

Title: The return of the merging galaxy subclusters of El Gordo? Manuscript ID: MN-14-3494-MJ
Authors: Ng, Karen (contact); Dawson, William; Wittman, David; Jee, Myungkook; Hughes, John; Menanateau, Felipe; Sifon, Cristobal

This paper is investigating the merger properties of the “El Gordo” merging cluster using a wide range of data set. Although the analysis sounds convincing, it would benefit of a better presentation so that the reader have a better understanding on the importance of various constraints. Once this is corrected, the paper can certainly be accepted.

Introduction:

more references on cluster merger and in particular regarding the typical speed of a merger should be given.

Accepted

Figure 1 is key for the understanding of the paper. I would suggest to make it larger (by rotating it by ~ 45 -50 deg in order to have the elongation axis of the cluster horizontal)

Accepted. After tiling the elongation axis, the RA and DEC coordinates are going to be diagonal. To remove any potential confusion about the coordinate grid, we have removed the axis ticks.

showing possibly the galaxy luminosity contours.

Maybe. There may be an overplotting issue.

Can the relic radio data be plotted on top instead of some schematic of it? (it looks like the size of the relic does not match the size given in Lindner et al 2014).

The concept of time-since-pericenter is interesting, but it need to be clarified (the time at pericenter is only defined in section 3.3). I would suggest that you draw a diagram of the merger (may be at different time step) so that the reader can have a clearer idea of the geometry and evolution of the system (on the plot all the quantities used such as distances and velocities must be indicated).

Accepted

There you can also define what are the different merger scenarios that will thereafter discussed (the outgoing and the returning scenario). At the moment, the reader needs to go through the literature to understand what are the effective geometric assumptions used.

Maybe

Section 2

The presentation of the data is not fully quantitative. A table is given for the WL data, but the paper is also using the radio data relic, and a summary table would be great. This table should underline the key number from the radio data used in the analysis (position, Mach Number/velocity?, polarisation? ...)

The radio data are not inputs like the other data in Table 1. The radio data helps determine the cuts to the inputs.

What about the velocity data? It is described in section 3.1.1 but should it not be moved to section 2?

We have moved some of the descriptions to section 2.

Section 3

I believe the vector D is representing the data, but this could be clearer, and it would be good to clarify which data is effectively used. Table 1 seems to only give part of the data used in the analysis.

We have added descriptions in Table 1 for clarification.

It would be helpful to describe a little bit more the MC simulation code. Does the simulation use a large number of particles? Or is it just using 2 “particles” with a NFW mass profile. It would be good to remind the reader of some of the key element in D13.

Agreed.

Are the galaxies introduces as test particles in the simulations? It seems not, but would this be a way to better model and possibly constraints the merger? I computed a Δv_{rad} of 463 km/s (based on the 2 redshift: 0.8684 and 0.8713) instead of the number of 476km/s given in the text, can you explain why? We thank the referee for double-checking our calculation. The calculations that led to the results were done with the entire PDF distribution, then we take the biweight location as the estimate. In the referee ’s calculation, only the best estimate was used, therefore, the discrepancies arise from the different inputs. Also, the uncertainty that we give is much bigger than this discrepancy.

Similarly the d_{proj} I found is 0.744 instead of .74 (based on the RA, DEC given)

We also used the full PDF for computing d_{proj} which is a more robust calculation.

It would be much better to define the output parameters using a diagram of the different merger scenarios.

Would there be a correlation between β and TSP ?

No. The parameter β is not a property, nor an output of each Monte Carlo simulation, it is a choice of parametrization of our uncertainty, i.e. you cannot find one β value for each simulation so you cannot compute a correlation between β and TSP , since TSP is an output and has one value for each Monte Carlo simulation.

Section 4

It would be good to move some of the key likelihood plot from the annex to the main text. Indeed, the start of section 4, starts with results that are basically described in the appendix, which is not ideal.

Which specific likelihood plot would you like to see in the main text? We feel like there are already many plots in the main text.

Section 5

For the comparison with other analysis, I would suggest that the author summarizes the comparison in two tables. One table comparing results with other El Gordo modelling.

A lot of the comparison has been done in the main text.

And one table comparing the properties of the different merger described with the same modelling principle, in particular comparing El Gordo to the bullet cluster and the musket cluster.

Accepted.

Written with [StackEdit](#).