

Response to the first report on the article
draft *The Impact of Gas Bulk Rotation on the
Lyman- α line.*

Juan N. Garavito-Camargo, Jaime E. Forero-Romero, Mark Disjksra

June 4, 2014

We thank the referee for a detailed report. Indeed, the report motivated us to explore a very important aspect of our results that we had overlooked.

We made a plot suggested by the referee that showed a clear dependence of the line morphology with the viewing angle an effect that we had deemed as negligible after measuring a proxy statistic for it (the integrated flux).

The correct interpretation is that, as the referee expected, there is a strong effect on the morphology.

This completely changed the focus of our paper. We have now completely rewritten the Results and Discussion section in order to highlight that result. We have also completely dropped sections (e.g. the asymmetrical emission part) that obfuscate this main result.

In this document we address one by one the questions in the report. However, we kindly ask the referee to revise directly the new version of the paper, given the substantial changes from the first version.

In what follows the comments by the referee are boldfaced.

Best regards,

The Authors

1 Global Comments

1.1 Variation with the viewing angle

The problematic of anisotropy is only studied from Sect 3.4, the former sections consider global quantities (spectral shapes, escape fractions, etc...). This is ok only if there is NO anisotropy induced by rotation, which is not obvious, a priori. You should make it clear from the beginning, telling that you will investigate anisotropy at the end of the paper only, because you checked that Ly α properties are isotropic, at least in the range of parameters that you investigated so far.

As we mentioned in the introduction to this letter, there is indeed an anisotropy in the line morphology. The paper was re-structured accordingly.

However, the properties that we had measured as isotropic (integrated flux and escape fraction) remain anisotropic.

As explained in sect 3.4, rotation kills the spherical symmetry of your problem, and the rotation axis defines a preferential direction. We could expect some variation of the emerging flux, the Lyman-alpha escape fraction, and the spectral shape, with viewing angle. From Fig 8, it seems that the flux is the same in all directions for spherical distributions of sources. This important result is not enough emphasized.

We now emphasize in the abstract, section 3.2 and the conclusions the result on the non-variation of the total flux with viewing angle.

Do you see any difference in the spectral shape with viewing angle? To illustrate this point, it would be interesting to build a 2D plot as you did on Fig 5, but replace Nb scat in ordinates by the viewing angle μ . We could immediately see if there is an evolution of the shape with viewing angle or not. If you find NO evolution of the Ly α shape with viewing angle, I think that it is an interesting counter-intuitive result, that you should advertise more.

As we mentioned in the introduction to this reply, we prepared the suggested plot and found strong variations of the spectral shape with viewing angle. This result motivated us to re-structure the paper to emphasize it.

What about the variation of Ly α escape fraction with viewing angle? I propose that in the beginning of Sect.3 Results, you first emphasize that, maybe counter-intuitively, you did not find




Figure 1: Escape Fraction as a function of μ

any variation of the Ly α properties with viewing angle, so you will present first angle average ly α properties, and you will come back to the anisotropy problematic only at the end on the paper.

We do not find any significant dependence of the escape fraction with the viewing angle. This is shown in Figure ?? of this document. We do not show this plot in the paper and only mention the result at the beginning of Section 3.5.

Outflow + Rotation

We want to study the pure effect of rotation on the spectra, off course it would be interesting to study the effect of rotation on systems with outflows, this paper is under preparation by M.C Remolina-Gutierrez et al.

Details

Introduction

With Orsi et al 2012, please cite also Garel et al 2012. With Zheng & Wallace 2013, please cite also Behrens et al 2014.

Added.

Fig.1

I guess that the spectra presented in Fig1 are integrated over all directions, right ? You should describe explicitly how you build them. You could skip the x notation in absciss, as it is not used in the discussion, whereas the velocity is used to compare to FWHM, on Fig2.

Now this figure is the Fig.4 in the paper. what we did was to fix a viewing angle in this case $\theta = \pi/2$ and make the histogram of the photons frequency

- Description about how we build Fig.1 (Done)
- Fig 1. remove x notation (Done)

Description about how we build Fig.1

(Done) **Fig 1. remove x notation**

(Done)

Fig.2

Fig.2 Can you explain how you measure the FWHM of a double-peaked profile ? Do you fit it with a gaussian ?

We e interpolate points to the line profile and then we measure the width by the closest points to the half maximum in our histogram.

Fig.3

Do you have an idea why the (central source, intermediate optical depth) case with $V_{\max}=300$ has a single plateau instead of 2 peaks ? Do you find this with the two codes ?

After close inspection in this figure the line was composed by two peaks, that looked like a plateau with the resolution used to construct the figure.

Fig4 and 6


This is a surprising result that the number of scatterings (escape fraction) stays constant as the rotation velocity increases, for a central source, whereas the global spectral shape is altered. Did you try with higher/extreme values of V_{\max} ($=1000$ km/s, even if not physically motivated) ? Do you believe that the number of scatterings decreases with very high values, or that it is independant of the rotation velocity ? Is the escape fraction from a dusty rotating cloud with central source independant of the rotation velocity ?

Fig5

This is a very nice figure ! Looking at the top right panel, with its “photosphere”, I’m surprised that the distribution of N_{scatt} is bipolar, I would have expected a smooth transition between the 2 regimes. Do you have a physical explanation why photons escape after either (less than 10) or (more than 1000) scatterings, and none escape with 100 scatt ? To test the ‘photosphere’ assumption, you could also do the radiation transfer in a cloud with the distribution of sources only in an inner sphere, and another experienment with sources only in an outer shell. If I understood corectly, you would expect thant the bottom spot on the top right panel is made of photons from the outer shell, and the upperr spot from photons emitted inside the cloud.

End of paragraph 3.3

One sentence is not clear : we see that the escape fraction does not increase significantly from $\tau = 10^5$ to $\tau = 10^6$. This counter-



intuitive result.... It sounds like you were expecting a strong increase... A decrease is expected from $\tau = 105$ to $\tau = 106$, not an increase, but indeed on the graphe we can see an unexpected (small) increase. I do not understand the explanation for this behaviour.

(Mark)

Fig8

Referred to as Figure 7 in the text (paragraph 3.4). To my mind, this figure illustrates the main result of your study, it has to be more demonstrative. On this figure, the numerical noise seems very big compare to the small number of bins, bigger than on the spectra from Fig1, how is it possible ? Could you re-do this figure with more photons, maybe with more bins ? Could you plot an histogram instead of broken lines, to ease the reading ? In the text, you write anisotropy induced by rotation is at the 3% level, how do to estimate this number? I think that the noise is at 3% level, and the distribution is compatible with 'flat'. In the corresponding text, you first say that $F(\mu)$ does not depend on V_{\max} . Again, if real, this is an important result, that you must advertise more. Please show it on this Fig, by comparing $F(\mu)$ without rotation (in red, for example) to the other distributions that you get with different values of V_{\max} . Then, you mention that for high optical depth values, $F(\mu)$ (not the variations of μ) can vary up to 15%. First, what do you call high optical depth ? your highest setup is $\tau = 10^7$, not extremely high for lyman alpha 'standards', corresponding to $\text{NHI} \sim 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-2}$. So, if you see a trend with optical depth, I encourage you to check higher optical depth regimes, corresponding better to galaxy scales. If you can probe that anisotropy induced by rotation is rising with optical depth, this would be an interesting result. If higher optical depth regimes lead to anisotropic escape, could you check the effet of anisotropy on the lya spectral shape?