

X-ray Group and cluster mass profiles in MOND: Unexplained mass on the group scale

G. W. Angus^{1*}, B. Famaey², D.A. Buote³

¹*SUPA, School of Physics and Astronomy, University of St. Andrews, KY16 9SS Scotland*

²*Institut d'Astronomie et d'Astrophysique, Université Libre de Bruxelles, CP 226, Bvd du Triomphe, B-1050, Bruxelles, Belgium*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Irvine, 4129 Frederick Reines Hall, Irvine, CA 92697-4575, USA*

Accepted ... Received ... ; in original form ...

ABSTRACT

We investigate the mass profiles of clusters in MOND for a sample of galaxy groups and clusters with temperatures ranging from 0.7 to 8.9 keV. We confirm that a huge hidden mass component, about 1.5 to 4 times more massive than the total visible mass (at the last measured radii, dropping thereafter), is needed to account for the hydrostatic equilibrium of these clusters. For the massive systems ($T \gtrsim 5$ keV) we show that neutrinos with masses just below the experimentally detectable limit ($m_\nu = 2eV$) can account for the bulk ($\gtrsim 90\%$) of this hidden mass, in agreement with Sanders (2007), and confirming the results of Pointecouteau & Silk (2005) that these neutrinos leave a further minor residual component in the centers ($r \lesssim 120$ kpc). However, the fractional contribution of the residual mass to the total MOND mass increases substantially with decreasing mass, reaching as high as $\approx 80\%$ for MOND masses below $10^{13} M_\odot$. In these lowest mass systems this residual mass cannot be explained by simply rescaling the stellar mass profile of the central galaxy. The stellar mass profiles not only have the wrong shape, but they also would require unlikely large K-band mass-to-light ratios between 2 and 11 for the BCG. Therefore, a MOND Universe filled with massive ordinary neutrinos cannot obviate the need for additional (maybe baryonic) dark matter in X-ray bright groups.

Key words: gravitation - dark matter - galaxies: clusters

1 INTRODUCTION

Recently obtained data from the cosmic microwave background (Spergel et al. 2006), large scale structure and type Ia supernovae would have us believe we inhabit a Universe dominated by some hitherto experimentally undetected dark matter requiring an extension to the current standard model of particle physics (cold dark matter, CDM) and something called dark energy, which no one can claim to understand, which drives the acceleration of the expansion of the Universe (Chernin et al. 2007). However, observations appear to thwart the extrapolation of this Λ CDM theory from its cosmological basis to the galaxy scale because they contradict a sizeable list of CDM predictions (e.g., Moore et al. 1999; Gentile et al. 2004; Simon et al. 2005; Famaey & Binney 2005; Kuzio de Naray et al. 2005).

Actually, the observed tight correlation between the mass profiles of baryonic matter and dark matter at all radii

in spiral galaxies (e.g. McGaugh et al. 2007; Famaey et al. 2007a) would rather lend support to modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND, Milgrom 1983abc), a theory postulating that for accelerations below $a_0 \approx 10^{-10} \text{ m s}^{-2}$ the effective gravitational attraction approaches $(g_N a_0)^{1/2}$ where g_N is the usual Newtonian gravitational field.

Without resorting to CDM, this simple prescription is known to reproduce galaxy scaling relations (Tully-Fisher, Faber-Jackson, fundamental plane) as well as the rotation curves of individual galaxies (Sanders & McGaugh 2002) over five decades in mass ranging from tiny dwarfs (e.g., Milgrom & Sanders 2007; Gentile et al. 2007a) through early-type discs (Sanders & Noordermeer 2007) to massive ellipticals (Milgrom & Sanders 2003). In particular, the recent kinematic analysis of tidal dwarf galaxies by Bournaud et al. (2007) strongly argues in favour of MOND, and is highly unlikely to be explained within the classical CDM framework (e.g. Gentile et al. 2007b; Milgrom 2007). Moreover, the theory successfully predicts the local galactic escape speed from the solar neighbourhood (Famaey, Bruneton &

* email: gwa2@st-andrews.ac.uk

Zhao 2007b; Wu et al. 2007), the statistical bar frequency in spirals (Tiret & Combes 2007), as well as the velocity dispersions of satellite galaxies around their hosts (Angus et al. 2007a), and the kinematics of superclusters of galaxies (Milgrom 1997). Recent developments in the theory of gravity have also added plausibility to the case for modification of gravity through the work of Bekenstein (2004), Sanders (2005) and Zlosnik, Ferreira & Starkman (2006, 2007), who have presented Lorentz-covariant theories of gravity yielding a MOND behaviour in the appropriate limit by means of a dynamical normalized vector field, which might arise from dimensional reduction of a higher-dimensional gravity theory (Bekenstein 2006; Mavromatos & Sakellariadou 2007). Although rather fine-tuned and still being a far cry from a fundamental theory underpinning the MOND paradigm (see e.g. Bruneton & Esposito-Farese), these theories remarkably allow for new predictions, especially regarding cosmology. Surprisingly, such a vector field has precisely been shown to generate the instability that may produce large cosmic structures today in a MOND Universe (Dodelson & Liguori 2006; Skordis et al. 2006), while it also has the potentiality to drive late-time acceleration without resorting to dark energy (Diaz-Rivera et al. 2006; Zhao 2006, 2007). However, before trying to build a consistent MOND cosmology, which is still a far cry, the MOND paradigm has yet to completely explain away the mass discrepancy in X-ray emitting clusters of galaxies.

Groups of galaxies were studied by Milgrom (1998, 2002) by checking the stellar mass to light ratio required for consistency with the line of sight velocity dispersion of the group galaxies w.r.t. the centre of mass. This method found mass to light ratios of around a solar unit which bears the hallmark of no mass discrepancy, however, it cannot probe the need for dark matter at smaller radii than these presumably largely separated galaxies. Of course, it is most probable that this absence of discrepancy is correct in the context of low mass groups, but for X-ray bright groups and clusters a better gauge of dynamical mass is found using measurements of the properties of the X-ray gas. Using this technique and others, MOND cannot as yet explain the mass discrepancy in X-ray emitting clusters of galaxies (Gerbal et al. 1992; Sanders 1994, 1999, 2003; McGaugh & de Blok 1998; The & White 1998; Aguirre et al. 2001): consequently, they still require substantial amounts of non-luminous matter.

Recently, weak gravitational lensing (Angus et al. 2007b; Takahashi & Chiba 2007; Famaey et al. 2007c), a technique which disregards the state of equilibrium, has provided a similar result and an extremely important constraint on the nature of all the missing mass i.e. that it must be of a collisionless nature (Clowe et al. 2006; Bradac et al. 2006; Angus et al. 2007b).

One solution would be that this hidden mass is in the form of collisionless baryons (e.g., MACHO's, or small dense clumps of cold gas), but it has also been assumed (Sanders 2003) that the dynamical mass problem in galaxy clusters could be resolved by the addition of a component of massive neutrinos $m_\nu \sim 2\text{eV}$, i.e. very near their maximum experimental mass. These were indeed shown to be potentially consistent with the majority of clusters with temperature greater than 4 keV by Sanders (2003), and with the bullet cluster (Angus et al. 2007b). This hypothesis has the great

advantage of naturally reproducing the proportionality of the electron density in the cores of clusters to $T^{3/2}$, as well as global scaling relations (Sanders 2007).

However, in a recent survey, Pointecouteau & Silk (2005, hereafter PS05) studied a large sample of hot clusters ($>4\text{keV}$) and found that the central density of the dark matter was generally greater than allowed by the Tremaine-Gunn limit on neutrino density. However, this result was not damning because the dynamical mass that could be accounted for by neutrinos under the Tremaine-Gunn limit was generally more than 90%. Nevertheless, the need for a second variety of DM in MOND was shown.

Something that has never been studied before in the literature is the application of MOND to X-ray emitting groups and cool clusters in the range $0.7 < T < 3.0\text{keV}$. The closest anyone has come is the study of the large elliptical NGC720 by Buote & Canizares (1994, 2002) which has $T \sim 0.6\text{eV}$. They showed that the major axis of the isophotes of the X-ray emission were significantly offset from the major axis of the galaxy requiring dark matter of at least 4 times the mass of the visible matter. NGC 720 is currently the only elliptical galaxy for which this misalignment can be attributed to dark matter with reasonable confidence. A program to search for other very isolated, flattened elliptical galaxies that are sufficiently bright in X-rays for this type of study is underway.

Here we use the high quality galaxy group data from Gastaldello et al. (2006) and cluster data from Vikhlinin et al. (2006), and do a systematic check of the mass profiles of the necessary MOND hidden mass in clusters required for hydrostatic equilibrium of the X-ray emitting plasma, by subtracting the X-ray gas and the brightest cluster galaxy (BCG). We explore the correlation between the mass discrepancy in MOND and the masses and temperatures of the studied groups and clusters. We present the data in §2, derive the MOND dynamical and hidden masses in §3, subtract the conjectured contribution of massive neutrinos in §4, and analyze the results in §5. These results confirm the findings of Pointecouteau & Silk (2005), i.e. that the central cores of hot clusters have densities that are too large to be consistent with 2eV neutrinos, needing an additional (maybe baryonic) dark component. But more significantly, we show that all cool groups ($0.7 < T < 3.0\text{keV}$) have their MOND dynamical mass completely dominated by this residual mass component, because groups are too cool to allow neutrinos to cluster densely enough.

2 DATA

We use results obtained primarily from two recent studies of X-ray clusters. We use the published results of Vikhlinin et al. (2006) for 8 of the most massive clusters ($2\text{keV} < T < 9\text{keV}$). For low-mass clusters (groups) we use results for 16 groups of galaxies (1-2 keV) from the recent work of Gastaldello et al. (2006) and another low-mass cluster (A2589) from Zappacosta et al. (2006).

The objects in our sample are listed in Table 1. We refer the reader to the references for details on the construction of the density, temperature, and Newtonian mass profiles. We note that for the massive systems in the Vikhlinin et al. sample we exclude the central ~ 20 kpc from the analysis.

We do this for consistency with their study, even though some of their systems (most notably A2029), do not exhibit substantial morphological irregularities in their cores that would lessen the validity of the approximation of hydrostatic equilibrium.

3 MOND DYNAMICAL MASS IN GROUPS AND CLUSTERS

To compute gravitating masses we assume the intracluster medium is represented by a spherical single-phase ideal gas in hydrostatic equilibrium. Although the X-ray isophotes of relaxed clusters are approximately circular with modest ellipticity, the underlying mass distribution is inferred to have substantial ellipticity (0.4-0.6; Buote & Canizares 1996). Nevertheless, many previous studies have shown that assuming spherical symmetry for relaxed clusters introduces fairly small errors $\lesssim 20\%$ which are acceptable for our purposes (e.g., Tsai, Katz, & Bertschinger 1994; Navarro et al. 1995; Buote & Canizares 1996; Evrard et al. 1996; Gavazzi 2004)

We derive the MOND dynamical mass for each system following the approach of Sanders (1999). From the temperature and density profiles of the hot gas, the centripetal gravitational acceleration, g , can be deduced from the equation of hydrostatic equilibrium independently of the gravitational theory:

$$g(r) = \frac{-kT(r)}{wm_p r} \left[\frac{d \ln \rho_X(r)}{d \ln r} + \frac{d \ln T(r)}{d \ln r} \right], \quad (1)$$

where w is the mean molecular weight and $wm_p = 5.2 \times 10^{-58} M_\odot$, $G = 4.42 \times 10^{-3} \text{pc} (\text{km s}^{-1})^2 M_\odot^{-1}$ is Newton's gravitational constant, and the combination $kT(r)$ is in units of keV. From this, the Newtonian dynamical mass can easily be deduced. The studies cited in the previous section from which we obtain our data use an NFW profile (Navarro, Frenk & White 1997) to fit to the residual dark matter.

Note that since we model clusters as spherical systems, we can ignore the curl field of MOND (Bekenstein & Milgrom 1984; Ciotti, Londrillo & Nipoti 2006; Angus, Famaey & Zhao 2006), and since the external field effect from Large Scale Structure (e.g., Angus & McGaugh 2007; Famaey et al. 2007b; Wu et al. 2007) is much smaller than the typical gravitational acceleration in the region of interest, we can simply use the relation of Milgrom (1983a) to derive the MOND dynamical mass:

$$M_m(r) = \frac{r^2}{G} g(r) \mu[g(r)/a_0]. \quad (2)$$

Here the function $\mu(x)$ is chosen to be the simple function shown to have a good fit to the terminal velocity curve of the Galaxy (Famaey & Binney 2005) and to rotation curves of external galaxies (Famaey et al. 2007a; Sanders & Noordermeer 2007):

$$\mu(x) = x/(1+x), \quad (3)$$

while taking $\mu = 1$ just yields back the Newtonian dynamical mass. This means that the MOND dynamical mass M_m is related to the Newtonian one M_n by

$$M_m(r) = \frac{M_n(r)}{1+a_o/g(r)}, \quad (4)$$

meaning that in MOND, there is a truncation of the dynamical mass $M_m(r)$ at low accelerations. Here we take the MOND acceleration constant to be $a_0 = 3.6 (\text{kms}^{-1})^2/\text{pc}$.

From Eq.4 one can see that at large radii, when the Newtonian mass rises more slowly than $d \ln M_n/d \ln r < 1$ then the MONDian dynamical mass begins to drop. This makes studies that do not consider the entire dynamical mass profile at all radii worthless. In this work, we flatten the mass profile beyond the radius when the MOND dynamical mass is zero.

For the objects in our sample from Gastaldello et al. (2007), and Zappacosta et al. (2006), we take the Newtonian gravitating mass profiles used in those studies and simply extract the MOND dynamical mass using Eq.???. Those studies also produced 20-30 Monte Carlo simulations of Newtonian mass profiles for each object, which we used to produce corresponding simulated MOND mass profiles. From these simulated MOND profiles we evaluated the enclosed mass at various points and quote the standard deviation of the simulations as the 1σ error.

Since we do not have error estimates for the density and temperature profiles of the objects in the Vikhlinin et al. sample, we just use the best-fitting values. Since the objects are more massive and generally brighter than the lower mass objects, we expect the relative uncertainty on the massive systems to be typically comparable to or less than the lower mass systems.

3.1 Subtracting the X-ray gas

We integrate the plasma component to find the observed gas enclosed mass, $M_X(r)$ from

$$M_X = \int_0^{r_{max}} 4\pi \rho_X(r) r^2 dr \quad (5)$$

where $\rho_X(r)$ is the density of plasma and r_{max} is r_{500} for the 8 clusters of Vikhlinin et al. (2006) and the last observed data point for the other systems. In all 25 systems, this radius r_{max} is beyond the saturation radius of the MOND dynamical mass.

The MOND dynamical mass of each cluster is plotted as a function of the X-ray gas mass (and BCG) in Fig. 1. We can see that these data confirm the findings of Sanders (1999, 2003, 2007), i.e. that the MOND dynamical mass represents about three to four times the X-ray gas mass. However, this ratio is taken at the last measured radii after the MOND dynamical mass has saturated, but the gas mass is still rising. This ratio evaluated at smaller radii ($\sim 120 \text{kpc}$) would be much larger.

3.2 Subtracting the galaxies

We first note that the empirical scheme for the galaxy density put forward by David et al. (1990) and employed by Pointecouteau & Silk (2005), i.e. $M_*(r)/M_X(r) \approx 0.4(kT(r)/\text{keV})^{-1}$ completely neglects the contribution of galaxies to the cluster mass below 120 kpc where the most massive galaxies reside. We thus ignore this empirical galaxy density, but instead look for the mass of the BCG at the center of the clusters using a Hernquist profile. The luminosity of the BCG in the K band from the Gastaldello et al.




Figure 2. Shows the mass profiles of the components of the dynamical mass for 4 representative clusters: N5044 ($T=1.0$ keV), N533, ($T=1.2$ keV), A2717 ($T=2.2$ keV), and A2029 ($T=8.5$ keV). The total MOND dynamical mass (M_m) is in black with solid linetype, the Newtonian dynamical mass is black with a dashed linetype. The red line corresponds to the observed mass of X-rays and the dashed red line is the mass of the BCG if $M/L_K=1$ for which we use a Hernquist profile. The green line is the maximum necessary contribution of neutrinos; by this we mean it is maximal (Eq.7) in the centre where the dynamical mass is unexplained, whereas at the outskirts the neutrinos no longer have maximum density, instead they have the density necessary to complete the budget after gas and the residual mass at the centre has been accounted for. The solid blue line is the residual mass unexplained by the neutrinos and gas, whereas the dashed blue line is the necessary residual mass if we have no significant neutrino density. The four representative clusters have respective temperatures 1.0, 1.2, 2.2 and 8.5 keV. Clearly, one sees that for small-temperature clusters such as N5044, no hidden mass is present at $r > 120$ kpc. The error bars are 1σ , but for the MOND dynamical mass, the intrinsic errors are dwarfed by the unknown form of the μ -function and for the neutrinos, the error is due to the error in the mean emission weighted temperature for a fixed neutrino mass $m_\mu=2eV$. Since we don't know the mass of the neutrino, the error on the temperature is slightly redundant. The errors are not independent.

(2006) sample are taken from their paper, while those from Vikhlinin et al. (2006) are taken from Lin et al. (2006) and the 2MASS survey.

We subtract this (using $M/L_K=1$) and the X-ray mass from the total MOND dynamical mass to give the total hid-

den mass (M_{HM}) which is simply the mass of dark material necessary to reach consistency with the dynamical mass,




Figure 1. Shows MOND dynamical mass vs X-ray gas mass integrated to r_{max} including the mass of the BCG.

4 NEUTRINOS AS THE MOND HIDDEN MASS?

At least two of the three active neutrinos (ν_e , ν_τ and ν_μ) have non-zero masses (Fukuda et al. 1998), meaning that they *must* be part of the mass budget of the Universe. Interestingly, in Λ CDM cosmology, it is possible to put stringent limits on the sum of the three neutrino masses, from the angular power spectrum of the Cosmic Microwave Background and from the slope of the matter power spectrum (e.g., Zunckel & Ferreira 2007), essentially because too massive a neutrino component would not leave enough room for CDM in the matter budget of the Universe, meaning that small-scale power would be lost. However, these constraints are not necessarily valid in a modified gravity cosmology (e.g., McGaugh 2004; Skordis et al. 2006) where the additional vector field can play the role of dark matter by adding a new instability in the process of structure formation (Dodelson & Liguori 2006).

On the other hand, model-independent experimental limits on the electron neutrino mass from the Mainz/Troitsk experiments, counting the highest energy β -decay electrons of ${}^3\text{H} \rightarrow {}^3\text{He}^+ + e^- + \nu_e + 18.57 \text{ keV}$ (the more massive the neutrinos, the lower the cutoff energy of electrons), are $m_\nu < 2.2 \text{ eV}$. The KATRIN experiment (under construction) will be able to falsify 2eV neutrinos at 95% confidence within months of taking data in 2009.

If the neutrino mass is so much higher than the mass differences, then all types have about the same mass, and the cosmological density of three left-handed neutrinos and their antiparticles (e.g., Sanders 2007) would be

$$\Omega_\nu = 0.062 m_\nu, \quad (6)$$

where m_ν is the mass of a single neutrino type in eV. If one assumes that clusters of galaxies respect the baryon-neutrino cosmological ratio, and that the MOND hidden mass is

mostly made of neutrinos as suggested by Sanders (2003, 2007), then the mass of neutrinos must indeed be around 2 eV. In their modelling of the CMB anisotropies, Skordis et al. (2006) showed that such a component of 2eV neutrinos could actually prevent the MOND Universe from accelerating too much, and could thus yield the right angular-distance relation to get the correct position of the peaks in the angular power spectrum of the CMB.

The main limit on the neutrino ability to clump together in clusters comes from the Tremaine-Gunn limit (Tremaine & Gunn 1979), stating that the phase space density must be preserved during collapse. This is a density level half the quantum mechanical degeneracy level. The maximum density for a cluster of a given temperature, T , is defined for a given mass of one neutrino type as

$$\frac{\rho_\nu^{max}}{7 \times 10^{-5} M_\odot \text{pc}^{-3}} = \left(\frac{T}{1 \text{ keV}} \right)^{1.5} \left(\frac{m_\nu}{2 \text{ eV}} \right)^4 \quad (7)$$

Sanders (2003) showed that such 2 eV neutrinos at the limit of detection could indeed account for the bulk of the dynamical mass in his sample of galaxy clusters of $T > 4 \text{ keV}$ (see his Fig.8). Angus et al. (2007b) also showed that such neutrinos could account for the weak lensing map of the bullet cluster (Clowe et al. 2004, 2006; Bradac et al. 2006), while Sanders (2007) showed that this hypothesis has the great advantage of naturally reproducing the proportionality of the electron density in the cores of clusters to $T^{3/2}$, as well as global scaling relations. However, looking at the central region of clusters, PS05 showed that neutrinos could not account for the dark matter all the way to the centre because the density reaches values much larger than the Tremaine-Gunn limit. However, this residual mass is only a few % of the dynamical mass explainable by neutrinos.

Here, we choose as a conservative approach to take the temperature of the neutrino fluid as being equal (due to violent relaxation) to the mean emission weighted temperature of the gas. We also assume that they contribute maximally, i.e. that their density is given by the Tremaine-Gunn limit, and constant (which is obviously untrue since the fluid obeys the equation of state of a partially degenerate neutrino gas, see e.g. Sanders 2007). As it happens, we show hereafter that even with maximum neutrino density, all the way to the centre, the neutrinos cannot clump densely enough to rid us of all the hidden mass. To this end, we consider a maximum density of neutrinos, from the centre until the radius where the dynamical mass no longer requires a maximum contribution (usually $\sim 120 \text{ kpc}$), and here we reduce the density until the dynamical mass saturates. Using the maximum neutrino density defined by $T(r)$ instead of the mean emission weighted temperature for all radii makes precious little difference.

5 RESULTS

In Fig. 2 we plot several components of the group or cluster mass distinctly as functions of radius. The total MOND dynamical mass (M_m) is in black with solid linetype, the Newtonian dynamical mass (M_n) is black with a dashed linetype. The red line corresponds to the observed mass of X-rays (M_X) and the dashed red line is the mass of the BCG assuming $M/L_K=1$ and a Hernquist profile. The

green line is the maximum necessary contribution of neutrinos (M_ν). The solid blue line is what we call the residual mass ($M_{m-X-\nu-*}$) unexplained by the neutrinos, galaxies and gas, whereas the dashed blue line is the necessary total hidden mass ($M_{m-X-*} = M_{HM}$) if we have no significant neutrino density. The four representative clusters have respective temperatures 0.8, 1.4, 2.4 and 8.5 keV. Clearly, one sees that for low-temperature groups such as NGC5044, no hidden mass is present at $r > 120$ kpc.

Neutrinos can explain the mass discrepancy in the outer parts of the clusters, especially for those with high temperatures ($T > 3$ keV), keeping in mind that no hidden mass at all is necessary in the outer parts for the cooler clusters. However, even with our approximations, which are favourable to a maximum contribution of the neutrinos, we found that neutrinos cannot account for the hidden mass in the central 120 kpc. Much fuss has been made in the literature about the neutrinos being unable to account for this core of residual mass (Pointecouteau & Silk 2005; Takahashi & Chiba 2007), which is true. Indeed, every one of the sample clusters has a dominant central core of residual mass. Nevertheless, although all these systems have a residual dark component, it has been neglected as to how serious this extra component is, which the neutrinos cannot account for, and how this varies with temperature and mass of the cluster. Actually, in Fig. 5, which plots the ratio of residual mass (with and without neutrinos) to MOND dynamical mass for all clusters, we see that for the hot clusters studied by Sanders (2003) and Pointecouteau & Silk (2005) the residual mass (after neutrinos have been added) is a small fraction, with gas and neutrinos being more important globally. Conversely, for groups like NGC5044, the residual mass is completely dominant and is up to four times more significant than the stellar and gas components. Recall that the neutrinos cannot lay claim to the high densities in the cores due to the Tremaine-Gunn limit, but at a certain radius begin to dominate the dynamical mass. This radius is plotted as a function of temperature in Fig.3. It is intriguing that if we do live in a universe with $\sim 2\text{eV}$ neutrinos then the core sizes of residual hidden mass in large and small clusters are very similar.

Of course, if neutrinos are not present, then the residual hidden mass is by far the most dominant component of the mass, moreso than the gas for all groups and clusters. It is also important to realise that any departures from hydrostatic equilibrium generally cause underestimates of the total mass; i.e., from non-thermal pressure support. This would only exacerbate the problems highlighted in this paper.

In Table 1 we list the masses of the different mass components in the sample of clusters, and in Fig.4 we plot the MOND dynamical mass of the clusters against temperature, which unearths an intriguing correlation of the form $M_m \propto T^{2.3 \pm 0.1}$, whereas Sanders (2007) predicts a relation of the form $M_m \propto T^2$.

Equally significant, we show in Fig.6 the total residual mass as a function of cluster mass. If neutrinos are not present, then the mass scales with temperature because it must account for the largest chunk of the dynamical mass, however, if neutrinos are present then the residual mass appears to saturate at a temperature of around 3 keV and a mass of $\sim 10^{13} M_\odot$. Interestingly, at the opposite end of the




Figure 3. Shows the radius below which neutrinos do not contribute in sufficient density to the MOND hidden mass.

scale, the residual mass is steeply falling towards zero for groups of $T < 0.7\text{keV}$, meaning that the amount of residual mass could in some sense be linked with the energy of X-rays themselves. Below this threshold we get back to systems like the groups studied by Milgrom (1998, 2002).

6 RESIDUAL MASS

To elucidate the importance of the residual mass in the MOND context, we plot in Fig. 5 the fraction of residual mass to MOND dynamical mass as a function of MONDian dynamical mass. The correlation is strikingly good in the case where neutrinos are present, meaning the residual mass fraction is increasing with decreasing cluster mass. On the other hand, if neutrinos are not present, the ratio of hidden mass is approximately constant and lies between 60% and 80%. We also checked if the residual mass in the case where neutrinos are present could be linked with the cooling time of the cluster defined as

$$T_{cool} = \frac{4.4 \times 10^{-4} T_{keV}^{0.5}}{\rho_X [M_\odot pc^{-3}]} \quad (8)$$

However, as you can see in table 1, even though all of our sample clusters have a cooling time smaller than the Hubble time (i.e. they are “cooling flow” clusters), the uncertain central density makes it impossible to forge any correlation between T_{cool} and any property of the residual mass.

We choose to express this quantity of residual mass in the central parts of the cluster as a MOND dynamical mass-to-light ratio for the BCG of the cluster, ranging between 2 and 11 (see Fig.8). This high dynamical mass-to-light ratio might perhaps be due to the interaction of this BCG with the neutrino fluid, allowing the fluid to heat and the neutrinos to clump more densely. From Fig.9 we see that the residual mass does indeed scale with the K-band luminos-




Figure 4. Shows the scaling of the MOND dynamical mass with cluster temperature. The fitted line is $M_m \propto T^{2.3 \pm 0.1}$.

ity of the BCG which is as expected if the neutrino fluid is heated allowing higher densities. Furthermore, if it was the case that the BCGs had large M/L_K we should be able to fit the stellar mass profile (with variable normalisation) without a DM profile and it should describe the data well. Unfortunately, the mass profiles of galaxy groups/clusters are not well fit by a De Vaucoulers profile with R_e set to that of the central galaxy but allowing for variable M/L_K . If we did this, we would over predict the interior mass profile. In addition, the barycentre of many clusters does not coincide with the BCG.

Another possibility is that this residual mass is in the form of cold gas. Indeed, given that in the global baryon inventory of the Universe 20% of the baryons produced during Big Bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) are still missing, and that the observed baryons in clusters only account for 5 to 10% of those produced during BBN (e.g., Silk 2006), there is plenty of room for this residual mass to be baryonic in MOND. One could thus say that, while CDM puts the missing baryons problem in individual galaxies, MOND has put it in galaxy clusters. The correlation in Fig.9 where we have plotted the residual mass against the luminosity of the BCG exposing a correlation might then just suggest that the baryonic residual mass is accreted onto the BCG enhancing its mass, or that brighter galaxies intrinsically possess more missing baryons in cold gas form.

Let us note that, if neutrinos were found by KATRIN in 2009 to have mass much below the present-day experimental limit, there would even be enough room for these missing baryons to explain absolutely all the MOND hidden mass in galaxy groups and clusters. Indeed, it should be highlighted that hidden mass in MOND only appears in systems with an abundance of ionised gas and X-ray emission (even in the case of galaxies such as NGC720!). It is then no stretch of the imagination to surmise that these gas rich systems have equal quantities of molecular hydrogen (or other molecules),




Figure 5. Shows the fraction of hidden mass (red stars) and of residual mass after neutrinos have been taken into account (black diamonds) as a function of the MOND dynamical mass. Clearly the ratio of hidden mass stays constantly high (>0.6) if neutrinos are not contributing, but the fraction of residual mass becomes less important for heavier (and hotter) clusters when neutrinos are added.




Figure 6. Shows the residual mass discrepancy vs. temperature after subtraction of X-ray gas, the BCG and of the maximum contribution of neutrinos (black diamonds) and for the case with no neutrinos (red stars). In the case of significant neutrino contribution, this discrepancy is a fairly constant value of $\sim 10^{13} M_\odot$ for $T > 3$ keV but drops steadily to zero for $T < 3$ keV. If neutrinos are not present, the hidden mass continues to rise with temperature.




Figure 7. Shows the marginal increase of the K-band luminosity of the BCG with cluster temperature.




Figure 8. Shows the necessary K-band M/L ratio of the BCG to explain the residual central mass discrepancy when neutrinos are present. It ranges between 2 and 11, meaning the stellar population of the BCG is probably not enough. If no neutrinos are present, then the ratio > 100 for some clusters.

in e.g. some compact form (very dense clumps of cold gas of only a Jupiter mass and a temperature of a few Kelvins, see Pfnegger & Combes 1994) which would fulfill the requirement of collisionless nature. Of course the formation and stabilization of these cold compact clouds in clusters should then be theoretically investigated in detail in the fu-




Figure 9. Shows the scaling of the residual mass discrepancy as a function of BCG luminosity, with (diamonds) and without (stars) neutrinos. The scaling may reflect the deeper potential well heating the neutrino fluid allowing a higher density far beyond that allowed by the mean cluster temperature, or the fact that dark matter in the form of cold gas is more present in brighter galaxies. More trivially, it is just the natural expectation of brighter galaxies residing in more massive clusters.

ture, to e.g. explain exactly how they would not form stars, and would not be detected by absorption in X-rays.

6.1 Transition temperatures

There is an increase in significance of the residual mass component left after the subtraction of gas and neutrinos for lower temperature clusters. Furthermore, for groups below 2keV, the contribution of neutrinos is negligible compared to the X-ray gas. Conversely, neutrinos are of great importance in the dynamics of clusters hotter than 2keV and subsequently are likely to help seed the collapse of these structures from cosmological perturbations. hierarchically, whereas hotter clusters collapse monolithically.

On the other hand, it is well known that stellar dynamical studies of elliptical galaxies generally do not require dark matter. Consequently, it is not surprising that they have also been shown to be consistent with MOND (Milgrom & Sanders 2003). In addition, there are the groups of galaxies studied by Milgrom (1998,2002) and Angus et al. (2007c) which appeared consistent with no dark matter. However, since those studies suffer from the well-known degeneracy from slight freedom in the M/L and velocity dispersion anisotropy, which allows a wide range of mass profiles to be consistent with the data, we can only be certain that HSB galaxies like those studied by Sanders & Noordermeer (2007) are fully consistent with MOND and no abundance of galactic DM. Below systems of this mass (at least) there is no need for DM.

Studies of very X-ray luminous elliptical galaxies have

not generally examined the viability of alternative gravity theories. One exception in NGC 720, where the observed misalignment of the major axis of the stars and hot gas, along with the elongation of the X-ray isophotes, has been suggested to imply a substantial mass discrepancy (Buote & Canizares 1994; Buote et al. 2002);

The requirement of DM at 0.6keV and no requirement for HSBs (and possibly X-ray dim ellipticals and galaxy groups), necessitates a transition temperature below which the residual mass diminishes in importance and above which it increases in importance, peaks (between 0.6keV and 2keV) and then falls at higher temperatures. Why systems cooler than 0.6keV show virtually no mass discrepancy in MOND must be related to the formation mechanism of such systems, and to the nature of the residual mass component found in X-ray groups. Let us note that the very presence of this residual mass seems to be synonymous with the ionised gas and X-ray emission, which might hint at the presence of similar quantities of unseen cold gas that can explain this residual mass.

7 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

We have used high quality data to show that galaxy groups and clusters in MOND either require a huge collisionless baryonic component (e.g. dense clumps of cold gas) to make up for all the hidden mass (60-80% of the total dynamical mass at the last observed radius, a percentage dropping afterwards), or require a less important to-be-discovered residual mass in the central 120 kpc if 2 eV neutrinos make their maximum contribution to the density of the cluster. In the latter case, the residual mass after taking into account the neutrinos corresponds to a mass-to-light ratio between 2 and 11 for the BCG in the K-band.

This is confirmation of the result of PS05, however, we have probed far lower masses ($< 10^{13} M_{\odot}$) and have shown that this residual mass component, which is present in all known X-ray bright systems hotter than 0.6keV, is the dominant one for groups $< 2keV$. The residual component in the clusters of PS05 is far less significant (a few %). This residual mass in groups is far more significant as it completely dominates the dynamical mass as neutrinos cannot cluster densely enough to contribute meaningfully. The total residual mass does still increase with temperature, but the significance decreases because the density of neutrinos increases more rapidly with temperature (i.e. $\rho_{\nu} \propto T^{3/2}$).

This leads us to believe that, if MOND is correct, the current baryon inventory of galaxy clusters is unfinished and that the unaccounted for baryons known to exist from arguments of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (depending on the fraction residing in the WHIM) are indeed buried in the central regions of clusters in some hitherto undetectable form. Constraints from the bullet cluster tell us that this mass must be compact and cool. This could hint at very small dense clumps of cold gas (or alternatively at the existence of a 4th sterile neutrino of large mass). Furthermore, if ordinary neutrinos do indeed have a 2 eV mass, only clusters beyond 2keV have halos of neutrinos in MOND, the cooler groups below 2keV being thus fully dependent on this to-be-discovered dark baryonic matter. Searches for this baryonic dark mat-

ter are crucial for the future of astronomy and should begin in earnest.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Fabio Gastaldello for his low temperature cluster data and Luca Zappacosta for providing the A2589 data from his paper. GWA and BF also appreciate the scientific guidance of Maxime Robert. GWA acknowledges his PPARC scholarship. BF is an FNRS research associate.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar L.A., Merrit D., 1990, ApJ, 354, 33
 Aguirre A., Schaye J., Quataert E., 2001, ApJ, 561, 550
 Angus G.W., Famaey B., Zhao H.S., 2006, MNRAS, 371, 138 (AFZ06)
 Angus G.W., Famaey B., et al., 2007a
 Angus G.W., Shan H.Y., Zhao H.S., Famaey B., 2007b, ApJ, 654, L13
 Angus G.W., McGaugh S.S., 2007a, MNRAS in press, astro-ph/07040381
 Angus G.W., McGaugh S.S., 2007b, submitted MNRAS
 Angus G.W., Famaey B., Tiret O., Combes F., Zhao H.S., 2007c, submitted MNRAS
 Baumgardt H., Grebel E.K., Kroupa P., 2005, MNRAS, 359, L1
 Bekenstein J.D., 2004, Phys. Rev. D70, 083509
 Bekenstein J.D., 2006, Contemporary Physics, 47, 387
 Bekenstein J., Milgrom M., 1984, ApJ, 286, 7
 Bradac M., et al., 2006, ApJ, 652, 937
 Bruneton J.-P., Esposito-Farese G., 2007, arXiv:0705.4043
 Buote D.A., Canizares C.R., 1994, ApJ, 427, 86
 Buote D.A., Canizares C.R., 1996, ApJ, 457, 565
 Buote D.A., Gastaldello F., Humphrey P.J., Zappacosta L., Bullock J.S., Brightenti F., Mathews W.G., 2007, ApJ, 664, 123
 Ciotti L., Londrillo P., Nipoti C., 2006, ApJ, 640, 741
 Ciotti L., Pellegrini S., 2004, MNRAS, 350, 609
 Clowe D., et al., 2006, ApJ, 648, L109 (C06)
 Ellis S.C., O'Sullivan E., 2006, MNRAS, 367, 627
 Famaey B., Binney J., 2005, MNRAS, 363, 603
 Famaey B., Gentile G., Bruneton J.-P., Zhao, H.S., 2007a, Phys. Rev. D, 75, 063002
 Famaey B., Bruneton J.-P., Zhao H.S., 2007b, MNRAS, 377, L79
 Famaey B., Angus G.W., Gentile G., Zhao H.S., 2007c, arXiv:0706.1279
 Farrar G.R., Rosen R.A., 2006, astro-ph/0610298
 Gastaldello F., Buote D.A., Humphrey P.J., Zappacosta L., Bullock J.S., Brightenti F., Mathews W.G., 2006, astro-ph/0610134
 Gentile G., Salucci P., Klein U., Granato G.L., 2007a, MNRAS, 375, 199
 Gentile G., Famaey B., Combes F., Kroupa P., Zhao H.S., Tiret O., 2007b, A&A in press, arXiv:0706.1976
 Hoekstra H., Yee H.K.C., Gladders M.D., 2004, ApJ, 606, 67
 Humphrey P.J., Buote D.A., Gastaldello F., Zappacosta

- L., Bullock J.S., Brightenti F., Mathews W.G., 2006, ApJ, 646, 899
- Jee M.J. et al., 2007, ApJ, 661, 728
- Knebe A., Gibson B.K. 2004, MNRAS, 347, 1055
- Lauer T.R., Postman M., 1994, ApJ, 425, 418
- Leon S., Meylan G., Combes F., 2000, A&A, 359, 907
- Masters K.L., Springob C.M., Haynes M.P., Giovanelli R., 2006, ApJ, 653, 861
- Milgrom M., 1983a, ApJ, 270, 365
- Milgrom M., 1983b, ApJ, 270, 371
- Milgrom M., 1983c, ApJ, 270, 384
- Milgrom M., 1998, ApJ, 496, L89
- Milgrom M., 2002, ApJ, 577, L75
- Milgrom M., Sanders, R.H., 2003, ApJ, 599, L25
- Milgrom M., Sanders, R.H., 2007, ApJ, 658, L17
- McGaugh S.S., 2004, ApJ, 611, 26
- McGaugh S.S., 2005, ApJ, 632, 859
- McGaugh S.S., de Blok W.J.G., 1998, ApJ, 499
- Natarajan P., Kneib J.-P., Smail I., 2002, ApJ, 580, L11
- Nipoti C., Londrillo P., Ciotti L., 2007a, ApJ, 660, 256
- Nipoti C., Londrillo P., Ciotti L., 2007b, MNRAS in press, (arXiv:0705.4633)
- Nusser A., 2002, MNRAS, 331, 909
- Pellegrini S., Ciotti L., 2006, MNRAS, 370, 1797
- Pfenniger D., Combes F., 1994, A&A, 285, 94
- Pointecouteau E., Silk J., 2005, MNRAS, 364, 654
- Prada F., et al., 2003, ApJ, 598, 260
- Sanders R.H., 1994, A&A, 284, L31
- Sanders R.H., 1999, ApJ, 512, L23
- Sanders R.H., 2003, MNRAS, 342, 901
- Sanders R.H., 2007, MNRAS in press, (astro-ph/0703590)
- Skordis C., Mota D.F., Ferreira P.G., Boehm C., 2006, Phys. Rev. Lett., 96, 1301
- Spergel D.N. et al., 2006, ApJS, 170, 377
- Strauss M.A., Cen R., Ostriker J.P., Lauer T.R., Postman M., 1995, ApJ, 444, 507
- Takahashi R., Chiba T., 2007, (astro-ph/0701365)
- The, L.H., White, S.D.M., 1988, AJ, 95, 1642
- Tiret O., Combes F., 2007, A&A, 464, 517
- Vikhlinin A. Kravtsov A., Forman W., Jones C., Markevitch M., Murray S.S., Van Speybroeck L., 2006, ApJ, 640, 691
- Zaritsky D., White S.D.M., 1994, ApJ, 435, 599
- Zappacosta L., Buote D.A., Gastaldello F., Humphrey P.J., Bullock J.S., Brightenti F., Mathews W.G., 2006, ApJ, 650, 777
- Zaritsky D., Smith R., Frenk C., White S.D.M., 1997, ApJ, 478, 39
- Zlosnik T.G., Ferreira P.G., Starkman G.D., 2006, PhRvD, 74, 044037
- Zlosnik T.G., Ferreira P.G., Starkman G.D., 2007, PhRvD, 75, 044017

Cluster	T keV	r_{\max} kpc	T_{cool} Gyr	M_n $10^{13}M_{\odot}$	M_X $10^{13}M_{\odot}$	M_m $10^{13}M_{\odot}$	M_{HM} $10^{13}M_{\odot}$	M_{ν} $10^{13}M_{\odot}$	r_{ν} kpc	$M_{m-X-\nu}$ $10^{13}M_{\odot}$	$L_{K,bcg}$ $10^{11}L_{\odot}$	$\Upsilon_{K,bcg}$ (13)	Ref
	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	
a2589	3.3 ± 0.06	779	2.7	17.4±0.4	1.83	4.4±0.1	2.8	2.4	133	0.5	(a)
a262	2.4 ± 0.02	276	0.3	3.5± 0.1	0.24	1.3±0.03	1.0	0.6	124	0.3	4.1	8.31	(c)
a2717	2.2 ± 0.04	840	1.9	12.5±0.4	1.40	2.2±0.07	1.3	1.0	139	0.3	5.4	5.96	(a)
awm4	2.4 ± 0.09	524	2.0	8.9±0.5	0.58	2.5±0.14	1.9	1.3	144	0.6	7.5	7.39	(a)
eso306	2.8 ± 0.07	284	1.3	5.1±0.3	0.25	2.2±0.12	1.8	1.2	141	0.6	7.0	9.04	(a)
eso552	2.0 ± 0.04	484	2.9	6.2±0.3	0.40	1.5±0.08	1.1	0.7	137	0.4	8.2	4.52	(a)
ic1860	1.3 ± 0.02	372	0.8	3.0±0.1	0.20	0.6±0.02	0.4	0.2	125	0.2	4.4	4.69	(a)
mkw4	1.9 ± 0.03	337	0.3	3.0±0.1	0.25	0.7±0.03	0.5	0.2	110	0.3	7.1	4.48	(a)
ms0116	1.4 ± 0.1	405	1.3	4.2±0.5	0.21	1.0±0.13	0.7	0.4	146	0.3	5.8	5.73	(a)
n1550	1.3 ± 0.02	216	0.1	1.5±0.1	0.10	0.4±0.01	0.3	0.1	100	0.2	2.1	11.4	(a)
n2563	1.2 ± 0.03	252	1.7	1.1±0.1	0.06	0.2±0.01	0.1	0.0	84	0.1	2.7	3.50	(a)
n4325	0.9 ± 0.02	225	0.5	1.4±0.1	0.07	0.3±0.01	0.2	0.1	115	0.2	2.3	7.90	(a)
n5044	1.0 ± 0.01	369	0.5	2.2±0.1	0.17	0.4±0.01	0.3	0.1	115	0.2	2.9	6.55	(a)
n5129	0.8 ± 0.03	278	0.7	1.1±0.1	0.08	0.2±0.01	0.1	0.0	95	0.1	5.0	1.21	(a)
n533	1.2 ± 0.03	265	0.1	1.3±0.1	0.09	0.3±0.01	0.2	0.0	90	0.1	6.2	1.91	(a)
rgb80	0.9 ± 0.03	521	0.8	2.3±0.1	0.47	0.2±0.01	0.1	0.0	97	0.1	5.3	1.38	(a)
rxj1159	1.6 ± 0.14	708	0.2	6.6±1.0	0.72	1.1±0.18	0.8	0.3	134	0.5	10.3	4.67	(a)
a383	4.8 ± 0.12	944	0.3	33.7±3.4	20.96	10.8±1.1	7.8	6.3	157	1.50	(b)
a478	7.9 ± 0.12	1337	0.5	227.1±29.6	27.07	33.6±4.38	17.8	17.3	153	0.50	8.4	6.0	(b)
a907	6.0 ± 0.08	1096	0.5	141.7±11.5	19.84	16.7±1.36	9.2	8.2	143	0.98	(b)
a1413	7.4 ± 0.11	1299	0.8	110.8±11.1	23.15	43.0±4.3	31.8	30.9	125	0.96	18.3	5.2	(b)
a1795	6.1 ± 0.05	1235	0.7	59.0±5.1	67.18	10.6±0.92	7.0	6.0	135	0.94	11.0	8.6	(b)
a1991	2.6 ± 0.06	732	0.5	14.0±1.9	5.17	3.6±0.5	2.4	1.8	139	0.69	6.9	10.0	(b)
a2029	8.5 ± 0.09	1362	0.5	90.4±8.8	33.97	33.1±3.2	23.7	22.3	132	1.41	20.1	7.0	(b)
a2390	8.9 ± 0.17	1416	0.3	216.8±21.7	56.22	84.2±8.4	56.8	55.8	88	0.97	(b)

Table 1. (1) Designations of the 25 groups and clusters. (2) Mean emission weighted temperature with error. (3) Radius of last data point. (4) Cooling time. (5) Newtonian dynamical mass at r_{max} . (6) X-ray mgas mass at r_{max} , may be larger than required for equilibrium. Error is always less than 1% (7) MOND dynamical mass. (8) Residual dark mass required if neutrinos are not present. (9) Contribution of neutrinos to M_m at r_{max} . (10) Radius beyond which neutrinos have high enough density to supply dynamical mass. (11) Residual mass if neutrinos contribute maximally. (12) K-band luminosity of BCG. (13) Necessary M/L_K to account for (11). (14) The reference from which the data is taken. (a) indicates Gastaldello et al. (2006), whereas (b) is Vikhlinin et al. (2006) and (c) Zappacosta et al. (2006).

