### **Insights from cosmological hydrodynamical simulations**

Joop Schaye (Yope Shea) Leiden University

# Outline

- 1. Cosmological hydro
  - a) General considerations
  - b) EAGLE
  - c) OWLS, Cosmo-OWLS and BAHAMAS
- 2. Results
  - a) Matter power spectrum
  - b) Cosmic shear
  - c) Halo mass function
  - d) Subhalo clustering
  - e) SHAM
  - f) Alignments
  - g) Matter outside haloes

# **Starting points**

- Strong outflows at high redshift are necessary to obtain agreement with a diverse set of observations
- Cosmological hydro simulations cannot predict radiative losses and momentum cancellation in the ISM
- Cannot predict stellar masses, black hole masses and gas fractions from first principles
- Calibration necessary → need to compare to relevant observations

# **Starting points**

- For testing observational cosmology, it is not necessarily better to use simulations that
  - Include more physics
  - Have higher resolution
  - Agree better with *some* observations
- Don't ask what solver/resolution/physics was used, ask to see a comparison with the *relevant* observations!





### **Galaxy stellar mass function**



JS, Crain, Bower, et al. (2015)

### **Galaxy sizes**



JS, Crain, Bower, et al. (2015)

#### The effect of baryons on the distribution of matter



McCarthy, JS+ (2011)

#### The effect of baryons on the distribution of matter



McCarthy, JS+ (2011)

### **Cosmo-OWLS: Stellar mass function**



Le Brun, McCarthy, JS, Ponman (2014)

### **Cosmo-OWLS: Stellar mass function**



Le Brun, McCarthy, JS, Ponman (2014)

### **BAHAMAS: Stellar mass function**



McCarthy, JS+ (in prep)

### **Cosmo-OWLS:** gas fractions



Le Brun, McCarthy, JS, Ponman (2014)

McCarthy, JS+ (in prep)

### **Cosmo-OWLS: Density profiles**



Le Brun, McCarthy, JS, Ponman (2014)

### Baryons and the matter power spectrum



Van Daalen, JS+ '11

### Baryons and the matter power spectrum

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

Van Daalen, JS+ '11

### Biases due to galaxy formation for a Euclid-like weak lensing survey

![](_page_16_Figure_1.jpeg)

Semboloni, Hoekstra, JS, et al. (2011)

### Two and three point statistics

![](_page_17_Figure_1.jpeg)

Euclid w<sub>o</sub> marginalised

## Halo mass function

![](_page_18_Figure_1.jpeg)

Velliscig, van Daalen, JS, et al. (2014)

#### Subhalo autocorrelation: AGN vs DMONLY

![](_page_19_Figure_1.jpeg)

Van Daalen, JS+ (2014)

#### Subhalo autocorrelation: AGN vs DMONLY

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Linked subhaloes only

Van Daalen, JS+ (2014)

## Real space clustering: relative error

![](_page_21_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

Chavez-Montero, Angulo, JS, et al. (2015)

## Redshift space clustering: rel. error

![](_page_22_Figure_1.jpeg)

----- Vpeak ---- Vrelax

Chavez-Montero, Angulo, JS, et al. (2015)

## Assembly bias: Effect of reshuffling haloes

![](_page_23_Figure_1.jpeg)

Chavez-Montero, Angulo, JS, et al. (2015)

### Stellar(<r)-halo alignment

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

Velliscig, Cacciato, JS, et al. (2015)

### Stellar(<r)-halo alignment

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

Velliscig, Cacciato, JS, et al. (2015)

### Halo contribution to the power spectrum

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

Van Daalen & JS (2015)

### Halo contribution to the power spectrum

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

L200N1024

Van Daalen & JS (2015)

## Conclusions

- Subgrid models for stellar feedback and BHs need calibration
- To estimate the effects of baryons, we should use simulations that fit observations (rather than the "most physics" or "highest resolution")
- Baryons, particularly their ejection, are important for:
  - Power spectrum (k > 0.3 h/Mpc)
  - Cosmic shear ( $\theta$  < 60 arcmin)
  - Halo mass function (M <  $10^{15}$  M<sub> $\odot$ </sub> for perfect estimator)
  - Clustering at fixed mass (all scales)
  - Clustering at fixed number density (< 1 Mpc)</li>
  - Galaxy-halo misalignment
- SHAM works relatively well, but not high precision (Vrelax)
- Matter outside haloes matters