



## LJMU Research Online

**Pechetti, R, Kamann, S, Krajnovic, D, Seth, A, Ven, GVD, Neumayer, N, Dreizler, S, Weilbacher, PM, Martens, S and Wragg, F**

**$\omega$  Centauri: A MUSE discovery of a counter-rotating core**

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/22586/>

### Article

**Citation** (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

**Pechetti, R, Kamann, S, Krajnovic, D, Seth, A, Ven, GVD, Neumayer, N, Dreizler, S, Weilbacher, PM, Martens, S and Wragg, F  $\omega$  Centauri: A MUSE discovery of a counter-rotating core. Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society. ISSN 0035-8711 (Accepted)**

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact [researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk](mailto:researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk)

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

# $\omega$ Centauri: A MUSE discovery of a counter-rotating core<sup>★</sup>

Renuka Pechetti,<sup>1</sup> Sebastian Kamann,<sup>1</sup> Davor Krajnović,<sup>2</sup> Anil Seth,<sup>3</sup> Glenn van de Ven,<sup>4</sup>  
Nadine Neumayer,<sup>5</sup> Stefan Dreizler,<sup>6</sup> Peter M. Weilbacher,<sup>2</sup> Sven Martens,<sup>6</sup> Florence Wragg<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Liverpool John Moores University, UK

<sup>2</sup>Leibniz-Institut für Astrophysik Potsdam (AIP)

<sup>3</sup>University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

<sup>4</sup>University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

<sup>5</sup>Max Planck Institut für Astronomie, Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>6</sup>Institut für Astrophysik, Göttingen, Germany

30 January 2024

## ABSTRACT

$\omega$  Centauri is considered the most massive globular cluster of the Milky Way and likely the former nuclear star cluster of a galaxy accreted by the Milky Way. It is speculated to contain an intermediate-mass black hole (IMBH) from several dynamical models. However, uncertainties regarding the location of the cluster center or the retention of stellar remnants limit the robustness of the IMBH detections reported so far. In this paper, we derive and study the stellar kinematics from the highest-resolution spectroscopic data yet, using the Multi Unit Spectroscopic Explorer (MUSE) in the narrow field mode (NFM) and wide field mode (WFM). Our exceptional data near the center reveal for the first time that stars within the inner 20'' ( $\sim 0.5$  pc) counter-rotate relative to the bulk rotation of the cluster. Using this dataset, we measure the rotation and line-of-sight velocity dispersion (LOSVD) profile out to 120'' with different centers proposed in the literature. We find that the velocity dispersion profiles using different centers match well with those previously published. Based on the counter-rotation, we determine a kinematic center and look for any signs of an IMBH using the high-velocity stars close to the center. We do not find any significant outliers  $>60$  km/s within the central 20'', consistent with no IMBH being present at the center of  $\omega$  Centauri. A detailed analysis of Jeans' modeling of the putative IMBH will be presented in the next paper of the series.

**Key words:** globular cluster – Galactic globular cluster– nuclear star clusters – Intermediate-mass black holes – globular cluster dynamics

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The most massive cluster of the Milky Way,  $\omega$  Centauri (NGC 5139), has been a topic of discussion for more than four decades now (e.g., Freeman & Rodgers 1975; Geyer et al. 1983; Meylan et al. 1995; Lee et al. 2002). Many studies have also theorized that it might be the surviving nucleus (or nuclear star cluster, NSC) of a stripped dwarf galaxy due to the presence of complex stellar populations that display a broad metallicity distribution (e.g., Johnson & Pilachowski 2010a; Husser et al. 2020), and are far more complex than the multiple populations routinely found in other clusters (e.g., Gratton et al. 2012; Piotto et al. 2015; Martocchia et al. 2018). It also has evidence for a central stellar disk and tangential velocity anisotropy consistent with tidal stripping (e.g., van de Ven et al. 2006). More recently, data from the Gaia satellite was used to trace the origin of Galactic globular clusters (GCs) (Massari et al. 2019), and  $\omega$  Centauri was suggested to be the former core of the *Gaia*-Enceladus/Sausage galaxy (Forbes 2020; Pfeffer et al. 2021), which was a dwarf galaxy with a mass

of  $\sim 10^8 M_{\odot}$  accreted by the Milky Way  $\sim 10$  Gyr ago (Helmi et al. 2018).

Several stripped nuclei, sometimes known as ultra-compact dwarf galaxies (UCDs), were recently detected around nearby galaxies. These remnants of more massive galaxies ( $>10^9 M_{\odot}$ ) are capable of hosting supermassive black holes with masses  $> 10^6 M_{\odot}$  (e.g., Seth et al. 2014; Ahn et al. 2017, 2018). Recent analyses have further shown that somewhat less massive black holes (BHs) are present in all five of the nearest early-type galaxies with stellar masses  $\sim 10^9 M_{\odot}$  and NSC masses between  $2 \times 10^6 - 7 \times 10^7 M_{\odot}$  (Nguyen et al. 2017a, 2018, 2019). Therefore, one might expect a high fraction of stripped NSCs from this mass range of galaxies to also host massive BHs  $< 10^6 M_{\odot}$ . Indeed, a  $10^5 M_{\odot}$  BH was recently found in the M31 globular cluster (GC), B023-G078 (Pechetti et al. 2022). Like  $\omega$  Centauri, this object has additional evidence of being a stripped nucleus. There have been other proposed detections, for example, G1 in M31 (Gebhardt et al. 2005), M54 (Ibata et al. 2009), the likely nuclear star cluster of the Sagittarius dwarf galaxy (e.g., Alfaro-Cuello et al. 2019). This establishes that GCs are potential sites of IMBHs despite the lack of robust detections in Milky Way GCs. Completing our picture of the number density of massive BHs in the cosmic neighborhood is a crucial step towards understanding the formation of the seed BHs in the early universe (e.g., Volonteri 2010; Greene

<sup>★</sup> Based on observations collected at the European Organisation for Astronomical Research in the Southern Hemisphere under ESO programs 0103.D-0204, 0104.D-0257, 105.20CR, and 109.23DV

et al. 2020) as well as the correlations between galaxies and their BHs (e.g., Saglia et al. 2016; Habouzit et al. 2021).

$\omega$  Centauri is a perfect candidate to search for an IMBH since it is the most massive cluster in the Milky Way, with a dynamical mass of  $2.5 - 3.5 \times 10^6 M_{\odot}$  (van de Ven et al. 2006; Baumgardt & Hilker 2018), and an outlier in the globular cluster luminosity function (Kruijssen & Portegies Zwart 2009). Like M54, it is an outlier from regular globular clusters in the relation between average metallicity and intrinsic metallicity spread (e.g., Figure 2 of Leaman (2012)), where both lie on the dwarf galaxy sequence. It is strongly rotating with a rotation velocity of  $\sim 4-5$  km/s (Meylan & Mayor 1986; Merritt et al. 1997; Sollima et al. 2019) and has one of the highest central velocity dispersions of  $\sim 22$  km/s (Noyola et al. 2010), which makes it an outlier in the  $V/\sigma$  among the Galactic GCs. The rise in the velocity dispersion in (Noyola et al. 2010) suggests the presence of an IMBH, but an IMBH is not the only solution. Several analyses, such as Baumgardt et al. (2019) and Zocchi et al. (2019) have shown that this rise could also be caused by the presence of an extended mass distribution consisting of stellar-mass BHs instead of a single IMBH. Zocchi et al. (2019) further show that if radial anisotropy near the center is considered, a central extended dark mass of  $<5\%$  of the cluster mass is sufficient to explain the observed kinematics. Other studies have also proposed the possibility of concentrated non-baryonic matter present in the core of  $\omega$  Centauri. For example, assuming a Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW) profile, Brown et al. (2019) find an integrated dark mass of  $\sim 5 \times 10^5 M_{\odot}$  at the cluster center. Evans et al. (2022) performed an analysis with different dark matter profiles for the central dark mass in the cluster and found that although stellar remnants can explain masses  $< 5 \times 10^5 M_{\odot}$ , any mass greater than that cannot be explained by it. Although various interpretations can be given for the central dark mass component, no conclusions have been found robustly yet.

A major source of uncertainty in dynamical measurements are the central density slope and the velocity dispersion profile, which changes based on the adopted center of the cluster, of which several estimates exist from Noyola et al. (2008, 2010); van der Marel & Anderson (2010), which are hereafter referred to as NGB08, N10 and vdMA10 respectively. These studies estimate centers based on kinematics or photometry and from different datasets such as integrated kinematics and proper motions of the stars. The NGB08 center was determined based on the central density of  $\omega$  Centauri and is  $\sim 12''$  away from N10 and vdMA10 center. The N10 and vdMA10 centers are  $\sim 3''$  apart but were determined using kinematics and number density counts respectively. These centers have produced different dispersion profiles, for example, the profile in N10 peaks strongly resulting in a central velocity dispersion of  $\sim 22$  km/s whereas the dispersion profile of vdMA10 is relatively flatter at  $\sim 19$  km/s towards the center. This has also resulted in different estimates for the IMBH mass where NGB08 and N10 argued for the presence of an IMBH with a mass of  $4 - 5 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ , whereas vdMA10 found that no IMBH was required to fit the observed kinematics of the cluster. As noted by vdMA10 and N10, the exact location of the center along with the kinematics based on that center are necessary for arguing the presence of an IMBH.

A detailed analysis of the kinematics is thus required to solve the discrepancies regarding the center. With  $\omega$  Centauri being the most extensively studied cluster in the Milky Way, several kinematic datasets from different instruments exist. We have obtained the highest spatial resolution data (50 mas) yet in the central  $20''$  using integrated field MUSE-NFM spectroscopy. We also obtained MUSE-WFM spectroscopy for  $\sim 40,000$  stars within the half-light radius of this cluster to quantify the presence of a dark mass, either in the form

of an IMBH (Noyola et al. 2010; Baumgardt 2017) or a collection of stellar mass BHs that have mass segregated to the central regions of the cluster (Baumgardt et al. 2019; Zocchi et al. 2019). We revisit two crucial aspects in this paper that are required to probe the presence (and constrain the potential mass) of an IMBH in  $\omega$  Centauri, namely the central kinematics as well as the determination of the cluster center. The latter will also enable an accurate determination of the surface brightness profile. We analyse the kinematics based on the different existing centers proposed in the literature and attempt to determine the kinematic center based on the detection of a centralized rotation signal. In a subsequent paper, an analysis of the presence/absence of the IMBH is done based on the Jeans' modeling of the kinematics.


This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the imaging and spectroscopic data. Section 3 presents the analysis of the kinematic data based on the different centers and Section 4 describes the analysis of the inner  $20''$  of the cluster. Section 5 consists of a discussion on the existence of high-velocity stars in  $\omega$  Centauri. Section 6 contains our summary and conclusions.

## 2 MUSE DATA - OBSERVATION AND REDUCTION

The observations used in this paper were carried out as a part of MUSE guaranteed time observations (GTO) of 25 GCs (PI: S. Kamann, S. Dreizler). We selected the clusters to be within 15 kpc and have central velocity dispersions of  $>5$  km/s. They were observed during multiple epochs, enabling binary stars to be detected. An overview of the survey is provided in Kamann et al. (2018). Another survey was also carried out using the MUSE-General Observer (GO) program, 105.20CG.001 (PI: N. Neumayer) and published in Nitschai et al. (2023), which contains the catalog with a combination of the GO data and our GTO data. For the analysis of  $\omega$  Centauri here, we only used a combination of wide field mode (WFM) and narrow field mode (NFM) GTO observations.

The WFM observations consist of the data presented in Latour et al. (2021) plus three additional epochs of observations taken during the nights 2021-05-09, 2021-08-05, and 2022-05-29 as part of program 105.20CR and 109.23DV. In total, 10 WFM pointings of  $1 \times 1$  arcmin each have been observed for 15 epochs on average. To this dataset, we add NFM observations consisting of 6 pointings of size  $7.5 \times 7.5$  arcsec, observed during 6 nights (2019-04-06, 2019-05-03, 2020-02-23, 2021-05-09, and 2022-05-29) as part of observing programs 0103.D-0204, 0104.D-0257, 105.20CR, and 109.23DV. An overview of the different pointings used in this work, including their number of epochs, total exposure times, and median seeing values, is provided in Table 1. The location of NFM pointings 91 to 94 was chosen to cover the different centers of  $\omega$  Centauri that have been proposed in the literature (NGB08; N10; vdMA10), while pointings 98 and 99 resulted from a misidentification of the requested tip-tilt star at the telescope. VRI mosaics created from the reduced WFM and NFM data are shown in Figure 1. The NFM data spans  $\sim 20'' \times 15''$ , while the WFM data spans approximately  $3 \times 5$  arcmin other than the two pointings that are  $\sim 5$  arcmin away from the center. These pointings were observed to complete the radial coverage inside the half-light radius of the cluster.

The raw data were reduced using the standard MUSE pipeline (Weilbacher et al. 2020) in versions 1.2 and later. All NFM data were reduced with pipeline version 2.8, which includes a strongly improved NFM flux calibration compared to the previous versions. We used the default settings of the pipeline, with two exceptions. First, we did not perform a sky subtraction, as it would also remove



**Figure 1.** MUSE data of  $\omega$  Centauri. The left panel shows a  $0.5^\circ$  image of  $\omega$  Centauri (image credit: ESO, <https://www.eso.org/public/images/eso0844a/>). The WFM data in the middle panel consists of 10 pointings of  $1' \times 1'$  each that were repeatedly observed for at least  $> 12$  epochs. Two of the pointings were taken  $\sim 5'$  away from the cluster center to cover the half-light radius of the cluster. The right panel shows the NFM data which spans  $\sim 20'' \times 15''$  of which each pointing has a size of  $7.5'' \times 7.5''$ .

**Table 1.** MUSE observations analysed in this work summarized per pointing.

Pointing no.	Mode	RA	Dec	$N_{\text{epochs}}$	$N_{\text{exposures}}$ [s]	Total exp. time [arcsec]	Median seeing
Pointing 01	WFM	13:26:45.0	-47:29:09	15	45	2025	0.62
Pointing 02	WFM	13:26:45.0	-47:28:24	14	42	1890	0.61
Pointing 03	WFM	13:26:49.5	-47:29:09	17	51	2253	0.60
Pointing 04	WFM	13:26:49.5	-47:28:24	17	51	2295	0.62
Pointing 05	WFM	13:26:40.6	-47:28:31	14	46	3646	0.60
Pointing 06	WFM	13:26:53.9	-47:29:01	17	51	4080	0.62
Pointing 07	WFM	13:26:36.8	-47:27:54	15	45	4500	0.60
Pointing 08	WFM	13:26:31.0	-47:29:55	16	49	7350	0.62
Pointing 11	WFM	13:26:40.3	-47:25:00	14	43	12900	0.92
Pointing 12	WFM	13:26:41.0	-47:24:03	12	36	21600	0.82
Pointing 91	NFM	13:26:47.2	-47:28:50	2	8	4800	0.08
Pointing 92	NFM	13:26:46.1	-47:28:45	2	8	4800	0.08
Pointing 93	NFM	13:26:46.8	-47:28:46	3	11	6080	0.06
Pointing 94	NFM	13:26:46.5	-47:28:51	2	8	4800	0.07
Pointing 98	NFM	13:26:46.6	-47:28:49	1	4	2400	0.08
Pointing 99	NFM	13:26:47.5	-47:28:51	1	4	2400	0.07

stellar light given the crowding of the observed fields. Second, we did not perform a correction for telluric absorption, which instead was corrected during the analysis of the spectra (see below). Data cubes were created for individual pointings and epochs, and they typically combined three (for WFM observations) or four (for NFM) exposures. In between exposures, derotator offsets of 90 degrees and small spatial dithers were applied.

The reduced data cubes were processed using PAMPELMUSE (Kamann et al. 2013; Kamann 2018), which performs a deblending of the individual stellar spectra based on a wavelength-dependent model

of the point spread function (PSF) that is recovered from the data and a wavelength-dependent coordinate transformation from a reference source catalogue to the MUSE data. As reference catalogues for  $\omega$  Centauri, two publicly available *Hubble* space telescope (HST) data sets were used. The central WFM pointings (01-05, cf. Table 1), as well as all NFM pointings used the catalogue created by Anderson et al. (2008) for the ACS survey of Galactic GCs (Sarajedini et al. 2007). The outer WFM pointings (06-12), which are not or only partially covered by the ACS footprint, used the photometric catalogue generated by Anderson & van der Marel (2010). As a PSF model, we

used a Moffat profile for all WFM cubes and optimized the FWHM as well as the kurtosis (parametrized by  $\beta$ , cf. Kamann et al. 2013) as a function of wavelength. In cases where visual inspection of the cubes suggested elongated stars, we included the ellipticity and the position angle (PA) of the semi-major axis of the Moffat in the set of free parameters. While the Moffat profile has been shown to accurately describe the WFM-PSF (Fusco et al. 2020), it cannot describe the more complicated shape of the NFM-PSF. Hence, the NFM data were instead processed using the MAOPPY model developed by Fétick et al. (2019), which has previously been successfully applied to NFM observations of the Galactic globular cluster M80 (NGC 6093) by Göttgens et al. (2021).

The extracted spectra were processed in several analyses to measure the LOS velocities and determine the stellar parameters of the corresponding stars. These analyses rely on useful initial guesses, which we obtained by comparing the aforementioned photometric catalogues to isochrones from the database of Bressan et al. (2012), where we assumed an age of 13 Gyr, a metallicity of  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}] = -1.33$ , and an extinction of  $A_V = 0.37$ . Initial guesses for the surface temperature  $\log g$  and the effective temperature  $T_{\text{eff}}$  of each star were obtained by finding the point that is closest to the isochrone in a color-magnitude diagram (CMD). A  $m_{\text{F606W}} - m_{\text{F814W}}$  vs  $m_{\text{F606W}}$  CMD was used for the Anderson et al. (2008) catalogue, while a  $m_{\text{F435W}} - m_{\text{F625W}}$  vs  $m_{\text{F625W}}$  CMD was used for the Anderson & van der Marel (2010) photometry. Note that despite the strong evidence for metallicity and/or age variations within  $\omega$  Centauri, we only used a single isochrone when deriving initial parameter guesses. This is because all parameters except for  $\log g$  were later refined during the spectral analysis.  $\log g$  was not refined because it impacts the shapes of the spectral lines rather than their strengths, and thus is difficult to measure at the low spectral resolution of MUSE. Moreover,  $\log g$  is only weakly dependent on the age and metallicity of the old stars present in the cluster. To infer LOS velocities, we first cross-correlated each extracted spectrum against various templates drawn from the PHOENIX spectral library presented in Husser et al. (2013). The templates were chosen to represent the range in stellar parameters expected in  $\omega$  Centauri ( $T_{\text{eff}} = \{3\,000\text{ K}, 6\,000\text{ K}, 9\,000\text{ K}\}$ ,  $\log g = \{1, 3, 5\}$ ), but had solar metallicity. We selected the LOS velocity provided by the template that gave the strongest cross-correlation signal and used it as an initial guess for the following full-spectrum fit with SPEXXY (Husser et al. 2016). When reliable initial guesses could not be obtained from the cross-correlation, the spectra were then initialized at the systemic velocity of  $\omega$  Centauri. During the full spectrum fit, which was performed using templates from the PHOENIX library of Husser et al. (2013), we determined  $[\text{Fe}/\text{H}]$  and  $T_{\text{eff}}$  alongside the LOS velocity. As illustrated in Husser et al. (2016), SPEXXY enables the user to fit the telluric absorption simultaneously with the stellar spectrum, which was done while analysing the spectra. To verify the wavelength accuracy of every MUSE cube, we determined the average velocity of the telluric absorption fits of all spectra extracted with an S/N > 30. This mean telluric velocity, which usually varied between  $-1$  and  $1$  km/s, was subtracted from all velocity measurements obtained for the cube.

The derived stellar velocities were assessed based on a reliability flag following the method described in § 3.2 of Giesers et al. (2019). This includes considering the signal-to-noise ratios of the extracted spectra or the agreement between the velocities derived from cross-correlation and spectral fit. Only velocities with a reliability grading above 80% were kept. Further, we considered the agreement between the magnitudes recovered from the spectra and those provided in the HST catalogs, as large discrepancies could indicate contamination in the spectra by nearby stars. PAMPLEMUSE expresses the photometric


agreement as a *MagAccuracy* parameter, ranging from 0.0 (large discrepancy) to 1.0 (perfect agreement). We imposed a cut value of 0.6.

The final step in the data analysis was a calibration of the uncertainties of the LOS velocity measurements. To do so, we followed the approach outlined in Kamann et al. (2018), which makes use of the different valid velocity measurements available for each star and is based on the expectation that in the absence of intrinsic variability, the normalized scatter of these measurements should follow a Gaussian distribution with a standard deviation of unity. Following this calibration, we averaged the filtered velocities per star, using inverse-variance weighting.

After extracting the reliable velocities, 38,602 stars were left in our sample, including the NFM and WFM data. To compare the depth of the NFM data, we plot stars within  $20''$ , which include 963 NFM stars and 1552 WFM stars, on the color-magnitude diagram (CMD) of Figure 2. We used the ACS photometry for the CMD, which has photometry in the F606W and the F814W filters. The completeness histograms show the comparison of number counts in the WFM and NFM samples relative to the HST catalogue within the NFM region. We found that the NFM data is complete for stars brighter than 19.5 mags, which excludes  $\sim 10$  stars that are on the edges of the pointings in these comparisons. For the WFM data, we are complete below 18 mags. 50% of the stars are below 18.6 mags in WFM mode whereas, in the NFM data, 50% of the stars are below 19.8 mags, which is close to the completeness limits. The mass range covered by the NFM data is also broader since more stars with lower masses (down to  $0.5 M_{\odot}$ ) are included. The masses of the stars were obtained based on the isochrone comparisons as mentioned above. There are no observations for the WFM data below 20 mags, whereas the NFM data extends down to the 22nd magnitude. But, further away from the center, the WFM data reach a similar depth due to longer exposure times and lesser crowding. The dataset covers everything from the tip of the RGB to 4 mags below the main-sequence turnoff. The median S/N is  $\sim 12$  for the NFM data and the median velocity uncertainties are  $\sim 2.3$  km/s. For stars around 16 mags, the typical uncertainties in velocities are  $\sim 1$  km/s, whereas, for a star of magnitude  $\sim 21$  mags, the uncertainties increase to  $\sim 5$  km/s because of the low S/N. The 50% completeness limit in the F606W magnitude and the masses are 18.6 mags and  $0.71 M_{\odot}$  respectively for the WFM data. For NFM data, the 50% completeness limit is 19.8 mags and  $0.65 M_{\odot}$ .

The membership probability of the stars being a part of the cluster was estimated using the procedure described in Kamann et al. (2018). Briefly, we assume that the observed stars are composed of cluster members and a field population. For the former, we assume that its velocity and metallicity distributions can be approximated as Gaussians, whereas for the latter, we use the Milky Way model by Robin et al. (2003) to predict velocities and metallicities. We then iteratively determine the likelihood of each star belonging to the cluster or field population, with the additional constraint that the fraction of cluster stars decreases monotonically with distance to the cluster center. The membership probability is then assigned to each star and those with a probability lower than 0.6 are excluded from our analyses. Although  $\omega$  Centauri has a metallicity spread of more than a factor of 10 (e.g., Johnson & Pilachowski 2010b), it has a radial velocity that offsets the member stars from those of the MW stars. For a more detailed description of the method, see Walker et al. (2009) and Kamann et al. (2016). We also excluded the stars with temporal variations in their LOS velocities that can be potential binary stars. We use the probabilities that were derived by using the method described in Giesers et al. (2019). This work will be presented in Wragg et al. (*in prep.*).

The final sample of stars that were used in the analysis of the central



**Figure 2.** Left: Color magnitude diagram of  $\omega$  Centauri. The points are the 963 NFM (colored) and 1552 WFM (gray) stars within  $20''$  from the [van der Marel & Anderson \(2010\)](#) center. They are colored by the S/N of the spectrum as determined during the extraction of the MUSE spectra. Right: Completeness histogram of MUSE NFM and WFM data as a function of magnitude and stellar mass on the NFM footprint. Gray lines correspond to the WFM data and the solid purple lines represent NFM data. The NFM data goes 2 magnitudes deeper than the WFM data and extends beyond 20 mags in the F625W band within  $20''$  from the center. The mass range of the stars covered by the NFM is also broader with stellar masses starting from  $\sim 0.5 M_{\odot}$ .

kinematics excludes non-member stars with a cluster membership probability cut of  $<0.6$ , a binary variability probability  $>0.7$ , and an S/N cut of  $<8$  for the mean of the extracted spectra, which leaves us with 28,108 stars of which 936 are NFM stars.

### 3 KINEMATIC DATA

We analyse the LOS velocities in this section within the half-light radius of  $\omega$  Centauri and create velocity and velocity dispersion radial profiles. This will help further study of a possible IMBH in  $\omega$  Centauri. The center of  $\omega$  Centauri is debated in the literature and several centers have been proposed based on photometry and kinematics.

#### 3.1 Existing Analyses and Proposed Centers

A putative BH in  $\omega$  Centauri was reported in [NGB08](#), and the center was estimated using the surface density counts of stars in the central  $40''$  of HST/ACS data. The kinematic data was obtained from GMOS integral-field spectroscopy with a spectral resolution of  $R = 5560 \text{ \AA}$  in the Ca-Triplet region (7900 - 9300  $\text{\AA}$ ), and the LOS velocities were derived using these spectra. Their dataset was seeing-limited, whereas the NFM data is at a resolution of 25 mas. The field-of-view (FOV) is also bigger covering the half-light radius of the cluster. Based on the LOSVD measurements from GMOS IFU and a clear cusp in the surface brightness profile, an IMBH of  $M_{\text{BH}} = 4.0^{+0.75}_{-1.0} \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ , and a LOS central velocity dispersion,  $\sigma_{\text{LOS}} = 23.0 \pm 2.0 \text{ km/s}$  were reported for this cluster. The measured cusp in the surface brightness profile was in agreement with the theoretical predictions from  $N$ -body simulations in [Baumgardt et al. \(2005\)](#) for clusters harboring IMBHs, where the central BH tends to prevent the core collapse.

[vdMA10](#) presented another analysis for the central few arcmins, where they estimated the projected number density distribution of

$\sim 10^6$  stars from HST photometry. The LOS velocities were obtained using the ground-based data from [Suntzeff & Kraft \(1996\)](#); [Mayor et al. \(1997\)](#); [Reijns et al. \(2006\)](#). Proper motions were also estimated using ground-based data from [van Leeuwen et al. \(2000\)](#) and also using  $10^5$  stars from HST data ([Anderson & van der Marel 2010](#)). The center of the cluster was determined using three independent ways and found to be offset from the one derived in [NGB08](#) by  $12''$ . Their analysis did not confirm the density cusp that was observed in [NGB08](#) due to the offset center. Anisotropic models were fit to the data wherein if a flat core was assumed, a no-BH model provided a good fit, whereas cuspy models required either an IMBH of  $M_{\text{BH}} = 8.7 \pm 2.9 \times 10^3 M_{\odot}$  or a dark cluster of size  $\leq 0.16 \text{ pc}$ . The final result was an upper limit on a possible IMBH with  $M_{\text{BH}} \leq 1.2 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$  at  $1\sigma$  confidence level, in strong tension with the IMBH mass suggested by [NGB08](#).

A third search for a central IMBH was performed in [N10](#) where they obtained additional integrated field spectroscopy for the central region of the cluster using VLT-FLAMES/ARGUS. These observations have a spectral resolving power of  $R \sim 10000$  and cover the 820 - 940 nm region using the GIRAFFE spectrograph with a FOV of  $11.5'' \times 7.3''$ . They combined the new LOS velocities derived from the Ca-Triplet region with the existing measurements from [NGB08](#) and estimated a different center from the additional kinematics. A peak in the velocity dispersion map was found by running a  $5''$  kernel across the 2-D map of velocity dispersion, which was their estimated center for the cluster along with a measured central velocity dispersion of  $22.8 \pm 1.2 \text{ km/s}$ . Using isotropic dynamical models and their kinematic center, they estimated a central BH of  $M_{\text{BH}} = 4.7 \pm 1.0 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ .

The above-mentioned measurements using various centers are listed in Table 2. The [NGB08](#) center is offset by  $12''$  from the [vdMA10](#) center. The [N10](#) and [vdMA10](#) seem to lie approximately on the rotation axis of the cluster but are  $\sim 3''$  apart (see Figure 3). Further analyses using these centers are presented in the subsequent sections.

**Table 2.** Existing and current measurements of  $\omega$  Centauri

	Center RA	Center Dec	$M_{BH}$ ( $M_{\odot}$ )	$\sigma_{LOS}$ (km/s)
NGB08	13:26:46.04	-47:28:44.8	$4.0^{+0.75}_{-1.0} \times 10^4$	$23.0 \pm 2.0$
vdMA10	13:26:47.24	-47:28:46.5	$\leq 1.2 \times 10^4$	–
N10	13:26:47.11	-47:28:42.1	$4.7 \pm 1.0 \times 10^4$	$22.8 \pm 1.2$
Kinematic Center (From Rotation)	13:26:47.31	-47:28:51.4	–	$19.3 \pm 1.4$
Dispersion Center (From Dispersion)	13:26:46.86	-47:28:42.5	–	$22.6 \pm 1.5$

*Note:* The first three rows list the existing measurements of  $\omega$  Centauri made in NGB08 (Noyola et al. 2008), vdMA10 (van der Marel & Anderson 2010), and N10 (Noyola et al. 2010). The bottom rows present measurements derived in this work, which are described in § 5.1.

### 3.2 Analysing the MUSE Kinematics

To study the dynamics of  $\omega$  Centauri, we created radial profiles of the velocity dispersion and the rotation velocity using two methods. In the first method, we radially binned the stars, where each bin consisted of a minimum of 100 stars, and covered a radial range of  $\log(r/1'') > 0.15$ . In the second method, we created analytical profiles for the cluster to estimate the rotation and line-of-sight velocity dispersion. For both methods, a maximum likelihood approach (Pryor & Meylan 1993) was used in combination with the Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm `emcee` (Foreman-Mackey et al. 2013) to estimate the quantities. A detailed description of this analysis is given in Kamann et al. (2018). For the maximum likelihood analysis, we assumed the probability of finding a star with a velocity ( $v_i \pm \epsilon_i$ ) at a projected distance  $r_i$  from the cluster center to be:

$$p(v_i, \epsilon_i, r_i) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{\sigma_r^2 + \epsilon_i^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(v_i - v_0)^2}{2(\sigma_r^2 + \epsilon_i^2)}\right) \quad (1)$$

Here,  $\sigma_r = \sigma_r(r_i)$  and  $v_0 = v_0(r_i)$  are the dispersion and heliocentric radial velocity of the cluster, respectively, at the position of star  $i$ . We then found the values of  $\sigma_r$  and  $v_0$  that minimized the negative log-likelihood of the model given the kinematic data. A limitation of this approach is that it applies to the stellar systems whose LOSVD is Gaussian ignoring the higher moments of the LOSVD. For determining the rotation velocity of the cluster, we assume that the cluster is a rotating disc and add an angular dependence ( $\theta$ ) to the mean velocity in Equation 1.

$$v_0 \rightarrow \bar{v}(r_i, \theta_i) = v_0 + v_{\text{rot}}(r_i) \sin(\theta_i - \theta_0(r_i)) \quad (2)$$

where  $v_{\text{rot}}$  and  $\theta_0$  are the projected rotation velocity and axis angle. This allows us to estimate the LOS velocity in each bin radially from the cluster center. We then implemented the MCMC analysis to minimize the negative likelihood in every radial bin and ran a total of 100 chains with 100 steps for each bin, which is sufficient for determining the parameters. We constrained three parameters,  $\sigma_r$ ,  $v_{\text{rot}}$ , and  $\theta_0$  with uniform, uninformative priors.

Since the effect of binning is removed while using the analytical forms, we create the analytical profiles using the following functional form for the rotational velocity,  $v_{\text{rot}}$ :

$$v_{\text{rot}}(r) = \frac{2v_{\text{max}}r}{r_{\text{max}}} \left[ 1 + (r/r_{\text{max}})^2 \right] \quad (3)$$

The  $v_{\text{rot}}$  profile is based on the prediction for a system undergoing violent relaxation (Lynden-Bell 1967) and has been previously used to model the rotation profiles of star clusters in, e.g., Bianchini et al. (2018).

Here three parameters were constrained, the peak amplitude of the rotational velocity-  $v_{\text{max}}$ , the radius at which  $v_{\text{max}}$  occurs-  $r_{\text{max}}$ , and  $\theta_0$ . Using the MCMC analysis as mentioned above, we fitted those parameters for a total of 100 chains and 500 steps and created radial profiles based on the median values and the 16th and 84th percentile of the distributions. The results of these methods applied to the data are discussed and presented in § 5.2 and Figure 5.

## 4 A COUNTER-ROTATING CORE IN $\omega$ CENTAURI


In this section, we analyse the central  $100''$  in detail with a focus on the central  $20''$  as this area is covered by the NFM data.

### 4.1 Creating Kinematic Maps

To study the mean LOS velocity as a function of position, we used a supervised neighbors-based learning method to create a smoothed velocity map. We used a K-nearest neighbors (KNN) analysis, where the basic principle is to group the stars based on a metric (Pedregosa et al. 2011). Here, the grouping classifies the nearby neighbors based on their distances and we estimated those using `biweight_location` (Beers et al. 1990) of `ASTROPY`, which performs a robust detection of the mean of the distribution, in this case, the LOS velocities of the stars.


In this method, the number of samples ( $k$ ) is defined as the number of neighbors that would be chosen to represent a group. A smaller  $k$ -value selects fewer neighbors and results in a coarser grouping whereas a higher  $k$ -value provides smoother grouping. At first, standard Euclidean distances are calculated between the neighbors based on the  $k$ -value, and then a maximum radius is given within which the grouping needs to be performed. We visually inspected maps of the KNN-based mean velocities with  $k$ -values ranging from 40–300. We found that smaller values of  $k$  ( $<200$ ) lead to patchiness of the velocity maps due to the lesser number of stars in each group (for example, see Figure A.1). Therefore, we used a  $k$ -value of 300 to derive the LOS velocity map, where the large-scale rotation of  $\omega$  Centauri is visible (see Figure 3, left column). A zoomed-in version shows the central  $20''$  of the core (Figure n3, left middle panel), mainly covered by the NFM data, which is counter-rotating with respect to the global rotation of the cluster. The central  $100''$  of  $\omega$  Centauri are rotating with maximum projected velocities of  $\sim 4$  km/s and the inner core within  $20''$  shows maximum rotational velocities of  $\sim 3$ – $5$  km/s. The different centers from the literature are marked here, with each center being a few arcsec apart. Other estimates of the centers based on our velocity and dispersion maps are also marked, which we discuss in the next subsection.

For a better visualization of the velocity maps with less noise, we employed another method to derive the velocity map of the cluster; the locally weighted regression (LOESS) technique, which was introduced in Cappellari et al. (2013) based on an algorithm developed by Cleveland (1979) for the 1-D case and further improved for the 2-D case in Cleveland & Devlin (1988). This is a regression method that uses a multivariate smoothing analysis on a surface by the local fitting of the function in a moving way similar to the moving average. This method robustly determines the mean values of the underlying parameters in case of noisy data. In our case, the parameters are the LOS velocities and the noise is the velocity dispersion of the stars. We used the code `loess_2d` from Cappellari et al. (2013), which requires input velocities, and a regularization factor ( $f$ ) that describes the fraction of points that are considered for the approximation and controls the amount of smoothing of the map. We used a value of



**Figure 3.** Rotation and velocity dispersion maps: *Top & Middle Panel:* Rotation velocity and velocity dispersion maps of the central 80'' and a zoomed version of the central 20'' of the MUSE WFM & NFM kinematics grouped using KNN with a k-value of 300. *Bottom panel:* LOESS smoothed 2-D maps of the rotation and dispersion. Different centers are marked in different colors as indicated in the legend.





**Figure 4.** Kinemetry results for the central 80'' of the cluster using the LOESS maps. Left: The PA of the cluster, measuring the change in the velocity structure on the map. Middle and Right: The coefficients  $k_1$  and  $k_5/k_1$  from the Fourier expansion of the velocity field for the best-fitting ellipse.  $k_1$  describes the bulk motion of the cluster with a peak at  $\sim 5''$  and decreases after that. Then it increases with the radius indicating the global rotation of the cluster.  $k_5/k_1$  is peaked at  $\sim 15\text{--}20''$ , which indicates the rotation components within the map.

$f = 0.1$  and assumed a linear approximation to determine the LOESS smoothed maps. The bottom panel of Figure 3 shows the LOESS map of the LOS velocities within 80'' around the cluster center. The result is consistent with the maps from the KNN analysis. On a larger scale, the global rotation is dominant and as we go towards the center, the counter-rotation is visible. The different centers are marked similarly as in the KNN maps, and we observe that except for the NGB08 center, the rest of the centers are aligned close to the rotation axis of the counter-rotating core. It is worth noting that the NGB08 center is also close to the zero velocity curve (green contour) of the counter-rotation, but on the other side, which is a local minimum.

In both maps, there is clear evidence that the rotation in the central region of the cluster is misaligned with the rotation at large radii. This counter-rotation dominates the kinematics within the central 10–20'' and appears to be centered south of the vdMA10 and N10 centers. To check for the effect of contamination from any bright stars, we removed stars brighter than 14th magnitude in the F625W filter. We found that there are two bright stars at the centers of the counter-rotating velocity components both moving in the same direction with a velocity of  $\sim 20$  km/s but the counter-rotation signal is still significant even after removing the stars.

Apart from the LOS velocities, we also analysed the velocity dispersion of  $\omega$  Centauri using KNN analysis. Here we grouped the stars and used the statistic `biweight_scale` from `ASTROPY`, which determines a robust standard deviation of the distribution of stars, i.e. a velocity dispersion in this case. We also used different  $k$ -values ranging from 40 – 300. A lot of peaks or patchiness was detected across the entire velocity dispersion map for smaller  $k$ -values (see Figure A.1). But, as we grouped more stars, for a  $k$ -value of 300, we found a prominent central peak. This is shown in the right column of Figure 3. This peak is close to the center from N10 as expected since their center was derived based on the peak in the velocity dispersion. The remaining centers are also marked similarly to the ones in the velocity maps. The bottom-most panel shows the LOESS smoothed map that was derived based on the KNN velocity dispersion map, where the central peak is visible. When we compare the mean velocity and the velocity dispersion maps in the middle panel, the peak in the central velocity dispersion appears to be offset from the rotation axis of the counter-rotating core. We quantify this rotation and dispersion in the subsequent sections and constrain different centers based on them.

## 4.2 Quantifying the counter-rotation with Kinemetry

To quantify the velocities and rotation, we performed *kinemetry* on the velocity and dispersion maps of the cluster. We used LOESS maps for this analysis only as an alternative to the KNN maps to test if the counter-rotating core is real and quantifiable using kinemetry. *Kinemetry* is a method from Krajnović et al. (2006) that performs a harmonic expansion of 2-D kinematic moments, in our case, mean local velocities that are the first kinematic moments, along a set of best-fitting ellipses on the map.

When analysing velocity maps, kinemetry assumes that there are ellipses along which the velocities can be described with a simple cosine law,

$$V(R, \psi) = V_0 + V_c(R) \sin(i) \cos(\psi), \quad (4)$$

where  $V_0$  and  $V_c$  are the systemic and circular velocities, projected on the sky at an inclination  $i$ , and traced along the ellipse via the azimuthal angle  $\psi$ , measured from the projected major axis. Eq. 4 is strictly correct for disks in which stars move on circular orbits, but Krajnović et al. (2008, 2011) showed that it applies to a large fraction of early-type galaxies, with deviations of less than 5%. The kinematic analysis of the velocities along an ellipse is performed by evaluating the harmonic terms:

$$K(a, \psi) = A_0(a) + \sum_{n=1}^N A_n(a) \sin(n\psi) + B_n(a) \cos(n\psi) \quad (5)$$

where  $a$  and  $\psi$  are the semi-major axis and the azimuthal angle, and in the case of the velocity,  $n$  is an odd number. The best-fit ellipse is determined by minimizing the A1, A3, and B3 terms, as they define the shape and the orientation of the ellipse. Kinemetry results are often presented in a compact form:

$$K(a, \psi) = A_0(a) + \sum_{n=1}^N k_n(a) \cos([n(\psi - \phi_n(a))]) \quad (6)$$

where  $k_n = \sqrt{A_n^2 + B_n^2}$  and  $\phi_n = \arctan(A_n/B_n)$ . In this form the term  $k_1$  describes the amplitude of the rotation, while  $k_5$  is the first non-minimized higher order coefficient which defines the deviations from a simple rotation as assumed in Eq. 4. For further details regarding *kinemetry*, we refer to Krajnović et al. (2006).

For the kinematic modeling, for the initial models, we fixed the

center of the cluster to an initial guess from the previous section. Since the photometric axis ratio of  $\omega$  Centauri is above 0.8 at all radii (Geyer et al. 1983), we limited the shape (axial ratio) of the ellipses for the kinemetry to be between 0.7 and 1.0. To increase the range of the fit, we used a cover value of 0.6, which means that 60% of the points on the ellipse should be present for the ellipse to be included in the fit. We also fixed the range for the PA from  $0^\circ$  to  $180^\circ$ . The results from these fits are shown in Figure 4.

The left panel of Figure 4 shows the PA that is varying with respect to the radius and twists at  $\sim 15\text{--}20''$  by  $180^\circ$  approximately indicating the observed counter-rotation. The errors on the PA of the data points below  $5''$  are large and can be ignored because the counter-rotation is on a scale of  $15''$  and the ellipses fitted on a scale smaller than  $5''$  are unable to trace the rotation. The  $k_1$  coefficient tracing the rotation shows a small peak at  $5''$  delineating the extent of the counter-rotation followed by the global rotation of the cluster. The large error bars on  $k_5$ , due partially to the very low-level rotation of the cluster, make it almost consistent with 0 and prohibit further analysis of the deviations. The peak in  $k_5$  at  $\sim 20''$  is correlated with the drop in  $k_1$ , as is expected at the edge of a kinematic component (Krajnović et al. 2006). Together with the radial variation of the PA of ellipses (Figure 4, left), which stabilizes at the end of the counter-rotating core,  $k_1 \sim 0$ , and where the error in  $k_5$  significantly drops, kinemetry analysis quantifies the extent and the shape of the central counter-rotation in  $\omega$  Centauri. To constrain the center, we explore the central  $20''$  with different techniques in the next section.

## 5 KINEMATIC CENTER AND COMPARISONS WITH THE PREVIOUS STUDIES

In this section, we describe various methods that were used to determine the center for this cluster and then use it to compare it with the previously published centers.

### 5.1 Finding the Kinematic Center

A well-defined center is crucial in determining the velocity dispersion and rotation profiles, which are required for the detection of any kind of dark mass in the cluster center. Below, we show that using several methods, we are unable to numerically constrain the center to better than  $\sim 5''$ , within the range of previous estimates. The kinematics near the center are so complex that the result also depends on the method we use. However, assuming that the counter-rotation represents the center, we constrain the center to be at RA = 13h 26m 47.31s and Decl =  $-47^\circ 28' 51.39''$  with an uncertainty of  $\sim 5''$  along the declination. This position is closest to **vdMA10**, while the centers **N10** and **NGB08** centers are not consistent with being at the center of the counter-rotating core. We describe each of the methods attempted to better constrain the center below; all of these are consistent with our center quoted above, with uncertainties ranging from  $5''\text{--}20''$ .

The first method we implemented was a slight modification to the MCMC analytical profile fits described in § 3.2. Here, we added two additional parameters to the MCMC analyses, dx and dy as offsets to the center and fit them in the iterations. We provided an initial guess for the center by eye based on the counter-rotation from the velocity map of the KNN analysis and allowed it to vary as offsets in dx and dy. We fit the center for every radial bin and based on several runs, we found that the best-fit median of the center was not very well constrained. Although dx and dy are scattered around zero, the average errors ranged up to  $20''$ , which is our entire region of counter-rotation. To test the accuracy of this method, we used a sample test


case of M80 using the data published by Göttingen et al. (2021), where the center was constrained using a similar MCMC analysis of their Jeans' models. The dx and dy offsets that we obtained were similar to those found in Göttingen et al. (2021), with median errors up to  $2''$ . We conclude that this method is most likely not suitable for  $\omega$  Centauri, due to the flatness of the core and the counter-rotation present close to the center.

We tried an approach using the pie-slice method, a similar approach that was used in Anderson & van der Marel (2010), where they used the number counts of the stars to determine the center whereas we use the LOS velocities instead of the photometry. This method determines the point around which the stellar kinematics are most symmetrically distributed. First, we provide the same initial guess that was used in the previous method as a trial center. Based on this center, a  $5''$  grid of trial centers is created around it. Around each grid point, we constructed 16 azimuthal wedges, extending to distances of  $20''$ , and each wedge was further divided into 7 radial bins. We minimized the differences between the mean velocities in opposite pairs of bins along with the uncertainties using the `biweight_location` robust statistic (described in § 4.1). Finally, we summed up these differences for all the bins to determine a  $\chi^2$  measure. This method yielded a  $\chi^2$  minima along the rotation axis of the counter-rotation of the cluster and hence appears not suited for locating the center of  $\omega$  Centauri.


Finally, we used an approach based on kinemetry, where we performed a grid search using the center as two variables. We divided the central  $20''$  into a grid of 30 centers and performed kinemetry using each center. Each center was fixed in the code along with the PA and the flattening (q) of the ellipses. To obtain the initial values for PA and q, we first ran the kinemetry code with our initial guess for the center and averaged the PA and q of the ellipse at  $\sim 3''$  and  $\sim 5''$ . We used this value PA =  $80^\circ$  and q = 0.84 for fixing the PA and q of the ellipses. To avoid the effects of the global rotation, we limited the number of ellipses to 9, and then performed kinemetry on the grid of centers. We estimated the  $\chi^2$  for the last three ellipses by minimizing the sum of the squares of their coefficients A1, A2, B2, A3, and B3 (Jedrzejewski 1987; Krajnović et al. 2006). We found that two local minima existed for the  $\chi^2$  along the counter-rotating axis that lies  $\sim 1.5''$  and  $\sim 7''$  from our initial guess. We used a mean of both the centers to get an estimate for the final center with a final uncertainty estimate of  $\sim 5''$  in the declination and  $\sim 1.5''$  in the right ascension. The uncertainty was estimated using the  $1\sigma$  map of the  $\chi^2$  for a  $\Delta\chi^2 = 2.3$ . Hereafter, we refer to this center as the kinematic center.

Based on this result and our earlier approaches to determining the center, we found that the location of the center is always degenerate along the rotation axis. The **vdMA10** center that lies along this rotation axis has the potential to be one of the possible centers as it is the closest to our derived center and is within the median uncertainties of  $5''$ .

We also estimated a center based on the LOESS dispersion maps from Figure 3. For using kinemetry on the dispersion maps, the profile is assumed to be constant and the corresponding coefficients are minimized. In this case, the dispersion maps are assumed to be point symmetric (refer Krajnović et al. (2006)), and since we are not analysing the rotation, we used circles instead of ellipses with a PA of  $0^\circ$ . We then minimized the sum of the square of the coefficients A1, A2, B1, B2, A3 and B3 to obtain the  $\chi^2$ . Here, A0 provides an estimate of the velocity dispersion, which is  $22.6 \pm 1.5$  km/s. We similarly performed kinemetry as previously mentioned and used the  $\chi^2$  estimate to determine the center. We estimated the center to be RA = 13h 26m 46.86s and Decl =  $-47^\circ 28' 42.46s$  with an uncertainty



**Figure 5.** Left: Rotation profile of the cluster using the kinematic center. Solid points are the result of discrete binning of the radial velocities (Eq. 3) whereas the shaded curve is the analytical rotation profile. Right: PA of the rotation of the cluster. Note the counter-rotation observed towards the center.



**Figure 6.** Rotation profile and PA of the rotation of  $\omega$ -Cen. The top panels show the rotation (amplitude) profile of the stars that are binned radially using the method in § 3.2. The bottom panels show the orientation of the rotation axis within each radial bin. From left to right: profiles using N10, vdMA10, and NGB08 centers. Note that the counter-rotation is only observed in vdMA10.

of  $1.5''$ . Hereafter, we refer to this center as the dispersion center. The uncertainty is estimated similarly as determined previously using the  $\chi^2$  map. This dispersion map based center is closest to the N10 center and is  $\sim 2.5''$  away from it. Although, there is a significant offset ( $\sim 10''$ ) between the counter-rotation center and the dispersion center, both the centers are closest to the vdMA10 and N10 centers respectively. On the contrary, the offset in the NGB08 is the largest. All the centers and corresponding central dispersion values are listed in Table 2.

## 5.2 Kinematic Profiles for the Various Centers

We choose our derived center from the counter-rotation i.e. kinematic center for the rest of the analysis. We do not use the center from dispersion in our analyses as it is close to the N10 center and results in similar profiles. We used the kinematic center to derive the rotational velocity profile, dispersion profile, and the PA of the rotation as shown in Figure 5 and Figure 7. These profiles were derived using the method described in § 3.2. The solid points in Figure 5 are a result of the discrete binning of the radial velocities whereas the curve is the analytical profile of the rotation (from Eq. 3). In the rotation plot of the cluster, we see the signal for a counter-rotating core, where the PA of the velocities close to the center (within  $20''$ ) is in the opposite direction to the global rotation of the cluster. The PA for the inner  $15''$  has a mean of  $136^\circ$  E of N with a scatter of  $20^\circ$  whereas the PA  $> 20''$  is  $\sim 10^\circ$ . The maximum rotational velocity of the inner  $15''$  is 3-5 km/s whereas the outer rotational velocity peaks at  $\sim 4.5$  km/s.


We also created radial profiles of the rotational velocity and velocity dispersions for the existing centers proposed in NGB08, vdMA10, and N10 using the same method. They are shown in Figure 6 and Figure 7. We observe that there is no significant counter-rotation around the NGB08 center. This is because the center is  $\sim 12''$  away from the other centers and further away from the counter-rotating core (see Figure 3). This is also visible in the PA plot where the innermost data points (within  $10''$ ) are scattered around in all directions, whereas the rest show a global rotation for the cluster  $\sim 19^\circ$  E of N. The rotation curve around the vdMA10 center again shows a scatter close to the center without any distinctive peak but the PA plot shows a clear counter-rotating signal, which is similar to what we find for the kinematic center. The velocities within  $10''$  have a mean PA of  $208^\circ \pm 21^\circ$  E of N except for the central data point and the rest of the velocities have a PA similar to the one from the previous center with a mean of  $10^\circ \pm 15^\circ$ . The velocities within  $10''$  from the N10 center are similar to those from the vdMA10 center but the PAs are scattered around in all directions, with some of the data points in the opposite direction compared to the global rotation. They have a mean of  $\sim 200^\circ$  but have a standard deviation of  $\sim 60^\circ$  which is much larger compared to the vdMA10 center. The rotation profiles at larger radii ( $> 20''$ ) for all the centers behave similarly as expected in GCs (e.g., Fiestas et al. 2006), including a detailed study of  $\omega$  Centauri in van de Ven et al. (2006). According to Eq. 3, we expect a maximum at a few half-light radii and then a steady decrease for larger radii. This trend was observed for 25 GCs in Kamann et al. (2018), where detailed rotation and dispersion profiles were derived. We observe a similar trend, but in addition, there's also an increase in the rotational velocity close to the center in our estimates of  $\omega$  Centauri due to the presence of counter-rotation in Figure 5.

Figure 7 shows the comparison between the observed dispersion profiles derived for different centers. First, we compared the dispersion profiles from the previously published data in NGB08, vdMA10, and N10 with the dispersion profiles derived using the MUSE data

for the same centers as used in those studies. The data from NGB08 consisted of only two data points from their observations using the GMOS-IFU. The measurements in N10 were done using the ARGUS IFU with FLAMES on VLT whereas the measurements for vdMA10 were taken from the HST proper motions that were estimated by Anderson & van der Marel (2010). We used a distance of 5.2 kpc (Harris 1996) for  $\omega$  Centauri to scale the proper motions to the LOS velocity dispersions. We found surprisingly similar trends with respect to each study within the error bars. The N10 result has a rise in the central velocity dispersion that we observe from our data too; this favors the presence of a  $\sim 10^4 M_\odot$  BH from the N10 analysis. The dispersion profiles from NGB08 and vdMA10 show a  $\sim 11\%$  and  $\sim 22\%$  drop for the center-most data point, respectively, compared to the N10 observations, but follow a similar trend in both profiles. Other than the N10 profile, all profiles seem consistent with a constant dispersion of  $\sim 20$  km/s in the central  $10''$ , since from the velocity dispersion map, the centers are offset from the peak and lie close to the counter-rotation axis. The rightmost bottom panel of Figure 7 includes the dispersion profile using our kinematic center along with the other dispersion profiles based on the MUSE data only. Including the uncertainties in the other profiles, the velocity dispersion rises smoothly towards the center up to a central velocity dispersion of  $\sim 20$  km/s, which is similar to other studies. There is no specific rise as observed in N10 though, which is mostly dependent on the assumed center.

To quantify this rise in dispersion, we did a linear regression on the data within  $15''$  for the dispersion values using the code from Kelly (2007), which takes into account the measurement errors in the y-direction and estimates the scatter in the regression. We found variable slopes for each center with the highest slope of  $-3.9 \pm 1.8$  km/s.arcsec for the N10 center. The slope for the vdMA10 center was found to be  $-3.2 \pm 1.9$  km/s.arcsec. This is almost similar to the N10 center because the majority of the points rise but the central data point drops to 18 km/s. On the contrary, we found a zero to positive slope for the NGB08 center with a value of  $-0.3 \pm 3.1$  km/s.arcsec. The slope for our kinematic center was  $-0.3 \pm 4.2$  km/s.arcsec. From our regression analysis, we have a significant scatter for the slopes for each center especially for the NGB08 center and the kinematic center. Although they all were found to lie within  $1\sigma$  significance of each other, there are differences in the velocity dispersions within the central  $5''$  from each center. For the N10 center and the vdMA10 center, we estimated the integrated central velocity dispersions ( $< 5''$ ), which were  $20.6 \pm 0.9$  km/s and  $20.9 \pm 0.7$  km/s respectively. For the NGB08 center, it was  $18.9 \pm 1.0$  km/s whereas for the kinematic center, it was  $19.6 \pm 0.9$  km/s. The highest difference was found to be between the NGB08 center and the vdMA10 and N10 centers. The differences in these central velocity dispersions can indeed make a difference in the detection of an IMBH from the previous studies. A detailed dynamical modeling using the different centers and the dispersion profiles is needed to quantify the presence/absence of an IMBH.

Another aspect that can be observed from the comparison of the dispersion profiles is that LOS velocity measurements from different types of observations such as integrated-light measurements or resolved stellar velocities result in similar velocity dispersion measurements. In the literature, such as Lützgendorf et al. (2015), significant changes between velocity dispersion measurements were found based on the type of observations. They compared the results from their previous work (Lützgendorf et al. 2011), which was based on seeing-limited integrated light kinematics, and the results from Lanzoni et al. (2013) based on adaptive optics assisted resolved stellar kinematics in NGC 6388. They found that the integrated-light measurements can



**Figure 7.** Comparison of the velocity dispersion profiles. Open triangles in green, orange, and blue are observations from the [NGB08](#), [vdMA10](#), and [N10](#). Other symbols in green, orange, and blue are the radially-binned velocities from this work for different centers. Note that our measurements match the overall dispersion profiles well from each study. The bottom right panel shows the velocity dispersion profile (brown solid circles) derived using the kinematic center (center from the counter-rotation) in this work. The other three profiles are the same as shown in the rest of the panels and are plotted for comparison with the kinematic center’s profile.

be biased towards higher velocities due to the contamination from bright stars close to the center. On the other hand, resolved velocities can also be biased because the contamination from neighboring stars can drive the individual star velocities to the mean velocity. We note that the previous observations from [vdMA10](#) were using the HST proper motion data whereas the studies from [NGB08](#) and [N10](#) were using the integrated-light data from GMOS-IFU and VLT-FLAMES respectively. From our analyses, the velocity dispersions derived from discrete velocities are quite similar to the integrated-light measurements, and we do not find any notable difference in the measurements from resolved kinematics vs. the integrated-light measurements (done by other work). This implies that the contamination effects are small while extracting our kinematics. Although the dispersion measurements are similar using different techniques, we note that the core density of  $\omega$  Centauri is  $\log \rho_c = 3.15 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{pc}^3$  whereas NGC 6388 has a  $\log \rho_c = 5.37 \text{ M}_\odot/\text{pc}^3$  ([Harris 1996](#)) which is significantly denser. Due to this, although the contamination of light from neighboring stars is higher for the integrated light measurements, the shot noise is much lower for NGC 6388 and is not affected by that uncertainty. For the MUSE data, we cannot make a straightforward comparison between the two clusters because of their different densities and different techniques involved in the extraction. Only a detailed analysis focusing on the differences between extraction techniques can help identify if there is a significant difference in the measurements obtained for  $\omega$  Centauri and NGC 6388.

## 6 HIGH-VELOCITY STARS IN $\omega$ CENTAURI

A smoking gun for the presence of an IMBH would be the detection of high-velocity stars close to the center of  $\omega$  Centauri using the NFM data. A discussion from [Baumgardt et al. \(2019\)](#) shows that for  $\omega$  Centauri to host a  $4.75 \times 10^4 \text{ M}_\odot$  BH, a tail of at least 20 high-velocity stars  $>62 \text{ km/s}$  should exist within  $20''$  of the center (see Figure 2 from [Baumgardt et al. \(2019\)](#)). They ran a large grid of N-Body simulations that had several parameters such as the initial density profile, half-mass radius, the initial mass function, the cluster metallicity, and the mass fraction of an IMBH in the clusters. In addition, they varied the retention fraction of the stellar-mass BHs. The best-fit model to the observed data had a 75% retention fraction of stellar-mass BHs at the center and no IMBH.

To test this theory, we looked for evidence of any high-velocity stars from our entire sample of stellar LOS velocities. We use a S/N cut of 8 but we do not use a cluster membership cut, since the membership estimation is also dependent on the LOS velocity of the stars. After the cut, we had 28,782 stars, out of which we excluded stars that were obvious non-members and foreground stars of MW with a mean velocity close to zero. For this, we removed stars with absolute velocities  $<75 \text{ km/s}$ , which left us with a sample of 28,719 stars including members and non-members. We used our kinematic center to estimate the distances for this analysis. We plot all these stars in Figure 8. This contains 50 stars that have a velocity  $>62 \text{ km/s}$ , but


none are significant outliers within  $20''$  (velocity and distance limits obtained from Baumgardt et al. (2019)). We define the significant outliers in the velocity higher than 62 km/s based on the uncertainty in the velocity of the star. A star would be a  $1\sigma$  outlier if its velocity is higher than 62 km/s including its uncertainty at the  $1\sigma$  level. From the histogram, we have 50 stars that have velocities  $>62$  km/s out of which 22 are  $1\sigma$  outliers, twelve are  $2\sigma$  outliers and nine are  $3\sigma$  outliers. We checked for the probability of the stars being binaries from a parallel work (Wragg et al. *in prep.*) and found that three out of those nine stars are likely binaries. From the six non-binary stars, we found one star that is at  $\sim 20''$  with a velocity of  $104 \pm 1.5$  km/s. We checked for the properties of this star on the color-magnitude diagram and it was redder than the main-sequence of the cluster, hence it is most likely a non-member of the cluster. This star also has a cluster membership probability of 0.0004 from our cluster membership analysis. The remaining stars are further away from the cluster center ( $>1$  arcmin). Their LOS velocities range from 92–128 km/s, and out of these, one star has a cluster membership probability of 0.99 and the rest of them are close to zero. A measure of the 3-D velocities of these stars can indicate the nature of their high-velocities.

The above analysis from Baumgardt et al. (2019) was based on N-Body simulations that were matched to the observed sample from Bellini et al. (2017). The Bellini et al. (2017) sample contained roughly 2900 stars within the central  $20''$ . We have a similar number of stars ( $\sim 2500$ ) compared to their sample within  $20''$ , but note that they treat the two velocity components of the stars as separate measurements. Hence, the number of detected high-velocity stars in our sample should be halved ( $\sim 10$ ). Although we do not detect any significant number of high-velocity stars as predicted from these simulations, there are still some possible implications to this: 1. There is no IMBH in  $\omega$  Centauri. 2. The IMBH is smaller than  $\sim 5 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ . 3. The existing simulations might not be fully scaled to  $\omega$  Centauri. From Baumgardt et al. (2019) simulations which were for a BH of  $\sim 4.7 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ , the number of high-velocity stars should scale with the BH mass. Assuming that the stars within the sphere of influence (SOI) are potentially high-velocity stars, the radius of the SOI scales with the BH mass, and the volume scales with the cube of the BH mass. Therefore, reducing the BH mass by 50% results in a decrease in the number of high-velocity stars by a factor of 8, which in our case would be 5 stars for a BH mass of  $2.3 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ . For a BH mass much lower than that, there might be no stars that we might be able to detect at all. This still does not completely rule out the no-IMBH scenario, and additional investigation using dynamical models is necessary.

## 7 SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we used the MUSE WFM and NFM spectroscopic data to analyse the central kinematics of  $\omega$  Centauri. The next paper in the series will present dynamical models based on different centers to infer whether a central dark mass or IMBH is present.

- We extracted the LOS velocities of 28,108 stars from both WFM and NFM datacubes. The dataset is of the highest resolution yet obtained for the central  $20''$  with a spatial resolution of 25 mas. We used the data to obtain the LOS velocity and velocity dispersion maps using KNN analysis and the LOESS method and then ran a *kinemetry* analysis on the maps. For the first time, our dataset revealed that the central  $20''$  of the cluster are counter-rotating with respect to the large-scale rotation that is on the scale of  $100''$ , with a rotation speed of  $\sim 3\text{--}4$  km/s.



**Figure 8.** Histogram of the LOS velocities of all the stars with an  $S/N > 8$  excluding the foreground stars. Note that we have a few high-velocity stars but they are  $\sim 1$  arcmin away from the center and none of them are close to the center (within  $20''$ ).

- We used several methods to determine a kinematic center for the cluster based on the counter-rotation and the peak in the velocity dispersion and finally used the kinemetry to constrain the centers using both kinematic maps. Our center based on the counter-rotation was closest ( $\sim 5''$ ) to the *vdMA10* whereas the center based on the dispersion peak was found to be near ( $\sim 2.5''$ ) *N10* centers. Both centers are offset by  $\sim 10''$ , which is  $\sim 0.25$  pc.
- We compared the proposed centers of  $\omega$  Centauri from *NGB08*, *N10*, *vdMA10*, and our kinematic center, and used those centers to derive the radial profiles for rotations and dispersions. We found similar trends in the dispersion profiles for different centers when compared to the previously observed data.
- While comparing the dispersion profiles we also found that irrespective of whether the data was integrated-light kinematics or discrete velocities, the trends for the velocity dispersion profiles were similar.
- To search for evidence of any potential IMBH, we searched for high-velocity stars ( $> 62$  km/s) close to the center ( $< 20''$ ) of the cluster but did not find any significant outliers. However, this does not completely rule out the IMBH as a lower mass in IMBH can result in non-detection of any high-velocity stars.

Assuming that the center of  $\omega$  Centauri contains an IMBH with a mass of  $4.7 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$ , the sphere of influence is  $15''$ , which is the region of the counter-rotation. An interesting possibility for the counter-rotation is the existence of a potential binary IMBH at the center of the cluster. Simulations of three-body encounters from Mapelli et al. (2005) show that a fraction of stars (55-70%) tend to align their angular momentum to the binary IMBH. These simulations consist of three-body encounters of two BHs (binary IMBH) and a cluster star of mass  $0.5 M_{\odot}$ , where the trajectories of stars were observed that were scattered by the binary IMBH. If the binary BHs were massive enough and their orbits were wide enough and in addition, if their orbital angular momentum was higher than that of the incoming star, the star could co-rotate with its angular momentum aligned to the binary IMBH. In our case, if the binary

IMBH orbital rotation is misaligned with the global rotation, there is a probability of finding stars aligned with the binary IMBH rotation and thus counter-rotating. But, this case is unlikely to explain the offset between the peak of the dispersion and the center of the counter-rotation that we find. One scenario that can likely explain the offset in the counter-rotation and the dispersion peak is a wandering IMBH. [de Vita et al. \(2018\)](#) estimated a scaling relation between the cluster parameters and the wandering radius for an IMBH using  $N$ -Body models. In particular, they derived the displacements of IMBHs in the clusters using a fixed ratio for cluster mass to IMBH mass and found that they deviated on average within  $1''$ . But, they also found a few outliers, specifically for  $\omega$  Centauri, which had an average displacement of  $2.5''$ . Note that their assumptions relied on the extrapolations of BH mass scaling relationships, where they assumed a fixed mass ratio between  $M_{BH}/M_{tot} = 10^3$ . The lower mass end of the scaling relationships suffers from a significant scatter and thus the displacements can vary too. We used their Equation 16 for a BH mass of  $4.7 \times 10^4 M_{\odot}$  to estimate a wandering radius  $r_w$ , which was  $\sim 0.7''$  for a cluster core radius of 3.6 pc and mass of  $3.6 \times 10^6 M_{\odot}$  ([Baumgardt & Hilker 2018](#)). The offset in our dispersion center and the kinematic center is  $\sim 9''$ , and within  $1\sigma$  this offset drops to  $\sim 3''$ . A wandering IMBH explanation is not highly unlikely although more detailed simulations tailored to  $\omega$  Centauri would be needed to investigate this scenario.

Several studies of early-type galaxies show a fraction of galaxies containing kinematically decoupled cores (KDCs) (e.g., [Krajnović et al. 2011](#); [Cappellari 2016](#)). These are the cores of galaxies that are not aligned to the global rotation of the galaxy, which is usually a consequence of a previous merger (e.g., [Kormendy et al. 1994](#); [Hoffman et al. 2010](#)). For example, the NSC of NGC 404 counter-rotates with respect to the galaxy ([Seth et al. 2010](#); [Nguyen et al. 2017b](#)), and this is believed to be due to a merger with a gas-rich dwarf around 1 Gyr ago. This is also supported by the young stars that are found near the center of this galaxy. Many galaxies are also observed to show this behavior such as NGC 4150, NGC 3032, NGC 4382, etc. ([McDermid et al. 2006](#)). Some GCs such as M15, which is a core-collapsed cluster ([Usher et al. 2021](#)), and M53 ([Boberg et al. 2017](#)) were also observed to have an inner rotation axis not aligned with the outer rotation similar to  $\omega$  Centauri. If  $\omega$  Centauri was formed through globular cluster mergers, there is a possibility for this kind of varied kinematics towards the center. The half-mass relaxation time of  $\omega$  Centauri is 9.6 Gyr ([Harris 1996](#)), so primordial kinematic features might still be observable. However, the relaxation time close to the center will be much shorter, and thus an initial central counter-rotation should have been erased. Despite the general expectation that rotation is lost on relatively short timescales, there is considerable nuclear rotation seen in many GCs with even shorter relaxation times than  $\omega$  Centauri (e.g., [Fabricius et al. 2014](#); [Kamann et al. 2018](#)). However, in a scenario with purely isotropic mergers of GCs, the expectation would probably be like in the case of galaxy dry mergers, a velocity field consistent with zero mean velocity and thus without any surviving rotating substructures (e.g., [Hernquist 1993](#); [Cox et al. 2006](#)). But, recently [Tsatsi et al. \(2017\)](#) found that even pure isotropic GC mergers can result in a rotating NSC, but the mechanism is not trivial.  $\omega$  Centauri also contains a complex population of stars and a spread in metallicities and ages (e.g., [Johnson & Pilachowski 2010b](#); [Latour et al. 2021](#)) that is suggestive of this scenario where different populations from multiple GCs might be surviving in the present-day cluster (e.g., [Lee et al. 1999](#); [Bedin et al. 2004](#)).

Recently, data from Gaia was used to trace the origin of  $\omega$  Centauri, where [Majewski et al. \(2012\)](#); [Massari et al. \(2019\)](#); [Forbes \(2020\)](#); [Pfeffer et al. \(2021\)](#) suggested it to be the former core of the *Gaia*-

Enceladus/Sausage galaxy and galaxies are likely to contain central BHs. If there were strong tidal interactions in the past, then it is a possibility that the core along with its BH could have been offset from the global rotation. If the offset of the core is an imprint of this tidal interaction, this tidal effect must have acted along the north-south direction, e.g. when  $\omega$  Centauri passed the Milky Way disk since we observe the counter-rotation elongated in that direction. These kinematics are indicative of a complex system with probable interactions in the past. However, recent studies by [Tiongco et al. \(2018, 2022\)](#) used  $N$ -Body simulations to follow the evolution of rotating star clusters in the presence of an external tidal field. They found that the dynamics within the cluster are perturbed by the tidal field, mainly a tidal torque from the host galaxy that affects the internal rotation of the cluster and introduces a precession of the cluster's rotation axis. Mostly, the inner regions are dominated by the cluster's natal rotation, which is dependent on the initial conditions, whereas precession is introduced in the outer parts of the cluster. As the cluster evolves, a radial variation of the rotation axis is observed, and depending on the initial intrinsic rotation, it can lead to a counter-rotation in the cluster. When compared, the precession would have to be observed in the outer parts of the cluster that are beyond the half-mass radius of the cluster (10.4 pc), whereas we observe the counter-rotation within the central  $20''$  (0.5 pc). It is highly unlikely from these simulations that the counter-rotation was caused by tidal effects.

Our next step is to model the kinematics using Schwarzschild dynamical models. This will allow us to constrain a possible IMBH or dark remnant mass distribution in this cluster. It is challenging, however, to set up this model due to the counter-rotation, its offset from the dispersion peak, and overall, the outer kinematics may dominate the rotation field.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

R.P. and S.K. acknowledge funding from UKRI in the form of a Future Leaders Fellowship (grant no. MR/T022868/1). PMW acknowledges support by the BMBF from the ErUM program (project VLT-BlueMUSE, grant 05A20BAB)

## DATA AVAILABILITY

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

## REFERENCES


- Ahn C. P., et al., 2017, *ApJ*, 839, 72  
 Ahn C. P., et al., 2018, *ApJ*, 858, 102  
 Alfaro-Cuello M., et al., 2019, *ApJ*, 886, 57  
 Anderson J., van der Marel R. P., 2010, *ApJ*, 710, 1032  
 Anderson J., et al., 2008, *AJ*, 135, 2055  
 Baumgardt H., 2017, *MNRAS*, 464, 2174  
 Baumgardt H., Hilker M., 2018, *MNRAS*, 478, 1520  
 Baumgardt H., Makino J., Hut P., 2005, *ApJ*, 620, 238  
 Baumgardt H., et al., 2019, *MNRAS*, 488, 5340  
 Bedin L. R., Piotto G., Anderson J., Cassisi S., King I. R., Momany Y., Carraro G., 2004, *ApJ*, 605, L125  
 Beers T. C., Flynn K., Gebhardt K., 1990, *AJ*, 100, 32  
 Bellini A., Anderson J., Bedin L. R., King I. R., van der Marel R. P., Piotto G., Cool A., 2017, *ApJ*, 842, 6

- Bianchini P., van der Marel R. P., del Pino A., Watkins L. L., Bellini A., Fardal M. A., Libralato M., Sills A., 2018, *MNRAS*, **481**, 2125
- Boberg O. M., Vesperini E., Friel E. D., Tiongco M. A., Varri A. L., 2017, *ApJ*, **841**, 114
- Bressan A., Marigo P., Girardi L., Salasnich B., Dal Cero C., Rubele S., Nanni A., 2012, *MNRAS*, **427**, 127
- Brown A. M., Massey R., Lacroix T., Strigari L. E., Fattahi A., Bøhm C., 2019, *arXiv e-prints*, p. [arXiv:1907.08564](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.08564)
- Cappellari M., 2016, *ARA&A*, **54**, 597
- Cappellari M., et al., 2013, *MNRAS*, **432**, 1862
- Cleveland W. S., 1979, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **74**, 829
- Cleveland W. S., Devlin S. J., 1988, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **83**, 596
- Cox T. J., Dutta S. N., Di Matteo T., Hernquist L., Hopkins P. F., Robertson B., Springel V., 2006, *ApJ*, **650**, 791
- Evans A. J., Strigari L. E., Zivick P., 2022, *MNRAS*, **511**, 4251
- Fabricius M. H., et al., 2014, *ApJ*, **787**, L26
- Fétick R. J. L., et al., 2019, *A&A*, **628**, A99
- Fiestas J., Spurzem R., Kim E., 2006, *MNRAS*, **373**, 677
- Forbes D. A., 2020, *MNRAS*, **493**, 847
- Foreman-Mackey D., Hogg D. W., Lang D., Goodman J., 2013, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, **125**, 306–312
- Freeman K. C., Rodgers A. W., 1975, *ApJ*, **201**, L71
- Fusco T., et al., 2020, *A&A*, **635**, A208
- Gebhardt K., Rich R. M., Ho L. C., 2005, *ApJ*, **634**, 1093
- Geyer E. H., Hopp U., Nelles B., 1983, *A&A*, **125**, 359
- Giesers B., et al., 2019, *A&A*, **632**, A3
- Göttgens F., et al., 2021, *MNRAS*, **507**, 4788
- Gratton R. G., Carretta E., Bragaglia A., 2012, *A&ARv*, **20**, 50
- Greene J. E., Strader J., Ho L. C., 2020, *ARA&A*, **58**, 257
- Habouzit M., et al., 2021, *MNRAS*, **503**, 1940
- Harris W. E., 1996, *AJ*, **112**, 1487
- Helmi A., Babusiaux C., Koppelman H. H., Massari D., Veljanoski J., Brown A. G. A., 2018, *Nature*, **563**, 85
- Hernquist L., 1993, *ApJ*, **409**, 548
- Hoffman L., Cox T. J., Dutta S., Hernquist L., 2010, *ApJ*, **723**, 818
- Husser T. O., Wende-von Berg S., Dreizler S., Homeier D., Reiners A., Barman T., Hauschildt P. H., 2013, *A&A*, **553**, A6
- Husser T.-O., et al., 2016, *A&A*, **588**, A148
- Husser T.-O., et al., 2020, *A&A*, **635**, A114
- Ibata R., et al., 2009, *ApJ*, **699**, L169
- Jedrzejewski R. I., 1987, *MNRAS*, **226**, 747
- Johnson C. I., Pilachowski C. A., 2010a, *ApJ*, **722**, 1373
- Johnson C. I., Pilachowski C. A., 2010b, *ApJ*, **722**, 1373
- Kamann S., 2018, PampelMuse: Crowded-field 3D spectroscopy (ascl:1805.021)
- Kamann S., Wisotzki L., Roth M. M., 2013, *A&A*, **549**, A71
- Kamann S., et al., 2016, *A&A*, **588**, A149
- Kamann S., et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, **473**, 5591
- Kelly B. C., 2007, *ApJ*, **665**, 1489
- Kormendy J., Dressler A., Byun Y. I., Faber S. M., Grillmair C., Lauer T. R., Richstone D., Tremaine S., 1994, in *European Southern Observatory Conference and Workshop Proceedings*. p. 147
- Krajnović D., Cappellari M., de Zeeuw P. T., Copin Y., 2006, *MNRAS*, **366**, 787
- Krajnović D., et al., 2008, *MNRAS*, **390**, 93
- Krajnović D., et al., 2011, *MNRAS*, **414**, 2923
- Kruijssen J. M. D., Portegies Zwart S. F., 2009, *ApJ*, **698**, L158
- Lanzoni B., et al., 2013, *ApJ*, **769**, 107
- Latour M., Calamida A., Husser T. O., Kamann S., Dreizler S., Brinchmann J., 2021, *A&A*, **653**, L8
- Leaman R., 2012, *AJ*, **144**, 183
- Lee Y. W., Joo J. M., Sohn Y. J., Rey S. C., Lee H. C., Walker A. R., 1999, *Nature*, **402**, 55
- Lee Y. W., Rey S. C., Ree C. H., Joo J. M., Sohn Y. J., Yoon S. J., 2002, in van Leeuwen F., Hughes J. D., Piotto G., eds, *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series Vol. 265, Omega Centauri, A Unique Window into Astrophysics*. p. 305 ([arXiv:astro-ph/0110688](https://arxiv.org/abs/astro-ph/0110688))
- Lützgendorf N., Kissler-Patig M., Noyola E., Jalali B., de Zeeuw P. T., Gebhardt K., Baumgardt H., 2011, *A&A*, **533**, A36
- Lützgendorf N., Gebhardt K., Baumgardt H., Noyola E., Neumayer N., Kissler-Patig M., de Zeeuw T., 2015, *A&A*, **581**, A1
- Lynden-Bell D., 1967, *MNRAS*, **136**, 101
- Majewski S. R., Nidever D. L., Smith V. V., Damke G. J., Kunkel W. E., Patterson R. J., Bizyaev D., García Pérez A. E., 2012, *ApJ*, **747**, L37
- Mapelli M., Colpi M., Possenti A., Sigurdsson S., 2005, *MNRAS*, **364**, 1315
- Martocchia S., et al., 2018, *MNRAS*, **473**, 2688
- Massari D., Koppelman H. H., Helmi A., 2019, *A&A*, **630**, L4
- Mayor M., et al., 1997, *AJ*, **114**, 1087
- McDermid R. M., et al., 2006, *MNRAS*, **373**, 906
- Merritt D., Meylan G., Mayor M., 1997, *AJ*, **114**, 1074
- Meylan G., Mayor M., 1986, *A&A*, **166**, 122
- Meylan G., Mayor M., Duquennoy A., Dubath P., 1995, *A&A*, **303**, 761
- Nguyen D. D., et al., 2017a, *ApJ*, **836**, 237
- Nguyen D. D., et al., 2017b, *ApJ*, **836**, 237
- Nguyen D. D., et al., 2018, *ApJ*, **858**, 118
- Nguyen D. D., et al., 2019, *ApJ*, **872**, 104
- Nitschai M. S., et al., 2023, oMEGACat I: MUSE spectroscopy of 300,000 stars within the half-light radius of  $\omega$  Centauri ([arXiv:2309.02503](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.02503))
- Noyola E., Gebhardt K., Bergmann M., 2008, *ApJ*, **676**, 1008
- Noyola E., Gebhardt K., Kissler-Patig M., Lützgendorf N., Jalali B., de Zeeuw P. T., Baumgardt H., 2010, *ApJ*, **719**, L60
- Pechetti R., et al., 2022, *ApJ*, **924**, 48
- Pedregosa F., et al., 2011, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **12**, 2825
- Pfeffer J., Lardo C., Bastian N., Saracino S., Kamann S., 2021, *MNRAS*, **500**, 2514
- Piotto G., et al., 2015, *AJ*, **149**, 91
- Pryor C., Meylan G., 1993, in Djorgovski S. G., Meylan G., eds, *Astronomical Society of the Pacific Conference Series Vol. 50, Structure and Dynamics of Globular Clusters*. p. 357
- Reijns R. A., Seitzer P., Arnold R., Freeman K. C., Ingerson T., van den Bosch R. C. E., van de Ven G., de Zeeuw P. T., 2006, *A&A*, **445**, 503
- Robin A. C., Reylé C., Derrière S., Picaud S., 2003, *A&A*, **409**, 523
- Saglia R. P., et al., 2016, *ApJ*, **818**, 47
- Sarajedini A., et al., 2007, *AJ*, **133**, 1658
- Seth A. C., et al., 2010, *ApJ*, **714**, 713
- Seth A. C., et al., 2014, *Nature*, **513**, 398
- Sollima A., Baumgardt H., Hilker M., 2019, *MNRAS*, **485**, 1460
- Suntzeff N. B., Kraft R. P., 1996, *AJ*, **111**, 1913
- Tiongco M. A., Vesperini E., Varri A. L., 2018, *MNRAS*, **475**, L86
- Tiongco M. A., Vesperini E., Varri A. L., 2022, *MNRAS*, **512**, 1584
- Tsatsi A., Mastrobuono-Battisti A., van de Ven G., Perets H. B., Bianchini P., Neumayer N., 2017, *MNRAS*, **464**, 3720
- Usher C., Kamann S., Gieles M., Hénault-Brunet V., Dalessandro E., Balbinot E., Sollima A., 2021, *MNRAS*, **503**, 1680
- Volonteri M., 2010, *A&ARv*, **18**, 279
- Walker M. G., Mateo M., Olszewski E. W., Sen B., Woodroffe M., 2009, *AJ*, **137**, 3109
- Weilbacher P. M., et al., 2020, *A&A*, **641**, A28
- Zocchi A., Gieles M., Hénault-Brunet V., 2019, *MNRAS*, **482**, 4713
- de Vita R., Trenti M., MacLeod M., 2018, *MNRAS*, **475**, 1574
- van Leeuwen F., Le Poole R. S., Reijns R. A., Freeman K. C., de Zeeuw P. T., 2000, *A&A*, **360**, 472
- van de Ven G., van den Bosch R. C. E., Verolme E. K., de Zeeuw P. T., 2006, *A&A*, **445**, 513
- van der Marel R. P., Anderson J., 2010, *ApJ*, **710**, 1063

## APPENDIX A: APPENDIX

This paper has been typeset from a  $\text{\TeX}/\text{\LaTeX}$  file prepared by the author.





**Figure A.1.** Velocity dispersion maps of  $\omega$  Centauri. The maps describe the velocity dispersion determined using the K-nearest neighbors method. From left to right the  $k$ -value increases from 40 to 300 in the KNN analysis. A central peak is visible for the  $k$ -value of 300. This peak coincides with the center from [N10](#) since their center was derived based on the peak of the velocity dispersion.