

STRONG LENSING PROBABILITY TO TEST TEVES

DA-MING CHEN¹ AND HONGSHENG ZHAO^{1,2,3}

¹National Astronomical Observatories, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100012, China and

²SUPA, University of St Andrews, KY16 9SS, Fife, UK

Draft version June 29, 2018

ABSTRACT

We calculate the strong lensing probability as a function of the image-separation $\Delta\theta$ in TeVeS (tensor-vector-scalar) cosmology, which is a relativistic version of MOND (MODified Newtonian Dynamics). The lens, often an elliptical galaxy, is modeled by the Hernquist profile. We assume a flat cosmology with $\Omega_b = 1 - \Omega_\Lambda = 0.04$ and the simplest interpolating function $\mu(x) = \min(1, x)$. For comparison, we recalculated the probabilities for lenses by Singular Isothermal Sphere (SIS) galaxy halos in LCDM with Schechter-fit velocity function. The amplification bias is calculated based on the magnification of the second bright image rather than the total of the two brighter images. Our calculations show that the Hernquist model predicts insufficient but acceptable probabilities in flat TeVeS cosmology compared with the results of the well defined combined sample of Cosmic Lens All-Sky Survey (CLASS) and Jodrell Bank/Very Large Array Astrometric Survey (JVAS); at the same time, it predicts higher probabilities than SIS model in LCDM at small image separations.

Subject headings: cosmology: theory—dark matter—galaxies: mass function—gravitational lensing—methods: numerical

1. INTRODUCTION

Since Bekenstein proposed the relativistic, modified Newtonian dynamics (MOND) theory, named tensor-vector-scalar (TeVeS; Bekenstein 2004), it has become possible to investigate the MOND phenomena in the cosmological sense. In particular, after determining the geometry and background evolution of the Universe, and calculating the deflection of light due to a weak gravitational field, one can test TeVeS and thus MOND with gravitational lensing (Chiu, Ko & Tian 2006; Zhao et al. 2006; Angus, Famaey & Zhao 2006). Before TeVeS, strong gravitational lensing in the MOND regime could only be manipulated by extrapolating non-relativistic dynamics (Qin, Wu, & Zou 1995; Mortlock & Turner 2001), in which the deflection angle is only half the value in TeVeS (Zhao & Qin 2006).

Needless to say, comparing the predicted results of gravitational lensing with observations is of key importance in testing TeVeS. Zhao et al. (2006) first examined the consistency of the strong lensing predictions in the TeVeS regime for galaxy lenses in the CfA-Arizona Space Telescope Lens Survey (CASTLES). In this *Letter*, we investigate the statistics of strong lensing in the TeVeS regime, and compare the predicted lensing probabilities to the well defined sample of CLASS/JVAS survey. We adopt the mass function of the stellar component of galaxies (Panter, Heavens, & Jimenez 2004). As a first approximation, we do not consider galaxy cluster lenses; the lenses in the well defined sample in CLASS/JVAS are believed to be produced by galaxies rather than galaxy clusters, although a cluster lens, SDSSJ1004, was discovered in Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) (Inada et al. 2003; Oguri et al. 2004). We consider the simplest MOND interpolating function $\mu(x)$ and use the Hernquist profile (Hernquist 1991) to model the galaxy lenses. It is now established that, in standard cosmology (LCDM), when galaxies are modeled by a Singular Isothermal Sphere (SIS) and galaxy clusters are modeled by a Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW) profile, the pre-

dicted strong lensing probabilities can match the results of CLASS/JVAS quite well (e.g., Chae 2003; Chen 2003a,b, 2004a,b; Li & Ostriker 2002; Mitchell et al. 2005; Oguri et al. 2002; Oguri, Suto & Turner 2003; Oguri & Keeton 2004; Peng et al. 2006; Sarbu, Rusin, & Ma 2001; Wang 2004; Zhang 2004; Zhang et al. 2005). For comparison, we recalculate the lensing probabilities predicted by the SIS modeled galaxy lenses in LCDM cosmology with the velocity function. Note that, in LCDM, baryon infall effect (e.g., Kochanek & Whilte 2001; Keeton 2001) has been well described by SIS model for galaxies (Rusin & Kochanek 2005; Koopmans et al. 2006), at least statistically; furthermore, the effects of substructures (Oguri 2006) are also considered since we use the velocity function to account for the number density of lensing galaxies. Throughout this *Letter*, we assume the source QSOs have a redshift of $z_s = 1.27$.

2. TEVES COSMOLOGY AND DEFLECTION ANGLE

As in Bekenstein (2004) and Zhao et al. (2006) we adopt the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker (FRW) metric in TeVeS, i.e., $d\tau^2 = -c^2 dt^2 + a(t)^2 [d\chi^2 + f^2(\chi)(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\psi^2)]$ all in physical coordinates, where c is the speed of light and $f(\chi) = \chi$ for a flat universe. The proper distance from the observer to an object at redshift z is $D^p(z) = c \int_0^z [(1+z)H(z)]^{-1} dz$, where the Hubble parameter at redshift z is $H(z) \equiv \dot{a}/a \approx H_0 \sqrt{\Omega_b(1+z)^3 + \Omega_\Lambda}$, where Ω_b and Ω_Λ are the constant density parameter for baryon and dark energy, respectively, and we set the contribution from the scalar field to be zero by approximation (Bekenstein 2004). The angular diameter distance from an object at redshift z_1 to an object at redshift z_2 , is $D(z_1, z_2) = [c/(1+z_2)] \int_{z_1}^{z_2} H_0 dz/H(z)$ for flat universe. We assume cosmologies with the baryon density $\Omega_b = 0.04$ and a Hubble parameter $h = 0.73$.

In TeVeS, the lensing equation has the same form as in general relativity (GR), and for a spherically symmetric density profile (Zhao et al. 2006)

$$\beta = \theta - \frac{D_{LS}}{D_S} \alpha, \quad \alpha(b) = \int_0^\infty \frac{4b}{c^2 r} \frac{d\Phi(r)}{dr} dl, \quad (1)$$

³ UK PPARC Advanced Fellow and Overseas Outstanding Youth Fellow




FIG. 1.— Source-image relation in a flat TeVeS cosmology with $z_l = 0.05$ and $z_s = 1.27$ for a Hernquist lens galaxy with a mass $M = 1.2M_\star$ (panel a) and $M = 0.1M_\star$ (panel b). Note that eq. (3) predicts a smaller r_h/r_0 hence a more effective lens for the $p = 0.35$ model (solid line) than the $p = 0$ model (dashed line) when $M > 0.287M_\star$ (as in panel a) and vice versa when $M < 0.287M_\star$ (as in panel b).

where β , $\theta = b/D_L$ and $\alpha(\theta)$ are the source position angle, image position angle and deflection angle, respectively; b is the impact parameter; D_L , D_S and D_{LS} are the angular diameter distances from the observer to the lens, to the source and from the lens to the source, respectively; $g(r) = d\Phi(r)/dr$ is the actual gravitational acceleration, $\Phi(r)$ is the spherical gravitational potential of the lensing galaxy and l is the light path. It is well known that the stellar component of an elliptical galaxy can be well modeled by a Hernquist profile $\rho(r) = \frac{Mr_h}{2\pi r(r+r_h)^3}$, with the mass interior to r as $M(r) = \frac{r^2 M}{(r+r_h)^2}$, where $M = \int_0^\infty 4\pi r^2 \rho(r) dr$ is the total mass and r_h is the scale length. The corresponding Newtonian acceleration is $g_N(r) = GM(r)/r^2 = GM/(r+r_h)^2$. According to MOND (Milgrom 1983; Sanders & McGaugh 2002; Sanders 2006), $g(r)\mu(g(r)/a_0) = g_N(r)$. We choose the simplest interpolating function $\mu(x)$ with $\mu(x) = x$ for $x < 1$ and $\mu(x) = 1$ for $x > 1$. Thus, the deflection angle is

$$\alpha(b) = \begin{cases} \int_0^{\sqrt{r_0^2 - b^2}} \frac{4GM}{c^2} \frac{bdl}{r(r+r_h)^2} + \int_{\sqrt{r_0^2 - b^2}}^\infty \frac{4v_0^2}{c^2} \frac{bdl}{r(r+r_h)}, & \text{for } b < r_0, \\ \int_0^\infty \frac{4v_0^2}{c^2} \frac{bdl}{r(r+r_h)}, & \text{for } b > r_0, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where r_0 and v_0 are defined by $GM/(r_0 + r_h)^2 = v_0^2/(r_0 + r_h) = a_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm s}^{-2}$, so that r_0 is a transition radius from the Newtonian to the Mondian regime, v_0 is the flat part of the circular velocity (i.e., the circular velocity in the Mondian regime). The above deflection angle has an analytical but cumbersome expression (Zhao et al. 2006), so we calculate it numerically.

We also need a relationship between the scale length r_h and the mass M , which could be determined by observational data. Firstly, the scale length is related to the effective (or half-light) radius R_e of a luminous galaxy by $r_h = R_e/1.8$ (Hernquist 1991). It has long been recognized that there exists a cor-

relation between R_e and the mean surface brightness $\langle I_e \rangle$ interior to R_e (Djorgovski & Davis 1987): $R_e \propto \langle I_e \rangle^{-0.83 \pm 0.08}$. Since the luminosity interior to R_e (half-light) is $L_e = L/2 = \pi \langle I_e \rangle R_e^2$, one immediately finds $R_e \propto L^{1.26}$. Secondly, we need to know the mass-to-light ratio $\Upsilon = M/L \propto L^p$ for elliptical galaxies. The observed data gives $p = 0.35$ (van der Marel 1991); according to MOND, however, we should find $p \approx 0$ (Sanders 2006). In any case we have $L \propto M^{1/(1+p)}$. Therefore, the scale length should be related to the stellar mass of a galaxy by $r_h \propto M^{1.26/(1+p)}$. In our actual calculations, we need to know r_0/r_h . Since $(r_0 + r_h) \propto M^{1/2}$, we have $\frac{r_0+r_h}{r_h} = AM^{-p'}$, where $p' = -0.5 + 1.26/(1+p)$, and the coefficient A should be further determined by observational data. Without a well defined sample at our disposal, we use the galaxy lenses which have an observed effective radius R_e (and thus r_h) in the CASTLES survey (Munoz, Kochanek, & Falco 1999), which are listed in table 2 of Zhao et al. (2006). The fitted formulae are

$$\frac{r_0}{r_h} + 1 = \begin{cases} f_1(M) = 16.24 \times \left(\frac{M}{0.287M_\star}\right)^{-0.43}, & \text{for } p = 0.35, \\ f_2(M) = 16.24 \times \left(\frac{M}{0.287M_\star}\right)^{-0.76}, & \text{for } p = 0 \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where $M_\star = 7.64 \times 10^{10} h^{-2} M_\odot$ is the characteristic mass of galaxies (Panter, Heavens, & Jimenez 2004).

Figure 1 shows us the cases when a lens is located at redshift $z = 0.05$ but with different values of r_0/r_h and mass M . Here we allow β and θ to take negative values due to symmetry. Generally, three images are produced when $\beta < \beta_{cr}$, where β_{cr} is the critical source position determined by $d\beta/d\theta = 0$ and $\theta < 0$. For all plausible range of $p = 0 - 0.35$, Figure 1 shows us that a smaller scale length results in a larger value of β_{cr} , as expected.

3. LENSING PROBABILITY

Usually, lensing cross section defined in the lens plane with image separations larger than $\Delta\theta$ is $\sigma(> \Delta\theta) = \pi D_L^2 \beta_{cr}^2 \Theta[\Delta\theta(M) - \Delta\theta]$, where $\Theta(x)$ is the Heaviside step function. This is true only when $\Delta\theta(M)$ is approximately constant within β_{cr} , and the effect of the flux density ratio q_r between the outer two brighter and fainter images can be ignored. From Figure 1 we see that this is not true, in particular for low mass galaxies. As usual, we consider the outer two images (the central image is very faint). For a given β , the left one (with $\theta < 0$) is closer to the center and is fainter, the right one (with $\theta > 0$) is further away from center and is brighter. On the other hand, when β increases, the fainter image approaches to the center and becomes fainter, and opposite for the brighter image. so larger β corresponds to larger flux density ratio, as is well known. We thus introduce a source position quantity β_{q_r} determined by

$$\left(\frac{\theta(\beta)}{\beta} \frac{d\theta(\beta)}{d\beta}\right)_{\theta=0} = q_r \left|\frac{\theta(\beta)}{\beta} \frac{d\theta(\beta)}{d\beta}\right|_{\theta_0 < \theta < \theta_{cr}}, \quad (4)$$

where $\theta_0 = \theta(0) < 0$, the absolute value of which is the Einstein radius, and θ_{cr} is determined by $d\beta/d\theta = 0$ for $\theta < 0$. Equation (4) means that when $\beta_{q_r} < \beta < \beta_{cr}$, the flux density ratio would be larger than q_r , which is the upper limit of a well defined sample. For example, in the CLASS/JVAS sample, $q_r \leq 10$. The flux density ratio effect is strongest for intermediate redshift and low mass lensing galaxies, e.g., for $z \sim 0.5$ and $f_1(M)$, $\beta_{q_r}/\beta_{cr} \sim 0.35$ at $M = 0.1M_\star$ and $\beta_{q_r}/\beta_{cr} \sim 0.15$ at $M = 0.01M_\star$. This effect can be ignored when the redshift of lensing galaxies $z \sim 0$ or $z \sim z_s$. On the other hand, we adopt the suggestion that the amplification

bias should be calculated based on the magnification of the second bright image of the three images rather than the total of the two brighter images (Lopes & Miller 2004). For the source QSOs having a power-law flux distribution with slope $\tilde{\gamma}$ ($= 2.1$ in the CLASS/JVAS survey), the amplification bias is $B(\beta) = \tilde{\mu}^{\tilde{\gamma}-1}$ (Oguri, 2002), where $\tilde{\mu}(\beta) = \left| \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \beta} \right|_{\theta_0 < \theta_{cr}}$.

We thus write the lensing cross section with image-separation larger than $\Delta\theta$ and flux density ratio less than q_r and combined with the amplification bias $B(\beta)$ as (Schneider, Ehlers & Falco 1992; Chen 2004a)

$$\sigma(> \Delta\theta, < q_r) = \begin{cases} \int_0^{\beta_{q_r}} \beta \tilde{\mu}^{\tilde{\gamma}-1}(\beta) d\beta, & \text{for } \Delta\theta \leq \Delta\theta_0, \\ 2\pi D_L^2 \left(\int_0^{\beta_{q_r}} - \int_0^{\beta_{\Delta\theta}} \right) \beta \tilde{\mu}^{\tilde{\gamma}-1}(\beta) d\beta, & \text{for } \Delta\theta_0 < \Delta\theta \leq \Delta\theta_{q_r}, \\ 0, & \text{for } \Delta\theta > \Delta\theta_{q_r}. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\beta_{\Delta\theta}$ is the source position at which a lens produces the image separation $\Delta\theta$, $\Delta\theta_0 = \Delta\theta(0)$ is the separation of the two images which are just on the Einstein ring, and $\Delta\theta_{q_r} = \Delta\theta(\beta_{q_r})$ is the upper-limit of the separation above which the flux ratio of the two images will be greater than q_r .

Now we can calculate the lensing probability with image separation larger than $\Delta\theta$ and flux density ratio less than q_r , in TeVeS cosmology, for the source QSOs at mean redshift $z_s = 1.27$ lensed by foreground elliptical stellar galaxies by (e.g., Wu 1996)

$$P(> \Delta\theta, < q_r) = \int_0^{z_s} \frac{dD^p(z)}{dz} dz \int_0^{M_{max}} n(M, z) (1+z)^3 \sigma(> \Delta\theta, < q_r) dM, \quad (6)$$

where M_{max} is the upper limit of the mass for the lensing galaxies, and $n(M, z)$ is the comoving number density of galaxies for which we use the well fitted mass function of the stellar component of galaxies in SDSS given by Panter, Heavens, & Jimenez (2004): $n(M)dM = n_\star \left(\frac{M}{M_\star}\right)^{\tilde{\alpha}} \exp\left(-\frac{M}{M_\star}\right) \frac{dM}{M_\star}$, where $n_\star = (7.8 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-3} h^3 \text{Mpc}^{-3}$, $\tilde{\alpha} = -1.159 \pm 0.008$ and $M_\star = (7.64 \pm 0.09) \times 10^{10} h^{-2} M_\odot$. The exact value of M_{max} is unimportant but we adopt $M_{max} = 10M_\star$ so that we do not consider the contribution from galaxy clusters; unlike the galaxies these are dominated by gas of mass $> 10^{12} M_\odot$ with a β -profile.

The numerical results of equation (6) are shown in Figure 2. The solid line represents the probabilities when $r_0/r_h = 6.3 \times (M/M_\star)^{-0.76} - 1$ for $M/L = \text{constant}$ supported by MOND, and the dotted line represents $r_0/r_h = 9.5 \times (M/M_\star)^{-0.43} - 1$ for $M/L \propto L^{0.35}$ from observations. For comparison, the survey results of CLASS/JVAS (Myers et al. 2003; Browne et al. 2003; Patnaik et al. 1992; King et al. 1999) and the predicted probability for galaxy lensing by SIS profiles in LCDM are also shown. The observational probability $P_{\text{obs}}(> \Delta\theta)$ (Chen 2003b, 2004a, 2005) is plotted as a thick histogram in Figure 2. We recalculate the lensing probability with image separation larger than $\Delta\theta$ and flux density ratio less than q_r , in flat LCDM cosmology ($\Omega_m = 0.3$ and $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.7$), for the source QSOs at mean redshift $z_s = 1.27$ lensed by foreground SIS modeled galaxy halos (Chae et al. 2002; Ma 2003; Mitchell et al. 2005): $P_{SIS}(> \Delta\theta, < q_r) = \int_0^{z_s} dz \frac{dD^p(z)}{dz} \int_{v_{\Delta\theta}}^\infty dv \tilde{n}(v, z) \sigma_{SIS}(v, z) B$, where $\tilde{n}(v, z) dv = n_\star (1+z)^3 \left(\frac{v}{v_\star}\right)^{\tilde{\alpha}} \exp\left[-\left(\frac{v}{v_\star}\right)^{\tilde{\beta}}\right] \tilde{\beta} \frac{dv}{v_\star}$ is the number density of galaxy halos at redshift z with velocity dispersion between v and $v + dv$




FIG. 2.— Predicted lens probability in TeVeS with an image separation angle $> \Delta\theta$ and the flux ratio $\leq q_r = 10$ by Hernquist galaxies. For comparison, the survey results of CLASS/JVAS (thick histogram) and the predicted probability for lensing by SIS halos in LCDM with different amplification bias ($B = 3.976$ for dashed line and 1.09 for dash-dotted line) are also shown.

(Mitchell et al. 2005), $\sigma_{SIS}(v, z) = 16\pi^3 \left(\frac{v}{c}\right)^4 \left(\frac{D_{LS} D_L}{D_S}\right)^2$ is the lensing cross section, $v_{\Delta\theta} = 4.4 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{c}{v_\star}\right) \sqrt{\frac{D_S \Delta\theta''}{D_{LS}}}$ is the minimum velocity for lenses to produce image separation $\geq \Delta\theta''$ and B is the amplification bias. We adopt $(n_\star, v_\star, \tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}) = (0.0064 h^3 \text{Mpc}^{-3}, 198 \text{kms}^{-1}, -1.0, 4.0)$ for early-type galaxies from Chae et al. (2002). According to equation (4) and equation (5), for SIS model and CLASS sample, $B = 2 \int_0^{\beta_{q_r}} \beta \tilde{\mu}(\beta)^{\tilde{\gamma}-1} d\beta$, with $\beta_{q_r} = 9/11$ and $\tilde{\gamma} = 2.1$ (see also Mitchell et al. 2005). Therefore, $B = 1.091$ based on the magnification of the fainter image (dash-dotted line in Figure 2) and $B = 3.976$ based on the total magnification of two images (dashed line).

4. DISCUSSION

It has been held that, in the MOND regime, the effect of lensing is inefficient, in particular, that strong lensing never occurs (e.g., Scarpa 2006). Our calculations shown in Figure 2 indicate, however, that this is not true. Although the Hernquist model predicts insufficient lensing probabilities in a flat TeVeS cosmology compared with the result of CLASS/JVAS, the result is acceptable considering, at least, that the lensing galaxy can be modeled by steeper slopes and more efficient MOND μ -functions.

Our results argue that TeVeS (and thus MOND) generates lenses with higher efficiency than CDM if the latter is modeled by SIS profile and in both cases the amplification bias is calculated based on the magnification of the second bright image (for SIS, the fainter image). Usually, B is calculated based on the total magnification of the two images considered. Because we introduced a cutoff β_{q_r} due to the flux ratio q_r , the total magnification is $2 \sim q_r + 1$ times larger than that of the second bright image (depending on β when $\beta \leq \beta_{q_r}$), which results in the corresponding value of B about 4 times larger (both for SIS in LCDM and Hernquist in TeVeS). As shown

in Figure 2, the lensing probabilities for SIS halos in LCDM with $B = 3.976$ (total) matches the results of CLASS/JVAS quite well (dashed line). Similarly, if we apply the total magnification to B for Mondian Hernquist model, the final lensing probabilities would be overpredicted compared with the results of CLASS/JVAS. Note that an SIS profile is more concentrated in mass than a Hernquist profile, so if both profiles are applied in the same regime (LCDM or TeVeS), the SIS profile would be more effective at lensing than Hernquist. Therefore, the fact that the probabilities for SIS model in LCDM ($B = 1.09$, dash-dotted line) are lower than the Hernquist model in TeVeS shown in Figure 2 implies that MOND demonstrates a higher lensing efficiency than CDM. This phenomena is, in fact, not difficult to understand. It is well known that MOND, as an alternative to dark matter for solving the “missing mass” problem, takes effect in the region surrounding the luminous matter with $r > r_0$, where a CDM halo is assumed to have non-zero density and its acceleration dominates over luminous matter in LCDM cosmology (Kaplinghat & Turner 2002). The deflection angle $\alpha(b)$ with impact parameter $b > r_0$ can be calculated using Newtonian CDM gravitation or Mondian luminous matter gravitation. We know that the acceleration $g(r)$ in the equation for deflection angle for an SIS modeled CDM halo is $g(r) \propto r^{-1}$, independent of b . So, the image separation is independent of the source position angle β (when $\beta < \beta_{cr}$), as is well known in the SIS model. However, for a lensing galaxy (with no dark matter) modeled by a Hernquist profile, we have $g(r) \propto r^{-1}$ only when $r > r_0$ (Mondian regime). So the higher probab-

ilities indicate a higher lensing efficiency between MOND and CDM.

As a first attempt at investigating strong lensing statistics in the TeVeS scenario, we have used the simplest interpolating function $\mu(x)$. The deflection angle is, of course, sensitive to $\mu(x)$ (Zhao & Famaey 2006). The simplest $\mu(x)$ adopted in this *Letter* corresponds to the lowest physical (or “true”) acceleration $g(r)$. Any other forms of $\mu(x)$ all give stronger physical accelerations than the simplest one (Zhao & Tian 2006). Furthermore, strong lensing is very sensitive to the concentration and the slope near the center of the density profile of lensing galaxies. The Hernquist model and an NFW model has $\rho(r) \sim r^{-1}$ near the center, both are inefficient in lensing. If elliptical galaxies were modeled as pressure-supported Jaffe model, e.g., with $\rho(r) \sim \frac{1}{r^2(r+a)^2}$ where a is a core scale length, then the lensing probability would be increased. Another important point is that we have assumed a flat universe with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.96$. However, by fitting to high- z SN Ia luminosity modulus, Zhao et al. (2006) showed that an open universe is more likely in TeVeS (with $\Omega_\Lambda = 0.5$). In summary, it is promising to constrain TeVeS vs CDM through lensing statistics.

We are grateful to the anonymous referee for his insightful comments and helpful suggestions. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant 10233040 and 10673012 to D.-M. C and 10428308 to H. Z.

REFERENCES

- Angus, G. W., Famaey, B., & Zhao, H. S. 2006, MNRAS, 371, 138
 Bekenstein, J. D. 2004, Phys. Rev. D, 70, 083509
 Browne, I. W. A., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 341, 13
 Chae, K. -H., et al. 2002, Phys. Rev. Lett., 89, 151301
 Chae, K. -H. 2003, MNRAS, 346, 746
 Chen, D. -M. 2003a, A&A, 397, 415
 Chen, D. -M. 2003b, ApJ, 587, L55
 Chen, D. -M. 2004a, A&A, 418, 387
 Chen, D. -M. 2004b, Chinese J. Astron. Astrophys., 4, 118
 Chen, D. -M. 2005, ApJ, 629, 23
 Chiu, M. -C., Ko, C. -M., & Tian, Y. 2006, ApJ, 636, 565
 Djorgovski, S., & Davis, M. 1987, ApJ, 313, 59
 Hernquist, L. 1991, ApJ, 356, 359
 Inada, N., Oguri, M., Pindor, B., et al. 2003, Nature, 426, 810
 Kaplinghat, M., & Turner, M. 2002, ApJ, 569, L19
 Keeton, C. R. 2001, ApJ, 561, 46
 King, L. J., Browne, I. W. A., Marlow, D. R., Patnaik, A. R., & Wilkinson, P. N. 1999, MNRAS, 307, 255
 Kochanek, C. S., & White, M. 2001, ApJ, 559, 531
 Koopmans, L. V. E., Treu, T., Bolton, A. S., Burles, S., & Moustakas, L. A. 2006, ApJ, accepted (astro-ph/0601628)
 Li, L. -X., & Ostriker, J. P. 2002, ApJ, 566, 652
 Lopes, A. M., & Miller, L. 2004, MNRAS, 348, 519
 Ma, C. -P. 2003, ApJ, 584, L1
 Milgrom, M. 1983, ApJ, 270, 365
 Mitchell, J. L., Keeton, C. R., Frieman, J. A., & Sheth, R. K. 2005, ApJ, 622, 81
 Mortlock, D., & Turner, E. L. 2001, MNRAS, 327, 557
 Munoz, J. A., Kochanek, C., & Falco, E. E. 1999, Ap&SS, 263, 51
 Myers, S. T., et al. 2003, MNRAS, 341, 1
 Oguri, M. 2006, MNRAS, 367, 1241
 Oguri, M., Inada, N., Keeton, C. R., et al. 2004, ApJ, 605, 78
 Oguri, M., & Keeton, C. R. 2004, ApJ, 610, 663
 Oguri, M., Suto, Y., Turner, E. L. 2003, ApJ, 583, 584
 Oguri, M., Taruya, A., Suto, Y., & Turner, E. L. 2002, ApJ, 568, 488
 Panter, B., Heavens, A. F., & Jimenez, R. 2004, MNRAS, 355, 764
 Patnaik, A. R., Browne, I. W. A., Wilkinson, P. N., & Wrobel, J. M. 1992, MNRAS, 254, 655
 Peng, C. Y., Impey, C. D., Rix, H. -W., et al. 2006, ApJ, accepted (astro-ph/0603248)
 Qin, B., Wu, X. -P., & Zou, Z. -L. 1995, A&A, 296, 264
 Rusin, D., & Kochanek, C. S. 2005, ApJ, 623, 666
 Sanders, R. H., & McGaugh, S. S. 2002, ARA&A, 40, 263
 Sanders, R. H. 2006, preprint(astro-ph/0601431)
 Sarbu, N., Rusin, D., & Ma, C., -P. 2001, ApJ, 561, L147
 Scarpa, R. 2006, preprint(astro-ph/0601478)
 Schneider, P., Ehlers, J., & Falco, E. E. 1992, Gravitational lenses (Berlin: Springer)
 van der Marel, R. P. 1991, MNRAS, 253, 710
 Wang, J. 2004, Chinese J. Astron. Astrophys., 4, 10
 Wu, X. -P., 1996, Fundam. Cosmic Phys., 17, 1
 Zhang, T. -J. 2004, ApJ, 602, L5
 Zhang, T. -J., Yang, Z. -L., & He, X. -T. 2005, Modern Physics Letters A, 20, 851
 Zhao, H., Bacon, D. J., Taylor, A. N., & Horne, K. 2006, MNRAS, 368, 171
 Zhao, H., & Famaey, B. 2006, ApJ, 638, L9
 Zhao, H. & Qin, B. 2006, Chinese J. Astron. Astrophys., 6, 141
 Zhao, H., & Tian, L. 2006, A&A, 450, 1005