Evolution of central dark matter of early-type galaxies up to $z \sim 0.8$
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ABSTRACT
We investigate the evolution of dark and luminous matter in the central regions of early-type galaxies up to $z \sim 0.8$. We use a spectroscopically selected sample of 154 cluster and field galaxies from the ESO Distant Clusters Survey (EDisCS), covering a wide range in redshifts ($z \sim 0.4–0.8$), stellar masses ($\log M_*/M_\odot \sim 10.5–11.5$ dex) and velocity dispersions ($\sigma_\star \sim 100–300$ km s$^{-1}$). We obtain central dark matter (DM) fractions by determining the dynamical masses from Jeans modelling of galaxy aperture velocity dispersions and the $M_\star$ from galaxy colours, and compare the results with local samples. We discuss how the correlations of central DM with galaxy size (i.e. the effective radius, $R_e$), $M_\star$ and $\sigma_\star$ evolve as a function of redshift, finding clear indications that local galaxies are, on average, more DM dominated than their counterparts at larger redshift. This DM fraction evolution with $z$ can be only partially interpreted as a consequence of the size–redshift evolution. We discuss our results within galaxy formation scenarios, and conclude that the growth in size and DM content which we measure within the last 7 Gyr is incompatible with passive evolution, while it is well reproduced in the multiple minor merger scenario. We also discuss the impact of the initial mass function (IMF) on our DM inferences and argue that this can be non-universal with the look-back time. In particular, we find that the Salpeter IMF can be better accommodated by low-redshift systems, while producing stellar masses at high $z$ which are unphysically larger than the estimated dynamical masses (particularly for lower $\sigma_\star$ systems).
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1 INTRODUCTION
Dark matter (DM) is a ubiquitous component of the universe. It dominates the mass density of virialized objects and has left its imprint at cosmological scales during the cosmic history (e.g. Komatsu et al. 2011). In the last decade, the large wealth of data from large sky surveys such as the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS; Abazajian et al. 2003, 2009; Adelman-McCarthy et al. 2008) have established that the DM budget is up to $\sim 85$ per cent of the total mass density of the universe. Numerical simulations of (DM only) structure formation within the consensus cosmology framework, i.e. the $\Lambda$ cold dark matter ($\Lambda$CDM) model, have provided accurate predictions on the DM density distribution in galaxies and clusters (Navarro, Frenk & White 1996, hereafter NFW; Bullock et al. 2001; Macciò, Dutton & van den Bosch 2008). More realistic models, which have tried to evaluate the effect of baryons on the DM distribution, have been characterized either through some approximate recipes such as the adiabatic contraction (e.g. Gnedin et al. 2004), which seems compatible with observations (e.g. Gnedin et al. 2007; Napolitano, Romanowsky & Tortora 2010), or to the simultaneous evolutions of the two components (Wu et al. 2014), making predictions on the expected DM fractions in the central galaxy regions (Hilz, Naab & Ostriker 2013).

Within this context, the study of the mass density distribution and the dark-to-baryonic mass ratio of early-type galaxies (ETGs,
ellipticals and lenticulars) is a crucial problem that has to be addressed in a systematic way, as these systems contain most of the cosmic stellar mass of the universe and represent the final stage of galaxy evolution, and contain the fossil record of the stellar and DM assembly through time.

Most of the current understanding of these systems is based on local galaxy samples. These have shown that the overall DM content depends crucially on the galaxy mass scale, which is possibly the effect of the overall star formation efficiency (Benson et al. 2000; Marisoni & Hudson 2002; Napolitano et al. 2005; Mandelbaum et al. 2006; van den Bosch et al. 2007; Conroy & Wechsler 2009; Moster et al. 2010). DM has been found to be relevant in the central galaxy regions (Gerhard et al. 2001; Padmanabhan et al. 2004; Cappellari et al. 2006; Thomas et al. 2007, 2009, 2011; Cardone et al. 2009, 2011; Hyde & Bernardi 2009; Tortora et al. 2009, T+09 hereafter; Auger et al. 2010; Cardone & Tortora 2010; Tortora et al. 2012) where ETGs show a substantial consistency with the concordance ΛCDM scenario (Napolitano et al. 2010; Tortora et al. 2012) and also some new scaling relations, like the one between DM fraction and formation epoch (Napolitano et al. 2010; Tortora et al. 2010b), which still need to be confirmed and fully understood.

Generally speaking, it has been shown that the central DM fraction (typically within one effective radius, R_e hereafter) is larger in more massive and large-sized galaxies (e.g. Hyde & Bernardi 2009; Ruszkowski & Springel 2009; T+09; Auger et al. 2010; Napolitano et al. 2010; Thomas et al. 2011; Tortora et al. 2012), even though there are also opposite claims from other studies (e.g. Grilli et al. 2009; Grilli 2010; Grilli & Gobat 2010). Although these trends are qualitatively unchanged independently of the adopted galaxy model or initial mass function, IMF (e.g. Cardone et al. 2009, 2011; Cardone & Tortora 2010), they can still be strongly affected by the assumptions on the stellar M/L, i.e. a non-homologous constant profile, as verified for the trend of the DM fraction as a function of mass (e.g. Trujillo, Burkert & Bell 2004; T+09; Tortora et al. 2012). The inventory of the pieces of evidence accumulated so far is complicated if one takes into account the effect of a non-universal IMF (Treu et al. 2010; Thomas et al. 2011; Cappellari et al. 2012, 2013b; Conroy & van Dokkum 2012; Spiniello et al. 2012; Wegner et al. 2012; Dutton et al. 2013; Ferreras et al. 2013; Goudfrooij & Kuijken 2013; La Barbera et al. 2013; Tortora, Romanowsky & Napolitano 2013; Weidner et al. 2013; Goudfrooij & Kuijken 2014; Tortora et al. 2014), which remains the largest source of uncertainty, since a systematic variation of the IMF with mass, from a bottom-lighter IMF in low-mass systems to a bottom-heavier IMF in massive galaxies, would wipe out the ‘aparent’ DM fraction trend with mass (e.g. Thomas et al. 2011; Tortora et al. 2013).

A robust assessment of all these correlations is crucial to have a clearer insight into the assembly of the two main galaxy components (stars and DM), and thus into the formation mechanisms across time. Unfortunately, with the currently available individual data sets, which generally cover small windows in redshift space, it is not possible to extend the investigation of the scaling relations found at lower redshifts to earlier epochs (but see, for instance, Auger et al. 2009, 2010; Tortora et al. 2010b; Sonnenfeld et al. 2013 for gravitational lenses). Only by accumulating data from different samples, a more systematic study of the DM fraction evolution with redshift is becoming possible.

This has been done, e.g., using weak and/or strong lensing analyses (e.g. Heymans et al. 2006; Lagattuta et al. 2010) to find that at higher redshift results point to an evolution of the total virial-to-stellar ratio that is larger at higher redshift. For the central DM content, results are still inconclusive, as both lower DM fractions (Faure et al. 2011, within the Einstein radius) and larger ones (Ruff et al. 2011, within R_e/2) have been found. However, the latter studies are based on limited galaxy samples with different model choices (e.g. on adopted scales at which the DM fractions are derived); thus, their conclusions are prone to uncertainties which are difficult to keep under control.

Instead, homogeneous approaches on well-studied high-z samples are still missing. Only recently, using massive galaxies from SDSS-III’s Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey (SDSS-III/Boss) combined with a sample from SDSS-II, Beifiori et al. (2014) have addressed the question, providing evidence that high-z ETGs are less DM dominated than their local counterparts. However, further independent analyses are needed to constrain not only the overall evolution of central DM, but also how it correlates with mass or galaxy size, and how these correlations change as a function of redshift.

The EDisCS sample (White et al. 2005; Saglia et al. 2010) includes ETGs in a wide range of redshifts (∼0.4–0.8) for which accurate photometry, structural parameters and central velocity dispersions are available. This provides us a rare opportunity to investigate the evolution of the central DM content, comparing these results with inferences in local galaxy samples.

The paper is organized as follows. Data samples and the analysis performed are introduced in Section 2. The evolution of the relations between size and velocity dispersion with stellar mass is discussed in Section 3, while Section 4 is devoted to the analysis of central DM content, its evolution with redshift, systematics and the interpretation within the formation scenarios. Conclusions and future prospects are discussed in Section 5. We adopt a cosmological model with (Ω_m, Ω_v, h) = (0.3, 0.7, 0.75), where h = H_0/100 km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1} (Komatsu et al. 2011).

2 SAMPLES AND DATA ANALYSIS

The aim of this paper is to present a uniform dynamical analysis for galaxies distributed on a wide redshift window. As higher redshift galaxies, we will use the sample from EDisCS survey (Saglia et al. 2010), which covers a redshift window from z ∼ 0.4 to z ∼ 0.8. As z ∼ 0 comparison samples, we use the data from the SPIDER project (La Barbera et al. 2010), ATLAS^{3D} (Cappellari et al. 2011) and from T+09. In the following, we will provide further details about data samples adopted.

2.1 EDisCS sample: data

The EDisCS survey (White et al. 2005; Saglia et al. 2010) provides photometric and spectroscopic data for ETGs in field and rich clusters with 0.4 ≤ z ≤ 0.8 and stellar mass completeness limit at log M_*/M⊙ = 10.4. We limit the analysis to objects with spectroscopic measurements, as these provide us accurate redshifts and internal kinematics. The final sample which we will use for this analysis has been further selected to have weak [O II] lines in order to remove late-type galaxies and contains 41 field galaxies and 113 in clusters.

For these systems, circularized Hubble Space Telescope I-band effective radii, R_e, and Sérsic fitting indices, n, are available.

The average slit width of the spectral observations, from which velocity dispersions have been derived, has been converted to an equivalent circular aperture of radius ≈1.025 (δx/π)^0.5, where δx is the slit width, in arcsec. The ratio between spectral aperture and the effective radius, R_{ap}/R_e, amounts to ∼1.5, with a tail to higher ratios.
As reference stellar masses, we have taken the ones from Saglia et al. (2010), using rest-frame absolute photometry derived from spectral energy distribution (SED) fitting (Rudnick et al. 2009), adopting the calibrations of Bell & de Jong (2001), with a ‘diet’ Salpeter IMF and $B − V$ colours. These masses are renormalized to a Chabrier IMF subtracting −0.1 dex, accordingly to results in T+09. Our masses are in very good agreement with those in Vulcani et al. (2011).

2.2 High-z sample: dynamics of EDisCS galaxies

Following the analysis in T+09 and Tortora et al. (2012), we model the velocity dispersion of each individual galaxy using the spherical isotropic Jeans equations, and hence estimate the (total) dynamical mass $M^{\text{dyn}}_{\text{tot}}$ (which, hereafter, we will refer to as $M^{\text{dyn}}_{\text{gal}}$) within $r = R_e$.

In the Jeans equations, the stellar density is provided by the Sérsic fit of the photometric data, and the total (DM + stars) mass is assumed to have the form of a singular isothermal sphere (SIS), from which $M(r) \propto \sigma^{2} r \rho$, where $\sigma_{\text{SIS}}$ is the model (3D) velocity dispersion.

The isothermal profile has been found to provide a robust description of the mass distribution in massive ETGs (e.g. Kochanek 1991; Bolton et al. 2006, 2008; Koopmans et al. 2006; Gavazzi et al. 2007; Auger et al. 2009, 2010; Chae, Bernardi & Kravtsov 2014; Oguri, Rusu & Falco 2014), and in particular the massive dark haloes dominating the outer regions of galaxies (Benson et al. 2000; Marini & Hudson 2002; Napolitano et al. 2005; Gavazzi et al. 2007; van den Bosch et al. 2007). This ‘conspiracy’ (Rusin, Kochanek & Keeton 2003; Treu & Koopmans 2004; Koopmans et al. 2006; Gavazzi et al. 2007; Auger et al. 2010) seems to be motivated also by theoretical arguments as the stellar body and dark haloes can produce an overall isothermal profile after having gone through the processes of gas contraction and star formation (Koopmans et al. 2006; Remus et al. 2013). For further details on the systematics introduced by the particular model choice, one can refer to T+09 and Tortora et al. (2012, see also Cardone et al. 2009, 2011; Cardone & Tortora 2010). However, in Section 4.1.2, we will discuss the impact on our results of the slope of the galaxy model adopted.

2.3 Reference $z \sim 0$ samples

We use three local data sets of ETGs to compare with high-z results. For these samples, we have performed the same dynamical analysis and use similar assumptions for the stellar and total density profiles as the ones for the high-z sample discussed in Section 2.2. Here below are given some details of the local data sets.

(i) SPIDER. This is the widest local data sample analysed in this paper, consisting of ∼4300 giant ETGs in the redshift range of $z = 0.05–0.1$ (La Barbera et al. 2010). The data set includes optical+near-infrared photometry (from the SDSS and the United Kingdom Infrared Telescope (UKIRT) Infrared Deep Sky Survey-Large Area Survey), high-quality measurements of galactic structural parameters (effective radius $R_e$ and Sérsic index $n$) and SDSS central aperture velocity dispersions $\sigma_{\text{Ap}}$. The sample galaxies are defined as bulge-dominated systems with passive spectra while late-type systems are removed through the SDSS classification parameters based on the spectral type and the fraction of light which is better described by a de Vaucouleurs (1948) profile (see Tortora et al. 2012 for further details). The sample is 95 per cent complete at the stellar mass $M_*=3 \times 10^{10} M_\odot$, which corresponds to $\sigma_{\text{Ap}} \sim 160 \text{ km s}^{-1}$. The stellar population synthesis (SPS)-based stellar mass-to-light ratios, $\Upsilon_\star$, were derived by fitting Bruzual & Charlot (2003) models to the multiband photometry, assuming a Chabrier IMF (see Swindle et al. (2011) and Tortora et al. (2012) for further details). A de-projected Sérsic law in the K band is used to describe the density profile of the stellar component. Then, both the light profile and total masses are calculated at $g$-band $R_e$, whose rest frame is approximately the observed $I$ band from EDisCS. The trends at $R_{g,e}$ will be discussed too.

(ii) T+09. This data set contains optical photometry and kinematics of the galaxy central regions from Prugniel & Simien (1996). The colours are measured within 1 $R_e$; the central velocity dispersions $\sigma_{\text{C}}$ are measured in circular aperture of radius $R_e/8$ from long-slit spectra. Non-homology in the light profile is taken into account using the $n−L/\text{M}^\star$ correlation in Prugniel & Simien (1997). $V_{\text{max}}$ is defined as the quadratic sum of the maximum rotation on the major and minor axes, and is taken into account in the dynamical modelling. Selecting galaxies with at least two measured colours brighter than $M_{\text{B}} = −16$ and further limiting the sample to ellipticals and lenticulars, we are left with $\sim 360$. See T+09 for further details on the sample selection and analysis. The $B$ band, like the $g$ band, approximates very well the rest frame of $I$-band measurements in EDisCS galaxies.

(iii) ATLAS$^{3D}$. This sample is originally constituted of 260 ETGs from the ATLAS$^{3D}$ survey (Cappellari et al. 2013a,b). About 15 per cent of the sample have significant gradients of the stellar mass-to-light ratio, as inferred by their young stellar populations (H$\beta$ equivalent width greater than 2.3 Å). We exclude these systems and we retain a sample of 224 galaxies. The relevant data for each galaxy include the effective radius, $R_e$ (obtained by renormalizing their $R_e$ from multi-gaussian expansion (MGE) light profiles with a factor of 1.35), the projected stellar velocity dispersion, $\sigma_e$, within a circularized aperture of radius $R_e$, the $r$-band total luminosity $L_r$ and stellar $M/L(\Upsilon_\star)$ derived by SPS fitting of the spectra with Vazdekis et al. (2012) models and a Salpeter (1955) IMF. The Chabrier (2001) IMF yields stellar masses that are $\sim 0.26$ dex smaller (see also Tortora et al. 2014 for further details).

These three local samples allow us to evaluate the impact on the results of (a) the prescription for light distribution profiles, (b) the apertures used to measure velocity dispersion and (c) SPS prescriptions for stellar mass estimates. As we will see, the trends are nearly independent of the sample adopted, making the results quite robust.

3 SIZE–MASS AND FABER–JACKSON EVOLUTION

A simple monolithic-like scenario, where the bulk of the stars are formed in a single dissipative event followed by a passive evolution, is no longer supported by the observations, while it is becoming increasingly evident in the occurrence of a strong mass and size evolution in ETGs (Trujillo et al. 2006; Trujillo, Ferreras & de La Rosa 2011).

For the analysis we want to perform, we are interested in comparing some relevant correlations found in local galaxies, such as the ones between the galaxy size, i.e. $R_e$, and the stellar mass, $M_\star$, and the one between the velocity dispersion and $M_\star$ (see e.g. T+09; La Barbera et al. 2010; Cappellari et al. 2013a) with the same for high-z galaxies (Saglia et al. 2010). In Fig. 1, we show the $R_e−M_\star$ relation for each galaxy of the four samples coloured according to their central velocity dispersion.
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Figure 1. Size–mass relation colourized according to the $\sigma_e$ bins in the colour bar (grayscale bar in the B&W version) in the top. We show single data points for single galaxies: $I$-band EDisCS (points), $g$-band SPIDER (open triangles), $B$-band T+09 (open squares) and $r$-band ATLAS3D (open stars).

Figure 2. Size–mass (top panels) and $\sigma_e$–mass (bottom panels) relations. Medians and 25–75th quantiles are plotted. The EDisCS sample is plotted as grey symbols; $I$-band $R_e$ are used. The average trends for lower $z$ ($z \leq 0.6$, blue lines) and higher $z$ ($z > 0.6$, blue dashed lines) EDisCS galaxies are also plotted. See the text for further details about bin selection. From left to right, we compare EDisCS results with $g$ band (open triangles) and $K$ band (dashed line) from SPIDER, $B$ band from T+09 (open squares) and $r$ band from ATLAS3D survey (open stars). Red (green) points and lines are for results corrected for progenitor bias for SPIDER (T+09) data sets.

This figure provides insights into the covariance among the stellar and dynamical parameters relevant in our analysis; we will adopt a similar approach in the next section when we will discuss the central DM content. Both low- and high-$z$ galaxies follow the typical positive $R_e-M_*$ relation. It is also evident that a similar positive correlation exists between $\sigma_e$ and $M_*$, independently of the redshift, as higher $\sigma_e$ galaxies are more concentrated at the higher stellar masses and lower $\sigma_e$ are found towards lower stellar masses both for high-$z$ and the low-$z$ samples. This is made clearer in Fig. 2, where we show the median results of the EDisCS sample compared face-to-face to the three local samples. The correlations for each data sample are quantified with a log–log fit, and the best-fitting parameters are reported in Table 1.

Consistently with the local observations and independently of differences in the bands adopted for the $R_e$s, the EDisCS sample presents the same size–mass trend, with more massive galaxies being larger (top panels in Fig. 2 and Table 1). All the correlations are significant at more than 99 per cent. Moreover, at fixed mass, the high-$z$ galaxies in the EDisCS sample show a systematic offset towards smaller radii with respect to the same quantities for the...
local samples, i.e. they are more compact at all masses. The same is found for the Sérsic indices (not shown) which are smaller than the local values. Instead, the slope of the size–mass for the EDisCS sample is identical to the ones of most of the samples analysed and a bit shallower than SPIDER sample. The high-\(z\) galaxies are, on average, ∼2–4 times smaller than local SPIDER galaxies while only ∼2 smaller than the other local samples (T+09 and ATLAS3D). If \(K\)-band \(R_e\) are used for SPIDER galaxies, then the difference with respect to the high-\(z\) sample becomes more similar to that found for the other local samples.

We have also split the high-\(z\) sample in two further bins to see whether there is the signature of a further evolution with \(z\) within the EDisCS sample itself. The two subsamples are selected to have redshifts ≤0.6 and >0.6, and have median redshifts of 0.52 and 0.75, respectively. We find that the trends are almost unchanged (see Table 1) and that there is possibly a further evolution in the intrinsic size towards more compact \(R_e\) at higher \(z\) (Saglia et al. 2010).

Going to the correlations between velocity dispersion and stellar mass, this is also seen in the EDisCS sample (bottom panels in Fig. 2 and Table 1). At fixed stellar mass, no significant evidence of evolution is found with respect to the local samples, except a marginal offset at \(M_* \lesssim 10^{11}\, M_\odot\), which shows smaller \(\sigma_e\) than the ones in EDisCS. In this case, the splitting of the EDisCS into two \(z\) bins does not show any further evolution signatures (see Fig. 2 and Table 1).

This mild evolution in velocity dispersion is consistent with predictions from galaxy mergers (Cenarro & Trujillo 2009; Hopkins et al. 2009), but not with the puffing-up scenario in Fan et al. (2008), which would produce a stronger change with redshift.

The results shown in Figs 1 and 2 do not take into account the progenitor bias, for which low-\(z\) ETG samples contain galaxies that have stopped their star formation only recently and that would not be recognized as ETGs at higher redshifts. In particular, a morphologically selected local sample of ETGs as the ones we have analysed contains systems with relatively young ages that, when evolved back to match the high-\(z\) sample, would not be recognized as being passive objects (van Dokkum & Franx 2001; Saglia et al. 2010; Valentiniuzzi et al. 2010a,b). For the SPIDER sample, luminosity–weighted ages are available (Swindle et al. 2011). These ages are derived from the spectral fitting code STARLIGHT (Cid Fernandes et al. 2005), which finds the best combination of simple stellar populations (SSPs) (with free age, metallicity and alpha enhancement) which reproduce the measured spectra. Thus, we only take those SPIDER objects which have an age ≥ 1.5 Gyr, at the average redshift of the EDisCS sample (i.e. older than 7.5 Gyr).

\footnote{The shallower size–mass relations found in T+09 and ATLAS3D with respect to the SPIDER sample are explained by the fact that fitting a high-\(n\) galaxy with a de Vaucouleurs profile gives a systematically smaller \(R_e\) value, hence flattening the size–mass relation.}

In contrast, for the T+09 data sample, ages estimated fitting exponential star formations (SFs) (with characteristic time-scale \(\tau\) ) to optical colours are available (T+09; Napolitano et al. 2010). For these reasons, we have only taken those systems that after a time \(\tau\) (corresponding to the epoch when the SF is reduced to 37 per cent of the initial value) are older than the look-back time at the average redshift of the sample. The results are fairly unchanged if we use the epoch when the SF is ∼14 per cent of the initial value (i.e. at the epoch 2\(\tau\)). Ages for ATLAS3D are not available; for this reason the impact of progenitor bias will not be discussed for this data set.

The outcomes for such old systems are shown in Fig. 2 as red and green lines for SPIDER and T+09 data samples, respectively. The impact on the results is very weak (e.g. Belli, Newman & Ellis 2014), and it is possibly more relevant in the \(\sigma_e-M_*\) correlation. We notice that in the two data samples, the impact of the progenitor bias pushes the \(R_e\) in the two opposite directions, since the correlation between \(R_e\) and galaxy age is still controversial. In fact, contrasting results are found by observational analysis, which find that at fixed mass/\(\sigma\), younger systems are larger (Shankar & Bernardi 2009; Napolitano et al. 2010; Valentiniuzzi et al. 2010a) or are as sized as older galaxies (Graves, Faber & Schiavon 2009). The outcomes from semi-analytic galaxy formation models are also still unclear, as there are results showing that younger galaxies are larger (Khochfar & Silk 2006) or also smaller (Shankar et al. 2010) than the oldest systems.

Despite these uncertainties, in the following we will discuss the results with and without the progenitor bias for those samples for which this has been computed (i.e. SPIDER and T+09).

### 4 DM EVOLUTION

In this section, we investigate the galaxy central DM content as a function of \(z\). To quantify that, we will use either the de-projected DM fraction at \(R_e\), \(f_{\text{DM}} = 1 - M_* (R_e)/M_{\text{tot}}(R_e)\), or the de-projected total-to-stellar mass ratio at \(R_e\), \(M_{\text{tot}}(R_e)/M_* (R_e)\). The latter will be useful to avoid unphysical negative \(f_{\text{DM}}\) values, in particular when computing the best-fitting relations among galaxy parameters.

From the previous section, we have seen that there is almost no evolution in the relation \(\sigma_e-M_*\), and this might suggest that so would be for the \(M_{\text{tot}}(r)/M_* (r)\), if the \(\sigma_e\) is a fair proxy of the total mass. On the other hand, we have observed a strong evolution of the \(R_e\) with the stellar mass, which shows that the scale where most

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPIDER</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>± 0.01</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.04</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
<td>2.21 ± 0.004</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T+09</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>± 0.01</td>
<td>0.58 ± 0.03</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
<td>2.26 ± 0.007</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS3D</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>± 0.02</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.04</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
<td>2.28 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDisCS</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>± 0.03</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.08</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
<td>2.29 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDisCS – low (z)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>± 0.05</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.12</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
<td>2.29 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDisCS – high (z)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>± 0.04</td>
<td>0.66 ± 0.10</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the mass in stars was confined was more compact in the earlier epochs with respect to present time (even in case the progenitor bias is taken into account). Thus, in the second part of the present section, we will discuss the role of this size evolution in our DM inferences.

### 4.1 DM content and correlations

In Fig. 3, we start by re-proposing the $R_e-M_*$ and $\sigma_e-M_*$ correlations (see Fig. 1), now colorized according to the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ bins in the color bar (grayscale bar in the B&W version) in the top. We show single data points as in Fig. 1.

#### 4.1.1 Results

As for the $R_e-M_*$ and $\sigma_e-M_*$ correlations, in local galaxies the DM trends are nearly independent of the sample adopted. In agreement with the local samples, the high-$z$ galaxies from EDisCS preserve almost all the DM trends against stellar mass, central velocity dispersion and effective radius (see Figs 3 and 4), with almost all correlations being significant at more than 99 per cent. However, a clear offset in the correlations is evident. In Fig. 3, we find that at fixed $M_*$, EDisCS galaxies present similar $\sigma_e$, but smaller $R_e$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ with respect to local galaxy samples. This is made even clearer in Fig. 4, where the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ median relations are shown. Here, the EDisCS galaxies are more DM dominated at larger $R_e$ and $\sigma_e$ (i.e. they follow a positive correlation) along a trend which runs almost parallel to the local sample but shifted towards lower $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ (see Table 2). In particular, we note that at any fixed $R_e$, the EDisCS sample presents $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ of $\sim 0.15$–$0.25$ dex smaller than the ones at low $z$. These differences are all significant at more than $3\sigma$, as evident from the linear regressions in Table 2. If $R_e$ was the only responsible for the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*-z$ trend, there have to be mechanisms related to the global stellar and dark mass assembly which also shape the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ trend with $z$. We will discuss the possible evolution scenarios later in Section 4.2; here we note that, taking the current $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ results at face values, the evolution of this quantity is evident from Figs 3 and 4, which has increased with time across the last $\sim 7$ Gyr. Indeed, this observed evolution in $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ is also found if we split the EDisCS sample into two redshift bins (see Fig. 4 and Table 2).

In Fig. 5, we summarize the average results for the Chabrier IMF and the bottom-heavier Salpeter IMF; this time represented as the DM fraction, $f_{\text{DM}}$, as a function of redshift (on the right axes the corresponding $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ are also shown). The increasing

![Figure 3. Size–mass (top panels) and $\sigma_e$–mass (bottom panels) relations colourized according to the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ bins in the colour bar (grayscale bar in the B&W version) in the top. We show single data points as in Fig. 1.](http://mnras.oxfordjournals.org/)
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**Figure 3.** Size–mass (top panels) and $\sigma_e$–mass (bottom panels) relations colourized according to the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ bins in the colour bar (grayscale bar in the B&W version) in the top. We show single data points as in Fig. 1.
Figure 4. $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ (in logarithmic scale) as a function of $R_e$ (top panels), $M_*$ (middle panels) and $\sigma_e$ (bottom panels). Symbols are as in Fig. 2. The dashed line is made calculating the SPIDER K-band profiles at $R_e$. The yellow lines (black in the B&W version) are for the roundest EDisCS objects with axial ratio, $q > 0.6$. Purple lines (short dashed black in the B&W version) are for field EDisCS systems. Grey point–dashed lines are for EDisCS elliptical morphologically selected (i.e. with $T \geq -4$).

Table 2. Best-fitting parameters for the relation $M_{\text{tot}}/M_* - R_e$, $M_{\text{tot}}/M_* - M_*$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_* - \sigma_e$. The following best relations are fitted: $\log M_{\text{tot}}/M_* = a + b \log (R_e/2 \text{kpc})$, $\log M_{\text{tot}}/M_* = a + b \log (M_* / 10^{11} \text{M}_\odot)$ and $\log M_{\text{tot}}/M_* = a + b \log (\sigma_e/200 \text{km s}^{-1})$. Best value, $1\sigma$ error and significance of the correlation are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>$M_{\text{tot}}/M_* - R_e$</th>
<th>$M_{\text{tot}}/M_* - M_*$</th>
<th>$M_{\text{tot}}/M_* - \sigma_e$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPIDER</td>
<td>$0.18 \pm 0.01$</td>
<td>$0.40 \pm 0.02$</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T+09</td>
<td>$0.29 \pm 0.02$</td>
<td>$0.28 \pm 0.04$</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLAS3D</td>
<td>$0.31 \pm 0.02$</td>
<td>$0.16 \pm 0.05$</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDisCS</td>
<td>$0.07 \pm 0.03$</td>
<td>$0.20 \pm 0.10$</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDisCS - low z</td>
<td>$0.14 \pm 0.05$</td>
<td>$0.26 \pm 0.13$</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDisCS - high z</td>
<td>$0.01 \pm 0.05$</td>
<td>$0.23 \pm 0.15$</td>
<td>99 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The net conclusion of this analysis is that according to the $f_{\mathrm{DM}}$ variation with $z$, the IMF which would be compatible with physical $f_{\mathrm{DM}}$ values can range from bottom-heavy to bottom-light at low $z$, but it does not have the same leverage at higher $z$ (e.g. $z \gtrsim 0.6$), where the IMF has to be mainly bottom-light (e.g. Chabrier-like), and compatible with a Salpeter IMF in very high $\sigma_e$ systems only, producing negative DM fractions just in a few of systems.

A detailed investigation of the IMF variation with $\sigma_e$ as a function of $z$ is beyond the scope of this paper. Therefore, in the following we will discuss the results based on a constant IMF across the look-back time.

### 4.1.2 Systematics

We have seen that the IMF is a major source of uncertainty in the $f_{\mathrm{DM}}$ trend with $z$. However, there are other sources of systematics that may provide alternative explanations for the negative $f_{\mathrm{DM}}$ values of the EDisCS sample within $1 \, R_e$ and eventually modify our trends with redshift. Besides systematics in the stellar mass estimates, the negative $f_{\mathrm{DM}}$ values can be due to measurement errors on galaxy parameters and/or a failure of the mass model adopted for the $M_{\mathrm{dyn}}$ (e.g. Tortora et al. 2012). A brief discussion of all possible systematics is given here below.

(i) We measure $R_s$ using $I$-band photometry, which means that $R_s$ are approximately the rest-frame $V$ and $B$ bands, respectively, at $z \sim 0.4$ and $z \sim 0.8$. $R_s$ are found to be larger at smaller wavelengths (Sparks & Jorgensen 1993; La Barbera & de Carvalho 2009; Roche, Bernardi & Hyde 2010; Vulcani et al. 2014). In particular, using a sample of galaxies with $z < 0.3$, Vulcani et al. (2014) estimate an increase from $g$ to $u$ and from $r$ to $g$ band of $\lesssim 15$ per cent, and similar results are found in La Barbera & de Carvalho (2009) following the method in Sparks & Jorgensen (1993). For this reason, our $R_s$ which are measured in the rest-frame $V$ band at the smallest EDisCS redshifts are conservative lower limits and would be larger if calculated in the same rest frame as the highest redshift ETGs. Thus, stronger evolution of $R_s$ and $f_{\mathrm{DM}}$ with redshift is expected if this effect would be taken properly into account. We have shown the impact of waveband in Fig. 4 for the SPIDER $M_{\mathrm{bol}}/M_*$ where the models are calculated at $K$-band $R_e$, which are smaller than our reference values. This reduces the difference with EDisCS galaxies with respect to the results from $g$-band light profile and $g$-band $R_e$ (not shown in the figure for brevity) which would give $M_{\mathrm{bol}}/M_*$ larger than our reference estimates.

(ii) In addition to uncertainties in stellar mass estimates, the choice of the mass profile that we have made (i.e. the SIS model) can be inappropriate for low-$\sigma_e$ (or $M_*$) galaxies and cause an excess of negative $M_{\mathrm{bol}}/M_*$ values, mainly at high $z$ (e.g. Sonnenfeld et al. 2013). In particular, $M_{\mathrm{bol}}/M_*$ and the slope of total mass density are tightly correlated, with shallower density profiles corresponding to larger $M_{\mathrm{bol}}/M_*$, (Humphrey & Buote 2010; Remus et al. 2013; Dutton & Treu 2014). To quantify the impact of a free total mass density slope, $\alpha$, we have adopted a power-law mass density $\rho \propto r^\alpha$, with slope steeper and shallower than isothermal. We use the two extreme values $\alpha = -2.5$ and $-1.5$, which bracket most of the results in the literature. We find that the average $M_{\mathrm{bol}}/M_*$ gets smaller (larger) of 0.12 (0.05) dex for $\alpha = -2.5$ ($\alpha = -1.5$); in a realistic case with a varying slope with mass, smaller changes, $< 0.12$ dex, will be found (e.g. Dutton & Treu 2014). If $\alpha$ is constant with time, then these corrections have to be applied to both local and EDisCS samples, and our results are left naturally unaffected. On the other hand, if we assume for local ETGs that the slope is varying with mass.
as it is effectively found, then the only way to totally remove any $M_{\text{ES}}/M_\star$ evolution is that EDisCS galaxies have total mass density slopes very shallow ($\alpha > -1.5$), and consequently larger $M_{\text{ES}}/M_\star$, which is not expected, since at high redshifts, where gas and in situ star formation dominate the galaxies, the ETGs from cosmological simulations have a total density slope very steep ($\alpha \sim -3$), and mergings tend to drive the galaxy to a nearly isothermal profile (Remus et al. 2013). Thus, although a varying slope with redshift has to be further investigated, our tests showed that the conclusions of the present paper are left nearly unchanged.

(iii) If rotation velocities would be included in the analysis, $M_{\text{dyn}}$ would get higher, reducing the fraction of negative $f_{\text{DM}}$.

(iv) As discussed in Section 3, galaxies which are star forming at the cosmic epoch of the EDisCS galaxies have to be removed. Thus, progenitor bias has to be applied, and we plot the results in Fig. 4. As for the trends of $R_e$ and $\sigma_e$ as a function of $M_\star$, the $M_{\text{ES}}/M_\star$ results are only little affected. In particular, the inclusion of the progenitor bias makes the $M_{\text{ES}}/M_\star$ larger (smaller) for SPIDER (T+09) samples. See Napolitano et al. (2010) for further details about the $f_{\text{DM}}$-age correlation (see also Tortora et al. 2010b). We notice that after the progenitor bias is applied, the median $M_{\text{ES}}/M_\star$ only slightly changes, since the largest fraction of galaxies (the oldest) is left unchanged.

(v) We have checked the effect of the ellipticity on the mass inferences and restricted the analysis to EDisCS objects with axial ratio $q > 0.6$ (60 per cent of the full sample, see yellow lines in Fig. 4), in order to limit to the roundest galaxies. The overall results are practically unchanged.

(vi) The results are also almost unchanged if we only take those objects with morphological type of pure ellipticals (i.e. $T \leq -4$). Both tests on the ellipticity (point (v)) and morphology above give support to the negligible impact of ordered motion on our $M_{\text{dyn}}$ estimates.

(vii) Finally, we find that $M_{\text{DM}}/M_\star$ in field galaxies are slightly larger than those in cluster galaxies (consistently with the stronger evolution found in the literature; Saglia et al. 2010), but due to the scatter in the sample and uncertainties this difference is not statistically relevant, pointing to a central DM content which is almost independent of the environment the galaxy lives in (accordingly to a similar analysis in local environments; Tortora et al. 2012).

4.2 Passive evolution versus accretion by merging

We complement the analysis performed in the previous section by discussing our results within the two dominant evolution scenarios: i.e. passive evolution from monolithic collapse and galaxy mergers from the hierarchical model.

4.2.1 Passive evolution

We start from discussing a pseudo-passive evolution, assuming no merging, and compute the age of stellar populations in our sample. The EDisCS galaxies, as spectroscopically selected passive objects, have low residual SF and can be fairly approximated by a single burst SSP, or at most a short-duration SF. We consider SPS models from Bruzual & Charlot (2003) and adopt an exponential SF with time-scale of $\tau = 500$ Myr (T+09) and different formation redshifts ($z_f = 1.5$, 2.5, 3). On average, for passive evolution the EDisCS stellar mass becomes smaller by 0.01–0.02 dex, due to mass-loss. This very mild evolution is not enough to produce the local $R_e$–$M_\star$ relations and similarly the local DM correlations. Longer SF history with $\tau > 1$ Gyr would increase the $M_\star$, increasing the discrepancies with the local observed local samples.

4.2.2 Hierarchical scenario

Alternatively, galaxy mergers seem to be the natural mechanisms that can account for both size and mass accretion. Simulations of dissipationless major mergers of elliptical galaxies in Boylan-Kolchin, Ma & Quataert (2005) have predicted the change in central DM in the merger remnants. They demonstrate that the DM fraction within a certain physical radius decreases a bit after the merger. But the DM fraction within the final $R_e$ is greater than the DM fraction within the initial $R_e$, because $M_{\text{tot}}(R_e)$ changes after the merger more than $M_\star(R_e)$ (see also below for more quantitative details).

The effect of merging on the central $f_{\text{DM}}$ has been investigated in detail with $N$-body simulations by Hilz et al. (2013). Here, three fiducial models with mass ratio of 1:1, 5:1 and 10:1 are analysed to find that, at different final stellar masses, the equal-mass mergers produce a smaller size increase of multiple minor mergers. In particular, the variation of $R_e$ with respect to the initial radius, $R_e/R_{e,0}$, in terms of the variation of $M_\star$ with respect to the initial stellar mass, $M_\star/M_{\star,0}$, is found to be $R_e/R_{e,0} \propto (M_\star/M_{\star,0})^{0.91}$ for the equal-mass merger and $\alpha(M_\star/M_{\star,0})^{2.4}$ for the minor mergers. The latter predictions on the $R_e$ and $M_\star$ accretion have been found to be consistent with observations (van Dokkum et al. 2010).

Taking these results into account, we have constructed some toy models assuming that $M_{\text{DM}} \propto M_{\star,0} r^\eta$ around $R_e$, with $\eta \sim 2$ for a standard NFW and $\eta \sim 1.2$ for a contracted NFW, hereafter AC+NFW (according with Boylan-Kolchin et al. 2005). Consistently with Hilz et al. (2013), we have also taken the average evolution of $R_e$ in terms of $M_\star$ evolution for the equal-mass merging (i.e. $R_e/R_{e,0} \propto (M_\star/M_{\star,0})^{0.91}$) and minor merging (i.e. $R_e/R_{e,0} \propto (M_\star/M_{\star,0})^{2.4}$) with the further assumption that the variation of the virial mass almost follows the one of the stellar mass, i.e. $\delta M_{\text{vir}} \approx \delta M_\star$. This intrinsically reflects the hypothesis that the systems concuring to mergings all have some constant $M_{\text{vir}}/M_\star$, which is reasonable for most of the stellar mass range covered by our sample.

These simplified models have the advantage of dealing with a limited number of parameters, but still providing a quantitative assessment of the impact of the evolution scenario on the observed DM fractions. In particular, we need to clarify whether the observed DM fraction evolution is compatible with a variation with $z$ of $R_e$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_\star$, or rather it is the IMF variation with $z$, the only viable explanation of the observed correlations.

In Fig. 6, we show the predicted evolved tracks for the median $R_e$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_\star$ of the EDisCS data set corresponding to a median log $M_\star/M_\odot = 11$. We have considered the evolution tracks related to different merging types, according to the list in Table 3. The major merging tracks are shown as blue lines with dots/squares indicating the events corresponding to $x \times M_0$ ($x = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n$) mass increments, while the minor merging tracks are shown by yellow lines where dots/squares indicate the $x \times M_0$ with $x = 0, 0.5, 1, \ldots, n$. Dots and squares are for NFW and AC+NFW profiles, respectively.

Comparing the model predictions with local results, we see that after a single major merger, it is not possible to reproduce the local correlations (blue lines in $R_e$–$M_\star$, and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_\star$–$M_\star$). Adopting an NFW profile (Major NFW), after $\sim 3$ major mergers the high-$z$ galaxy moves along the track to overlap the local observed $M_{\text{tot}}/M_\star$, while it would need more merging events if a AC+NFW is used.
Figure 6. Evolution of $R_e$–$M_*$ (top panels) and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$–$M_*$ (bottom panels). The symbols for local and EDisCS samples are the same as in Figs 2 and 4. The grey line is for EDisCS sample, but averaging over only three mass bins. We take as example the average galaxy at log $M_*/M_\odot = 11$ and evolve it accordingly to the toy models discussed in the text and in Table 3. Blue and orange tracks are for major and minor mergings, respectively. Dots and squares are for the NFW and AC+NFW profiles, and set the $R_e$, $M_*$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ after each single merging. Of course, the DM model only impacts the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*–M_*$ trends. Notice that for the minor merging case, dots and squares mark the epochs when one-half of the initial mass is accreted.

Table 3. Typical parameters of toy models for major and minor mergings. See the text for details. The predictions for $R_e$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ are plotted in Fig. 6: Major NFW (blue lines and dots), Minor NFW (yellow lines and dots), Major AC+NFW (blue lines and squares) and Minor AC+NFW (yellow lines and squares). See the text and caption of Fig. 6 for further details.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$M_*/M_0$</th>
<th>Merging type</th>
<th>$\eta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Major NFW</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor NFW</td>
<td>0.5, 1, 1.5,...</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major AC+NFW</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor AC+NFW</td>
<td>0.5, 1, 1.5,...</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Major AC+NFW, open squares). In both cases, though, the toy-model predictions do not match the average local $R_e$–$M_*$ relations, showing a deficiency of size growth expected for major merging events.

In contrast, after a few minor mergers (yellow lines) which accrete $\sim 0.5$–1.5 of the initial $M_*$ (depending on the DM profile adopted), both $R_e$–$M_*$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$–$M_*$ are matched (see Minor NFW and Minor AC+NFW).

To summarize the behaviour of our toy models: (a) the impact of minor merging on $R_e$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ is stronger than the one of major merging at fixed accreted $M_*$, and the latter do not seem to account for the observed $R_e$ evolution; (b) uncontracted NFW models provide larger $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$.

For simplicity, we have not analysed here the case of $M_{\text{vir}}$ which changes less (more) than $M_*$, i.e. $\delta M_{\text{vir}} < \delta M_*$ ($\delta M_{\text{vir}} > \delta M_*$). For example, if $\delta M_{\text{vir}} > \delta M_*$, then $M_{\text{dyn}}$ and $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ get larger.

In Section 4.1, we have shown that $M_{\text{vir}}/M_*$ are slightly smaller in field than in cluster galaxies, but this difference is not statistically significant. For galaxies living within dense environments, the chance to interact with neighbouring galaxies is very high, but for galaxies in the field merging is a less common event. Thus, the only ways to put EDisCS field galaxies and local objects within a coherent scenario are (a) they will fall in the following 7 Gyr within a cluster or a group of galaxies, and merge with other galaxies, (b) they are atypical objects which set out of the median local relations, (c) any other phenomenon is working to puffing up the galaxy size (as AGN feedback; Fan et al. 2008, 2010) and consequently the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$.  

5 CONCLUSIONS

We have analysed the central DM content in a sample of high-$z$ ($\sim 0.4$–0.8) ETGs from the EDisCS survey, parametrized in this paper through the total-to-stellar mass ratio, $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$, (calculated at $r = 1 R_e$), and compared the results with local galaxy samples (SPIDER, Tortora et al. 2012; ATLAS$^{3D}$, T+09; Cappellari et al. 2011).

We have shown that local correlations between $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ and $R_e$, and $M_*$ and $\sigma_e$, are fairly independent of the sample adopted and almost all conserved at high $z$ (see Fig. 4). In fact, high-$z$ galaxies are more DM dominated at larger $R_e$ and $\sigma_e$ (i.e. they follow a
positive correlation). For this sample, this is a clear indication that the main driver in the observed positive correlations is the effective radius, consistently with local galaxies as found in Napolitano et al. (2010, see also Auger et al. 2010; Tortora et al. 2010b, 2012). A less significant negative correlation is found in terms of stellar mass, in the opposite direction to the correlations of the local galaxies.

As seen in Figs 3 and 4, an overall offset of the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ from high- to low-$z$ galaxies is evident, suggesting an evolution of the DM fraction within $R_e$. In particular, we find that at fixed $R_e$, the EDisCS sample presents $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ of $0.15-0.25$ dex smaller than local galaxies. The change in $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ is stronger at $M_*$ and $\sigma_v$ fixed, being $\sim 0.3-0.35$ and $\sim 0.5-0.6$ dex, respectively. At fixed $M_*$, a clear variation of the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ as a function of $R_e$ is found from high- to low-$z$ galaxies (Fig. 3), but not in $\sigma_v$ (Fig. 1). The overall evolution of the DM fraction with redshift (see Fig. 5) is consistent with the results found in Faure et al. (2011), but in contrast with the opposite trend found by Ruff et al. (2011, within $R_e/2$), which find larger DM fractions at high $z$, and inconsistent with the absence of evolution in Bezanson et al. (2013). Our findings are consistent with results in Beifiori et al. (2014) which, using SDSS-III/BOSS and SDSS-II data sets, find smaller DM fractions in higher $z$ galaxies, but the trend with redshift is shallower than ours. Instead, we do not agree with the absence of evolution found in Belli et al. (2014) for a sample of quiescent galaxies at $z > 1$.

We find that, on average, the inferred $f_{\text{DM}}$ from a Salpeter IMF (or bottom-heavier IMFs in general) are disfavoured with respect to a Chabrier IMF, mainly at high redshift and in low-$\sigma_v$ systems. Thus, we can reproduce our $f_{\text{DM}}$ assuming a Chabrier/Salpeter IMF at high/low redshift, which would point to an IMF evolution with redshift. This result seems to be in contrast with the recent findings in Shetty & Cappellari (2014), who find a Salpeter IMF in $z \sim 0.7-0.8$ massive galaxies. However, their models assume a constant $M/L$ profile, and no DM content in the central regions (i.e. the mass is only in stars) which might have biased the overall stellar $M/L$ as their dynamical $M/L$ and the inferred $\Upsilon_*$ are just upper limits (Tortora et al. 2013). Furthermore, their sample is composed of very massive ($M_* \gtrsim 10^{11} M_\odot$) galaxies with very high $\sigma$ (most of the systems have $\sigma > 200$ km s$^{-1}$). Taking all these specifics of their sample, their results are substantially consistent with ours, since a Salpeter IMF is allowed by the EDisCS systems at similar velocity dispersions, providing nearly null DM fractions consistent with their assumption (see bottom panels in Fig. 4).

We have briefly discussed the possibility that the IMF is non-universal, not only as a function of redshift, but that it can also vary with the mass/central velocity dispersion (see e.g. Tortora et al. 2013). The impact on our results of a more realistic IMF variation with $\sigma_v$ from local observations (Tortora et al. 2013) has been analysed, and assumed to be valid and the same at all redshifts. This has been shown to produce a smaller number of negative DM fractions with respect to a Salpeter IMF. However, a combined evolution with mass/$\sigma_v$ and redshift would completely solve the issue of negative $f_{\text{DM}}$. Although most of stars are already in place at $z < 1$, a change of IMF across the time could be produced by two different processes: (a) new stars formed in the core during a wet merging process, which also produce positive age gradients (e.g. Hopkins et al. 2008; Tortora et al. 2010a) and 'higher mass' IMF (Napolitano et al. 2010) in young and massive local ETGs, or (b) by stars from both merging galaxies characterized by two different IMFs, which can combine to modify the cumulative IMF of the remnant. Unfortunately, the net effect of these processes on the final IMF is not yet clear, and in most cases the combination of a ‘higher’ and a ‘lower mass’ IMF would produce a final diluted IMF. Therefore, it is also plausible to scan alternative mass modelling and mechanisms to explain the negative $f_{\text{DM}}$ at high $z$ and in low-$\sigma_v$ ETGs, as (i) adopting realistic and viable DM halo profiles, (ii) the effect of some dissipative processes that might alter the standard DM distribution like the adiabatic contraction (Napolitano et al. 2010; Tortora et al. 2013) or (iii) some other DM flavour (e.g. some warm DM; Schneider et al. 2012).

However, a detailed analysis of the IMF and DM halo evolution across the time is beyond the scopes of this paper and will be addressed in future, assuming more complex mass modelling (Tortora et al. 2013, 2014). From the theoretical point of view, this evolution would pose a further open question: Which circumstances might have caused the IMF variation across time at any given $M_*$? This is a new fundamental question which has to be added to the IMF evidence of non-universality (Cappellari et al. 2012; Conroy & van Dokkum 2012; Spiniello et al. 2012; Dutton et al. 2013; Ferreras et al. 2013; Goudreau & Kruĳssen 2013; La Barbera et al. 2013; Tortora et al. 2013, 2014; Weidner et al. 2015).

We have finally investigated our results with a fixed IMF within galaxy formation scenarios and found that simple passive evolution is not able to reproduce local results. In contrast, the galaxy merging scenario allows us to reproduce the growth of the $R_e$ and the $M_{\text{tot}}/M_*$ with $z$. We have used toy models which take into account size and mass accretion from minor and major mergings to show that a single major merger is not able to reproduce local correlations, while many minor mergers work better (e.g. Hilz et al. 2013; Belli et al. 2014). Of course, in order to have a firmer assessment on the actual DM content evolution with redshift, much larger samples are needed, with full spectroscopic and photometric information. In particular, gravitational lensing can provide us very robust mass estimates (e.g. Barnabè et al. 2009, 2011; Covone et al. 2009; Auger et al. 2010; Tortora et al. 2010b; Spiniello et al. 2011). Thus, survey projects like SLACS or COSMOS (e.g. Faure et al. 2008) or the ongoing European Southern Observatory public surveys with VST telescope (such as KiDS) together with spectroscopic surveys (e.g. BOSS/SDSS, Thomas et al. 2013; Beifiori et al. 2014 and GAMA, Baldry et al. 2010) are fundamental to collect a large sample of galaxies, which span a wide range of luminosity and redshifts, in order to probe more massive galaxies in the universe and their evolutionary history, by means of the description of the different history of stellar and DM and their interplay in the inner and outer regions of galaxies.
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