A NEW STRATEGY WITH UNAVOIDABLE PARAMETERS ONLY

Eduard Salvador-Solé Alberto Manrique Jordi Bracons Sinue Serra Jordi Viñas



Dept. Astronomy & Meteorology Institut of Cosmos Sciences (UB-IEEC) University of Barcelona



June 24-25 2008

SIM & SAM

At first glance:

gravo-hydrodynamical SIMs are based on first principles, while SAMs are a set of recipes with many free parameters

so much freedom in SAMs that they can fit almost anything, meaning that their predictive power is doubtful

But:

SIMs include many recipes and free parameters of SAMs

extremely hard to fit all the observables at once, so we could really trust any SIM or SAM able to do so

On the other hand:

SIMs are at the limit of current computing capabilities, while SAMs can still be substantially improved

Common parameters in SIMs & SAMs

- Ordinary galaxies
 - Star formation efficiency
 - Yield
 - Reheating and coupling efficiencies
 - IMF
 - Dust extinction
- > AGN
 - MBH feeding efficiency
 - Duty cycle
 - Reheating and coupling efficiencies
 - MBH radiation
- Boundary conditions
 - Initial z for star formation
 - Initial metallicity
 - Initial MBH mass
 - Ionizing and heating backgrounds

Extra parameters in SAMs

ndnybriðriæræiosisns

- DM clustering
 - Halo growth rates
 - Formation times, progenitor masses
- Halo inner structure
 - Mass and time dependence of NFW concentration
 - Velocity dispersion, anisotropy and angular momentum profiles
- Dynamical state of trapped gas
 - Density profile
 - Temperature profile
- Disc properties
 - Scale radius
- Spheroid properties
 - Effective radius and surface density, Sérsic index n
- Galaxy interactions
 - Minimum mass for disc destruction, truncation radius, disc-to-bulge mass transfer efficiency

□ Fully analytical approach using sampled PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z



□ Fully analytical approach using sampled PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z

Keep unavoidable parameters only and improve usual procedures by adding molecular cooling and avoiding unjustified boundary conditions > realistic metal enrichment, MBH seeds, and ionizing and heating backgrounds

■ Adjust as many observables as possible higher internal consistency → more reliable

June 24-25 2008

□ Fully analytical approach using samp ed PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z

 Keep unavoidable parameters only and improve usual procedures by adding molecular cooling and avoiding unjustified boundary conditions → realistic metal enrichment, MBH seeds, and ionizing and heating backgrounds

■ Adjust as many observables as possible higher internal consistency → more reliable

June 24-25 2008

Unavoidable parameters

- boundary conditions + molecular cooling

Ordinary galaxies

- Star formation efficiency
- Yield
- Reheating and coupling efficiencies
- IMF
- Dust extinction

> AGN

- MBH feeding efficiency
- Duty cycle
- Reheating and coupling efficiencies
- MBH radiation
- Boundary conditions
 - Ditiatat foetstaic formation
 - RitialImbtall(eityrivalent to yield and mass fraction locked into MBH)
 - FritiationBH asasping UV photons from ordinary galaxies
 - Ionizing and heating backgrounds

■ Fully analytical approach using samp ed PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z

 Keep unavoidable parameters only and improve usual procedures by adding molecular cooling and avoiding unjustified boundary conditions *→* realistic metal enrichment, MBH seeds, and ionizing and heating backgrounds

■ Minimize extra parameters by causally connecting physical processes less freedom (less extra parameters) → more predictive

June 24-25 2008

■ Fully analytical approach using samp ed PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z

Keep unavoidable parameters on y and improve usual procedures by adding molecular cooling and avoiding unjustified boundary conditions > realistic metal enrichment, MBH seeds, and ionizing and heating backgrounds

□ Minimize extra parameters by causally connecting physical processes less freedom (less extra parameters) → more predictive

■ Adjust as many observables as possible higher internal consistency → more reliable

June 24-25 2008

Connected physics: no extra parameters (except a few)

DM clustering: EPS + frontier between minor and major mergers

- Growing rates
- Formation time pdf, progenitor mass pdf
- Halo inner structure
 - Mass and time dependence of NFW concentration
 - Velocity dispersion, anisotropy and angular momentum profiles
- Dynamical state of trapped gas
 - Density profile
 - Temperature profile
- Disc properties
 - Scale radius
- Spheroid properties
 - Effective radius and surface density, Sérsic index n
- Galaxy interactions
 - Minimum mass for disc destruction, galaxy truncation radius, disc-to-bulge mass transfer efficiency

DM clustering (EPS + frontier minor/major mergers)

Halo accretion, formation and destruction rates (Raig et al. 2001)



Formation time and main progenitor mass PDFs (Raig et al. 2001)



Halo inner structure (collapse time increasing function of turnarround radius)

Density (Salvador-Solé et al. 2007)



Birmingham-Nottingham E

Kinematics (González-Casado et al. 2007)



Dynamical state of trapped gas (polytropic approximation, self-consistent γ)

(Solanes et al. 2005; see also Ostriker et al. 2005)



 M_x vs T_x



June 24-25 2008

Spheroid properties (major mergers of two galaxies)

2D and 3D density profiles compared to typical 2D and 3D Sérsic profiles for ellipticals of $3\cdot10^9$, 10^{10} , $3\cdot10^{10}$, 10^{11} and $3\cdot10^{11}$ M_{\odot}

(Serra et al. 2008, in preparation)



June 24-25 2008

□ Fully analytical approach using samp ed PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z

Keep unavoidable parameters on y and improve usual procedures by adding molecular cooling and avoiding unjustified boundary conditions > realistic metal enrichment, MBH seeds, and ionizing and heating backgrounds

□ Minimize extra parameters by causally connecting physical processes less freedom (less extra parameters) → more predictive

■ Adjust as many observables as possible higher internal consistency → more reliable

June 24-25 2008

■ Fully analytical approach using samp ed PDFs reaching very high-z and low-M → accurate (trivial) boundary conditions distinguishing between accretion & major mergers → accurate merger trees accounting for all M at each z → accurate integrals over M and evolution over z

Keep unavoidable parameters on y and improve usual procedures by adding molecular cooling and avoiding boundary conditions > realistic metal enrichment, MBH seeds, and ionizing and heating backgrounds

■ Minimize extra parameters by causally connecting physical processes less freedom (less extra parameters) → more predictive

□ Adjust as many observables as possible higher internal consistency → more reliable

June 24-25 2008

Adjusted parameters: $Z_{crit} = 10^{-4} Z_{\odot}$ Pop III top-heavy IMF $(Y_{PIII} = 0.25; M_{BH}/M_{PIII} = 0.5)$ $f_{esc} = 0.17$

Observed values used: $\Omega_{cg}(z\sim3) \sim 1.8 \cdot 10^{-3}$ SFR(z=3) ~ 0.34 M_o yr⁻¹ Mpc⁻³ # ion/baryon (z=4) ≤ 7 $Z_{IGM}(z=4) > 3.54 \cdot 10^{-4} Z_{o}$ $z_{ion} \sim 6.0 \& 9-11$

Conclusions

SAMs have SIMs as guideline, but...

They are not only more practical, but also more easy to improve than SIMs.

E.g., one can include molecular cooling and connect physical processes.

Doing so, SAMs become even more predictive and reliable than SIMs.

THE END

June 24-25 2008