Galaxy Formation Simulations: Problems and Answers



Neal Katz UMass Astronomy

S. Huang, L. Yang, R. Dave, E. Scannapieco, D. Weinberg September 2022



Galaxy Formation Today

- Recently a consensus has emerged around a paradigm where accretion and feedback together govern galaxy growth.
- Some of these baryons form stars and central black holes, but most leave galaxies through supernova and quasar winds.
- Much of the ejected material can reaccrete, a fraction of which then forms stars, but most of which is re-ejected.
- Gas remains in the galaxy about 500 Myrs before it is either ejected or turned into stars; SFRs are determined by the net gas supply.



- Cold/Hot accretion
- Galactic winds
- Wind reaccretion



Let Us Compare

Found large code to code variations of galaxy stellar mass function when modeling the same physics.



In MUFASA wind recycling dominates while in EAGLE there is almost none but both match the GSMF.



Galaxy Stellar Mass Function



Changing the SPH has only a minor effect at the largest masses.

Changing the wind launch has a major effect at the largest masses.



Galaxy Stellar Mass Function



- Changing the SPH has only a minor effect at the largest masses.
- Changing the wind launch has a major effect at the largest masses.
- The Hydro technique (SPH, AMR, AREPO, GIZMO etc.) is much less important than the feedback implementation in simulations of galaxy formation.



Fake News!

- Still need scaling laws to launch the winds.
- Wind particles are individual particles and individual particles do not properly represent hydrodynamics.
- Individual particles cannot mix metals.
- The results are highly sensitive to the exact form of the subgrid wind model and how it interacts with the numerics including the hydro code and resolution.
- Why not just solve the problem by brute force?

Why not just solve the problem by brute force?

- Winds are dominated by cold gas that is thought to be entrained.
- Simulations show that the convergence of this process does not occur until the resolution is Solar System in scale and Jupiter in mass.
- Even then clouds are not accelerated.
- Entrainment does not occur unless perhaps there is magnetic draping.





More Fake News; SAD!

- Any claims that any simulation can have winds develop naturally are highly dubious.
- One expects that the problems would be even worse for propagating winds through the CGM into the IGM.
- Cold gas clouds traveling through a less dense, hot CGM should typically not slow down but slowly disintegrate on a time scale of many t_{cc} , which does not happen in current simulations.
- The interactions at wind/halo gas interfaces in the CGM occur on scales that are much below the resolution of any galaxy formation simulation, including FIRE, Illustris, FOGGIE, and Eagle.



More Fake News; SAD!

- Any claims that any simulation can have winds develop naturally are highly dubious.
- One expects that the problems would be even worse for propagating winds through the CGM into the IGM.
- Cold gas clouds traveling through a less dense, hot CGM should typically not slow down but slowly disintegrate on a time scale of many t_{cc} , which does not happen in current simulations.
- The interactions at wind/halo gas interfaces in the CGM occur on scales that are much below the resolution of any galaxy formation simulation, including FIRE, Illustris, FOGGIE, and Eagle.
- Do not have and will not have for many years the ability to simulate superwinds leaving galaxies and in particular their interactions with the CGM and IGM so we must develop a subgrid model.
- PhEW, there is another way forward.



- Want the model to be limited by our physical assumptions and not by numerics.
- Want a method that must be as independent of resolution as possible.
- Want a method that must be as independent of hydro technique as possible.
 - Works with SPH, AMR, and moving mesh codes (e.g. AREPO and GIZMO).
- Want to try to limit the number of free parameters.
- Want it to globally conserve mass, momentum, and energy.
- Most importantly: want it to correctly represent the physics and not depend on unknown numerics.



Physically Evolved Winds (PhEW)

- Wind particles are launched as before.
- They are evolved analytically using microphysics that depends on the surrounding medium.
- Wind particles are "removed" and added to their surroundings when their mass becomes small relative to the surrounding particles.





- Cloud motion affected by:
 - gravity,
 - ram pressure.
 - Cloud temperature affected by:
 - radiative and adiabatic heating and cooling,
 - ram pressure heating,
 - conduction.
- Clouds lose mass, thermal energy, and metals to surroundings owing to:
 - Kelvin-Helmholtz and Rayleigh Taylor instabilities,
 - Conductive evaporation.



Physically Evolved Winds (PhEW)





- Assume each wind particle is made of many cylindrical clouds with mass M_c , temperature T_c , uniform density, ρ_c , and radius R_c .
- Clouds create a conductive bow shock, creating a post-shock medium whose properties depend on the ambient conditions and the cloud speed.
- Assume clouds are in pressure equilibrium and thermal contact with the post-shock medium.



Physically Evolved Winds (PhEW)



- The model can be set using high resolution single cloud simulations.
- These simulations can also determine cloud absorption line properties.
 - Still need parameters:
 - M_{cloud} : the sub-cloud mass,
 - f_s : the fraction of the Spitzer rate for conductive processes.
 - $f_{\rm KH}$: controls the Kelvin-Helmholtz destruction time.

KCF@80 Perth



Galaxy Stellar Mass Function



- Proof of concept simulation; parameters have not been tuned.
- Better matches the GSMF at the knee.
- Too many high mass galaxies.



Resolution and *M_c* **Effects on GSMFs**



- The old wind model is very sensitive to resolution and hydro method (not shown).
- The PhEW model is not very sensitive to resolution or M_c or hydro method (not shown).



Anywhere the Wind Blows



When the KHI dominates the mass loss, $\tau_{\rm KH} \propto f_{\rm KH} M_{\rm c}^{1/3}$.

When conductive evaporation dominates the mass loss, $\tau_{ev} \propto M_c^{2/3}/f_s$.



How Galaxies get their gas in PhEW



- Redefine wind reaccretion as fraction of particle formally in wind.
- Wind reaccretion now dominates accretion below about $10^{12.3}$ M_{\odot}.
- The total amount of cold accretion is similar but the amount of hot and wind accretion increases.



CGM gas metallicities in PhEW



- Metallicity without PhEW is trimodal (40% of particles have $Z \approx 0$).
- With PhEW metallacities have a single peak around 10^{-1} .
- In PhEW the metal distributions are robust to numerical resolution.

KCF@80 Perth



Conclusions

- The Hydro technique is much less important than the feedback implementation in simulations of galaxy formation.
- Do not and will not have for many years the resolution to correctly model superwinds leaving galaxies and their interactions with the CGM and IGM so we must develop a subgrid model.



Conclusions

- The Hydro technique is much less important than the feedback implementation in simulations of galaxy formation.
- Do not and will not have for many years the resolution to correctly model superwinds leaving galaxies and their interactions with the CGM and IGM so we must develop a subgrid model.
- This is even more true for AGN feedback!
- Physically Evolved Winds (PhEW) are a way forward.
 - Can be tuned to match very high resolution ISM simulations.
 - Can be used in any code and is almost independent of resolution.
- Current "proof of concept" simulations look promising.



Conclusions

- The Hydro technique is much less important than the feedback implementation in simulations of galaxy formation.
- Do not and will not have for many years the resolution to correctly model superwinds leaving galaxies and their interactions with the CGM and IGM so we must develop a subgrid model.
- This is even more true for AGN feedback!
- Physically Evolved Winds (PhEW) are a way forward.
 - Can be tuned to match very high resolution ISM simulations.
 - Can be used in any code and is almost independent of resolution.
- Current "proof of concept" simulations look promising.
- Making Galaxy Formation Simulations Great Again!
- Huang, Katz et al MNRAS (2020 497 2586; 2022 509 6091).