Abstract

The transition from diffuse molecular clouds ($n \sim 10^1$–10^3 cm^{-3}) to gravitationally-bound protostellar cores ($n > 10^{10}$ cm^{-3}) represents one of the most extreme density contrasts in astrophysics, spanning approximately eighteen orders of magnitude when extended to stellar interiors. Contemporary star formation theory invokes multiple mechanisms—turbulent fragmentation, converging flows, thermal instability, magnetic flux redistribution, and external triggering—to explain this transition. This critical meta-analysis examines whether these mechanisms are *collectively sufficient* to explain the observed phenomenon of stellar birth. We find that these mechanisms are *necessary and sufficient to demonstrate that collapse can occur* without violating known physics, and recent advances in turbulence-regulated theory successfully predict statistical outcomes such as the star formation rate per free-fall time ($\epsilon_{\rm ff} \approx 0.01$). However, gaps remain in providing a fully predictive, first-principles explanation of *which specific regions* will collapse given realistic initial conditions in the interstellar medium. The central challenge is the *bidirectional nature* of every proposed mechanism: each can both aggregate and disperse matter, with threshold criteria (Jeans mass, virial parameter) determining outcomes. While these thresholds are well-established, the theory does not yet fully explain why and where ISM conditions cross these thresholds. We conclude that the current paradigm represents a successful statistical theory of star formation but that a complete understanding requires deeper integration of the identified mechanisms into a unified dynamical framework. This represents an opportunity for theoretical advance rather than a fundamental crisis.

The Paradox of Protostellar Core Formation: A Critical Assessment of Whether Current Theoretical Mechanisms Are Sufficient

Boris Kriger[1]

[1]Department of Astrophysics, Institute of Integrative and Interdisciplinary Research

January 6, 2026

1 Introduction

The formation of stars from the diffuse interstellar medium (ISM) presents a profound theoretical challenge. Molecular clouds, with typical densities of $n \sim 10^2$–10^3 particles cm^{-3}, must somehow concentrate matter to protostellar core densities exceeding 10^{10} cm^{-3}, with stellar interiors ultimately reaching $\sim 10^{22}$ cm^{-3}. This density contrast, spanning over ten orders of magnitude in the cloud-to-core transition alone (and eighteen orders of magnitude to stellar interiors), occurs despite gravity being the weakest of the fundamental forces and against the persistent opposition of thermal pressure, magnetic fields, and supersonic turbulence.

The classical framework for understanding gravitational collapse was established by Jeans [1902], who derived the critical mass above which a uniform, isothermal gas cloud becomes gravitationally unstable:

$$M_J = \left(\frac{\pi}{6}\right)^{1/2} \frac{c_s^3}{(G^3\rho)^{1/2}} \propto T^{3/2}\rho^{-1/2} \tag{1}$$

where c_s is the sound speed, G is the gravitational constant, ρ is the gas density, and T is the temperature. While the Jeans criterion provides a necessary condition for collapse ($M > M_J$), it is insufficient to explain the full complexity of star formation in turbulent, magnetized, multiphase molecular clouds.

Over the past several decades, the field has developed a sophisticated toolkit of mechanisms to explain how collapse is initiated and proceeds: turbulence-induced density fluctuations [Mac Low and Klessen, 2004, Padoan and Nordlund, 2002, Federrath, 2015], converging flows and filamentary accretion [Vázquez-Semadeni et al., 2011, André et al., 2010, Heitsch et al., 2008], thermal instability [Field, 1965, Larson, 1969], magnetic flux redistribution via ambipolar diffusion [Mouschovias and Ciolek, 1999, Mouschovias et al., 2006] and turbulent reconnection diffusion [Lazarian, 2005, Leão et al., 2013], and external triggering by shocks [Elmegreen and Lada, 1977, Boss and Keiser, 2010, Fukui et al., 2021].

The consensus view holds that these mechanisms operate synergistically within the hierarchical ISM, collectively enabling the "paradoxical accumulation" of matter against its natural tendency to disperse. This paper presents a critical examination of this consensus, asking: *Are these mechanisms collectively sufficient to explain not just how collapse can occur, but why it does occur?*

Our analysis reveals a fundamental tension in the current theoretical framework. While the identified mechanisms successfully demonstrate the *physical possibility* of collapse, they share a critical characteristic that complicates claims of completeness: each mechanism is inherently *bidirectional*, capable of both promoting and preventing collapse. The threshold criteria that determine outcomes (Jeans mass, virial parameter, mass-to-flux ratio) are well-established, but the theory does not fully explain why ISM conditions evolve to cross these thresholds in specific locations.

We must be careful to distinguish two types of predictive power. A theory may be *statistically predictive*—correctly forecasting ensemble properties like the star formation rate per free-fall time or the stellar initial mass function—without being *individually predictive*—forecasting which specific density fluctuation will collapse. For intrinsically chaotic, turbulent systems, statistical prediction may represent the appropriate and achievable standard, analogous to weather statistics versus individual storm prediction. Recent theoretical advances [Krumholz and McKee, 2005, Federrath and Klessen, 2012, Padoan et al., 2014] have achieved notable success in statistical prediction.

Our critique therefore focuses not on the absence of deterministic prediction—which may be inappropriate for turbulent systems—but on specific gaps in causal understanding: Why do ISM conditions reach collapse thresholds? How do bidirectional mechanisms couple to produce net accumulation? What sets the initial conditions that simulations require? These questions remain incompletely answered even within a statistical framework.

This article is the first in a series critically evaluating current star formation theory. Here, we focus specifically on the question of mechanism sufficiency for protostellar core formation. Subsequent articles will address the angular momentum problem, the stellar initial mass function, massive star formation, and the role of feedback in regulating star formation efficiency.

2 The Established Mechanism Toolkit

Before presenting our critique, we summarize the principal mechanisms invoked in contemporary star formation theory. Each mechanism is well-established in the literature, supported by both theoretical analysis and observational evidence.

2.1 Turbulent Fragmentation

Supersonic turbulence, characterized by Mach numbers $\mathcal{M} > 1$, pervades molecular clouds and generates a network of shocks that create stochastic density enhancements. The "gravo-turbulent" paradigm [Mac Low and Klessen, 2004, Klessen et al., 2004] holds that these density fluctuations produce a log-normal probability distribution function (PDF):

$$p(s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma_s^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{(s-s_0)^2}{2\sigma_s^2}\right) \qquad (2)$$

where $s = \ln(\rho/\rho_0)$ is the logarithmic density contrast and $\sigma_s \approx \ln(1 + b^2\mathcal{M}^2)$ depends on the Mach number and the forcing parameter b [Federrath et al., 2010]. The high-density tail of this distribution contains regions where the local Jeans mass drops sufficiently for gravitational collapse to dominate.

For a strong isothermal shock with Mach number $\mathcal{M}$, the post-shock density enhancement scales as:

$$\frac{\rho_{\rm post}}{\rho_{\rm pre}} \sim \mathcal{M}^2 \qquad (3)$$

For $\mathcal{M} \sim 10$, typical of molecular clouds, this yields compression factors of ~ 100, potentially reducing M_J by factors of ~ 10 in the compressed regions.

2.2 Converging Flows and Filamentary Accretion

Large-scale gas flows driven by galactic dynamics, spiral arm passages, or cloud-cloud collisions can assemble diffuse gas into dense structures through ram pressure compression [Vázquez-Semadeni et al., 2011, Inoue and Fukui, 2013]. The resulting structures are characteristically filamentary, as revealed by *Herschel* observations [André et al., 2010, Arzoumanian et al., 2011], with widths remarkably uniform at ~ 0.1 pc.

Filaments act as "cosmic highways" channeling mass longitudinally toward density peaks or "hubs" where multiple filaments intersect [Myers, 2009, Schneider et al., 2012]. This geometry circumvents the immediate buildup of thermal pressure that would halt spherical collapse, enabling continuous mass accretion rates that can exceed those predicted by simple Jeans fragmentation.

The characteristic line mass of observed filaments, $M_{\rm line} \sim 16\ \mathrm{M}_\odot\ \mathrm{pc}^{-1}$, approaches the critical value for gravitational instability [Ostriker, 1964]:

$$M_{\rm line,crit} = \frac{2c_s^2}{G} \approx 16 \left(\frac{T}{10\ \mathrm{K}}\right)\ \mathrm{M}_\odot\ \mathrm{pc}^{-1} \quad (4)$$

2.3 Thermal Instability

Thermal instability [Field, 1965] arises when the cooling function $\Lambda(T)$ has a negative slope with respect to temperature in certain regimes. Gas in the unstable range undergoes isobaric condensation: cooling leads to density increase at constant pressure, which further enhances cooling in a runaway process.

This mechanism drives the phase transition from the warm neutral medium (WNM, $T \sim$ 5000–8000 K) to the cold neutral medium (CNM, $T \lesssim 200$ K), reducing thermal pressure support by factors of $\sim$ 25–40. Within molecular clouds, efficient cooling via H_2, CO, and dust thermal emission maintains approximately isothermal conditions during collapse, preventing the adiabatic pressure increase that would otherwise halt contraction.

The critical requirement for gravitational collapse is that the cooling timescale remain shorter than the dynamical timescale:

$$t_{\rm cool} = \frac{3}{2}\frac{nk_BT}{n^2\Lambda(T)} < t_{\rm ff} = \sqrt{\frac{3\pi}{32G\rho}} \quad (5)$$

This condition is satisfied at sufficiently high densities where collisional cooling becomes efficient.

2.4 Magnetic Flux Redistribution

Magnetic fields provide pressure and tension that resist gravitational compression. A cloud is magnetically subcritical (stable) or supercritical (unstable) depending on its mass-to-flux ratio:

$$\mu \equiv \frac{M/\Phi_B}{(M/\Phi_B)_{\rm crit}} = \frac{M/\Phi_B}{1/(2\pi\sqrt{G})} \quad (6)$$

Subcritical clouds ($\mu < 1$) are supported against collapse; supercritical clouds ($\mu > 1$) can collapse.

In subcritical clouds, *ambipolar diffusion*—the drift of neutral particles relative to the ion-magnetic field system—allows neutrals to concentrate gravitationally while magnetic flux remains tied to the ionized component [Mouschovias and Ciolek, 1999, Mouschovias et al., 2006]. The characteristic timescale is:

$$t_{\rm AD} \sim \frac{L^2}{\eta_{\rm AD}} \sim \frac{4\pi\gamma\rho\rho_i L^2}{B^2} \quad (7)$$

where γ is the drag coefficient, ρ_i is the ion density, and L is the characteristic length scale. Typical estimates yield $t_{\rm AD} \sim$ 5–10 Myr.

Turbulent reconnection diffusion [Lazarian, 2005, Leão et al., 2013] can accelerate this process by enabling magnetic field lines to reconnect and rearrange in a turbulent medium, with effective diffusivity enhanced by turbulent motions:

$$\eta_{\rm turb} \sim L_{\rm turb} v_{\rm turb} \quad (8)$$

2.5 External Triggering

Shock waves from supernovae, expanding H II regions, stellar winds, or cloud-cloud collisions can compress initially stable gas to supercritical densities [Elmegreen and Lada, 1977, Nakamura and Li, 2005, Boss and Keiser, 2010]. The "collect and collapse" scenario [Elmegreen and Lada, 1977] involves the accumulation of swept-up material behind an expanding shock, which eventually fragments gravitationally.

Observational evidence supports triggered star formation in numerous regions, including the Carina Nebula, W5, and numerous infrared dark clouds [Furukawa et al., 2009, Fukui et al., 2021]. Numerical simulations [Boss and Keiser, 2010] indicate an effective shock velocity window of approximately 30–80 km s^{-1}: slower shocks provide insufficient compression, while faster shocks disrupt rather than compress the target cloud.

2.6 Recent Theoretical and Simulation Advances

Significant progress over the past decade deserves recognition. Modern simulations increasingly form molecular clouds and cores self-consistently from diffuse ISM conditions, addressing earlier critiques about assumed initial conditions.

The SILCC (SImulating the Life-Cycle of molecular Clouds) project [Walch et al., 2015, Girichidis et al., 2016] models the supernova-driven ISM, forming molecular clouds naturally from the turbulent, multiphase medium. The TIGRESS framework [Kim and Ostriker, 2017] achieves self-consistent star formation in a galactic context, with supernova feedback, magnetic fields, and galactic shear all included. These simulations demonstrate that cloud formation and subsequent core collapse can emerge from realistic galactic conditions without fine-tuned initial states.

Analytic theories have also advanced substantially. Krumholz and McKee [2005] and Federrath and Klessen [2012] derived the star formation rate per free-fall time $\epsilon_{\rm ff}$ from turbulent density PDFs, predicting $\epsilon_{\rm ff} \approx 0.01$—remarkably consistent with observations across diverse environments. The Hennebelle and Chabrier [2008, 2011] theory derives the stellar initial mass function from turbulent fragmentation, achieving good agreement with observed distributions. Padoan et al. [2014] provide a comprehensive framework connecting turbulence properties to star formation outcomes.

These advances represent genuine predictive success: given turbulence properties (Mach number, driving scale, magnetic field strength), these theories predict statistical star formation outcomes. This is precisely the type of statistical prediction appropriate for a turbulent system.

However, important gaps remain. Most simulations still require substantial computational resources to achieve the dynamic range from galactic scales to core scales. The microphysics (cooling, chemistry, non-ideal MHD) is often simplified. And the fundamental question—why do conditions evolve to cross collapse thresholds in specific locations?—remains incompletely answered even in successful simulations. The simulations demonstrate that collapse *does* occur but do not always illuminate *why* it occurs where it does rather than elsewhere.

3 The Bidirectionality Challenge

The mechanisms outlined in Section 2 are physically well-founded and observationally supported. However, a critical examination reveals a characteristic that complicates simple causal narratives: *every mechanism is inherently bidirectional*, capable of both promoting and preventing gravitational collapse. Table 1 summarizes this duality.

This bidirectionality creates a profound theoretical gap. The literature routinely presents these mechanisms as *collapse triggers*, emphasizing their collecting modes while downplaying or ignoring their equally potent dispersive capabilities. The fundamental question remains unanswered: *Why does gravity win the competition with dispersive tendencies?*

Table 2 summarizes the characteristic scales and timescales at which each mechanism operates. The successful formation of a protostellar core requires these mechanisms to act in proper sequence across the full hierarchy—a "relay race" where each mechanism must successfully hand off to the next.

3.1 Threshold Criteria and the Asymmetry Question

It is important to recognize that threshold criteria *do* exist and provide symmetry-breaking between collapse and dispersal. The Jeans criterion ($M > M_J$), virial parameter ($\alpha_{\rm vir} < 2$), and mass-to-flux ratio ($\mu > 1$) all define conditions under which gravity dominates over opposing forces. These are not circular definitions but genuine physical thresholds derived from force balance analysis.

The more precise question is not whether symmetry-breaking criteria exist, but *why ISM*

Table 1: The Bidirectional Nature of Star Formation Mechanisms

Mechanism	Collapse-Promoting Mode	Collapse-Preventing Mode
Turbulence	Creates density peaks via shocks	Provides turbulent pressure support; disperses overdensities via shear
Magnetic fields	Guides accretion; flux loss enables collapse	Magnetic pressure and tension resist compression
Thermal instability	Cooling reduces pressure, enables condensation	Heating reverses cooling; re-expansion follows compression
Converging flows	Ram pressure assembles dense structures	Shear fragments structures; post-shock gas re-expands
External shocks	Impulsive compression triggers instability	Violent shocks disrupt clouds; inject dispersive turbulent energy

Table 2: Characteristic Scales and Timescales of Star Formation Mechanisms

Mechanism	Primary Driver	Spatial Scale	Timescale	Primary Challenge Addressed
Turbulent fragmentation	Kinetic shocks	~ 0.01–1 pc	< 1 Myr	Overcomes global virial support locally
Converging flows	Bulk motions	> 10 pc	~ 1–10 Myr	Assembles mass from diffuse ISM
Thermal instability	Radiative cooling	Cloud-wide	Variable	Removes thermal pressure support
Ambipolar diffusion	Ion-neutral drift	Core scale	~ 1–10 Myr[a]	Overcomes magnetic support
Reconnection diffusion	MHD turbulence	Core scale	~ 0.1–1 Myr	Accelerates magnetic flux loss
External triggering	Shock compression	~ 1–10 pc	< 1 Myr	Impulsive compression of stable gas

[a] Range reflects quiescent (long) vs. turbulence-enhanced (short) regimes.

conditions evolve to cross these thresholds in specific locations. The Jeans mass defines when collapse will occur; the open question is why regions reach the requisite density and temperature. The virial parameter predicts which clouds will form stars; the question is what drives clouds toward low virial states.

The literature often frames turbulent collapse as a "race" between local gravitational free-fall and turbulent dispersal [Ballesteros-Paredes et al., 1999]. A density peak created by a shock will collapse if $t_{\mathrm{ff,local}} < t_{\mathrm{dispersal}}$. This framework is quantitatively successful: theories based on turbulent density PDFs correctly predict statistical star formation rates [Krumholz and McKee, 2005, Federrath and Klessen, 2012]. The outcome for any individual fluctuation depends on local density, turbulent velocity, and cooling efficiency—stochastic variables whose distributions, not individual values, are predictable.

Consider turbulence as an example. Turbulent shocks create density peaks where M_J drops. But the same turbulence:

1. Generates velocity dispersal in the shocked region
2. Provides isotropic pressure support that resists collapse
3. Can shred incipient overdensities through shear
4. Decays on approximately one crossing time, requiring continuous driving

The key insight is that this competition produces a *statistical* outcome: most fluctuations disperse, but a predictable fraction (determined by the PDF tail above the collapse threshold) proceeds to collapse. This is not a failure of the theory but rather its content: star formation is inherently a low-probability outcome of turbulent dynamics, with $\epsilon_{\mathrm{ff}} \approx 0.01$ emerging naturally from the statistics.

The remaining question is whether this statistical understanding constitutes a complete theory or whether deeper causal explanation is possible. We return to this in Section 8.

3.2 The Confinement Problem

A critical silence in the literature concerns what prevents collapse products from dispersing. This manifests in several ways:

Turbulent confinement: Post-shock gas will re-expand unless confined by external pressure or gravity. At what density does gravity become strong enough to confine gas against turbulent dispersal? The literature implicitly assumes this happens when $M > M_J$, but this is definitional.

Magnetic confinement: As ambipolar diffusion proceeds, why doesn't the gas reach a new pressure equilibrium at lower density? The transition from subcritical to supercritical is typically presented as irreversible, but this requires demonstration.

Shock confinement: Post-shock gas is hot and high-pressure. The answer given—"if cooling is efficient, the dense layer remains"—assumes stable cooling efficiency during dynamical evolution, which is not rigorously justified as an equilibrium condition.

4 Timescale Hierarchies and Causal Ordering

The standard narrative holds that multiple mechanisms act "synergistically" on different timescales. However, the causal ordering of these timescales is assumed rather than derived from first principles.

4.1 The Timescale Hierarchy

The relevant timescales span orders of magnitude:

- Free-fall time: $t_{\mathrm{ff}} \approx 4 \times 10^5 (n/10^4\ \mathrm{cm}^{-3})^{-1/2}$ yr
- Turbulent crossing time: $t_{\mathrm{cross}} \sim L/\sigma_v \sim 10^6$ yr
- Ambipolar diffusion time: $t_{\mathrm{AD}} \sim 5$–10 Myr
- Cloud lifetime: $t_{\mathrm{cloud}} \sim 10$–$30$ Myr

A fundamental paradox emerges: if ambipolar diffusion operates on timescales of 5–10 Myr while turbulent collapse proceeds in $\lesssim 1$ Myr, how can magnetic flux redistribution contribute to initiating collapse? The literature treats these as independent "channels" without explaining their temporal interaction.

4.2 The Cooling Question

The literature emphasizes that collapse requires efficient cooling ($t_{\rm cool} \lesssim t_{\rm dyn}$) and isothermal evolution. An apparent circularity exists:

At low densities ($n \sim$ 1–10 cm^{-3}, diffuse cloud conditions), cooling is inefficient because collisional processes scale as $\Lambda \propto n^2$. With $t_{\rm cool} \gg t_{\rm dyn}$, gravity alone cannot overcome thermal pressure.

At intermediate densities ($n \sim 10^3$–10^5 cm^{-3}), H_2 cooling and dust emission become efficient. But this is *after* density has already increased by orders of magnitude.

However, this circularity is *resolved* in the literature, contrary to some critiques. The key insight is that *non-gravitational compression*—primarily turbulent shocks and converging flows—can increase density without requiring self-gravity. Audit and Hennebelle [2005] and Heitsch et al. [2008] explicitly model the warm-to-cold neutral medium transition via converging flows, demonstrating that the WNM→CNM→molecular pathway proceeds through ram pressure compression and thermal instability, not gravitational collapse.

The "loitering point" identified by Masunaga and Inutsuka [1999] at $n \sim 10^3$ cm^{-3} marks where compressional heating balances cooling, creating a quasi-equilibrium. Gas reaches this density through shock compression; whether it subsequently collapses depends on whether the accumulated mass exceeds the local Jeans mass.

The remaining question is not circularity but *probability*: what fraction of shock-compressed gas achieves the requisite density and mass before re-expanding? This is addressed statistically by turbulent PDF theories, which predict that only a small fraction ($\sim$ 1–10%) of cloud mass reaches collapse conditions—consistent with observed star formation efficiencies.

5 The Initial Condition Problem

Contemporary models frequently assume initial conditions that effectively presuppose the outcome they seek to explain.

5.1 Turbulence as a Given

The literature assumes supersonic turbulence ($\mathcal{M} > 1$) as a background condition. But turbulence dissipates on an eddy turnover timescale. For a diffuse cloud, the dissipation timescale can be comparable to or shorter than the free-fall timescale.

What maintains turbulence against dissipation? Possible drivers include supernovae, galactic shear, protostellar outflows, and gravitational instability itself. But this introduces dependence on external events that are not part of the collapse physics per se.

The question becomes: why should collapse mechanisms work whenever external driving happens, and conversely, why doesn't collapse occur everywhere external driving exists? The answer—that multiple conditions must align favorably—transforms the problem from one of mechanism sufficiency to one of probability.

5.2 The "Near-Critical" Assumption

Models of magnetically-regulated collapse frequently assume clouds are "marginally critical" or "just subcritical," positioned to become supercritical with modest flux loss. But the observed distribution of mass-to-flux ratios is not strongly peaked at the critical value [Crutcher, 2012].

Why are clouds not predominantly supercritical (already collapsing) or strongly subcritical (permanently stable)? Invoking a narrow distribution of initial conditions risks circular reasoning: observational selection of clouds in the "right" regime to demonstrate collapse mechanisms.

5.3 The Chicken-and-Egg of Cooling

Efficient cooling requires:

- H_2 formation, which requires dust surfaces
- Dust grains, which are destroyed in strong shocks
- UV shielding, which requires high column density

High dust content requires a low-density environment free from destructive shocks. But shocks are invoked to initiate collapse. High column density requires mass accumulation, which is the process being explained. These requirements appear contradictory and are not simultaneously satisfied at initial conditions.

5.4 The Pushed-Back Paradox: Atomic to Molecular Transition

A significant weakness in the current framework is that many models effectively presuppose their success by starting simulations with already cold, coherent, and marginally bound molecular clouds. This sidesteps the more fundamental question: how do molecular clouds themselves form from the warm, diffuse, atomic interstellar medium?

The atomic-to-molecular transition is governed by the same bidirectional processes under critique [Audit and Hennebelle, 2005, Glover and Mac Low, 2007]. Converging flows in the warm neutral medium must create sufficient column density for H_2 self-shielding and dust shielding against photodissociating UV radiation. This requires:

1. Sustained convergence without disruptive shear
2. Cooling from atomic (Lyα, C II) to molecular (CO, H_2) phases
3. Magnetic field configurations that permit compression
4. Sufficient time for molecule formation ($\sim$ 1–3 Myr)

By starting models at the molecular cloud stage, the literature pushes the explanatory burden backward without resolving it. The "paradox" of core formation may simply be inherited from an equally unresolved paradox of cloud formation.

5.5 Galactic Context and Environmental Dependence

The galactic environment introduces additional complications. Galactic tides, differential rotation, and shear flows act on molecular clouds throughout their lifetimes. Recent work [Jeffreson et al., 2025] demonstrates that in some galactic environments, these large-scale forces disrupt clouds more effectively than internal processes can aggregate them.

This environmental dependence challenges the universality of proposed mechanisms. A framework that works in the solar neighborhood may fail in galactic centers, outer disks, or interacting galaxies. The criteria determining which regime applies—and why star formation proceeds at all in hostile environments—are not clearly defined.

Furthermore, feedback from previously formed stars (supernovae, stellar winds, ionizing radiation) disperses parent clouds on timescales comparable to star formation itself [Chevance et al., 2020]. This creates a recycling problem: the paradox of accumulation must be resolved anew in each generation of cloud formation, with initial conditions set by the dispersive aftermath of prior star formation.

6 Quantitative Tensions

Beyond conceptual difficulties, several quantitative inconsistencies emerge from careful analysis.

6.1 The Density Jump Problem

Turbulent shocks achieve density ratios $\chi \sim \mathcal{M}^2 \sim$ 4–100 per shock. A naive calculation suggests that traversing from $n \sim 1$ cm^{-3} to $n \sim 10^{10}$ cm^{-3} via successive $\chi \sim 4$ compressions would require:

$$N_{\text{shocks}} = \frac{\log(10^{10})}{\log(4)} \approx 17 \tag{9}$$

successive compression events affecting the same parcel of gas.

However, this calculation is misleading. The key insight is that turbulent compression need only bring gas to the *threshold* where self-gravity dominates ($M > M_J$); beyond that point, gravitational collapse proceeds continuously without requiring additional shock events. For typical molecular cloud conditions, this threshold occurs at $n \sim 10^4$–10^5 cm^{-3}, requiring only $\sim$ 3–5 compression events from diffuse conditions—a much more plausible scenario.

The remaining question is the *probability* that any given parcel of gas experiences the requisite sequence of compressions without dispersing between events. This is addressed by turbulent PDF theories, which predict that only the high-density tail of the distribution—a small fraction of the total mass—reaches collapse thresholds. The low star formation efficiency ($\epsilon_{\text{ff}} \approx 0.01$) is thus a natural consequence of the statistics, not evidence of theoretical failure.

6.2 The Efficiency Paradox

Observations indicate that star formation is remarkably inefficient: molecular clouds convert only $\sim$ 1–10% of their mass to stars over their lifetimes [Evans et al., 2009, Lada et al., 2010]. This is often cited as evidence that dispersive mechanisms dominate, with collapse occurring only in rare, favorable locations.

Yet this efficiency should be explained, not merely accommodated. If the mechanisms described are sufficient to trigger collapse, why is efficiency so low? If dispersive tendencies dominate, what tips the balance in the minority of cases where stars form? The answer—that conditions must align favorably—is descriptive rather than explanatory.

Furthermore, triggered star formation exhibits higher efficiencies ($\sim$ 10–30%) than "spontaneous" turbulent fragmentation ($\sim$ few percent). If external triggers are more efficient, why don't all clouds experience triggering? If turbulence-dominated clouds are common despite inefficiency, what makes this mode prevalent?

6.3 The Magnetic Field Evolution Problem

Observations show that magnetic field strength scales with density as $B \propto \rho^\alpha$ with $\alpha \sim 0.4$–0.7 [Crutcher, 2012], rather than $\alpha = 0.5$ expected for flux-frozen, isotropic contraction ($B \propto \rho^{2/3}$ for spherical collapse along field lines).

This indicates flux loss, consistent with ambipolar diffusion or reconnection diffusion. But the implied timescale for flux loss is $\sim$ 1–10 Myr. If flux loss is slow (ambipolar diffusion, $t \sim 5$–10 Myr), it cannot explain rapid core formation in turbulent clouds ($t \sim 1$ Myr). If flux loss is fast (turbulent reconnection diffusion), significant magnetic energy must be dissipated—where does this energy go? If it heats the gas, it opposes collapse.

The literature treats ambipolar and reconnection diffusion as independent channels without explaining their relative importance or how they couple dynamically.

6.4 Gravity-Driven Turbulence: A Conflation Problem

A subtle but significant issue is the conflation of externally-driven turbulence with gravitationally-induced motions. The literature typically categorizes turbulence as either "driven" (by supernovae, galactic shear, or protostellar outflows) or "decaying." However, in a self-gravitating system, gravitational contraction itself generates velocity dispersions that observationally resemble turbulence.

This creates a potential double-counting problem. When models attribute collapse to "turbulence-driven" density enhancements, some of the observed "turbulent" velocity field may actually be gravitationally-induced infall. The causal arrow may be reversed: rather than turbulence seeding collapse, incipient collapse may generate the velocity structures interpreted as turbulence.

Disentangling these contributions requires detailed kinematic analysis beyond simple velocity dispersion measurements. Without such separation, claims that turbulence "triggers" collapse may partially reflect the tautology that collapse is occurring where collapse is occurring.

6.5 Microphysical Uncertainties in the Final Stages

The journey from molecular cloud to protostar culminates in the formation of the *first hydrostatic core*—a quasi-equilibrium structure at $n \sim 10^{10}$–10^{13} cm^{-3} where the gas becomes optically thick to its own cooling radiation. At this "opacity limit," thermal pressure rises sharply, temporarily halting collapse.

This transition marks a fundamental change in physics. The processes governing the early stages (large-scale turbulent/MHD dynamics) differ starkly from those controlling the final stages (opacity, radiative transfer, non-ideal MHD at high densities including Ohmic dissipation and the Hall effect). The ionization fraction χ_e, which controls magnetic coupling, depends on cosmic ray penetration, dust grain charging, and thermal ionization—all of which evolve nontrivially through collapse.

The ionization fraction problem: The rate of ambipolar diffusion scales as $\eta_{\rm AD} \propto 1/\chi_e$. A factor-of-ten uncertainty in χ_e—easily within the range of observational and theoretical uncertainties given stochastic cosmic ray flux and variable UV shielding—translates directly to an order-of-magnitude uncertainty in the collapse timescale. This can shift the ambipolar diffusion timescale from "consistent with observed core formation" to "far too slow to be relevant," fundamentally altering which physical regime applies.

The literature often treats χ_e as a fixed scaling parameter rather than deriving it self-consistently from radiative transfer, cosmic ray propagation, and chemical networks. This parametric freedom undermines claims of predictive power: if a key timescale can be adjusted by an order of magnitude, the theory can accommodate almost any observed outcome without actually predicting it.

More broadly, the microphysical parameters are coupled to the dynamical evolution in ways that are not self-consistently modeled. This indicates a *disjointed* process rather than a seamless single mechanism: different physics dominates at different stages, requiring careful matching of solutions across regimes.

7 The Problem of Necessary vs. Sufficient Conditions

A fundamental distinction must be drawn between *necessary conditions* for collapse and *sufficient conditions* that guarantee collapse.

7.1 What the Literature Establishes

The literature convincingly establishes:

1. Necessary conditions for collapse: $M > M_J$ at the core scale, efficient cooling, sufficiently weak magnetic support
2. Mechanisms that *can contribute* to density increase: turbulent shocks, converging flows, cooling, magnetic flux redistribution, external shocks
3. Observed structures consistent with theoretical predictions: filaments, cores, hierarchical fragmentation patterns, mass functions
4. Timescales for collapse once initiated: gravitational free-fall is fast ($\sim 10^5$ yr)

7.2 What Remains Unestablished

The literature does *not* establish:

1. Why collapse occurs rather than dispersal given the bidirectionality of all mechanisms
2. How the system transitions from stable to unstable—the symmetry breaking that selects collapse over equilibrium
3. What sets the initial conditions that enable collapse mechanisms to operate

4. Why timescale orderings are consistent and favorable

5. What prevents post-compression dispersal

6. What terminates fragmentation to produce the observed mass function rather than exclusively low-mass fragments

7.3 Causal Chains vs. Condition Lists

Consider the example of turbulent shock compression. The literature states: "Turbulent shocks create density peaks where M_J drops, enabling collapse."

For this to constitute a *causal* explanation, the following must be established:

1. Turbulence must exist (requires external driving)

2. Shocks must be supersonic ($\mathcal{M} > 1$)

3. Shock-compressed gas must not re-expand (requires confinement mechanism)

4. Collapse must complete before shocks decay (requires timescale matching)

5. Cooling must prevent re-expansion at all intermediate densities

The literature lists these conditions but does not derive them from first principles or explain their coupling. The theory describes a possible pathway, not an inevitable outcome.

8 The Statistical vs. Deterministic Nature of Star Formation

Our analysis suggests that current theory describes star formation as a *statistical process* rather than a *deterministic* one. This distinction has profound implications.

8.1 Star Formation as Probabilistic Filtering

The emerging picture is that of a hierarchical filtering process. The turbulent ISM generates a spectrum of density fluctuations. Most fluctuations disperse. Those that happen to satisfy multiple conditions simultaneously—adequate compression, efficient cooling, weak magnetic support, favorable geometry, absence of disruptive feedback—may proceed to collapse.

This framework explains the observed low efficiency: most structures fail the multi-condition test. It explains environmental variations: different environments weight the probability distribution differently. It explains the stochastic spatial and temporal distribution of star formation.

However, this framework is *descriptive* rather than *predictive*. It cannot, given the properties of a specific molecular cloud, forecast where and when cores will form. It provides a statistical ensemble description, not a deterministic trajectory.

8.2 The Difference from Other Physical Theories

In other areas of physics, we expect theories to predict outcomes given initial conditions. Classical mechanics, given positions and velocities, predicts future states. Statistical mechanics derives macroscopic properties from microscopic distributions.

Star formation theory, as currently formulated, cannot make analogous predictions. Given a molecular cloud's density, temperature, magnetic field, and velocity structure, the theory cannot deterministically predict core formation. It can only assert that cores *may* form if conditions align favorably—a claim consistent with both success and failure.

This is not necessarily a flaw; many complex systems exhibit emergent, probabilistic behavior. But it does indicate that the theory is incomplete in a specific sense: it lacks the predictive power of a closed physical theory.

9 Observational Ambiguities

Several observational features remain incompletely explained by current theory.

9.1 Filamentary Ubiquity

Herschel and other surveys reveal that molecular clouds are dominated by filamentary structures [André et al., 2014, Arzoumanian et al., 2019]. Theory attributes this to converging flows and instabilities.

But why do converging flows preferentially create one-dimensional (filamentary) structures rather than two-dimensional (sheet) or three-dimensional (blob) overdensities? Basic hydrodynamics suggests that two converging planar flows should produce a *sheet* at their interface, not a filament. The ubiquity of filaments therefore implies either:

1. An underlying instability (e.g., the non-linear thin shell instability) that fragments sheets into filaments

2. Specific magnetic field geometries that channel flows into linear structures

3. A selection effect where only filamentary structures survive long enough to be observed

The literature does not clearly distinguish between these possibilities or derive filament formation from first principles. This is not a minor detail: the characteristic width of filaments ($\sim$ 0.1 pc) and their critical line mass set the fragmentation scale for cores. If the theory cannot explain why filaments form, it cannot fully explain core formation either.

Is filamentary structure a consequence of collapse mechanisms, or a prerequisite that enables collapse? The causal direction is unclear, and this ambiguity propagates into assessments of mechanism sufficiency.

9.2 The Core Mass Function

The core mass function (CMF) resembles the stellar initial mass function (IMF), suggesting a direct mapping [Motte et al., 1998, Alves et al., 2007]. Hierarchical fragmentation via Jeans instability predicts that as density increases, M_J decreases, so smaller overdensities become unstable.

This predicts ongoing fragmentation toward smaller masses. What terminates fragmentation? The "opacity limit" at $n \sim 10^{10}$ cm^{-3} provides a minimum fragment mass ~ 0.01 M$_\odot$. But the CMF peaks at ~ 0.5 M$_\odot$, well above this limit.

Magnetic support is invoked [Crutcher, 2012] to halt fragmentation at intermediate masses, but this mechanism is not quantitatively developed. The stopping condition for fragmentation remains poorly constrained.

9.3 The Angular Momentum Problem

A critical but often under-integrated aspect of core formation is the angular momentum budget. Molecular clouds and cores possess rotation and angular momentum inherited from galactic shear and turbulent motions. For collapse to proceed to protostellar scales, approximately 99% of the initial angular momentum must be shed—otherwise centrifugal support would halt contraction at scales far larger than observed protostars.

The primary mechanism invoked is *magnetic braking*: as a rotating, magnetized core contracts, torsional Alfvén waves propagate along field lines, transferring angular momentum to the surrounding envelope [Mouschovias and Paleologou, 1981]. However, this process is so efficient in ideal MHD simulations that it produces what has been termed the "magnetic braking catastrophe"—disks fail to form entirely, contradicting ubiquitous observations of protoplanetary disks.

Resolution requires non-ideal MHD effects (ambipolar diffusion, Ohmic dissipation, Hall effect) to decouple the magnetic field from the collapsing gas at appropriate scales. Yet these effects depend sensitively on ionization fraction, which evolves during collapse in ways that are not self-consistently modeled. The literature acknowledges the problem but does not integrate angular momentum evolution into a unified collapse framework.

9.4 The High-Mass Star Formation Problem

The formation of massive stars ($M > 8$ M$_\odot$) presents additional paradoxes beyond those affecting low-mass star formation. As a massive protostar grows, its luminosity increases dramatically ($L \propto M^{3-4}$), generating radiation pressure that theoretically should halt further accretion once $M \gtrsim 20$–40 M$_\odot$. Yet stars exceeding 100 M$_\odot$ are observed.

Proposed resolutions include the "flashlight effect" [Yorke and Sonnhalter, 2002], where radiation escapes preferentially along polar cavities cleared by outflows, reducing the effective radiation pressure on the accretion disk. Disk-mediated accretion [Zinnecker and Yorke, 2007] channels mass onto the star through geometrically thin structures that intercept less radiation. Competitive accretion in clustered environments [Bonnell et al., 2001] allows massive stars to grow by accreting from a shared gas reservoir.

While these mechanisms are physically plausible, they require specific geometric and environmental conditions. The question of whether massive star formation proceeds via scaled-up versions of low-mass mechanisms or requires qualitatively different physics (e.g., global cloud collapse rather than local fragmentation) remains debated. This uncertainty propagates into the sufficiency assessment: if different mechanisms dominate at different mass scales, the integrated theory is correspondingly less unified.

9.5 The Absence of a Universal Core Formation Criterion

Despite decades of research, no universal criterion exists for identifying regions that *will* form cores versus those that will disperse. Virial parameter ($\alpha_{\rm vir}$), mass-to-flux ratio (μ), Jeans number, and other diagnostics provide necessary but not sufficient conditions.

This observational ambiguity mirrors the theoretical incompleteness: we can identify regions where collapse *could* occur but cannot predict where it *will* occur.

10 Assessment and Conclusions

10.1 What Current Theory Accomplishes

Contemporary star formation theory accomplishes the following:

1. **Physical plausibility:** The mechanisms invoked do not violate known physics. Collapse from diffuse cloud to protostellar core is demonstrably possible within the framework of hydrodynamics, MHD, and thermodynamics.

2. **Observational concordance:** Simulations and analytic models reproduce many observed properties: filamentary structure, core mass functions, low efficiency, environmental variations, magnetic field scaling.

3. **Mechanism identification:** The field has cataloged the physical processes that can contribute to collapse: turbulent compression, converging flows, thermal instability, magnetic flux loss, external triggering.

4. **Timescale estimation:** Once collapse begins, theoretical timescales match observations reasonably well.

5. **Statistical prediction:** The star formation rate per free-fall time $\epsilon_{\rm ff} \approx 0.01$ is successfully derived from turbulent density PDFs [Krumholz and McKee, 2005, Federrath and Klessen, 2012], matching observations across diverse environments. The virial parameter $\alpha_{\rm vir}$ provides a useful predictor: clouds with $\alpha_{\rm vir} < 2$ preferentially form stars.

6. **IMF prediction:** Analytic theories [Hennebelle and Chabrier, 2008, Padoan et al., 2014] derive the stellar initial mass function from turbulent fragmentation, achieving reasonable agreement with observations.

These accomplishments represent genuine predictive success within a statistical framework appropriate for turbulent systems.

10.2 Remaining Gaps

Despite these successes, gaps remain:

1. **Individual prediction:** The theory predicts statistical distributions but cannot forecast which specific density fluctuation will collapse. Whether this is a gap or an intrinsic limitation of chaotic systems is debatable.

2. **Causal chain:** The theory identifies threshold conditions but does not fully explain why ISM conditions evolve to cross these thresholds in specific locations.

3. **Initial condition derivation:** While modern simulations form clouds self-consistently, the connection from galactic-scale dynamics to cloud properties remains incompletely understood.

4. **Mechanism integration:** How turbulence, magnetic fields, and thermal physics couple non-linearly to produce emergent behavior is not fully characterized.

10.3 Verdict: Successful Statistical Theory with Room for Deeper Understanding

We conclude that the mechanisms described in contemporary literature are **necessary and sufficient to demonstrate that collapse can occur without violating known physics**. Moreover, recent theoretical advances achieve genuine **statistical predictive power**: given turbulence properties, the theory correctly predicts star formation rates, efficiencies, and mass distributions.

This represents substantial success. For an intrinsically turbulent, chaotic system, statistical prediction may be the appropriate and achievable standard—analogous to climate science, which predicts statistical properties without forecasting individual weather events.

However, opportunities for deeper understanding remain. The theory explains *what* the collapse thresholds are and *how often* they are crossed, but not fully *why* ISM conditions evolve to cross them in specific locations. The current framework can be understood as a "relay race" model: different mechanisms hand off the collapse process across scales and density regimes. This relay successfully spans the density gap, and we can predict what fraction of races complete successfully. But we do not yet fully understand the dynamics that determine which specific races succeed.

10.4 No New Mechanisms Required

Importantly, our critique does *not* imply that new physical mechanisms are required. The identified processes—turbulence, magnetic fields, thermal physics, gravity—are demonstrably at work in star-forming regions and are consistent with observations. The gap is not in mechanism identification but in *integration*: understanding how these bidirectional processes couple non-linearly to produce the observed, statistically robust outcome of star formation at ~ 1–10% efficiency.

The path forward lies not in discovering new physics but in developing deeper theoretical frameworks that explain why the interplay of known bidirectional forces consistently breaks symmetry to favor accumulation over dispersal in specific locations and at specific times.

10.5 Path Forward

Closing this theoretical gap requires advances on several fronts:

1. **Bifurcation analysis:** Rigorous identification of the exact density, temperature, and magnetic field thresholds where gravity breaks the symmetry of turbulent dispersal. The ISM should be treated as a non-linear dynamical system with multiple attractors (dispersed equilibrium, gravitational collapse). The goal is to map the *bifurcation surface* in parameter space that

separates these basins of attraction. Concepts from catastrophe theory—fold bifurcations, hysteresis, critical slowing—may illuminate why certain density fluctuations grow irreversibly while others disperse.

2. **Coupled instability theory:** Moving beyond single-mechanism analyses to study the *coupled* behavior of thermal, gravitational, and magnetic instabilities. The relevant question is not whether each instability can operate in isolation, but how their coupling produces emergent behavior not predictable from individual mechanisms. This requires formal stability analysis of the full MHD equations with realistic cooling functions, not linearized approximations around idealized equilibria.

3. **Self-consistent microphysics:** Coupling ionization fraction, cooling rates, and magnetic diffusivity evolution self-consistently through the collapse trajectory rather than treating them as free parameters. This requires radiative transfer, chemical networks, cosmic ray propagation, and non-ideal MHD to be solved simultaneously with dynamics—a computationally demanding but necessary step toward predictive theory.

4. **Initial condition theory:** Developing predictive models for turbulent driving, magnetic field generation, and molecular cloud assembly from galactic-scale flows. Current simulations often begin with pre-formed clouds; a complete theory must derive cloud properties from galactic dynamics, closing the explanatory chain from kiloparsec to AU scales.

5. **End-to-end simulations:** Three-dimensional MHD simulations that do not assume an initial molecular cloud but rather form the cloud and the core simultaneously from the diffuse warm neutral medium. Such simulations would test whether the full pathway from atomic ISM to protostellar core emerges naturally or requires fine-tuned initial conditions.

6. **Observational discrimination:** Designing observations that can distinguish between regions destined to collapse and those destined to disperse *before* the outcome is evident. Next-generation facilities—JWST for embedded protostars, ALMA for core kinematics, SKA for magnetic field mapping, and proposed far-infrared missions—offer unprecedented access to the physical conditions in pre- and proto-stellar environments. The key is identifying observational signatures that predict future evolution, not merely describe current states.

These advances would move the field from successful statistical description toward deeper causal understanding. The goal is not to replace probabilistic prediction with deterministic forecasting—which may be impossible for turbulent systems—but to understand *why* the statistics emerge as they do from the underlying physics.

Star formation theory has achieved remarkable success in explaining the "how" and "how much" of stellar birth. The remaining frontier is the "why here" and "why now"—understanding not just that collapse thresholds exist and are crossed with predictable frequency, but why the ISM evolves to cross them in specific locations. This represents an opportunity for theoretical advance rather than a crisis of the field. The mechanisms are identified; the statistics are predicted; what remains is the deeper integration that transforms correlation into causation.

Acknowledgments

[Acknowledgments to be added]

References

J. H. Jeans. The stability of a spherical nebula. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London A*, 199:1–53, 1902. doi: 10.1098/rsta.1902.0012.

M.-M. Mac Low and R. S. Klessen. Control of star formation by supersonic turbulence. *Re-*

views of Modern Physics, 76:125–194, 2004. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.76.125.

P. Padoan and Å. Nordlund. The stellar initial mass function from turbulent fragmentation. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 576:870–879, 2002. doi: 10.1086/341790.

C. Federrath. Inefficient star formation through turbulence, magnetic fields and feedback. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 450:4035–4042, 2015. doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv941.

E. Vázquez-Semadeni, R. Banerjee, G. C. Gómez, P. Hennebelle, D. Duffin, and R. S. Klessen. Molecular cloud evolution iv. magnetic fields, ambipolar diffusion and the star formation efficiency. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 414:2511–2527, 2011. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2966.2011.18569.x.

P. André et al. From filamentary clouds to prestellar cores to the stellar imf: Initial highlights from the herschel gould belt survey. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 518:L102, 2010. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201014666.

F. Heitsch, L. W. Hartmann, A. D. Slyz, J. E. G. Devriendt, and A. Burkert. Cooling, gravity, and geometry: Flow-driven molecular cloud formation. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 674: 316–328, 2008. doi: 10.1086/523697.

G. B. Field. Thermal instability. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 142:531–567, 1965. doi: 10.1086/148317.

R. B. Larson. Numerical calculations of the dynamics of a collapsing proto-star. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 145: 271–295, 1969. doi: 10.1093/mnras/145.3.271.

T. Ch. Mouschovias and G. E. Ciolek. Magnetic fields and star formation: A theory reaching adulthood. *The Origin of Stars and Planetary Systems*, 540:305–340, 1999.

T. Ch. Mouschovias, K. Tassis, and M. W. Kunz. Observational constraints on the ages of molecular clouds and the star formation timescale. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 646: 1043–1049, 2006. doi: 10.1086/500125.

A. Lazarian. Astrophysical implications of turbulent reconnection: from cosmic rays to star formation. *Magnetic Fields in the Universe: From Laboratory and Stars to Primordial Structures*, 784:42–53, 2005. doi: 10.1063/1.2077168.

M. R. M. Leão, E. M. de Gouveia Dal Pino, R. Santos-Lima, and A. Lazarian. The collapse of turbulent cores and reconnection diffusion. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 434:2749–2764, 2013. doi: 10.1093/mnras/stt1118.

B. G. Elmegreen and C. J. Lada. Sequential formation of subgroups in ob associations. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 214:725–741, 1977. doi: 10.1086/155302.

A. P. Boss and S. A. Keiser. Collapse and fragmentation of molecular cloud cores. x. magnetic braking of initially nonmagnetized spheroids. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 717: 1067–1077, 2010. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/717/2/1067.

Y. Fukui et al. Cloud-cloud collisions and triggered star formation. *Publications of the Astronomical Society of Japan*, 73:S1–S34, 2021. doi: 10.1093/pasj/psaa103.

Mark R. Krumholz and Christopher F. McKee. A general theory of turbulence-regulated star formation, from spirals to ultraluminous infrared galaxies. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 630:250–268, 2005. doi: 10.1086/431734.

Christoph Federrath and Ralf S. Klessen. The star formation rate of turbulent magnetized clouds: Comparing theory, simulations, and observations. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 761: 156, 2012. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/761/2/156.

Paolo Padoan, Christoph Federrath, Gilles Chabrier, et al. The star formation rate of molecular clouds. *Protostars and Planets VI*, pages 77–100, 2014. doi: 10.2458/azu_uapress_9780816531240-ch004.

R. S. Klessen, F. Heitsch, and M.-M. Mac Low. Gravoturbulent star formation. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 601:1074–1086, 2004. doi: 10.1086/380847.

C. Federrath, J. Roman-Duval, R. S. Klessen, W. Schmidt, and M.-M. Mac Low. Comparing the statistics of interstellar turbulence in simulations and observations. solenoidal versus compressive turbulence forcing. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 512:A81, 2010. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/200912437.

T. Inoue and Y. Fukui. Formation of massive molecular cloud cores by cloud-cloud collision. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 774:L31, 2013. doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/774/2/L31.

D. Arzoumanian et al. Characterizing interstellar filaments with herschel in ic 5146. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 529:L6, 2011. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201116596.

P. C. Myers. Filamentary structure of star-forming complexes. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 700:1609–1625, 2009. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/700/2/1609.

N. Schneider, T. Csengeri, M. Hennemann, et al. Cluster-forming filaments in the cygnus x cloud revealed by herschel. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 540:L11, 2012. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201118566.

J. Ostriker. The equilibrium of polytropic and isothermal cylinders. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 140:1056–1066, 1964. doi: 10.1086/148005.

F. Nakamura and Z.-Y. Li. Magnetically regulated star formation in three dimensions: The case of the taurus molecular cloud complex. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 631:411–428, 2005. doi: 10.1086/432606.

N. Furukawa, J. R. Dawson, A. Ohama, et al. Molecular clouds toward rcw 49 and westerlund 2: Evidence for cluster formation triggered by cloud-cloud collision. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 696:L115–L119, 2009. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/696/2/L115.

S. Walch, P. Girichidis, T. Naab, et al. The silcc (simulating the lifecycle of molecular clouds) project - i. chemical evolution of the supernova-driven ism. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 454:238–268, 2015. doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv1975.

P. Girichidis, S. Walch, T. Naab, et al. The silcc (simulating the lifecycle of molecular clouds) project - ii. dynamical evolution of the supernova-driven ism and the launching of outflows. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 456:3432–3455, 2016. doi: 10.1093/mnras/stv2742.

Chang-Goo Kim and Eve C. Ostriker. Three-phase interstellar medium in galaxies resolving evolution with star formation and supernova feedback (tigress): Algorithms, fiducial model, and convergence. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 846:133, 2017. doi: 10.3847/1538-4357/aa8599.

Patrick Hennebelle and Gilles Chabrier. Analytical theory for the initial mass function: Co clumps and prestellar cores. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 684:395–410, 2008. doi: 10.1086/589916.

Patrick Hennebelle and Gilles Chabrier. Analytical theory for the initial mass function. ii. properties of the flow. *The Astrophysical Journal Letters*, 743:L29, 2011. doi: 10.1088/2041-8205/743/2/L29.

J. Ballesteros-Paredes, E. Vázquez-Semadeni, and J. Scalo. Clouds as turbulent density fluctuations: Implications for pressure confinement and spectral line data interpretation. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 515:286–303, 1999. doi: 10.1086/307007.

E. Audit and P. Hennebelle. Thermal condensation in a turbulent atomic hydrogen flow. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 433:1–13, 2005. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20041474.

H. Masunaga and S. Inutsuka. A radiation hydrodynamic model for protostellar collapse. i. the first collapse. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 531:350–365, 1999. doi: 10.1086/308439.

R. M. Crutcher. Magnetic fields in molecular clouds. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 50:29–63, 2012. doi: 10.1146/annurev-astro-081811-125514.

S. C. O. Glover and M.-M. Mac Low. Simulating the formation of molecular clouds. i. slow formation by gravitational collapse from static initial conditions. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement*, 169:239–268, 2007. doi: 10.1086/512238.

S. M. R. Jeffreson, M. R. Krumholz, et al. Environmental dependence of molecular cloud properties. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 2025. in press.

M. Chevance et al. The lifecycle of molecular clouds in nearby star-forming disc galaxies. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 493:2872–2909, 2020. doi: 10.1093/mnras/stz3525.

N. J. Evans et al. The spitzer c2d legacy results: Star-formation rates and efficiencies; evolution and lifetimes. *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement*, 181:321–350, 2009. doi: 10.1088/0067-0049/181/2/321.

C. J. Lada, M. Lombardi, and J. F. Alves. On the star formation rates in molecular clouds. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 724:687–693, 2010. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/724/1/687.

P. André, J. Di Francesco, D. Ward-Thompson, S.-I. Inutsuka, R. E. Pudritz, and J. E. Pineda. From filamentary networks to dense cores in molecular clouds: Toward a new paradigm for star formation. *Protostars and Planets VI*, pages 27–51, 2014. doi: 10.2458/azu_uapress_9780816531240-ch002.

D. Arzoumanian et al. Characterizing the properties of nearby molecular filaments observed with herschel. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 621:A42, 2019. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201832725.

F. Motte, P. André, and R. Neri. The initial conditions of star formation in the ρ ophiuchi main cloud: wide-field millimeter continuum mapping. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 336:150–172, 1998.

J. Alves, M. Lombardi, and C. J. Lada. The mass function of dense molecular cores and the origin of the imf. *Astronomy & Astrophysics*, 462:L17–L21, 2007. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361:20066389.

T. Ch. Mouschovias and E. V. Paleologou. Magnetic braking of an aligned rotator during star formation. i. exact solution. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 246:48–64, 1981. doi: 10.1086/158897.

H. W. Yorke and C. Sonnhalter. On the formation of massive stars. *The Astrophysical Journal*, 569:846–862, 2002. doi: 10.1086/339264.

H. Zinnecker and H. W. Yorke. Toward understanding massive star formation. *Annual Review of Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 45:481–563, 2007. doi: 10.1146/annurev.astro.44.051905.092549.

I. A. Bonnell, M. R. Bate, C. J. Clarke, and J. E. Pringle. Competitive accretion in embedded stellar clusters. *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 323:785–794, 2001. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-8711.2001.04270.x.