The Digital Cosmos: A Historical and Technical Review of Cosmological Simulations

Part I: Theoretical and Numerical Foundations

Chapter 1: From Theory to Computation: The Genesis of the Simulated Universe

The development of cosmological simulations was not merely a technological inevitability but a direct and necessary consequence of a century of theoretical and observational breakthroughs in physics and astronomy. These simulations emerged as the essential tool to bridge the gap between the elegantly simple initial conditions of the universe and the profoundly complex, structured cosmos we observe today. This journey from abstract theory to tangible computation was driven by a clear causal chain of discovery, beginning with our understanding of the universe's fundamental nature and culminating in the recognition that its non-linear evolution could only be deciphered numerically.

1.1 The Cosmological Principle and the Expanding Universe

The modern understanding of the universe rests upon two foundational pillars established in the early 20th century. The first is the Cosmological Principle, a postulate which asserts that on sufficiently large scales, the universe is both homogeneous (the same at every location) and isotropic (the same in every direction).[1] This principle, named by Edward Milne in 1933, simplifies the cosmos from a place of infinite special cases to one governed by universal laws, making a physical description of the universe as a whole tractable.[3]

The second pillar was the observational discovery of the expanding universe. In the 1910s and 1920s, astronomers like Vesto Slipher observed that the light from distant "spiral nebulae" was systematically redshifted, indicating they were receding from us.[4] This work was synthesized by Edwin Hubble and Georges Lemaître in the late 1920s. Lemaître, in 1927, was the first to derive the linear relationship between distance and recession velocity and propose an expanding universe model based on Einstein's equations.[4] Hubble independently published his observational discovery of this relationship in 1929, now known as the Hubble-Lemaître law, providing the definitive empirical evidence that the fabric of spacetime itself is stretching.[3]

These discoveries were framed within the theoretical context of Albert Einstein's General Theory of Relativity, published in 1915.[4] General relativity describes gravity not as a force, but as the curvature of a dynamic, four-dimensional spacetime continuum warped by the presence of mass and energy.[6] The solution to Einstein's field equations for a universe that adheres to the Cosmological Principle is the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric, which mathematically describes the uniform expansion or contraction of space.[7] Together, the Cosmological Principle and the observed expansion established a picture of a universe with a dynamic history, one that began in a vastly different state and evolved over billions of years—a history that could, in principle, be modeled and understood.

1.2 The Hot Big Bang and the Seeds of Structure

If the universe is expanding today, it must have been smaller, denser, and hotter in the past. This logical conclusion led to the "Hot Big Bang" theory, a concept proposed by Georges Lemaître in 1931 as the expansion from a "primeval atom".[5] The theory gained its most powerful piece of evidence in 1965 with the discovery of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) by Arno Penzias and Robert Wilson.[5] This faint, uniform bath of microwave radiation permeating all of space was immediately interpreted by a team at Princeton, including Robert Dicke and P.J.E. (Jim) Peebles, as the relic afterglow of the universe's hot, dense infant state.[4] The CMB is a snapshot of the universe when it was only about 380,000 years old, at the moment it cooled enough for protons and electrons to combine into neutral atoms, allowing light to travel freely for the first time.[9]

The Hot Big Bang model made other testable predictions. Seminal work by George Gamow, Ralph Alpher, and Robert Herman in the 1940s detailed the process of Big Bang Nucleosynthesis (BBN), predicting the primordial abundances of the lightest elements—hydrogen, helium, and lithium—that would be forged in the first few minutes of the universe's existence.[3] These predictions have been spectacularly confirmed by observations, providing another strong pillar of support for the model.

Crucially for the story of structure formation, the CMB was not perfectly uniform. In 1992, the COBE satellite detected minuscule temperature fluctuations—variations of just one part in 100,000—across the microwave sky.[5] These tiny anisotropies were the seeds of all future structure. Theorists like Evgeni Lifschitz in the 1940s, and later Jim Peebles and Yakov Zeldovich in the 1960s and 70s, had developed the theory of gravitational instability, which posited that regions of slightly higher density in the early universe would attract more matter due to their stronger gravity, growing ever denser over cosmic time.[1] The theory of cosmic inflation, proposed in the 1980s by Alan Guth and Alexei Starobinsky, provided a physical mechanism for generating these primordial fluctuations from quantum jitters in the universe's first fraction of a second, stretching them to cosmological scales.[5] The CMB, therefore, provided a precise map of the initial conditions: a well-defined starting point from which the entire subsequent evolution of the cosmos could be traced.

1.3 The Problem of Non-Linearity and the Birth of Simulation

The evolution of the primordial density fluctuations can be described with relative ease in the early universe when their amplitude is small. During this phase, their growth is governed by linear perturbation theory, where the equations can be solved analytically.[12] However, as gravity relentlessly amplifies these initial seeds, the density contrast (

$\delta\rho/\rho$) in the densest regions eventually becomes large. At this point, the evolution becomes highly non-linear; different regions begin to interact strongly, and the simple linear equations break down completely.[1] This non-linear gravitational collapse is the process that forms the vast, filamentary "cosmic web" of dark matter, along with the dense knots within it—the halos that host galaxies and galaxy clusters.[9]

The inability of analytical physics to describe this non-linear regime created a fundamental gap in cosmology. While theorists could describe the universe at its beginning (the CMB) and observe its complex structure today, they could not mathematically connect the two with pen and paper. Analytical approximations were developed to gain insight into the non-linear outcome. The most influential of these was the Press-Schechter formalism, introduced by William H. Press and Paul Schechter in 1974.[1] This model provided a remarkably successful analytical prediction for the number density of collapsed objects (halos) of a given mass. However, it was inherently statistical and could not capture the detailed spatial distribution, internal structure, or merging histories of these halos.[15]

This "analytic-numerical gap" created the scientific imperative for a new tool. To truly test whether the initial conditions seen in the CMB could evolve under the known laws of physics into the structured universe we observe, scientists needed to solve the full, non-linear equations of motion for billions of interacting particles. This was a task perfectly suited for computers. Cosmological computer simulations thus became the "method of choice" for tackling the complexities of structure formation, serving as a virtual laboratory to bridge the chasm between simple initial conditions and the rich, non-linear final state.[1]

1.4 The Standard Model: The Λ-Cold Dark Matter (ΛCDM) Framework

The final piece of the puzzle required to build a realistic simulation was the recipe for the universe's ingredients. By the late 1990s, a "concordance cosmology" had emerged from a wide range of independent observations, resolving a period of apparent inconsistencies.[7] This framework, known as the Lambda-Cold Dark Matter (

ΛCDM) model, is the standard model of cosmology and provides the foundational recipe for virtually all modern simulations.[17]

The ΛCDM model posits that the universe's energy density is composed of three main components [1]:

1. **Ordinary (Baryonic) Matter (~5%):** This is the matter made of protons and neutrons that constitutes stars, planets, gas, and dust. Its abundance is precisely constrained by Big Bang Nucleosynthesis and CMB observations.[1]
2. **Cold Dark Matter (CDM) (~27%):** This is a mysterious, non-baryonic form of matter that does not interact with light (hence "dark") and was moving slowly (hence "cold") in the early universe.[1] Its existence was first inferred by Fritz Zwicky in the 1930s from the unexpectedly high velocities of galaxies in the Coma cluster,

which implied a great deal of unseen mass was needed to hold the cluster together gravitationally.[3] The evidence became overwhelming with the work of Vera Rubin, Kent Ford, and Albert Bosma in the 1970s and 80s, who measured the flat rotation curves of spiral galaxies, showing that stars in their outskirts were orbiting far too fast to be explained by the visible matter alone.[4] In the ΛCDM model, this collisionless dark matter provides the gravitational scaffolding for all structure formation.[1]

3. **Dark Energy (Λ) (~68%):** This is an even more enigmatic component, represented by Einstein's cosmological constant, Lambda (Λ). It is a form of energy inherent to the vacuum of space itself, possessing a negative pressure that drives the expansion of the universe to accelerate.[1] Its existence was confirmed in 1998 by two independent teams studying Type Ia supernovae, who found that these "standard candles" were dimmer than expected, implying that the expansion of the universe has been speeding up for the last five to six billion years.[5]

With the establishment of the ΛCDM model, cosmologists had a complete, self-consistent framework. It specified the background expansion history (governed by dark energy), the composition of matter (dominated by CDM), and the initial conditions (the tiny, nearly scale-invariant fluctuations observed in the CMB). All the necessary ingredients were in place to build a digital universe from first principles and watch it evolve.

Chapter 2: The N-body Era: Charting the Cosmic Web in a Dark Universe

With the theoretical framework of ΛCDM in place, the first major wave of cosmological simulations focused on the universe's dominant, yet invisible, component: dark matter. Because dark matter interacts only through gravity and is assumed to be collisionless, its evolution can be modeled by tracking the gravitational interactions of a large number of discrete particles—a classic N-body problem. This "N-body era" was foundational, demonstrating the power of simulation to test cosmological models and revealing the intricate, web-like structure of the dark matter backbone upon which galaxies would later form.

2.1 The Pioneers: From Lightbulbs to Digital Particles

The intellectual heritage of N-body simulations predates the digital computer. In a remarkable 1941 study, Swedish astronomer Erik Holmberg modeled the tidal interactions between two galaxies using an ingenious analog computer. He represented each galaxy with 37 lightbulbs, and the gravitational force, which follows an inverse-square law, was mimicked by the flux of light, which also diminishes as the inverse square of distance. A photocell measured the "force" on each bulb, which was then used to manually calculate the next step in the galaxies' orbits.[15] This work was a conceptual blueprint for the numerical experiments to come.

The advent of digital computers in the 1960s ushered in the era of true numerical N-body simulations. Pioneering work by Sebastian von Hoerner, Sverre Aarseth, and others marked the first attempts to integrate the equations of motion for gravitating systems on a computer.[15] These early efforts were severely limited by computational power, typically handling systems of no more than about 100 particles, and were focused on problems like the dynamics of star clusters.[10]

The application of N-body techniques to a cosmological context began in earnest in the 1970s. P.J.E. Peebles performed simulations of the collapse of galaxy clusters.[15] A landmark moment arrived in 1974 with the influential paper by William H. Press and Paul Schechter, which, alongside their famous analytical mass function, included results from some of the first N-body simulations of hierarchical clustering in an expanding universe.[15] These early cosmological simulations, though small by modern standards, laid the groundwork for the large-scale explorations that would define the next decade.

2.2 The Algorithmic Challenge: Taming the N^2 Problem

The primary obstacle to scaling up N-body simulations is the immense computational cost. The force on any given particle is the vector sum of the gravitational forces from all other N-1 particles in the simulation. A direct, particle-by-particle summation of these forces requires a number of calculations that scales with the square of the number of particles, a computational complexity known as $O(N^2)$.[10] This scaling makes it computationally prohibitive to simulate systems with millions, let alone billions, of particles. Overcoming this "N^2 problem" was the central algorithmic challenge of the field.

Several key innovations were developed to make large simulations feasible:

- **Particle-Mesh (PM) Methods:** A significant breakthrough, detailed in the 1981 textbook *Computer Simulation Using Particles* by Hockney and Eastwood, was the Particle-Mesh method.[1] Instead of calculating direct particle-particle forces, the mass of the particles is first assigned to a regular grid. The gravitational potential on this grid is then calculated by solving the Poisson equation ($\nabla 2\phi=4\pi G\rho$) using highly efficient Fast Fourier Transforms (FFTs). The force on each particle is then found by interpolating from the grid. This approach dramatically reduces the computational cost but suffers from poor spatial resolution on scales smaller than the grid cell size, smearing out the details of dense structures.
- **Tree Codes:** In 1986, Josh Barnes and Piet Hut developed a revolutionary hierarchical algorithm known as the "tree code".[1] This method organizes particles into a hierarchical tree structure (an octree in three dimensions). To calculate the force on a given particle, the algorithm traverses the tree. If a group of distant particles is sufficiently far away (as determined by a cell-opening criterion), their collective gravitational pull can be approximated by a single multipole expansion (treating them as a single, more massive particle at their center of mass). This avoids summing the forces from each individual distant particle, reducing the computational complexity from $O(N^2)$ to a much more manageable $O(N \log N)$.[1]
- **Hybrid TreePM Codes:** The most successful and widely used modern codes, such as GADGET, employ a hybrid approach that combines the strengths of both methods.[25] The gravitational force is split into a long-range component and a short-range component. The smooth, long-range force is calculated efficiently on a grid using the PM method, while the highly non-linear, short-range force is calculated with high accuracy using the tree algorithm. This TreePM approach provides an optimal balance of speed and accuracy across all scales, enabling the massive simulations of the modern era.

The evolution of these algorithms demonstrates a critical divergence in methodology tailored to specific scientific questions. Cosmological simulations, focused on the large-scale, collisionless dynamics of dark matter, could leverage these powerful approximation schemes. Here, the collective gravitational field is paramount, and individual close encounters are rare and dynamically unimportant.[1] In contrast, simulations of dense stellar systems like globular clusters or planetary systems require exquisite precision to handle frequent close encounters and the formation of stable binary systems, where the $1/r^2$ singularity of gravity is a real numerical challenge. This led to a separate branch of code development, focused on high-precision direct integration and specialized techniques to handle these encounters.

2.3 The Workhorse of N-body: Sverre Aarseth and his Codes

Within the field of high-precision N-body simulation, the work of Sverre Aarseth stands as legendary. Throughout his scientific life, Aarseth developed a series of highly efficient and robust N-body codes, often referred to simply as the NBODY series, which became the gold standard for studying collisional systems.[24]

Aarseth's codes incorporated several key innovations that were crucial for achieving the accuracy needed for stellar dynamics. These included adaptive (or hierarchical) time-stepping, where each particle is advanced with a time step appropriate to its own dynamical timescale, allowing the code to efficiently handle the vast range of timescales present in a star cluster. He also developed sophisticated "neighbor schemes" to efficiently handle the force calculations for nearby particles.[24]

Perhaps his most important contribution for this domain was the development and implementation of "regularization" techniques.[24] These are mathematical transformations applied to the equations of motion for two particles undergoing a very close encounter. By changing the variables, the singularity in the Newtonian force law is removed, allowing the interaction to be integrated with high accuracy without numerical breakdown.[24] While these techniques are computationally expensive and generally unnecessary for the collisionless dark matter particles in large cosmological volumes, they are indispensable for accurately modeling the dense, collisional environments of star clusters and galactic nuclei. Aarseth's comprehensive 2003 book,

Gravitational N-body Simulations, remains a foundational text, codifying the decades of algorithmic development required to master the N-body problem.[26]

2.4 The Triumph of Cold Dark Matter

The algorithmic breakthroughs of the 1980s, combined with growing computational power, enabled the first truly large-scale cosmological simulations. A pivotal moment for the field came in 1985 with the work of Marc Davis, George Efstathiou, Carlos Frenk, and Simon White (often abbreviated as DEFW).[1] Using an N-body simulation with 32,768 particles, they demonstrated that a universe dominated by Cold Dark Matter (CDM) could naturally evolve from smooth initial conditions into a complex, filamentary network of structures.

This simulated "cosmic web," with its interconnected filaments, massive clusters at the nodes, and vast empty voids, bore a striking resemblance to the emerging picture of the large-scale galaxy distribution from early redshift surveys.[5] This result was a profound success for the CDM paradigm. It showed that the simple assumption of a non-relativistic, collisionless dark matter particle, evolving under gravity, was sufficient to explain the large-scale architecture of the universe. These gravity-only simulations firmly established the concept of dark matter halos—the gravitationally bound, collapsed clumps of dark matter—as the fundamental building blocks of the cosmos and the gravitational "backbone" upon which all subsequent galaxy formation would occur.[1] The N-body era had successfully charted the invisible scaffolding of the universe, setting the stage for the next great challenge: understanding how the visible matter would populate it.

Chapter 3: Incorporating the Baryons: The Rise of Hydrodynamics

While N-body simulations provided a revolutionary understanding of the dark matter skeleton of the cosmos, they were fundamentally incomplete. Galaxies, the luminous tracers of this cosmic web, are composed of baryons—the ordinary matter of protons, neutrons, and electrons. The physics governing baryons is far more complex than gravity alone. Baryonic gas can cool, be compressed, form stars, and be violently affected by pressure forces and shocks.[11] To simulate the formation of the visible universe, it was essential to move beyond pure gravity and incorporate the equations of fluid dynamics, or hydrodynamics. This step marked a major increase in complexity but was indispensable for connecting the dark matter halos to the galaxies observed within them.

3.1 Why Hydrodynamics is Essential

The behavior of baryonic gas is fundamentally different from that of collisionless dark matter. While dark matter particles only interact gravitationally and can pass through each other, gas particles collide, creating pressure and allowing for the formation of shock waves. Most importantly, gas can lose energy through radiative cooling. This energy loss is the critical mechanism that allows gas to shed its orbital energy, sink to the centers of dark matter halos, and condense to the high densities required to form stars.[1] Without modeling hydrodynamics, it is impossible to simulate the birth of galaxies.

Solving the equations of hydrodynamics (the Euler or Navier-Stokes equations) coupled with the Poisson equation for gravity in a cosmological context became the next great challenge. Two primary numerical approaches emerged, each with its own set of strengths and weaknesses: the Lagrangian approach, typified by Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH), and the Eulerian approach, exemplified by Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR).

3.2 The Lagrangian Approach: Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH)

Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics was independently invented for astrophysical applications in 1977 by Leon Lucy and by Robert Gingold and Joseph Monaghan.[1] SPH is a Lagrangian method, meaning the computational elements move with the fluid flow. It works by discretizing the fluid into a set of particles, each carrying properties like mass, temperature, and velocity. The continuous properties of the fluid at any point in space are then calculated by averaging, or "smoothing," the properties of nearby particles using a weighting function known as a smoothing kernel.[31]

SPH quickly became a popular choice for cosmological simulations due to several key advantages:

- **Adaptive Resolution:** Because the particles themselves are the points of resolution, the method is naturally adaptive. Resolution automatically increases in high-density regions where particles cluster together, which is precisely where it is most needed to model gravitational collapse and galaxy formation.[31]
- **Conservation Laws:** The formulation of SPH makes it manifestly conservative. Quantities like mass, momentum, and energy are conserved to a high degree of accuracy without special effort, a desirable property for long-term cosmological integrations.[32]

- **Galilean Invariance:** Because the method is not tied to a fixed grid, it is trivially invariant under Galilean transformations (i.e., boosting to a different velocity frame), which avoids certain numerical artifacts that can affect grid-based codes.

These advantages led to the development of highly successful and widely used simulation codes. The most prominent of these is **GADGET** (and its public successor, GADGET-2), developed by Volker Springel. GADGET became one of the workhorse codes of computational cosmology in the 2000s, used for major projects like the Millennium Simulation (in its N-body mode) and countless hydrodynamical studies.[16]

Despite its successes, the standard formulation of SPH has known weaknesses. It can struggle to accurately capture sharp discontinuities like shock fronts and can artificially suppress fluid instabilities and mixing at contact surfaces.[31] These issues can lead to incorrect results in scenarios involving strong shocks or turbulent flows. Over the decades, this has motivated the development of numerous improved SPH formulations designed to mitigate these problems, such as the density-entropy formulation and the use of more advanced kernel functions.[31]

3.3 The Eulerian Approach: Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR)

In contrast to the particle-based SPH, Eulerian methods solve the hydrodynamic equations on a computational grid that is fixed in space (or expands with the universe). A naive approach using a single, uniform grid across the entire cosmological volume is computationally infeasible, as it would require an impossibly high number of cells to resolve the small scales of galaxy formation while also covering a representative volume.

The breakthrough for Eulerian cosmology was the development of Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR), pioneered by Marsha Berger and Phillip Colella in 1984 for shock hydrodynamics.[1] The core principle of AMR is to use computational resources only where they are most needed. The simulation begins with a coarse base grid covering the entire volume. As the simulation progresses, the code identifies regions that require higher resolution—such as collapsing halos or propagating shock fronts—based on user-defined criteria (e.g., high density or steep gradients). In these tagged regions, finer sub-grids are dynamically created and overlaid on the parent grid. This process can be applied recursively, creating a hierarchy of nested grids with progressively higher resolution.[12]

The main advantages of AMR include:

- **Excellent Shock Capturing:** Grid-based methods, particularly those using modern Godunov schemes, are exceptionally good at resolving shocks and other sharp discontinuities in the fluid, which is a major advantage over traditional SPH.[39]
- **Computational Efficiency:** By focusing resolution only where needed, AMR can achieve a vast dynamic range in spatial scales without the prohibitive cost of a uniformly fine grid.[38]

Prominent AMR codes used in cosmology include **ENZO**, **RAMSES**, and the **Adaptive Refinement Tree (ART)** code.[1] These codes have been instrumental in many areas of astrophysics, particularly for problems involving complex gas dynamics, such as the study of the intergalactic medium and cosmic reionization. The primary challenges for AMR codes include potential artifacts at the boundaries between coarse and fine grids and the fact that they are not inherently Galilean-invariant, which can introduce subtle errors if objects move at high velocities relative to the grid.

3.4 The Modern Synthesis: Moving-Mesh Codes

In the late 2000s, a new class of code emerged that sought to combine the best features of both the Lagrangian and Eulerian approaches. These "moving-mesh" codes represent a modern synthesis of decades of algorithmic development. The key idea is to solve the finite-volume equations of hydrodynamics (a grid-based technique) on an unstructured mesh that is allowed to move with the fluid flow (a Lagrangian concept).[34]

The most successful implementation of this idea is the **AREPO** code, developed by Volker Springel.[1] AREPO constructs a mesh at each time step by creating a Voronoi tessellation of the domain, where each cell is defined as the region of space closer to its generating mesh-point than to any other. These mesh-generating points are then allowed to move with the local fluid velocity.

This hybrid approach yields significant advantages [34]:

- It retains the primary advantage of SPH: the resolution is adaptive and naturally follows the mass, clustering in dense regions.

- It is fully Galilean-invariant, like a particle code.
- By solving the hydrodynamic equations with a finite-volume Godunov scheme on the mesh, it accurately captures shocks and fluid instabilities, overcoming a key weakness of SPH.
- It avoids the potential issues with grid orientation and coarse-fine boundaries that can affect AMR codes.

The AREPO code has become the engine for the state-of-the-art Illustris and IllustrisTNG simulation projects, demonstrating the power of the moving-mesh technique to produce highly realistic galaxy populations.[16] The development of this method represents a major step forward, providing a robust and accurate tool that synthesizes the most desirable properties of the two previously distinct schools of thought in computational hydrodynamics.

Methodological Era	Key Pioneers / Papers	Core Innovation	Primary Advantage	Example Codes
N-body (Direct)	Aarseth (1963) [15]	Regularization of close encounters	High accuracy for collisional systems	NBODY series [26]
N-body (PM)	Hockney & Eastwood (1981) [1]	Solving Poisson's equation on a grid with FFTs	Speed for large particle numbers	Early cosmological codes
N-body (Tree)	Barnes & Hut (1986) [1]	Hierarchical grouping of distant particles	O(N log N) scaling, good accuracy	Early cosmological codes
Hydro (SPH)	Lucy (1977); Gingold & Monaghan (1977) [1]	Discretizing fluid into smoothed particles	Lagrangian, adaptive resolution, conservation	GADGET, GASOLINE [16]
Hydro (AMR)	Berger & Colella (1984) [1]	Dynamic placement of finer sub-grids	Excellent shock capturing, high dynamic range	ENZO, RAMSES, ART [16]
Hydro (Moving-Mesh)	Springel (2010) [1]	Solving hydro equations on a moving Voronoi mesh	Combines advantages of SPH and AMR	AREPO [16]

Table 1: A chronology of key methodological developments in cosmological simulations, highlighting the evolution from early N-body techniques to modern, sophisticated hydrodynamical schemes.

Part II: Modeling the Physics of Galaxy Formation

The transition from pure N-body simulations to full hydrodynamics was a monumental step, but solving the equations of gravity and fluid dynamics alone is not sufficient to form realistic galaxies. The universe is governed by a host of complex, multi-scale physical processes—star formation, stellar evolution, supernova explosions, and the growth of supermassive black holes—that operate on scales far smaller than what can be directly resolved in a simulation of a representative cosmological volume. The greatest challenge, and the area of most active development in modern simulations, is the implementation of this "subgrid physics." The history of this endeavor is a story of layered discovery, where each new piece of physics was added to solve a specific, glaring failure of the previous generation of models to match observations.

Chapter 4: Igniting the Stars: Simulating Star Formation

The birth of stars from dense clouds of interstellar gas is the fundamental process that makes galaxies visible. However, this process is itself a "grand challenge" problem, occurring deep within molecular clouds on scales of parsecs or even smaller.[47] A cosmological simulation aiming to model a volume hundreds of millions of light-years across might have a maximum spatial resolution of a few hundred parsecs. This vast separation of scales makes it computationally impossible to simulate star formation from first principles within a large-scale context.

4.1 The Subgrid Imperative

This resolution gap necessitates the use of "subgrid" or "sub-resolution" models for star formation.[48] Instead of simulating the collapse and fragmentation of individual molecular clouds, simulations employ phenomenological recipes that convert gas into "star particles" based on the local, resolved properties of the gas in a given simulation cell or particle. A star particle is not a single star but a representation of a stellar population, born at a specific time with a given mass and metallicity, and assumed to follow a specific Initial Mass Function (IMF) that dictates the distribution of stellar masses within that population.[51] The development of these subgrid models is a critical component of modern simulations, as they directly govern the rate at which galaxies build up their stellar mass.

4.2 Evolution of Star Formation Models

The sophistication of these subgrid models has evolved significantly over time.

- **Early Models:** The first and simplest models were based on the empirically observed Kennicutt-Schmidt law. This law relates the surface density of star formation in a galaxy to the surface density of its gas. In simulations, this was typically implemented as a simple recipe: if a gas cell or particle exceeded a critical density threshold, a fraction of its mass was converted into star particles over a timescale related to the local dynamical time of the gas.[52] This approach captures the basic correlation between gas density and star formation but ignores the more complex physics of the interstellar medium (ISM).
- **Modern Models:** More recent simulations employ more physically motivated prescriptions. For example, the model used in the IllustrisTNG simulations is based on the work of Springel & Hernquist (2003), which posits a two-phase ISM where cold, dense clouds are embedded in a hot, diffuse medium.[1] Star formation is assumed to occur only in the cold clouds, and the fraction of gas in this phase is determined by a subgrid equilibrium model. Other advanced models, like those used in the VINTERGATAN simulations, make the star formation law dependent on additional resolved properties of the gas, such as its local turbulence and temperature, in an attempt to more closely link the subgrid model to the resolved state of the ISM.[54]
- **The First Stars (Pop III/Pop II):** A particularly challenging frontier is modeling the very first generation of stars. Theory predicts that the first stars, known as Population III (Pop III), formed from pristine, metal-free hydrogen and helium gas. The cooling processes in this primordial gas were inefficient, leading to the formation of very massive stars, perhaps hundreds of times the mass of the Sun.[55]

These massive stars lived short, violent lives, exploding as powerful supernovae that enriched the surrounding gas with the first heavy elements (or "metals").[55] This chemical enrichment fundamentally changed the cooling properties of the gas, allowing it to fragment into smaller clumps and form the lower-mass Population II and I stars that we see today.[57] Simulating this crucial transition from a top-heavy Pop III IMF to a more normal, low-mass-dominated IMF is a key goal of high-resolution "zoom-in" simulations that focus on the formation of the very first galaxies.[55] These simulations must self-consistently track the production and dispersal of metals to capture this change in star formation mode.[56]

Chapter 5: Galactic Regulation: The Role of Stellar and Supernova Feedback

The first hydrodynamical simulations that included gas cooling and star formation encountered a catastrophic failure known as the "overcooling problem." In these simulations, gas would cool with extreme efficiency, rapidly lose pressure support, and collapse into the centers of dark matter halos. This led to a runaway process of star formation that converted nearly all the available baryons into stars at very early times. The resulting simulated galaxies were far too massive, overly compact, and much older than the real galaxies observed in the universe.[52]

5.1 The Overcooling Problem and the Need for Feedback

This discrepancy was a clear signal that a crucial piece of physics was missing. Some process had to counteract gravity and prevent this runaway cooling and star formation. This process is known collectively as "feedback"—the injection of energy and momentum from stars back into the ISM.[21] In lower-mass galaxies (those up to about the size of the Milky Way), the primary source of this feedback is thought to be massive stars, through their powerful stellar winds, ionizing radiation, and, most importantly, their explosive deaths as supernovae (SNe).[52] The implementation of effective stellar feedback became one of the most critical and difficult challenges in computational galaxy formation.

5.2 Modeling Supernova (SN) Feedback

A single supernova explosion releases a tremendous amount of energy, roughly 1051 ergs. The challenge for subgrid models is to couple this energy, which is released on a sub-parsec scale, to the surrounding gas in a simulation where a single resolution element might be hundreds of parsecs across and contain millions of solar masses of gas.[52] The naive approach of simply depositing this energy as heat proved ineffective.

- **The Failure of Thermal Feedback:** The simplest method is to identify a newly formed star particle and, after a delay corresponding to the lifetime of massive stars, inject the SN energy as heat into the surrounding gas particles or cells.[49] However, because star formation occurs in the densest gas, the cooling times in these regions are extremely short. The injected thermal energy is often radiated away almost instantaneously, before it has a chance to expand and do any mechanical work (i.e., push gas around). This numerical "overcooling" renders the feedback impotent.[52]
- **Overcoming Overcooling: Kinetic and Delayed Cooling Schemes:** To circumvent this problem, modelers developed more sophisticated techniques. One approach is **kinetic feedback**, where instead of heating the gas, a subset of neighboring gas particles are given a velocity "kick" away from the supernova site.[49] This directly injects momentum and ensures the energy is not immediately lost to radiation. Another popular method is **delayed cooling feedback**. In this scheme, radiative cooling is temporarily disabled for the gas particles that receive the thermal energy injection, allowing them to remain hot and build up pressure for a dynamically significant amount of time before they are allowed to cool again.[60] The EAGLE simulations famously use a variant of this, injecting thermal energy and ensuring it is not immediately radiated away by tying the energy injection to the local gas density.[62] While effective, these methods introduce "nuisance parameters"—such as the wind velocity or the cooling shut-off time—that are not derived from first principles and must often be tuned or calibrated.
- **Towards More Physical Models: Mechanical Feedback:** A more physically motivated approach, often called **mechanical feedback**, attempts to bypass the unresolved initial phase of the supernova remnant's expansion. A real SN remnant goes through an energy-conserving phase (the Sedov-Taylor phase) where it sweeps up the surrounding ISM, converting its thermal energy into the kinetic energy of an expanding shell. By the time this phase ends, the momentum of the shell is significantly larger than the initial momentum of the SN ejecta. Mechanical

feedback schemes aim to inject this final, larger amount of momentum directly into the resolved gas scales of the simulation.[52] This approach is designed to be less sensitive to numerical resolution and to reduce the number of tunable parameters.

The ultimate goal of all these feedback models is to drive large-scale, powerful galactic outflows, or "winds." These winds are crucial for regulating a galaxy's growth by expelling gas from the star-forming disk, preventing it from forming more stars.[59] These outflows also play a vital role in the cosmic ecosystem by transporting heavy elements, forged inside stars, out of the galaxy and into the surrounding circumgalactic medium (CGM) and even the distant intergalactic medium (IGM), enriching the universe with the building blocks for future generations of stars and planets.[63]

Chapter 6: The Quenching Engine: Supermassive Black Holes and AGN Feedback

The implementation of supernova feedback was a major breakthrough, successfully resolving the overcooling problem in simulations of dwarf and Milky Way-mass galaxies. However, it soon became clear that another layer of physics was needed. Simulations that included only stellar feedback still failed dramatically at the high-mass end of the galaxy population. They produced massive galaxies that were far too blue and actively star-forming, in stark contrast to the "red and dead" giant elliptical galaxies that dominate the centers of galaxy clusters in the real universe.[64]

6.1 The High-Mass Problem

The reason for this failure is that the gravitational potential wells of massive halos are simply too deep for supernova-driven winds to escape. While SNe can effectively blow gas out of a dwarf galaxy, in a massive galaxy, that same gas is quickly pulled back by gravity, where it cools and fuels more star formation.[52] This pointed to the need for a much more powerful energy source to "quench" star formation in the most massive systems. The leading candidate for this energy source was the supermassive black hole (SMBH) that resides at the center of nearly every massive galaxy. When these SMBHs actively accrete matter, they can shine as Active Galactic Nuclei (AGN) and release colossal amounts of energy into their surroundings, dwarfing the energy output of all the stars in the host galaxy combined.[63] This "AGN feedback" is now considered the key mechanism for regulating the growth of massive galaxies.

6.2 Implementing Black Holes and AGN Feedback

Incorporating AGN feedback into simulations required the development of subgrid models for the seeding, growth, and energy output of black holes.

- **Seeding and Growth:** Since the formation of the first SMBHs is itself an unsolved problem, simulations typically "seed" black holes by placing a "sink particle" of a certain initial mass (e.g., 105 solar masses) into any dark matter halo that grows above a specific mass threshold and does not already contain a black hole.[66] These sink particles then grow in two ways: by merging with other black hole particles during galaxy mergers, and by accreting gas from their surroundings, with the accretion rate typically modeled using a Bondi-Hoyle-Lyttleton-type formula.[53]
- **Dual-Mode Feedback (The IllustrisTNG Model):** A pivotal development in AGN feedback modeling, heavily influenced by observational evidence, was the implementation of a "dual-mode" feedback scheme, which is a cornerstone of the IllustrisTNG simulations.[67] This model recognizes that AGN appear to operate in two distinct modes depending on their accretion rate:
    - **Quasar Mode (High Accretion Rate):** When the black hole is accreting gas rapidly (at a significant fraction of its Eddington limit), it is in a "quasar" or "thermal" mode. In the simulation, this is modeled by injecting a fraction of the accreted rest-mass energy as thermal energy into the surrounding gas cells. This powerful thermal dump can drive strong, wide-angle winds that clear gas from the galactic nucleus.[64]
    - **Radio Mode (Low Accretion Rate):** When the black hole's accretion rate drops to a low level, it enters a "radio" or "kinetic" mode. This is inspired by observations of radio jets emanating from the centers of massive, gas-poor elliptical galaxies. In the simulation, this is modeled by accumulating energy over time and then injecting it periodically as kinetic energy in random directions into the surrounding gas. This gentler, more continuous "maintenance mode" heating prevents the hot gas halo (the intracluster medium) from cooling and re-igniting star formation, thus keeping the massive galaxy quenched.[64]

- **Stochastic Thermal Feedback (The EAGLE Model):** The EAGLE simulation suite employs a different, though conceptually related, approach. Here, AGN feedback is purely thermal. A black hole particle stores accreted mass in a subgrid reservoir until it has accumulated enough to heat a number of neighboring gas particles by a fixed, large temperature difference ($\Delta T=108.5$ K in the reference model). This energy is then injected stochastically into the surrounding gas.[61] The parameters of this model, particularly the heating temperature, were calibrated to ensure that the simulations reproduce the observed relationship between black hole mass and galaxy stellar mass.[61]

The progressive inclusion of these physical processes reveals the iterative, problem-solving nature of the field. The journey began with gravity-only simulations, which successfully formed the dark matter cosmic web but contained no galaxies. The addition of baryons and hydrodynamics led to the overcooling problem, where galaxies formed too many stars. This was solved, at least for low-mass galaxies, by the inclusion of stellar feedback. Finally, the failure of stellar feedback at the high-mass end necessitated the implementation of AGN feedback to create realistic massive, quenched galaxies. The immense complexity of the subgrid physics models in state-of-the-art simulations is a direct reflection of this historical accumulation of solutions, each layer of physics added to correct a specific, observationally-driven failure of the previous model.

Part III: Landmark Projects and the Era of Precision Cosmology

As computational resources grew and numerical methods matured, the 21st century saw the rise of large-scale, collaborative simulation projects. These "landmark" simulations were not just individual research efforts but massive undertakings designed to serve as community resources. By producing vast, publicly accessible datasets, projects like the Millennium Simulation, EAGLE, and IllustrisTNG have defined the modern era of "precision cosmology," providing powerful virtual laboratories for testing the ΛCDM model and the physics of galaxy formation against a flood of new observational data.

Chapter 7: The Millennium Simulation: A Watershed Moment (2005)

The Millennium Simulation, run in 2005 by the international Virgo Consortium, represented a watershed moment for computational cosmology. It was a project of unprecedented scale and ambition that fundamentally changed the way simulations were used by the astronomical community.[35]

7.1 Scale and Methodology

At its core, the Millennium Simulation was a dark-matter-only N-body simulation. It tracked the evolution of more than 10 billion particles in a cubic volume with sides of 500 h^{-1} Mpc (about 2 billion light-years), a staggering increase in both particle number and volume over previous efforts.[35] The simulation was run on the principal supercomputer at the Max Planck Society's Supercomputing Centre in Garching, Germany, using the GADGET-2 code, and it generated 25 terabytes of output data.[35]

Because the simulation only tracked the evolution of dark matter, it could not directly model the formation of galaxies. Instead, the properties of the galaxy population were added in a post-processing step using **Semi-Analytic Models (SAMs)**. SAMs use the detailed dark matter halo merger trees extracted from the N-body simulation as a backbone. They then apply a set of simplified, physically-motivated recipes to model baryonic processes like gas cooling, star formation, supernova feedback, and galaxy mergers within these evolving halos.[35] This approach allowed the Virgo Consortium to generate vast, detailed mock galaxy catalogs from the simulation output.

7.2 Key Scientific Impact

The Millennium Simulation had a profound and lasting impact on the field for two main reasons. First, it provided a powerful validation of the ΛCDM model. A key scientific puzzle at the time was the existence of extremely bright quasars, powered by billion-solar-mass black holes, observed at very high redshifts ($z > 6$), when the universe was less than a billion years old. Many had questioned whether such massive objects could form so early in a hierarchical, bottom-up formation scenario. The Millennium Simulation, when coupled with SAMs, demonstrated for the first time that the ΛCDM model could indeed produce a few rare, massive halos at these early times that were capable of hosting these extreme objects, thus resolving a major tension.[71] It also showed that the model could reproduce the observed large-scale clustering of galaxies with high fidelity.[35]

Second, and perhaps more importantly, the project pioneered the concept of the simulation as a public scientific resource. The Virgo Consortium made the entirety of the simulation's output—including the raw particle data, halo catalogs, and full merger trees—publicly available to the entire astronomical community through a powerful, queryable SQL database.[35] This transformed the field. Instead of being a tool used only by a small group of specialists, large-scale simulations became a virtual laboratory accessible to any researcher worldwide. This democratic approach to data unleashed a flood of scientific papers using the Millennium data to study everything from galaxy clustering and gravitational lensing to the assembly history of the Milky Way.

The success of the original simulation led to follow-up runs, most notably the **Millennium-II Simulation**. This run used the same number of particles but in a much smaller box (100 h^{-1} Mpc), resulting in a mass resolution 125 times better than the original. This allowed for detailed studies of the internal structure of dark matter halos and the abundance of low-mass subhalos, providing crucial data for addressing the small-scale challenges to ΛCDM.[76] The Millennium project set a new standard for cosmological simulations, establishing them not just as tools for testing theories, but as foundational datasets for astrophysical discovery.

Chapter 8: The Modern Hydrodynamical Suites: IllustrisTNG and EAGLE

Building on the legacy of the Millennium Simulation, the 2010s saw the emergence of a new generation of flagship projects that took the next logical step: incorporating full hydrodynamics and baryonic physics directly into large-volume cosmological simulations. The two most influential and widely used of these modern suites are the EAGLE project and the IllustrisTNG project. While both aim to create realistic galaxy populations within the ΛCDM framework, their different choices in numerical methods and subgrid physics philosophy have created a fascinating and productive tension in the field, leading to distinct predictions that can be tested with observations.

8.1 The EAGLE Project (Evolution and Assembly of GaLaxies and their Environments)

The EAGLE project is a suite of simulations run by the Virgo Consortium, the same international collaboration behind the Millennium Simulation.[77] The flagship EAGLE simulation, presented in a 2015 paper by Schaye et al., models a cubic volume of 100 comoving Mpc (cMpc) on a side.[61]

- **Numerical Method:** EAGLE uses a heavily modified version of the GADGET-3 code, which is based on Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH). The developers implemented significant improvements to the SPH scheme, including a pressure-entropy formulation and modifications to the artificial viscosity and kernel functions, to better handle fluid mixing and thermal conduction. This advanced version of SPH is sometimes referred to as "Anarchy" or P-SPH.[61]
- **Subgrid Physics and Calibration:** The defining feature of the EAGLE project is its approach to subgrid feedback. Recognizing that the efficiencies of stellar and AGN feedback cannot be predicted from first principles at the resolution of the simulation, the EAGLE team adopted a calibration strategy. They explicitly tuned the parameters governing the efficiency of stellar feedback and the accretion onto black holes to force the simulation to reproduce a small number of key observations at redshift $z \approx 0.1$: the galaxy stellar mass function, the sizes of disk galaxies, and the relation between central black hole mass and galaxy stellar mass.[61] This is a fundamentally empirical approach, where the subgrid models are adjusted until they yield a realistic outcome for a few well-observed galaxy properties.
- **Key Results:** The power of the EAGLE approach was demonstrated by its success in reproducing a wide range of other observed galaxy properties that were *not* used in the calibration process. These include the observed specific star formation rates of galaxies, the fraction of passive (non-star-forming) galaxies as a function of mass, the color-magnitude diagram, the Tully-Fisher relation (linking galaxy rotation speed to luminosity), and the mass-metallicity relation.[80] This success showed that once the feedback models are calibrated to set the overall stellar content correctly, a host of other realistic galaxy properties emerge naturally from the simulation. The full EAGLE particle data and halo catalogs have been made publicly available, continuing the legacy of the Millennium project.[83]

8.2 The IllustrisTNG Project (The Next Generation)

The IllustrisTNG project is the successor to the original Illustris simulation, developed by a collaboration led by researchers at the Max Planck Institute for Astrophysics and Harvard University.[44] It is a suite of three flagship simulations with varying combinations of volume and resolution: TNG50 (a high-resolution 50 Mpc box), TNG100 (a 100 Mpc box), and TNG300 (a large-volume 300 Mpc box).[44]

- **Numerical Method:** IllustrisTNG is built upon the **AREPO** code, which uses a moving-mesh hydrodynamics scheme.[46] This is a key difference from EAGLE's SPH approach. A particularly novel feature of TNG is the inclusion of ideal magnetohydrodynamics (MHD), allowing the simulations to self-consistently track the amplification and evolution of cosmic magnetic fields from the early universe to the present day.[44]
- **Subgrid Physics:** In contrast to EAGLE's calibration-focused approach, the IllustrisTNG team aimed to build a more physically-motivated model for feedback with less direct tuning to z=0 observations. The cornerstone of the TNG model is its dual-mode AGN feedback. As described previously, the feedback mechanism switches from a thermal "quasar" mode at high accretion rates to a kinetic "radio" mode at low accretion rates.[67] This kinetic mode, which injects momentum into the halo, was a major update from the original Illustris model and proved crucial for regulating the growth of massive galaxies and their gas content.
- **Key Results:** The updated TNG model showed a striking improvement over the original Illustris simulation. Most notably, it successfully produced a realistic galaxy color bimodality, with a clear separation between a "red sequence" of quiescent galaxies and a "blue cloud" of star-forming galaxies, a feature that had been difficult to achieve in previous simulations.[51] TNG has also provided detailed predictions for a wide range of observables, including the clustering of galaxies as a function of mass and color, the impact of baryonic physics on the total matter power spectrum (a crucial input for weak lensing cosmology), and the properties of the magnetized gas in and around galaxy clusters.[74] Like EAGLE, the full TNG data suite has been made public, featuring a sophisticated web-based API and an online JupyterLab environment that allows researchers to analyze the data without downloading petabytes of files.[84]

8.3 A Tale of Two Simulations: A Comparative Analysis

The existence of these two parallel, state-of-the-art simulation projects provides a unique opportunity to assess the robustness of our understanding of galaxy formation. While both EAGLE and IllustrisTNG are broadly successful within the ΛCDM framework, their different underlying numerical methods and feedback philosophies lead to different predictions in specific physical regimes, highlighting the current frontiers of the field.[47]

- **The Circumgalactic Medium (CGM):** The diffuse, multi-phase gas surrounding galaxies is a key area where the models diverge. Because the CGM is shaped directly by galactic winds driven by feedback, the different feedback implementations in EAGLE and TNG result in different predictions for the temperature, density, and metal content of this gas. Studies comparing the predicted X-ray emission from the hot CGM in the two simulations show significant differences, particularly when galaxies are separated by their star formation activity.[89] For example, TNG predicts a much larger difference in X-ray brightness between star-forming and quiescent low-mass galaxies than EAGLE does.[89] These differing predictions provide clear observational targets for X-ray telescopes like eROSITA, offering a powerful way to test and constrain the feedback models.
- **Environmental Processes and Satellite Galaxies:** The way galaxies are affected by their environment, particularly satellite galaxies orbiting within larger halos, also differs. A direct comparison running the L-GALAXIES semi-analytic model on the TNG dark matter halo trees found that the full hydrodynamical TNG simulation was more effective at removing gas from satellite galaxies via processes like ram-pressure stripping than the semi-analytic recipes.[91] This suggests that the detailed hydrodynamic interactions captured by TNG play a crucial role in quenching satellite galaxies, a process that may be underestimated in simpler models.
- **Impact on the Matter Power Spectrum:** A critical issue for precision cosmology is understanding the impact of baryonic physics on the total matter power spectrum, which is a key observable for weak gravitational lensing surveys. The feedback processes in simulations eject vast amounts of gas from the centers of halos out to large radii, which suppresses the clustering of matter on small to intermediate scales ($k > 0.1$ h/Mpc) compared to a dark-matter-only universe. Because EAGLE and TNG have different feedback models, they predict different levels of suppression (TNG generally predicts a stronger suppression than

EAGLE). This "baryonic uncertainty" is currently one of the largest theoretical systematics limiting the constraining power of upcoming cosmological surveys, making the refinement of these feedback models a top priority.[87]

Project Name	Year(s)	Flagship Volume	Primary Code	Hydro Scheme	Key Physics / Philosophy	Public Data Access
Millennium	2005 [71]	(500 h^{-1} Mpc)^3 [35]	GADGET-2 [35]	N/A (DM-only)	DM-only + Semi-Analytic Models (SAMs) post-processing. [35]	Yes (SQL Database) [35]
EAGLE	2015 [80]	(100 cMpc)^3 [79]	GADGET-3 (mod) [61]	P-SPH	Calibrated thermal feedback; tuned to z=0 stellar mass function & sizes. [62]	Yes (SQL + Particle Data) [83]
IllustrisTNG	2017-2019 [44]	(300 cMpc)^3 (TNG300) [46]	AREPO [46]	Moving-Mesh	MHD + physically-motivated dual-mode (thermal/kinetic) AGN feedback. [67]	Yes (Web API + JupyterLab) [84]

Table 2: A comparative overview of the three most influential large-scale cosmological simulation projects of the 21st century. The table highlights the evolution in methodology from dark-matter-only with post-processing to full, self-consistent hydrodynamics, and contrasts the different numerical and subgrid physics choices of the contemporary EAGLE and IllustrisTNG suites.

Chapter 9: Specialized Frontiers: Simulating the Epoch of Reionization

While large-volume simulations like EAGLE and TNG focus on galaxy evolution across the bulk of cosmic time, a specialized and particularly challenging frontier of computational cosmology is dedicated to modeling the very first billion years of the universe's history. This period, known as the Cosmic Dawn and the Epoch of Reionization (EoR), marks the last major phase transition of the universe, when the light from the very first stars and galaxies ionized the all-pervading neutral hydrogen gas of the intergalactic medium (IGM), ending the cosmic "dark ages".[55]

9.1 The Challenge of the Cosmic Dawn

Simulating the EoR is considered a "grand challenge" problem for several reasons, pushing computational capabilities to their absolute limits.[93]

- **Extreme Dynamic Range:** The primary sources of the ionizing photons that drove reionization are believed to be numerous, faint, low-mass dwarf galaxies.[94] Accurately modeling the formation and clustering of these tiny objects requires extremely high mass and spatial resolution. However, the process of reionization itself is patchy and unfolds on very large cosmological scales. A simulation must therefore have a volume of at least ~100 Mpc to capture a representative region of the universe and model the large-scale morphology of the growing ionized bubbles. This simultaneous demand for high resolution and large volume creates a formidable dynamic range requirement.[94]
- **Radiative Transfer:** The core physical process of reionization is the transport of ionizing radiation from sources through the neutral IGM. This requires solving the equations of radiative transfer (RT) coupled to the equations of hydrodynamics and gravity. RT is notoriously computationally expensive, as it involves tracking the propagation of light and its interaction with gas across the entire simulation volume, often requiring the solution of a seven-dimensional equation (3 space, 2 angle, 1 frequency, 1 time).[97] Developing fast and accurate RT algorithms that can be integrated into cosmological codes is a major area of research in its own right.

9.2 Key Simulation Projects

To tackle these challenges, several dedicated simulation projects have been developed.

- **Cosmic Reionization on Computers (CROC):** This is a long-term program of numerical simulations designed to model the EoR by self-consistently coupling all the relevant physics.[100] The CROC project uses the **Adaptive Mesh Refinement (AMR)** code **ART**, which includes modules for gas dynamics, star formation, stellar feedback, and radiative transfer.[41] A key goal of CROC is to make detailed, testable predictions for the properties of the high-redshift galaxies and IGM that are now being observed by the James Webb Space Telescope (JWST) and to inform the design and analysis of upcoming 21-cm radio surveys.[41]
- **THESAN:** Named after the Etruscan goddess of the dawn, THESAN is a state-of-the-art suite of radiation-magneto-hydrodynamic simulations aimed at providing a comprehensive model of the EoR.[103] The project's unique strength lies in its combination of three key components:
  1. The **AREPO** moving-mesh code for accurate hydrodynamics and gravity.
  2. The well-tested **IllustrisTNG** galaxy formation model for realistic ionizing sources.
  3. A self-consistent, on-the-fly radiative transfer solver (**AREPO-RT**).[105]

     THESAN is explicitly designed to serve as a direct theoretical counterpart for observational campaigns with JWST and 21-cm radio arrays like HERA and the Square Kilometre Array (SKA).103

9.3 Key Scientific Questions

These specialized simulations are designed to answer some of the most pressing questions in early universe cosmology:

- **The Sources of Reionization:** What was the relative contribution of different sources? Were faint dwarf galaxies the primary drivers, or did more massive galaxies or even early AGN play a significant role? [97]
- **The Escape of Ionizing Photons:** What physical mechanisms govern the escape fraction (fesc)—the fraction of ionizing photons produced by stars that actually escape the dense interstellar medium of their host galaxy to ionize the IGM? This

is a critical, and poorly understood, parameter.[103]

- **The Topology and Timing of Reionization:** How did the process unfold in space and time? Did it proceed "inside-out," with high-density regions ionizing first, or was it more complex? How long did the entire process take? [95]
- **Reionization Feedback:** How did the energy injected into the IGM during reionization affect the subsequent formation of galaxies? The heating of the IGM is expected to raise the minimum halo mass required to form a galaxy (a process called "photoionization suppression"), but the details of this feedback are a key prediction of the simulations.[94]

By creating detailed, physically-rich models of this pivotal epoch, simulations like CROC and THESAN provide the essential theoretical framework needed to interpret the flood of new data from JWST and other facilities that are, for the first time, opening a clear observational window onto the cosmic dawn.

Part IV: Confronting ΛCDM: Successes, Tensions, and the Path Forward

Cosmological simulations have evolved into powerful tools for testing the fundamental tenets of our standard cosmological model, ΛCDM. This confrontation between simulation and observation has revealed a complex picture: while ΛCDM, as implemented in simulations, has been spectacularly successful at explaining the large-scale structure and evolution of the universe, a number of persistent tensions have emerged on smaller, sub-galactic scales. Disentangling whether these tensions signal a failure of the underlying ΛCDM paradigm or merely reflect the unresolved complexities of baryonic physics is the central challenge that drives much of the current research in the field. The path forward involves pushing simulations to new frontiers of scale and physical fidelity with exascale computing, while simultaneously leveraging the power of artificial intelligence to analyze the immense datasets produced by both simulations and observations.

Chapter 10: The Small-Scale Challenges

The narrative of ΛCDM is one of a stark contrast between its triumphs on large scales and its struggles on small scales.[108] On scales of tens to thousands of Megaparsecs, the model's predictions for the Cosmic Microwave Background anisotropies and the large-scale clustering of galaxies are in remarkable agreement with observations.[110] However, on the scales of individual galaxies and their satellite systems (kiloparsecs to a few Megaparsecs), several well-documented discrepancies have arisen. These challenges all occur in the regime where the non-linear physics of galaxy formation—cooling, star formation, and feedback—becomes dominant. This makes it exceedingly difficult to determine if the problems lie with the assumption of Cold Dark Matter or with the subgrid models used to approximate the baryonic physics.[108]

10.1 The Cusp-Core Problem

- **The Problem:** One of the earliest and most persistent challenges is the "cusp-core" problem. N-body simulations of collisionless Cold Dark Matter consistently and robustly predict that the central density profile of dark matter halos should rise steeply towards the center, following a power law, $\rho(r) \propto r^{-\alpha}$ with $\alpha \approx 1$. This is known as a "cusp" and is a key feature of the famous Navarro-Frenk-White (NFW) profile.[1] However, observations of the rotation curves of many dark-matter-dominated galaxies, particularly dwarf and low-surface-brightness galaxies, suggest that their central dark matter density is nearly constant, forming a flat "core" ($\alpha \approx 0$).[112]
- **Potential Solutions:** Two main classes of solutions have been proposed. The first involves **baryonic physics**. It is theorized that rapid, repeated episodes of energetic feedback, such as outflows driven by supernovae, can dynamically heat the central dark matter. The rapid gravitational potential fluctuations caused by blowing gas out and letting it fall back in can effectively transfer energy to the dark matter particles, causing them to migrate outwards and transform an initial cusp into a core.[117] Modern hydrodynamical simulations are beginning to show this process in action. The second class of solutions invokes **new dark matter physics**. If dark matter particles are not perfectly collisionless but can interact with each other (Self-Interacting Dark Matter, or SIDM), these interactions would be most frequent in the dense central regions of halos, naturally scattering particles out of the center and erasing the cusp.[114]

10.2 The Missing Satellites Problem

- **The Problem:** In the late 1990s, high-resolution N-body simulations revealed that a Milky Way-sized dark matter halo should contain thousands of smaller, self-bound subhalos that survived the hierarchical merging process. If every one of these subhalos hosted a galaxy, our own Milky Way should be surrounded by thousands of satellite galaxies. At the time, however, only about a dozen were known, creating a vast discrepancy known as the "missing satellites problem".[118]
- **Evolution of the Problem:** This problem, in its original form, has been largely resolved by advances in both observation and theory. On the observational side, large-area sky surveys like the Sloan Digital Sky Survey (SDSS) and the Dark Energy Survey (DES) have discovered dozens of new "ultra-faint" dwarf galaxies, significantly increasing the known satellite count.[118] On the theoretical side, it is now understood that galaxy formation is highly inefficient in low-mass halos. Two key astrophysical processes are thought to suppress star formation in these small systems:
  1. **Cosmic Reionization:** The heating of the intergalactic medium during the EoR raised its pressure, preventing gas from collapsing into the shallow potential wells of the smallest dark matter halos.[118]
  2. **Stellar Feedback:** For those small halos that did manage to form some stars, the energy from their own supernovae was likely powerful enough to blow out all the remaining gas, permanently shutting down further star formation.[118]

     Together, these processes imply that the vast majority of low-mass subhalos should be completely dark or host only a tiny, faint smattering of stars, thus explaining why we do not see thousands of bright satellites.

10.3 The Too-Big-To-Fail (TBTF) Problem

- **The Problem:** As the simple missing satellites problem was being resolved, a more subtle and challenging version emerged: the "too-big-to-fail" problem.[111] This problem focuses not on the total number of subhalos, but on the properties of the
  most massive ones. ΛCDM simulations predict that a Milky Way-sized halo should

contain about 10-20 very massive subhalos that are far too large to have had their star formation completely suppressed by reionization or feedback. These subhalos are "too big to fail" to form a luminous galaxy. The problem is that the central densities of these predicted massive subhalos are significantly higher than the central densities inferred from the stellar kinematics of the actual bright satellite galaxies (like Fornax, Leo I, and the Magellanic Clouds) that orbit the Milky Way. In essence, the observed bright satellites appear to inhabit less massive, less dense halos than the most massive subhalos that simulations predict should exist.[117]

- **Significance:** The TBTF problem is more difficult to solve than the missing satellites problem because it cannot be explained by simply making star formation inefficient. The predicted halos are massive enough that they should have formed galaxies. The discrepancy points directly to a mismatch in the predicted *structure* of halos. This intimately connects the TBTF problem to the cusp-core problem. If baryonic feedback processes can lower the central densities of halos by turning cusps into cores, this would also solve the TBTF problem by making the predicted massive subhalos less dense, bringing them into agreement with observations. Alternatively, it could be a powerful hint that the physics of dark matter itself (e.g., SIDM) is responsible for reducing halo central densities.[117]

Challenge Name	Core Discrepancy	Proposed Baryonic Physics Solutions	Proposed Dark Matter Physics Solutions
Cusp-Core Problem	Predicted cuspy ($\rho \sim r{-}1$) central DM profiles vs. observed flat cores ($\rho \sim$const.).[112]	Energetic feedback from repeated supernova outflows dynamically heats and expands the central dark matter cusp.[117]	Self-Interacting Dark Matter (SIDM) scatters particles out of the center; Warm Dark Matter (WDM) prevents initial cusp formation.[114]
Missing Satellites Problem	Predicted number of DM subhalos vastly exceeded the number of observed satellite galaxies (historically).[118]	Star formation is suppressed in low-mass halos by cosmic reionization and stellar feedback, rendering most subhalos dark.[118]	WDM suppresses the formation of low-mass halos from the outset.[122]
Too-Big-To-Fail Problem	The most massive predicted subhalos are too dense to host	The same feedback mechanisms that solve the cusp-core	SIDM or WDM reduces the central densities of all halos,

	the observed bright satellite galaxies. [111]	problem also lower the central densities of massive subhalos. [121]	including the most massive subhalos. [117]

Table 3: A summary of the primary small-scale challenges to the ΛCDM model, outlining the core discrepancy for each and the main classes of proposed solutions, which fall into either modifying baryonic physics within simulations or altering the fundamental nature of dark matter.

Chapter 11: The Future Trajectory I: The Exascale Era

The historical progression of cosmological simulations has been inextricably linked to the advancement of computing technology. The field is now entering a new, transformative epoch with the advent of **exascale computing**. The deployment of supercomputers like Frontier at Oak Ridge National Laboratory and Aurora at Argonne National Laboratory, capable of performing over an exaflop—a quintillion (1018) floating-point operations per second—is enabling simulations of unprecedented scale and physical fidelity.[19]

11.1 The Leap to Exascale

The jump to exascale is more than just an incremental increase in speed. For decades, simulationists have faced a fundamental trade-off between volume and resolution. One could either simulate a very large volume of the universe at low resolution, suitable for studying large-scale structure, or a very small region (a "zoom-in") at high resolution, suitable for studying the detailed formation of a single galaxy. Exascale computing is beginning to break this trade-off, allowing for simulations that are simultaneously large-volume *and* high-resolution.[125]

This new capability is driven by a radical shift in computer architecture. Exascale systems derive their power from massive parallelism, utilizing hundreds of thousands of nodes, each equipped with powerful Graphics Processing Units (GPUs).[126] This has required a complete re-engineering of cosmological simulation codes. Projects under the US Department of Energy's Exascale Computing Project (ECP), such as the

ExaSky project, have been dedicated to redesigning legacy codes like the Hardware/Hybrid Accelerated Cosmology Code (**HACC**) and the AMR code **Nyx** to run efficiently on these new GPU-accelerated architectures.[126] These efforts have resulted in performance gains of hundreds of times over previous petascale systems, opening the door to a new class of simulation.[126]

11.2 The New Science of Exascale

The power of exascale computing is enabling new scientific frontiers in cosmology.

- **Hydrodynamics at Scale:** For the first time, it is becoming possible to run full hydrodynamical simulations in volumes of a cubic Gigaparsec or larger.[128] These simulations are large enough to generate statistically representative samples of the rarest and most massive objects in the universe (like massive galaxy clusters) and, crucially, are large enough to be directly compared with the vast datasets from the next generation of cosmological surveys, such as the Dark Energy Spectroscopic Instrument (DESI), the Vera C. Rubin Observatory's Legacy Survey of Space and Time (LSST), and the Euclid and Roman space telescopes.[129]
- **Digital Twins of the Cosmos:** This leads to the concept of creating "digital twins" of the universe.[19] These are simulations so large and physically realistic that they can be used as virtual laboratories to forward-model entire observational surveys. Scientists can create synthetic sky catalogs from these simulations to design optimal survey strategies, test and calibrate data analysis pipelines, and quantify the systematic errors that are critical to achieving the precision goals of these surveys.[129]
- **Exploring New and Complex Physics:** The computational power of exascale systems allows for the inclusion of more complex physical processes that were previously too expensive to model in large volumes. This includes full radiation-magneto-hydrodynamics (R-MHD), which couples the flow of gas and magnetic fields with the transport of radiation, and the physics of cosmic rays.[127] These more comprehensive models are essential for making high-fidelity predictions for observables ranging from the 21-cm signal from the EoR to the properties of the hot, magnetized gas in galaxy clusters.[128] By running hundreds or thousands of these complex simulations with varying assumptions, researchers can rapidly explore the vast parameter space of cosmological models and

compare them to observations to unravel the mysteries of dark matter and dark energy.[19]

Chapter 12: The Future Trajectory II: The Symbiosis of Simulation and AI

Concurrent with the rise of exascale computing, a second revolution is reshaping the landscape of computational cosmology: the integration of machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence (AI). The sheer volume of data produced by both modern simulations and next-generation surveys—routinely measured in petabytes—has created a "data deluge" that is impossible to analyze using traditional methods alone. ML and AI are becoming indispensable tools for navigating this new data-rich environment.[43]

12.1 Key Applications of ML in Cosmological Simulations

The application of ML to cosmology is a rapidly expanding field with several key areas of impact.

- **Emulation and Surrogate Models:** One of the most powerful applications is the creation of "emulators." A full, high-fidelity hydrodynamical simulation is computationally expensive, taking millions of CPU hours to run for a single set of cosmological and astrophysical parameters. Exploring the vast parameter space of possible models is therefore intractable. Emulators solve this problem by training a deep neural network on a carefully chosen set of high-cost simulations. Once trained, the ML model can make instantaneous predictions for the simulation's output (e.g., the matter power spectrum or galaxy mass function) for any new set of input parameters, acting as a fast "surrogate" for the full simulation. This allows for rapid exploration of parameter space and robust cosmological parameter inference.[19]
- **Super-Resolution and "Painting":** ML techniques, particularly Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), can be used to add physical detail to simulations that lack it. For example, a GAN can be trained to learn the relationship between the dark matter distribution and the gas distribution in a full hydrodynamical simulation. It can then be applied to a cheap, large-volume dark-matter-only

simulation to "paint" on a realistic baryonic component. Similarly, ML can be used for "super-resolution," learning to add small-scale structure to a low-resolution simulation to generate a high-resolution realization at a fraction of the computational cost.[138]

- **Enhanced Information Extraction:** Traditional cosmological analysis has relied heavily on two-point statistics, like the power spectrum or correlation function. However, on small scales, gravitational collapse makes the matter distribution highly non-Gaussian, and a wealth of cosmological information is contained in higher-order statistics that are difficult to model analytically. ML methods, particularly convolutional neural networks (CNNs), are adept at identifying patterns in complex fields and can be trained on simulations to extract this non-Gaussian information from observational maps (e.g., from weak lensing or galaxy surveys), leading to tighter constraints on cosmological parameters.[133]
- **Improving Subgrid Models:** The development of subgrid physics models has largely been a manual process of trial and error. ML offers a path toward creating more sophisticated and physically grounded models. By training an ML algorithm on extremely high-resolution "zoom-in" simulations that can resolve some of the relevant physics (e.g., the structure of the multi-phase ISM), it may be possible to learn the complex, non-linear relationships that govern processes like star formation and feedback. This learned model could then be implemented as a more intelligent and accurate subgrid model in large-volume simulations.

The relationship between simulations and AI is not a one-way street but is rapidly evolving into a powerful, symbiotic feedback loop that is fundamentally changing the scientific method in cosmology. High-fidelity simulations, such as IllustrisTNG and EAGLE, provide the essential "ground truth" data needed to train and validate sophisticated ML models.[53] These trained AI models are then turned back onto the products of simulation and observation, enabling the rapid analysis of massive datasets, the classification of objects, and the identification of subtle patterns that would be missed by human inspection.[133]

This cycle closes as the AI models are then used to generate new simulated data at a fraction of the cost, either through emulation or by augmenting existing simulations with painted-on physics or super-resolution details.[136] This creates a virtuous cycle where better simulations lead to more powerful AI tools, which in turn enable the creation of faster, larger, and more physically realistic new simulations, dramatically accelerating the pace of discovery. The ultimate vision of this symbiosis is captured by emerging concepts like the "AI Cosmologist," an agentic system designed to automate the entire research workflow—from formulating hypotheses and designing computational experiments to analyzing results and synthesizing new approaches—heralding a new paradigm for scientific exploration in the digital age.[141]

Conclusion: A Synthesis of the Digital Cosmos

The history of cosmological simulations chronicles a remarkable journey of scientific and technological advancement. Over the span of just a few decades, the field has progressed from analog computers with a few dozen lightbulbs to exascale-powered, AI-enhanced digital universes containing billions of resolution elements and modeling a complex tapestry of interacting physical processes. This evolution was not random; it was driven by a relentless dialogue between theory, observation, and computation. Foundational theories like General Relativity and the Hot Big Bang provided the framework and initial conditions. Observational discoveries, from the CMB to galaxy rotation curves, posed specific, pointed questions and revealed the shortcomings of simplistic models. In response, simulations grew in complexity and fidelity, becoming the indispensable tool for exploring the non-linear consequences of our physical theories.

The development of numerical methods tells a story of algorithmic ingenuity, from the first N-body codes struggling with the $O(N^2)$ problem to the sophisticated TreePM, SPH, AMR, and moving-mesh schemes that power today's simulations. An equally important story is the layered accumulation of subgrid physics. Each major addition—from gas cooling and star formation to supernova and AGN feedback—was a direct response to a specific failure of the previous generation of models to match what was seen in the real universe. This iterative process of model refinement has culminated in flagship projects like EAGLE and IllustrisTNG, which, despite their different approaches, successfully reproduce a vast array of observed galaxy properties within the standard ΛCDM paradigm.

Yet, these successes have not eliminated all challenges. Persistent tensions on small scales, such as the cusp-core and too-big-to-fail problems, remain at the forefront of research. These issues highlight the profound difficulty of modeling the intricate physics of galaxy formation and underscore the boundary where our understanding of baryonic processes, or perhaps even the nature of dark matter itself, may be incomplete.

The future of the field is being shaped by two concurrent revolutions. The arrival of exascale computing is breaking the long-standing compromise between simulation volume and resolution, enabling the creation of "digital twins" of the cosmos that are sufficiently large and realistic to be compared directly with the next generation of observational surveys. Simultaneously, the integration of artificial intelligence and machine learning is providing the essential tools to navigate the resulting data deluge, to accelerate computational tasks through emulation, and to extract subtle information from complex datasets that was previously inaccessible.

Cosmological simulations have firmly established themselves as the third pillar of cosmology, standing alongside theory and observation. They are no longer just a tool for visualizing theoretical ideas; they are virtual laboratories for testing fundamental physics, for interpreting observational data, and for guiding the design of future experiments. The path forward lies in the ever-deepening synergy between these three pillars. As telescopes like JWST and the Rubin Observatory peer deeper into the real cosmos, simulations will provide the crucial theoretical context, translating the raw data of observation into a profound understanding of how our universe came to be.

Works cited

1. MIT Open Access Articles Cosmological simulations ... - DSpace@MIT, accessed June 24, 2025, https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/129432/1909.07976.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
2. Chapter 1: Overview: Cosmological Framework and the History of Computational Cosmology - World Scientific Publishing, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/10.1142/9789813231962_0001
3. Timeline of cosmological theories - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_cosmological_theories
4. History of Cosmology Timeline - Rational Realm, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.rationalrealm.com/science/physics/history-cosmology-timeline.html
5. Cosmological Structure Formation, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.astro.rug.nl/~weygaert/tim1publication/cosmic_origins2019/cosmic_origins2019.lect1a.cosmology_timeline.pdf
6. Timeline Cosmology, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.astro.rug.nl/~weygaert/tim1publication/cosmic_origins2017/cosmic_origins2017.lect1a.cosmology_timeline.pdf
7. Lambda-CDM model - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lambda-CDM_model
8. The Nobel Prize for the Foundations of Modern Cosmology - Astrobites, accessed June 24, 2025, https://astrobites.org/2019/10/17/nobel-prize-foundations-of-modern-cosmology/

9. Cosmology | Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.cfa.harvard.edu/research/science-field/cosmology
10. Mastering N-Body Simulations in Cosmology - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-nbody-simulations-in-cosmology
11. Cosmological Simulations Explained - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/cosmological-simulations-explained
12. FLUIDS IN THE UNIVERSE: ADAPTIVE MESH REFINEMENT IN COSMOLOGY - Electrical and Computer Engineering, accessed June 24, 2025, http://users.ece.northwestern.edu/~wkliao/ENZO/fluids_in_the_universe.pdf
13. Pubs.GISS: Peebles and Yu 1970: Primeval adiabatic perturbation in an expanding universe, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.giss.nasa.gov/pubs/abs/pe00300h.html
14. Timeline of the Universe – Planck Satellite, accessed June 24, 2025, https://plancksatellite.org.uk/science/timeline/
15. SIMULATIONS OF STRUCTURE FORMATION IN THE UNIVERSE - UC Santa Cruz - Physics Department, accessed June 24, 2025, http://physics.ucsc.edu/~joel/09Astr233/Simulations-EdBertARAA98.pdf
16. Cosmological Simulations in Galactic Cosmology - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-cosmological-simulations-galactic-cosmology
17. Lambda-CDM Model: The Universe Explained - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/lambda-cdm-model-astrophysics-guide
18. Guide to ΛCDM | astrobites, accessed June 24, 2025, https://astrobites.org/2025/01/06/lambda_cdm/
19. Mining the dark sky with advanced cosmological simulations - Space Daily, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Mining_the_dark_sky_with_advanced_cosmological_simulations_999.html
20. Matter Era in Cosmology - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/matter-era-in-cosmology
21. Unveiling the Mysteries of the Universe - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/cosmology-standard-model-applications
22. Cosmological - American Institute of Physics., accessed June 24, 2025, https://pubs.aip.org/aip/cip/article-pdf/5/2/164/11699442/164_1_online.pdf
23. Mastering N-body Simulations in Astronomy - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/mastering-nbody-simulations-in-astronomy
24. N-body simulation - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/N-body_simulation

25. New MillenniumTNG simulation helps to test standard model of cosmology, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.mpg.de/20761326/millennium-tng-cosmology-simulation
26. Gravitational N-Body Simulations - Cambridge University Press, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/gravitational-nbody-simulations/A5D1D86EA634C9D354B7C82C029D6933
27. Gravitational n body simulations tools and algorithms - Cambridge University Press, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/9780521432726
28. Gravitational N-body simulations : Aarseth, Sverre J. (Sverre Johannes), 1934- : Free Download, Borrow, and Streaming - Internet Archive, accessed June 24, 2025, https://archive.org/details/gravitationalnbo0000aars
29. The New Horizon Run Cosmological N-Body Simulations - KIAS Astrophysics Group, accessed June 24, 2025, https://astro.kias.re.kr/Horizon-Run23/paper.pdf
30. repository.rit.edu, accessed June 24, 2025, https://repository.rit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=11014&context=theses#:~:text=Smoothed%20Particle%20Hydrodynamics%20(SPH)%20was,which%20are%20grid%20based%20methods.
31. Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics in Cosmology - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-smoothed-particle-hydrodynamics-cosmological-simulations
32. Smoothed-particle hydrodynamics - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smoothed-particle_hydrodynamics
33. Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics in Astrophysics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://e-l.unifi.it/pluginfile.php/834732/mod_resource/content/0/Springel_ARAA.pdf
34. A model for cosmological simulations of galaxy formation physics - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/436/4/3031/984888
35. Millennium Simulation Project - MPA, Garching, accessed June 24, 2025, https://wwwmpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/galform/virgo/millennium/
36. The Mathematics of Smoothed Particle Hydrodynamics (SPH) Consistency - Frontiers, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/applied-mathematics-and-statistics/articles/10.3389/fams.2021.797455/full
37. Adaptive mesh refinement - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adaptive_mesh_refinement
38. Mastering Adaptive Mesh Refinement - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/mastering-adaptive-mesh-refinement
39. Adaptive Mesh Refinement - Exascale Computing Project, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.exascaleproject.org/research-project/adaptive-mesh-refinement/
40. JWST Science Simulations: Galaxy Formation - NASA Scientific Visualization

Studio, accessed June 24, 2025, https://svs.gsfc.nasa.gov/10661/
41. COSMIC REIONIZATION ON COMPUTERS, accessed June 24, 2025, http://bluewaters.ncsa.illinois.edu/liferay-content/document-library/BW-Annual-Report-2018/bwar18_gnedin.pdf
42. The Future of Cosmological Simulations: Moving Mesh - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/future-cosmological-simulations-moving-mesh
43. Advanced Cosmological Simulation Techniques - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/advanced-cosmological-simulation-techniques
44. IllustrisTNG - Main, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.tng-project.org/
45. AGN Feedback in Galaxy Formation - University of Memphis Digital Commons, accessed June 24, 2025, https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1097&context=quaesitum
46. Public Data Access Overview / Background and Important Details - IllustrisTNG, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.tng-project.org/data/docs/background/
47. Simulations of Galaxy Formation and Comparison with Observations - Journal of Biomedical Research & Environmental Sciences, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.jelsciences.com/articles/jbres2112.pdf
48. [2502.06954] Hydrodynamic methods and sub-resolution models for cosmological simulations - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2502.06954
49. Cosmological Implications of Supernova Feedback - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/cosmological-implications-supernova-feedback
50. Chapter 0 Hydrodynamic methods and sub-resolution models for cosmological simulations, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2502.06954v1
51. First results from the IllustrisTNG simulations: the galaxy colour bimodality | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/475/1/624/4657187
52. Supernova feedback in numerical simulations of galaxy formation: separating physics from numerics - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/478/1/302/4980956
53. Machine learning and cosmological simulations – II. Hydrodynamical simulations | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/457/2/1162/965470
54. Star formation in cosmological simulations of Milky Way-like galaxies - Lund University, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/lup/publication/57a13fc4-411c-4171-8607-43507198ea7a
55. The first galaxies: simulating their feedback-regulated assembly - Oxford

Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/452/2/1152/1059909
56. (PDF) AEOS: Star-by-Star Cosmological Simulations of Early Chemical Enrichment and Galaxy Formation - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385140273_AEOS_Star-by-Star_Cosmological_Simulations_of_Early_Chemical_Enrichment_and_Galaxy_Formation
57. Formation of the first generation of stars and blackholes in the Universe - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed June 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC6395782/
58. [1501.01002] The first galaxies: simulating their feedback-regulated assembly - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.01002
59. A model of supernova feedback in galaxy formation - Astrophysics Data System, accessed June 24, 2025, https://adsabs.harvard.edu/pdf/2000MNRAS.317..697E
60. Osaka Feedback Model II: Modeling Supernova Feedback Based on High-Resolution Simulations - Cambridge University Press, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/services/aop-cambridge-core/content/view/462132F71AE91C8450C3639F2367B580/S1743921322004860a.pdf/osaka_feedback_model_ii_modeling_supernova_feedback_based_on_highresolution_simulations.pdf
61. The EAGLE project: simulating the evolution and assembly of galaxies and their environments - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/446/1/521/4139718/stu2058.pdf
62. [1501.01311] The EAGLE simulations of galaxy formation: calibration of subgrid physics and model variations - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.01311
63. (PDF) Feedback models in galaxy simulations and probing their impact by cosmological hydrodynamic simulations - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371462792_Feedback_models_in_galaxy_simulations_and_probing_their_impact_by_cosmological_hydrodynamic_simulations
64. Cosmic evolution of radio-AGN feedback: confronting models with data - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/523/4/5292/7199797
65. From giants to dwarfs: unveiling stellar and AGN feedback in the first 3 Gyr of the Universe - EAS 2025, accessed June 24, 2025, https://eas.unige.ch/EAS2025/session.jsp?id=SS36
66. Cosmological Simulations with AGN Feedback, accessed June 24, 2025, https://uhra.herts.ac.uk/id/eprint/16844/
67. Results - IllustrisTNG, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.tng-project.org/results/
68. First results from the IllustrisTNG simulations: The galaxy colour bimodality - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/318392536_First_results_from_the_Illust

risTNG_simulations_The_galaxy_colour_bimodality
69. [2402.00929] The role of AGN feedback on the evolution of dwarf galaxies from cosmological simulations: SMBHs suppress star formation in low-mass galaxies - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.00929
70. The EAGLE project : simulating the evolution and assembly of galaxies and their environments - Academic Bibliography - Universiteit Gent, accessed June 24, 2025, https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/5920916
71. Millennium Run - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Millennium_Run
72. Millennium Simulation -- The Largest Ever Model Of The Universe | ScienceDaily, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2005/06/050604061156.htm
73. Resolving cosmic structure formation with the Millennium-II Simulation - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/398/3/1150/1261296
74. First results from the IllustrisTNG simulations: matter and galaxy clustering | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/475/1/676/4772886
75. Millennium Simulation - the largest ever model of the Universe - Interactions.org, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.interactions.org/press-release/millennium-simulation-largest-ever-model-universe
76. Millennium-II Simulation: Papers - MPA Garching, accessed June 24, 2025, https://wwwmpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/galform/millennium-II/papers.html
77. The EAGLE simulations - The EAGLE simulationsThe EAGLE simulations | Evolution and Assembly of GaLaxies and their Environments, accessed June 24, 2025, https://eagle.strw.leidenuniv.nl/wordpress/
78. Virgo Consortium - Wikipedia, accessed June 24, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Virgo_Consortium
79. The EAGLE Project - The Virgo Consortium, accessed June 24, 2025, https://virgo.dur.ac.uk/2014/11/11/EAGLE/
80. EAGLE project: simulating the evolution and assembly of galaxies and their environments | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/446/1/521/1316115
81. EAGLE simulations publications, accessed June 24, 2025, https://eagle.strw.leidenuniv.nl/wordpress/index.php/eagle-technical-description/
82. The EAGLE project: Simulating the evolution and assembly of galaxies and their environments - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264312790_The_EAGLE_project_Simulating_the_evolution_and_assembly_of_galaxies_and_their_environments
83. [1706.09899] The EAGLE simulations of galaxy formation: Public release of particle data, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.09899
84. The IllustrisTNG simulations: public data release - DSpace@MIT, accessed June 24, 2025,

https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/128889/40668_2019_Article_28.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
85. (PDF) The IllustrisTNG simulations: public data release - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333090502_The_IllustrisTNG_simulations_public_data_release
86. First results from the IllustrisTNG simulations: matter and galaxy clustering - Portal de Periódicos da CAPES, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.periodicos.capes.gov.br/index.php/acervo/buscador.html?task=detalhes&id=W2735395126
87. First results from the IllustrisTNG simulations: matter and galaxy clustering - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article-pdf/475/1/676/23534347/stx3304.pdf
88. First results from the IllustrisTNG simulations: the stellar mass content of groups and clusters of galaxies | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/475/1/648/4683271
89. EAGLE and Illustris-TNG predictions for resolved eROSITA X-ray ..., accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.13889
90. Some Constructive Feedback on Feedback Models - Astrobites, accessed June 24, 2025, https://astrobites.org/2022/03/17/some-constructive-feedback-on-feedback-models/
91. Comparing galaxy formation in the L-GALAXIES semi-analytical model and the IllustrisTNG simulations (Journal Article) - OSTI, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.osti.gov/pages/biblio/1840642
92. The case for large-scale AGN feedback in galaxy formation simulations: insights from XFABLE - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2501.16983v1
93. EC16 — Program, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.cpt.univ-mrs.fr/~cosmo/EC2025/index.php?page=program
94. (PDF) Simulating Cosmic Reionization - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/1737166_Simulating_Cosmic_Reionization
95. Simulating cosmic reionization at large scales – I. The geometry of reionization | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society | Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/369/4/1625/1087589
96. Simulating Cosmic Reionization - CiteSeerX, accessed June 24, 2025, https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=5ce1e0c8732df44e1b6abd2621fc2ab339dcb875
97. Simulating cosmic reionization and the radiation backgrounds from the epoch of reionization - University of Texas at Austin, accessed June 24, 2025, https://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/bitstreams/0f613038-60ac-44a9-b418-19b95ebcaa33/download
98. Cosmological Simulations: Radiative Transfer Essentials - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025,

https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/ultimate-guide-cosmological-simulations-radiative-transfer
99. A deep learning model to emulate simulations of cosmic reionization - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/490/1/1055/5584889
100. [1403.4245] Cosmic Reionization On Computers I. Design and Calibration of Simulations, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1403.4245
101. COSMIC REIONIZATION ON COMPUTERS, accessed June 24, 2025, http://bluewaters.ncsa.illinois.edu/liferay-content/document-library/BW-Annual-Report-2019/gnedin_reionization.pdf
102. Cosmic Reionization On Computers | Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.alcf.anl.gov/science/projects/cosmic-reionization-computers-1
103. THESAN - Main, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.thesan-project.com/thesan/index.html
104. THESAN - Main - MPA Garching, accessed June 24, 2025, https://wwwmpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/thesan/index.html
105. THESAN- Project Description, accessed June 24, 2025, https://wwwmpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/thesan/thesan.html
106. Scientists develop the largest, most detailed model of the early universe to date | MIT News, accessed June 24, 2025, https://news.mit.edu/2022/early-universe-model-0324
107. Reionization and its sources, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2502.12004
108. Small scale problems of the Λ \Lambda CDM model: a short review - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/386657184_Small_scale_problems_of_the_LambdaCDM_model_a_short_review
109. [1606.07790] Small scale problems of the $Λ$CDM model: a short review - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.07790
110. The fallacies of LCDM falsifications, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2505.06244
111. Small Scale Problems of the ΛCDM Model: A Short Review - MDPI, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4434/5/1/17
112. Review Article The Core-Cusp Problem - University of Cape Town, accessed June 24, 2025, https://open.uct.ac.za/bitstreams/a7ba6865-0991-405a-81ef-2b0c14bd0d8d/download
113. Cold dark matter: Controversies on small scales - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed June 24, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4603506/
114. Review of Solutions to the Cusp-Core Problem of the ΛCDM Model - Bohrium, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.bohrium.com/paper-details/review-of-solutions-to-the-cusp-core-problem-of-the-cdm-model/814697775101902848-29792
115. Review of Solutions to the Cusp-Core Problem of the ΛCDM Model -

ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/357176913_Review_of_Solutions_to_the_Cusp-Core_Problem_of_the_LCDM_Model
116. Review of Solutions to the Cusp-Core Problem of the ΛCDM Model - MDPI, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4434/9/4/123
117. Small-Scale Challenges to the ΛCDM Paradigm - Annual Reviews, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.annualreviews.org/content/journals/10.1146/annurev-astro-091916-055313
118. The Dark Matter Conundrum: Missing Satellites Revisited - Number Analytics, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.numberanalytics.com/blog/dark-matter-conundrum-missing-satellites
119. Notes on the missing satellites problem (Chapter 3) - Local Group Cosmology, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/local-group-cosmology/notes-on-the-missing-satellites-problem/2E35A209A32C46583D61FB0CD466B20D
120. Galaxies That Are Too Big To Fail, But Fail Anyway - Sean Carroll, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.preposterousuniverse.com/blog/2014/07/18/galaxies-that-are-too-big-to-fail-but-fail-anyway/
121. Too big to fail? The puzzling darkness of massive Milky Way subhaloes | Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnrasl/article/415/1/L40/965196
122. (PDF) Redefining the Missing Satellites Problem - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230952492_Redefining_the_Missing_Satellites_Problem
123. Exascale Supercomputers Tracking Down Dark Matter, Dark Energy, accessed June 24, 2025, https://cacm.acm.org/news/exascale-supercomputers-tracking-down-dark-matter-dark-energy/
124. Supercomputer runs largest and most complicated simulation of the universe ever, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.livescience.com/technology/computing/supercomputer-runs-largest-and-most-complicated-simulation-of-the-universe-ever
125. Is Dark Energy Changing? Mysterious New Data Challenges Einstein's Cosmological Constant - SciTechDaily, accessed June 24, 2025, https://scitechdaily.com/is-dark-energy-changing-mysterious-new-data-challenges-einsteins-cosmological-constant/
126. Record-breaking run on Frontier sets new bar for simulating the universe in the exascale era, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.ornl.gov/news/record-breaking-run-frontier-sets-new-bar-simulating-universe-exascale-era
127. Adapting arepo-rt for Exascale Computing: GPU Acceleration and Efficient

Communication, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2404.17630v1
128. ExaSky - Exascale Computing Project, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.exascaleproject.org/research-project/exasky/
129. Probing the Primordial Universe with Exascale Simulations, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.alcf.anl.gov/science/projects/probing-primordial-universe-exascale-simulations
130. Charting the Night Sky with Exascale Computers - Department of Energy, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.energy.gov/science/articles/charting-night-sky-exascale-computers
131. Exascale Cosmology: Lighting up the Dark Universe | Argonne Leadership Computing Facility, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.alcf.anl.gov/science/projects/exascale-cosmology-lighting-dark-universe
132. A simple sub-grid model for cosmic ray effects on galactic scales - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/522/2/2936/7104068
133. arXiv:2203.08056v1 [hep-ph] 15 Mar 2022 Machine Learning and ..., accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/2203.08056
134. Review Paper: Machine Learning in Cosmology -Advances, Challenges, and Future Directions - ResearchGate, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/391251431_Review_Paper_Machine_Learning_in_Cosmology_-Advances_Challenges_and_Future_Directions
135. [2303.15794] Machine Learning for Observational Cosmology - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.15794
136. arXiv:2409.02154v2 [astro-ph.IM] 21 Jan 2025, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.arxiv.org/pdf/2409.02154
137. Machine Learning and Cosmological Simulations II: Hydrodynamical Simulations - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/pdf/1510.07659
138. AI-assisted superresolution cosmological simulations - PNAS, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.pnas.org/doi/10.1073/pnas.2022038118
139. AI-assisted super-resolution cosmological simulations III: time evolution - Oxford Academic, accessed June 24, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/mnras/article/528/1/281/7492793
140. Review of Machine Learning for cosmology (Benjamin D. Wandelt) - YouTube, accessed June 24, 2025, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MLWLto6_Pfg
141. The AI Cosmologist I: An Agentic System for Automated Data Analysis - arXiv, accessed June 24, 2025, https://arxiv.org/html/2504.03424v1