Ringberg 2014

Realistic Spirals?

Michael Aumer & Simon White

Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics

<u>Gadget-based multiphase SPH</u> Scannapieco et al 2006, 2009

Particle *i* does not consider *j* as a neighbour if: $A_i > 50 A_j$; $\underline{\mathbf{v}}_{ij} \cdot \underline{\mathbf{\hat{r}}}_{ij} > -\mathbf{c}_{ij}$ where $A \sim p \rho^{-5/3}$ is the entropic function and c is the sound speed

Diffuse gas does not "see" much denser gas → avoids interface cooling, etc.

Full chemical evolution network and cooling rates Wiersma et al 2009

SN Ia, SNII and AGB evolution following 9 heavy elements

Complex stellar feedback (no AGN)

Thermal and kinetic feedback *separately* to hot and cold phases Feedback to cold phase *promotion* to hot phase *mass-loaded* winds "Radiation" feedback from young massive stars

<u>Metal diffusion</u> → "subgrid" turbulent mixing → no chemothermal instability

Four Aquarius halos also simulated by Scannapieco et al 2009 Twelve halos from the study of Oser et al (2010)

Halo	$\frac{M_{\rm vir}}{[10^{10}M_{\odot}]}$	$m_{ m dm}$ $[10^6 M_{\odot}]$	$m_{ m gas}$ $[10^5 M_{\odot}]$	Origin	Aumer et al 2013
6782-4x	17.03	3.62	7.37	LO	
4323-4x	29.50	3.62	7.37	\mathbf{LO}	
4349-4x	30.28	3.62	7.37	\mathbf{LO}	
2283-4x	49.65	3.62	7.37	LO	
Aq-B-5	70.35	1.50	2.87	\mathbf{CS}	
1646-4x	81.61	3.62	7.37	\mathbf{LO}	
1192-4x	100.03	3.62	7.37	LO	
1196-4x	113.81	3.62	7.37	LO	
0977-4x	129.56	3.62	7.37	LO	
Aq-D-5	150.43	2.31	4.40	\mathbf{CS}	
Aq-C-5	151.28	2.16	4.11	\mathbf{CS}	
Aq-A-5	164.49	2.64	5.03	\mathbf{CS}	
0959-4x	164.54	3.62	7.37	LO	
0858-4x	182.44	3.62	7.37	LO	
0664-4x	213.74	3.62	7.37	LO	
0616-4x	235.77	3.62	7.37	LO	



Effects of feedback on the SFH of the Aquila halo

Updating metal production and cooling rates has no effect

Including kinetic FB has no effect in this particular case

Including early "radiation" FB has a large effect

The simplest model suppresses SF at all times

In most successful model, the FB strength increases with ρ , σ and Z

Old/new models vs abundance-matching expectations



Old/new models vs abundance-matching expectations







Circular velocity curves at z = 0



Aumer et al 2013





Photometric decompositions mostly a good fit to exp.disk+deV.bulge

Photometric B/T are typically << kinematic B/T: Most are < 0.1



Disk formation occurs at late times





Stellar disk sizes

increase slowly with mass and time.

They agree well with observation at high redshift, but appear somewhat too large at z = 0

HI masses and sizes

are, however, in good agreement with observation at low redshift

Gas Fractions

Are larger and lower mass and at higher redshift, in qualitative agreement with observation

Aumer et al 2013

Stellar mass growth is inside-out

Aumer et al 2014

Comparing strong and weak FB from the same IC's

Why does strong early FB promote disk formation

- 1) The SFR is strongly suppressed at early times
- 2) Low J gas is preferentially ejected
- 3) Many stars form from recycled gas which has gained J
- 4) Disk is predominantly formed from late-time, high J accretion
- 5) Much gas is ejected altogether less compact galaxies