Stellar feedbackdriven galactic winds

Matthew C. Smith



MAX-PLANCK-INSTITUT FÜR ASTROPHYSIK



GALACTIC WINDS*

JAMES C. BAKER Department of Physics, University of California, San Diego Received 1971 May 10; revised 1971 July 7

Gas ejected from stars in elliptical galaxies is heated by supernova explosions and produces outwardflowing galactic winds. Except possibly for the dust component, steady-state galactic winds are impossible to observe. However, some galactic winds have thermally unsteady cores which can be observed in optical emission lines. If the gas which is thermally unsteady remains ionized as it goes into free fall at the galactic center, objects more massive than stars tend to form. It is likely that nonthermal radio emission and optical line emission can occur only in those ellipticals with thermally unsteady galactic winds.

WILLIAM G. MATHEWS Lick Observatory, Board of Studies in Astronomy and Astrophysics, University of California, Santa Cruz

AND

ABSTRACT

WHAT DO WE NEED GALACTIC WINDS TO DO?

We often invoke stellar feedback-driven galactic winds to:

- Regulate the stellar mass of galaxies
- Regulate gas fractions (ISM, CGM)
- Regulate enrichment (stars, ISM, CGM, IGM)
- Influence CGM phase structure
- Influence galaxy sizes via re-distribution of material

•

Mass loading factor:

Energy loading factor:

Supernova feedback specific energy:

Metal loading factor:

Or enrichment factor:

$$\eta_{M} = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{out}}}{\dot{M}_{\star}}$$

$$\tilde{v}_{w} = \left(2u_{\star}\frac{\eta_{E}}{\eta_{M}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$\eta_{E} = \frac{\dot{E}_{\text{out}}}{u_{\star}\dot{M}_{\star}}$$

$$u_{\star} \sim \frac{10^{51} \,\mathrm{erg}}{100 \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot}} = 5 \times 10^5 \,\left(\mathrm{km \, s^{-1}}\right)^2$$

$$\eta_Z = \frac{\dot{M}_{\rm Zout}}{f_Z \dot{M}_{\star}}$$

$$\xi_Z = \frac{Z_{\text{out}}}{Z_{\text{ISM}}}$$

$$\eta_{M} = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{out}}}{\dot{M}_{\star}} \qquad \qquad \tilde{v}_{w} = \left(2u_{\star}\frac{\eta_{E}}{\eta_{M}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \eta_{E} = \frac{\dot{E}_{\text{out}}}{u_{\star}\dot{M}_{\star}}$$

$$u_{\star} \sim \frac{10^{51} \,\mathrm{erg}}{100 \,\mathrm{M_{\odot}}} = 5 \times 10^5 \,\left(\mathrm{km \, s^{-1}}\right)^2$$

$$\eta_Z = \frac{\dot{M}_{\rm Zout}}{f_Z \dot{M}_{\star}}$$

$$\xi_Z = \frac{Z_{\text{out}}}{Z_{\text{ISM}}}$$

Where?

What spatial scale?

From one reservoir to another? Across a surface? What geometry?

Over what timescale?

Which gas? What phase?

$$\eta_M = \frac{\dot{M}_{\rm out}}{\dot{M}_{\star}}$$

 $\eta_E = \frac{E_{\text{out}}}{u_+ M_+}$

 $\tilde{v}_{\rm w} = \left(2u_{\star}\frac{\eta_E}{\eta_M}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$

$$u_{\star} \sim \frac{10^{51} \text{ erg}}{100 \text{ M}_{\odot}} = 5 \times 10^5 \text{ (km s}^{-1})^2$$
$$\eta_Z = \underbrace{\dot{M}_{Z\text{out}}}_{f \text{ M}}$$

$$\xi_Z = \frac{Z_{\text{out}}}{Z_{\text{ISM}}}$$

 f_7M_1

Over what timescale?

Is this the star formation responsible for the wind?

What about wind travel time? What about burstiness?

$$\eta_{M} = \frac{\dot{M}_{\text{out}}}{\dot{M}_{\star}}$$
$$\eta_{E} = \frac{\dot{E}_{\text{out}}}{u_{\star}\dot{M}_{\star}}$$

$$\tilde{v}_{\rm w} = \left(2u_{\star}\frac{\eta_E}{\eta_M}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$u_{\star} \sim \frac{10^{51} \text{ erg}}{100 \text{ M}_{\odot}} = 5 \times 10^5 \text{ (km s}^{-1})^2$$





The mode of galactic wind feedback



Ejective feedback

Voit+ 2024b

Energetics of Ejective feedback

 10^{1}

If a wind has η_M at 0.05 r_{vir}, what energy loading does it need to never come back?

 $\begin{array}{c|c} \eta_{E} & \eta_{M} \\ \eta_{E} & \frac{1}{2} \eta_{M} \\ \eta_{M} & \frac{v_{\rm esc}(0.05r_{\rm vir})^2}{u_{\star}} \\ 10^{-1} & \eta_{\star} \\ 10^{-5} & \eta_{\rm vir} \\ 10^{-5} & \eta_{\rm vir} \\ \eta_{M} & \eta_{\rm vir} \\ \eta_{M} & \eta_{M} \\ \eta_{M} & \eta_{M$

 10^{-3} ,



The mode of galactic wind feedback



Ejective feedback

Voit+ 2024b

The mode of galactic wind feedback



uncoupled

Recycling crisis



Ejective feedback

Voit+ 2024b



Voit+ 2024b

Ejective feedback

Preventative feedback



Preventative feedback in regulator models and SAMS

Carr+2023, see also e.g. Pandya+2023, Voit+2024

Bennett, MCS+ 2024 test this picture in hydro volumes

Regulation of SF by increasing specific energy of CGM









Coarse resolution simulations

- TNG50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 0 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ - TNG50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ Nelson+19
- --- TNG100 (z = 2), Wright+24
 - EAGLE, Mitchell+20
- --- EAGLE (z = 2), Mitchell+20
- --- EAGLE (z = 2), Wright+24
- --- SIMBA (z = 2), Wright+24

Comparing simulated baryon cycles



Wright+ 2024





Coarse resolution simulations

- TNG50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 0 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ - TNG50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ Nelson+19
- --- TNG100 (z = 2), Wright+24
 - EAGLE, Mitchell+20
- --- EAGLE (z = 2), Mitchell+20
- --- EAGLE (z = 2), Wright+24
- --- SIMBA (z = 2), Wright+24



Coarse resolution simulations

- TNG50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 0 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ TNC50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$
- TNG50 (z = 2), $v_{out} > 150 \text{ km s}^{-1}$ Nelson+19
- --- TNG100 (z = 2), Wright+24
 - EAGLE, Mitchell+20
- --- EAGLE (z = 2), Mitchell+20
- --- EAGLE (z = 2), Wright+24
- --- SIMBA (z = 2), Wright+24
 - FIRE Muratov+15
 - -- FIRE Anglés Alcázar+17
- ••••• FIRE-2 Pandya+21









Suppression of mass loading in cosmological dwarfs by early feedback



Rey+ 2025, measured at 0.25 r₂₀₀, averaged over history

Keep everything the same, except vary discretisation of formed stellar mass















Multiphase outflows

Resolved ISM simulations produce highly multiphase outflows

Mass loading dominated by cold/ warm slow moving material (ejective feedback)

Energy loading dominated by hot, fast, metal enriched outflow (preventative feedback)







Phase interactions

Highly complex co-evolution of gas phases, relevant physics is very small-scale

But can have large scale impact on evolution of the wind



Gronke & Oh 2018





Schneider+2020

Fielding & Bryan 2022

Weinberger & Hernquist 23 Das+23

single fluid discretization

2-fluid discretization







mass coupling





phase 2

1400

- 1200

density

800

600

0.4

- 0.3

- 0.2

- 0.1

- 0.0

-0.1

- -0.2

-0.3

-0.4

Ę

veloc

-0.4

Butsky+24

Smith+24a,b "Arkenstone"







Resolved gas density

Cloud particles, cloud masses

Resolved gas radial velocity

Cloud particles radial velocity

Velocity dispersion of clouds within each cell

Smith+2024b

Summary

- - Ejective vs. preventative (and combinations of both) \bullet $\frac{\eta_E}{M}$ is as important as η_M
 - η_M
 - CGM properties may provide constraints \bullet
- Tensions between high resolution idealised and coarse resolution cosmological simulations? 2.
 - Possibly, but we could be comparing apples with oranges \bullet
 - Need very high resolution, ideally "star-by-star" simulations to capture "a priori" wind generation \bullet
 - Observational comparison on even footing more important than ever \bullet
- 3. Multiphase nature of winds significantly complicates the picture
 - Combination of idealised experiments with novel numerical methods (e.g. multi-fluid approaches) will help \bullet

didn't talk about:

- Chemical enrichment. What constraints can the MZR and abundance patterns place on winds?
- How does any of this work at high redshift? Does it still make sense to talk about "winds"?
- How do we forward model the simulations? What are the most robust ways to obtain constraints? How do we account for selection effects e.g. are we simulating the right things?

Matthew C. Smith

There are multiple modes in which stellar feedback driven galactic winds can participate in the baryon cycle

msmith@mpa-garching.mpg.de

