixed transfer function with the strict adiabatic case. In this plot, the choice of \( \alpha_0 = 0.003 \text{ Mpc} \) corresponds to the maximum value for this parameter to be consistent with the CMBR anisotropies (see AWR04). This scale, at recombination, corresponds to the comoving length scale of \( 10^{12} \text{ M}_\odot \), the baryonic damping mass by photon diffusion) and should be equivalent to the minimal value of \( \alpha_0 \) for later times of the structure formation process. Note in this figure that the effect of the mixed field is a power transfer from smaller scales to larger physical scales, the critical point being \( k \approx 0.04 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1} \) (the pure effect of \( T_{\text{mix}}^2(k) \)). This point is displaced to \( k \approx 0.45 \text{ h Mpc}^{-1} \) when we compute the power spectrum, as we can see in Fig. 2 (resulting from the combined effect of \( T_{\text{mix}}^2(k) \) and \( M^{\text{mix}}(\alpha_0, k) \)). Hence, the distinctive feature of the mixed model is the prediction of less power at galaxy scales and slightly more power at larger scales.
n = 0.96 (Spergel et al. 2003), we find the behavior presented in Fig. 3, where we also plot some data points on the theoretical curve in order to set observational constraints to the model. The estimates of $\sigma_8$ are based on different methods and were taken from the compilation of Pierpaoli et al. (2003). The data suggest that the value of $\sigma_8$ is approximately in the range 0.7–0.9, which corresponds to the range 0.001–0.01 Mpc for $\alpha_0$. The presence of a maximum value of $\sigma_8 \approx 0.95$ corresponding to $\alpha_0 \approx 0.03$ Mpc is seen. This is the scale where the mixed transfer function becomes dominated by the contribution of small scales ($k \to \infty$) in integral (20). This is an interesting feature of the model, being directly related to the way we define $T^{\text{mix}}_2(k)$ in Eq. (18).

4.3. Mass function of massive clusters

By modifying the original PS formula to take into account the small non-Gaussianity, we rewrite Eq. (10) as a function of $\sigma_M$

$$f(\sigma_M^d) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \left[ (1 - \alpha_0) (\delta, \sigma_M^{-1}) \exp \left( - (\delta, \sigma_M^{-1})^2 / 2 \right) \right]$$

$$+ \frac{2}{\pi} \left( \ln \delta, \sigma_M^{-1} \right) \exp \left( - (\ln \delta, \sigma_M^{-1})^2 / 2 \right). \quad (21)$$

The result is presented in Figs. 4 and 5, where we compare our model with the standard PS (just the first term of Eq. (21)) and also with the fitting formula obtained from the Virgo Consortium Cluster Data by Jenkins et al. (2001)

$$f(\ln \sigma_M^d) = A \exp \left[ - | \ln \sigma_M^{-1} | + B \epsilon \right]$$

(22)

where the parameter $B$ controls the location of the peak in the collapsed mass fraction, $A$ controls the overall mass fraction in halos and $\epsilon$ stretches the function to fit the overall shape of the simulations (in this work we follow Jenkins et al. 2001 and set $A = 0.315, B = 0.61$ and $\epsilon = 3.8$). In Fig. 4, all the spectra are built from the CMBFAST transfer function: pure adiabatic for Gaussian and mixed for non-Gaussian models. We verify a higher density of objects with $M > 8 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$ at high redshifts in comparison with the strictly Gaussian case. This result is similar to others found in different works dealing with non-Gaussianity (e.g. Amara & Refregier 2003; Mathis et al. 2004).

This effect is even clearer if we integrate Eq. (21) for $M > 8.0 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$, thus finding the abundance as a function of the redshift: $n(z)$. The result is presented in Fig. 5, where we also depict a possible scenario of galaxy cluster formation based on observational evidence of high-$z$ galaxy clustering in the Universe. In this figure we see a vertical line indicating the redshift up to which galaxy clusters are detected in the Chandra + XMM-Newton experiments (Rosati et al. 2004); and regions where we find observations of high-$z$ galaxy clustering, Ly-$\alpha$ and LBG objects at $z \gtrsim 2$ (Röttgering et al. 2003; Pentericci et al. 2000) and
The evolution of cluster abundance with redshift also indicates the need for well selected cluster samples around \( z \geq 1 \) to discriminate between Gaussian and non-Gaussian (mixed) distribution models. Although the available data are not complete up to such redshifts, current (and future) observational missions will probably allow us to answer this question. For the moment, we conclude that the observational evidence for earlier stages of galaxy cluster formation since \( z \approx 5 \) marginally favors models with a small level of non-Gaussianity. The question of possible effects of dark energy on our present results will be probed in future work.
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Fig. 5. Galaxy cluster evolution scenario at high redshifts. Data points correspond to the most massive EMSS clusters. Possible formation sequence: 1) quasar clustering at first stage \((z \approx 4–5)\); then 2) normal galaxy clustering – the protocluster stage \((z \approx 3–4)\) and 3) virialized clusters \((z \approx 1–2)\).


5. Discussion

Continuing the work of RWL, AWR04 and AWR05, we explore the effects of small non-Gaussianities, defined by a mixed distribution model, on the mass variance at galaxy cluster scale. The mixed power spectrum and the \( \sigma_8 - \alpha_0 \) relation were obtained from a finite mixture model according to RWL, with a weighted adiabatic and isocurvature transfer function. Observational data on \( \sigma_8 \) allowed us to constrain the mixture parameter to \( 0.001 \leq \alpha_0 \leq 0.01 \) Mpc. If we take this in conjunction with the result of AWR04, \( \alpha_0 \approx 0.003 \) Mpc in order for the model to be consistent with the CMBR anisotropies, we are led to a very restricted range for the mixture parameter: \( 0.001–0.003 \) Mpc. As a consequence, we have \( \sigma_8 \approx 0.7–0.74 \).

Using the extreme values for \( \alpha_0 \) (one for each value of \( \sigma_8 \), and relaxing the upper limit set by AWR04 in the case of \( \sigma_8 = 0.9 \)), we estimate the effects of such small Gaussian deviations on the number density evolution of galaxy clusters. Our results suggest a scenario where structures develop earlier in comparison to strictly Gaussian models due to the mass function dependence on the mixture parameter \( \alpha_0 \) and the lognormal component (the positive skewness effect).