# Do assumptions about the central density of subhaloes affect dark matter annihilation and lensing calculations?

Nicole E. Drakos<sup>1\*</sup>, James E. Taylor<sup>2,3</sup>, and Andrew J. Benson<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064 USA <sup>2</sup>Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada <sup>3</sup>Waterloo Centre for Astrophysics, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada <sup>4</sup>Carnegie Observatories, 813 Santa Barbara Street, Pasadena, CA 91101, USA

Accepted XXX. Received YYY; in original form ZZZ

## ABSTRACT

A growing body of evidence suggests that the central density of cuspy dark matter subhaloes is conserved in minor mergers. However, empirical models of subhalo evolution, calibrated from simulations, often assume a drop in the central density. Since empirical models of subhaloes are used in galaxy-galaxy lensing studies and dark matter annihilation calculations, we explore the consequences of assuming different subhalo models. We find that dark matter annihilation calculations are very sensitive to the assumed subhalo mass profile, and different models can give more than a magnitude difference in the *J*-factor and boost factor in individual haloes. On the other hand, the shear and convergence profiles used in galaxy-galaxy lensing are sensitive to the initial profile assumed (e.g., NFW versus Einato) but are otherwise well-approximated by a simple model in which the original profile is sharply truncated. We conclude that since the innermost parts of haloes are difficult to resolve in simulations, it is important to have a theoretical understanding of how suhaloes evolve to make accurate predictions of the dark matter annihilation signal.

Key words: dark matter - galaxies: haloes - methods: numerical

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

Dark matter haloes grow through repeated, hierarchical mergers, and simulations of this process predict that the central regions of merging haloes can survive as self-bound substructures within the final system. These 'subhaloes' should host most of the visible galaxies in the low-redshift Universe, and may be one of the best environments in which to explore and constrain the particle nature and non-gravitational properties of dark matter (see e.g. Bullock & Boylan-Kolchin 2017, for a review).

In general, observational tests of this predicted dark matter distribution include galaxy dynamics, gravitational lensing, and 'indirect detection' (i.e., searches for radiation or products from dark matter annihilation). All of these tests are most sensitive where dark matter densities are highest, at small radii within haloes and subhaloes. The annihilation signal in particular will depend sensitively on subhalo density profiles, concentration, mass loss, and disruption (as summarized in, e.g. Okoli et al. 2018; Ando et al. 2019). Since this signal is proportional to the local density squared, one must understand the details of the density distribution within haloes and subhaloes, down to the smallest scales on which CDM can cluster, in order to place reliable constraints on dark matter particle properties.

The visible structure of galaxies can be used to trace the central density distribution in haloes (e.g. Taylor et al. 2019, and references therein), but only out to a few percent of the virial radius (Kravtsov 2013; Somerville et al. 2018). Typically, measurements of the inner core or cusp of dwarf-galaxy haloes require tens of thousands of stars, and are sensitive to dynamical assumptions (Chang & Necib 2021). Gravitational lensing studies can probe the total mass distributions around galaxies, groups, and clusters more directly. However, while gravitational lensing has the advantage of being insensitive to the dynamical state of the system, the effect is normally weak enough that good models of the lens potential are required. As first shown by Natarajan et al. (2002), the tidal truncation of galaxy haloes within clusters relative to those of field galaxies is detectable in lensing and needs to be included in models of the total mass distribution in order to obtain accurate halo mass estimates (Baltz et al. 2009).

As subhaloes orbit within a larger system post-merger, they will lose mass through tidal stripping. This process generally works from the outside in (e.g. Hayashi et al. 2003; Diemand et al. 2007). However, the exact effect of tidal stripping in the innermost part of the subhalo remained unclear from previous work, given the resolution limits of simulations. In principle, repeated mass loss can also disrupt substructure completely, as is often seen in cosmological simulations of halo formation. Recent work suggests that much of this disruption is artificial, and due to insufficient resolution (van den Bosch et al. 2018;

<sup>\*</sup> E-mail: ndrakos@ucsc.edu, nicoledrakos@gmail.com

van den Bosch & Ogiya 2018; Benson & Du 2022), and that the central density of cuspy subhaloes should be preserved to arbitrarily small masses (Kazantzidis et al. 2006; Errani & Peñarrubia 2020; Drakos et al. 2022).

Fundamentally, subhalo structure depends on the initial properties of the halo at infall, and the subsequent effect of tidal evolution. Studies of the earliest forming haloes— which are expected to exist as subhaloes at low-redshifts— suggest that these objects are cuspier than systems that form later and have an inner density profile of the form  $r^{-1.5}$  (e.g. Ishiyama 2014; Angulo et al. 2017; Ogiya & Hahn 2018; Delos et al. 2019a; Delos & White 2023)<sup>1</sup> Given the strong dependence of the annihilation signal on the dark matter density on the smallest scales and in the densest systems, this has enormous implications for current annihilation constraints (Delos et al. 2023). For instance, it has been suggested that there should be ~  $10^{16}$  "prompt cusps" in the Milky Way (Delos & White 2022), which would contribute 20-80 per cent of a putative annihilation  $\gamma$ -ray background (Stücker et al. 2023).

The aim of the current study is to consider how modelling assumptions for subhalo density profiles affect the dark matter annihilation and lensing signals in individual subhaloes. The structure of this paper is as follows: first, in Section 2, we summarize the subhalo models considered in this work. In Section 3, we show how the concentration evolves in these different models. In Sections 4 and 5, we explore the implications of a conserved central density to the dark matter annihilation rate and lensing signal, respectively. Finally, we discuss our results in Section 6 and conclude in Section 7.

## 2 HALO MODELS

## 2.1 Isolated dark matter haloes

Most of our understanding of halo structure comes from cosmological simulations. One of the most important results from these studies is that isolated haloes have a universal density profile (UDP) when averaged spherically. The UDP was originally approximated in Navarro et al. (1996, 1997) hereafter NFW—as:

$$\rho_{NFW}(r) = \frac{\rho_0 r_{\rm s}^3}{r(r+r_{\rm s})^2} \quad , \tag{1}$$

where  $\rho_0$  is a characteristic density and  $r_s$  is the scale radius, describing the point where the logarithmic slope is  $d \log \rho/d \log r = -2$ .

Another common model is the Einasto profile (Einasto 1965)

$$\rho_{Ein}(r) = \rho_{-2} \exp\left(-\frac{2}{\alpha} \left[ \left(\frac{r}{r_{-2}}\right)^{\alpha} - 1 \right] \right) \quad , \tag{2}$$

where  $\rho_{-2}$  and  $r_{-2}$  correspond to where the logarithmic slope is d log  $\rho$ /d log r = -2. The parameter,  $\alpha$ , controls the inner slope of the density profile, with small  $\alpha$  values corresponding to "cuspier" centres. Though NFW profiles are the most common models, dark matter haloes in cosmological simulations are better described by an Einasto profile down to the resolution limit (e.g. Navarro et al. 2004; Gao et al. 2008; Klypin et al. 2016), but the detailed form of the profile at very small radii remains uncertain.

Aside from their density profiles, haloes are often described by their mass and concentration. The concentration parameter c is defined as the ratio of the virial radius to the scale radius, or more generally, the radius at which the logarithmic density profile has a slope of -2, i.e.,  $c = r_{\rm vir}/r_{-2}$  (Navarro et al. 1997). Concentration is broadly correlated with formation epoch, early-forming haloes being more concentrated, though the details of the relationship are complicated (e.g. Wechsler et al. 2002; Zhao et al. 2003, 2009; Wong & Taylor 2012; Ludlow et al. 2014; Correa et al. 2015; Wang et al. 2020).

#### 2.2 Tidally-stripped dark matter subhaloes

As haloes merge together hierarchically, tidal stripping primarily removes material from the outer radii, causing characteristic changes to the density profile. These tidally stripped systems are often described by empirical models calibrated to simulations. The first of these models was developed in Hayashi et al. (2003)—hereafter H03—which posits that at large radii, the slope of tidally stripped systems is  $d \log \rho/d \log r = -4$ , and the central density is decreased, according to the parameterized equation:

$$\rho(r) = \frac{f_t}{1 + (r/r_{te})^3} \rho_{NFW}(r) \quad . \tag{3}$$

where  $r_{te}$  is an "effective" tidal radius, and  $f_t$  describes the reduction in central density. Both of these parameters can be estimated using a single parameter—the bound mass fraction,  $f_b$ , of the satellite:

$$\log(r_{te}/r_{\rm s}) = 1.02 + 1.38 \log f_{\rm b} + 0.37 (\log f_{\rm b})^2$$
  

$$\log f_t = -0.007 + 0.35 \log f_{\rm b} + 0.39 (\log f_{\rm b})^2 + 0.23 (\log f_{\rm b})^3 .$$
(4)

In H03, the bound mass fraction  $f_{\rm b}$  is defined the mass of the bound satellite compared to the mass of an untruncated NFW profile within radius  $r_{\rm vir} = 10$ .

The disadvantage to empirical methods (like H03) is that these models are only valid across the range of models used in the simulations and therefore are generally limited to specific density profiles and orbital parameters. Additionally, they also capture numerical artefacts. For example, H03 predicts an artificial reduction in the central density, which is due to the approximation they used to set up the initial conditions in their simulation (Kazantzidis et al. 2004). More recent empirical models (e.g. Peñarrubia et al. 2010; Green & van den Bosch 2019) predict similar trends but with less reduction in the central density. In general, empirical models accurately reproduce a suite of isolated simulation results by construction but cannot be reliably extrapolated beyond the suite of simulations. Since the very centre of haloes will never be satisfactorily resolved in N-body simulations due to two-body interactions, these parameterizations are not able to predict the evolution at small radii/small mass-fractions (Drakos et al. 2022).

An alternative approach to empirical models is to model the evolution of subhaloes using physical principles. These approaches are generally less accurate than parameterized models, with the possible exception being the Energy-Truncation

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This is steeper than the commonly-used NFW profile, which has an inner density profile of  $r^{-1}$ , as discussed in Section 2.1.

model developed in Drakos et al. (2017, 2020) (see also Widrow & Dubinski 2005). The Energy-Truncation model is based on the observation that particles are primarily stripped as a function of their energy (e.g. Choi et al. 2009; Drakos et al. 2017; Stücker et al. 2021). In practice, this energy truncation is performed by lowering and shifting the distribution function,  $f_0$ , of the initial profile, according to

$$f(\mathcal{E}) = f_0(\mathcal{E} + \mathcal{E}_T) - f_0(\mathcal{E}_T) \quad , \tag{5}$$

where  $\mathcal{E} = \Psi(r) - v^2/2$  is the relative "binding" energy and  $\Psi(r) = -\phi(r)$  is the relative potential energy. The parameter  $\mathcal{E}_T$  is termed the truncation energy and sets the mass and tidal radius of the truncated system. Then, the potential of this system can be found by solving Poisson's equation and Eddington's inversion of the density profile (Eddington 1916). This procedure is analogous to the derivation of the King model (King 1966) and has been described in detail in (Drakos et al. 2017, 2020, 2022). The free parameter  $\mathcal{E}_T$  can be determined from the orbital parameters of the merger (Drakos et al. 2020), and thus, the Energy-Truncation model has no free parameters (i.e., it does not need to be tuned to simulations).

Fig. 1 demonstrates how well the Energy-Truncation model predicts the subhalo density profile evolution compared to simulation-tuned parameterizations (Hayashi et al. 2003; Peňarrubia et al. 2010; Green & van den Bosch 2019). We have used two simulations; Example 1 is demonstrative of a case in which the Energy-Truncation Model works quite well, and Example 2 is a case where the Energy-Truncation Model does not work as well; these correspond to the Slow and Fast Mass loss simulations in Drakos et al. (2022). In general, the Energy-Truncation model predicts a higher central density than the other models, and the Hayashi et al. (2003) predicts the lowest central density.

Overall, the Energy-Truncation model agrees very well with isolated simulations and has comparable accuracy to parameterized models above within the range of radii that is properly resolved in simulations (Drakos et al. 2020). Further, the Energy-Truncation model appears to be universally applicable to any tidally-stripped collisionless system (Drakos et al. 2022). Unlike most empirical parameterizations, the Energy-Truncation model predicts the central density is preserved, which may have important consequences for applications such as dark matter annihilation and lensing predictions.

## 2.3 This work

Overall there is fundamental uncertainty in the density profile of isolated haloes (e.g., NFW versus Einasto) and also in the effect of stripping. It is impossible to completely resolve these uncertainties by direct numerical simulation; given the limited dynamic range of simulations, we will never be able to resolve the very centre of haloes. Given that the central density of subhaloes may be higher than previously expected, in the remaining sections of the paper, we examine how this influences the dark matter annihilation and galaxy lensing signals.

We will consider three initial profiles

(i) an NFW profile

(ii) a more "cuspy" Einasto profile (EinLow;  $\alpha=$  0.15), and

(iii) a more "cored" Einasto profile (EinHigh;  $\alpha = 0.3$ ).

We will use units G = 1,  $r_{unit} = r_{-2}$ , and  $M_{unit} = M_{NFW}(r < 10r_{-2})$ ; i.e., of profiles will be normalized to have the same virial mass and a concentration of c = 10. As shown in Fig. 2, though these profiles have the same virial mass and concentration, at radii less than 10 per cent of scale radius, the central densities begin to differ considerably.

We will primarily use the Energy-Truncation method to describe our tidally stripped systems and compare these results to two commonly used approximations in the literature: (1) the H03 model and (2) a sharp truncation (ST) of an NFW model. The H03 model is known to underestimate the central density, while the ST model preserves the NFW profile precisely within the tidal radius. These two approximations of a tidally-stripped NFW profile will therefore serve as limiting cases. The parameterizations by Peñarrubia et al. (2010) and Green & van den Bosch (2019) are expected to fall somewhere between the Energy-Truncation model and the H03 model.

A summary of the models for describing the tidally stripped systems is given in Table 1, and Fig. 3. These models will allow us to compare

(i) Differences in predictions caused by assumptions about the initial profile model; i.e., between NFWT, EinHighT, and EinLowT

(ii) Differences in predictions caused by assumptions of how a tidally-stripped profile evolves, i.e., between NFWT, H03, and ST.

## **3 EVOLUTION OF THE CONCENTRATION PARAMETER**

Density profiles can be characterized by a concentration parameter, which reflects the distribution of mass within the system. For isolated haloes, the concentration parameter c is traditionally defined in terms of the radius at which the logarithmic density profile has a slope of -2, i.e.,  $c = r_{\rm vir}/r_{-2}$  (Navarro et al. 1997), where  $r_{\rm vir}$  is the virial radius. As discussed in Klypin et al. (2016); Drakos et al. (2019b), this definition can be problematic for general cases, as it does not capture deviations from an NFW profile. Several other definitions of concentration exist, but the relationship between them is profile dependent. Thus we will restrict ourselves to the traditional definition, taking the ratio of  $r_{\rm vir}$  and  $r_{-2}$ .

In cosmological simulations, the virial radius is normally defined in terms of a (redshift-dependent) mean enclosed density. In idealized merger studies, the definition of the virial radius is somewhat arbitrary, but as in Section 2.3, we assume the satellite haloes begin merging with a concentration of c = 10. This corresponds to an over-density of  $\bar{\rho}_{\rm vir} = 0.2387 \,\rho_{\rm unit}$ . As the satellite is stripped, we solve for  $r_{\rm vir}$  as the radius where the  $\bar{\rho}(r_{\rm vir}) = \bar{\rho}_{\rm vir}$ . The scale radius,  $r_{-2}$ , is calculated directly by numerically differentiating and then solving  $d \log_{10} \rho/d \log_{10} r = -2$ .

In addition to the classical concentration,  $c = r_{\rm vir}/r_{-2}$ , we will consider an "effective" concentration parameter,  $c_t = r_t/r_{-2}$ . As argued in Bartels & Ando (2015); Okoli et al. (2018), this definition may be more natural for two reasons;

## 4 N. E. Drakos et al.



Figure 1. Comparison of models for tidally stripped NFW haloes. The simulation results are from an idealized simulation of an NFW subhalo inside a fixed background potential after 5 orbits. Examples 1 and 2 correspond to the Slow and Fast Mass loss simulations in Drakos et al. (2022). The Energy-Truncation Model (Drakos et al. 2020) has no free parameters, while the three parametric models (Hayashi et al. 2003; Peñarrubia et al. 2010; Green & van den Bosch 2019) are calculated from the bound mass of the simulated subhalo. Overall, all of the models do a comparable job of predicting the subhalo density profile.

Table 1. Summary of the subhalo models used in this work. For all models, subhaloes are assumed to have an infall mass of  $M_{\text{unit}} = M_{\text{NFW}}(r < 10 r_{-2})$  and a concentration of c = 10.

Profile Name	Subhalo Model	Initial Profile
NFWT	Energy-Truncation	NFW
EinHighT	Energy-Truncation	EinHigh
EinLowT	Energy-Truncation	EinLow
ST	Sharp truncation	NFW
H03	Analytic form from (Hayashi et al. 2003)	NFW

models.

first, it better reflects the mean density of subhaloes and second, it captures the lower mean concentrations at the redshift at which the subhalo was accreted. In general, we define the tidal radius,  $r_t$ , to be the radius at which the density profile is zero. With this definition, the H03 profile does not have a tidal radius, so for this profile, we will instead use the effective tidal radius,  $r_{te}$ , as defined in Equation (3).

With these definitions, Fig. 4 shows the evolution of the scale radius, the virial radius, the tidal radius, and the two concentration parameters as a function of bound mass. For all three energy-truncated models (NFWT, EinHighT and EinLowT) the scale radius decreases monotonically as the halo is tidally stripped, as expected (Drakos et al. 2022). The relative change in  $r_{-2}$  is always slower than the relative mass loss rate, such that when the system has lost 90% of its mass,  $r_{-2}$  has only decreased to 20–50 per cent of its initial value. The behaviour for the evolution of  $r_{-2}$  the H03 approximation is similar, however, the H03 model generally predicts a scale radius that is 10–50 per cent higher. The ST approximation predicts a constant  $r_{-2}$  until the tidal radius is less than the

The virial radius shows a similar monotonic decrease that is approximately the same for all three energy-truncated models. Once again, run changes more slowly relative to its ini-

approximately the same for all three energy-truncated models. Once again,  $r_{\rm vir}$  changes more slowly relative to its initial value than the bound mass. The tidal radius,  $r_t$ , also decreases with mass, however—unlike  $r_{\rm vir}$ —the value of  $r_t$ varies widely between models. For the three energy-truncated models,  $r_t$  is initially very large and decreases rapidly until the mass is approximately 10 per cent of  $M_{\rm unit}$ . At smaller masses, the three energy-truncated models agree quite well. The H03 and ST approximations do not agree with energytruncated models and, instead, look similar to each other. Both of these approximations start with  $r_t = r_{\rm vir}$  and then rapidly decrease. We emphasize that the tidal radius is defined differently for the H03 model, using the parameter  $r_{te}$ . This effective tidal radius is used in the H03 parameterization but does not have a clear physical meaning. We also note that the "virial" radius is typically higher than the tidal

scale radius (at approximately  $0.5 M_{\text{unit}}$ ), at which point the

evolution of the scale radius is similar to the energy-truncated



Figure 2. Comparison of initial, unstripped profiles used in this work. All of these are normalized to have the same virial mass and a concentration of c = 10. At radii smaller than approximately 10 per cent of the scale radius (grey box)—which are beyond what is typically resolved in isolated simulations—there is a significant difference in the central density of the different models.

radius, except for the Energy-Truncation models at highmass fractions; this means the virial radius is simply given by  $r_{\rm vir} = (4\pi \bar{\rho}_{\rm vir}/3M)^{1/3}$ .

Taking the ratio of the two outer radii, to the scale radii we calculate concentration parameters. For the energy-truncated models, the concentration,  $c = r_{r_{\rm vir}}/r_{-2}$ , increases with decreased mass. This finding is consistent with the picture that subhaloes have higher concentrations than field haloes of the same mass (e.g. Diemand et al. 2007). Due to the more rapidly decreasing scale factor, the EinLow model has the largest increase in concentration. Interestingly, Einasto profiles with low  $\alpha_E$  parameters also show different behaviour in concentration evolution in major mergers; Ein-Low haloes show a decrease in concentration after a major merger, compared to other profiles (Drakos et al. 2019b). Since the earliest-forming haloes may have higher central densities (and thus lower Einasto  $\alpha$  values), this suggests that these early-forming haloes might evolve quite differently than later-forming haloes. The H03 and ST approximations show very different behaviour in c evolution compared to the energy-truncated models. Both show an initial decrease in concentration. The H03 model, in particular, does not accurately predict concentration evolution and underestimates the NFWT concentration by up to a factor of 3 at low masses.

Finally, in the bottom panel of Fig. 4, we show how the effective concentration,  $c_t$  evolves. This concentration is completely independent of any choice made for virial radius and likely better reflects the characteristics of the subhaloes at infall. Once the subhaloes have been stripped to about 20% of their original mass, the effective concentration is approximately constant at  $c_t \approx 10$ . Again, the EinLowT profile has higher concentrations than the NFWT and EinLowT profiles.

The ST and H03 models under-predict  $c_t$  by an order of magnitude or more, though in the case of the H03, this is largely because the tidal radius definition is different.

Overall, these results demonstrate the large differences in concentration evolution that are predicted simply based on differences in (1) the initial profile model and (2) the tidal stripping model. The effective concentration,  $c_t$ , is a more physically relevant parameter for defining subhalo structure compared to the traditional concentration, c, but is poorly defined for profiles that do not have clear tidal radii. Curiously, the energy-truncated model predicts that after some initial mass stripping, the scale radius and tidal radius will evolve at similar rates, resulting in a constant  $c_t$  value.

## **4 DARK MATTER ANNIHILATION**

One potential technique for determining the identity of dark matter particles is through dark matter annihilation. To place constraints on particle masses and interaction cross-sections, it is important to have accurate predictions of the distribution of dark matter within subhaloes, since the dark matter annihilation signals depend sensitively on substructure. Assuming the dark matter particles are Majorana WIMPs (weakly interacting massive particles) that can annihilate with one another, the rate at which dark matter annihilates is given by:

$$R = \frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle}{2m^2} \int_V \rho^2 dV \quad , \tag{6}$$

where  $\langle \sigma v \rangle$  is the velocity-averaged annihilation cross section, *m* is the mass of the dark matter particle,  $\rho$  is the density and *V* is a volume (e.g. Taylor & Silk 2003). Thus, the annihilation rate is proportional to the quantity

$$J \equiv \int \rho^2 \mathrm{d}V \quad , \tag{7}$$

which is sometimes called the *J*-factor.<sup>2</sup> This quantity is sensitive to the high-density inner region of the halo and does not vary with the choice of integration volume as long as the volume is sufficiently large.

Since the *J*-factor depends on the overall size and mass of the system (with units of mass squared over volume), it is also convenient to define a dimensionless quantity,

$$B(V) = \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}^2 V} \int \rho^2 dV \quad , \tag{8}$$

which is often called the boost factor.<sup>3</sup> Unlike the annihilation rate, the boost factor is sensitive to the integration volume. In the case of CDM haloes, it is common to use the spherical volume within the virial radius. The boost factor is useful in calculating the total annihilation signal from a system; a common approach is to draw subhalo properties such as infall redshift, mass, concentration, and/or orbital properties from random distributions, and then use the boost factor to calculate the contribution from each individual subhalo to

 $<sup>^2</sup>$  Here we follow the definition of Delos (2019); more commonly the *J*-factor is expressed as a projected quantity.

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>$  Not to be confused with the substructure boost factor, which is the luminosity of the signal divided by the luminosity from the smooth host halo (Okoli et al. 2018).



Figure 3. Tidally stripped subhalo density profiles. The models are summarized in Table 1. Each panel is tripped to a different bound mass. As in Fig. 2, the grey box indicates radii that are beyond what is typically resolved in isolated simulations. The energy-truncated models (NFWT, EinHighT, and EinLowT) agree very well, except at very small radii. The two approximations of a tidally stripped NFW profile do not agree well with the energy-truncated model. The H03 model underestimates the density of the subhaloes at small mass fractions, while the ST model only agrees with NFWT at small radii.

the total (e.g. Bartels & Ando 2015; Han et al. 2016; Stref & Lavalle 2017; Okoli et al. 2018; Hiroshima et al. 2018; Hütten et al. 2019; Ibarra et al. 2019; Delos et al. 2019b; Stref et al. 2019; Facchinetti et al. 2022).

In terms of the boost factor, the annihilation rate can be expressed as:

$$R(V) = \frac{\langle \sigma v \rangle}{2m^2} \bar{\rho}^2 V B(V) \quad , \tag{9}$$

where the first term,  $\langle \sigma v \rangle / 2m^2$ , depends on the particle physics of the dark matter candidate, the second term  $\bar{\rho}^2 V$ depends on the mean density and volume (or equivalently the mass and volume) of the system, and B(V) characterizes the inhomogeneity of the particle distribution within the volume V.

#### 4.1 Model Comparisons

The boost parameter (top) and J-factor (bottom) calculated within a volume of radius r are shown in Fig 5 for each profile model. For the boost parameter (which is a measurement of how inhomogeneous the mass distribution is), the parameter is roughly constant within scale radius,  $r_{-2}$ , and then increases rapidly with radius (with  $B \propto V$  outside the tidal radius). Inside  $r_{-2}$ , there is little evolution in the boost factor as mass is stripped, while outside this radius, the boost factor is higher for more stripped systems. Conversely, the J-factor increases with a radius for  $r < r_{-2}$  and then is approximately constant at larger radii.

In the top row of Fig. 6, we show how the boost factor evolves as a function of bound mass using different volumes. As expected from Fig. 5, when calculated within the scale radius, the boost factor stays roughly constant. Within the virial radius—with the exception of the H03 approximation the boost factor increases as mass is stripped. Finally, within the tidal radius, the boost factor *decreases* as the profile is stripped, with both the H03 and ST approximation having a lower boost factor by two orders of magnitude. This difference is largely because of the different volumes in which the boost factor is calculated. If we focus on the evolution of the boost factor (second row), this difference disappears.

It is also worth comparing predictions of boost factors to the values obtained using the untruncated profile. The bottom row of Fig. 6 shows the ratio  $B/B_{\rm un}$ , where  $B_{\rm un}$  is the initial un-truncated profile. We compare our findings to the constant value of 1.3, since Taylor & Silk (2003) showed that the H03 model follows the relation  $B \simeq 1.3 B_{\rm un}$  when measured within  $r_{te}$ .

When measured inside the scale radius, the boost factor is constant for all models and consistent with  $B = 1.3B_{\rm un}$ . When measured within the virial radius, we find much higher values of  $B/B_{un}$ . This result is because the virial radius is typically larger than the tidal radius in these systems. Since mass loss reduces the density in the outer parts of the stripped halo, this makes the density distribution of stripped systems more centrally concentrated and less homogenous, and thus it increases B. When measured within the tidal radius, we find the ST and H03 approximations agree with the  $B \simeq 1.3 B_{\rm un}$ prediction and underestimate the boost factor compared to the energy-truncated models by a factor of 10 (for bound mass less than 10 per cent). For the energy-truncated models, B is very sensitive to the evolution of the density profile; accounting for mass loss within the tidal radius can make a difference of a factor of 10 or more in B value relative to using the original profile.

Ultimately we are interested in predicting the annihilation rate in dark matter subhaloes, which is proportional to the J-factor defined in Equation 7. In Fig. 7, we show predictions for how the J-factor evolves with mass loss for the different profile models. We calculate the J-factor within the tidal radius but note that the J-factor is insensitive to this choice. We find a very large difference in the J-factor between the different models. By the time the profile is stripped to 5 per cent of the initial mass, there is an order of magnitude difference in the annihilation signal between the ST approximation and the H03 approximation. This result is contrary to the ex-



Figure 4. Evolution of the parameters used to characterize subhalo concentration as a function of mass fraction, for various profiles: (1) the scale radius  $r_{-2}$ , (2) the virial radius  $r_{\rm vir}$ ; the radius enclosing an overdensity of  $\bar{\rho}_{\rm vir} = 0.2387 \rho_{\rm unit}$  (3) the tidal radius (4) the concentration parameter  $c = r_{\rm vir}/r_{-2}$ , and (5) the effective concentration  $c_t = r_t/r_{-2}$ . All three energy-truncated models evolve similarly to each other, with the EinLowT concentration being about 20 per cent higher than NFWT, and EinHighT models. The concentration parameters calculated from two approximate models, H03 and ST, evolve quite differently.

pectation that the high-density inner regions of subhaloes are resilient against tidal forces, and thus the annihilation rate is fairly constant during tidal stripping (Bartels & Ando 2015).

Comparing the three energy-truncated models, the Ein-LowT J-factor (whose density profile has a steeper central cusp; Fig. 2) decreases the least, while the value from the

flatter EinHigh profiles decreases the most. The ST model (dashed line) always overestimates the annihilation signal. Although the H03 model (dotted line) gives a reasonable match to the stripped density profile except at very low masses/radii (Fig. 3), this model predicts much lower annihilation rates overall.

The variation in the predicted *J*-factor between models reflects the sensitivity of the annihilation signal to the central density. In Fig. 8 we show how the enclosed central density evolves with bound mass. We consider the mean density within 10 per cent ( $\bar{\rho}_{0,1}$ ; top panel) and 1 per cent ( $\bar{\rho}_{0,01}$ ; bottom panel) of the initial virial radius (as described in Section 3). The cuspy EinLow profile has the smallest change in central density, which is why the J-factor for this model changes slowly. When comparing approximations for tidally stripped NFW profiles, the central density of the ST model is constant as expected, as long as the tidal radius exceeds the radius used to calculate the enclosed density. Relative to the NFW results, both the ST and the H03 model do a fairly good job at predicting the enclosed density within 10 per cent of the virial radius. However, the ST approximation over-predicts the central density within 1 per cent of the virial radius, while the H03 approximation greatly under-predicts the enclosed density, as discussed in Section 2.3.

#### 4.2 Dependance on structural parameters

For an NFW profile, the boost factor can be wellapproximated as a function of the concentration parameter  $c = r_{\rm vir}/r_{-2}$  alone, with  $B \sim c^{2.5}$ , while the boost factor for Einasto profiles scales similarly with a slight dependence on the shape parameter  $\alpha$  (Okoli et al. 2018). For tidally stripped haloes,  $r_t$  is a more natural outer radius, as discussed in Section 7. In Fig. 9, we show the relationship between the boost factor and the effective concentration parameter,  $c_t$ . We also compare this relation to the Okoli et al. (2018) parameterization for how B evolves as a function of c for an untruncated NFW profile (the dash-dot grey line). As mentioned in Okoli et al. (2018), we expect that  $B(c_t)$  should be approximately equal between the unstripped and stripped profiles since most of the mass is removed outside the tidal radius. We find that though  $B(c_t)$  matches the un-truncated NFW calculation for the H03 and ST models, our three energy-truncated models have much higher boost factors for a given tidal radius.

The J-factor and structural properties of subhaloes are also known to be related. For instance, Delos (2019) examined the relationship between J and  $G^{-1}v_{\max}^4 r_{\max}^{-1}$ , where  $v_{\max}$  and  $r_{\max}$  are the maximum circular velocity ( $v_c = \sqrt{GM(\langle r \rangle/r)}$ , and corresponding radius. They show that while for an NFW profile  $\log_{10} J = 1.23 \log_{10} (G^{-1}v_{\max}^4 r_{\max}^{-1})$ , their tidally-stripped simulations of NFW profiles have a slightly shallower slope of 0.86. Our NFWT model agrees remarkably well with their findings, but differences in the profile model can cause a difference in the J-factor by an order of  $\approx 2$ .

#### 4.3 Summary

In this section, we considered the effects of tidal mass loss on the inner structure of subhaloes as they relate to calculations of the annihilation rate. Assuming a truncation of the



Figure 5. Boost parameter (top) and J-factor (bottom), as a function of the radius in which the integral is calculated. The characteristic radii  $r_{-2}$ ,  $r_{\rm vir}$  and  $r_t$  are labelled as circles, triangles, and crosses, respectively. The boost parameter is approximately constant within the scale radius and then increases as  $r^3$ . Conversely, the J-factors increase rapidly within the scale radius and then are constant at large radii. This plot demonstrates how the boost factor and J-factor measurements depend on the choice of integration volume.

distribution function in energy space, we calculated quantities related to the dark matter annihilation rate for NFW, EinHigh and EinLow profiles. Additionally, we compared our prediction for NFW profiles to two widely used approximations; first, a model in which the original NFW profile is sharply truncated such that it contains the same bound mass (ST model), and secondly, the parameterization from Hayashi et al. (2003) that was tuned to simulation results (H03).

Considering the energy-truncated NFW and Einasto profiles, we found that for fixed mass, the concentration, boost factor (measured within the tidal radius), and J-factor of the EinLowT profile is typically 10-50 per cent higher than the NFWT profile, while the EinHighT profile is typically lower. These differences reflect the different central densities of the initial models, as the annihilation signal is dominated by these high-density regions.

Then, comparing the NFWT model to the commonly used ST and H03 approximations, we found that neither approximation agrees well with the energy-truncated model. The effective concentration is lower by a factor of 10 for both approximations. Both models under-predict the boost factor within the tidal radii by a factor of  $\sim 100$ . However, this result is mainly due to the differences in the tidal radii, and if we consider the evolution of  $B/B_{init}$  the H03 and ST model underestimate and overestimate the boost factor by ~ 20 per cent, respectively. If we consider the  $B/B_{\rm un}$ ; i.e., the boost factor from our model compared to a truncated profile within the same radius,  $r_{\rm t}$ , we can find that the two approximations underestimate the boost factor by an order of magnitude. Overall, the J-factor is overestimated in the ST model and underestimated in the H03 model; the differences between these models are a factor of 10 once the halo has been stripped to  $\sim 5\%$  of its initial mass.

In summary, subhalo concentrations, boost factors, and Jfactors of tidally stripped haloes are sensitive to the innermost part of the density profile and can vary by an order of magnitude depending on profile assumptions. Thus, it is important to have physically motivated models, such as the Energy-Truncation model, that allow us to predict the annihilation of subhaloes down to arbitrarily small bound mass fractions. Our results suggest that current constraints on the CDM annihilation cross-section may be inaccurate due to their underlying assumptions about subhalo density profiles; addressing these inaccuracies will be the focus of future work.

#### 5 LENSING EXPERIMENTS

In gravitational lensing, an image of a background galaxy will be distorted by mass along the line of sight. The mapping between the source and image plane for a background galaxy (i) and its lens (j) is given by the amplification matrix,  $a_{ij}$ :

$$a_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \kappa - \gamma_1 & -\gamma_2 \\ -\gamma_2 & 1 - \kappa - \gamma_1 \end{pmatrix} , \qquad (10)$$



Figure 6. Evolution of the boost factor calculated within different volumes. The top row shows the boost factor, the second panel shows the evolution from the initial value, and the bottom shows the ratio between the boost factor of the tidally-stripped profiles and the initial, untruncated profiles.

where  $\kappa$  is the convergence and  $\gamma$  is the shear. The corresponding convergence and shear profiles are defined as

$$\kappa(R) = \Sigma(R) / \Sigma_{\text{crit}} \text{ and,} \gamma(R) = (\bar{\Sigma}(\leq R) - \Sigma(R)) / \Sigma_{\text{crit}} ,$$
(11)

for axisymmetric haloes. In the case of multiple lenses, the total amplification matrix can then be calculated by summing the contributions of each lens.

The projected density profile  $\Sigma(R)$  can be calculated from

the density profile,

$$\Sigma(R) = 2 \int_{R}^{\infty} \frac{\rho(r)r}{\sqrt{r^2 - R^2}} dr \quad , \tag{12}$$

and the mean projected surface mass

$$\bar{\Sigma}(\leq R) = \frac{M_{\text{proj}}(R)}{\pi R^2} \quad , \tag{13}$$

with the projected mass  $M_{\text{proj}}(R)$  is given by:

$$M_{\rm proj}(R) = 2\pi \int_0^R \Sigma(R') R' dR' \quad , \tag{14}$$

MNRAS 000, 1-15 (2023)



Figure 7. Change in the *J*-factor versus bound mass fraction predicted from our models. There are large differences between all of the models, suggesting that *J*-factor predictions are very sensitive to assumptions about subhalo profiles. Further, the *J*-factor is not constant as is often assumed but can decrease by a factor of 2 or more by the time the subhalo is stripped to half of its mass.

Finally, the critical surface density,  $\Sigma_{\rm crit}$  is given by:

$$\Sigma_{\rm crit} = \frac{c^2}{4\pi G} \frac{D_S}{D_L D_{LS}} \quad , \tag{15}$$

where  $D_S$ ,  $D_L$ , and  $D_{LS}$  are the angular diameter distances from the observer to the source, the observer to the lens, and the lens to the source, respectively. Since  $\Sigma_{\rm crit}$  depends on the geometry of the problem (and consequently the cosmology), it is not well-defined for our isolated simulations. Therefore, in Fig. 11 we show  $\Sigma$  and  $\Gamma \equiv \overline{\Sigma} - \Sigma$  for our model, as they are proportional to the convergence and shear, respectively; these profiles can then be scaled appropriately given a value of  $\Sigma_{\rm crit}$ .

In Fig. 11, the projected density profiles (top) show similar trends to the 3D density profiles, with  $\Sigma(r > r_t) = 0$  (with the exception of H03). The shear profiles (bottom) are approximately constant within the tidal radius and then follow  $\Gamma \propto R^{-2}$ . The discontinuity in the slope of the ST model is evident in the shear profiles; the shear is finite but not differentiable at the cutoff radius, as discussed in Baltz et al. (2009). Fig. 12 shows  $\Sigma$  and  $\Gamma$  calculated within 0.5  $r_{\text{unit}}$  and 1  $r_{\text{unit}}$ . At large masses, the EinHighT lens models differ the most from the other models, predicting a higher convergence and shear. The ST differs the most near the tidal radius, where there is a discontinuity in the profile.

#### 5.1 Model Comparisons

To understand better how the convergence and shear depend on the profile model, in Fig. 13, we compare different subhalo models. Between 0.1  $r_{-2}$  and  $r_t$ , EinHighT and EinLowT converge profiles differ from the NFWT profile by up to 20



Figure 8. Change in the central density versus bound mass fraction for various profiles. The enclosed density is calculated in either 10 per cent (top) or 1 per cent (bottom) of the initial virial radius. The enclosed density decreases over time, with slight differences between the three energy-truncated profiles. For the ST approximation, the enclosed density is constant over time within the tidal radius and thus over-predicts the NFWT model. The H03 approximation predicts a large decrease in the central density and thus under-predicts the NFWT model.

per cent, where the shear profiles differ from NFWT profiles by up to 50 per cent. This disagreement is largest at very small radii, with the EinLowT profile having higher convergence and sheer values, due to the increased density in the centre of the profile. We also compare the energy-truncated NFWT profiles to the commonly used H03 and ST approximations. The H03 model underestimates the convergence and shear profiles at small radii, though differences between H03 and NFWT are comparable to differences found between the Energy-Truncation models. The ST model closely matches the NFWT model at small radii but is less extended.

## 5.2 Summary

We find there is a large difference in the lensing and shear profiles between NFW and Einasto profiles and that the central values of NFWT lensing and shear profiles are close to those predicted by ST. This suggests that, for lensing applications, assumptions about the properties of the infalling sub-







Figure 9. Boost factor as a function of the effective concentration parameter,  $c' = r_t/r_{-2}$ . For comparison, we show the expected relation for an unstripped NFW profile (dotted gray line), using the parameterization from Okoli et al. (2018). We find that the energy-truncated models have boost factors about 5 times larger than expected from the unstripped profiles; this is contrary to the expectation that the boost factor of the stripped profile should be approximately equal to that of the unstripped profile within the tidal radius.

halo are more important than the model for how the system is stripped; this is opposite to our findings for the annihilation signal.

Previous work typically finds that different lens models introduce an error of ~ 10 per cent in mass estimates (e.g. Limousin et al. 2005; Baltz et al. 2009; Sereno et al. 2016). We found that errors in the convergence and shear profiles were dominated by the initial profile rather than the tidal model; i.e., while an ST model does a fairly good job of predicting the convergence and shear of subhaloes profiles, different values of the Einasto  $\alpha$  value can introduce large differences. Thus, we suspect that using updated tidal models (such as the energy-truncated model) is unlikely to improve lensing mass estimates.

## 6 DISCUSSION

In this work, we have considered the implications of different models for subhalo initial density profiles and subsequent tidal evolution for calculations of the dark matter annihilation rate and lensing signals. Overall, we found that the annihilation rate and boost factor are very sensitive to both the subhalo profile and to mass loss modelling; at small bound mass ratios, different assumptions lead to annihilation signals that differ by an order of magnitude. While there were also varying predictions in the quantities measured in subhalo lensing experiments, we found that these are generally less sensitive.

As discussed in Drakos et al. (2020, 2022), since subhalo

Figure 10. Relationship between the J-factor, and the combination of structural parameters  $G^{-1}v_{\max}^4r_{\max}^4$ , where  $v_{\max}$  and  $r_{\max}$  are the maximum circular velocity. The slope of 1.23 is what is expected for an NFW profile, while 1.86 is what has been found for tidally stripped NFW profiles (Delos 2019). We find that our NFWT model agrees with this scaling relation, but differences in initial profiles can cause a deviation in the J-factor by factors of  $\approx 2$ .

evolution is primarily understood from idealized simulations (due to resolution constraints), predictions for subhalo evolution depend sensitively on the initial halo models assumed in simulations. Here, we have considered Einasto profiles spanning the range of  $\alpha$  values one might expect to exist, and also NFW profiles, for comparison with earlier work. Since lower Einasto  $\alpha$  values correspond to steeper density profiles, the results in this paper from the EinLow model are the most relevant for the case of microhaloes, the smallest structures to form in the early universe, whose size is determined by the free-streaming scale of the dark matter particles.

Assuming dark matter particles have a mass of 100 GeV, the mass of the smallest microhaloes is approximately Earth mass (e.g. Diamanti et al. 2015). It is expected that the central density profile of these microhaloes is steeper than that found in larger haloes and thus may contribute greatly to the dark matter annihilation signal (e.g. Stücker et al. 2023). We found the concentration of EinLowT profiles increases rapidly during tidal stripping and has larger annihilation signals than NFWT profiles at a fixed mass. Interestingly, in Drakos et al. (2019b), it was found that Einasto profiles with low  $\alpha$  values were the only ones that decreased in concentration after *major* mergers. These results all suggest that profiles with cuspier centres (as found in the earliest haloes) evolve differently.

Ishiyama (2014) found that microhaloes may have much higher densities than expected from extrapolations of the low-redshift concentration-mass-redshift relations, and Okoli et al. (2018) showed that if these densities are conserved, concentrations of the smallest haloes are still uncertain by a



Figure 11. The projected density profile,  $\Sigma$ , (top) and  $\Gamma \equiv \overline{\Sigma} - \Sigma$  (bottom) from our models, as a function of bound mass.  $\Sigma$  is proportional to the convergence,  $\kappa$ , and  $\Gamma$  is proportional to the shear  $\gamma$  for axisymmetric systems.



Figure 12. The projected density profiles (left) and shear profiles (right) measured in  $0.5 r_{unit}$  (top) or  $1 r_{unit}$  (bottom). The projected density decreases with mass loss. The shear also decreases with decreased mass, except at the discontinuity in the ST model at the tidal radius. Within the tidal radius, all models agree to within 10–20 per cent.



Figure 13. The projected density profile,  $\Sigma$ , (top) and  $\Gamma \equiv \overline{\Sigma} - \Sigma$  (third row) for our model applied to three different profiles (NFW, EinLow and EinLow), and the predictions for a tidally stripped NFW profile from Hayashi et al. (2003) (H03; dotted line) and a sharply truncated NFW profile (ST; dashed line). Each column corresponds to a different bound mass, as indicated. The second and last rows show the ratio of  $\Sigma$  and  $\Gamma$  to our model for an NFW profile, respectively. The grey box indicates radii that are beyond what is typically resolved in isolated simulation. There are wide differences between the initial halo models, but the ST approximation does a good job of approximating the NFWT profiles.

factor of ~ 5 when extrapolated to low redshift (considering the redshift evolution of the virial radius). Okoli et al. (2018) show that this uncertainty in concentration translates to an increased boost factor by up to two orders of magnitude. In our work, we find that the energy-truncated model results in boost factors that are approximately 5 times higher at a given effective concentration (Fig. 9). These results offer separate evidence that the boost factors of the smallest haloes may be greatly underestimated.

While we have focused on dark matter annihilation and lensing applications, subhaloes can also be used to study the nature of dark matter through stellar streams created by disrupted dwarf galaxies. For example, stream morphology can help constrain the potential of the host dark matter halo (e.g. Dai et al. 2018), and features in streams caused by perturbations from other subhaloes can be used place constraints on dark matter properties (e.g. Carlberg 2020). In particular, there has been a lot of interest in studying the GD-1 stellar stream (Bonaca et al. 2020), which may have been perturbed by a compact dark matter subhalo. Other applications include semi-analytic models of galaxy formation, of which subhalo evolution models are often a key component (e.g. Yang et al. 2020; Jiang et al. 2021). We leave the implications of conserved central density on these applications to future work.

A major assumption in this work is that the Energy-Truncation model is an accurate representation of subhalo evolution. However, this model has a number of assumptions that are important to address. First, the infalling subhaloes are assumed to be spherical and isotropic. We expect that as the material is stripped off of subhaloes, the subhalo quickly becomes spherical and isotropic (Drakos et al. 2020), and therefore this assumption is approximately valid. However, we plan to explore tidal stripping on non-spherical systems in future work. One way to create non-spherical initial conditions for idealized simulations is by using the output of major merger simulations, as proposed in (Moore et al. 2004); in future work, we plan to use the simulations presented in (Drakos et al. 2019a,b) to explore stripping of non-spherical systems.

Perhaps the most important assumption made in the Energy-Truncation model is that subhaloes only evolve due to tidal fields, and there is no interaction with a baryonic component; extensive work has shown that baryonic matter influences dwarf galaxy properties (as reviewed in Bullock & Boylan-Kolchin 2017). It has been proposed that dwarf galaxy haloes can transform from cusps to cores based on the stellar-to-halo mass ratio,  $M_*/M_{200}$  (Peñarrubia et al. 2012), where the cusp is protected from supernova feedback if  $M_*/M_{200} \lesssim 5 \times 10^{-4}$  (Di Cintio et al. 2014), which has been supported by a number of measurements (Read et al. 2019; De Leo et al. 2023). On scales of  $M_{200} < 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ , star formation should be greatly suppressed by photo-heating (e.g. Hoeft et al. 2006; Noh & McQuinn 2014). Therefore, it is expected that dark-matter dominated systems (down to putative Earth-mass-sized haloes) should not be affected by baryonic feedback. These dark matter-dominated systems may contribute greatly to an annihilation signal.

Finally, this work has focused on the effect of subhalo structure on the annihilation signal from individual haloes. To understand what this means, for a complex system like the Milky Way, we would need to model a full population of subhaloes, merging at different times on different orbits and with different concentration parameters. Estimating the signal directly in a self-consistent simulation requires properly correcting for numerical mass loss, which in turn is sensitive to the tidal stripping model assumed. In future work, we plan to track subhalo evolution in a cosmological simulation, using the Energy-Truncation model to correct for artificial disruption. We will then use this corrected population to determine the total annihilation rate and place new constraints on proposed dark matter annihilation signals.

## 7 CONCLUSION

Our best hope for constraining the properties of dark matter through astrophysical observations comes from tests at the highest dark matter densities. Important examples include searches for a gamma-ray or other signal from dark matter annihilation, and tests of substructure in gravitational lenses. The inferences derived from observations depend strongly on the assumed clustering of dark matter on the smallest scales. Unfortunately, this remains unclear from theory; while there has been progress in understanding the average density profile of isolated haloes, including the smallest ones, it remains unclear how this profile evolves once these become subhalos. Idealized cases of single mergers have been simulated at increasing resolution, but remain susceptible to numerical effects which can cause increased mass loss (e.g. van den Bosch et al. 2018; van den Bosch & Ogiva 2018) and decreased central densities (e.g. Errani & Peñarrubia 2020; Drakos et al. 2022). To attempt to overcome numerical limitations, we have used a theoretically-motivated, universal Energy-Truncation method to study subhalo evolution. We quantify the effect of underestimating the central density of tidally-stripped haloes on annihilation signals and lensing profiles of individual subhaloes.

For lensing mass experiments, we conclude that the details of tidal stripping are less important than assumptions about the original density profile. Thus, recent estimates of the uncertainties in mass introduced by different profiles (approximately 10 per cent) are likely reliable. On the other hand, annihilation constraints are extremely sensitive to uncertainties both in subhalo profiles and in the details of tidal stripping. In particular, our energy-based truncation method predicts annihilation signals that are an order of magnitude larger than some previous estimates. The full annihilation calculation is complicated, however, and beyond the scope of this paper. Future work needs to be done to fully quantify the uncertainties in current dark matter annihilation constraints in light of updated subhalo evolution models.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NED acknowledges support from NSERC Canada, through a postgraduate scholarship. JET acknowledges financial support from NSERC Canada, through a Discovery Grant.

Software: numpy (Harris et al. 2020), matplotlib (Hunter 2007), scipy (Virtanen et al. 2020).

## DATA AVAILABILITY

The data underlying this article will be shared on reasonable request to the corresponding author.

#### REFERENCES

- Ando S., Ishiyama T., Hiroshima N., 2019, Galaxies, 7, 68
- Angulo R. E., Hahn O., Ludlow A. D., Bonoli S., 2017, MNRAS, 471, 4687
- Baltz E. A., Marshall P., Oguri M., 2009, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys., 2009, 015
- Bartels R., Ando S., 2015, Phys. Rev. D, 92, 123508
- Benson A. J., Du X., 2022, MNRAS, 517, 1398
- Bonaca A., et al., 2020, ApJ, 892, L37
- Bullock J. S., Boylan-Kolchin M., 2017, ARA&A, 55, 343
- Carlberg R. G., 2020, ApJ, 889, 107
- Chang L. J., Necib L., 2021, MNRAS, 507, 4715
- Choi J.-H., Weinberg M. D., Katz N., 2009, MNRAS, 400, 1247
- Correa C. A., Wyithe J. S. B., Schaye J., Duffy A. R., 2015, MN-RAS, 452, 1217
- Dai B., Robertson B. E., Madau P., 2018, ApJ, 858, 73
- De Leo M., Read J. I., Noel N. E. D., Erkal D., Massana P., Carrera R., 2023, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2303.08838
- Delos M. S., 2019, Phys. Rev. D, 100, 063505
- Delos M. S., White S. D. M., 2022, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2209.11237
- Delos M. S., White S. D. M., 2023, MNRAS, 518, 3509
- Delos M. S., Bruff M., Erickcek A. L., 2019a, Phys. Rev. D, 100, 023523
- Delos M. S., Linden T., Erickcek A. L., 2019b, Phys. Rev. D, 100, 123546
- Delos M. S., Korsmeier M., Widmark A., Blanco C., Linden T., White S. D. M., 2023, arXiv e-prints, p. arXiv:2307.13023
- Di Cintio A., Brook C. B., Macciò A. V., Stinson G. S., Knebe A., Dutton A. A., Wadsley J., 2014, MNRAS, 437, 415
- Diamanti R., Catalan M. E. C., Ando S., 2015, Phys. Rev. D, 92, 065029
- Diemand J., Kuhlen M., Madau P., 2007, ApJ, 657, 262
- Drakos N. E., Taylor J. E., Benson A. J., 2017, MNRAS, 468, 2345
- Drakos N. E., Taylor J. E., Berrouet A., Robotham A. S. G., Power C., 2019a, MNRAS, 487, 993
- Drakos N. E., Taylor J. E., Berrouet A., Robotham A. S. G., Power C., 2019b, MNRAS, 487, 1008
- Drakos N. E., Taylor J. E., Benson A. J., 2020, MNRAS, 494, 378
- Drakos N. E., Taylor J. E., Benson A. J., 2022, MNRAS, 516, 106
- Eddington A. S., 1916, MNRAS, 76, 572
- Einasto J., 1965, Trudy Inst. Astrofiz. Alma-Ata, 5, 87
- Errani R., Peñarrubia J., 2020, MNRAS, 491, 4591
- Facchinetti G., Lavalle J., Stref M., 2022, Phys. Rev. D, 106, 083023
- Gao L., Navarro J. F., Cole S., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., Springel V., Jenkins A., Neto A. F., 2008, MNRAS, 387, 536
- Green S. B., van den Bosch F. C., 2019, MNRAS, 490, 2091
- Han J., Cole S., Frenk C. S., Jing Y., 2016, MNRAS, 457, 1208
- Harris C. R., et al., 2020, Nature, 585, 357
- Hayashi E., Navarro J. F., Taylor J. E., Stadel J., Quinn T., 2003, ApJ, 584, 541
- Hiroshima N., Ando S., Ishiyama T., 2018, Phys. Rev. D, 97, 123002
- Hoeft M., Yepes G., Gottlöber S., Springel V., 2006, MNRAS, 371, 401
- Hunter J. D., 2007, Computing in Science & Engineering, 9, 90
- Hütten M., Stref M., Combet C., Lavalle J., Maurin D., 2019, Galaxies, 7, 60
- Ibarra A., Kavanagh B. J., Rappelt A., 2019, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys., 2019, 013

- Ishiyama T., 2014, ApJ, 788, 27
- Jiang F., Dekel A., Freundlich J., van den Bosch F. C., Green S. B., Hopkins P. F., Benson A., Du X., 2021, MNRAS, 502, 621
- Kazantzidis S., Magorrian J., Moore B., 2004, ApJ, 601, 37
- Kazantzidis S., Zentner A. R., Kravtsov A. V., 2006, ApJ, 641, 647 King I. R., 1966, AJ, 71, 64
- Klypin A., Yepes G., Gottlöber S., Prada F., Heß S., 2016, MN-RAS, 457, 4340
- Kravtsov A. V., 2013, ApJ, 764, L31
- Limousin M., Kneib J.-P., Natarajan P., 2005, MNRAS, 356, 309
- Ludlow A. D., Navarro J. F., Angulo R. E., Boylan-Kolchin M., Springel V., Frenk C., White S. D. M., 2014, MNRAS, 441, 378
- Moore B., Kazantzidis S., Diemand J., Stadel J., 2004, MNRAS, 354, 522
- Natarajan P., Kneib J.-P., Smail I., 2002, ApJ, 580, L11
- Navarro J. F., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., 1996, ApJ, 462, 563
- Navarro J. F., Frenk C. S., White S. D. M., 1997, ApJ, 490, 493
- Navarro J. F., et al., 2004, MNRAS, 349, 1039
- Noh Y., McQuinn M., 2014, MNRAS, 444, 503
- Ogiya G., Hahn O., 2018, MNRAS, 473, 4339
- Okoli C., Taylor J. E., Afshordi N., 2018, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys., 8, 019
- Peñarrubia J., Benson A. J., Walker M. G., Gilmore G., Mc-Connachie A. W., Mayer L., 2010, MNRAS, 406, 1290
- Peñarrubia J., Pontzen A., Walker M. G., Koposov S. E., 2012, ApJ, 759, L42
- Read J. I., Walker M. G., Steger P., 2019, MNRAS, 484, 1401
- Sereno M., Fedeli C., Moscardini L., 2016, J. Cosmology Astropart. Phys., 2016, 042
- Somerville R. S., et al., 2018, MNRAS, 473, 2714
- Stref M., Lavalle J., 2017, Phys. Rev. D, 95, 063003
- Stref M., Lacroix T., Lavalle J., 2019, Galaxies, 7, 65
- Stücker J., Angulo R. E., Busch P., 2021, MNRAS, 508, 5196
- Stücker J., Ogiya G., White S. D. M., Angulo R. E., 2023, MNRAS, 523, 1067
- Taylor J. E., Silk J., 2003, MNRAS, 339, 505
- Taylor J. E., Shin J., Ouellette N. N. Q., Courteau S., 2019, MN-RAS, 488, 1111
- Virtanen P., et al., 2020, Nature Methods, 17, 261
- Wang K., Mao Y.-Y., Zentner A. R., Lange J. U., van den Bosch F. C., Wechsler R. H., 2020, MNRAS, 498, 4450
- Wechsler R. H., Bullock J. S., Primack J. R., Kravtsov A. V., Dekel A., 2002, ApJ, 568, 52
- Widrow L. M., Dubinski J., 2005, ApJ, 631, 838
- Wong A. W. C., Taylor J. E., 2012, ApJ, 757, 102
- Yang S., Du X., Benson A. J., Pullen A. R., Peter A. H. G., 2020, MNRAS, 498, 3902
- Zhao D. H., Mo H. J., Jing Y. P., Börner G., 2003, MNRAS, 339, 12
- Zhao D. H., Jing Y. P., Mo H. J., Börner G., 2009, ApJ, 707, 354
- van den Bosch F. C., Ogiya G., 2018, MNRAS, 475, 4066
- van den Bosch F. C., Ogiya G., Hahn O., Burkert A., 2018, MN-RAS, 474, 3043

This paper has been typeset from a  $\mathrm{T}_{\!E}\!X/\mathrm{I}\!A^{\!}\mathrm{T}_{\!E}\!X$  file prepared by the author.