Formation & evolution of galaxies & SMBHs

Cedric Lacey

Durham University

Outline of lectures

- 1. Structure formation & assembly of dark halos
- 2. Gas cooling & angular momentum
- 3. Star formation & feedback
- 4. Galaxy mergers & morphologies
- 5. Cosmic evolution of galaxies
- 6. Formation of black holes
- 7. BH binaries & spin
- 8. Co-evolution of galaxies & AGN

Lecture 5: Evolution of the galaxy population

Topic 5 outline

- summary of physical processes in galaxy formation
- galaxy properties at z~0
 - luminosity functions
 - bimodality in colours & SFRs
- cosmic star formation history
- evolution of stellar mass density

Modelling galaxy formation



Galaxy formation in the CDM model: key physical processes

- Assembly of dark matter halos
- Shock-heating and radiative cooling of gas within halos
- Star formation and feedback
- Production of heavy elements
- Galaxy mergers

Assembly of dark matter halos: Merger trees







Galaxy formation: the basics

Infalling gas shock-heated to Tvir

Gas cools radiatively onto central galaxy and forms disk, conserving J

 \rightarrow r_{disk} ~ λ_h r_{cool}

Stars form in disk And give rise to feedback effects Satellite sinks by dynamical friction and merges onto central galaxy Mergers trigger central starburst

In major mergers, stellar disks → spheroids New disk may form by gas accretion

Chemical Enrichment of stars & gas

- Chemical enrichment of ISM from metals ejected by dying stars: SNII, SNIa & AGB star winds
- yields of different elements depend on IMF



Properties of present-day galaxies

Galaxy luminosity function

The halo mass function and the galaxy luminosity function have very different shapes

Complicated variation of M/L with halo mass

this is result of cooling
& feedback effects



Benson et al 2003



Galaxy formation

Cluster

10¹⁵ M



Cooling time ∼ dynamical time
→ Gas cools efficiently

Formed early:

→ Central galaxy grows by accretion and mergers

→ Satellites dimmed by feedback



Cooling time >> dynamical time
Gas does NOT cool efficiently
Formed late: Log N
Fewer mergers
Brighter satellites

Halo mass-to-light ratios

Theoretical prediction

Halo M/L obtained by summing light from all galaxies in halo

Efficiency of galaxy formation Galaxy formation is most efficient (=> M/L lowest) in $\sim 10^{12}$ M_ohalos, corresponding to galaxy groups with $L(\text{group}) \sim 10^{10} L_{o}$



Group luminosity

Halo mass-to-light ratios - test against observed groups & clusters

Mocks and data agree well!

Factor of 4 decrease in M/L from rich clusters to poor groups

Data consistent with existence of a minimum



Galaxy luminosity function



Models including these effects can give good match to lum fn at z=0, when include AGN feedback also

Bimodal colour distribution of galaxies observations



Baldry etal 2004 - SDSS

 most galaxies at low z lie on either RED or BLUE sequence

- determined by recent star formation history
- RED = passive, insignificant recent star formation
- BLUE = active,
- ongoing star formation
- bimodal colours due to bimodal SFR/M_{*}

Bimodal colour distribution in models



- galaxy formation models can reproduce bimodal colour distribution
- satellite galaxies nearly all red, because gas cools only onto central galaxies
- blue sequence dominated by central galaxies in halos which still have gas cooling onto them
- need AGN feedback to suppress star formation in most massive galaxies & make them red

Bower etal 2006

Cosmic star formation history

Star Formation Indicators

Several tracers of star formation:

- Ultraviolet emission
- Radio continuum emission (from SNe)
- Emission lines: H α , [OII] 3727 (from HII regions)
- Mid- or far-infrared emission (from dust)

Different indicators used at different redshifts

Ideally want an SFR indicator which:

- is relatively immune to dust extinction
- is sensitive (avoid large extrapolations of LF)
- can be studied over a wide range in redshift

All of these are sensitive to massive (> $5 M_o$) stars only – need to assume Initial Mass Function (IMF)

UV tracers of SFR



SFR_{UV} $(M_{\odot} \text{ yr}^{-1}) = 1.4 \times 10^{-28} L_{\nu} (\text{ergs}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \text{ Hz}^{-1})$ at 1500–2800 Å (for Salpeter IMF). Remember also: L $\propto M^{3.5}$ so the luminosity of a stellar population is dominated by most massive stars.

Cosmic SFR history – comparison of different SFR tracers









 different observational tracers of SFR density fairly consistent for z < 2(but some calibrations have been adjusted to achieve this!) for z>2, far-UV is currently only available tracer

Hopkins 2006

Cosmic SFR history – comparison of different SFR tracers



SFR density inferred from observations peaks at z~2
increases by factor 10-20 from z=0 to z~2
gradually declines at z>2

Hopkins 2006 compilation

Cosmic SFR history - effects of dust



- SFR estimates from rest
 -frame UV heavily affected by dust (~ 1-2 mag)
- UV extinctions difficult to estimate from obs
- estimates from mid-IR/sub
 -mm depend on assumed SED shape

Obs compilation: Hopkins 2006

Effects of dust: cosmic optical & IR backgrounds

Optical/IR extragalactic background



- cosmic far-IR
 background ~ 1-2x UV
 opt-NIR background
- implies most of light from young stars has been reprocessed by dust
- so to understand cosmic star formation history, need to include effects of dust in galaxies

Effects of dust: SEDs of star-forming galaxies

Silva et al 1998

M100 (spiral)







star-forming galaxies have IR luminosities from dust comparable to UV/optical luminosities from stars

Measuring the SFR density to z~10 using Lyman-break galaxies (LBGs)



LBG at z~10 in Hubble Ultra-deep field

Bouwens etal 2011

main obs technique to measure SFR history at z~3-10 uses far-UV luminosities of galaxies detected as LBGs

Lyman-break selection

z~3 LBG

z~8 LBG



use multi-band imaging to search for objects with break in SED corresponding to Lyman break (912A or 1216A) in rest-frame of galaxy – should select star-forming galaxies at that redshift
use 2-colour selection to exclude other types of object

Evolution of observed far-UV Iuminosity density & SFR density

UV luminosity density (not corrected for dust)

inferred SFR

density (with

& without

correction

extinction)

for dust



UV luminosity & SFR densities decline by factor 10-100 from z~2 to z~10

Bouwens etal 2008, 2011

Cosmic SFR history: comparison with galaxy formation models



evolution of SFR can be understood in terms of:
(a) growth of typical halo mass with time
(b) varying efficiency of galaxy formation with halo mass due to cooling & feedback

 decline to high-z due to increasing efficiency of SN feedback

 decline to low-z due to increasing cooling time



Evolution of characteristic UV luminosity of galaxies



 characteristic L_{UV} evolves in similar way to ρ_{UV}
 => typical SFR of star-forming galaxies increases to peak at z~3 & then declines



evolution of observed far-UV LF of LBGs

Bouwens etal 2011



Hα SFRD Evolution



 L^* increases to z>2 ϕ^* increases to z~1, then decreases Evoln in SFRD slightly faster than canonical UV-derived (1+z)⁴ out to z~1 and then levelling. Evolution of stellar mass density & stellar mass function of galaxies

Measuring stellar masses for high-z galaxies

- stellar masses of galaxies estimated PHOTOMETRICALLY
- measure galaxy SED using multi-band photometry
- estimate stellar mass by fitting stellar population model, varying galaxy age, star formation history, dust extinction
- answer depends on assumed IMF & metallicity
- often estimate redshift using same photometric data

Observed evolution of stellar mass density



obs => 50% of stellar mass formed since z~1, 90% since z~3 - agrees with predictions from CDM-based galaxy formation models e.g. Cole etal 1994



SFR density vs stellar mass density



theoretically:

$$\rho_*(t) = \int_0^t \rho_{SFR}(t') dt'$$

 current observational estimates of SFR & stellar mass density histories appear roughly consistent with this

Observed evolution of stellar mass function of galaxies



 obs => stellar mass function at z<4 evolves more strongly at low than high mass – DOWNSIZING
 contrary to simple theoretical expectations based on hierarchical structure formation

Marchesini etal 2009

Evolution of stellar mass function in galaxy formation models



stellar mass function & halo mass function evolve differently due to effects of cooling and feedback
models including AGN feedback for high-mass galaxies appear more successful in explaining observed evolution of stellar mass function

Bower etal 2006