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Motivation: counting clusters to measure cosmological parameters

• we **want** to count clusters as a function of mass and redshift
• we **can** count clusters as a function of a mass-like observable
• we **need** accurate scaling relations and **mass calibration**

\[ \frac{M_{WL}}{10^{14} M_\odot} = a \left( \frac{L_K}{10^{12} L_\odot} \right)^b \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mulroy, et al., 2014,} & \quad \text{MNRAS, 443, 3309} \\
b &= 1.00 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.20 \\
\sigma_{\ln M/L} &= 0.11 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.06
\end{align*}
\]
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Goals relating to cluster cosmology include:

• To test the reliability of cluster mass measurement methods at low-z: $M_{WL}$, $M_{HSE}$, $M_{Dyn}$, ...

• To measure the shape, normalization, and intrinsic scatter of scaling relations: $P(M_{WL}|O)$

• To test theoretical “predictions”: NFW profile, mass-concentration relation, adiabatic contraction, …

• …
Local Cluster Substructure Survey
A low redshift baseline study of clusters as a cosmological probe

- L_X-limited sample of 50 “High-L_X” clusters:
  - L_X/E(z)>4.1x10^{44} erg/s, -25°<δ<+65°, 0.15<z<0.3
- Subaru (Gemini) [50]:
  - V/i-band, i(5σ)=26
  - FWHM_{median}=0.7arcsec
- Chandra [44], XMM [39]

... and lots of data from SZA, HST, UKIRT/WFCAM, MMT/Hectospec, Spitzer, GALEX, Herschel: Marrone et al., 2012; Mulroy, et al., 2014; Richard et al. 2010; Zhang et al. 2008, 2010; Haines et al., 2014, 2013, 2010, 2009b, 2009a; Smith et al. 2010a,b; Okabe et al., 2010a,b; ...
Local Cluster Substructure Survey
A low redshift baseline study of clusters as a cosmological probe

Goal = control systematic bias in ensemble cluster cluster mass calibration at sub-4% [30%/sqrt(50)]

• **Weak-lensing mass calibration of galaxy clusters**

• **Exploring the selection of faint background blue galaxies for cluster weak-lensing**

• **Testing hydrostatic equilibrium in galaxy clusters**

• Also relevant:
Sources of bias in cluster weak-lensing

• Contamination of background galaxy samples, i.e. dilution of shear signal by faint cluster members

• Uncertainty in the redshift distribution of the background galaxies

• Shear calibration, i.e. biases in measurement of galaxy shapes

• Extracting mass measurements from shear profiles, i.e. mass modelling biases
A new low bias method to select red background galaxies

Model of color-dependence of shear:
\[ G_+(\Delta C) = A \times D(\Delta C) \times (1 - B f(\Delta C)) \]

Lensing kernel:
\[ D(\Delta C) \equiv \left\langle D_{LS}/D_S \right\rangle \]

Contamination:
\[ f(\Delta C > 0) = \left[ 1 - erf\left(\Delta C / \sqrt{2}\sigma\right) / 2 \right] \]

Color cut tuned to achieve 1% contamination... gives 5 arcmin^{-2}

Blue galaxies cannot be selected as safely as red galaxies

Faint blue galaxies dominate catastrophic failures of 5-band photo-z’s at \( z < \sim 0.3 \)

\[
P_{bgk} = \frac{\int_{0}^{z_{max}} P(z)dz}{\int_{0}^{z_{max}} P(z)dz}
\]

Ziparo et al. 1507.04376 + POSTER THIS WEEK
Number of red galaxies improved via radius-dependent colour cut

Color cut tuned to achieve $1\%$ contamination… gives $13 \text{arcmin}^{-2}$
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Image simulations matched to our cluster observations:

Model galaxies based on GALFIC (Oguri et al. 2012) and Shera (Mandelbaum et al. 2012)

\[ g_{\text{out}} - g_{\text{in}} = m \, g_{\text{in}} + c \]

\( m \approx -0.03 \quad c \approx 10^{-4} \)

No obvious trend with size and magnitude (i.e. negligible noise bias)

Simulations match LoCuSS data:

- FWHM = 0.7 arcsec
- \( 22 < i_{\text{AB}} < 26 \)
- \( 0 < |g| < 0.3 \)
- \( 2 < r_g < 5 \) pix
- S/N > 10
- FoV = 30x42 arcmin

Okabe and Smith, 1507.04493
Tests of NFW model fitting on hydro simulations: sub-1% bias on $M_{500}$

Suite of NFW model fits:
- $50\text{kpc}/h < r_{\text{inner}} < 300\text{kpc}/h$
- $2\text{Mpc}/h < r_{\text{outer}} < 3\text{Mpc}/h$
- $4 < N_{\text{bin}} < 8$
- $M_{200}$ and $c_{200}$ are free params

$M_\Delta$, $c_\Delta$ for each cluster is based on the fit that is closest to geometrical mean of the suite of fits

- Simulations are Cosmo–OWLS (McCarthy et al. 2014, Le Brun et al. 2014; see also Joop Schaye’s talk)
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Sources of bias in cluster weak-lensing

- Contamination of background galaxy samples, i.e. dilution of shear signal by faint cluster members
  
  *Contamination of red background galaxies = 1%*

- Uncertainty in the redshift distribution of the background galaxies
  
  *Folded into our shear measurement errors*

- Shear calibration, i.e. biases in measurement of galaxy shapes
  
  *Multiplicative bias of 3%*

- Extracting mass measurements from shear profiles, i.e. mass modeling biases
  
  *Sub-1% bias*

Okabe and Smith, 1507.04493
Mass-concentration relation in excellent agreement with predictions

Okabe and Smith, 1507.04493
LoCuSS, CCCP, CLASH masses are agree at \(<\sim 1\sigma\); WtG are \(\sim 2\sigma\) higher

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{M_{\text{CCCP}}}{M_{\text{LoCuSS}}} : 1.04 \pm 0.07 \\
\frac{M_{\text{WtG}}}{M_{\text{LoCuSS}}} : 1.18 \pm 0.08 \\
\frac{M_{\text{WtG}}}{M_{\text{CCCP}}} : 1.13 \pm 0.08
\end{align*}
\]

“Like for like” comparison

- 12 cluster overlap between:
  - LoCuSS (Okabe & Smith 2015)
  - CCCP (Hoekstra et al. 2015)
  - WtG (Applegate et al. 2014)
- Match the modeling method to WtG: \(c200=4, 0.75<R<3\text{Mpc/h}\)
- Measure \(M(<1.5\text{Mpc}/h_{70})\)

The pairwise comparison of surveys in our paper and in the literature is consistent with this result, i.e. it is more general than for clusters within LoCuSS
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Observed number density profile of background galaxies is **not** flat...

Stacked number density of blue galaxies

**Curves**: number density profile expected from 0% contamination + magnification bias based on best-fit NFW model to shear.

**Data**: measured stacked number density profile based on colour-magnitude selections
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Testing hydrostatic equilibrium with Subaru, XMM/Chandra, and Planck

11 cluster overlap between LoCuSS, CCCP, WtG, and Planck:

LoCuSS: $\beta_X = 1.00 \pm 0.12 \quad \beta_P = 0.86 \pm 0.07$

WtG: $\beta_P = 0.72 \pm 0.08$

CCCP: $\beta_P = 0.93 \pm 0.12$

Smith et al., 2015, submitted; Okabe & Smith 1507.04493;
Martino et al., 2014, MNRAS, 443, 2342: Chandra/XMM = 1.02+/−0.05
New constraints on hydrostatic bias disagree with “best-fit” $(1-b)$ at $\sim 5\sigma$

Vertical lines show $\beta_p$ from like-for-like comparison: WtG, LoCuSS, CCCP

$(1-b)\sim 0.9$ is consistent with all simulation studies — see Nick Battaglia’s talk

Figures from Planck 2015 XXIV 1502.01597

Smith et al., 2015, submitted
Hydrostatic bias, lensing biases, (or SZ biases?) change with redshift?

LoCuSS: Weak-lensing mass calibration of galaxy clusters and hydrostatic bias

- LoCuSS weak-lensing systematic biases calibrated to sub-4%
- LoCuSS, CCCP, CLASH mass calibrations are consistent at ~1σ
- WtG mass calibration is ~8-15% higher at ~1-2σ
- LoCuSS hydrostatic bias: \( \beta_X = 0.95 \pm 0.05 \), \( \beta_P = 0.92 \pm 0.04 \)
- LoCuSS/X-ray, LoCuSS/Planck and CCCP/Planck hydrostatic bias measurement consistent at z<0.3
- We need: larger overlap between lensing surveys, especially at z>0.3 and lower mass (see Marguerite Pierre’s talk)
- Stay tuned: LoCuSS scaling relations and selection function
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