THE EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT COOLING AND HEATING FUNCTION MODELS ON A SIMULATED ANALOG OF NGC300

David Robinson

Department of Physics; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA and Leinweber Center for Theoretical Physics; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

CAMILLE AVESTRUZ®

Department of Physics; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA and Leinweber Center for Theoretical Physics; University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

NICKOLAY Y. GNEDIN

Particle Astrophysics Center; Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory; Batavia, IL 60510, USA Kavli Institute for Cosmological Physics; The University of Chicago; Chicago, IL 60637, USA and Department of Astronomy & Astrophysics; The University of Chicago; Chicago, IL 60637, USA

VADIM A. SEMENOV

Center for Astrophysics | Harvard & Smithsonian, 60 Garden St, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA Version December 23, 2024

Abstract

Gas cooling and heating rates are vital components of hydrodynamic simulations. However, they are computationally expensive to evaluate exactly with chemical networks or photoionization codes. We compare two different approximation schemes for gas cooling and heating in an idealized simulation of an isolated galaxy. One approximation is based on a polynomial interpolation of a table of Cloudy calculations, as is commonly done in galaxy formation simulations. The other approximation scheme uses machine learning for the interpolation instead on an analytic function, with improved accuracy. We compare the temperature-density phase diagrams of gas from each simulation run to assess how much the two simulation runs differ. Gas in the simulation using the machine learning approximation is systematically hotter for low-density gas with $-3 \leq \log (n_b/cm^{-3}) \leq -1$. We find a critical curve in the phase diagram where the two simulations have equal amounts of gas. The phase diagrams differ most strongly at temperatures just above and below this critical curve. We compare C II emission rates for collisions with various particles (integrated over the gas distribution function), and find slight differences between the two simulations. Future comparisons with simulations including radiative transfer will be necessary to compare observable quantities like the total C II luminosity. *Subject headings:* Galaxy evolution, computational methods, hydrodynamical simulations

1. INTRODUCTION

Gas in the interstellar medium (ISM) and circumgalactic medium (CGM) of galaxies exists in multiple interacting phases with different temperatures and densities. These phases include a diffuse hot ionized medium (Spitzer 1956), clouds of an atomic cold neutral medium (Ewen and Purcell 1951), a warm ionized medium surrounding the cold clouds (Hjellming *et al.* 1969), and very cold molecular clouds (Cheung *et al.* 1968). Gas cools and heats through the respective emission and absorption of radiation, providing a critical mechanism for gas to transition between these phases (e.g. McKee and Ostriker 1977). Star formation (primarily) occurs in cold molecular clouds, and the star formation rate can depend on both the thermal state *and turbulent properties* of the molecular gas (see Dobbs (2023) and Hennebelle and Grudić (2024) for recent reviews).

Gas cooling and heating rates thereby play a vital component of galaxy evolution models, including hydrodynamic simulations. However, there are many different prescriptions in use for calculating the cooling and heating rates as functions of the gas properties and the galactic environment (see Kim *et al.* (2023) for an overview).

The effects of different cooling and heating function models on galaxy formation can be tested using galaxy formation simulations. Simulation comparisons from the Aquila and AGORA collaborations typically focus on the effects of differing stellar feedback models (Scannapieco *et al.* 2012; Kim *et al.* 2014). But, differences between varied gas thermodynamic prescriptions in simulations is relatively understudied. Previous work has explored the effect of varying the assumed initial temperature and density profiles of halo gas in semi-analytic models (SAMs), which changes how the gas subsequently cools (e.g. Monaco *et al.* 2014; Hou *et al.* 2018, 2019). However, each of these works assumes a non-evolving cooling function which does not depend on the ionization state of particles in the gas.

Some hydrodynamic simulations now incorporate nonequilibrium chemistry, where the simulations calculate element abundances on-the-fly using a chemical network. We can also calculate gas cooling and heating rates from these non-equilibrium abundances. The assumption of gas photoionization equilibrium yields an alternate set of cooling and heating rates. Richings and Schaye (2016) compare isolated galaxy simulations run with gas cooling calculated from non-equilibrium against those run with equilibrium chemical abundances. Capelo et al. (2018) perform a similar comparison, but with the nonequilibrium metal abundances only used to calculate cooling in cold $(T < 10^4 \text{ K})$ gas. Both works find that non-equilibrium cooling has little effect on the overall star formation rate of the galaxy, but can change the overall amount of molecular gas.

In this paper, we consider the isolated galaxy simulations of an NGC300 analog presented in Semenov *et al.* (2021). These simulations were originally used to study the spatial decorrelation between dense molecular gas and sites of recent star formation, and include subgrid models for gas turbulence and turbulence-regulated variable star formation efficiency. We use these simulations to compare two different prescriptions for approximating cooling and heating functions: the interpolation table approach from Gnedin and Hollon (2012) and the machine learning approximation from Robinson *et al.* (2024), which yields more accurate cooling and heating function approximations at fixed metallicity.

Since the only differences between the two simulation runs are in the gas cooling and heating functions, we focus on the comparison between the resulting temperature-density phase diagrams of the simulated gas. These phase diagrams describe the gas fraction in various phases of the ISM and CGM. We also compare C II emission between each simulation run. The luminosity in various ionic emission lines depend on the thermal state (i.e. temperature and density) of the gas. The $157.7\,\mu\mathrm{m}$ fine-structure line emitted by ionized carbon (C II) is a particularly important case. This line is often used to trace molecular, star-forming gas in galaxies (e.g. Zhao et al. 2024; Casavecchia et al. 2024). The C II fine-structure line is also a candidate for line-intensity mapping (LIM) surveys mapping the 3-D structure of the universe. LIM surveys could probe C II emission across a wide range of redshifts $3 \leq z \leq 9$, stretching back into the Epoch of Reionization (Kovetz *et al.* 2017).

We explain our methodology, including the simulation code and how we analyze simulated snapshots, in Section 2. We compare gas phase diagrams and C II emission rates from our two simulation runs in Section 3, and present conclusions and further discussion in Section 4.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Simulations

In this work, we use the isolated galaxy simulation of Semenov *et al.* (2021). This simulation is run using Adaptive Refinement Tree (ART), a Eulerian adaptive mesh refinement hydrodynamics code (Kravtsov 1999;

Kravtsov et al. 2002; Rudd et al. 2008).

The specific simulation we use includes a sub-grid prescription for turbulence and a star formation efficiency that depends on the velocity dispersion (including both turbulent and thermal components) through the local virial parameter (Padoan *et al.* 2012; Semenov *et al.* 2016, 2021). Different versions of the isolated galaxy simulation incorporate a constant value for star formation efficiency below a maximum virial parameter (or above a minimum density), different contributions to feedback (type II supernovae and/or pre-supernova stellar winds), and iterations with and without radiative transfer (Semenov *et al.* 2021).

The metallicity-dependent atomic gas cooling and heating functions in the simulation are evaluated using the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012), which interpolates between exact cooling and heating rates evaluated with the photoionization code Cloudy (Ferland *et al.* 1998). This approximation depends on the temperature T, baryon number density n_b , and metallicity Z of the gas, and on rates calculated from the local radiation field: P_{LW} (the photodissociation rate of molecular hydrogen), and the photoionization rates P_{HI} , P_{HeI} , and P_{LW} , in units of [s⁻¹] (Gnedin and Hollon 2012).

The thermal energy density U of the gas evolves due to radiative processes as:

$$\left. \frac{dU}{dt} \right|_{\rm rad} = n_b^2 \left[\Gamma - \Lambda \right],\tag{1}$$

where Γ is the heating function and Λ is the cooling function. Note that the cooling and heating functions also include additional contributions from non-atomic components of the gas such as molecules that are not included in the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012), as they depend on additional properties of the gas. Examples include heating from the photodissociation of molecular hydrogen, and cooling from vibrational and rotational transitions in molecular hydrogen, which both depend on the molecular gas fraction. These contributions are treated separately in the simulation (Gnedin and Kravtsov 2011), and are not varied in this paper.

The initial conditions of the fiducial simulation are chosen to approximate observed structural properties of the NGC300 galaxy from Westmeier *et al.* (2011). The dark matter particles are initialized with a Navarro-Frenk-White profile with mass $M_{200c} \approx 8.3 \times 10^{10} \,\mathrm{M_{\odot}}$ (defined as the mass contained in a sphere with average density equal to 200 times the critical density) and concentration $c_{200c} \approx 15.4$. The stellar and gas components are initialized as (independent) exponential scale disks. The stellar disk has mass $M = 10^9 M_{\odot}$, scale radius 1.39 kpc, and scale height 0.28 kpc. The gas disk has mass $2.29 \times 10^9 M_{\odot}$ and scale radius 3.44 kpc (the scale height is determined by the ISM pressure gradient). The minimum gas cell size reached in the simulation run is $\Delta = 10 \,\mathrm{pc}$. The fiducial simulation run includes radiative transfer, all feedback processes, and a star formation efficiency depending on the local virial parameter (Semenov et al. 2021).

As described in Section 2.2, we turn off radiative transfer and use constant photoionization rates. We also fix the gas metallicity. Following Semenov *et al.* (2021), we initialize our simulations with a snapshot from a

Parameter	Value
Radiative transfer	Off
$Q_{\rm LW}$	$2\times 10^{-11}{\rm s}^{-1}$
$Q_{\rm HI}$	$2\times 10^{-17}{\rm s}^{-1}$
$Q_{ m HeI}$	$3\times 10^{-16}{\rm s}^{-1}$
$Q_{ m CVI}$	$9\times 10^{-18}{\rm s}^{-1}$
Z	$0.3 Z_{\odot}$
Timestep	$1\mathrm{Myr}$

TABLE 1

IMPORTANT PARAMETERS FOR OUR SIMULATION RUNS

fiducial simulation run at $t \approx 600$ Myr. The fiducial simulation turns on various physical processes (such as radiative transfer, gas cooling, and star formation) in stages, allowing the galaxy to 'settle' after each stage. By $t \approx 600$ Myr, each relevant process has been incorporated (Semenov *et al.* 2021). After the initial snapshot, we save snapshots every $\Delta t = 1$ Myr.

Key parameters for our simulations are shown in Table 1. We run both simulations for the same duration in simulated cosmic time and find that the thermodynamic properties of the gas in the two simulations have sufficiently converged relative to each other after 5 Myr. This convergence is discussed in more detail in Appendix A.

2.2. Cooling and heating function models

The Semenov et al. (2021) simulations calculate metallicity-dependent atomic gas cooling and heating functions using the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012), which incorporates a local radiation field including contributions from a synthesized stellar spectrum, quasar-like power law, and absorption by neutral hydrogen and helium. Gnedin and Hollon (2012) constructed these tables by interpolating between exact calculations of cooling and heating function from the Cloudy photoionization code (Ferland *et al.* 1998). Robinson et al. (2024) trained machine learning models on the same Cloudy calculations, with the same gas properties and radiation field parameters as inputs. So, we can directly replace the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) interpolation table with machine learning models from Robinson et al. (2024) in the simulation code. The interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012) implements a quadratic interpolation in metallicity that can lead to occasional unphysical *negative* predicted cooling or heating functions. The machine learning models in of Robinson et al. (2024) are constructed to always predict positive cooling and heating functions.

Additionally, the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012) is known to make 'catastrophic errors' at some points in parameter space, due to interpolating a non-linear function on a grid of parameters with fixed spacing. To assess the impact of these catastrophic errors on the simulation, we replace the interpolation table with analogous machine learning models from Robinson *et al.* (2024), constructed using the gradient-boosted tree algorithm XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin 2016). We label the simulation run using the cooling and heating function interpolation table from Gnedin and Hollon (2012) as 'GH12' and the run using the analogous XGBoost models from Robinson *et al.* (2024) as 'XGB'.

More specifically, we use *fixed metallicity* cooling and

heating function models from Robinson et al. (2024) with input parameters that parallel the dimensions of the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) interpolation table: temperature T, hydrogen number density $n_{\rm H}$, and rates $Q_{\rm LW}$, $Q_{\rm HI}$, $Q_{\rm HeI}$, and $Q_{\rm CVI}$, where $Q_j = P_j/n_{\rm H}$. Separate models are trained to predict the cooling function and the heating function. Both the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012) and the machine learning models of Robinson et al. (2024) use quadratic interpolation in metallicity to make predictions at arbitrary metallicities, and Robinson et al. (2024) finds that this quadratic interpolation (with the 5 metallicity values present in the training data) is the main limitation to improving accuracy at intermediate metallicities. In order to avoid the complications of the metallicity interpolation, we fix the gas metallicity at $Z = 0.3 Z_{\odot}$ (this is one of the metallicites with exact Cloudy calculations used to train the machine learning models (Robinson et al. 2024)).

Since the inputs (gas temperature, gas density, and 4 photoionization rates) and outputs (cooling function and heating function) at fixed metallicity are the same, we can perform a one-to-one replacement of the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) interpolation table for the machine learning models of Robinson *et al.* (2024) in the simulation code. For this initial study, because the machine learning models of Robinson *et al.* (2024) are more computationally expensive than the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) interpolation table, we turn off radiative transfer in the ART code. So, the photoionization rates are spatially constant throughout the simulation box. For these rates, we use ISM averages computed from the fiducial simulation run in Semenov *et al.* (2021) with radiative transfer: $Q_{\rm LW} = 2 \times 10^{-11} \, {\rm s}^{-1}$, $Q_{\rm HI} = 2 \times 10^{-17} \, {\rm s}^{-1}$, $Q_{\rm HeI} = 3 \times 10^{-16} \, {\rm s}^{-1}$, and $Q_{\rm CVI} = 9 \times 10^{-18} \, {\rm s}^{-1}$.

The exact Cloudy calculations used to train both approximations we use are done on a grid of data points with gas temperature $10 \leq T/K \leq 10^9$ and hydrogen number density $10^{-6} \leq n_{\rm H}/{\rm cm}^{-3} \leq 10^6$ (Gnedin and Hollon 2012). We approximate the conversion between the number densities of hydrogen and baryons as:

$$n_b = \frac{1.4n_{\rm H}}{1 - 0.02(Z/\rm Z_{\odot})}.$$
 (2)

For $Z = 0.3 Z_{\odot}$, $n_b \approx 1.41 n_{\rm H}$. Outside of these ranges, both models are extrapolating from the Cloudy calculations. The table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012) performs a linear extrapolation from the nearest tabulated value. The machine learning approximations of Robinson *et al.* (2024) are piecewise constant, so will simply output the nearest tabulated value

To compare the approximations on the entire grid of Cloudy computations (which is used to train both models), we compute the mean squared error $\Delta = \langle (\log \mathcal{F}_{true} - \log \mathcal{F}_{pred})^2 \rangle$, where \mathcal{F} is either the cooling function or the heating function. Note that a fraction 2.98×10^{-4} of the grid points result in negative predicted cooling functions using the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) interpolation table. These points are removed from the mean squared error calculation. The mean squared errors for the approximations at $Z = 0.3Z_{\odot}$ are shown in Table 2, which shows that both models have small errors, but the machine learning models of Robinson *et al.* (2024) produce mean squared errors that are 2-3 orders of

	GH12	XGB
Cooling	1.69×10^{-3}	1.28×10^{-5}
Heating	2.19×10^{-2}	3.22×10^{-5}

TABLE 2

Mean squared errors of the cooling and heating function approximations used in our simulations on the training grid of Cloudy calculations at Gas metallicity $Z = 0.3 Z_{\odot}$. The mean squared errors for the XGBoost models from Robinson *et al.* (2024) are 2-3 orders of magnitude smaller than those for the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) INTERPOLATION TABLE.

magnitude smaller at this metallicity. More details about the performance comparison can be found in Robinson *et al.* (2024). However, this comparison is only on the data used to construct both models, so does not realistically predict their performance on new data. In the rest of the paper, we investigate the physical effect of these differences to assess how significant how they are in a simulated galaxy.

Note that, while we can directly replace calls of the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012) with evaluations of machine learning models from Robinson et al. (2024) in the ART code, this has a major computational cost. Evaluating each timestep of the Semenov et al. (2021) isolated galaxy simulation (see Section 2.1 for details) is nearly 20 times slower with the machine learning models. While it is possible that this slowdown could be reduced with careful optimization of the simulation run with machine learning models, a one-to-one replacement for simulations run over a longer timescale or a cosmological volume is simply not practical. For these applications, an interpolation table that can be evaluated quickly and an understanding of the effects of the errors made by this interpolation are crucial. But, it is much easier to incorporate additional photoionization rates as inputs in the machine learning framework of Robinson et al. (2024) (which includes models using as many as 22) photoionization rate features) than to add an additional dimension to an interpolation table.

2.3. CII luminosity

From the simulation data, we can compute quantities that depend on the density and temperature of the gas. As a representative example, here we consider C II emission. When collisionally excited, C II ions can emit a 157.7 μ m photon. Setting this photon energy equal to kT yields a temperature of 91.2 K (Draine 2011).

To compare the two simulation runs, we compute the ratio of CII emission due to various excitation channels, j:

$$r_j = \frac{\int f_{\text{XGB}}(n_b, T) R_j(T) \, dT}{\int f_{\text{GH12}}(n_b, T) R_j(T) \, dT}.$$
(3)

where $f(n_b, T)$ is the density-temperature distribution function (the phase diagram, normalized by the total gas mass) and $R_j(T)$ is a temperature-dependent rate factor that encodes the likelihood of a collision inducing the emission of a 157.7 μ m photon, with units [erg cm³ s⁻¹]. The excitation channels *j* include free electrons, elemental hydrogen and helium, molecular hydrogen H₂, and CMB photons (Draine 2011). Note that the only difference between the numerator and denominator of Equation (3) is the simulation run used to determine the distribution function, while $R_j(T)$ remains the same.

Since $R_j(T)$ appears inside a temperature integral in both in the numerator and denominator of Equation (3), we only need the temperature dependence of $R_j(T)$ and can neglect multiplicative constants. For $j = H_2$ (i.e. for collisions with molecular hydrogen), we separate the two spins of molecular hydrogen, and have (Draine 2011):

$$R_{\rm H_2\,para}(T) \propto \left(\frac{T}{100\,\rm K}\right)^{0.124-0.018\ln\left(T/(100\,\rm K)\right)},$$
 (4)

and

$$R_{\rm H_2 \, ortho}(T) \propto \left(\frac{T}{100 \,\rm K}\right)^{0.095 + 0.023 \,\ln\left(T/(100 \,\rm K)\right)}$$
. (5)

For collisions with atomic hydrogen, we use: (Barinovs *et al.* 2005)

$$R_{\rm H}(T) \propto e^{-91.2 \,{\rm K}/T} \left(16 + 0.344 \sqrt{\frac{T}{1 \,{\rm K}}} - \frac{47.7 \,{\rm K}}{T} \right).$$
 (6)

The rate for helium $R_{\text{He}}(T) = 0.38R_{\text{H}}(T)$ (Draine 2011),

and so has identical dependence on the gas temperature. Collisions with free electrons result in the rate:(Tayal 2009; Draine 2011)

$$R_e(T) \propto e^{-91.2 \,\mathrm{K/T}} \sqrt{\frac{1 \,\mathrm{K}}{T}}.$$
(7)

Finally, C II emission can be excited by CMB photons at a rate which depends on the CMB temperature T_{CMB} (Draine 2011):

$$R_{\rm CMB}(T) \propto e^{-91.2 \,{\rm K}/T_{\rm CMB}}.$$
(8)

Since the CMB temperature is independent of the local gas temperature, $R_{\text{CMB}}(T) = \text{const.}$

3. RESULTS

Here, we present results comparing our two simulation runs, using the cooling and heating function interpolation table from Gnedin and Hollon (2012, labelled 'GH12') and the analogous XGBoost models from Robinson *et al.* (2024, labelled 'XGB'). We show results from our final snapshot, 5 Myr after our starting snapshot. This is sufficiently long for the new steadystate temperature-density distribution to settle (see Appendix A).

3.1. Phase diagrams and residuals

We begin by calculating residuals between the temperature-density phase diagrams of gas in each simulation. Without radiative transfer, simulation snapshots include the gas mass density ρ , thermal energy density $u_{\rm th}$, and molecular weight μ . From these, we calculate the baryon number density n_b and temperature T as follows

$$n_b = \frac{\rho}{m_p},\tag{9}$$

$$T = \frac{2}{3} \frac{\mu}{kn_b} u_{\rm th},\tag{10}$$

where m_p is the mass of a proton and k is Boltzmann's constant.



FIG. 1.— Upper panel: Median (curves), 25th-75th percentile (darker bands), and 10th-90th percentile (lighter bands) temperatures as a function of gas density bin for GH12 (blue, solid curve) and XGB (orange, dashed curve) runs. Bottom panel: ratio of median temperature for the XGB run to the GH12 run as a function of density bin.

We select 175 logarithmically spaced bins in temperature with $10 < T/\text{K} < 10^8$ and 200 logarithmically spaced bins in baryon number density with $10^{-7} < n_b/\text{cm}^{-3} < 10^3$ to include nearly all of the gas in the simulation box.

In each density bin, we calculate the median gas temperature, as well as the 10th, 25th, 75th, and 90th percentiles to show the spread. These temperature quantiles are shown for both simulation runs as a function of gas density in the upper panel of Fig. 1. The ratio of the median temperatures for the two runs is shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 1. The distributions are generally similar, but the temperature for the XGB run is systematically higher for low gas densities $-3 \lesssim \log (n_b/\mathrm{cm}^{-3}) \lesssim -1$. The bottom panel of Fig. 1 shows that the median temperature for the XGB run is generally *lower* than for the GH12 run at higher gas densities $-1 \leq \log (n_b/\mathrm{cm}^{-3}) \leq 1$. However, at these densities, the 25th-75th percentile spread is larger than the difference between median temperatures, so the two simulations do not have systematically different temperatures here.

To further examine the difference in gas thermodynamics between the two simulations, we evaluate the residual in each temperature-density bin:

$$\Delta = \frac{m_{\rm GH12} - m_{\rm XGB}}{m_{\rm GH12} + m_{\rm XGB}},\tag{11}$$

where m_j is the gas mass in a temperature-density bin for simulation j. The sign of the residual Δ indicates which simulation run has a higher gas mass in a given bin. These residuals are shown for our final snapshot in Fig. 2.

Fig. 2 shows that there is a 'critical curve' where $\Delta = 0$, indicating that the two simulation runs have identical gas mass in the bins along this curve. The critical curve runs from temperatures of $T \sim 10^4$ K at a density of



FIG. 2.— Residual of gas mass between runs using the interpolation table of GH12 and XGBoost cooling and heating functions after 5 Myr. There is a 'critical curve' where the residual is equal to 0.

 $n_b \sim 10^{-4} \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ down to $T \sim 10 \,\mathrm{K}$ at $n_b \sim 10^2 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$, and has a non-trivial shape. Just above this curve, the GH12 run has higher gas masses ($\Delta > 0$), while just below it, the XGB run has higher gas masses ($\Delta < 0$). There is also a band at $T \sim 10^4 \,\mathrm{K}$ across several orders of magnitude in density where the XGB run has higher gas masses ($\Delta < 0$). This band and the residuals on either side of the critical curve are the most prominent structures in Fig. 2. At temperatures $T \gtrsim 10^4 \,\mathrm{K}$, there is noise with no clear structure in phase space.

To better understand the critical curve in Fig. 2, we examine the temperature dependence of cooling and heating functions at fixed density $n_b = 1 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$ calculated using the same approach as in the GH12 and XGB simulation runs. This is shown in Fig. 3. Note that the gas reaches thermal equilibrium at a temperature T_{equib} when $\Gamma(T_{\mathrm{equib}}) = \Lambda(T_{\mathrm{equib}})$ (i.e., when the cooling and heating functions are equal) if no external work is done on it. Thus, the curves for a given model in Fig. 3 intersect at the equilibrium temperature for that model.

Fig. 3 shows that XGBoost predicts a lower equilibrium temperature $T_{\rm eq}$ than does GH12 for $\log(n_b/{\rm cm}^{-3}) = 0$. At some value between the two predicted equilibrium temperatures, the two simulation runs will have equal gas masses (the values are consistent with the 'critical curve' in Fig. 2). Just below this critical temperature, $\Gamma > \Lambda$ for GH12, so the gas in the GH12 simulation heats up and gets above the critical temperature. For the XGB simulation, $\Lambda > \Gamma$, so the gas can cool down to its equilibrium temperature. So, the XGBoost simulation should have higher gas mass just below the critical curve, as we see in Fig. 2. A similar argument predicts that the GH12 simulation should have higher gas mass just above the critical curve.

3.2. Effects on CII Luminosity

In addition to seeing differences in the temperaturedensity phase diagram of simulated gas in Section 3.1, we would also like to understand how these differences affect observable properties of the gas. To investigate this, we plot the ratio r_j defined in Equation (3) versus n_b in the upper panel of Figure 4 for the various processes contributing to the C II emission described in Section 2.3.



FIG. 3.— Predicted cooling (blue curves) and heating functions (red curves) for the GH12 interpolation table (Gnedin and Hollon 2012, solid curves) and XGBoost machine learning models (Robinson *et al.* 2024, dashed curves) at $n_b = 1 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$. The cooling and heating curves for a given model intersect at the equilibrium temperature.

In the lower panel, we show the overall density profile for the GH12 simulation run (the profile for the XGB run is nearly identical) to compare the size of the difference in C II emission with where most of the gas lies in phase space.

As shown in Figure 4, the density profile is nearly flat between $-4 \leq \log(n_b/\mathrm{cm}^{-3}) \leq 2$, and sharply decreases for $\log(n_b/\mathrm{cm}^{-3}) \gtrsim 2$. The ratios r_j are always of order 1 for all C II emission processes. The largest values $r_i \approx$ 1.4 are reached for collisions with electrons and atomic hydrogen or helium at densities $\log(n_b/\mathrm{cm}^{-3}) \approx 2$, where the gas mass has already begun to decrease from its value at lower densities. At the lower densities where the gas mass is at is plateau for both simulation runs, r_i differs noticeably from 1 for collisions with electrons (as low as 0.9 and as large as 1.2), ortho H₂ (as low as 0.95 and as large as 1.05), and atomic hydrogen and helium (as low as 0.9). At a density of $n_b \sim 10^2 \,\mathrm{cm}^{-3}$, all processes shown have $r_j \gtrsim 1$. So, we would expect the actual C II luminosity to be different between XGB and GH12 runs for gas at these densities (and, in particular, for the XGB gas to have a higher C II luminosity). At other densities, some processes have $r_j \gtrsim 1$ while others have $r_j \lesssim 1$, so it is not clear whether the two simulations would have systematically different C II luminosities.

4. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

In this paper, we implement the machine learning approximation scheme for radiation-field-dependent cooling and heating functions (at a fixed metallicity) of (Robinson *et al.* 2024) into the ART hydrodynamic simulation code, as an alternative to the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012). We compare runs of an isolated galaxy simulation of an NGC300 analog using the two different approximations, without radiative transfer and at fixed gas metallicity. We start the simulations from a fiducial simulation snapshot after the galaxy has 'settled' once all relevant physical processes have been added to the simulation. We compare the gas thermodynamics in the two simulations after 5 Myr using their temperature-density phase diagrams. Our main conclu-



FIG. 4.— The C II emission ratio r_j , as defined in Equation (3) as a function of baryon number density n_b (upper panel) exicted by interactions with electrons (solid blue), atomic hydrogen or helium (dashed orange), CMB photons (dash-dotted green), and molecular hydrogen with para (dashed red) and ortho (solid purple) spins. For comparison, the bottom panel shows the overall baryon number density profile for the GH12 simulation run (solid brown). sions are:

- The gas in the XGB simulation is systematically hotter for low-density gas with $-3 \lesssim \log (n_b/\mathrm{cm}^{-3}) \lesssim -1$ (see Fig. 1).
- There is a 'critical curve' where the two simulation runs have identical gas masses. The largest differences in simulated gas mass occur at temperatures just above and below this critical curve (see Fig. 2).
- At a given density, the critical curve lies at a temperature between the equilibrium temperatures corresponding to the predicted GH12 and XGB cooling and heating functions at that density (see Fig. 3)
- The differences in gas thermodynamics result in small, but not necessarily negligible (10-20%) differences in the integrated C II rate for some emission processes (see Fig. 4).

The net cooling function (the cooling function minus the heating function) determines the temperature of a gas cloud. The thermal properties of the gas are one of the factors that determine its velocity dispersion. In

the simulations that we use, the local star formation efficiency is calculated using the local velocity dispersion (Semenov et al. 2016, 2021). So, the differences between the thermal properties of the gas in the two simulations can propagate to differences in the local star formation rate and stellar feedback. To explore these effects in a more realistic setting, we would need simulations including radiative transfer and varying metallicity, over a long enough timescale to look for effects on the star formation history of the galaxy. With radiative transfer, it would also be possible to directly compute C II luminosities for the two simulated galaxies. Here, we take a step towards this goal by investigating the simplified case of gas thermodynamics in a 'settled' isolated galaxy simulation with spatially constant metallicity and photoionization rates. This case is interesting because it allows us to explore the direct impact of changes in the gas cooling and heating functions. In a more realistic simulation, this would be difficult to disentangle from the effects of other processes that depend on gas thermodynamics (such as star formation and feedback). Even in this simplified case, we see differences in the gas thermodynamics and C II emission efficiencies for several emission processes.

In a more realistic case with varying gas metallicity across the simulated galaxy, we would expect the difference between the XGB and GH12 runs to be smaller than seen here. This is because the difference in performance between the two approximations is smaller across a sample of points with arbitrary metallicity (Robinson et al. 2024). However, future machine learning cooling and heating approximations (with access to more training data in metallicity) will likely be able to improve the performance at arbitrary metallicity.

As described in Section 2.2, the direct implementation of the Robinson et al. (2024) XGBoost models we used in the simulation code resulted in timesteps that were an order of magnitude slower than for simulation using the interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012). So, utilizing the Robinson et al. (2024) models in simulations of more massive galaxies or cosmological volumes is computationally infeasible. However, the machine learning approach of Robinson et al. (2024) much more easily accommodates additional radiation field dimensions. Adding an additional input to an interpolation table of Gnedin and Hollon (2012) would require increasing the dimension of the table by one, increasing the size of the table that must be stored in memory. Every node of the regression trees used in XGBoost models only considers the value of one input feature (Chen and Guestrin 2016). The tree depth and number of trees used in the trained models of Robinson *et al.* (2024) do not increase with the number of inputs. This makes it feasible to train models with large numbers of photoionization rate features. So, in cases where more features describing the radiation field are needed, machine learning models could be less computationally expensive than an interpolation table. The machine learning setup of Robinson et al. (2024) also allows for the calculation of 'feature importance' values describing how much each input affects model predictions. Robinson *et al.* (2024) uses these feature importances to construct additional machine learning models using different sets of 4 photoionization rates than the set used by the Gnedin and Hollon (2012) interpolation table. This approach can inform the identification of new sets of radiation field properties for constructing new, more accurate cooling and heating function interpolation tables in various regimes.

With these computational constraints, we only considered an isolated galaxy simulation in this paper. However, the effects of different cooling and heating function models could depend on galaxy mass, galaxy environment, and redshift. To explore these effects, future work could extend the comparison of simulations with different cooling and heating function models to both a suite of multiple isolated galaxies, and a cosmological volume.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Raziq Noorali for his assistance calculating C II emission rates due to various processes from simulation data.

DR and CA acknowledge support from the Leinweber Foundation. CA acknowledges support from DOE grant DE-SC009193. This manuscript has been co-authored by Fermi Research Alliance, LLC under Contract No. DE-AC02-07CH11359 with the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics. Support for VS was provided by Harvard University through the Institute for Theory and Computation Fellowship. This research was also supported in part through computational resources and services provided by Advanced Research Computing (ARC), a division of Information and Technology Services (ITS) at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, in particular the Great Lakes cluster and the U-M Research Computing Package.

This work utilizes several Python packages, including XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin 2016), yt (Turk et al. 2011), and numpy (Harris et al. 2020). The code used to analyze the simulation data and produce the plots can be found at https://github.com/davidbrobins/ ngc300_analysis.

REFERENCES

- J. Spitzer, Lyman, ApJ **124**, 20 (1956).
- H. I. Ewen and E. M. Purcell, Nature 168, 356 (1951).
- R. M. Hjellming, C. P. Gordon, and K. J. Gordon, A&A 2, 202 (1969).
- A. C. Cheung, D. M. Rank, C. H. Townes, D. D. Thornton, and W. J. Welch, Phys. Rev. Lett. 21, 1701 (1968).
- C. F. McKee and J. P. Ostriker, ApJ 218, 148 (1977).
- C. Dobbs, Frontiers in Astronomy and Space Sciences 10, 1272771 (2023), arXiv:2312.01854 [astro-ph.GA].
- P. Hennebelle and M. Y. Grudić, arXiv e-prints,
- arXiv:2404.07301 (2024), arXiv:2404.07301 [astro-ph.GA].
- J.-G. Kim, M. Gong, C.-G. Kim, and E. C. Ostriker, ApJS 264, 10 (2023), arXiv:2210.08024 [astro-ph.GA].
- C. Scannapieco, M. Wadepuhl, O. H. Parry, J. F. Navarro,
- A. Jenkins, V. Springel, R. Teyssier, E. Carlson, H. M. P. Couchman, R. A. Crain, C. Dalla Vecchia, C. S. Frenk,
- C. Kobayashi, P. Monaco, G. Murante, T. Okamoto, T. Quinn, J. Schaye, G. S. Stinson, T. Theuns, J. Wadsley, S. D. M. White, and R. Woods, MNRAS **423**, 1726 (2012),
- arXiv:1112.0315 [astro-ph.GA].

- J.-h. Kim, T. Abel, O. Agertz, G. L. Bryan, D. Ceverino, C. Christensen, C. Conroy, A. Dekel, N. Y. Gnedin, N. J. Goldbaum, J. Guedes, O. Hahn, A. Hobbs, P. F. Hopkins, C. B. Hummels, F. Iannuzzi, D. Keres, A. Klypin, A. V. Kravtsov, M. R. Krumholz, M. Kuhlen, S. N. Leitner, P. Madau, L. Mayer, C. E. Moody, K. Nagamine, M. L
 - Norman, J. Onorbe, B. W. O'Shea, A. Pillepich, J. R. Primack, T. Quinn, J. I. Read, B. E. Robertson, M. Rocha, D. H. Rudd,
 - S. Shen, B. D. Smith, A. S. Szalay, R. Teyssier, R. Thompson,
 - K. Todoroki, M. J. Turk, J. W. Wadsley, J. H. Wise,
 - A. Zolotov, and t. AGORA Collaboration29, ApJS 210, 14 (2014), arXiv:1308.2669 [astro-ph.GA]
- P. Monaco, A. J. Benson, G. De Lucia, F. Fontanot, S. Borgani, and M. Boylan-Kolchin, MNRAS 441, 2058 (2014), arXiv:1404.0811 [astro-ph.CO].
- J. Hou, C. G. Lacey, and C. S. Frenk, MNRAS 475, 543 (2018), arXiv:1708.02950 [astro-ph.GA].
- J. Hou, C. G. Lacey, and C. S. Frenk, MNRAS 486, 1691 (2019), arXiv:1803.01923 [astro-ph.GA].
- A. J. Richings and J. Schaye, MNRAS 458, 270 (2016), arXiv:1506.08829 [astro-ph.GA].
- P. R. Capelo, S. Bovino, A. Lupi, D. R. G. Schleicher, and T. Grassi, MNRAS 475, 3283 (2018), arXiv:1710.01302 [astro-ph.GA].
- V. A. Semenov, A. V. Kravtsov, and N. Y. Gnedin, ApJ 918, 13 (2021), arXiv:2103.13406 [astro-ph.GA]
- N. Y. Gnedin and N. Hollon, ApJS 202, 13 (2012), arXiv:1201.5116 [astro-ph.CO]
- D. Robinson, C. Avestruz, and N. Y. Gnedin, MNRAS 528, 255 (2024), arXiv:2310.09328 [astro-ph.CO]
- Y. Zhao, J. Liu, Z.-Y. Zhang, and T. G. Bisbas, arXiv e-prints, arXiv:2410.20684 (2024), arXiv:2410.20684 [astro-ph.GA]. B. Casavecchia, U. Maio, C. Péroux, and B. Ciardi, arXiv
- e-prints, arXiv:2410.14284 (2024), arXiv:2410.14284 [astro-ph.GA].
- E. D. Kovetz, M. P. Viero, A. Lidz, L. Newburgh, M. Rahman, E. Switzer, M. Kamionkowski, J. Aguirre, M. Alvarez, J. Bock, J. R. Bond, G. Bower, C. M. Bradford, P. C. Breysse, P. Bull,
 - T.-C. Chang, Y.-T. Cheng, D. Chung, K. Cleary, A. Corray, A. Crites, R. Croft, O. Doré, M. Eastwood, A. Ferrara,

 - J. Fonseca, D. Jacobs, G. K. Keating, G. Lagache, G. Lakhlani,
 - A. Liu, K. Moodley, N. Murray, A. Pénin, G. Popping,
 - A. Pullen, D. Reichers, S. Saito, B. Saliwanchik, M. Santos,
 - R. Somerville, G. Stacey, G. Stein, F. Villaescusa-Navarro,
 - E. Visbal, A. Weltman, L. Wolz, and M. Zemcov, arXiv
 - e-prints , arXiv:1709.09066 (2017), arXiv:1709.09066 [astro-ph.CO].

- A. V. Kravtsov, High-resolution simulations of structure formation in the universe, Ph.D. thesis, New Mexico State University (1999).
- A. V. Kravtsov, A. Klypin, and Y. Hoffman, ApJ 571, 563 (2002), arXiv:astro-ph/0109077 [astro-ph].
- D. H. Rudd, A. R. Zentner, and A. V. Kravtsov, ApJ 672, 19 (2008), arXiv:astro-ph/0703741 [astro-ph].
- P. Padoan, T. Haugbølle, and Å. Nordlund, ApJ 759, L27 (2012), arXiv:1208.3758 [astro-ph.GA]
- V. A. Semenov, A. V. Kravtsov, and N. Y. Gnedin, ApJ 826, 200 (2016), arXiv:1512.03101 [astro-ph.GA]
- G. J. Ferland, K. T. Korista, D. A. Verner, J. W. Ferguson, J. B. Kingdon, and E. M. Verner, PASP **110**, 761 (1998).
- N. Y. Gnedin and A. V. Kravtsov, ApJ 728, 88 (2011), arXiv:1004.0003 [astro-ph.CO].
- T. Westmeier, R. Braun, and B. S. Koribalski, MNRAS 410, 2217 (2011), arXiv:1009.0317 [astro-ph.CO].
- T. Chen and C. Guestrin, Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (2016).
- B. T. Draine, Physics of the Interstellar and Intergalactic Medium (Princeton University Press, 2011).
- Ğ. Barinovs, M. C. van Hemert, R. Krems, and A. Dalgarno, ApJ 620, 537 (2005)
- S. S. Tayal, A&A 501, 381 (2009).
- M. J. Turk, B. D. Smith, J. S. Oishi, S. Skory, S. W. Skillman, T. Abel, and M. L. Norman, ApJS **192**, 9 (2011), arXiv:1011.3514 [astro-ph.IM].
- C. R. Harris, K. J. Millman, S. J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau, E. Wieser, J. Taylor, S. Berg, N. J. Smith, R. Kern, M. Picus, S. Hoyer, M. H. van Kerkwijk, M. Brett, A. Haldane, J. F. del Río, M. Wiebe, P. Peterson, P. Gérard-Marchant, K. Sheppard, T. Reddy, W. Weckesser, H. Abbasi, C. Gohlke, and T. E. Oliphant, Nature 585, 357 (2020), arXiv:2006.10256 [cs.MS]

APPENDIX

CONVERGENCE OF THE GAS PHASE DIAGRAM

As discussed in Section 2.1, we start our simulation runs from fiducial snapshots after the simulated galaxy has settled. So, we need only be concerned with the convergence of the gas thermodynamics due to the different cooling and heating function models. To assess this, we compute a residual between Δ (see Equation 11) across two snapshots a and b (note that the two simulation runs have snapshots at identical times):

$$\delta_{a,b} = \frac{\Delta_b - \Delta_a}{|\Delta_a + \Delta_b|}.\tag{A1}$$

Since the residuals at the two timesteps Δ_a and Δ_b can be positive or negative (see Fig. 2), the absolute value in the denominator is crucial to ensure that $-1 \leq \delta_{a,b} \leq 1$. For convergence, the phase space map of $\delta_{a,b}$ should have no structure. That is, the value of $\delta_{a,b}$ in nearby bins should be as uncorrelated as possible.

To demonstrate the convergence of gas thermodynamics by 5 Myr, we show $\delta_{1 Myr, 2 Myr}$ at left and $\delta_{4 Myr, 5 Myr}$ at right in Fig. 5. Going from 1 to 2 Myr in the left panel of Fig. 5, clear structure can be seen in vertical stripes between $-6 \leq \log(n_b/\text{cm}^{-3}) \leq -4$ and $4 \leq \log(T/\text{K}) \leq 6$, as well as a similar structure to the critical curve seen in Fig. 2. By the timestep from 4 to 5 Myr in the right panel of Fig. 5, the vertical stripes are no longer visible, and the critical curve structure is both much thinner and peaks at lower values of $|\delta|$. The remaining regions in Fig. 5 show noise with no clear phase space structure. So, we can say that the gas thermodynamics of our simulation runs have sufficiently converged after 5 Myr, and all of the analysis in Section 3 use the final 5 Myr timestep.

This paper was built using the Open Journal of Astrophysics LATEX template. The OJA is a journal which provides fast and easy peer review for new papers in the astro-ph section of the arXiv, making the reviewing process simpler for authors and referees alike. Learn more at http://astro.theoj.org.



FIG. 5.— Residual between residuals $\delta_{1 \text{ Myr}, 2 \text{ Myr}}$ (left, see Equation (A1)) and $\delta_{4 \text{ Myr}, 5 \text{ Myr}}$ (right).