

# Mass-invariance of the iron enrichment in the hot haloes of massive ellipticals, groups, and clusters of galaxies

F. Mernier,<sup>1,2,3\*</sup> J. de Plaa,<sup>3</sup> N. Werner,<sup>1,2</sup> J. S. Kaastra,<sup>3,4</sup> A. J. J. Raassen,<sup>3</sup> L. Gu,<sup>5</sup> J. Mao,<sup>3,4</sup> I. Urdampilleta<sup>3,4</sup> N. Truong,<sup>1</sup> and A. Simionescu<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup>MTA-Eötvös University Lendület Hot Universe Research Group, Pázmány Péter sétány 1/A, Budapest, 1117, Hungary

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Physics, Eötvös University, Pázmány Péter sétány 1/A, Budapest, 1117, Hungary

<sup>3</sup>SRON Netherlands Institute for Space Research, Sorbonnelaan 2, 3584 CA Utrecht, The Netherlands

<sup>4</sup>Leiden Observatory, Leiden University, P.O. Box 9513, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands

<sup>5</sup>RIKEN Nishina Center, 2-1 Hirosawa, Wako, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

<sup>6</sup>Institute of Space and Astronautical Science (ISAS), JAXA, 3-1-1 Yoshinodai, Chuo-ku, Sagami-hara, Kanagawa 252-5210, Japan

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

## ABSTRACT

X-ray measurements find systematically lower Fe abundances in the X-ray emitting haloes surrounding groups ( $kT \lesssim 1.7$  keV) than in clusters of galaxies. These results have been difficult to reconcile with theoretical predictions. However, models using incomplete atomic data or the assumption of isothermal plasmas may have biased the best fit Fe abundance in groups and giant elliptical galaxies low. In this work, we take advantage of a major update of the atomic code in the spectral fitting package SPEX to re-evaluate the Fe abundance in 43 clusters, groups, and elliptical galaxies (the CHEERS sample) in a self-consistent analysis and within a common radius of  $0.1r_{500}$ . For the first time, we report a remarkably similar average Fe enrichment in all these systems. Unlike previous results, this strongly suggests that metals are synthesised and transported in these haloes with the same average efficiency across two orders of magnitude in total mass. We show that the previous metallicity measurements in low temperature systems were biased low due to incomplete atomic data in the spectral fitting codes. The reasons for such a code-related Fe bias, also implying previously unconsidered biases in the emission measure and temperature structure, are discussed.

**Key words:** galaxies: clusters: intracluster medium – X-rays: galaxies: clusters

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The largest gravitationally bound structures in the Universe, such as giant elliptical galaxies, groups, and clusters of galaxies, are surrounded by hot, X-ray emitting atmospheres, which typically account for more than ~60–80% of the total baryonic mass of these systems (e.g. [Giodini et al. 2009](#)). This intra-cluster medium (ICM) is also rich in heavy elements that were produced by Type Ia and core-collapse supernovae, before escaping from their host galaxies about 10 Gyr ago (for recent reviews, see [Werner et al. 2008](#); [de Plaa 2013](#); [de Plaa & Mernier 2017](#)).

Because the ICM is in a collisional ionisation equilibrium (CIE), abundances of various elements (typically from oxygen to nickel) can be robustly measured. This is especially true for Fe, whose both K- and L-shell transitions have high emissivities and fall within the typical energy windows (~0.5–10 keV) of our X-ray observatories. For this reason,

Fe abundances can be precisely measured in the X-ray halos of both hot, massive clusters (via the Fe-K transitions) and cooler, less massive groups and ellipticals (via the Fe-L transitions). In turn, these Fe abundance measurements are usually interpreted as a reliable tracer of the overall metallicity in clusters and groups, and are thus valuable to understand the history of metal enrichment in these systems.

In the past, several works extensively studied the Fe abundance in the hot gas of either nearby ellipticals and galaxy groups (e.g. [Mahdavi et al. 2005](#); [Finoguenov et al. 2006](#); [Grange et al. 2011](#); [Sasaki et al. 2014](#)), or galaxy clusters (e.g. [Tamura et al. 2004](#); [de Plaa et al. 2007](#); [De Grandi & Molendi 2001, 2009](#); [Matsushita 2011](#); [Zhang et al. 2011](#)). Very few studies, however, attempted to compare directly the metal content of all these systems together (e.g. [Bregman et al. 2010](#); [Sun 2012](#)).

In what has been perhaps the most comprehensive study so far, [Yates et al. \(2017\)](#) compiled from the literature a large number of Fe abundances measured in 79 nearby groups and clusters and homogenised these measurements by

\* E-mail: mernier@caesar.elte.hu

extrapolating them to a radius of  $r_{500}$ . While in hot clusters, the Fe abundance was found to converge to a rather uniform value of  $\sim 0.3$  Solar, in low temperature groups and giant ellipticals the metallicity appeared to be on average significantly lower (see also [Rasmussen & Ponman 2007, 2009](#)). These results were not reproduced by predictions from semi-analytical models of galaxy evolution, in which (at least) as much Fe was expected in groups as in clusters ([Yates et al. 2017](#)).

Do theoretical models really miss some important chemodynamical process at play in galaxy groups, or do spectroscopic measurements instead suffer from unexpected biases in low-temperature systems? From an observational perspective, this question remains open. In fact, homogenising Fe abundance measurements from the literature is very challenging, essentially because: (i) different authors utilised different data reduction and analysis methods, (ii) instrumental calibration and spectral models continuously evolved with years, and (iii) the lack of accurate measurements for radial Fe profiles of individual systems out to  $r_{500}$  makes the extrapolation to this radius quite uncertain. Last but not least, cooler systems ( $kT \lesssim 2$  keV) require careful attention as the Fe-L complex, which is unresolved by CCD instruments, may be underestimated if one assumes the plasma to be isothermal (the "Fe-bias"; [Buote & Canizares 1994](#); [Buote 2000](#)). Since most of the baryons (and metals) are rather in groups than in clusters, determining their accurate, unbiased metallicity is nevertheless of a crucial importance to estimate the global metal budget of the universe. Clearly, measurements of such metallicities in hot haloes at all masses need to be further investigated and better understood.

In a recent work ([Mernier et al. 2016](#), hereafter Paper I), we used *XMM-Newton* EPIC observations to measure Fe – among other elemental abundances – in the hot haloes of 44 nearby cool-core ellipticals, groups, and clusters of galaxies (the CHEERS<sup>1</sup> catalog). Interestingly, we found an apparent deficit of Fe in the coolest systems, supporting the previous findings of [Rasmussen & Ponman \(2007, 2009\)](#) and [Yates et al. \(2017\)](#), which are in tension with theoretical expectations. In that study, however, groups and ellipticals were investigated only within  $0.05r_{500}$ , making it difficult to compare with most simulations given their limited resolution. In addition, a major update of the plasma models from the SPEX fitting package ([Kaastra et al. 1996](#)) has been publicly released. As briefly noted in [Mernier et al. \(2017\)](#), such an improvement could affect the Fe abundance measured by CCD instruments in cooler plasmas and potentially revise our current picture of the ICM enrichment from massive ellipticals to the largest structures of the universe.

In this Letter, we revisit the observed Fe abundances in the CHEERS sample by: (i) analysing EPIC spectra within a common astrophysical radius of  $0.1r_{500}$  – easier to compare with simulations – and (ii) exploring how recent spectral model improvements alter the measured Fe abundances and their interpretation. Throughout this Letter, we assume  $H_0 = 70$  km s<sup>-1</sup> Mpc<sup>-1</sup>,  $\Omega_m = 0.3$ , and  $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$ . Error bars are given within a 68% confidence interval. All the abundances mentioned in this work are given with respect to their proto-solar values obtained by [Lodders et al. \(2009\)](#).

## 2 REANALYSIS OF THE CHEERS SAMPLE

The sample, data reduction, background modelling, and spectral fitting strategy are all described in detail in Paper I (see also [Mernier et al. 2015](#)). Compared to our previous work, we discard the observation of M89 (ObsID:0141570101) because of its high background contamination. This leaves us with *XMM-Newton* EPIC observations of 43 nearby cool-core clusters, groups, and ellipticals, all being part of the CHEERS project (see also [Pinto et al. 2015](#); [de Plaa et al. 2017](#)). The brightness of these nearby sources, combined to their relatively moderate temperature (not exceeding  $\sim 8$  keV), allows a robust determination of the Fe abundance with the EPIC instruments, based on the Fe-K lines and/or the Fe-L complex.

Unlike in Paper I, where the spectra were extracted within  $0.05r_{500}$  and/or  $0.2r_{500}$  (depending on the distance of the system), the goal of this paper is to measure the Fe abundance within the same physical scale. Therefore, all the spectra of our sample are re-extracted and re-analysed within  $0.1r_{500}$ . The only exception is the Virgo cluster (centred on M87), which could be analysed only out to  $0.05r_{500}$  within the EPIC field-of-view. The redshift and hydrogen column density ( $n_H$ ) values are adopted from Paper I.

### 2.1 From SPEXACT v2 to SPEXACT v3

A key improvement with respect to Paper I is the updated version of the SPEX Atomic Code and Tables (hereafter SPEXACT). While in Paper I our analysis relied on SPEXACT v2.05 (hereafter v2), in this Letter we take advantage of the up-to-date release of SPEXACT v3.04 (hereafter v3). This most recent version is the result of a major update started in 2016 (SPEXACT v3.00) with further minor improvements implemented until the end of 2017 ([Hitomi Collaboration et al. 2017](#)). Compared to SPEXACT v2, the total number of energy transitions has increased by a factor of  $\sim 400$ , to reach more than 1.8 million in SPEXACT v3. The new transitions include for instance higher principal quantum numbers for both H-like and He-like ions. In addition, significant updates were performed in collisional excitation and de-excitation rates, radiative transition probabilities, auto-ionisation and dielectronic recombination rates (either from the literature or consistently calculated using the FAC<sup>2</sup> code [Gu 2008](#)). Finally, significant improvements were obtained in radiative recombination ([Badnell 2006](#); [Mao & Kaastra 2016](#)) and collisional ionisation coefficients ([Urdampilleta et al. 2017](#)). In order to compare the effects of the improvements in a consistent way, in the following we use successively SPEXACT v2 and SPEXACT v3 to fit all our EPIC spectra (MOS 1, MOS 2, and pn are fitted simultaneously, see Paper I).

### 2.2 Multi-temperature modelling

As already demonstrated by e.g. [Buote & Canizares \(1994\)](#); [Buote \(2000, Fe-bias\)](#) and [Rasia et al. \(2008\)](#); [Simionescu et al. \(2009, inverse Fe-bias\)](#), modelling the ICM with a multi-temperature structure is essential to derive correct

<sup>1</sup> CHEMical Enrichment Rgs Sample


<sup>2</sup> <https://www-amdis.iaea.org/FAC>

abundances. The most intuitive assumption would be to consider that the temperature follows a Gaussian differential emission measure distribution (the `gdem` model; see e.g. de Plaa et al. 2006; Simionescu et al. 2009). Such a model, however, requires appreciable computing resources, especially when using SPEXACT v3. A cheaper, yet equally reasonable approach would be to mimic a `gdem` distribution with only three temperature components (3T): (i) the main component, for which the temperature  $kT_{\text{mean}}$  and the emission measure  $Y$  are left free in the fits; (ii) a higher-temperature component, whose temperature  $kT_{\text{up}}$  is left free but its  $Y$  is tied to half of that of the main component; (iii) a lower-temperature component (of temperature  $kT_{\text{low}}$ ), for which we apply the same rules as for the higher-temperature component. Using this way, we systematically keep a Gaussian behaviour while the ratio  $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}}$  can be seen as the typical width of the entire distribution. Using SPEXACT v3, we find a median value of  $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}} \approx 2.8$ , which corresponds to a Gaussian width  $\sigma_T \approx 0.2$  in the case of a `gdem` model (i.e. typical value found in most systems; see Paper I). We verify using a subsample of systems that, compared to the `gdem` model, this simplified approach provides consistent and reliable results.


### 3 RESULTS

The measured Fe abundances of the 43 CHEERS systems reanalysed within  $0.1r_{500}$  are shown as a function of their  $kT_{\text{mean}}$  in Figure 1. Because the overall temperature of the ICM scales linearly with the total mass of the system (e.g. Giodini et al. 2013),  $kT_{\text{mean}}$  can be seen as a reasonable proxy for the total mass of our sources. Therefore, we split our sample into two subsamples, namely: (i) "clusters", for which  $kT_{\text{mean}} > 1.7$  keV, and (ii) "groups/ellipticals", for which  $kT_{\text{mean}} < 1.7$  keV. The choice of the threshold value  $kT_{\text{mean}} = 1.7$  keV is of course arbitrary, but well justified by the usual classification attributed to each system in the literature.

While compared to SPEXACT v2, the Fe abundances measured in clusters remain essentially unchanged, the Fe abundances in groups and ellipticals are systematically revised upwards when using SPEXACT v3. This result is better quantified in Figure 2, where the distribution of Fe abundances is compared between clusters and groups/ellipticals, using the two versions of the code. Based on the entire sample, the SPEXACT v3 results provide a mean Fe abundance of  $0.74 \pm 0.03$  with an intrinsic scatter of 25% (computed following the method described in Paper I). When splitting the sample, we find consistent average Fe abundances of  $0.75 \pm 0.04$  and  $0.70 \pm 0.03$  for clusters and groups/ellipticals, respectively. This is in contrast with the SPEXACT v2 results, where the average Fe abundance values for clusters ( $0.75 \pm 0.04$ ) and groups/ellipticals ( $0.58 \pm 0.03$ ) are significantly different. In other words, spectral fits obtained using updated atomic data indicate that the average concentration of Fe in the hot haloes of groups and giant ellipticals is the same as that in clusters of galaxies.




**Figure 1.** Iron abundance measured as a function of the mean temperature within  $0.1r_{500}$  of the ellipticals, galaxy groups and clusters from the CHEERS sample (only M 89 is discarded, see text). For a given system, the corresponding SPEXACT v2 (orange stars) and SPEXACT v3 (blue dots) measurements are tied by a green-brown dashed line. Clusters and groups/ellipticals are delimited arbitrarily beyond and below  $kT_{\text{mean}} = 1.7$  keV, respectively.



**Figure 2.** Histograms showing the Fe abundance distribution of the CHEERS sample, when using successively SPEXACT v2 (top panel) and SPEXACT v3 (bottom panel). In each case, the distribution for clusters ( $kT_{\text{mean}} > 1.7$  keV) and groups/ellipticals ( $kT_{\text{mean}} < 1.7$  keV) is shown separately. The mean value of each distribution (and corresponding errors) is shown by the vertical dashed lines (and filled areas around them).

#### 3.1 The code-related Fe-bias


In clusters, the Fe abundance determination is predominantly based on the prominent Fe-K lines. Since only the low temperature groups/ellipticals are significantly affected by the update of SPEXACT, the reason for such a change is to be found in the Fe-L emission, which is dominant at  $kT_{\text{mean}} \lesssim 2$  keV. In order to better understand the code-related Fe bias that we report above, we adapt an instructive exercise previously introduced in Mernier et al. (2017) and de Plaa et al. (2017). In short, we start by using SPEXACT



**Figure 3.** Relative deviations on the parameters  $Y$ ,  $kT_{\text{mean}}$ ,  $\text{Fe}$ , and the ratio  $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}}$  when EPIC mock spectra of 3T plasma (simulated using SPEXACT v3 for various initial mean temperatures) are fitted using SPEXACT v2. The two horizontal dashed lines indicate the  $\pm 10\%$  relative deviations.

v3 to simulate mock EPIC spectra with 100 ks exposure on a grid of various  $kT_{\text{mean}}$  values. In all these simulations  $Y$  and the abundances are assumed to be  $10^{72} \text{ m}^{-3}$  and 1 proto-solar, respectively. Moreover,  $kT_{\text{up}}$  and  $kT_{\text{low}}$  are assumed such that  $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}} = 2.8$ . As a second step, we fit these mock spectra using SPEXACT v2 with  $Y$ ,  $\text{Fe}$ ,  $kT_{\text{mean}}$ ,  $kT_{\text{up}}$ , and  $kT_{\text{low}}$  as free parameters. The relative deviation of these SPEXACT v2 best-fit parameters with respect to their input SPEXACT v3 values is shown in Figure 3 as a function of the input mean temperature. As expected from our results above, the Fe consistency between the two versions of SPEXACT is excellent in the clusters regime, while it dramatically deteriorates when the plasma becomes cooler than  $\sim 2$  keV. In addition, other interesting effects occur in the groups/ellipticals regime. Below  $kT_{\text{mean}} \lesssim 1.5$  keV and  $kT_{\text{mean}} \lesssim 1$  keV, the ratio  $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}}$  and  $Y$  are respectively under- and overestimated by SPEXACT v2. The mean temperature, however, remains reasonably reproduced by SPEXACT v2, except for very hot plasmas where  $kT_{\text{mean}}$  is at most  $\sim 15\%$  underestimated (though without affecting the Fe abundance).

To better understand all the biases we observe in cool plasmas with the EPIC instruments, we investigate further the case of a 3T plasma simulated for 100 ks with SPEXACT v3, assuming  $kT_{\text{mean}} = 0.7$  keV (Figure 4, black data points). A direct comparison of this simulated spectrum with its equivalent model using SPEXACT v2 (Figure 4, red line) shows significant discrepancies throughout the entire Fe-L complex (0.6–1.2 keV). In fact, the emissivity of many important lines (e.g. Fe XVII at  $\sim 0.73$  keV; Fe XVIII at  $\sim 0.77$  keV) were revised lower with the update of SPEXACT, while new transitions were incorporated and/or updated with a higher emissivity (e.g. Fe XVIII at  $\sim 1.18$  keV). When fixing the Fe abundance to its best-fit value estimated *a posteriori* by SPEXACT v2 (Figure 4, orange line), the emitting bump at  $\sim 0.7$  get smoother, in better agreement with the overall shape of the Fe-L complex. However, over the entire soft band the flux significantly decreases, which the fit attempts to “correct” by increasing  $Y$  (Figure 4, green line). Finally,



**Figure 4.** EPIC MOS2 simulated spectrum of a 3T plasma with  $kT_{\text{mean}} = 0.7$  keV, using SPEXACT v3. For comparison, we show the same model calculated using SPEXACT v2 (red). Then, we progressively fix the Fe (orange),  $Y$  (green), and eventually  $kT_{\text{mean}}$ ,  $kT_{\text{up}}$ , and  $kT_{\text{low}}$  (blue) to their *a posteriori* best-fit SPEXACT v2 values. The residuals of such models with respect to the input simulated spectrum are shown in the bottom panel.

the fit smooths the residual bumps (in particular around  $\sim 0.9$ – $1$  keV) by simultaneously decreasing  $kT_{\text{up}}$  and increasing  $kT_{\text{low}}$  to provide a formally acceptable – but incorrect – best-fit to the input spectrum (Figure 4, blue line).

In summary, in cool plasmas the emission measure, the Fe abundance, and the width of the temperature distribution ( $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}}$ ) influence each other to reproduce the observed shape of the unresolved Fe-L complex. As a consequence, even outdated spectral codes can reasonably fit the Fe-L complex, yet providing strongly biased measurements. This conspiracy between all these parameters explain the code-related Fe-bias that we report in this Letter.

#### 4 IMPLICATIONS FOR THE IRON CONTENT IN ELLIPTICALS, GROUPS AND CLUSTERS

By measuring Fe abundances within  $0.1r_{500}$  in a self-consistent way and using the latest SPEXACT version available to date, we report for the first time a similar level of Fe enrichment in ellipticals, galaxy groups, and galaxy clusters. In other words, gas-phase metallicities remain constant across two orders of magnitude in halo mass.

These new results contradict previous papers (e.g. Rasmussen & Ponman 2009; Bregman et al. 2010; Sun 2012; Yates et al. 2017), which reported systematically lower Fe abundances in groups and/or ellipticals with respect to the hotter, clusters of galaxies. Rather than SPEX, most of those previous studies used many (very different) versions of AtomDB to fit their data, making a direct comparison with this work difficult. All these (mostly outdated) atomic codes, however, likely encountered similar problems of a too simplistic modelling of the Fe-L transitions. From a theoretical perspective, that trend was not trivial to explain. For example, when comparing the observational trend with a semi-analytic model, Yates et al. (2017) did not succeed



to reproduce the previously reported positive temperature-metallicity correlation in galaxy groups. Instead, the metal content in low-mass systems is systematically overestimated by their model (however, see Liang et al. 2016).

In principle, many astrophysical mechanisms might play a role in enriching the ICM with freshly produced metals. In order to explain why less Fe was observed in the lower mass systems of their sample, Rasmussen & Ponman (2009) considered for instance the possibility of depletion of metal rich material into filaments, escape of metals via powerful AGN feedback from the shallower gravitational potential of less massive systems, or even different star formation histories in clusters and groups. Our results, instead, suggest a simpler astrophysical framework. The appreciable intrinsic scatter of our measurements (25%) might be due to the differences in the central enrichment and AGN outburst histories in our sample and/or due to residual biases caused by the deviations of the true temperature structures from our Gaussian emission measure distribution models. Nevertheless, unlike what has been reported so far, our results suggest that metals are synthesised, released, transferred and/or possibly removed in the ICM with the same average efficiency across at least two orders of magnitude in total mass.

In order to place them in the context of our general understanding of the ICM enrichment, these new measurements are directly confronted to (and are found to be in good agreement with) recent chemo- and hydrodynamical simulations in a companion paper (Truong et al. submitted). As an interesting consequence, these results provide new (indirect) support to the scenario of an early enrichment of largest structures in the universe. Indeed, since they grow hierarchically, isolated massive ellipticals and assembling groups can be seen as the first steps of the formation of more massive clusters. Although, admittedly, nearby groups may have different specific properties (star formation, AGN feedback, etc.) than high-redshift proto-clusters, finding a similar level of enrichment in ellipticals, groups, and clusters at low redshift strongly suggests that the bulk of metals in hot haloes was already in place well before clusters effectively assembled.

We remind that these integrated measurements cover  $0.1r_{500}$ , without further information on their inner or outer spatial distributions. The question of whether clusters and groups/ellipticals are really self-similar in terms of metal enrichment would require at least to derive the individual abundance profiles for the entire sample using SPEXACT v3. Because of the non-negligible time required by SPEXACT v3 to fit each spectrum, we leave such a study for future work. We note, however, that the SPEXACT v2 results suggest a similar decreasing slope of the Fe profile between hotter and cooler systems, with a similar abundance decrease from clusters to groups in every radial bin (probably due to the code-related Fe-bias discussed here). In addition, while the Fe abundance in the outskirts of massive clusters is becoming well determined (e.g. Werner et al. 2013; Urban et al. 2017), fewer constraints were reported in the outskirts of less massive systems (see however Thölken et al. 2016; Simionescu et al. 2017). Future exploration of these regions, directly witnessing the chemical state of the accreting gas during or even before its virialisation, will be crucial to complete the picture. This, unfortunately, is very challenging for the still flying X-ray observatories (*Chandra* and

*XMM-Newton*), because of the considerable level of particle background affecting their instruments.

In addition to the code-related Fe bias discussed in this work, we also note from Figure 3 that fitting the spectra of cool systems with an outdated plasma code may also bias the emission measure, the mean temperature and the  $kT_{\text{up}}/kT_{\text{low}}$  ratio by +35%, +7%, and -24%, respectively. In turn, these biases may have consequences on the estimates of further interesting quantities. For instance, we estimate that the ICM pressure, usually defined as  $P = n_e kT$  can be biased high by ~19% in the case of a ~0.7 keV plasma. Unlike the pressure, the ICM entropy, usually defined as  $K = kT/n_e^{2/3}$ , remains very close to its true value, with an underestimate of less than ~1%. Similarly, the total hydrostatic mass is not expected to be affected by more than a few percent, as temperature and density gradients do not change dramatically. A more precise quantification, however, is left to future work. Our results also reveal the complication of measuring accurately the temperature structure of lower-mass systems, as long as the Fe-L complex remains unresolved by the observing instruments.

Finally, it should be reminded that no spectral code is perfect. It is certain that further improvements on SPEXACT will be pursued in the future, with potential implications on the interpretation of moderate resolution spectra of X-ray sources. In that respect, micro-calorimeters onboard future missions such as *XARM* and *Athena* will enable us to observe the Fe-L complex with unprecedented resolution. These observations will be invaluable to better understand all the radiation processes in the ICM and push our knowledge of astrophysical plasma emission to the next level.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Kiran Lakhchaura for fruitful discussions. F.M. is supported by the Lendület LP2016-11 grant awarded by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. This work is partly based on the *XMM-Newton* AO-12 proposal “*The XMM-Newton view of chemical enrichment in bright galaxy clusters and groups*” (PI: de Plaa), and is a part of the CHEERS (CHEMical Evolution Rgs cluster Sample) collaboration. This work is based on observations obtained with *XMM-Newton*, an ESA science mission with instruments and contributions directly funded by ESA member states and the USA (NASA). The SRON Netherlands Institute for Space Research is supported financially by NWO, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research.

## REFERENCES

- Badnell N. R., 2006, *ApJS*, **167**, 334
- Bregman J. N., Anderson M. E., Dai X., 2010, *ApJ*, **716**, L63
- Buote D. A., 2000, *MNRAS*, **311**, 176
- Buote D. A., Canizares C. R., 1994, *ApJ*, **427**, 86
- De Grandi S., Molendi S., 2001, *ApJ*, **551**, 153
- De Grandi S., Molendi S., 2009, *A&A*, **508**, 565
- Finoguenov A., Davis D. S., Zimer M., Mulchaey J. S., 2006, *ApJ*, **646**, 143
- Giodini S., et al., 2009, *ApJ*, **703**, 982
- Giodini S., Lovisari L., Pointecouteau E., Ettori S., Reiprich T. H., Hoekstra H., 2013, *Space Sci. Rev.*, **177**, 247

- Grange Y. G., de Plaa J., Kaastra J. S., Werner N., Verbunt F., Paerels F., de Vries C. P., 2011, *A&A*, **531**, A15
- Gu M. F., 2008, *Canadian Journal of Physics*, **86**, 675
- Hitomi Collaboration et al., 2017, preprint, ([arXiv:1712.05407](https://arxiv.org/abs/1712.05407))
- Kaastra J. S., Mewe R., Nieuwenhuijzen H., 1996, in Yamashita K., Watanabe T., eds, *UV and X-ray Spectroscopy of Astrophysical and Laboratory Plasmas*. pp 411–414
- Liang L., Durier F., Babul A., Davé R., Oppenheimer B. D., Katz N., Fardal M., Quinn T., 2016, *MNRAS*, **456**, 4266
- Lodders K., Palme H., Gail H.-P., 2009, *Landolt Börnstein*, p. 44
- Mahdavi A., Finoguenov A., Böhringer H., Geller M. J., Henry J. P., 2005, *ApJ*, **622**, 187
- Mao J., Kaastra J., 2016, *A&A*, **587**, A84
- Matsushita K., 2011, *A&A*, **527**, A134
- Mernier F., de Plaa J., Lovisari L., Pinto C., Zhang Y.-Y., Kaastra J. S., Werner N., Simionescu A., 2015, *A&A*, **575**, A37
- Mernier F., de Plaa J., Pinto C., Kaastra J. S., Kosec P., Zhang Y.-Y., Mao J., Werner N., 2016, *A&A*, **592**, A157
- Mernier F., et al., 2017, *A&A*, **603**, A80
- Pinto C., et al., 2015, *A&A*, **575**, A38
- Rasia E., Mazzotta P., Bourdin H., Borgani S., Tornatore L., Ettori S., Dolag K., Moscardini L., 2008, *ApJ*, **674**, 728
- Rasmussen J., Ponman T. J., 2007, *MNRAS*, **380**, 1554
- Rasmussen J., Ponman T. J., 2009, *MNRAS*, **399**, 239
- Sasaki T., Matsushita K., Sato K., 2014, *ApJ*, **781**, 36
- Simionescu A., Werner N., Böhringer H., Kaastra J. S., Finoguenov A., Brüggén M., Nulsen P. E. J., 2009, *A&A*, **493**, 409
- Simionescu A., Werner N., Mantz A., Allen S. W., Urban O., 2017, *MNRAS*, **469**, 1476
- Sun M., 2012, *New Journal of Physics*, **14**, 045004
- Tamura T., Kaastra J. S., den Herder J. W. A., Bleeker J. A. M., Peterson J. R., 2004, *A&A*, **420**, 135
- Thölken S., Lovisari L., Reiprich T. H., Hasenbusch J., 2016, *A&A*, **592**, A37
- Urban O., Werner N., Allen S. W., Simionescu A., Mantz A., 2017, *MNRAS*, **470**, 4583
- Urdampilleta I., Kaastra J. S., Mehdipour M., 2017, *A&A*, **601**, A85
- Werner N., Durret F., Ohashi T., Schindler S., Wiersma R. P. C., 2008, *Space Sci. Rev.*, **134**, 337
- Werner N., Urban O., Simionescu A., Allen S. W., 2013, *Nature*, **502**, 656
- Yates R. M., Thomas P. A., Henriques B. M. B., 2017, *MNRAS*, **464**, 3169
- Zhang Y.-Y., Laganá T. F., Pierini D., Puchwein E., Schneider P., Reiprich T. H., 2011, *A&A*, **535**, A78
- de Plaa J., 2013, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, **334**, 416
- de Plaa J., Mernier F., 2017, *Astronomische Nachrichten*, **338**, 299
- de Plaa J., et al., 2006, *A&A*, **452**, 397
- de Plaa J., Werner N., Bleeker J. A. M., Vink J., Kaastra J. S., Méndez M., 2007, *A&A*, **465**, 345
- de Plaa J., et al., 2017, *A&A*, **607**, A98