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**ABSTRACT**

**Aims.** We aim at constraining the assembly history of clusters by studying the intra cluster light (ICL) properties, estimating its contribution to the fraction of baryons in stars, and understanding possible systematic/bias using different ICL detection techniques.

**Methods.** We developed an automated method, GALlo/I/CL, based on the software GALAPAGOS to obtain a refined version of typical BCG+ICL maps. We applied this method to our test case MACS J1206.2-0847, a massive cluster located at \( z \sim 0.44 \), that is part of the CLASH sample. Using deep multi-band SUBARU images, we extracted the surface brightness (SB) profile of the BCG+ICL and we studied the ICL morphology, color, and contribution to \( f_* \), out to \( R_{200} \). We repeated the same analysis using a different definition of the ICL, SBlimit method, i.e., a SB cut-off method, to compare the results.

**Results.** The most peculiar feature of the ICL in MACS1206 is its asymmetric radial distribution, with an excess in the SE direction and extending towards the 2nd brightest cluster galaxy which is a Post Starburst galaxy. This suggests an interaction between the BCG and this galaxy that dates back to \( \sim 0.15 \) Gyr. The BCG+ICL stellar content is \( \sim 8\% \) of \( M_{200} \) and the (de-) projected baryon fraction in stars is \( f_* \sim 0.0177(0.0116) \), in excellent agreement with recent results. The SBlimit method provides systematically higher ICL fractions and this effect is larger at lower SB limits. This is due to the light from the outer envelopes of member galaxies that contaminate the ICL. Though more time consuming, the SBlimit method provides safer ICL detections that are almost free of this contamination. This is one of the few ICL study at redshift \( z > 0.3 \). At completion, the CLASH/VLT program will allow us to extend this analysis to a statistically significant cluster sample spanning a wide redshift range: \( 0.2 < z < 0.6 \).
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**1. Introduction**

Since its first discovery by Zwicky (1937) to the most recent works Guennou et al. (2012), Burke et al. (2012), Adam et al. (2012) the intra cluster light (ICL) has gained increasing interest because it can help us understanding both the assembly history of galaxy clusters and its contribution to the baryonic budget. The ICL consists of stars which are bound to the cluster potential after being stripped from member galaxies as they interacted and merged with either the brightest cluster galaxy (BCG) or other member galaxies (Murante et al. 2004, Sommer-Larsen et al. 2005, Monaco et al. 2006, Murante et al. 2007, Conroy et al. 2007, Puchwein et al. 2010, Rudick et al. 2011, Cui et al. 2013, Contini et al. 2013). The ICL signature can be seen in the surface brightness (SB) profile of the ICL as an excess of light with respect to the typical \( r^{1/4} \) law (de Vaucouleurs 1953). Gonzalez et al. (2005) showed that a double \( r^{1/4} \) model provides a better fit to the BCG+ICL SB profile and that the ICL has a more concentrated profile than that of the total cluster light (see also Zibetti et al. 2005). The origin of the ICL strictly connects it to the evolutionary history of the clusters, thus, we can recall the assembly history of the clusters by studying the ICL properties. The ICL colors can provide us information on the timescales involved in ICL formation and on its progenitors when compared to BCG colors. Some works found that ICL colors are consistent with those of the BCG (e.g., Zibetti et al. 2005, Krick & Bernstein 2007, Pierini et al. 2008, Rudick et al. 2010), suggesting that the ICL has been originated by ongoing interactions among cluster members and the BCG. The merging cluster in the sample of Pierini et al. (2008) and some compact groups (Da Rocha & Mendes de Oliveira 2005) represent an exception showing bluer colors for the ICL, hinting to either in-situ star formation or blue dwarf disruption after interaction.

Usually the ICL is found to be strongly aligned with the position angle (PA) of the BCG (Gonzalez et al. 2005, Zibetti et al. 2005), but there are cases of misalignment and/or prominent features/plumes (Mihos et al. 2005, Krick & Bernstein 2007). Studying the connections between the ICL spatial distribution and the presence of cluster substructures can shed a light on the origin of the ICL and its connection to the assembly history of the cluster. ICL plume-like structures bridging together the BCG and other galaxies, arcs and tidal streams of ICL have been found by many works (e.g., Gregg & West 1998, Calcáneo-Roldán et al. 2000, Feldmeier et al. 2004, Krick et al. 2006, Da Rocha et al. 2008). According to simulations these features trace recent...
interactions and/or merger events between galaxies and/or clusters and they are supposed to last only ~1.5 times their dynamical timescale because of disruption by cluster tidal field (Rudick et al. 2009; Adami et al. 2005; Krück & Bernstein 2007) also found an association between ICL sources and infalling groups of galaxies and they used it to infer the dynamical evolution of the clusters.

Beside characterizing the ICL properties and the specific evolution of a single cluster, the ICL can be put in a much more comprehensive context by determining its contribution to the total stellar cluster mass and, as a consequence, to the baryon fraction. Observational studies show fractions of ICL ranging from few percent of the total light up to half of it (Feldmeier et al. 2004; Da Rocha & Mendes de Oliveira 2005; Zibetti et al. 2005, Krück & Bernstein 2007; Gonzalez et al. 2007; Da Rocha et al. 2008; Guennou et al. 2012; Burke et al. 2012; Adami et al. 2012), depending on enclosing radius, and/or cluster mass. On top of this there is no common definition of ICL both among observational works and simulations. Ideally the ICL consists of the residual light after having subtracted the contribution of all galaxies, including the BCG. However both choosing the separation between the BCG and the ICL, and determining the best fit of galaxy and ICL constitutes a diificult task. As a consequence some studies prefer to focus on a BCG+ICL map and mask other members (Gonzalez et al. 2005; Krück & Bernstein 2007), while other authors chose to mask all galaxies down to different arbitrary surface brightness levels (Zibetti et al. 2005; Krück & Bernstein 2007; Burke et al. 2012), and finally Da Rocha & Mendes de Oliveira (2005); Guennou et al. (2012) remove all the galaxy contribution via a wavelet technique. Different ICL detection methods can suffer from different systematics/bias thus providing discordant ICL fractions as shown for simulations (Cui et al. 2013). This variety of ICL definitions can explain part of the lack of a general consensus on the effective role played by the ICL in the cluster baryon budget.

Moreover the fraction of ICL can correlate with global cluster properties such as mass, projected distance and redshift depending on the dominant process and epoch at which they occur (see Krück & Bernstein 2007, for a comprehensive description of the origin of these correlations). Guennou et al. (2012) found only a weak correlation between the ICL content and the cluster velocity dispersion/mass and there is no variation in the amount of ICL between z = 0.4 and z = 0.8. The absence or mildness of these trends is confirmed also at lower redshifts, i.e., z < 0.3. (Zibetti et al. 2005; Krück & Bernstein 2007). These findings are inconsistent with most of the previous results from both cosmological and analytical simulations which generally agree with an increasing ICL fraction as cluster mass grows (Murante et al. 2004; Lin & Mohr 2004; Purcell et al. 2007; Watson et al. 2012). However recent simulations suggest a much weaker dependence of the ICL fraction on cluster mass (Murante et al. 2007; Dolag et al. 2010; Puchwein et al. 2010; Martel et al. 2012; Cui et al. 2013).

Apparently ICL is a promising and complementary way to understand the mechanisms occurring in galaxy cluster and their constituents, however there are two main disadvantages. First the ICL features typically have extremely faint surface brightnesses of ~1% of the brightness of the night sky, making their study extremely difficult. Secondly, the surface brightness dimming increases with redshift as: (1 + z)^4. As a consequence, detecting the ICL is very difficult and there are only few detections at z > 0.3 (Jee 2010; Guennou et al. 2012; Burke et al. 2012; Adami et al. 2012; Giallongo et al. 2013).

### Table 1. Photometric data set summary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filter</th>
<th>Exposure time (ks)</th>
<th>Seeing (″)</th>
<th>Mag limit (AB mag)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rc</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ic</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z’</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this paper we present our ICL detection and measurement method and the results we obtained from optical images of MACS1206.2-0847 (hereafter MACS1206), one cluster in the Cluster Lensing And Supernova survey with Hubble (CLASH) sample (Postman et al. 2012). Overall this cluster is one of the most massive, M_{200} = 1.4\times10^{15} M_\odot, among the CLASH sample and it is located at a medium-redshift, z = 0.44, with plenty of ancillary information, so it is a suitable case in order to test the performances of our ICL detection method. The CLASH survey comprises 25 massive clusters of galaxies in the redshift range 0.2 ≤ z ≤ 0.9. Among these, 14 have been selected for spectroscopic follow-up at the VLT. At completion, both photometric and dynamical properties of each cluster will be available allowing the study of ICL and its connection to cluster properties over a wide redshift range. Using deep multi-band images from SUBARU, we studied the colors and the morphology of the ICL in MACS1206, as well as its connection to cluster substructures and its contribution to the total baryon budget. We then compare these results with those we obtain applying different ICL detection methods, in order to explore advantages/disadvantages of each method and to reveal possible systematics in each method.

In Sect. 2 we show the data set we used and the details of the reduction, in Sect. 3 we explain our ICL detection and measurement method. Sect. 4 describes our results in terms of both ICL properties and its contribution to the total cluster light/mass. We discuss our results in Sect. 5 and in Sect. 6 we draw our conclusions and future prospects.

Throughout this paper we use H_0 = 70 km s^{-1} Mpc^{-1}, Ω_M = 0.3, and Ω_{\Lambda} = 0.7, which gives 5.685 h_{70}^3 \text{ kpc/"} at z = 0.44, the distance of MACS1206.

### 2. Data

CLASH is one of the 3 multi-cycle treasury program of HST targeting 25 relaxed galaxy clusters with mass range 5 × 30 × 10^{14} M_\odot and redshift range 0.2 ≤ z ≤ 0.9 and providing images for each cluster in 16 pass-bands using WFC3/UVIS, WFC3/IR and ACS/WFC (see Postman et al. 2012, for a detailed description of the survey). MACS1206 is part of the CLASH sample and it has also been selected for the CLASH-VLT follow-up proposal (Rosati et al. 2014) and for SUBARU imaging for the weak lensing program (Umetsu et al. 2012). We choose this cluster as the test case for our analysis because it is the first cluster for which VLT data reduction is completed, thus we have a wealth of both photometric and spectroscopic information. In this Section we describe the data set at our disposal and the reduction techniques.

#### 2.1. Photometry

We analyzed deep BVRcz images obtained with the Suprime-Cam mounted at SUBARU telescope and that are available in
the Subaru archive, SMOKA\textsuperscript{1}. A full description of the observations can be found in Umetsu et al. (2012) while for a detailed explanation of data reduction we refer the reader to Nonino et al. (2009), here we only provide a brief description. The typical seeing in the final sky subtracted images varies from 0.58′′ in the z band up to 1.01′′ in the B band with exposure times ranging between 1.6 ks and 3.6 ks with a pixel scale of 0.2′′ pixel\textsuperscript{-1}. The limiting magnitudes are \( m_B = 26.5, m_v = 26.5, m_R = 26.2, m_k = 26.0 \), and \( m_{z} = 25.0 \) mag for a 3σ limiting detection within a 2′′ diameter aperture, see Tab. 1 for a summary of our photometric data set.

Sky subtraction and diffuse low-level light patterns removal are crucial because part of the ICL can be removed in these steps of the data reduction. As described in Nonino et al. (2009), we carefully determine the background by a back-and-forth process. First, we detect sources in a preliminary stacked image, the area covered by each source is enlarged by 20%, and the corresponding segmentation map is used to flag the same pixels in each original image. Flagged pixels in each individual image are replaced by a random value normally distributed with mean and standard deviation obtained by a 30′′ × 30′′ box surrounding each pixel, excluding flagged pixel values. Finally, each resulting image is wavelet transformed and the background of each image corresponds to the lowest order plane of the wavelet transformation. To ensure that this process does not affect our estimation from the spectroscopic dataset of CLASH/VLT we use our BCG+ICL map of MACS1206, see Sects. 3.1 and 3.2 as a control map. Only 0.37% of the BCG+ICL map pixels having a value larger than 3×\( \sigma_{sky} \) fall out of the enlarged segmentation map, where \( \sigma_{sky} \) refers to the \( \sigma \) of the residuals after sky subtraction as estimated in an area free from any source contamination. None of these pixels is recognized as a source by SExtractor, i.e., these few pixels are randomly distributed and they most probably represent fluctuations. If we restrict this analysis to a 3′′ × 2′′ area surrounding the BCG, then the percentage of outlier pixels decreases to 0.09%. Thus, the enlarged mask used in the background subtraction process ensures us that no pixels associated to the ICL has been oversubtracted. As a consequence, background subtraction does not affect our ICL estimation and we consider \( \sigma_{sky} \) as our limit to detect the ICL. As a further check, we applied the SBindist method, see Sect. 4.3 to the F625W HST stacked image, i.e., the closest HST filter to the Rc SUBARU band, and we cross-correlate it with the corresponding Rc image. This way we can check whether the spatial distribution of the ICL down to different SB levels is the same in both images. According to the cross-correlation analysis, the optimal x, y shift to match the two images is zero for all the SB levels. Given that the HST image has been reduced in an independent way, i.e., using a different background subtraction process, this ensures us that we did not remove any real low surface brightness sources during the data reduction.

The stellar point spread functions (PSFs) were measured from a combination of unsaturated stars with \( S/N \geq 50 \) and ellipticity \( \leq 0.1 \), here ellipticity is defined as \( (1 - a)/(1 + a) \), where \( a \) is the source aspect ratio, i.e., an ellipticity of 0.1 corresponds roughly to an aspect ratio of \( \sim 0.8 \). The point sources are detected and modeled using SExtractor and PsfEx softwares (Bertin & Arnouts 1996; Bertin 2011) and their PSF model is derived solely from the robust combination of their resampled input vignettes. In the following analysis this PSF model is convolved with the best fit model of each galaxy obtained as described in Sect. 3.1.

The B and Rc broad-band filters nicely probe the spectral region across the 4000 Å break at the cluster redshift, thus the (B-Rc) color is a good indicator of the galaxy average star formation (SF) history and it can constrain the characteristics of the bulk of its stellar population. We will use this color to infer information on the ICL properties.

We obtained magnitudes in each band and the relative colors for all detected sources, these data were used to derive photometric redshifts, \( z_{\text{photo}} \), using a method based on neural networks: The Multi Layer Perceptron with Quasi Newton Algorithm (MLPQNA) (Brescia et al. 2013). This method was calibrated on a subsample of objects with spectroscopic redshifts and it was applied to the whole data-set with available and reliable BVRcIcz band magnitudes down to \( m_{Rc} = 25.0 \) (see Biviano et al. 2013; Mercurio et al. 2014 for a detailed description on the \( z_{\text{photo}} \) estimation). The validation process with spectroscopically measured redshifts makes the estimated \( z_{\text{photo}} \) insensitive to photometric systematic errors and more robust than methods based on Spectral Energy Distribution (SED) fitting because the neural network method do not depend neither on synthesis models nor on photometric zero point accuracy. Tests on the MLPQNA based on a combination of parameters from different surveys estimate an excellent accuracy of \( \Delta z_{\text{photo}} = 0.004 \times (1 + z_{\text{spec}}) \) (Cavuoti et al. 2012; Brescia et al. 2013).

2.2. Spectroscopy

Though our work is based on the imaging data described in the previous Section, we will also take advantage of the information from the spectroscopic dataset of CLASH/VLT to interpret our results. Here we only give the basic description of this dataset and we refer the reader to Rosati et al. (2014) and references therein for the details. The CLASH/VLT program is VLT/VIMOS follow-up of 12/25 CLASH clusters, it comprises a total of 98 pointings that were obtained in the spectral range of 3700-9700 Å using the medium resolution (MR) and low resolution (LR) grisms, yielding spectral resolutions of 580 and 180, respectively.

In the case of MACS1206 12 masks (4 MR, 8 LR) were observed for a total exposure time of 10.7 hours. Additional spectra were obtained at VLT/FORS2, Magellan telescope, and from literature/archival data (Lamareille et al. 2006; Jones et al. 2004; Ebeling et al. 2009). The final data-set contains 2749 objects with reliable redshift estimates, \( z_{\text{spec}} \) with an average error of 75 and 153 km s\textsuperscript{-1} for spectra in MR and LR mode respectively.

We measure the main spectral features in the observed spectral range, i.e., Dn(4000), H\textsc{δ}, [OIII], [OIII], and H\textsc{z}. Joining this information to the (B-Rc) color allows us to classify each source according to its stellar population (see Mercurio et al. 2004). In particular, two classes of galaxies will be relevant for discussing the results we obtained (see Sect. 3):

1. Passive galaxies: sources with Dn(4000) > 1.45 and EW(H\textsc{δ}) < 3.0 Å;
2. Red H\textsc{δ}: sources with Dn(4000) > 1.45 and EW(H\textsc{δ}) > 3.0 Å.

2.3. Cluster membership

We will need to discriminate between cluster members and foreground sources both in the ICL detection method for MACS1206 (see Sect. 4), and when determining the cluster total light (see Sect. 4.2). Photometric information is complementary.

\textsuperscript{1} http://smoka.nao.ac.jp
to the spectroscopic one, thus allowing a cluster member association complete down to $m_R=25$.

The cluster membership for each object is assigned according to its spectroscopic redshift, when available, or to its photometric redshift combined with a color-color cut. We refer the reader to Biviano et al. (2013) for a detailed description of membership assignment, here we summarize the main steps. In brief, spectroscopic members with $18 \leq m_R \leq 23$ were defined according to the Peak+Gap (P+G) method of Padda et al. (1996). Photometric members were selected among all the sources having a photometric redshift in the range $0.34 \leq z_{spec/photo} \leq 0.54$ and satisfying one of the following color-color cut in the $(B-V)$ and $(Rc-Ic)$ diagram:

\begin{align}
\text{if } 0.20 < (B - V) < 0.45 \text{ then:} \\
-0.09 + 0.52 \cdot (B - V) < (Rc - Ic) < 0.21 + 0.52 \cdot (B - V) & \quad (1) \\
\text{if } 0.45 < (B - V) < 0.80 \text{ then:} \\
-0.09 + 0.52 \cdot (B - V) < (Rc - Ic) < 0.36 + 0.52 \cdot (B - V) & \quad (2) \\
\text{if } 0.80 < (B - V) < 1.30 \text{ then:} \\
0.01 + 0.52 \cdot (B - V) < (Rc - Ic) < 0.36 + 0.52 \cdot (B - V) & \quad (3)
\end{align}

### 3. ICL detection

As already mentioned, the ICL consists of the residual light after having removed all the light contribution of galaxies. Ideally, this can be obtained by subtracting each galaxy best fitting model, choosing among many different light profiles, e.g., de Vaucouleurs, Sérsic (Sérsic 1963, 1968), Exponential disk, and any combination of them. Unfortunately it is not always possible to perfectly fit the galaxies, such that the final residuals are not artifacts due to a bad subtraction. As a consequence, most works favor masking galaxies down to an arbitrary surface brightness level or subtract a direct image via wavelet transformation. In our approach we both subtract the best fit model and mask whenever the fit is not satisfying.

#### 3.1. Method

We developed an automated method based on the software GALAPAGOS (Barden et al. 2012), which makes extensive use of the code GALFIT (Peng et al. 2010). GALAPAGOS detects sources in the target image using SExtractor, estimates sky background, creates postage stamp images for all detected sources, prepares object masks and finally performs Sérsic fitting with GALFIT. We refer the reader to Barden et al. (2012) for more details, here we focus only on those steps which are of key importance for our goal. The source detection is performed with a double pass of SExtractor, one for the bright sources and the second for the faintest ones, then the code recognizes whether to discard or to keep a faint source depending on its position with respect to the nearest bright source. This minimizes the number of missing/mistaken faint sources.

We set the setup parameter file in order to extract faint source with at least $S/N \geq 1.5 \sigma_{sky}$. We removed the sky background estimation step as we worked with sky subtracted images, however, if this step is included, the sky is generally estimated as $0.000 \pm 0.001$, this support the goodness of our global sky subtraction. The most important step of this code is the postage stamps creation: in this step GALAPAGOS centers the image section on the source of prime interest and optimizes the area in order to include also the neighbour galaxies. This enables GALFIT to simultaneously fit all sources that contribute to the total light in each section, thus providing a better fit of each contributing source and removing light coming from the outer envelopes of close companions. This cleans the final residual image and ideally provide us the light contribution coming only from ICL. It is worth noticing that GALAPAGOS forces GALFIT to fit a single Sérsic model to each source. The initial guess for the Sérsic model parameters correspond to the SExtractor estimates of $x_{image}$, $y_{image}$, $mag_{best}$, $(flux_{radius})$, and $theta_{image}$. In many cases a single Sérsic model is a good approximation but sometimes it can represent a poor fit, as described in the following. As a last step the code creates the final output catalog containing both SExtractor and GALFIT information for each source.

At this point we developed an IDL code, GALtoICL, able to go the other way around: from single postage stamps to a final global residual image which we call the BCG+ICL map. The code is composed of 4 main steps:

1. creation of a global GALFIT parameter files for a 1000x1000 pixels section of the global science image;
2. creation of the global best fit model image and the residual image;
3. creation of a global postage stamp images for each detected source;
4. creation of a global sky subtraction image.

![Fig. 1. GALFIT residuals examples. From left to right: original image, best fit model and residuals. Top panels refer to a clean fit case, while bottom panels show a case with a high percentage of high residuals.](image1)

![Fig. 2. Comparison of pixel values distribution in the residual image (red dashed line) with that of an empty area (black solid line), i.e., free from source contamination, to identify deviant pixel/sources, see text for details.](image2)
3. extraction of those sources with a high percentage of high residuals and manual intervention;
4. creation of the final BCG+ICL map.

At first all sources are listed according to their \( \chi^2 \) and their best fit model parameters are stored. Then a number of GALFIT set-up files containing at most 50 sources each are created till accounting for all sources filling the 1000x1000 section, i.e. \( \sim1150\times1150 \ h^{-1}_{70} \) kpc at MACS1206 redshift. The choice of 50 sources to be modeled in a 1000x1000 pixels section corresponds to the best compromise of \( N_{\text{filt}} \) and area that GALFIT is able to deal with due to memory issues. All parameters of each source profile are kept fixed as they correspond to their best fit model and we run GALFIT in model mode, i.e., no fitting, only model image creation based on input parameters. To check whether our conversion from \((x,y)\) postage coordinates to \((X,Y)\) global coordinates is well determined we made some tests allowing \((X,Y)\) to vary within \( \pm 2 \) pixels to account for possible errors in centering the sources. We do not find the need for any \((X,Y)\) marginal correction and thus we rely on our coordinates transformation.

Then, all models in each 1000x1000 pixels section are put together to obtain the final global best fit model which is then subtracted from the original global science image to obtain the global residual image. Bright stars are excluded from the global fit because they might show strong residuals in case of saturation and they need specific masking. The code allows you to interactively check the global best fit model, and the residuals images using DS9, to update the global best fit model if necessary, and to run again GALFIT. This is the only step at which manual intervention is possible. The reason for it is well explained in Fig. 1 where we show two examples of GALFIT performances on postage stamps: from left to right we show the original image, its best fit model and the residuals. Top panels refer to a clean fit case, while bottom panels show a case with a high percentage of high residuals. Most of the times we get large residuals because a single Sérsic model is not enough to properly describe the galaxies and more components are needed.

To identify in an automated way the sources with bad fitting residuals, we compare the distribution of pixels values in a region of pure sky with that of the residual image. Fig. 2 shows these distributions with a black solid and red dashed line respectively. Those pixels deviating more than 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5\( \sigma_{\text{sky}} \) are flagged and through SExtractor segmentations maps are connected to the source they belong to. At this point one can choose to simply mask them or to perform manual fitting, to update the model and to re-run GALFIT to create a better global best fit model and residuals images. As a final step the code allows to add ad-hoc masks to those automatically created to fix bad pixels, i.e., bright saturated stars, spikes. The code is meant to provide BCG, only model image creation based on input parameters. To check whether our conversion from \((x,y)\) postage coordinates to \((X,Y)\) global coordinates is well determined we made some tests allowing \((X,Y)\) to vary within \( \pm 2 \) pixels to account for possible errors in centering the sources. We do not find the need for any \((X,Y)\) marginal correction and thus we rely on our coordinates transformation.

Sources, especially the faint/small satellites of the BCG. To do this, one can choose the “ICL” maps mode and feed again GALAPAGOS with them.

The parameters of the global best fit model can be used as a benchmark for other observed bands by running each 50-sources GALFIT set-up file in optimize mode, i.e., allowing \( X, Y, R_e \) and Mag to change within a certain range.

### 3.2. Detection Efficiency

Before applying our detection method to the real images, we test its efficiency in detecting faint diffuse-light sources. We generate fake faint sources with different surface brightnesses and we randomly introduce them into our real Rc-band images. We also want to determine our ability to deblend and identify these faint sources from close bright companions, thus a small percentage of these fake sources are forced to lie close to a bright one. We then run our code on these real+simulated images.

The artificial faint sources are modeled as de Vaucouleurs profiles with total magnitude ranging from 21.5 to 24.5 and effective radius varying from 20 to 60 pixels, i.e., \( \sim 25-70 \ h^{-1}_{70} \) kpc at \( z=0.44 \), the cluster MACS1206 redshift. These parameters choice translates into surface brightness values ranging between 28 and 32 mag/arcsec\(^2\) within a 2" diameter aperture (28 and 30 mag/arcsec\(^2\) for the blended sources). In the Local Universe the ICL is usually detected in the V-band, as the light surviving a surface brightness level cut-off, typically \( \mu_V = 26.5, 27.5 \text{ mag/arcsec}^2 \) (Feldmeier et al. 2004; Miho et al. 2005; Krick & Bernstein 2007). To compare our results with these studies we transform these V-band SB levels to the corresponding ones at \( z=0.44 \) in the Rc-band, i.e., we add the surface brightness cosmological dimming 2.5 \( \cdot \log(1+z)^2 \) and we applied the k-correction for different bands. The latter term is determined running the GALAXEV code on stellar population synthesis models (Bruzual & Charlot 2003) for a solar metallicity with formation redshift \( z_f = 3 \), a Chabrier initial mass function (IMF) (Chabrier 2003), and accounting for the stellar population evolution. Metallicity and formation redshift values are
chosen according to the similarity between typical ICL colors and those of the BCGs (Zibetti et al. 2005; Krick & Bernstein 2007; Pierini et al. 2008; Rudick et al. 2010). The resulting SB levels are $\mu_{R_c}(z = 0.44) = 28.87, 29.87$ mag/arcsec$^2$ respectively while our $1\sigma_{sky}$ level corresponds to $\mu_{r_{sky}} = 30.9$ mag/arcsec$^2$, thus our Re-band images are deep enough to detect typical diffuse light sources redshifted to the considered cluster distance.

In Fig. 3 we show our results in terms of SExtractor detection efficiency as a function of the Rc-band surface brightness. We set up the SExtractor parameter such that a minimum significant area of 5 pixels for a 1.5σ detection threshold is requested. Black diamonds refer to the complete sample of artificial faint sources, i.e., both the randomly positioned ones and those lying close to bright companions, while blue triangles refer only to the well deblended sources. The dotted line corresponds to the $1\sigma_{sky}$ surface brightness while dashed and dot-dashed lines correspond to the surface brightness limits $\mu_{R_c}(z = 0) = 26.5; 27.5$ transformed into the corresponding Rc-band value at z = 0.44.

We note that the detection efficiency for the deblended sample is 100% at SB values well far beyond the lowest $\mu_{R_c}(z = 0)$ SB level, moreover the detection efficiency at sky level is almost 50%. If we consider only the range of SB for which we have also deblended sources, then the detection efficiency is still more than 70%.

These tests ensure us that the combination of these deep SUBARU images and our detection method is good enough to allow diffuse light source detections for our test case cluster MACS1206.

The efficiency in recovering the initial parameters, such as $R_s$, Sérsic index, PA, and ellipticity, should be also tested. We used our sample of artificial sources to estimate our ability to recover the original parameter value as a function of the surface brightness as measured within a 2′ diameter aperture. We split our sample in two subsets: $\mu_{R_c,2ap} \leq 26.5$ and $26.5 < \mu_{R_c,2ap} < 30.5$ in order to highlight the presence of trends with the SB, if any. Table 3 summarizes our results in terms of the median, low and high quartile of the distribution of either the difference or the ratio between the retrieved and the original parameters for each sub sample. We do not find any strong trend of the median value as a function of SB, while the errors on the median value increase as we move from high to low surface brightness sources. This result is in good agreement with Barden et al. (2012) where they used a larger sample of simulated data set-up, i.e., ~ $10^3$ more galaxies, in order to achieve enough statistical significance and to test the recoverability with GALAPAGOS of source parameters and its dependence on neighboring. Barden et al. (2012) showed that GALAPAGOS has optimal performances for bright galaxies, i.e., $\mu_{input} \leq 22.5$, while its efficiency decreases at faint magnitudes, i.e., $\mu_{input} > 22.5$, and high Sérsic indices, i.e., 2.5 $< n < 8.0$, see the left panel of their Fig. 14. Generally speaking there is no systematic trend/bias for the mean recovered parameter value, while the accuracy gets worse from bright to faint sources. As far as the influence of neighbouring galaxies is concerned, Barden et al. (2012) showed that GALAPAGOS results do not depend on either the magnitude of or the distance from the next neighbour, see their Fig. 16. Given the agreement on parameters retrieval tests, we did not repeat this test and we rely on their conclusions.

Both the absence of systematic trends and the satisfying accuracy level ensure us that the recovered global model will not be significantly affected by our parameters retrieval ability.

4. Results: MACS1206 the test case

Our test case cluster, MACS1206, is located at RA = 12°06′12.28”, Dec = -08°48′02.4′′ (J2000), and z = 0.44 and it was originally part of the Most Massive Galaxy Clusters survey (MACS Ebeling et al. 2001). It was codified with morphological class 2, i.e., good optical/X-ray alignment and concentric contours (Ebeling et al. 2010) and this relaxed appearance made it a good target for CLASH survey, Umetzu et al. (2012) showed that there is only a small offset, i.e., 1′′ between the DM peak of mass and the location of the BCG, which coincides also with the X-ray peak emission (Ebeling et al. 2009). The excellent agreement between the mass profile of MACS1206 as derived by the kinematical analysis (Biviano et al. 2013) and the lensing analysis Umetzu et al. (2012) is a further indication that this cluster is dynamically relaxed. The global relaxed status of the cluster is also confirmed by the absence of a significant level of substructures as found by Lemze et al. (2013).

We notice that despite this general relaxed condition, MACS1206 displays an elongated large-scale structure (LSS) along the NW-SE direction, (Umetzu et al. 2012). This preferential direction is well aligned with the position angle (PA) of the BCG and it is traced also by a few infalling groups as revealed by the dynamical analysis (Girardi et al. 2014). The cluster has a velocity dispersion $\sigma_{v_{sky}} = 1087$ km s$^{-1}$ as estimated by the dynamical analysis of Biviano et al. (2013), from which we also infer a virial mass $M_{200} = 1.41 \times 10^{15}$ M$\odot$ which is in good agreement with the results from weak/strong lensing Umetzu et al. (2012), and it corresponds to $r_{200} = 1.98 h_{70}^{-1}$ Mpc.

We run GALioLICL in the iterated mode on the Rc band image of MACS1206 and use the global best fit model as the benchmark model to be adapted for the B-band. After obtaining the first tentative global best fit model we allow interactive check and manual intervention in case of large residuals. Specifically, for each galaxy showing a high level of residuals we proceed this way: we checked its $z_{spec}$, if available and consistent with cluster membership, we performed a detailed manual fit and updated the global best fit model, while whenever there was not spectroscopic information we masked at different $\sigma_{sky}$ levels. When improving the model by manual fitting we generally added a second component to the single Sérsic model. Close-enough initial guesses for each component parameter are important to obtain a reliable fit, thus we took advantage of the SExtractor+PsEx softwares combination which allows spheroïd+disk decomposition for each extracted source. The estimated MAG_SPHEROID/DISK, SPHEROID/DISK_PEAK_IMAGE, SPHEROID_DISK_ASPECT_IMAGE, and SPHEROID_SERSICN values are then used as first guess for GALFIT. Tests on simulated galaxies show that manual intervention reduces by 1.5-2.0 times the number of masked pixels while providing similar improvement for the residuals in the outermost area of the source segmentation map, i.e., where the signal starts to blur into sky and small differences in the residuals become important for low SB sources.

In Fig. 4 we show the Rc-band image of the MACS1206 core (left panel), its global best fit model (central panel) and the final BCG+ICL map masked down to $1\sigma_{sky}$ level. The galaxy contribution to the light has been removed efficiently and only 4.8% of the pixels needed to be masked down to 1$\sigma_{sky}$ level (only 1.4% when choosing 5$\sigma_{sky}$ level).

In the following we report the results we obtained using the masking down to 3$\sigma_{sky}$ for the SUBARU data which corresponds to $\mu_{R_c} = 29.3$ mag/arcsec$^2$ at z = 0.44.
We performed the classical isophotal analysis of the BCG line indicates the psf FWHM limit. Looking at the residuals, it is clear that the $r^{1/4}$ law is a poor representation of the data and in the outer region of the BCG, $R \geq 40 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc , there is an excess of light with respect to the fit. This excess of light increases as we move farther away from the center and it is the signature of the ICL. At this distance the ellipticity has increased till $\epsilon \sim 0.55$, while the PA has basically a constant value of $PA \sim -74^{\circ}$ (degrees measured counterclockwise from N direction). In all panels the red squares correspond to those points for which the isophotal analysis didn’t converge and values are unreliable. We notice that these points are located in the regime where the SB reaches the sky level. A close inspection of the BCG that these points are located in the regime where the SB reaches the sky level, and the dotted-dashed line indicates the psf FWHM limit. Looking at the residuals, it is clear that the $r^{1/4}$ law is a poor representation of the data and in the outer region of the BCG, $R \geq 40 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc , there is an excess of light with respect to the fit. This excess of light increases as we move farther away from the center and it is the signature of the ICL. At this distance the ellipticity has increased till $\epsilon \sim 0.55$, while the PA has basically a constant value of $PA \sim -74^{\circ}$ (degrees measured counterclockwise from N direction). In all panels the red squares correspond to those points for which the isophotal analysis didn’t converge and values are unreliable. We notice that these points are located in the regime where the SB reaches the sky level. A close inspection of the BCG that these points are located in the regime where the SB reaches the sky level, and the dotted-dashed line indicates the psf FWHM limit.

### 4.1. ICL properties

We performed the classical isophotal analysis of the BCG+ICL using the IRAF task ellipse. We kept the center position fixed and we let the ellipticity and PA vary. Fig. 5 shows the SB profile and residuals to the de Vaucouleurs best fit (top panels), the ellipticity (central panel), and the PA (bottom panel) as a function of the distance from the center. The dotted and dashed lines in the top panel refer to the SB at $1\sigma_{sky}$ level, and the dot-dashed line indicates the psf FWHM limit. Looking at the residuals, it is clear that the $r^{1/4}$ law is a poor representation of the data and in the outer region of the BCG, $R \geq 40 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc , there is an excess of light with respect to the fit. This excess of light increases as we move farther away from the center and it is the signature of the ICL. At this distance the ellipticity has increased till $\epsilon \sim 0.55$, while the PA has basically a constant value of $PA \sim -74^{\circ}$ (degrees measured counterclockwise from N direction). In all panels the red squares correspond to those points for which the isophotal analysis didn’t converge and values are unreliable. We notice that these points are located in the regime where the SB reaches the sky level. A close inspection of the BCG+ICL maps reveals an asymmetric elongation of the ICL in the SE direction, thus we suppose that in the SE direction we might be able to detect the ICL also at these distances.

To verify the presence of an asymmetric light distribution, we extract the SB profile from two slits along the PA: one in the SE direction and the other in the NW direction. In the left panel of Fig. 6, we show a smoothed version of the BCG+ICL map for the Rc band with the slits overlayed: blue and red colors correspond to the SE and NW direction respectively. We located two slits along the SE direction: the main one coinciding with the BCG major axis and an extra slit following the ICL elongation towards the second brightest galaxy which is marked with a green circle. We extracted the SB profile from each slit and we show it in the top left panel of Fig. 7. Points are color coded according to the slit they belong to, the dotted and the green solid lines refer to the sky level and the de Vaucouleurs (d) best fit model respectively. To separate between the two slits along the SE direction, we highlight with a yellow circle those points obtained from the SE extra slit. The SB profiles along each direction show a similar behaviour within $r \sim 60 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc , while at larger distances the SB profile in the SE direction is systematically above the one in the NW direction. Moreover at $r \geq 100$ kpc...
Table 3. Best fit parameters for different profiles, where ‘deVauc’ and ‘Sérs’ refer to the de Vaucouleurs and Sérsic profile respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profile type</th>
<th>Mag$_{tot}$ (AB mag)</th>
<th>$r_e$ ($h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>PA (deg)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>single deVauc</td>
<td>18.35±0.01</td>
<td>28.4±0.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.47±0.01</td>
<td>-73.42±0.19</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single Sérs</td>
<td>18.48±0.00</td>
<td>22.4±0.1</td>
<td>3.16±0.01</td>
<td>0.48±0.01</td>
<td>-74.24±0.02</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single Sérs (4 &lt; n &lt; 8)</td>
<td>17.83±0.01</td>
<td>77.1±1.1</td>
<td>6.78±0.04</td>
<td>0.43±0.01</td>
<td>-72.74±0.02</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deVauc+deVauc</td>
<td>18.72±0.07</td>
<td>26.3±1.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.51±0.06</td>
<td>-79.5±12.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deVauc+Sérs</td>
<td>19.09±0.01</td>
<td>32.2±0.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.44±0.06</td>
<td>-71.4±4.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deVauc+Sérs (n ≤ 3.99)</td>
<td>19.03±0.01</td>
<td>15.4±0.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.41±0.01</td>
<td>-76.35±0.12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both SB profiles show an excess with respect to the single de Vaucouleurs best fit model, so we tried different models to describe the light profiles: 1) a generic Sérsic profile either constraining or not the allowed range for the Sérsic index (Oemler 1976; Carter 1977; Schombert 1986; Stott et al. 2011), 2) a double de Vaucouleurs model (Gonzalez et al. 2005), and 3) a composite de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic profile with either free n or within a constrained range of allowed values. In the top left panel of Fig. 7 the dot-dot-dot-dashed, long-dashed, dot-dashed, short-dashed, and solid lines refer to the generic Sérsic (gs), generic Sérsic with high index (gshn), double de Vaucouleurs (dd), de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic (ds), and de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic with low index (dshn) best fit models respectively. The generic Sérsic best fit profile ($n = 3.16$) gives even worse results than the single de Vaucouleurs one, especially in the outer region where the ICL contribution becomes important. The double de Vaucouleurs profile improves the fit even though there is still an excess of light that can not be fit in the outer region. This light excess can be better appreciated in the zoomed version of the SB profile in the right panel of Fig. 7.

$h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc the SB profile in the NW direction blurs into the sky regime, while in the SE direction there is still signal. We also detect signal from the extra slit even if it is at sky level.

As mentioned above we chose to use the Rc band global best fit model as the benchmark model to be adapted for the B-band.
Fig. 7. Top Left panel: SB profile of the Rc-band BCG+ICL map along the SE (blue) and NW (red) directions. Points from the extra slit along the SE direction are highlighted with a yellow circle, while the $\sigma_{sky}$ level is shown by the dotted line. The generic Sérsic (gs), generic Sérsic with high index (gshn), double de Vaucouleurs (dd), de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic (ds), and de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic with low index (dsln) best fit models are shown by the dot-dot-dot-dashed, long-dashed, dot-dashed, short-dashed, and solid lines respectively. Top Right panel: Zoomed version of the SB profile in the radial range $20 \leq R \leq 100 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc to highlight the asymmetric radial distribution of the SB profile. Bottom Left panel: Fit residuals along each direction for the single component profiles, i.e., the generic Sérsic (circles) and the generic Sérsic with high index (triangles). Bottom Right panel: Fit residuals along each direction for the double component profiles, i.e., the double de Vaucouleurs (upside-down triangles), de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic (stars), and de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic with low index (squares).

this enabled us to create a color BCG+ICL map. We degraded the Rc-band image to the same PSF as that of the B band, i.e., the one with the worst seeing. To transform the PSF of the Rc-band we estimated the kernel function $K(r)$ such that: $\text{PSF}_{\text{Rcband}}(r) \ast K(r) = \text{PSF}_{\text{Bband}}(r)$, where the symbol $\ast$ denotes a convolution and only unsaturated stars were used. Sky uncertainties are very challenging in creating color maps, in particular at very low SB they can significantly affect the final color even if they are very small, i.e., at $\mu_V = 28.5$ mag/arcsec$^2$ an offset of 1$\sigma_{sky}$ transforms into an uncertainty of $\sim 0.2$ mags in the $(B - Rc)$ color, while at 2 mag brighter the uncertainty is only 0.02. For this reason we rely only on those pixels with $\mu_V \leq 29.5$.

In the right panel of Fig. 6 we show the $(B-Rc)$ color map for the BCG+ICL, the color bar shows exactly the color value that ranges from 2.3 in the very core of the BCG, down to 1.5 at distances larger than 50 $h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc. As a reference we overlayed the same slits we used in the SB profile analysis. At first glance the map shows a color gradient from redder to bluer colors when moving from the core of the BCG towards the outer regions which are ICL dominated. We quantified this trend extracting the mean color along the slits and in Fig. 8 we show the mean color as a function of the distance from the BCG center in bins of 5 $h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc, points are color coded as in the previous plots. The errors correspond to the standard deviation of colors in each bin, as expected in the outer regions the large spread in colors shows the difficulty to retrieve reliable colors at very shallow SB. There is a bluening trend from the BCG center towards outer regions such that the ICL colors tend to be much more similar to those of the outer envelope of the BCG rather than its central region. This is consistent with previous results, e.g., (Zibetti et al. 2005; Rudick et al. 2010). However the BCG+ICL is reliably detected only out to $r=50 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc in the B band, i.e., 2$\sigma$ detection, thus the bluening trend is milder if we consider only the safe detection region. A linear fit to the color profile out to $r=50 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc returns a slope of $-0.16 \pm 0.12$ in $\Delta(B - Rc) / \Delta \log(r)$ which is compatible with zero gradient or very weak negative gradient. As a reference we overplot the mean $(B-Rc)$ color of cluster member galaxies within $R=300 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc (dotted line) and within $R=400 h^{-1}_{70}$ (dashed line). The shaded area correspond to the standard deviation of satellite colors within $R=300 h^{-1}_{70}$ kpc which is approximately
the same for satellites within $R_{500}$. We note that BCG+ICL colors within the safe detection region, i.e., $r \lesssim 50 \, h_{70}^{-1}\,\text{kpc}$, are in good agreement with those of the satellite galaxies residing in the core of the cluster.

The color profile along the two directions is in good agreement within the error bars but we note that the innermost point, i.e., $r \lesssim 10 \, h_{70}^{-1}\,\text{kpc}$, in the SE direction tend to be bluer than the corresponding one along the NW direction, though within 1σ. This blueness is confirmed by the presence of [OII] emission in the BCG spectrum obtained by our team with FORS2 as part of the program 090.A-0152(A) (see Grillo et al. 2014). This [OII] emission line was already noted by Ebeling et al. (2009) and it was interpreted as an evidence in favour of MACS1206 being a CC cluster. However a careful inspection of HST data reveals the presence of both a compact source and an inner core spiral arm at ~1", i.e., $\sim 6 \, h_{70}^{-1}\,\text{kpc}$, which are completely blended to the BCG center in the SUBARU data due to their pixel scale. Both these features are embraced in the spectrum aperture and may be responsible for the [OII] emission. Left panel of Fig. 9 shows the HST F140W image of the BCG center (see Postman et al. 2012; Koekemoer et al. 2011) for the description of HST image observation and data reduction), the green cross point is located at the BCG center and the presence of a small source in the SE direction is highlighted by a red arrow. In the right panel we show the same region but for the F475W filter, whose transmission curve brackets the [OII] emission redshifted at the cluster redshift. In this bluer filter the blue compact source is well visible and separated from the BCG center. This filter highlights also the presence of a sort of spiral arm in the very center of the BCG extending only in the SE direction. Given that this structure is present only in one direction it is more probable to be a residual of stripped material.

Our data may suggest that this [OII] emission can be associated to the blue compact source and/or peculiar features blended with the BCG core emission, but we can not exclude the presence of a moderate/weak CC. Whether MACS1206 is a CC or not is far beyond the purpose of this paper, thus we refer the reader to Appendix A for a brief discussion of this point. For the sake of completeness, we should mention the possibility of the blue compact source being a foreground source, while the spiral arm seems connected to the BCG center.

4.2. ICL contribution to the total mass budget

We determined the BCG+ICL fraction as a function of the cluster-centric radius. We extracted the total flux within a set of circular apertures from both the BCG+ICL map and the total members map. To create the total members map we need to assign membership to each source in the field of view and we rely on the cluster membership as described in Sect. 2.3. We mask all the light contribution from fore- and back-ground galaxies down to $1\sigma_{\text{sky}}$, while bright stars were identified using the CLASS_STAR parameter of SExtractor, i.e., CLASS_STAR $> 0.98$, and we create an ad-hoc mask to ensure spikes coverage.

In the left panel of Fig. 10 we show the BCG+ICL contribution to the total cluster light within each circular aperture of radius $R$. Error bars are estimated in a similar way as in Djorgovski & King (1984); we divide each aperture into eight sections and estimate the total flux in each sector. The error bars represent the rms of total flux in each sector thus taking into account the possible lumpiness of light distribution in each aperture.

We note that at $100 \, h_{70}^{-1}\,\text{kpc}$ the BCG+ICL contributes more than 50% while at $R \sim 350 \, h_{70}^{-1}\,\text{kpc}$ it drops down to ~ 20% of the total light within that circular aperture. This BCG+ICL percentage is also confirmed by the analysis of the dark matter profile decomposition performed by Grillo et al. (2014) at a similar radial distance.

In our approach we extract BCG+ICL maps because it is not trivial to distinguish between the two components and we decide to avoid any a priori separation. However we can quantify the ICL contribution by combining the de Vaucouleurs + Sérsic profile parameters that best fit the SB profile of the BCG+ICL, see Sect. 4.1 and a proper M/L conversion. Our (B-Rc) color analysis shows that the ICL color tend to be similar to that of the BCG outer envelope, i.e., it can be treated as a red/passive source. To derive the M/L conversion for the ICL we then determine the best fit of the relation between the stellar masses of red cluster member galaxies, i.e., $2.0 \lesssim (B-Rc) \lesssim 2.5$ and the total Re magnitude of their best fit model we obtained with GALAPAGOS:

$$\log(M/M_\odot) = (19.43 \pm 0.94) - (0.41 \pm 0.04) \times R_{\text{e}tot\,\text{mag}}$$

where we use stellar masses by Annunziatella et al. (2014), i.e., obtained by SED fitting using the MAGPHYS software (da Cunha et al. 2008), based on the 2007 version of the BC03 models (Bruzual & Charlot 2003; Bruzual 2007) with Chabrier IMF (Chabrier 2003) and assuming a set of exponentially declin-
ing star formation histories and random bursts superimposed to them. Applying this relation to the total Rc magnitude of the de Vaucouleurs plus generic Sérsic best fit model, we obtain $M_{\text{ICL}} = (9.9 \pm 3.8) \times 10^{11} M_\odot$ and $M_{\text{BCG}} = (4.0 \pm 2.1) \times 10^{11} M_\odot$.

By summing all the galaxy stellar masses of cluster members down to log($M/M_\odot$) = 9.5, i.e., the stellar mass completeness limit corresponding to 23 mag in Rc band [Annunziatella et al. 2014; see text for details], out to $R_{500}$ and that of the BCG as obtained using the above calibration we obtain the total stellar mass of the cluster, $M_{*, 500} = (1.7 \pm 0.7) \times 10^{13} M_\odot$. Error bars on $M_{*, 500}$ are obtained by summing in quadrature the typical galaxy stellar mass error and errors from standard bootstrap technique. The critical radius $R_{500}$ is determined using the NFW profile for $M_{500} = (1.4 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{15} M_\odot$ and $c_{200} = 5.8 \pm 1.1$ as obtained by the lensing analysis of [Umetsu et al. 2012] and we get $R_{500} = 1.3$ Mpc which means $M_{500} = 1.0 \times 10^{15} M_\odot$. The ICL contains $5.9 \pm 1.8\%$ of the stars within $R_{500}$, while the BCG+ICL contribution to $M_{*, 500}$ is $8.2 \pm 2.5\%$. As a further check we estimated the light contained in the de Vaucouleurs + Sérsic best fit model, i.e., in the BCG+ICL components, out to $R_{500}$, and we summed the light of each member galaxy out to $R_{500}$, rather modelling them, to obtain the total cluster light out to $R_{500}$. The corresponding BCG+ICL and ICL fractions are $6.3 \pm 0.6\%$ and $4.3 \pm 0.2\%$ respectively. These values are in good agreement with those obtained converting the BCG+ICL total magnitudes into stellar masses within the errorbars.

The corresponding contribution of stars, $f_*$, to the total mass of the cluster, taking into account also the ICL contribution, is then $(M_{*, 500} + M_{\text{ICL}})/M_{500} = 0.0177 \pm 0.006$. We should also remind that the total galaxy stellar mass within $R_{500}$ is affected by projection effects that tend to increase its value. If we consider a spherical cluster having MACS1206 values for $M_{500}$ and $c_{200}$ and extending out to $3 \times R_{200}$, then the 2D projected mass within $R_{500}$ is $1.56 \times M_{500}$. Taking into account this projection effect, $M_{*, 500, \text{proj}} = 1.18 \times 10^{13} M_\odot$, corresponding to $f_* = 0.0116 \pm 0.006$, where we have excluded the BCG from the correction as it lies in the center of the cluster.

4.3. Comparison with the surface brightness method

We now compare these results with those obtained using a different definition of the ICL. We determine the ICL fraction by applying the same approach of many works in the literature [Krick & Bernstein 2007; Burke et al. 2012; and references therein]: choosing an arbitrary SB cut-off level below which pixels are masked and counting all the light above this level as the ICL. This ICL definition is a very naive way to separate galaxy light and ICL, but it is the most suitable definition from the operational point of view and for comparison purpose. Moreover we will be able to explore advantages/disadvantages of each method and to reveal possible systematics.

We produced ICL maps using SExtractor segmentation maps: we set-up the THRESH_TYPE parameter to absolute mode and we choose three different SB cut-off thresholds: 26.5, 27.5 and 28.5 mag/arcsec$^2$. This way the sources are extracted only down to each SB level and the segmentation maps correspond to the galaxy light to be masked. In the ICL maps those pixels associated to either a source counterpart in the segmentation maps, or stars, fore- and back-ground galaxies, or sky areas were masked. All the remaining pixels are considered as ICL.

In Fig. 11 we show the Rc-band ICL map down to 26.5, 27.5 and 28.5 mag/arcsec$^2$ and the total cluster light map from top left to bottom right. These images show the same asymmetric light distribution along the SE-NW direction in the proximity of the BCG as we found with the GALLoICL code.

These images have only a display purpose, to quantify the ICL fraction we sum-up all the flux contained in circular apertures out to $R_{500}$ for each image in Fig. 11.

In the right panel of Fig. 10 we show the ICL contribution to the total light for each SB level. Blue empty circles, triangles, and squares refer to 26.5, 27.5, and 28.5 mag/arcsec$^2$ surface brightness levels respectively while the dotted line indicates $R_{500}$.

The fraction of ICL shows a common trend among all SB levels: it has a steep increase from the core out to R~100 kpc where it reaches its maximum, then it shows a plateau. Given that the BCG+ICL fraction as obtained with the GALLoICL code
Fig. 11. Images show only cluster members light below given surface brightness levels which is considered as ICL. The surface brightness limits correspond to $\mu_R = 26.5, 27.5, 28.5$ mag/arcsec$^2$ and total cluster light from top left to bottom right. The black circle in the bottom right panel corresponds to $R_{500}$.

accounts for more than 50% of the light at $R \sim 100$ kpc and then it drops quite rapidly, then the plateau trend at larger radii can only be justified as light contribution from the other member galaxies. As a further confirmation, we masked the BCG+ICL map with a circle centered on the BCG and a radius corresponding to the typical distance at which the BCG SB profile reaches 26.5, 27.5, and 28.5 mag/arcsec$^2$, i.e., $R \sim 15, 30$, and 50 kpc. We then extracted the light in the same aperture as before and we determine its contribution to the total light. This is shown by the filled symbols in the right panel of Fig. 10. Different symbols correspond to different SB masking levels as before. We notice that at large radii, i.e., $\sim 300 h_70^{-1}$ kpc, the ICL contribution drops to 10-15% depending on the adopted SB limit. This suggests that most of the ICL is concentrated in the close surroundings of the BCG, while at larger distances the ICL contribution is not significant.

By comparing the ICL fraction as obtained from the GALto-ICL code and the SB limit method we note that even at small distances, i.e., at $R \sim 50$ kpc, there is a significant difference between them. Moreover the general trend of increasing ICL fraction out to $R \sim 80-100$ kpc is still present, but then at larger radii the ICL fraction drops down to a small percentage instead of showing an almost constant value. This reinforces the idea that the SB limit...
Fig. 12. Top panel: SED of the total cluster light within R_{500} (red empty circles) and that of the ICL within R_{500} for different SB limits: \( \mu_B(z = 0.44) = 26.5, 27.5, 28.5 \) mag/arcsec\(^2\) (violet filled circles, blue filled triangles, and cyan filled squares respectively). Bottom panel: residuals between the observed fluxes in each band and those obtained using the SEDs best fitting models for each SB level.

5. Discussion

We developed an automated method to create BCG+ICL maps and we measured a diffuse intracluster component in MACS1206. We confirm previous findings on general ICL properties: 1) a composite profile best fits the data (Gonzalez et al. 2005; Zibetti et al. 2005), though we find that a de Vaucouleurs plus Sérsic profile provides a better fit than a double de Vaucouleurs one. 2) BCG and ICL position angles agree to within degrees (Gonzalez et al. 2005; Zibetti et al. 2005) and both are in agreement with the global cluster elongation and its filament (Umetsu et al. 2012; Girardi et al. 2014), and 3) ICL colors agree with those of the outer envelope of the BCG (Zibetti et al. 2005; Krick et al. 2006; Pierini et al. 2008; Rudick et al. 2010).

Disentangling the BCG component from the ICL is one of hardest task when studying the diffuse light and for this reason we preferred to create BCG+ICL maps. However in order to quantify the ICL properties and its contribution to the total cluster light we shall separate it from the BCG. We tried different profiles, either single or composite ones by combining the de Vaucouleurs and the Sérsic profiles. Ellipticities and PA show a small range of values both in case of a single and composite profiles, while the effective radius show a wider range depending on the adopted profile. In case of a single component fit the effective radius ranges between \( \sim 20 \, h_{70}^{-1} \) kpc and \( \sim 80 \, h_{70}^{-1} \) kpc , while when we adopt a composite profile, the component associated with the BCG has \( 15 \leq r_{e,BCG} \leq 32 \) whereas the ICL one is less concentrated and it has larger effective radius: \( 37 \leq r_{e,ICL} \leq 175 \) kpc. Ascaso et al. (2011) analyzed a sample of BCGs at a similar redshift, they fitted them with both a single de Vaucouleurs and a generic Sérsic profile and they find \( < r_{e,deVauc} > = 19 \pm 10 \, h_{70}^{-1} \) kpc and \( < r_{e,Sers} > = 23 \pm 15 \, h_{70}^{-1} \) kpc . Their mean effective radii are in good agreement with our results if we consider that MACS1206 has a higher X-ray luminosity than that of Ascaso et al. (2011) sample, i.e., \( L_{X,0.1-2.4\, keV} = 24.3 \times 10^{44} \) erg s\(^{-1}\), and that larger BCGs are located in more massive clusters. Similarly, Stott et al. (2011) find \( < r_{e,deVauc} > = 27 \pm 2 \, h_{70}^{-1} \) kpc and \( < r_{e,Sers} > = 57 \pm 16 \, h_{70}^{-1} \) kpc at higher redshift, i.e., \( z \sim 1 \). Concerning the effective radius of the outer component for the double de Vaucouleurs fit, we find a small radius when compared to \( r_{e,ICL} < 50 \) kpc. Their mean effective radii of the ICL component is \( \sim 160 \) kpc though 20% of their sample have \( r_{e,ICL} < 50 \) kpc, thus small ICL effective radius are not ruled out.

We should also consider that our double de Vaucouleurs profile is not able to properly fit the outer component, see residuals in bottom panel of Fig. 12 thus it might be that we are also underestimating \( r_e \). On the contrary, the effective radius of the outer component for the de Vaucouleurs + Sersic profiles has a larger value, \( \sim 140 \) kpc.

The most peculiar feature of the ICL in MACS1206 is its asymmetric radial distribution: there is an excess of ICL in the SE direction. Peculiar streams of ICL are supposed to last only \( \sim 1.5 \) times their dynamical timescale in the cluster according to simulations (Rudick et al. 2009) because of disruption by cluster tidal field. More generally the streams found in the cluster core live only \( \tau_{ICL,survive} \leq 1 \) Gyr due to the strong tidal fields they are subject to. Thus the galaxy/ies from which this material has been stripped away should have interacted with the BCG no later than a Gyr ago. Moreover the ICL enhancement along the SE direction extends out to the second brightest galaxy which is classified as an H\text{\textit{o}} red galaxy, i.e., poststarburst galaxies (PSBs). The spectral properties of PSB galaxies can only be reproduced by either models of galaxies in a quiescent phase soon after a starburst (\( \tau_{PSB} \leq 1.5 \) Gyr) or by models where a regular star-for-
mation has been halted in an abrupt way (Poggianti et al. 1999). Recently Pracy et al. (2013) showed that H_0 equivalent width radial profiles in local PSBs can be reproduced by merger simulation even at shorter ages after the peak of the starburst: 0.2-0.75 Gyr. The ICL survival timescale and that of PSBs are in good agreement, thus the ICL stream along the SE direction can be interpreted as the stars stripped from the second brightest galaxy which has crossed the cluster, sunk to the center, and interacted with the BCG. We note that the second brightest galaxies is aligned with the ICL extra slit PA along the SE direction, see Fig. 5. The dynamical analysis of MACS1206 has highlighted the presence of a preferential direction which is traced by both the passive and H_0 red galaxies with PA_{H_0}/D_{max} ∼ 110° (measured counter-clock-wise from north) (Girardi et al. 2014). Matching our BCG/ICL PA estimates, we find 101° ≤ PA_{BCG/ICL} ≤ 109° which is similar to this preferential direction, thus suggesting a further connection between the ICL and the infalling direction of the PSBs population. This scenario is also supported by the presence of an elongated large scale structure (LSS) around the cluster whose major axis runs along the NW-SE direction, 15° ≤ PA_{LSS} ≤ 30° measured north of west (Umetsu et al. 2012). Matching our PA estimates to the same reference system as Umetsu et al. (2012) we find 11° ≤ PA_{BCG/ICL} ≤ 19°, depending on the assumed BCG+ICL best fit profile. Thus both the BCG and the ICL are oriented along the same axis as that of the LSS, this holds also when comparing the ellipticity of the LSS and of the BCG+ICL. As a consequence the BCG of MACS1206 should have experienced a strong interaction that dates back to at least t_{pass/merger} ≤ 1.5 Gyr ago, this interaction might involve also the second brightest galaxy and it may has occurred along the preferential NW-SE direction.

Both observation and simulations suggest that short-lived major mergers can produce a significant fraction of the ICL. Burke et al. 2012; Burke & Collins 2013; Murante et al. 2007; Laporte et al. 2013; Contini et al. 2013. If we consider the extreme case of the second brightest galaxy merging into the BCG of MACS1206, we can determine the dynamical friction timescale and compare it with the light travel time to z=0. If the former is shorter than the latter, then we can roughly estimate the 2nd brightest galaxy contribution to the ICL at the end of the merging process. The dynamical friction timescale for a galaxy of mass M_gal at a given initial radius R_{gal} that spirals into the center of the cluster potential well on a circular orbit with velocity V_c is given by Eq. 5 (Binney & Tremaine 1987).

$$\tau_{df} = 1.17 \frac{R_{gal}^2 V_c}{\ln(A)GM_{gal}}$$

(5)

where ln(A) is the Coulomb logarithm, ln(A) ∼ ln(b_{max}/V_C). In the cluster core the impact parameter, b_{max}, is roughly 100 kpc, the typical circular velocity is V_c ∼ 220, σ ∼ 220 ∗ 1100 ∼ 1500 km s^{-1}, where we used the velocity dispersion obtained by Biviano et al. (2013), and the 2nd brightest galaxy has M_{gal} ∼ M_{gal}/M_{baryon} ∼ 10^{11}/0.05 ∼ 6.3 ∗ 10^5, where we used the galaxy stellar mass obtained by Annunziatella et al. (2014) and the typical baryon fraction of early-type galaxies (Hoekstra et al. 2005; Jiang & Kochanek 2007). Thus, ln(A) ∼ 2.2 and τ_{df} ∼ 2.7 Gyr, given the projected radial distance between the 2nd brightest galaxy and the BCG, R_gal ∼ 300h_{70}^{-1} kpc . Nath (2008) find similar dynamical timescales values for a massive galaxy (M_gal = 3 × 10^{13}M_⊙) embedded in a rich cluster (M_d = 10^{14}M_⊙) at a similar initial radius. Equation 5 is based on strong approximation, i.e., circular orbit and point-like object. Boylan-Kolchin et al. (2008) take into account the effect of an extended object with different orbital parameters on the τ_{df} estimate and find that standard approximation tend to shorten the dynamical friction timescale. They also provide a fitting formula to determine the merging timescale due to dynamical friction as a function of both the satellite to host halo mass ratio and the satellite orbital properties, see their Eq. (5). If we consider the host halo as mainly composed by the BCG+ICL, M_{halo} ∼ 10^{13}11, and we assume the same baryon fraction as for the 2nd brightest galaxy, then our mass ratio is M_{gal}/M_{halo} = 10^{11}/10^{12} ∼ 0.25. Allowing the initial circularity and the initial orbital energy parameter to vary in the same validity range as Boylan-Kolchin et al. (2008), i.e., 0.33-1.0 and 0.65-1.0 respectively, we obtain 1.0 ≤ t_{merger,df} ≤ 6.0 Gyr with a (t_{merger,df}) ∼ 2.6. The light travel time to z=0 is ∼ 4.6 Gyr, thus there is enough time for the 2nd brightest galaxy to merge into the BCG, if this is the case.

The fraction of ICL coming from galaxies that merged with the BCG ranges between 5% to 30% for the most massive clusters depending on the simulation set-up (Murante et al. 2007; Puchwein et al. 2010; Laporte et al. 2013; Contini et al. 2013). If the 2nd brightest galaxy is going to merge with the BCG, then it will release 1.6 ∗ 10^{11}M_⊙ to the ICL by z=0. This corresponds to ∼ 10% of the ICL at z=0.44 and this increase is well within the errorbars, similar consideration can be made in terms of f_{ICL} which would become ∼ 5.9 – 6.4%.

We quantified the mass contribution of the BCG+ICL to the stellar cluster mass within the critical radius R_{200} as ∼ 8%, this value is in good agreement with the general trend of decreasing BCG+ICL mass (light) fraction with increasing cluster mass (Lin & Mohr 2003; Gonzalez et al. 2007; 2013) G13 hereafter. For comparison purpose in the bottom left panel of Fig. 13 we show BCG+ICL fraction of light (mass) within R_{200} as a function of cluster mass for both MACS1206 and the Gonzalez et al. (2013) cluster sample, red triangle and open circles respectively. Gonzalez et al. (2013) provides BCG+ICL luminosity fractions while we estimate the mass BCG+ICL fraction. According to Cui et al. (2013) luminosity-weighted and mass-weighted ICL fractions are in good agreement especially at the high cluster mass end of their sample, i.e., the ratio of luminosity to mass fractions at M_{200} ∼ 10^{12} M_⊙ is consistent with 1 when AGN feedback is taken into account. The dot-dashed line indicates the predicted cluster mass M_{200} lower limit for the CLASH sample according to the M–T_x best fit relation of Mahdavi et al. (2013) and to the CLASH cluster selection T_x ≥ 3keV. We note that the expected cluster mass range covered by the CLASH sample will fill the lack of observational data at the high mass end, thus allowing this kind of study on a wider cluster mass range and with a well constrained total cluster mass estimate. On top of this, the CLASH/VLT sample will also span a wider range in cosmic time and we will be able to study the BCG+ICL contribution to the cluster stellar mass disentangling between halo mass and redshift dependences, if any. In the bottom right panel of Fig. 13 we show the BCG+ICL fraction as a function of redshift, the G13 sample is color coded according to their M_{200}: Blue, green, red circles correspond to M_{200} ≤ 2 × 10^{14}M_⊙, 2 × 10^{14} ≤ M_{200} ≤ 3 × 10^{14}M_⊙, and M_{200} ≥ 4 × 10^{14}M_⊙ respectively.

We notice that the ICL stellar mass (light) of MACS1206 represents ∼ 72 (70)% of that of the BCG+ICL assuming our best fit model parameters and the adopted mass to light conversion. Though using a different composite profile, we obtain similar results to Gonzalez et al. (2005) with a large percentage of the light residing in the outer component, the one associated to...
the ICL. As a consequence, the ICL contribution on small scales is very important, though on larger scales it becomes less significant. This is clearly shown in the right panel of Fig. 10 once we adopt a SB threshold on our BCG+ICL maps, i.e., red points, on the contrary applying the same SB limit to the original image shows a plateau of the ICL fraction at large radii. This highlights the systematic error in the ICL contribution estimate depending on the adopted method: light from the outer envelopes of member galaxies can significantly affect the ICL fraction when using the SB limit method. This effect is larger at lower SB limits, but even at the higher SB limit the estimated ICL fraction is twice that obtained with the \textit{GALtoICL} method. Once again we stress the importance of removing all the light from galaxy members that can affect the real ICL contribution. Unfortunately the \textit{SBlimit} method is the best way to compare results among observational works and simulations. We find good agreement between our ICL fractions at $R_{500}$ as function of cluster mass for both MACS1206 and the G13 cluster sample, symbols/lines as above.

Fig. 13. 
Top panel: Stellar baryon fraction as a function of $M_{500}$ for both MACS1206 and the cluster sample of Gonzalez et al. (2013, G13 hereafter). (Orange square) Red triangle refers to the (de-)projected $f_*$ for MACS1206, while (upside-down grey triangles) open circles refer to the (de-)projected G13 sample. The (green dashed) blue solid line correspond to the (de-)projected best fit relation from G13 while the dot-dashed line indicates the predicted cluster mass $M_{500}$ lower limit for the CLASH sample (see text for details).

Bottom left panel: BCG+ICL fraction of light/mass within $R_{500}$ as function of cluster mass for both MACS1206 and the G13 cluster sample, symbols/lines as above.

Bottom right panel: BCG+ICL fraction of light/mass within $R_{500}$ as function of cluster redshift. G13 sample is color coded according to their $M_{500}$. Blue, green, red circles correspond to $M_{500} \leq 2 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$, $2 \times 10^{14} \leq M_{500} \leq 3 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$, and $M_{500} \geq 4 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$ respectively.

simulation, i.e., with either gas cooling, star forming, and supernova feedback or including AGN feedback, thus showing good agreement with our results. Rudick et al. (2011) simulated clusters with a smaller mass range, still if we consider their most massive cluster B65, $M_{200}=6.5 \times 10^{14} M_\odot$, the ICL fraction for $\mu_V(z=0)=26.5$ is nearly 12% within $1.5 \times R_{200}$. Given that they claim only a smaller increase in the ICL fraction within $R_{500}$, these values are in good agreement with our results. A direct comparison with observational works is less trivial due to different ICL enclosing radius or lack of cluster total mass information. For instance Feldmeier et al. (2004) finds ICL fraction of $\sim 10$ (2%) above $\mu_V(z=0)=26.5(27.5)$ mag/arcsec$^2$ for a set of clusters located at $z=0.17$. These values are in good agreement with our ICL fraction of $\sim 12$ (4%) at Re-band SB levels corresponding to $\mu_V(z=0) \geq 26.5(27.5)$ mag/arcsec$^2$ thus suggesting a lack of evolution in the ICL fraction with cosmic time. This result agrees with the absence of strong variation in the amount of ICL between $z=0$ and $z=0.8$ reported by Guennou et al. (2012) and other authors (Krick & Bernstein 2007). However we should remind that this comparison is regardless of the cluster total mass and/or ICL enclos-
ing radius. On the contrary, we should mention that most of the simulation studies report a significant increase of the ICL with time. Irrespective of the formation redshift of the ICL, simulations show that roughly 60-80% of the ICL present at z=0 is built up at z<1 ([Murante et al. 2007, Rudick et al. 2011, Contini et al. 2013]). Both simulation and observation suggest that part of the ICL origins from tidal disruption of intermediate-mass galaxies as they interact with the BCG or the other most massive galaxies in the cluster ([Willman et al. 2004] [Murante et al. 2007, Coccato et al. 2011], [Martel et al. 2012, Galliano et al. 2013]). This scenario is supported by the analysis of environmental dependence of the galaxy mass function of MACS1206 (see [Annunziatella et al. 2014]).

We estimate the total star contribution to the baryon fraction and both our projected and de-projected f∗, in good agreement with the results of the recent analysis of [Gonzalez et al. 2013] where they also considered the effects of projection. More generally our values agree with previous studies and the general trend of low f∗ for the most massive clusters ([Andreon 2010] [Zhang et al. 2011] [Laganá et al. 2011] [Lin et al. 2012, Gonzalez et al. 2013]). In the top panel of Fig. [13] we show f∗ as a function of M500 for both MACS1206 and the cluster sample of Gonzalez et al. [2013]. (Orange square) Red triangle refers to the (de-)projected f∗ for MACS1206, while (upside-down grey triangles) open circles refer to the (de-)projected G13 sample. The (green dashed) blue solid line correspond to the (de-)projected best fit relation from G13 while the dot-dashed line indicates the predicted cluster mass M500 lower limit for the CLASH sample as in the bottom left panel. We note that our estimate of f∗ is in excellent agreement with the expectation from the best fit relation of G13. Once again we stress that at completion CLASH/VLT will enlarge the baseline of the f∗,M500 relation with the advantage of a well constrained cluster total mass.

Adding the gas fraction fgas=0.144±0.025 as estimated by Ettori et al. [2009] to the stellar component, we obtain the total baryon fraction fB=0.156±0.026, to be compared with fB=0.167 (0.154) as expected from WMAP7 (PLANCK) results ([Planck Collaboration et al. 2013] [Komatsu et al. 2011]). The comparison with PLANCK results is less straightforward due to different cosmological parameters which have a strong impact as shown by Gonzalez et al. [2013]. Our total baryon fraction is 7% below the expected value but well within 1σ. Generally speaking this result is in agreement with the trend of increasing (decreasing) fB (f∗) with cluster total mass, thus supporting the idea of a less efficient star formation at the high end of the cluster mass function ([Andreon 2010] [Zhang et al. 2011] [Laganá et al. 2011] [Lin et al. 2012] [Gonzalez et al. 2013] and references therein).

6. Summary and Conclusions

In conclusions we have developed an automathed method to extract BCG+ICL light maps in a refined way: GALtoICL. Applying this technique to MACS1206:

1. We have highlighted the presence of an extra component, i.e., the ICL, when studying the SB profile of the BCG. This component appears to be asymmetric in radial distribution and we interpret it as an evidence of a past merger. We have linked the ICL properties to those of the cluster substructures and this way we have reconstructed the most recent cluster assembly history.

2. We have estimated the BCG+ICL mass fraction and the (de-)projected f∗ of MACS1206 to be in good agreement with recent literature results suggesting a lowering in star formation efficiency at higher cluster masses.

3. We have estimated the sole ICL contribution with two different methods, GALtoICL and the SBlimit methods, and compared their results. The SBlimit method provide ICL fractions systematically larger than those obtained with the GALtoICL method due to member galaxies, other than the BCG, light contamination. The GALtoICL method removes this contamination by fitting simultaneously galaxies, thus providing safe ICL detection and it also highlights the presence of features/plumes in the ICL. As a con, the GALtoICL method is much more time consuming compared to simpler methods such as the SB limit definition and it can only be applied to small field of view.

4. Based on the SBlimit method, we have obtained the first tentative ICL global SED. The ICL mass fraction we obtained by the SED fitting are in qualitative good agreement with those simply obtained by fluxes in the single reference broadband filter Rc.

The high-quality dataset, the new refined ICL detection method, and the comparison of different ICL detection methods are the most striking novelties of this work. Deep multiband photometry allowed us to securely detect the ICL at a relatively high redshift, z=0.44, while the spectroscopic information allowed us to select cluster members, determine their masses down to log(M/M⊙)=9.5 and thus obtain an accurate estimate of the cluster stellar mass, BCG+ICL stellar mass, and f∗. The wide spectroscopic dataset also permit to associate the ICL properties to the dynamical analysis of MACS1206 and thus reconstruct its assembly history. While a single data point can not give statistical relevance to our results and/or allow to draw strong conclusions, at completion the CLASH/VLT survey will provide a high quality dataset over a wide redshift range, thus enabling us to constrain both the role of the ICL in the baryon budget and the f∗,M500 relation.

This work has also highlighted the importance of a common definition of ICL to allow comparison among both observational and numerical works. Simple ICL definition such as the SBlimit might be easier to compare but they do not retrieve the real ICL properties because of contamination effects.
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Appendix A: BCG [OII] emission line

Our team obtained a medium resolution spectrum of the BCG with FORS2 as part of the program 090.A-0152(A) (see Grillo et al. 2014). We measure the [OII] Equivalent Width (EW) from an aperture of $\sim 1.5''$, i.e., $9 h_{\text{eff}}$ kpc diameter, around the peak emission of the BCG flux calibrated spectrum: $\text{EW}_{\text{[OII]}} = -4.9 \pm 3.2 \text{ Å}$. This corresponds to $L_{\text{[OII]}} = 7.4 \pm 4.8 \times 10^{39} \text{ erg} \text{s}^{-1}$, having multiply the EW by the flux density of the best-fitting SED at 3727Å. The level of our [OII] emission line detection is very low, in contrast to what is expected for strong/moderate cool core (CC) (Crawford et al. 1995) and in agreement with normal BCG showing no/low [OII] emission (Samuele et al. 2011). This [OII] emission line was already noted by Ebeling et al. (2009) and it was interpreted as an evidence in favour of MACS1206 being a CC cluster. Ebeling et al. (2009) also note that the [OII] emission was at a much lower level than typically observed in large CC clusters, thus flagging MACS1206 as a moderate CC cluster. Using a different parameter, also Baldi et al. (2012) classify MACS1206 as a CC cluster even if the temperature profile is approximately constant around $kT \sim 10 \text{ keV}$. This kind of temperature is very high as compared to typical CC central temperatures, i.e., $3-4 \text{ keV}$ (Guesoune et al. 2001) and it also has a too low central metallicity, i.e., $0.25$ (Cavagnolo et al. 2009) see also the ACCEPT web site edge, with respect to typical CC. Cavagnolo et al. (2009) also estimated the central cooling time, $t_0 \sim 1Gyr$, and the central entropy, $K_0 \sim 70\text{keV cm}^2$, of MACS1206. These values are borderline between the absence of CC and the presence of a weak CC according to the multi-parameter analysis of Hudson et al. (2010).