Dynamics of the Local Group in different theories of gravity

by Christoph Saulder Institute of Astronomy University of Vienna

Overview

 Local Group sequence of the sequence of * a plane of galaxies origin of Local Group satellites
 Dark Matter Dynamical Friction Genetic Algorithm Modified Newtonian Dynamics overview advantages
 problems

Simulations

* working hypothesis
* my main model
* programs
* interplay of programs
* NewHExI and DeMonI
* GeneAI

- Results
- Conclusions
- References

Some nice pictures (if there is some time left)

Local Group



• mass: 2-5 10¹² M_{sol}

 contains two large spiral galaxies (which make up most of its mass)

diameter: >2 Mpc

moves to the Virgo cluster with (200 ± 50)km/s

 4 subgroups (MW-subgroup, M31-subgroup, Local Group Cloud and NGC 3109-subgroup)

A plane of galaxies

- Most galaxies in the local group are distributed in a thin plane (see Sawa & Fujimoto 2005)
- This plane doesn't correspond to a galactic plane of the two large spirals galaxies.



Sawa & Fujimoto My own results

Normal vector in galactic coordinates

l=206°, b=-11° (Milky Way on plane) I=200°, b=-20° (A) I=203°, b=-27° (2σ -clipping) I=200°, b=-20° (Milky Way and M31 on plane) (B)

Thickness of the Local Group plane

About 50-100 kpc

21 galaxies within 100kpc (A)28 galaxies within 100kpc (B)

Results basically similar but no perfect match

Origin of the Local Groups satellites

- Cosmological dark matter sub-halos
 - Problem: expected distribution would be spherical symmetric
- Infall and scattering of a filament
 - Problem: expected plane would be too thick
- Early interaction of extended gas-rich discs of Milky Way and M31
 - reproduces observed distribution very well

- Problem: missing satellite problem, except in MOND, because no dark matter

Dark Matter

galaxies rotate too fast



need additional matter to explain rotation curves

same problem appears also in clusters

- WIMPs (or MACHOs)
- different profiles for its distribution
- isothermal halo (simple):

$$\rho(r) = \frac{M_0}{4\pi r_0} \frac{1}{r^2}$$

NFW profile (most common):



- problem: particles haven't been found yet
- other problems: missing satellites, tidal dwarfs, ...

Dynamical friction



• General formula:

$$\frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = -16\pi^2 \ln(\Lambda)G^2 \mu(m+\mu)\frac{\vec{v}}{v^3}\int_0^v f(w)w^2 dw$$

• Usual formula (after some assumptions):

$$\frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = -4\pi^2 \ln(\Lambda) G^2 \rho m \frac{\vec{v}}{v^3} \left[erf\left(\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}\sigma}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{2}v}{\sqrt{\pi}\sigma} e^{\frac{v^2}{2\sigma^2}} \right]$$

In an isothermal halo:

 $\rho(r) = \frac{M_H}{4\pi r_H} \frac{1}{r^2}$

$$\frac{d\vec{v}}{dt} = -\frac{Mm\ln\left(1 + \frac{M_r}{r_H m}\right)}{r_H r^2 v^2} \left[erf\left(\frac{v\sqrt{r_H}}{\sqrt{M}}\right) - \frac{2v\sqrt{r_H}}{\sqrt{\pi M}}e^{\frac{v\sqrt{r_H}}{\sqrt{M}}}\right]\vec{d}_{DF}s$$

Genetic Algorithm

Simulate evolution (selection – recombination – mutation)

Many different implementations

 Fast way to find minima in large number parameter spaces

May get caught in local minima



MOdified Newtonian Dynamics

 Alternative theory to explain observed rotations curves of galaxies

Avoids dark matter (on galactic scales)

- First suggested by Milgrom in 1983
- Relativistic extension by Bekenstein in 2004

Modified Poisson-equation

$$\vec{\nabla} \left(\mu \left(\frac{a}{a_0} \right) \cdot \vec{\nabla} \Phi \left(\vec{r} \right) \right) = 4\pi G \cdot \rho \left(\vec{r} \right)$$

• Interpolating function $\mu(x)$



No longer superposition of accelerations possible

Force on particle depends on absolute acceleration

distance from central mass in system units

10

Advantages

- No Dark Matter on galactic scales
- Some observed relations follow naturally from MOND, like the Tully-Fisher relation
- Fits rotation curves very well with only one free parameter $a_0 \sim 1.2 \ 10^{-10} \text{ m/s}^2 \sim c H_0 / 2\pi$
- Can explain rotation curves of LSB and HSB galaxies in one model

Problems

 merging is less likely in MOND, but it also takes much longer → observed merging rate?

 violation of strong equivalence principle → Lyman α forest problem
 → maybe solved by TeVeS

 Requires (hot) dark matter on cluster scale (remaining mass discrepancy of a factor of 2-3 with MOND) Galaxy cluster 1E0657-558 (a.k.a. Bullet Cluster) → separation of visible matter and Dark matter by a high velocity collision

 Timing of the Local Group: Milky Way and M31 cannot be on their first orbit in MOND
 too much visible matter already found

 Physical motivation and consequences: new theory of gravity or new theory of inertia? Is it the best way to modify gravity?

Simulations

 Several simulations with Newtonian gravity (including Dark Matter) and deep MOND

Wrote a lot of new programs

 Aim: to reproduce today's distribution of galaxies in the Local Group and to see if Dark Matter or MOND is true

Working hypothesis

 Most dwarf galaxies has been formed by an encounter of the gaseous discs of Milky Way and M31 more than 10 Billion years ago

Scattered across the Local Group

Orbits dominated by the two main galaxies

 Dwarfs are located now near the movement plane of Milky Way and Andromeda-galaxy

My main model

- Milky Way and M31 on an elliptical orbit (parameters optimized by 2body simulations)
- LMC, SMC and M33 are also massive
- All other dwarf galaxies are test particles
- Simulation starts with MW and M31 separated only by 24 - 150 kpc about 12 Gyr in the past

 Initial positions of other galaxies are located relatively near MW and M31

 In case of Newtonian gravity it includes dynamical friction, extended halos and the Hubble expansion.

 In case of MONDian gravity it includes the Hubble expansion.

 20 generation with 1000 individual models per generation

Programs

• Written in Fortran90

• Using a NEMO-compatible file format

 Although all programs has been developed for a special problem, but most of them can be used for other problems as well (with some modifications).

Controlled by a Shell-Script

Interplay of my programs

mkinput

Loop for N generations (

mkmodel

NewHExl or DeMonl

extracting required information after integration GeneAI)

tidy up the results

NewHExI and DeMonI

 Stellar dynamical integrators for Newtonian and MONDian gravity

 NewHExI can perform calculations using Newtonian gravity, extended halos, dynamical friction and the Hubble expansion.

 DeMonI can perform calculations using deep-MOND gravity and the Hubble expansion.

GeneAl

- 237 variable starting parameters
- 158 fitting parameters
- Normal parameter scan unreasonable
- Fast alternative: genetic algorithm
- Partly restricted N-body problem → can do some tricks to increase its performance

• For every model:

- Calculate fitness parameter for massive galaxies: position and radial velocity
- Find the best test particle for every massless galaxy → origin of a new test particle cloud
- Calculate total fitness of the model
- Create children by recombination of all parents (one child can have >2 parents)
- Choose mutating children randomly
- Mutate single parameters of a model within reasonable values

Results

11 different setups (6 Newtonian, 5 MONDian)

 MOND can fit the positions of the Local Group dwarf galaxies very well

 But MOND totally fails at the velocities, everything moves to fast (by several 100 km/s)

 In MOND the Milky Way and the Andromeda Galaxy are on their second orbit Newtonian gravity fits moderately (mainly due to problems in the outermost regions of the Local Group)

 Very extended Dark Matter halos are preferred for MW and M31 (r > 250 kpc)

Early interaction about 12 Gyr ago is possible

 Minimal distance between MW and M31 at early encounter was about 50 – 100 kpc (Sawa and Fujimoto: 150 kpc) M33, LMC and SMC shouldn't get to close to one of the large spirals → danger of merger

• Orbital plane of MW and M31 doesn't has to correspond with the plane of dwarf galaxies

Initial distribution: compact (diameter ~100 kpc) agglomeration around the two main galaxies, but with a tail like structure extending in the orbital plane several 100 kpc.

 Many ideas for further improvement of the simulation and the model

Conclusions

• The working hypothesis is possible model to explain the observed distribution.

 MOND has significant problems to reproduce the dynamics of our galaxy group.

 The plane of galaxies doesn't have to correspond with the orbital plane of the Milky Way and the Andromeda galaxy.

References

- Saulder, C.: Dynamics of the Local Group in different theories of gravity (2010)
- Sawa, T. and Fujimoto, M.: PASJ 57, 429 (2010)
- Milgrom, M.: ApJ 270, 365 (1983)
- Bekenstein, J. D.: Phys. Rev. D 70(8), 083509 (2004)
- Zwicky, F.: Helvetica Physica Acta 6, 110 (1933)
- Teuben, P.: ADASaS IV, Vol. 77 ASP-CS
- Peacock, J. A.: Cosmological Physic (1999)
- Binney, J. & Tremaine, S.: Galactic Dynamics (2008)
- van den Bergh, S.: ArXiv (2003)
- Mateo, M. L.: ARA&A 36, 435 (1998)

ANY QUESTIONS?

The Milky Way



The Andromeda Galaxy

The Triangulum-Nebula

The Large Magellanic Cloud

by NASA

The Small Magellanic Cloud

by ESA