

Cosmological Zoom-In Simulations of Milky Way Host Size Dark Matter Halos with a Blue-Tilted Primordial Power Spectrum

Jianhao Wu ^{1,*} Tsang Keung Chan ^{1,†} and Victor J. Forouhar Moreno ²

¹*Department of Physics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong, China*

²*Leiden Observatory, Leiden University, PO Box 9513, NL-2300 RA Leiden, the Netherlands*

(Dated: December 23, 2024)

Recent observations from the James Webb Space Telescope revealed a surprisingly large number of galaxies formed at high redshift. Along with strong lensing studies and nearby galaxy observations, these could challenge the standard Lambda Cold Dark Matter cosmology with a power-law primordial power spectrum. In this study, we conduct high-resolution cosmological zoom-in dark matter-only simulations of Milky Way host size halos with a blue, tilted primordial power spectrum ($P(k) \propto k^{m_s}$ with $m_s > 1$ at small scales $> 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$). We find that the blue-tilted subhalo mass functions can be enhanced by more than a factor of two for subhalo masses $M_{\text{sub}} \lesssim 10^{10} M_{\odot}$, whereas the subhalo V_{max} functions can be enhanced by a factor of four for maximum circular velocities $V_{\text{max}} \lesssim 30 \text{ km/s}$. The blue-tilted scaled cumulative substructure fraction can be an order of magnitude higher at $\sim 10\%$ of the virial radius. The blue-tilted subhalos also have higher central densities, since the blue-tilted subhalos reach the same V_{max} at a smaller distance R_{max} from the center. We have also verified these findings with higher-resolution simulations.

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard cosmology model includes the single-field slow-roll inflation model [1–5], which predicts the approximately single power-law (PL) primordial power spectrum (PPS) [6], and the lambda cold dark matter model (LCDM, [7, 8]), which governs the later evolution of our universe. It has achieved great successes on large scales, e.g. supported by the cosmic microwave background (CMB) [9, 10], galaxy surveys [11, 12] and Lyman-alpha forest [13]. However, there are relatively sparse constraints for the scales smaller than $\sim 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. In particular, there have been active debates over the so-called small-scale crisis of LCDM [14], including the Missing Satellite Problem (MSP, [15, 16]), the Core-Cuspy problem [17, 18], and the Too-Big-To-Fail problem [19], etc. This leaves room for other models beyond the standard cosmology, including different models of dark matter, effects of baryons, and modifications to the PPS.

One possible modification is to enhance the PPS on small scales ($> 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$) [20–22], deviating from the PL PPS. In these small-scale enhanced models, PPS will follow the traditional PL model on large scales, preserving the success of the PL PPS, while having an enhancement on small scales. For example, Ref. [23] considered blue-tilted (BT) models, which are broken power law PPSs with a higher power law index in scales $> 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. They found a significant boost in dark matter halos with BT BBS, especially at high redshift. More complicated forms also exist, such as several bumps in the PPS [24].

With the recently launched James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) [25], Ref. [26] found a large number of galaxies formed in the high redshift universe ($z > 10$),

which may be in tension with the standard cosmology [27, 28]. Ref. [29] eased this tension with the BT formalism, based on the Press-Schechter formalism [30] and the Sheth-Tormen correction [31]. Ref. [32] performed cosmological N-body simulations with the BT model, achieving similar conclusions that the BT model could match the JWST observations without invoking ultra-high star formation rates. However, other mechanisms in galaxy formation models (e.g. Refs. [33–35]) could potentially explain the JWST data. Thus, apart from the high redshift massive galaxies, additional observations are required to distinguish the BT and PL models.

The strong lensing observations can provide another constraint. The asymptotic flux ratio relation, which serves as a general principle in smooth lensing potentials [36], is often observed to be violated. This is taken as evidence for the presence of the substructures around lensing galaxies [37]. However, in the PL LCDM cosmology, there could be not enough low mass substructures in lensing galaxies to explain the violations [38–40]. This could suggest extra structures not present in dark matter-only simulations under the standard PL LCDM cosmology. On the other hand, Ref. [41] constrained sub-galactic PPS to be consistent with PL with the 11 strongly lensed and quadruply image quasars, albeit with possibilities with blue/red tilted PPS on small scales.

The density profiles and statistics of nearby low-mass dwarf galaxies can also inform us about the nature of dark matter, baryonic physics, and the PPS. For example, the observed central densities of dwarf galaxies can provide insights into the nature of dark matter [42, 43] or constraining baryonic physics [44–47]. The “missing satellite problem” describes the discrepancy between the number of subhalos from cosmology dark matter simulations and the observed satellite galaxy population [15, 16]. This problem could signify a challenge to the standard PL LCDM cosmology, or the importance of including accurate galaxy formation physics in dwarf galax-

* contact author: jianhao.wu@link.cuhk.edu.hk

† contact author: tsangkeungchan@cuhk.edu.hk

ies. Nearby dwarf galaxies also provide constraints on the PPS. For example, Refs. [48, 49] employed semi-analytic models to constrain the BT PPS parameter space, using the observed relation between half-light radius and V-band luminosity function in nearby dwarf galaxies.

Thanks to the recent improvements in observations, many more ($\gtrsim 50$) faint satellite galaxies have been discovered in Milky Way (MW) and nearby MW mass hosts [50–54]. After correcting for the detection efficiency (completeness correction), Ref. [55] argued that the “missing satellites problem” can be solved. It could even become the “too many satellites problem”, meaning that there are too many satellite galaxies inferred from observations than expected in simulations/models [55]. This happens if some mechanisms can reduce the number of satellites in simulations / models. For example, a baryonic disk can tidally strip subhalos [56], and/or the minimum subhalo mass to host an observable galaxy is large [57]. This “too many satellites problem” motivates us to explore mechanisms to boost the number of subhalos, which includes the BT model.

Motivated by high redshift, strong lensing, and nearby galaxy observations, we explore the impact of the BT PPS on the substructures in dark matter halos, which, to our knowledge, has not been previously investigated with numerical simulations. We perform cosmological zoom-in dark matter-only simulations of MW host size halos with BT PPS to study its substructures at $z = 0$. Note that we only modify the PPS but still consider only cold dark matter (i.e. not warm or self-interacting dark matter).

In [section II](#), we will give a theoretical overview, laying down the framework for the BT PPS and our simulation. Then in [section III](#), we introduce our numerical codes for initial conditions, cosmological simulations, and halo identification. We present our main results in [section IV](#) and conclude in [section V](#). Additionally, as the first work to use HBT-HERONS (see [section III C](#)) for zoom-in simulations, we show the comparison between HBT+HERONS and another halo finder VELOCraptor in [section A](#). We also run higher-resolution simulations and compare the fiducial results in [section B](#).

II. THEORETICAL OVERVIEW

The upper panel of [Figure 1](#) shows the cosmic chronology. Shortly after the Big Bang, the primordial power spectrum (PPS) and small inhomogeneities were established during the inflation era. At the cosmic recombination $z \sim 1100$, electrons are combined with protons to form neutral hydrogens, allowing radiation to travel freely and resulting in the cosmic microwave background (CMB). Under the influence of gravity, the small density fluctuations are amplified, which can still be described by Lagrangian perturbation theories. By $z \sim 100$, nonlinearities started to grow and more dark matter collapsed into halos, requiring N-body simulations to model

accurately. Eventually, stars and galaxies are born at the centers of dark matter halos, leading to the structure we observe today. Our study connects the very early universe to the present-day nearby galaxy structures and statistics.

The matter power spectrum in the post-recombination era is connected to the primordial power spectrum $P_i(k)$ through [58]:

$$P(k, t) = P_i(k)T^2(k)D^2(t), \quad (1)$$

where $T(k)$ is the linear transfer function and $D(t)$ is the growth factor. In the traditional single-field slow-roll inflation, the PPS follows the PL model:

$$P_i(k) \propto k^{n_s}, \quad (2)$$

with the spectral index $n_s \sim 0.96$ (see [section III B 1](#)).

Ref. [23] gave the following formalism for the BT models:

$$P_i(k) \propto \begin{cases} k^{n_s}, & (\text{for } k \leq k_p), \\ k^{n_s} \cdot \left(\frac{k}{k_p}\right)^{m_s - n_s}, & (\text{for } k > k_p), \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

which is a broken power law modification of [Equation 2](#). We introduce k_p as the pivot scale and m_s as the spectral index on small scales. We require m_s to be larger than n_s to give an enhancement (i.e. blue-tilted, BT). When m_s is smaller than n_s , the corresponding PPS model is called the red tilted (RT) model [49].

In this paper, along with the PL model, we pick two BT models from Ref. [32]¹: BT_deep and BT_soft, listed in [Table I](#). BT_soft with a reasonable star formation efficiency ~ 0.2 can explain the large number of galaxies formed at high redshift as observed by JWST [32]. However, to match the JWST observations, BT_deep requires a high star formation efficiency, comparable to PL [32]. Although BT_deep does not help to explain the JWST observations, it is still interesting to examine its impact on the substructures of dark matter halo.

Both models are within the allowable parameter space in Ref. [49] (constrained with nearby dwarf central densities), although BT_soft is the marginal case. We also confirm that our models are within the parameter space constrained with strong lensing [41].

For all of our PPS models, the matter power spectra at $z=1089$ and the parameter settings are shown in [Figure 2](#) and [Table I](#) respectively. BT_soft deviates from PL at 0.7 Mpc^{-1} , whereas BT_deep deviates at 3.51 Mpc^{-1} , but they have the same power law index afterward.

¹ For k_p , the value in our table is a float number to several digits because original models use $h \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ as a unit of k_p , but we convert it into Mpc^{-1} .




FIG. 1. The conceptual steps of the cosmological stages and our simulation steps. The *upper panel* shows the universe’s chronology, along with redshifts of some critical eras; the *lower panel* shows the numerical tools we used.




FIG. 2. The *upper panel* shows the power spectra for the matter density perturbation at $z=1089$ with PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red). The *inset* is for a wider wave vector k range. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the BT to PL power spectrum. The model parameters are listed in [Table I](#).

Models	Related parameters
PL	Power Law Primordial Power Spectrum $n_s = 0.961$
BT_deep	$k_p = 3.51 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ $m_s = 1.5$
BT_soft	$k_p = 0.702 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ $m_s = 1.5$

TABLE I. The parameters of all the chosen models. k_p is the wave vector at which the BT PPS would deviate from the PL PPS. m_s is the enhanced spectral index for $k > k_p$, at the small scales. For other cosmological parameters, see [section III B 1](#).

The wave number k can be connected with a mass scale M_l at $z=0$ [14], by assuming the sphere radius r_l to be half wavelength $\frac{\pi}{k}$:

$$M_l = \frac{4\pi}{3} r_l^3 \rho_m = \frac{\Omega_m H_0^2}{2G} r_l^3 = 1.71 \times 10^{11} \left(\frac{\Omega_m}{0.3}\right) \left(\frac{H_0}{70}\right)^2 \left(\frac{r_l}{1 \text{ Mpc}}\right)^3 M_\odot. \quad (4)$$

We further give the pivot mass M_p under which the BT model can enhance the structure formation:

$$M_p = 5.29 \times 10^{12} \left(\frac{\Omega_m}{0.3}\right) \left(\frac{H_0}{70}\right)^2 \left(\frac{k_p}{1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}}\right)^{-3} M_\odot. \quad (5)$$

For the BT_deep and BT_soft models, M_p would be $\sim 1.1 \times 10^{11} M_\odot$ and $\sim 1.4 \times 10^{13} M_\odot$ respectively, using the cosmological parameters in our paper (see [section III B 1](#)). The host halo of an MW-size galaxy is believed to be around $M_{\text{halo}} \sim 10^{12} M_\odot$. Therefore, while

both the BT_deep and BT_soft models can enhance the substructures of MW host size halos, only in BT_soft the main halo can be affected.

To illustrate the impact of the BT model on the dark matter halo statistics across different redshifts, we apply a public semi-numerical code genmf [59]². It can predict halo mass functions in cosmological simulations at a given redshift. Ref. [32] verified that genmf is accurate within a factor of 2-3, by comparing it with numerical N-body simulations (with PL and BT).

We use genmf to show the cumulative halo mass function at $z = 0$ and $z = 9$ for the BT and PL models in Figure 3. The figure shows, at $z = 9$, the BT models can produce an order-of-magnitude more halos, especially for $M_{\text{halo}} < 10^{10-11} M_{\odot}$. At $z = 0$, the enhancement in the number of halos reduces to a factor of 2-3 for $M_{\text{halo}} < 10^{10-11} M_{\odot}$. Ref. [59] also found that the high redshift halo mass function is more sensitive to cosmology, due to the stiffness of the function. This high redshift enhancement motivates Ref. [32] to explain the early formation of galaxies discovered by JWST with the BT models.

However, at both redshifts, there is no enhancement at the high-mass end, since the BT models can only enhance the structures lower than the pivot mass M_p (Equation 5), shown as the triangles in the figure.

While genmf can estimate the halo mass functions in the BT models within a factor of two, we still require cosmological N-body simulations to accurately capture the sub-halo distributions and statistics in the BT models. This will help us explore BT PPS's impact on nearby galaxies and strong lensing observations.

III. NUMERICAL METHODS

Our cosmological simulation pipeline is outlined in the bottom panel of Figure 1. We will introduce more details in the following three subsections.

A. Zoom-in initial conditions (IC)

We carry out a suite of cosmological zoom-in simulations of MW host-size halos. We increase the number of particles in a selected zoom-in region, which contains high-resolution (HRS) particles. The particles outside the zoom-in region are called background or low-resolution (LRS) particles. We chose the public code MUSIC - *multi-scale cosmological initial conditions* [60], which can handle multi-scale IC, to generate initial conditions for our cosmological zoom-in simulations. We adopted the Eisenstein and Hu [61] transfer function and




FIG. 3. The cumulative halo mass function generated by genmf, at $z=9$ (dashed line) and $z=0$ (solid line), with PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red). The *upper panel* shows the cumulative halo mass function per unit comoving volume. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of BT to PL. The triangle symbols on the solid lines show the pivot masses M_p for BT_deep (green) and BT_soft (red), respectively.

modified it according to section II to mimic the blue-tilted primordial power spectra.

For the convenience of comparison, we adopt the MUSIC configuration files of the existing simulation project FIRE [62, 63]. We choose the zoom-in initial conditions at the size of MW host halos (i.e., $M_h \sim 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ in mass), specifically, m12i [64] and m12f [65]. We obtain those configuration files from the Flatiron Institute Data Exploration and Comparison Hub³.

B. Simulation code

We perform several zoom-in simulations using the state-of-the-art cosmological simulation code SWIFT [66,

² Publicly available at https://icc.dur.ac.uk/Research/PublicDownloads/genmf_readme.html

³ Publicly available at <https://flathub.flatironinstitute.org/fire>

67]⁴. For N-body simulations, SWIFT uses the Fast Multipole Method (FMM) at small scales [68], which can reduce the complexity of gravity calculation (including both the potential and force calculation) to $O(N)$. The Particle Mesh Method is also coupled at large scales to handle periodic volumes [69].

1. Cosmological parameters

For all the cosmological simulations in this paper, we adopt the WMAP-7 result [70], which is also used in the original m12i [64] and m12f [65] simulations.

1. Universe density parameters $\Omega_m = 0.272$, $\Omega_b = 0.0455$, $\Omega_L = 0.728$.
2. Hubble constant $H_0 = 70.2 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$
3. Scalar spectral index $n_s = 0.961$
4. Root-mean-square matter fluctuation averaged over a sphere of radius $8h^{-1} \text{ Mpc}$, $\sigma_8 = 0.807$.

C. Halo finder and halo property post-processor

Current halo finders can be categorized into three types based on working mechanism: (A) the configuration space finders, (B) the phase space finders (which utilize both spatial and velocity space information), and (C) the tracking finders (which build the particle list of a certain subhalo based on its progenitors).

In the main text of the paper, we adopt HBT+HERONS [71] (Forouhar Moreno et al in preparation)⁵ as our halo finder, which is a tracking finder. We also explore the result with a phase space finder, VELOCIRaptor [72], and compare their results in section A. In this paper, we adopt 20 as the minimum number of particles to be identified as a dark matter halo for both halo finders. We choose the position of the most bound particle as the halo center.

We use SOAP (*Spherical Overdensity and Aperture Processor*)⁶ to calculate the spherical overdensity properties, based on the results from HBT+HERONS.

1. Convergence radius

The dark matter halo's radial density profile would be underestimated within a resolution limit radius in N-body simulations, due to the two-body relaxation effect

[73]. This would artificially turn a cuspy profile into a core profile. This radius is called the convergence radius and defined as the smallest r fulfilling Equation 6:

$$\frac{t_{\text{relax}}(r)}{t_0} = \frac{\sqrt{200}}{8} \frac{N(r)}{\ln N(r)} \left[\frac{\rho(r)}{\rho_{\text{crit}}} \right]^{-1/2} > 0.6, \quad (6)$$

where ρ_{crit} is the critical density of universe, $\rho(r)$ is the average density within radius r , $N(r)$ is the number of enclosed particles within radius r . t_0 is the integration time, which is close to the age of the Universe. We will indicate the regions within the convergence radius with shades in Figure 5.

IV. RESULT

We run nine simulations using the numerical pipeline mentioned in section III. Their numerical settings are listed in Table II.

The six fiducial-resolution simulations are used to compare the BT and the PL models. Two initial conditions, m12i and m12f, are used to validate the conclusions. Thus, it would give six fiducial-resolution simulations in total. Additionally, we run three high-resolution simulations with m12i for the resolution studies in section B.

A. Terminology

We give a summary of the concepts and terminologies used in our paper:

1. **Dark Matter Halo and Subhalo**: a dark matter halo is a high-density region in the universe composed of dark matter particles that are gravitationally bound to each other. Smaller overdense regions can also exist inside the halo, which are also self-bound. Those smaller halos are called the subhalos of the host halo. In zoom-in simulation, the most massive halo is called **main halo**, which hosts the largest number of subhalos in the zoom-in region.
2. M_{sub} : the total mass of all the bound particles in a subhalo (as defined by the halo finders). In this paper, we use this mass definition for the subhalo mass function.
3. **Spherical overdensity (SO) properties**: these properties are calculated based on all the enclosed particles within a sphere around the center of the selected dark matter halo. This sphere's radius is usually where the average density for the enclosed region reaches an integer (like 50, 100, 200, ...) multiple of the critical density (labeled with 50c, 100c, 200c, ...) or the background mean density (labeled with 50m, 100m, 200m, ...). The properties include the spherical overdensity radius (R_{200c} , R_{200m} , ...), the spherical overdensity mass (M_{200c} , M_{200m} , ...),

⁴ Publicly available at <https://swiftsim.com/>

⁵ This is an updated version of HBT+ that improves the tracking of subhalos. It can be found at <https://github.com/SWIFTSIM/HBT-HERONS>

⁶ <https://github.com/SWIFTSIM/SOAP>

the spherical overdensity concentration parameter of the NFW fitting (C_{200c}^{NFW} , C_{200m}^{NFW} , ...). With the SO radius and SO mass properties, we can calculate the SO circular velocity properties (V_{200c} , V_{200m} , ...) via [Equation 7](#).

4. R_{vir} & M_{vir} : Special kinds of the SO properties. R_{vir} is the virial radius of a dark matter halo. The most commonly used virial radius definition is given by Ref. [74]. M_{vir} is then the total mass within a sphere of radius R_{vir} . We use this definition for the subhalo mass in [section A 2](#).
5. V_{max} , V_{peak} & R_{max} : The circular velocity is defined as:

$$V_{\text{cir}}(R) = \sqrt{\frac{GM(< R)}{R}}, \quad (7)$$

where R is the distance to the halo center, $M(< R)$ the enclosed mass that is bound to the halo, within radius R . The R – $V_{\text{cir}}(R)$ graph is called the galaxy rotation curve, and V_{max} is simply the maximum circular velocity of the rotation curve. In the simulation, the subhalo would lose its mass due to the tidal forces from the host halo. However, V_{max} is robust and representative of a dark matter subhalo because it reflects the subhalo’s central, gravitationally bound part, which is less affected by the stripping effect and how the boundary of the subhalo is defined.

During the evolution history of a dark matter halo, its V_{max} may change, and the largest V_{max} is called the peak circular velocity, V_{peak} .

The distance R corresponding to the maximum circular velocity V_{max} is denoted as R_{max} . For a central galaxy whose rotation curve is usually flat, R_{max} is quite sensitive to the simulation details even though V_{max} changes only slightly.

B. Comparison between the PL and the BT models

[Table II](#) shows some selected properties for the main halos in all the simulations. We learn that the main halo of BT_soft is larger than that of the PL model in mass, radius, concentration, and V_{max} . However, the BT_deep model behaves similarly to the PL model, consistent with the pivot mass M_p based on [Equation 5](#).

[Figure 4](#) shows the dark matter projection maps of the PL, BT_deep and BT_soft m12i simulations. Since their sizes are similar, the main halos in the projection map look alike in these three cases. However, there are significantly more subhalos in BT than in PL, including both the small subhalos and the massive ones. For the spatial distribution, the substructures are also more centrally concentrated in BT than in PL.

In the rest of this subsection, we would quantify these differences in terms of the subhalo mass function, the

subhalo V_{max} function (velocity refers to V_{max} of the subhalos), the subhalo radial distribution (subhalo distance function), the cumulative substructure mass fraction, the subhalo $R_{\text{max}} - V_{\text{max}}$ relationship, and the main halo radial density profile.

1. Main Halo Radial Density Profile

We present the radial density profiles of the main halos in [Figure 5](#), for m12i and m12f, respectively. It is an essential property of the dark matter halo inner structure, which is well-characterized by the Navarro–Frenk–White (NFW) profile [76]. We show the NFW fitting result in dashed lines and our simulation results in solid lines.

The upper panels of [Figure 5](#) show a good match between the simulation results and the NFW fitting lines. Thus we can use the concentration parameters given by the NFW profile to describe the radial density profile. The concentration parameters of BT_deep and PL are pretty close (see [Table II](#)), consistent with their similar radial density profiles for the main halos. Meanwhile, the BT_soft model gets a larger concentration parameter than others, consistent with its higher radial density profiles. The unresolved regions are based on the criterion described by [section III C 1](#).

In the bottom panels, the BT_deep model behaves like the PL model in the resolved region, while the BT_soft model is enhanced by a factor of two in the inner part of the main halo ($r < 0.01R_{200m}$). It is also consistent with our calculation of the pivot masses for the deep and soft models. As the radius increases, BT and PL approach a similar density, indicating that the enhancement in the main halo density mainly occurs in the inner region.

2. Subhalo Mass Function

We present the subhalo mass function in [Figure 6](#). We show the subhalo count within R_{50c} from the main halo center, $N(> \mu)$, as a function of $\mu = M_{\text{sub}}/M_{200c}$, namely the ratio between the gravitationally bound subhalo masses and the M_{200c} of the main halos. We adopt this scaled mass definition because it can make the subhalo mass function insensitive to the host halo mass [77, 78]. The grey ‘‘COCO fit’’ line is the best fitting power function for the subhalo mass ($N(> \mu) \sim \mu^{-s}$ with $s = 0.95$) in Ref. [78], for all the subhalos within R_{50c} ⁷ of the main halo.

The upper panel of [Figure 6](#) shows a reasonable match between the COCO fit and our PL simulation, showing that we are consistent with COCO. The two BT models’ lines diverge clearly from the PL line, with a higher

⁷ In COCO paper, they used the empirical relation to calculate R_{50c} , $\sim 1.66 \cdot R_{200c}$.




FIG. 4. The comparison between the dark matter mass projection maps with the PL and BT (deep/soft) PPS for m12i at $z=0$. The color scales are the same across the three panels. All the images are 2D plane projections of cubic volumes with a side length of 400 kpc, centered at the main halo's most bound particle identified by HBT+HERONS.

Property	m12i-fiducial resolution			m12i-high resolution			m12f-fiducial resolution		
	PL	BT:deep	BT:soft	PL	BT:deep	BT:soft	PL	BT:deep	BT:soft
M_{200c} [$10^{12} M_{\odot}$]	0.950	0.938	1.12	0.955	0.945	1.13	1.32	1.35	1.50
M_{vir} [$10^{12} M_{\odot}$]	1.14	1.13	1.28	1.14	1.11	1.28	1.61	1.61	1.73
M_{200m} [$10^{12} M_{\odot}$]	1.26	1.26	1.41	1.26	1.25	1.42	1.82	1.81	1.87
R_{200c} [kpc]	202	202	214	203	202	214	226	228	236
R_{vir} [kpc]	273	273	284	273	271	284	307	307	314
R_{200m} [kpc]	344	343	357	344	343	357	388	387	391
V_{200c} [km/s]	142	141	150	142	142	151	159	160	165
C_{200m}^{NFW}	14.4	14.0	20.7	14.7	14.6	19.9	11.5	13.1	22.8
V_{max} [km/s]	155	154	174	166	167	188	176	171	194
m_p^{HRS} [$10^3 M_{\odot}$]	42.3	42.3	42.3	5.28	5.28	5.28	42.3	42.3	42.3
l_{soft} [kpc]	0.208	0.208	0.208	0.104	0.104	0.104	0.208	0.208	0.208

TABLE II. Some selected properties for the main halos and the basic parameters of the simulations. The first and second rows give the simulation names, encoding the main halo (m12i or m12f), the resolution levels (fiducial or high resolution), and the PPS models (PL, BT_deep or BT_soft). The rest are the properties and basic parameters in the simulations. The properties (from 3rd to 11th rows) are all explained in [section IV A](#). m_p^{HRS} is the mass of high-resolution particle in the simulation. l_{soft} is the gravitational softening length (in terms of co-moving value), which is 0.02 times the mean inter-particle distance [75].

number. The BT_deep and BT_soft subhalo mass functions almost overlap, indicating that the enhancement in subhalo mass is similar between these two models.

The flattening of the subhalo mass functions in [Figure 6](#) is due to the limited mass resolution: we cannot resolve subhalos with fewer than ~ 20 particles. The shaded area shows the mass range cannot be covered due

to the halo finder's setting for the minimum halo size, which is 20 particles. Though both m12i and m12f are using the same parameters in the halo finder and thus the same mass of the minimum size halo, m12f has a larger M_{200c} so its scaled subhalo mass limit $\mu = M_{\text{sub}}/M_{200c}$ would be smaller.

In the bottom panel, the BT models have an apparent




FIG. 5. The density profiles of the main halos for m12i (left) and m12f (right) respectively. For both figures: The *upper panel* shows the density profiles of the main halo with the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models; the NFW fitting line is also shown for each model as a dashed line. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the BT density to the PL density. The *shaded area* shows the radial range expected to be affected by the numerical two-body relaxation, given by Equation 6.

enhancement in the number of dark matter subhalos at different masses. Especially at the low mass range ($\mu < 10^{-4}$, $M_{\text{sub}} < 10^8 M_{\odot}$), the BT effect can double the subhalo number. At the high mass range ($10^{-4} < \mu < 10^{-3}$, $10^8 M_{\odot} < M_{\text{sub}} < 10^9 M_{\odot}$), the BT models still have tens of percent enhancement. At an even larger mass ($\mu > 10^{-3}$, $M_{\text{sub}} > 10^9 M_{\odot}$), the ratio curve is dominated by the noise due to a lack of statistics. We can use an inverse S shape function to fit the ratio of BT to PL, by introducing two free parameters m, μ_c :

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot (m - 1) \cdot \left(\frac{-x}{\sqrt{1 + x^2}} + 1 \right) + 1, \quad (8)$$

where

$$x = 4 \cdot \log_{10} \frac{\mu}{\mu_c}. \quad (9)$$

Here, m indicates the maximum relative ratio the BT model can touch compared to the PL model, and μ_c is the middle point between μ starting to drop and μ value finishing the dropping. According to the definition of Equation 8, μ_c is also where the inverse S shape function drops to half. Since the deep and soft models perform

pretty closely in the subhalo mass function, we can use one set of parameters to fit: $m = 2, \mu_c = 10^{-3}$. After getting this fitting function from the bottom ratio panel, we draw it on the upper panel of Figure 6, showing a good fit with the simulation results.




FIG. 6. The cumulative scaled subhalo mass functions for m12i (colored solid) and m12f (colored dashed) respectively. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo mass function for all the subhalos within R_{50c} from the main halo center in the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) simulations, with the subhalo mass M_{sub} scaled by M_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the BT to PL numbers. The *shaded areas* show the subhalo mass cutoff due to the halo finder’s setting for minimum halo size, where we set it to 20 particles. However, based on our resolution study in [section B](#), the subhalo mass function is reliable on $\mu \geq 10^{-5.5}$, i.e. for subhalos with at least 50 particles. $\mu \sim 10^{-5.5}$ is also approximately the μ point where the subhalo mass function starts to deviate from a power-law function, i.e. a straight line in the log-log graph.

3. Subhalo V_{max} Function

In [Figure 7](#), we present the subhalo V_{max} function. We show the subhalo count within R_{100c} from the main halo center, $N(> \nu)$, as a function of $\nu = V_{\text{max}}/V_{200c}$, which is the subhalo maximum circular velocity (V_{max}) in the units of its main halo circular velocity at R_{200c} (V_{200c}). We adopt this scaled V_{max} definition because it can make the function insensitive to the main halo masses [[78](#), [79](#)]. The grey “Cautun fit” line results from Ref. [[80](#)] under the PL LCDM cosmology, which includes all the subhalos within R_{100c} of the main halo. It is also adopted by Ref. [[78](#)] as a fiducial reference line.

Note that when the number of particles is too few, the V_{max} of this subhalo is not resolved. The usual choice is not to trust subhalos with fewer than 100 particles [[81](#)], which corresponds to the shaded area in the figure.

The upper panel of [Figure 7](#) shows a good match between the Cautun fit and our PL simulation, verifying the correctness of our pipeline. While the BT_soft and BT_deep lines are higher than the PL line, the soft model has an even stronger enhancement than the deep model. It is because the BT_soft subhalos are more concentrated than the BT_deep subhalos (see [section IV B 6](#)). Thus, the subhalo V_{max} function can help us to differentiate the BT_soft and BT_deep models, although the subhalo mass function cannot.

In the bottom panel, the BT models increase the number of dark matter subhalos across a wide range of V_{max} , especially between $0.03V_{200c}$ and $0.1V_{200c}$. Compared to the PL model, the BT_deep model gets more than 300% enhancement, while the BT_soft model gets more than 400%. The ratio begins to drop at a V_{max} slightly larger than $0.1V_{200c}$ and has the trend to approach the unity at the high V_{max} end. Similarly, we can use the inverse S shape function in [Equation 8](#) to mimic the ratios of BT to PL. Only that we need to use ν instead of μ to define x :

$$x = 4 \cdot \log_{10} \frac{\nu}{\nu_c}. \quad (10)$$

And we have different parameter sets for the two BT models: for BT_soft, $m = 5 \nu_c = 0.2$; for BT_deep, $m = 3.5 \nu_c = 0.15$. This indicates that the BT_soft model has a stronger enhancement for a wider range of halo sizes than the BT_deep model.

4. Subhalo Radial Distribution

In [Figure 8](#), we present the subhalo radial number density profile: the normalized radial number density, $n(r)/\langle n \rangle$, as a function of r/R_{200c} , which is the subhalo’s distance to the main halo center in the units of its main halo’s R_{200c} . Here, $n(r)$ is the subhalo number density in the specific radial bin; $\langle n \rangle$ is defined by:

$$\langle n \rangle = \frac{N_{50c}}{\frac{4}{3}\pi R_{50c}^3}, \quad (11)$$

where N_{50c} is the number of subhalos within R_{50c} in the corresponding mass bin. The grey “Aquarius A1” line is the highest resolution simulation result of the Aquarius project [[82](#)], with which the COCO project has shown its fitting. Although the original line uses kpc as a unit, we divide r over Aquarius A1’s $R_{200c} \sim 245$ kpc to get the scaled radius. Ref. [[82](#)] suggested that if splitting subhalos with different mass bins across from $10^5 M_{\odot}$ to $10^{10} M_{\odot}$, the radial distribution at every bin would all follow this line. Due to the resolution limit of our simulation, we only show the four mass bins from $10^6 M_{\odot}$ to $10^{10} M_{\odot}$.




FIG. 7. The cumulative scaled subhalo V_{\max} functions for m12i (colored solid) and m12f (colored dashed) respectively. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo V_{\max} function for all the subhalos within R_{100c} from the main halo center in the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) simulations, with V_{\max} of the subhalo scaled by V_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the BT to PL numbers. The *shaded areas* show the unresolved V_{\max} range, the limit of which is the median V_{\max} value among all the subhalos with 100 particles in the PL simulations. 100 is an empirical lower limit of particle number for dark matter halo to be resolved [81]. Our resolution limit study in [section B](#) also shows that for subhalos with at least 100 particles, the relative deviation in the subhalo V_{\max} function does not exceed 30%, which is within acceptable limits.

The upper panels of [Figure 8](#) show the PL results between $10^6 M_{\odot}$ and $10^9 M_{\odot}$ fit well with the Aquarius lines. However, for the $10^9 M_{\odot}$ to $10^{10} M_{\odot}$ mass bin, we have too few subhalos (only ~ 20 within R_{50c}), so the plotting has a substantial scatter around the Aquarius A1 line.

In the bottom panels, for the whole mass range (or at least $10^6 M_{\odot} \sim 10^9 M_{\odot}$ which noise effect is not too much), the BT models boost the normalized radial number density near the center by a factor of two.

As suggested by [82], within the range of $10^5 M_{\odot} \sim 10^{10} M_{\odot}$, massive subhalos tend to exist in the radially outer region while different mass bins follow the same line. Both our BT and PL simulation results also show this trend. Although the BT subhalo number density is

higher, the radial range where subhalos exist within that mass range does not change.

5. Cumulative Substructure Mass Fraction

In [Figure 9](#), we present the cumulative substructure mass fraction: the mass of particles belonging to subhalos over the total mass, within a certain radius to the main halo center r . This substructure fraction could be useful for future strong lensing studies [83] on the BT models. We take the cumulative substructure mass fraction function for the PL LCDM model from Ref. [84] as the Lovell CDM result. Additionally, we rescale the radius by R_{200c} of the main halo, to eliminate the influence of the different main halo sizes.

The upper panel of [Figure 9](#) shows a good match between the Lovell CDM result and our PL simulation for m12i. But, unexpectedly, the PL simulation of m12f is higher than the Lovell CDM result. This is because, in m12f, there is a subhalo with $7.7 \times 10^8 M_{\odot}$ within $0.1R_{200c}$, which can account for the unusually high substructure fraction for the m12f PL simulation.

We find that the BT_deep and BT_soft lines are higher than the Lovell CDM result and our BT simulations, implying that there are more substructures with the BT than PL PPS. The enhancement is especially strong in the inner region, where strong lensing is likely to probe.

To quantify the difference, in the bottom panel, we show the ratio of the cumulative substructure mass fraction between the BT and PL simulations. For BT_deep, the fraction is enhanced by a factor of ten at the inner region ($0.1R_{200c}$). As the radius increases, the enhancement ratio drops and finally becomes stable around a factor of two at the outer region. This is also consistent with our result in [section IV B 2](#): the BT models can double the total mass residing in resolved subhalos.




FIG. 8. The subhalo radial number density profiles at four different mass bins for m12i (colored solid) and m12f (colored dashed). In each subfigure (also in each mass bin): The *upper panel* shows the radial number density $n(r)$ normalized by $\langle n \rangle$ in Equation 11, for the PL (orange), the BT_deep (green), and the BT_soft (red) models. The grey solid line shows the equivalent substructure profile from Figure 12 of Ref. [82]. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the BT normalized number density to the PL normalized number density.




FIG. 9. The cumulative mass fraction in substructures as a function of the radius for PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red). The *upper panel* shows the cumulative substructure fraction function, with r (the subhalo distance from the main-halo center) scaled by R_{200c} of the main halo. The grey solid line shows the equivalent substructure profile from Ref. [84]. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the BT substructure fractions to the PL substructure fractions.

6. Subhalo $R_{\max} - V_{\max}$ relationship

We present the subhalo $R_{\max} - V_{\max}$ relationship in Figure 10 for all the subhalos within R_{200c} from the main halo center, with m12i and m12f, respectively. It is a measurement of the subhalo central density, thus astrophysically interesting: for a specific V_{\max} bin, a larger(smaller) R_{\max} usually means a lower(higher) central density. The black line is taken from Ref. [85] (Robert) for the PL LCDM cosmology, considering all the subhalos within R_{200c} of the main halos.

The upper panel of Figure 10 shows a good match between the Robert result and our PL simulation, for both m12i and m12f. The two BT models have much smaller R_{\max} than the PL model. The BT_soft model has a lower R_{\max} than the BT_deep model. This implies while subhalos in BT_deep are more concentrated than in PL, the BT_soft model is even more concentrated than the BT_deep model. The unresolved regions for m12i PL and m12f PL are indicated with shaded areas, following the same definition as in section IV B 3.

In the bottom panels, the BT models suppress R_{\max} at nearly the whole resolved V_{\max} range. The effects in m12i and m12f are similar: for the BT_deep model, R_{\max} decreases by $\sim 40\%$; for the BT_soft model, R_{\max} decreases nearly by half.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The standard model of cosmology – the Power Law Primordial Power Spectrum + the Lambda Cold Dark Matter – has been successful over the past several decades, especially on the large scales of the universe [9–13]. However, there are still possible tensions between the observational results and the theoretical simulations.

JWST’s high redshift observations revealed that galaxies could form earlier than those in the standard model of cosmology [26–28]. The strong lensing observations prefer more substructures [38–40]. Furthermore, the recent observations [53, 54] and theories [55] suggested there could be a “too many satellites” problem in the nearby universe. These motivate us to consider alternative cosmological models with an enhanced Primordial Power Spectrum at small scales ($> 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$), namely the blue-tilted (BT) model.

In this study, we have conducted cosmological zoom-in simulations of MW host-size halos with the blue-tilted primordial power spectrum. We have considered two blue-tilted models from Ref. [32]: BT_soft with the enhancement at $\gtrsim 1 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$ and BT_deep with the enhancement at $\gtrsim 4 \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$. They are all within the accepted parameter space according to the JWST observation [32] and the dwarf galaxy central density observation [49].

Our main results are summarized in the following:

1. We have found that BT_soft can enhance the mass, radius, V_{\max} , concentration (Table II), and the radial density profile (section IV B 1) of the main halo. However, the effects of the BT_deep model on the main halo are much smaller, since it is blue-tilted at a smaller scale in the primordial power spectrum, which corresponds to a smaller mass scale (Equation 5).
2. The BT models enhance the subhalo mass function by ~ 2 and the subhalo V_{\max} function by $\gtrsim 3$ for a wide range of halo masses ($\sim 10^6 \text{ M}_{\odot} - 10^9 \text{ M}_{\odot}$) and maximum circular velocities ($\sim 5 \text{ km/s} - 50 \text{ km/s}$) (section IV B 2 and section IV B 3). The enhancement ratios, defined as the numbers of subhalos in BT over that in PL, follow inverse S shape functions (Equation 8) in both mass and V_{\max} functions.

In both the BT_deep and BT_soft simulations, the enhancements in the subhalo mass function are similar. However, the BT_soft simulation has a stronger enhancement in the subhalo V_{\max} function than the BT_deep simulation.




FIG. 10. The subhalo V_{\max} - R_{\max} relations for m12i (left figure) and m12f (right figure) respectively. For both figures: The *upper panel* shows the subhalo $R_{\max} - V_{\max}$ relations for all the subhalos within R_{200c} from the main halo center with the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models. The colored solid lines depict the median relation found by binning the subhalos according to their V_{\max} values. The colored regions surrounding the colored lines illustrate the 16th-84th percentiles around the medians. The black solid line is the result of Ref. [85] for the PL LCDM model, taking account of all the subhalos within R_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of R_{\max} between the BT and PL models. The *shaded area* is the same as that in Figure 7.

3. The BT primordial power spectrum increases the number density of subhalos in the inner region of the main host halo by more than a factor of two, compared to PL (section IV B 4). In the BT simulations, the number densities of subhalos in the lower mass bins are more centrally concentrated.
4. We have found that the BT models can boost the mass fraction of the substructures in the inner region ($< 0.1R_{200c}$) by an order of magnitude (section IV B 5). Even around R_{200c} , the BT models could have a two-fold increase in the substructure mass fraction, compared to PL.
5. At a fixed V_{\max} , the BT models reduce the mean R_{\max} values of the subhalos by 40% – 50% (section IV B 6). This reveals that subhalos are more concentrated in BT than PL.

To constrain the primordial power spectrum with our simulations, we require comparisons with observations, including the statistics of nearby satellite galaxies and

the strong lensing observations of Milky-Way size host halos. However, at these small scales, baryonic physics cannot be ignored, e.g. the tidal stripping of subhalos with baryonic disks [56], the uncertainties in the stellar-to-halo mass relation [86], the baryonic effects on the inner density profiles [45], and the lensing effects of the stellar structures [87, 88]. Therefore, it is necessary to incorporate regulator-type models [89, 90], semi-analytic models [91, 92], or even cosmological galaxy simulations [62, 93] to disentangle the effects of the primordial power spectrum from baryons.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Matthieu Schaller, Yiming Zhong, Ariane Dekker, and Kin-Wang Ng for their thoughtful comments. The research in this paper used the SWIFT open-source simulation code (<http://www.swiftsim.com>, [66]) version 1.0.0. We also used SWIFTSIMIO [94, 95] to generate the projection maps. This work also made use of

matplotlib [96], numpy [97], scipy [98, 99] and NASA’s Astrophysics Data System. We acknowledge the support of the CUHK Central High-Performance Computing Cluster, on which the computation in this work has been performed; and we thank Edward So, Anny Cheung, and Nicky Leung for their assistance.

TKC is supported by the ‘Improvement on Competi-

tiveness in Hiring New Faculties’ Funding Scheme from the Chinese University of Hong Kong (4937210, 4937211, 4937212). TKC and JW are partially supported by the Direct Grant project (4053662) from the Chinese University of Hong Kong. VJFM acknowledges support by NWO through the Dark Universe Science Collaboration (OCENW.XL21.XL21.025).

-
- [1] A. H. Guth, “Inflationary universe: A possible solution to the horizon and flatness problems,” *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347–356 (1981).
- [2] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, “The cold dark matter density perturbation,” *Phys. Rep.* **231**, 1–105 (1993).
- [3] P. J. Steinhardt and M. S. Turner, “Prescription for successful new inflation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 2162–2171 (1984).
- [4] D. S. Salopek and J. R. Bond, “Nonlinear evolution of long-wavelength metric fluctuations in inflationary models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3936–3962 (1990).
- [5] A. R. Liddle and D. H. Lyth, “COBE, gravitational waves, inflation and extended inflation,” *Physics Letters B* **291**, 391–398 (1992).
- [6] D. H. D. H. Lyth and A. A. Riotto, “Particle physics models of inflation and the cosmological density perturbation,” *Phys. Rep.* **314**, 1–146 (1999).
- [7] P. J. E. Peebles, *Principles of Physical Cosmology* (Princeton University Press, 1993).
- [8] C. S. Frenk, S. D. M. White, G. Efstathiou, and M. Davis, “Cold dark matter, the structure of galactic haloes and the origin of the Hubble sequence,” *Nature* **317**, 595–597 (1985).
- [9] Planck Collaboration *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. X. Constraints on inflation,” *A&A* **641**, A10 (2020).
- [10] Planck Collaboration *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *A&A* **641**, A6 (2020).
- [11] M. A. Troxel *et al.* (DES), “Dark Energy Survey Year 1 results: Cosmological constraints from cosmic shear,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 043528 (2018).
- [12] M. R. Blanton *et al.* (eBOSS), “Sloan Digital Sky Survey IV: Mapping the Milky Way, Nearby Galaxies and the Distant Universe,” *Astron. J.* **154**, 28 (2017).
- [13] S. Chabanier, M. Millea, and N. Palanque-Desabrouille, “Matter power spectrum: from Ly α forest to CMB scales,” *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **489**, 2247–2253 (2019).
- [14] J. S. Bullock and M. Boylan-Kolchin, “Small-Scale Challenges to the Λ CDM Paradigm,” *ARA&A* **55**, 343–387 (2017).
- [15] A. Klypin, A. V. Kravtsov, O. Valenzuela, and F. Prada, “Where Are the Missing Galactic Satellites?” *ApJ* **522**, 82–92 (1999).
- [16] B. Moore, S. Ghigna, F. Governato, G. Lake, T. Quinn, J. Stadel, and P. Tozzi, “Dark Matter Substructure within Galactic Halos,” *ApJL* **524**, L19–L22 (1999).
- [17] P. Salucci and A. Burkert, “Dark matter scaling relations,” *The Astrophysical Journal* **537**, L9 (2000).
- [18] R. A. Flores and J. R. Primack, “Observational and Theoretical Constraints on Singular Dark Matter Halos,” *ApJL* **427**, L1 (1994).
- [19] M. Boylan-Kolchin, J. S. Bullock, and M. Kaplinghat, “Too big to fail? The puzzling darkness of massive Milky Way subhaloes,” *MNRAS* **415**, L40–L44 (2011).
- [20] L. Covi and D. H. Lyth, “Running-mass models of inflation and their observational constraints,” *Phys. Rev. D* **59**, 063515 (1999).
- [21] J. Martin and R. H. Brandenberger, “Trans-Planckian problem of inflationary cosmology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 123501 (2001).
- [22] J.-O. Gong and M. Sasaki, “Waterfall field in hybrid inflation and curvature perturbation,” *JCAP* **2011**, 028 (2011).
- [23] S. Hirano, N. Zhu, N. Yoshida, D. Spergel, and H. W. Yorke, “Early Structure Formation from Primordial Density Fluctuations with a Blue, Tilted Power Spectrum,” *ApJ* **814**, 18 (2015).
- [24] M. V. Tkachev, S. V. Pilipenko, E. V. Mikheeva, and V. N. Lukash, “Excess of high- z galaxies as a test for bumpy power spectrum of density perturbations,” *MNRAS* **527**, 1381–1388 (2024).
- [25] J. P. Gardner *et al.*, “The James Webb Space Telescope,” *Space Sci. Rev.* **123**, 485–606 (2006).
- [26] I. Labbé, P. van Dokkum, E. Nelson, R. Bezanson, K. A. Suess, J. Leja, G. Brammer, K. Whitaker, E. Mathews, M. Stefanon, and B. Wang, “A population of red candidate massive galaxies 600 Myr after the Big Bang,” *Nature* **616**, 266–269 (2023).
- [27] M. Boylan-Kolchin, “Stress testing Λ CDM with high-redshift galaxy candidates,” *Nature Astronomy* **7**, 731–735 (2023).
- [28] C. C. Lovell, I. Harrison, Y. Harikane, S. Tacchella, and S. M. Wilkins, “Extreme value statistics of the halo and stellar mass distributions at high redshift: are JWST results in tension with Λ CDM?” *MNRAS* **518**, 2511–2520 (2023).
- [29] P. Parashari and R. Laha, “Primordial power spectrum in light of JWST observations of high redshift galaxies,” *MNRAS* **526**, L63–L69 (2023).
- [30] W. H. Press and P. Schechter, “Formation of Galaxies and Clusters of Galaxies by Self-Similar Gravitational Condensation,” *ApJ* **187**, 425–438 (1974).
- [31] R. K. Sheth and G. Tormen, “Large-scale bias and the peak background split,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **308**, 119–126 (1999).
- [32] S. Hirano and N. Yoshida, “Early Structure Formation from Primordial Density Fluctuations with a Blue, Tilted Power Spectrum: High-redshift Galaxies,” *ApJ* **963**, 2 (2024).
- [33] A. Dekel, K. C. Sarkar, Y. Birnboim, N. Mandelker, and Z. Li, “Efficient formation of massive galaxies at cosmic dawn by feedback-free starbursts,” *MNRAS* **523**, 3201–3218 (2023).
- [34] M. Haslbauer, P. Kroupa, A. H. Zonoozi, and

- H. Haghi, “Has JWST Already Falsified Dark-matter-driven Galaxy Formation?” *ApJL* **939**, L31 (2022).
- [35] L. Y. A. Yung, R. S. Somerville, S. L. Finkelstein, S. M. Wilkins, and J. P. Gardner, “Are the ultra-high-redshift galaxies at $z > 10$ surprising in the context of standard galaxy formation models?” *MNRAS* **527**, 5929–5948 (2024).
- [36] S. Mao, “Gravitational Microlensing by a Single Star plus External Shear,” *ApJ* **389**, 63 (1992).
- [37] S. Mao and P. Schneider, “Evidence for substructure in lens galaxies?” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **295**, 587–594 (1998).
- [38] A. V. Macciò and M. Miranda, “The effect of low-mass substructures on the cusp lensing relation,” *MNRAS* **368**, 599–608 (2006).
- [39] D. D. Xu, S. Mao, J. Wang, V. Springel, L. Gao, S. D. M. White, C. S. Frenk, A. Jenkins, G. Li, and J. F. Navarro, “Effects of dark matter substructures on gravitational lensing: results from the aquarius simulations,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **398**, 1235–1253 (2009).
- [40] D. Xu, D. Sluse, L. Gao, J. Wang, C. Frenk, S. Mao, P. Schneider, and V. Springel, “How well can cold dark matter substructures account for the observed radio flux-ratio anomalies,” *MNRAS* **447**, 3189–3206 (2015).
- [41] D. Gilman, A. Benson, J. Bovy, S. Birrer, T. Treu, and A. Nierenberg, “The primordial matter power spectrum on sub-galactic scales,” *MNRAS* **512**, 3163–3188 (2022).
- [42] M. Rocha, A. H. G. Peter, J. S. Bullock, M. Kaplinghat, S. Garrison-Kimmel, J. Oñorbe, and L. A. Moustakas, “Cosmological simulations with self-interacting dark matter - I. Constant-density cores and substructure,” *MNRAS* **430**, 81–104 (2013).
- [43] D. Yang, E. O. Nadler, H.-B. Yu, and Y.-M. Zhong, “A parametric model for self-interacting dark matter halos,” *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2024**, 032 (2024).
- [44] A. Di Cintio, C. B. Brook, A. V. Macciò, G. S. Stinson, A. Knebe, A. A. Dutton, and J. Wadsley, “The dependence of dark matter profiles on the stellar-to-halo mass ratio: a prediction for cusps versus cores,” *MNRAS* **437**, 415–423 (2014).
- [45] T. K. Chan, D. Kereš, J. Oñorbe, P. F. Hopkins, A. L. Muratov, C.-A. Faucher-Giguère, and E. Quataert, “The impact of baryonic physics on the structure of dark matter haloes: the view from the FIRE cosmological simulations,” *MNRAS* **454**, 2981–3001 (2015).
- [46] E. Tollet, A. V. Macciò, A. A. Dutton, G. S. Stinson, L. Wang, C. Penzo, T. A. Gutcke, T. Buck, X. Kang, C. Brook, A. Di Cintio, B. W. Keller, and J. Wadsley, “NIHAO - IV: core creation and destruction in dark matter density profiles across cosmic time,” *MNRAS* **456**, 3542–3552 (2016).
- [47] A. Lazar, J. S. Bullock, M. Boylan-Kolchin, T. K. Chan, P. F. Hopkins, A. S. Graus, A. Wetzel, K. El-Badry, C. Wheeler, M. C. Straight, D. Kereš, C.-A. Faucher-Giguère, A. Fitts, and S. Garrison-Kimmel, “A dark matter profile to model diverse feedback-induced core sizes of Λ CDM haloes,” *MNRAS* **497**, 2393–2417 (2020).
- [48] I. Esteban, A. H. G. Peter, and S. Y. Kim, “Milky way satellite velocities reveal the dark matter power spectrum at small scales,” *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 123013 (2024).
- [49] A. Dekker and A. Kravtsov, “Constraints on blue and red tilted primordial power spectra using dwarf galaxy properties,” *arXiv e-prints*, arXiv:2407.04198 (2024).
- [50] A. Drlica-Wagner *et al.*, “Eight ultra-faint galaxy candidates discovered in year two of the dark energy survey,” *The Astrophysical Journal* **813**, 109 (2015).
- [51] K. Bechtol *et al.*, “Eight new milky way companions discovered in first-year dark energy survey data,” *The Astrophysical Journal* **807**, 50 (2015).
- [52] S. E. Koposov, V. Belokurov, G. Torrealba, and N. W. Evans, “Beasts of the southern wild: Discovery of nine ultra faint satellites in the vicinity of the magellanic clouds,” *The Astrophysical Journal* **805**, 130 (2015).
- [53] D. Homma, M. Chiba, Y. Komiyama, M. Tanaka, S. Okamoto, M. Tanaka, M. N. Ishigaki, K. Hayashi, N. Arimoto, R. H. Lupton, M. A. Strauss, S. Miyazaki, S.-Y. Wang, and H. Murayama, “Final results of the search for new Milky Way satellites in the Hyper Suprime-Cam Subaru Strategic Program survey: Discovery of two more candidates,” *PASJ* **76**, 733–752 (2024).
- [54] O. Müller, M. S. Pawlowski, Y. Revaz, A. Venhola, M. Rejkuba, M. Hilker, and K. Lutz, “A too-many-dwarf-galaxy-satellites problem in the M 83 group,” *A&A* **684**, L6 (2024).
- [55] S. Kim, A. Peter, and J. Hargis, “There is No Missing Satellites Problem,” in *APS April Meeting Abstracts*, APS Meeting Abstracts, Vol. 2018 (2018) p. K15.005.
- [56] S. Garrison-Kimmel, A. Wetzel, J. S. Bullock, P. F. Hopkins, M. Boylan-Kolchin, C.-A. Faucher-Giguère, D. Kereš, E. Quataert, R. E. Sanderson, A. S. Graus, and T. Kelley, “Not so lumpy after all: modelling the depletion of dark matter subhaloes by Milky Way-like galaxies,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **471**, 1709–1727 (2017).
- [57] A. S. Graus, J. S. Bullock, T. Kelley, M. Boylan-Kolchin, S. Garrison-Kimmel, and Y. Qi, “How low does it go? Too few Galactic satellites with standard reionization quenching,” *MNRAS* **488**, 4585–4595 (2019).
- [58] H. Mo, F. van den Bosch, and S. White, *Galaxy Formation and Evolution* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
- [59] D. S. Reed, R. Bower, C. S. Frenk, A. Jenkins, and T. Theuns, “The halo mass function from the dark ages through the present day,” *MNRAS* **374**, 2–15 (2007).
- [60] O. Hahn and T. Abel, “Multi-scale initial conditions for cosmological simulations,” *MNRAS* **415**, 2101–2121 (2011).
- [61] D. J. Eisenstein and W. Hu, “Baryonic Features in the Matter Transfer Function,” *ApJ* **496**, 605–614 (1998).
- [62] P. F. Hopkins *et al.*, “FIRE-2 simulations: physics versus numerics in galaxy formation,” *MNRAS* **480**, 800–863 (2018).
- [63] A. Wetzel *et al.*, “Public Data Release of the FIRE-2 Cosmological Zoom-in Simulations of Galaxy Formation,” *ApJS* **265**, 44 (2023).
- [64] A. R. Wetzel, P. F. Hopkins, J.-h. Kim, C.-A. Faucher-Giguère, D. Kereš, and E. Quataert, “Reconciling Dwarf Galaxies with Λ CDM Cosmology: Simulating a Realistic Population of Satellites around a Milky Way-mass Galaxy,” *ApJL* **827**, L23 (2016).
- [65] S. Garrison-Kimmel, A. Wetzel, J. S. Bullock, P. F. Hopkins, M. Boylan-Kolchin, C.-A. Faucher-Giguère, D. Kereš, E. Quataert, R. E. Sanderson, A. S. Graus, and T. Kelley, “Not so lumpy after all: modelling the depletion of dark matter subhaloes by Milky Way-like galaxies,” *MNRAS* **471**, 1709–1727 (2017).

- [66] M. Schaller *et al.*, “SWIFT: SPH With Inter-dependent Fine-grained Tasking,” *Astrophysics Source Code Library* (2018), [ascl:1805.020](#).
- [67] M. Schaller *et al.*, “SWIFT: A modern highly-parallel gravity and smoothed particle hydrodynamics solver for astrophysical and cosmological applications,” *MNRAS* **530**, 2378–2419 (2024).
- [68] W. Dehnen, “A very fast and momentum-conserving tree code,” *The Astrophysical Journal* **536**, L39 (2000).
- [69] R. W. Hockney and J. W. Eastwood, *Computer simulation using particles* (CRC Press, 1988).
- [70] E. Komatsu *et al.*, “Seven-year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Interpretation,” *ApJS* **192**, 18 (2011).
- [71] J. Han, S. Cole, C. S. Frenk, A. Benitez-Llambay, and J. Helly, “hbt+: an improved code for finding subhaloes and building merger trees in cosmological simulations,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **474**, 604–617 (2017).
- [72] P. J. Elahi, R. Cañas, R. J. J. Poulton, R. J. Tobar, J. S. Willis, C. d. P. Lagos, C. Power, and A. S. G. Robotham, “Hunting for galaxies and halos in simulations with VELOCItaptor,” *Publ. Astron. Soc. Austral.* **36**, e021 (2019).
- [73] C. Power, J. F. Navarro, A. Jenkins, C. S. Frenk, S. D. M. White, V. Springel, J. Stadel, and T. Quinn, “The inner structure of Λ CDM haloes - I. A numerical convergence study,” *MNRAS* **338**, 14–34 (2003).
- [74] G. L. Bryan and M. L. Norman, “Statistical Properties of X-Ray Clusters: Analytic and Numerical Comparisons,” *ApJ* **495**, 80–99 (1998).
- [75] T. Zhang, S. Liao, M. Li, and L. Gao, “The optimal gravitational softening length for cosmological N-body simulations,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **487**, 1227–1232 (2019).
- [76] J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White, “A Universal Density Profile from Hierarchical Clustering,” *ApJ* **490**, 493–508 (1997).
- [77] A. V. Kravtsov, A. A. Berlind, R. H. Wechsler, A. A. Klypin, S. Gottlöber, B. Allgood, and J. R. Primack, “The Dark Side of the Halo Occupation Distribution,” *ApJ* **609**, 35–49 (2004).
- [78] W. A. Hellwing, C. S. Frenk, M. Cautun, S. Bose, J. Helly, A. Jenkins, T. Sawala, and M. Cytowski, “The Copernicus Complexio: a high-resolution view of the small-scale Universe,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **457**, 3492–3509 (2016).
- [79] B. Moore, S. Ghigna, F. Governato, G. Lake, T. Quinn, J. Stadel, and P. Tozzi, “Dark matter substructure within galactic halos,” *The Astrophysical Journal* **524**, L19 (1999).
- [80] M. Cautun, W. A. Hellwing, R. van de Weygaert, C. S. Frenk, B. J. T. Jones, and T. Sawala, “Subhalo statistics of galactic haloes: beyond the resolution limit,” *MNRAS* **445**, 1820–1835 (2014).
- [81] A. Rodríguez-Puebla, P. Behroozi, J. Primack, A. Klypin, C. Lee, and D. Hellinger, “Halo and subhalo demographics with Planck cosmological parameters: Bolshoi-Planck and MultiDark-Planck simulations,” *MNRAS* **462**, 893–916 (2016).
- [82] V. Springel, J. Wang, M. Vogelsberger, A. Ludlow, A. Jenkins, A. Helmi, J. F. Navarro, C. S. Frenk, and S. D. M. White, “The Aquarius Project: the subhaloes of galactic haloes,” *MNRAS* **391**, 1685–1711 (2008).
- [83] S. Vegetti and L. V. E. Koopmans, “Statistics of mass substructure from strong gravitational lensing: quantifying the mass fraction and mass function,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **400**, 1583–1592 (2009).
- [84] M. R. Lovell, C. S. Frenk, V. R. Eke, A. Jenkins, L. Gao, and T. Theuns, “The properties of warm dark matter haloes,” *MNRAS* **439**, 300–317 (2014).
- [85] R. J. J. Grand and S. D. M. White, “Baryonic effects on the detectability of annihilation radiation from dark matter subhaloes around the Milky Way,” *MNRAS* **501**, 3558–3567 (2021).
- [86] L. V. Sales, A. Wetzel, and A. Fattahi, “Baryonic solutions and challenges for cosmological models of dwarf galaxies,” *Nature Astronomy* **6**, 897–910 (2022).
- [87] D. Gilman, A. Agnello, T. Treu, C. R. Keeton, and A. M. Nierenberg, “Strong lensing signatures of luminous structure and substructure in early-type galaxies,” *MNRAS* **467**, 3970–3992 (2017).
- [88] J. W. Hsueh, C. D. Fassnacht, S. Vegetti, J. P. McKean, C. Spingola, M. W. Auger, L. V. E. Koopmans, and D. J. Lagattuta, “SHARP - II. Mass structure in strong lenses is not necessarily dark matter substructure: a flux ratio anomaly from an edge-on disc in B1555+375,” *MNRAS* **463**, L51–L55 (2016).
- [89] K. Finlator and R. Davé, “The origin of the galaxy mass-metallicity relation and implications for galactic outflows,” *MNRAS* **385**, 2181–2204 (2008).
- [90] A. Kravtsov and V. Manwadkar, “GRUMPY: a simple framework for realistic forward modelling of dwarf galaxies,” *MNRAS* **514**, 2667–2691 (2022).
- [91] S. Cole, C. G. Lacey, C. M. Baugh, and C. S. Frenk, “Hierarchical galaxy formation,” *MNRAS* **319**, 168–204 (2000).
- [92] A. J. Benson, “GALACTICUS: A semi-analytic model of galaxy formation,” *New Astron* **17**, 175–197 (2012).
- [93] J. Schaye *et al.*, “The FLAMINGO project: cosmological hydrodynamical simulations for large-scale structure and galaxy cluster surveys,” *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society* **526**, 4978–5020 (2023).
- [94] J. Borrow and A. Borrisov, “swiftsimio: A python library for reading swift data,” *Journal of Open Source Software* **5**, 2430 (2020).
- [95] J. Borrow and A. J. Kelly, “Projecting sph particles in adaptive environments,” [arXiv:2106.05281 \[astro-ph.GA\]](#).
- [96] J. D. Hunter, “Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment,” *Computing in Science and Engineering* **9**, 90–95 (2007).
- [97] S. van der Walt, S. C. Colbert, and G. Varoquaux, “The numpy array: A structure for efficient numerical computation,” *Computing in Science Engineering* **13**, 22–30 (2011).
- [98] E. Jones *et al.*, “SciPy: Open source scientific tools for Python,” (2001), [Online; accessed <today>].
- [99] P. Virtanen *et al.*, “SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python,” *Nature Methods* **17**, 261–272 (2020).
- [100] V. Springel, N. Yoshida, and S. D. M. White, “GADGET: a code for collisionless and gasdynamical cosmological simulations,” *New Astron* **6**, 79–117 (2001).
- [101] P. S. Behroozi, R. H. Wechsler, and H.-Y. Wu, “The ROCKSTAR Phase-space Temporal Halo Finder and the Velocity Offsets of Cluster Cores,” *ApJ* **762**, 109

(2013).

Appendix A: Results from another halo finder: VELOCiraptor

Apart from HBT+HERONS, we also identify the halos and subhalos with VELOCiraptor (VR) [72], a code based on the friends-of-friends (FOF) algorithm that identifies peaks in 6D phase-space to find subhalos (both the configuration space and phase space). We compare the HBT+HERONS and VR results on the subhalo mass function, subhalo V_{\max} function, and subhalo radial distribution in section A 1.

Currently, SOAP (see section III C) only allows the calculation of spherical overdensity properties for field halos. Besides, HBT+HERONS (without SOAP post process) could only calculate limited kinds of SO properties. Hence, we used VR (without SOAP post process) to calculate the virial masses for all the halos (also including subhalos) and show the $M_{\text{vir}} - V_{\max}$ relationship in section A 2. Usually, the spherical overdensity properties will include all of the particles within the SO radius, regardless of whether they are bound to the main halo. However, for subhalos, VR only considers the bound particles⁸. Otherwise, the subhalos near the center of the main halo will have unphysically large masses.

Our essential parameters for VR are listed in Table III, based on the sample configuration for 6D dark matter-only simulation⁹. We set the most bound particle's position as the reference frame center to be consistent with HBT+HERONS for comparison in section A 1.

Parameters	Value
FoF_Field_search_type	3
Minimum_halo_size	20
Bound_halos	1
Kinetic_reference_frame_type	0
Reference_frame_for_properties	1

TABLE III. Selected parameter settings in the VELOCiraptor configuration file. For detailed explanations of these parameters, refer to the usage section in the documentation¹⁰.

1. Comparison between halo finders: HBT+HERONS and VELOCiraptor

Here, we choose m12i to analyze the difference between the two halo finders. VR stands for VELOCiraptor in

both the text and figures. In this subsection, we also use SOAP to process VR and HBT+HERONS catalogs in a consistent manner.

However, for the previous literatures we fit with, COCO [78] and Aquarius [82] use SUBFIND [100] as their halo finder, which is a configuration space finder; Cautun fit line ([80]) is derived via ROCKSTAR [101], a phase space finder. So there would be inherent offset simply due to the choice of halo finder, for the fitting lines. As a result, the deviation from fitting lines could not imply the capability of the halo finder. The relative ratio between the two halo finders would be more meaningful.




FIG. 11. The cumulative scaled subhalo mass functions for m12i, with two halo finders HBT+HERONS (colored solid) and VR (colored dashed), respectively. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo mass function for the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models, with the subhalo mass M_{sub} scaled by M_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the VR to HBT+HERONS number. The *shaded areas* are the same as that in Figure 6. The shaded areas overlap because we set the minimum size of the subhalo to be the same in both halo finders.

The **subhalo mass function** comparison between VR and HBT+HERONS is shown in Figure 11. These two halo finders agree with each other for $10^{-5} < \mu < 10^{-3}$, $10^7 M_{\odot} < M_{\text{sub}} < 10^9 M_{\odot}$. However, HBT+HERONS is higher and closer to the COCO fitting line than VR at the high mass end, implying that

⁸ See *Mass and radius properties* in <https://velociraptor-stf.readthedocs.io/en/latest/output.html>

⁹ https://velociraptor-stf.readthedocs.io/en/latest/_downloads/97ba16973bcff9d4afe940c2e13d12d2/sample_dmcosmological_6df_of_subhalo.cfg

HBT+HERONS is better at finding more massive subhalos. But at the low mass end, VR appears to have more subhalos than HBT+HERONS.




FIG. 12. The cumulative scaled subhalo V_{\max} functions for m12i, with two halo finders HBT+HERONS (colored solid) and VR (colored dashed), respectively. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo V_{\max} function for the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models, with the subhalo V_{\max} scaled by V_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the VR to HBT+HERONS number. The *shaded areas* are the same as those in Figure 7.

The **subhalo V_{\max} function** comparison between VR and HBT+HERONS is shown in Figure 12. These two halo finders give similar results except at the low V_{\max} end near the resolution limit. When approaching the limit V_{\max} value, VR deviates from the power-law behavior later than HBT+HERONS.

The **subhalo radial distribution** comparison between VR and HBT+HERONS is shown in Figure 13. In mass bins larger than $10^7 M_{\odot}$, VR and HBT+HERONS have nearly the same results. But, at the lower mass end, VR has much fewer subhalos in the inner region than HBT+HERONS and the Aquarius result.

To summarize, VR and HBT+HERONS behave similarly for the subhalo mass and V_{\max} functions. However, for the radial properties (the subhalo radial distribution function), VR gives a lower halo count near the host halo center for the low halo mass bin.

2. Halo $M_{\text{vir}} - V_{\text{max}}$ relationship

We present the halo $M_{\text{vir}} - V_{\text{max}}$ relationship in Figure 14 for all the field halos and subhalos. The black line is the extrapolation of Ref. [81] for the PL LCDM cosmology, including both the field halos and subhalos.

The upper panels of Figure 14 show a good match between the BolshoiP & MDPL simulation and our PL simulation, for both m12i and m12f. The BT lines are lower than the PL lines, implying the BT halos are more concentrated. We also observe the BT_soft model has a lower M_{vir} than the BT_deep model for the same V_{max} .

In the bottom panels, we show that the BT models suppress M_{vir} at the resolved V_{max} range. The suppressions in m12i and m12f are similar: for the BT_deep model, M_{vir} decreases by around 30%; for the BT_soft model, M_{vir} decreases by around 50%. At high velocities, the BT models are closer to the PL model's M_{vir} value. This implies the BT effects are stronger in the lower mass halos.

Appendix B: Resolution limit study

To investigate whether the conclusion still holds at a higher resolution, we take m12i as an example to study the consistency between different resolutions. In the high-resolution run, we reduce the particle mass to one-eighth of the original (and boost the number of particles by a factor of 8 times). The main halo properties for the high-resolution runs are also shown in Table II.




FIG. 13. The subhalo radial number density profiles at four different mass bins for m12i, using different halo finders HBT+HERONS (colored solid) and VR (colored dashed). We consider the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models in each subfigure (also in each mass bin): the *upper panel* is the same definition as that in Figure 8; the *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the VR results to the HBT+HERONS results.




FIG. 14. The subhalo $M_{\text{vir}} - V_{\text{max}}$ relations for m12i (left figure) and m12f (right figure) respectively. For both figures: The *upper panel* shows the $M_{\text{vir}} - V_{\text{max}}$ relationship for all the field halos and subhalos within the simulation domain, with the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models. The colored solid lines depict the median relation by binning the subhalos according to their V_{max} values. The colored regions surrounding the colored lines illustrate the 16th-84th percentiles around the medians. The black solid line results from Ref. [81] for the PL LCDM model, including both the field halos and subhalos. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of BT M_{vir} to PL M_{vir} . The shaded area is the same as that in Figure 7.




FIG. 15. The cumulative scaled subhalo mass functions for m12i, under fiducial resolution (colored solid) and high resolution (colored dashed), respectively. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo mass function for the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models, with the subhalo mass M_{sub} scaled by M_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of high-resolution to fiducial-resolution numbers. The *shaded areas* are the same definition as that in Figure 6. However, the high-resolution run has a smaller particle mass, so the lower bound is also lower.

The **subhalo mass function** comparison between the high and fiducial resolution is shown in Figure 15. From the upper panel, we find that the high-resolution run can extend the power-law behavior to a lower mass range, matching the COCO fitting line. We find the overlapping of the deep and soft models in Figure 6 still holds at a higher resolution. From the bottom panel, by comparing the high and fiducial runs, we find that the fiducial run deviates from the high-resolution run at around $\mu \sim 10^{-5.5}$. This implies that we can trust the results from halos with more than 50 particles. The main conclusions in Figure 6 still hold.




FIG. 16. The cumulative scaled subhalo V_{max} functions for m12i, under fiducial resolution (colored solid) and high resolution (colored dashed), respectively. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo V_{max} function for the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models, with V_{max} of subhalo scaled by V_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the high-resolution to fiducial-resolution numbers. The *shaded areas* are the same definition as that in Figure 7. Similar to Figure 15, the high-resolution run can resolve the subhalos with a lower V_{max} .

The **subhalo V_{max} function** comparison between the high and fiducial resolution is shown in Figure 16. Similar to Figure 15, we find the power-law behavior to a lower V_{max} range. The BT_deep line is higher than the BT_soft line, which is higher than the PL line. Thus, as in section IV B 3, we find that the subhalo V_{max} function is a better distinguisher for the BT models than the subhalo mass function. From the bottom panel, we find that the V_{max} of subhalo with 100 particles is reliable (with 30%).




FIG. 17. This figure is the same as the upper panel of Figure 10, but with a higher resolution. The *upper panel* shows the subhalo $R_{\max} - V_{\max}$ relationship with the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models, in the **high-resolution run of m12i**; the colored solid lines depict the median relation found by binning the subhalos according to their V_{\max} values. The colored regions surrounding the colored lines illustrate the 16th-84th percentiles around the medians. The black solid line is the result of Ref. [85] for the PL LCDM model, taking account of all the subhalos within R_{200c} of the main halo. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of R_{\max} between the BT models and the PL model. The *shaded area* is the same definition as in Figure 16.

The **subhalo $R_{\max} - V_{\max}$ relationship** at a higher resolution for m12i is shown in Figure 17. From the upper panel, we find that the PL result starts to diverge with the reference line [85] from $V_{\max} \lesssim 10$ km/s. It suggests that the R_{\max} of subhalos at the low- V_{\max} end is overestimated in the fiducial-resolution run (see the upper panels of Figure 10). However, for the subhalos whose V_{\max} is beyond 10 km/s, the results on different resolutions are consistent; besides, the relative differences among different PPS models still hold: from the bottom panel, there is a 40% (50%) decrease in BT_deep (BT_soft) in R_{\max} at the same V_{\max} bin.

The **subhalo radial distribution** comparison between high resolution and fiducial resolution is shown in Figure 18. The upper panels show that the relative differences among different PPS models still hold: at the inner region $BT_soft > BT_deep > PL$. The bottom panels show that for the mass bins larger than $10^7 M_{\odot}$, the result is quite close at these two resolutions within scatters. However, consistent with what we see in the mass function comparison, the mass bin $10^6 M_{\odot} < M_{\text{sub}} < 10^7 M_{\odot}$, part of which is close to the minimum halo size of the fiducial-resolution run, shows the largest difference at two resolutions: the fiducial case has over-predicted subhalo number by a quarter in the inner region, while underestimated that by around 30% in the outer region.

Summary: We have proven the fiducial-resolution simulation’s conclusions still hold at a higher resolution. We can trust results from halos with $\gtrsim 50$ particles for the subhalo mass function and $V_{\max} \gtrsim 10 \text{ km/s}$ for the subhalo $R_{\max} - V_{\max}$ relation and the subhalo V_{\max} function.




FIG. 18. The subhalo radial number density profiles at four different mass bins for m12i, with the fiducial (colored solid) and high resolution (colored dashed), respectively. We consider the PL (orange), BT_deep (green), and BT_soft (red) models in each subfigure (also in each mass bin): The *upper panel* is the same definition as that in Figure 8. The *bottom panel* shows the ratios of the result under the high resolution to the result with the fiducial resolution.