Galaxy-Scale AGN Outflows: Two Puzzles, Two Solutions

Claude-André Faucher-Giguère

UC Berkeley Miller Institute for Basic Research in Science

with Eliot Quataert & Norm Murray



Models that assume f~5% L_{AGN} couples to ISM are successful in explaining in these observations

Observational breakthroughs on AGN outflows

- Massive, galaxy-scale AGN outflows in local ULIRGs
 - neutral, ionized, CO, OH, HCN, ...

• Herschel, E-VLA, ALMA, ... to revolutionize this field

 Physical conditions in QSO outflows using low-ion BALs (⇒ energetics)



• Photoionization modeling particularly constraining in QSOs with Fell* broad line absorption ($T \sim 10^4$ K, $v \sim 5,000$ km/s; FeLoBALs):



Observations from Moe+09, Dunn+10, Bautista+10, Arav 10

• Photoionization modeling particularly constraining in QSOs with FeII* broad line absorption ($T \sim 10^4$ K, $v \sim 5,000$ km/s; FeLoBALs):



Observations from Moe+09, Dunn+10, Bautista+10, Arav 10

• Photoionization modeling particularly constraining in QSOs with Fell* broad line absorption ($T \sim 10^4$ K, $v \sim 5,000$ km/s; FeLoBALs):



 $\Rightarrow \Delta R/R \sim 10^{-5}$ Jupiter mass!



• Photoionization modeling particularly constraining in QSOs with Fell* broad line absorption ($T \sim 10^4$ K, $v \sim 5,000$ km/s; FeLoBALs):

 $n_{\rm e} \sim 10^4 {\rm cm}^{-3}$ $N_{H} \sim 10^{20-21} {\rm cm}^{-2}$ ionization param $\Delta R \sim 0.01 {\rm pc}$ $R \sim 1-3 {\rm kpc}$ $\Rightarrow \Delta R/R \sim 10^{-5}$ Jupiter mass!



- I. What are these things?
- 2. How can we use them to measure outflow energetics?

Observations from Moe+09, Dunn+10, Bautista+10, Arav 10

Compact absorbers must form in situ, at R~kpc from SMBHs

• If they traveled from the SMBH to their implied location...

$$t_{\rm flow} \approx \frac{R}{v} \approx 3 \times 10^5 \text{ yr} \left(\frac{R}{3 \text{ kpc}}\right) \left(\frac{v}{10,000 \text{ km s}^{-1}}\right)^{-1}$$

• But destroyed by hydro instabilities and thermal evaporation in

$$t_{\rm KH}, t_{\rm evap} \sim {\rm few} \times 10^3 {\rm yr}$$

Not a direct accretion disk wind!

Radiative shock model

• Form in interaction of the QSO blast wave with an ISM clump:



pre-existing ISM cloud

CAFG, Quataert, & Murray 12

Radiative shock model

• Form in interaction of the QSO blast wave with an ISM clump:



pre-existing ISM cloud

cloud crushing by QSO blast, accel by ram pressure

Radiative shock model

• Form in interaction of the QSO blast wave with an ISM clump:



pre-existing ISM cloud

cloud crushing by QSO blast, accel by ram pressure

absorption by transient, compressed shreds

Cloud crushing by shocks, Kelvin-Helmholtz instability

• Well-studied problem for SNRs (e.g., Klein+94, Cooper+09)



CAFG, Quataert, & Murray 12

Requirements for radiative shocks explain properties of cool absorbers

• Acceleration, cold gas:

$$t_{\rm drag} < t_{\rm KH} \\ t_{\rm cool} < t_{\rm cc}$$
 $\Rightarrow N_{\rm H} \gtrsim 10^{20} \ {\rm cm}^{-2} \ \left(\frac{v_{\rm sh}}{5,000 \ {\rm km \ s}^{-1}} \right)^{4.2}$

• Post-shock compression:

$$\begin{split} n_{\rm H}^{\rm BAL} &\approx 4 n_{\rm H}^{\rm pre} \left(\frac{T_{\rm sh}}{10^4 \text{ K}} \right) \sim 10^4 \text{ cm}^{-3} \\ &\Rightarrow \Delta R \sim N_{\rm H} / n_{\rm H} \sim 0.01 \text{ pc} \end{split}$$

• Also: super-thermal line widths, multiple v components, reddening, ...

CAFG, Quataert, & Murray 12

Energetics of QSO outflows

• Outflows are multiphase

• Most of kinetic power in hot flow:

 $\dot{M}_{\rm hot} = 8\pi\Omega_{\rm hot}RN_{\rm H}^{\rm hot}\mu m_{\rm p}v_{\rm hot}$

Using radiative shock model:

 $\dot{E}_{\rm k} \approx 2 - 5\% L_{\rm AGN}$ $\dot{M} \approx 1,000 - 2,000 \,\mathrm{M}_{\odot}/\mathrm{yr}$ $\dot{P} \approx 2 - 10 \,L_{\rm AGN}/c$



The puzzle of large momentum fluxes



 If all photons scatter once & P is conserved,

$$\dot{P} \sim L_{\rm AGN}/c$$

- Observations indicate $\dot{P} \sim 10 L_{\rm AGN}/c$
- Simulations also require $\dot{P} \gg L_{
 m AGN}/c$

to reproduce M_{\bullet} - σ (DeBuhr+)

CAFG & Quataert, in prep.

Momentum driving



No thermal pressure

P_{final} ~ P_{start}

e.g., AGB wind

Energy driving

 $t_{cool} \gg t_{flow}$

Shocked gas does work



e.g., Sedov-Taylor SNR





Proposal: AGN outflows are energy-driven

- Possible in ULIRGs despite extreme densities
 - \Rightarrow relevant criterion is cooling of *reverse* shock: $T_{sw} \sim 10^{10}$ K for $v_{in} \sim 0.1c$
 - ⇒ 2-T plasma inhibits IC cooling



CAFG & Quataert, in prep.

Energy conservation naturally explains measured AGN momentum boosts

• Predicts

 $\frac{\dot{P}}{L_{\rm AGN}/c} \sim \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\rm nuclear \ wind \ speed}{\rm galaxy \ wind \ speed} \right)$

• To be tested soon with Herschel, E-VLA, ALMA, ...

• Analytic model will inform numerical implementations



Robust to mixing, leakage

- Stellar wind bubbles smaller & slower than in energy-conserving models (Castor)
 - cooling due to mixing (McKee+84)
 - ➡ hot gas vents out (H.-C. & Murray 09)
- AGN winds more robust
 - ~30× wind mass of cool gas
 before catastrophic ff cooling
 - escape along paths <10⁻³ underdense can still boost P by factor
 >10 in ULIRGs

Carina nebula



CAFG & Quataert, in prep.

Summary

- Compact, cool absorbers form in radiative shocks
- Energetics in good agreement with M_{\bullet} - σ requirements
- Observations of galaxy-scale AGN outflows suggest

$$\dot{P} \gg L_{\rm AGN}/c$$

- Proposal: outflows are energy-conserving
- Prediction:

$$\frac{\dot{P}}{L_{\rm AGN}/c} \sim \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\rm nuclear \ wind \ speed}{\rm galaxy \ wind \ speed} \right)$$