

università degli studi FIRENZE

# Fast outflows quenching star formation in quasar host galaxies

#### **Alessandro Marconi**

Department of Physics and Astronomy University of Florence

INAF-Arcetri Astrophysical Observatory, Florence

B. Balmaverde, S. Carniani, C. Cicone, R. Maiolino, G. Cresci, F. Mannucci, T. Nagao, H. Netzer, G. Risaliti, M. Salvati, O. Shemmer, M. Brusa, F. Fiore, F. La Franca, A. Comastri, M. Cano-Diaz, David J. Axon (1951-2012)

## **Evidences for AGN feedback?**

- 💢 Scarce direct evidence (suppression of Star Formation) but almost ubiquitous fast winds in ionised and, especially, molecular gas
- $\approx$  Large outflow rates for SFRs and gas masses (up to ~100-1000 M<sub> $\odot</sub>/yr,$ </sub> several  $\times$ SFR)  $\rightarrow$  short depletion time scale (~10<sup>7</sup> - 10<sup>8</sup> yr)



- $\overleftrightarrow$  Spectral stacking of SDSS galaxies in bins of M<sub>star</sub>,SFR (no AGN!)
- $\overleftrightarrow{}$  Accurately measure ionised gas and star kinematics
- Cutflow velocity (gas velocity star velocity) as a function of position across the Main Sequence of Star Formation ...



- $\overleftrightarrow$  Spectral stacking of SDSS galaxies in bins of M<sub>star</sub>,SFR (no AGN!)
- $\overleftrightarrow{}$  Accurately measure ionised gas and star kinematics
- Cutflow velocity (gas velocity star velocity) as a function of position across the Main Sequence of Star Formation ...



Gas outflows are only present in galaxies above the MS, velocity increases with offset from MS

Cutflows may be responsible for shaping the upper envelope of the MS by providing a self-regulating mechanism for the SFR

- ☆ Gas outflows are only present in galaxies above the MS, velocity increases with offset from MS
- ☆ Outflows may be responsible for shaping the upper envelope of the MS by providing a self-regulating mechanism for the SFR





- Quasar phase is the one where "quasar mode" feedback should be operating
- $\checkmark$  Sample: ~100 luminous unobscured quasars from SDSS DR7 and DR 10.

with a share wood by I lawa abal









#### $\overleftrightarrow$ Fast ionised outflows ...

w ... but no apparent relation between outflow velocity and bolometric luminosity and Eddington ratio as might be expected for radiatively driven winds from the AGN



Were the emission of "cold" dust heated by young stars





#### 🙀 SED combining Herschel + WISE measurements

SED fitting to estimate AGN IR luminosity and SF (Clumpy torus models by Nenkova & Elitzur, Starburst templates by Chary & Elbaz)





🙀 No clear relation between SFR and ionised gas kinematics



#### Balmaverde, AM+, in prep.

small scale outflow velocity



🙀 No clear relation between SFR and ionised gas kinematics



small scale outflow velocity

![](_page_14_Picture_0.jpeg)

43.0

43.5

44.0

200

0

#### TISBANK

![](_page_14_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_15_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Balmaverde, AM+, in prep.

VISNEN

small scale outflow velocity

#### 🙀 The prequel: luminous "normal" quasar at z~2.4 VLT/SINFONI H band

![](_page_16_Figure_2.jpeg)

Cano-Diaz+12

 $\overleftrightarrow$  The prequel: luminous "normal" quasar at z~2.4 VLT/SINFONI H band

![](_page_17_Figure_2.jpeg)

Cano-Diaz+12

The prequel: luminous "normal" quasar at z~2.4 VLT/SINFONI H band

![](_page_18_Figure_2.jpeg)

The prequel: luminous "normal" quasar at z~2.4 VLT/SINFONI H band

![](_page_19_Figure_2.jpeg)

- The sequel: sample of 6 luminous "normal" quasars at z~2.3-2.5
- ☆ L<sub>bol</sub>~ 10<sup>47</sup> 10<sup>48</sup> erg sec⁻¹
- SINFONI@VLT spectroscopy in H band

![](_page_20_Picture_5.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_20_Figure_7.jpeg)

- The sequel: sample of 6 luminous "normal" quasars at z~2.3-2.5
- ☆ L<sub>bol</sub>~ 10<sup>47</sup> 10<sup>48</sup> erg sec⁻¹
- SINFONI@VLT spectroscopy in H band

![](_page_21_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_21_Figure_6.jpeg)

- The sequel: sample of 6 luminous "normal" quasars at z~2.3-2.5
- ☆ L<sub>bol</sub>~ 10<sup>47</sup> 10<sup>48</sup> erg sec⁻¹
- SINFONI@VLT spectroscopy in H band

![](_page_22_Figure_5.jpeg)

![](_page_22_Figure_6.jpeg)

50

0.0

arcsec

-40

0.0

arcsec

-10

0.0

arcsec

0.5

1.0

1.5

0.5

1.0

400

1.0

0.5

![](_page_23_Picture_1.jpeg)

Get PSF from broad H $\beta$  flux map

- 🙀 🙀 🙀 [OIII] kinematical maps in 5/6 objects
- 2 Outflow velocities of ~300-600 km/s

🙀 Velocity dispersions up to ~800 km/s

![](_page_23_Figure_6.jpeg)

![](_page_23_Figure_7.jpeg)

1.0 0.0 0.5 arcsec

1.5

-1.5

-1.0 -0.5

![](_page_24_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

Simple kinematical model: disk + conical outflow

![](_page_25_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

#### Simple kinematical model: disk + conical outflow

![](_page_26_Figure_3.jpeg)

Subtract "broad" (~1000-1500 km/s) [OIII] → outflow

![](_page_27_Figure_2.jpeg)

Subtract "broad" (~1000-1500 km/s) [OIII] → outflow

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### Subtract "broad" (~1000-1500 km/s) [OIII] → outflow

Residual faint "narrow" (~100-200 km/s) [OIII] → host galaxy, star formation?

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

Origin of "narrow" [OIII] emission? AGN or Star Formation excited? K band observations targeting  $H\alpha$  ... subtract broad  $H\alpha$  and outflow component ... narrow  $H\alpha$  residual

Origin of "narrow" [OIII] emission? AGN or Star Formation excited? K band observations targeting  $H\alpha$  ... subtract broad  $H\alpha$  and outflow component ... narrow  $H\alpha$  residual

![](_page_31_Figure_2.jpeg)

2.35

2.40

Origin of "narrow" [OIII] emission? AGN or Star Formation excited? K band observations targeting  $H\alpha$  ... subtract broad  $H\alpha$  and outflow component ... narrow  $H\alpha$  residual

![](_page_32_Figure_2.jpeg)

Origin of "narrow" [OIII] emission? AGN or Star Formation excited?

K band observations targeting  $H\alpha$  ... subtract broad  $H\alpha$  and outflow component ... narrow  $H\alpha$  residual

no [NII], upper limit on [NII]/H $\alpha$  excludes AGN excitation  $\rightarrow$  star formation!

![](_page_33_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_5.jpeg)

Origin of "narrow" [OIII] emission? AGN or Star Formation excited?

K band observations targeting  $H\alpha$  ... subtract broad  $H\alpha$  and outflow component ... narrow  $H\alpha$  residual

no [NII], upper limit on [NII]/H $\alpha$  excludes AGN excitation  $\rightarrow$  star formation!

![](_page_34_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### K band: broad H $\alpha$ subtracted

![](_page_34_Figure_6.jpeg)

#### Narrow $H\alpha$ flux

![](_page_34_Figure_8.jpeg)

![](_page_34_Figure_9.jpeg)

Origin of "narrow" [OIII] emission? AGN or Star Formation excited?

K band observations targeting  $H\alpha$  ... subtract broad  $H\alpha$  and outflow component ... narrow  $H\alpha$  residual

no [NII], upper limit on [NII]/H $\alpha$  excludes AGN excitation  $\rightarrow$  star formation!

![](_page_35_Figure_4.jpeg)

Physical properties of ionised outflows: uncertainty on outflow mass, only ionised gas is traced !

![](_page_36_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\log_{10}(L_{agn}/c)$ 

Physical properties of ionised outflows: uncertainty on outflow mass, only ionised gas is traced !

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_38_Picture_0.jpeg)

### Conclusions

From larger sample of local quasars at z < 1 The presence of ionized outflows does not appear to significantly affect star formation (problem of time scales?)

From the small sample of quasars at z~2.5: Ionized gas outflows (partially) sweep away gas in quasar host galaxies and prevent star formation

☆ One possibility which reconciles both results is that feedback from a single episode of quasar activity does not significantly affect SF on the whole galaxy; the "feedback" observed in the z~2.5 quasars does not significantly depress SF over the whole galaxy

🙀 ALMA observations planned

Stay tuned for more ! Balmaverde+, in prep Carniani+, in prep

![](_page_38_Figure_7.jpeg)

~180 M<sub>o</sub>/yr

![](_page_38_Figure_9.jpeg)