XIV SOCHIAS Meeting December 2020

ACDM and galaxy formation: is the problem solved?

Simon White Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics

The Hot Big Bang: Set out, 1920's, confirmed 1960's

The Hot Big Bang: Set out, 1920's, confirmed 1960's

Nonbaryonic DM: Introduced, 1975 – 85, confirmed 1993 –

The Hot Big Bang: Set out, 1920's, confirmed 1960's

Nonbaryonic DM: Introduced, 1975 – 85, confirmed 1993 –

A: Introduced 1917, resurfaced 1970's, 80's, confirmed 1997 –

The Hot Big Bang: Set out, 1920's, confirmed 1960's

Nonbaryonic DM: Introduced, 1975 – 85, confirmed 1993 –

A: Introduced 1917, resurfaced 1970's, 80's, confirmed 1997 –

Inflationary fluctuations: Introduced ~1980, confirmed 2003 –

The Hot Big Bang: Set out, 1920's, confirmed 1960's

Nonbaryonic DM: Introduced, 1975 – 85, confirmed 1993 –

 Λ : Introduced 1917, resurfaced 1970's, 80's, confirmed 1997 –

Inflationary fluctuations: Introduced ~1980, confirmed 2003 –

All critical elements of the Λ CDM model were in place before any of the last three was experimentally confirmed

The first simulation of Λ CDM structure formation dates from 1985

Neutrinos fail, but Cold Dark Matter, is possible

Davis, Efstathiou, Frenk & White 1985







The current CMB evidence for ΛCDM



Planck Collaboration 2018

Parameter	Combined
$\overline{\Omega_{\rm b}h^2}$	0.02233 ± 0.00015
$\Omega_{\rm c}h^2$	0.1198 ± 0.0012
$100\theta_{MC}$	1.04089 ± 0.00031
au	0.0540 ± 0.0074
$\ln(10^{10}A_{\rm s})$	3.043 ± 0.014
$n_{\rm s}$	0.9652 ± 0.0042
$\Omega_{\rm m}h^2$	0.1428 ± 0.0011
H_0 [km s ⁻¹ Mpc ⁻¹]	67.37 ± 0.54
$\Omega_{\rm m}$	0.3147 ± 0.0074
Age [Gyr]	13.801 ± 0.024
σ_8	0.8101 ± 0.0061
$S_8 \equiv \sigma_8 (\Omega_{\rm m}/0.3)^{0.5}$	0.830 ± 0.013
$Z_{\rm re}$	7.64 ± 0.74
$100\theta_*$	1.04108 ± 0.00031
$r_{\rm drag}$ [Mpc]	147.18 ± 0.29

• <u>No</u> local/low-redshift data are used

Measurements of all 6 ΛCDM parameters Cosmic properties, not fitting parameters

• Low-z data needed to specify <u>nature</u> of the DM

The current CMB evidence for ΛCDM



• Low-z data needed to specify <u>nature</u> of the DM

The current CMB evidence for ΛCDM



• Low-z data needed to specify <u>nature</u> of the DM

Lyman α forest spectra compared to ACDM predictions





Galaxies are diverse, complex, multi-scale and evolving systems



Galaxies are diverse, complex, multi-scale and evolving systems Their population shows regularities with varying scatter/evolution

Galaxy formation is an insoluble problem

• Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos growing by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter

• Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos growing by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter

Semi-analytic and Subhalo Abundance Matching models <u>assume</u> this and tune a physically based (SAM) or purely statistical (SHAM) relation between galaxy properties and subhalo history to fit observation.

Average mass profiles around bright galaxies



• Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos growing by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter

Semi-analytic and Subhalo Abundance Matching models <u>assume</u> this and tune a physically based (SAM) or purely statistical (SHAM) relation between galaxy properties and subhalo history to fit observation.

Main outstanding issues are:

I. The dependence of the survival of satellite subhalos on resolution, integration accuracy, and baryon effects – the "orphan" problem

Galaxy formation is an insoluble problem Without orphans With orphans 1000 1x10⁻²Mpc⁻³ 3x10⁻²Mpc⁻³ $3 \times 10^{-2} Mpc^{-3}$ $1 \times 10^{-2} Mpc^{-3}$ 10000 $1.51 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$ $3.77 \times 10^{10} M_{\odot}$ 2.58×10⁸M_o 3.47×10⁹M_o 100 5.59×10¹⁰M_o $1.82 \times 10^{11} M_{\odot}$ 3.31x10⁸M 3.66x10⁹M_o 1000 100 ŝ 10 10 z = 01 z = 01 1000 0.3x10⁻²Mpc⁻ 0.1x10⁻²Mpc⁻ 0.3x10⁻²Mpc⁻ 0.1x10⁻²Mpc⁻ 10000 2.42×10¹⁰M_☉ 5.66×10¹⁰M_o 5.89×10¹¹M_o $1.89 \times 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ 5.98×10¹⁰M 100 2.60×10¹⁰M_o 6.45×10¹¹M_o $1.96 \times 10^{12} M_{\odot}$ 1000 100 ŝ 10 10 MS MS 1 **MSII MSII** Guo & White 2014 1.0 10.0 0.1 1.0 10.0 0.1 10 10 1 1 r[Mpc] r[Mpc] r[Mpc] r[Mpc] saterine subilatos on resolution.

integration accuracy, and baryon effects – the "orphan" problem

• Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos growing by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter

Subhalo Abundance Matching and Semi-analytic models assume this and tune a more (SAM) or less (SHAM) complicated relation between galaxy properties and subhalo history to fit observation.

Main outstanding issues are:

- I. The dependence of the survival of satellite subhalos on resolution, integration accuracy, and baryon effects the "orphan" problem
- II. The number of properties of subhalo histories needed to predict their galaxy content to the required precision the "assembly bias" problem

Galaxy formation is an insoluble problem



galaxy content to the required precision – the "assembly bias" problem

- Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos as these grow by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter
- The efficiency of galaxy formation is limited by feedback that is most effective at low and at high halo mass. Different astrophysical processes are required in the two cases.



- Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos as these grow by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter
- The efficiency of galaxy formation is limited by feedback that is most effective at low and at high halo mass. Different astrophysical processes are required in the two cases.

At low mass: Reionization heating; Star-formation-driven winds At high mass: Inefficient cooling; AGN feedback

Galaxy formation is an insoluble problem or G⁻¹-10⁻¹F 🕆 problem Norberg et al. (2002) 10^{-2} • Galaxies f es of a population of massive h: 10^{-3} in an initia 10^{-3} in an initia 10^{-3} 10^{-4} The efficie M_{Σ}^{-3} effective a 10^{-5} ation of fluctuations g dark matter • The efficie ack that is most physical processes 10⁻⁵ are require Millennium Simulation 10-6 Croton et al (2006) n winds At low mas Cooling only At high ma 10^{-7} -22 -20 -18 -16 -24 -14 $M_{bJ} = 5 \log_{10} h$

Galaxy formation is an insoluble problem or problem G-1-10-1 F Norberg et al. (2002) 10^{-2} • Galaxies f es of a population of massive ha 10^{-3} in an initia M_{2}^{-5} 10^{-3} The efficie M_{2}^{-3} 10^{-4} effective a 10^{-5} tion of fluctuations g dark matter • The efficie ack that is most physical processes 10-5 are require Millennium Simulation 10^{-6} Croton et al (2006) n winds At low may Cooling+SN winds At high ma 10^{-7} -22 -20 -18 -16 -14 -24M_{bJ} - 5loq₁₀h

Galaxy formation is an insoluble problem or G long et al. (2002) **problem** 10^{-2} • Galaxies f es of a population of massive h: (10^{-3}) in an initia tion of fluctuations g dark matter 10^{-4} The efficit $\stackrel{\text{od}}{\underset{M}{\overset{}}}$ ack that is most • The efficie physical processes 10-5 are require Millennium Simulation 10-6 Croton et al (2006) n winds At low may Cooling+SN winds+AGN At high ma 10^{-7} -22 -20 -18 -16 -14 -24М_ы — 5loq₁₀h



- Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos as these grow by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter
- The efficiency of galaxy formation is limited by feedback that is most effective at low and at high halo mass. Different astrophysical processes are required in the two cases.

At low mass: Reionization heating; Star-formation-driven winds At high mass: Inefficient cooling; AGN feedback

Main outstanding issues:

I. Mechanical/radiative feedback, B-fields/cosmic rays, ejection/recycling II. Can "subgrid" processes be sufficiently well/uniquely characterised?

- Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos as these grow by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter
- The efficiency of galaxy formation is limited by feedback that is most effective at low and at high halo mass. Different astrophysical processes are required in the two cases.
- The sizes and internal structure of galaxies are regulated primarily by the generation of angular momentum and its transfer between components.

- Galaxies form as gas cools and condenses at the centres of a population of massive halos as these grow by gravitational amplification of fluctuations in an initially near-uniform distribution of pre-existing dark matter
- The efficiency of galaxy formation is limited by feedback that is most effective at low and at high halo mass. Different astrophysical processes are required in the two cases.
- The sizes and internal structure of galaxies are regulated primarily by the generation of angular momentum and its transfer between components. Tidal torques on protogalaxies. Disk formation and instability
 (Lack of) loss in winds, transfer in galactic fountains
 Randomisation in mergers, feeding of AGN



Recent cosmological (magneto)hydrodynamical simulations reproduce many aspects of the observed internal structure of galaxies....





Simulating the structure of galaxies

FIRE



- ...but they differ strongly in their treatment of the ISM, of star formation, of feedback, of nuclear BH's...
- They do not include processes known to be significant (cosmic rays/B-fields, binary evolution, dust evolution)
- They make different predictions for properties not used as constraints (gas/bar fractions, CGM/ ISM structure)
- They are not yet checked across the full range of galaxy masses and environments.

Recent cosmological (magneto)hydrodynamical simulations reproduce many aspects of the observed internal structure of galaxies....

• Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust
- SMBH formation and fuelling

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust
- SMBH formation and fuelling
- Launching of SF/starburst/AGN winds: the mechanisms of mass loading

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust
- SMBH formation and fuelling
- Launching of SF/starburst/AGN winds: the mechanisms of mass loading
- Inflow/outflow interactions: galactic fountains, IGM metals

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust
- SMBH formation and fuelling
- Launching of SF/starburst/AGN winds: the mechanisms of mass loading
- Inflow/outflow interactions: galactic fountains, IGM metals
- Mergers: the genealogy of the 1%, restructuring through major(?) mergers

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust
- SMBH formation and fuelling
- Launching of SF/starburst/AGN winds: the mechanisms of mass loading
- Inflow/outflow interactions: galactic fountains, IGM metals
- Mergers: the genealogy of the 1%, restructuring through major(?) mergers
- Environment effects: nature vs nurture, stripping/harassment/strangulation

- Star formation: IMF as a function of Z, p, ρ , $\langle v^2 \rangle$, B...; GRB, GW precursors
- Spirals/bars/warps: internal versus external driving, the role of gas
- Phase structure of the ISM/CGM/IGM: role of B-fields, cosmic rays, dust
- SMBH formation and fuelling
- Launching of SF/starburst/AGN winds: the mechanisms of mass loading
- Inflow/outflow interactions: galactic fountains, IGM metals
- Mergers: the genealogy of the 1%, restructuring through major(?) mergers
- Environment effects: nature vs nurture, stripping/harassment/strangulation

(Multiple) phenomenological models have been suggested for all of these Convincing *ab initio* physical models are available for very few Mass and detailed assembly history determine their relative importance

Epistemology for complex systems

(galaxy formation, climate change, ecology, macro-economics, brain function)

- Agreement of the galaxy population in a modern cosmological hydrodynamical simulation with (aspects of) real populations may contribute rather little to our knowledge/understanding of galaxy formation, since
 - part of the agreement is due to calibration/tuning
 - simulations with *different* subgrid models often agree equally well
 - unexamined (but linked) aspects often disagree with observation
 - better resolution or subgrid modelling may ruin the agreement
- It is important to understand *why* simulation and observation agree. Intuition is often helped by models which isolate individual processes
- Stronger conclusions can often be drawn from showing that some aspects of the observations *cannot* be fit, implying e.g. that
 - the integration scheme is insufficiently accurate, or
 - the subgrid models incorrectly represent the astrophysics, or
 - critical processes are not yet included, or
 - $-\Lambda CDM$ is wrong

Summary points?

- ΛCDM is an *a priori* theoretical model with parameters fully specified by CMB measurements
- Of its basic tenets, only the cold nature of the Dark Matter *requires* data from the low-redshift Universe for justification/validation
- In principle, ACDM thus predicts **all** properties of the nonlinear, latetime universe (e.g. all galaxy properties) with no further freedom
- In practice, it can be very hard to calculate these predictions reliably.
- Different (uncertain) treatments of astrophysical processes can lead to very different galaxy properties within the *same* ΛCDM framework

Summary points?

- ΛCDM is an *a priori* theoretical model with parameters fully specified by CMB measurements
- Of its basic tenets, only the cold nature of the Dark Matter *requires* data from the low-redshift Universe for justification/validation
- In principle, ACDM thus predicts **all** properties of the nonlinear, latetime universe (e.g. all galaxy properties) with no further freedom
- In practice, it can be very hard to calculate these predictions reliably.
- Different (uncertain) treatments of astrophysical processes can lead to very different galaxy properties within the *same* ΛCDM framework

It seems very unlikely that the detailed structural properties of galaxies can be used reliably to infer failings of Λ CDM

Summary points?

- ΛCDM is an *a priori* theoretical model with parameters fully specified by CMB measurements
- Of its basic tenets, only the cold nature of the Dark Matter *requires* data from the low-redshift Universe for justification/validation
- In principle, ACDM thus predicts **all** properties of the nonlinear, latetime universe (e.g. all galaxy properties) with no further freedom
- In practice, it can be very hard to calculate these predictions reliably.
- Different (uncertain) treatments of astrophysical processes can lead to very different galaxy properties within the *same* ΛCDM framework

Complex simulations of knowledge?

Limited observations of a more complex reality