### **Regulation of star formation in** low-metallicity galaxies by feedback and turbulence

#### Ava Polzin with Andrey Kravtsov, Vadim Semenov, and Nick Gnedin

**18th Potsdam Thinkshop** July 17, 2025

avapolzin.github.io apolzin@uchicago.edu



#### **Classical picture of SF in galaxies** Feedback, turbulence encoded in ISM + regulates SF



Ava Polzin, Potsdam Thinkshop July 2025

HabEx Final Report

#### A key part of the parameter space Local dwarfs + high redshift galaxies are low Z



#### State-of-the-art simulations Reproducing H<sub>2</sub> distribution and SF in nearby low Z dwarfs

- High resolution (~10) pc), realistic simulation (Semenov+21)
- SF (and so feedback) not based on  $H_2$  self-consistent modeling of hydrodynamics, UV radiative transfer
- Recover detailed SF properties observed in local dwarf galaxies



#### **Virial parameter-based SF** Flexible, varies with gas properties, + not tuned

- Stochastic star formation set by star formation efficiency per free-fall time
- Fraction of gas forming stars set by gas motions, gas density, cell size
- Feedback + turbulence encoded in ISM behavior

$$\dot{\rho_{\star}} = \epsilon_{\rm ff} \frac{\rho_{\rm gas}}{t_{\rm ff}}$$

$$\epsilon_{\rm ff} pprox e^{-\sqrt{\alpha_{\rm vir}/0.53}}$$
Padoan+12

$$\alpha_{\rm vir} = \frac{9.35 \, (\sigma_{\rm tot}/100 \, \rm km \, s^{-1})}{(n/100 \, \rm cm^{-3}) \times (\Delta x/40 \, \rm pc)}$$

Bertoldi & McKee 92

#### Calibrating on an isolated disk Simulating galaxies at low metallicity



Polzin+24a, arXiv:2310.10712

Ava Polzin, Potsdam Thinkshop July 2025

- Run at fixed Z, evenly log-spaced  $0.01 - 1 Z_{\odot}$ , leaving all other physics the same
- Changes in ISM structure with metal abundance
- Changes in atomic/molecular fraction with metal abundance

### H<sub>2</sub> should be less abundant at low Z

- At typical GMC densities ( $n_H \sim 50$ cm<sup>-3</sup>), H<sub>2</sub> formation time is comparable to lifetime of star forming regions at ~0.1  $Z_{\odot}$
- At lower Z, H<sub>2</sub> abundances drop dramatically
- HI-H<sub>2</sub> models for metal-rich gas will overpredict H<sub>2</sub> at low Z

#### Metal-rich models won't apply properly to this regime



Krumholz 12

#### Isolating the role of metallicity Predictions from a suite of realistic simulations



hydrogen number density

#### Capturing the Z, U-dependences Accurate HI-H<sub>2</sub> transition location and max f<sub>H2</sub>



hydrogen number density

#### **Accurately model H<sub>2</sub> in low Z regime** Good for recovering HI + H<sub>2</sub> masses!

- Simple functional form, dependent on n<sub>H</sub>, radiation field strength, and gas metallicity
- Recovers H<sub>2</sub> mass to within factor of 1.25 (1.5) across metallicitie (and scales)
- No assumptions of chemical equilibrium etc.



# H<sub>2</sub> abundance and SF decouple ... so H<sub>2</sub> should not be used in SF prescriptions



- SF and H<sub>2</sub> abundance decouple at low metallicity
- Stars form out of cold, dense gas generally in absence of molecular gas

## **SFR** lower in low Z runs due to less cold, dense gas



#### H<sub>2</sub> abundance and SF decouple ... so H<sub>2</sub> should not be used in SF prescriptions

- Star-forming gas is ~uniformly efficient, regardless of metallicity
- On small scales, SFE set by turbulence and feedback, not H<sub>2</sub> fraction



#### Accurate SFEs across conditions Modeling star formation directly for low Z galaxies

 $\epsilon_{\mathrm{ff}}$ 

 $t_{\rm ff} \, (\rm Myr)$ 

 $/\epsilon_{\mathrm{ff}} \; (\mathrm{Myr})$ 

 $\stackrel{\scriptstyle \sim}{\underset{\scriptstyle \downarrow}{\boxplus}} 10^2$  e

 $10^{-10}$ 

 $10^{-2}$ 

 $10^{4}$ 

 $10^{-2}$ 

- Little dependence on Z , U, or  $\Sigma$ ; universality of  $\epsilon_{\rm ff}$  on galaxy scales (+ smaller) with no tuning
- Similarly, SFE not tied to H<sub>2</sub> abundance
- Preparing a cell-bycell model of star forming gas fraction + timescale

 $- = 2 = 0.01 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.10 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.30 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 1.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot}$  $- = 2 = 0.03 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.20 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.60 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.60 \text{ Z}_{\odot}$  $- = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot}$  $- = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot}$  $- = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot}$  $- = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot} \qquad - = 2 = 0.00 \text{ Z}_{\odot}$ 



Polzin+24c, arXiv:2407.11125

#### **Non-turbulent re-simulation** Role of thermal vs. turbulent motions in the ISM

- Use Padoan+12 model for subgrid turbulence as default — based on virial parameter, where  $\sigma_{tot} = \sqrt{\sigma_t^2 + c_s^2}$
- Turn off turbulence which redefines  $\sigma_{tot} = c_s$

$$\epsilon_{\rm ff} pprox e^{-\sqrt{\alpha_{\rm vir}/0.53}}$$
Padoan+12

$$\alpha_{\rm vir} = \frac{9.35 \, (\sigma_{\rm tot}/100 \, \rm km \, s^{-1})}{(n/100 \, \rm cm^{-3}) \times (\Delta x/40 \, \rm pc)}$$

Bertoldi & McKee 92

#### **Non-turbulent re-simulation** Role of thermal vs. turbulent motions in the ISM



#### **Non-turbulent re-simulation** Role of thermal vs. turbulent motions in the ISM





Note different axis scales!

#### **Quick summary** SF regulated by turbulent compression + dispersive feedback

