AGN-driven Outflows and Galactic Conformity at z~1-2

Alison Coil UCSD

Collaborators: Gene Leung, Angela Berti, Mojegan Azadi, James Aird, Peter Behroozi MOSDEF co-PIs: Alice Shapley, Mariska Kriek, Naveen Reddy, Brian Siana, Bahram Mobasher PRIMUS co-PIs: Daniel Eisenstein, Michael Blanton (+John Moustakas)

Role of AGN in Galaxy Evolution

- Regulate galaxy growth?
- Determine the shape of the high mass end of the stellar mass function?
- Quench star formation?

— All related to AGN feedback!



MOSDEF survey

Spectroscopic survey at 1.4 < z < 3.8 using MOSFIRE on Keck 4 year survey, 48 nights total, finished taking data this spring Full sample has ~1500 galaxies + AGN



stellar mass

Targeting CANDELS fields, H-band selected (depth=24.5) Sample spans a wide range of stellar mass and SFR

BPT Diagram at z~2

Galaxies + X-ray and IR-selected AGN (1st half of survey)



Small shift in galaxies compared to z~0, but known AGN separate well at z~2; NII/Ha is crucial.

We are using the Melendez et al. (2014) line to identify optical AGN: less contaminated than Kauffmann, much more complete than Kewley.

Azadi, Coil, et al. in prep.

AGN Host Galaxy Properties at z~2



There are well understood observational biases towards identifying AGN in massive galaxies.

Once this is taken into account (by comparing to a mass-matched galaxy sample) the host properties of active galaxies are the <u>same</u> as inactive galaxies. Not seeing evidence for AGN quenching SF, in terms of host properties.

Azadi, Coil, et al. in prep.

Outflow Identification



outflow

broad line, no outflow

Perform multiple-component Gaussian fits simultaneously to H β , [OIII], H α and [NII]. Allow for an outflow component in all lines and/or very broad component in H α and H β .

Outflow vs Merger

Use HST imaging to remove potential mergers

potential mergers



no indication of merger



Incidence of Detected Outflows

Out of initial sample of 67 AGN (X-ray/IR/optical):

- 19 sources have a potential outflow component (ie, a 2nd kinematic component) with S/N>3 in [OIII] and/or H α
- 13 of those do not appear to be potential mergers in HST
- The detected outflow rate is 19% this is a lower limit on the actual AGN outflow rate, as need high S/N spectra and/or fast outflow to detect (and some mergers could have outflows).



Incidence of Detected Outflows

AGN vs galaxies:

- The detected AGN outflow rate is 19% (excluding mergers)
- For galaxies without detected AGN it is only 1.8%
 (8 galaxies with outflows out of sample of 457 galaxies)

— 10 times more likely to detect an outflow in a galaxy with an AGN!

AGN Outflow Host Galaxy Properties

All star-forming hosts, span the main sequence:



SFR

Leung, Coil, et al. in prep.

Outflow Kinematics

- velocity centroid of outflow component ~100-500 km/s
- maximum velocity of outflow component ~300-1300 km/s
- FWHM ~100-1300 km/s



 $[NII] + H\alpha$

[OIII]

Leung, Coil, et al. in prep.



Spatial extent from 2d spectra:



7/13 are resolved, FWHM of physical extent is ~3-10 kpc 6/13 are spatially offset from narrow line, with a max. physical offset of ~7 kpc

Mass and Energy Outflow Rates

Can get a <u>lower</u> limit from counting photons from recombining hydrogen atoms and an <u>upper</u> limit assuming an energy conserving bubble expanding into a uniform medium:

> dE/dt ~ $(0.3 - 9.6) \times 10^{43}$ erg/s AGN L_{Bol} ~ $10^{44 - 46}$ erg/s

 $\frac{dM/dt \sim (0.5 - 3.8) \times 10^2 M_{o}/yr}{SFR \sim (0.02 - 24) \times 10^2 M_{o}/yr}$

Rates are ~order of magnitude lower than ULIRGs at z~2 (Harrison et al. 2012) - sizes and velocities are a bit lower for our sample than in ULIRGs

Positive AGN Feedback

Usually AGN feedback is thought to be "negative" - shuts off star formation, clears away and/or heats gas in a galaxy.

"Positive" AGN feedback is when an AGN drives a jet that shocks the ISM in a galaxy and induces star formation (at least temporarily).



Minkowski's object, Croft et al. 2006



simulation, Gaibler et al. 2012

Positive AGN Feedback

Not seen in MOSDEF

narrow line component:

outflow component:





log ([OIII]/HB)

Leung, Coil, et al. in prep.

$\log ([NII]/H\alpha)$

Positive AGN Feedback

Not seen in SDSS

NL optical AGN:

NL optical + radio AGN:



using catalogs from Mullaney et al. 2013

Galactic Conformity

- Observed correlation between whether a "central" galaxy is quenched and its neighbor galaxies are also quenched.
- 1-halo vs 2-halo conformity:
 - 1-halo (*intra-halo*): correlation between central and satellite galaxies being quenched
 - 2-halo (*inter-halo*): correlation between central galaxy and galaxies in *adjacent* halos being quenched

Galactic Conformity

- 1-halo conformity first observed in SDSS (Weinmann et al. 2006)
- 2-halo conformity recently observed in SDSS (Kauffmann et al. 2013)
- z > 0.2 measurements have all been 1-halo only and used photometric redshifts (Kawinwanichakij et al. 2015, Hartley et al. 2015)



star forming fraction

PRIMUS Redshift Survey



Spectroscopic faint galaxy redshift survey using IMACS on Magellan

- Used a low-dispersion prism to measure redshifts to dz/(1+z)=0.5%
- 0.2 < z < 1.2 to a depth of *i*=23
- ~120,000 spec z's
- 9 sq. deg. over 7 independent fields with multi-wavelength coverage





PRIMUS Conformity Sample

- 4 separate fields covering
 5.5 deg²
- 0.2 < z < 1.0
- 60,000 galaxies with spectroscopic redshifts
- Split into star forming or quiescent using evolving SFR-M* cut:



Isolated Primary Sample

- Stellar mass completeness cut
- Similar isolation (i.e., central) criteria as Kauffmann et al. 2013:
 - Isolated primary (IP) galaxies have no other galaxies within R=500 kpc and M* > M*_{IP}/2
- ~20,000 IP/central candidates



Isolated Primary: Matching M* and z

- Small differences in median M* and z of the SF vs Q isolated primary samples mimics conformity signal!
- We therefore match the M* and z distributions of the SF and Q isolated primary galaxies
- Results in ~6,000 Q IPs and ~4,000 SF IPs



Conformity Signal at z~0.7

- f_{late} = late-type (SF) fraction of satellites / neighbors around SF and Q IPs SF %
- Shown as a function of projected distance (R_{proj})

• Normalized signal:

$$\xi_{\text{norm}} = \frac{f_{\text{late}}^{\text{SF-IP}} - f_{\text{late}}^{\text{Q-IP}}}{\left(f_{\text{late}}^{\text{SF-IP}} + f_{\text{late}}^{\text{Q-IP}}\right)/2}$$



R (Mpc)

Conformity Signal at z~0.7

- 1-halo signal: 5% (3.6σ)
- 2-halo signal: 1% (2.5σ)

% signal

- Using jackknife errors
- Errors are 2x smaller using bootstrap resampling, which does not capture cosmic variance.



R (Mpc)

Cosmic Variance

 Substantial variation in 1-halo signal among different fields

signal

%

 A meaningful measure of conformity at z > 0.2 should include several spatially separate fields



A Related Quenching Signal

Another 2-halo conformity signal is star-forming fraction of <u>central</u> galaxies and large-scale environment:



2-halo signal now detected at 5σ !

0.2 < z < 0.8

 $10^{10.1} < M_{*\rm IP} < 10^{10.4} \ M_{\odot}$ 0.2 < z < 0.65

Environment Quenches SF



M^{*} of central galaxy

Central galaxies only:

Mean sSFR of star-forming central galaxies is <u>not</u> impacted by environment.

But quenched fraction is!

Environment doesn't impact SF of centrals, until it halts it.

mean sSFR

Conclusions

AGN-driven outflows occur in at least 19% of X-ray/IR/optical AGN at z~2 in "normal" star-forming galaxies.

Outflows are often resolved and/or spatially offset. We detect physical sizes (FWHM) of ~3-10 kpc. These are <u>galaxy-wide</u> outflows.

Maximum velocities ~300-1200 km/s. Energy injection rates ~10⁴³ erg/s and mass outflow rates ~10² Mo/yr.

Galactic conformity on I and 2-halo scales has now been robustly detected at z > 0.2. Have to be very careful about systematic errors and cosmic variance at z > 0.2. Likely observational evidence for assembly bias!

Environment doesn't impact the sSFR of central galaxies while they are still forming stars, but it can impact quenching of centrals.