Black hole accretion

Feng Yuan (袁 峰)

Shanghai Astronomical Observatory Chinese Academy of Sciences

Outline

Chapter 1: Introduction to some basic concepts and Review of accretion models Chapter 2: The standard thin disk and slim disk Chapter 3: Hot accretion flow: dynamics & radiation Chapter 4: Hot accretion flow: applications Chapter 5: Wind and jet Chapter 6: AGN feedback

Chapter 6: Interaction between AGN and ISM

6.1 Fermi bubbles

The Fermi Bubbles

Su et al. 2010

Two giant γ-ray bubbles discovered by Fermi-LAT
Morphology, Surface brightness, Spectrum



Jet Model (I) Guo & Mathews 2012; Guo et al. 2012; Yang et al. 2012, 2013

- Jet lasted for ~0.3 Myr, quenched 1-2 Myr ago
- Jet interacts with ISM and form the bubbles
- Gamma-rays: IC scatterings of ISRF by CRe.





Jet Model (II) Guo & Mathews 2012; Guo et al. 2012; Yang et al. 2012, 2013

Assumptions:

➢ Jet direction ⊥ Galactic plane
➢ Jet velocity too low: ≤ 0.1c
➢ Jet mass loss rate too large:
➢ Guo et al. 2012: 0.3M_{Edd} (one jet)
➢ Guo & Mathews 2012, Yang et al. 2012, 2013: 3 or 170M_{Edd} (one jet)

v_{jet}	Jet speed	0.025	С
R _{jet}	Radius of cross section	0.5	kpc
tjet	Duration of injection	0.3	Myr

Yang et al. 2013





Models (II): Quasar outflow model

Zubovas, Nayakshin & King 2011; Zubovas & Nayakshin 2012

- Assume Sgr A* was a quasar; lasting for 1Myr; quenched 5 Myr ago
- Strong wind from quasar
- Parameters of wind: v~0.1c , $\dot{M}_{out} \sim \dot{M}_{Edd}$, $P_{wind} \sim 5\% L_{Edd}$



Problems:

Mildly super-Eddington – too large?

- Totani (2006) shows that $P_{wind} \sim 10^{41} \text{ erg/s} \ (\sim 10^{-3} L_{Edd})$.
- Suzaku observation: confirm the above value (Kataoka et al. 2013).

Our model: Inflated by accretion wind

Mou et al. 2014, 2015



Past activity of Sgr A*

- Independent constrain on Mdot: 10⁴ times higher
- Still a RIAF
- Detailed numerical simulation
 - Accretion rate: from other independent constrain
 - Properties of outflow: determined by MHD simulation of accretion flow
 - 3DMHD+two-fluid
- Consistent with observations

Application I: "accretion wind" model for Fermi bubbles

Mou, Yuan et al. 2014; 2015

Significance of integrated residual, E = 10.0 - 500.0 GeV



Su et al. 2010; Ackermann et al. 2014 (Rossi X-ray Prize)

Our wind model:

- Scenario: int. between wind & ISM
- Parameters not free
- Simul.: 3DMHD + Two-fluid



Results: γ -ray radiation

Mou et al. 2015



Left: density and velocity. Right: CR energy density and magnetic field.

Results: γ -ray spectrum and others



Models	Jet	Radiation- driven wind	SF-driven Wind	Hot Accretion Wind	
Temperature (NPS)	> 5 keV	∼ 1 keV	Ν	0.4-1 keV	
Age	1-2 Myr	6 Myr	10^2 - 10^3 Myr	7-12 Myr	

0.1

1.0

10.0

E (GeV)

100.0

1000.0

Velocity of bubble edge --- consistent with observations

Example & Implication: roles of wind in other aspects

Example: Heliosphere: by solar wind Implications:

- Formation of X-ray cavities and bubbles: by wind?
- Solving the cooling flow problem with wind ?





6.2 AGN feedback

Observational evidence of AGN Feedback (Fabian 2012, ARAA; Kormendy & Ho 2013, ARAA) (I): Coevolution of AGNs and Their Host Galaxies



Observational evidence for AGN Feedback: (II) High-mass end truncation of galaxy luminosity function



Croton Springel et al. 2006

Other evidences of AGN feedback

Downsizing puzzle (Cowie et al. 1996)
The most massive galaxies and BHs are the oldest
Cooling flow problem in galaxy clusters (Peterson et al. 2001)
Lack of significant cooling in cluster cores
AGN heating may be the key

Why AGN Feedback Important ? --- Energetic estimation

The total energy emitted by the black hole during its growth:

Etot=
$$\varepsilon M_{BH} c^2$$

The gravitational energy of a virialized sphere (e.g., the stellar bulge):

$$E_{grav} \approx M_{sph} \sigma_*^2$$

The ratio is

 $E_{tot}/E_{grav} >> 1$

AGN feedback

Mechanical & Radiative feedback



ISM

Bondi radius

Gas fueling

Key issues of AGN feedback:

• How to determine BH accretion rate ?

• For a given rate, what are the outputs from AGN?

Hydrodynamical Equations

$$\frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} = \alpha \rho_* + \dot{\rho}_{II} - \dot{\rho}_*^+,$$

$$\rho \frac{D\mathbf{v}}{Dt} = -\nabla p + \rho \mathbf{g} - \nabla p_{rad} - \dot{m}_*^+,$$

$$\rho \frac{D}{Dt} \left(\frac{e}{\rho}\right) = -p \nabla \cdot \mathbf{v} + H - C + \dot{E}_S + \dot{E}_I + \dot{E}_{II} - \dot{E}_*^+,$$

Physics included in the model:

Stellar mass loss from dying stars
Gas depletion from star formation
Feedback of Type II supernovae
Feedback of Type Ia supernovae
Thermalization due to stellar dispersive motion

Angular Momentum Transport

Yoon et al. 2018

- Magneto-rotational Instability (MRI; Stone+99,01)
- Gravitational Instability (Gammie 01)
- Anisotropic Gravitational Torque (Hopkins+10,11)
 - This is what we adopt
 - We use alpha description to mimic it



Galaxy Model

We focus on the **cosmological evolution** of an **isolated elliptical galaxy.**

Gas source

• only stellar mass loss during their cosmological evolution

Gravity

- Super massive black hole
- Stellar population
- Dark matter halo
- But no gravity from interstellar medium



Contribution of SN Ia to energy

Ciotti, Ostriker et al. 2009

Massive stars (SNe II) died before the simulation starts due to their short lifetime.

But **SNe** Ia can be triggered by **accretion or merger** events of neutron stars/white dwarfs,

$$R_{\rm SN}(t) \approx 0.32 \times 10^{-12} h^2 \frac{L_{\rm B}}{L_{\rm B,sun}} \left(\frac{t}{13.7 \,{\rm Gyr}}\right)^{-1.1} {\rm yr}^{-1.1}$$

Each SN Ia releases energy in an order of 10⁵¹ erg

Star Formation

We estimate SFR using the standard Schmidt-Kennicut prescription:

$$\dot{\rho}_{\rm SF} = \frac{\eta_{\rm SF} \rho}{\tau_{\rm SF}} \quad \tau_{\rm SF} = \max(\tau_{\rm cool}, \tau_{\rm dyn})$$

We also consider **SNe II** among the **newly formed stars**.

$$N_{\rm II} = \int_{M_{\rm II}}^{\infty} \frac{dN}{dM} dM = \left(1 - \frac{1}{x}\right) \left(\frac{M_{\rm inf}}{M_{\rm II}}\right)^{x} \frac{M_{sun}}{M_{\rm inf}} \frac{\Delta M_{*}}{M_{sun}} \approx 7 \times 10^{-3} \frac{\Delta M_{*}}{M_{sun}}$$

Radiative Heating & Cooling

Sazonov et al. 2005

Net energy change rate per unit volume:

 $\dot{M} = n^2 \left(S^1 + S^2 + S^3 \right)$

Bremsstrahlung cooling $S_1 = -3.8 \times 10^{-27} \sqrt{T}$

Compton heating/cooling

 $S_2 = 4.1 \times 10^{-35} (T_X - T) \xi$

photoionization heating, **line and recombination** cooling

$$S_{3} = 10^{-23} \times \frac{a + b(\xi / \xi_{0})^{c}}{1 + (\xi / \xi_{0})^{c}}$$

Compton temperature T_c

Sazonov et al. 2004; Xie, Yuan & Ho 2017

Compton heating \sim (Tc - TISM)

Definition of Tc

$$T_C = \frac{1}{k} \cdot \frac{\int F_{\nu} \cdot h\nu d\nu}{\int F_{\nu} \cdot d\nu}$$

In cold (radiative/quasar) mode (Sazonov et al. 2004): $Tc \sim 10^7 \text{ K}$

In hot (kinetic/radio) mode (Xie, Yuan & Ho 2017):

 $Tc \sim 10^8 K$

(This is because the SED of LLAGN is different from luminous AGNs: more hard photons)

Setup of MACER code (Massive AGN Controlled Ellipticals Resolved)

Yuan et al. 2018; Ciotti & Ostriker 2001, 2007; Novak et al. 2012; Gan et al. 2014

- Based on ZEUS-MP; 2D + hydro + radiation
- Resolution: 0.3 pc
- Simulation domain (spherical coordinate):
 - R_in=2.5 pc (~0.1 Bondi radius);
 - R_out=250 kpc
- Evolve for cosmological time (~12 Gyr)
- Mdot self-consistently determined (not Bondi!)
- Two accretion/feedback modes discriminated
- Inject wind & radiation from R_in then calculate their interaction with ISM



Light curve of AGN (I)

Yuan et al. 2018

- Most of time, AGN stays in LLAGN phase
- Wind rather than radiation controls Mdot & BH growth
 - Why?





Lightcurve of AGN (II): AGN lifetime



- Difference between Gan et al. (2014) & Yuan et al. (2018): Wind strength
- Typical *L* differs by ~ 100 times
- Lifetime of AGN: 10⁵ yr (vs. 10⁷ yr), consistent with observations (e.g., Keel et al. 2012; Schawinski et al. 2015; King & Nixon 2015)

Growth of black hole mass

Yuan et al. 2018



AGN feedback (mainly by wind) regulates BH mass growth.

AGN duty-cycle



Percentage of the total simulation time spent above an Eddington ratio; Consistent with observations Percentage of the total energy emitted above an Eddington ratio *NOT consistent with observations*: why?

