

Astro 596/496 PC  
Lecture 39  
April 28, 2010

Announcements:

- PS6 due now
- Final Preflight posted, due next Wednesday noon  
fun, optional, easy bonus points
- **ICES!** please don't skip written comments
- *No class this Friday* – woo hoo!

Last time:

- embraced  $\Lambda$ CMB cosmology Q: *what's that?*  
Q: *examples of viable alternatives?*
- began move beyond linear perturbations  
Q: *why is this important? why is it hard?*  
Spherical collapse model Q: *what's that?*  
Q: *qualitative results? quantitative results?*

## Spherical Collapse: Quantitative Lessons

first-order pert:  $\delta_{\text{lin}}(t) \propto D(t) \propto t^{2/3} \propto a_{\text{bg}}$   
same as usual **linear** result!

$$\delta_{\text{nonlin}}(t) = \left( \frac{a_{\text{bg}}}{a_{\text{nonlin}}} \right)^3 - 1 \quad (1)$$

$$\delta_{\text{lin}}(t) \approx \frac{3}{20} \left( \frac{12\pi t}{t_{\text{coll}}} \right)^{2/3} \quad (2)$$

connects full nonlinear result with linear counterpart  
→ maps between the two

E.g., at **turnaround**

$$\delta_{\text{nonlin}} = (6\pi)^2/4^3 = 5.6, \text{ but } \delta_{\text{lin}} = 1.06$$

at **virialization** (PS6):

$$\delta_{\text{nonlin}} \approx 180, \text{ but } \delta_{\text{lin}} = 1.69$$

→ defines a critical linear overdensity

*Q: why useful?*

Strategy: look at initial linear density field

find perturbations with linear growth  $\delta_{\text{lin}}(t) = D(t)\delta_i > 1.69$

→ these will be collapsed objects by time  $t$

- $\delta_c$  cut in *linearized*  $\delta_{\text{lin}}(t_0)$  divides virialized vs nonvirialized
- also: in nonlinear field, can use  $\delta_{\text{vir}} \sim 180$   
as working *definition* of collapsed structure  
good for comparing theory, observation  $Q$ : *procedure?*

# Nonlinear Evolution: Lessons from Spherical Collapse

## Qualitatively

- ▷ overdensity evolves as closed “subuniverse”
- ▷ starts expanding, but slower than cosmic background  
pulls away from Hubble flow: reach max expansion, then turnaround
- ▷ virialize → form bound object
- ▷ no further expansion, except due to accretion, merging

## Quantitatively

- ▷ can compute **both**  $\delta_{\text{lin}}(t)$  and exact  $\delta(t)$   
gives mapping from *easy* to (more) *correct*
  - ▷ **collapse/virialization** when  $\delta_{\text{lin}} = 1.69$  and  $\delta = 18\pi^2 \simeq 180$   
recipe for forecasting structures in initial field  $\delta_{\text{init}} \ll 1$   
recipe for defining halos: region surrounding density peak  
and having overdensity  $\delta\rho/\rho \sim 180$
- ★ Given these, can devise analytical tools to describe distribution of structures

# Press-Schechter Analysis

## Outlook

adopt hierarchical picture (i.e., some form of CDM)

⇒ matter at *every* point belongs to some structure

over time: go from many small structures to fewer, larger ones

## Goal

Given properties of density field—i.e.,  $P_{\text{init}}(k)$  and  $P(k, t) = T_k^2(t)P_{\text{init}}(k)$

Compute distribution of structures as function of mass, time

**Quantitatively:** want “mass function”

comoving number density of structures

in mass range  $(M, M + dM)$ :

$$\frac{dn_{\text{com}}}{dM}(M, t) \quad (3)$$

5

from this, can compute many other things

e.g., density in  $(M, M + dM)$  Q: *which is...?*

## Press-Schechter Ingredients/Assumptions

- given mass  $M$ , **filter** density field

on comov length  $R$  such that  $M = 4\pi/3 \rho_{\text{bg,com}}(t)R^3$

density contrast has variance  $\sigma^2(M) = \int P(k) W(k; R) d^3k$

- **in linear** regime, density field obeys **Gaussian statistics**:

in filtered field, probability of finding contrast in  $(\delta_{\text{lin}}, \delta_{\text{lin}} + d\delta_{\text{lin}})$ :

$$P(\delta_{\text{lin}}; M, t) d\delta_{\text{lin}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2(M, t)}} \exp\left[-\frac{\delta_{\text{lin}}^2}{2\sigma^2(M, t)}\right] d\delta_{\text{lin}} \quad (4)$$

why only good in linear regime  $Q$ : *why?*

- **Spherical collapse model** maps from linear  $\rightarrow$  nonlinear  
identifies **linear contrast threshold**  $\delta_c \simeq 1.69$  for collapsed objects

note:  $\delta_c$  is time indep! (in EdS cosmo)

$\Rightarrow$  can find fraction of cosmic mass in objects of mass  $M$

$Q$ : *how?*

fraction of mass or of comoving volume  
in collapsed objects of mass  $M$  at time  $t$  is

$$f(> \delta_c; M, t) = \int_{\delta_c}^{\infty} P(\delta_{\text{lin}}; M, t) d\delta_{\text{lin}} \quad (5)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2(M, t)}} \int_{\delta_c}^{\infty} \exp\left[-\frac{\delta_{\text{lin}}^2}{2\sigma^2(M, t)}\right] d\delta_{\text{lin}} \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\delta_c/\sqrt{2}\sigma}^{\infty} e^{-u^2} du \equiv \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc}\left[\frac{\delta_c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(M, t)}\right] \quad (7)$$

- for realistic  $P(k)$ ,  $\sigma^2(M) \sim \int k^3 P(k) W_k(M) dk/k \sim M^{-(n+3)/3}$   
 $\rightarrow$  at fixed mass,  $\sigma(M, t)$  **monotonically decreases** with  $M$   
 (down to some minimum  $M$  cutoff)
- $\sigma(M, t)$  evolves (linearly) as  $\sigma \sim a(t) \sim 1/(1+z)$

↘ *Q: implications for mass distribution at fixed time?*

*Q: implications for structure formation over time?*

## Press-Schechter: mass fraction and structure formation

$$f(> \delta_c; M, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\delta_c/\sqrt{2}\sigma}^{\infty} e^{-u^2} du = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc} \left[ \frac{\delta_c}{\sqrt{2}\sigma(M, t)} \right] \quad (8)$$

★ mass distribution at fixed  $t$ :

as filter mass  $M$  **decreases**, variance  $\sigma(M)$  **increases**

▷ more large fluctuations → more above threshold

▷ more structures at smaller masses

i.e.,  $\delta_c/\sqrt{2}\sigma(M)$  decreases → larger  $f$

⇒ smallest halos most numerous → hierarchy of masses!

★ time evolution at fixed  $M$ :

at time, scale factor **increases**, variance  $\sigma(t) \propto a(t)$  **increases**

▷ more structures at fixed mass

▷ small structures merge → larger (at expense of smallest)

⇒ hierarchical clustering!



## Press-Schechter Mass Function I: Quick-n-Dirty

Press & Schechter (1974):

note that structures can only be made from *over*densities

but *under*densities (voids) occupy mass fraction  $f(\delta_{\text{lin}} < 0) = 1/2$

so fraction of *overdensities* in collapsed objects of  $M$  is

$$F(> \delta_c; M, t) = \frac{f(\delta_{\text{lin}} > \delta_c)}{f(\delta_{\text{lin}} > 0)} = 2f(\delta_{\text{lin}} > \delta_c) \quad (9)$$

famous factor of two!

Compare mass fraction at  $M$  and  $M + dM$ : difference

$$dF = F(M + dM) - F(M) \simeq \frac{dF}{dM} dM \quad (10)$$

$$= \sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)} \frac{d\sigma(M)^{-1}}{dM} \frac{\delta_c}{\sigma(M)} e^{-\delta_c^2/2\sigma^2(M)} dM \quad (11)$$

But probability of finding structure  $M$  in filter volume  $V_{\text{com}} = M/\rho_{\text{bg}}$  is

$$dF(M) = V \frac{dn}{dM} dM = \frac{M}{\rho_{\text{bg}}} \frac{dn}{dM} dM \quad (12)$$

and so PS mass function is

$$M \frac{dn}{dM} = \frac{\rho_{\text{bg}}}{M} M \frac{dF}{dM} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \frac{d \ln \sigma(M)^{-1}}{d \ln M} \frac{\delta_c}{\sigma(M)} \frac{\rho_{\text{bg}}}{M} e^{-\delta_c^2/2\sigma^2(M)}$$

- implicitly also a function of  $t$  via  $\rho_{\text{bg}}(t)$  and  $\sigma(M, t)$
- encodes and quantifies hierarchical clustering

from this can immediately find, e.g., distribution of (comoving) density across masses of collapsed objects:

$$\frac{d\rho(M)}{dM} = M \frac{dn}{dM} \quad (13)$$

# Press-Schechter: Summary

## Quantitative Output

- ★ Easy to use, very powerful (semi-)analytic mass function

## Qualitative Worldview/Limitations

- ★ every point lies in **exactly one** structure:  
largest above threshold
- ★ all structures have  $\delta_{\text{lin}} = \delta_c$ : born today!
- ★ PS blind to interior substructure  
and formation history of a given object

*Q: how to test PS theory?*

*Q: which structures should be best described? worst?*

# Tests of Press-Schechter

## Versus Numerical Simulations

PS is idealized analytic approximation of hierarchical clustering  
assumes true density field  $\delta$  perfectly mapped onto  
linear field  $\delta_{\text{lin}}$  vis spherical collapse model

Even if underlying CDM, hierarchy idea right, PS approximate  
→ test against numerical simulations w/ non-ideal  $\delta$  field  
results: unreasonably good agreement!

## Versus Observations

Best applicable to those just formed:  $\sigma(R) \sim \sigma_8 \sim 1$   
→ galaxy clusters!  $M \sim 10^{15} M_{\odot}$ , and so PS gives

$$n(M) \sim M \frac{dn}{dM} \sim \frac{\rho_0}{M} \nu e^{-\nu^2/2} \sim \frac{\rho_0}{M} \sim 10^{-4} \text{ Mpc}^{-3} \quad (14)$$

<sup>12</sup> about right! (where  $\nu = \delta_c / \sqrt{2}\sigma \sim 1$ )  
...and works unreasonably well at other scales too

# Director's Cut Extras

## Press-Schechter II: Excursion Sets

More sophisticated (and insightful) derivation of same result

Sketch of procedure:

1. given initial density field and (Gaussian) filter window
2. pick a point  $\vec{x}$  in space, filter over neighborhood  $R$ , mass  $M(R)$
3. **scan down** in mass: at  $M \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\sigma(M) \rightarrow 0$  Q: *why?*  
and so filtered  $\delta(\vec{x})_M = 0$
3. as  $M$  decreases,  $\sigma(M)$  increases  
filtered  $\delta(\vec{x})_M \neq 0$ , alternates sign, amplitude  
 $\Rightarrow \delta(\vec{x})_M$  is a **random walk** vs  $\sigma(M)$ ! exactly!
4. can ask: at which  $M$  does  $\delta(\vec{x})_M$  **first** cross threshold  $\delta_c$   
 $\Rightarrow$  this sets  $M$  of structure containing point  $\vec{x}$
5. repeat for all  $\vec{x}$  and average  $\rightarrow$  PS distribution follows!

Q: *limitations/implicit assumptions?*