# The effects of Accretion Luminosity from Population III protostars.

#### **Rowan Smith**

ITA, Universität Heidelberg

Paul C. Clark, Simon Glover, Thomas Greif, Ralf Klessen



#### Summary

#### Accretion Luminosity feedback modifies and delays fragmentation but it cannot prevent it.

Consider two cases:

- In a protostellar disk
- In 5 mini-halos

#### Motivation

1

Rowan Smith

#### Fragmentation

Recent works have shown evidence of fragmentation and the formation of small N stellar clusters in the primordial universe.



*Turk et. al. 2009* 

*AMR* forms wide binary 800AU



Stacy et. al. 2010

SPH + Sinks small N cluster

# **Suppressing Fragmentation**

Fragmentation is a paradigm shift in our understanding of Pop III star formation. Can we suppress it?

Possible suppression mechanisms:

**Ionisation** feedback - predicted to be highly effective after protostar reaches Kelvin Helmholtz stage.

Accretion luminosity - effect unclear

Dark Matter annihilation - effect unclear

# **Modeling Accretion Luminosity**

#### Heating Rate

We use a version of GADGET2 which has been heavily modified to include a detailed chemical network:

Accretion luminosity included as a heating term in the chemical and thermodynamic evolution of the gas.

Assuming the gas is optically thin the heating rate for the gas will be

$$\Gamma_{acc} = \rho_g \kappa_P \left( \frac{L_{acc}}{4\pi r^2} \right)$$
 in erg g<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>

Where  $\kappa_P$  is the Planck mean opacity of the gas from Mayer & Duschl (2005)

$$L_{acc} = GM_*\dot{M}/R_*$$

Rowan Smith

ITA, Universität Heidelberg

#### **Stellar Model**



#### Feedback on Protostellar Disks

#### **Primordial Disk Fragmentation**

Previously detected fragmentation was at scales of 1000 AU+.

- Clark et. al. (2010 *submitted*) resolve the protostellar disk around Pop III protostars starting from cosmological initial conditions using a re-zooming technique.
- The disk is unstable to fragmentation.
- This leads to the exciting prospect of Pop III close binaries.

If these survive the accretion phase, high red-shift gamma ray bursts and X-ray binaries are potential outcomes.

#### Effect of Heating



Fragmentation due to:

 $-H_2$  line cooling keeping the disk cool, T~ 1000K

Accretion rate:  $10^{-3} M_{\odot}$  /yr Scale:  $10^{13} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  (dark blue) to  $10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  (red)

## Effect of Heating



Stronger feedback:

-fragmentation at larger radii.

- fragmentation after a longer time.

-disk is hotter and more diffuse in inner 5 AU.

Accretion rate:  $10^{-2} M_{\odot}$  /yr Scale:  $10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  (dark blue) to  $10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3}$  (red)

#### Feedback on Mini-haloes

#### A tale of 5 mini-haloes



5 mini halos from cosmological initial conditions (*Greif et. al. 2010 submitted*)

All of which fragment in the inner 200 AU of a disky region over a 1000 yrs.

Q. What is the effect of accretion luminosity?

Q. How much fragmentation is there before ionisation becomes significant?

Rowan Smith

#### A tale of 5 mini-haloes

Re-simulate inner 2 pc.

mass resolution  $10^{-2}$  M<sub> $\odot$ </sub>, sink radius 20 AU, follow over 10,000 yrs

Fragmentation still occurs in all cases



# Effect of Heating



Accretion luminosity delays fragmentation.

Mass in fragments remains the same.

#### Variability

#### Number of fragments depends on time:

|      |                             |                             | (tidy this to                      |                           |
|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Halo | No feedback                 |                             | Feedback final version)            |                           |
|      | $10 \ {\rm M}_{\odot}$      | $15 \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$   | $10 \ {\rm M}_{\odot}$             | $15 \ \mathrm{M}_{\odot}$ |
| 1    | $10~{\rm at}~1520~{\rm yr}$ | $11~{\rm at}~2914~{\rm yr}$ | $10~{\rm at}~2518~{\rm yr}$        | 16  at  6040  yr          |
| 2    | $10~{\rm at}~7637~{\rm yr}$ | 12+ at $14093+yr$           | 7  at  4491 yr                     | 8+ at 9502 yr             |
| 3    | 5+ at 9,153+yr              | 5+ at 9,153+yr              | 5  at  5140  yr                    | 6+ at 11,256+ yr          |
| 4    | $17~{\rm at}$ 7,318 yr      | 19+ at 17,077 yr            | $5 \mathrm{~at} 1006 \mathrm{~yr}$ | 6 at 3697 yr              |
| 5    | 7  at  604  yr              | 17  at  1060  yr            | $18~{\rm at}~1441~{\rm yr}$        | 23  at  3901  yr          |

Rough order of importance:

- 1) Inter halo variability.
- 2) Accretion feedback.

If many fragments form in a short time then dynamical interactions dominate the evolution.

#### **Stellar Modeling**

What is the correct stellar model for a variable accretion rate?



ITA, Universität Heidelberg

#### Future Work

#### Future Work

Future work:

- Ionisation feedback, with Thomas Peters.
- Dark stars, with Dominic Schleicher and Fabio locco
- Initial conditions for stellar modelling

Outstanding issues:

- The dynamics of close interactions in the primordial universe

#### Conclusions

#### Conclusions

# Accretion Luminosity feedback modifies and delays fragmentation but it cannot prevent it.

- 1. Protostellar disks will fragment into multiple objects.
- 2. Feedback increases the time for the disk to become unstable and the radius of fragmentation.
- 3. Inter-halo variability has a larger effect on fragmentation than accretion feedback.
- 4. Feedback can suppress the total number of fragments in a mini-halo... *sometimes.*
- 5. The dynamical nature of these halos is a challenge to current stellar evolution models.



#### Overview

- 1. Motivation
- 2. Modeling Accretion Luminosity
- 3. Feedback on Protostellar Disks
- 4. Feedback on Mini Haloes
- 5. Conclusions

#### How Massive are Pop III stars?

Early simulations found massive single stars were formed in primordial mini-haloes.

-Abel et. al. (2000, 2002), Yoshida (2008)

but these works had to stop after the first star...



Abel et. al. 2002

### The Code

We use a version of GADGET2 which has been heavily modified to include a detailed chemical network:

- H<sub>2</sub> cooling using the detailed cooling function of Glover & Abel (2008)
- Optically thick H<sub>2</sub> cooling using the **Sobolev approximation** as Yoshida et al. (2006)
- Collision induced emission from H<sub>2</sub> at high densities (Ripamonti & Abel 2004)
- Ionisation and recombination as described in Glover & Jappsen (2007)
- Heating and cooling from changes in the **chemical makeup** of the gas.
- Heating and cooling from shocks, compression and expansion of the gas.

-In the disk:

-At very high densities,  $H_2$  dissociation and CIE cooling take over.

-Compressional and viscous heating are more important than luminosity