Millennium Simulations and beyond

Simon White Max Planck Institut für Astrophysik



802

 l_{Jh}

 $12^{\rm h}$

13^h

R M

The Millennium Simulation (2005)

125 Mpc/h

15.6 Mpc/h





333 papers making direct use of data from the MS (18-09-2010)Most by authors unassociated with the consortiumMost based on the galaxy catalogues, particularly mock surveys

Limitations of the Millennium Simulation

- Limited volume too small for BAO work, precision cosmology
- Limited resolution too poor to model formation of dwarfs
- No convergence tests are galaxy results numerically converged?
- Only one ("wrong") cosmology
- Users unable to test dependences on parameters/assumptions



Millennium-II (2008)

Same cosmology

Same N

1/5 linear size

Same outputs/ post-processing

Resolution tests of MS results and extension to smaller scales



New galaxy formation models based on MS+MS-II

Qi Guo et al 2010

- Implement modelling simultaneously on MS and MS-II
- Test convergence of galaxy properties near resolution limit of MS
- Extend to properties of dwarf galaxies
- Improve/extend treatments of "troublesome" astrophysics
- Adjust parameters to fit new, more precise data
- Test against clustering and redshift evolution

Things that work well

The stellar mass function of galaxies



Luminosity functions of galaxies





Luminosity function of Milky Way satellites

Luminosity functions of satellites around 1500 "Milky Ways" i.e. isolated disk galaxies with $\log M_* = 10.8$

Galaxy colour distributions



Scaling relations



Clustering of massive galaxies



Data from SDSS/DR7

Projected galaxy number density profiles of clusters



 $\log M_{gal} > 10.0$ 14.0 < $\log M_{clus} < 14.3$

Note: good agreement of MS with MS-II is *only* when orphans are included

Orphan treatment is physically consistent and needed to fit SDSS











Galaxy stellar mass versus maximum past halo mass



"Successful" simulations fail to match this



Things that work less well



The cosmic star formation density history



--- <u>observed</u> SFR are inconsistent with <u>observed</u> stellar masses ------ star formation peaks <u>too early</u> in the model ---

Colours of dwarf galaxies



Too many passive low mass galaxies in the MS-II

--- formation is too fast/too early ---



Evolution of stellar mass function

Lower mass galaxies log $M_* < 10.5$ form too early

Conclusions from MS/MS II comparison

"Precision" modelling of the formation and evolution of the galaxy population is now possible

Viable models should address abundances *and* scaling relations *and* clustering *and* evolution

The Millennium Simulation amplitude $\sigma_{g} = 0.9$ is too high

In current models star formation occurs *too early* in low-mass systems



Need a better understanding of star formation and a lower fluctuation amplitude

Limitations of the Millennium Simulation

- Limited volume too small for BAO work, precision cosmology
- Limited resolution too poor to model formation of dwarfs
- No convergence tests are galaxy results numerically converged?
- Only one ("wrong") cosmology
- Users unable to test dependences on parameters/assumptions

Moore's Law for Cosmological N-body Simulations

- Computers double their speed every 18 months
- A naive N-body force calculation needs N^2 op's
- simulation particles Simulations double their size every 16.5 months
- Progress has been roughly equally due to hardware and to improved algorithms



Moore's Law for Cosmological N-body Simulations

Millennium-XXI

- Computers double their speed every 18 months
- A naive N-body force calculation needs N^2 op's
- simulation particles Simulations double their size every 16.5 months
- Progress has been roughly equally due to hardware and to improved algorithms





Angulo et al 2010



Angulo et al 2010

Angulo et al 2010

Angulo et al 2010

Angulo et al 2010

Limitations of the Millennium Simulation

- Limited volume too small for BAO work, precision cosmology
- Limited resolution too poor to model formation of dwarfs
- No convergence tests are galaxy results numerically converged?
- Only one ("wrong") cosmology
- Users unable to test dependences on parameters/assumptions

Scaling Simulations to neighboring cosmologies

Angulo & White 2010

For example: 'WMAP1' -
$$\Omega_{m} = 0.25$$
, $\Omega_{b} = 0.045$, $\sigma_{8} = 0.9$
to 'WMAP3' - $\Omega_{m} = 0.238$, $\Omega_{b} = 0.0418$, $\sigma_{8} = 0.76$

1) Scale simulation size to match power spectrum slopes of original and target cosmologies on the scales of the original z=0 halos
-- 500 Mpc/h
433 Mpc/h

2) Reassign redshifts to match linear amplitudes on these scales -- z = 0.57, 1.68, 2.92 z = 0, 1, 2

3) Scale particle masses and velocities to match $\Omega_{\rm m}$ and new size -- 9 x 10⁸ M_o/h 5.6 x 10⁸ M_o/h

4) Adjust for the difference between amplitudes of original and target power spectra on large scales using linear theory.

Power spectra agree to better than 1% for k < 0.3

Positions agree to a few tens of kpc Peculiar velocities, masses and concentrations to a few percent

Goals for the GALFORMOD project

• Model formation and evolution of the full galaxy population

- -- over volumes comparable to next generation surveys
- -- out to redshifts beyond 6
- -- for all viable gaussian cosmologies
- -- for a wide range of DE and galaxy formation models
- Study the interplay between galaxy formation physics and "precision" estimates of cosmological parameters
- Enable rapid exploration of the full parameter space with accelerated MCMC or similar techniques
- Make the modelling capabilities publicly available through high-speed VO-type databases and web interfaces