

MNRAS L^AT_EX 2_ε template – title goes here

Keith T. Smith,¹[★] A. N. Other,² Third Author^{2,3} and Fourth Author³

¹*Royal Astronomical Society, Burlington House, Piccadilly, London W1J 0BQ, UK*

²*Department, Institution, Street Address, City Postal Code, Country*

³*Another Department, Different Institution, Street Address, City Postal Code, Country*

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

ABSTRACT

This is a simple template for authors to write new MNRAS papers. The abstract should briefly describe the aims, methods, and main results of the paper. It should be a single paragraph not more than 250 words (200 words for Letters). No references should appear in the abstract.

Key words: keyword1 – keyword2 – keyword3

1 INTRODUCTION

This is a simple template for authors to write new MNRAS papers. See `mnras_sample.tex` for a more complex example, and `mnras_guide.tex` for a full user guide.

All papers should start with an Introduction section, which sets the work in context, cites relevant earlier studies in the field by [Others \(2013\)](#), and describes the problem the authors aim to solve (e.g. [Author 2012](#)).

2 ILLUSTRIS SIMULATION

Illustris-1, also known simply as Illustris, is a highly resolved cosmological simulation which reproduces large-scale statistical features of the Universe, such as the galaxy population of massive clusters, as well as small-scale properties such as the morphology of galaxies and detailed values for their stellar and gas content. This was achieved by following the evolution of 1820^3 DM particles with mass resolution $m_{\text{DM}} = 6.26 \cdot 10^6 M_{\odot}$, together with 1820^3 baryonic particles with mass resolution $m_{\text{b}} = 1.26 \cdot 10^6 M_{\odot}$ from a glass-like configuration, in a periodic box of 106.5Mpc, all of which is consistent with a standard Λ CDM cosmology with $\Omega_{\Lambda} = 0.7274$, $\Omega_{\text{m}} = 0.2726$, $\Omega_{\text{b}} = 0.0456$, $\sigma_8 = 0.0.809$, $n_s = 0.963$ & $H_0 = 70.4 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. Illustris has a constant spatial resolution of 1.4kpc for DM particles in comoving units, and for baryonic particles it has the same spatial resolution of DM for $z \geq 1$, which is later modified to 0.7kpc in physical units for the rest of the simulation. The evolution in time was performed with the hydrodynamic algorithm AREPO[?], which combines a moving Voronoi tessellation with the finite volume approach. Included in the evolution algorithm, there are galaxy formation models which account for the evolution of stars and SMBHs. The

level of detail in Illustris is advantageous and hard to find among other simulations, and is the reason why we chose it to perform our calculations.

This simulation consists of 136 snapshots where 61 of them were taken at $z < 3$ spaced with a cosmological scale factor $\Delta a \approx 0.02$, while the remaining 75 were taken at $z > 3$ with spacing $\Delta a \approx 0.01$. Each snapshot was post-processed with modified versions of FOF and SUBFIND algorithms^{??} to generate halo and subhalo catalogues with their respective characterization properties.

3 THE METHOD

The principal purpose of this work is to verify if the results obtained observationally by Jones et al. [?] are supported by a similar analysis in the cosmological simulation Illustris. For this purpose, we want to adaptate the observational method as closely as possible for it to work on computational data.

The principal method used in Jones et al. [?] for the analysis of the dependence of the Schechter parameters on the cosmological environment is as follows. To obtain a quantification of environment, they calculated for, each galaxy in the studied survey, the projected distance in the sky to the third nearest neighbor, filtrating candidate galaxies by its radial velocity relative to the galaxy studied. According to Hubble’s law, this effectively restricts the candidate galaxies to a smaller radial range, reducing apparent closer galaxies arising from the projection method. The radial relative velocity cut was chosen to be 450 km/s . Furthermore, a photometrics preselection was performed, selecting galaxies whose r-filter magnitude was above -19 (VERIFY).

[★] E-mail: mn@ras.org.uk (KTS)

Once quantified the environment with the distance to

Table 1. This is an example table. Captions appear above each table. Remember to define the quantities, symbols and units used.

A	B	C	D
1	2	3	4
2	4	6	8
3	5	7	9

the 3rd nearest neighbor definition for each galaxy in their post-selected survey they divided the group in four quartiles according this quantity. For each quartile, the respective HIMF was calculated, and with this, a Schechter fit was obtained. The analysis was specifically performed over the Schechter parameters of the Knee-mass and the faint-end slope.

In dark matter cosmological simulations, access to the information is instantaneous and at no cost. However, as we want to replicate as closely as possible the method effectuated by Jones et. al. ? . We also calculate the projected distance in the simulation, according to a specified point of view, taking the same radial velocity cut having into account distance and peculiar velocities. Even when we could easily calculate the distance to the third nearest neighbor we take into account these observational simplifications, to make our study as comparable as possible to that of Jones et al. ?

4 RESULTS

4.1 Preliminaries

4.2 Mass functions comparison

Figures and tables should be placed at logical positions in the text. Don't worry about the exact layout, which will be handled by the publishers.

Figures are referred to as e.g. Fig. ??, and tables as e.g. Table 1.

5 CONCLUSIONS

The last numbered section should briefly summarise what has been done, and describe the final conclusions which the authors draw from their work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Acknowledgements section is not numbered. Here you can thank helpful colleagues, acknowledge funding agencies, telescopes and facilities used etc. Try to keep it short.

REFERENCES

- Author A. N., 2013, *Journal of Improbable Astronomy*, 1, 1
Others S., 2012, *Journal of Interesting Stuff*, 17, 198




Figure 1. Upper side: Schechter fits of each gas mass function for each environmental quartile using the 3rd nearest neighbor definition. Down side: Knee-mass m_* and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.

APPENDIX A: SOME EXTRA MATERIAL

If you want to present additional material which would interrupt the flow of the main paper, it can be placed in an Appendix which appears after the list of references.

This paper has been typeset from a $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$ file prepared by the author.




Figure 2. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each gas mass function for each morphological environment characterized by the T-Web algorithm proposed by Forero et al. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_* and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.




Figure 3. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each DM mass function for each environmental quartile using the 3rd nearest neighbor definition. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_* and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.




Figure 4. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each DM mass function for each morphological environment characterized by the T-Web algorithm proposed by Forero et al. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_* and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.




Figure 5. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each stellar mass function for each environmental quartile using the 3rd nearest neighbor definition. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_* and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.




Figure 6. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each stellar mass function for each morphological environment characterized by the T-Web algorithm proposed by Forero et al. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_{*} and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.




Figure 7. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each BH mass function for each environmental quartile using the 3rd nearest neighbor definition. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_{*} and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.




Figure 8. **Upper side:** Schechter fits of each BH mass function for each morphological environment characterized by the T-Web algorithm proposed by Forero et al. **Down side:** Knee-mass m_* and the faint end slope α values obtained from the Schechter fits for each curve shown above.