Difficulties with Simulating Cosmological Ionizing Radiative Transfer

> Matthew McQuinn UC Berkeley



- <u>the impact of Lyman-limit systems on</u> <u>reionization</u>
- towards better source models

the impact of photoionization feedback

# The importance of Lyman-limit systems (LLSs) After Reionization



Are they capturing this transition?

### During Reionization



Mean free path limited by dense systems w/  $\delta$  =10-1000 Mean free path limited by bubbles



Intensity of Ionizing Background = (mean free path) x (source emissivity)

### Capturing LLSs is crucial for understanding z=6 Hydrogen Ly $\alpha$ forest Neutral region: $\tau_{\rm GP} = 3 \times 10^5 x_{\rm HI} (1 + \delta) \left(\frac{1+z}{z}\right)^{3/2}$

7000	7500	8000	λ (Å)	8500	9000	9500
J1148+5251 z=6.42						
J1030+0524 z=6.28					A	
J1623+3112 z=6.22					Man	
J1048+4637 z=6.20					V	
J1250+3130 z=6.13				-		
J2315-0023 z=6.12				~		
J0303-0019 z=6.10						
J0842+1218 z=6.08						
J1602+4228 z=6.07						
J0353+0104 z=6.07				~~~		
J2054-0005 z=6.06				and the second	with a second	$\sim \sigma r h r r$
J1630+4012 z=6.05						
J1137+3549 z=6.01				M		
J0818+1722 z=6.00		-				
J1306+0356 z=5.99						
J0841+2905 z=5.98				~~~		
J1335+35334z=5.95				· · · · · ·		~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~
J1411+1217 z=5.93						
J0203+0012 = 5.86			_	and the second division of the second divisio		
J0840+5624 z=5.85						
JC005-0006 z=5.85						
J1436+5007 z=5.83			~			- Aller and
J0836+0054 z-5.82						
JC002+2550 z=5.80			$\sim$			
JC927+2001-z=5.79	-					
J1044-0125 z=5.74			-			
J1621+5150 z=5.71					~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	
7000	7500	8000	2 (8)	8500	9000	9500

Currently  $\geq$  47 z > 5.7 QSOs known (many faint)

Photoionized region:  $\tau_{GP} = 9 \ (1+\delta)^2 \left(\frac{10^{-12} \text{ s}^{-1}}{\Gamma_{\text{HI}}}\right) \left(\frac{1+z}{7}\right)^{9/2}$ 



Difficult to explain fast evolution with reionization because occurs in 0.1 H(z)<sup>-1</sup>

# Other reason: could change structure of reionization



McQuinn et al 2007 (see also Furlanetto & Oh '05)

<u>Project: Study Lyman-limit systems</u> (dense self-shielding systems) Goal: Understand properties at end and after reionization



Do this for a few tens of thousands of groups.

# What self-shielding systems look like (z=4)



# Comparison w/ Observations at z=4



Simulations able to (approximately) reproduce gas at outskirts of galactic halos. They should do better with increasing redshift.

# Comparison w/ Observations at z=4



Simulations able to (approximately) reproduce gas at outskirts of galactic halos. They should do better with increasing redshift.

## Intensity = (mean free path) x (source emissivity)

# Intensity = (mean free path) x (source emissivity) Measured from Ly $\alpha$ Forest

Distance between dense self-shielding systems

### Intensity = (mean free path) x (source emissivity)

Measured from Ly  $\alpha$ 

Forest

Distance between # of Recombinations dense self-shielding (clumpiness of dense systems systems)

### Intensity = (mean free path) x (source emissivity)

Measured from Ly  $\alpha$ 

Forest

Distance between # of Recombinations dense self-shielding (clumpiness of dense systems systems)

Intensity = (mean free path) x (source emissivity)  $\approx \text{emissivity}^{1/(2-\beta)}$  (assumes power-law profile for systems)

Measured from Ly  $\alpha$ 

Forest

Distance between # of Recombinations dense self-shielding (clumpiness of dense systems systems)

# Intensity = (mean free path) x (source emissivity) ≈ emissivity<sup>1/(2 - β)</sup> (assumes power-law profile for systems) At z=4, simulations predict a 10% change in emissivity can result in 30% change in Γ. At z=6, simulations predict a 10% change in emissivity can result in factor of 2 change in Γ. Possible explanation for evolution seen in Fan et al (2006).

Strong scaling related to result that IGM clumping factor <(1 +  $\delta$ )<sup>2</sup>> is << 10 (e.g., Pawlik et al '08)</p>

# Implications for reionization simulations

- ionizing background and Lyman-limit systems strongly coupled
  - we aren't making it any easier on ourselves by having sources that are too emissive!
- You cannot barely resolve these systems to capture their impact. The mfp is also not just one number during reionization.

LL density:  

$$\delta_{b} = 13 \left(\frac{1+z}{10}\right)^{-3} \left(\frac{N_{\text{HI}}}{10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-2}} \frac{\Gamma_{\text{HI}}}{10^{-12} \text{ s}^{-1}}\right)^{2/3} \left(\frac{T}{10^{4} K}\right)^{0.17}$$
LL size:  

$$\ell = 0.11 \left(\frac{1+z}{10}\right) \left(\frac{N_{\text{HI}}}{10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-2}} \frac{\Gamma_{\text{HI}}}{10^{-12} \text{ s}^{-1}}\right)^{-1/3} \left(\frac{T}{10^{4} K}\right)^{0.41} \text{ comoving Mpc}$$
Above numbers are from model of Schaye '01

# Temperature



dashed and solid curves are at 10 and 100 Myr respectively (McQuinn '12)

# Conclusions

- Simulations need to capture Lyman-limit systems!
- There is an intuitive picture that describes the halo masses that can accrete gas after reionization.