Galaxy workshop 2010

University of California, Santa Cruz

August 16-20, 2010

Anti-hierarchical growth of black holes

M. Hirschmann

with R. Somerville (STScI), T. Naab (MPA) and
A. Burkert (Munich observatory)

I. Observations

AGNs from soft X-ray, *Hasinger et al. (2005)*



Aim of our study?

Which are the underlying physical processes causing the anti-hierarchical growth of black holes?

How can we reproduce this behaviour with a semi-analytic model (SAM)?

I. Observations

- Bolometric correction
- Dust correction factor, observable 'fraction' is approximated using



Hopkins et al., 2006

II. Semi-analytic model

Somerville et al., 2008

Radiative gas cooling

Photo-ionization: Suppression of gas collapsing into small mass halos

Quiescent star formation based on the empirical Schmidt-Kennicutt-law

Supernova feedback modeled as energy-driven winds

Merging history of the Millennium simulation

Star formation during a burst (triggered by mergers)

Black hole growth: Radio and Quasar mode

Metal enrichment

II. Semi-analytic model

Growth of black holes in the quasar mode

- Triggered by galaxy-galaxy major mergers (mass ratio > 0.1)

- Assumption: black holes in the two progenitor galaxies merge rapidly and form a new black hole (mass conservation)

- Accretion onto the BH: Self-regulated, based on numerical simulations (Springel et al. 2005, *Robertson et al. 2006, Cox et al. 2006, Hopkins et al. 2007*)

II. Semi-analytic model

Growth of black holes in the quasar mode

- Parametrization (from sim. of *Hopkins et al. 2007*):

$$\log(M_{\rm BH}/M_{\rm sph}) = -3.27 + 0.36 {\rm erf}[(f_{\rm gas} - 0.4)/0.28]$$

- Regime I: below $M_{\rm BH,crit}$ black hole is allowed to *accrete at the Eddington rate* (till $M_{\rm BH,peak}$)

$$M_{\rm BH,crit} = f_{\rm BH,crit} 1.07 (M_{\rm BH,final}/10^9 M_\odot)^{1.1}$$

- Regime II: *blow-out phase*, power-law decline in the accretion rate (set to light curves from *Hopkins et al., 2006*)

III. Results from SAMs

Original code

Somerville et al., 2008

SAM output

Observations

$$L = \frac{\epsilon_r}{1-\epsilon_r} \cdot \frac{dM_\bullet}{dt} \cdot c^2$$





III. Results from SAMs

Which *additional physical mechanisms* do we need in order to achieve a better agreement with observations?

III. Results from SAMs

Assuming a redshift dependent Eddington-ratio

Observations: *Netzer et al. (2007) (also: Shen et al., 2008; Kollmeier et al. ,2006; Padovani et al.,1989)*

Type-1 AGN for z < 0.75



$$L/L_{\mathrm{edd}} \propto z^{\gamma(M)}$$

Assumption in our model:

$$z > 1: \quad \frac{L}{L_{\mathrm{edd}}} = 1$$

$$z < 1: \quad \frac{L}{L_{\mathrm{edd}}} = 0.95 \cdot z + 0.05$$

No mass dependence so far

III. Results from SAMs

Assuming a redshift dependent Eddington-ratio





Steeper slope for more luminous objects at low z

III. Results from SAMs

Additional accretion onto the black hole due to disk instabilities

Stability criterion for disks:

$$M_{\rm disk,crit} = \frac{v_{\rm max}^2 \, R_{\rm disk}}{G \, \epsilon}$$

Efstathiou et al., 1982

Stability parameter

If $M_{disk} > M_{disk,crit}$:

Difference (M_{disk} - $M_{disk,crit}$) goes into the bulge component

Certain fraction is accreted onto the black hole:

$$\Delta M_\bullet = f_{\rm BH,disk} \cdot \left(M_{\rm disk} - M_{\rm disk,crit}\right)$$

III. Results from SAMs: *Best fit model*

Consider disk instabilities *and* redshift dependent Eddington-ratio





III. Results from SAMs: *Best fit model*

Consider disk instabilities *and* redshift dependent Eddington-ratio



IV. Summary

- Additional physical processes to achieve better agreement with observations:

1. Assume decreasing Eddington ratio with z after z=1
→
Decrease of number densities for high luminous objects at low z

2. Additional accretion channel due to disk instabilities
→
Increase of number densities for low-luminous objects at low z

→ DOWNSIZING!

...Thanks for your attention...

II. What has been done so far?

Basic problems:

Underprediction of low luminous objects and overprediction of high luminous objects at low z

&

Too less high luminous objects at high z

Marulli et al., 2008



Bonoli et al., 2009



Figure 3. Bolometric luminosity function assuming Eddington-limited accretion (Mod I, blue-dashed curve), or Eddington-limited accretion followed by a quiescent phase of low luminosity (Mod II, green-solid curve), with errors calculated using Poisson statistics. The luminosity functions are compared with the compilation of Hopkins et al. (2007) (grey points with best fit given by the grey band).

III. Results from SAMs: *Best fit model*

Can we still reproduce obs. constraints??