RRLs and SF M82

May 21, 2011

François Viallefond

An long story...

- 1. It is a follow-up of:
 - first detections with the VLA of SB galaxies (Jun-Hui paper)
 - observations of mm RRLs of Arp 220 using with IRAM-30m (Anantha paper)
- 2. The starting point: 408 MHz Merlin image of M82:

the number of 'point' sources increases with increasing frequency

Suggestion: free-free absorption (Pedlar et al.). Our question: could that be caused by a dense plasma which would be observable with mm RRLs?

- 3. Test the hypothesis of a free-free absorption and the influence of density fluctuations (compact HII regions)
- 4. Use the IRAM-PdB (95-97) for M82 H40 α (2.7" resolution)
- 5. Use the IRAM-30m (98-01) for M82 (H42 α ,H40 α ,H31 α ,H29 α)



Molecular lines.

- CH₃CCH 85.4 GHz (probes $\sim 10^5$ cm⁻³ dense regions)
- SO 99.3 GHz
- C₄H 85.7 GHz (observed in galactic PDRs (*e.g.* the horse head) First extragal detection, TBC by observing other transitions
- HC₃N 209.2 GHz ? (could be blended with H31α)



ARP 220

Note about our Arp220 H31 α result

- 1. We indeed recognized the low S/N (in particular at 3mm)
- 2. Only a portion of the H31 α spectrum had been observed (512MHz BW backend limitation)

but to convince ourselves about the H31 α line result we re-observed H31 α at the IRAM-30m with a new 1GHz backend.

Result with good S/N:

Line for ν_{rest} of H31 α with the expected width and velocity confirmed.



Extra-galactic mm RRLs are difficult to observe!

- 1. with Jun-Hui at SEST we realized that H36 α in NGC253 was too easily detected (too strong) when comparing to other RRLs. \rightarrow the lines must be very carefully selected!
- 2. for M82: PdB H40 α and OVRO H41 α (Seaquist) not consistent between each other! H41 α at anomalous velocity. Some of the regions of line emission have no continuum counterpart!

Issues:

- Lines are weak. starburst spectra full of molecular lines for the desired sensitivity.
- ARP220 is the worth case for line blending ($\Delta V = \sim 1000 \text{ km}.\text{s}^{-1}$) SMA 1.3 mm survey: H31 α appears to be HC₃N!

Does that mean there is no dense plasma?

H42 α and H40 α in M82



H42 α is blended with C₄H!



Solutions to minimize these issues

- high spatial resolution \implies sensitive telescopes (PdB, ALMA)
- get broad bands data to disentangle the different lines
- observe several RRLs ⇒ different atm windows (only ~ one region clean enough per window given the RRL line frequencies)

IRAM M82 H40 α results

- \bullet Good spatial correspondance between the line and 8 & 100 GHz continuum emissions
- No anomalous velocities
- Excellent correspondance with the 12.8μ m NeII line spatial morphology
- The H40 α and HCN (the high vel. grad compnt) correspondence (HCN probes high density regions ($\geq 10^5 cm^{-3}$)

but only 2.7 arcsec resolution and relatively low S/N

H40 α and 99GHz continuum



Why measuring mm RRLs

- Physical state of the plasma: multi-density components?
- Physical origin of the mm RRL emission: extended component, compact HII regions, PDRs?
- Relation with the atomic and molecular phases of the ISM
- SF of the massive stars: time-scales, rate and efficiency

H40 α and 408 MHz continuum



H92 α emission and 408 MHz continuum (molecular region at 10³ to 10⁴ cm⁻³)



SNR Luminosity function and distribution (at 5 GHz and 0.4 GHz)



Free-free absorption, dense plasma and SNRs

- 1. SNR distribution correlates with H92 α brightness distribution
- 2. But no SNR when $B_{H92\alpha} > 80$ Jy km.s⁻¹ (sharp cut-off)
- 3. The massive stars do not seem to diffuse far away from their birth place
- 4. The difference between the luminosity functions at 0.4GHz and 5GHz can be explained by the free-free absorption from the H92 α emitting regions (density fluctuations (localized UCHIIs, PDRs) vs pure depth effects along line-of-sights).

 \implies typical lifetimes UCHII in the range 1 to 4 Myr.

(vs \sim 0.1Myr in our Galaxy)

Nature of the mm RRLs emitting regions

- 1. A diversion: data reduction and analysis
- 2. Results

Data reduction and analysis

Facts: After more that 30 years Gipsy remains a unique tool in its way to appoach (astronomical) data!

- I still use Gipsy (its infrastructure, *i.e.* its user interface and data structure, plus several enrichments... event-driven GMP, visu tool, open to OO, ...)
- Most of the original works, e.g. for analyzing these M82 observations, were realized using Gipsy thanks to the pioneering (?) thoughts of the peoples who invented this infrastructure Example: the way I analyze multi-D images (a multi-line <u>co-constrained profile analysis</u>)
- I have been attracted by this package from the very beginning, primarily because of its **data structure**.
- A diversion because **the key peoples are here**! I have my own questions to elucidate some points within a context that I discovered only very recently.

The context:

- 1. I am of the generation who learned *"math modernes"* at college the **set theory** as promoted by the french **Bourbaki school** *When you use Gipsy you work (and think) in a multi-D space based on the concepts of* **sets and subsets** *(the Gipsy Data Structure (GDS)).*
- 2. I promoted a MS-like structure for the ALMA data model

(btw the first 'ASDM' datasets were produced in Gipsy by a simulator!)

Being used to the **GDS** allows to capture easily how works the **MS**!

Why this connection between the GDS and MS ?

GDS is a generic meta-model: can be described mathematically using the theory of categories.

It is effectively a sheaf on a topological space.

- This topology is a CW complex, an Hausdorff space partitioned into open cells. (points with the concepts of distinguishable, distinct, uniqueness of limits of sequences)
- Sheaves are based on two axioms, local identity and gluing properties.
- Sheaves encode exactly the data needed to pass between local and global situations.

The GDS can be described using concepts from <u>cohomology</u> theory. It is also connected to mathematical logic.

With little improvements the structures inside the MS can be turned into sheaves. This model may be seen as a set of topoi.

 \implies towards a single generic approach (GDS, xMS meta-model) which has all of what we need when applied to our domain, radioastronomy.

My questions!

If you read the Gipsy documentation you will see the usage of

CW acronym for **C**oordinate **W**ord that you can take in category terms as sub-object identifier (*characteristic function when the category is* **Set**.

CW in topological space is for Closure finite Weak topology

Q1: Is this just a coincidence?

poly-crystalline data structure (ref drawing in Gipsy doc)

Q2: Were you aware of the work of Grothendieck? Is there a link with his crystalline cohomology?



From this diversion to a use-case!

What can we do with the glue?

Strategy in data reduction:

factorize information, hopefully in a meaningful way. But does not work always \implies look for emergence of new (unexpected) things.

Fact:

Millimeter data will be extremely rich in information *e.g.* the number of lines observed simultaneously.

Objective: build model theories, the two upper triangles (each commutes)

Example:

the co-constrained line profile analysis developed for M82

My suggestion: use genericity (math) to re-use







RRL emission, HI and molecular gas

H92 α profiles can be represented on the basis of the HI spectral component model

- 1. common velocity positions and line widthes (same Δ_v if not co-constrained
- 2. perfectly co-extensive along the mid-plane (max brightness ridge) H92 α and HI
- 3. away from this ridge extra component in H92 α
 - connected to an $H\alpha$ component farther away
 - represents few % of the total H92 α emission
 - appears very near $(\pm 1'' \text{ on either side of the ridge})$

Conclusions

- cm+mm RRIs reveal density fluctaions of the plasma
- most likely tight connection with the different density component revealed by the molecular lines
- not all in pressure equilibrium