Dawn : The childhood of stellar clusters

Y. Bernard, E. Moraux, D. J. Price, F. Motte, F. Louvet and I. Joncour

DAWN I: Simulating the formation and early evolution of stellar clusters with Phantom N-Body submitted to A&A

Giant Molecular Cloud collapse simulations







Dynamical evolution of young clusters

Gutermuth + 2011



with the spatial distribution of *Spitzer*-identified YSOs.

NGC6611 : ~6 Myr

Dynamical evolution of young clusters

Pure N-body dynamics : Integration for 10 Myr



Dawn : Definitions and Objectives

GMC collapse up to gas removal

- Hydro/N-Body solvers
- Star formation
- Precise stellar dynamics
- Stellar feedback

gaia





eesa

RESPA: Two levels Leapfrog integrator



2nd order vs 4th order



(a) 10 orbits of a point mass around a fixed potential. Initial eccentricity is set to 0.7 and the semi-major axis is 1. The amount of (spurious) orbital precession can be seen to inversely correlate with integrator precision.

..... Leapfrog: 2nd order

- --- **PEFRL**: 4th order
- **FSI**: Forward 4th order



(b) Logarithm of the relative energy of the particle on 1 orbit.

Dynamical collisions are essential in the evolution of a star cluster:

- Collisional gravitational interactions are expensive to integrate
 - Close encounters and highly eccentric binaries





Regularisation of equations of motion

- Kustaanheimo and Stiefel (1965)
 - Spatio-temporal transformation
- Algorithmic regularisation (Mikkola et Tanikawa 1999)
 time transformation

$$\mathrm{d}s = \Omega(\mathbf{r})\mathrm{d}t, \qquad \Omega(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{i\neq j}^{N}\frac{m_{i}m_{j}}{r_{ij}}.$$



Hard binaries and stable hierarchical systems:

- Strong time step constraint
- Stable on the cluster crossing time (~Myr)

(Mikkola et Aarseth 1996)

Slow Down binaries



$$H = \frac{1}{\kappa} H_b + (H - H_b),$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{v}_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = -\frac{Gm_c(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_c)}{\kappa ||\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_c||^3} - \frac{\partial U(\mathbf{r}_i)}{\partial \mathbf{r}_i},$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\mathbf{r}_i}{\mathrm{d}t} = \frac{\mathbf{v}_i}{\kappa},$$

$$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t_{sph}\mathbf{a}_{sph}$$

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{6}\Delta t_{fast}\mathbf{a}_{fast} \\ \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t_{fast}\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{r}_{sub} = \text{SDAR}(\mathbf{r}_{sub}, \mathbf{v}_{sub}) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{fast} = \mathbf{a}_{fast}(\mathbf{r}_{*}); \qquad \mathbf{r}_{*} = \mathbf{r} + \frac{\Delta t_{fast}^{2}}{24}\mathbf{a}_{fast}(\mathbf{r}) \\ \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \frac{2}{3}\Delta t_{fast}\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_{fast} \\ \mathbf{r}_{sub} = \text{SDAR}(\mathbf{r}_{sub}, \mathbf{v}_{sub}) \\ \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t_{fast}\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{a}_{fast} = \mathbf{a}_{fast}(\mathbf{r}) \\ \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{6}\Delta t_{fast}\mathbf{a}_{fast} \\ \mathbf{a}_{sph} = \mathbf{a}_{sph}(\mathbf{r}) \\ \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta t_{sph}\mathbf{a}_{sph}, \end{cases}$$

11

Methods : Star formation prescription



Methods : HII region expansion feedback

HII region fully sampled



inside the cold sphere sweeping up the gas. A denser shell of material forms just next to the ionization front.

13

Methods : HII region expansion feedback

$$R_{\rm St} = \left(\frac{3Q}{4\pi\alpha_{\rm B}n_{\rm H}^2}\right)^{1/3},$$
 Strömgren radius

$$\frac{I(r)}{4\pi} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\rm LOS}} r_i^2 \langle n(r_i) \rangle^2 \alpha_B \Delta r_i. \quad \mathbf{x} \, \mathbf{N}_{\rm gas}$$

 $4\pi r^2 F(r) = Q_{\rm H} - I(r)$ > 0 is ionised

HII region fully sampled



Figure 1. Illustration of the method used to select particles whose densities are to be used to derive the density profile along the line-of-sight between the radiation source and a given target particle, denoted by the thick dashed line.

Performance bottleneck

Sinks-gas interactions:

- direct N² into Phantom
- always at the lowest bin

Hit the perf when $N_{sinks} > \sim 1000$

- Waste of computations:
- Softened interactions
- Long range interactions

Push sinks in the KD tree



Simulation setup

Initial GMC:

- R = 10 pc
- M = 10 000 Msun
- T = 10 K
- *µ* = 2.35
- $\alpha = 2$
- 2 500 000 SPH particles
- T_{ff} = 5.7 Myr Turbulent velocity field:
- $E_k \propto k^{-2}$





Conclusions and perspectives



The need for a statistical study