

Star Formation Main Sequence in a Hierarchical Universe

ChangHoon Hahn¹, Jeremy L. Tinker², Andrew R. Wetzel^{3,4,5}

changhoon.hahn@lbl.gov

DRAFT --- b6a58e0 --- 2017-10-27 --- NOT READY FOR DISTRIBUTION

ABSTRACT

motivation, methodology, impact. In observations star forming galaxies form a tight $\log M_*$ to $\log SFR$ relation referred to as the *star formation main sequence* (SFMS) out to $z \sim 2$. Beyond the evolution “along” this SFMS, however, the star formation histories of star forming galaxies have not been precisely characterized. The SFH of these galaxies govern SMF, SFMS, and also observed constraints on the stellar mass to halo mass relation.

By combining high-resolution cosmological N -body simulation with observed evolutionary trends of SF galaxies, we construct a model that tracks the evolution of star forming central galaxies over the redshift $z < 1$. Comparing this model

Observations find a remarkably small scatter in the stellar mass to halo mass relation. Somehow the star formation histories of galaxies must

According to observations, star forming galaxies form a tight $\log M_*$ to $\log SFR$ relation referred to as the “star formation main sequence” out to $z \sim 2$.

Subject headings: methods: numerical – galaxies: clusters: general – galaxies: groups: general – galaxies: evolution – galaxies: haloes – galaxies: star formation – cosmology: observations.

Checklist

- Check the correlation between halo growth rate with different t_{delay} and δt_{bias} with the total halo growth rate between $z \sim 0$ and $z \sim 1$.

¹Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, Berkeley, CA 94720

²Center for Cosmology and Particle Physics, Department of Physics, New York University, 4 Washington Place, New York, NY 10003

³TAPIR, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA USA

⁴Carnegie Observatories, Pasadena, CA USA

⁵Department of Physics, University of California, Davis, CA USA

1. Introduction

- Motivate why we think SF galaxies evolve along the main sequence
- Discuss the current thought process on galaxy assembly bias
- Explain the limitation of SFH derivable from observations (Claire’s fisher matrix paper would be really good; ask her about the details)
- Observations also can’t provide detail host dark matter halo properties
- So the approach with combining observations with N-body (empirical modeling) is very effective in the context of the halo.
- Maybe talk about how the bigger context of why this is important?
- Why only centrals – because our current best understanding of satellites is that they quench after infall, so it doesn’t make sense to look at them

2. Central Galaxies of SDSS DR7

We construct our galaxy sample following the sample selection of Tinker et al. (2011). We select a volume-limited sample of galaxies with $M_r 5\log(h) < 18$ and complete in $M_* > 10^{9.4} M_\odot$ from the NYU Value-Added Galaxy Catalog (VAGC; Blanton et al. 2005) of the Sloan Digital Sky Survey Data Release 7 (SDSS DR7; Abazajian et al. 2009) at $z \approx 0.04$. The stellar masses of these galaxies are estimated using the `kcorrect` code (Blanton & Roweis 2007) assuming a Chabrier (2003) initial mass function. The star formation of the galaxies are estimated spectroscopically using the specific star formation rates (SSFR) from the current release of the MPA-JHU spectral reductions¹ (Brinchmann et al. 2004). Generally speaking, $\text{SSFR} > 10^{-11} \text{yr}^{-1}$ are derived from $\text{H}\alpha$ emission, $10^{-11} > \text{SSFR} > 10^{-12} \text{yr}^{-1}$ are derived from a combination of emission lines, and $\text{SSFR} < 10^{-12} \text{yr}^{-1}$ are based on D_n4000 (see discussion in Wetzel et al. 2013). We note that $\text{SSFR} < 10^{-12} \text{yr}^{-1}$ should only be considered upper limits to the true galaxy SSFR (Salim et al. 2007).

From our galaxy sample, we identify the central galaxies using the Tinker et al. (2011) halo-based group-finding algorithm, which is based on the Yang et al. (2005) algorithm and tested in Campbell et al. (2015). The algorithm assigns a probability of being a satellite galaxy, P_{sat} , to each galaxy in the sample. Galaxies with $P_{\text{sat}} \geq 0.5$ are classified as satellites and $P_{\text{sat}} < 0.5$ are classified as centrals. In this paper we focus on central galaxies. In any group finding algorithm, galaxies are misassigned due to projection effects and redshift space distortions. The purity of the full central galaxy sample is $\sim 90\%$ with a completeness of

¹<http://wwwmpa.mpa-garching.mpg.de/SDSS/DR7/>

$\sim 95\%$ (Tinker et al. 2017). Furthermore, Campbell et al. (2015) find that the algorithm robustly identifies red and blue centrals as a function of stellar mass, which is highly relevant to our analysis.

In the left panel of Figure 1, we plot the SFR- M_* distribution of the SDSS DR7 central galaxies. In the right panel, we plot the distribution of SSFR, $p(\log \text{SSFR})$, for galaxies with $10.6 < \log M_* < 10.8$ (stellar mass range highlighted on the left panel). Both panels of Figure 1 illustrate the bimodality in the galaxy sample. The SFR- M_* distribution also illustrates the correlation between SFR and M_* in star-forming galaxies *i.e.* the star-formation main sequence (SFMS).

2.1. Simulated Central Galaxies

We’re interesting in constructing a model that tracks central galaxies and their star formation within the hierarchical growth of their host halos. This requires a cosmological N -body simulation that accounts for the complex dynamical processes that govern the host halos of galaxies. In this paper we use the high resolution N -body simulation from Wetzel et al. (2013) generated using the White (2002) **TreePM** code with flat Λ CDM cosmology ($\Omega_m = 0.274$, $\Omega_b = 0.0457$, $h = 0.7$, $n = 0.95$, and $\sigma_8 = 0.8$). 2048^3 particles with mass of $1.98 \times 10^8 M_\odot$ are evolved in a $250 \text{Mpc}/h$ with a Plummer equivalent smoothing of $2.5 \text{kpc}/h$ from initial conditions at $z = 150$ generated using second-order Lagrangian Perturbation Theory. For a more detailed description of the simulation, we refer readers to Wetzel et al. (2013, 2014).

From the TreePM N -body simulation, ‘host halos’ are identified using the Friends-of-Friends (FoF) algorithm of Davis et al. (1985) with linking length of $b = 0.168$ times the mean inter-particle spacing. Within these host halos, Wetzel et al. (2013) identifies ‘subhalos’ as overdensities in phase space through a six-dimensional FoF algorithm (FoF6D White et al. 2010). The host halos and subhalos are then tracked across the 45 simulation outputs from $z = 10$ to 0 to build merger trees (Wetzel et al. 2009; Wetzel & White 2010). The most massive subhalos in newly-formed host halos at a given simulation output are defined as the ‘central’ subhalo. A central subhalo retains its ‘central’ definition until it falls into a more massive host halo. At this point it becomes a ‘satellite’ subhalo.

Each subhalo is assigned a M_{peak} , the maximum host halo mass that it ever had as a central subhalo. Using M_{peak} , a galaxy catalog is constructed from the subhalos using subhalo abundance matching (SHAM; Vale & Ostriker 2006; Yang et al. 2009; Wetzel et al. 2012, 2013, 2014; Hahn et al. 2017a) **citations conroy2006, leja2013**. In principle, SHAM assumes a one-to-one mapping that preserves the rank ordering between subhalo M_{peak} and galaxy stellar mass M_* : $n(> M_{\text{peak}}) > n(> M_*)$. Using this mapping, we can assign galaxy stellar mass to subhalos based on observed stellar mass functions (SMFs) at the redshifts of the simulation outputs (snapshots). By assigning galaxy M_* independently at each snapshot,

we not only track the evolution of subhalos, but also the evolution of the galaxies’ M_* .

In our SHAM prescription, we use the SMF from Li & White (2009) at $z = 0.05$ and interpolate at higher redshifts between the Li & White (2009) SMF and the SMF from ? at $z = 1.6$. We choose the Li & White (2009) SMF because it is based on the same SDSS NYU-VAGC sample as our SDSS DR7 group catalog (see Section 2). We choose the ? SMF, amongst others, because it produces interpolated SMFs that monotonically increase at $z < 1$. As noted in Hahn et al. (2017b), at $z \approx 1$, the SMF interpolated between the Li & White (2009) and ? SMFs is consistent with more recent measurements from Muzzin et al. (2013) and Ilbert et al. (2013). In this paper, as we describe later in this section, we are only interested in the snapshots at $z \approx 1$ and 0.05.

While SHAM in principle assumes a one-to-one mapping, observations find a significant scatter in this stellar mass to halo mass mapping ($\sigma_{\log M_*}$). Gu et al. (2016) compile Hence, when we use SHAM to construct our galaxy catalogs, we apply a 0.2 dex log-normal scatter in M at fixed M_{peak} .

In Section A,

2.2. Selecting $z \sim 0$ Star Forming Central Galaxies

- Describe how f_{SFMS} is calculated. Reference to Tjitske in prep
- Then explain how it’s not circular because the integrated M_* has to reproduce the same SMF

2.3. Evolving along the Main Sequence

- Talk about the SFR and M_* prescriptions
- parameterization of SFMS
- explicitly talk about the free parameters of the model.
- priors for β_M and β_z encompass the observable constraints
- talk about inference using ABC

3. Results

3.1. The duty cycle of star formation

- Figure that illustrates the fit to observables
- Figure of sigma M star as a function of duty cycle compared to observations

3.2. The need for a galaxy assembly bias

- discuss how t_{duty} is not enough to be consistent with σ_{M_*} .
- first clarify what you mean by galaxy assembly bias
- discuss implementation of galaxy assembly bias
- Figure (pedagogical) of $d\log SFR$ versus $dM_h dt$ for different correlation amounts
- Figure of different t_{delay} and dt_{bias}
- Figure of σ_{M_*} as a function of duty cycle and realistic dt_{bias} and t_{delay}

4. Discussion

4.1. Rethinking the Main Sequence?

- Test the SMHMR for Louis’s SFHs

5. Summary

A. $z \sim 1$ observations

Much of the results presented in this paper are based on comparison between our model and observations at $z \sim 0$. Our model is initialized at $z \sim 1$. Therefore, in this section we test some of the choices we make in our initializations.

- Test impact of $z \sim 1$ SMF
- Test impact of $z \sim 1$ $\sigma_{\log M_*}$

Acknowledgements

Louis Abramson

REFERENCES

- Abazajian, K. N., Adelman-McCarthy, J. K., Agüeros, M. A., et al. 2009, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series, 182, 543
- Blanton, M. R., & Roweis, S. 2007, The Astronomical Journal, 133, 734
- Blanton, M. R., Schlegel, D. J., Strauss, M. A., et al. 2005, The Astronomical Journal, 129, 2562




Fig. 1.— SDSS DR7 Group Catalog. Fitting of the SFMS.




Fig. 2.— SFMS fraction versus quiescent fraction from Hahn




Fig. 3.— Pedagogical figure that illustrates how star forming central galaxies in our model evolve along the SFMS.




Fig. 4.—

- Brinchmann, J., Charlot, S., White, S. D. M., et al. 2004, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 351, 1151
- Campbell, D., van den Bosch, F. C., Hearin, A., et al. 2015, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 452, 444
- Chabrier, G. 2003, *Publications of the Astronomical Society of the Pacific*, 115, 763
- Davis, M., Efstathiou, G., Frenk, C. S., & White, S. D. M. 1985, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 292, 371
- Gu, M., Conroy, C., & Behroozi, P. 2016, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 833, 2
- Hahn, C., Tinker, J. L., & Wetzel, A. R. 2017a, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 841, 6
- Hahn, C., Vakili, M., Walsh, K., et al. 2017b, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 469, 2791
- Ilbert, O., McCracken, H. J., Le Fèvre, O., et al. 2013, *Astronomy and Astrophysics*, 556, A55
- Li, C., & White, S. D. M. 2009, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 398, 2177
- Muzzin, A., Marchesini, D., Stefanon, M., et al. 2013, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 777, 18
- Salim, S., Rich, R. M., Charlot, S., et al. 2007, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 173, 267
- Tinker, J., Wetzel, A., & Conroy, C. 2011, *ArXiv e-prints*, 1107, arXiv:1107.5046
- Tinker, J. L., Hahn, C., Mao, Y.-Y., & Wetzel, A. R. 2017, arXiv:1705.08458 [astro-ph], arXiv:1705.08458 [astro-ph]
- Vale, A., & Ostriker, J. P. 2006, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 371, 1173
- Wetzel, A. R., Cohn, J. D., & White, M. 2009, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 395, 1376
- Wetzel, A. R., Tinker, J. L., & Conroy, C. 2012, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 424, 232
- Wetzel, A. R., Tinker, J. L., Conroy, C., & van den Bosch, F. C. 2013, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 432, 336
- . 2014, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 439, 2687
- Wetzel, A. R., & White, M. 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 403, 1072
- White, M. 2002, *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series*, 143, 241
- White, M., Cohn, J. D., & Smit, R. 2010, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 408, 1818
- Yang, X., Mo, H. J., & van den Bosch, F. C. 2009, *The Astrophysical Journal*, 695, 900
- Yang, X., Mo, H. J., van den Bosch, F. C., & Jing, Y. P. 2005, *Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society*, 356, 1293




Fig. 5.—