UNIVERSITY OF Southampton

Probing black hole-galaxy co-evolution from de-biased scaling relations

FRANCESCO SHANKAR

With: V. Allevato, M. Bernardi, A. Lapi, R. Sheth, P. Grylls, C. Marsden, L. Zanisi, and many more…

F.Shankar@soton.ac.uk

WHAT I WILL DISCUSS:

Local Scaling Relations:
Slopes, Normalizations, Scatters



Discussion of biases:
Observed vs '*Intrinsic*' relations



Consequences: **X-rays**
Basic models, AGN feedback, Accretion, Gravitational waves



Local Scaling Relations:
Slopes, Normalizations, Scatters

BH-galaxy scaling relations

$M_{BH} \sim M_{star}$

$M_{BH} \sim \sigma^{4-5}$



$L_{K,bulge}$ (Lsun)

σ (km/s)

Kormendy & Ho 13

The M_{BH}-σ: The most fundamental?



Shankar+16, 17, 19

The M_{BH}-σ: The most fundamental?



Shankar+16, 17, 19

Take-home message I:

Stellar velocity dispersion is more fundamental!

Discussion of biases:
Observed vs '*Intrinsic*' relations

One major problem!

$M_{BH/Msun}$



$L_{K,bulge}$ (Lsun)

σ (km/s)

Kormendy & Ho 13

A case study: The Illustris simulation (Horizon also!)



Sijacki+15

A case study: The Illustris simulation (Horizon also!)



Sijacki+15

Another major problem!



Shankar+16

The 'sphere of influence' of a SMBH

$$r_h \sim \frac{GM_{BH}}{\sigma^2} \sim 11 \left(\frac{M_{BH}}{10^8 M_{sun}}\right) \left(\frac{\sigma}{200\ km/s}\right)^2 \quad \text{pc}$$

"...defined as the region of space within which the gravitational potential of the SMBH dominates over that of the surrounding stars."

Implications?
As an example, a SMBH of $M_{BH} \sim 3 \times 10^7$ Msun placed at the distance of the Virgo cluster (~15 Mpc), would shrink to a projected radius of 0.07", beyond the reach of even HST (~0.1")!

Ferrarese 06


$r_{lim} < r_h \sim \frac{GM_{BH}}{\sigma^2}$
BIASED/OBSERVED
INTRINSIC
r_{lim}
ΔMBH
-1- Assume BHs' hosts follow SDSS
-2- Assume underlying MBH-σ (residuals)
-3- Cut above the resolution limit
log M_{BH} [$M_\odot$]
10
9
8
7
2.0
2.1
2.2
2.3
2.4
2.5
log σ [km s^{-1}]
Shankar+16


2.6
2.4
2.2
2.0
1.8
log σ [km s-1]
BIASED
INTRINSIC
ΔMBH
10.5
11.0
11.5
12.0
log MSTAR [M⊙]
Shankar+16


10
9
8
7
log M_{BH} [$M_\odot$]
BIASED
ΔMBH
INTRINSIC
MW
10.0
10.5
11.0
11.5
12.0
log M_{STAR} [$M_\odot$]
Shankar+16

Take-home message II:

Be cautious with 'raw' scaling relations!

Consequences:

Basic models,

AGN feedback, Accretion,

Gravitational waves


AGN feedback? Which one?
$\propto \sigma^{4.5}$
log M_{BH} − <log M_{BH} |log M_{STAR}>
log σ − <log σ |log M_{STAR}>
1.0
0.5
0.0
−0.5
−1.0
−0.3
−0.2
−0.1
−0.0
0.1
0.2

Shankar+16

Thermal AGN feedback does not work!



Barausse, FS, et al. 2017


Kormendy&Ho13
Shankar+16 (observed)
Shankar+16 (unbiased)
(MBH-σ) + (σ-Mstar)
log M_{BH} [$M_\odot$]
log M_{STAR} [$M_\odot$] ⇨ log Mhalo
10
9
8
7
6
10.0
10.5
11.0
11.5

Shankar+19



Shankar+19b, Nature Astronomy, resubmitted

AGN ARE NOT (GRAVITATIONALLY) BIASED!!



Shankar+19


0.2<z<0.5
0.7<z<1.1
<log Lx>(z,MSTAR) [erg s-1]
log MSTAR [M⊙]
<log MBH>(z) [M⊙]
z
ϵ=0.1
Carraro+
g+18
$\dot{M}_{BH} \propto \frac{1-\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \mathrm{L}$



Shankar+19 in prep, Suh+19 submitted, Carraro+19 submitted, ...



Shankar+19, NatAstro, resubmitted

Sesana, FS, et al. 2016



characteristic Amplitude GWs at f=1/yr

Take-home message III:

From de-biased scaling relations more radiative efficiency, less evolution, less GWs!

WHAT I HAVE DISCUSSED:

Local Scaling Relations:
Slopes, Breaks, Scatters



Discussion of biases:
Observed vs '*Intrinsic*' relations



Consequences:
Basic models, AGN,
Accretion, Gravitational waves