Draft version August 9, 2013
Preprint typeset using LaTeX style emulateapj v. 11/10/09

ON MEASURING INNER HALO PROFILES WITH WEAK LENSING SHEAR AND MAGNIFICATION

Matthew R. George
Department of Astronomy, University of California, Berkeley and
Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA

Draft version August 9, 2013

ABSTRACT

Subject headings:

1. INTRODUCTION

We want to measure the shape of the dark matter profile on small scales. This will tell us how baryons have affected the dark matter distribution, the assembly history of the baryons and dark matter as well as feedback processes, and whether dark matter interacts to form "cored" profiles as opposed to the "cuspy" profiles seen in cold dark matter simulations. Measurements of the mass distribution on scales comparable to the effective radius of a galaxy can also constrain the mass-to-light ratio of the stellar population which is uncertain by a factor of ~ 2 depending on the initial mass function which is generally assumed.

Various observational probes have been used to constrain the mass profile of galaxies and dark matter halos, typically with dynamical measurements within a few kpc of the galaxy center, stong lensing arcs a bit farther out, and weak lensing on larger scales to measure the total mass of the halo (e.g., Sand et al. 2004; Koopmans et al. 2006; Gavazzi et al. 2007; Auger et al. 2010; Schulz et al. 2010; Newman et al. 2013). While central velocity dispersions or rotation curves can be measured for large samples of galaxies, detailed kinematic measures on scales $\gtrsim 10$ kpc are difficult and strong lenses exist in only a sparse sample of the galaxy population. Weak lensing, on the other hand, can probe the average profile for large samples of galaxies, allowing studies of population differences and redshift evolution. For instance, the assembly histories of disk and elliptical galaxies may differ and hydrodynamical simulations predict significant differences in the inner profiles of their dark matter halos. The aim of this letter is to investigate how well weak lensing shear and magnification can constrain the inner mass profile of dark matter halos and galaxies.

Several authors have studied the complementarity of shear and magnification, primarily for measuring halo masses (Bartelmann et al. 1996; Bridle et al. 1998; Schneider et al. 2000; Van Waerbeke et al. 2010; Rozo & Schmidt 2010; Umetsu et al. 2011) or probing the matter distribution on cosmological scales (van Waerbeke 2010; Casaponsa et al. 2013; Duncan et al. 2013; Krause et al. 2013). Combining shear and magnification increases the statistical precision of a lensing experiment and also enables tests of systematic effects which differ between probes.

Magnification can be measured using sizes, fluxes, or by combining the two (). Magnification has recently been measured with signal-to-noise approaching that from shear (Scranton et al. 2005; Hildebrandt et al. 2009; Ménard et al. 2010; Huff & Graves 2011; Ford et al. 2012; Schmidt et al. 2012).

2. LENS MODELING

Magnification and shear represent different components of the lensing distortion matrix. [EQ] They are related to different aspects of the surface mass density profile. [EQ]

NFW, gNFW, AC models.

Assumptions: neglect covariance, systematics. Reduced shear? Non-weak lensing? Relative S/N of shear vs. magnification. No contraction beyond virial radius, extrapolation with NFW.

We assume that the quantity $\Delta\Sigma(\Sigma)$ can be estimated from shear (magnification) observables in an unbiased manner even on small scales where the weak limit breaks down. For discussion of modeling lensing observables into the nonlinear regime, see) for shear and Ménard et al. (2003); Takada & Hamana (2003) for magnification.

Plots of rho, sigma, delta sigma.

3. FORECASTS

Results. Choice of fiducial system(s) - galaxy vs cluster, concentration, mention miscentering.

Priors

Plots of constraints.

4. CONCLUSIONS

REFERENCES

Auger, M. W., Treu, T., Bolton, A. S., Gavazzi, R., Koopmans, L. V. E., Marshall, P. J., Moustakas, L. A., & Burles, S. 2010, ApJ, 724, 511
Bartelmann, M., Narayan, R., Seitz, S., & Schneider, P. 1996, ApJ, 464, L115
Bridle, S. L., Hobson, M. P., Lasenby, A. N., & Saunders, R. 1998, MNRAS, 299, 895
Casaponsa, B., Heavens, A. F., Kitching, T. D., Miller, L., Barreiro, R. B., & Martínez-González, E. 2013, MNRAS, 430, 2844
Duncan, C., Joachimi, B., Heavens, A., Heymans, C., & Hildebrandt, H. 2013, ArXiv e-prints
Ford, J., et al. 2012, ApJ, 754, 143
Gavazzi, R., Treu, T., Rhodes, J. D., Koopmans, L. V. E., Bolton, A. S., Burles, S., Massey, R. J., & Moustakas, L. A. 2007, ApJ, 667, 176

Hildebrandt, H., van Waerbeke, L., & Erben, T. 2009, A&A, 507, 683
Huff, E. M., & Graves, G. J. 2011, ArXiv e-prints
Koopmans, L. V. E., Treu, T., Bolton, A. S., Burles, S., & Moustakas, L. A. 2006, ApJ, 649, 599
Krause, E., Chang, T.-C., Doré, O., & Umetsu, K. 2013, ApJ, 762, L20
Ménard, B., Hamana, T., Bartelmann, M., & Yoshida, N. 2003, A&A, 403, 817
Ménard, B., Scranton, R., Fukugita, M., & Richards, G. 2010, MNRAS, 405, 1025
Newman, A. B., Treu, T., Ellis, R. S., Sand, D. J., Nipoti, C., Richard, J., & Jullo, E. 2013, ApJ, 765, 24
Rozo, E., & Schmidt, F. 2010, ArXiv e-prints
Sand, D. J., Treu, T., Smith, G. P., & Ellis, R. S. 2004, ApJ, 604, 88
Schmidt, F., Leauthaud, A., Massey, R., Rhodes, J., George, M. R., Koekemoer, A. M., Finoguenov, A., & Tanaka, M. 2012, ApJ, 744, L22
Schneider, P., King, L., & Erben, T. 2000, A&A, 353, 41
Schulz, A. E., Mandelbaum, R., & Padmanabhan, N. 2010, MNRAS, 408, 1463
Scranton, R., et al. 2005, ApJ, 633, 589
Takada, M., & Hamana, T. 2003, MNRAS, 346, 949
Umetsu, K., Broadhurst, T., Zitrin, A., Medezinski, E., & Hsu, L.-Y. 2011, ApJ, 729, 127
van Waerbeke, L. 2010, MNRAS, 401, 2093
Van Waerbeke, L., Hildebrandt, H., Ford, J., & Milkeraitis, M. 2010, ApJ, 723, L13