







ASTR615 HW#4

Group 4: ChongChong He & Mohammed Khalil
November 21, 2017





1 Problem 1


2nd order leapfrog vs. 4th order Runge-Kutta for $e = 0.5$





2nd order leapfrog vs. 4th order Runge-Kutta for $e = 0.9$





Comments

- Leapfrog is better at conserving energy. For $e = 0.9$, the energy error in RK4 reaches 90% after 100 periods. While in LF2, the fractional change in energy oscillates with a maximum error of 5%.
- This is also clear from the phase diagram; LF2 repeats almost exactly the same cycle, while RK4 produces larger errors since the separation decreases continually as the system loses energy.
- LF2 leads to larger phase error than RK4. After 100 periods, the phase error is almost $\pi/2$ for LF2 (at the given time step), while the phase remains almost the same for RK4.
- Therefore, leapfrog is more practical for N-body simulations with long simulation time, while Runge-Kutta is more accurate for small simulation time.

Problem 2

We perform a series of simulations of globular clusters.

Stellar Cluster

We did a few simulations of stellar clusters with made-up initial conditions

Mass distribution

We implement in all of our simulations the Kroupa IMF:

$$\phi(m) \propto \begin{cases} m^{-1.3} & (0.08M_{\odot} < m < 0.5M_{\odot}) \\ 0.5m^{-2.3} & (0.5M_{\odot} < m < 100M_{\odot}) \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

after doing transformation we get

$$m = \begin{cases} -\frac{0.566179}{\sqrt[3]{1.7987 - x}(x^3 - 5.39611x^2 + 9.70599x - 5.81939)} & (0 < x < 0.760707) \\ \frac{0.166558}{(1.00024 - x)^{10/13}} & (0.760707 < x < 1) \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where x is a random number between 0 and 1. Figure 1 shows the histogram of the masses of the generated particles as compared to the analytical line.




Figure 1: The mass distribution of the particles in our simulation compared to analytical Kroupa IMF lines.

Spacial and velocity distribution

The cluster is a specially uniformly distributed sphere with a radius of 1. The initial velocities are from a Gaussian distribution with a dispersion correspondent to a virial ratio of $\alpha \sim 0.4$. A virial ratio $\alpha < 0.5$ implies the system is bounded. The velocity dispersion in one axis is $\sigma_x = 11.4$ and the crossing time is $t \approx 0.08$, so we use a step size of 0.0005, i.e. 160 steps per crossing time.

Softening parameter and step size

However, the binary radius is $\sim 10^{-3}$ and the period is of order 10^{-4} , so our resolution it is far away from resolving binary particles. In order to avoid binaries, we use a large softening parameter $\epsilon = 0.005$. We also do a control run with $\epsilon = 10^{-5}$ to be compared with (Figure 2).

Results: Energy and Time Consumption

The total number of particles in our simulation is 1000. We run this simulation with both our PP-nbody code and BH-nbody code. The energy curve through 400 steps is shown in Figure 2. When the softening parameter is too small, the energy of the system increases dramatically due to close encounters being thrown away with large step sizes.

As for PP-nbody vs. BH-nbody, in our simulations of 1000 particles, BH code has little advantage. With a step size 0.0005 and softening parameter 0.005, when running for 400 steps, i.e. 2 - 3 dynamic time, PP code conserves energy better than BH code, even with a small critical angle, and the BH code is not significantly faster. It takes 21.0 seconds for the PP code to run the simulation, 15.0 seconds for the BH code with $\theta = 0.6$, and 31.8 seconds for the BH code with $\theta = 0.3$. The videos are shown in *simulations/* as *cluster_rotating_camera.mp4* and *cluster_static_camera.mp4*.




Figure 2: Energy curve of the systems in our simulations of stellar clusters. All simulations use the same initial conditions but different softening parameters (left) and different methods of force calculation, i.e PP vs BH-tree (right). Epsilon is the softening parameter and theta is the critical angle in BH-tree. In the simulations shown in the right panel, epsilon = 0.005.

RAMSES-RT

We also use initial conditions taken from a snapshot of a simulation from *RAMSES-RT*, an AMR MHD code with radiative transfer. A total of 820 particles are formed from a cold molecular cloud. This work is not shown in the directory due to limited time, but I use the units and time scales in this simulation to investigate into binary problem.

Units and Time Scales

The units in this simulation are as follow: $[T] = 2.5395 \times 10^{15} \text{ s} \approx 80 \text{ Myr}$, $[L] = 3.08 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm} \approx 1 \text{ pc}$, $[M] = 6.7925 \times 10^{31} \text{ g} \approx 0.03416 M_{\odot}$. In this setup the gravitational constant is unity.

Imaging a cluster of stars from the outputs of *RAMSES* simulation which has ~ 1000 stars with Kroupa IMF located in a box of length $L = 50$. If this system is virialized, then $\sigma^2 = M_{\text{tot}}/R$, from which we obtain $\sigma \approx 27$. Here I use a mean mass of $0.638 M_{\odot} = 20$ (code unit) from Salpeter IMF and $R = 25$. Then, the crossing time of dispersion velocity is $t_{\sigma} = L/\sigma \approx 2$. If we choose a step size $\Delta t = t_{\sigma}/50 = 0.04$, i.e. 50 steps in a crossing time, then with 5000 steps we are able to simulate 100 crossing time, which is equal to 16 Gyr. This can be done with a PP n-body code on my laptop, and it could be even faster with our BH-tree n-body code.

Binary Problem

I have an attempt on solving the problem of binarity in stellar cluster simulation. The basic idea is to check if two particles 1) are close enough to each other, and 2) $K + V < 0$ every n steps. If yes, we just replace these two particles with one star representing the motion of the center of mass. Binaries may further merge into trinaries and so on.

Realization of the Binary Problem

If two stars with velocities σ are in virial equilibrium, i.e. $\alpha = K/|W| = 0.5$, the separation between them would be $d_{\text{virial}} = m/2\sigma^2 = 0.016$. However, the typical displacement of a particle in one step

is $d_{\text{step}} = \sigma\Delta t \approx 1$, much greater than d_{virial} . Therefore our simulation is not able to identify binary stars. We need a step size ~ 1000 times smaller to achieve the resolution of binary systems.

Searching for close encounters

We consider two stars in the center-of-mass frame. We defined the following two parameters:

- The *close-encounter parameter* α or γ which defines the criteria of being close enough to each other:

$$|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| < d_{\text{close}} = \alpha \cdot d_{\text{virial}} = \gamma \cdot d_{\text{step}}. \quad (3)$$

- The *escape parameter* β which confines the particles in a small region:

$$\frac{K}{|W|} < 1 - \beta^{-1}. \quad (4)$$

This relation gives the largest separation between the two particles at any time,

$$d_{\text{max}} = \beta d_{\text{close}}, \quad (5)$$

ignoring interactions with other particles ¹. When $d_{\text{max}} \ll d_{\text{step}}$ the two particles may be considered as a binary.

The solution to binary problem then becomes the balancing between typical particle separation $d_{\text{sepa}} = L/\sqrt[3]{N}$, one-step displacement $d_{\text{step}} = \sigma\Delta t$, the close-encounter parameter α or γ , and the escape parameter β .

Results

To test our code, we artificially create a three-body system and show that a binary system will appear when the step size is small enough. However, it will not be resolved when running with large step sizes. When we implement our BH-nbody Binary code, it successfully catches the binary when running with the same large step size. The movies of the three run described above are shown *simulations/binary/movie*. We were working on this in a new branch. Due to limited amount of time we couldn't merge it to our master branch. We just show the videos here.

¹This relation is obtained by solving equation $(1 - \beta^{-1})|V_0| + V_0 = 0 + V_1$ and $V_0 \propto 1/d_0$, $V_1 \propto 1/d_{\text{max}}$.