

# Giant Low Surface Brightness Galaxies As Merger Remnants

Peter Yoachim<sup>1</sup>, Denise Schmitz<sup>4</sup>, Sarah Loebman<sup>2</sup>, SungWon Kwak<sup>1</sup>, Victor P. Debattista<sup>3</sup>

## ABSTRACT

We present IFU observations of the giant low surface brightness galaxies Malin 2 and UGC 6614. We fit the stellar dynamics of these systems and compare their spatially resolved spectra to star formation history models. We argue that Malin 2 and UGC 6614 are normal elliptical galaxies which have undergone a high angular momentum mergers which formed their GLSB disks, making them unique systems for probing the dark matter halos of elliptical systems. We find the stellar dynamics are consistent with earlier measurements of the GLSB H I disks. The stellar populations of the GLSB disks are dominated by old metal-poor stars, while the central ellipticals are metal rich.

*Subject headings:* galaxies: kinematics and dynamics — galaxies: formation — galaxies: structure

## 1. Introduction

Since the discovery of Malin 1 (Bothun et al. 1987), giant low surface brightness galaxies (GLSB) have presented a unique problem for galaxy formation theories. Low surface brightness (LSB) galaxies are typically defined as disks with central surface brightnesses fainter than 23  $B$  mag arcsec<sup>2</sup>. While LSB galaxies span a wide range of sizes and masses, the few giant low surface brightness that have been discovered seem to be unrelated objects that are at least an order of magnitude larger in extent than typical LSB systems.

Observers tend to classify GLSB systems as normal spirals. Matthews et al. (2001) list Malin 2 as an Scd while Das (2013) concludes that GLSB systems are an extreme form of late type spiral galaxies. Similarly, Kasparova et al. (2014) claim that the large dark matter

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Astronomy, University of Washington, Box 351580, Seattle WA, 98195

<sup>2</sup>XXX-U Mich

<sup>3</sup>Jeremiah Horrocks Institute, University of Central Lancashire, Preston PR1 2HE, UK. RCUK Fellow

<sup>4</sup>XXX-Cal Tech

scale of Malin 2 can explain its features. Even the Galaxy Zoo project classifies GLSB galaxies as spirals. While GLSB systems superficially resemble normal spiral galaxies, they are clearly extreme outliers when their scale lengths are compared to other galaxy samples, being around a factor of 2 larger than the largest typical spirals (Dalcanton et al. 1997).

The disks in GLSB systems are incredibly large, with Malin 1 being detected in  $R$ -band to a radius of over 100 kpc (Moore & Parker 2006). Disks of this size are a challenge for typical  $\Lambda$ CDM cosmology galaxy formation and exotic formation scenarios have been proposed for GLSB systems. Mapelli et al. (2008) form GLSB-like galaxies in simulations via the fading of collisional ring galaxies. In their model, a collision sets off an expanding ring of star formation. As this the star formation subsides and the stellar population ages, the ring galaxy fades over  $\sim 100$  Myr to resembles observed GLSBs. One obvious problem with this scenario is that most GLSBs are relatively isolated, and thus there are no obvious candidates for the impactor systems that would have triggered the star formation burst.

The another formation scenario for GLSB systems is that they are normal galaxies that undergo a high angular momentum minor merger where the LSB disk is the shredded remains of an accreted galaxy. Peñarrubia et al. (2006) find that extended disks can be formed via the disruption of dwarf galaxies. These simulated debris disks have exponential profiles and extend out to 200 kpc from the central galaxy.

Observations of Malin 1 support the accretion model of GLSBs. Barth (2007) analyze HST imaging of Malin 1 and find that the central object is well described as a normal early-type barred galaxy that was previously unresolved in ground-based imaging. Barth (2007) points out that extended disk structures in galaxies such as M31 appear to be a smooth continuation of the inner disk (Ferguson et al. 2002), while Malin 1’s extended disk is better described as a distinct component, (although Ibata et al. (2005) claim M31’s extended disk is of accretion origin).

If GLSB disks are indeed the remains of accreted dwarf galaxies, they represent a unique opportunity to observationally probe the outer regions of galaxy dark matter halos, especially if they form around elliptical galaxies. The mass profiles of elliptical galaxies have been difficult to constrain since they lack the extended H I disks found around spirals. As an example of how difficult it can be to measure the outer regions of elliptical galaxy kinematics, Murphy et al. (2011) model M87 out to  $\sim 23$  kpc with stellar kinematics and out to 51 kpc with globular clusters (or  $R = 4.8 R_e$ , where  $R_e$  is the effective radius). Raskutti et al. (2014) are also limited to measuring kinematics out to  $\sim 2\text{--}5 R_e$ .

In comparison, the stellar disk of Malin 2 extends beyond 40 kpc ( $5.9 R_e$ ), and the HI disk reaches beyond 100 kpc ( $14.8 R_e$ ). These distances have occasionally been reached by

x-ray observations (Buote & Humphrey 2012).

XXX-Kasparova et al. (2014) has an amazing analysis of Malin 2. They combine ARC photometry, DIS spectra, and Gemini spectra to mass-model the system. They find the broadband colors are not consistent with a catastrophic formation, but are best fit by exponentially declining SFH. They think the main difference between Malin 2 and non-giant LSB galaxies is the dark matter halo scale. I think this is begging the question a little bit

Galaz et al. (2015) take deep images of Malin 1 and find the stellar disk extends to 160 kpc.

## 2. Observations

### 2.1. IFU spectra

We obtained spatially resolved spectroscopy of our target galaxies using the Mitchell Spectrograph (formerly VIRUS-P)(Hill et al. 2008) on the 2.7m Harlan J. Smith telescope at McDonald Observatory. Observations were made during dark time in February, March, and April 2010. Identical instrument setups were used for all observations. The Mitchell Spectrograph with the VP-2 IFU bundle used here has a square array of 246 optical fibers which sample the  $1.9' \times 1.9'$  field-of-view with a 1/3 filling factor, with each fiber having a diameter of  $4.23''$ . The spectrograph images the spectrum of each fiber on a  $2048 \times 2048$  Fairchild Imaging CCD.

For each galaxy, observations were taken at three unique dither positions to provide nearly complete spatial coverage. Individual science exposures were 30 minutes. Malin 2

Table 1. Basic Properties of GLSB Galaxies

Name	SDSS ID (DR 9)	$z$	$r$ (mag)	$R_e$ arcsec	$\sigma$ km s <sup>-1</sup>	Stellar Mass log <sub>10</sub> M <sub>⊙</sub>	H I mass log <sub>10</sub> M <sub>⊙</sub>
Malin 2	1237667735572381852	0.046	14.34	7.17	202	11.15	10.6
UGC 06614	1237668585435365393	0.021	13.52	7.3	150	10.66	10.5

Note. — H I masses updated to our adopted cosmological parameters from Pickering et al. (1997). The rest taken from SDSS.

had 10 exposures per dither position (11 exposures for dither position 1), for a total of 15 hours of exposure time. Observations of UGC 06614 had alignment issues between observing runs. This resulted in a deep stack of 6 exposures, and a shallow stack with only 2 exposures. With only 2 exposures, cosmic ray rejection becomes difficult, therefore, we use these shallow frames when looking at the surface brightness profiles, but use only the aligned deep co-add when analyzing the stellar kinematics and stellar populations. Twilight flat field frames, bias frames, and wavelength calibration Hg and Cd lamps were taken during the day. Flux standard stars were observed in twilight.

We use the Mitchell Spectrograph software pipeline Vaccine (Adams et al. 2011) to perform basic reduction tasks. Vaccine subtracts the over-scan region and generates and subtracts a bias frame. Bad pixels are masked. Twilight flats and arc lamps from each night are combined. The combined flat frame is used to trace the spatial profile of each fiber and correct for pixel-to-pixel variation. The combined arc lamp is used to fit a wavelength solution for each fiber. We use a 4th order polynomial and find the wavelength solutions have a typical RMS of 0.06-0.2 Å ( $\sim 0.1$  pixel). Vaccine then masks potential cosmic rays and collapses each fiber to a one dimensional spectrum. The fibers are adequately spaced, and our targets are predominately low surface brightness, so we find making a fiber cross-talk correction unnecessary.

Once the Vaccine routines are completed we make the following additional reductions using standard IRAF routines and custom IDL scripts. The reduced twilight frames are used to generate a fiber-to-fiber flux correction (similar to a longslit illumination correction). We use the b-spline procedure described in Kelson (2003) to generate background frames. The corners contain enough empty fibers to measure the sky background in each exposure. Because we bin fibers together, imperfect sky-subtraction represents a serious source of potential systematic errors.

The spectra are then rectified to a common wavelength scale, and the photo-spectroscopic standards are used to flux calibrate the spectra and correct for atmospheric extinction. The

Table 2. Fitted Structural Properties

Name	$h_r$ (arcsec)	inclination (deg)
Malin 2	6.1	35.5
UGC 06614	5.7	33.4

spectra are then velocity shifted to the Local Standard of Rest. Images taken at identical dither positions are averaged together with outlier rejection to eliminate any remaining cosmic rays. Some observations were taken in non-photometric conditions, so before combining frames we scale them to a common average flux level.

Our final reduced data for each galaxy includes 738 spectra spanning a  $1.9' \times 1.9'$  field-of-view. The spectra have a wavelength range of  $\sim 3550\text{--}5840$  with  $2.2 \text{ \AA}$  pixels (with some fibers only reaching  $5500 \text{ \AA}$  due to the warping of the trace). The FWHM of reduced arc lamp images is  $5.3 \text{ \AA}$ , giving us a resolution of  $R \sim 700 - 1000$ . The fiber-to-fiber changes in resolution are less than 10%.

With our final reduced data cubes, we used Penalized Pixel-Fitting (pPXF) (Cappellari & Emsellem 2004) and Gas AND Absorption Line Fitting (GANDALF) (Sarzi et al. 2006) on each fiber to fit stellar velocities, stellar dispersions, and emission line velocities and fluxes. For stellar templates we use a suite of SSP spectra from Bruzual & Charlot (2003). We use GANDALF to measure the [O II] doublet, [O III] doublet, and the higher order Balmer lines  $H\beta$ ,  $H\gamma$ ,  $H\delta$ ,  $H\epsilon$  while masking the night skyline at  $5577 \text{ \AA}$ . The fit also includes a 4th degree multiplicative polynomial to correct for any dust or flux calibration mis-match between the observations and templates. Because our data do not extend out to  $H\alpha$ , we cannot use the Balmer decrement to place tight constraints on the dust extinction. While pPXF fits the stellar velocity dispersion, our instrumental resolution is low enough ( $\sim 140 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ ) that we are unable to make meaningful velocity dispersion measurements beyond the central fibers.

In addition to individual fibers, we have binned sets of three neighboring fibers together to boost the signal-to-noise ratio and run pPXF on these super-fibers. The fiber surface brightnesses are plotted in Figures 4 and 9, and the pPXF stellar velocity maps are shown in Figures 5 and 13.

### 3. Comparisons to Other Galaxies

By eye, GLSB systems resemble large faint spiral disks at large radii, and regular ellipticals at their centers. In the SDSS DR10 (Ahn et al. 2014), the Galaxy Zoo classifications (Willett et al. 2013) are spiral for Malin 1 and 2 and UGC 6614. In this section, we compare the properties of the GLSB centers and disks with other systems.

### 3.1. GLSB Centers

Both of our objects, as well as Malin 1, have been observed with SDSS, making it possible to compare them to a large number of systems. The outer disks of GLSBs are faint enough that the SDSS photometric pipeline effectively ignores them.

To make a comparison sample of galaxies from SDSS, we select galaxies with redshifts between 0.01 and 0.07 and de-reddened  $r$  magnitude between 13.5 and 17.7. When comparing to just elliptical galaxies we make the additional color-cut of  $u - r > 2.1$  (and some morphology selectors). These are simply galaxies for comparison, not a rigorously defined volume-complete sample. Our full SQL queries are shown in §A. This gives us a sample of 141,001 objects, 45,703 of which have red colors. Throughout, we use the CosmoloPy<sup>1</sup> fiducial cosmology ( $h = 0.704$ ,  $\Omega_{m0} = 0.2726$ ,  $\Omega_{\lambda0} = 0.7274$ ). Note that we are not correcting for Malmquist bias or biases in the SDSS spectroscopic selection criteria. Our selection is simply for galaxies of a similar magnitude and redshift.

Figure 1 shows where the GLSBs fall on the major galaxy relations. We use extinction corrected magnitudes and  $k$ -corrected colors (Chilingarian et al. 2010). Both of our GLSBs lie on the red-sequence in the color-magnitude diagram.

The central regions of GLSBs are often called “bulges”, however, looking at Figure 1, it is clear that these are much brighter than bulges of typical spiral galaxies and the centers of GLSBs are on the bright end of the red-sequence.

We follow Bernardi et al. (2003a,b) in fitting fundamental plane parameters to our selected SDSS galaxies. We fit the fundamental plane by minimizing  $\chi^2$  in,

$$\chi^2 = \log R_0 - a \log \sigma - b \log I_0 - c \quad (1)$$

where  $R_0$  is the effective radius,  $\sigma$  is velocity dispersion in kilometers per second and  $I_0$  is the surface brightness. The resulting best-fit parameters are  $a = 1.376$ ,  $b = -0.661$ ,  $c = -9.938$ . We note that we have not made a rigorous volume-complete selection of galaxies, rather, simply galaxies with similar magnitudes, colors, and redshifts to our GLSBs. See Saulder et al. (2013) for a more rigorous analysis of the fundamental plane in SDSS.

---

<sup>1</sup><http://roban.github.com/CosmoloPy/>




Fig. 1.— Top Left: The color-magnitude diagram for 141,000 galaxies of similar redshift and magnitude as Malin 2 and UGC 6614. Top Right: The Faber-Jackson relation for 45,700 SDSS galaxies, along with a best-fit line. Left: The  $r$ -band fundamental plane from SDSS along with our GLSB galaxies and best-fit line. Bottom Right: The relation between central velocity dispersion and the Mg2 absorption feature. Looking at the SDSS data, our GLSB galaxies appear as relatively typical red elliptical galaxies.

### 3.2. GLSB Disks

The diameters of GLSB disks are very large, with Malin 1’s stellar disk detected out to a radius of 115 kpc (Moore & Parker 2006). Stellar disks are typically embedded in much larger H I disks. The size of the GLSB stellar disks is similar to the largest H I disks observed in nearby galaxies, in support of the Mapelli et al. (2008) model where the GLSB disks are the faded remnants of a normal H I disk that has experienced a merger induced star-burst.

For comparison: Williams et al. (2013) trace star formation out to 11 disk scale lengths (radius of 22 kpc) in NGC 2403.

In Figure 2, we compare the sizes of the stellar disks of the GLSB galaxies with other observations. For this plot, we take the maximum detected radius from the literature for the galaxies. It is possible that deeper observations could increase the values of  $R_{max}$ . While UGC 6614 is close in size to the upper end of local H I disks, Malin 1 and 2 are much larger than galaxies observed in the THINGS survey. This seems to point against the GLSB formation mechanism of Mapelli et al. (2008), as we do not observe H I disks large enough to convert into GLSB systems without some additional source of angular momentum.

## 4. Kinematics

It might be nice to spin this as a chance to measure the DM halo of ellipticals to very large radii. Some relevant papers for comparison: Weijmans et al. (2009) use SAURON to get way out. Proctor et al. (2009) use Keck. Murphy et al. (2011) use VP.

The kinematics of the extended GLSB disks represents a unique probe for measuring the extended dark matter halo of elliptical galaxies.

We use the kinemetry package presented in Krajnović et al. (2006) to fit a tilted-ring model to the stellar kinematics. For these fits, we hold the position angle and inclination fixed to values found from fitting the fiber-photometry. Figures 5 and 13 show the kinemetry fits and extracted rotation curves. We iterate the fit, clipping residuals which deviate from the model by more than  $250 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ .

While we are making rather sweeping assumptions about the nature of the GLSB disks by fitting a simple disk with fixed position angle and inclination, the fits are quite good. We also note that by observing disks, we do not have to worry about the velocity anisotropy parameter that traditionally makes dynamical modeling of ellipticals difficult.

Notes on individual rotation curves: The Malin 2 rotation curve is rather complicated,



having several abrupt rises. This is especially strange given the very smooth photometric profile. UGC 6614, on the other hand, has a relatively normal spiral galaxy-like rotation curve that rises linearly out to 10 kpc and then flattens.

The lack of rotation in the central regions of the galaxies is not particularly surprising, as this is the region that is flux-dominated by the central elliptical galaxy. XXX-that hopefully we have data that shows they are not rotating or rotating in a different orientation.

The extracted rotation curves imply large dark matter halos. For Malin 2,  $V_{circ} \sim 280$  km s<sup>-1</sup> at  $R = 42$  kpc implies a mass of  $7.6 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$  (compared to an SDSS stellar mass of  $1.4 \times 10^{11}$ ). For UGC 6614,  $V_{circ} \sim 200$  km s<sup>-1</sup> at  $R = 17$  kpc gives a dynamical mass of  $1.6 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$  (compared to a stellar mass of  $0.46 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$ ).

If we use the circular speed of the H I data, we end up with masses of  $25 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$  for Malin 2 and  $6.5 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$  for UGC 6614. So that's dynamical to stellar mass ratios of 18 and 14 respectively. Looks like they both have  $M_{HI}$  around 3-4  $10^{10} M_{\odot}$ .

Thus, for Malin 2, we reach a radius of  $\sim 6.2 R_e$ , and find a dark matter fraction of 81%. For UGC 6614, we reach a radius of  $\sim 5.2 R_e$  and find a dark matter fraction of 71%.

Murphy et al. (2011) reach  $\sim 2 R_e$  using just stellar data, and then rely on globular cluster kinematics to extended out to  $5 R_e$ .

XXX-It would be great to get high resolution H I observations of these systems since they could probably be higher spatial resolution.

XXX-We are currently observing higher spatial resolution IFU data with Gemini (GN-2015A-Q-75) of the central region of these galaxies to confirm they are normal elliptical galaxies and to help constrain a more sophisticated dynamical model.

## 5. Star Formation Histories

Following the work in Yoachim et al. (2010, 2012), we generate a suite of model galaxy SEDs using relatively simple star formation histories and find the best fitting single model. We break the star formation history into three age bins, 0-10 Gyr, 10-11.5 Gyr, and 11.5-12 Gyr. We assume each age bin has a constant star formation with a level of 0, 0.5, 1, or 10 solar-masses per year. Each SFH can have a metallicity of  $[Z/H] = -2.3, -1.70, -0.70, -0.40, 0.0$ , or  $0.40$ . We do not include any metallicity evolution, as all the age bins in a given model has the same metallicity. This gives us 361 unique non-zero model spectra.

Figures 6 and 10 show the fibers that were binned and the resulting spectra for Malin

2 and UGC 06614. Both galaxies have elliptical-galaxy like spectra in their centers, with outskirts that have significant emission lines.

The best fitting star formation histories are shown in Figures 7 and 11, while the best fitting stellar metallicities are shown in Figures 8 and 12. We find that *both galaxies have stellar populations dominated by old stars at all radii*. While the outer disks have emission lines and have spectra that are best fit with some current star formation, the total stellar mass is still overwhelmingly dominated by old stars. Both galaxies also show very steep metallicity gradients, with centers that are super-solar metallicity (at the limit of our models), while the outer disks are both best fit by  $[Z/H]=-0.7$ .

A problem with fitting observed galaxy spectra with templates is that residuals between the model and data are dominated by non-Gaussian systematic effects such as template mismatch and improper parameterization of the SFH. Since the residuals are non-Gaussian, there is no statistical formalism for generating uncertainties in the fit. To generate our error bars, we look at the range of fits which have  $\chi^2$  values within 100 of the minimum. In many cases, this eliminates nearly all fits except for the minimum. In these cases, we use the 4 best-fitting models to estimate the range of possible fits.

The dominance of an old stellar population at large radii seems to contradict the starburst formation mechanism of Mapelli et al. (2008), and favor an accretion model where a galaxy already containing old stars is disrupted by a massive elliptical galaxy.

These are incredibly steep metallicity gradients. The logarithmic gradients  $\delta[Z/H] \log R/R_e$  is  $\sim -1.6$  for Malin 2 and  $\sim -0.68$  for UGC 6614. These are very steep compared to gradients typically observed in elliptical galaxies (Greene et al. 2012, 2015). Other cites for elliptical gradients (Kuntschner et al. 2010)

## 6. Disk Progenitors

It should be relatively easy to speculate about the galaxies that merged to form the disk. I can pull H I masses, and then calc some stellar masses given the SDSS photometry and my own stellar M/L ratios. Then given a baryonic mass and a typical stellar metallicity, it should be easy match that up to something. Using baryonic TF relation, I’m getting pretty large  $V_c$  values for what the accreted galaxy would have been. I guess we could even speculate that this was a 3+ body encounter, so multiple gas rich systems that settle in. That would help explain the low metallicities.

Figure 3 shows the total H I mass for galaxies observed in the THINGS survey (Walter

et al. 2008), along with the H I masses for GLSB galaxies (Pickering et al. 1997).

We can’t really use the stellar luminosity of the disk to constrain the progenitor since there are signs of current *in situ* star formation in the disks. However, the very low stellar metallicities point to low-mass progenitors.

Hard to estimate what the progenitor system of the disks were. Is there a good plot of disk H I mass and metallicity out there? Might even need to measure Lick indices to try and get everything on the same metallicity system.

These systems are rare enough, that one might imagine rather complicated scenarios for creating them. For example, a three-body encounter could eject one galaxy while leaving a second in a nearly circular orbit. Back of the envelope, a galaxy ejected at  $5000 \text{ km s}^{-1}$  would go 1.5 degrees per gigayear. Even if the ejection was partly along the line of sight, it would be hard to find several gigayears later. Unlike the collisional ring scenario where one would expect the galaxy that stimulated the ring formation to still be nearby.

The basic observational properties of GLSBs that need to be explained:

1. These galaxies have H I disks that extend much farther than typical spiral galaxies (Figure 2).
2. While GLSBs have large disks, the total H I mass in these disks is lower than expected given their rotational velocities (Figure 3)
3. The central bulges are similar to elliptical galaxies in SDSS (Figure 1).
4. The stellar populations in the centers of GLSBs are old and very metal-rich.
5. The stellar populations in the extended disks shows some signs of ongoing star formation, but is consistent with being dominated by an old metal-poor population.

## 7. Discussion

Outline for discussion section

- We find the GLSB systems Malin 2 and UGC 6614 are observationally most consistent with being normal elliptical galaxies that have undergone a high angular momentum minor merger with a gas rich system.
- recap photometric evidence—the centers look just like SDSS ellipticals.




Fig. 2.— Comparison of the GLSB disks with other galaxy disks from the literature. THINGS data taken from de Blok et al. (2008), Malin 1 from Moore & Parker (2006), Malin 2 and UGC 6614 from Pickering et al. (1997). Here,  $R_{max}$  is the maximum radius with an H I detection for the THINGS galaxies, Malin 2, and UGC 6614 and the maximum radius with a stellar flux detection for Malin 1. It is interesting to note that the *stellar* disks of GLSB galaxies can be larger than the H I disks of nearby systems.




Fig. 3.— Comparison of GLSB H I masses (Pickering et al. 1997) with H I masses measured in the THINGS survey (Walter et al. 2008). While the H I masses in the GLSB systems are high, they are consistent with what would be available in a merger with a  $V_{max} \sim 110$  km/s or smaller galaxy, assuming the merger did not trigger large amounts of star formation and feedback.

- recap star formation histories. Disk is dominated by old stars.
- Discuss metallicity gradient. Hard to imagine how such a metal poor disk could form right next to a very metal rich core. Raskutti et al. (2014) use VIRUS-P to look at stellar halo kinematics of massive ellipticals. Lots of good stuff on fast/slow rotators. Also a very nice plot showing the radial gradients in age and metallicity as measured from Lick indices. They don't see any sharp transition like I do, all very smooth age and metal curves.
- extended comparison to Kasparova et al. (2014)
  - Mass model of Malin 2 requires a huge isothermal core radius.
  - They measure gas metallicities and find solar in the center and half-solar at 20-30 kpc. While it is a fool's errand to compare metallicities between stars and gas, it is interesting that the gas metallicity gradient is much smaller than in the stars. If the central stellar metallicity is indeed super-solar and the gas metallicity only solar, that implies there must have been low-metallicity gas accretion onto the system at some point. Hmm, looking at DR12 stuff, the pipeline reductions are fitting solar metallicity to the center, not sure I believe that.
  - They have a nice mass-model that becomes dark matter dominated at around  $r=20$  kpc. Could this be the normal shape of elliptical dark matter halos?
- This could be the strongest evidence for very massive elliptical dark matter halos.
- plan on getting higher spatial resolution spectra of the centers to confirm they are typical elliptical galaxies.

We find that the centers of these two GLSB systems very closely resemble normal galaxies, with the extended faint disks being distinct components, in line with the previous results for Malin 1 (Barth 2007) and NGC 7589 (Lelli et al. 2010).

An accretion formation scenario does the best job explaining all the observations. While a collisional ring could fade to a GLSB, the stellar population should be relatively young, and one might not expect a steep metallicity gradient. Also, there are no obvious galaxies near GLSBs to act as progenitor colliders.

It also seems unlikely that GLSBs are just extreme versions of normal disk galaxies (Das 2013). It's hard to imagine how such a large massive central spheroid could be formed without also disrupting the surrounding disk.

Accretion can also form GLSB systems around any type of host galaxy, explaining how Barth (2007) can find that Malin 1 is an SB0 galaxy, while our two systems are normal ellipticals.

If these systems do prove to be ellipticals with accreted high angular momentum disks, they represent an amazing opportunity to probe the dark matter halo properties of elliptical systems to very large radii.

Should probably figure out if these things are fast or slow rotators by the Emsellem et al. (2011) definition. Also see Cappellari et al. (2011) that says slow rotators are very rare in the field. So it might be strange if Malin 2 and UGC 6614 are slow rotators.

XXX-clearly need to look up bulge-to-disk metallicity gradient. Lauren did it with colors in MacArthur et al. (2004). Nice look with metallicity gradients as a function of scale-length, and kpc, and  $v_{rot}$  and galaxy type. Did spectra gradients in MacArthur et al. (2009). MANGA would make this easy to compare...Maybe there's a SAURON paper on metallicity gradients.

## 8. Conclusions

We have observed two giant low surface brightness galaxies with the VIRUS-P IFU. We find the systems are best explained as massive elliptical galaxies which have managed to accrete stars and gas into a large disk. We find the inner bulge is similar to elliptical galaxies found in SDSS. The stars have a disk-like velocity field, are dominated by old stars, but do show signs of ongoing star formation. The stars also show a sharp metallicity transition, consistent with the disk forming independently of the bulge. The H I content of the disk is also consistent with coming from a low-mass accreted galaxy.

In a future work, we plan to combine our IFU observations with higher spatial resolution long-slit spectra from the Apache Point 3.5m telescope to determine if the central ellipticals are dynamically distinct from their disks.

Thanks to Dave Doss and the staff at McDonald Observatory for their help on these observing runs.

This paper includes data taken at The McDonald Observatory of The University of Texas at Austin.

This research made use of the “K-corrections calculator” service available at <http://kcor.sai.msu.ru/>

GANDALF was developed by the SAURON team and is available from the SAURON website ([www.strw.leidenuniv.nl/sauron](http://www.strw.leidenuniv.nl/sauron)). See also Sarzi et al. (2006, MNRAS, 366, 1151) for details.

Funding for SDSS-III has been provided by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, the Participating Institutions, the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science. The SDSS-III web site is <http://www.sdss3.org/>.

SDSS-III is managed by the Astrophysical Research Consortium for the Participating Institutions of the SDSS-III Collaboration including the University of Arizona, the Brazilian Participation Group, Brookhaven National Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Carnegie Mellon University, University of Florida, the French Participation Group, the German Participation Group, Harvard University, the Instituto de Astrofísica de Canarias, the Michigan State/Notre Dame/JINA Participation Group, Johns Hopkins University, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics, Max Planck Institute for Extraterrestrial Physics, New Mexico State University, New York University, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, University of Portsmouth, Princeton University, the Spanish Participation Group, University of Tokyo, University of Utah, Vanderbilt University, University of Virginia, University of Washington, and Yale University.

## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. J., Blanc, G. A., Hill, G. J., Gebhardt, K., Drory, N., Hao, L., Bender, R., Byun, J., Ciardullo, R., Cornell, M. E., Finkelstein, S. L., Fry, A., Gawiser, E., Gronwall, C., Hopp, U., Jeong, D., Kelz, A., Kelzenberg, R., Komatsu, E., MacQueen, P. J., Murphy, J., Odoms, P. S., Roth, M., Schneider, D. P., Tufts, J. R., & Wilkinson, C. P. 2011, *ApJS*, 192, 5
- Ahn, C. P., Alexandroff, R., Allende Prieto, C., Anders, F., Anderson, S. F., Anderton, T., Andrews, B. H., Aubourg, É., Bailey, S., Bastien, F. A., & et al. 2014, *ApJS*, 211, 17
- Barth, A. J. 2007, *AJ*, 133, 1085
- Bernardi, M., Sheth, R. K., Annis, J., Burles, S., Eisenstein, D. J., Finkbeiner, D. P., Hogg, D. W., Lupton, R. H., Schlegel, D. J., SubbaRao, M., Bahcall, N. A., Blakeslee, J. P., Brinkmann, J., Castander, F. J., Connolly, A. J., Csabai, I., Doi, M., Fukugita, M., Frieman, J., Heckman, T., Hennessy, G. S., Ivezić, Ž., Knapp, G. R., Lamb, D. Q., McKay, T., Munn, J. A., Nichol, R., Okamura, S., Schneider, D. P., Thakar, A. R., & York, D. G. 2003a, *AJ*, 125, 1817

- . 2003b, *AJ*, 125, 1866
- Bothun, G. D., Impey, C. D., Malin, D. F., & Mould, J. R. 1987, *AJ*, 94, 23
- Bruzual, G., & Charlot, S. 2003, *MNRAS*, 344, 1000
- Buote, D. A., & Humphrey, P. J. 2012, in *Astrophysics and Space Science Library*, Vol. 378, *Astrophysics and Space Science Library*, ed. D.-W. Kim & S. Pellegrini, 235
- Cappellari, M., & Emsellem, E. 2004, *PASP*, 116, 138
- Cappellari, M., Emsellem, E., Krajnović, D., McDermid, R. M., Serra, P., Alatalo, K., Blitz, L., Bois, M., Bournaud, F., Bureau, M., Davies, R. L., Davis, T. A., de Zeeuw, P. T., Khochfar, S., Kuntschner, H., Lablanche, P.-Y., Morganti, R., Naab, T., Oosterloo, T., Sarzi, M., Scott, N., Weijmans, A.-M., & Young, L. M. 2011, *MNRAS*, 416, 1680
- Chilingarian, I. V., Melchior, A.-L., & Zolotukhin, I. Y. 2010, *MNRAS*, 405, 1409
- Dalcanton, J. J., Spergel, D. N., & Summers, F. J. 1997, *ApJ*, 482, 659
- Das, M. 2013, *Journal of Astrophysics and Astronomy*, 34, 19
- de Blok, W. J. G., Walter, F., Brinks, E., Trachternach, C., Oh, S.-H., & Kennicutt, Jr., R. C. 2008, *AJ*, 136, 2648
- Emsellem, E., Cappellari, M., Krajnović, D., Alatalo, K., Blitz, L., Bois, M., Bournaud, F., Bureau, M., Davies, R. L., Davis, T. A., de Zeeuw, P. T., Khochfar, S., Kuntschner, H., Lablanche, P.-Y., McDermid, R. M., Morganti, R., Naab, T., Oosterloo, T., Sarzi, M., Scott, N., Serra, P., van de Ven, G., Weijmans, A.-M., & Young, L. M. 2011, *MNRAS*, 414, 888
- Ferguson, A. M. N., Irwin, M. J., Ibata, R. A., Lewis, G. F., & Tanvir, N. R. 2002, *AJ*, 124, 1452
- Galaz, G., Milovic, C., Suc, V., Busta, L., Lizana, G., Infante, L., & Royo, S. 2015, *ApJ*, 815, L29
- Greene, J. E., Janish, R., Ma, C.-P., McConnell, N. J., Blakeslee, J. P., Thomas, J., & Murphy, J. D. 2015, *ArXiv e-prints*
- Greene, J. E., Murphy, J. D., Comerford, J. M., Gebhardt, K., & Adams, J. J. 2012, *ApJ*, 750, 32



- Hill, G. J., MacQueen, P. J., Smith, M. P., Tufts, J. R., Roth, M. M., Kelz, A., Adams, J. J., Drory, N., Grupp, F., Barnes, S. I., Blanc, G. A., Murphy, J. D., Altmann, W., Wesley, G. L., Segura, P. R., Good, J. M., Booth, J. A., Bauer, S., Popow, E., Goertz, J. A., Edmonston, R. D., & Wilkinson, C. P. 2008, SPIE, 7014
- Ibata, R., Chapman, S., Ferguson, A. M. N., Lewis, G., Irwin, M., & Tanvir, N. 2005, ApJ, 634, 287
- Kasparova, A. V., Saburova, A. S., Katkov, I. Y., Chilingarian, I. V., & Bizyaev, D. V. 2014, MNRAS, 437, 3072
- Kelson, D. D. 2003, PASP, 115, 688
- Krajnović, D., Cappellari, M., de Zeeuw, P. T., & Copin, Y. 2006, MNRAS, 366, 787
- Kuntschner, H., Emsellem, E., Bacon, R., Cappellari, M., Davies, R. L., de Zeeuw, P. T., Falcón-Barroso, J., Krajnović, D., McDermid, R. M., Peletier, R. F., Sarzi, M., Shapiro, K. L., van den Bosch, R. C. E., & van de Ven, G. 2010, MNRAS, 408, 97
- Lelli, F., Fraternali, F., & Sancisi, R. 2010, A&A, 516, A11+
- MacArthur, L. A., Courteau, S., Bell, E., & Holtzman, J. A. 2004, ApJS, 152, 175
- MacArthur, L. A., González, J. J., & Courteau, S. 2009, MNRAS, 395, 28
- Mapelli, M., Moore, B., Ripamonti, E., Mayer, L., Colpi, M., & Giordano, L. 2008, MNRAS, 383, 1223
- Matthews, L. D., van Driel, W., & Monnier-Ragaine, D. 2001, A&A, 365, 1
- Moore, L., & Parker, Q. A. 2006, Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia, 23, 165
- Murphy, J. D., Gebhardt, K., & Adams, J. J. 2011, ApJ, 729, 129
- Peñarrubia, J., McConnachie, A., & Babul, A. 2006, ApJ, 650, L33
- Pickering, T. E., Impey, C. D., van Gorkom, J. H., & Bothun, G. D. 1997, AJ, 114, 1858
- Proctor, R. N., Forbes, D. A., Romanowsky, A. J., Brodie, J. P., Strader, J., Spolaor, M., Mendel, J. T., & Spitler, L. 2009, MNRAS, 398, 91
- Raskutti, S., Greene, J. E., & Murphy, J. D. 2014, ApJ, 786, 23

- Sarzi, M., Falcón-Barroso, J., Davies, R. L., Bacon, R., Bureau, M., Cappellari, M., de Zeeuw, P. T., Emsellem, E., Fathi, K., Krajnović, D., Kuntschner, H., McDermid, R. M., & Peletier, R. F. 2006, *MNRAS*, 366, 1151
- Saulder, C., Mieske, S., Zeilinger, W. W., & Chilingarian, I. 2013, *A&A*, 557, A21
- Walter, F., Brinks, E., de Blok, W. J. G., Bigiel, F., Kennicutt, Jr., R. C., Thornley, M. D., & Leroy, A. 2008, *AJ*, 136, 2563
- Weijmans, A.-M., Cappellari, M., Bacon, R., de Zeeuw, P. T., Emsellem, E., Falcón-Barroso, J., Kuntschner, H., McDermid, R. M., van den Bosch, R. C. E., & van de Ven, G. 2009, *MNRAS*, 398, 561
- Willett, K. W., Lintott, C. J., Bamford, S. P., Masters, K. L., Simmons, B. D., Casteels, K. R. V., Edmondson, E. M., Fortson, L. F., Kaviraj, S., Keel, W. C., Melvin, T., Nichol, R. C., Raddick, M. J., Schawinski, K., Simpson, R. J., Skibba, R. A., Smith, A. M., & Thomas, D. 2013, *MNRAS*, 435, 2835
- Williams, B. F., Dalcanton, J. J., Stilp, A., Dolphin, A., Skillman, E. D., & Radburn-Smith, D. 2013, *ApJ*, 765, 120
- Yoachim, P., Roškar, R., & Debattista, V. P. 2010, *ApJ*, 716, L4
- . 2012, *ApJ*, 752, 97




Fig. 4.— Upper Left: SDSS image of Malin 2. Upper Right: Image made with the VIRUS-P datacube. Lower: An exponential fit to the fiber magnitudes. Red points show fibers that were clipped while the solid line shows the best-fit.




Fig. 5.— Fitting the line-of-sight velocity maps measured with Ppxf with the kinemetry package. The dashed curve shows the expected stellar mass contribution to the rotation curve. Vertical lines mark  $R_e$  and  $5R_e$ . H I data from Pickering et al. (1997).




Fig. 6.— Left: Map of which fibers were binned together. Right: Resulting binned spectra, residuals from the bright skyline at 5577Å have been masked.




Fig. 7.— Best fitting star formation histories. For each bin, the SFH is normalized by the peak at each radius. Error bars are based on  $\Delta\chi^2 = 100$  or the best fitting 4 models, whichever provides more points.




Fig. 8.— Best fitting stellar metallicities. Dashed line shows the maximum model metallicity used in the models (minimum is below the y range). Error bars are as in Figure 7.




Fig. 9.— Upper Left: SDSS image of UGC 06614. Upper Right: Image made with the VIRUS-P datacube. Lower: An exponential fit to the fiber magnitudes. Red points show fibers that were clipped while the solid line shows the best-fit. We only included fibers beyond the outer ring structure.




Fig. 10.— Left: Map showing which fibers were binned for UGC 6614. Right: The binned spectra, color-coded to match the map on the left.




Fig. 11.— Best fitting star formation histories. For each bin, the SFH is normalized by the peak bin. Error bars are based on  $\Delta\chi^2 = 100$  or the 4 best fitting models, whichever provides more points.




Fig. 12.— Best fitting stellar metallicities.




Fig. 13.— Fitting the velocity maps with kinemetry package. Vertical lines mark  $R_e$  and  $5R_e$ . The dashed lines shows a rotation curve based in the enclosed flux, normalized so that all the SDSS stellar mass is contained within  $3R_e$ . H I data from Pickering et al. (1997).



## A. SDSS SQL Queries

To build our sample of comparison galaxies from SDSS, we used the CasJobs interface to query the SDSS DR10 database.

the galaxy CMD contours in Figure 1 were obtained via:

```
select
objid,ra,dec,
dered_u,dered_g,dered_r,dered_i,dered_z,
z,4.27E+3*z as d_hubble_mpc,
dered_u-dered_r as u_minus_r,
dered_r-5*log10(4.27E+8*z) as abs_mag_r

from specphotoall
where
class='GALAXY'
AND dered_r between 13.5 and 17.7
AND ((flags & 0x100000000) != 0)
AND ((flags & 0x81000000c00a0) = 0)
AND (((flags & 0x4000000000000) = 0) or (psfmagerr_g <= 0.2))
AND (((flags & 0x1000000000000) = 0) or (flags & 0x1000) = 0)
AND zerr < 0.05
AND z BETWEEN 0.01 and 0.085
AND dered_r - 5*log10(4.27E+08*z) BETWEEN -23.5 and -15.5
```

The fundamental plane contours in Figure 1 was computed from:

```
select
ph.objid, sp.z, sp.velDisp, sp.velDisperr, deVMag_g,deVMag_r, ph.deVRad_r,
ph.r,ph.dered_r, ph.extinction_r, ph.extinction_g, ph.deVAB_r, gs.best_model_z,
gse.oh_p50, gse.lgm_tot_p50, gs.model_chisq_040, gs.model_chisq_080,
gs.model_chisq_170, gs.model_chisq_400, zoo.spiral, zoo.elliptical,
zoo.uncertain, zoo.p_el, zoo.p_cw,zoo.p_acw

from specobj as sp, photoobj as ph, galSpecIndx as gs,
galSpecExtra as gse, zoospec as zoo

where
```

```
sp.bestObjID = ph.objID and gs.specObjID = sp.specObjID
and gse.specObjID = sp.specObjID
and zoo.objid = ph.objID

AND sp.class='GALAXY'
AND sp.velDisp != 0
AND sp.z BETWEEN 0.01 and 0.085
AND sp.zerr < 0.05
AND ph.dered_r between 13.5 and 17.7
AND ph.dered_u-ph.dered_r > 2.1
AND ph.lnLDeV_r-ph.lnLExp_r > 0.29559
AND ph.petroR90_i/ph.petroR50_i > 2.5
AND ((ph.flags & 0x10000000) != 0)
AND ((ph.flags & 0x8100000c00a0) = 0)
AND (((ph.flags & 0x400000000000) = 0) or (ph.psfmagerr_g <= 0.2))
AND (((ph.flags & 0x100000000000) = 0) or (ph.flags & 0x1000) = 0)
```

Finally, the mass-metallicity relation in Figure 1 was obtained via:

```
select
ph.objid,sp.velDisp, gse.lgm_tot_p50, gs.lick_hd_a_sub, gs.lick_hd_f_sub,
gs.lick_cn1_sub, gs.lick_cn2_sub, gs.lick_Ca4227_sub, gs.lick_G4300_sub,
gs.lick_hg_a_sub, gs.lick_hg_f_sub, gs.lick_fe4383_sub, gs.lick_ca4455_sub,
gs.lick_fe4531_sub, gs.lick_c4668_sub, gs.lick_hb_sub, gs.lick_fe5015_sub,
gs.lick_mg1_sub, gs.lick_mg2_sub, gs.lick_mgb_sub, gs.lick_Fe5270_sub,
gs.lick_Fe5335_sub, gs.lick_Fe5406_sub, gs.lick_Fe5709_sub, gs.lick_Fe5782_sub,
gs.lick_NaD_sub, gs.lick_Ti01_sub, gs.lick_Ti02_sub

from specobj as sp, photoobj as ph, galSpecIndx as gs, galSpecExtra as gse

where
sp.bestObjID = ph.objID and gs.specObjID = sp.specObjID
and gse.specObjID = sp.specObjID
AND sp.class='GALAXY'
AND sp.velDisp != 0
AND sp.z BETWEEN 0.01 and 0.085
AND sp.zerr < 0.05
AND ph.dered_r between 13.5 and 17.7
```

```
AND ph.dered_u-ph.dered_r > 2.1
AND ph.lnLDeV_r-ph.lnLExp_r > 0.29559
AND ph.petroR90_i/ph.petroR50_i > 2.5
AND ((ph.flags & 0x100000000) != 0)
AND ((ph.flags & 0x81000000c00a0) = 0)
AND (((ph.flags & 0x4000000000000) = 0) or (ph.psfmagerr_g <= 0.2))
AND (((ph.flags & 0x1000000000000) = 0) or (ph.flags & 0x1000) = 0)
```